04/12/2012 MARIE-University of Alberta Collaboration Webinar on Community Interpreting

Slide 1.   Research and best practices in community interpreting: to mediate or not to mediate?
             Jemina Napier, Webinar for University of Alberta. April 2012

Slide 2.   Overview: This webinar will give an overview of how interpreting research studies in spoken and signed languages have impacted on community interpreting practice. Seminal studies will be presented that have changed our view of our role as mediators of communication, with discussion of shifting trends in practice and pedagogy that have been influenced by evidence-based research.

Slide 3.   Pre-requisite readings
             - Pöchhacker, F. (2008). Interpreting as mediation. In Valero-Garcés, C. & Martin, A. (Eds.), *Crossing borders in community interpreting: Definitions and dilemmas* (pp.9-26). Philadelphia/Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
             - Leeson, L., Wurm, S., Vermeerbergen, M. (2011). "Hey Presto!" Preparation, practice and performance in the world of signed language interpreting and translating. In Leeson, L., Wurm, S., Vermeerbergen, M. (Eds.), *Signed language interpreting: Preparation, practice and performance* (pp.2-11). Manchester: St Jerome.

Slide 4.   What are we talking about when we say 'community interpreting'?
             1. Community interpreting; 2. Public service interpreting; 3. cultural interpreting; 4. dialogue interpreting; 5. ad hoc interpreting; 6. Liaison interpreting; 7. Escort interpreting; 8. Medical and/or legal interpreting. (Roberts, 1997)

Slide 5.   Is community interpreting a distinct type of interpreting?: 1. Gentile (1997) questions whether we need to distinguish between the different types of interpreting (conference, community, court etc); 2. Does the term "community interpreting" constitute a distinct category?; 3. What are the characteristics of this type of interpreting?

Slide 6.   Definition "Community Based Interpreting (CBI) encompasses interpreting which takes place in everyday or emergency situations in the community. Possible settings include health, education, social services, legal, and business" (Chesher et al, 2003, p.318)

Slide 7.   Parameters: Gentile (1997), Roberts (1997) & Kalina (2002) identified parameters that are used to describe interpreting: 1. Setting ; 2. Technique (mode) i.e. simultaneous/ consecutive ; 3. Language Direction A<>B; 4. Social dynamics (interpersonal features) ; 5. Participant goals .

Slide 8.   Typology of interpreting: 1. distance vs proximity (physical); 2. non-involvement vs involvement; 3. equality/solidarity vs non-equality/power (in relation to status & role of speaker and addressee); 4. formal vs informal setting; 5. literacy vs orality; 6. Cooperativeness/directness vs non- ooperativeness/indirectness (relevant to negotiation strategies); 7. shared vs conflicting goals (Alexieva, 1997)

Slide 9.   Photo

Slide 10.   Photo

Slide 11.   Photo

Slide 12.   Role of the community interpreter as it is normatively defined: 1- Sole function of the interpreter is "message transfer"; 2- The interpreter is not an active participant in the social encounter; 3- The interpreter

is unobtrusive and non-relational; 4- No interventions are initiated by the interpreter; 5- The interpreter is likened to a "linguistic instrument" (Beltran-Avery, 2001); 6- "relaying talk function" (Wadensjö, 1998)

Slide 13.   The conduit model: "Unfortunately, these definitions and descriptions have limited the professional's own ability to understand the interpreting event itself and the role of the interpreter within the event. This has led to a belief system about interpreting which is based on the unexamined notion of the interpreter as a conduit" (Roy, 2002 p. 345)

Slide 14.   Controversy: Role of the interpreter: 1. Is community interpreting a form of mediation?; 2. Mediation: Intervening between conflicting parties or viewpoints (legal); Activity of an intermediate to transmit something (interpreting); 3. Interpreting: Linguistic mediation, Cultural mediation, Interlingual mediation, Intercultural mediation, (Pöchhacker, 2008)

Slide 15.   Translation, interpreting & mediation (Pöchhacker, 2008): 1. Translation as mediation = mediation between languages and cultures ("talk as text" - Wadensjö, 1998); 2. Interpersonal mediation = interpreting enables communication between persons or groups who do not speak the same language ("talk as activity" - Wadensjö, 1998); 3. The 'interpreter-mediated encounter'; 4. 'coordinating talk function' (Wadensjö, 1998)

Slide 16.   What is interpreter-mediated communication?: 1. Interpreters are actors in a social, cultural and institutional context in which other players contribute to shaping the nature of the communication. 2. Tools from other disciplines: Ethnography of speaking: communication in its social and cultural context (e.g. Hymes – see Angelelli), Sociology: frame reference & footing which describes speaker/hearer roles (e.g., Goffman – see Metzger), Interactional sociolinguistics: dialogic communication where meaning is negotiated in interaction (e.g., Bakhtin – see Roy).

Slide 17.   The gap between theory & practice: Berk-Seligson, 1990 – legal (Spanish), Wadensjö, 1998 – egal/medical (Swedish), Metzger, 1999 – medical (ASL), Roy, 2000 – university (ASL), Napier, 2002 – university (Auslan), Angelelli, 2004 – medical (Spanish), Hale, 2004 – legal (Spanish), Russell, 2008 – education (ASL), Lee, 2010 – legal (Korean), Dickinson, 2010 – workplace (BSL)

Slide 18.   The role continuum

Slide 19.   A new paradigm: Challenges to notions of neutrality and invisibility, Interpreter as active participant, Interpreting as mediation, A refined model of community interpreting (Turner, 2007), Mediation, manipulation & empowerment: Celebrate the complexity of the interpreter's role (Apostolou, 2009)

Slide 20.   A new paradigm: Challenges to notions of neutrality and invisibility, Interpreter as active participant, Interpreting as mediation, A refined model of community interpreting (Turner, 2007), Mediation, manipulation & empowerment: Celebrate the complexity of the interpreter's role (Apostolou, 2009)

Slide 21.   Be mindful of use of the term 'mediation': 1. Potential conflict between concept of mediation in contractual sense and communicative sense (Pöchhacker, 2008); 2. Contractual notion of mediation relies on neutrality of mediator to broker agreement (often legal); 3. Communicative notion of mediation relies on participation of interpreter to coordinate and relay talk, E.g., Lee (2009) legal personnel strongly objected to use of the term 'mediation';

Slide 22.   Don't throw out the baby with the bathwater: 1. Pollitt (2000): Pendulum swing from conduit to interactive model – we embraced change; But literal interpretation still has its place (see also Napier,

2002). 2. "Interpreter-mediated communication" = we embraced change; 3. Interpreter-mediated communication or interpret**ed** communication/ interaction?

Slide 23. Community interpreting research: 1. Growing body of literature and publications to complement existing body of conference interpreting research (which has dominated): Erasmus et al (1999), Hale (2007), Valero-Garcés & Martin (2008), Corsellis (2008), Ricoy et al (2009). 2. Need for more dialogue between research and practice (Angelelli, 2008); 3. Need for interpreters as practisearchers (Shlesinger, 2009; Napier, 2011a)

Slide 24. Signed language interpreting expertise: 1. Our roots are in the community; 2. Our profession and practice has guided community interpreting in other languages (Mikkelson, 1999; Pöchhacker, 1999; Angelelli 2004); 3. Increasing bridge between spoken and signed language interpreting research (e.g., Shaw, 2006; Swabey & Nicodemus, 2011); 4. Growing body of signed language interpreting research (Grbic, 2007; Napier, 2011b)

Slide 25. Emerging research in signed language interpreting: Three-way approach: 1. Generation zero – descriptive and prescriptive works; 2. First generation – theoretical considerations and analyses (we are still here); 3. Second generation – research needed that investigates what students/ professionals do with the knowledge gleaned from first generation research. (Leeson, Wurm & Vermeerbergen, 2011)

Slide 26. Future research: Three strands needed: 1. Research that feeds into academic teaching and leads to provision of *strategies* for interpreters; 2. Research that results in the development of *tools* that can be used by interpreters; 3. Research that leads to better understanding of limitations on the functionality of interpreters in certain contexts . (Leeson, Wurm & Vermeerbergen, 2011)

Slide 27. Joint research: Need for joint spoken-signed language community interpreting research: 1. Do we mediate?; 2. How do we mediate?; 3. When do we mediate?; 4. Why do we mediate?; 5. Should we mediate?