

**A Thesis Presented To Graduate Institute Of Translation And Interpretation
National Taiwan Normal University**



**Thesis Supervisors: Dr. Chung-tien Chou
Dr. Tze-wei Chen**

**Directionality in Simultaneous Interpretation:
A Reassessment**

Advisee: Yu-mei Renee Jen

January, 2006

In dedication to my beloved parents: Chao-fu and Li-qing Chang

Acknowledgement

Immense appreciation to my parents, the thesis supervisors and all who took part or contributed even the slightest bit as to making the completion of this thesis research possible.

May wisdom of the world be with us all.

Abstract

This study discussed SI directionality by examining the validity of the claim that interpreting into A language was a better/standard direction. Two approaches were taken: literature review and Internet survey. On the part of literature review, aside from the fact that the ambiguity of the existing language terms that necessarily involved in the discussion of directionality deserved more research attention, some of the major arguments for supporting A-B and B-A were reviewed respectively. Other previous empirical studies also revealed important clues which might turn out to be factors that determined SI directionality in quite independently of the interpreter's working languages being native or non-native, as identified by this study. It was highly likely that SI directionality was an issue that had gone beyond the discussion of native vs. non-native languages. On the other hand, the Internet survey results showed that interpreting into A language as the standard direction was a well-noted idea in the field but few respondents actually gave their support to its strict practice mostly out of the concern for market reality.

Key words: simultaneous interpretation, directionality

Table of Content

CHAPTER ONE INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 RESEARCH BACKGROUND	1
1.2 RESEARCH OBJECTIVE	4
1.3 ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY	5
CHAPTER TWO INTERPRETING: HISTORY AND DEFINITION.....	6
2.1 OVERVIEW OF INTERPRETING.....	6
2.1.1 Interpreting: Definition	6
2.1.2 Interpreting: An Overview of History.....	7
2.2 LANGUAGE TERMS	11
2.2.1 Mother Tongue	12
2.2.2 The Definition of A language, B Language and C Language.....	15
2.2.3 Definition Supplement.....	18
CHAPTER THREE DIRECTIONALITY IN SI.....	23
3.1 DIRECTIONALITY: IS THERE AN ISSUE?	23
3.1.1 Arguments for Interpreting into A	23
3.1.1.1 Quality Language Production	23
3.1.1.2 B Production vs. B Comprehension.....	25
3.1.2 Arguments for Interpreting into B	26
3.1.2.1 Market Reality.....	26
3.1.2.2 Native Understanding	28
3.1.2.3 Content Accuracy.....	30
3.2 FACTORS THAT DETERMINE SI DIRECTIONALITY	34
3.2.1 Language-Specific Combination.....	35
3.2.2 Context	40
3.2.3 Personal Factor.....	42
3.2.4 Interpreting Norms	43
3.2.5 Experience.....	45
CHAPTER FOUR METHODOLOGY.....	55
4.1 RESEARCH SCOPE.....	55

4.2 RESEARCH QUESTION.....	56
4.3 RESEARCH METHOD.....	56
4.4 ADMINISTRATION OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE	58
4.5 THE RESPONDENTS AND THE SELECTION	59
4.6 QUESTIONNAIRE DESIGN	60
4.7 PRETEST	64
4.8 DATA ANALYSIS	65
CHAPTER FIVE RESULTS AND ANALYSIS	66
5.1 RESPONSES FROM THE GROUP OF SCHOOL DIRECTORS AND ANALYSIS	67
5.2 RESPONSES FROM THE GROUP OF CONFERENCE INTERPRETERS AND ANALYSIS ..	68
5.3 RESULTS AND ANALYSIS	69
CHAPTER SIX CONCLUSION	71
6.1 CONCLUSION.....	71
6.2 RESEARCH LIMITATION.....	75
6.3 SUGGESTION FOR FUTURE STUDIES	75
REFERENCES.....	78
APPENDIX I.....	83
APPENDIX	86
APPENDIX	95

List of Tables

Table 2.1	13
Table 2.2	21
Table 2.3	22
Table 3.1	32
Table 3.2	33
Table 3.3	53

Chapter One Introduction

1.1 Research Background

Interpreting is a task of verbally translating a source language into a target one so it inevitably involves at least two languages in order to establish communication. Chang (2005) indicates that in simultaneous interpreting, interpreting from one's non-native language (B language) into mother tongue (A language) is different from the vice versa. For example, Chang points out that “the comprehension and production process in the second language (L2) often differ from the first language” (p. 1) even for a fluent L2 learner. Such difference has been the basis of a long-debated issue, that is, directionality in SI (Chang 2005). What is the debate of SI directionality all about? According to Chang, it is “whether an interpreter should work from L2, or a weaker language, into L1, or a dominant language (referred as B-to-A), or vice versa (referred as A-to-B).” (p. 1) Working into and out of mother tongue is also known as AB retour (AIIC website). Members in the field have tried to “answer the question as to which combination is easier for the interpreters and provides better interpreting quality.” (Bartlomieczyk 2004b, p. 239) Many have noted that interpreting into A is generally the dominant direction or standard practice as adopted by some major international organizations (Schweda-Nicholson 1992, cited in Chang 2005; Szabari 2002). Some even suggest working into A is a consensus achieved by professionals in the field (Tommola and Helevä 1998). However, Gile (1990) reminds us that the subject of directionality has not been properly dealt with as far as SI research is concerned although many differences across language direction have been observed. This study believes the claim that working into mother tongue (Or A language) is a standard practice should be further discussed and whether directionality is only related to the pros and cons of interpreting from and into mother tongue is an important issue that

requires more research efforts. By clarifying these questions, more can be learned and ascertained on (1) whether working into A is indeed commonly practiced and for what reasons (2) are we on the right track by simply examining the issue of directionality regarding one's native and nonnative languages.

Note that Kees de Bot (2000) cautions that interpreting into A may not be as a widespread preference as it is claimed in the literature. Kees de Bot may be right in suggesting so. The point is that not all organizations/places are exclusive about working into A even for those who do support and practice it. For example, The Joint Interpreting and Conference Service (Or SCIC) has also now acknowledged and practiced interpreting into B; according to the website of the European Parliament, which allows their interpreters for the Finnish booth and countries that made their accession from 2004 and onwards to work in both directions (EU website). In Taiwan, interpreters whose language combination is Chinese/English are indeed required to work in both directions due to a shortage of English-A interpreters in the market (Chang 2005). Very little research has indeed looked into "Where, in what situation and with what languages do interpreters work exclusively into their A language and B language respectively" as well as the fact that factors that determine directionality have so far received equally modest attention (Szabari 2002).

The first thing that must be ascertained is whether there is any evidence that working into A is ever supported or practiced by any professionals, organizations, institutes or companies, etc. to the degree that it is clearly stated in written form as a working principle or standard. Pokorn (2004) mentions the fact that many translation theorists demand that texts be translated only into the translator's mother tongue

based on the claim that “native speakers have an infallible ability to distinguish native speakers from non-native speakers.” (p. 114) In the book *Approaches to Translation*, Peter Newmark believes that a translator working into a foreign language cannot avoid the production being “unnatural and non-native, any more than he can speak one.” (Newmark 1981, p. 180) Written translators in the EU institutions “translate exclusively into their mother tongue.” (Wagner, Bech and Martinez 2002, p. 32) When it comes to translation and interpreting as a business, strict practice of working into A is also observed because this direction is considered to be of higher quality. One example is Langbridge Inc., a translation/interpretation agency that claims to be working with more than 5,000 translators and interpreters worldwide and offers translation service in nearly 200 languages and dialects while interpreting in over 20. This agency advertises the quality of their work by reassuring their clients that not only their translators and interpreters are certified and have one or more university degree and/or certifications in translation but more important, the agency’s working principle is that all work be done in the mother tongue (On the website of Langbridge, Inc).

In terms of organizations in the field, Institute of Linguists (IoL) in its Code of Professional Conduct under scope of work which Practitioners (Referring to members of the Institute) may undertake states that “Practitioner who act as translators shall work only into the language they register with the Institute as their mother tongue or language of habitual use.” (The website of IoL) What is more, Swiss Association of Translators, Terminologists and Interpreters (ASTTI) even draws down the following as one of the admission criteria for its active members:

“avoir une compréhension et une maîtrise parfaites des langues de travail pour lesquelles il demande son admission à l'ASTTI; en règle générale, la langue d'arrivée ne peut être que la langue maternelle ou la langue de culture” (ASTTI website).

The above quote can be translated as *“To have perfect comprehension and control of the working languages as ASTTI admission requires; as a general rule, the target language can only be the mother tongue or the language of education”*. Regardless of the number of people who support and practice working into A as a standard, the fact that interpreting into A is considered the standard practice by some of the members in the field is undeniable. As demonstrated above, they seriously take working into A as a standard practice or even an admission requirement for membership as a way to ensure work quality and/or to attract business. The practical extensiveness of working into A accepted in reality as a benchmark is a matter that requires further research. The study scope of this research thus probes into the issue of directionality on the part of the validity of interpreting into A as a standard practice not only by reviewing the literature and the opinions and practices of some members in the field but also examining what factors, other than interpreter’s native and nonnative language, may have existed and manipulated interpreting across language direction.

1.2 Research Objective

The frequent citation of working into A as a dominant or standard practice in the literature and the fact that it is indeed followed by some in the real world are undeniable facts. This study will look into the issue of working into A, exploring aspects of feasibility of such a principle to gain a better understanding of possible impacts regarding the practice of SI by examining the formation, historical reason and factors that contribute to the current practice. Opinions and actual practices of members in the field are also collected and analyzed. Therefore, literature review and

survey method are both taken to approach the issue; the former is the focus while the latter functions as additional support for this study.

1.3 Organization of the Study

The present study is consisted of six chapters. Chapter One is Introduction which states the research background, research objective and organization of the study.

Chapter Two presents an overview of interpreting regarding its history and definition. Terms which are constantly referred to throughout the study (i.e. the definitions for A, B and C languages) are defined and further discussed in this chapter.

While arguments supporting A-B and B-A are reviewed respectively in Chapter Three, previous empirical studies presented to the issue of SI directionality reveal important clues which are also identified by this study as factors that may determine directionality in this chapter.

Chapter Four is the research methodology which concerns the qualitative questionnaires administered through email (Internet survey) as adopted by this study. Its functioning as a research tool is critical in testing the research questions that this study has raised according to the literature review.

Chapter Five states the research results and analysis while Chapter Six finally presents the conclusion of the study founded on the analysis of the literature review and the collected data from the survey.

Chapter Two Interpreting: History and Definition

Chapter two takes two key topics into consideration: an overview of interpreting regarding its history and definition to begin with, followed by a review of the working definition for A, B and C languages of an interpreter.

2.1 Overview of Interpreting

This section provides an overall picture for interpreting including its definition and history.

2.1.1 Interpreting: Definition

“Interpreting is a form of Translation in which a first and final rendition in another language is produced on the basis of a one-time presentation of an utterance in a source language.” (Pöchhacker 2004, p. 11) There are various working modes of interpreting; some of these include consecutive interpretation, simultaneous interpretation (SI), whisper interpretation/whispering and sight translation/sight interpretation. Consecutive interpreting is conducted in a way that the interpreter first listens to the original speech whether it is complete or fragmented; then, the interpreter reproduces the message in the target language (Baigorri-Jalón 2000).

Sight translation is simply the “the rendition of a written text ‘at sight’.” (Pöchhacker 2004, p. 19) The interpreter’s delivery is simultaneous with his/ her visual reception of the written source text.

On the other hand, SI is carried out in the way that two or three interpreters usually pair up in a soundproofed booth where they take turns interpreting. With the

help of technical equipment (i.e. headset, microphone, console, etc.), the interpreter orally translates what he/she hears into a target language, which the audience can listen to through a headset. SI is unique among various kinds of translation and interpreting practices because it requires an interpreter to “orally translating the message heard in one language immediately and continuously into another language while the message is still being produced.” (Chang 2005, p. 1; Liao 2005, p. 12) In other words, the interpreter listens to the incoming messages and provides an oral translation into another language as upcoming messages are still in the process of being produced by the speaker. As Hamers and Blanc (1989) adds, the interpreter “speaks one part of the message in the target language while listening simultaneously to the next part of the message in the source language.” (p. 244) In SI, the interpreter’s listening and interpreting are almost simultaneously done while the speaker is never interrupted by the interpreting task, Yagi (1999) mentions time is a very important factor in SI because the task is comprised of “concurrent and semi-concurrent cognitive activities (listening, decoding, encoding and speaking).” (p. 268)

Whispering is a form of rendition that is done as the interpreter works right next to one or a few of listeners by speaking in a soft voice. In fact, whispering can also be done by using “portable transmission equipment.” (Pöchhacker 2004, p.19)

2.1.2 Interpreting: An Overview of History

Interpreting is a type of translation which predates written translation and even the writing practice as its ancestry can be traced all the way back around 1900 BC (Pöchhacker 2004).

In Ancient Greece, interpreters were regarded as the linguistic mediators for business. The only way Greeks could communicate with “high status Roman Senate representatives or non-classical people like Egyptians or Celts were through interpreters.” (Angelelli 2004) Based on the fact that the Greeks “were somewhat averse to “foreign tongue”, interpreters were constantly in demand.” (p. 8)

The entire history of Buddhist scripture translation in China proceeded nearly as long as nine hundred years (Cao 1990). As Lin (2000) reports, Buddhist scripture in the early days were often written in Sanskrit or in the translated versions such as in Kucha or Khotan, the foreign languages from the West Area. Few Chinese could understand Sanskrit or the foreign languages from the West Area during the early days of translation of Buddhist scripture (Cao 1990). Even during the entire nine hundred years those who were in charge of translation or exponent tasks were mostly foreign monks who came to China and among them, few could speak as fluent Chinese such as Kumarajiva and Dharmaksema (Or Dharmaraksa). Therefore, the majority who did not have the knowledge of Chinese had to depend upon interpreters for language assistance (Cao 1990). Cao clearly documented that the foreign monk who was in charge of the oral teaching of Buddhist texts would first recite the texts using the foreign language that the texts were written in before interpreting the content into Chinese. For those in charge of the same task but did not speak Chinese, an interpreter would stand by and interpret what the foreign monk in charge had said, while a disciple took down the interpreter’s delivery in written form. Huang (1990) commented that working into a foreign language in such case was a must for there were no other alternatives. It should be noted that foreign monks who could speak Chinese as an additional language also

served as interpreters for those who did not. Lokaksema (Or Lokaksin) was cited as the earliest example for such purpose by Cao (1990). Therefore, not all foreign monks who came to China to teach were required to learn Chinese as a prerequisite.

Shifting the focus to some of the western world's events, a somewhat similar functioning of interpretation driven by market reality is also documented. Ever since the Spanish Conquest, interpreters have held an important position in the Americas. As Christopher Columbus set foot in the Americas, communication with the Native Americans was blocked for both sides did not understand each other's language whatsoever. It turned out that Columbus had to train some of the Natives to learn Spanish and its culture. This was done by capturing some natives and sending them to Spain for the above purpose of education and later bringing them back to go on subsequent voyages with Columbus. It turned out to be a successful tactics and communication between the Spanish and the Natives was bridged by "a new generation of Native interpreters." (Angelelli 2004, p. 9) An educated guess here is that to begin with, those Native interpreters must have worked both ways in order to fulfill the communicating task since they were the only ones who understood both languages.

In more recent history, interpreting service dated back in the 1920s, after more languages were recognized as official diplomatic languages when "the virtual monopoly enjoyed by French as the language of diplomacy ended." (Baigorri-Jalón 2000, p. 1) Consecutive interpreting and whispering were the earliest forms of interpreting to be adopted.

Prior to the Second World War, an interpreting activity similar to SI was practiced at the League of Nations (Gaiba 1998) and International Labor Office (Baigorri-Jalón 2000). In the early days, SI was conducted in a way a little different from what was done in Nuremberg and the way we do it today. Gaiba called it “simultaneous successive interpretation and the simultaneous reading of pretranslated texts.” (Gaiba 1988, p. 31) A consecutive mode was done first by various interpreters, and then as the speaker came to a conclusion, one interpreter took the stand and translated it in into a language (usually French). In the meantime, the other interpreters were in the booth interpreting the notes they had taken down previously into various target languages. Yet “ the international environment in the 1930s was far from ideal for technical innovation or for political experimentation in the field of multilateralism...” and the era of SI did not fully take place until the Nuremberg Trial in 1945 (Baigorri-Jalón 2000, p. 3).

The Nuremberg Trial, which lasted 217 days (De Jongh 1992) and involved participants who spoke English, French, Russian and German among themselves, did not adopt consecutive interpreting because the proceedings would have lasted much longer than expected (Baigorri-Jalón 2000); instead, an SI mode similar to the way SI is performed today was chosen and 36 SI interpreters were selected for the task (Gaiba 1998). However, the Court Interpreting Branch under The Translation Division in the Nuremberg Trial did provide about 12 auxiliary consecutive interpreters for “languages different than the languages of the tribunal, such as Polish and Yiddish.” (Gaiba 1998, p. 51) The criteria to select simultaneous interpreters in the Nuremberg Trial were numerous according to Gaiba. Other than the requirement of immense cultural and educational knowledge, personal characteristics such as self-

composure and the ability to concentrate under stressful conditions, was the concern for language factor. The selected interpreters should be very fluent in their working languages supported by an extensive “cultural and educational background.” (Gaiba 1998, p. 46) To be more exact, these interpreters were indeed required to have a “native-like knowledge of the foreign language(s) with which they wanted to work.” (p. 46) In the Nuremberg Trial, it was believed that “greater mastery and fluency were needed for interpreting into a language rather than from it.” Therefore, as one of the selection criteria, the Translation Division “was looking for people with a consistent and recent experience with the foreign language” for the interpreters to work into a foreign language in the Trial (Gaiba 1998, p. 46).

The concern for SI directionality has existed since the Nuremberg Trial as a historical check point. The debate of respective advantages supporting interpreting into A and into B has been going on since the beginning of SI (Donovan 2002). Since SI took the shape as we know it today in the Nuremberg Trial, members in the interpreting community were aware of a set of features that distinguish working into native language and working into nonnative language; take arguments that support A-B for example, the interpreting job was best done when the interpreter translated into a foreign language as the Trial believed and indeed practiced. Once the interpreter fully understood input message, he/she often had no trouble providing a suitable rendering in the second language (Gaiba 1998).

2.2 Language Terms

Language terms that are involved in this study such as mother tongue, dominant language as well as A, B and C languages should be clarified first for a

more based discussion on the issue of directionality that follows. This section is comprised of the definitions/discussion on mother tongue, dominant language, A, B and C languages as far as they are concerned in the field of interpretation.

2.2.1 Mother Tongue

Pokorn (2005) indicates “the general usage of the term “mother tongue”denotes not only the language one learns from one’s mother, but also the speaker’s dominant and home language.” (p. 3) Regarding dominant language, The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics (1994) and Pokorn (2005) both mention that a person may have more than one dominant language when the home language is different from that of the public standard code in a multilingual or multidialectal societies. In addition, the term “dominant language” can be used for the language that was acquired later. In other words, the person’s mother tongue can change over time and is eventually replaced by a later acquired language that becomes his/her dominant language because of other influences (The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics 1994). Pokorn further argues that translation theoreticians’ claim “that one should translate only into one’s mother tongue, is in fact a claim that one should only translate into one’s first and dominant language.” (p. 3)

However, Pokorn goes on and warns that the ambiguity of the term “mother tongue” has had “different connotative meanings” according to “the intended usage of the word and that differences in understanding the term can have far-reaching and often political consequences” as claimed by some researchers (p. 3). Pokorn explains that the many existing definitions for the term mother tongue (See Table 2.1 for the various common definitions of mother tongue compiled by Pokorn) do not

“objectively and completely” define what mother tongue is (p. 3). It is interesting how Pokorn pin points the problems in the existing definitions for mother tongue and the degree of vagueness these definitions can be. For instance, regarding the fourth definition for mother tongue, that is, identification internal or external, Pokorn mentions a recorded case in which an English-speaking Indian who believed himself to be a native speaker of English (Identification-internal) because it was the only language he spoke (as his mother tongue, dominant language and language of habitual use), and yet he was rejected as a teacher in Great Britain on the grounds that the language school he applied to did not consider him an English native speaker (Identification-external), which was an advertised criterion for the applicants. Ironically, this study suspects that if the very same individual learned a foreign language later and became an interpreter, he would be accepted as an English A interpreter, as justified by the rest of criteria below for mother tongue — competence, origin and function.

Table 2.1 Some of the most common linguistic definitions for mother tongue compiled by Pokorn

Criterion	Definition
Origin	The language(s) one learned first
Competence	The language(s) one knows best
Function	The language(s) one uses most
Identification	
- Internal	The language(s) one identifies with
- External	The language(s) of which one is identified as a native speaker by others

Pokorn believes that the fourth criterion of identification is related to a controversial subject which is the recognition of the variants of a particular language (i.e. the variants of English and French). Take the native varieties of English vs. the non-native varieties for instance, some examples Pokorn provides for the former is British English and American English which are institutionalized; the latter can include Indian English and Nigerian English, etc. In other words, all native speakers of any non-native variety of English are not recognized as its native speakers “and are therefore denied any right to define the correctness or appropriateness of a particular expression in English.” (Pokorn 2005, p. 5)

Despite of all the other problems Pokorn has identified additionally with these common definitions for mother tongue, the term has not yet had a dependable and agreed definition in the way that its definition seems to vary from one condition to another as discussed above; what one qualifies in a definition as a native speaker of a language may turn out to be unqualified in another, which this study suspects may also be one of the reasons that linguists have yet to achieve a consensus on the term “native speaker.” (Davis 1991) The vagueness of mother tongue as a term therefore is likely to have set the definition of A language concerning the field of interpreting on thin ice. What one believes himself/herself to be interpreting into his/her mother tongue may turn out to be interpreting into a nonnative language in the eyes of another in the sense that mother tongue in its “every definition necessarily reflects the original cultural, political and personal experience and expectations of the one providing the definition” and these expectations “vary considerably from those of the speakers defined and classified by such definitions.” (Pokorn 2005, p. 3)

One question this study would like to point out is, when the home language is different from the public standard code as both can be one's dominant language according to The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics (1994) and Pokorn (2005), which can be claimed as one's A language? Can this person simply declare to have two A languages? Where do we draw the line? These questions are out of the research scope of this study but may be issues that require more research attention before a more based discussion on directionality is achieved.

2.2.2 The Definition of A language, B Language and C Language

Prior to discussing the difference among A, B and C languages, we must first know that interpreters talk about language in two types: the active language and the passive language. An active language refers to "a language the interpreters speak that delegates can listen to" and a passive language is "a language the interpreters understand that is spoken by the delegates." An interpreter's mother tongue (Which is yet to reach any definitional consensus as discussed above) is usually considered the active language, or the A language; some interpreters have "a perfect command" in a language other than their mother tongue and are able to work into this language. In this case, these interpreters are said to have a second active language (SCIC website), or also known as the B language, of which the definition is that in addition to the native language, some of the interpreters also have a second active language with which they can work into from one or more other languages. In contrast, a passive language, or also called a C language, is a language that an interpreter completely understands and often speaks to a certain extent but does not have the kind of command to work/interpret into it, according to the website of SCIC.

To paraphrase the above, the way this particular field views a second language which makes it distinctive from a linguistic point of view is that an interpreter's second active language must be strong enough to carry out interpreting tasks in both directions; if the interpreter's second language was not fluent/active enough to perform such task, then it is considered a passive language/C language, which by definition is a language an interpreter knows but does not know it well enough to work into it. AIIC provides a very similar definition for A, B and C languages (AIIC website) and the same definitions of A, B and C are also found on the website of European Masters in Conference Interpreting (EMCI).

“Active languages:

A: The interpreter's native language (or another language strictly equivalent to a native language), into which the interpreter works from all her or his other languages in both modes of interpretation, simultaneous and consecutive.

B: A language other than the interpreter's native language, of which she or he has a perfect command and into which she or he works from one or more of her or his other languages. Some interpreters work into a 'B' language in only one of the two modes of interpretation.

Passive languages:

C: Languages, of which the interpreter has a complete understanding and from which she or he works.”

Note that the concern brought up by Stern (1983) and Routledge Encyclopedia of Language Teaching and Learning (2000) suggests a person may acquire his/her first language in early childhood but switch to a different language acquired later and became his/her language of dominance due to, for example, immigration to a foreign country. Thus dominant language may assume another role, that is, a later acquired

language which replaces one's mother tongue as the language of primary competence. AIIC's flexibility with the A language definition which can be referred to one's mother tongue or one's language of education so far seems to have taken care of such ambiguity. The organization further specifies that an interpreter's main active language, that is, the mother tongue, is a language in which "the interpreter was formally educated and feels completely at ease." Once again, a person's mother tongue may or may not be his/her language of primary competence (The website of Barinas Translation Consultants, Inc. or BTC). The use of the term 'native language' as an interpreter's A language can be thus confusing in some cases. On its website, BTC clarifies this matter a little by suggesting A language should be defined as an interpreter's dominant language since A language is usually but not necessarily an interpreter's native language. Again what we have seen here is under the support of The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics (1994) and Pokorn (2005) in the sense that dominant language may be a later acquired language that eventually replaces one's mother tongue. It seems that A language includes not only one's mother tongue but also dominant language in the way that it is a language that later replaces the mother tongue and becomes one's language of primary competence.

However, the double definitions of A language does not erase the fact that the two may still be different. For instance, it is "widely observed that children from immigrant families eventually speak the language of their new community with native-like fluency, but their parents rarely achieve such high levels of mastery of the spoken language." (Lightbown and Spada 2001, p. 60) The point of these two authors is that age of language acquisition is a factor that may determine the levels of language competence of one's dominant language (As the language that later replaced

the mother tongue). Lightbown and Spada offer one explanation for this: the Critical Period Hypothesis. A critical period for second language acquisition exists (mostly claimed around puberty but may even be earlier as some suggested) and older language learners depend on “more general learning abilities – the same ones they might use to learn other kinds of skills or information.” Lightbown and Spada is not denying the existence of many successful adult second language learners “but, for most, differences of accent, word choice, or grammatical features distinguish them from native speakers and from second language speakers who begin learning the language while they were very young.” The general language learning thus may not be as successful as that of the young child in the sense that it is less innate and specific (p. 60). Therefore, defining an interpreter’s A language as either the mother tongue or the dominant language that later replaces the mother tongue can be problematic in the way that the dominant language may in fact pose different levels of competence for various individuals according to their age of acquisition.

2.2.3 Definition Supplement

Linguists have not yet agreed on the term “native speaker” (Davis 1991) and simply taking A language as one’s native language or mother tongue is ambiguous. Adding on the fact that AIIC’s definition for B language “does not go into enough details for training purposes” (Adams 2002, p. 20), we also need a clearer definition to characterize B language as this field justifies.

During the University of Westminster (UoW) short course, the definition of B language was discussed in detail and a consensus was reached as listed by Adams (2002). A ‘B’ language is: “1). A language in which you can think-in a formal

structured situation (e.g. interpreting); 2). A language in which you can deliver a clear message to conference participants, colleagues on relay, and colleagues who share your A language. So we have a little more to go on than ‘perfect command’.” (p. 20)

Adams went on to describe the subtle difference between a language with “perfect command” and a native language is that a ‘B’ language is a language that one should handle with care because it is not a language known native to an interpreter; problems can arise in B such as tenses, vocabulary, collocations, accent, articles, preposition, idioms and pronunciation. These categories can be used to further differentiate A language from B language since B is prone to have these problems more so than A.

Adams in fact conducted an interview for the selection of interpreting course applicants and focused specifically on the function of A/B combination. Three selecting criteria assessing B language were identified there: 1). “It is important to fully investigate applicant’s understanding of B because they “may be able to think in their ‘B’ and deliver a message in words of their choosing but not have a wide enough vocabulary or an adequate sense of register”(p. 21); 2).what defines one’s B language involves “a genuine understanding of the ‘B’ language culture”, which refers to “a sense of rootedness in that language” and 3). “their active use of the language – fluency.” (p. 21) What Adams suggests here may be linked to a deeper issue of “where and how the interpreter mastered the B language.” (Szabari 2002, p. 15)

“If this was done in his own country within an organized framework as was probably the case in the Soviet Union, listening comprehension was probably more problematic than speaking as he had no opportunity to gain familiarity with the multitude of native speakers. On the other hand, interpreters in western countries generally master their foreign languages while living or studying in the target language country, thus comprehension is not difficult for them even if a speaker has a poor articulation or complicated wording.” (p. 15)

Note that AIIC did mention a B language, as it is not the interpreter's mother tongue, "can only be acquired after years of hard work and frequent stay in a country of that language." (The website of AIIC) Therefore, a deep understanding of the source to be translated is not something that interpreting can do without and the task of interpreting is more than what languages alone can justify. Discussions concerning the definitions of A, B and C languages in 2.2.1 and 2.2.2 are organized into Table 2.2 using Yagi's four activities in SI (See 2.1.1.).

Table 2.2 Definition Supplement for A, B and C

Task	Listening	Decoding	Encoding	Speaking
Language				
Mother Tongue	Relatively low difficulty (but may have exceptions <i>i.e.</i> when it is replaced by a later acquired language)	Relatively low difficulty (but may have exceptions <i>i.e.</i> when it is replaced by a later acquired language)	Relatively low difficulty (but may have exceptions <i>i.e.</i> when it is replaced by a later acquired language)	Relatively low difficulty (but may have exceptions <i>i.e.</i> when it is replaced by a later acquired language)
Dominant Language	Relatively low difficulty (but as a later acquired language that replaces the mother tongue, language competence may vary due to age of acquisition)	Relatively low difficulty (but as a later acquired language that replaces the mother tongue, language competence may vary due to age of acquisition)	Relatively low difficulty (but as a later acquired language that replaces the mother tongue, language competence may vary due to age of acquisition)	Relatively low difficulty (but as a later acquired language that replaces the mother tongue, language competence may vary due to age of acquisition)
A Language	Relatively low difficulty	Relatively low difficulty	Relatively low difficulty	Relatively low difficulty
B Language	Not a mother tongue/dominant language but with perfect command as quality justifies	Not a mother tongue/dominant language but with perfect command as quality justifies	Not a mother tongue/dominant language but with perfect command as quality justifies	Not a mother tongue/dominant language but with perfect command as quality justifies; one can clearly and accurately interpret into B language; prone to have more problems in tenses, vocabularies, collocations, accent, idioms, articles, preposition and Pronunciation more so than A
C Language	One totally understands the C language	One totally understands the C language	One does not know it well enough to work into C language	Unlike working into B language, one does not know it well enough to work into C language

Source: Compiled by this study

Compelled by the fact that language terms have yet to reach any clear consensus, such as the ambiguity of the term mother tongue and A language as mentioned earlier, it is necessary for the purpose of this study to establish a working definition for mother tongue, dominant language, A, B and C language (See Table 2.3) for discussion on directionality in the subsequent chapters to base on, until further clarification of the language terms in the future. Note that the working definitions are generally formulated on the basis that some are the most frequently cited definitions in 2.2.1 and 2.2.2.summarized by this study.

Table 2.3 Working Definitions for mother tongue, dominant language, A, B and C language for the Purpose of this Study

Mother tongue: One's language of primary competence as the language learned mother (the home language) which is the same as the public standard code of the society that one lives and is educated in

Dominant language: Dominant language which may or may not be one's mother tongue. When it is not the mother tongue, it is defined as acquired later and replaces the mother tongue as the language of education which becomes one's language of primary competence

A language: Interpreter's mother tongue as defined above

B language: Interpreter's additional active language other than the language of primary competence. The interpreter should have a perfect command with the B language to enable the task of AB retour as quality justifies

C language: It is not a language of primary competence which differs from B language in the sense that B is an active language and C is a passive language; the interpreter does not know the C language well enough to work into it (i.e. A-C or B-C is not practicable).

Source: Compiled by this study

Chapter Three Directionality in SI

This chapter reviews the previous discussions/debates concerning directionality as background knowledge to begin with. This study then questions whether working into A is a standard by identifying some of the factors that may have affected interpreting process across language direction.

3.1 Directionality: Is There an Issue?

The task of interpreting always proceeds from one direction to another (From a source language to a target language) and as Bartłomiejczyk (2004b) indicates, whether to simultaneously interpret into one's A or B language has been a controversial subject over the years. Before approaching the issue of directionality, one must first ask: is there a difference between working into A and working into B?

3.1.1 Arguments for Interpreting into A

This section presents the views supporting the direction of B-A. There are two major claims for working into A, most oft-cited consideration is B-A renders a better quality of language production. Also, some believe that B comprehension is easier to achieve than B production.

3.1.1.1 Quality Language Production

The first and foremost argument found supporting B-A by is the concern for quality language production. Since the very beginning of interpreting research, most authors were convinced by the superiority of B-A combination (Bartłomiejczyk 2004b). For example, Herber (1953, cited in Bartłomiejczyk 2004b) believed that working into A “so far as possible and with few exceptions” (p. 239), should be

strictly applied in simultaneous and consecutive interpreting. In addition, Seleskovitch (1978) claimed that working into B produces inevitably flawed speech and the interpreter's native language had an influence on the foreign language production.

With today's ample opportunities to travel abroad and massive foreign media coverage, the claim that working from one's A has the advantage of better input comprehension which helps rendering a higher interpreting accuracy cannot effectively convince EMCI (2002) although EMCI does acknowledge interpreting into B on the basis of the concern for market reality. Seleskovitch and Lederer (1998, cited in Szabari 2002) believe B-A generates the best result of a familiar interpretation to the listener or user who does not need to reformulate or reinterpret what is being heard. Seleskovitch and Lederer further suggest that the main problem of A-B is that the mother tongue has an effect on the B language output in which the interpreter strives to "convey it in all of its dressing", and such interpretation is likely to contain alien tools exist in the source language, making it more difficult for the listener to understand (p. 15). Working into B is also a more energy-consuming direction for interpreters, which leads to more rapid performance deterioration, again according to Seleskovitch and Lederer. In fact, some mention the claim that working into the non-dominant language places an "extra cognitive burden" on the interpreter, leading to "loss of quality." (Szabari 2002; Chang 2005, p.15) The drawback of "extra cognitive burden" when working into B may be supported by Kurz (1992, cited in Bartlomiejczyk 2004b), who measured the brain activity (EEG) of an interpreter who only worked mentally without actually uttering the output in both directions. Interestingly, it was discovered that more brain areas were involved as the interpreter worked from A to B than from B to A. Kurz's discovery may explain why interpreters

in Donovan's user survey all show a preference of working into their mother tongue as they feel "it is less tiring, one is less tense and has more flexibility." (Donovan 2002, p. 7)

The unnatural B language production is also suggested by Campbell (1998, cited in Szabari 2002). Gaiba (1998) mentions that those who do not support working into B suggest that this direction often has the problem of delivery; for instance, the foreign accent perceived in the interpreter's B production. In fact, it is a commonly held opinion that when interpreting into B, the production is more likely to be problematic under stress (Dornic 1978; Selinker 1972 and Dewaele 2002 cited in Chang 2005). The general assumption based on the argument as reviewed is that when one interprets into A, what he/she also offers is a more fluent and natural production comparing to production in B. In other words, it seems that one is less likely challenged in the A production with all else being equal, which lead to the next argument in 3.1.1.2.

3.1.1.2 B Production vs. B Comprehension

Another familiar argument for working into A is that accurate comprehension in B can be achieved with a greater likelihood than accurate production in B. This means that B receptive skills are higher than B productive skills, thus it is "advantageous to have B-language text as the source text to be understood", while having to produce messages in A (Gerver 1976, cited in Tommola & Helevä 1998, p.178). Others further suggest that it is not only the syntactic structure but also the prosodic features of B that necessarily draws away an interpreter's attention while interpreting in the direction of A-B (Schweda-Nicholson 1992, cited in Chang 2005).

Alfred Steer also believes that “a refined and elegant delivery” is harder to achieve with B production (Gaiba 1998. p. 48).

To sum up, two general ideas support working into A. First, the linguistic quality of delivery when working into A is much more dependable thus the language production is relatively more natural and familiar to the listener who shares the interpreter’s mother tongue. The additional argument is that accurate B comprehension is easier to achieve than accurate production in B.

3.1.2 Arguments for Interpreting into B

This section discusses various views and facts supporting the direction of A-B. This study identifies three major supporting arguments for A-B in the literature review. They are related to market demand, the advantage of native understanding of input and content accuracy as interpreting priority

3.1.2.1 Market Reality

Market reality may be one of the most important arguments for accepting AB retour because it is the most oft-cited concern according to this study’s literature review. In the past, the exponent and translation of Buddhist scripture in China as well as how the Spanish trained the Natives to be the interpreters as mentioned (See 2.1.2) are both good examples for the necessity of working into a foreign language in order to accommodate market in the past.

Today, interpreting into B is known as retour interpreting. “Retour interpreting is particularly useful to provide relays out of less well-known languages into more

wide spread languages.” (SCIC website) Working between A and B (Or interpreting in both directions) is also called AB retour (AIIC website). The reality requires AB retour is based on the fact that as more and more countries establish channels to communicate for various purposes, it is difficult to find interpreters who speak a less well-known language as his/her B or C. Therefore, “A-B combinations are an absolute necessity for some languages”, such as those of the many EU new members (Bartłomiejczyk 2004b, p. 247). It is sometimes “a practical necessity” (EMCI 2002; Tommola & Helevä 1998) because there may not always be enough interpreters who are the native speakers of a certain language; therefore, those who know the language as a second language may be required to work in both directions. For example, in Taiwan, a shortage of English-native interpreters is a fact so usually a Taiwanese interpreter (Whose A is Chinese and B is English) must work both ways (Chang 2005). A similar problem also exists in other Asian countries such as in Korea since it is difficult to find interpreters whose B or C is Korean while their A is a more well-known language (Lee 2002).

Not only in Asia but in fact as Szabari (2002) points out, a similar need for retour interpreting exists in Europe today. Minns (2002) contributes such reality to “the accession of new member countries to the EU as well as the overall phenomenon of globalization.” (p. 35) Thus for practical reasons, retour interpreting is now also adopted by some international organizations and private market contracts (EMIC 2002; Donovan 2002). Practicing and teaching techniques of working into B have been receiving increasing attention and discussion than ever. For example, EMCI accepts retour interpreting as a fact and has been in the discussion on issues relating to associated training requirements (Donovan 2004). AIIC also recognizes that the

European Commissions accepts interpreting into B provided that the language that is worked into is English, French or German now also known as retour languages (AIIC website). Apparently, a strict application of working into A is not an option since it is difficult to find native speakers whose A is, for example, one of the retour languages and at the same time also have a less sought-after language as an additional B. The truth is, market demands AB retour is no longer news. AIIC recognizes the need for AB retour. It mentions that Chinese is becoming more important while Japanese is also much in demand but few interpreters can speak either language as an active language except for interpreters who have the language as their mother tongue (AIIC website). Strictly working into A is practically difficult, if not totally impossible, in virtually many parts of the world.

3.1.2.2 Native Understanding

The most difficult part in B-A SI is input/source text comprehension (Weller 1991, cited in Lee 1999; Chang 2005). In addition, Seleskovitch (1978, cited in Lee 1999) believes that the greatest difficulty in SI is that the interpreter is not allowed to work at his/her own speed. In terms of time pressure, Gile (1995) also indicates that SI is however different from “translation work, in which at least some time is generally available for research and consultation of native speakers in case some words or structure are not understood...” (p. 84); it is a view that is also shared by other scholars such as Hamers & Blanc (1989). Good listening comprehension is important in SI partially because SI is a completely different sociolinguistic setting from reading given that a reader can “pause or go back for further understanding” (Lee 1999, p. 261) which is simply impossible to do in SI. The way SI is carried out does not allow as much time (As written translation) to think and work, as Gile further

comments, “a translator has the advantage to have the chance to select a text to be worked on but the same advantage does not apply to an interpreter so comprehension of the source language must be very good even though it is not fully put to use.” (p. 84) In addition, Gile (1995) cautions that working from B into A’s problem is “an uncertainty factor: speeches may be quite easy most of the time but professional ethics require that the interpreter be able to handle difficulties when they do arise.” (p. 84) This piece of comment supports the advantage of native understanding which almost functions as “insurance” for listening comprehension although “accidents” may or may not happen despite whether the interpreter has such insurance when interpreting.

Another advantage of working into B is a better understanding of the source text, which in fact is a crucial stage in interpreting (Szabari 2002; Denissenko 1989, cited in Chang 2005). Studies show that at least 80% of the cognitive effort is put to work at the listening and understanding of a speech during interpreting and only 20% at the stage of production (Padilla 1995, cited in Rejšková 2002). Szabari (2002) added the fact that Russian interpreters in the days of the Soviet Union also favored working from their mother tongue because of better comprehension in the source language as an additional example supporting this direction. This study considers the advantage of native understanding when working from A as a strongest argument at the cognitive level not only because it is an oft-cited point of view but it is compelled by the fact that comprehension is the first and foremost concern in interpreting (Seleskovitch 1978, cited in Rejšková 2002). What we have seen here is how the nature of SI works closely with native listening to generate an argument for working into B. Given that SI is an immediate translating mode which does not allow the interpreter to pause for input clarification, the processing advantage of native listening

seems to stand out more than nonnative listening. Comprehension in SI, as crucial and yet difficult as it is, may be best overcome if interpreting is from A to B where native understanding is put to work, as all other things being equal. Based on the word translation task carried out, Kees de Bot (2000) believes that although more time is needed to retrieve the right word from the dominant into the weaker language, “the advantage of a better and deeper understanding of the incoming message more than compensates for this.” (p. 85)

3.1.2.3 Content Accuracy

An additional argument supporting working into B is that content accuracy of an interpretation is more important than style of language production and the possible linguistic flaws in B production should not be used to challenge such priority, as this study sums up for the following studies.

As far as users are concerned, content accuracy is what users expect from an interpreter who should be able to convey the speaker’s message instead of a word-for-word translation of what the speaker said (Donovan 2002). Donovan’s study presents a survey conducted in Paris at around some 30 events at which interpreters worked into English and French, users, in this case delegates, did not perceive directionality, accent or grammatical errors as a quality issue. What the users expected, other than the quality of presentation (i.e. “smooth delivery, synchronicity, lack of hesitation” (Donovan 2002, p. 5)), was accuracy of the renderings in the sense that the speaker’s message is conveyed. In terms of how users perceive grammatical errors, which B is prone to more so than A (Adams 2002), Kurz (1993) also reports that correct grammatical usage is considered less important or even the least important quality

criterion by certain user groups. Content accuracy is almost viewed as the basic requirement that the users expect from the interpreting service as Donovan noted and thus this study believes content accuracy is the most important criterion to evaluate interpretation quality on the basis of user's point of view. Donovan indeed marked that users rated content accuracy and presentation quality to be essential and they did not seem to be concerned with interpreter's language direction. An inference may be drawn on the basis of the above studies and that is, as long as quality justifies, users do not necessarily consider interpreting into B unacceptable.

Denissenko (1989, cited in Szabari 2002) suggests that “conveying a full or near full message even in a somewhat less idiomatic or slightly accented language serves the purpose much better than an incomplete or erroneous message albeit elegantly worded and impeccably pronounced” (p. 15) and Shlesinger (1997, cited in Szabari 2002) who believes in the latter case that the listener may go even unnoticed that the message is distorted or lost.

Other arguments favoring A-B point out to a slightly different direction. A theoretical discussion supporting working into B focuses on the role of non-verbal components of discourse. Seel (2005) is another example. The rationale behind Seel's study is the idea that interpreters working in the direction of B-A do not necessarily have the required knowledge of the source culture and therefore do not have the advantage of taking non-verbal clues as completely and as rapidly as working in A-B. Another shortcoming of working into A as it is also criticized for is a weaker memory capacity for receiving input in B compared to input received in A (Call 1985). The memory capacity for one's native language is nine words but only five words for

second language (Griffiths 1990). Aided by literature as reviewed, three major arguments and concerns favoring working in to B are sorted out (See Table 3.1) as (1) driven by market reality, (2) a better input comprehension and (3) content accuracy is more important than linguistic flaws. Table 3.2 again uses Yagi's four tasks in SI (1999) to summarize the arguments supporting both directions respectively.

Table 3.1 Most-cited Claims for working into B

-
-
1. Market Factor — As market in many parts of the world requires: Not all languages have an equal amount of B or C interpreters
 2. Skill Factor — (a) Better input comprehension
(b) Content accuracy is important in interpreting and linguistic flaws, although may be a more likely occurrence in A-B, should not be used to challenge such priority

Source: Compiled by this study

Table 3.2 Pros and Cons of Both Directions as Claimed

	B-A Combination	Source	A-B Combination	Source
Listening	May pose uncertainty factor	Gile 1995	Better due to native understanding of input	Denissenko 1989; Szabari 2002, etc.
Decoding	May pose uncertainty factor	Gile 1995	Better due to native understanding of input	Denissenko 1989; Szabari 2002, etc
	Receptive skills are better than productive skills in this direction	Gerver 1976;		
Encoding	May be challenged due to nonnative input for working memory is less satisfactory in this direction	Call 1985; Griffiths 1990	Better due to native input for working memory is more satisfactory in this direction	Call 1985; Griffiths 1990
			This direction may be more tiring	Kurz 1992
Speaking	Users expect interpreter conveying message instead of worrying about AB retour	Donovan 2002	May be challenged due to nonnative language production	Seleskovitch & Lederer 1998; Campbell 1998, etc.
	Accuracy is more valuable than hampered but fluent message	Shlesinger 1997		
*Market reality	<i>Required</i>	<i>Bartłomiejczyk (2004b); Chang 2005, etc.</i>	<i>Required</i>	<i>Bartłomiejczyk (2004b), Chang 2005, etc.</i>

Source: Compiled by this study

3.2 Factors that Determine SI Directionality

As discussed earlier, a difference exists between working into A and working into B based on the pros and cons of either direction. The issue of directionality is also driven by the availability of interpreters who can speak a certain language combination so AB retour is inevitable in many parts of the world. As we take the matter one step further, factors which seem to affect SI directionality surface and their existence question the direction of B-A ever assuming the standard role.

The effect of these factors can be observed and assessed in the end product, that is, the SI performance, in terms of content accuracy and presentation quality. Note that many surveys conducted in the past by numerous authors such as Gile, Kurz, Bühler, Kopczynski and AIIC Research Committee report mentioned by Donovan (2002) have generally indicated an “emphasis on content accuracy and the need to focus on specific requirements of listeners.” For instance, AIIC reported “the criterion most frequently mentioned by participants in evaluating SI is accuracy of content.” (Donovan 2002, p. 2) Additionally, Seleskovitch (1986, Cited in Kurz 1993) believes that “interpretation should always be judged from the perspective of the listener and never as an end in itself” (p. 314) when the “ultimate goal must obviously be to satisfy our audience.” (Déjean le Féal 1990, cited in Kurz 1993, p. 314) Therefore, this study makes use of Donovan’s findings (2002) regarding user’s expectations and needs in SI as benchmarks to examine the factors which are identified to have an effect on the quality of AB retour. According to Donovan, users have two major expectations of interpretation: content accuracy and quality of presentation (See 3.1.2.3 for more details), this study thus points out how the identified factors may affect the tasks in SI in relation to these expectations.

3.2.1 Language-Specific Combination

Based on the findings of an Arabic/English SI study conducted by Al-Salman & Al-Khanji (2002), a majority of participants in the SI study showed higher interpreting efficiency (on the basis of the strategies they adopted) in the direction of A-B rather than B-A. When interpreting from English (B) to Arabic (A), more reduction/unsuccessful strategies (i.e. message abandonment, incomplete sentences and literal interpretation, etc.) were adopted than achievement/successful strategies (i.e. anticipation and approximation, etc.). Yet when working from Arabic to English, “the reduction strategies found in the Arabic interpretation did not appear in English interpretation, and their occurrence here was frequently low.” No incomplete sentences were observed when English/B is the target language. Al-Salman & Al-Khanji also provided questionnaires for the interpreters to fill out. The majority of respondents/interpreters reported to feel more comfortable interpreting from their native language into the nonnative language. Al-Salman & Al-Khanji (2002) also drew the conclusion that “it may not always be the case that people generally perform the same task (in speaking or in interpreting) less well in a second language than in a first.” (p. 624) Based on Donovan’s findings on interpreting quality as users judged, the performance of the interpreters in Al-Salman & Al-Khanji’s study are also considered better when interpreting into English/B for less reduction (unsuccessful) strategies were employed (i.e. lower frequency of literal translation and no incomplete sentences, etc.).

Al-Salman & Al-Khanji brings up an interesting comment by indicating that even in the case when Arabic is the dominant language, production in Arabic may not be as easy as comprehension in it because a difference exists among the use of

colloquial, standard and classical Arabic especially when it is the target language. This may be further supported by the questionnaires in which 90% of interpreters reported to have better oral fluency when working into English (B) and 70% indicated syntactic demand hampered transfer strategy when interpreting into Arabic (A).

Al-Salman & Al-Khanji took the time to describe the three registers of Arabic. Colloquial Arabic is what the Arabic native speakers “begin developing as they acquire the language, and it serves as the medium for most spoken interaction throughout life.” (p. 621) Standard Arabic on the other hand, is similar to learning a foreign language because it is “learned rather than acquired.” (p. 621) Therefore, more educated people may be able to orally use the standard form of the language in formal discussions as required more effectively than the less educated ones as Al-Salman & Al-Khanji suggested. Regarding the third type of Arabic use, the classical Arabic, it is totally a different and even not a “spoken language.” (p. 622) It seems that classical Arabic has its own rules of syntax and vocabulary and the use of it can also depend on context based on Al-Salman & Al-Khanji’s account. The three uses of Arabic are very different phenomenon as the two researchers indicate. When interpreting from English to Arabic, code switching may be required and most of them occur, for example, when the speaker starts to read from the written text which usually has more “sophisticated vocabularies, more complex syntax and more complex semantic and pragmatic implicatures.” (p. 621)

Al-Salman & Al-Khanji’s study shows that working into A can be more difficult in some cases (i.e. English as the source language & Arabic as the target language) and produce less efficiency in interpreting as reduction (unsuccessful)

strategies are adopted more frequently when interpreting from English to Arabic because the language characteristics can affect the encoding stage in SI. For example, code-switching is more frequently adopted when interpreting into Arabic “as an easy way out to use the informal form of Arabic instead of the demanding standard Arabic” (p. 619) and interpreters summarized the message they failed to convey in the standard Arabic. This may be additionally supported by the questionnaires which showed 80% of interpreters pointed out that they resorted to non-standard slang when immediate retrieval of an equivalent failed when the target language was Arabic. The possibility is that the issue of directionality may be more complicated than just the discussions between working from and into native language, as Bartłomiejczyk (2004b) states near the end of the study that such “intrinsic qualities” (language specificity) “may sway interpreters’ opinions and preferences regarding the language combinations they work in quite independently of the given languages being native or non-native for them.” (p. 247) Al-Salman & Al-Khanji’s study shows that working into A can be more difficult in certain language combination (i.e. Arabic A/English B). Whether this is also true for other languages certainly is a matter that requires future research.

Note that Gile (1997) addresses the same concern by introducing the term “language specificity”. With other things being equal, some languages may be easier to work into because it requires “fewer processing capacity related problems in production” (p. 210) while others are easier to work from due to “lower requirements in comprehension.” (p. 210) Such differences are contributed to “word length, redundancies, lexical coverage, syntactic flexibility, and so on.” (p. 210) Gile further implies that one should take language specificity into consideration and question

whether work into B necessarily generates poor production quality since language specificity may offset the drawbacks related to an interpreter's deficiency in his/her B language. To illustrate the "intrinsic requirement of specific languages in terms of listening effort and/or in terms of the production effort", Gile uses Chinese and Japanese as languages that "could be more vulnerable in the listening effort because of the lack of redundancy" and because the two languages have many "short words and homophones and few grammatical indicators." On the other hand, languages may pose higher production effort if they have "a limited vocabularies and a rather rigid grammar that imposes strict conditions on order of elements in the sentence as well as grammatical agreement conditions." (p. 209) The idea of language specific combination determines directionality is further discussed by Bartlomiejczyk (2004b), who also suggests the language-specific factor may be at work in the task of interpreting. AB retour may have been under the influence of what the source and the target language are since various language combinations do not seem to pose equal level of interpreting difficulty in AB retour.

"Some languages, (e.g. English) seem to pose fewer difficulties and involving less production effort as target language than others, and some require extra listening effort (e.g. Chinese and Japanese) or an extra strain on the memory effort (e.g. German) as source language." (p. 247)

Chang (2005) conducted an SI study focusing on the impact of interpreting direction on SI performance and interpreters' strategy use. Chang uses propositional analysis (for semantic content) and error analysis (for linguistic quality) as criteria to measure participants' SI performance. Seven out of nine interpreters showed consistently better performance in terms of higher output propositional accuracy when interpreting from English to Chinese. On the other hand, in terms of error analysis of

language (errors per minute), all interpreters made more errors when interpreting from Chinese to English, although those who reported equal dominance in both languages showed a smaller gap in the number of language error across language direction. For all except one participant, “the frequency of presentation errors did not seem to be affected very much by interpreting direction.” (p. 64) Again when content accuracy is used to measure the interpreters’ performances in Chang’s study, performance yielded better results when interpreting from English to Chinese on the basis of more correctly rendered propositions. Note that Chang (2005) also mentions the language effect on directionality as observed and it echoes with Gile and Bartlomiejczyk in suggesting how Chinese may be a language more difficult to listen to (i.e. compared to English) as follows:

“The language in which the source text was delivered, i.e. Chinese or English, appeared to be more important to the interpreters’ processing of information. As already exemplified above, Chinese and English require the interpreters’ attention to different areas, both in terms of comprehension and production. Without exception, all participants claimed they needed to “listen harder” for Chinese.” (p. 102)

It is interesting that all participants who were professional interpreters in Chang’s study were indeed native speakers of Chinese with three of them actually either reported dominance in English or reported equal dominance in both languages. However, all of them unanimously indicated that Chinese was harder to listen to compared to English, regardless in which language direction they performed better. When interpreting from Chinese to English, interpreters made more inferences as the participants described “many words left unsaid” and sometimes “illogical.” (p. 106) Change’s study serves as empirical evidence that supports Gile (1997) and Bartlomiejczyk (2004b) who are convinced that some languages, such as Chinese,

require more listening effort as a language-specific factor that may thus influence the task of interpreting. In other words, directionality may be subject to the type of language involved since some languages do not seem to pose equal or similar levels of difficulty regarding interpreting tasks. A-B or B-A may not always be a better or a worse direction to work in for it may involve the actual language combination at work.

3.2.2 Context

Chang (2005) presented her Chinese/English SI research findings, which suggest interpreter use different strategic approaches to deal with different requirements of interpreting into A and interpreting into B; this result concurs with that of Bartłomiejczyk (2004a) in a Polish/English SI study. The majority of interpreters in Chang's study received a higher score in terms of prepositional accuracy while interpreting into Chinese. Chang additionally presents three important determinants affecting directionality in SI as observed. They are contextual factors, personal factors and norms.

The first condition, the contextual factors, refers to the context of interpreting. For instance, time, place, and participants that are involved in the interpreting situation are found to pose more effect on the direction of interpreting from Chinese to English than the other way around (Chang 2005). For example, the place where the experiment took place in Chang's study was an artificial setting and when the Chinese speaker started by greeting which literally translated as “‘Hello, everyone’, almost all participants recalled “for not being able to decide whether to say ‘good morning’ or ‘good afternoon’” as hesitation occurred. Note that according to Donovan (2002), one of the two major expectations from users is presentation quality which includes

fluency (i.e. lack of hesitation). It seems that as Chinese being a more difficult source language, hesitation can arise during the stage of encoding and thus the performance may be penalized by users' standard. Chang also mentioned that many participants felt "uncertain about which pronoun to use for many of the Chinese null-subject sentences because of a lack of sufficient information about the composition of the audience." (Chang 2005, p. 101) Al-Salman & Al Khanji's findings also seems to echo with Chang on the part that context can also influence directionality. The three varieties of Arabic (the colloquial, standard and classical Arabic), which shift from one to another based on context, creates more interpreting difficulty when Arabic is the target language (As opposed to English). Evidence of such difficulty is that the interpreters in Al-Salman & Al-Khanji study also filled out a questionnaire and 70% indicated that their switch mechanism was at its best when interpreting from Arabic to English.

Features of the source text are also considered as contextual factors. For example, numbers were found to be problematic in both directions as far as the Chinese/English language combination is concerned as Chang records that the "interpreters made more errors and omissions when it came to numbers." (p.102) In addition, what seems to make Chinese harder to listen to, other than the factor of language specificity as Gile and Bartlomiejczyk point out, may also be contributed to one of the contextual factors (Who the speaker is) as Chang sees it. All interpreters/participants in Chang's study on the part of retrospective interview commented on the problem of "Chinese speakers in general being 'bad speakers'." (p. 101) "For example, the interpreters reported to have more experience with "bad speakers" of Chinese texts in the way that the speeches were disorganized and lack of

logical connections.” (p. 96) Many even mentioned the challenge posed by interpreting from Chinese to English when it comes to Question and Answer sections. “They had to consciously process the disorganized comment form the audience and produced a coherent English interpretation” (p. 97), as one participant even believed that the English listeners might in fact understand the message through the interpretation better than the Chinese listeners. Also on the basis of the opinions of the participants, Chang (2005) further specifies that Chinese as a language is harder to listen to (Comparing to English) due to the fact that the language itself has the tendency of “omission of subjects, loose use of connectives, and the rich meaning encoded in some Chinese usage” (p. 97), resulting in one of the reasons for Chinese speakers being considered bad speakers in general, as unanimously indicated by Chang’s participants (Regardless of their English proficiency) that “one needs to spend more effort understanding Chinese in order to interpret it into English.” (p. 98) This piece of evidence reflects what Gile and Bartlomiejczyk mention how Chinese may pose more listening effort as a source language under the consideration for language specificity. In other words, Chinese is more difficult to listen to as a source language because of its specific language characteristics which subsequently creates a negative impact on the way Chinese speakers conduct their speeches in general (As one of the contextual factors affecting directionality).

3.2.3 Personal Factor

Chang’s account for the second factor which determines directionality is a personal factor, including the interpreter’s language proficiency in the source and the target languages and his/her prior knowledge to the speaker, the topic and the characteristics of the two languages that the interpreter works with. For instance, most

interpreters in Chang study “also reported adjusting their lag during interpreting based on their confidence in their memory in either language.” (p. 102) In terms of language proficiency, most of the participants in Chang’s study reported to have made use of various interpreting strategies because they were aware of their B language deficiency. Some interpreters avoided unfamiliar expression by adopting strategies such as omission, paraphrasing or generalization. Such awareness of AB language gap affects their use of strategies in different directions “especially in terms of producing B language....” (Chang 2005, p. 93)

“Moreover, there was a strong correlation between the interpreters’ self-perceived gaps in their A and B language proficiency and the gaps in the percentage of propositions they actually rendered when interpreting in different directions.” (p.120 & p.121)

3.2.4 Interpreting Norms

Last but not least, the third factor that is identified to pose impact on directionality is the interpreting norms, which refers to what the interpreters believe their interpreting output should be like and what strategies are available to achieve the goal (Chang 2005). The interpreters in Chang’s study were found to share very similar ideas towards their interpreting output; for example, they believed interpreting should be “fluent, understandable, without long pauses, and in complete sentences.” (p. 104) They also indicated that literal translation should be avoided and the focus to convey important messages was the goal which Chang believed was the result of their training and years of experience.

The linkage here is, when interpreters hold a certain belief towards how to perform in a certain direction, such belief no doubt has an impact on that particular

direction. Donovan (2002) also mentions that most interpreters in the survey tend to focus on getting the message across instead of worrying too much about the style of their delivery as they worked into B. This may be the result of one of the teaching strategies adopted for interpreting into B known as the KISS principle: “Keep in short and simple.” (Adams 2002; Minns, 2002; Rejšková 2002)

“Stay away from colloquial expressions, they may be too colloquial or simply wrong for the native speakers of the language (including the interpreter relying on your input), and - replace idiomatic phrases, proverbs with a more straightforward, less embellished message.” (Rejšková 2002, p.33)

“However, a ‘B’ remains a B, when in doubt, students should “KISS”.” (Minns 2002, p.37)

“When working into B, he is best advised to use only previously “verified” solutions, i.e. those which he had already heard uttered by native speakers. The booth is not the place to test whether the listeners understand linguistic solutions the interpreter tries out for the first time.” (Szabari 2002, p.17)

Interpreting norms like these which have been implemented to interpreters since they were beginners definitely shape the way they interpret in a certain direction. This may also explain why Chang (2005) observed that the interpreters in her study were inclined to avoid unfamiliar phrases and adopt various strategies, such as paraphrasing and generalization, when work into B as mentioned earlier. Chang additionally marks the observation of the “language norms of the source and the target languages which also affect the interpreters’ comprehension and production process.” (p. 105) The interpreters in Chang’s study paid more attention to their grammar, sentence structure and logical links when working into B. They also considered it was “important to go beyond the surface of the original Chinese text and to express both the explicit and implicit message obtained in the text” when interpreting from Chinese

to English (p. 105). The present study suspects the fact that Chang reports more attention is allocated to “making cultural adaptations” when working into A (p. 105) may be due to the fact that B-A is less restricted to the effect of KISS principle as a possible explanation.

3.2.5 Experience

Compared to the inexperienced interpreters, Lawson (1967) believes the more experienced are less sensitive to the effect of directionality. Barik (1994) carried out a SI study examining the relationship between various proficiency levels of interpreters and omissions, additions and substitutions they make. Although directionality was not a concern in the study, Barik did reported an observation in which he discovered that the more experienced interpreters made “about the same omission measures” in both language directions, while the less experienced interpreters interestingly did better interpreting from A to B, “making fewer omissions and omitting less material in that situation than when translating from their weaker into their dominant language.....” (p. 134) The amateurs were in fact even more likely to render a word-for-word translation instead of “interpretation” of the source message in B-A comparing to A-B, while the professionals were “substantially more in agreement with the idiom of the target language.” (p. 135) Once again in terms of interpreting quality from user’s standpoint, let us not forget Donovan (2002), who clearly indicates that users do not want a literal translation from the interpreter; instead, they expect task be done in “getting the speaker’s point across.” (p. 5) Therefore, Barik’s findings here may be referred to the fact that the less experienced interpreters rendered a better interpreting quality in A-B as far as users are concerned. Also when working in A-B, the less experienced interpreters on average showed fewer disruption and fewer serious errors

(p. 136) based on Barik's error index (See Appendix I for Barik's error index as summarized by this study). Although the experienced interpreters might be more seriously penalized by the error index compared to the less experienced in some cases, Barik did put forward the fact that the error index itself was mostly concerned with changes in meaning, not the overall interpreting performance. This meant that the amateurs' translations were less intelligible and those of the professionals were more flexible and thus prone to paraphrasing which was something that the error coding system could not reflect. Barik did admit that the error index was not to be taken as a perfect one since it only calculated errors in a general way and could not reflect the overall quality of the interpretation. In general, Barik's study may suggest that the more experienced interpreters performed relatively steady in AB retour but the less experienced were less so in that A-B seemed to generate more satisfactory results.

A slight advantage of working in A-B was recorded by Tommola and Helevä (1998), who conducted a SI study (English/Finish) on directionality concerning linguistic complexity of the text with trainee interpreters. Tommola and Helevä (1998) assessed their performances with propositional accuracy. The results indicated a slightly higher accuracy in the interpreters' renderings while in A-B than B-A.

“...linguistically more complex source texts produced a lower propositional accuracy score than did linguistically simpler and more redundant texts. However, there was no statistically significant effect of the language direction in which interpretation proceeded, although the data revealed a slight trend suggesting that when the subjects were interpreting from their mother tongue into their B language, more propositions were correctly rendered.” (p. 184)

The two authors also suggest it is possible that source text complexity may pose less negative impact on more experienced interpreters because their lexical access and

syntactic parsing “are more automatized and modularized.” (p. 184) The implication here is that experienced interpreters can process a message more effectively than inexperienced interpreters “who may be faced with information overload which has an adverse effect on the quality of the performance.” (p. 184)

More recent psycholinguistic researchers, such as Kees de Bot (2000) who also believes that such asymmetry effect across language direction can be reduced with increased proficiency of the interpreter. Kees de Bot conducted a word translation task (Dutch/French) for the groups of intermediate participants, advanced participants and near-native participants in terms of their language proficiency. While each group has 14 subjects, they “sat in front of a screen on which a stimulus word was presented. They had to say the translation of that word as quickly as possible” (p. 81). The results showed that a clear effect on translation direction but the “difference diminishes with increasing proficiency.” (p. 82) A verification task was also conducted to test if participants had the lexical knowledge of the words tested but had difficulty rendering the translation in due course. The verification task had the same grouping but involved different individuals who must indicate if the Dutch word and the French word both shown on the screen were translation equivalents. The results showed a “significant effect of level of proficiency, in particular for the lowest level of proficiency” the reaction times were significantly prolonged (p. 83). What is important about Kees de Bot’s study is that although shorter reaction times were observed in the direction from the weaker into the dominant language, such effect was reduced as proficiency increased. Again Kees de Bot discusses the possibility that experience may be a factor that influences directionality; the more experienced

interpreters may be less sensitive to the effect of interpreting direction compared to the inexperienced.

In addition, Kurz and Färber (2003) conducted a SI study which involves seven native German interpreting students and seven native English interpreting students. Unlike Barik who applied error index as assessing criteria, Kurz and Färber measured the performance in terms of completeness and content accuracy. The results showed that students performed better in A-B and supported those of Barik in 1994 on the part that the less experienced interpreters seemed to perform more satisfactorily when working into B.

Lee (2003) had nine beginning SI students from Monterey Institute of International Studies to interpret a Korean speech into English and another speech in the opposite direction. Semantic error frequency, language quality & delivery parameters were the assessing criteria. Lee discovered that when student interpreters working into A, more meaning errors were observed than working into B. More language and presentation problems were found in A-B for these student interpreters. Lee's observation may also suggest that experience does play a part in the quality of directionality and that students are prone to producing more meaning errors in B-A. Again to translate the results into Donovan's findings based on users' standpoint, the interpreting efficiency is probably higher in the A-B direction in this particular study since content accuracy is considered the basic requirement (As Donovan indicates) that a good interpretation cannot do without.

Leardini (2003) conducted an observational study investigating SI at two medical conferences. All the SIs were performed by the same group of interpreters who had English A and Italian B as they worked both ways. Frequency of departures and error types were measured in the study and the findings indicated that directionality did not affect these interpreters in the completeness and fidelity of their renderings. Once again more proof pointing to the direction that the more experienced interpreters seem less influenced by language directions. In other words, interpreters with more experiences seem less affected by AB retour while the less experienced ones generally show a more desirable performance in the A-B direction.

Bartłomiejczyk (2004b), after conducting a directionally study using questionnaires survey, provided results which showed that most professional interpreters preferred working into A but only half of the student interpreters felt the same way while 26% indicated they preferred A-B. Bartłomiejczyk attempted to offer an explanation for the phenomenon. Such a difference between the two groups “might be explained as a result of students having too high an opinion in their own mastery of their B language.” (p. 246) This means that students may not know the many errors they make in B but they do notice them when working into A. A second possibility contributing to the difference is that “there is a stage in interpreting training where students do perform better interpreting into a foreign language.” (p. 246) Professional interpreters generally thought that they performed better when working into A as 82.9% indicated so. No professional interpreters seem to suggest they perform better when working into B. More important, 39% of those professional interpreters who indicated a preference working into A actually reported that such difference (into A and into B) was small for them (reflected in grades by only one point).

This study found something interesting in Bartłomiejczyk's study and before the discussion proceeds, the researcher of this study wishes to first explain why taking the group of student interpreters as an example for the following discussion instead of using the professional ones. The truth is, 35 out of the 40 professional interpreters involved in Bartłomiejczyk's questionnaire survey were indeed AIIC members and whether their opinions regarding directionality stood neutral was unclear but it was a concern noted also by Bartłomiejczyk. Therefore, this particular group of respondents was disregarded in the following discussion. The student interpreters were recruited from two different schools that did not particularly encourage work into A or into B and students were required to be able to work in both directions by the schools so their opinions were more likely to remain neutral on the issue.

Now, what's interesting about Bartłomiejczyk's survey results is that an indication of the 53 student respondents who show mixed opinions towards directionality is made. "26% of the students respondents thought themselves to be equally good (or equally bad) in both directions, and 74% made a distinction in their estimation depending on the direction: 48% though they interpreted better from B into A, 26% from A into B." (Bartłomiejczyk's 2004b, p. 242) The research of this study finds the disagreement intriguing and subsequently looks into the background information of these student respondents. Most of them had learnt interpreting for 3-4 terms and were between the age of 22~24. The only significant difference posed by these 53 student interpreters as could be viewed from the study was that they had different language combinations. As Bartłomiejczyk' stated, 32 of the student respondents (From the University of Silesia) had Polish A and English B while some of them also had an additional B or C language(s). The other 21 subjects (From the

Vienna Institute) in fact had “a wide variety of A, B and C languages” (p. 242) while all of them had German as A or B. Other A and B involved including English, French, Hungarian, Polish, Russian and Spanish as listed by Bartłomiejczyk. While respondents/participants in many other studies as reviewed earlier in this study often indicated a consistent agreement concerning directionality and their language combination in each of these studies did not vary (Meaning only one language combination in each study was tested), the researcher became curious again in the possibility that specific language combination may be another factor at work when it comes to the issue of language direction in interpreting. The general observation in Bartłomiejczyk’s study is that students’ opinions are not similar to those of the professional interpreters in terms of interpreting across language direction and it remains consistent with what this study is inclined to suggest that experience as a factor is very likely to have affected interpreting across language direction.

It is important to note that this study certainly is not suggesting all inexperienced interpreters necessarily perform better in A-B (although it appears to be the general trend in the studies as reviewed) or all experienced ones always come up with nearly equal performance in both directions, but merely discussing the possibility that the less experienced interpreters can be more “sensitive” to the effect of language direction in SI in comparison to the more experienced ones who seem to perform more “steadily” and reduce the “gap” more effectively in AB retour. SI performance thus seems to be affected by their interpreting experience. Table 3.3 organizes the above studies that point to the direction suggesting experience may be a factor at work in AB retour.

Note that Donovan (2002) specified that users, other than demanding presentation quality, “went to the trouble” (p. 5) of pointing out by accuracy they expected an interpreter to convey the speaker’s message instead of rendering a literal translation. Such expectation for production is also found in the self-constructed norms that interpreters develop as their experiences increase and gradually change the way interpreters approach how they want to interpret/speak according to Chang (2005). To probe further into the matter, Chang states that self-constructed norms of interpreters can be established as the interpreter becomes more experienced and these norms have an impact on how interpreters wish to approach the task of interpreting. For instance, many interpreters in Chang’s retrospective interview indicated that as they became more experienced in interpreting, they began to focus on the need of the audience (users) and the need to get the message across instead of worrying about how well they could translate the words or every word (Better quality in terms of content accuracy according to Donovan’s users expectations), as they gradually came to believe what interpreting should be like. Whether this may be one of the reasons that the more experienced interpreters perform more steadily in both directions than the inexperienced is another interesting point that no doubt deserves further research attention.

Table 3.3 Results of the Studies Pointing to the Factor of Experience

Data & Results Authors	Language Combination	Criteria of Assessment	Study Results
Barik (1994) * <i>SI Study</i>	English/French	Frequency of error and error types	The less experienced: perform better in A-B; The more experienced: performed similarly in both directions.
Tommola & Helevä (1998) * <i>SI Study</i>	English/Finnish	Propositional accuracy of content	The less experienced: Performed slightly better in A-B.
Kees de Bot (2000) * <i>Word-Translation Task</i>	French/Dutch	Reaction times	Shorter reaction times were observed in B-A and yet such effect was reduced as language proficiency increased.
Kurz & Färber (2003) * <i>SI Study</i>	English/German	Completeness & content accuracy	The less experienced: Performed better in A-B.
Lee (2003) * <i>SI Study</i>	English/Korean	Semantic error frequency, quality of language & delivery parameters	The less experienced: when working into A, more meaning errors occurred; in A-B, more linguistic as well as presentation problems.
Leardini (2003) * <i>SI Study</i>	English/Italian	Frequency of departures and error types	The more experienced: performance is about the same in both directions.
Bartłomiejczyk (2004b): * <i>Questionnaire Survey</i>	Various combinations	Self-assessment regarding performance in both directions	The less experienced: 48% preferred working into A, 26% into B, 26% believed they were equally good/bad in both directions. The more experienced: 82.9% preferred into A, 17.1% believed they were equally good in both directions.

Source: Compiled by this study

3.3 Directionality: An Issue More than Native vs. Non-native

This chapter presents the discussion on directionality. Market reality for one, was and still is a fact today that AB retour in many parts of the world. Working into A could not have been a standard practice or a tradition if strictly putting it to work is practically difficult, if not totally impossible. Some places indeed consider working into B as a dominant practice under certain situations (i.e. Major international events) in Central and Eastern Europe (Szabari 2002) and there are those who basically stand neutral on the issue by indicating the necessity for AB retour (i.e. the Institute of English, University of Silesia, Poland and the Institute for Translation and Interpreting, University of Vienna, Austria, Bartłomiejczyk 2004b).

Directionality may be affected by various factors so the quality of AB retour, (content accuracy and presentation quality based on users' account (Donovan 2002)), may not be consistently better or worse in either direction. Other than the fact that market reality demands AB retour in many places around the world, the interpreter's experience, specific language combination, interpreting context, personal factors and norms together may determine SI directionality to a large extent. In other words, SI directionality is a complex issue rather than simply tangling on native and non-native languages can explain; the depth of the issue is very likely to have gone beyond the discussion of native vs. nonnative languages. Neither A-B nor B-A always produces a better interpreting quality; therefore under this rationale granting interpreting into A the standard status cannot effectively convince this study. All these raise further doubt that working into A was ever a worldwide standard put into practice by members in the interpreting community as it was suggested in the literature.

Chapter Four Methodology

This study starts off with a brief review of the history of interpreting as to when and how it was done. The present study hopes to sort out important facts and clues from past works for research direction on the basis of the literature review so accumulative debates and empirical studies regarding directionality are an important part of examination for any particular point of interest related to the subject of working into A as a standard. This study is also interested in revealing the actual extensiveness of working into A as acknowledged and put into practice in the worldwide field of interpreting today thus a supplemented qualitative questionnaire survey (the Internet survey) to either support or refute the research question that this study has come to according to the literature review. This chapter discusses the research design of this study. It starts with a section on the research framework, research method and research instrument employed by this study.

4.1 Research Scope

Working into A and into B each has its advantages and drawbacks and directionality has long been an issue of debate over the years. As reviewed in Chapter Three, working into A has its distinct advantages as claimed, however, strict practice of this direction may not be possible in various parts of the world due to the market demand for AB retour. In addition, whether working into A indeed assumes the standard role as it is seemingly claimed in the literature is another point of interest. To answer these questions, this study intends to gather and evaluate the opinions and facts from members in the field regarding the issue of AB retour. Data collected from targeted groups are analyzed and compared for results. The objective is to unveil

either any pattern or inconsistency, if there is one, regarding the actual practices and views about interpreting direction.

4.2 Research Question

This study attempts to gather and evaluate opinions and facts of practice from members in the field concerning the issue of directionality. Based on the literature review in Chapter Two and Chapter Three, this study assumes that:

- Working into A as a standard may be a claim well-noted but not as many actually support or practice it.

4.3 Research Method

Literature review and a qualitative survey were this study's research method while the former takes on a heavier portion than the latter. According to Neuman (2003), qualitative research often depends upon "interpretive or critical social science" and qualitative researchers focus on "detailed examination of cases" and often present "authentic interpretations that are sensitive to specific social historical contexts." (p. 139) The research tool adopted in this study is analysis of secondary data (literature) and questionnaire. Survey research can be applied to various sizes of groups. Its aim is to reveal facts or phenomenon among the targeted group/sample instead of focusing on any particular case study. It also generates the highest external validity among all types of empirical research (Chang 2004).

This study adopts sample survey. The way to conduct sample survey is to select several representative samples out of the population through either random or

non-random sampling method in order to reveal certain facts or attitudes. The followings are some of the reasons for this study to adopt sample survey according to Chang (2004, P. 375):

- Low cost and less demand of human resources
- Research time is considerably reduced due to fewer subjects involved and the results are valid in terms of timeliness.
- Quality research data also due to fewer subjects involved.

In terms of types of survey research, four general categories are identified: questionnaire survey, Internet survey, visiting survey and telephone survey (Chang 2004). This study makes use of Internet survey to administer questionnaires to the respondents through the convenience of electronic mail. According to Chang, an Internet survey can be conducted through ways such as setting up personal Web server, BBS and electronic mail (p. 280). Chang further specifies that Internet survey poses the advantages such as (1) the lowest cost, (2) The fastest collection of data which is already in the form of electronic files and requires no additional manual work for key-in, (3) the widest sample distribution which virtually covers all over the world and (4) the best anonymity of respondent's identity (p. 381). The one drawback of Internet survey as Chang cautions is that it may have problems in its sample selection; for example, the sample may be composed of Internet surfers who may not be located again for additional questioning.

4.4 Administration of the Questionnaire

This study makes use of several strategies to encourage response rate. First, there are only three questions contained in the questionnaires for all respondents; the respondent is only required to check one of the provided responses for each question although some questions may also require a subsequent short answer. Instruction as to how to make response and definition of the key terms are stated on top of the questionnaire. Other precautions are also taken to encourage the return of the questionnaires such as stating the identity of the research institute and offering incentives (Chang 2004). In the email (the introduction letter), the respondent is informed that the survey is concerned with a thesis research. On the first page of the questionnaire, the research institute, in this case the name of the researcher and the affiliation, are specified. What is more, the names and professional titles of the research supervisors are both listed clearly on the top of the questionnaire to raise a sense of trust out of the respondent. The researcher also offers to send the survey results via email upon respondent's request as an additional incentive to increase response rate. A list of all other invited respondents is also attached to the email (except for the pretest) so that the respondent knows who else is involved in this worldwide survey and that this is a chance in which their voice can be heard. Yet perhaps the most effective way to encourage response rate, as Chang (2004) suggests and this study certainly applies, is to foster a sense of altruism by informing the respondents that their participation is an important contribution to the research. While Chang (2004) also cautions that it is difficult to control who actually fill out the questionnaire in a mail survey, all questionnaires in this study are sent straight to each and every respondent's personal email box instead of having someone else (i.e. the department's secretary, etc.) to forward it to the targeted respondent. The results

showed that all returned questionnaires were directly replied through the personal email boxes of the targeted respondents as originally sent. Note that some of the questions may pose a problem to respondents who lack the knowledge to reply. This means that the respondent does not know the answer “but someone in the selected household does”. One of the solutions to deal with such problem is to “identify and interview the household member who is best informed.” (Fowler 1993, p. 87; Chang 2004)

To fulfill research confidentiality and anonymity, the respondents in this study cannot be linked to their responses in any ways and the respondents are assured of it “as almost all surveys promises.” (Fowler 1993, p. 90) The respondents are also informed to state their answers in details so that the researcher can better avoid having to contact the respondent twice for of an ambiguous answer they made the first time.

4.5 The Respondents and the Selection

In order to obtain the required data, this study intends to send out questionnaires and collect data form those who are in the position to reply. The selected respondents come from three different populations: 1). Directors of interpreting schools/institutes, 2). President/Director of related organizations and 3) conference interpreters. The selected respondents are the key persons who have the knowledge and are in the position to answer the questions. The focus is not how many respondents are involved in this survey but who and what they represent. It is not the quantity but the quality of the responses of those who have the knowledge to reply that is of top importance in order to build up the linkage between the facts gathered from literature in this study and the real world practice.

The questionnaires go out to a total of 17 different countries across four continents. It is the hope of this study to invite more respondents from a wider geographical scope. Two key criteria are taken into account in respondent selection as follows:

1. Questionnaires must be sent to as many names via e-mail as obtained within the limited timeframe. For this study to remain neutral on the subject, the survey should include the respondents whose standpoints and practices are clearly against/not in favor of the research question.
2. For the rest of the invited respondents, their views and actual interpreting practices should remain unknown to the researcher until their response. In other words, this study attempts to avoid being put under the suspicion that the survey mostly invites those who do not support strictly interpreting into A as previously identified and thus favors the research question for results.

4.6 Questionnaire Design

The three questions contained in the questionnaire are based on the research question derived from the literature review in this study. Several important points are also taken into consideration in the design of questions as proper measures (Fowler 1993). First, inadequate wording should be avoided. For example, questions that are incomplete or those with improper optional wording or poor wording. This study therefore makes sure that all questions are formulated in clear and complete sentences with one question asking for one definite answer only. Next, in the attempt to ensure “consistent meaning to all respondents”, the way to do it is to keep away from “poorly defined terms” (p. 74), thus key terms such as A language and B language are first

defined on top of the questionnaire using AIIC's current definitions. The third is to be very careful with "The 'Don't Know' option" (p.76); it means that sometimes respondents do not want to reply as required or "legitimately do not know" the answer (p. 76). The best way to approach the problem is to first provide a "standardized screening question" (p. 76) to all respondents and see if they are familiar with the subject in question. This study thus designs the screening question (*Have you ever heard of the notion suggesting that interpreting into A is the standard practice?*) as the first question in the questionnaire to make sure all respondents do have some knowledge about the argument to begin with. The three questions only vary slightly for the three intended groups and are indeed very similar in nature. The first question across the three groups is the same and it is the screening question as stated above. The second question differs only in the way the respondent is addressed; for example, for the group of school directors, Question 2 is "*Can (name of the school) put the interpreting direction as supported strictly into all related practices?*" but for the presidents/directors of various organizations the same question is "*Can (name of the organization) put the interpreting direction as supported strictly into all related practices?*". Question 2 requires all respondents to clearly state the reason(s) for their response. Again the wording in Question 3 is different except the difference is to a larger extent for the group of interpreters. For the school directors Question 3 is "*Can (name of the school) put the interpreting direction as supported strictly into all related practices? (Please do not answer this question if the response you made in Question 2 was "We support interpreting in both directions" or "We do not take a side on this issue")*" and for organization presidents/directors it is similar "*Can (name of the organization) put the interpreting direction as supported strictly into all related practices? (Please do not answer this question if the response you made in Question 2*

was “*We support interpreting in both directions*” or “*We do not take a side on this issue*”). For the interpreters participating in this survey, Question 3’s wording is “*Do you insist on interpreting only in a certain language direction when interpreting assignments are referred to you?*”, while basically Question 3 in all three groups aims to reveal if a strict practice of working into A is possible for the intended respondents. A short answer question also came with Question 3 for all respondents and the only condition in which they were not required this attached question was if their indication in Question 2’s provided responses was either “*We support interpreting in both directions*” or “*We do not take a side on this issue.*” (See Appendix for the three versions of questionnaire)

In addition, this study insists on using only one language, English, for the questionnaire survey due to a concern raised by Fowler (1993). Respondents answering questionnaires in different languages may pose an “extreme challenge” because “it is doubtful that adjectival rating scales are ever compatible across languages.” (p.77) Therefore, all the respondents answered the questionnaire in English as the questionnaire was formulated. Last but not least, Fowler mentioned “Standardized expectations for type of response.” (p. 78) That is, it is essential to design good survey questions that refer to the same thing to all respondents who should be able to perceive an adequate response. It can be done through using close questions which provides the respondent a set of alternatives to choose as the answer to a question or through making use of open questions that are specific. This study uses the provided-response type of questions and the specific open questions for the survey as mentioned earlier. Two out of the three questions are attached with an open question (short answer question as mentioned earlier) which simply asks the

respondent to state the reason(s) for the response they made. The advantages of open questions are that they allow not only unanticipated answers from the respondents but also provide “more closely the real views of the respondent...., who also like the opportunity to answer some questions in their own words.” In addition, when possible answers are more than numerous, the choice of replacing provided response with open questions is appropriate (Fowler 1993, p. 82), such as in our case when the respondent is asked to state the reason(s) for their response.

This study’s questionnaires are generated in the way which is also supported by Chang (2004) who stated three similar key points in the design of questionnaire content:

- Questions asked must be essential concerning the research question:
This means that the designated questions must be necessary and relevant to the research. Some question designing techniques include do not ask or paraphrase the same question twice and each question should pose a clear objective instead of “By the way” kind of inquiry.
- Question adequacy: To word the question adequately and reduce question complexity, etc.
- Questions must be to the respondent’s knowledge to reply: For example, does the respondent have the knowledge to answer the questions in the questionnaire?
Can they recall the required information in order to make reply, etc.?

4.7 Pretest

A pretest of the questionnaires was sent to the first respondent via email. Slight changes in the questionnaire were made after it was sent to the first respondent who was not informed of these changes because they were of trivial significance, such as one typo and phrasing of a sentence as later discovered. Although the pretest did not include the questionnaires for the other two groups (only the group of interpreters), the functioning of the questions for the three groups of respondents was indeed very similar in nature except that wording was not exactly identical as explained earlier. The first pretest respondent indicated that she was aware of the standard claim of working into A but she supported interpreting in both direction for reasons quoted below. The first pretest respondent was not required to answer Question 3 due to her response in Question 2.

“An interpreter must be able to interpret both into his/her A and B languages. The speaker almost always takes questions from and has some form of discussion with the audience. It’d be senseless to require an interpreter to interpret only into his/her A or B language”

After examining the reply, slight revision of a question and phrasing were made; for example, requesting the respondent to provide the reason(s) for the response they made clearly in details. The researcher consulted the first respondent through telephone to know if there were any perceived problems from the questionnaire. The revised questionnaire was then e-mailed to a second pretest respondent. The second respondent replied the next day and telephone consulting with the second respondent was also conducted. The second respondent in the pretest had no knowledge of working into A as a standard whatsoever and indicated that she did not take a side on the issue for reasons as follows:

“Under the premise that only accurate enough interpretations are considered, it is my guess that if an interpreter is capable of interpreting accurately enough between a certain set of languages (namely the interpreter’s A language and B language) in whichever direction, his or her B language should be at least of a certain level, in which case he or she should be able to speak the B language adequately. Therefore, if an interpreter chooses to interpret in one direction only, it may be more due to personal reasons or principles, rather than because of limitations of his or her language abilities. Thus, in my opinion, choice of interpreting direction should be treated as personal preference, and nothing more.”

Both pretest respondents chose an answer in Question 2 that did not require them to answer Question 3 as indicated. To avoid the possibility that respondents might choose an answer because they knew by selecting this option the effort to answer the next question could be waived, such indication was erased from Question 2 and moved to Question 3. A short-answer question was deleted for similar reason. The format of the questionnaire and wording were also modified as well.

4.8 Data Analysis

This study analyzes and compares the primary data contained in the collected questionnaires for results against the claim that working into A is a traditional standard in the interpreting field. All data are cross-compared to reveal if there is any general agreement or inconsistency in the respondents’ opinions as well as their actual practices as to how many support or refute the claim.

Chapter Five Results and Analysis

This chapter presents the survey results. Two sections are in this chapter: the responses from the school directors and the conference interpreters. Both group's responses are analyzed respectively.

A total of 36 copies of questionnaires across the three groups of respondents were sent out. 24 copies were sent to the group of school directors, six copies to the group of organization director and another six for the group of interpreters. The names and email contacts of the school directors were easier to obtain for this study so more intended respondents were derived for this group. Eleven questionnaires were returned and ten of them valid. The ten respondents are from nine different countries across four continents: North America, Europe (Western Europe, Central Europe and Northern Europe), Asia (Eastern Asia and The Middle East) as well as Oceania (Australia). To state the questionnaire response rate for each group, seven out of 24 copies of questionnaires sent to the group of school directors were returned and all were valid. The response rate for this group is 29.2%. Regarding the group of organizations, originally six copies of questionnaires were sent out and two replied that the nature of their organizations were not suitable to answer the questionnaires because the organizations were interpreters of cultural and heritage instead of languages as this study had mistaken. Therefore the two were subsequently removed and two new ones were added to the list of intended respondents. The response rate of this group is 0%. One questionnaire did come back from this group but it was indeed invalid. For the group of conference interpreters, six copies of questionnaires were generated and three were returned. They were all valid questionnaires. The response

rate for the group of conference interpreters is 50%. All the responses were examined on the basis of this study's research questions as derived from the literature review. To ensure anonymity, every respondent is assigned a code name based on the sequence of their reply. See Appendix for all of the original responses compiled by this study. Note that those who do not support/practice uni-directionality are not required to answer Question 3. To ensure anonymity, the responses may be subject to slight modification on the part that the original response may reveal the respondent's identity.

5.1 Responses from the Group of School Directors and Analysis

A total of seven respondents who are school directors participate in this survey. The respondents from this group are coded as S1, S2, S3 and so on as the coding is based on the sequence of their reply.

Their replies to Question 1 indicate that the claim of B-A as a standard is widely known as noted by professionals in charge of interpreting schools and institutes across different continents. Although one respondent (S1) chose the option '*Other*' for Question 1, the reasons S1 put forward not only shows that S1 was aware of the claim but also seemed to acknowledge the validity of it. It should be noted that S1 acknowledged the quality of interpreting into A under the assumption that A production is more resourceful while all other things being equal so far as the way A and B languages are defined.

In Question 2, none of the schools supports uni-directional practice although respondent S4 does specify that the school supports both directions only when the

quality of A-B justifies as a precondition. It is interesting that S3 checked both “Interpreting into A” and “Interpreting into B” instead of “We support interpreting in both directions.” S3 reasoned that their school’s interpreting course aimed at interpreting into A and from C, yet they had separate courses for interpreting into B and for AB retour. It seems that this school evaluates directionality as context requires. For example, at their exam interpreting into B is not compulsory but for a different course interpreting into B is provided. In community interpreting, AB retour is required for dialogue interpreting. For the purpose of convenience, this study is inclined to interpret S3’s response to Question 2 as supporting both directions.

Regarding Question 2, market reality turns out to be the major concern for these schools to support AB retour. Market reality is a factor that sets the interpreting practice in the way that AB retour is necessary and required. None supports strict uni-directional practice (Into A or Into B only) in this group. Many schools in this survey state the fact that AB retour is necessary when less-well known languages are involved. Neither interpreting into A nor interpreting into B alone can satisfy market demand. S2 also states that they do not expect the same proficiency in B and A. All the schools and institutes in this survey generally give their support to AB retour even though all have heard of the standard claim.

5.2 Responses from the Group of Conference Interpreters and Analysis

This group’s response rate is 50%. The way respondents are coded is also based on the sequence of their replies (I1, I2 and I3). The three respondents indeed station in different countries across three continents. The survey results in Question 1 showed that respondent I2 indeed had never heard of the into-A-as-a-standard claim.

I2 neither took a side on directionality nor did he practice uni-directional interpreting. This was also the indication in one of pretest respondents. As this is a qualitative survey research instead of quantitative, this study cannot draw a conclusion as to how many members in the field are/are not aware of the standard claim; what we can say based on the results is that there are those who have never heard of the claim before.

I3 was aware of the standard claim but he neither lended his support to it nor did he practice uni-directional interpreting not only because he was taught in AB retour but it had always been the practice for Chinese/English combination as the respondent indicated. Both I2 and I3 agreed by mere coincidence that the reasons they did not insist a direction when interpreting was that uni-directional practice was impossible due to exiting market mechanism and demand. I1 supported and insisted on interpreting into A quite clearly. It should be noted that as much as I1 agreed with the quality of interpreting into A, this respondent also recognized the fact that AB retour was a necessity when there was a shortage of interpreters who could work into A from a certain language.

5.3 Results and Analysis

Most of the respondents who know about the standard claim do not strictly support nor practice unidirectional interpreting and the most-cited reason for the response in this survey is market reality as provided by the respondents from both groups. None from the group of school directors supports the idea of only working into A under all conditions; in fact, many of them recognize the practice of AB retour. The only respondent (From the group of interpreter) who is not aware of the claim does not choose a side on the issue of directionality but also acknowledges that it is

impossible to function as an interpreter to work only in one direction. Evidence suggests that many are aware of market demand for the practice of AB retour.

Based on the practices and reasons provided by the respondents, this study is inclined to identify Asian market as another place currently rely heavily on the practice AB retour. S7 pointed out the fact that the School had “different practices for different languages”; for example, all students at the School must be able to work both ways in CI (Consecutive interpretation) regardless of their language combinations but AB retour is usually practiced for both SI and CI with Asian languages. In addition, I3 points out that AB retour is always the case in Chinese/English combination and S1 agrees by indicating the overwhelming demand for AB retour in the combinations of Chinese/English and Japanese/English. Other than Europe as the literature review has suggested and some of the respondents also indicated in this survey, Asia may be another market that also demands AB retour. Many “smaller” languages have a serious shortage of interpreters whose A is a more common language (i.e.English) as we have been informed over and over again through out the literature and survey conducted by this study.

Chapter Six Conclusion

This chapter presents the conclusion and limitation of the research. Suggestions for future studies are also highlighted here.

6.1 Conclusion

Directionality has been a long debated issue. Interpreting into A and interpreting into B have been the center of the discussion and concern. Some believe that interpreting into A is the standard way of practice and actually follow; for example, one respondent in the survey took time to state that the interpreters in their country usually work into A although they must have the ability to work into their B language sometimes. ASTTI even supports the practice of B-A to the degree that the organization actually draws it down as one of the admission criteria for its active members. Many empirical studies are carried out and have revealed important clues. These clues are examined by this study and they turn out to be the factors that may determine directionality, especially when it comes to questioning the validity of claiming working from one's foreign language into mother tongue is a standard as many have heard.

Foreign monks who came to Ancient China teaching Buddhist scripture but did not speak Chinese relied on the assistance of interpreters who might as well be another foreign monk that learned Chinese as a foreign language. In the West, Christopher Columbus had to train the natives in the Americas to speak Spanish so that through them communication between the Spaniard and the Native Americans was possible. The Nuremburg Trial in 1945 was when simultaneous interpretation first appeared as we know it today. Interpreting into a foreign language was the

direction the Trial adopted because it was found that interpreting into B yielded a better quality thus all SI interpreters were asked to interpret into their foreign tongue in the Trial. Today, Globalization and accession to international or regional organizations (i.e. EU) require interpreters of smaller languages to practice AB retour. These facts and evidence tell us one thing: interpreting is a task also subject to market demand so far and should not be marked otherwise.

Many places in fact have never credited working into A as a standard code. Countries in Central and Eastern Europe have always practiced working into B that has now even become the dominant direction in some cases. Graduate interpreter training in Germany have never switched their focus on the teaching of working into B (Szabari 2002). Some schools in Eastern Europe have always believed in the quality generated when interpreting from A (Donovan 2002). Many of the respondents regardless which group they represent in our survey clearly specify that although they are aware of the standard claim, they justify interpreting in both directions and the most oft-cited reason is market reality. In other words, market reality still sets the practice of AB retour in many parts of the world today.

The truth is, in our small number of survey respondents, two (including another respondent from the pretest) in the interpreter's group reported they had never heard of the standard claim. Both of them chose not to take a side on the issue of directionality but they did specify that they worked in both directions when interpreting assignments were referred to them. One of them, again as we have heard many times from other respondents, contributed his reason of practice to the market for the necessity of AB retour and the other simply believed that interpreters should

be able to work both ways and any insisted direction was a result of personal preference. All these facts and evidences indicate two things: interpreting into A was never a tradition to begin with and the task of interpreting is subject to market reality. In contrast to taking a side on directionality, there are also those who do not support any particular interpreting direction and they practically stay neutral on the issue. For instance, institutes in Europe such as the Institute of English, University of Silesia in Poland and the Institute for Translation and Interpreting, University of Vienna in Austria do not systematically favor working into either direction and the truth is they expect their graduates to work in both directions. (Bartłomiejczyk 2004). The survey results of the present study also support the existence of those who do not take a side on the issue as three respondents from the group of institute directors and interpreters indicate. According to the three retour languages (English, French and German) as mentioned by AIIC and the survey results (i.e. one respondent pointed out that their school required AB retour in Asian languages for both SI and CI), this study has reasons to believe that other than the many European countries, Asia, where most countries do not have any of the three retour languages as a public standard code, is another market in demand of AB retour so far today.

As far as language is concerned, not only do we need a clearer definition for the working languages of interpreters but we may want to reconsider the language terms such as mother tongue, of which the definition appears to slide among various existing common definitions resulting in the inconsistency of granting one the title of being the native speaker of a particular language; for example, an interpreter may be recognized as having a language as his/her A (either it is his/her mother tongue or dominant language based on the existing definition identified by the field of

interpretation), and yet the very same person may turn out to be unqualified to claim the native status of that language in the eyes of another. More important, as the current A language definition seems to yield acceptance to either the interpreter's mother tongue or the dominant language (As the language later replaced the mother tongue), the gap between mother tongue and dominant language in terms of language competence is distinguished by age of acquisition according to the Critical Period Hypothesis. In other words, the present language classification for interpreters may not be a credible system and thus urgently requires more research attention. The fact that this study must first work out temporary definitions for language terms for the rest of the discussions regarding directionality to be based on shows the language issue requires further research urgently.

What about interpreting into A as a standard since the claim is that this direction generates better interpreting quality than the other way around? To answer the question, we must go back to the important clues derived out of the literature. These clues or factors so far identified are experience of interpreters, specific language combinations, context, interpreting norms and people that are involved in SI. They may affect the quality of AB retour in terms of content accuracy and/or presentation quality. What is important about these factors is that they do not have much to relate to the discussions on the advantages/problems for the source and target languages being native or nonnative to the interpreter. The purpose and function of this study is simple. It is inviting us to take a different and closer look at directionality, including the validity of interpreting into A being always a "better" direction as claimed. The quality of interpretation is more than what native and nonnative input/production can justify. It can be challenged by other elements and what happens

is that the “end product” may be affected by these elements. Interpreting into A or interpreting into B thus cannot always be a better or a worse direction to work in.

6.2 Research Limitation

This research adopts a qualitative questionnaire survey so the survey results cannot reach a quantitative conclusion. Neither the researcher nor the respondents had a second chance to make additional clarification as visiting interviews allow unless a follow-up is in the arrangement. Information contained in the returned questionnaires might be incomplete in the sense that it was unlikely the collected data represented the respondents’ full knowledge on what was asked. In addition, some of the factors identified by this study require future research for additional support of their validity. For example, more studies should be designed to test the factor of experience across language direction (and perhaps its interaction with different language combinations if there is one) since all of the previous studies reviewed were not specifically designed for such objective, except for Barik (1994) who had close enough results to suggest a performance difference across language direction (English/French) on the basis of the experience of his SI participants.

6.3 Suggestion for Future Studies

The interpreting quality of a certain language direction (A-B or B-A) may not always be better or worse and knowing this sets us free. For example, in terms of course arrangement, we no longer have to worry as much about finding a teacher/instructor who must have a particular A and B in order to teach a course in the direction of B-A without taking other things into consideration, such as experience and expertise. Market reality is an intriguing phenomenon; for instance, we

understand that interpreting in both directions is a must for small languages. However, Mandarin Chinese is by no means a small language simply considering the number of its worldwide (native) speakers today. Why is it still difficult to find, for example, English A interpreters who have Chinese as his/her B or C (i.e. in Taiwan) (Chang 2005)? What can possibly cause this curiosity? In addition, the factors identified in this study require further exploration for more support; one example is that language combinations which favor interpreting into A and those into B or the ones that pose similar difficulty at the linguistic level should be identified. Once such identification is made, interpreter's training may be planned and carried out more effectively.

Furthermore, how do the factors interact with one another, if they do at all? Does one dominate the other and how (i.e. Can one be used to offset another or more)? Interaction of factors that determine directionality is definitely a seek-out point for future studies. Are there other factors that have yet to surface? Chatilov (2003) discovers that native listeners do not need to hear the whole word or phrase in order to understand what it means (The study was carried in the context of listening comprehension, not in SI). The perception of the main part, mostly the root morpheme, is enough for a native listener to achieve comprehension. Then, by following the word-form rules of a given language the native listener quickly and accurately understands the word or phrase. A nonnative listener, on the other hand, needs more time to extract the meaning of what is heard and consequently it slows down the comprehension process. In other words, native listeners have better and faster linguistic anticipation compared to nonnative listeners, as in one of the two kinds of anticipation (The other is extralinguistic anticipation) an interpreter uses to predict what a speaker is likely to say next (Besien, 1999). Conrad (1981) also indicates that

the difficulty for a nonnative listener lies in extracting semantic information from the source text. Despite the fact that neither Chatilov's nor Conrad's study was tested and measured in the context of SI, the results may serve as evidence that point to the disadvantage listeners are exposed to when listening to a nonnative language especially when input rate is high. Therefore, apart from what we have already known from the early days that SI performance deteriorates as speech rates increases (Gerver 1969), how do input rates affect interpreting performance across language direction? Too many important questions anxiously await future research to take a closer look.

Interpreting into A was never a golden rule. Having a better understanding of the factors that are likely to affect SI directionality and knowing how to make good use of these factors bring us better prospects of gain than simply worrying about not having enough interpreters speaking a "rare" B or C. From here, we can carry out interpreting as a task and training more successfully. We need to start asking questions other than simply examining our interpreters through the "native-nonnative glasses" before we can see the best interpreters have always been there.

References

- Adams, C. (2002). What is a B language? Towards a working definition and selection criteria. *EMCI workshop proceeding: Teaching simultaneous interpretation into a "B" language*. 20-22.
- Aiic. Retrieval Date: 2005/11/08, from the World Wild Web:
<http://www.aiic.net/ViewPage.cfm/article25>
- Al-Salman, S., & Al-Khanji, R. (2002). The native language factor in simultaneous interpretation in an Arabic/English context. *Meta*, 47(4), 607-625.
- Angelelli, C. V. (2004). *Revisiting the interpreter's role: A study of conference, court, and medical interpreters in Canada, Mexico, and the United States*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Asher, R. E. and Simpson, J. M.Y. (Eds.), (1994). *The encyclopedia of language and linguistics*. Vol. 5. Oxford, New York, Seoul and New York: Pergamon Press Ltd.
- ASTTI. Retrieval Date: 2006/01/15, from the World Wild Web:
<http://www.astti.ch/fr/fadmis.html>
- Barik, Henry C. (1994). A description of various types of omissions, additions and errors of translation encountered in simultaneous interpretation. In S. Lambert & B. Mercer-Moser (Eds.), *Bridging the gap: Empirical research in simultaneous interpretation* (pp. 121-137). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Baigorri-Jal?nm, J. (2000). A century in retrospect: Bridging the language gap at the United Nations. *United Nations chronicle* (Online edition), Vol. XXXVII, Department of public information.
- Besien, Fred Van. (1999). Anticipation in simultaneous interpretation. *META*, 44(2), 250-259.
- Bartlomiejczyk, M. (2004a). *Strategies of simultaneous interpreting from English into Polish and from Polish into English*. Doctoral dissertation. Faculty of philology, University of Silesia.
- Bartlomiejczyk, M. (2004b). Simultaneous interpreting A-B vs.-A from the interpreters' standpoint. In G. Hansen, et al. *Claims, changes and challenges in translation studies*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Barinas Translation Consultants, Inc. Retrieval Date: 2005/10/28, from the World Wild Web: <http://www.barinas.com/>
- Bot De, Kees. (2000). Simultaneous interpreting as language production. *Language processing and simultaneous interpreting*. In B.E. Dimitrova and K. Hyltenstam (eds), Amsterdam John Benjamins.

- Byram, M. (Ed.). (2000). *Routledge Encyclopedia of Language Teaching and Learning*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Cao, S. B. (1990). *The history of Buddhist scripture translation in China*. Taipei: Tung Chu (As in Chinese).
- Chatilov, A. (2003). *Oral speech perception: Native vs. nonnative language*. Hwa Kang journal of foreign languages & literature, Vol. 10, 51-60 (As partially in Chinese, English and mostly in Russian).
- Chang, C. C. (2005). *Directionality in Chinese/English simultaneous interpreting: impact on performance and strategy use*. Published doctoral dissertation, The University of Texas at Austin.
- Chang, S. S. (2004). *Research method*. Taichung: Tsang Hai Book Publishing Co. (As in Chinese).
- Conrad, L. R. (1981). *Listening comprehension Strategies in Native and Second Language*. Published Dissertation, Ann Arbor: University Microfilms International.
- Cutler, A. (2000). Listening to a second language through the ears of a first. *Interpreting*, 5(1), 1-23
- De Jongh, E. M. (1992). *An introduction to court interpreting: Theory and practice*. Lanham, New York and London: University Press of America.
- Dewaele, J. M. (2002). Individual differences in L2 fluency: The effect of neurobiological correlates. In V. Cook (Ed.), *Portraits of the L2 user*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Dillinger, M. (1994). Comprehension during interpreting: What do interpreters know that bilinguals don't? In S. Lambert and B. Moser-Mercer (Eds), *Bridging the gap: Empirical research in simultaneous interpretation*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Donovan, C. 2002. Survey of users expectations and needs. *EMCI Workshop proceedings: Teaching simultaneous interpretation into a "B" language*. 2-11.
- Donovan, C. (2004). European masters project group: Teaching simultaneous interpretation into a B language. *Interpreting*, 6(2), 205-216.
- Dornic, S. (1978). The bilingual's performance: Language dominance, stress and individual difference. In D. Gerver & H. W. Sinaiko (Eds.), *Language interpretation and communication*. New York: Plenum Press.
- EMCI (European Masters in Conference Interpreting). 2002. Introduction. *Proceedings of EMCI Workshop Paris 2002: Teaching simultaneous interpretation into a B language*. Paris: ESIT.

- EMCI. Retrieval Date: 2006/01/19, from the World Wild Web:
<http://www.emcinterpreting.net/curriculum.htm>
- EUROPA-DG SCIC. Retrieval Date: 2005/11/08, from the World Wild Web:
http://europa.eu.int/comm/scic/interpreting/tech_combination_en.htm
- European Parliament. Retrieval Date: 2005/11/08, from the World Wild Web:
http://www.europarl.eu.int/interp/public/careers/careers_en.htm
- Gaiba, F. (1998). *The origins of simultaneous interpretation: The Nuremberg Trial*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.
- Gerver, D (1969). The effects of source language presentation rate on the performance of simultaneous conference interpreters. In Franz Pochhacker & M. Shlesinger (Eds.), *The interpreting studies reader*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Gile, D. (1990). Scientific research vs. personal theories in the investigation of interpretation. In Gran & Taylor (Eds.), *Aspect of applied and experimental research on conference interpretation*. Udine: Campanotto Editore.
- Gile, D. (1995). *Basic concept and models for interpreter and translator training*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Gile, D. (1997). Conference interpreting as a cognitive management problem. In J. H. Danks et al. (Eds.), *Cognitive processes in translation and interpreting*. Thousand Oaks/London/New Delhi: Sage Publications. 196-214.
- Huang, C. H. (1990). *The history of Buddhism in China*. Taipei: Xin Wen Feng (As in Chinese).
- Institute of Linguists. Retrieval Date: 2006/01/08, from the World Wild Web:
<http://www.iol.org.uk/membership/default.asp>
- Kurz, I. (1993). Conference interpretation: Expectations of different user groups. In F. Pöchhacker & M. Shlesinger (Eds.), *The interpreting studies reader*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Langbridge, Inc. Retrieval Date: 2006/01/06, from the World Wild Web:
http://www.langbridge.com/translation_services.htm
- Lawson, E. (1967). Attention and simultaneous translation. *Language and speech*, 10. 29-35.
- Lee, S. (2002). Obstacles in simultaneous interpretation - With focus on language interference. *Conference Interpretation and Translation*, 4(1), 153-166.
- Lee, T.-H. (1999). Speech proportion and accuracy in simultaneous interpretation from English into Korean. *META*, 44(2), 260-267.

- Liao, H.-H. (2005). *Quality Standards and Training for Television News Interpreting: From the Perspective of Television News Translator and Interpreters*. Unpublished thesis, National Taiwan Normal University (As in Chinese).
- Lightbown, P. M. and Spada, N. (2001). *How languages are learned*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lin, K.-M. (2000). *Easy learning Sanskrit characters: The basic chapter*. Taipei: Buddhall Cultural Enterprise Co., Ltd. (As in Chinese).
- Minns, P. (2002). Language interpreting into B: Some conclusion gathered from experience. *EMCI workshop proceeding: Teaching simultaneous interpretation into a "B" language*. 35-37.
- Neuman, W. L. (2003). *Social research method: Qualitative and quantitative approaches*, 5th ed., Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Newpark, P. (1981). *Approaches to translation*. Oxford, New York, Toronto, Sydney, Frankfurt: Pergamon Press.
- Pöhhacker, F. (2004). *Introducing interpreting studies*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Pokorn, N. K. (2004). Challenging the myth of native speaker competence in translation theory. In G. Hansen et al. (Eds.), *Claims, changes and challenges in translation studies*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Rejšková, J. (2002). Teaching experience of simultaneous into B. *EMCI workshop proceeding: Teaching simultaneous interpretation into a "B" language*. 30-34.
- Seel, Olaf-Immanuel. (2005). Non-Verbal Means as Culture-Specific Determinants that Favour Directionality into the Foreign Language in Simultaneous Interpreting. In R. Godijns & M. Hinderdael (Eds.), *Directionality in interpreting. The 'Retour' or the Native?* Gent: Communication & Cognition, 63-82.
- Stern, H. H. (1983). *Fundamental concepts of language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Tommola, J. and Helevä, M. (1998). Language direction and source text complexity: Effects on trainee performance in simultaneous interpreting. In L. Bowker et al. (Eds.), *Unity in diversity?: Current trends in translation studies*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Wagner, E., Bech, S. & Martínez, J. M. (2002). *Translating for the European Unions Institutions*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Yagi, S. M. (1999). Computational discourse analysis for interpretation *META*, 44(2), 268-279.

Zhong Cun, Y. (1984). *The history of Buddhism development in China*. Upper Vol., Taipei: Tian Hua (As in Chinese).

Appendix I:

Barik's Errors Index

Barik's Insignificant Omissions

Type of omission	Reason	Example
Omission of connective	Not disruptive	and
Omission of fillers	Superfluous and often untranslatable	well, now, you see, etc.
Omission of definite articles, etc.	Not disruptive	the, a, etc.
Omission of specification	Its reference is understood from the context (p. 125)	This young man → The young man
Skipping omission	Does not change the grammatical structure of the clause and thus loss of meaning is minimal	adjectives, prepositions, conjunctions, etc.

Source: Compiled by this study

Barik's Omissions that affect the meaning of the original message

Type of omission	Reason
Comprehension omission	An interruption in translation or a disjointed speech is observed where omissions "involved larger units of material, resulting in a definite loss in meaning." (p. 123)
Delay omission	Some of what the speakers said did not register with the interpreter who would then wait until a new unit comes out or simply bypass what has been lost. A disjointed speech is observed.
Compounding omission	Some of what the speakers said did not register with the interpreter who would then combined bits and pieces which generates a slightly different meaning.

Source: Compiled by this study

Barik's inconsequential additions

Type of addition	Example/Reason
Qualifier addition	adjectives or adverbs
Elaboration addition	extraneous but unaffected to the speaker's intended message.
Addition of connective	and
Addition of specification	this/that → the
Addition of preposition	Not disruptive
Translation of language-specific items not required in the target language (p. 127)	the

Source: Compiled by this study

Additions that affect the meaning of the original message

Type	Definition
Relationship addition	Some new meaning or relationship is introduced (i.e. causal relationship) but the gist is kept
Closure addition	Insubstantial additions servers to give a closure but its presence may be due to misinterpretation, rephrasing or omission of previous parts of the text that affect the meaning of the message

Source: Compiled by this study

Barik's Inconsequential Substitutions

Type	Reason
Mild phrasing change	The interpretation is slightly changed but the gist of what the speaker said is not affected
Substantial phrasing change	Errors of this type create a somewhat different meaning but the overall gist is retained
Mild semantic error	Some lexical item was inaccurately translated which only changes the intended meaning a bit. "The inaccuracy is restricted to the lexical item or expression, and does not affect the rest of the unit which it is part." (p. 128)

Source: Compiled by this study

Barik's Substitutions that affect the meaning of the original message at word level

Type (at word level)	Reason/Definition
Gross semantic error: Error stemming from assumed misunderstanding by the interpreter	The interpreter misunderstood some lexical item due to "a homonym or near homonym, or because of confusion in reporting with a near-sounding word (p. 128)
Gross semantic error: Error of meaning, not caused by confusion	Substantial semantic errors not likely caused by confusion
Gross semantic error: Error of false reference	Errors of this type "possibly stemming from confusion and having its basis in the text." (p. 128)
Gross phrase change: error due to mistranslation, miscomprehension, lagging or omission of some item	Create a more considerable deviation from the original message (compared to the other type) i.e. "meaningless or confused translation, reversal of meaning, transforming a question into a statement, etc." (p. 132)

Source: Compiled by the study

Appendix :

Questionnaire for the Group of School Directors

Once again thank you for taking time to participate. **This questionnaire aims to reveal the opinions as well as the actual practices of professionals and institutes in the field of interpreting worldwide on the issue of directionality.** The responses you made cannot be linked to you in any ways. Information contained in the reply is solely for the analysis of this research. **An electronic copy of this survey results will be e-mailed to you** by simply making the request as indicated at the bottom of this questionnaire.

Research Supervisors: Prof. *Chung-tien Chou*, Department of English and Director of Mandarin Training Center, National Taiwan Normal University, Taiwan.

Prof. *Tze-wei Chen*, Graduate School of Translation and Interpretation, National Taiwan Normal University, Taiwan.

Thesis Researcher: *Yu-mei Renee Jen*

Graduate School of Translation and Interpretation
National Taiwan Normal University, Taiwan.

Questionnaire

‘A’ language refers to an interpreter’s mother tongue and ‘B’ language is the second active language with which the interpreter has a perfect command although it is not the mother tongue. Please answer the following questions by inserting an ‘x’ in the bracket while some questions may also require a short answer. **Note that the term “interpreting” in this questionnaire refers to simultaneous interpreting but it can include other interpreting modes in general such as consecutive interpreting.**

1. Have you ever heard of the notion suggesting that interpreting into A language is the standard practice?
 Yes
 No
 Other (*Please specify*) :

2. Which interpreting direction does (Name of the School) support?

- Interpreting into A language
- Interpreting into B language
- We support interpreting in both directions
- We do not take a side on this issue
- Other (*Please specify*) :

Please state the reason(s) for your response in Question 2 in details.

Answer:

3. Can (Name of the School) put the interpreting direction as supported strictly into all related practices? (*Please do not answer this question if the response you made in Question 2 was “We support interpreting in both directions” or “We do not take a side on this issue”*).

Yes, we can put it strictly into practice without exceptions.

Yes, we can put it into practice but not strictly without exceptions.

No, we cannot put it into practice.

Other (*Please specify*):

Please explain and state the reason(s) for your response in Question 3 in details.

Answer:

Would you like to receive a copy of the survey results for your future reference through e-mail when this research is concluded?

Yes, please. **No, thank you.** **Other** (*Please specify*):

Questionnaire for the Group of Organization Presidents/Directors

Once again thank you for taking time to participate. **This questionnaire aims to reveal the opinions as well as the actual practices of professionals and institutes in the field of interpreting worldwide on the issue of directionality.** The responses you made cannot be linked to you in any ways. Information contained in the reply is solely for the analysis of this research. **An electronic copy of this survey results will be e-mailed to you** by simply making the request as indicated at the bottom of this questionnaire.

Research Supervisors: Prof. *Chung-tien Chou*, Department of English and Director of Mandarin Training Center, National Taiwan Normal University, Taiwan.

Prof. *Tze-wei Chen*, Graduate School of Translation and Interpretation, National Taiwan Normal University, Taiwan.

Thesis Researcher: *Yu-mei Renee Jen*

Graduate School of Translation and Interpretation
National Taiwan Normal University, Taiwan.

Questionnaire

‘A’ language refers to an interpreter’s mother tongue and ‘B’ language is the second active language with which the interpreter has a perfect command although it is not the mother tongue. Please answer the following questions by inserting an ‘x’ in the bracket while some questions may also require a short answer. **Note that the term “interpreting” in this questionnaire refers to simultaneous interpreting but it can include other interpreting modes in general such as consecutive interpreting.**

1. Have you ever heard of the notion suggesting that interpreting into A language is the standard practice?
 Yes
 No
 Other (*Please specify*) :

2. Which interpreting direction does (Name of the Organization) support?

- Interpreting into A language
- Interpreting into B language
- We support interpreting in both directions
- We do not take a side on this issue
- Other (*Please specify*) :

Please state the reason(s) for your response in Question 2 in details.

Answer:

3. Can (Name of the Organization) put the interpreting direction as supported strictly into all related practices? (*Please do not answer this question if the response you made in Question 2 was “We support interpreting in both directions” or “We do not take a side on this issue”*).

Yes, we can put it strictly into practice without exceptions.

Yes, we can put it into practice but not strictly without exceptions.

No, we cannot put it into practice.

Other (*Please specify*):

Please explain and state the reason(s) for your response in Question 3 in details.

Answer:

Would you like to receive a copy of the survey results for your future reference through e-mail when this research is concluded?

Yes, please. **No, thank you.** **Other** (*Please specify*):

Questionnaire for the Group of Conference Interpreters

Once again thank you for taking time to participate. **This questionnaire aims to reveal the opinions as well as the actual practices of professionals and institutes in the field of interpreting worldwide on the issue of directionality.** The responses you made cannot be linked to you in any ways. Information contained in the reply is solely for the analysis of this research. **An electronic copy of this survey results will be e-mailed to you** by simply making the request as indicated at the bottom of this questionnaire.

Research Supervisors: Prof. *Chung-tien Chou*, Department of English and Director of Mandarin Training Center, National Taiwan Normal University, Taiwan.

Prof. *Tze-wei Chen*, Graduate School of Translation and Interpretation, National Taiwan Normal University, Taiwan.

Thesis Researcher: *Yu-mei Renee Jen*

Graduate School of Translation and Interpretation
National Taiwan Normal University, Taiwan.

Questionnaire

‘A’ language refers to an interpreter’s mother tongue and ‘B’ language is the second active language with which the interpreter has a perfect command although it is not the mother tongue. Please answer the following questions by inserting an ‘x’ in the bracket while some questions may also require a short answer. **Note that the term “interpreting” in this questionnaire refers to simultaneous interpreting but it can include other interpreting modes in general such as consecutive interpreting.**

1. Have you ever heard of the notion suggesting that interpreting into A language is the standard practice?

Yes

No

Other (*Please specify*) :

2. Which interpreting direction do you support?

- Interpreting into A language
- Interpreting into B language
- I support interpreting in both directions
- I do not take a side on this issue
- Other (*Please specify*) :

Please state the reason(s) for your response in Question 2 in details.

Answer:

3. Do you insist on interpreting only in a certain language direction when interpreting assignments are referred to you?

Yes, I do.

No, I do not.

Other (*Please specify*):

Please explain and state the reason(s) for your response in Question 3 in details.

Answer:

Would you like to receive a copy of the survey results for your future reference through e-mail when this research is concluded?

Yes, please. **No, thank you.** **Other** (*Please specify*):

Appendix :

Overview of Responses from the Group of Schools Directors

Response Question 1: *Have you ever heard of the notion suggesting that interpreting into A language is the standard practice?*

N=	7	Yes (85.7%)	No (0%)	Other (14.3%)
S1				v
S2		v		
S3		v		
S4		v		
S5		v		
S6		v		
S7		v		

Source: Compiled by this study

*** S1's reasons for response in Q1 as 'Other':**

“It is widely accepted in the profession (and specifically by its international representative organization, AIIC), that the B into A direction offers greater potential for the highest quality interpretation, on the basis of the definitions of A and B languages. This proviso is key since it assumes that comprehension of the two languages is virtually equivalent, while production into the A language will always draw on much richer resources and therefore will be both more elegant and precise, all other things being equal. Since the difference is mainly due to linguistic resources available for output, the discrepancy between B>A and A>B will be greater for

flowery, literary and polemical speeches (oratory) than for technical or factual, informative discourse.”

***S6’s additional comment in Q1:** *“This is the standard suggested by AIIC, however, interpreters with small languages work in both directions, so in my country this requirement has never been a standard.”*

Response to Question 2: *Which interpreting direction does your school support?*

N= 7	Into A(0%)	Into B(0%)	Both(71.4%)	Do not take a side(14.3%)	Other(14.3%)
S1			✓		
S2			✓		
S3	✓	✓			
S4					✓
S5			✓		
S6			✓		
S7				✓	

Source: Compiled by this study

***S4's response in Q2 as 'Other':** *"We support interpreting into A and B when the quality of the B language justifies this. Otherwise, we support interpreting into A only (in simultaneous)."*

Note: For purpose of convenience, this study is inclined to interpret S3's indication in Q2 as supporting both directions

Reasons for Response in Question 2

S1: *“The market for CH-EN and JA-EN interpretation overwhelmingly requires interpreters to work in both A>B and B>A directions, since unlike the situation with European languages, for example (especially the EU), there is an almost total absence of interpreters with an A in one language (in this case, English). Everything must be done to remedy this imbalance, and to encourage more interpreters to learn additional languages, so that more B>A interpretation can be provided, and relay can be minimised in multilingual conferences (again, a widely shared goal to ensure greater accuracy). However, we are aware that this is a long-term goal.”*

S2: *“Interpreters in our country mainly work towards their A language (dominant language), but must also be able to work occasionally into their B language. But in our School, we do not expect the same proficiency in B than in A.”*

S3: *“Our course for Interpreting aims at students who interpret into their A language from a C language. Interpreting into a B language is not a compulsory part of the exam. We offer a short course separately into B as a part of continues further education. We also offer courses for public service interpreters (community interpreters) who are mainly trained in dialogue interpreting between an A and a B language.”*

S4: *“Interpreting into B is widely practiced and is acceptable as long as quality is maintained. The B must be fluent and precise. The interpreter must be able to convey fully the speaker’s meaning in the target language, whether it is an A or a B.”*

Reasons for Response in Question 2 (Continued)

S5: *“Because the market in our county is small and limited in its financial resources. Therefore one should be able to interpret into both one's A and B languages.”*

S6: *“It is a must for a small language. In our market there are very few non-native interpreters who can work into the native language of our country. EU institutions (EC, Parliament...) try to solve the problem with relay interpreting – which is a method that we also teach in the Institute.”*

S7: *“We do not take a side on this issue because we have different practices for different languages. For European languages, people usually work into their A languages, particularly at international organizations or at conferences in Europe, but even for these interpreters, there are more and more conferences where they are asked to work into both directions. At our school, all students, regardless of their language combinations, work into both directions for consecutive interpretation. For Asian languages, the usual practice is to work into both directions, either for consecutive or simultaneous interpretation.”*

Source: Compiled by this study

Note: For purpose of convenience, this study is inclined to interpret S3's indication in Q2 as supporting both directions

Responses to Question 3: *Can your school put the interpreting direction as supported strictly into all related practices?*

N=	7	Yes (0%)	No (0%)	Other (0%)
S1				(Answer not required because of response made in Q2)
S2				(Answer not required because of response made in Q2)
S3				
S4				(Answer not required because of response made in Q2)
S5				(Answer not required because of response made in Q2)
S6				(Answer not required because of response made in Q2)
S7				(Answer not required because of response made in Q2)

Source: Compiled by this study

***S3's reasons for response in Q3:** Not provided. Further information is added by S3:

“Within the framework of the consortium for the European Masters in Conference Interpreting (EMCI) there has been study concerning “interpreting into B” led by a school in Paris. One can also add that the interpreting services within the European Union emphasis interpreting into A as the main type of interpreting. But they also encourage their interpreters to acquire a B language strong enough to function in interpreting into that B language. It makes it easier to compose interpreting teams that can cover a wide range of languages.”

Note: For purpose of convenience, this study is inclined to interpret S3's indication in Q2 as supporting both directions thus S3's response in Q3 as 'Yes' can be seen as 'not required' as the rest of the respondents in this group.

Overview of Responses from the Group of Conference Interpreters

Responses to Question 1: *Have you ever heard of the notion suggesting that interpreting into A language is the standard practice?*

N=	3	Yes (66.7%)	No (33.3%)	Other (0%)
I1		✓		
I2			✓	
I3		✓		

Source: Compiled by this study

Responses to Question 2: *Which interpreting direction do you support?*

N= 3 Into A(33.3%) Into B(0%) Both(33.3%) Do not take a side(33.3%) Other(0%)

I1

I2

I3

Source: Compiled by this study

Reasons for response in Q2:

I1: *“As a general rule it is always better to interpret into the A language.*

Exceptions to this rule are:

- *interpreting into a strong B, but only from the A language (as opposed to C into B)*
- *interpreting in both directions in the case of languages for which there are no interpreters who can provide interpretation from a given language into the required A language”*

I2: *“In my work as interpreter this is not and has not been an issue in that there has never been any demand/need for Conference interpreting. The nearest to it is whispering interpreting in Court, which I do not equate with Conference interpreting.”*

I3: *“I was taught to interpret in both directions, and it has always been the practice in Mandarin/English interpreting. It is the only way that one would be accepted in the practice.”*

Source: Compiled by this study

Responses to Question 3: *Do you insist on interpreting only in a certain language direction when interpreting assignments are referred to you?*

N=	3	Yes (33.3%)	No (66.7%)	Other (0%)
I1		✓		
I2			✓	
I3			✓	

Source: Compiled by this study

Reasons for response in Question 3

I1: *“In simultaneous interpreting the language combination should always correspond to the cases mentioned above. An exception can be made for liaison interpreting, for example, one-to-one conversations during coffee breaks or meals.”*

I2: *“In interviews with professionals eg doctors, lawyers, social workers, psychologists etc, where most/all my work is done, it would not be practicable to be a uni-directional interpreter. Even if you feel that you are much more comfortable/confident in interpreting in a particular direction, assisting with communication in these situations would be impossible if you were not bi-directional.”*

I3: *“It is not possible to insist a certain direction in the market. There is market mechanism and as a service provider, one should follow the practice.”*

Source: Compiled by this study