

**An-Najah National University
Faculty of Graduate Studies**

**The Interplay among Variables in Consecutive
Interpreting and their Effects upon
Human Interactions**

**By
Tahseen Mohammed Hasan Khamis Dawud**

**Supervised by
Dr. Odeh Odeh
Dr. Ayman Nazzal**

**This Thesis is Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements of
the Master Degree in Applied Linguistics and Translation, Faculty of
Graduate Studies, An-Najah National University, Nablus, Palestine.**

2017

**The Interplay among Variables in Consecutive
Interpreting and their Effects upon
Human Interactions**

**By
Tahseen Mohammed Hasan Khamis Dawud**

This Thesis was defended successfully on 20/2/2017 and approved by:

Defence Committee Members

Signature

- | | |
|---|-------|
| 1. Dr. Odeh Odeh / Supervisor | |
| 2. Dr. Ayman Nazzal / Co- Supervisor | |
| 3. Dr. Mohammed Thwabteh / External Examiner | |
| 4. Dr. Ruqaya Herzallah / Internal Examiner | |

Dedication

I dedicate this thesis first and foremost to Allah, the most gracious, the most merciful, for enlightening my way and giving me the will and patience through the final steps in this work, and to the prophet Mohammed, peace and blessings of Allah be upon him.

I also dedicate this thesis to the souls of my father and mother, may Allah have mercy on them, who would have been fascinated to see this work come to life.

This thesis is also dedicated to the dearest people in my life, my faithful aunt, the source of continuous love and emotional support; my dear wife; my son Hasan; my daughters Izyia, Elissa and my little angel Lamis, who were a source of inspiration and offered me true love when I needed it the most.

I also dedicate this work to my brothers and sisters, nieces, nephews, and above all, to all my cousins, and finally, to all those who taught me even a letter.

Acknowledgements

First of all, my heartfelt gratitude goes to my greatest supervisors, Dr. Odeh Odeh and Dr. Ayman Nazal, who from the very beginning expressed their keen interest in the project, and continued to encourage me through their invaluable insights, constant advice, perceptive comments and criticism. Actually, I cannot find words to express my special thanks to my main supervisor, Dr. Odeh Odeh, for his inspiring words, patience and support. Indeed, without his indispensable guidance, this thesis would not have been accomplished.

I would like also to register my deep gratitude to the contributions of all participants, who devoted their precious time for answering the questionnaire, or with whom I conducted an interview. Special thanks and sincere gratitude go to my friends and colleagues for their encouragement and support, and finally, I feel grateful to whoever offered me assistance and helped bring this thesis to light.

إقرار

أنا الموقع أدناه مقدم الرسالة التي تحمل العنوان: **التفاعل بين متغيرات الترجمة المتتالية وأثره على التواصل الإنساني**

The Interplay among Variables in Consecutive Interpreting and their Effects upon Human Interactions

أقر بأن ما اشتملت عليه هذه الرسالة إنما هي نتاج جهدي الخاص، باستثناء ما تمت الإشارة إليه حيثما ورد، وأن هذه الرسالة ككل، أو أي جزء منها لم يقدم من قبل لنيل أية درجة علمية أو بحث علمي أو بحثي لدى أية مؤسسة تعليمية أو بحثية أخرى.

Declaration

The work provided in this thesis, unless otherwise referenced, is the researcher's own work, and has not been submitted elsewhere for any other degree or qualification.

Student's name:

اسم الطالب:

Signature:

التوقيع:

Date:

التاريخ:

Table of Contents

No.	Subject	Page
	Thesis Tittle	II
	Dedication	III
	Acknowledgements	IV
	Declaration	V
	Table of Contents	VI
	List of Tables	IX
	Abbreviations	X
	Abstract	XI
	Definitions of Key Terms	XIII
Chapter One: Introduction		
1.1	Introduction	1
1.2	Statement of the Problem	5
1.3	Purpose of the Study	6
1.4	Significance of the Study	7
1.5	Research Questions	7
1.6	Hypothesis	8
1.7	Limitations of the Study	8
1.8	Design of the Study	10
1.9	Theoretical and Conceptual Framework	11
Chapter Two: Review of Related Literature		
2.1	Introduction	17
2.2	A brief History of Interpreting	17
2.3	Types of Interpreting Activities	19
2.4	The Similarities and the Differences between Translating and Interpreting	20
2.5	The Differences between Simultaneous and Consecutive Interpreting	23
2.6	Consecutive Interpreting	26
2.7	Studies Related to the Interpreting Process in General and Consecutive Interpreting in Particular	29
Chapter Three: Methodology		
3.1	Introduction	42
3.2	Naturalistic (Observational) Studies	42
3.3	Other Types of Empirical Research Used	44
3.4	The Process and Causal Models	45
3.5	The Use of both the Qualitative and the Quantitative Methods	46

3.6	Other Approaches Applicable to the Examining of Interpretation as an End-Product	47
Chapter Four: Data Analysis and Findings		
4.1	The Psychological Dimension of Consecutive Interpreting	50
4.1.1	Introduction	50
4.1.2	Types of Psychological Pressures	50
4.1.3	The Importance of the Psychological State of Interpreters	51
4.1.4	The Contributions of the Psycholinguistic Research	52
4.1.5	The Consequences of Surrendering to Psychological Pressures	55
4.1.6	The Psychological Symptoms of Interpreting	58
4.1.7	Does the Psychological State of Interpreters Work Alone?	60
4.1.8	The Skills Required to Balance the Psychological Pressures	62
4.1.9	A promising Approach to the Interpreting Process	67
4.1.10	The Association between Cognitive Overloads and Psychological Pressures	68
4.1.11	Interpreters' Strategies to Ease Psychological Pressures	69
4.2	The Social and Sociological Dimension of Consecutive Interpreting	71
4.2.1	Introduction	71
4.2.2	The Interpreting Process as a Social Phenomenon	71
4.2.3	The Interpreting Process as a Human Phenomenon	72
4.2.4	The Central Paradigm in the Investigation of the Interpreting Process	75
4.2.5	Relevant Notions in the Enquiry of the Interpreting Process	79
4.2.6	Community Interpreting	83
4.2.7	The Essence of Community Interpreting	84
4.2.8	The Complex Role of Community Interpreters	86
4.2.9	Courtroom Interpreting	90
4.2.10	Healthcare Interpreting	93
4.2.11	The Controversial Role of Consecutive Interpreters	96
4.3	The Pragmatic Dimension of Consecutive Interpreting	102
4.3.1	Introduction	102
4.3.2	The Differences between the Semantic and the Pragmatic Meaning	103

VIII

4.3.3	The Close Link between Pragmatics and other Interpreting Variables	104
4.3.4	Cross-Cultural Pragmatics	105
4.3.5	Speakers' Intentions with Respect to the Wider Notion of Context	106
4.3.6	The Intersect between Coherence and the Context of Occurrences	112
4.3.7	Basic Pragmatic Notions and their Applications during the Interpreting Process	114
4.4	The Political Dimension of Consecutive Interpreting	125
4.4.1	Introduction	125
4.4.2	The Characteristics of Political Speeches	126
4.4.3	Political Constraints in Face-to-Face Interactions	127
4.4.4	Ideologies, Hedges and Political Discourses	128
4.4.5	Consecutive Interpreters and Political Pressures	131
4.4.6	The Interpreting Process Amid Political Encounters	133
4.4.7	The Analysis of Samples of Consecutive Interpreters' Mediated Encounters	139
4.5	Questionnaire	145
4.5.1	Introduction	145
4.5.2	Study Design	145
4.5.3	Population & Sample of the Study	145
4.5.4	Instrumentation	146
4.5.5	Reliability of the Instrument	148
4.5.6	Validity of the Instrument	148
4.5.7	Statistical Analysis	148
4.5.8	Ethical Issues	148
4.5.9	Results and their Analysis	149
4.5.10	Discussion	161
4.5.11	Conclusion	164
Chapter Five: Conclusions and Recommendations		
5.1	Introduction	167
5.2	Conclusion	168
5.3	Anticipated Results	171
5.4	Recommendations for Further Studies	172
	References	173
	Appendixes: Appendix (1): Questionnaire	180
	Appendix (2): Interview (A)	183
	Appendix (3): Interview (B)	187
	The Analysis of the two Interviews	190
	الملخص باللغة العربية	ب

List of Tables

Table No	Title	Page
Table (1)	Distribution of the study sample according to types of interpreters	146
Table (2)	Distribution of the study sample according to experience	146
Table (3)	Alpha formula of instrument reliability	148
Table (4)	The extent of the intervention of interpreters' psychological state in the process	149
Table (5)	The intrusion of interpreters' emotions in the interpretive outcome	150
Table (6)	The existence of stress, anxiety and frustration during the interpreting process	150
Table (7)	The type of relations between interpreters and interlocutors	151
Table (8)	The interpreters commitment to faithfulness	151
Table (9)	The degree of sympathy with clients	152
Table (10)	Social/Cultural differences and the interpreting process	152
Table (11)	Remote languages and cultures and the interpreting process	153
Table (12)	Social determinants and the outcome of the interaction	153
Table (13)	The degree of mediation on the part of interpreters	154
Table (14)	Interpreters' views of their role	154
Table (15)	The extent of interpreters' intervention to explain certain messages	155
Table (16)	Interpreters' responsibilities in relaying every aspect of the interpretive encounter	155
Table (17)	The importance of the notion of context in interpreting utterances	156
Table (18)	Whether interpreters can manipulate messages while remaining faithful to their content	156
Table (19)	Interpreters preference for the semantic meaning of utterances at the expense of their pragmatic one	157
Table (20)	Whether interpreters can resort to alternative rendition of utterances at the expense of their intended meaning	158
Table (21)	The political atmosphere and the choice of certain interpreting techniques	158
Table (22)	Power relations and the outcome of the interpretive encounter	159
Table (23)	Softening interlocutors' utterances at times of political crises	159
Table (24)	The existence of constant interactions among variables of consecutive interpreting	160
Table (25)	The most important variable in consecutive interpreting	161

Abbreviations

SL	Source Language
TL	Target Language
ST	Source Text
TT	Target Text
LTM	Long Term Memory
STM	Short Term Memory
IT	Interpretive Theory Paradigm
CP	Cognitive Processing Paradigm
NL	Neurolinguistic Paradigm
TT	Target Text Paradigm
DI	Dialogic-Discourse Based Interaction
SI	Simultaneous Interpreting
CI	Consecutive Interpreting
EVS	Ear-Voice Span
DI	Dialogue Interpreting
AIIC	International Association of Conference Interpreters
DA	Discourse Analysis
CDA	Critical Discourse Analysis
ICE	Interpretive Communicative Event
PSI	Public Service Interpreting
FTA	Face-Threatening Act

The Interplay among Variables in Consecutive Interpreting and their Effects upon Human Interactions

By

Tahseen Mohammed Hasan Khamis Dawud

Supervised by

Dr. Odeh Odeh

Dr. Ayman Nazzal

Abstract

"Interpreters are linguistic acrobats constantly walking on a tightrope" (Roland, 1999:3). This is a succinct and an eloquent description of the interpreting process, emphasizing its delicacy and complexity at the same time. The interpreting process is a multi-faceted activity in which several variables interact and affect each other in extremely complex ways.

The prime emphasis of this thesis is on the interplay among the psychological, social, pragmatic and political dimensions of the multi-layered process of consecutive interpreting. Moreover, it aims at probing the different ways in which these variables interact, cooperate, collaborate, compete and, in certain cases, be in struggle with each other, for the purpose of dictating interpreters' verbal behaviors during the interpreting encounter.

First of all, the external and internal psychological constraints can exert tremendous pressures on consecutive interpreters' performance, particularly where the interpreters are in the midst of the action. These pressures, sometimes, compel interpreters to enter into some sort of internal struggle with their psyche to cope with the criteria of their own job, as to achieve an acceptable level of integrity and impartiality.

Secondly, and owing to the fact taken for granted and has a consensus endorsement among scholars of interpretation, that the interpretive communicative event does not take place in a social vacuum, but instead is surrounded and shaped by a multiple array of social determinants, such as class, status, ethnicity, power relations, which may

inevitably affect the performance of consecutive interpreters. Interpreters as human beings cannot isolate themselves from the influence emanating from their social environment, surrounding the reception and production of speech, especially its hierarchies and the power which pervades every aspect of its structure.

Closely related to the social and sociological dimension of the mediated interpretive encounter, is the controversial issue regarding the role of interpreters during face-to-face interactions, and the permissible degree of intervention on the part of interpreters as linguistic and cultural mediators. In carrying out their task, interpreters will recognize that there are cultural gaps and formidable social barriers among languages, and even between various classes within the same speech community, and the task of interpreters is to narrow these gaps.

Thirdly, the interpretation of any segment of speech is not only determined by the surface meaning of an utterance, but also, and probably, to a great extent, by the reality of the situation in which the interpreted encounter takes place. This will bring us directly to the domain of pragmatics, and how this unavoidable dimension will reshape the interpretive outcomes. At the end of the interpreting tunnel, it seems that, it is all pragmatics that must be taken into account. The importance of this variable emerges from the fact that it may not be included directly and explicitly in the messages delivered.

Finally, needles to indicate the influence of the political scene overshadowing and surrounding mediated encounters, including the balance of power, the identity of interlocutors, and the political atmosphere, whether it is tense or relaxed, and how all of these might affect interpreters' performances in recognizable and consistent ways.

Definitions of Key Terms

Variables: The aspects of reality that we are trying to connect, as a way of understanding them better, and they are called variables because they vary. They are not constantly present in the same way, nor do they necessarily occur in the same way among different groups.

Dimension: An aspect of a situation, problem.

Pragmatics: The study of speaker meaning as distinct from word or sentence meaning.

Code-switching: The alternating by bilinguals between their two languages in speech production.

Selective strategies: Goal-oriented process under intentional control.

Paralanguage: Vocal features that accompany speech and contribute to communication, but are not generally considered to be part of the language system, as vocal quality, loudness and tempo.

Somatic systems: Nearly the same as Paralanguage.

Kinesics: The interpretation of body motion communication, such as facial expressions and gestures, non-verbal behavior related to movement of any part of the body, or the body as a whole.

Textual function of language: Creating well-formed and appropriate text.

Ideational function of language: Language used to convey information, ideas or experience. It is a means of giving structure to our experience of inner feelings and emotions, as well as of the external world around us.

Interpersonal function of language: The function by which the speaker intrudes on the discourse, takes up a position and expresses his/her role in the speech exchange, which illustrates the personality type of language users.

Paradigm: A set of basic assumptions, values and standard methods shared by members of a specific research community.

Speech event: A type of communicative event in which speech is the main component (conference, meeting, summit, wedding, funerals, elections).

Psycholinguistics: The science of human language production, comprehension and acquisition.

Sociolinguistics: The study of the interaction between the language and the structure and functioning of society.

Context: Linguistic elements which occur immediately before or after a particular linguistic feature, and which may influence the particular form used, including the physical environment in which a word is used.

Communicative clues: Grammatical and lexical features which indicate the purposes for which utterances are used (e.g. the use of parallel structures or alliteration to convey irony).

Cross-cultural pragmatics: The study of culturally different ways of using language, and of different expectations among different members of linguistic communities regarding how meaning is negotiated.

Discourse: The use of language in speech or writing to relay attitudes and negotiate meaning in the light of such conceptual frameworks as ideology.

Ideology: A body of assumptions which reflect the beliefs and interests of an individual, a group of individuals or an institution.

Encyclopedic knowledge: Knowledge of the world, including linguistic competence.

Genre: A type of text, written or spoken, with particular characteristics established by convention.

Register: A speech variety used in a specific social situation.

Hermeneutics: A model which considers the act of translation in the wider context of human communication across barriers of language, culture, time and personality.

Illocutionary force: The communicative value assigned to an utterance or a sequence of utterances.

Informativity: The extent to which items of linguistic expression in a text are known/unknown, expected/unexpected.

Intentionality: The purpose for which utterances are used.

Intertextuality: The dependence of one text or part of text upon other previously encountered texts.

Micro-structure: Text structure in detail, including aspects of text, such as connectivity and cohesion.

Politeness: Showing awareness of another person's public self-image.

Relevance: In cognitive linguistics, the principle of relevance derives from the tendency on the part of communicators to expect maximal benefit for minimal effort, and to increase the effort only if more benefit is in store.

Schemata: Pre-existing knowledge structures based on experience with language use in given cultural settings, e.g. stories, descriptions.

Scripts: Sequences of events and actions and the way they relate to different situations viewed from a cross-cultural perspective (e.g. bargaining or protesting).

Hedges: Cautious notes expressed about how an utterance is to be taken, e.g., 'as far I know', used when giving some information.

Inference: The listener's use of additional knowledge to make sense of what is not explicit in an utterance.

Semantics: The study of how words literally connect to things, or more generally, the investigation of meaning as encoded in language.

Coherence: Conceptual connectedness within a text.

Cohesion: The various lexical and grammatical devices which ensure that elements of a text exhibit surface connectivity.

Skopos theory: A theory which holds that translation strategy is determined by the function of the translated text, which may not be the same as that of the source text.

Applied research: Is specifically used to make or recommend some good use of particular research results or conceptual analyses in meeting some social needs.

Applied linguistics: Is concerned with practical applications of language studies, i.e., the study of language as it affects situations in real life, for example, language teaching, translation, and speech therapy.

Short-term memory (STM): Closely related to "working" memory and it is the very short time that you keep something in mind before either dismissing it or transferring it to long-term memory.

Long-term memory (LTM): Is our brain's system for permanently storing, managing, and retrieving information over a long period of time for later use.

Frames: Global patterns that contain commonsense knowledge about some central concepts.

Chapter One : Introduction

1.1 Introduction

This section briefly describes the structure of this thesis, which consists of five chapters handling the most significant variables of consecutive interpreting. The analysis of the psychological, social, pragmatic and political dimensions is not the ultimate aim of this study, but rather, and more importantly, their ramifications upon consecutive interpreters' performance during any face-to-face communicative encounter, between participants who do not speak the same language and wish to communicate properly.

This does not mean, in any way, that these are the only variables affecting interpreters' outputs. There are in fact many forces influencing the interpreting process in one way or another, and exerting tremendous pressures on it, such as the effect of time pressure on the quality of interpreting, the paralinguistic features, stage fright, fatigue, tempo of delivery, cognitive overload, environmental noises, etc.

Furthermore, and at the heart of this study, the focus is on the role of consecutive interpreters in facilitating communication across languages and cultures. The discussion of the various dimensions mentioned above, cannot be separated from considering the role played, or expected to be played, by consecutive interpreters in real life oral interactions.

The researcher is working on consecutive interpreting activity because he wants to find out more about the impact of these variables, and the way they interact in complex and dynamic ways. This initiative is undertaken in order to understand the mechanisms employed by consecutive interpreters to handle these variables during the interpreting event. The researcher wants to show how these forces pull the interpreter in different directions, in order to reach a better understanding of this multi-layered phenomenon, interpreting.

In the researcher's opinion, the essence of all types of interpretation is to avoid, where possible, unwarranted communication problems due to

inadequate language mediation. Moreover, interpreting seeks to capture and deliver the appropriate meanings of the messages transmitted between interactants at the moment of speaking. The crucial problem in this endeavor, is that meaning is the most complex and elusive component of any human language, since it is not merely determined by features of language alone, but also and to a greater extent, by life experiences, cultural and social knowledge, background expectations, prior knowledge and level of education, the identity of interlocutors, and above all, the time and place of the interaction, since meaning evolves at a particular time and place.

In addition, the notion of meaning varies tremendously across the diverse languages and cultures, even among speakers of the one and the same speech community. Indeed, there are huge differences between languages world-wide, not only linguistically, structurally, lexically, but also conceptually as well. Gile (1995:75) argues that "languages are not isomorphic: since they are not modeled on exactly the same lexical and structural patterns, there is no one-to-one correspondence between the words and structures of any two languages". Consequently, during any act of translational activity, including interpretation, there is always some loss of meaning when messages are transformed from the source text (ST) into a corresponding target text (TT).

It is not surprising that the act of interpreting has been described by some professionals (e.g. Gile, 1995:191) as "crises management", due primarily to its specificity, sensitivity, delicacy, responsibility, difficulty, graveness, complexity, etc.

For the purpose of this thesis, the researcher wants to be clear from the outset about his use of the term consecutive interpreting. Consecutive interpreting is defined here as the process of rendering the speech of the original speaker after s/he has completed one or more ideas or units of thoughts, in the source language orally, and pauses, while the interpreter provides the interpretation.

As far as consecutive interpreting itself is concerned, Pöchhacker (2004:18) claims that "since consecutive interpreting does not presuppose a particular duration of the original act of discourse, it can be conceived of as a continuum which ranges from the rendition of utterances as short as one word to the handling of entire speeches". The consecutive interpretation of longer speeches usually involves note-taking techniques, which serves as reminders to the interpreter's memory when it needs help (e.g. to help the interpreter retrieve said information from memory). Another advantage of note-taking is that it can provide the interpreter by a means for analyzing the source language message(s). The use of note-taking is absolutely necessary in consecutive interpreting, since there might be a long interval between input and output, which, in turn, puts heavy burden upon interpreters' memory.

In a 'classic' consecutive interpreting setting, the interpreter listens to utterances while taking notes, since a few people have the capacity to remember a lengthy piece of discourse or a complete unit of thought without suffering a permanent loss of details. As soon as the primary party has finished, the consecutive interpreter begins rendering the speech uttered in the language required by the other party in the encounter. This means that the reformulation phase is put off until later, that slowing down separates, at least, part of the interpreting process. The interpretation is not, as it seems, a summary of what has been said, but rather it is a complete rendition of the original sense in another language, since interpreters never work with words but with ideas embedded in the utterances themselves. One major drawback of using the consecutive mode, is the obvious fact that it is time-consuming, as the time element is almost doubled. This is, apparently, the main motivation for the wide spread of simultaneous interpreting, especially in conferences.

Actually, the ascendancy of interpreting world-wide is due primarily to globalization, and to the astonishing development of means of transport and telecommunications, which necessitates that, both translators and

interpreters go abreast of these changes and not lag behind. In addition, the growing demand for interpreters nowadays is further strengthened by the growth of international organizations, such as the United Nations, the African and the European Unions, and the increasing interactions in our global village. Indeed, the information explosion, cultural diversity, and above all, extensive migration among countries, are among several factors which contribute to the increasing demand of interpreters. Hatim and Munday (2004:318) acknowledge that, “extensive migration and the growing recognition of border cultures means that more translation, and interpreting, is occurring world-wide, and this includes the home countries of former colonizers”.

As mentioned earlier that consecutive interpreters are vulnerable and at the mercy of various forces, (apart from the variables under discussion), that are strong enough which oblige the interpreters to adapt their linguistic behavior accordingly. In addition, the true nature of the interpreting process as an interlingual operation, which is defined by Jakobson (1959/2004, as cited in Munday 2001:5) as “an interpretation of verbal signs by means of some other language”, adds further complications to the already complex activity. Interpreters are confronted with a wide variety of constraints, such as syntactic and semantic, phonological and prosodic, cultural, paralinguistic and psychological, etc., that make the interpreter-mediated encounter an arduous job.

In addition, the skills of competent interpreters tend to exceed those required from translators. As-Safi (2011:12) believes:

There are at least five common requirements for both translation and interpretation such as, mastery or proficiency in both SL and TL, thorough knowledge of source and target cultures, familiarity with the topic of the interaction, vocabulary wealth, and finally awareness of the three-phase process, i.e. SL decoding, transcoding or SL-TL transfer and TL encoding. Interpreting, on the other hand, requires at least five more: short-

term memory for storage and retrieval, acquaintance with prosodic features and different accents, quick wittedness and full attention, knowledge of short-hand writing for consecutive interpreting, and, finally, a great deal of self-composure.

These skills and qualifications put more pressures on anyone who wishes to be a competent interpreter. So, interpreting becomes a very demanding and an awesome task, simultaneously. As Roberts et al. (2000:209) contend, "interpreters brought a variety of different skills with them, thereby influencing the outcome of the whole truth-telling process with their strengths and weaknesses".

Moreover, in carrying their work, consecutive interpreters must have strong personalities and a satisfactory degree of self-confidence, and above all, a reasonable degree of fluency of delivery for the sake of earning the trust of the interlocutors. As one professional interpreter as cited in Diriker (2004:69-70) thought that fluency was important and explained her views by an analogy:

Interpreting is like wave-surfing. If you stop, you fall. Just like in surfing, you try to prolong your time on a wave. You prolong its breaking point. From former experience, you can feel and hear the next wave is on its way; you can feel the sprinkles on your face. If you sense a chance of moving to the other wave, you extend your time riding the current wave, you extend its breaking point, until the next one arrives.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

In fact, there is no place in the literature of interpreting that handles these variables collectively, and investigates their consequences upon human communication, that exceeds the linguistic and cognitive points of view.

The focus of all kinds of interpreting activities is to avoid relaying undesirable messages among interlocutors as a result of inadequate treatment of any oral encounter. This may occur as a result of the consecutive interpreters' reluctance to take the psychological, social,

pragmatic and political variables into due considerations when conducting their job. Indeed, bad interpretation can lead to a significant misunderstanding and deviation from the intended meaning of the message(s), which, in turn, may lead to a significant escalation of hostility, and may even develop further into conflict.

As a matter of fact, and according to (<http://books.google.ps>):

The potential for misunderstanding always exists between people trying to communicate with one another, even if they are speakers of the same language who share a common cultural background. That potential becomes even greater when people assume that they understand each other because of either a shared language or the presence of the interpreter. Sometimes, the interpreter bridges the linguistic gap but not the cultural one.

Interpreters may decide not to be engaged, or deliberately intervene, in the interaction, because they have certain convictions that their task is primarily a conduit or a channel for oral messages among speakers and listeners. In adopting that stance, in all cases, they can do more harm than benefit to the way participants in communicative activities perceive one another.

1.3 Purpose of the Study

This study aims at exploring the interplay among the most prominent variables in consecutive interpreting, and their potential effects upon the outcomes of the communicative processes. The researcher wants to investigate whether these particular dimensions of the interpreting phenomenon might first of all interact with each other, compete with each other for the purpose of controlling interpreters' verbal behaviors, or coordinate and cooperate with each other in facilitating or impeding the flow of information during the interpreter-mediated encounter. Secondly, to investigate how and why these variables might interfere with interpreters' actual performances. Thirdly, it is to justify the various decisions interpreters have to make in response to the pressures exerted upon them by

the psychological, social, pragmatic and political variables, surrounding and influencing the production of speech. In attempting to find answers to these inquiries, it is a hope to discover whether interpreters can neglect or resist these forces and to what extent, or whether interpreters are vulnerable and subjected to them.

The researcher's goal in this study is to enhance the conception of interpretation, particularly that in the consecutive mode, in the view of the different forces that may affect and shape the interpretive process. This study aims to expand the focus and the horizons of people interested in this phenomenon, beyond its the cognitive and the linguistic aspects.

1.4 Significance of the Study

This thesis may be a promising attempt to offer a comprehensive and balanced account of consecutive interpreting, that would subsume all its complications and ramifications upon human interactions. The researcher thinks this thesis is a pioneering one hoping to understand, or at least to reach a better understanding, of the interpreters' decisions and choices, not only from a linguistic point of view, but also from the perspective of the psychological, social, pragmatic and political dimensions of consecutive interpretation.

1.5 Research Questions

The questions, below, are in focus:

- 1- Does the psychological state of interpreters influence and/or interfere in their understanding of the SL messages?
- 2- Are interpreters shielded from the influence of social factors? And does the role of interpreters intersect or clash with the interlocutors' expectations?
- 3- Do language use and the reality of the communicative situation facilitate or impede the interpreting process?
- 4- Does the political atmosphere affect speech interpretation?

1.6 Hypothesis

The researcher hypothesis in this thesis is threefold. First of all, consecutive interpreters are bounded by the interplay among the psychological, social, pragmatic and political variables of this mostly, if not totally, a human activity. Furthermore, consecutive interpreters in carrying out their work can neither isolate the interference of their feelings and emotions, nor resist the pressures which govern the social hierarchies in any human society, which have in turn enormous impact on their verbal behaviors. Last but not least, interpreters cannot and should not neglect either the reality of the situation where a face-to-face interaction takes place, or the political atmosphere pervading and shadowing the whole encounter.

1.7 Limitations of the Study

In this study, the researcher will focus primarily on those types of interpreting performed in the consecutive and bilateral mode, such as small meetings, press conferences, interviews, and community interpreting or public service interpreting, and its offshoots namely, healthcare interpreting and court interpreting. Sometimes, a reference to other types of interpreting is mentioned, and when necessary, for the sake of comparison.

First of all, there is a very general sense of the word 'interpretation', as the process of making sense of something one hears or reads in one way or another (e.g. the interpretation of empirical data, the interpretation of natural phenomena or historical events, the interpretation of dreams and the subconscious of humans, etc.). This conception must not be confused with the process of interpreting, as the art of listening to a person speaking in one language, and then immediately, after or even simultaneously, producing an equivalent rendition in a different language. This conception emphasizes the interpersonal role of the interpreter in face-to face interactions.

Furthermore, by confining interpretation to oral rendering of spoken utterances, interpreting in sign language, commonly known as interpreting for the deaf is excluded.

Another important limitation, especially in conducting an empirical research in the field of interpreting, and according to Mary Phelan (Dublin City University) in Schaffner (2004) is access to materials. It seems that it is much easier to have access to materials for translation than for interpreting, primarily due to ethical and moral issues. For instance, when one embarks on such an enterprise, like doing a research on interpreting, one has a whole load of obstacles in one's way. These obstacles may involve getting permission from the authorities to access such materials, the limited availability of consecutive interpreters, and their prior consent to videotape or record their renditions, and the fact that this type of materials is protected by laws and issues of confidentiality. These obstacles can make collecting data for discourse study even more problematic. In addition, and apart from the fact that transcription is never easy and always time-consuming, there is the need to prepare and bring recording equipment and further logistical support, which makes recording and analyzing such encounters an arduous mission.

And finally, as Diriker (2004:51) states that "it is important to emphasize that analyzing actual consecutive interpreter's behavior is not a straightforward task. Accessing, storing and analyzing all kinds of naturally occurring data, present major challenges for researchers". What is impressive about analyzing the outcomes of real-life consecutive interpreting settings is the fact, taken for granted, that the researcher amidst the intense and heated interaction among participants, in which an interpreter is one of its pillars, cannot be pretty sure why the interpreter, surrounded by various types of constraints and pressures, decides to handle the interpreting process the way s/he does. Of course, researchers can theorize and construe interpreters' decision-making processes, but they cannot know the precise circumstances and considerations at that particular time and place, that instigated interpreters to act in those specific ways.

1.8 Design of the Study

The current thesis includes five main chapters, dealing primarily with the process of consecutive interpreting, their sequence is summarized here below:

Chapter One is an introductory chapter, which briefly overviews the main issues that are going to be discussed in this study. It also provides a detailed theoretical foundation for this, albeit relatively, a new field of inquiry. It aspires to take the reader swiftly into the skeleton of this thesis. This chapter also presents the statement of the problem, the purpose of the study, the significance of the study, research questions, hypothesis, limitations of the study, the layout of the study, and finally the adopted theoretical framework for this research.

In Chapter Two, the researcher presents a review of related literature. In this chapter, he gives a brief history of interpretation and presents a concise classification of types of interpretation relevant to this study. The researcher also introduces the common ground and the differences between translation and interpretation. Furthermore, and for illuminating, exactly, what is meant by consecutive interpreting, the researcher holds a comparison between the simultaneous and the consecutive modes of interpretation. He also gives a detailed description of the process of consecutive interpreting, the prime issue in this research. The researcher also quotes previous studies related directly or indirectly to consecutive interpreting, in order to relate the findings of those studies with the researcher's project.

Chapter Three addresses the thesis methodology. It consists of six sections. The first section is the introduction, which asserts the complexity of consecutive interpreting to the extent of acknowledging that no single model could be validated as an account of the phenomenon as a whole. The second section presents the naturalistic approach used for the investigation of the phenomenon at hand, and the sources used for collecting the data for this study. The third section introduces other methods for gathering

qualitative data to enhance the credibility of the research, namely, the interview and the questionnaire. The fourth section discusses the interpreting activity in the view of the process and the causal models. The fifth section shows the utilization of a combination of both the qualitative and the quantitative methods of research adopted by the researcher, in order to analyze the interpretive outcome more thoroughly. The final section introduces other approaches for the investigation of the interpreting process as an end-product.

In Chapter Four, the researcher presents the research data analysis and findings. It comprises five main sections handling the four variables under investigation, i.e. the psychological, social, pragmatic and the political, besides analyzing the results of the questionnaire answered by both professional and freelance interpreters. Moreover, in this chapter, the researcher also gives answers to the four research questions, which in turn, support the main claim of the study.

Chapter Five consists of conclusions and recommendations for future research, besides the indication of the way this thesis may contribute to enrich the field of interpreting studies.

1.9 Theoretical and Conceptual Framework

This section of the research aims at representing the main concepts used in this study and the various relationships between them. In doing so, the researcher aspires to lay down the theoretical foundations of this thesis, and to shed light on the main issues that will be treated as the research proceeds. But while stressing that interpreting studies is characterized by an overwhelming degree of diversity, and above all, by interdisciplinarity, this study provides evidences of the existence of different interrelationships, sometimes antithetical, among the various dimensions of the interpreting process handled in this thesis, i.e., the psychological, social, pragmatic and political variables. This can be done to justify the vision, and as Pöchhacker (2004:80) termed it, 'unity in diversity'.

Before proceeding further, and for the purpose of this thesis, it is necessary to survey some theories of communication, since interpretation is primarily an act of communication. There are many theories of human communication, however; what concern the researcher here are only two modes in which messages can be transferred from source to target language. As Gambier, Gile and Taylor (1997:52) believe that it is expedient to survey only two basic models of communication theories as the major alternatives, namely the transfer (conduit) model, and the social-interactional one. The former is monological, in which the speaker dominates the entire course of interaction, while his/her partner is just only a channel for relaying what the speaker creates. In its own turn, the social-interactionist model is dialogical, during which the speaker becomes responsive to the entirety of circumstances surrounding the production of speech, subsuming the human and situational contexts. In other words, the interactionist model represents the true nature of human communication, in which messages are produced collectively in dialogues.

The social-interactional model, i.e. dialogic-discourse based interaction paradigm (Wadensjö, 1998), is of a prime interest in the study of the interpreting process, emphasizing the interpersonal relations that characterize the interpreter-mediated encounter. The multiple relationships and the density of interaction among interlocutors, including interpreters, demonstrate beyond any doubt, the complexity of the interpreting phenomenon as a pure human activity. During interpreting, interpreters respond and interact, first of all, to the immediate requirements of the setting of interaction, including the social environment in which the communicative event takes place. Furthermore, interpreters enter into dialogue with their psyche and with the reality of the situation, including the time and place of interaction, the identity of interlocutors, their cultural specificities and above all, with the purpose of interaction. In addition to that is the influence of the political atmosphere on the interpreting outcomes, in which interpreters weigh the different forces that may intervene and shape the structure of the communicative encounter.

However, and by adopting the social-interactional model of communication in the analysis of the interpreting process, interpreters

always enter into a dialogue with themselves, to neutralize the side effects as a result of being engaged into such an intense enterprise, where participants are having diverse interests and motives behind such interaction. In fact, during the act of interpreting, interpreters need to listen to the speakers, and at the same time, listen to themselves. All of these motives justify the adoption of the dialogic-discourse based interaction for the analysis of authentic interpreting encounters.

Thus to recapitulate, while the interpreters are in the middle of oral interactions, they are subject to the interplay of the psychological, social, pragmatic and political variables, surrounding and influencing the interpreting outcomes. These dimensions can disperse the interpreters in different directions, since they can be at odd with each other, may be in conflict with one another, in a way that can put the interpreters on a crash course with their personal and professional ethics. Nevertheless, at the end, one or more of these variables will prevail, directing and dictating the interpreting product.

In addition, and according to Pöchhacker (2004:47) who states that "the field of interpreting studies, which began to form a (sub) disciplinary identity of its own in the 1990s, has been strongly shaped by conceptual and methodological approaches from other, more established disciplines". The branches of modern linguistic which feed the field of interpreting studies subsume sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics, pragmatics and more recently text-linguistics. As a result of all these contributions from the above mentioned disciplines of modern linguistics, major reorientations and developments have occurred in the field of interpreting, in which interpretation is seen as an autonomous field of inquiry, related directly to applied linguistics, or more specifically, to applied research.

In this research, a framework has begun to emerge from analyzing the role of interpreters in relation to social hierarchies that prevail in certain interpretive encounters. This framework is intended to provide a means to conceptualize the relationships between the interpreter and the social

world, and to consider how sociological and ideological determinants function and operate within the interpreting contexts.

It is axiomatic to believe that the essence of any research is about finding relationships between variables. In considering the psychological, social, pragmatic and political variables and their interrelationships, one is dealing with variables that have to do with the world outside the interpreting activity itself. Nevertheless, they impose themselves, in one way or another, strongly on the interpretive outcomes, in a way that deserves a more thorough investigation into its consequences on the interpreters' verbal behaviors.

The delicacy and the mystery of the interpreting phenomenon justify the existence of more than a single research tradition in interpreting studies, and at the same time, to foreground the interdisciplinary nature of the process. For mainly this reason, and to satisfy the requirements of the interpreting process, the emergence of several paradigms or research traditions becomes absolutely necessary. In Kuhn's (1962/1996, as cited by Pöchhacker 2004:67) account, paradigms "are made up of the basic assumptions, models, values and standard methods shared by all members of a given scientific community". Consequently, the notion of 'paradigm' indicates the emergence of particular research models in interpreting studies.

Pöchhacker (2004:68-79) cites examples of several paradigms that have been influential in interpreting research, such as the interpretive theory paradigm (IT), the cognitive processing paradigm (CP), the neurolinguistic paradigm (NL), the target-text paradigm (TT), and finally, the dialogic-discourse based interaction paradigm (DI). As far as the dialogic-discourse based interaction paradigm is concerned, Pöchhacker contends that, "the success of the DI paradigm was clearly associated with the increasing recognition of community interpreting as a significant field of professional practice and hence a fruitful area of research". This paradigm will form the basis for the researcher analysis of authentic

speech, since it borrows concepts and methods from sociolinguistic and sociology, and simultaneously, applied discourse-analytical methods.

Nevertheless, and while acknowledging that the interpreting phenomenon is characterized as having a multi-dimensional context, it is self-evident to suppose that no paradigm, however elaborate and flexible it is, can afford to describe the complexity of human interaction. Shlesinger (1995a, as cited by Pöchhacker 2004:80) captures the paradigm status of interpreting studies in this succinct statement: "we do not have – nor should we necessarily desire – a unifying paradigm". Consequently, the main paradigms of interpreting are variously interrelated and largely complement rather than compete with one another, to achieve the vision of unity in diversity.

There are remaining two more significant concepts: *role* and *context*. Role is an indispensable part of this framework, since the analysis of the psychological, social, pragmatic and political variables cannot achieve its desired end without considering the role played, or expected to be played, by consecutive interpreters in the communicative interaction. Actually, interpreters seem to shape their role by intuition. Nevertheless, the variables mentioned above are strong enough to shape the interpreters' role, in accordance with the exigencies of the communicative encounter. This thesis attempts to explore whether and how the defined roles of interpreters differ from how they are expected to behave in certain interpretive settings.

The discussion of *context* means that interpretation involves a pragmatic setting. Building on this outlook, what counts is not merely the surface meaning of the text, but also and more importantly, the acknowledgement of the reality of the situation in shaping and limiting the meaning of the speaker's utterances, including the identity of interlocutors and their interrelationships, the setting of occurrences and the purpose of the interaction itself. In that case, the interpreting outputs are judged in terms of the adequacy between the interpretation and the speaker's intended meaning. In the analysis of interpretation as a process and a result, one has

gradually come within the scope of pragmatics, i.e. the study of languages in use rather than language as an abstract system. In this regard, interpretive choices must be made because of certain inescapable characteristics of natural languages, such as vagueness, indeterminateness and indirectness. And this is precisely the function of context of occurrences to help disambiguate utterances, which appear on the surface form, anomalous and incompatible.

Chapter Two

Review of Related Literature

2.1 Introduction

This chapter is dedicated to provide a sufficient background information about the consecutive interpreting activity, by venturing this phenomenon from a historical point of view, and surveying the various types of the interpreting process in general. Furthermore, it seeks to explore the common ground and the differences between interpretation on the one hand, and translation on the other, as essentially acts of communication.

Moreover, in the analysis of the consecutive mode of interpretation, the researcher feels that it is absolutely necessary to acquaint the readers with the simultaneous mode of interpretation as a major competitor to the consecutive mode, since a lot of people have a blurred vision about the characteristics of these both activities, and, sometimes, they find it difficult to distinguish between them. In addition, this chapter addresses the main topic of this thesis, namely, consecutive interpreting, by supplying the readers with a theoretical foundation of this mostly human activity. Actually, the review will survey the previous studies related, in one way or another, to the discussion of consecutive interpreting and the various forces influencing the interpreters' linguistic performances.

The investigation of these studies and their theoretical and practical findings concerning the influence of the psychological state of interpreters, their social identities, the pragmatics of interpretation and the political environment embracing this communicative interaction, is, in fact, of crucial importance that serves the benefit of this thesis in the first place, and more importantly, paves the way for anyone who wishes to build upon this study in the future.

2.2 A brief History of Interpreting

Consecutive interpreting has a very long tradition, nevertheless, what concerns the researcher in this study is with the modern history of the process. Actually, the Paris Peace Conference in 1919 marks the beginning

of its modernity and represents a complete turn over in the profession, foregrounding its methods and principles and illuminating, at the same time, the various types of pressures in its human subjects.

To begin with and according to Pöchhacker (2004:9-10):

the English word 'interpreter' is derived from Latin *interpres* (in the sense of 'expounder', 'person explaining what is obscure'), the semantic roots of which are not clear. While some scholars take the second part of the word to be derived from *partes* or *pretium* ('price'), thus fitting the meaning of a 'middle man', 'intermediary' or 'commercial go-between', others have suggested a Sanskrit root. The Latin *intepres*, denoting someone 'explaining the meaning', making sense of what others have difficulty understanding, is a highly appropriate semantic foundation for 'interpreter' and 'interpreting' in our current understanding.

From a historical perspective, the process of interpreting occurred when members of different linguistic and/or social/cultural backgrounds, whether within the one and the same speech community, i.e. among various ethnic minorities, or among totally heterogeneous cultures, came into direct contact with each other for various different purposes, and needed the help of interpreters to remove language barriers, and place the minority language speakers in a position similar to those who speak the main stream language. Consequently, the presence of a third party becomes absolutely necessary to facilitate communication and eliminate the reasons of confrontation and hostility.

Perhaps, what motivated the earliest form of mediated contacts between diverse communities speaking different languages was largely economical, i.e. for the purpose of trading goods, of doing business. This urgent need to communicate emerged from the desire of certain linguistic communities to obtain things that other communities possessed. In other words, interpretation was a verbal mediation between two different

languages and cultures historically came into existence when people from diverse and heterogeneous speech communities began trading. Henri Van Hoof (1962) mentioned 'liaison interpreting' as a form of interpreting practiced mainly in commercial negotiations, and is now known as business interpreting. More than thirty years later, Gentile et al. (1996) extended the term 'liaison interpreting' denoting the idea of connecting or linking up, to a variety of interpreting settings within and beyond the social context of interpretations, i.e. across the inter vs. intra-social dimensions (quoted from Pöchhacker, 2004:13-14).

2.3 Types of Interpreting Activities

Before embarking into profound analysis of consecutive interpreting, it is expedient to survey the various types of interpretation pertinent to this study. According to Pöchhacker (2004:17-23), interpreting activities have a broad classification into interpreting types depending on clear-cut criteria, among them are:

1- Social context and institutional setting: Pöchhacker (ibid) divides it into inter-social settings subsuming business interpreting which became to be known as liaison interpreting. Other types of interpreting according to setting yielded diplomatic interpreting, military interpreting, legal interpreting, courtroom interpreting, educational interpreting, and healthcare interpreting. An interpreting type whose linkage to the intra-social sphere is media interpreting or broadcast interpreting.

2- Situational constellations and formats of interaction: Further significant distinctions are between bilateral interpreting (e.g. in international conferences) and community-based dialogue interpreting (e.g. court or legal, healthcare interpreting).

3- Language modality: This classification is between spoken language interpreting and sign language interpreting, popularly known also as 'interpreting for the deaf'.

4- Working mode: The distinction here is between consecutive interpreting (after the source-language utterance) and simultaneous interpreting (as the source-language text is being presented).

5- Directionality: While the interpreting process always proceeds in one direction – from source to target language, the issue of direction is more complex at the level of the communicative event. The communicative encounter, thus, can be done bilaterally, i.e. in two directions, and relay interpreting, i.e., in one direction.

6- Use of technology: In order to overcome spatial distances and connect speakers (including interpreters) and listeners, the need for remote interpreting has increased significantly. In this case, the interpreter is not in the same room as the speaker or listener, or both (e.g. telephone interpreting and machine interpreting).

7-Professional status: This distinction relates to the level of skills and expertise for interpreters, for example, professional interpreting is done by interpreters with special skills, and natural or lay interpreting is done by bilinguals without special training for the task.

Such classifications and distinctions among various types of interpretation serve to shed light on the diversity of interpreting activities. But actually, as Roberts et al. (2000:15) postulate that "despite the differences, however, at least one element is common to all types of interpreting: the fundamental commitment to accuracy or fidelity". Furthermore, the process of relating new information with the previous one, is an issue of significant importance for all forms of translational activities, including interpretation.

2.4 The Similarities and the Differences between Translation and Interpretation

For the researcher's purpose in this thesis, and owing to the fact taken for granted, that both translating and interpreting activities can be considered as acts of communication, the researcher will implement concepts, notions and theories devised specifically for translation to the investigation into the

interpreting phenomenon. Indeed, interpreting can be regarded as a special form of translating and according to Gile (1995:2), both of these activities "can be defined as performing essentially the same function, namely reexpressing in one language what has been expressed in another". Furthermore, like translating, interpretation is pre-eminently the occupation in which one has to be thinking of several things at the same time.

Before attempting to differentiate translating from interpreting, it is essential to survey their common features:

- 1- Both of them have been a major shaping force in the development of world's cultures.
- 2- They are used as tools to promote understanding among different nations and civilizations.
- 3- Achieving the closest natural equivalent between the source and target texts, constitutes the common ground between translating and interpreting activities.
- 4- They are used primarily to avoid misunderstanding and thus contribute to world's harmony.
- 5- Translating and interpreting are used frequently for domination and control over other cultures by superior powers.
- 6- Interpreting, like translating, requires a mediator who intervenes between source and target texts to relay the intended meanings of messages to the addressees.
- 7- Both of them can have long-term effects upon the course of history. A striking example occurred while translating the United Nations Resolution 242 regarding the Palestinian-Israeli conflict, which is left deliberately ambiguous and fluid, capable of bearing several interpretations.
- 8- Interpreters and translators are working within the interactional framework, in compliance with their mission as linguistic and cultural mediators.
- 9- According to Gile (1995:19) "interpretation and translation are a service provided to particular persons in a particular communication situation".

Despite all these similarities between translating and interpreting, there exist fundamental differences between the two activities:

- 1- Translating is concerned with written texts; interpreting with oral speech.
- 2- One major distinction between translating and interpreting is related to immediacy. Interpreting occurs in real time, immediately after the speaker(s), while translation is out of time or, frozen in time, unless it is restricted within a certain period.
- 3- In translating, the source text is available in some fixed form, while the source text is presented to the interpreter orally and only once, unless it is recorded.
- 4- The final target text in translating may be the result of several attempts. An interpreter, in contrast, gets only one chance at producing the target text.
- 5- For an interpreter, there is no possibility for consulting other tools and a very limited opportunity for correcting the output. However, a translator has a variety of tools for consultation at his/her disposal, and this allows the translator to correct and revise the target text.
- 6- The differences in the working conditions and practices of translators and interpreters are undeniable, and these differences demand different skills.
- 7- Riccardi (2002:84) argues that there are fundamental differences between the communicative setting of both translating and interpreting. On their own part, translators are not very concerned with the author of the original text they are translating, and have zero contact with their potential readers, while interpretation is characterized by enormous degree of interaction between interpreters and speakers, and sometimes with the listeners, who may react immediately to what is being interpreted.
- 8- Translations may be read even hundreds of years after they have been written. Interpretation is evanescent, vanishing almost immediately after being performed, unless it is recorded on tapes.

9-The speaker is usually, but not always, physically present and will inevitably influence the interpretation process directly with his presence, voice and gestures, and this is not the case in translation where the author is not in sight.

10- The knowledge and awareness of the audience will inevitably influence the interpreters' performances, in their choice of techniques and above all, in the choice of language. In contrast, translators may not know the identity of their readers.

11- Interpretation is usually carried out on pragmatic texts; translation on literary ones. In other words, interpretation is exclusively used in face-to-face interactions.

12- Interpretation is a combination of both writing and speaking skills, while translation focuses, primarily, on good writing.

13- "While translating is associated with word-for-word transfer, interpreting is associated with the transfer of messages intended by speakers" (Diriker, 2004:34).

14- While interpretation may involve some sort of interaction and cooperation between the interpreter and the listeners (especially in consecutive interpreting), who can help the interpreter with word equivalents, such interaction is rare in translation.

Despite these differences, what applies to translation applies automatically to interpretation. In fact, translation and interpretation have much more in common that justify considering the two activities as belonging to the same category, Translation.

2.5 The Differences between Simultaneous and Consecutive Interpreting

Although simultaneous interpreting (SI) is not the focus of this thesis, it bears a close affinity with consecutive interpreting (CI) as the two main types of interpretation, so drawing a distinction between them became absolutely necessary. In SI, the interpreters are in a booth, where they are less constrained by social factors than consecutive interpreters. In this

situation, the interpreter renders a target language message(s) almost immediately as the source discourse is being produced. The time lag, i.e. ear-voice span (EVS) or the time between the interpreter's reception of the speaker's utterance and his/her production of the target rendition, ranges from a few words to several sentences, depending on the nature of the SL message(s), the syntactic and lexical complexities, cognitive processing load, memory capacity, fatigue and stress.

As Danks et al. (1997:55) point out that "a direct comparison between simultaneous and consecutive interpretation may disclose the role of simultaneity of listening and speaking in the former, and of memory in the latter". Consequently, as the consecutive interpreter embarks on taking notes, the flow of information and messages accumulate in his/her working memory. In that case, the consecutive interpreter may suffer from memory failure more frequently than in SI, which is performed in a fast paced operation.

Compared to CI, SI tends to be geared to word for word rendering, since simultaneous interpreters cannot lag too far behind the speaker for the fear of losing significant details enclosed in the speaker's utterances. It is also characterized by focusing on the surface structure of the message(s), leading to deficiencies in the messages' grammatical layouts, and consequently, in its presentational style. Nevertheless, the listeners' tolerance of deficiencies is normally higher, because the audience is generally aware of the enormous difficulties and complexities confronting simultaneous interpreters.

By contrast, the situation in CI differs from that in SI, owing to the fact that discourse reception and production are part of separate phases, and thus, can be clearly distinguished. In that case, consecutive interpreters are, to a certain extent, shielded from many distractions confronted in naturally occurring simultaneous interpreting settings. Due to the temporal separation of the two phases, consecutive interpreters have the freedom to liberate themselves from source discourse peculiarities. As a result, the

interpreting outcomes transcend word-for-word rendering, to capturing and relaying the sense of the utterance(s) *per se*'. Furthermore, consecutive interpreters can have certain influence on the length of the source message to be interpreted, through the use of visual contact with the speaker. In such a situation, a consecutive interpreter can signal the termination of the speakers' turn and the start of her/his rendition. On the other hand, simultaneous interpreters cannot halt the flow of messages of the original speakers to begin their rendition.

Another significant distinction between the techniques employed by both simultaneous and consecutive interpreters is concerned with the anticipation technique. While simultaneous interpreters rely heavily on this technique in order to predict what the next segment of speech the speaker is going to utter, for the sake of mitigating the flow of information, consecutive interpreters rarely depend on this technique to help them ease the high speech density. As Pöchhacker and Shlesinger (2002:261) argue that "consecutive interpreting thus affords the interpreter the advantage of not having constantly to wait for or anticipate the next fragment of input". What justifies this point of view is the noticeable fact that there might be a long interval between the input and the output in consecutive settings.

Last but not least, consecutive interpreters rely heavily on memory, even with the assistance of note-taking techniques, which can be regarded as a kind of memory on papers. However, simultaneous interpreters rely mainly on the simultaneity of listening and speaking, since they cannot afford the cost of falling too far behind the speaker.

As a matter of fact, SI proved itself strongly after the Second World War, due to its potentiality and fast nature, and, indeed, has almost exclusively, replaced CI in all international gatherings. Nevertheless, CI has not totally disappeared, but instead, is confined to situations where simultaneous translation equipment is not available. CI could be useful for a question and answer session, a press conference, confidential hearing, guided tours, small meetings, speeches of welcome and inauguration,

interviews, individual consultations or after dinner speeches, negotiation sessions, to name just a few situations.

2.6 Consecutive Interpreting

As said earlier, interpreting is primarily concerned with oral language and not with its form (i.e. the package which carries the content). According to Pöchhacker (2004:138), "the concept of 'orality' refers to a significant distinction in the study of text and discourse. In a fundamental sense, orality points to the primordial form of language use in immediate (face-to-face) interpersonal contact". Interpreting, therefore, signifies speech or utterances, in the sense of natural language use for immediate communication between participants wishing to communicate successfully. In addition, Pöchhacker (2004:139) adds that a serious consequence of treating orality in the interpreting process is "the limited scope of planning and its reflection in the interpreter's product in the form of hesitation phenomena, or 'disfluencies'".

In this study, the interpreter is present in the interaction as it takes place in the consecutive mode, in which the interpreter is usually in direct contact with the participants, and next to the speaker(s), rather than in a booth far away from the intense pressures as in the case of simultaneous interpreting in conferences. Simultaneous interpreting in conferences with its international aspect is generally characterized by a greater degree of cultural transparency, as opposite to consecutive interpreting, since the latter is related to a specific domain whether economic, legal, political or social framework.

Actually, consecutive interpreting is a two-stage process, source-speech comprehension followed by re-expression in another language. Memory is crucial in consecutive interpreting. Consecutive interpreting in interactive discourse situations has been studied not as much as a processing mode, but as a communicative activity shaped by, and in turn shaping, the dynamics of cross-cultural encounters (www.oxfordhandbooks.com).

According to Danks et al. (1997:201) "in consecutive interpreting (CI), the interpreter alternates with the speaker, translating SL speech segments of at least several sentences after the speaker has completed them and has paused for translation". However, interpreters' task exceeds and goes beyond the mere process of code-switching, to include all the circumstances influencing the act of speaking. The focus of this thesis is on selective strategies, adopted by consecutive interpreters overshadowed by psychological, social, pragmatic and political determinants pertaining to the interpreting event, which in turn affect and influence interpreters' goal-oriented behavior, and, consequently, their interpreting outcomes.

What characterizes the consecutive interpreting process, apart from the fact that it is a multiparty talk, is the obvious fact that neither interlocutor knows the other party language. This means that the only person present in the interaction who knows both languages is the interpreter. Furthermore, consecutive interpreting is characterized by a greater intensity of interaction, since the interactants pay a great amount of attention, not only to what each member says, but also to the eye contact and body language of other participants, and this feature of interaction is completely missing in written translation.

In interpreted-mediated encounters, consecutive interpreters should take into account the interpersonal meaning that any human language often serves, emanating from the nature of face-to-face interactions. This interpersonal meaning is a crucial aspect of any distinctive meaning of the utterance, apart from the textual and the ideational functions of language, which, in turn, is utilized in order to define and determine the kind of existing relationships between speakers and listeners during the communicative interactions.

Actually, What characterizes the act of interpreting according to Roy (2000:40) is that "the multiple relationships between linguistic means and social meaning are brought to light". Consequently, consecutive interpreters, in particular, do not confine themselves to the rendering of the

surface meaning of oral messages, but also and more importantly, go beyond that to take extra-linguistic factors into due consideration.

It goes without saying that the act of interpreting is not at all a mechanical one, but rather a highly complex cognitive operation, in which the human factors play the dominant role. To avoid the breakdown of the communication attempt, interpreters first of all must completely understand the message(s) delivered. This view is stressed by Gerver and Sinaiko (1978:13) who suggest that "to interpret is first and foremost to understand".

In the process of understanding, memory plays a fundamental role in this dynamic operation. Here, comprehension is seen as a dynamic and evolutionary process, that largely depends on what one already knows. Pöchhacker (2004:119) says that "processing new information thus requires the active construction of some form of mental representation by integrating the input with various kinds of pre-existing knowledge – lexical, syntactic, pragmatic, encyclopedic, etc".

For genuine comprehension to take place, contextual knowledge of the subject matter is indispensable. This may be what Gile (1995:5) calls "extra-linguistic knowledge" or "world knowledge" and in its turn, is considered a decisive skill component for an interpreter who plays a very important role in the interactive outcome. As Gile (1995:78, emphasis in the original) maintains that "besides knowledge of the language, comprehension implies knowledge of the *outside world*, called *extralinguistic knowledge*, *world knowledge*, or *encyclopedic knowledge*".

In their role as mediators and cultural brokers, interpreters often deal with elements of meaning beyond the level of the utterance itself. This stage of interpretation is explained by Gile (1990, as cited by Lambert & Moser-Mercer 1994:192) as 'deverbalization', "a stage at which only the meaning remains in the interpreter's mind without any trace of its linguistic vehicle". This endeavor is undertaken by interpreters in order to enhance the quality and the credibility of their rendering. Thus, no matter what type

of interpreting one focuses on, quality should be determined on the basis of whether communication reaches its desired end, or the other way round. Although, and according to Shlesinger et al. (1997, as cited by Gambier, Gile & Taylor 1997:123) who believe that "the debate over interpreting quality is still a controversial and an unresolved issue due to the elusiveness of the concept of quality". This view is further underpinned by Pöchhacker and Shlesinger (2002) who maintain that "interpreters analyze the tiniest bits of information, probe more and more deeply into the intended meaning of speakers and, as this stored knowledge builds up, their interpretation departs from the linguistic meaning of the source language and consequently their rendering becomes more natural and their language more native".

From all these discussions, interpreters are regarded as representing communication channels among interlocutors of different language communities, engaged in cross-language communication, using interpreters as interlingual mediators. The interpreter listens to the speaker's source discourse and produces a corresponding target discourse, which will enable the target audience understand what the speaker meant.

2.7 Studies Related to the Interpreting Process in General and Consecutive Interpreting in Particular:

Research on interpreting studies has not attracted the translation scholars' attention until recently, in spite of the fact that interpreting has been practiced since antiquity, and actually predates the invention of written systems and written translation. The reason for this phenomenon, and according to Danks et al. (1997:3) is that "serious research has to wait the invention of voice-recording equipment: Interpreting involves reproducing fleeting speech, which, under realistic communicative conditions, is not recoverable once it has been uttered by the source speaker". Furthermore, as Angelelli and Jacobson (2009:3) argue "research in interpreting focused traditionally on conference interpreting after the establishment of the International Association of Conference Interpreters (AIIC) in 1953".

In his own part, Pöchhacker (2004:18-19) divides the notion 'consecutive interpreting' into two categories: classic versus short: "consecutive interpreting with the use of systematic note-taking is sometimes referred to as 'classic' consecutive, in contrast to short consecutive without notes, which usually implies a bidirectional mode in a liaison constellation".

Generally speaking, CI is regarded as one of the two working modes in international conferences, in which SI plays the dominant role. In fact, CI is the most essential part of the profession of interpreting, since it is considered an indispensable component in all types of interpreters' training, while acknowledging, at the same time, that the interpreting process is similar whether one does simultaneous or consecutive.

In addition, Pöchhacker (2004:183) argues that "while no hard and fast line can be drawn between short consecutive (as used in dialogue interpreting) and the 'classic' form of consecutive implying the rendition of at least five to ten minutes of uninterrupted discourse, consecutive interpreting skills are usually taken to be synonymous with the latter and thus clearly linked to note-taking skills". Indeed, most publications on the teaching of consecutive interpreting are mainly concerned with note-taking. Moreover, Pöchhacker (ibid:184) adds that "the interaction between memory and note-taking stands out as a focus of investigation".

Indeed, note-taking is the most striking feature pertaining to CI. Although the consecutive interpreters rely heavily on their memory, psychological studies have proved that long-term memory fades very rapidly, as fatigue and high speech delivery will force it to dwindle bit by bit. Psychological studies have also shown that, although it is very difficult to remember a large number of words, it is not so difficult to remember a series of ideas. As a consequence, note-taking is seen as a strategic maneuver that consecutive interpreters resort to in order to ease the pressures on their memory, and ultimately, help them to cope with the specific demands for undertaking such a dangerous and an awesome task.

In spite of the fact that consecutive interpreters rely heavily on their long-term memory (LTM), for the purpose of combining their notes with the main points enclosed in the messages delivered to produce a coherent output – in contrast with their counterparts in simultaneous interpreting who use their short-term memory (STM) extensively, there is no doubt at all that consecutive interpreters make use of their short-term memory as well. As a matter of fact, writing notes depends primarily on STM as a matter of attentional resource management.

In his own contribution to the investigation of consecutive interpreting, Pöchhacker (2004:124) describes the association between note-taking and LTM as "semantic chunking of input for storage in LTM and the use of efficient retrieval cues are essential skills in the 'classic' form of consecutive interpreting". He contends that "interpreters' LTM and note-taking skills as the most salient aspects of the interpreting process"(ibid). Actually, during the interpretive process, interpreters sort the ideas enclosed in the messages exchanged into chunks of meaning, linking these chunks together, and then sort all this somehow, somewhere before later reforming them in another language, after, of course, the stage of processing and analysis of the messages' contents.

The significance of note-taking as far as consecutive interpreting is concerned is manifested in a unique case in the AIBI-Mikasa study (2008 as cited by Nicodemus and Swabey 2011:90) in which the interpreter's notes are the primary data. The notes are seen as notation texts and, despite their fragmentary nature, are considered to be suitable to the method of text analysis like regular texts. In the study, the notes were examined against the transcripts of the source speech and interpreters' target language renditions in terms of the underlying propositional representation. Here, notes are the primary data, and discourse analysis is the main method for data analysis.

Before proceeding further, it is expedient to mention that research on interpreting has originally focused on interpreting as a process, examining

which parts of the brain the interpreter uses during the different stages of the interpreted encounter. Furthermore, the emphasis was on such features as working memory, human processing capacity, time lag, attention span and cognitive skills. In addition, research on interpreting has traditionally placed the emphasis on the strategic processes interpreters resort to when trying to cope with the specific conditions and requirements of interpreting. As Pöchhacker and Shlesinger (2002:250) state "rhetorical purpose, register, politeness, power and ideology are some of the key notions which have proved particularly applicable to the analysis of bilateral interpreting in non-conference settings".

In a similar vein, Pöchhacker (2004:115) raises objection to the assumption believed among cognitive psychologists that attention can be shared only for highly automatic tasks, and that the human mind can attend only to one task at a time. Recent research suggests beyond any doubt the validity of the principle of shared attention in interpreting. However, Pöchhacker (2004:116) argues that the details of interpreters' selective allocation, if not switching, of their attentional resources remain to be demonstrated.

Nevertheless, and according to Gile (1995:215) commenting on factors that limit the understanding of source language segments "during interpretation, attention-sharing reduces the capacity available for speech comprehension, and interference between source language and target language also makes comprehension more difficult". In the same line of thought, Pöchhacker (1993, as cited by Pöchhacker 2004:120) discussed the interpreter's strategic use of knowledge structures like 'frames' and 'scripts', to make inferences, in order to provide the missing links necessary to build mental models of the message content.

In their own turn, Hatim and Mason (1997, as cited by Hale 2004:4) name three relevant contextual factors that should be considered in order to interpret the utterances correctly, or, more precisely, appropriately, and this, actually, can be applied to all types of interpreting activities: the

register membership to which the text belongs to, the communicative force which accompanies the utterance, and the culture in which the interpreting event takes place. Such considerations and requirements put a further burden upon the interpreters' shoulders, and complicate their job in achieving complete accuracy in their renditions, and, consequently, shed further light which illuminate the complexity of the interpreting process.

In the domain of the psychology of discourse comprehension, Chernov (1994 as cited by Pöchhacker 2004:12) pointed to promising avenues of research by emphasizing the role of situational and pragmatic inferences, and the need for sociolinguistic studies, which have indeed come to the fore in the study of dialogue interpreting. Furthermore, and according to Pöchhacker (2004:115) who contends that "while simultaneity in the form of 'overlapping talk' and the interpreter's multiple involvement in the interactivity of discourse, also plays a significant role in dialogue interpreting research, the focus here is on the 'classic' view of the problem in terms of divided attention and the synchrony of psycholinguistic operations".

Closely related to the psychological analysis of the interpreters' performances, Peter Mead (2002, as cited by Bilic' et al. 2010:3) had conducted an empirical study regarding the effect of cognitive overload upon consecutive interpreting. The study has revealed that lack of fluency of delivery is attributed mainly to cognitive difficulties rather than linguistic ones. As a matter of fact, cognitive difficulties can be a natural consequence of cognitive overload, in which cognitive processing capacity clashes with processing requirements. And mainly for this reason, Shlesinger (1994, as cited by Pöchhacker & Shlesinger 2002:28)) concludes that "the T's speech is generally less smooth than 'natural' speech", since, and by definition, a copy does not equal the original, however hard interpreters try to reach that stage. When President Obama and Iraqi PM Nuri al-Maliki addressed the press in a meeting which was published on 13/08/2014, under the influence of cognitive overload, even the most experienced interpreter overlooked rendering certain segments of

speech, such as 'election law', 'transition', well-attended', mainly because of cognitive difficulties.

The social and sociological dimension of interpreting gained momentum when Cecilia Wadensjo (1998) launched her unique paradigm known as the dialogic discourse-based interaction, (mentioned earlier). This approach marks a fundamental breakthrough in the investigation of the interpreting process, in which interpreting started to be socially recognized in community-based settings. Consequently, the issues of context and the role of interpreters gained prominence.

The role of interpreters was first discussed by Anderson (1976, as cited by Gercek 2008:5) who refers to an interpreter as "the man in the middle" with obligations to both parties engaged in any communicative event, i.e. acting as non-partisan mediator who serves two masters at the same time. He mentions the power of the interpreter and his/her control over the situation by acting as "faithful echo" of the interlocutors involved in the interaction. His contribution brings forth the thorny debate of the myth of the interpreter's neutrality and what s/he is expected to behave in reality. Furthermore, he claims that the interpreting process takes place "in social situation – situations amenable to sociological analysis" and that "in any such setting, the role played by the interpreter is likely to exert considerable influence on the evolution of group structure and on the outcome of the interaction" (ibid).

Linell (1997, as cited by Gercek 2008:6) also draws attention to the social interactionist approach as an unavoidable method to the analysis of face-to-face interactions. He claims that interpreters go beyond translating, acting "as chairpersons and gate keepers, monitoring the social and discursive situation". Interpreters, indeed, act as 'chair' in the interpreted encounter to ensure that each party has his/her turn to speak, and their description as 'gate keepers' indicates that the interpreter becomes the only powerful participant in the interaction. Furthermore, he also maintains that norms of interpreting prevailing in a particular speech community, in the sense of what is considered neutral or correct interpreting, can have a significant impact on interpreters' verbal outputs. Of course, interpreters are

forced to recognize these norms, which stem from the set of social values and cultural knowledge, needed to fully understand a communicative event and consequently, make communication more effective. This recognition is vital to select appropriate solutions to the problems they meet during the interpreted encounter. However, Linell (*ibid*) casts doubt on the extent these norms would be valid in all interpreting contexts and situations.

By the same token, and according to Bourdieu (1977) who builds on the norms and sociological theories of social reproduction, his approach deepens our awareness of the role of interpreters as participating in shaping and managing participants' communicative practices, and characterized the interpreted event as a form of sociolinguistic activity, not merely confined to linguistic transfer out of its social and sociological contexts. This approach views the interpreting process as located in, and governed by, distinctive belief and value systems unique to a particular society, which both operate and legitimize particular communicative practices subsuming interpreters' performances.

Focusing on community interpreting, Wadensjö (1995:112) looks mainly at how responsibility "for the progression and the substance of interaction is distributed in and through talk". From the discourse analysis performed, she concludes that the interpreters' role during face-to-face interactions exceeds the mere transfer of meaning. She argues that interpreters do actually co-construct meaning together with interlocutors, and that responsibility during interpretation is shared by various parties involved in the interaction. This conclusion sheds light on other interpreting skills that extend beyond mere code-switching and information processing.

Indeed, interpreters in dealing with the peculiarities of the interpreting process with all its complexity and dynamic nature, acting as conciliators between interactants, who possess diverse interests and motives, and their constant attempt to gear the outcome of the encounter in their favor, must possess a great deal of resilience and flexibility to handle

those forces that extend beyond and above the linguistic content of the messages themselves. These forces have to do with the world outside the utterance itself, which may include among other things, the psychological state of interpreters and their perception of their roles, the social context of the interpreting event, the reality of the situation, and above all the political atmosphere pervading and shadowing the whole encounter.

In this sense, interpreters do not have a *carte blanche* and an absolute freedom to translate the way they like, but rather, to convey the messages intended by interlocutors by conceptualizing them as a form of social action within a particular social organization.

In a similar vein, Wadensjö (1998 as cited by Angelelli and Jacobson 2009:58) was one of the first researchers to describe the community interpreter as an interlocutor who actively contributes to the dialogue and takes responsibility for the progression of talk. Her data, collected in a number of different community settings, including healthcare, show that the interpreter's role cannot be expected to be that of a "non-person" who is invisible and uninvolved.

The role of interpreters as active participants in the interaction has been also stressed in Brunette, et al. (2003:225) who state that "four studies in particular (Berk-Seligson 1990; Jansen 1995; Morris 1989; Shlesinger 1991) demonstrate that, to secure effective communication, some court interpreters are prepared to exercise latitude and modify original utterances in order to secure effective communication, convey their perception of speaker meaning, or modify the impact of their rendition on end-receivers".

This perspective is further reinforced in Hale, Ozolins and Stern (2009:153) who maintain that "this view of the interpreter as having the power to influence the interaction has been supported by different observational studies giving rise to a new independent research paradigm applied to community interpreting which Pöchhacker (2004:79) refers to as 'dialogic discourse-based interaction DI'".

Moiro Inghilleri (2003, as cited by Gercek 2008:7) has pursued the investigation of the social context of the interpreting phenomenon, and has examined the macro-micro dimensions of interpreting as a socially situated activity. Inghilleri (ibid) builds on Toury's model of norms as a foundation of her analysis. She suggests a model for interpreting in asylum interviews, but claims, at the same time, that it could be valid for other interpreting contexts, too. According to her, "locating both the training and practice of interpreters in its wider social context has relevant and important implications for deepening our understanding of the social/linguistic nature of the interpreting activity".

In the same line of thought, Pöchhacker (2004) indicates that conceptual references and the way people view life cannot be separated from the overall cultural, social and political milieu and the language in which they are expressed. He concludes that cultural and social knowledge shapes meaning in communication, besides role relationships and expectations.

Similarly, Katan (2004:11-13) believes that it is important for both translators and interpreters to penetrate the cultures they are mediating between, including customs, behavioral patterns, geography, history, balance of power dominating their hierarchies, and even popular culture. This sound background knowledge enables interpreters to negotiate meaning among interlocutors, eliminating the reasons for misunderstanding, and helping participants to reach the desired end of the interaction. Makintosh (1985 as cited by Pöchhacker 2004:120) pointed to the relevance of macro-processing operations such as, 'deletion', 'generalization' and 'construction' in both simultaneous and consecutive interpreting. These operations must be carried out by interpreters in compliance with the unique features of face-to-face interactions, between people who wish to communicate successfully.

In addition, interpretations have been described as texts in terms of standards of textuality, in order to be considered as having a continuity of sense. Pöchhacker (2004:140) states that "all seven standards of textuality –

cohesion, coherence, intentionality, acceptability, informativity, situationality and intertextuality – have been discussed by a number of authors as relevant to interpreting ...".

In order to accommodate for the complexity and the diversity of the interpreting process, many disciplines have been incorporated into the investigation of this miscellaneous and elusive phenomenon. In other words, interdisciplinarity has led to the growth of interpreting studies. A clear example of this multi-disciplinarity is the bulk of studies on interpreting drawing on such Translation Studies components, such as text linguistics, discourse analysis, sociology, cognitive psychology, pragmatics, sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics, neuropsychology, to name just a few.

Furthermore, genres of discourse and the internal structure of speech events have also been a focus of research on dialogue interpreting. In the work of Wadensjö (1998, as cited by Pöchhacker 2004:138), for example, the basic unit of analysis during any face-to-face interaction, is the "interpreter-mediated encounter" as an interaction event rather than the activity of interpreting per se'.

Another fundamental variable in consecutive interpreting that imposes itself strongly in this particular human domain comes from pragmatics. Pragmatics as a sub-discipline of modern linguistics has been expanding its scope quite rapidly. Pragmatics is a cognitive, social and cultural investigation into language use as different from language form. Pragmatics has recently been taken into due consideration by interpreters world-wide, with a consequence of making their task even more difficult. Nevertheless, the outcome of their renditions has become much more accurate, or at least more acceptable and appropriate.

Specifically, interpreting research focuses primarily on face-to-face interactions as a pragmatic need; consequently, it offers the opportunity to observe steps in the act of communication. By focusing on the analysis of authentic interpreting settings as they occur in real life situation, this

endeavor has led to the acknowledgement of the presence of wider context of occurrences, and their crucial effects on the way the interpreting event proceeds. There is no doubt that the concept of 'context' is tremendously broad, subsuming the entirety of circumstances surrounding the reception and production of speech, including the human dimension of the interpreting process. By concentrating on this human dimension and the interpersonal role of interpreters, the researcher hopes to show how the interactional pragmatic variables, politeness, relevance, presuppositions, implicatures, Speech Act Theory and Grice's conversational maxims are central to the concerns of interpreters.

Lindstrom (1992, as cited by Diriker 2004:16) in his discussion of the role of context and how people use language, views the context of talk as consisting of "orders of discourse" and approaches it as a set of cultural rules, conditions and practices, that govern the way people exchange and understand messages. He (ibid) contends that "already existing discourses and already existing conditions set limits on what can be said and how it can be said". Nevertheless, and at the same time, he also recognizes that contexts are not static at all, but rather dynamic and flexible. What justifies this point of view is the fact that it is not easy to predict what people would say and do in a particular context, due primarily to the complexity of human interaction, and to the fact that it relates to the desires and interests of people involved in any oral encounter. Thus, Lindstrom (ibid) maintains that "orders of discourse are not monolithic, and possibilities of counter-discourse always exist".

The investigation of the shift of the pragmatic force of utterances has been carried out by a number of researchers. Berk-Seligson (1990 as cited by Pöchhacker 2004:144) "studied such issues as politeness and register in a corpus of 114 hours of judicial proceedings involving interpreting between English and Spanish". Similarly, Hale (ibid) "reported findings on English-Spanish interpreters' handling of register and politeness forms in a fieldwork corpus of thirteen Australian court cases". Both researchers

found evidence of a number of shifts in the pragmatic force of interpretations compared to the original utterances.

Furthermore, the issue of 'face' as a crucial concept in personal interaction has received due care by researchers interested in the analysis of reasons that cause the breakdown of communication channels. Mason and Stewart (2001 as cited by Pöchhacker 2004:144) "discussed court and police interpreters' failure to render devices like hedging, modality and register in such a way as to create their face-threatening or face-protecting illocutionary force".

Last but not least, needless to indicate the enormous impact of the political dimension of the interpreting event, and its influence on the outcomes of the interpreter-mediated encounter. Actually, over the course of history, languages has been used as a tool for subjecting and dominating the less advanced cultures, and force them to come to terms with new realities imposed upon them, by adopting the value systems and norms prevailing in the Western way of life, in what is termed nowadays as cultural invasion.

Even at the level of interpersonal communication, language is a means for demonstrating supremacy and superiority, in which power relations manifest themselves blatantly in the way people use language, and more obviously, on how to gear the direction of the interaction to their own favor. Takeda (2008 as cited by Nicodemus and Swabey 2011:95) drew on the reoccurring concepts of power and trust as the general analytical framework, and focused on the "choices, strategies and behaviors of the interpreters, with reference to the social and political contexts of the setting, in which they operate". Furthermore, Anderson (1976/2002, as cited by Pöchhacker 2004:50) who points "to the research potential of issues like situational constellations and role conflict as well as the power and relative status of participants with regard to social class, education and gender".

Although, some of these studies seem to digress from the main argument of this study, the treatment of these incompatible forces operating

in any interpretive-mediated encounter, cannot achieve a satisfactory level of comprehensiveness, without penetrating into the psychological mood of interpreters, including the attentional resources available to them, the role of interpreters, their social, pragmatic and political surroundings. The investigation of the constant and dynamic interaction among these forces, constitute the backbone of this thesis. And finally, and based on the above studies, one can say that to the best of the researcher's knowledge, the studies consulted above are the only ones that were found that addressed the topic undertaken directly or indirectly.

Chapter Three

Methodology

3.1 Introduction

As a matter of fact, several factors contribute to the flourishing of more detailed accounts of interpreting in the form of models, among them, the complexity and the mystery of the phenomenon *per se*', the researchers' different disciplinary backgrounds, and their constant attempts to venture this human processing activity from different perspectives. These models seek to represent the phenomenon in terms of the type and number of its components and their relationships, which could explain their operation. As Nicodemus and Swabey (2011:9) assert, " it is with regard to the diversity of models that the true complexity of interpreting as an object of study is most clearly revealed". Therefore, no single model, however comprehensive and detailed, could be validated as an account for the phenomenon, as a whole.

Since the interpreting process itself cannot be studied directly, the interpretation outcome is often analyzed to provide insight into the various variables that might intervene in this mostly human activity. In conducting any research and, in particular, interpreting research, the researcher will never arrive at absolute truth, but, at least, s/he hopes to reach a better understanding of the phenomenon under investigation. Gile (1995) contends that "in most of the literature on interpretation, the methods and data on which ideas are based are not made explicit". Consequently, its methods are largely built upon mere speculations, reflections and intuition, i.e. personal theorizing. But without any doubt, the use of the interaction model is of primary importance in the study of the interpreting process, since it represents the social, situational and communicative relations, obtaining between various parties involved in the process of interaction.

3.2 Naturalistic (Observational) Studies

This thesis uses one of the two main subtypes of empirical research, namely, naturalistic, based on indirect observation, by analyzing transcripts

or recorded data in audio or video form. According to Williams and Chesterman (2014:62), "naturalistic (or observational) studies are those that investigate a phenomenon or a process as it takes place in real life in its natural setting". What this type of empirical research does is to use indicators in order to try to establish correlations between values that can be measured, and entities that cannot be measured directly. This can be done by collecting samples of language use randomly, to make sure that the data collected is representative, and where all the variables affecting the interpreting process are at play. This methodology is more reliable than experimental research, since the variables involved in this complex phenomenon are hard to isolate.

The main reason for adopting the indirect observation method, apart from the fact that it is inexpensive, is the obvious fact that the presence of a researcher can potentially affect the interaction among participants. This point has been stressed by Labov (1969, as cited by Nicodemus & Swabey 2011:157) who states that "we must also bear in mind that the act of observation can impact on behavior, described as the 'observer's paradox'". That is "the very act of observation can change the candidates' normal behavior, and its their normal behavior that we want to see" (ibid). Actually, a simple type of analogy can be drawn when conducting a comparison between the observer's work, and what happens in the ministry of education nowadays. The similarity between the two professions is clearly demonstrated when a supervisor visits a school to attend a period to monitor the teacher's performance, in order to write the assessment annual report. From our experiences as teachers, this direct observation will inevitably affect the usual performance and make him/her in high alert, to avoid committing any sort of mistakes. This stilted behavior by the teacher is done to give the supervisor a good impression, and consequently, to attain a satisfactory rating. Nevertheless, the teacher would not act the way s/he does, in normal circumstances, and this, actually, what happens during direct observation.

Observational research is based on a systematic collection of data as observed in real life interactions, without trying to manipulate the situations for obtaining this kind of data. But since the researcher's field of study is human, it is very difficult or even impossible to put all the variables of the interpreting event under strict control. Gile (1990a, as cited by Pöschhacker 2004:72) warns against the methodological pitfalls of experimental studies and recommends "giving priority to observational research". Furthermore, experimental studies of language cannot directly be implemented and used as a model of naturally occurring language processes, since it necessitates the creation of an artificial environment. What strengthens this point of view and as Williams and Chesterman (2014:63) believe that the researcher in an experimental study "deliberately interferes with the natural order of things in order to isolate a particular feature for study and, as far as possible, eliminate other features that are not relevant to the research".

3.3 Other Types of Empirical Research Used

There are, of course, other important types of empirical research; the most common means of attempting to define and gather qualitative data, remains the questionnaires or the interviews. Gile (1983, as cited by Lambert & Moser-Mercer 1994:47) regards them as "the most straightforward scientific way of collecting data on actual quality perception by delegates would clearly be by way of questionnaires or interviews". Nevertheless, the most important pitfall of using the questionnaire as a reliable scientific method is in finding the appropriate candidates of consecutive interpreters, which justify the needs of conducting an empirical research in any speech community.

In this thesis, the researcher makes advantage of the potentiality of gathering qualitative data by conducting an interview with two types of interpreters, a freelance interpreter and a professional one. The interview consists of 21 items, which is designed, specifically, to support the main claim of this thesis. Furthermore, the researcher uses a questionnaire form, which comprises of 24 questions divided into five main categories,

representing the four variables under discussion and the main claim in this study. The researcher analyzes the respondents' answers and builds upon them in order to further enhance the validity of his hypothesis

3.4 The Process and Causal Models

In carrying out this study, the researcher chooses a combination of a process and causal models of interpreting, and simultaneously, examines interpretation as an end product (i.e. a result of the interpreter's decision-making process). First of all, the process model is used in this thesis because the research focuses on the interpreters' problem-solving procedures, embodying the negotiation of meaning between the speaker(s) and the listener(s) of the oral message(s). Interpreters are confronted, under the pressures of the psychological, social, pragmatic and political variables, with a major dilemma in conveying the subtleties of meanings. So, interpreters resort to some kind of shifts during their rendition of the SL messages, in which they are understood as strategic solutions to interpreting problems. In its turn, the causal model is used in this study because it brings in many more of the contextual variables affecting the interpretive outcomes. These contextual variables and as Williams and Chesterman (2014:85-86) state subsume, source-text variables (e.g. style, format, text type, structural and semantic aspects); target language variables (e.g. language-specific structural and rhetorical constraints); task variables (e.g. production factors); translator variables (e.g. experience, emotional attitude to the task, male or female); socio-cultural variables (e.g. norms, cultural values, ideologies); reception variables (e.g. client's reactions, listeners' responses, quality assessment).

A word of caution is needed here: in using the causal model, and this is a very important remark, the researcher is not interested in causes proper, simply because they do not exist in this field of study, but rather the researcher is primarily concerned with causes as influences, e.g., social and psychological pressures. And finally, and as far as the investigation of the interpretive outcome is concerned, this will lead to the issue of quality

assessments based on investigating the cognitive end-result, i.e. how well the listener(s) had understood the message(s) conveyed.

3.5 The Use of both the Qualitative and the Quantitative Methods

Furthermore, in this thesis, the researcher adopts both the qualitative and the quantitative methods of research, since they complement rather than compete with one another. Despite the fact that the researcher's field of study is not, totally and purely, scientific, in which it cannot be handled, completely, according to the mathematical and arithmetic measurements, the quantitative method of research can supply researchers in interpretation with invaluable insights, regarding the presence of unique frequencies, statistics, tendencies and percentages, related to the examination of the interpreting outcome. By doing so, this method can discover certain patterns and remarkable features in the interpreters' renditions, which can be observed in similar cases. This method can, ultimately, help researchers in their endeavor to analyze, and, consequently, understand the interpreting process more thoroughly.

As far as the qualitative method of research is concerned, the quality of interpretation remains a thorny issue, since it can be viewed from different perspectives. Indeed, the quality of interpretation can be seen as making adequate compromise between the content and the packaging of utterances to their intended receivers. Another criterion which can be used to weigh the quality of interpretation is based on whether communication has been successful, and this can be achieved when the interpreting output embodies enormous sensitivity to the contextual milieu in which the act of speech occurs. Furthermore, the quality of interpretation can be gauged in terms of actual comprehension by the audience (i.e. whether the interpretation gets the message across). The quality of translation according to Angelelli and Jacobson (2009:2) "must be judged by whether it meets the linguistic, social and cultural norms of the context in which it will be used". In other words, the quality of any act of translational activity depends on the purpose and function of the interpreting process. And

finally, and as Nicodemus and Swabey (2011:106) comment on the qualitative approach that "emphasizes studying phenomena and human behavior in their natural settings, taking into consideration the different aspects of these phenomena and behavior".

3.6 Other Approaches Applicable to the Examining of Interpretation as an End-Product

Another promising approach to the investigation of the interpreting process is Vermeer's Skopos Theory (Skopos is a Greek word for 'aim' or 'purpose'). As Munday (2001:79) puts it "Skopos Theory focuses above all on the purpose of the translation, which determines the translation methods and strategies that are to be employed in order to produce a functionally adequate result". In other words, the purpose of the translation/interpretation is essentially determined by the communicative needs and expectations of the target audience, and its situational context and socio-cultural environment. According to Hatim (2001:75) "Skopos Theory subscribes to a view of communication which posits 'feedback' (i.e. response by the text receiver) as an essential part of any interaction. The reaction to the message once it is delivered indicates the extent of its 'success'". In other words, the significance of Skopos theory emanates from the assumption that the interpreter will be able to produce an appropriate interpretation of utterances if s/he understands the specific purpose that instigates the initiation of the speech.

Another crucial approach to the investigation of the interpreting process is Discourse Analysis (DA). Analysis of discourse(s) is indispensable to this study, since it illuminates how language communicates meaning, social and power relations within the cultural context of face-to-face interactions. Discourse analysis in its broadest definition refers to analyzing language beyond the sentence. More specifically, it investigates the form and function of what is said and written in some context to express intention. Moreover, discourse analysis is a holistic way to study human interaction, since interpreters are

interpreting discourse, or conversations, consequently, it can be regarded as an ideal approach to the study of the interpreting process.

Within this thesis, discourse can be regarded as a form of language use, i.e. utterances, or more generally to spoken language or ways of speaking. Roy (2009:9) defines discourse as "language as it is actually uttered by people to accomplish a goal". Furthermore, in a discourse process and according to Roy (2000:5), "the flow of talk and the contributions of all speakers must be considered to understand the meaning of any single utterance". Furthermore, analysis of discourse has a clear association with the domain of pragmatics. Actually, both of these fields of study focus on the way people in any communicative encounter exchange and understand messages signaled explicitly or implicitly. As Yule (1996:84) purports that "within the study of discourse, the pragmatic perspective is more specialized. It tends to focus specifically on aspects of what is unsaid or unwritten (yet communicated) within the discourse being analyzed".

Last but not least, it is expedient to mention another important approach to the investigation of the interpreting process namely Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). What characterizes this approach is the importance it attaches to interpretation of data. This approach to discourse analysis takes as its prime interest the social conditions governing the production and reception of utterances, and consequently, handles the topics of power, class, gender and race.

One final remark which must not be overlooked or underestimated in conducting a research on consecutive interpreting, and as Diriker (2004:53) says, that when analyzing real-life interaction performed in the consecutive mode, interpreters should bear in mind that one crucial aspect in processing data, is the irrevocability of the context in which data is collected. As soon as the interpreter-mediated encounter is over, the materials are either recorded on cassettes or in the interpreter's notes. Both cassettes and notes will inevitably exclude other aspects if the interpreting event, such as

hesitations, pauses, silences, facial expressions and gestures. Consequently, materials stored on tapes and notes can only be re-played and analyzed in a new context, different from the original. Therefore, this new context cannot represent the exact picture of the original context, with all its peculiarities and subtleties. This comparison is akin to an athlete who is running on either a running machine or in the open air. Although s/he runs the same distance, the degree of fatigue varies significantly in the two cases, due primarily to the different context in which the exercise takes place. There are certain features that are unique to running in the open air that are completely missing in running indoors, such as temperature, humidity, the direction of wind, the state of the road and the geographical nature of the field.

Chapter Four

Data Analysis and Findings

4.1 The Psychological Dimension of Consecutive Interpreting

4.1.1 Introduction

This part is of primary importance to the investigation of the interpreting process as a human phenomenon, since interpreters, as human beings, cannot isolate themselves from the ramifications of being totally engaged in mediating interactions, characterized by an enormous degree of instability and diversity.

In performing their mission as social/cultural conciliators, interpreters are vulnerable to a wide variety of pressures, not only from the participants in a conversation, but also from their psyche, when, for example, the messages they are supposed to transmit collide with their principles, attitudes, convictions, value systems, religious and political affiliations. In such situations, interpreters can experience the imminent consequences of the eruption of some sort of internal struggle in order to eliminate their emotional involvement in the interaction, and, consequently, upon the interpretive outcome. What justifies this point of view is the fact that interpreters amid the heated exchange of messages, enter into a dialogue, not only with the utterances spoken, but also and more fundamentally, with themselves, represented by their feelings and emotions.

4.1.2 Types of Psychological Pressures

The psychological analysis of interpreters' performances during real-life communicative encounters, may reveal invaluable insights regarding the nature and the mechanisms employed in the interpreting process. The psychological state of the consecutive interpreter comprises a combination of both internal and external dimensions, which usually, but not always, guide interpreters in forming sound judgments concerning the outcomes of their mediated encounter. The internal psychological dimension stems from

interpreters' ideologies and convictions, beliefs, values, attitudes, feelings, emotions, religious and political affiliations, to name just a few.

In their turns, the external psychological pressures emanate from the presence of interpreters in the middle of the communicative interaction, the audience, the nature of the topic under discussion including cognitive overloads, and the general atmosphere, i.e. environmental noises surrounding the interpreted event. Furthermore, and during the interpreting process, there is always something unexpected, which may cause interpreters to become stressed and in high alert. These internal and external psychological pressures are directly or indirectly responsible, or, at least, have certain repercussions, for these features, such as stress and anxiety upon interpreters, and consequently, upon the interpretive outcomes. This outlook cannot, and should not, be overlooked in any kind of investigation addressing the interpreting phenomenon *per se*'.

4.1.3 The Importance of the Psychological State of Interpreters

Leech (1983:46), in his discussion of language as either formalist or functionalist, observes that "it would be foolish to deny that language is a psychological phenomenon, and equally foolish to deny that it is a social phenomenon. Any balanced account of language has to give attention to both these aspects: the 'internal' and 'external' aspects of language". He (ibid) concludes that "the correct approach to language is both formalist and functionalist".

Actually, the most prominent, vital and promising discipline which has some bearing on the study of interpreting is clearly the field of psychology. As Pöchhacker (2004:48-49) stresses that "psychology has undergone some major reorientations and 'paradigm shifts', and these were carried over also to psychological research on issues relating to interpreting". Furthermore, and as purported by Lambert and Moser-Mercer (1994:213) who state that "decoding a message in one language and encoding it in another appears to be a challenging task. The demands, as

well as the responsibility associated with this task make it an interesting object for psychological study".

From the outset of the researcher's examination of the psychological state of interpreters, Pöchhacker (2004:49) states that "it should be understood that there is no such thing as a (single) psychological approach which could be brought to bear on the study of interpreting". Rather, research on aspects related to interpreting has been linked to different subfields of psychology, including cognitive psychology, which focuses on sense, notice, memory and information. It discloses the inner mechanism of information processing. In addition to that, there are educational psychology, psycholinguistics and neuropsychology, which are in turn highly interdisciplinary in nature. It is obvious that the main reason for adopting various psychological approaches to interpreting owes to the fact that investigating the psychological states of interpreters is a very complicated and mysterious task, that requires handling them from different perspectives.

4.1.4 The Contributions of the Psycholinguistic Research

One of the fundamental approaches investigating the interpreting phenomenon comes from psycholinguistics (i.e. the science of human language production, comprehension and acquisition), focusing on the cognitive working inside the 'black box', i.e. the human brain, instead of shedding lights on verbal behavior at the level of conditional reflexes. Consequently, laboratory experiments lost ground to the study of real-life, authentic interpreting settings (quoted from Pöchhacker, 2004:49).

In a similar vein, Lederer (1978/2002, as cited by Pöchhacker 2004:71) actually argues that the task of interpreting obviated the need for laboratory experiments: "interpreting is a human performance in which cognitive activity is first and foremost; it therefore leads us into the field of psychology with no need to resort to special equipment; in this field the connection between thinking and speaking can be observed as it materializes with each segment of speech".

What justifies Lederer's point of view is that in an experimental study, the researcher deliberately interferes with the natural order of 'things', for the sake of isolating a particular feature for study and, as far as possible, eliminates other features that are not directly relevant to the research, but may nevertheless affect the result of the experiment. In other words, the researcher sets up controlled conditions or an ideal environment to conduct his/her experiment. But since the researcher's field of research is completely human, and despite the fact that researchers can neutralize some variables within the limits of the environmental experiments, they stand helpless regarding variables affecting the internal structures of interpreters as humans. As a result, it is difficult or even impossible in practice for the researcher to isolate or paralyze other variables affecting or influencing the phenomenon being tested.

As Pöchlacker (2004:53) purports that, "interpreting as verbal processing has been studied both from a linguistic point of view, with regard to particular lexical and structural input-output correspondences, and from a psychological vantage point, with regard to measuring performance aspects of this verbal processing task".

Psycholinguistic researchers interested in this human activity describe the stages of the interpreting process in this formula:

Input → Black box → Output.

The fact that the black box represents the interpreter's mind makes the investigation into the stages of the interpreting processes as they occur in the interpreter's mind a matter of speculation, rather than a matter of scientific research supported by conclusive evidence, since we cannot see and observe directly what is going inside the minds of other people. In other words, the mental interpretation process itself is actually invisible, and much of the process leading from input to output remains unknown. Owing to the invisible nature of the processes, they can be explored only by the process of inference. Unfortunately, researchers cannot answer this legitimate question with utmost degree of certitude, "what is going exactly

in the head of the interpreter at the moment of producing the interpretive outcomes?"

In addition, this simple description is deficient, since it portrays only part of the observed verbal behavior of the interpreter, on the basis of what seems to go in and what comes out. From this perspective, psycholinguistic researchers into translation/interpretation make implicit use of the process model, emphasizing the complexity of this dynamic activity. One must pay much more attention to other psychological concepts such as background knowledge, beliefs and expectations. This point of view is also stressed by Pöchhacker (2016:57) who maintains that "as psychologists turned from observing verbal behavior to speculating about the mental operations taking place in the 'black box', researchers' attention shifted from the verbal input-output relationship to the mental process as such".

Actually, the mental processes of human beings are inaccessible; they are usually an object of mere reflection and speculation, besides their mysterious nature. Toury (1982, as cited by Neubert and Shreve 1992:30) talks about the enigma of the 'black box' of the translation processes while commenting upon the empirical implications of the psycholinguistic model:

translated texts and their constitutive elements are observational facts ... translation processes, those series of operations whereby actual translations are derived from actual source texts, though no doubt empirical facts, and as such part of the object-level of translation studies, are nevertheless only indirectly available, for study as a kind of 'black box'.

Furthermore, Lambert and Moser-Mercer (1994:214) acknowledge that "the term 'black box' became an all-inclusive label which seemed to absolve the researcher from looking into the intricacies of the work carried out by a translator". Indeed, the psychological research into interpreting does not penetrate deeply enough to take into account the unnoticed operations performed by consecutive interpreters in carrying out their task, and more significantly, the effect of the category of feelings and emotions,

which further emphasizes the complexity of this dynamic and sensitive activity.

From a logical point of view, we can assume that our feelings, emotions, ideologies and attitudes as human beings, can in certain cases interfere and influence our own behaviors and judgments concerning specific issues happening around us, and constitute an integral part of our daily lives, and consecutive interpreters are no exception.

In his discussion of the several paradigms or disciplines influencing translation including psycholinguistics, Hatim (2001:83) maintains that the transfer of meaning in any translational activity constitutes a mental process and, consequently, relies on a complex form of information processing. He argues that "psycholinguistic studies of translation proceeded by analyzing the constraints under which bilingual mediation works".

4.1.5 The Consequences of Surrendering to Psychological pressures

Interpreters may undergo counter pressures from the two clients they serve for the purpose of convincing them to adopt their point of view in the encounter and, simultaneously, gear their verbal outcomes towards meeting that desired end. "The fact that the interpreter is often of the same nationality can also create a conflict of loyalty in such a situation" (Carr et al. 1997:162). For instance, when rendering the Arabic expression "الكيان الصهيوني" by an Arab interpreter into "Zionism", due to the interpreter's sense of loyalty towards his/her national cause, may lead to serious problems, and may have opposite echoes on the audience, especially in international gatherings. The reason for this misconception relates to the differing connotations associated with 'Zionism' in both the Arab and Western worlds. "Whereas 'Zionism' is condemned by the Arabs as a 'racist', 'expansionist movement', it is generally regarded by the Westerners as a 'national, liberation movement'" (Farghal & Shunnaq, 2011, as cited by Al-Azzam et al. 2014:277). To avoid this problem of being biased towards

any party in the encounter, the interpreter could render the foregoing Arabic expression into 'The Jewish State' or even 'Israel'.

In fact, interpreters deal with speaker(s) and listener(s) in the communicative setting, having different status, intentions and attitudes. In their job as language and cultural conciliators, interpreters face formidable challenges in meeting these conflicting requirements. One such conflict, and according to Lambert and Moser-Mercer (1994:89), is the frequently-quoted empathy with either the speaker or the audience. In their words, "empathy with the speaker is a metaphorical term meaning rendering the speaker's communicative intentions, style, as well as the tone of his speech, including paralinguistic and nonverbal signals (tempo, intensity of voice, gestures)."

When the interpreter feels that s/he cannot fulfill these requirements satisfactorily, this situation can put him/her in moral conflict and cause a state of nervousness, and may sometimes put a heavy burden on the interpreter for not being able to represent the participants adequately. As Gile (1995:30) believes, "interpreters do belong to social groups, do have moral, political, and religious convictions, and do have personal interests which may be difficult for them to speak against". Furthermore, Hatim and Mason (1990:15) argue that "since total re-creation of any language transaction is impossible, translators will always be subject to a conflict of interests as to what are their communicative priorities". Actually, in almost all forms of translational activities, there will be always some sort of loss or gain of meaning, owing to the formidable differences among languages and cultures. The consecutive interpreters' mission in this regard is to balance these operations, in a way that does not constitute an obstacle for genuine understanding between participants in oral interactions.

Indeed, consecutive interpreters are subjected to mounting pressures from different parties engaged in any oral interaction. What intensifies the pressures on consecutive interpreters is the fact that the physical distance between participants is not so great. This posture prevents the interpreter

from delivering an objective rendering of the oral messages transmitted between interactants in face-to-face interactions, since the moods of the speakers can have a certain impact on his/her performance.

In addition, the number of audience attending the mediated interaction can have certain repercussions on the interpreter's verbal behavior, the greater the number, the higher degree of self-monitoring. And above all, interpreters may be amenable to pressures affecting their interpreting behavior by situational constraints (e.g. in-group loyalties, the concept of power, the sensitivity of the occasion, audience expectations, etc.).

Actually, the two main conditions that can hinder interpreters' performances are the fear of public speaking and anxiety. First of all, the fear of public speaking, where consecutive interpreters are in the middle of the action, is due to being exposed to audience's judgment, since they are, directly, in the public eyes not in a booth, as in the case of simultaneous interpreting, that may instigate negative emotions and even a total rejection of the outcomes of the interaction. In that situation, interpreters should learn how to speak publicly, and be wary not to challenge, completely, the expectations of the audience attending the interpretive meeting. As far as anxiety is concerned, it is primarily associated with public speaking, which derives from the feeling of insecurity or/and lack of self-confidence. In the point of view of Brunette et al. (2003:16) "as the interpreted communicative event (ICE) unfolds, the interpreter brings not just the knowledge of languages and the ability to language-switch or assign turns. The interpreter brings the self". In an interview with President Saddam Hussein by CBS Channel in 2003 and published on 21, 06, 2013, the psychological state of the interpreter influences his verbal outcome to the extent of being completely emotionally involved in the heated argument. This engagement is obvious in the interpreter's choice of language to be used to render the reporter's questions.

Reporter: Mr. President, you say that knowing that boost on your water is a tremendous armada willing to be level destruction in all.

Interpreter: سيدي الرئيس أنتم تقولون هذا في الوقت الذي تتحشد على حدودكم جيوش وأساطيل مريعة ومستعدة هذه الجيوش والأساطيل لتدميركم.

(<https://www.youtube.com/watch?V=LjzbQu9kkus>)

The Iraqi interpreter seems to be emotionally involved in this heated argument adopting a hostile attitude towards the Western coalition from the outset of the interview. The psychological state of the interpreter exerts phenomenal pressure on his linguistic behavior to the extent of rendering "tremendous armada" (أساطيل هائلة) into "أساطيل مريعة". This observed verbal output suggests that he was totally immersed in this interaction, not only as a faithful echo of the speaker, but also gives himself the right to be an active participant in this interpreted encounter.

The interpreter identifies himself with the Iraqi version of the reality of the situation to the extent of being, utterly, biased to it. In a similar vein, what motivates the interpreter is, by and large, the intense political period, in which the whole region was at the brink of a major international crisis. Another variable that cannot be avoided is the social influence on the interpreter in being a member of the same community. Consequently, he feels under these exceptional pressures, with no choice but to take sides with his country's vision of truth. In this example, the psychological, social and political dimensions of the interpreted event collaborate in dictating the interpreter's verbal behavior, with the psychological state of the interpreter shaping and dominating the whole scene.

4.1.6 The Psychological Symptoms of Interpreting

For mainly this reason, the view of Sampson (1989, as cited by Kearns 2008:8) can hardly be proven true or even justified. According to his point of view:

Our understanding of the individual in the modern world is that the individual's self and the roles that the person plays in their families, religious life, work are separate. It follows from a

strictly logical point of view that the relationship between the individual and his/her attachment to the profession of translation or interpretation is more likely to be instrumental than based on emotional attachment.

The reason for rejecting Sampson's view is that there is an internal psychological dimension, apart from the external one, of the interpreting process, which may affect interpreters' performances in highly charged and intense situations. For example, interpreters working in conflict zones cannot freeze their own feelings and emotions and be truly objective, as in the case of interpreting in atrocity cases, as happened in interpreting the atrocities committed by the Serbian troops in Bosnia. This is exactly what Roberts et al. (2000:210) are trying to assert, "it appears that most of the interpreters find the work stressful. In fact, some of the interpreters resigned for exactly that reason. Working in an environment that is constantly changing places or under a lot of pressure". In fact, the idea that consecutive interpreters must be in high alert and always ready to cope with constant changing related to their working conditions, may inevitably cause impact upon their psychological states, leading to the feeling of exhaustion, extra stress and emotional and physical instability.

Indeed, there are some of the symptoms mentioned by interpreters, as a result of performing their job in hostile and challenging situations. Roberts et al. (2000:212) mention some of these symptoms: "anxiety, fatigue, muscle tension, sleep disturbances, panic attacks, loss of sexual appetite, nausea, sweating, dizziness, chills and hot flushes, fear of dying, intense fear, helplessness, distressing recollections, recurring dreams, avoiding thoughts, difficulty concentrating, shortened life expectancy, etc". These symptoms are related primarily to ordinary work-related stress. As Roberts et al. (2000:213) elucidate "many became physically sick from trying to cope with the heavy load of other people's personal problems and their own fears".

What exacerbates the internal psychological pressures upon the consecutive interpreter's performance is the fact that the audience perceive that they are not listening to the original speaker(s) directly, but instead, through the interpretation channel, which depends on the interpreter's understanding of the original speaker's messages. At the same time, and at any moment of the interpreting event, speakers, on their own turn, are generally aware of the fact that they are being interpreted. Consequently, they usually, but not always, try to facilitate the mission of consecutive interpreters, by delivering messages devoid of vagueness and obscurity. In such cases, the role of the interpreter becomes more crucial, which may put him/her under constant pressures.

One more additional factor which may even make the task of interpreters even more difficult, is the situation where consecutive interpreters possess strict beliefs and convictions, or in case where s/he is a member of certain religious and political sects. This factor can, sometimes, interfere in forming sound judgments by interpreters and make them manage the situation instead of monitoring it. Interpreters' beliefs and convictions cause tremendous internal conflict in their psyches, and may have certain impacts in the way they carry out their task. What aggravates the situation is when the interpreter has completely different convictions and attitudes from the parties s/he is mediating between. In such instances, the interpreter is in internal moral struggle with his/her beliefs, consciously or unconsciously, and tries as far as possible to balance these conflicting forces, to avoid being on a crash course with his/her ethical and moral standards. Interpreters should try to curb their emotions and be as objective as possible, so that, in the end, the interpretive outcome becomes more plausible and sensible.

4.1.7 Does the Psychological State of Interpreters Work Alone?

A striking example demonstrating beyond any doubt this conflicting view happened when BBC's News night programme (2004) interviewed Khaled Meshaal, the political leader of Hamas, concerning the legal and the moral

legitimacy of resistance operations in the West Bank and Gaza of Palestine. This interview, as cited in Al-Zahran (2007), exhibits that misunderstanding can only occur when the listener, in this case, the interpreter, lacks the relevant extralinguistic knowledge necessary to unfold the intended meaning of the messages delivered. Actually, The presence of two or more diverse cultural/social systems in the interpreted encounter, especially when there is some sort of struggle over loyalty, can give rise to disparities between the speaker's intended meaning and the interpreter's understanding and reproduction of his/her message(s).

Meshaal refers to operations executed by Hamas military wing as "عمليات استشهادية" (martyrdom operations); the interpreter renders Meshaal's term as "suicide bombings" (عمليات انتحارية). By choosing to do so, the interpreter under the influence of his own beliefs and convictions, deliberately deforms facts on the ground, and equates the resistance operations protected by the international law, with barbaric acts executed by savages. It seems from the analysis of the interpreter's rendition, that the interpreter sympathizes with the Israeli point of view and describes them, albeit implicitly, as victims. The interpreter surrenders to his internal psychological belief, which prevents him from forming sound judgments concerning the appropriate rendition of Meshaal's designation. Consequently, the interpreter's verbal behavior distorts the meaning intended by the speaker, and egregiously, foregoes a referential or pragmatic equivalence to the original message.

In other words, the term (martyrdom operations) undergoes unjustified, radical modification by the interpreter under the pressure of his inner psychological state. Meshaal's designation carries positive connotations in the Arab's cultural/social milieu, as an act of heroism, that is to be justified and glorified, whereas the totally different term used by the interpreter is notoriously and negatively associated with terrorism, that is to be strongly condemned and widely rejected in the Western cultures and democratic nations. The implication of this attitude on the part of the

interpreter reveals his hidden intention to glorify Israel as an oasis of democracy and freedom amid unjust and totalitarian regimes.

In the above example, the psychological state of the interpreter not only interferes in forming sound judgments, and ultimately affects the outcome of the interpreted setting, but also, and to a large extent, overrides the social, pragmatic and the political dimensions of it. The interpreter's verbal behavior, in this particular case, deserves the utmost degree of criticism, since the concept of martyrdom exists even in the Western value systems. Consequently, the interpreter's decision has no excuse, except for the influence of his deep psychological state, and his subjective outlook that dictates his unwarranted interpretation.

4.1.8 The Skills Required to Balance the Psychological Pressures

In their struggle to cope with the huge demands required to perform their job adequately, consecutive interpreters develop unique and extraordinary types of skills essential to handle the interpreted-mediated encounter in the most appropriate ways. These skills enable interpreters not only to relay the sense of the message(s) to the parties involved, but also, and more importantly, to cope with the inherent stress and anxiety, which are a natural subsequence of being honest and faithful to the profession itself. Interpreters work amidst situations involving asymmetry of knowledge and even power and gender differences. In these circumstances, interpreters should possess enormous emotional stability, in order to balance these inequalities, in their efforts to make communication effective. Furthermore, they also need to incorporate other abilities (e.g. quick wittedness, self-composure, strong personalities, flexibility, honesty, etc.), in compliance with the sensitive atmosphere they work in (e.g. social, cultural, political and sometimes religious settings). According to Roberts et al. (2000:209) who state that "these are the skills needed to survive the huge emotional onslaughts from the external evils and the internal pressures created when dealing with such evils".

Furthermore, for the consecutive interpreters to have stable emotional and moral qualities, is indeed of primary importance to help them avoid getting emotionally involved in any communicative encounter, however its intensity and sensitivity. To cope with this potential active involvement outlined above, interpreters must possess a great deal of imperturbability and resilience, in order to successfully undertake certain aspects present in the nature of their work, including an essential moral element required. Consecutive interpreters, like all human beings, can affect, and at the same time affected by, natural or artificial environmental surroundings. But at least, they should refrain from being completely biased towards any party in the encounter, in their endeavor to maintain an acceptable level of integrity and impartiality.

As a matter of fact, interpreters are not strong enough to control the various conditions and circumstances affecting the interpreting process, however hard they try, since there are some external forces that exert undeniable pressures upon the outcome of any interaction. For instance, in some cases, the commissioners of the interpretation put heavy pressures on the interpreter to skip certain parts of the speech, because they do not want the audience to hear them, in spite of the fact that the speaker(s) clearly intend them to be an integral part of the message(s) delivered. This case leads directly to a ferocious conflict between intentions and interests, between the commissioners' desires and the interpreters' perceptions of their roles as 'catalysts' and social/cultural consultants. In such a situation, the interpreter is in internal moral struggle with his/her beliefs and ethics.

A clear demonstration of the interplay and struggle over supremacy, for the purpose of dictating interpreters' verbal behaviors, among the psychological, social, pragmatic and political variables of consecutive interpreting, and in which the psychological state of the interpreter manages to resist and challenge the equation of power, and, consequently, performs his/her role with the utmost degree of restraint and defiance, happened at the beginning of the modern history of consecutive

interpreting. This incident took place during the Paris Peace Conference in the aftermath of World War 1 in 1919, which was conducted in the consecutive mode of interpretation. The example below was quoted from a Ph.D. dissertation by Aladdin Al-Zahran, University of Salford, UK (May 2007).

Colonel Stephen Bonsal (the US President Wilson's interpreter) reports being asked by one of the four superpowers at that time (United States, Britain, France and Italy) to suggest to Colonel Lawrence of Arabia, Emir Faisal's interpreter, to:

soften the impact of some of Faisal's words that were giving offence in influential quarters [... and] follow the precedent of Professor Mantoux, the official interpreter at the plenary sessions of the conference, who smoothed out so many rough places in the impassioned appeals of the nationalistic speakers.

Lawrence is reported to have strongly rejected this forceful advice:

I see the point and I have the greatest respect for this gentleman [...] but I cannot follow his suggestion. You see, I am an interpreter, I merely translate. The Emir is speaking for the horsemen who carried the Arab flag across the great desert from the holy city of Mecca to the holy city of Jerusalem and to Damascus beyond [... and] the thousands who died in the long struggle. He is the bearer of their last words. He cannot alter them. I cannot soften them.

As manifested from the analysis of the above example, the interpreter's psychological dimension, subsuming his own beliefs and attitudes, enables him to resist the influence and the pressures exerted upon him by the social, pragmatic and political variables surrounding the atmosphere of this mediated encounter. Even though, these variables are strong enough to compel the interpreter to adapt the outcome of the interaction, the interpreter's strong personality and his self-composure enable him to impose his own perspective. His decision defies the

established social hierarchies and the balance of power, the reality of the situation, in which the parties involved in the encounter have various, and contradictory goals and interests. And above all, the sensitivity of the political milieu. Despite all these formidable forces, the interpreter emerges victorious in relaying what he believes to be an appropriate rendition of the occasion. The interpreter's decision to be completely faithful to the speaker's message, demonstrates beyond any doubt, the interplay and the constant struggle among the various dimensions of the interpreting process, for the purpose of determining the decisions and the choices, often made by the interpreter in a semi or fully conscious way.

Furthermore, and according to Pöchhacker (2004:172) "the types and levels of stress experienced by interpreters on the job are clearly subject to a variety of situational and personal factors". For instance, "occupational health hazards for interpreters in the community include the risk of infection in medical settings and even threats to personal safety, as in police settings, legal cases, etc." (<http://www.benamins.nl/cgi>). These psychological pressures intensify during highly tense political turmoil and international crises, and more, egregiously, in conflict zones, where the lives of interpreters may be at stake. These internal and external formidable forces must have certain repercussions on the way interpreters decide to deal with the various elements presented in the interpreting event, in their efforts to be completely fair and honest.

It goes without saying that the most critical issue in all kinds of interpreting activities, and, indeed, in all kinds of human behaviors, is the question of power and control. The balance of power influences to a great extent the nature of the relationships among participants in oral interactions, including interpreters, which in turn has severe implications on the rise of certain types of conflict in communication. This is partly due to the diverse interests and goals that each party in a conversation has, and their constant attempts to impose certain realities on the way the interpretive encounter proceeds.

It has been noted by many scholars that power conflict in communication is associated with gender, class, nationality or identity. It seems that power is a determining element in all kinds of human activities, including the verbal behavior among interlocutors involved in any kind of communicative interaction. The effects of this undeniable force can without doubt have some echoes upon the interpreter's performances, and, consequently, upon the interpretive outcome. Interpreters cannot defy the established principle of power in governing and dictating human relationships, but instead, they abide by these norms that gear the principles of human encounters.

Nevertheless, and according to Furmanek (2006:58) who thinks that "the problem of control also lies deeply within each individual's psychological structure, which determines the interpreter's linguistic behavior and choices during the interpreting performance". Indeed, interpreters constantly enter into a dialogue with other parties in the communicative event, and with oral discourse, but more fundamentally, with themselves, too. It is futile to assume that interpreters can practice their profession without exerting some sort of power on the evolution of the whole communicative encounter, since they are the only persons authorized to orchestrate the way messages can be understood. Indeed, Anderson (1976, as cited by Furmanek 2006) argues that the interpreter is "the powerful figure, exercising power as a result of monopolization of the means of communication". Such a dialogical principle, either with oneself or with others, constitutes the backbone of the researcher's analysis of the interpreter's vulnerability, as all human beings, to emotions during his/her meaning construction. When the forces surrounding the interpretive encounter (e.g. social, religious, personal, political, etc.) are strong enough in gearing the outcome of the interaction, in a way that cannot be avoided, this may create intense internal psychological pressures on the interpreters, that may cause an enormous degree of stress and frustration.

4.1.9 A promising Approach to the Interpreting Process

Closely related to the psychological dimension of consecutive interpreting, which can lay the foundation for better understanding of this elusive phenomenon, is the notion of hermeneutics. In *'After Babel'*, George Steiner (1975/1998, as cited by Munday 2016:251) defines the hermeneutic approach as "the investigation of what it means to understand a piece of oral or written speech, and the attempt to diagnose this process in terms of a general model of meaning". The importance of this ambitious perspective, and according to Hatim and Munday (2004:163), is that, Steiner's initial focus is on the psychological and intellectual functioning of the mind of the translator/interpreter, and he goes on further to discuss the process of getting at meaning and understanding underlying the translating /interpreting process.

In the hermeneutic method, and according to Chau (1983, as cited by Shaheen 1991:33), "interpretation is not merely recreating the 'meaning' hidden in the texts, as Text Analysts do. The text, instead of being an 'object', is a 'co-subject' with which the translator as the interpreter 'falls into a dialogue to create new meanings'". The advantage of this subjective approach is that it pays attention not only to the cultural and the pragmatic contexts, but also, and more importantly, to the interpreter's emotional context (i.e. his/her interaction with and reaction to the SL messages). It is precisely this reaction of the interpreter at the time and place of the interpreted encounter that determines the reconstruction of the meaning of utterances. Indeed, meaning evolves at a particular time and place, as a result of the dynamic interaction among the different variables in the communicative encounter, including the internal and external psychological state of interpreters, which cannot and should not be overlooked in any kind of investigation targeting the interpreting process *per se*'.

Many insights that a translator/interpreter can gain from this subjective process that may enhance his/her understanding and

reproduction of the SL messages, among them: understanding can never be totally objective since the subjective element, normally intervenes in this complex process; being biased to one party during the interpretive encounter is unavoidable, and, sometimes, can serve the interests of crushed citizens; interpreters cannot, always, explain what they understand from the messages delivered; and finally, interpreters, like translators, cannot but change the meaning of the original messages in a way that suits the interests and motives of those engaged in oral interactions (quoted from Chau, 1984b, as cited by Shaheen 1991:34). Interpreters need to acknowledge the inevitable intrusion of their psychological state in any kind of face-to-face oral encounter. This understanding can help them confront, and deal with their inner feelings, and, consequently, assist themselves in their attempt to curb the influence of their emotions upon the interpretive outcomes.

4.1.10 The Association between Cognitive Overloads and Psychological Pressures

In discussing the relevant factors influencing, directly or indirectly, the working conditions of interpreters, which cause a considerable amount of stress and anxiety upon them, one should look at the way messages are transmitted between speakers and listeners. The most significant factor that may create enormous psychological pressures upon consecutive interpreters' performances, can be attributed to cognitive overloads. Indeed, Gile (1995:173) contends that "high speech density is probably the most frequent source of interpretation problems". Furthermore, and as Bilic' et al. (2010:3-4) contend that interpreting-related cognitive overloads can be recognized in three main aspects: firstly, there is too much information. The interpreter has to bear huge mental and psychological pressures, since s/he is confronted with constant flows of information, and the obvious fact that s/he has little time for manipulation, especially when the interpreter has problems with the previous flow of utterances. Secondly, there are too many tasks at one and the same time, and the possibility of overlapping

among listening, note-taking and speaking during the interpreting process constitutes the true nature of this phenomenon. This may mean that, sometimes, the completion of note-taking may be at the expense of both the understanding and the reproduction of the target text. Thirdly, cognitive overloads may be concomitant with so many distractions. Some of these distractions may be due to physical aspects (e.g. fatigue), psychological instability (e.g. anxiety, frustration), or poor working conditions (e.g. noise, equipment breakdown). In fact, cognitive overload is associated, directly, with certain psychological symptoms that consecutive interpreters experience during actual face-to-face interpretive encounters. These psychological syndromes, such as stress, tension, anxiety and frustration, may inevitably affect both the quality and the credibility of interpreters' linguistic output.

4.1.11 Interpreters' Strategies to Ease Psychological Pressures

One of the strategies interpreters resort to in order to mitigate the psychological pressures upon them, is that of the reduction of the message(s) delivered, while remaining faithful to the original sense of utterances. This can be done through the selection or omission of irrelevant information, in response to high input speed and information density. Compression can be viewed not only as a rescue technique, but also as a strategic solution used excessively by consecutive interpreters to eliminate the source of stress and anxiety upon them, and consequently, go abreast with the ongoing flow of information in the communicative setting. Herbert (1952, as cited by Wu and Wang 2009:404) stipulated that full consecutive interpretation should only take up to 75% of the time taken by the original speaker. Such a reduction can be achieved by speaking at a faster pace, and simultaneously, avoiding repetition, hesitation, pauses and redundancy. The consecutive interpreter should only focus on the essence of the message(s), while maintaining the arrangement of ideas uttered by the original speaker. Helle Dam (1993, as cited by Wu and Wang 2009:405) concluded that

"text condensing" achieved by various types of substitutions and omissions, was a necessary and usually a good interpreting strategy.

In a similar vein, consecutive interpreters in performing their sensitive mission can benefit from the notion of relevance, in order to mitigate the influence of the psychological stress upon their performances. This is an area where the psychological state of interpreters intersects with one of the main issue in pragmatics, which is the notion of relevance. According to Sperber and Wilson (1986/1995, as cited in Hickey 1998:43), "the central factor that makes communication succeed is the pursuit of optimal relevance on the part of both the communicator and the addressee". As a result, it can be of great help to consecutive interpreters, since it focuses on what is intentionally communicated. With the aid of this theory, consecutive interpreters can disregard inessential or irrelevant information, especially when this kind of information may distract the audience, or when it jeopardizes the success of the interpretation process.

Summary:

From the previous discussion, we can assume that the interpreter-mediated encounter, with its interpersonal relations, overflows with feelings and emotions, due primarily to the intensity and sensitivity of this uniquely human enterprise, where interpreters strive to reconcile and select the appropriate meaning to be conveyed. The researcher intends to prove that without taking the inner feelings and attitudes of interpreters into due consideration, this analysis of the interpreter-mediated encounter would suffer from major drawbacks. We cannot deny the involvement of the psychological states of interpreters in shaping the outcomes of the interpretive settings, in which these forces exert tremendous pressures, especially in the case of consecutive interpreting, where interpreters are in the middle of these charged situations. Interpreters are subjected to a wide range of psychological pressures, both internal emanating from interpreters' own beliefs and attitudes, and external emanating from the speaker(s), the audience, the general atmosphere of the encounter, besides the nature of the

subject matter. Unfortunately, researchers in the field of interpreting have so far focused on the psychological states of interpreters from a purely cognitive and physical perspective, without any attempt to address the internal and external psychological pressures, directly responsible for those features like stress and anxiety upon interpreters.

4.2 The Social and Sociological Dimension of Consecutive Interpreting

4.2.1 Introduction

At the heart of the analysis of interpreter-mediated encounters is the investigation of the social context of interaction. In fact, the social and sociological context of the interpreting process is probably the most important variable that should never be underestimated. Roy (2000:53) thinks that "social interaction is both composed of and composed by the interactants, their roles, their expectations, and their obligations within a social situation". Furthermore, Yule (1996:59) maintains that "a linguistic interaction is necessarily a social interaction".

4.2.2 The Interpreting Process as a Social Phenomenon

In his discussion of the implication of the view that language is a form of social practice, Fairclough (1989:22) maintains that "language is a part of society, and not somehow external to it ..., language is a social process Language is a socially conditioned process, conditioned that is by other parts of society". This means that communicating is a social activity – a joint activity – that requires people to coordinate with each other as they speak and listen, for the purpose of reaching the desired end of conducting such an interaction. Indeed, interpreters act in a social context of which they are an organic part of its structure.

From the previous discussion, one can be pretty sure that the interpretive event does not happen in a social vacuum, and like any human practice, cannot be considered in isolation, but instead is embedded and subsumed in a certain society and culture. Bourdieu (1977) tells us that any interaction between interlocutors participating in oral forms of communication is defined and organized by the established relations

between the social groups to which the participants belong, for example, doctors checking patients, bosses talking to subordinates, judges addressing the defendants, etc. When this sort of interaction occurs and according to Angelelli (2004:2), "the self and the other interact. When that happens, the interaction is colored by an array of social factors, such as class, gender, age and ethnicity". As a consequence, the consecutive interpreters in conducting their work should attend to the social hierarchies pervading in the community they are mediating among its members. These established hierarchies are due primarily to the variety of social roles, and the impact of status and power on the language people use.

This section attempts to investigate the potential influence of social factors overshadowing the production and the reception of speech upon consecutive interpreters' performances. Furthermore, it seeks to study the role of the interpreter in response to cultural differences among participants, in relation to the social context where the interaction takes place. In other words, it aims to find out whether, and how, the interpreter's role differs from the way it is defined by different parties involved in the interaction, and how interpreters deal with social/cultural differences in consecutive settings. The fact that the consecutive interpreters are in the middle of the communicative encounter, acting as members of a certain community, justifies examining the impact of the social and the sociological dimension of this totally (until now) a human endeavor.

4.2.3 The Interpreting Process as a Human Phenomenon

It is true that there are many attempts by interpreting scholars to implement systems for speech-to-speech machine translation, i.e. automatic interpreting, but until now, these projects are confined, merely, to theoretical applications, and so, do not reach the satisfactory stage of substituting human interpreters. Pöchhacker (2004:170) in his comments on automatic interpreting projects, clearly states that these projects "are restricted in both mode and domain; that is, limited to consecutive dialogue interpreting in such specific communicative genres as appointment

scheduling and travel information". To conclude this discussion of the applicability of automation in the interpretive encounters, Danks et al. (1997:187) maintain that "machine assisted interpreting projects have so far relied heavily on machine translation research and hardly at all on interpreting research". The main reason for the reluctance of adopting automatic interpreting is due primarily to the complexity and unpredictability of human interaction.

For mainly this reason, this section also adopts a more sociological approach concerning how interpreting is done and in what social context. Indeed, sociological approaches of interpretation consider the problem of the delicate interpersonal role that the interpreter plays during the interaction between interlocutors, since the interpreter is in direct contact not only with the participants engaged in oral interactions, but also with the various conditions and circumstances surrounding the production or reception of speech. Or more precisely, it examines how participants, including interpreters, adapt their verbal behavior in response to the exigencies and the peculiarities of the social atmosphere, engulfing such personal encounters, such as status, class, level of education and the power relations governing and regulating the principles of any interaction. This modification of interpreters' verbal behaviors can be justified by considering the social determinants that govern and regulate interpersonal relations among various sectors of a society, in which power relations play the dominant role. In fact, power is constantly being negotiated through the control of the discourse in the interpreter-mediated encounter.

To reiterate, the balance of power constitutes the primary motivation that controls and determines the nature of the relationships between participants involved in any oral interpretive encounter. This point of view is also stressed by Gerver and Sinaiko (1978:208) who contend that "power is a word that has a number of negative connotations, but its use in social psychology simply refers to the influence one person has over another". Actually, conventions of discourse in any society, i.e. conventional

practices of speaking and writing that exist among various ethnic groupings, between young and old and even between women and men, contribute to sustaining existing power relations.

In handling the interpretive event, interpreters actually act as a member of a certain speech community, in which they live and interact with the various aspects of its structure. Consequently, amid this particular environment, linguistic means must combine with the social framework pervading in that community, in order to produce an appropriate rendition that meets the demands and the expectations of those engaged in face-to-face interactions within a particular speech community. The concept of speech community is crucial to understand the interplay among the various forces operating within this particular social environment, and consequently, upon interpreters' verbal behaviors. Hymes (1972, as cited by Bauman & Sherzer 1989:240) defines speech community as "a community sharing rules for the conduct and interpretation of speech, and rules for the interpretation of at least one linguistic variety". What characterizes the interpretive encounter is the obvious fact that each interlocutor belongs to a specific speech community, i.e. the two primary speakers do not share a common language, this situation necessitates the presence of an interpreter who may be a member of at least one speech community, or has a sufficient linguistic and social knowledge of the two speech communities s/he is mediating between.

In their endeavor to successfully contribute to creating harmony and understanding among interactants, and according to (<http://www.aiic.net/ViewIssues.CFM>):

consecutive interpreters are subjected to pressures from various parties in the community. One of the most influential types of pressures is exerted on interpreters on the home front. Pressures on interpreters come from different forces. The interpreter may live within the very community for which s/he liaises with the host country. Defendants in criminal cases, their families and

friends, fathers and mothers in childcare proceedings have been known to approach the interpreter directly in an attempt to bring him/her to their side by means of threats or bribes; withdrawal of favors by the local community is another way. Social exclusion generally is yet another.

As outlined above earlier, professional interpreting is located in a particular social context, shadowed by a complex interplay of responsibilities and duties, expected or requested from different parties in the society, and simultaneously, places certain constraints on this human activity. On the other hand, interpreting in international settings, such as in conference interpreting performed in the simultaneous mode, is less constrained by social factors than community-based interpreting performed in the consecutive mode. Conference interpreting does not take as its prime interest the details and the specificities that pertain to, and exist in, a particular community, due to its international characteristics.

4.2.4 The Central Paradigm in the Investigation of the Interpreting Process

As it has been mentioned from the outset of this study, the dialogic-discourse based interaction paradigm for Cecilia Wadensjö (1998) constitutes one of the main poles for conducting this thesis, and this is exactly what differentiates consecutive from simultaneous interpreting. In fact, one of the fundamental distinctions between simultaneous and consecutive interpreting is that, the former has a monologic nature, while the latter has a dialogic one. Gambier, Gile and Taylor (1997:52) contend that in the social-interactionist, contextualist theory, and during the process of communication, interlocutors, all the time, engage in practical problem-solving routines in situated action, leading, usually, to understanding for various practical purposes, provided that the communication attempt was successful, yielding mutual understanding among interactants. The dialogic-discourse based interaction is also stressed by Linell (1998:43) who maintains that "a dialogistic account emphasizes the gradual

emergence of meanings, as utterances are successively constructed, often in collaboration with the other interlocutors". According to the dialogical aspect of language use, there is neither definitive nor absolute meaning of utterances, since meaning evolves at a particular time and place, as it is negotiated between participants in the communicative interaction. This lends support to the fact that languages change over time, and even a common word may acquire new meanings in certain contexts.

Furthermore, and as Cecilia Wadensjo (1998, as cited by Hale 2004:12) believes that "meaning conveyed by language use is conceptualized as co-constructed between speakers and hearers in interaction". Interpreters are essentially involved in any interaction as active participants, and are, therefore, subjected to a variety of constraints, emanating from the peculiarities of such an interaction and the surrounding social environment in which they perform their work. Actually, interpreters' working conditions in specific verbal encounters are shaped, first of all, by the physical surroundings, subsuming the time and place of interaction, the type of audience, the sensitivity of the topic discussed, and above all, by an aura of interpersonal factors. In addition, the forces at play within the institution, and the society as a whole, cause a significant impact upon the course of interaction. As Angelelli (2004:45) argues "all interlocutors, are key players in the co-construction of meaning as they interact with other parties and juggle the impact of both the institution and the society in which the interaction is embedded".

Consequently, the content progression of utterances and the end-product of the interpreter-mediated encounter are, ultimately, to be conceived as a collective responsibility of all parties, including interpreters, and so is the success or failure of the communication attempt. Only for this reason, consecutive interpreting, in particular, must be understood in terms of special kinds of context-bound activities. Actually, the price for not adopting this vision during real-life mediated encounters is, normally, quite high.

From this perspective, Pöchhacker (2000, as cited by Valero-Garces & Martin 2008:205) concludes that "'just translating' is little more than a simplistic fiction in an interaction marked by the interlocutors' unequal status and different educational, social and cultural backgrounds". Furthermore, Bourdieu (1990, as cited by Angelelli 2004:40) states that "the construction of social reality is not only an individual enterprise, but may also become a collective enterprise". Here, culture is not treated in isolation, but rather as part of the communicative interaction taking place in interpreting practices. Indeed, culture is reflected in language and, consequently, in communication.

In the same line of thought, speech producers and receivers, including interpreters, approach language in use by reacting to, and interacting with, a number of contextual factors at every stage of the interpretive encounter. When the social context is misinterpreted, e.g. by not taking the balance of power, status, identity, the level of education and experiences of interlocutors, the norms prevailing in certain communities, this can lead to departures from the intended meaning evoked in the interaction, which may inevitably result in communication breakdown, and furthermore, causes severe misunderstanding among the parties engaged in face-to-face communicative encounters. This area of research intersects with one of the main principles of pragmatics, in relaying the intended meaning of the original speaker. The problem in mediating communication between various parties wishing to communicate successfully, is due not to linguistic differences only, but also, and more importantly, to cultural/social differences.

It goes without saying that interpreters perform their task in social gatherings, at which they are subjected to certain expectations held by both the interlocutors in the current exchange, and by the audience attending the interpretive setting. Audience's expectations can without doubt affect the process of interpretation in at least two ways. Audience's level of education may affect the interpreter's choice of language suitable to the intellectual

levels of listeners. Furthermore, audience's expectations may also influence the outcome of the interpretive process; in as far as it obliges the interpreter to soften the impact of the speakers' utterances, or the other way round. This does not mean at all that the interpreter's work should be completely responsive to the anticipations of the target audience. The interpreter can challenge the audience's expectations, in some cases, without jeopardizing the intelligibility and the credibility of the interpretive outcomes.

However, and due to the complexity of human interactions, interpreters should bear in mind that when interpreting a certain message in its social setting of occurrences, misunderstanding or deviation from the intended meanings of the messages delivered, always remains possible. First of all, interpreters cannot predict for sure what the next segment of discourse the speaker(s) is going to utter. Secondly, when the speaker delivers any piece of discourse, s/he cannot control the interpretation of his/her message, and the speaker, in fact, is at the mercy of the interpreter's awareness of the intended meaning of the speaker's utterance. Thirdly, owing to the fact that the views and the interests of the participants, directly or indirectly, involved in the production of discourse, tend to diverge from each other, which paves the way to the possibility of the emergence of clashes of opinions. Fourthly, the internal dynamics of human languages tends to invoke and encourage multiple interpretations of utterances. And finally, misunderstanding may occur because of differences in interactional styles between participants belonging to diverse languages and cultures. Consecutive interpreters should recognize that languages, and, even within the same speech community, interactional styles vary enormously.

In the same line of thought, it is axiomatic to assume that even the socio-cultural domain is not always stable. Elements in this domain of signs could take in varying degrees of dynamism and change, and thus become slightly problematic, calling for the wider context to be integrated fairly subtly into the unfolding text (quoted from Simms, 1997). Furthermore, the social order of any society is not completely stable; the

structural hierarchies of any community may change drastically, depending on the degree of change that might strike it.

4.2.5 Relevant Notions in the Enquiry of the Interpreting Process

Another pertinent issue related to the interpreted performance which impinges on the social context of interpretation is the notion of intertextuality. This notion has a considerable impact on the way consecutive interpreters could interpret the messages transmitted properly. Intertextuality, according to Beaugrande and Dressler (1981:10) concerns “the factors which make the utilization of one text dependent upon knowledge of one or more previously encountered texts”. In other words, it is the mutual relevance of separate texts. As Beaugrande and Dressler (1981:182) contend that “this knowledge can be applied by a process describable in terms of MEDIATION (the extent to which one feeds one's current beliefs and goals into the model of the communicative situation”. In other words, mediation is the process in which interpreters intervene in the transfer process, feeding their own knowledge and beliefs into their reproduction of the messages. Consequently, in performing their work, consecutive interpreters, consciously or unconsciously, can implement their knowledge and experiences to enhance and even enrich the interpretive process, or, at the worst scenario, impose their own interpretations upon the communicative event, in which they are supposed to mediate between its parties.

In examining and analyzing the interpreting process, we cannot neglect one of the formidable social forces which may exert tremendous pressures upon the work of consecutive interpreters, ideology. According to Simpson (1993:5), "ideology can be defined as the tacit assumptions, beliefs and value systems which are shared collectively by social groups". Ideology is without doubt pervasive in human languages, since languages, all the time, are used to express and promote certain ideologies, attitudes, beliefs, and even, ways of life. Consequently, language and ideology are inherently interrelated, and any attempt to separate them is doomed to

failure. As a result, consecutive interpreters should be cautious in using language to include, exclude or promote certain ideologies, and devote their attentional resources, only and always, to serve the purpose of communication. This perspective is stressed by Hatim and Mason (1997:119) who maintain that "ideology shapes discourse, and the way discourse practices help to maintain, reinforce or challenge ideologies remains a sensitive issue that affects the outcome of the interpretive process".

Norms of interpreting are another important social determinant, since they focus on the social and ideological nature of human languages, and consequently, have severe implications upon the interpreting process. It is axiomatic to suppose that each language or culture has its ways in organizing its members' interactions, including the interactional styles, orders of discourse, specific modes of address, initiation and termination of conversations, the mechanism of turn-taking, the amount of information which ought to be kept implicit, to name just a few. These norms impose certain constraints within particular interpreting contexts, in response to the issues of power, class, status, the nationalities and identities of interlocutors as manifested in the communicative encounter. Norms of interpreting shape human interactions in a way that obliges the consecutive interpreter to adhere to them while performing the interpreted event. Indeed, interpreters need norms of interpreting pervading in a certain speech community in order to select appropriate solutions to the problems they encounter.

A striking example of the influence of norms upon the consecutive interpreter's verbal behavior, and, consequently, on his/her choice of language to be used, happened when President Obama and King Abdullah met at the White House on 29/06/2010.

President Obama: Hello everybody, I want to welcome his Majesty King Abdullah to the White House, and I'm very pleased to be able to return the extraordinary hospitality that he showed me and my delegation when we visited Saudi Arabia and when we visited his majesty's farm.

Interpreter: مرحبا للجميع، وأرحب بصاحب الجلالة خادم الحرمين الشريفين الملك عبدالله إلى البيت الأبيض، ويسعدني بأن أبادله الضيافة الرائعة التي قدمها لي وللوفد المرافق لي عندما زرت المملكة العربية السعودية وزرته في مزرعته هناك.

(<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HJNRW3TkuLA>)

Here, the interpreter adds the phrase "خادم الحرمين الشريفين" even though the original source message does not contain the honorary title "the custodian of the two holy mosques". The interpreter's verbal rendition can be justified on the basis of observing the political, and more importantly, the social motivation that instigates the interpreter to act in that particular way. The interpreter grants the right to herself to add this kind of information in order to avoid causing any sort of embarrassment, and to maintain a friendly relationship between high-profile political leaders. In this interaction, the phrase "خادم الحرمين الشريفين" is not merely a political compliment, but rather and more significantly, a social compliment, necessary in this sort of meetings, due to the social roles and the impact of status and power relations upon language people use.

To reiterate, the influence of the social environment, with all its complexities and peculiarities, where the interpretive event takes place, imposes itself strongly on the way interpreters understand the source message(s). Consequently, interpreters cannot escape and avoid the effects of this broad and formidable cycle. Actually, this particular social cycle provides interpreters with a wide variety of choices to handle, manipulate and consider the tiniest pieces of meanings embedded in the messages themselves. As a matter of fact, the social milieu of the oral encounter can, without any doubt, direct and shape the way the mediated interpretive outcomes may proceed. During an interview with former Iraqi President Saddam Hussein conducted by American channel CNN in 1991, Saddam expresses his view towards the imminent consequences of Iraqi invasion of Kuwait:

صدام حسين: أتمنى ألا تسيل دماء كثيرة.

Interpreter: We pray that not a lot of blood will be shed.

(<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=J00vcNYcpDS>).

Instead of rendering "أتمنى" into "wish", the interpreter renders this word into "pray". Here, the interpreter takes advantage of the social and religious connotations of the word "pray" to emphasize that if war is inevitable, shedding a lot of blood cannot be, in any circumstances, considered to have priority in the Islamic faith, since Islam does not have such an aggressive nature. Furthermore, what Saddam implies in this utterance is that, if war was imposed on Iraqi people, it would not only be the Iraqi side suffering its tragic consequences, but also the Western coalition would pay a heavy price for their own enterprise. This is, of course, an implicit threat used mainly to deescalate the already hostile and tense situation, and this is used primarily for political reasons. Indeed, the impact of the reality of the situation caused the interpreter to use an indirect speech act in his rendition of Saddam's threat. In this example, the social, pragmatic and the political variables of this encounter, interact to determine the interpreter's verbal behavior.

Another important issue related directly to the way the interpreting process may proceed, and on which the social variable of interpreting has a considerable impact, is the mechanism of turn-taking. According to Corsellis (2008:127), "examples of turn-taking at meetings and on social occasions, which can be signaled by both verbal and prosodic and paralinguistic means, as well as gestures, facial expressions and body language, provide further interesting insights into the nature of human communication".

It is true that interpreters act as 'chair' to ensure that each party in the conversation has his/her own turn to speak, nevertheless, this technique varies tremendously among various speech communities, depending on the traditions of speech peculiar to each specific community. Actually, turn-taking is a very complex feature of oral interactions and, simultaneously, imposes certain restrictions on the way messages are delivered between interlocutors. For the purpose of organizing the exchange of messages

between the different parties in a conversation, interpreters, sometimes, may feel obliged to intervene and interrupt current exchanges, in order to make sure that the communication attempt does not reach a dead-end.

Roy (2000:36), in her discussion of turn-taking as a discourse process, believes that "turn-taking in interpreting has unique and complex features that actively involve the interpreter in organizing, managing, constraining, and directing the flow of talk". This means that the establishment of the messages' meanings depends, to a large extent, on the way turn-taking is allocated between participants in the interpretive setting. On certain occasions, some participants violate the principle of turn-taking, due to their high status and their belonging to a prestigious caste, by controlling a large portion of speaking time, in order to gear the interaction to their benefits, and simultaneously, prevent other parties from having equal opportunities to express their own point of view. In this situation, the interpreter's intervention is a must to redress the imbalance of power between interlocutors and place them at equal footing. This perspective is stressed by Roy (2000:38) who maintains that "turn-taking is a discourse process which can help us understand how the exchange of messages actually takes place".

4.2.6 Community Interpreting

At the heart of consecutive interpreting in a social context is what has come to be known as 'community interpreting'. Community interpreting is perhaps the oldest type of interpretation in the world, which has begun to form its unique identity since the first encounter between different linguistic groups wishing to communicate successfully. What characterizes community interpreting, apart from the fact that it is primarily used in face-to-face interactions, is that it involves a bi-directional, consecutive mode of interpreting, i.e. interpreting in both language directions. Interpreters are employed in community settings to ensure principles of equity, access to services, and in response to the needs for those not speaking the dominant language of the country where they live.

4.2.7 The Essence of Community Interpreting

Roberts et al. (2000:13) argue that "in many countries, the tradition out of which community interpreting has risen is one of social justice and equity". Furthermore, and according to Hale, Ozolins and Stern (2009:2), "community interpreters are the critical link between the mainstream community and the minority language speakers". The ultimate aim of community interpreting in any society, is the need and the desire to help minority sects to fully integrate within the host culture, where they co-exist with other people. Another important function is to eliminate, as far as possible, the social differences between people living side-by-side in the same speech community.

As a matter of fact, community interpreting activities which serve diverse linguistic/social minorities in various countries, have acquired different designations, while remaining, virtually, performing the same function. According to (<http://www.aiic.net/ViewIssues.CFM>):

There is a certain amount of confusion about what term to use to describe this type of interpreting. 'Public service interpreting' (PSI) is the term used in the United Kingdom. Most other countries use the term 'community interpreting'. In Australia, the preferred term is community-based interpreting. Some commentators prefer the term *ad hoc* interpreting, or even contact interpreting or dialogue interpreting.

For the purpose of this thesis, these terms may be used interchangeably to describe this unique phenomenon, since the same principles apply to all of them.

The term 'community interpreting' refers mainly to those services that are provided for the general public by authorities in any country. They include interpreting of services, such as legal, healthcare, courtroom proceedings, education, housing, to name just a few. Consecutive interpreters are needed when the public service provider and the residents in a particular speech community do not share sufficient common grounds

linguistically, that may impede the flow of communication between different parties involved in any verbal interaction. Moreover, community interpreters are also needed to avoid the potential risk as a result of miscommunication, in their endeavor to preserve the human rights of the less fortunate people. The clash of cultures, sometimes, or on certain occasions, may result in serious harm, since the interlocutors belong to diverse and remote civilizations and cultural/social backgrounds. Indeed, community interpreters seek to ensure communication between two other parties taking into account power asymmetry between interlocutors. The old adage to "just translate and translate everything", (Roy, 2000:31), cannot and should not be applicable to the interpreting process. This rejection of this point of view is due primarily to the idiosyncrasy of the phenomenon, and the constant interaction between various components in the communicative event.

In this sense, community interpreting is a highly complex process, which may inevitably exceed the mechanical transfer of messages' content. The psychological, social, pragmatic and political dimensions of the interpreting encounter may have considerable impacts upon the interpreters' decisions regarding the way they choose to interpret certain segments of discourse. As Hale, Ozolins and Stern (2009:152) purport that "research has clearly demonstrated that interpreting in public service settings is a highly complex process and the sociocommunicative, contextual, pragmatic and functional characteristics which make up this complexity often affect the interpreter's role". Actually, the complexity of face-to-face interactions is obvious, since the encounter is typically characterized by the imbalance of power relations among interactants, and broadly discrepant social/cultural backgrounds overshadow the whole interpreting scene, apart from the additional language diversity, which in turn, can pose another formidable obstacle to those not speaking the mainstream language of the host country.

Of course, the most urgent need for community interpreters world-wide emanates from the demographic changes which are happening at a large scale around the globe. Indeed, globalization, the fast development that has struck modern means of transport and the exponential growth in tourism, have resulted in the increasing movement of people between countries for shorter or longer periods of time. People migrate to other countries for various different purposes, such as work, political instability and military turmoil, poverty and lack of employment, education and pleasure. They also do so to escape natural or man-made disasters. A clear example of this phenomenon in recent times is the massive influx of migrants from countries in the Middle East and North Africa to Europe, seeking better conditions of life and more attractive opportunities.

As a consequence, almost most countries have multilingual, multicultural populations. So, community interpreters have become the link between the host communities and new comers. However, the need for community interpreters occurs, sometimes, in an anomalous cases where the original habitants in their own homeland, became a minority and, subsequently, speaking a different language from the majority, as in the case of aboriginal Australia and the Red Indians in the United States of America.

4.2.8 The Complex Role of Community Interpreters

In fact, what complicates the interpreter's job is the observable reality that community/dialogue interpreting is marked by constant interactions between the interlocutors through the medium of the interpreter. The dynamics of this interpersonal communications usually shape the interpreter-mediated encounter, and, simultaneously affect its outcome. For obviously this reason, community/dialogue interpreting entails not just facilitating communication but also managing communication, that involves active participating in the conversation to illuminate vague and obscure aspects of the communicative encounter. This unique interpersonal interaction has precedence over the content processing of the utterance

itself, where failure to act accordingly, can impede participants' grasp of the interpreted situation. Consequently, community interpreting has come to place almost exclusive emphasis on exploring the interpreting process in relation to the context of occurrences, whether legal, courtroom proceedings, healthcare settings, etc.

In addition, community interpreters have to observe the various aspects of the interpretive encounter, including the sensitivity of the discussion, the feelings and emotions of interlocutors, their asymmetrical degree of knowledge and power, etc. Indeed, "in community interpreting, factors exist which determine and affect language and communication production, such as speech's emotional content, hostile or polarized social surroundings, its created stress, the power relationships among participants, and the interpreter's degree of responsibility" (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Language_interpretation). These factors determine the way people, including the interpreter, ought to use the language and to what extent. They also put some restrictions upon language users in how to express specific ideas.

As in the case of nearly all social activities within particular societies, people performing certain roles may be subjected to certain types of constraints, and this can apply automatically to community interpreters, as well. Public service interpreters and according to Corsellis (2008:8), "are vulnerable to pressures from public services to abandon their impartial status and from other language speakers or from the media to break confidences". In the community setting, the interpreter relation is almost nearly between two parties, one of them is superior, the other is inferior. All consecutive interpreters, who either answer the questionnaire, or with whom the researcher conducts the interview, maintain that the primary standard of their work is to be impartial and credible. Nevertheless, it is doubtful if the interpreter, against this challenging situation, can always defy and resist the pressures exerted upon him/her by people with authority, or people in whose hands are the keys to success.

From a linguistic point of view, interpreters' work in community settings is fraught with many obstacles and difficulties. The chief of them is the fact that both the client and the public service provider belong to diverse social worlds. The social distance among interlocutors will inevitably reflect itself in the language they use for communication. Consequently, interpreters ought to struggle to cope with different registers and dialect words peculiar to certain social groups, of vulnerable, frightened and, often, uneducated people, who may suffer of communication problems. Nevertheless, the community interpreter's needs, according to Carr et al. (1997:161),

are superior to the interlocutors' needs in the conversation. In fact, the interpreter is the centre of the turn-taking process, and he must both take responsibility for and influence his own speaking time. He must ensure that he both claims the necessary speaking space, and maintains it for long enough. He must also ensure that simultaneous talk is avoided, as it can become a threat to his chances of grasping and remembering everything that is being said. All these requirements mean that he may be forced to interrupt one or several interlocutors when they are speaking.

The interruption in the current course of interaction is done to keep the messages' production by speaker in short chunks, often in the form of a question and a response. All these measures undertaken by interpreters are implemented for the sake of offering them more room for maneuver in face-to-face interactions.

In the same line of thought, acquaintance of interactional patterns community interpreters are involved in, is of fundamental importance for the successful management of dialogically organized settings. As Wadensjo, Dimitrova and Nilsson (2007:53) argue "interpreters as well as primary parties systematically and necessarily co-orient toward

communicative tasks such as signaling change in footing, i.e., managing different ways of production or reception of utterances".

The concept of 'footing' was introduced by Goffman (1981, as cited by Partington 2003:60) and can provide profound insights for understanding interpreters' choices and decisions during the interpreting process. According to him "a change in footing implies a change in the alignment we take up to ourselves and the others present as expressed in the way we manage the production or reception of an utterance". This can be done, and as Goffman argues, when interpreters exceed the mere linguistic meaning of the utterance to take into account the various aspects of the communicative encounter, e.g. managing the turn-taking process, asking for explanations, etc. Furthermore, interpreters should deal with certain degrees of flexibility with the mechanism of turn-taking and the relationships embedded in the interpretive event. As Angelelli and Jacobson (2009:57) argue "community interpreters are faced with the daunting task of managing the flow of conversation". Indeed, interpreters resort to the footing strategy mainly and in compliance with the complex social reasons. As Partington (2003:60) argues that "of particular interest here will be to study how shifts of footing are employed deliberately or semi-deliberately to protect or further speaker's rhetorical interests". In other words, the interpreter's role can be envisioned as a tool for the negotiation of power relations among interlocutors in conversations.

Before examining the two main types of community interpreting, it would be expedient to emphasize once again that the balance of power constitutes the primary motivation that controls and governs the relationships between interlocutors in any oral encounter. It could be argued that power differentials are more salient in a court of law or in a medical consultation, due primarily to the asymmetry of power and status among participants in the communicative setting. In the words of Roberts et al. (2000:19), "the imbalance of power inherent in so many community settings has given rise to the view of some interpreters that the interpreter must also be an advocate for the client". This notion is held strongly by

interpreters despite the recognition that impartiality is an indispensable quality in community interpreting. The main reason for adopting this particular stance by interpreters, is their sympathy with the less fortunate and deprived sectors of society, although some interpreters believe that it is possible to be both an interpreter and an advocate at the same time. The emphasis on advocacy, and according to Carr et al. (1997:13), "implies defending, pleading for or actively supporting the client". In other words, amid the social inequality pervading in most of the community settings, interpreters usually work in favor of their underprivileged clients.

4.2.9 Courtroom Interpreting

The most striking example of the influence of the social context upon the performances of interpreters can be detected in the courtroom setting. The constraints placed on interpreters in the legal system, including the pressures exerted upon them by the defendants' families, the judges, juries, lawyers, the strict procedures, the media and finally the society as a whole if the case has aroused public opinion, restrict interpreters' freedom in their selection of the appropriate interpreting strategy, suitable and responsive to the specific needs of interlocutors. The main reason for those limitations is the fact that the courtroom proceedings demand verbal translation of the defendants' speech, which may lead to the interpreters assuming a very restricted role in the interpretive encounter.

By closely observing the original version of the messages transmitted, i.e., by translating literally, the interpreter is deemed to be offering to the court an exact version of what has been said in another language without any sort of intervention. According to Gonza'lez, Va'squez and Mikkelson (2012:872), "court interpreters must not omit a single element of meaning, whether verbal or non-verbal". He justifies this kind of behavior, "because the interpreter represents the voice of the defendant to the court and vice versa, it is imperative for the interpreter to capture every element of the SL message and transfer it as wholly and

faithfully as humanly possible". For this reason, courtroom proceedings must ensure equal opportunities of interaction for all parties involved.

The rigorous demand of accurate interpreting in the court of law, to the extent of maintaining equivalence of style of the witnesses' testimonies, may be at odds with the main mission of interpreters as social/cultural mediators. Indeed, Carr et al. (1997:196) contend that "the law sees the interpreter as a conduit rather than a linguistic mediator who is trained to have an awareness of multiple meanings according to the context and then to make communicative choices between them". On the other hand, one can consider now a rather different point of view concerning the admissible degree of intervention on the part of court interpreters. According to Roberts et al. (2000:145) that "internally, the interpreter must maintain neutrality towards the defendant or witness. The interpreter's cultural intervention should not derive from sympathy with the defendant or a belief in his guilt or innocence". The only permissible condition for such an intervention is only to bridge linguistic, cultural and social differences. Valero-Garces and Martin (2008:114) justify this permissible degree of intervention on the part of the interpreter by stating that, "a literal, word for word translation will not produce a faithful rendition. It is very unlikely that any interpreter would ever attempt to do so consistently, even if they think the courts expect them to, as it would be an impossible task".

Before proceeding further, it is expedient to reiterate that several forces collaborate for the purpose of determining court interpreters' verbal behaviors including the time constraints, the pressures exerted upon them by counsels, judges and the social hierarchies which shape the structure of the encounter, where power differentials are clear. These forces must be taken into consideration when analyzing interpreters' performances at court. Against these formidable forces, interpreters need to resort to appropriate linguistic resources quickly, without any real time to stop and think. Furthermore, what makes the court interpreters' job much more demanding than other forms of interpreting activities, is that they cannot entirely

disregard non-semantic information such as pauses, hesitations and silences, since they must be included in the TL version to provide an exact copy of the SL message.

Indeed, "the work of court interpreters is highly demanding. It necessitates a specific skill set, such as thorough awareness of cultural variations, integrity and honesty and above all an adequate knowledge of the standards of court proceedings and the legal terminologies used in the court of law" (www.criticallink.org/cli-blog). In addition, in many courtroom settings, the interpretive output is considered an essential part of the evidence. Consequently, court interpreters should perform their sensitive and delicate job with utmost degree of faithfulness, and above all complete loyalty that serves the benefits and the interests of their clients. This can be done by being extremely sensitized to the social factors operating within and beyond the courtroom's atmosphere, and simultaneously having the ability to manipulate and deal with the entire circumstances affecting the communicative outputs.

It is necessary to acknowledge that in the courtroom proceedings, language constitutes the weapons, by which the various parties in the interaction fight, in their endeavor to emerge victorious in this confrontation. As Maley and Fahey (1991, as cited by Carr et al. 1997:201) contend that "if the trial is a battle, it is a battle fought with words and the role of discourse strategies in achieving supremacy becomes all important". Actually, the most important thing that court interpreters should be completely aware of, according to Mason (2001:21), is that "questions in the adversarial courtroom are used strategically by counsel to guide, control and constrain the information presented in evidence". Consequently, questions in courtroom interpreting are used as a means to impose certain realities and, simultaneously, prove certain points of view, by controlling and manipulating the evidences. And for mainly this reason, and as Mason (ibid) contends that "it is essential that interpreters understand the purpose of questions in the courtroom and the pragmatic effect of each type in order

to render accurate interpretations". Interpreters should be fully aware of their positions in courtroom interactions, and realize that, usually, attorneys may abuse the imbalance of power that operates in this type of setting, in order to influence the outcome of the mediated encounter. Court interpreters must be wary not to be drawn into the trap of the social determinants pervading the structure of courtroom proceedings, to the extent of jeopardizing the interests and the fates of their clients. The fact that the defendants belong to less dominant and vulnerable groups, apart from being members of linguistic and ethnic minorities, necessitates using the words of the defendants with the utmost degree of responsibility. In fact, the main motive of using court interpreters' services to migrants or indigenous people, is somehow to give them a fair advantage in the legal system.

In fact, court interpreters have to deal with very complex forms of interaction, since it is characterized as having multi-dimensional angles that should be taken into due consideration during the interpreting process. According to Mădălina Gălie (2016) "the court interpreter has to mediate communication between the court and the defendant or a witness, who does not speak the language of the court. This communication can be characterized as an interlingual, intercultural and intersocial communication" ([https://ar.scribd.com/doc/304151250/Cursul-3-Interpretarea -CA-Act-de-Comunicare](https://ar.scribd.com/doc/304151250/Cursul-3-Interpretarea-CA-Act-de-Comunicare)). That the communication is interlingual is obvious, since it takes place between interlocutors belonging to different linguistic groups. The intercultural nature of the interaction stems from the fact that the languages used in the encounter have their own cultures. Sometimes, however, the two cultures involved differ immensely. Finally, the communication is intersocial because the defendants often belong to a social class that differs greatly from that of their interlocutors.

4.2.10 Healthcare Interpreting

A comparable picture emerges from interpreting in healthcare settings, the second major domain of spoken language interpreting in the community. In

studying the expected role of consecutive interpreters in healthcare settings, interpreters are bounded by the social reality of this particular encounter, in which the social forces can have the upper hand in dictating the interpreters' verbal behaviors. Here, interpreters can be viewed as cultural and social brokers working to redress the imbalance of power among interlocutors. In healthcare interpreting, interpreters should overcome the social and language diversity to bridge the gaps between interlocutors in clinical encounters. Medical interactions are, according to Carr et al. (1997:154), "therefore, to a great extent asymmetrical by nature, as regards social roles, linguistic features and inter-action".

Furthermore, and as Brunette et al. (2003:70) state, "doctor-patient communication in medical institutions is basically characterized by an asymmetric distribution of knowledge. Stocks of knowledge differ not only with regard to medical issues, but also in relation to institutional types of discourse". Indeed the asymmetry of power and knowledge is obvious during this unequal encounter between a doctor and a patient. First of all, the doctor is a specialist in medicine and the patient lacks this knowledge. Secondly, the doctor is in a position to determine how a health problem should be dealt with, while the patient's role is to provide the necessary information about his/her condition. Thirdly, the doctor has the right to give orders and ask whatever questions s/he might think of, whereas the patient has to comply and answer. Fourthly, the doctor is the one who makes decisions and controls the course of the consultation and of the treatment, and most of the time interrupts the patient's turn-taking whenever s/he wants, while the patient should only cooperate. And finally, the doctor decides the time and the duration of the consultation. In other words, power enjoyed by the doctor gives him/her the right to control orders of discourse and more importantly, which discourse is the most appropriate one for the setting.

The healthcare interpreters should be completely responsive to the cultural and social milieu overshadowing the whole medical encounter, the

most prominent aspect observed in such interpretive encounters, is the power differentials among interlocutors. This is besides being utterly aware of the social and cultural specificities as regards to the interactional styles, the appropriate ways of dealing with embarrassing and intimate subjects, and the strict adherence to the issues of confidentiality. According to Corsellis (2008:103), "the psychiatrist without a true understanding of a patient's particular culture and above his/her social background, would be hampered in recognizing the symptoms if they were transferred in such circumstances".

The fact that the doctor-patient relationship is governed by the asymmetry of power, which stems from the social hierarchies in the community, as the doctor assumes a high status, and the patient who is supposed to have a very humble status in the society, should not give the interpreter the pretext of assuming the role of institutional advocate. According to Angelelli (2004:113), "doctors are under time constraints, and most of the time they do not want to listen to those stories". This example portrays the justification of one of the Californian hospital interpreters interviewed by Angelelli for omitting much of what patients say in the consultation: "doctors don't have time to listen". As the example above illustrates, adopting the role of the advocate for the institution or service provider, due to the social determinants, can have detrimental consequences in the context of the interaction. This can be done by getting the patients to answer in prescribed forms dictated to them by doctors, which limits their freedom to express themselves freely and explain their conditions. In other words, doctors control the behavior of patient by taking control of turn-taking in conversations. Indeed, amid this challenging situation, interpreters must act in accordance with the ethics and standards of their profession, and avoid, as far as possible, adopting an ambivalent stance that serves only the interests of one party in the interaction. Actually, interpreters' interests in keeping the communication channels

open, must converge with the motives of both parties involved in the interpreted encounter, but unfortunately, this is not always the case.

4.2.11 The Controversial Role of Consecutive Interpreters

An indispensable element in examining the interplay of the psychological, social, pragmatic and the political variables of face-to-face interactions, is the analysis of the role of interpreters amid these, sometimes, conflicting and competing forces. This ought to be carried out for the purpose of understanding and justifying the decisions and choices made by interpreters in conscious or unconscious ways. In addition, the role adopted by interpreters can have significant effects on the evolution of the interpretive encounter, or more precisely, in meeting the desired end of such personal contacts. By denying the complexity of interpreters' role as they facilitate communication, this attitude can distort the reality of the interpreters at work, limiting the opportunities for understanding the dynamic and the multi-faceted role interpreters play in interactions. In fact, the principles of neutrality and impartiality are the foundations of interpreters' ethics; nevertheless, in reality, they are not easy to achieve.

It is a matter of fact that the most essential requirement of all types of interpretation is that interpreters should be completely faithful to the original messages transmitted between interlocutors. According to this perspective, Gile (1992, as cited by Moody 2011:41) demands that the interpretation should be faithful to the original both in "message and style". Though he gives priority to the informational content over the linguistic "package" of the utterance. Nevertheless, he affirms that the form of the target language product should be natural and native. What Gile meant is that while faithfulness relates to the content of the end-product, delivery is the package that delivers that content, which does not constitute the main goal of initiating the encounter. Indeed, and according to Gile (1995:33), "packaging may result in a distorted view of quality, especially in interpreting". Of course, the linguistic package of the utterance can be manipulated by modulating form without informational changes, and this

can be done by using more familiar expressions instead of more formal ones, to suit the intellectual levels of both interlocutors and listeners.

When interpreters adhere to their prescribed role and interpret literally, this decision will inevitably lead to inaccurate or at least inappropriate interpretations, due primarily not only to linguistic differences, but also to social and cultural ones. What strengthens this point of view, is that language is not a monolithic block at all, and the complexity of real face-to-face communication has a considerable amount of consensus and endorsement by translating and interpreting scholars alike. Adopting the stance of literal and faithful interpretation is actually based on the ideal assumption that there will be no communication problems between participants involved in the interpretive event. Nevertheless, in real-life communications, misunderstanding can occur at any moment of the interpretive process, since interlocutors belong to various linguistic and social environments, apart from having diverse interests and motives behind initiating such personal contacts.

The conceptualization of an interpreter as a conduit or language converter like a 'voice box', considers accuracy to have precedence over the intentions and the goals of the parties involved in the oral interaction. Actually, this limited outlook ignores the true nature of human interaction as highly fluid and largely unpredictable, since it relies mainly upon the hidden meanings of utterances rather than their surface meanings. If the interpreters stick to their prescribed role and remain largely passive, there might exist some sort of contradictions between the surface meaning of the utterance and its intended meaning, which inevitably may result in a complete breakdown of the communication channels. What justifies this view, and according to Gile (1995:166), is the fact that "following the source-language structure and lexical choices in one's target-language speech is risky: the interpreter may get stuck at a certain point because of syntactic and grammatical differences between the languages".

In fact, the interpreter's mission of enabling and keeping the communication channels open, necessitates some form of mediating intervention, in compliance with the expected role the interpreter plays, as a cultural/social ambassador. This expected role of the interpreter will inevitably contradict and clash with the prescribed role of him/her of being completely faithful to the original message(s). Indeed, Knapp-Potthoff and Knapp (1986, as cited by Valero-Garces & Martin 2008:18) found that, "the non-professional interpreter at the same time functions as a transmitter of the messages of S_A and S_B and as a mediator between conflicting viewpoints, assumptions, and presuppositions". In other words, they (ibid) envisage a mediator role as "located somehow on a continuum between that of a mere medium of transmission and that of a true third party". Such findings have shed light on the thorny debate concerning the interpreter's role, that is, the question of what, apart from relaying messages, the interpreter is expected and permitted to do in order to facilitate understanding in any communicative event. In the interpreted encounter, the interpreter transcends the passive role prescribed by the traditional outlook and engages in active participation in any communicative event, to help reconstruct the meaning intended by various parties in a conversation. As Linell (1998:22) asserts, "meanings are simply not the products of autonomous individuals alone".

Actually, the interpreter's role differs significantly from that of the translator, in as far as the former role involves a human dimension highlighted by the direct contact between the interpreter and the participants in oral interactions. What characterizes face-to-face communications is that the interpreter can grasp the entirety of the situation, and, consequently, becomes aware of the communicative needs of the interlocutors. His/Her role exceeds the mere transfer of information, and extends to actively participating in the collective construction of meaning, in his/her endeavor to help unfold the situation to both parties wishing to communicate successfully. Roy (2000:66), in her discussion of

participants' roles and purposes, provides evidence that "an interpreter's role is more than to 'just translate' or 'just interpret'", and highlights the interpreter's active involvement in the interaction. In fact, interpreters, usually, guide and direct turns at talk, initiate requests for clarification and respond to questions directed to them by other participants, and this is an irrefutable evidence that strongly supports the interpreters' engagement in creating and shaping the communicative event.

It is axiomatic to assume that interpreters constantly react to and interact with, participants involved in the interpretive event, in compliance with their role as facilitators of communication. In fact, the role of interpreters will differ slightly in response to the context of occurrences, i.e., the exigencies of each specific context. On the other hand, the permissible degree of the interpreters' intervention can be measured, first of all, by evaluating the interlocutors' needs to go beyond mere mediation, depending on the degree of their mutual understanding to each other's intentions. The most succinct and convincing vision that could spare this controversy was envisioned by Gile (1995:59), who contends that "in determining principles of fidelity for interpretation and translation, it seems appropriate to start not with the finished linguistic product, but with the setting of communication". In other words, the successful intervention by interpreters should be gauged by whether the aim of the interaction has been achieved.

Building on this conception, and according to Angelelli (2004:13), "the different settings in which interpreters work, and the people for whom they interpret, impose different constraints and needs on the interpreted communicative events they facilitate. Thus, their role as interpreters undergoes constant change in order to satisfy those needs and constraints". However, the role of interpreters throughout history, and according to Pöchhacker and Shlesinger (2002:394), "has been crucially determined by the prevailing hierarchical constitution of power and their position in it". Although the social forces in any speech community, as we mentioned

earlier, compel interpreters to adopt certain stances towards participants in the interpretive event, consecutive interpreters should refrain from adopting an ambivalent attitude in performing their duties, regarding their verbal treatment of utterances uttered by different parties in the interaction. This may result in espousing double standards in the way they handle the interpreting process, and, consequently betray the trust of people engaged in the interaction and the audience, in general. In addition, this attitude on the part of interpreters may bereave the interpreted encounter of any reliability and credibility.

What makes the interpreters' work more delicate and riskier is that they actually participate with other interlocutors in creating and constructing the meaning of the interpretive event. Cecilia Wadensjö (1998) shows how participants in the triadic exchange affect each other's verbal behavior. In other words, the construction of meaning is not an individual enterprise, but rather a collective one, since meaning is not totally objective and independent of the parties who are constructing it. In fact, interpreters are key players in the construction of meaning between interlocutors seeking to communicate successfully. Pöchhacker and Shlesinger (2002:209) state that the interpreter "is likely to exert considerable influence on the evolution of group structure and on the outcome of the interaction". Interpretation is like translation, in which the outcome of the interaction is viewed as a process of negotiation of meaning in order to reach an acceptable compromise that satisfies the diverse needs and interests of the multiple parties engaged in this verbal encounter. More precisely, interpreters are conciliators of the way messages are understood by others, by actively participating in the interaction as a third party. Furthermore, the interpreters' understanding of their role as social/cultural mediators, in a way that enables them to balance the various social forces related directly or indirectly to the communicative event, will inevitably have certain impacts on their performances. This is why Fritsch Rudser (1988, as cited by Pöchhacker and Shlesinger 2002:147) maintains that

"interpreters don't have a problem with ethics, they have a problem with their role".

By the same token, the negligence of the ramifications of the social dimension of the interpreting process can result in creating a foggy conception regarding the role of consecutive interpreters. According to Gentile et al. (1996, as cited by Hale 2004:11) on their comment on liaison interpreting, "since the operations of liaison interpreters have been little studied, and not much interest has been shown in the social dimension of liaison interpreting, the construction of the role has occurred in a fairly haphazard and uncoordinated manner. This has created significant professional and ethical problems for the interpreter".

In order to bridge that cavity and assume the role of social and cultural conciliators, professional interpreters, sometimes, make some improvements on the original message(s). These improvements usually take place at the lexical level and hardly interfere with the essential semantic content of the source message(s). In that case, these interventions do not amount to a breach of the principles of fidelity and accuracy, since they do not involve the interpreters adding their own point of view to that of the speakers. Interpreters must be sensitive and flexible while remaining faithful to the speaker. Additional information should be only provided if it is indispensable to bridge the cultural/social gaps, and only if it enhances the audience's understanding of the speaker's intentions, without jeopardizing the communicative goals or causing a breakdown in the communication attempt.

However, in order to ensure the reliability and the credibility of the interpretive outcome, the interpreters cannot be over engaged in the interaction socially and emotionally, to the extent of deciding to interpret only what they like or agree with, and overlook what they do not like or agree with. According to Angelelli (2004), various degrees of interpreters' interventions or visibility at work results from the interplay of social factors. Interpreters' behaviors are impacted by both the reality of the

situation where the interpreting process occurs, and above all, by the realities and identities of the interlocutors.

Summary:

At this point, one can summarize the main argument so far regarding the influence of the social factors upon interpreters' verbal behaviors, and consequently upon the interpretive output as a whole. Interpreters should bear in mind that language reflects society, and this is evidence of the close correlations between aspects of language and the social hierarchies of each specific linguistic community. Sedarka (as cited by Rajend et al. 2000:335) thinks that "semantics itself has become subject to a kind of social relativity. That is, the 'meaning' of key terms may well differ according to the class position of the speaker". What lends support to this perspective, is the undeniable fact that language changes over time, due to the dramatic social and political changes that strike every aspect of the society's structure. Similarly, as Bourdieu (as cited by Rajend et al. 2000:342) contends that "every linguistic interaction, however personal and insignificant it may appear, bears the traces of the social structure". Therefore, in his words (1977b, *ibid*) "what speaks is not the utterance, the language, but the whole social person".

4.3 The Pragmatic Dimension of Consecutive Interpreting

4.3.1 Introduction

One of the most important considerations in all kinds of translational activities, including interpretation, is the reality of the situation in which the communicative encounter takes place. According to Baker (1992:217), "we need to get away from the linguistic organization and look at reality, precisely because that reality is encoded in situations and texts for the translator and not in languages". In addition, Searle (1969:146) in his discussion of the slogan "meaning in use" believes that "the meaning of a word is not to be found by looking for some associated mental entity in an introspective realm, nor by looking for some entity for which it stands, whether abstract or concrete, mental or physical, particular or general, but

rather by carefully examining how the word is actually used in the language".

This part of the study will be concerned with how segments of speech are used in particular communicative interactions, and the way they are interpreted in contexts. This conception will lead one directly to the domain of pragmatics. Pragmatics, as a relatively new sub-discipline in modern linguistics, is according to Baker (1992:217) "the study of language in use. It is the study of meaning not as generated by the linguistic system, but as conveyed and manipulated by participants in a communicative situation". In other words, pragmatics is the study of the relationships between linguistic forms and the users of these forms, i.e., the study of the speakers' intended meanings. Indeed, many linguists argue, including Leech (1983:1), that "we cannot really understand the nature of language itself unless we understand pragmatics: how language is used in communication". Interpretation cannot be separated from the study of pragmatics since "It is important to note that interpreting entered academia in order to meet a pragmatic need rather than to become an object of study" (<https://books.google.ps/books?id>).

4.3.2 The Differences between the Semantic and the Pragmatic Meaning

Before proceeding further, it is expedient to differentiate between the semantic and the pragmatic meaning of an utterance. It is true that both of them deal with meaning; however, they describe the meaning of an utterance in different ways. According to Leech (1983:15), "pragmatics is distinguished from semantics in being concerned with meaning in relation to a speech situation". Actually, some linguistic scholars conceive pragmatics as the 'waste basket' of the language, in cases where the semantic meanings seem paralyzed in illuminating themselves in words or utterances, or when these linguistic units do not make sense with reference to their referential bases. As Leech (1983:19) postulates, "the semantic representation (or logical form) of an utterance is distinct from its

pragmatic interpretation". Furthermore, he asserts that the distinction between sense (meaning as semantically determined) and force (meaning as pragmatically, as well as semantically determined) is essential in order to understand the nature of human communication.

In addition, Gerver and Sinaiko (1978:201) in their explanation of the characteristics of message-meaning versus language-meaning state that "message-meaning, i.e. the meaning of any utterance or fragment of an utterance as it is intended by the speaker or writer is normally unambiguous, not-agreed upon (original), and pre-dominantly dependent on situational context". They contend that every individual uses speech in order to communicate new information, where the words of an utterance are not chosen for their own sake, but according to the goal of the interaction, and it is this choice that constitutes the meaning of words on any given occasion.

4.3.3 The Close link between Pragmatics and other Interpreting Variables

There is no doubt that pragmatics offers an additional fundamental dimension to the analysis and processing of the interpreter-mediated encounter, since it grants a central place to the roles of all parties in the construction of meaning, and takes due account of the social and psychological factors involved in the production and interpretation of utterances. Indeed, the relation between pragmatics and the social surroundings needs no further identification, as it is mentioned earlier in section two, and the link between pragmatics and the psychological state of both speakers and hearers, including interpreters, cannot be denied. As a matter of fact, and according to Hill and Irvine (1993:25) who state that, "meanings as intentions coincide with certain psychological states and it is implied that the meaning of an utterance is fully determined in the speaker's mind before the act of speaking". Moreover, the relatedness between the pragmatics of interpretation and the political surrounding has a considerable impact for maintaining the communication channels among

interlocutors in their right course, and avoiding, at the same time, relaying face-threatening acts between participants during oral interactions.

4.3.4 Cross-Cultural Pragmatics

Actually, what necessitates this pragmatic turn in linguistic is the obvious fact that the use of certain words or linguistic structures can mean one thing in one language, and a completely different thing in another, even among members of the same speech community, to the extent of causing severe misunderstanding among participants in oral interactions. Furthermore, the use of certain words and phrases may acquire different meanings in different contexts. Carr et al. (1997:202) contend that "one major problem that interpreters face is that they are not always aware of the pragmatic differences between the two languages and, thus, render a faithful, semantic interpretation in the belief that they are being accurate, when in fact they are not". Numerous examples demonstrate that the negligence of the pragmatic differences between languages and cultures can impair the communicative attempt, and in some cases, can have detrimental effects on the way participants in a conversation perceive one another. Baker (1992:234) reports the event which exhibits this dangerous linguistic behavior:

When President Nixon expressed his worries about Japanese textiles exports to the United States, to Premier Sato in 1970, Sato answered that he'll handle it as soon as he can. To Nixon, this meant that he will take care of it, that is Sato would settle the problem and find ways to curtail the exports. To Sato, however, it was a polite way of ending the conversation.

The consecutive interpreter should have illustrated Sato's answer at the spot, which means 'No' according to the Japanese standards. According to these standards, oriental people do not like to say anything that might give offense. This misinterpretation leads to a significant misunderstanding between the two leaders.

4.3.5 Speakers' Intentions with Respect to the Wider Notion of Context

In studying pragmatics, which is of primary concern for consecutive interpreters, since it is concerned with the interpretation of linguistic meanings in context, we are in fact in the realm of a wider context, consisting of the entirety of circumstances (not only linguistic) surrounding the production and the interpretation of speech. The importance of the concept of 'context', including the human context, i.e. power relations, facial expressions and the speakers' moods, is that it determines the amount of language production required for reaching a better understanding of the speakers' intentions. Searle (1983, as cited in Hill and Irvine 1993:25) asserts that "the view of communication as an exchange of individuals' intentions through a particular code is still very common in the Western tradition of linguistic studies". And this perspective is presumably what Pochhacker (2004:56) is implying when he argues that, "understanding ('making sense of') what has been expressed in a source language, and expressing the ideas grasped, i.e. the 'message', in another language so that they would 'make sense' to the target audience, appeared as the main pillars of the interpreter's work". This perspective is further reinforced by Seleskovitch (1978a, as cited by Pöchhacker 2004:57) who demands that the interpreter's target-language output "must be geared to the recipient", and describes the interpreter's task as grasping the speaker's intended sense.

This is of course the ideal situation, but in reality, and owing to the complexity and the high unpredictability of human interactions, things do not proceed so smoothly and incidents of misunderstanding sometimes occur, due precisely to the interpreter's misconception of the speakers' intentions. And this is, of course, one of the fundamental feature of human interactions, since people when conversing, will never understand fully their interlocutor's intended meaning. One of the many reasons behind this phenomenon is that human beings, including interpreters, do not have the adequate means at their disposal to penetrate into the speaker's mind, and

know exactly what s/he intends to communicate at that particular time and place.

Only for this reason, Yule (1996:4) thinks that "pragmatics is appealing because it's about how people make sense of each other linguistically, but it can be a frustrating area of study because it requires us to make sense of people and what they have in mind". Therefore, the process of inferencing is an unavoidable stage in the evolution of the meaning of utterances, and, consequently, on the interpreting process as a whole. This aspect of human communication is stressed by Sperber and Wilson (1986, as cited by Freeman & Smith 2013:274)) who maintain that "communication is successful not when hearers recognize the linguistic meaning of the utterance, but when they infer the speaker's 'meaning' from it". Furthermore, Pöchhacker and Shlesinger (2002:180) argue that "a decoded speech stimulus is indeterminate (vague or ambiguous) until enriched and disambiguated with the help of context in the inferential phase".

Moreover, what complicates the interpreter's work from the perspective of pragmatics and according to Yule (1996:3), is that, "a great deal of what is unsaid is recognized as part of what is communicated". This conception will bring us directly to what Grice (1975, as cited by Baker 1992:223) terms 'implicature', "to refer to what the speaker means or implies rather what s/he literally says". Implicature and according to Baker (1992:223) is "a successful interpretation of a particular speaker's intended or implied meaning in a given context". In performing their delicate work, consecutive interpreters should be alerted to the fact that the speaker's actual words are only tools for conveying the meaning of his/her utterance as manifested on the surface structure of the speech. Nevertheless, beneath this surface structure lies the true or the implied meaning that the speaker aspires to relay, which motivates him/her in using these linguistic units as an umbrella in an attempt to express his/her intended meaning. Gile (2009:29) states that "an overwhelming majority of texts and utterances

which are translated or interpreted professionally can be viewed as representing their senders' aims or intentions to provide information or explanations to their intended receivers, or more generally, to have some sort of influence on them".

There are several incidents where consecutive interpreters destroy the intended meaning of the speaker(s) and, consequently, deprive him/her of presenting his/her case in the strongest possible ways. A clear incident happens in an interview with President Saddam Hussein conducted by CBS channel in 2003, which was published on 21, 06, 2013. Towards the end of the interview, the reporter asks Saddam Hussein the following question: to make sure that the interpreter understands the question, the reporter asks the interpreter whether the question is clear enough. The Iraqi interpreter answers the reporter affirmatively, which was not the case.

Reporter: Not so long ago, you were clearly hailed by Arabs from Palestinians to Jordanians throughout the Arab world as we quote, "Arab avenger". Are you still relevant in the Arab street or as Osama Ben Laden made you with other Arabs irrelevant?

Interpreter: قبل مدة ليست بالبعيدة كان العرب يحيونكم من الفلسطينيين والأردنيين في كل أنحاء العالم العربي وكانوا يصفونك ببطل العرب. هل في رأيك أنك مازلت شخصا مهما ذو أهمية في الشارع العربي، أم أنك أصبحت بما فعله أسامة بن لادن لك ولغيرك من العرب غير مهما في الشارع العربي؟ (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?V=LjzbQugkkus>)

Before trying to analyze the interpreting outcome, it is absolutely necessary first of all to comment on the reporter's selection of language used. The reporter's description or even his quotation of Saddam's character as "Arab avenger" is totally an unacceptable designation in this kind of highly charged political interview, conducted at the highest political level, especially at this critical juncture of history, which may determine the destiny of the entire region. Instead of describing Saddam as "Arab hero", the reporter tries to mislead, not only the interpreter, but also the whole global audience by describing Saddam as "Arab avenger", which certainly has negative connotations as an indication of primitivism and narrow-

mindfulness, and is strongly condemned in the Western cultures as a savage behavior.

Perhaps, what motivates the reporter to use this term to describe the personality of Saddam is the fact that this concept is deeply rooted in the Arabs' social and cultural heritage. Throughout the Arabs' history, when someone seeks to take revenge as a retaliation for the unjust deeds of others, the Arab milieu considers it to be a normal and even a justified action, to the extent of describing it as an act of manhood. However, in this international context, the reporter intentionally uses this designation negatively to indicate that Saddam has a primitive and an aggressive character that can neither condone nor tolerate in any civilized society. In this particular context, this description can be conceived as an implicit insult aiming to lessen the morality of all Arabs, who still live in the dark ages, and Saddam is no exception. Another hidden intention for this usage is to deprive Saddam from presenting his case to the Western public opinion in the most suitable way, in his endeavor to prevent the imminent war. The reporter, by doing so, aims to legitimize the Western aggression as an act of self-defense against tyranny and dictatorship.

Here, the interpreter consciously foiled the reporter's attempt by rendering "Arab avenger" (المنتقم العربي) into (بطل العرب) "Arab hero", under the influence of his psychological state, his social awareness and above all, for pragmatic and political motivations. The careful selection of words and the quick wittedness on the part of the interpreter, seek to mitigate the inappropriate use of language by the reporter. Actually, the interpreter's verbal output aims to avoid face-threatening act in order to maintain the communication channels between interlocutors, and to ensure the continuous flow of information.

Obviously, and regardless of the hidden intention of the reporter, the interpreter appears to misunderstand the reporter's question. The interpreter under the influence of his psychological state and his utter feeling of loyalty to his President, completely destroys the intended meaning of the

illocution of the question. What the reporter meant, which the interpreter fails to understand, and, consequently, has weakened the pragmatic force of the utterance, is that Osama Ben Laden has become the defender, the dominant figure and the sole champion of the Arabs' street, at the expense of even Saddam Hussein himself. Many Arabs have considered Saddam as the savior until the appearance of Ben Laden and his 9/11 bold attack on the USA, during which the status of Saddam has been marginalized. However, the interpreter's conception is that the deeds of Ben Laden have distorted the reputation of Arabs world-wide, which is contrary to what the reporter intended the question to be. What the reporter meant is that Ben Laden hijacks the spotlight from everyone, including Saddam himself and becomes the dominant figure in the Arabs' public scene. But the interpreter under the influence of the psychological, social and political dimensions sacrifices the pragmatics of the question, through his belief that the comparison between Saddam and Ben Laden cannot, and should not, be held, nor has a solid ground.

At the end of the interview, the reporter tries to mislead Saddam, by instigating him to answer the following question, albeit indirectly, without being aware of the hidden intention behind initiating such a question, which appears on the surface, as an innocent and normal one. Even the interpreter does not estimate the true nature of the reporter's question, which aims to drag Saddam to fall into a well-planned scheme, for the sake of revealing to the global audience, from the Western point of view, the true nature of Saddam's character. By not paying attention to the pragmatics of the question, the interpreter, inadvertently, facilitates the reporter's evil mission, and, consequently, makes Saddam to commit the grave error.

Reporter: And he does or does not agree that Osama Ben Laden is now the
Champion of the Arab street?

The interpreter renders Saddam's answer as follows:

Interpreter: فإذا كنتم في أمريكا تعتبرون أسامة بن لادن بطلا فنحن لا نغار منه، وإذا كانت الأمة العربية، على وفق سؤالكم، تعتبره بطلا، كذلك لا نغار منه.

From the analysis of Saddam's answer, indeed, he falls in the pitfall of this last question. The pragmatics of the reporter's question seeks to know whether Saddam supports the deeds of Ben Laden, who kills 3000 Americans, or whether he considers it a crime, since this attack targets innocent civilians, from the international standards. Saddam falls in this trap when he says, "فنحن لا نغار منه". At least, the researcher detects from the second part of Saddam's answer, that Saddam is, absolutely, in favor of the deeds of Ben Laden, since the vast majority of Arabs glorify and idealize Ben Laden's unprecedented blow to the USA. This means that the reporter reveals the truth, that Saddam supports the killing of American people, as opposite to what Saddam claims at the beginning of the interview, that he is not the enemy of the American people.

Here is another example where the interpreter does not catch the intended meaning of the speaker, and as a result, causes a severe misunderstanding between interlocutors according to Ronald (1999:2-3):

A harmless phrase can provoke a diplomatic incident. '*Il ya anguille sous roche*', a Soviet delegate once said in a speech at the time of the Cold War. With no malice aforethought, the interpreter translated this expression by "there is a nigger in the wood pile". A black man got up immediately and left the room. He was the leader of the American delegation: he thought the Russian was insulting him. If the interpreter had said, "there is more than meets the eye" instead, which means the same as "there is a nigger in the woodpile", he would not have offended the sensitive American delegate and would have avoided an international incident.

Obviously, the speaker's intended meaning, which the interpreter didn't capture, is that the negotiation teams from both sides should focus on

important issues and avoid wasting time on trivial matters, and thus an unnecessary face-threatening act could have been avoided.

4.3.6 The Intersect between Coherence and the Context of Occurrences

In this particular context, the interpreter fails to make sense of the whole text, and, consequently, fails to arrive at a coherent interpretation of it. In other words, the interpreter fails to establish a 'fit' between the speaker's utterance and the external world surrounding the production of speech, including the human context of interpretation. Actually, the concept of coherence is a controversial one in the field of pragmatics, because the same text/speech seems coherent for one reader/listener but it seems the other way round for another. In its simplistic version, the coherence of a text or speech signifies that a stretch of language is recognized as having a continuity of sense, or the meaning of any segment of speech is not odd or anomalous, and does not contradict the reality of the situation in which the communicative event takes place. According to Baker (1992:219), "what actually gives texture to a stretch of language is not the presence of cohesive markers but our ability to recognize underlying semantic relations which establish continuity of sense". Indeed, the coherence of a text or a speech emerges as a result of the interaction between the knowledge presented in the text/speech and the reader's/interpreter's own knowledge and experience of the world. Interpreters should supply the missing links in order to fill the gaps in any utterance within the process of inferencing. So, the process of interpretation combines both the interpretation of text as well as the context of occurrences.

In this sense, and according to Yule (1996:3), context influences what is said and what is not said. The success of communication attempts depend to a greater extent on whether the interpreter captures the right interpretation from several probable ones, that is, the speaker's intended context. Hickey (1998:42) believes that "the success of communication can depend very much on whether the audience uses the right, that is, the speaker-intended context. The use of wrong contextual information can

lead to a complete failure in the communication attempt". By the same token, consecutive interpreters should construct messages depending on the new communicative exigencies, that transcend the linguistic reality of the message itself. The reality of the situation should constitute the ultimate criteria for selecting the appropriate interpretation of the oral messages. In cases where there is some sort of contradiction between the linguistic meaning and the reality of occurrences, consecutive interpreters ought to favor the latter at the expense of the former, since it corresponds to real language use. This perspective is further underpinned by House (1977, as cited by Carr et al. 1997:202) who claims that "pragmatic meaning thus overrides semantic meaning. We may, therefore, consider a translation to be primarily a pragmatic reconstruction of its source text".

Only for this reason, it seems that the sensitivity and the delicacy of the wider notion of 'context' seem to constitute the main obstacle in implementing machine translation in the interpreting process at a large scale. Indeed, there have been many attempts to incorporate machine translation in the interpreting phenomenon, to overcome problems inherent in the verbal behaviors of human interpreters, such as neutrality, objectivity, loyalty, etc. Nevertheless, and as Hatim and Mason (1990:23) contend that, "the whole notion of context was deemed to be intractable and, consequently, beyond the bounds of machine processing".

Below is another example where the interpreter fails to grasp the intended meaning of the speaker, and stick primarily to its linguistic meaning, and, consequently, jeopardizes the success of the whole encounter at senior political level, as cited in (<http://www.aiic.net/ViewIssues.CFM>):

This is a serious incident that occurred during President Nixon's administration, while personal negotiations were going on between the President and Emperor Hirohito of Japan. The Emperor, at one point, responded to a question with "I'll think about it". The interpreter should have made it clear to Mr. Nixon

that this answer rendered as "No", since this was not done, the result was a misunderstanding that produced some resentment.

4.3.7 Basic Pragmatic Notions and their Applications during the Interpreting Process

Furthermore, Hicky (1998) believes that the speaker's intended interpretation of an utterance is highly context dependent. The reason for this context-dependency lies according to Relevance Theory, in the inferential nature of human communication. In Relevance Theory, the notion of 'context of an utterance' is as Sperber and Wilson (191986, as cited by Hickey 1998:42) maintain is "a psychological construct, a subset of the hearer's assumptions about the world", more specifically, it is "the set of premises used in interpreting [that] utterance". Moreover, as Sperber and Wilson (1986, as cited in Hickey 1998:42-43) believe that, "a context in this sense is not limited to information about the immediate physical environment or immediately preceding utterances: expectations about the future, scientific hypotheses or religious beliefs, anecdotal memories, general cultural assumptions, beliefs about the mental state of the speaker, may all play a role in interpretation". Under this definition, context is a tremendously broad notion that can include virtually all the circumstances involved in one way or another to unfold the essence of the messages exchanged, where the most important one is the human context, which is the chief extra-linguistic factor in language use. By focusing on the inferential nature of human communication, Relevance Theory examines the interaction between linguistic meanings and contextual factors in the interpretation of utterances. More precisely, Relevance Theory seeks to maximize the contextual effects of the utterance, in exchange for the lowest expenditure of processing effort. Indeed, the notion of "optimal relevance" was used by Sperber and Wilson (1986/1995, as cited in Hickey 1998:43) to indicate that "an utterance is optimally relevant (a) when it enables the audience to find without unnecessary effort the meaning intended by the communicator and (b) when that intended meaning is worth the audience's

effort, that is, when it provides adequate benefits to the audience". Interpreters can apply the notion of relevance, to be constantly brief (efficient) and to the point (effective), and, moreover, predict when communication problems might occur during face-to-face interactions. Nevertheless, this does not mean at all that the interpreter is the sole responsible for either the success or the failure of the communicative attempt, since there are other parties involved and are responsible, in differing degrees, for reaching its desired end.

Closely related to the notion of relevance is the notion of presupposition. This notion is, in fact, of great benefit to consecutive interpreters, since it allows for the economy of communication. Presupposition according to Munday (2001:97), "relates to the linguistic and extra-linguistic knowledge the sender assumes the receiver to have or which are necessary in order to retrieve the sender's message". Presupposition relieves interpreters of oral messages from the burden of having to state everything in the speaker's message(s), because s/he assumes the audience to have a sufficient background knowledge concerning the topic being discussed; consequently, the interpreter focuses only on the new information essential to understand the messages transmitted.

In addition, interpreters' familiarity with the context of occurrences is a prerequisite to understand the potential meanings of certain lexical items, since a word can often mean one thing in one context, and a totally different thing in another. In consecutive interpreting, interpreters' main mission is to convey the intended meanings of the speakers. According to Gile (1995), "the interpreter is constantly confronted with unexpected situations that must be dealt with while he/she is already working at the limits of his/her available processing capacity". According to this conception, a new perspective on pragmatics was enunciated by Leech (1983:36) who conceptualized pragmatics as involving problem-solving procedures, both from the speakers and the hearer's point of view.

According to him, "they involve general human intelligence assessing alternative probabilities on the basis of contextual evidence".

Furthermore, Seleskovitch (1978, as cited by Janzen 2005:69) goes further to contend that the actual words of the original message are largely immaterial, to the extent that interpreters must immediately discard the words and retain only the ideas or the sense of the message. One reason for this claim is that meaning itself is relative, and a single word may have, as said earlier, several potential meanings. What actually determines the meaning of any linguistic unit is primarily the context of occurrences. The meaning of the source message is inextricably tied to the context of a unique communicative situation. In that case, the interpreters have to look at features in the surrounding circumstances for clues to unfold the intended meaning of the speaker(s) at that particular time and place.

As mentioned from the outset of this thesis, consecutive interpreting is extensively used to help people speaking different languages to overcome the barriers to cross-cultural communication. Without taking all these considerations into due account, pragmatic failure becomes inevitable. Actually, pragmatic failure in consecutive interpreting can lead to a significant misunderstanding or even an unintentional offense, even with the help of interpreters as social and cultural mediators, due primarily to the interpreters' preoccupation with the literal meanings of the messages exchanged, and being under constant pressures by the constraints of the interpreting situations. Interpreters should remember the fact that humans when conversing, do not abide by the rules of grammatical correctness, but follow the rules of language use.

Thomas (1983, as cited by O'keeffe, Clancy & Adolphs 2011:100) believes that "while grammatical errors may reveal a [non-native] speaker to be a less than proficient language user, pragmatic failure reflects badly on his/her as a person ...". When the consecutive interpreter commits grammatical errors, the listeners have no difficulty in following the main stream of thought, and the channel of communication is likely to continue.

However, and according to Wu (2007:51), "pragmatic failures can lead to an unpleasant conversation because one speaker is apt to be irritated by pragmatically inappropriate meaning conveyed by the interpreter, which is assumed to be the other speaker's original meaning". Therefore, it is necessary to raise consecutive interpreters' awareness of the ramifications of pragmatic failures in order to avoid misinterpretation in face-to-face mediated encounters.

Furthermore, in dealing with various language inputs, consecutive interpreters must make a distinction between static versus dynamic texts. As Hatim and Mason (1997) believe that while the static (stable) speech provides the interpreter with a stable world, where they would be no communication problems, and the conventions of discourse could be applied automatically, the dynamic speech, which is the true nature of human interaction, poses greater challenges for interpreters in capturing the intended meaning of the messages transmitted from the multi-layered meanings that the utterances can carry. According to Hatim and Mason (1997:93), dynamism is defined "as the motivated removal of communicative stability". The dynamic nature of speeches, in particular, always defies one's expectations and relays new meanings embedded in the utterance itself. The dynamism of a discourse is a clear indication of the creativity in the way people use languages in a way that, sometimes, defies the usual modes of expression pervading in certain speech communities. Moser-Mercer (1997, as cited by Ribas 2012:813) asserts this point of view by acknowledging that "research on the interpreting process needs to go further, addressing not only the knowledge structures, but more particularly, the dynamic nature of their application during the interpreting process".

In order to reach a better understanding of the dynamics of human communication, many attempts have been made to characterize and specify the essence of human interaction, and how speakers deliver their messages. The most pertinent and decisive issue in the pragmatics of interpretation is

what has come to be known as Speech Act Theory which was proposed by the English philosopher John Austin in the late 1950s. It reveals the fundamentals of language communication from a philosophical perspective, in an attempt to answer the eternal question concerning what people do when using languages. Speech acts are used to express people's aims and intentions; in other words, what people want to do with words. "in Speech Act Theory, for instance, meaning is often identified with the speaker's intentions to express certain beliefs or bring about certain changes in the world" (Searle, 1983, as cited by Hill and Irvine 1993:25). Consequently, speech acts are the basic or the minimal units of linguistic communication. Searle (1969:18) contends that "a study of the meaning of sentences is not in principle distinct from a study of speech acts". Furthermore, Leech (1983:23) asserts that "all human communication boils down to performing certain action categories".

According to this mode, one can do three things while speaking: locutionary act, illocutionary act and perlocutionary act. Locutionary act refers to actions expressed by words, phrases and clauses; in other words, locutionary act indicates the physical act of saying something, i.e. the mere uttering of something. Illocutionary act refers to actions which expresses the speaker's intentions. And perlocutionary act refers to actions caused by an incident. The speaker's locutionary act is the surface meaning of the utterance. His illocutionary act is the intention of the speech, and his perlocutionary act is the effect of the speech on the audience (quoted from Searle, 1969:22-25).

The most important of these three acts is the illocutionary one, since it is the communicative purpose for which an utterance is employed in that particular context. In other words, it is the communicative force that accompanies the utterance, e.g. promising, threatening, denying, warning. This illocutionary act is the intention of the speaker that is to be conveyed, and for this reason, it holds the key to successful communication. The interpreter of oral messages has to consider the illocutionary force of an

utterance for the purpose of achieving an equivalence of the illocutionary act in the target language, using whatever linguistic resources available in the target language.

Nevertheless, interpreters, sometimes, distort the speakers' intentions, since there are enormous differences in how speakers of various languages and cultures encase their hidden intentions during the act of speaking. In an interview with former Iraqi President Saddam Hussein by American channel CNN in 1991, the interpreter favors the literal translation of Saddam's utterances at the expense of their pragmatic force.

صدام حسين: كلما توقعت الإدارة الأمريكية أنها ملأت بغداد بالظلام

Interpreter: the American administration expects that is filling Baghdad or covering Baghdad with darkness

صدام حسين: فستواجه الضياء الذي في صدور الشعب العراقي

Interpreter: Then the American administration will face the light that exist in the chest of Iraqi people

(<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JoovcNYcpDs>).

Irrespective of the grammatical mistakes that the rendition suffers from, and that is, of course, a feature of immediate translation, what Saddam meant in this context is that, however hard the Americans are trying to disguise or conceal their hidden intentions in striking Iraq, and launching an assault against its people, they will be always faced with the determination and the persistence of the free will of the nation. The literal rendition of the interpreter does not take the pragmatic force of this utterance into consideration. The intended meaning of Saddam's utterance serves to shed light on the fact that the Iraqi people are aware of this conspiracy that aims, in the first place, to destroy the achievements of this nation. In fact, Saddam did not mean, at all, the cut of the electric power as a result of air strikes conducted by the Western coalition. As a result, the truth will prevail at the end supported by the extraordinary courage of the Iraqi people.

A similar attitude by the interpreter which exhibits his mistreatment of the pragmatics of Saddam's utterances, happens in the interpreter's rendition of the President's comment in response to a question by the interviewer about whether the Russian's missile 'Scode' is the same as the Iraqi missile 'Al-Hussein'.

صدام حسين: الأمريكان يعرفون، ليش انتو حساسين من أن تسمون الأمور بأسمائها؟

Interpreter: Why you find it difficult to call a state a state, why don't you call a state a state?

Once again, in rendering Saddam's word 'حساسين' into 'difficult', the interpreter is weakening the pragmatic force of the utterance. What Saddam intended to mean is that, the courage of the Americans betrayed them when they were in direct confrontation with the Iraqi army, or more precisely, they were, at least, reluctant to acknowledge the military achievements of this army. The Americans resorted to underestimate the capacity and the deterrence of the Iraqi army as a kind of psychological war, in order to lessen the morale of the Iraqi soldiers.

Another example which demonstrates the significance of the pragmatics of interpretation happens during a bilateral meeting between President Obama and President Mahmoud Abbas, published on 17/ 03 / 2014.

الرئيس محمود عباس: ليس لدينا وقت نضيعه، الوقت ضيق جدا خاصة وأننا نعيش في الشرق الأوسط في ظروف صعبة للغاية في محيطنا، نأمل أن تستغل هذه الفرصة للوصول إلى سلام.

Interpreter: We don't have any time to waste. Time is not in our side, especially the very difficult situation that the Middle East is experiencing and the entire region is facing, and we hope that we will be able to seize this opportunity to achieve a lasting peace.(<https://www.youtube.com/watch?V=EB5kgDgfk1c>).

The interpreter in this excerpt transposes the phrase 'الوقت ضيق جدا' into 'time is not in our side', mainly to strengthen the illocution force of Abbas' verbal behavior. The interpreter's choice is in harmony with her attempt to emphasize that the peace process is in a race with time, amid the sensitive

and challenging situation that the entire region undergoes. Consequently, the interpreter's choice intersects with both the pragmatic and the political dimensions of the encounter, that instigates the issuance of this particular utterance. In a similar vein, the interpreter renders Abbas' word 'سلام' into 'lasting peace' (سلام دائم), for obviously the same motivations.

Another pragmatic contribution which is of primary importance to consecutive interpreters is, without doubt, Grice's (1975) co-operative principle and its maxims, "make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged" (Grice, 1975 as cited in Baker 1992:225). Consecutive interpreters need to be fully aware of the different co-operative principles operating across languages and cultures. The importance of the Grice's maxims is that they are developed primarily with spoken conversation in mind. As a consequence, they provide invaluable insights for interpreters to fully comprehend the way people manipulate the language for their own specific purposes. Of course, these maxims should be conceived as unstated assumptions people use when conversing. Interlocutors rarely mention these principles because they are taken for granted in normal interactions.

Grice's maxims (Baker, 1992:225), that the consecutive interpreter should familiarize him/herself of them are:

1- Quantity:

- a- make your contribution as informative as is required,
- b- do not make your contribution more informative than is necessary.

2- Quality:

- a- do not say what you believe to be false,
- b- do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.

3- Relevance:

Make your contribution relevant to the current exchange, i.e., be topically relevant.

4- Manner: be perspicuous, especially

- a- avoid obscurity and ambiguity of expression,
- b- be brief.
- c- be orderly: present your materials in the order in which they are required.

It goes without saying that in normal human conversations, interlocutors adhere to the co-operative principle in certain instances, but more likely, they defy, flout these maxims or exploit them to convey an intended meaning for the purpose of communication. For this reason, consecutive interpreters do not have to abide by Grice's maxims all the time. The shortcoming of the co-operative principle resides in the fact that one can, and does actually; refuse to adhere to the maxims in some communicative situations. For instance, participants may try to avoid adhering to one or more of the maxims in order to evade a topic or a question. This is often the case in political interviews, where some politicians may resort to this strategy when they are embarrassed, not authorized to respond or when answering a particular question may threaten their country's national security, and thus flout the maxims of quantity and quality.

What complicates the interpreter's mission, is that being polite in some interpreting situations can be far more important than being accurate. In some interpreting contexts, there exist a tension between politeness and accuracy, which puts the interpreter in a dilemma of favoring one of them at the expense of the other. Sometimes, to be polite is more acceptable than to be co-operative, just to maintain the channel of communication, or at least to avoid face-threatening acts that may jeopardize the success of the communication attempt. At any rate, neglecting the politeness principle in a face-to-face encounter, seems to cause severe cross-cultural difficulties, with serious ramifications in some instances.

Indeed, politeness is without doubt a feature of language in use, and, above all, a socio-cultural phenomenon that differs, sometimes, greatly across different linguistic systems. Lakoff (1990, as cited by Yule

1996:106) defines politeness as "a system of interpersonal relations designed to facilitate interaction by minimizing the potential for conflict and confrontation inherent in all human interchange". The experienced interpreter should be aware of the possibility of cross-cultural variation with regard to what is considered as a polite verbal behavior. This acknowledgement serves to help consecutive interpreters negotiate the various aspects of politeness among different parties involved in face-to-face interactions. The interpreter endeavors, in this regard, is to try, as far as possible, to reach an acceptable compromise between what is considered as polite linguistic behaviors among heterogeneous cultures and communities. Actually, the most effective way of increasing the degree of politeness between interlocutors is by using more and more indirect form of illocutions. Consequently, the chief motivation for using indirectness in the outcome of any interaction, is essentially politeness.

In launching Politeness Theory, Brown and Levinson (1987, as cited by Hatim and Mason 1997:66) maintain that "all competent language users have the capacity of reasoning and have what is known as 'face'". Another definition of politeness and according to Yule (1996:60) which highlights the notion of one's face is "the means employed to show awareness of another person's face". Face is defined according to Brown and Levinson (ibid) as: "the public self-image that everyone lays claim to, consisting of two related aspects: a) negative face: the basic claim to freedom of action and freedom from imposition; b) positive face: positive self-image and the desire that this self-image be appreciated and approved of". Consecutive interpreters should refrain from relaying face-threatening acts (FTAs) between interlocutors, and try, as far as possible, to mitigate the force of them, in order to keep the communication channels active and wholesome.

Here is a clear example of applying the politeness principle in the interpretation of utterances, by reducing (FTA) from Mason and Stewart (2001, as cited by Valero-Garces & Martin 2008:104). The dialogue is

between a father, who is an Italian, responding to an offer from a judge in the courtroom, and his daughter performing as his interpreter.

Father: *Digli che e un imbecile!* (Tell him he's an idiot).

Daughter: My father won't accept your offer.

The daughter knows for sure that her father is not in a position that enables him to produce a face-threatening act. Indeed, the weight of a (FTA) is subject to the variables of the social distance and the relative power that governs the relationships between interlocutors, and as in our case, the defendant cannot afford the consequences of enunciating such an act. The daughter weighs the imbalance of power between interlocutors, which is an important aspect of interpreter-mediated encounters, by acknowledging that by calling the judge an "idiot", her father's answer implies a total rejection of the offer. Instead, she changes an offensive remark into a polite statement. The daughter's verbal behavior aims at reducing, or, more precisely, eliminating face-threatening act. In other words, the daughter helped her father in avoiding an unnecessary confrontation.

Summary:

To sum up, the interpreting process itself is essentially a pragmatic notion, used to indicate what the various parties engaged in oral interactions intended their messages to be understood by other participants. Morris (1995, as cited by Hale 2004:7) argues that the interpreter must understand "... the speaker's intention, and not merely the speaker's words", which implies the urgent need for a pragmatic equivalence to the messages uttered by interactants in conversations. Actually, the prime motivation for the emerging of interpreting studies, is to meet the pragmatic needs of participants in any interpretive context. In other words, the interpreting process is primarily a pragmatic reconstruction of the original messages exchanged among participants in face-to-face encounters.

4.4 The Political Dimension of Consecutive Interpreting

4.4.1 Introduction

Interpreting political discourse is perhaps the most challenging and daunting task for consecutive interpreters to be embark on, since it involves portraying totally contradictory perspectives regarding what it seems, from the speaker's point of view, the one and the only legitimate conception on the way speeches must be interpreted. Furthermore, there is, usually, zero tolerance if any mistake has been committed by the consecutive interpreters during the interpreting process. In that case, they will be subjected to severe criticism, not only from the participants engaged in the interpretive setting, but also from the general public, as a whole. Indeed, interpreters can have significant influence upon the general public opinion. For instance, Roland (1999:3) says, "at a time when the tension between the United States and the USSR was at its highest, an American interpreter was accused of being a 'card carrying communist' for having enthusiastically interpreted in front of television cameras a virulent condemnation of the West by the Soviet ambassador to the United Nations". Far worse happened when "an interpreter who worked for the Italian foreign minister was captured and interrogated by the allies at the end of the Second World War. In an ironic vein, a British officer had demanded to know why he had not prevented Italy from entering the war" (Donald, 1999:160). These incidents demonstrate beyond any doubt that in decisive and critical points in history, interpreters are not entirely independent from the persons they represent, and, sometimes, can be equated with them, and held accountable for their deeds and opinions. It is hard to believe that the interpreters who worked for the Nazi regime in Germany, can be truly objective or neutral, or raise their objections to the atrocities that had been committed by the German troops in concentration camps, in front of the German political leaders.

This delicate situation may endanger and jeopardize the interpreters' legitimacy and reputation, and may have negative effects upon their career in the future. All these pressures put interpreters in real dilemmas while

they are struggling to perform enormous efforts to reconcile these multiple and antithetical parties, in a way that enables them to preserve the communication channels widely open.

4.4.2 The Characteristics of Political Speeches

In addition, what aggravates the interpreters' mission in this regard is the obvious fact that political communications tend to be intentionally vague, abstract and mostly indirect, and this is exactly what characterizes political speeches at a large scale. Moreover, interpreters, as human beings, cannot curb the influence of their attitudes, political and religious affiliations upon the outcome of the interpreted encounter. This point of view is stressed by Roberts et al. (2000:209) who maintain that "interpreters brought along their own political upbringing and ideology, showing tremendous variation even within the same culture". And this is exactly why, especially in political interpretations, total objectivity and credibility, simply do not exist.

Before attempting to examine the influence of the political atmosphere upon the interpretive outcome, it is expedient to define what makes speeches belong to the categories of political discourses. Generally speaking, any speech can be considered as political when articulated by a politician, but also, when it contains some form of resistance or tussle over power and dominance. Only for this reason, it seems that, occasionally, interpreting speeches in some languages can be an extremely an arduous job for consecutive interpreters, not only because of their linguistic characteristics, but also and more importantly, due to the sensitive political situation pervading in that turmoil region. For example, consecutive interpreters find themselves in a thorny trap in interpreting the conflicting version of truth as perceived by both the Israeli and the Palestinian side of the bloody conflict in the Middle East, regarding the main cause of the conflict, and the ideal solution to end that long-term hostility. By the same token, the interpretation of the Basque language, a region in northern Spain which campaigns to attain its independence from Madrid, makes the task of

interpreters especially difficult. In both cases, interpreters should follow the utmost degree of diplomacy, in order to avoid causing any harm to the sensations of patriotic people living in that region, who consider their cause a holy one, and deserves to be respected and understood by others.

4.4.3 Political Constraints in Face-to-Face Interactions

Actually, what necessitates the investigation of the repercussion of the political dimension of consecutive interpreting, is the fact that it can override any other constraints in face-to-face interactions. According to Baker (1997:111), "the vast majority of research has been, and continues to be, devoted to investigating cognitive aspects of interpreter's performance Little or no attention has so far been given to investigating constraints which arise from the nature of the role played by the interpreter and the pressures put on him or her by other participants in specific settings".

In face-to-face interpreting, where the consecutive interpreters are in the midst of the action, the pressures exerted upon them by other participants in the communicative setting, may exceed cognitive constraints, which are less relevant than other types of constraints in face-to-face encounters. The constraints relevant to political interactions reside, primarily, from the presence of high-profile people with all their power and influence, and their constant attempt to control the linguistic behavior of others. Besides, the nature and the sensitivity of the subject matter, and the possibility of the meeting occurring in a highly tense political atmosphere, or at the brink of an international crisis. In such cases, consecutive interpreters are expected to play a particular role in the interaction, or come by a certain linguistic behavior, in order to guarantee the success of the communication attempt. In all these cases, interpreters are vulnerable to various instances of struggle over power and control.

According to Rajend et al. (2000:317), "one of the chief concerns of a critical sociolinguistic approach is the analysis of samples of language to reveal the way language creates, sustains and replicates fundamental inequalities in societies". It is true that interpreters deal primarily with the

linguistic and extra-linguistic units of language, but needless to indicate that these units are supported and strengthened by the power structures that exist in all human societies. This hidden but governing power, instigates Foucault (1972, as cited in Rajend et al. 2000:323) to conclude that "power is everywhere, it is not a commodity that can be acquired but exists in all kind of relations, including the political, economic and even educational arenas". In his later work, Foucault (as cited by Rajend et al. 2000:324) further strengthens this view by stating that "individuals are constituted not by discourse but by relations of power, which form the ultimate principle of social reality".

4.4.4 Ideologies, Hedges and Political Discourses

Another unstated motive that language often serves, which has political orientations, and, consequently, has a tremendous power in reshaping the interpreters' performances, is without any doubt, ideology. Indeed, the exercise of power in any oral interaction is increasingly achieved through and by ideology hidden in language, used to sustain existing power relations among members involved in oral interactions. Fairclough (1989:3) argues that "ideology is pervasively present in language, that fact ought to mean that the ideological nature of language should be one of the major themes of modern social science". Therefore, the relationship between politics, on the one hand, and language people use, on the other, is, in fact, inseparable, since politicians rely on language to achieve their intended goals. Furthermore, Fairclough (1989:2) claims that "ideologies are closely linked to power". He justifies this assumption by assuming that ideologies can legitimize existing social relations and differences of power. He further adds that ideologies are further linked to language people use, since language is the commonest form of socialization.

Building upon this perspective, Fairclough (1989:52) once again, contends that "it is a form of power to constrain content: to favor certain interpretation and 'wording' of events, while excluding others ...". A clear demonstration of this tendency which is exercised, especially in the

totalitarian regimes, is when and under the pretext of security reasons, consecutive interpreters may be, occasionally, ordered by the intelligence agency in that country, to render the speaker's utterances in a way that does not constitute a threat to the political system in that country, or to withhold from rendering utterances that criticize its policy. Actually, the recognition of the existence of power relations in political discourses is of primary significance for the verbal conduct of consecutive interpreters, since it can be useful to enhance interpreters' special language skills, including adopting diplomatic attitudes and communication skills, necessary to tackle the unstable socio-political milieu that surrounds any act of speech.

The most striking example of people exerting their power, controlling the way in which utterances are interpreted, and consequently, dominating the linguistic verbal behavior of consecutive interpreters, can be found in political meetings and interviews. As a matter of fact, words can be considered as the main carrier of power relations that reflect the diverse motives and interests of those who initiate the talk. Consequently, politicians can be interpreted in different ways, depending on their established power positions. Furthermore, politicians, sometimes, resort to certain strategies that may help them to impose certain interpretations for their speeches, in a way that seems favorable to them and serves their interests. They exert their power and their influence upon consecutive interpreters' performances to achieve their personal and national objectives. Furthermore, politicians often manipulate the language used in order to distance themselves from the ramifications of particular situations, in which they will be vulnerable to criticism from others. This behavior is obvious and can be observed when a politician denies what s/he has said, and simultaneously accuses the media of misinterpreting his/her speech, by using certain strategies, such as hedges embedded in his/her speech.

The experienced consecutive interpreter should be fully familiar with hedges or cautious notes used by politicians, that can serve their own purposes. This political maneuver can absolve the speaker from being a

target to criticism, help the politician in keeping the channel of negotiations open, and using words whose meanings are loose instead of clear-cut, in compliance with political etiquettes, etc. Lakoff (1975, as cited by Kaltenbock, Mihatsch & Schneider 2010:51) defines hedges as "words whose meaning implicitly involves fuzziness—words whose job is to make things fuzzier or less fuzzy ". In the point of view of Hickey (1998:185), "fuzziness can be related to vagueness, indeterminateness, variation of sense, which are constitutive characteristics of natural languages".

In fact, hedges are a typical feature of political texts that the consecutive interpreters should acquaint themselves of their implied motivations. Hedging devices, for instance, include phrases such as, "as far as I know", "I may be mistaken", "I'm not sure if this is right", "I guess/think", "there is some evidence to suggest", "it seems/might", "to a certain extent", "sort of", "I would suggest", etc. In addition, and according to Hickey (1998:187), "hedges can be used to introduce fuzziness with respect to the speakers' degree of commitment to the truth of the proposition being conveyed". Therefore, political interpreters' responsibilities in this regard, are to identify the pragmatic functions of these devices, and be wary and cautious not to render the indeterminate statements into more determinate ones. In the latter case, interpreters will be, automatically, accused of misinterpreting the speech, by distorting the facts embedded in the utterances themselves.

This point was also stressed by Fairclough (1989:23) who maintains that "politics partly consists in the disputes and struggles which occur in language and over language". For mainly this reason, hedges have, without any doubt, a pragmatic function, since the use of these devices by interactants, especially in political discourses, can serve the function of reducing (FTAs), which may threaten one's self-image, and, as a result, could jeopardize the continuity of the communication attempt. Actually, this is an area where the political and the pragmatic dimensions of the interpretive encounter intersect, for the purpose of maintaining the channel

of communication widely open. This perspective has been strengthened by Kaltenbock, Mihatsch and Schneider (2010:1), who believe that the main function of hedges resides in the fact that they are "a discourse strategy that reduces the force or truth of an utterance and thus reduces the risk a speaker runs when uttering a strong or firm assertion or other speech act".

Actually, and for the benefits of consecutive interpreters themselves, and in order to represent the various interlocutors adequately, they should be fully aware that these norms of language used in political discourse, provide the politicians with a narrow escape from any tense or embarrassing situation, by giving them the opportunities to reshape their statements, in a way that serves the interests of the speakers regarding certain issues. By comprehending this political maneuver, interpreters safeguard themselves against falling prey to this tricky word-game, whose champions are the politicians themselves. Interpreters should be resilient in dealing with these expressions, and try, as far as possible, to render them by retaining the status-quo of the original settings where they were used. As Hickey (1998:187-188) puts it, "in political discourse, hedging devices which function to relieve speakers of some of the responsibility for their statements (and thus avoid criticism), may be found in televised debates between the main candidates before an election".

4.4.5 Consecutive Interpreters and Political Pressures

Indeed, the question of the credibility and objectivity of consecutive interpreters' performances and the challenges they confront, cannot be avoided, especially in mediating encounters overshadowed by an aura of struggle and the logic of power, embedded implicitly or explicitly in the messages themselves. There is no doubt that consecutive interpreters are subjected to various instances of pressures in performing their job, particularly in conflict zones. These pressures may include considerable security risks for them and their families, various means of intimidations, threats, the constant attempt to make them renounced, and the accusations of being double agents, spies or even traitors. As a matter of fact, in

conflict and war situations, it is easy to fall prey to moral conflict, due primarily to the scramble between the human dimension embedded in the interpretive encounter, and the different forces which shape the whole encounter, including the asymmetry of power among interlocutors, on the one hand, and the interpreters' code of ethics, on the other. Under such circumstances, the question of the interpreters' credibility and impartiality concerning the interpretive outcomes, remains a thorny debate.

For instance, and as cited in (<http://www.aiic.net/ViewIssues.CFM>): ISAF's withdrawal from Afghanistan sheds light on the fate of its local interpreters. Both the military and journalists rely on interpreters in conflict zones. This assignment involves considerable security risks for the interpreters and their families. The challenges faced by the interpreters in conflict zones are undeniable which necessitates particular measures to protect them from the consequences of their tasks.

These measures must be adopted to ensure that the interpreters' mentalities and, consequently, the interpretive outcomes, are invulnerable to the interplay of forces engulfing the interpreting activity in political settings.

Here is another example demonstrating beyond any doubt the type of pressures exerted upon interpreters in carrying out their work, in the shades of extremely tense political atmospheres. The incident happened in the aftermath of the Second World War, when the international community was engaged in holding prosecutions of the Nazi regime, performed in the simultaneous mode of interpreting, as cited in (<http://www.aiic.net/ViewIssues.cfm>):

During the Nuremberg Trial, not only did the world learn about the scale of the German atrocities, the deliberations also covered information that for the victorious allies was politically highly charged. This put the Soviet interpreters in a difficult position, when for instance, they learned for the first time about the secret protocols to the Hitler-Stalin pact of 1939, or the Polish officers

murdered by the Red Army in Kalyn. In 1946, these disclosures were a sensation –and in the Soviet Union, they constituted highly classified information. Interpreting the German perpetrators, witnesses and survivors hence presented the Soviet linguists with a considerable personal dilemma.

4.4.6 The Interpreting Process Amid Political Encounters

In addition, highly charged situations as in the case of consecutive interpreting for political leaders at the brink of international crises, are likely to be subjected to various types of constraints and exceptional pressures, apart from cognitive overloads, which may influence the interpreters' verbal behaviors in specific ways. First of all, this is owing to the fact that the interpreter is in the presence of high-profile, important people who possess a great amount of power, especially in the totalitarian regimes, which may cause a certain degree of stress and anxiety overshadowing the atmosphere of the whole encounter. Secondly, is the interpreter's sense of loyalty to the speaker, and his/her fear to break the leader's vital trust if s/he does not capture the intended meaning of the speech. Thirdly, the interpreter feels that his/her performance is subjected to monitoring by large numbers of people. Fourthly, the interpretive outcomes can have severe implications, affecting the lives of millions of people around the globe. For instance, if any error had been committed in the interpreting process during the Russian missiles crisis in Cuba in 1962, that would have ignited a Third World War, using weapons of mass destruction. And last but not least, the consecutive interpreter has to follow the standard etiquettes pervading in all political settings, including using political compliments to soften the impact of some utterances, and avoid causing any sort of embarrassment to either the political leader or his/her nation.

In fact, professional consecutive interpreters can weigh the impact of some utterances upon the way they are perceived by both the other parties engaged in oral interactions, or their influence on the general public. For

this particular reason, they try to manipulate the language used in order to help their employer(s) to present their case in the most suitable way. All these measures serve the interests and goals of the speakers, to whom they lend their voice to. In an interview with former Iraqi President Saddam Hussein with American channel CNN in 1991, the experienced interpreter manipulates Saddam's utterance while preserving the gist of the message that the utterance serves.

صدام حسين: نأمل ألا نضطر إلى الاضطرار.

Interpreter: We pray that we shall not be forced into taking a force measure. (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JoovcNYcpDs>).

The illocution of this utterance is that of threatening. What Saddam meant is that, in case Americans use untraditional weapons, the Iraqis will be forced to take a decisive action as a retaliation to this breach of the international laws, including using whatever they have in their disposal. The interpreter favors a literal rendition of the utterance, while injecting it with religious connotation operating not only in the social milieu of the Arab world, but also in the Western habitat, in order to soften the force of the threat and to keep the threat implicit. The interpreter renders "نأمل" (we hope) into "we pray" (نحن نصلي), to emphasize the peaceful nature of the nation represented by its leader Saddam Hussein. The interpreter's strategy is to keep the vagueness of the utterance, mainly for political reasons. The interpreter's decision aims to send an indirect message to Americans in order to deescalate or ease the tension, and not to aggravate the highly charged situation. In this example, the social, the pragmatic and the political dimensions of this interpreted encounter intersect, and consequently affect the interpreter's verbal behavior, with the political variable having primacy and as a result, overrides other interpreting variables in this particular interpreted encounter.

One of the most striking examples of the influence of the political scene upon the consecutive interpreter's verbal behavior, and, consequently, upon the outcomes of the interpreting process, took place during the

Second Gulf War in 1990, when the Iraqi army invaded Kuwait, thus creating a major international crisis. This example is quoted from Mona Baker's article "Non-cognitive constraints and interpreter strategies in political interviews" (1997). Baker in her analysis of the interpreter's linguistic behavior during the interview sheds light on the need for an investigation of non-cognitive constraints, specific to interpreting for political leaders, especially the type of pressures exerted on the consecutive interpreters, due to the presence of a person of supreme power, and moreover, in response to the working conditions in countries with totalitarian regimes. The interpreting process took place during a televised interview with President Saddam Hussein by Sir Trevor MacDonald. The interview was recorded live in Baghdad and was broadcast by the British television channel ITV on 11th November 1990 about two months before the start of the war, and thus overshadowed by an extremely tense political period.

Before engaging in the analysis of the interpreted encounter, it should be noted that Sir. Trevor McDonald raised his utter rejection of ITV news chiefs, who wanted him to focus during the interview with Saddam on the perceived threat from the Iraqi regime's weapons of mass destruction. They tried to direct the interview to their own interests, motivated by political reasons, in order to convince the general opinion in Britain of the legitimacy of launching a war, as an act of self-defense, as Saddam's weapons pose an imminent threat to the national security of Britain. This demonstrates beyond any doubt the types of pressures imposed, not only upon interpreters, but also on whoever can affect how the interpreted setting can proceed in one way or another. Nevertheless, and against this hostile background, McDonald insisted that he would prefer to be sacked rather than sacrifice his principles of fair and honest coverage (quoted from <https://www.theguardian.com>).

From the outset of the interview, the interpreter knew for sure that the parties involved in the interaction had conflicting goals and motives. It

was obvious that Saddam and McDonald belonged to two different cultures where the asymmetry of power overshadowing the whole encounter worked in favor of one party at the expense of the other. The interpreter was aware of the fact that McDonald represented the Western view, and the political positions of the Western coalition, on the one hand, and Saddam's were unbridgeable. Consequently, the interview developed not to prove a certain point of view or to reach a certain kind of compromise, but instead, to weaken the other party's position.

That was a lengthy interview, but what concerns one in this regard is the analysis of the interpreter's performances during this heated argument. The interpreter's linguistic strategies in this tense interview were essentially concerned with accuracy. For instance, when MacDonald asked Saddam: Mr. President, Mrs. Thatcher of Great Britain says that even if you withdraw from Kuwait you must be made to pay compensation for the damage that you've caused there. Do you take that warning seriously? She says you have been warned.

The interpreter translates Saddam's answer literally, almost word-for-word as follows:

In any case, when Mrs. Thatcher says anything like this seriously, of course it has to be taken seriously.

The phrase "In any case" in this context, has the force of something like the ironic "Oh well" in Arabic. Saddam is clearly being sarcastic in his answer, but the sarcasm does not appear in the English version because of the literal rendering of the conjunction. The interpreter's decision can be justified by his withholdings from entering into the maze of the Arabic rhetoric repertoire. Furthermore, we can notice in McDonald's question a sense of superiority, and we can detect the logic of power, by using the phrase "Great Britain", which raises the status of the question into an order, and leaves Saddam with no choice but to comply to Mrs. Thatcher request.

The interpreter is conscious of the sensitivity of the situation, so he translates as literally as possible, delivering a detailed semantic analysis of

important lexical items, in order to absolve himself of any responsibility and, simultaneously, avoids the risk of being accused of misinterpreting the speaker. For this reason, he does not try to convey the rhetoric of Saddam's argument, nor the subtle irony in some of his statements, but deliberately sticks to semantic meanings only. The interpreter's linguistic behavior can be justified building on the perspective of Hatim and Mason (1990:7) who believe that "Formal equivalence is, of course, appropriate in certain circumstances. At crucial points in diplomatic negotiations, interpreters may need to translate exactly what is said rather than assume responsibility for interpreting the sense and formulating it in such a way as to achieve what they judge to be equivalence of effect",

Nevertheless, the interpreter's psychological state is engulfed by stress and anxiety, and above all, by the genuine feeling of patriotism as one of the defenders of his just case. All these sentiments emanate from the seriousness of the interpreted setting and the moral and historical responsibilities attached to the task. Besides, of course, the additional worry of having to interpret and in the presence of someone of enormous power, instigates some form of intervention at some juncture of the interview. This is in addition to the influence of the social variable upon the interpreter, as being a member of the same speech community, and this in turn exerted enormous pressure on the interpreter to be involved in the interaction, and to present his own point of view.

Actually, the interpreter's involvement is evident in his use of certain linguistic devices such as intensifiers (e.g. "clearly", "obviously"). For example, in discussing the Israeli occupation of Arab territories and the world's attitude to that, versus its attitude to the invasion of Kuwait, Saddam says:

Isn't there any anomaly and double standards there towards the Arabs and Muslims?

This is rendered by the interpreter as follow:

Isn't there any irony there, double standards clearly there is in the behavior towards the Arabs and towards Muslims?

At times, the interpreter elaborates on Saddam's concise statements quite extensively. As the interview proceeds, McDonald says to Saddam: But now, Mr. President, as a result of that action you have the world uniquely raged against you. Even your friends, the Soviet and the French, they say you must get out of Kuwait.

Saddam replies: We respect the opinion of whoever has an opinion.

The interpreter elaborates as follow: We respect the view of anybody who may have a view on the subject of Kuwait, because the issue of Kuwait is a complicated one and we do not presuppose that whoever had a view that it must not be accepted or wrong.

These types of interventions are motivated, first of all, due to the influence of the psychological state of the interpreter. There is no doubt that the interpreter was frightened and in enormous emotional stress, not only because he was interpreting for Saddam himself, but also due to his knowledge that his performance was monitored all over the globe. Secondly, the social dimension of the interaction affects the interpretive outcome to a great extent, owing to the interpreter's sense of loyalty to what he believes his cause and his, seemingly, patriotic nature. Thirdly, the reality of the situation in which the interpreted encounter took place imposes itself strongly on the interpreter's linguistic behavior, and this is evident in his constant attempt to soften the force of some of Saddam's utterances and his endeavor to keep the channels of communication widely open. And, of course, above all, is the undeniable influence of the political atmosphere surrounding the interpreted encounter, subsuming the balance of power between interlocutors and the tragic consequences of the imminent war. All these variables co-operate and co-exist in determining the interpreter's performance, with the political dimension having priority over all other variables in shaping this interaction.

Actually, at times of national and international crises, as the previous example demonstrates, the interpreter has no choice but to stick, completely, to the literal rendition of utterances, even, sometimes, at the expense of scarifying both the social and the pragmatic variables of any mediated-interpretive encounter. This excerpt is part of Al-Gaddafi interview with Western media conducted on (28 02 2011) and was published on (19 11 2011). During the interview, Al-Gaddafi was very nervous, in his response to the allegations spearheaded by David Cameron, the Prime Minister of Britain, of having enormous, secret bank accounts and deposits in Western banks. And this nervousness is reflected on the interpreter's mood, and, consequently, upon his verbal renditions.

القذافي: وأتحدى كامرون هذا.

Interpreter: I challenge this Cameron.

القذافي: وعيب عليه رئيس وزراء دولة زي بريطانيا يقول هذا الكلام.

Interpreter: It is shame upon him for being a Prime Minister of such a state to say such things.

القذافي: وأحط أصابعي هذي في عيونهم.

Interpreter: I'll put my two fingers in their eyes.

(<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Oc11polxns8>).

4.4.7 The Analysis of Samples of Consecutive Interpreters' Mediated Encounters

In a similar vein, political interpreters, in performing their mission in reducing differences and promoting understanding among diplomats and political leaders, must capture every opportunity available to facilitate communication and, therefore, create a friendly atmosphere necessary in this sort of meetings. For this main reason, interpreters should not underestimate the interplay among the several variables operating in the interpreted encounter and determining, at the same time, the end-product of the interaction. In the following example, and in spite of the fact that the meeting proceeds without difficulties, the interpreter does not take

advantage and consider the political and social dimensions adequately in this kind of political meetings at high political levels.

The example under discussion represents a meeting between President Obama with President Mahmoud Abbas (28 May 2009).

الرئيس محمود عباس: شكرا فخامة الرئيس على استقبالنا هنا في البيت الأبيض وجئنا أيضا لنقول لكم نحن نهنئكم على ثقة الشعب الأمريكي بكم وثقة العالم بكم ونتمنى لكم النجاح و التوفيق في هذه المهمة التي تتولونها.

Interpreter: Thank you very much Mr. President for receiving us here at the White House, we came here to tribute our first of all, that we congratulate you for the confidence that was expressed by the American people in electing you President of the Unites States and We wish you all success in your mission. (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?V=giaNfFtI-vIQ>).

Obviously, the interpreter in this interpreted exchange overlooks the phrase "وثقة العالم بكم", omitting it at all from the rendition of Abbas' utterance. In doing so, the interpreter deprives the utterance of a diplomatic and political compliment necessary in this sort of meetings between high-profile leaders, wishing to create a friendly atmosphere engulfing such encounters at senior political levels. Another crucial issue that the interpreter misjudges is the fact that it is a social gathering as well. The interpreter should not underestimate the balance of power which governs the relationships between leaders of one of the superpowers, and any leader from the so-called 'The Third World'. As a result, rendering the phrase " وثقة " العالم بكم " was an indispensable step pertaining to the asymmetry of power between interlocutors. This is, apart from the political dimension, is another crucial variable that the interpreter must not ignore.

Indeed, the interpreter's presence is vital at important meetings of politicians wishing to settle international disputes, and therefore, helps to deescalate the already tense situations. In any political gathering, consecutive interpreters should be resilient in handling such interpreted settings, by being, completely, responsive to the volatile or unexpected situation that the meeting may lead to, in a way that does not cause any sort

of embarrassment to the various parties involved in the oral interaction. In the following example, the interpreter observes the political scene overshadowing the joint press conference between the British Prime Minister David Cameron, and President Sisi of Egypt (11th June 2015). The interpreter in this example manipulates the reporters' questions in his rendition, mitigating their force, and, simultaneously, reshaping them in a way that serves the interests of the two political leaders, in bridging the deteriorating relations between the two nations in the aftermath of the downing of the Egyptian airplane, and thus, avoiding any reason for hostility and enmity.

In this joint press conference, a question from Chris Chip of ITV Channel is directed to British prime minister related to the incident of the Egyptian airplane in Sharm Al-Shikh, and the possibility of detecting a dangerous security breach.

Reporter: No other country is taking the decision we have to suspend flights. Why is UK intelligence so sure that there was an explosive device onboard this plane, or even the Russians who claim this was, have not said that? Do we have intelligence that they don't have? Or do you think that the Russians are withholding some information?

Interpreter: لماذا لم تقرر أي دولة أخرى إيقاف الرحلات، ولماذا كانت الاستخبارات البريطانية متأخرة بينما الاستخبارات الروسية لم يكن لديها أي معلومات أيضاً؟

(<https://www.youtube.com/watch?V=NuGR6x57ZQ>).

The interpreter in this instance seems, intentionally, to misrepresent the reporter's question by his contracted rendition, eliminating its strength and the potentiality of sarcasm, mainly for political reasons. His decision aims to restore the normal diplomatic relations between the two countries to their natural course. As a result, the interpreter avoids accusing the British government directly of being one of the forerunners to ban flights to Egypt, taking the security concerns as a pretext. It is obvious that the illocution of the question is that of blaming the British authorities for the decision they had made, but the interpreter sacrifices the pragmatics of the

question, motivated by both the social and the political variables of the encounter. In this particular interpretive setting, we can deduce some sort of struggle over dominance among the various variables operating in the interaction, for the sake of determining the interpreter's linguistic outputs. In other words, the interpreter's strategy and his careful selection of words, aim to deescalate the tension arising from imposing restrictions on flights to Egypt by the British authorities.

As the press conference proceeds, another question is addressed to President Sisi of Egypt:

Reporter: You have reasons today to be unhappy with the British response. Firstly, you were not informed of the decision to suspend flights, and secondly, the UK now appears to be suggesting that Egypt cannot run a secure airport in Sharm Al-Shikh, as I understand that it is in using is very secure!

interpreter: هل لديك أي سبب سيادة الرئيس لعدم اقتناعك لاستجابة الانجليز أو البريطانيين لهذا الحادث، وهل هناك أي سبب يدعو لعدم الثقة لوجود ضمان أمني كافٍ في مؤتمر شرم الشيخ؟

First of all, the social dimension of this encounter instigates the interpreter to render "you" (أنت) into "سيادة الرئيس" (Mr. President), in order to provide an atmosphere of deference and to formalize such kind of meetings. More importantly, the interpreter in this exchange decides not to interpret the reporter's statement that "the UK now appears to be suggesting that Egypt cannot run a secure airport", for the sake of mitigating the illocution force of the utterance, which aims to cast doubt on the Egyptians' abilities to prevent similar future attacks. In this example, both the pragmatic and the political dimensions of the interpreted encounter collaborate in the interpreter's strategy to produce an acceptable rendition of the reporter's question. What justifies the interpreter's linguistic behavior is his relentless commitment to provide a diplomatic exit, in order to avoid causing any sort of embarrassment at high political levels. For the sake of maintaining friendly relationships with the present and future allies, the

interpreter, deliberately, tries to empty the question from its intended content. Indeed, the interpreter was conscious of the highly sensitive political atmosphere surrounding the press conference; consequently, his decision can be justified in compliance with one of the basic tenets in modern linguistics. As Simpson (1993:130) argues that, "while directness may lead to greater clarity in interaction, it is a strategy which is often evaluated as tactless or impolite".

As a matter of fact, the political interpreter must weigh the various forces operating in any political interaction, and to respond accordingly, depending on the exigencies and peculiarities of such encounters. This means that s/he can adapt the messages exchanged in a way that serves the interests of the different parties involved, while remaining faithful and responsive to the entirety of circumstances surrounding the production of speech. In a meeting between President Obama of the United States and President Abbas of the State of Palestine (published on 25 09 2013), the interpreter was fully aware of the sensitivity and the gravity of the crisis in the Middle East; consequently, the interpreter renders Abbas' speech with utmost care.

الرئيس محمود عباس: شكرا فخامة الرئيس. شكرا جزيلا على استقبالنا هنا وإعطائنا هذا الوقت الكافي لكي نتداول في القضايا الرئيسية التي نحن بصدد حلها وهي قضية السلام في الشرق الأوسط.

Interpreter: Thank you very much Mr. President for hosting us here and to agree to meet us to discuss very critical issues related to the peace process in the Middle East. (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?V=wpERH8gEGgu>).

Here, the interpreter, in compliance with the social variable of the meeting, renders " وإعطائنا الوقت الكافي " (and to give us enough time), into "and to agree to meet us" (والموافقة على لقائنا), observing the asymmetry of power between the two political leaders, since when someone agrees to meet someone else, this is an indication that the former has more prestigious and powerful merits, or in a favorable position that gives him/her the authority to accept or refuse to do anything, from the

standpoint of power. Moreover, the interpreter translates the honorary title "فخامة الرئيس" into "Mr. President", in response to the social variable of the meeting, since different linguistic communities differ in their modes of address. Here, the interpreter is abiding by the social, pragmatic, and, above all, the political dimensions of this interpreted encounter.

Another remarkable issue in this exchange is that the interpreter feels that the deteriorating situation that the peace process in this turmoil region suffers from, has precedence over any other topic under negotiation and of mutual interest of the two nations. For this reason, the interpreter renders "القضايا الملحة/الحاسمة/الحرّجة" (main issues) into "critical issues" in response to the reality of the situation, and the tragic consequences of the total breakdown of the fragile peace process. In this instance, the political and the pragmatic dimensions of this encounter co-ordinate their efforts in reshaping the messages delivered, in a way that seems appropriate in that particular time and place.

Summary:

What this section wants to prove is that political discourse is characterized by a greater degree of sensitivity, and this sensitivity in the context of consecutive interpreting is partly determined by linguistic aspects. Other features related to the interpretation of political encounters may inevitably influence and shape the interpreter's verbal behavior in specific ways, where the interpreter is at the mercy of diverse political enticements, as was the case when the world was so polarized during the Cold War era between the Eastern and Western camps. These features specific to interpreting mediated political, face-to-face interactions subsume the intensity of the situation, the general atmosphere surrounding the interpreted situation, the pressures exerted upon interpreters by both the commissioner of the interpretation, or by the shades of the personalities and identities of high-profile people involved in the interaction itself, and finally, the expectations of the audience towards the outcomes of the interaction. These forces may have the upper hand in determining how the interpreted

political encounter may proceed. In other words, the linguistic foundations of interpreting, especially for political discourse, have to be seen in a wider perspective, taking into due consideration the specific functions they fulfill in their respective cultures and situations. Therefore, these pressures and forces belong to the categories of non-cognitive constraints, which deserve to be treated in a distinctive way, preserving their special characteristics and their peculiarities.

4.5 Questionnaire

4.5.1 Introduction

This section is devoted to specify the steps and the methodology used in carrying out the research endeavor. It discusses research design, study population and sample, instrument and its validity and reliability, data collection procedures, and the statistical analysis.

4.5.2 Study Design

This study uses a cross-sectional design, based on implementing and the distributing of questionnaires. The study design involves the analysis of the reactions of a representative sample of interpreters at Language Department Center (n=16) and Alkilani Legal Translation and Training Company in Ramallah (n=5). Besides, circulating the questionnaires on a selected number of professors at An-Najah National University, English Department, and the University Administration (n=12). The questionnaire method aims at permitting comparison and cross-analysis of the results obtained with different target populations in order to gain insight into this human activity. It employs descriptive and inferential design. The primary goal is to try to provide a comprehensive description to the process of consecutive interpreting , whereas the cross sectional is focused on individuals at fixed events during life.

4.5.3 Population & Sample of the Study

This study was conducted by taking advantage of the experiences of interpreters at Language Development Center, Alkilani company in Ramallah, and a number of practitioners at An-Najah National University.

The study population included all interpreters that the researcher could contact in the West Bank of the State of Palestine. By design, the respondents were not required to have a comprehensive education and training in interpretation to participate. The only condition was that they have practiced consecutive interpretation during their life career.

The following table shows the numbers and distribution of the study sample. A representative stratified sample of (n=33) was selected.

Table (1): Distribution of the study sample according to types of interpreters

Options	Frequency	Percent
a freelance interpreter	20	60.6
a professional interpreter	13	39.4
Total	33	100.0

As we can see from the previous table, the freelance interpreters represent 60.6% of the study sample, while the professional ones represent only 39.4%. This can be attributed to the limited availability of professional consecutive interpreters in our country.

How long have you worked as a professional consecutive interpreter?

Table (2): Distribution of the study sample according to experience

Options	Frequency	Percent
less than 5 years	23	69.7
more than 5 years	10	30.3
Total	33	100.0

As table (2) shows that the vast majority of the target population groups have been practicing consecutive interpreting for a relatively short period of time. This finding is natural, since the field of interpretation, itself, is a relatively new one, and has not been practiced extensively in our part of the world until recently.

4.5.4 Instrumentation

After conducting an extensive literature review on the process of consecutive interpreting, using whatever resources available at the researcher's disposal, data was collected via a structured questionnaire developed by the researcher himself, and edited by Dr. Odeh Odeh, which consists of (24) items in 4 parts, organized to measure interpreters'

responses to the various variables operating in actual interpreting settings, and their effects upon interpreters' decisions and choices during the different stages of the interpreting encounter.

At the beginning were the questionnaire, and the introductory note aim to inform the potential respondents of the objectives and the importance of the study, and assured them that the data collected was for scientific purposes only.

The first two questions, mentioned earlier, extract, to some extent, personal information related to interpreters themselves, for the sake of discovering the degree of their experiences and commitment to the profession of interpreting.

The first part of the questionnaire is devised specifically to question the side effects of the influence of the psychological state of interpreters, and whether this variable has a positive or negative effect upon the outcome of the interpretive encounter.

The second part deals with the interpreting process, not only from a linguistic point of view, but also and more importantly, as a social and sociological activity, which shapes and, in turn, is shaped by the actual social forces operating in any speech community.

The third part is concerned with the investigation of the reality of the situation in which the mediated-interpreted encounter takes place. It tries to find out how this formidable force obliges interpreters, in certain cases, to favor the pragmatic meaning of utterances at the expense of their semantic ones.

The fourth part is devoted to the investigation of the repercussions of the political atmosphere engulfing the interpreting process, and explores, at the same time, the reasons for adopting unique strategies and techniques on the part of interpreters, aimed this challenging surrounding.

The last two questions seek to support the main claim of this thesis, by endorsing the existence of certain degree of interaction among these variables operating in any communicative interaction, for the purpose of determining interpreters' linguistic output.

4.5.5 Reliability of the Instrument

To determine the reliability of the four sub-questionnaires, alpha formula was used as in table (2).

Table (3):Alpha formula of instrument reliability.

Domain	Reliability
Total Score	0.77

The results of table (2) show that the ranges of reliability were between (0.72 – 0.82), and total score (0.77), all of these values are suitable for conducting such a study.

4.5.6 Validity of the Instrument

The questionnaire was reviewed by a group of experts in the field of scientific research. They deleted and rephrased some items until the study instrument reached its final form.

4.5.7 Statistical Analysis

The Statistical package for social science (SPSS) version 17 was used for data analysis. Various statistical tests and procedures were used including (percentages, frequencies,).

4.5.8 Ethical Issues

This study was conducted on human subjects, and to be sure that the ethical issues are taken into consideration, permission to conduct this study was obtained. In addition, respondents were informed about the purpose of the study before the distribution of the questionnaire, and were told that their participation was voluntary, and any information obtained would be confidential and would be used for scientific research purposes only .

4.5.9 Results and Their Analysis

The Results will be presented in two parts. The first part deals with the descriptive analysis of the potential effects of the psychological, social, pragmatic and the political variables of consecutive interpreting upon interpreters' verbal behaviors. The second part is dedicated to test the validity of the study hypothesis, and to discuss the role of these variables in the perception of interpreters that the researcher could reach.

The main question of the study was: Are there dynamic and consistent patterns of interaction among variables of consecutive interpreting? What is the consequence of this interaction upon human communications?

To answer the study questions, and, ultimately, strengthen the main claim of the thesis, frequencies and percentages of the respondents' answers representing the four parts of the questionnaire are computed. The results, then, are analyzed and commented upon, for the sake of finding answers to the questions of the study, and, consequently, validate the project as a whole.

Results of the first part of the questions: Does the psychological state of interpreters influence and/or interfere in their understanding and reproduction of the SL messages?

1-Do you think that the psychological state of consecutive interpreters can intervene in their rendition of oral messages?

Table (4): The extent of the intervention of interpreters' psychological state in the process

Options	Frequency	Percent
yes, definitely	12	36.4
yes, sometimes	21	63.6
Total	33	100.0

As the table shows, 63.6% of interpreters believe that their psychological state can intervene, sometimes, in their rendition of the messages exchanged during the interpretive process. What justifies this trend is the fact that interpreters' psychological state may be, often, in harmony with the requirements of the communicative interaction.

2- Do you give the rein for your emotions to be directly involved in the outcome of the interpreting process?

Table (5): The intrusion of interpreters' emotions in the interpretive outcome

Options	Frequency	Percent
to a great extent	2	6.1
to a lesser extent	19	57.6
not at all	12	36.4
Total	33	100.0

Related to the above question, 57.6% of interpreters think that they should, in principle, curb the influence of their emotions upon the outcome of the interpreting process, to achieve a reasonable degree of objectivity and impartiality. On their own part, 36.4% of interpreters totally reject this kind of intrusion. This can be attributed to the possibility of having special training programs to cope with this natural intervention.

3- Some psychological symptoms such as, stress, anxiety and frustration ,cannot be avoided when mediating between different parties having diverse interests and motives behind such interactions.

Table (6): The existence of stress, anxiety and frustration during the interpreting process

Options	Frequency	Percent
completely agree	14	42.4
partially agree	19	57.6
Total	33	100.0

A striking demonstration of the enormous impact of the psychological state of interpreters is exhibited in the respondents' answers to this proposition. From interpreters' answers, 42.4% of them believe that the psychological side effects, such as stress and anxiety cannot be avoided, while 57.6% of respondents agree with this perspective, albeit partially. This finding foregrounds the human dimension involved in the interpreting process and, furthermore, lends support to the complexity of this process.

Results of the second part of the questions:

Are interpreters shielded from the influence of social factors? And does the role of interpreters intersect or clash with the interlocutors' expectations?

1-Do you feel prone to minimize your relations with clients (e.g., patients, defendants, victims, witnesses, attorneys, relatives, etc.)?

Table (7): The type of relations between interpreters and interlocutors

Options	Frequency	Percent
always	4	12.1
usually	11	33.3
sometimes	15	45.5
never	3	9.1
Total	33	100.0

Most of the interpreters surveyed (45.5%) stated that they, sometimes, feel prone to minimize their relations with both parties engaged in oral interpreted interaction, while 33.3% of them would, usually do that. The main reason behind this tendency is related to the obvious fact that the interpreter is, in fact, an outsider to the interaction or an ephemeral guest, whose main job is to help interlocutors to communicate successfully, without any attempt to build personal relations that may have negative effects on how the interpreting process may proceed.

2- Do you think that the consecutive interpreter should faithfully interpret messages even when s/he does not agree with what the speaker is saying?

Table (8): The interpreters commitment to faithfulness

Options	Frequency	Percent
yes	5	15.2
yes, certainly	25	75.8
yes, sometimes	3	9.1
Total	33	100.0

The vast majority of respondents (75.8%) affirm that it is absolutely necessary to render the speakers' messages with the utmost degree of faithfulness, even when they had totally different perspectives, and this is, of course, in compliance with their mission as the voice of speakers. Acting in that particular way, interpreters adhere to the ethical and moral standards of the profession.

3- Do you agree that interpreters as cultural/social ambassadors should identify with their clients?

Table (9): The degree of sympathy with clients

Options	Frequency	Percent
yes	5	15.2
yes, occasionally	18	54.5
no, not at all	10	30.3
Total	33	100.0

This is, in fact, a thorny issue in the field of interpreting, related directly to the complex role interpreters perform during the interpreted encounters. While 30.3% of interpreters reject, totally, the alignment towards any party, 54.5% of them are prone to implement this strategy in certain cases. This behavior is, perhaps predictable, since interpreters work in social gatherings, where the asymmetry of power and knowledge is obvious, and interpreters, occasionally, take side towards the less fortunate and deprived sectors of societies.

4- Do you support the idea that social differences or culture-specific references can constitute obstacles, difficulties or breakdowns in the communication channels?

Table (10): Social/Cultural differences and the interpreting process

Options	Frequency	Percent
yes	5	15.2
yes, sometimes	27	81.8
no	1	3.0
Total	33	100.0

Regarding cultural differences, if the *yes* and *sometimes* answers are combined, it becomes apparent that the vast majority of respondents (97%) affirm that cultural gaps among various linguistic universes can, indeed, constitute obstacles during the course of interaction, to the extent of causing severe communication problems.

5- If your answer to the above question is 'yes', do you think that this difficulty becomes greater when the source and target cultures belong to very remote linguistic universes?

Table (11): Remote languages and cultures and the interpreting process

Options	Frequency	Percent
yes	30	90.9
no	3	9.1
Total	33	100.0

As observed from the respondents' answers as manifested in the table above, the vast majority of interpreters (90.9%) believe that the more remote the two cultures and languages in question, the more communication problems are to be expected. Actually, the lack of cultural background between interlocutors, can hinder mutual understanding necessary to communicate specific ideas, values and moral systems. In such cases, and even with the presence of interpreters, who should spend considerable efforts to fill the linguistic/social/cultural gaps, the interpreting process may proceed, but with greater degree of difficulties.

6- Do the status, the identity of interlocutors, and the social hierarchies which exist in specific speech communities play a decisive role in dictating interpreters' verbal behavior?

Table (12): Social determinants and the outcome of the interaction

Options	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
agree completely	9	27.3	27.3	27.3
agree to a certain extent	22	66.7	66.7	93.9
disagree	2	6.1	6.1	100.0
Total	33	100.0	100.0	

The majority of respondents (93.9%) answered affirmatively, either by *completely* or by *to a certain extent*, which demonstrates, beyond any doubt, that interpreters are bounded by social determinants operating in any speech community. These undeniable forces can have the upper hand in directing and reshaping the messages exchanged by interlocutors, to the extent of forcing interpreters to adapt their linguistic behavior accordingly. Actually, interpreters cannot escape their social surroundings and the intrusion of these forces in the interpreting process becomes inevitable.

7- Do you believe that social/cultural mediation means going beyond establishing understanding between delegates in face-to-face interactions?

Table (13): The degree of mediation on the part of interpreters

Options	Frequency	Percent
no	8	24.2
absolutely not	7	21.2
always	1	3.0
whenever necessary	17	51.5
Total	33	100.0

There seems to be some sort of closeness in the respondents' answers to the above question, but in the opposite direction. While a total of 45.4% of interpreters think that the interpreting process should not exceed the mere relaying of messages delivered, 51.5% of them believe that promoting certain attitudes and ideologies undertaken by interpreters in specific interpretive settings, are necessary as far as the exigencies of the communicative encounter require. This means that interpreters are divided between withholding from expressing themselves directly during the encounter, and the other argument in support of injecting the interaction with certain agendas, whenever necessary, as a form of propaganda.

8- How do you define your role as a consecutive interpreter?

Table (14): Interpreters' views of their role

Options	Frequency	Percent
gate keeper	6	18.2
a faithful echo	17	51.5
a chair person	1	3.0
a third party	9	27.3
Total	33	100.0

While more than half of respondents (51.5%) indicate that their role can be defined as a *faithful echo* of the speakers, in compliance with the prescribed role of interpreters, which assumes interpreters to render the speakers' utterances faithfully, preserving both the form and the content of the messages exchanged, 27.3% of respondents adopt the new outlook regarding the expected role of interpreters as participating in the construction of meaning between interactants. This response can be justified by referring to the fact that the percentage of professional interpreters participating in the questionnaire is only 39.4%, and this can explain the humble percentage of interpreters who identify themselves as a

third party in the interaction. Indeed, professional interpreters assume more freedom in their treatment of the interpreting process.

9- As a consecutive interpreter, do you support the view that one of the main responsibilities of interpreters is to add explanations, clarifications, illustrations and elucidations that are not included explicitly in the content of the messages transmitted?

Table (15): The extent of interpreters' intervention to explain certain messages

Options	Frequency	Percent
completely agree	9	27.3
partially agree	19	57.6
completely against	5	15.2
Total	33	100.0

In compliance with their mission as conciliators of meaning among diverse parties in conversations, and, furthermore, to make sure that each interlocutor has an equal opportunity to contribute to the current exchange, regardless of their experiences and background, most respondents (84.9%) agree whether *completely* or partially that interpreters' responsibilities to further understanding among participants, necessitate adding some explanation to the speakers' messages. This can be done when, for instance, interpreters feel that the message in its original form cannot serve the benefit of the current exchange, or when they sense that the message cannot get across successfully. In this situation, respondents adopt a humanitarian role, in order to fully transmit the source language messages adequately.

10- Do you agree that consecutive interpreters should translate every aspect of the communicative encounter, including the intensity of feelings, the tone, body language and gestures of participants?

Table (16): Interpreters' responsibilities in relaying every aspect of the interpretive encounter

Options	Frequency	Percent
yes, certainly	10	30.3
yes, when necessary	18	54.5
no, it is impossible	3	9.1
Total	31	93.9

As a matter of fact, during actual face-to-face interpretive encounters, messages can be exchanged not only by language verbal behavior, but also by features of paralinguage, such as feelings, tone, body language and gestures. While 30.3% of respondents believe that interpreters should, indeed, reflect these features in their renditions, 54.5% of them contend

that this non-verbal behavior can be implemented, as far as the interpreted setting calls for that.

Results of the third part of the questions:

Do language use and the reality of the communicative situation facilitate or impede the interpreting process?

1-Consecutive interpreters are playing the role of intercultural conciliators because they deal not only with languages, but also, and more importantly, with the wider context of interpretation.

Table (17): The importance of the notion of context in interpreting utterances

Options	Frequency	Percent
completely true	21	63.6
partially true	12	36.4
Total	33	100.0

It seems that there is a complete consensus among interpreters regarding the necessity of the wider context of interpretation, subsuming all the circumstances surrounding the reception and reproduction of the speakers' messages, including the human context, in their treatment of the interpretive setting. All the respondents (100%) answered affirmatively, whether *completely* or *partially*, concerning the significance of the pragmatics of interpretation, as a major shaping force in rendering appropriate and acceptable messages among participants, belonging to diverse cultures and languages. This can be done by taking the reality of the situation into due concern.

2- Do you think that consecutive interpreters can adapt the nature of the messages transmitted while remaining faithful to the meaning of the original speech delivered?

Table (18): Whether interpreters can manipulate messages while remaining faithful to their content

Options	Frequency	Percent
yes, always	7	21.2
yes, when necessary	26	78.8
Total	33	100.0

Most of the interpreters surveyed (78.8%) stated that they did actually resort to this strategy when necessary, for the purpose of facilitating communication among interlocutors, while keeping the intended meaning of the original speakers in mind. This endeavor is undertaken by interpreters to accommodate with the various needs and expectations of participants, including their intellectual levels, age, sex, etc. Indeed, one of the main tenets of pragmatics is that messages should be geared to the recipients.

3- When you feel that there is some sort of disparity between the reality of the situation and the semantic meaning of utterances, do you choose adhering to the latter no matter what the consequences are?

Table (19): Interpreters preference for the semantic meaning of utterances at the expense of their pragmatic one

Options	Frequency	Percent
yes	21	63.6
no	12	36.4
Total	33	100.0

Once again, the difference between the linguistic behavior of both the professional and the freelance interpreters is blatantly manifested in their responses to the above question. It seems that freelance interpreters (63.6%) favor being in the safe side, and did not want to enter into the stage of defending their decisions and choices made by them, to either the participants or to the audience as a whole. Actually, what justifies this point of view is that human beings, including interpreters, have no adequate means to penetrate deeply into the speakers' mind in order to discover, for sure, their intended meaning at that particular time and place. Instead, they stick to the semantic meaning of utterances, and let the interlocutors on their own to find out each other's intended meanings.

4- When you are unable to find the appropriate rendition, do you resort to alternative rendition of utterances at the expense of the intended meaning of the messages transmitted?

Table (20): Whether interpreters can resort to alternative rendition of utterances at the expense of their intended meaning

Options	Frequency	Percent
yes	5	15.2
sometimes	19	57.6
never	9	27.3
Total	33	100.0

While 27.3% of respondents would never destroy the intended meaning of the messages delivered, and sacrifice their pragmatic force, no matter what the consequences are, such as being exposed to self-monitoring or falling into an embarrassing situation, 57.6% of them may do that, by resorting to alternative rendition, even when it weakens the intended meaning of the speakers. This deformed verbal behavior, according to them, serves the benefit of the continuation of the communication attempt, and, simultaneously, avoids its breaking point.

Results of the fourth part of the questions:

Does the political atmosphere affect speech interpretation?

1-Do the sensitivity of the occasion and the intensity of the political atmosphere affect the choice of your interpretation techniques?

Table (21): The political atmosphere and the choice of certain interpreting techniques

Options	Frequency	Percent
always	7	21.2
sometimes	23	69.7
never	3	9.1
Total	33	100.0

In mediating interactions at times of political crises and instabilities, interpreters are, indeed, forced to adopt specific strategies and techniques, that they usually do not implement in normal circumstances, in compliance with the sensitivity and graveness of the occasion. If we combine the *always* and the *sometimes* answers together, the overwhelming majority of respondents (90.9%) believe that this trend, such as adhering to the literal rendition of utterances, is suitable in this kind of meetings between high-profile persons, in order to absolve interpreters from the huge responsibilities associated when handling the interpretive process, and to avoid the potential accusations of misinterpreting the speakers.

2- Does the balance of power between individuals and leaders impose itself directly and shape the interpretive outcomes?

Table (22): Power relations and the outcome of the interpretive encounter

Options	Frequency	Percent
yes, absolutely	6	18.2
yes, occasionally	21	63.6
not at all	6	18.2
Total	33	100.0

A considerable number of respondents (63.6%) stated that the balance of power between individuals and their nation's position on the international map, occasionally, can impose itself strongly upon the interpreting process, and, ultimately, upon its outcome. Let alone that (18.2%) also contend that interpreters are, always, at the mercy of power relations that shape and direct interpersonal relations. This outlook has a solid ground, owing to the fact endorsed by scholars of interpretation that interpreters are not constituted by discourse, but rather, by relations of power, which form the absolute principle of any human behavior, including the verbal behaviors of interpreters.

3- At times of political crises, do you prefer to soften the impact of utterances upon interlocutors for fear of escalating the situation?

Table (23): Softening interlocutors' utterances at times of political crises

Options	Frequency	Percent
always	3	9.1
sometimes	20	60.6
never	10	30.3
Total	33	100.0

While 30.3% of respondents stated that they never resort to soften the impact of speakers' utterances, even at times of political crises, in order to preserve the status-quo of the original utterances, for the fear of relaying misguided or distorted messages at high political levels. On their own turn, 60.6% of interpreters might implement this strategy, to maintain the communication channels open and avoid any possibility of the breakdown of it. Furthermore, by adopting this strategy, interpreters may help interlocutors avoid, unnecessary, face-threatening acts, which may

jeopardize the whole interpretive meeting. And this is precisely where the pragmatics of utterances intersect with political discourses.

Results of the main claim of the thesis:

1-Is it true that there is a constant interaction or even struggle among the different variables affecting the interpretive outcome?

Table (24): The existence of constant interactions among variables of consecutive interpreting

Options	Frequency	Percent
completely agree	10	30.3
agree	22	66.7
completely disagree	1	3.0
Total	33	100.0

Finally, the main claim of this thesis seems to be materialized and reaches its conclusive stage. After examining the four variables affecting the consecutive interpreting extensively, namely, the psychological, social, pragmatic and the political ones, and after analyzing the respondents' answers to the questionnaire under discussion, a remarkable feature of the consecutive phenomenon can be detected. The observable fact from the table above indicates that the overwhelming majority of respondents (93%) answered affirmatively, with either *completely* or just *agree* to the above proposition. This clearly demonstrates that nearly almost all the interpreters surveyed, and building on their actual interpreting experiences, support the idea of the existence of dynamic and complex patterns of interaction among these, sometimes, conflicting forces. This kind of constant interaction is a natural consequence related to the interpreting process as completely, until now, a pure human activity. This interaction is done for the purpose of governing and determining how the interpretive encounter should be dealt with.

2- If your answer to the above question is positive, in your opinion what variable has a considerable effect in dictating interpreters' verbal behaviors?

Table (25): The most important variable in consecutive interpreting

Options	Frequency	Percent
Psychological	21	63.6
Social	4	12.1
Political	2	6.1
all of them are important	6	18.2
Total	33	100.0

Actually, from the start of the study, one major limitation that had confronted the researcher in conducting a study on consecutive interpreting, was due to the relative difficulty in accessing certain target population groups representing an adequate number of consecutive interpreters. In fact, it seems that this constraint had certain echoes upon the respondents' replies. A clear manifestation of this drawback can be detected from the analysis of the respondents' answers to the last question. 63.6% of interpreters believe that the psychological dimension of the interpreting process has the upper hand in determining actual consecutive interpreters' linguistic behaviors. The reason for this tendency, as mentioned earlier, is owing to the fact that only 39.4% of respondents are professionals, and only 30.3% of all the target sample practiced the profession more than 5 years. That lends support to the fact that the lack of professionalization is the primary reason of espousing this attitude on the part of interpreters. It seems that interpreters feel, under the mounting pressures of the profession of interpreting, of a sense of insecurity and lack of confidence, which instigate them to respond the way they do. Another possible justification of this choice is due to the lack of training programs that address, directly, the psychological effects as a result of embarking on this complex and flexible process of interpreting.

4.5.10 Discussion

The results show that in terms of professionalization, there are, indeed, consistent patterns of differences in the respondents' answers to the questionnaire. These differences are predictable, since the two groups possess uneven levels of qualifications and experiences in the field of consecutive interpreting.

As far as the first part of the questionnaire is concerned, the results demonstrate that the psychological state of interpreters can, indeed, intervene and shape the interpreters' renditions of oral messages. Furthermore, the category of feelings and emotions aroused during the interpreting process is, in fact, a natural consequence related to the treatment of the interpreting phenomenon as a human activity, in which the

interpersonal relations among the different parties in the interaction, including interpreters, can have certain impact upon interpreters' linguistic behaviors. In addition, and during actual interpretive encounters, some psychological symptoms, such as stress, anxiety, frustration, etc., cannot be avoided when mediating among participants having diverse interests and motives behind such interactions.

The second part of the questionnaire handles the social and sociological milieu where the interpretive encounter takes place, and further, discusses the role of interpreters against this challenging environment. As a matter of fact, interpreters seem to shape their role according to intuition and personal criteria, which is, without any doubt, a reflection of the general lack of professionalization, as observed from the respondents' answers. While the vast majority of interpreters believe that they should faithfully interpret messages as far as possible, there is a foggy conception and disparity regarding the criteria that determine the extent of faithfulness, interpreters must not exceed.

In considering the interpreters' role during real-life interactions, it seems that some interpreters engage actively in the construction of meaning as a third party in the interaction, while others are skeptic towards the fruitfulness of this initiative, and stick to their prescribed role as a conduit for communication. In fact, the overwhelming majority of interpreters do actually support the idea of the inevitable intrusion of various social forces, operating in any interpretive encounter, to the extent of reshaping and determining the outcome of the interpreting process. In addition, in their mission as social and cultural ambassadors, most interpreters contend that one of the main responsibilities of consecutive interpreters is to further understanding among interlocutors, using whatever means at their disposal.

It is obvious that the interpreting process is characterized by an enormous degree of interaction among different parties involved in conversations, consequently, messages can be transmitted by either verbal or non-verbal forms of behavior. For only this reason, interpreters and owing to their direct presence in the encounter, can estimate which aspects of the interaction must not be overlooked by interpreters.

But while acknowledging that interpreters deal not only with languages, but also and more importantly, with the reality of the situation in which the interpreted encounter takes place. Actually, the third part of the questionnaire tackles one of the most important considerations in all acts of mediated encounters, namely, the pragmatics of interpretation. As said in the main body of the study that what instigates interpreting studies, in the first place, is to meet a pragmatic need rather than to become an object of study. Consequently, all the interpreters surveyed lend support to the importance of the wider context of occurrences, necessary to unfold the communicative interaction. Nevertheless, and owing to the obvious distinction in the qualifications and experiences between professional and freelance interpreters, a large proportion of interpreters surveyed prefer sticking to the semantic meaning of utterances, at the expense of their pragmatic one, which is contrary to their mission as facilitators of communication. By the same token, some interpreters may resort to alternative rendition of utterances, even if it leads to the distortion of the intended meanings of the original messages.

The fourth part of the questionnaire deals with the consequences of occurring the interpreting process at extremely tense political period. In that case, interpreters might adopt certain strategies and techniques peculiar with the exigencies of this sensitive and charged atmosphere. Moreover, the asymmetry of power between individuals, occasionally, seems as a determining factor in guiding interpreters to reach the desired end of the interaction. Indeed, the balance of power can, sometimes, constrain meaning by favoring certain interpretations of events while excluding others. As a result, the vast majority of interpreters resort to soften the impact of utterances upon interlocutors, for the sake of maintaining friendly relationships necessary in this type of meeting between high-profile people, and, simultaneously, being cautious not to lead the interaction into a dead-end. In that case, the interpretive outcome can do more harm than benefit to the current exchange however accurate it may be.

Concerning the questions addressing the basic claim of this thesis, there is, in fact, an undeniable agreement among interpreters surveyed who

endorse the tendency of the existence of recognizable patterns of interaction among the psychological, social, pragmatic and the political variables operating in any mediated encounter. Indeed, this sort of interaction may, inevitably, affect the end-product of the interpreting process in consistent ways. Amid this interaction, the most important variable, according to the respondents' answers, is the psychological state of interpreters, which can override other variables in the communicative interaction, and, consequently, dominate interpreters' linguistic output.

4.5.11 Conclusion

The present study would seem to indicate that the consecutive interpreting process is characterized by an overwhelming degree of complexity, and above all, by the constant interaction among the various parties involved in oral interactions, including interpreters. Although, the main emphasis of this thesis is on the dynamic interaction, cooperation, competition, and even struggle among the psychological, social, pragmatic and the political variables of this human activity, other variables specific to the interpreting process might exert considerable pressures upon the consecutive interpreters' performances, as well (e.g. cognitive overloads, tempo of delivery, environmental noises). The variables discussed in the main body of the thesis and in the questionnaire, as well, are not, completely, independent from each other and act separately, but rather they co-exist in the one and the same interpretive encounter.

Firstly, and as the results of the questionnaire show that interpreters cannot isolate their feelings and curb, totally, the intrusion of their emotions upon the outcome of the mediated interaction. In certain interpreting settings, they, sometimes, feel sympathized with one party in the interaction, which raises the issue of the credibility and the impartiality of interpreters' performances. Indeed, most interpreters' answers in the questionnaire believe that the psychological state of interpreters play a decisive role in dictating interpreters' verbal behaviors.

Secondly, the social and the sociological context of interpretation, including the identities of interlocutors, social hierarchies, status, etc., is, in fact, one of the major constraints overshadowing the whole interpretive

encounter, which obliges interpreters to gear their renditions according to the norms, specific to that particular speech community. It is, therefore, highly improbable that interpreters can work against this determining force. Actually, interpreters tend to perceive their responsibilities as social and cultural mediators, in order to negotiate the various aspects of the communicative encounter with other participants involved directly in the interaction. As a result of the questionnaire, most interpreters, however, stick to their prescribed role as conduits of communication, and refrain from the consequences of the possible implications of their over intervention in the oral encounter.

Thirdly, and as the results of the questionnaire point out that interpreters take into account the reality of the situation, where the communicative event takes place. In this sense, the role of interpreters exceeds the notion of linguistic mediation and goes beyond that to examine, with utmost care, the intended meaning of the original messages. As a matter of fact, the interpreters' role undergoes constant changes depending on the interlocutors' communicative needs. This endeavor is undertaken by interpreters to avoid any possibility of the breakdown of the communication attempt.

Finally, the peculiarities of the political scene engulfing the whole interpretive encounter, especially during critical juncture of history, add further difficulties and complicate interpreters' mission in producing objective and neutral renditions. Indeed, in interpreting political discourses, the consecutive interpreters should consider the balance of power established in the structure of such meetings, where failure to act accordingly, may jeopardize the success of such encounters. In compliance with the general political atmosphere, interpreters may adopt certain strategies to cope with the exigencies and the sensitivity of this charged situation. For this reason, interpreters may adhere to the literal rendition of utterances, to the extent of adopting word-for-word translation, to avoid the accusations of manipulating and misrepresenting the speakers' utterances.

From the examples cited in the main body of the study, and as the analysis of the questionnaire indicates that the interaction among the

variables under discussion is inevitable, and can be found in any interpreter-mediated encounter, since these variables seldom act alone, due primarily to the complexity and the diversity of human interactions. Actually, what gives these variables their significance is the fact that they are related directly to the interpersonal role interpreters perform during face-to-face interpretive interactions, where the most important one, and according to the respondents' answers, is the psychological dimension of consecutive interpreting. This finding can be justified in accordance to the fact that human beings, including interpreters, when conversing, they do not abide to the rules of language systems all the time, but instead they make advantage of the rules of language use. Furthermore, during the interpreting process, interpreters engage in a dialogue not only with the various participants in the interaction, but also and more importantly, with themselves, where the psychological state of interpreters can play the decisive role in determining interpreters' verbal outputs.

Chapter Five

Conclusions and Recommendations

5.1 Introduction:

This research is an empirical examination of the consecutive interpreting process, or more particularly, a naturalistic or an observational study, which aims to examine and analyze interpreters' decisions and choices during real-life mediated encounters. The researcher concentrates on those aspects of the interpreting process beyond the linguistic and cognitive aspects of it. Therefore, the researcher examines the psychological, social, pragmatic and the political variables of the consecutive interpreting, for the sake of discovering a recognizable pattern of interaction among these variables operating in any mediated encounter, where the interpreters are in the middle of the interaction. This attempt is undertaken to reach a better understanding of this multi-layered phenomenon.

For this purpose, the researcher analyzes each of these variables separately, while acknowledging the inevitable interplay among them, in order to determine interpreters' linguistic outputs. The analysis of authentic interpreting performances reveals, beyond any doubt, the interference of these variables in the interpreting process, to the extent of reshaping the end-product of the interpreter-mediated encounters.

Furthermore, and in order to consolidate the findings of this study, the researcher uses the most straightforward methods of collecting qualitative data in this human field, by conducting an interview form and distributing questionnaires on a reasonable sample of interpreters, both freelance and professionals. This endeavor is undertaken in order to obtain reliable and credible responses from the practitioners of consecutive interpreting, to enhance and strengthen the main claim of this thesis, and thus guarantee the validity of his project.

5.2 Conclusion

The consecutive interpreter can be conceived of as a skilled artist, who constantly tries, depending on his/her degree of creativity and expertise, to transmit, whenever possible, every detail of the scene s/he drew to the onlookers, in a way that enables the audience to capture every aspect of the picture, as if they were observing the scene directly, or as if the picture was engaging into a dialogue with them, revealing its secrets and mysteries. In other words, the interpreter is as the painter who works within the limitations imposed on him/her by the natural surroundings, in order to enable the spectators to have a deep insight of the multiple angles of the setting, and, simultaneously, widen the horizons of the onlookers and make them conceive the various dimensions of the whole picture, affecting his/her piece of art.

In treating the various dimensions of the interpreting process handled in this thesis, subsuming the psychological, social, pragmatic and the political dimensions, operating and forcing themselves in any face-to-face mediated interaction, the researcher, in fact, cannot and should not underestimate the other variables taking part and exerting enormous pressures upon the consecutive interpreters' performances, such as the effect of time pressure on the quality of interpreting, fatigue, stage fright, environmental noises, foreign accent, tempo of delivery, cognitive overloads, etc. However, and in spite of the fact that the researcher treated these variables, and for convenience, separately, in real human interactions, it is seldom the case. Actually, it is evident from analyzing the examples available in the main body of this thesis, that the various dimensions discussed earlier, are not independent of each other, but instead, they interact, collaborate, compete and co-exist in the one and the same encounter. Nevertheless, they, sometimes, may act differently and be in struggle with each other, for the sake of determining the interpreters' linguistic behaviors.

As a matter of fact, and during the actual interpreting process, which is, by definition, characterized by an enormous degree of complexity and diversity, consecutive interpreters, who like all human beings, work within the boundaries of a wider circle of pressures, limitations, forces and constraints, cannot, totally, isolate their feelings, emotions, attitudes and ideologies, like machines, and above all, curb their potential influences upon the outcomes of the interpreted event. It is, therefore, a futile attempt to assume that consecutive interpreters can be utterly neutral, without injecting their personal beliefs and perspectives and their reflections into the interpreting process.

Indeed, the consecutive interpreter had no choice and cannot but liaises with members of the same speech community where s/he lives, and as a result, the interpreter must abide by the norms prevailing in that part of the world. It is axiomatic to believe that each linguistic community has its own social determinants that, in turn, govern and regulate interpersonal relations in any kind of face-to-face interaction. These social forces, include the asymmetry of power among interlocutors, the principle of social hierarchies, the impact of status upon language people use, the idiosyncratic conversational styles, to name just a few. There is no doubt that these forces may have tremendous influence upon the mediated oral interactions, and consequently, upon the interpreter's linguistic outputs. Ultimately, the interpreter cannot escape and be immune to the social milieu surrounding the production and the interpretation of utterances.

In order to perform their task adequately, consecutive interpreters working in the middle of the real interpreting process, are expected to intervene when necessary, to remove the potential misunderstanding arising from social/cultural/pragmatic differences and the lack of shared knowledge among participants in face-to-face mediated interactions, using whatever means available at their disposal, such as using communication skills and diplomacy maneuvers to reduce or, at least, mitigate differences

and promote understanding among interactants wishing to communicate successfully. In order to avoid the risk of communication breakdown, interpreters must assume an active role during the interpreted encounter, and, as a result, can influence both the direction and the outcome of the interpretive event.

In considering interpretation as both a process and a product, the interaction between the linguistic organization, on the one hand, and the context of occurrences in which utterances take place, on the other, cannot, in fact, be ignored or sacrificed. The extralinguistic factors subsuming the entirety of circumstances surrounding the production and the interpretation of speech – as the most significant of these is the human context – are of primary importance in reshaping the messages delivered. They are, in fact, a determining factor to ensure the fruitfulness and the purposefulness of the communication attempt. Indeed, the interpreting process acquires its significance as essentially a pragmatic need, by taking the reality of the situation into due consideration in determining the interpretive end-product. According to this perspective, the role of the interpreter, ultimately, exceeds the notion of linguistic mediation and goes beyond the boundaries of utterances, to subsume social and cultural mediation, primarily to avoid the possibility of a complete failure in the communication attempt. Sometimes, the pragmatic meanings should have precedence over the semantic meanings of utterances.

As the search for the most important variable of consecutive interpreting proceeds, the political scene, with all its peculiarities and characteristics, imposes itself strongly upon the interpreter's performance, to the extent of obliging the interpreter to adopt certain strategies and language choices, in compliance with the exigencies of an intense and highly charged situation. In these sort of interpreted encounters, consecutive interpreters are vulnerable to stress and anxiety, particularly when mediating between political leaders at times of tension and hostility

between their nations, owing, of course, to the great responsibility put on their shoulders. In interpreting political discourse, the consecutive interpreter can neither overlook the power established in the structure of such meetings, nor can resist its potential influence upon his/her performance. Actually, interpreters in performing their mission, are, in fact, at the mercy of the equation of struggle over power and dominance, and this, will inevitably, reflect on the way they handle messages exchanged in the encounter. Unfortunately, and amid this charged and, sometimes, polarized atmosphere, interpreters are, in fact, the weakest factor in this circle.

5.3 Anticipated Results

This thesis may contribute to enrich the field of interpreting studies, beyond the linguistic and cognitive aspects of this multi-layered phenomenon, consecutive interpreting. The close investigation of the psychological, social, pragmatic and political variables of this human activity, par excellence, reveals how these variables operate, almost collectively, in any interpreter-mediated encounter. Consequently, instead of envisage these variables operating exclusively in the interpretive encounter, this new perspective can widen the horizons of those people interested in the consecutive mode of interpretation, by acknowledging the existence of some sort of interplay among these variables during mediated oral interactions.

Actually, the basic claim of this study asserts the presence of a reasonable degree of interaction, co-existence, collaboration, co-ordination, competition, and even, a struggle among these variables, for the sake of determining interpreters' linguistic behaviors. This finding, can without any doubt, enhances people's conception of this process, and help them to understand, or at least, to excuse the decisions made by consecutive interpreters, consciously or unconsciously, regarding the appropriate way to handle the interpretive encounter.

5.4 Recommendations for Further Studies

Building on the fact taken for granted, that we will never arrive at absolute truth, but, at least, we hope to reach or approach to a better understanding of the phenomenon under investigation. Despite the obvious fact that this thesis builds upon previous studies, and simultaneously, handles the consecutive interpreting process from totally different and new angle, things can be done better than the way it proceeds, due primarily, to the limited resources available at the researcher's disposal.

One of the main issue that could be treated more elaborately in this study, concerns the study of culturally different ways of using language, and the diverse expectations of how meaning is constructed and negotiated among heterogeneous speech communities, or what comes to be known as 'cross-cultural pragmatics'. This is, of course, a very broad topic and a flourishing area of research, requires full integration between the cultures involved on the part of the researcher. What necessitates this kind of further research, is the fact that this issue has an enormous impact on the way consecutive interpreters handle the interpreting process.

References

References to Books

- Al-Zahran, A. (2007). *The Consecutive Conference Interpreter as Intercultural Mediator: A cognitive-Pragmatic Approach to the Interpreter's Role* (Doctoral dissertation, Salford University, 2007).
- Angelelli, C.,V. (2004). *Revisiting the Interpreter's Role*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Angelelli, C.V. & Jacobson, H. E. (eds.) (2009). *Testing and Assessment in Translation and Interpreting Studies*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- As-Safi, A.B. (2011). *Translation Theories: Strategies and Basic Theoretical Issues*. Al Manhal.
- Baker, M. (1992). *In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation*. London and New York: Routledge.
- _____ (1997). Non-cognitive constraints and interpreter strategies in Political interviews. In K. Simms (ed.), *Translating Sensitive Texts: Linguistic Aspects*. (pp. 113-131). Amsterdam and Atlanta: Rodopi.
- Bauman, R. & Sherzer, J. (eds). (1989/2nd ed). *Explorations in the Ethnography Of Speaking*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Beaugrande, R.de & Dressler, W.U. (1981). *Introduction to Text Linguistics*. London: Longman.
- Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brunette, L. et al. (eds.) (2003). *The Critical Link 3: Interpreters in the Community*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Carr, S.E. et al. (eds.) (1997). *The Critical Link: Interpreters in the Community*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

- Corsellis, A. (2008). *Public Service Interpreting: The First Step*. London: Macmillan Press Ltd.
- Danks, J.H. et al. (eds.) (1997). *Cognitive Processes in Translation and Interpreting*. Sage Publications, Inc.
- Diriker, E. (2004). *De-/re-contextualizing conference interpreting: interpreters in the ivory tower?* John Benjamins Publishing.
- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and Power*. London: Longman.
- Freeman, M. & Smith, F. (2013). *Law and Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gambier, Y., Gile, D. & Taylor, C. (eds.) (1997). *Conference Interpreting: Current Trends in Research*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Gerçek, E.S. (2008). "Cultural Mediator" or "Scrupulous Translator"? Revisiting Role, Context and Culture in Consecutive Conference Interpreting (Doctoral dissertation, Turkey, Seyda Eraslan University).
- Gerver, D. & Sinaiko, H.W. (eds.) (1978). *Language Interpretation and Communication*. London and New York: Plenum Press.
- Gile, D. (1995). *Basic Concepts and Models for Interpreter and Translator Training*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- _____ (2009). *Basic Concepts and Models for Interpreter and Translator Training (Vol.8)*. John Benjamins Publishing.
- González, R.D., Va'squez, V.F. & Mikkelsen, H. (2012, 2nd ed.). *Fundamentals of Court Interpretation: Theory, Policy, and Practice*. Durham, NC: Carolina Academic Press.
- Hale, S. (2004). *The Discourse of Court Interpreting: Discourse practices of the law, the witness and the interpreter*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

- Hale, S., Ozolins, U. & Stern, L. (eds.) (2009). *The Critical Link 5: Quality in Interpreting-A shared Responsibility*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Hatim, B. (2001). *Teaching and Researching Translation*. London and New York: Longman.
- Hatim, B. & Mason, I. (1990). *Discourse and the Translator*. London and New York: Longman.
- _____ (1997). *The Translator as Communicator*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Hatim, B., & Munday, J. (2004). *Translation: An advanced resource book*. Psychology Press.
- Hickey, L. (ed.). (1998). *The Pragmatics of Translation*. Clevedon and Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters.
- Hill, H.J. & Irvine, T.J. (eds.) (1993). *Responsibility and Evidence in Oral Discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Janzen, T. (ed.) (2005). *Topics in Signed Language Interpreting*. Amsterdam And Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Kaltenbock, G., Mihatsch, W. & Schneider, S. (eds.) (2010). *New Approaches to Hedging*. UK: Howard House.
- Katan, D. (2004). *Translating Cultures: An Introduction for Translators, Interpreters and Mediators*, (2nd ed). London and New York: Routledge.
- Kearns, J. (ed.) (2008). *Translator and Interpreter Training: Issues, Methods And Debates*. London: Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Lambert, S., & Moser-Mercer, B. (Eds.). (1994). *Bridging the gap: Empirical research in simultaneous interpretation* (Vol. 3). John Benjamins Publishing.

- Leech, N.G. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. London and New York: Longman.
- Linell, P. (1998). *Approaching Dialogue: Talk, Interaction and Contexts in Dialogical Settings*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Mason, I. (ed.) (2001). *Triadic Exchanges: Studies in Dialogue Interpreting*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Munday, J. (2001). *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Application (2nd ed.)*. London and New York: Routledge.
- _____ (2016). *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Application (4th ed.)*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Neubert, A. & Shreve, M.G. (1992). *Translation as Text*. Kent, Ohio and London, England: The Kent State University Press.
- Nicodemus, B. & Swabey, L. (eds.) (2011). *Advances in Interpreting Research*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- O'keeffe, A., Clancy, B. & Adolphs, S. (2011). *Introducing Pragmatics in Use*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Partington, A. (2003). *The Linguistics of Political Argument*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Pöchhacker, F. (2004). *Introducing Interpreting Studies*. London and New York: Routledge.
- _____ (2016). *Introducing Interpreting Studies, (2nd ed.)*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Pöchhacker, F., & Shlesinger, M. (2002). *The interpreting studies reader*. Psychology Press.
- Rajend, M. et al. (eds.) (2000). *Introducing Sociolinguistics*. London: Edinburgh University Press.
- Riccardi, A. (ed.) (2002). *Translation Studies: Perspectives on an Emerging Discipline*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Roberts, Carr, S.E., Abraham, D. & Dufour, A. (eds.) (2000). *The critical link 2: interpreters in the community: selected papers from the Second International Conference on Interpreting in Legal, Health, and Social Service Settings, Vancouver, BC, Canada, 19-23 May 1998 (Vol. 31)*. John Benjamins Publishing.

- Roland, R. A. (1999). *Interpreters as diplomats: a diplomatic history of the role of interpreters in world politics*. University of Ottawa Press.
- Roy, C.B. (2000). *Interpreting as a Discourse Process*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Schaffner, C. (ed.) (2004). *Translation Research and Interpreting Research: Traditions, Gaps and Synergies*. London: Cromwell Press Ltd.
- Searle, J. (1969). *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Shaheen, M. (1991). Theories of translation and their Application to the Teaching of English/Arabic-Arabic/English Translating (Doctoral dissertation, University of Glasgow, 1991).
- Simms, K. (ed.) (1997). *Translating Sensitive Texts: Linguistic Aspects*. Amsterdam and Atlanta: Rodopi.
- Simpson, P. (1993). *Language, Ideology and Point of View*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Valero-Garc'es, C. & Martin, A. (eds.) (2008). *Crossing Border in Community Interpreting: Definitions and Dilemmas*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Wadensjo, C. (1998). *Interpreting as Interaction*. London and New York: Longman.
- Wadensjo, C., Dimitrova, B. & Nilsson, A. (eds.) (2007). *The Critical Link 4: Interpreters in the Community*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Widdowson, H.G. (2004). *Text, Context, Pretext: Critical Issues in Discourse Analysis*. Blackwell Publishing.

Williams, J. & Chesterman, A. (2014). *The Map: A Beginner's Guide to Doing Research in Translation Studies*. London and New York: Routledge.

Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

References to Articles in Journals

Al-Azzam, B. et al. (2014). Electoral Slogans in Jordan: A Translational and Political Analysis. *International journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 4 (3), 277-278.

Bilic', V. et al. (2010). The Conceptual Mapping Modle in Consecutive Interpreting Teaching. *T2 In-Translation in Translation*, Ying Jin (Auckland), 2010-07, p.3.

Furmanek, O. (2006). The Role of Emotions in Establishing Meaning: Implications for Interpreting. *Journal of Specialized Translation*, Wake Forest University, Issue 5, 58.

Moody, B. (2011). What is a Faithful Interpretation?. *Journal of Interpretation*, Vol.21: Issue 1, Article 4.

Ribas, A.M. (2012). Problems and Strategies in Consecutive Interpreting: A Pilot Study at two Different States of Interpreting Training. *Meta*, Vol.57 No.3, 813.

Wadensjo, C. (1995). Dialogue Interpreting and Distribution of Responsibility. *Journal of Linguistics*, No.14, 111-129.

Wu, G., & Wang, K. (2009). Consecutive interpretation: A discourse approach. Towards a revision of Gile's effort model. *Meta: Journal des traducteursMeta:/Translators' Journal*, 54(3), 401-416.

Wu, S. (2007). Pragmatic Failure in Consecutive Interpreting/DE L'ECHEC PRAGMATIQUE DANS L'INTERPRETATION CONSECUTIVE. *Canadian Social Science*, 3(4), 51.

References to Electronic Sources

- www.oxfordhandbooks.com (Retrieved on 05, 11, 2015)
<http://books.google.ps/books?id> (Retrieved on 02, 12, 2015)
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?V=LjzbQu9kkus> (Retrieved on 10, 01, 2016)
<http://www.benjamins.nl/cgi> (Retrieved on 21, 12, 2015)
<http://www.aiic.net/ViewIssues.CFM> (Retrieved on 13, 05, 2016)
<http://www.youtube.com/watch/v=HJNRW3TkuLA> (Retrieved on 08, 02, 2016)
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Language_interpretation (Retrieved on 15, 08, 2016)
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=J00vcNYcpDS> (Retrieved on 26, 07, 2016)
www.criticallink.org/cli-blog (Retrieved on 19, 10, 2015)
<https://books.google.ps/books?id> (Retrieved on 15, 11, 2015)
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?V=LjzbQu9kkus> (Retrieved on 03, 05, 2016)
<http://www.google.com/search?q> (Retrieved on 14, 12, 2015)
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?V=EB5kgDgfkIc> (Retrieved on 13, 06, 2016)
<https://www.theguardian.com> (Retrieved on 09, 10, 2015)
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Oc11polxns8> (Retrieved on 22, 08, 2016)
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?V=giaNfFtI-vIQ> (Retrieved on 12, 07, 2016)
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?V=NuGR6x57ZQ> (Retrieved on 16, 08, 2016)
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?V=wpERH8gEGgu> (Retrieved on 12, 06, 2016)
<https://ar.scribd.com/doc/304151250/Cursul-3-Interpretarea-CA-Act-de-Comunicare> (Retrieved on 14, 04, 2016)

Appendixes

Appendix (1): Questionnaire

Thank you very much for your participation to kindly answer this questionnaire, in which your valuable opinions and points of view will serve the benefit of the academic research. Your answers will be helpful in reaching a better understanding of the process of consecutive interpreting; therefore, your responses will only be used for survey purposes.

This study is dedicated to improve people's outlook concerning consecutive interpreters' decisions during face-to-face interactions, by analyzing the potential influence of specific variables operating during the interpreting process, which may affect the interpreters' verbal behaviors, and, consequently, upon the interpretive outputs. The variables under investigation subsume the psychological states of consecutive interpreters, their social surroundings, the reality of the interpretive settings, and the political atmosphere overshadowing the whole oral encounters. Obtaining feedback from respondents is vital to the analysis of the basic claims of this study. The questionnaire should take approximately 15 minutes to complete. Your responses are completely anonymous. Responses will not be identified by individuals. All responses will be compiled together and analyzed as a group.

Questionnaire

Question 1

Are you:

☐ a freelance interpreter ☐ a professional interpreter

Question 2

How long have you worked as a professional consecutive interpreter?

☐ less than 5 years ☐ more than 5 years

Question 3

Do you think that the psychological state of consecutive interpreters can intervene in their rendition of oral messages?

☐ yes, definitely ☐ yes, sometimes ☐ no, at all

Question 4

Do you feel prone to minimize your relations with clients (e.g., patients, defendants, victims, witnesses, attorneys, relatives, etc.)?

☐ always ☐ usually ☐ sometimes ☐ never

Question 5

Do you give the rein for your emotions to be directly involved in the outcome of the interpreting process?

☐ to a great extent ☐ to a lesser extent ☐ not at all

Question 6

Some psychological symptoms such as, stress, anxiety and frustration ,cannot be avoided when mediating between different parties having diverse interests and motives behind such interaction.

☐ completely agree ☐ partially agree ☐ completely disagree

Question 7

Do you think that the consecutive interpreter should faithfully interpret messages even when s/he does not agree with what the speaker is saying?

☐ yes ☐ yes, certainly ☐ yes, sometimes ☐ no

Question 8

Do you agree that interpreters as cultural/social ambassadors should identify with their clients?

☐ yes ☐ yes, occasionally ☐ no, not at all

Question 9

Do you support the idea that social differences or culture-specific references can constitute obstacles, difficulties or breakdowns in the communication channels?

☐ yes ☐ yes, sometimes ☐ no

Question 10

If your answer to the above question is 'yes', do you think that this difficulty becomes greater when the source and target cultures belong to very remote linguistic universes?

☐ yes ☐ no

Question 11

Do the status, the identity of interlocutors, and the social hierarchies which exist in specific speech communities play a decisive role in dictating interpreters' verbal behavior?

☐ agree completely ☐ agree to a certain extent ☐ disagree

Question 12

Do you believe that social/cultural mediation means going beyond establishing understanding between delegates in face-to-face interactions?

☐ no ☐ absolutely not ☐ always ☐ whenever necessary

Question 13

How do you define your role as a consecutive interpreter?

☐ gate keeper ☐ a faithful echo ☐ a chair person ☐ a third party

Question 14

As a consecutive interpreter, do you support the view that one of the main responsibilities of interpreters is to add explanations, clarifications, illustrations and elucidations that are not included explicitly in the content of the messages transmitted among delegates in the interpreting process?

☐ completely agree ☐ partially agree ☐ completely against

Question 15

Consecutive interpreters are playing the role of intercultural conciliators because they deal not only with languages, but also, and more importantly, with the wider context of interpretation.

☐ completely true ☐ partially true ☐ completely false

Question 16

Do you think that consecutive interpreters can adapt the nature of the messages transmitted while remaining faithful to the meaning of the original speech delivered?

☐ yes, always ☐ yes, when necessary ☐ no

Question 17

When you feel that there is some sort of disparity between the reality of the situation and the semantic meaning of utterances, do you choose adhering to the latter no matter what the consequences are?

☐ yes ☐ no

Question 18

When you are unable to find the appropriate rendition, do you resort to alternative rendition of utterances at the expense of the intended meaning of the messages transmitted?

☐ yes ☐ sometimes ☐ never

Question 19

Do you agree that consecutive interpreters should translate every aspect of the communicative encounter, including the intensity of feelings, the tone, body language and gestures of participants?

☐ yes, certainly ☐ yes, when necessary ☐ no, it is impossible

Question 20

Do the sensitivity of the occasion and the intensity of the political atmosphere affect the choice of your interpretation techniques?

☐ always ☐ sometimes ☐ never

Question 21

Does the balance of power between individuals and leaders impose itself directly and shape the interpretive outcomes?

☐ yes, absolutely ☐ yes, occasionally ☐ not at all

Question 22

At times of political crises, do you prefer to soften the impact of utterances upon interlocutors for fear of escalating the situation?

☐ always ☐ sometimes ☐ never

Question 23

Is it true that there is a constant interaction or even struggle among the different variables affecting the interpretive outcome?

☐ completely agree ☐ agree ☐ completely disagree

Question 24

If your answer to the above question is positive, in your opinion what variable has a considerable effect in dictating interpreters' verbal behaviors?

☐ psychological ☐ social ☐ pragmatic ☐ political

[] all of them are important

Appendix (2): Interview (A)

This is an interview conducted on 13/08/2016, with Jaber Abdullah Isa Al-Saifi, who had worked in Germany for more than thirty years, and then moved to the United Arab Emirates to work as an interpreter from German to Arabic and vice versa. Actually, the interviewee knows little English, but his answers were delivered in Arabic, and the researcher renders them into English.

Thank you very much for devoting part of your time and for your patience, and above all, for your acceptance to co-operate kindly to make this interview possible, which is conducted primarily for the purpose of academic research.

[1] First of all, are you a freelance or a professional consecutive interpreter, and how long have you worked in this particular field?

I am a professional simultaneous and consecutive interpreter, besides being a translator. I have been working in this particular field for almost 15 years.

[2] In your opinion, to what extent can the psychological state of consecutive interpreters subsuming their beliefs, convictions and ideologies, have certain repercussions upon the outcomes of the interpretive encounter?

From my own experience, I think that the psychological state of the interpreter can, indeed, affect no less than 50% of the outcome of the interpreting process.

[3] Do you think that consecutive interpreters are subjected to a considerable degree of stress and anxiety as a result of the pressures exerted upon them by other parties in the communicative encounter?

The level of stress and anxiety associated with the profession depend to a large extent upon the personality and the character of the interpreter. If the interpreter has a weak personality, these psychological pressures will intensify automatically, to the extent of jeopardizing the credibility of his/her rendition.

[4] How can you describe your relationship with participants in the interpreted interaction? Do you describe it as friendly, or do you try to confine it for the purpose of communication only and keep it to the minimum?

I try, as far as possible, not to be over engaged emotionally with the different parties in the interpretive encounter, and, at the same time, make sure that this relation serves, only, the purpose of communication, and remains in its minimum level.

[5] How can the category of feelings and emotions dictate consecutive interpreters' decisions regarding the choice of language to be used?

The interpreter's feelings and emotions can interfere, to a certain extent, and oblige the interpreter to select a certain type of language to be used, whether formal or intimate.

[6] In compliance with their mission as social/cultural brokers, do you think that the consecutive interpreter should faithfully interpret messages, even when s/he does not agree with speakers' opinions?

The interpreter's mission as social/cultural ambassador necessitates being completely faithful to the gist of messages exchanged.

[7] Do you describe yourself as a non-partisan interpreter, or are you under certain pressures forced to identify with either of your clients?

In principle, in carrying out my work, I, usually, adopt the non-partisan outlook, and deal with various parties in the interaction at equal footing.

[8] Do you agree that social differences or culture-specific references can oblige interpreters to adopt certain strategies to overcome these obstacles, especially when the languages involved are perceived to be too distant?

Owing to the fact taken for granted, that the parties involved in the communicative interaction, belong to diverse cultures and languages, consequently, the consecutive interpreter's task is to bridge these gaps, using whatever strategies at his/her disposal.

[9] When performing their task, do interpreters take into due consideration the social forces prevailing in any particular speech community as a major shaping force in dictating interpreters' linguistic behavior?

The social forces operating during the interpreted encounter, subsuming the balance of power and the social hierarchies, cannot be neglected in any form of oral interaction, nevertheless, their effects should be kept to the minimum.

[10] Do you believe that social/cultural mediation gives interpreters a *carte blanche* that exceeds establishing understanding among interlocutors to the extent of promoting certain attitudes and ideologies?

In certain interpretive events, I inject certain ideologies and announce my own perspective regarding specific issues when mediating between interlocutors. Sometimes, I refuse to accept some interpretive tasks, for fear of being completely unfair in handling such encounters, particularly, when the participants have different ideologies and beliefs, which may collide with my own.

[11] How do you define your role in oral interactions as a consecutive interpreter? Do you adopt the conduit approach, or do you actually participate in the interpreting event as a third participant, and consequently, in the construction of meaning of the messages delivered?

It is believed that the main role of consecutive interpreter during the mediated interaction, is to be a conduit or a channel for communication. Nevertheless, in reality, it is the other way round.

[12] In cases of communication failure, do you try to add explanations, clarifications, illustrations and elucidations that are not included in the messages themselves?

I try, as far as the interaction proceeds without difficulties, to let the interaction to take its natural course. However, this does not mean that the consecutive interpreter cannot adapt the content of the messages delivered to suit the intellectual levels of the interactants.

[13] Do you support the idea that consecutive interpreters have the absolute freedom to adapt the content of the messages transmitted while remaining faithful to the originals? In other words, do you agree that the main mission of interpreters is to relay the surface meaning or the sense of the messages delivered?

In my opinion, I believe that the consecutive interpreter should relay the intended meanings of the speakers' messages, regardless of their surface structures. Sometimes, the speaker may not use appropriate expressions suitable to either the listeners' intellectual levels, or to the occasion. In that case, the interpreter can use the appropriate linguistic vehicles that can represent the sense of the messages adequately.

[14] In case there is some sort of contradiction between the semantic meaning of utterances and the reality of the situation, do you get prone to the latter at the expense of the former? And why?

In that situation, I prefer the pragmatic meaning of utterances, even at the expense of their semantic meaning, simply because it represents the true nature of human communication, as it relies heavily upon the hidden meaning of the messages exchanged.

[15] When you cannot find the right word, do you resort to alternative rendition, even though it might distort the intended meaning of the message? Or do you admit that you are unable to relay the appropriate sense of the message to both parties?

I would omit the problematic expressions, while acknowledging the difficulties confronting me in rendering such expressions to the interlocutors.

[16] Do you believe that it is one of the duties and responsibilities of interpreters to relay every aspect of the communicative encounter, including the intensity of feelings, the tone, body language and gestures of interactants?

Yes, absolutely, nevertheless, it is a hard thing to achieve.

[17] In times of political crises, do you try to soften the impact of the messages delivered, or do you stick to literal rendition, no matter what the consequences are?

At times of political instability, the wise consecutive interpreter should stick to the literal rendition of utterances, due to the huge responsibility put

on his/her shoulder, and, moreover, to avoid the accusation of misrepresenting the speakers.

[18] Do you adopt different interpretation techniques and strategies when mediating between high-profile persons?

In actual interpreting settings, consecutive interpreters might choose different strategies in compliance with the sensitivity of the political atmosphere. Nevertheless, in principle, interpreters should not possess double standards in dealing with different interlocutors, regardless of their levels and statuses.

[19] Does the balance of power between leaders and individuals impose itself directly and shape the interpretive outcomes?

Yes, definitely, and to a great extent, no matter how hard interpreters try to deny this obvious fact.

[20] Do you believe that there is some sort of interplay or even struggle among the different variables operating in the interpretive event?

The continuous interaction among the various variables operating in the communicative interaction, lends support to the dynamics of the interpreter-mediated encounter, that should not be underestimated in any research addressing the interpretive phenomenon.

[21] If your answer to the above question is positive, then, what do you think is the most important variable that has a significant effect on interpreters' choices and consequently upon their verbal output?

All of them are important, but the most significant ones are, of course, my principles and attitudes towards the interpreting process.

Appendix (3): Interview (B)

This second interview was conducted on 31st/07/2016 with Manar Abid Al-Halim Al-Nabout, who works at Language Development Center in Ramallah. The interpreter sent me her answers via e-mail, and, actually, this is what I have received from the source.

[1] First of all, are you a freelance or a professional consecutive interpreter, and how long have you worked in this particular field?

Yes, I am a freelance interpreter and translator. I have been working in this field for about 6 years.

[2] In your opinion, to what extent can the psychological state of consecutive interpreters subsuming their beliefs, convictions and ideologies, have certain repercussions upon the outcomes of the interpretive encounter?

The psychological state can, sometimes, have an effect, as the interpreter might not be fully prepared for the task, due to lack of preparation for the work, such as for interpreting, especially if the material on the subject matter had not been sent to them or made clear in order to be aware of the terminology.

[3] Do you think that consecutive interpreters are subjected to a considerable degree of stress and anxiety as a result of the pressures exerted upon them by other parties in the communicative encounter?

When one party questions the capabilities of the interpreter to render the correct message, yes it does. Also, if the speakers do not give the interpreter enough time to interpret, this could cause doubts and a break in the communication.

[4] How can you describe your relationship with participants in the interpreted interaction? Do you describe it as friendly, or do you try to confine it for the purpose of communication only and keep it to the minimum?

My relationship with the participants starts before the session, I introduce myself and ask whether they have worked with interpreters before, so as to know how well they know the importance of proper breaks between sentences and to make sure the participants do not speak out of turn. Therefore, I try to make my role clear, to have everyone on the same page together so the discussions include everyone, those who are listening to the interpretation, and those who are not.

[5] How can the category of feelings and emotions dictate consecutive interpreters' decisions regarding the choice of language to be used?

I have learned to keep emotions out of my work, for the words and messages I am communicating are not my own, but the speakers. Should they wish to include their own emotions and feelings, then that is what I interpret and mirror.

[6] In compliance with their mission as social/cultural brokers, do you think that the consecutive interpreter should faithfully interpret messages, even when s/he does not agree with speakers' opinions?

Yes, I do. My own opinions and thoughts have no room in my work while I am on the clock.

[7] Do you describe yourself as a non-partisan interpreter, or are you under certain pressures forced to identify with either of your clients?

I identify as a non-partisan.

[8] Do you agree that social differences or culture-specific references can oblige interpreters to adopt certain strategies to overcome these obstacles, especially when the languages involved are perceived to be too distant?

Yes, I do agree, for it is my job to bridge these differences as much as I possibly can.

[9] When performing their task, do interpreters take into due consideration the social forces prevailing in any particular speech community as a major shaping force in dictating interpreters' linguistic behavior?

These social determinants cannot be totally discarded in any form of mediated encounter, nevertheless, I try to keep their effect to the minimum.

[10] Do you believe that social/cultural mediation gives interpreters a *carte blanche* that exceeds establishing understanding among interlocutors to the extent of promoting certain attitudes and ideologies?

Yes, I believe that to be true. Interpreters are the voice of the speaker, not their own person when working.

[11] How do you define your role in oral interactions as a consecutive interpreter? Do you adopt the conduit approach, or do you actually participate in the interpreting event as a third participant, and consequently, in the construction of meaning of the messages delivered?

I follow the conduit approach, as I am never a third party even when asked to be.

[12] In cases of communication failure, do you try to add explanations, clarifications, illustrations and elucidations that are not included in the messages themselves?

I would only do so after consulting with the clients, should they think it needs to be further clarified.

[13] Do you support the idea that consecutive interpreters have the absolute freedom to adapt the content of the messages transmitted while remaining faithful to the originals? In other words, do you agree that the main mission of interpreters is to relay the surface meaning or the sense of the messages delivered?

The main mission of the interpreter is to relay the message before the words.

[14] In case there is some sort of contradiction between the semantic meaning of utterances and the reality of the situation, do you get prone to the latter at the expense of the former? And why?

Should there be such a contradiction, I refer to the clients, putting them in the picture first as to why I would be explaining a certain message that was not clear with merely interpretation.

[15] When you cannot find the right word, do you resort to alternative rendition, even though it might distort the intended meaning of the message? Or do you admit that you are unable to relay the appropriate sense of the message to both parties?

I would resort to an alternative rendition, while explaining why, whether it is because I had forgotten the word or because it may simply not exist as a one word in the target language. This would bring the audience closer and perhaps even more interested to participate, to be more engaging.

[16] Do you believe that it is one of the duties and responsibilities of interpreters to relay every aspect of the communicative encounter, including the intensity of feelings, the tone, body language and gestures of interactants?

Yes, of course, after all, that is why we are hired, to be the clients' voice and to represent them as they wish they could themselves in the language they do not speak.

[17] In times of political crises, do you try to soften the impact of the messages delivered, or do you stick to literal rendition, no matter what the consequences are?

Having found myself in such situations several times through my work, I would first sit down with the client if possible, and try to understand their background and purpose of using strong language or politically sensitive terms. I then would inform them of the usual expected reaction and see if they are okay with it. Preparation is key.

[18] Do you adopt different interpretation techniques and strategies when mediating between high-profile persons?

Yes, sometimes.

[19] Does the balance of power between leaders and individuals impose itself directly and shape the interpretive outcomes?

Yes.

[20] Do you believe that there is some sort of interplay or even struggle among the different variables operating in the interpretive event?

Owing to the complexity of the interpreting process, the interaction among its dimensions is natural, and in most cases, these variables co-operate with each other, in other cases, they compete with one another, and in extreme cases, they may be in struggle with each other, for the purpose of determining the interpreters' linguistic behaviors.

[21] If your answer to the above question is positive, then, what do you think is the most important variable that has a significant effect on interpreters' choices and consequently upon their verbal output?

An interpreter's role is not to soften the blow or mitigate its force, what the speaker says must be communicated as such, our only responsibility and job is to bring both parties to the same page, regardless how it would make either party feel or how it would affect them, as that is not why I am there. In order to reach to an appropriate rendition, all these factors must be taken into account.

The Analysis of the Two Interviews

From the analysis of the responses of both interpreters to the interview questions, it appears that the main concern of them is to be constantly faithful to the original speakers' messages, without trying to inject and manipulate the speech delivered for their own purposes. For mainly this reason, both interpreters follow the conduit approach in mediating between delegates, while acknowledging, at least from the professional interpreter's point of view, that in reality, it is the other way round. Nevertheless, both the freelance and the professional interpreters agree, without any hesitation, that the psychological state of interpreters can intervene and reshape the interpretive outcome. On the one hand, the self-employed interpreter endorses the idea that interpreters are subjected to a variety of constraints and pressures, that in turn, may cause some sort of stress and anxiety upon them while performing their mediated mission. On the other hand, the professional interpreter believes that the level of these pressures depends, to a large extent, upon the interpreters' personalities and characters.

As far as the social context of interpretation is concerned, both interpreters concede that the social forces operating in any interpretive encounter cannot be totally discarded, and their effects can hardly be avoided, but they maintain, at the same time, that their echoes should be kept to the minimum. Furthermore, in cases where there is some sort of contradiction between the semantic meaning and the pragmatic one, the professional interpreter is prone to favor the latter at the expense of the former, and so do the freelance interpreter, but after putting the participants in the whole picture. In addition, both of them support the idea of relaying every aspect of the interpretive-mediated encounter, while admitting that it is a difficult thing to achieve.

At times of political crises, the professional interpreter would stick to the literal rendition of utterances, and the freelance interpreter would move away from this strategy, only when informing the interlocutors of the consequences of such departure. Moreover, the identity of interactants, the asymmetry of power and the sensitivity of the interpretive setting, may oblige the interpreter, not only in adopting different techniques and

different strategies, but also in adapting the interpretive outcome, in a way that does not constitute a threat to either the communication attempt, or to the participants themselves or to the sovereignty of their nations.

And finally, both interpreters strongly support the existence of dynamic and continuous interactions among these variables in the interpretive encounter, and the organic nature of this interaction, actually, is what characterizes this kind of face-to-face interpretive encounters. Having said that, both interpreters lend support to the biggest challenge that this thesis is trying to prove, which is the presence of invisible patterns of interaction, cooperation, collaboration, competition, and even struggle, among these, sometimes, conflicting forces. Both interpreters corroborate that in order to deliver credible and reliable interpretations, all these variables should be taken into due account, and any attempt to avoid this temptation is doomed to a complete failure in the communication attempt.

جامعة النجاح الوطنية

كلية الدراسات العليا

التفاعل بين متغيرات الترجمة التتابعية وأثره على التواصل الإنساني

إعداد

تحسين محمد حسن خميس داود

إشراف

د. عوده عوده

د. أيمن نزال

قدمت هذه الأطروحة استكمالاً لمتطلبات الحصول على درجة الماجستير في اللغويات التطبيقية
والترجمة بكلية الدراسات العليا في جامعة النجاح الوطنية في نابلس، فلسطين.

2016

ب

التفاعل بين متغيرات الترجمة التتابعية وأثره على التواصل الإنساني

إعداد

تحسين محمد حسن خميس داود

إشراف

د. عوده عوده

د. أيمن نزال

الملخص

"المترجمون الفوريون كالبهلوانيين اللغويين الذين يمشون باستمرار على حبل مشدود" (رولاند، 3:1999). هذا وصف بليغ ومقتضب لعملية الترجمة الفورية والتتابعية، مؤكداً، في نفس الوقت، دقة وتعقيد هذه العملية. وتعتبر عملية الترجمة الفورية بمثابة نشاط متعدد الأوجه والتي تتفاعل وتؤثر فيه العديد من المتغيرات بعضها مع بعض بطرق معقدة للغاية.

سيكون التركيز الأساسي في هذه الرسالة على التفاعل بين الأبعاد النفسية والاجتماعية والواقعية والسياسية لعملية الترجمة التتابعية ذات الأوجه المتعددة. وعلاوة على ذلك، تهدف الدراسة إلى التعرف على الطرق المختلفة التي تتفاعل فيها هذه المتغيرات وتتعاون وتتنافس، وفي بعض الحالات، تكون في صراع مع بعضها البعض، من أجل فرض السلوك اللفظي للمترجمين الفوريين خلال اللقاء المفسر.

أولاً وقبل كل شيء، من الممكن أن تمارس الحالة النفسية الداخلية والخارجية ضغوطاً شديدة على أداء المترجمين الفوريين التتابعيين، لا سيما عندما يكون المترجمون في خضم العمل. وأحياناً تجبر هذه الضغوط المترجمين للدخول في نوع من الصراع الداخلي مع أنفسهم للتكيف مع معايير العمل الخاصة بهم، من أجل تحقيق مستوى مقبول من الحيادية والنزاهة.

وثانياً، ووفقاً للحقيقة المسلم بها والتي نالت تأييد وإجماع علماء الترجمة الفورية، والتي تنص على أن هذا الحدث التواصلية التفسيرية لا يحدث ضمن فراغ اجتماعي، ولكن بدلاً من ذلك، يكون محاطاً ومشكلاً بمجموعة متعددة من العوامل الاجتماعية مثل الطبقة والوضع الاجتماعي والعرق وعلاقات القوة والتي قد تؤثر حتماً على أداء المترجمين التتابعيين الفوريين. ولا يستطيع المترجمون كبشر أن يعيشوا بمعزل عن تأثير البيئة الاجتماعية المحيطة بالاتصال والتواصل، وخصوصاً السلم الاجتماعي ومنطق القوة الذي يتخلل كل جوانب النسيج الاجتماعي.

ت

ويرتبط الدور المثير للجدل للمترجمين الفوريين خلال التفاعل وجها لوجه ارتباطا وثيقا بالبعد الاجتماعي لهذا اللقاء التفسيري من حيث درجة التدخل المسموح بها للمترجمين الفوريين كوسطاء لغويين وثقافيين. وسيدرك المترجمون الفوريون خلال أدائهم لمهمتهم أن هناك فجوات ثقافية وحواجز اجتماعية هائلة بين اللغات، وحتى بين الطبقات المختلفة للمجتمع نفسه، ومهمة المترجمون هي تضيق هذه الفجوات.

وثالثا، لا يتحدد تفسير أي جزء من الكلام بمعناه السطحي فقط ولكن على الأرجح أيضا وإلى حد كبير وفقا لواقع الموقف الذي تم فيه اللقاء، وهذا يقودنا مباشرة إلى مجال الواقعية وكيف سيقوم هذا البعد، الذي لا مفر منه، بإعادة هيكلة نتائج العملية التفسيرية. ويبدو أن واقعية الوقف في نهاية المطاف هي التي يجب أن تأخذ بعين الاعتبار. حيث تتبثق أهمية هذا المتغير من حقيقة كونه قد لا يكون متضمنا بشكل مباشر وواضح في الرسائل المتبادلة.

وأخيرا، لا بد من الإشارة إلى تأثير المشهد السياسي الذي قد يطغى ويحيط باللقاءات المفسرة بما في ذلك موازين القوى وهوية المتحاورين والجو السياسي من حيث كونه مشوبا بالتوتر أو مستقرا، وكيفية تأثير كل ذلك على أداء المترجمين الفوريين بطرق متميزة ومتسقة.

This document was created with Win2PDF available at <http://www.win2pdf.com>.
The unregistered version of Win2PDF is for evaluation or non-commercial use only.
This page will not be added after purchasing Win2PDF.