NEWSLETTER

Edited by Kyriaki Kourouni (Aristotle), Matilde Nisbeth Brøgger (Aarhus), Elisabet Tiselius (Stockholm)

European Society for Translation Studies   **May 2018 No. 52**

Editorial

Contents

Dear EST members,

We are happy to present the May 2018 issue of the EST Newsletter, our 52nd issue. This issue was prepared by Kyriaki Kourouni, Matilde Nisbeth Brøgger and Elisabet Tiselius.

The EST Newsletter provides you with the latest news on EST activities, TS initiatives and past events, as well as publications. The highlights of EST activities and initiatives are presented in the "Word from our President", which includes news about the 9th EST Congress at Stellenbosch as well as about hosting the 10th EST Congress. More details can be found in the "Initiatives by the Board" section, which presents updates about the 9th EST Congress, the call for the 10th EST Congress and the 1st Graduate Conference organized by the ID-TS network. We also bid sad farewell to two influential TS scholars: Katharina Reiss and Erich Prunč.

This time, the Hot Topics section focuses on Migration and Public Service Interpreting with contributions by Michaela Albl-Mikasa, Eugenia Dal Fovo, Zoi Resta along with our Board Member and co-editor Elisabet Tiselius and is accompanied by a relevant and equally Hot Links section.

As usual, you will also find a list of new publications. We would like to thank all the EST members and colleagues outside EST who have contributed to this Newsletter. We are looking forward to your ideas, suggestions, comments and contributions for the November 2018 Newsletter via secretarygeneralEST@gmail.com.

Kyriaki Kourouni
Aristotle University

Matilde Nisbeth Brøgger
Aarhus University

Elisabet Tiselius
Stockholm University

Kyriaki, Matilde and Elisabet

Hot Topics in Translation Studies:

Migration and Public Service Interpreting

"Interpreter" in Public Service Interpreting Research

Elisabet Tiselius
Stockholm University, Sweden

What's in a name? Would that which we call an interpreter by any other name talk as sweet? (adapted from Shakespeare)

Research into public service interpreting (PSI) has grown during the past 20 years. PSI has been investigated, as Albl-Mikasa points out in this newsletter, mainly from a discourse perspective, but also focusing on the interpreters' role (Valero-Garcés & Martin, 2008), and other professions' perception of interpreters (Briset, Leanza & Laforest, 2013). Resta, also in this newsletter, stresses the fact that within the interpreting profession, interpreters often discuss who the person doing the public service interpreting task is, and whether that person can call themselves an interpreter or not. In fact, the qualifications needed for a person to call themselves an interpreter in the public service domain are nonexistent in many Western countries. With luck, the person acting as an interpreter knows the two languages in question, but as many news reports reveal, language knowledge is not a guarantee (Rice, 2014). In an ongoing questionnaire study, we have looked into different Swedish medical professions' understanding of interpreters, and, not surprisingly, it turns out that the medical professions expect the interpreters they have booked and paid for to be trained and knowledgeable in their profession. However, depending on language, the majority of individuals providing interpreting services for the health care sector are not trained for their task. Yet, using the term interpreter implies for the uninitiated party that the person is trained in what s/he is doing (Granhagen Jungner et al., n.d.).

When it comes to research into public service interpreting, articles about court and medical interpreting or dialogue interpreting give ample examples of interpreted events, and the interpreters' handling of different situations from an interactional perspective (e.g. Baraldi & Gavioli, 2012). Furthermore, public service interpreting is also studied from other fields such as health care sciences (like Briset, Leanza & Laforest, 2013, mentioned above) or Social Sciences (Licoppe & Veyrier, 2016), where the research focuses on other aspects of the interpreter-mediated event, for example how interpreters and interpreting are perceived by the other professions. Given the fact that the profession seems to struggle in terms of defining who can call themselves an interpreter, it is surprising that research into public service interpreting focuses so little on the background of the participants in the research studies. Who is an interpreter in a research study? Angelelli (2004), in her work on interpreters at California Hope, went to great lengths to describe the participants, but it is more often the opposite. Especially in neighboring fields, but also in our own, many studies simply seem to define an interpreter as someone who provides interpreting services, regardless of their background or skills (e.g. Fatahi, 2010).

Building a research community and a research field is a strong contribution to the professionalization of an activity (Parsons, 1968). In this respect, it seems important that the participants studied should be labelled according to both what activity they perform (interpreting) and how trained they are at doing so (language broker, bilingual mediator, ad-hoc interpreter, or interpreter). Indeed, when it comes to defining participants, I argue one should follow T.S. Elliot's advice: the naming of cats is a difficult matter, it isn't just one of your holiday games.

References

Angelelli, Claudia. V. 2004. Medical interpreting and cross-cultural communication. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Baraldi, Claudio and Gavioli, Laura. (Eds.) 2012. Coordinating Participation in Dialogue Interpreting. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.

Brisset, Camille, Leanza, Yvan and Laforest, Karine. 2013. Working with interpreters in health care. A systematic review and a meta-ethnography of qualitative studies. Patient Education and Counselling, 91, 131-140.

Fatahi, Nabi, Nordholm, Lena, Mattsson, Bengt, & Hellström, Mikael. 2010. Experiences of Kurdish war-wounded refugees in communication with Swedish authorities through interpreter. Patient education and counseling, 78(2), 160-165.

Granhagen Jungner, Johanna, Tiselius, Elisabet, Blomgren, Klas, Lützen, Kim, Pergert, Pernilla. (manuscript). Language barriers and the use of interpreters – A national cross-sectional survey in paediatric oncology healthcare.

Licoppe, Christian and Veyrier, Clair-Antoine. 2016. How to show the interpreter on screen? The normative organization of visual ecologies in multilingual courtrooms with video links. Journal of Pragmatics 107, 147-164.

Parsons, Talcott. 1968. Professions. In D.L. Sills (Eds.), International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, Vol. 12, 536–547. New York: The Free Press.

Resta, Zoi. 2017. Community Interpreting in Greece: The case of refugee camps [in Greek]. Athens: Diavlos.

Rice, Sabriya. 2014. Hospitals often ignore policies on using qualified medical interpreters. Modern health care. http://www.modernhealthcare.com/article/20140830/MAGAZINE/308309945

Valero-Garcés, Carmen, & Martin, Anne. (Eds.). 2008. Crossing borders in community interpreting: Definitions and dilemmas. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.

Cognition in Community Interpreting

Michaela Albl-Mikasa
ZHAW, Switzerland

One of the main differences between public service interpreting (PSI) and conference interpreting (CI) is the conversation partners whom the disciplines serve. While PSI caters mostly to national service providers or authoritative representatives and migrants or refugees, CI is often provided to international delegates and experts. The study of PSI has been greatly influenced by Wadensjö's frequently cited 1998 book. Wadensjö already proposed three years earlier an "interactionist, non-

normative, dialogical approach to studies of interpreter-mediated talk" (1995: 111). As a result, two distinct paradigms were propagated for the study of PSI and CI: PSI was dealt with within the discourse-in-interaction (DI) paradigm, while CI was firmly rooted in the cognitive-processes (CP) paradigm (Pöchhacker 2015: 69). With this in mind, PSI research focusses on discourse interaction, conversation management and role behaviour, leaving CI to the realm of cognitive processing, capacity management and strategic behaviour. This is not, however, merely a matter of emphasis. The distinction has been used to claim "radical differences between conference and dialogue interpreting" (Merlini 2015: 28) in an effort to bring agency, visibility and involvement back to the fore in PSI after it was felt in the beginning that the "the same rules and principles laid down for conference interpreters" should be adopted, binding interpreters to "confidentiality, maximum objectivity, impartiality, and self-effacement" (Merlini 2015: 28). Thus, the "body of research on community interpreting has to date focused mainly on aspects of the interpreter's role in the interaction between interlocutors/ participants and in the communication process" at the expense of the cognitive processing dimension (Englund Dimitrova and Tiselius, 2016: 195).

Coming from a conference interpreting background, when I first became involved with my colleague Gertrud Hofer's research project "Interpreting in Medical Settings: Roles, Requirements and Responsibility" in 2012 (see Albl-Mikasa et al. 2015), I was surprised to find that the body of PSI literature barely touched upon the cognitive processing and situating communicative dimensions. My background being the Heidelberg School's "cognitive and pragmatic discourse model of interpreting" (Albl-Mikasa and Hohenstein 2017), I had understood interpreting to be an example of situated cognition – as (source-text) comprehension and (target-text) product-ion processes influenced by manifold individual, textual and situational factors. The conference interpreters I knew and had conducted in-depth interviews with had never shown any sign of the alleged ideal of not being active, involved or visible. They were more and less active or passive, involved or not involved and visible or invisible depending on the above factors. How could descriptions of PSI possibly be complete without considerations of cognitive processing as part of situated communication? I started to discuss these concerns with Barbara Ahrens (Cologne University of Applied Sciences) in 2014. At the 2016 Critical Link Conference in Edinburgh, we learned that Elisabet Tiselius

and Birgitta Englund Dimitrova (Stockholm University) were thinking along similar lines (Englund Dimitrova and Tiselius 2016). At the EST conference in Aarhus later that year, Barbara, Elisabet and I decided to take the idea further, looking at PSI from the angle of longstanding results in cognitive conference interpreting research. We set up an interpreting-oriented sub-group in the Translation, Research, Empiricism, Cognition (TREC) network called "Cognitive Research in Interpreting on Empirical grounds" or "CRIE" the very same year.

In a forthcoming chapter (Albl-Mikasa 2018), I propose a model that presents typical PSI-related notions and concepts, such as role, ethics, agency, etc., from a cognitive socio-constructivist perspective. The model suggests an interpreter can consider and put into practice in the situation (performance) only what s/he knows (competence). That is, ethical norms can be brought to bear on the decision-making process only insofar as the interpreter is familiar with them, i.e. they must be mentally represented in the interpreter's mind. This clarifies the alleged gap between professional ideology and professional practice, i.e. the gap between codes of conduct and standards and interpreters' actual performance, which is one of the lynchpins of the discussion in the PSI literature (Wadensjö 2004). From a cognitive angle, norms are defined as knowledge (Schäffner 1999: 1) which is learned and then moulded and strengthened through experience (performance level). The resulting expertise (competence level) feeds back into the actual interpreting activity (performance level) and shapes "the performed and assumed roles enacted by interlocutors" (Hlavac 2017: 198). Role (behaviour) is, thus, an enactment process at the interface of competence and performance that depends on mentally encoded experience and expertise. As interpreters' understanding of the task and related rules and standards grows, top-down guidance from their background knowledge helps balance out bottom-up influences from the source text or situation, e.g. when circumstances override coded specifications (as in the event of a moral dilemma, when impartiality may be unmaintainable). This framework, characterized by constant trade-offs on the performance level in interdependence with the competence level, encourages us to take a fresh look at agency and the liberties professional interpreters may have to take when trying to reconcile adherence to rules and regulations with meeting clients' and other conversation participants' expectations and, not least, their own subjective requirements. Calling into question the common misconceptions in the

PSI literature surrounding the conduit model and related notions, such as neutrality, invisibility and impartiality, it highlights the importance of flexibility in making these judgement calls.

References

Albl-Mikasa, Michaela. 2018. "Interpreters' roles and responsibilities". In The Bloomsbury Companion to Language Industry Studies, E. Angelone, M. Ehrensberger-Dow and G. Massey (eds), London: Bloomsbury (forthcoming).

Albl-Mikasa, Michaela, Glatz, Elisabeth, Hofer, Gertud and Sleptsova, Marina. 2015. "Caution and compliance in medical encounters. Non-interpretation of hedges and phatic tokens". Translation & Interpreting 7 (2): 76-89.

Albl-Mikasa, Michaela and Hohenstein, Christiane. 2017. "Cognition in community interpreting: the influence of interpreter's knowledge of doctor-patient interaction". In Doing Applied Linguistics: Enabling Transdisciplinary Communication, D. Perrin and U. Kleinberger (eds), 130-138. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Englund Dimitrova, Birgitta and Tiselius, Elisabet. 2016. "Cognitive aspects of community interpreting. Towards a process model". In Reembedding Translation Process Research, R. Muñoz Martín (ed), 195-214. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Hlavac, Jim. 2017. "Brokers, Dual-role mediators and professional interpreters: A discourse-based examination of mediated speech and the roles that linguistic mediators enact". The Translator 23 (2): 197-216.

Merlini, Raffaela. 2015. "Empathy: A 'zone of uncertainty' in mediated healthcare practice". Cultus 8: 27-49.

Pöchhacker, Franz. 2015. "Evolution of interpreting research". In The Routledge Handbook of Interpreting, H. Mikkelson and R. Jourdenais (eds), 62-76. London/New York: Routledge.

Schäffner, Christina (ed). 1999. Translation and norms. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Wadensjö, Cecilia O. 1995. "Dialogue interpreting and the distribution of responsibility". Hermes: Journal of Language and Communication Studies 14: 111-129.

Wadensjö, Cecilia O. 1998. Interpreting as interaction. London: Longman

Wadensjö, Cecilia O. 2004. "Dialogue interpreting: A monologising practice in a dialogically organized world". Target 16 (1): 105-124.

The language of migration in institutional