
Sharing the Responsibility for Interpreting Quality

*Ludmila Stern**

University of New South Wales
Australia

*Sandra Hale***

University of New South Wales
Australia

Resumen

La calidad de la interpretación es quizás uno de los temas más estudiados en el campo de la interpretación de conferencias. Los dos principales enfoques que han sido utilizados para evaluar la calidad han sido: por un lado, la percepción de los usuarios y, por el otro la comparación analítica del mensaje original con el mensaje traducido (Reithofer, 2013). A pesar de que algunos estudios han investigado los diferentes factores que pueden afectar el rendimiento del intérprete (ver por ejemplo Pöchhacker, 1994; Cooper et al., 1982; van Besien & Meuleman, 2004), hasta el momento no se ha examinado el grado en que los usuarios/oradores perciben el impacto directo que ellos mismos pueden tener en el rendimiento del intérprete, y la responsabilidad que comparten respecto de la calidad de la interpretación. El presente estudio intenta en moderada medida cerrar esa brecha en el conocimiento en cuanto a la relación entre la calidad de la interpretación y la responsabilidad de los oradores, por medio de la investigación de: (a) el conocimiento de un grupo de delegados sobre las necesidades del intérprete

* Doctora. Profesora Asociada y Coordinadora de la Maestría en Interpretación y Traducción de la Escuela de Humanidades y Estudios del Lenguaje en University of New South Wales (Sydney, Australia). Correo electrónico: l.stern@unsw.edu.au

** Doctora en Lingüística. Magíster en Lingüística Aplicada. Diplomada en Educación. Licenciada en Interpretación y Traducción. Profesora de Interpretación y Traducción en University of New South Wales (Sydney, Australia). Correo electrónico: s.hale@unsw.edu.au

Ideas, I, 1 (2015), pp. 79-99

© Universidad del Salvador. Escuela de Lenguas Modernas. Instituto de Investigaciones en Lenguas Modernas. ISSN 2469-0899

a la hora de interpretar y el grado de conciencia sobre su influencia directa en la calidad de la interpretación, y (b) las opiniones de un grupo de intérpretes respecto de cómo son percibidos por los mismos delegados, en las reuniones anuales de la Comisión para la Conservación de Recursos Vivos de la Antártida (CCRVMA).

Palabras clave: interpretación de conferencias, usuarios de servicios de interpretación, calidad de la interpretación, necesidades laborales del intérprete, responsabilidad compartida.

Abstract

The quality of interpreting is among the most thoroughly researched topics in the literature on conference interpreting. The main two approaches taken to assess quality have been: one; to canvass the views and expectations of users of interpreting services and of interpreters themselves, and two; to compare real interpretations with the original speech (Reithofer, 2013). Although a number of studies have investigated the different factors that can affect interpreters' renditions (see Pöchhacker, 1994; Cooper et al., 1982; van Besien & Meuleman 2004), to our knowledge, none has yet explored the users' understanding of their own influence on interpreter performance and their shared responsibility for effective interpreted communication. The current case study attempts to fill that gap in a small measure by investigating (a) the meeting participants' understanding of the interpreters' working needs and of how they influence their performance, and (b) the interpreters' perceptions of the participants' views about them, in the context of the annual meetings of the Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources (CCAMLR).

Keywords: *conference interpreting, interpreter users, quality of interpretation, interpreters' needs, shared responsibility.*

Fecha de recepción: 06-05-2015. **Fecha de aceptación:** 03-06-2015.

Introduction

The Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living

Resources (CCAMLR) is an international organization that works under the auspices of the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Parties. With 25 member states and a further 10 acceding countries, CCAMLR has been working with interpreters since its inception in 1981, in four official languages: English, French, Russian and Spanish. The annual meetings are held on the last week of October and first week of November at CCAMLR's Headquarters in Hobart, Tasmania, Australia, where the Secretariat is permanently located. During the first week, the CCAMLR Scientific Committee (SC) meeting is held. During the second week, the Commission (CC) meets partly to discuss matters based on the SC recommendations. Interpreters have always been an essential part of these meetings and it is arguably the longest single international event held in Australia that employs free-lance conference interpreters. Until 2014 interpreter booths were positioned in the plenary room that can fit approximately 150 participants and were visible to all delegates. More recently, in 2008, interpreters were also hired to interpret for one of the CCAMLR's standing committees, the Standing Committee for Inspection and Compliance (SCIC), which meets concurrently with the Scientific Committee on the first week and had previously not had interpreters. Due to lack of space, the interpreting for this committee is conducted remotely, via video link in another room. This case study has not looked into the differences between the two setups, but has concentrated on the main interpreting that takes place in the plenary room, where the interpreters are visible to all the participants. One important characteristic of these meetings has been the ongoing relationship between the delegates and the interpreters, most of whom have worked continually for many years and have become known to the delegates and well acquainted with the content and structure of the meetings. The interpreters enjoy good working conditions, including the provision of all the same documents as the delegates ahead of time, in order to prepare. During the meeting, reference is made to different working papers and at times delegates read directly from the various documents. There is also a team of translators who work for the Secretariat. As the topics discussed are highly specialized, including fisheries, marine ecosystems, biostatistics, etc., and the speech genres range from extemporaneous exchanges between members on technical topics to legal and diplomatic speeches, the interpreters are guided by the terminology used by the translators and they attempt to use it consistently. Nevertheless, new terminology arises every year, and

interpreters are confronted with terms that are not found in their glossaries or specialized dictionaries. This usually leads to discussions with the relevant delegates to ascertain their meanings and equivalents in the other languages. Such close interactions with the delegates inevitably increase their awareness of interpreters and their work. Another characteristic of this group of interpreters is that they work in teams of three in recognition of the duration of the conference and the demanding nature of interpreting in the multidisciplinary field.

Although the working conditions for interpreters at CCAMLR seem to be ideal, not all delegates are aware of the way their own delivery impacts on the quality of the interpretation, and of interpreters' needs. Since no research has ever been conducted on interpreting issues in this very specialized setting, the authors of this paper, who have been working as Russian and Spanish interpreters for CCAMLR since 1989 and 1991 respectively, conducted a study in 2009 with the permission of the CCAMLR Executive Secretary. The study was also approved by the University of New South Wales's Human Ethics Research Committee.

This case study aimed to investigate: first, the delegates' awareness of interpreters and their working needs, and their perception of their own influence on interpreting quality; in other words, whether they understood that they shared some of the responsibility for the success of the interpreted communication, a point that has not been explored in previous studies about user expectations or quality of conference interpreting. Second, the study also aimed to discover the interpreters' views of the way the delegates' speech performance affects their work and of the delegates' awareness of their presence and professional needs. In other words, the study sought to look at the interaction between all the participants involved and their awareness of each other's influence on the quality of the interpretations.

Previous research into conference interpreting quality has focused on delegates' and interpreters' expectations of interpreters' performance, and assessments of interpreter quality based on a number of different criteria, including, among others, faithfulness of content, correct use of technical language, and quality of delivery (see Bühler, 1986; Kurz,

2001; Ng, 1992; Moser, 1995; Shlesinger et al., 1997; Vuorikoski, 1998; Collados Aís, 1998; Kahane, 2000; Pochhacker, 2001; Rennert, 2010; Zwischenberger, 2010; Diriker, 2011). Few studies, however, have explored conference delegates' awareness of interpreters' professional needs or of their own impact on interpreting quality. The general perception among users seems to be that interpreters are fully responsible for the quality of their work. One AIIC survey (Moser, 1995) suggested that while some delegates recognized interpreters' professional pressures and stress caused by various factors (such as intense concentration, speed and adaptation to speaker, constant knowledge update and simultaneous listening, processing and speaking), their references to interpreters were not infrequently phrased in negative terms. Delivery flaws such as the lack of synchronicity and long pauses, inaccurate use of terminology, unsatisfactory use of microphone and even the lack of trust in interpreting quality (Moser, 1995; Vuorikoski, 1998, p. 187) were referred to as "irritants". Interestingly, delegates also tended to attribute blame for imperfections of interpreted delivery to interpreters and not the original speakers, something that can be described as "interpreter scapegoating". Interpreters were often blamed for the original speakers' poor rhetorical and presentational skills, mistakes, poor quality of speech content (Moser, 1995), and opaqueness in the message (Ng, 1992, p. 37).

In the context of community interpreting, the need to raise awareness about speakers sharing the responsibility for quality of interpreting was the theme of the 5th Critical Link International Conference in Sydney in 2007 (see Hale, Ozolins, & Stern, 2009). Ozolins & Hale (2009) make the strong point that interpreters cannot be held solely responsible for ensuring quality and that speakers need to realise that the way they speak has a direct effect on the way interpreters interpret. Similar claims have been made in relation to poor working conditions in court interpreting (Colin & Morris, 1996; Gaiba, 1998; Hale, 2011; Hale & Stern, 2011; Stern, 1995, 2001, 2012). The best qualified, most competent interpreter may not be able to interpret adequately if the working conditions are not conducive to performing at their optimum level. This means that often, despite the interpreters' best efforts, the quality of interpreting will suffer. Despite this fact, as Vuorikoski points out, virtually no studies about interpreting quality relate criticisms of simultaneous interpreting to "features in the communication situation that

were beyond the interpreters' control" (Vuorikoski, 1998, p. 192).

Some studies have sought to identify the factors that impact on interpreter quality. Cooper et al. (1982) carried out a study that surveyed conference interpreters from three cities (Strasbourg, Brussels and Geneva) about their main sources of stress. The factors these interpreters identified that can be directly linked to the speakers were: "the delegates' use or misuse of microphones", "inconsideration on the part of the delegates" and "incompetent speakers" (Cooper, Davies & Tung 1982, pp. 97-99). The most relevant of these to our study is "inconsideration on the part of the delegates". The interpreters in this study reported as examples of lack of consideration, when speakers read from a text that was not provided to the interpreters in advance; speed of delivery: reading at very high speeds, or conversely, speaking very slowly; being used as scapegoats in political meetings; and not acknowledging them at the end of the session. As will be seen, some of these concerns were shared by the interpreters in our study, even in a setting where much good will has been shown by the organisation over many years.

Experimental research has provided some evidence of the link between the speakers' behaviour and quality of interpreting. Speed of delivery, for example, has been shown to be a major factor affecting the interpreter's performance (see Shlesinger, 2003). Another major factor is sentence complexity (see Meuleman & Van Besien, 2009). Language competence, including speaker accent, use of vocabulary and correct syntax, has also been cited as affecting interpreting quality. Reithofer (2013) speaks of the increasing trend to use English as a *lingua franca*, which means that many delegates whose first language is not English may not be able to express themselves very well. A number of studies have cited this as a major problem for interpreters, who may have difficulties understanding the speaker and in turn produce an inadequate rendition in the target language (see Neff, 2008; Pöchhacker, 1994).

Attempts have been made to educate speakers about how to best work with interpreters. One such example is the European Commission's "Tips for speakers", which include all of the factors we have mentioned above (EU DG Interpretation http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/scic/working-with-interpreters/tips-for-speakers/index_en.htm; see also Phelan, 2001).

However, little is known about how much such guidelines are read by those who use interpreting services and how much speakers know about their share in the responsibility of producing a quality interpreted product. In the absence of data-based knowledge about conference delegates' awareness about interpreters' requirements, the researchers undertook a case study with the aim of comparing what has been known anecdotally with empirical data. Despite its limited scope, this study aims to make a small contribution towards filling this gap in the knowledge by presenting the results of two surveys, a focus group discussion, and observations conducted in the context of a small international meeting.

Methodology

The study consisted of four parts: a short questionnaire for the delegates, a short questionnaire for the interpreters containing counterpart questions, a focus group discussion with the nine interpreters who worked at CCAMLR (all undertaken in 2009) and observations from the booths by the two authors while their team members were interpreting (2009-2010 and a 2012 follow-up observation).

Permission was granted by the CCAMLR Executive Secretary to distribute the questionnaires in the delegates' pigeon holes on the first day of each week, as different delegates attend the different meetings each week. An information sheet about the study was attached to the questionnaire. As the delegates are constantly receiving excessive amounts of reading material at these meetings, we anticipated a low response rate, and most probably only from those who are interested in interpreting issues. We therefore do not claim representativeness of the sample and cannot generalize the results to the whole population of CCAMLR delegates, which we estimate to be over 100. Similarly, we do not claim representativeness to any population beyond our limited sample of twenty one. The interpreters were also invited to complete the questionnaire, and six interpreters participated in the study. The responses of the two groups were later compared to ascertain whether the two groups coincided on their perceptions of each other. The questionnaires consisted of both closed and open-ended questions. The survey questions

were based on the authors' vast experience interpreting at the CCAMLR meetings, as well as on previous similar studies. The answers were later entered into the survey software package "QuestionPro" for quantitative analysis.

The interpreters and delegates were further invited to participate in a focus group discussion towards the end of week one, however, only the interpreters agreed to participate in this phase of the study and consequently, the researchers were unable to have follow up discussions with the delegates. All of the interpreters had worked for CCAMLR before, ranging from 1 to 20 years. They all willingly participated after reading the information sheet and signing a consent form. The discussion was audio recorded and later transcribed and analyzed, and used to complement the results of the survey. The observations took place during both weeks, by both authors, over two years, with a follow-up observation in 2012, using observation pro-formas devised by the authors. The results were later triangulated, with the main data source being the questionnaires. The purpose of the observation was to compare the delegates' and interpreters' responses with the actual performance of the delegates during the meetings.

Results and Discussion

Before asking the delegates about their awareness of their own influence on the interpretation, it was necessary to firstly ascertain their awareness of the presence of the interpreters. Angelelli (2004), in a study of interpreters' role in conference, medical and court interpreting, found that conference interpreters were the most invisible compared to medical and court interpreters who use the consecutive mode and interact directly with the speakers. In the context of CCAMLR, these conference interpreters are not as invisible as those who participate in very large conferences and are placed in booths that are out of view of the delegates. However, neither are they as visible as consecutive interpreters in other settings. We therefore expected these delegates to be more aware of interpreter presence than in other larger, more impersonal conferences.

Therefore, the first question asked delegates if they were conscious of the fact that they were being interpreted as they were speaking. Unsurprisingly, the majority of the delegates (19/21) said yes, and only two said no, and some of them also stated that sometimes forget. The interpreters' perception was slightly different; with a lower proportion (4/6) believing that delegates were aware of them, one (1/6) believing they were not and one stating that it depends on the delegate, with the French-speaking delegates being more aware than their English speaking counterparts. One of the interpreters in the focus group gave an example of a delegate being "excessively" aware of the interpretation, to the point of making the interpreter's job more difficult, as expressed in the following quote:

He can speak English very well. He listens to it, and he waits. So, when you finish that sentence, then he goes on. Sometimes, it's a bit off-putting because you want to change things around... but he does that, I am sure, maybe because he wants to make sure that it's being interpreted properly, and I also remember hearing (...) "slow down, you're going too fast" by his colleague. (*Interpreter comment in focus group discussion*)

When asked the corroborating question on whether delegates sometimes forget that they are being interpreted as they speak, a much higher percentage (10/21) admitted that they do, while a lower percentage of interpreters (2/6) agreed with the same statement. Our observations from the booth in 2009-2010 noted that the Chairs did not instruct the delegates on how to work with interpreters at the start of the session, so whether delegates became aware of interpreters and their needs depended on their own individual experience and knowledge. However, the Chairs always thanked the interpreters when breaks were shortened, when they agreed to work overtime and at the conclusion of the meeting, when they were also praised on the quality of their work, often to the acclaim of the delegates. We also observed that some Chairs and delegates came to greet interpreters in their booths before and during the conference and to personally thank them. Evidence of the delegates' awareness of interpreter presence resulting from the 2012 follow-up observations included non-

verbal signs from those conference participants who were in close proximity to the booths. For example, the Governor of Tasmania who attended the Opening ceremony, the Chairs of the Scientific Committee and the Commission, and the Executive Secretary made eye contact with interpreters in the booths to greet them as they walked to their seat on the podium, nodded and smiled in acknowledgement and appreciation or signalled through gestures when no interpretation could be heard or when the interpretation was transmitted through the wrong channel. In these instances interpreters were acknowledged through the Chairs of the meetings initiating a contact with them for phatic reasons or to convey a message, something that also happens at the International Court for the Former Yugoslavia (see Hajdu, 2009, on ICTY). This is in contrast with the experience of other interpreters in other settings who have complained about lack of acknowledgement, as discussed above.

The next question in the questionnaire under this section was if delegates observe the interpreters while they are working in their booths. A not insignificant percentage (9/21) stated that they do. This is a similar result to that found by a previous study which found that about half of the respondents who were conference delegates, had ever looked into the interpreters' booth (Moser, 1995). In contrast, none of the interpreters was convinced that they were observed; one said that they are sometimes observed under certain circumstances, and another one stated that it does not happen at CCAMLR but it often happens at even smaller conferences or meetings with less than 50 delegates.

Another question that relates to the concept of awareness of the interpreter's presence is whether anything about the interpreters' performance or demeanour bothers the delegates. Once again, the result was not surprising, with an overwhelming 20 out of 21 delegates stating that nothing bothers them. However, when asked if anything irritates them, a slightly lower number (18/21) said no. Some delegates provided open answers with regards to what irritates them, which appear in Table 1. Some concerned the interpreters' body language (#1), confirming that interpreters are being observed in the booth by the delegates; others related to interpreters' level of accuracy (#2 & #3), including the manner of delivery, which indicates they are being monitored; and

other comments were on technical glitches (#4) or technical aspects of interpreting (#5). One delegate (#6) commented that s/he has developed tolerance to interpreters over the years, which supports some of the interpreters' comments during the focus group discussion that the more experienced delegates are more aware of them and of their needs.

Table 1 Aspects of interpreting that irritate delegates
1. When interpreters look perplexed
2. When the interpreter adds his/her own emotion rather than accurately rendering the original
3. There was some experience with an interpreter whose manner was irritating
4. When the wrong language comes through from the wrong channel
5. When there is a long lag between the speaker and the interpreter starting to interpret
6. Maybe 10 years ago, but now I see myself as a problem. One develops tolerance with age. I see an interpreter as an interlocutor.

Similar to previous surveys, the current responses comment on the annoyance caused by any time lag between the original and the interpretation but make no comments about the use of correct terminology and voice features (e.g., Mackintosh, 1995). The results of our questionnaire also include comments about the interpreters' body language and manner of delivery absent in other studies.

The interpreters were in turn asked if they thought the speakers felt frustrated by their interpretation, a question that elicited a split response, with 50% saying yes, and 50% saying no. They were also asked if they believed the delegates who were listeners rather than speakers, felt frustrated with their interpretations. To this question, 4/6 said "no" and 2/6 said "yes". The interpreters were asked to elaborate on their response and they cited poor quality of interpretation, but did not seem to be aware of other aspects of potential irritation, such as their body language, or their manner of speech. On the other hand, the interpreters identified some aspects of the delegates' behaviour that frustrated or irritated them (see Table 2), all of which corroborate what has been identified in previous studies (e.g., Cooper, Davies, & Tung, 1982).

Table 2 Aspects of delegates' speech and behaviour that frustrate interpreters
1. When delegates switch languages as they are speaking
2. When delegates speak in poor English instead of their mother tongue
3. When delegates speak too fast
4. When delegates' speech lacks coherence
5. When delegates read, especially at high speeds
6. When delegates use the interpreter as a scapegoat

As discussed above, these quotations point to interpreting difficulties generated by the speakers that are beyond the interpreters' control. In reference to #1, one interpreter gave the following example:

One of the culprits is a delegate where he switches from Spanish to English and, when he feels like it, into French, and he doesn't realize the difficulty he's causing for the interpreters by doing that.
(Interpreter comment in focus group discussion)

Example 2 is an obvious illustration of a delegate forgetting that he is being interpreted and unconsciously switching from one language to another. Other delegates, however, according to these interpreters, deliberately avoid using interpreters (*see the quote below*), a comment that echoes Vuorikoski's (1998) findings regarding the speakers' lack of confidence in the interpreters' competence or Reithofer's (2013) analysis of the increasing tendency to use English as a lingua franca at international conferences. "I've heard some say: 'we don't like interpreters'. We prefer to speak directly." (*Interpreter comment in focus group discussion*)

This practice causes problems for interpreters if the delegate's second language competence is not very high and they need to interpret into the target language from often ungrammatical or poorly pronounced speech. Such an attitude also demonstrates a lack of understanding of the interpreted event, as interpreters still need to interpret, regardless of the language the delegate chooses to use, because in this case, there are four official languages. In relation to these issues, the interpreters suggested that delegates should be educated on how to work with interpreters and that the Chairs must take

a more active role in ensuring that the communication flow is conducive to interpretation. For example, if a delegate switches between three languages, it may well be that three different interpreters will need to interpret, making it very cumbersome for the interpreters and for those listening. These are issues that need to be understood by those being interpreted.

The next set of questions related to the concept of shared responsibility for quality of interpreting. During the focus group discussion, the interpreters identified two themes: (a) the already existing feeling of team work between conference organisers, interpreters and delegates at CCAMLR, which is very particular to this context, and (b) the interpreters' wish to "train" the delegates to use accommodating tactics to help them perform at an optimum level. Interpreters listed the already existing instances of accommodation strategies by the speakers and Chairs; for example, some delegates approach the booths to alert the interpreters that they were about to intervene, some informally provide their written statement to the relevant booth in advance, alert the audience about a joke forthcoming, pace the speech for the interpreters during the presentation and the Chair sometimes requests that the speaker slow down, or wait for the interpreter to finish the phrase before continuing to speak. One respondent reported that the Chair would approach the booth every now and again, to ask: "is the convenor going too fast?" Nevertheless, the interpreters still believed that delegates needed to be "trained" to be able to work with interpreters more adequately, because such behaviour was not universal and tended to originate mainly from two types of delegates, those who were more experienced, and those who were mostly non-English speaking.

The questions in the questionnaires under this theme aimed at ascertaining whether the delegates laid all the responsibility of effective communication on the interpreters, or whether they attributed some of the blame to the original speakers of the utterances, including themselves. Consistent with previous findings (Cooper, Davies, & Tung, 1982; Moser, 1995), the interpreters in the focus group thought that blame for errors in communication was always attributed to interpreters ("interpreter scapegoating") or that delegates hid "behind the interpreter as a deliberate tactic", as expressed by one interpreter in the quote below: "They don't want to lose face. And what do they do? They blame the interpreter, of course." (*Interpreter comment in focus group discussion*)

However, we found that not all delegates consistently blamed interpreters. The first question in the delegates' questionnaire under this theme was: "When the interpreted version of another speaker's intervention is confusing or incoherent, do you attribute this to the interpreter's incompetence, the original speaker's lack of eloquence, both or other?" Contrary to interpreters' expectations, 13 delegates out of 21 blamed the original speaker, with only 2 solely blaming the interpreter and 4 blaming "both". The other two chose "other" or "neither". Open explanations were provided to supplement the closed answers. These included that the speaker may be speaking or reading too fast and the interpreter is unable to keep up; that the speaker is speaking in his or her second language; or that it is simply due to the task being too complex. These responses show awareness on the part of at least some of the speakers who admit that they can contribute to inadequate interpretation, with such a humble attitude being in contrast with the interpreters' somewhat negative perceptions of delegates using the interpreter as a scapegoat. However, as mentioned before, the poor response rate means that the results cannot be representative of all delegates.

This leads us to the next set of questions about the delegates' awareness of interpreter needs and their actions to help interpreters perform adequately. In other words, these questions address the issue of how responsible delegates felt as speakers for the success of the interpreted interaction and whether they had used any accommodating tactics. The first question under this theme was if they were aware of the interpreters' needs in order to interpret accurately, to which 17 delegates replied "yes" and 4 "no". When we looked at the open answers it became apparent that some delegates misunderstood this question to mean "What do interpreters need to do?" A number of them replied that they needed to interpret accurately, and concentrate and listen carefully. This misunderstanding may have been caused by a flaw with the original question or possibly by the respondents' non-native English competence. Those who understood the original intention of the question stated that interpreters needed the speakers to speak slowly, clearly, logically and coherently. Some also mentioned that interpreters needed copies of any written documents that would be presented, discussed or read in the meeting. A number admitted that although they are aware of these needs, they do not always do what they should to help interpreters. Although there were some encouraging answers, they comprised less

than half of the sample, which in real numbers represents fewer than ten delegates. Interestingly, a higher proportion of interpreters (4/6), believed that delegates were aware of their needs, and only one interpreter thought they were not, and one interpreter did not respond.

The next question was whether delegates were proactive about facilitating the interpreting process, to which 17 delegates said “yes” and 4 said “no”. The ones who said “yes” elaborated on their answers by describing accommodating tactics such as generally trying to speak more slowly and clearly, thinking about what they are about to say carefully so it is expressed clearly and coherently, pausing and speaking in short, concise sentences. These practices are of course good not only for interpreters but also for everyone else listening to the speech, and especially for those whose first language is not English or one of the official Commission languages, as they must listen to English without the aid of interpreters. Some specific actions suggested by the delegates included explaining technical details to interpreters before an intervention outside of the room; providing written statements before reading them and repeating interventions twice, to make sure they were understood. Table 3 presents open answers from different delegates that show a high level of awareness and respect for the work of the interpreter:

1.	I feel I need to speak clearly, slowly, and concisely. I also feel that I need to make my main point twice so that the interpreters and listeners can hear my message more than once. I also try not to make jokes because I feel these are difficult to interpret.
2.	Clarity with which speakers express their thought. Speakers must express their thought clearly, in short sentences and completed ideas.
3.	a. Think before you start speaking.
	b. Speak slowly & clearly, making pauses between phrases.
	c. While speaking try to listen how the interpreter is doing her work. That helps!
	d. If you have a prepared text of your statement, give it to the interpreter beforehand.
	e. Remember: the interpreter is your great assistant in negotiations. S/he is a shield for you to hide behind. S/he helps you to gain time: a second, two or three. Sometimes that’s crucial.

Response 3 is interesting because it supports some of the prejudices against using interpreter services for the benefit of the person being interpreted. This delegate states in his/her last point that the interpreter can be used to their own advantage, to assist in negotiations by hiding behind them and by gaining extra time.

Although these comments from some of the delegates reflect a high level of awareness about interpreters' needs, there is likely to be a gap between what they say and what they do, as some of them have admitted. Indeed, our observations over three years include very few instances of delegates consistently speaking slowly and clearly, with the exception of only one or two delegates who are very experienced and were probably two of the respondents of the survey. We observed that the majority of speakers tended to increase their speed, especially under time pressure, and some did not slow down even after the request by the Chair.

The interpreters, however, all agreed that delegates tend to accommodate for them, although not always very successfully. In the open answers, they stated that some delegates accommodate sometimes by slowing down, repeating the technical terms in English if they are speaking another language and providing them with written statements. One interpreter, however, expressed annoyance at the practice of some delegates of repeating themselves. Whereas one of the delegates commented that he repeated himself in an attempt to help interpreters.

The final question on the questionnaire was whether speakers accommodated for the interpreter when reading, and again, most delegates (16/21) said "yes", and only 4 said "no", leaving one missing response. Many of the open answers demonstrated an understanding of interpreters' needs. They stated that they try to read slowly and clearly, with an adequate intonation; and that they hand interpreters the text in advance and indicate the paragraph number from which they will be reading so interpreters can follow. One stated that they do not accommodate because they expect interpreters to have the translated version of the text in front of them. Nevertheless, as we pointed out above, even when delegates are aware of what they must do to help interpreters, they often forget to put it into practice, especially when they are reading, as the following quote indicates:

I try to go slowly & indicate where I am in the document (or indicate the paragraphs to which sections of the document I refer). I also try to take pauses to allow the interpreters (& everyone) to catch up. I must admit that it is easier to lose track of the interpreters' needs when I am reading from a document rather than speaking from a short list of bullet points to guide my thinking. It seems that the latter provides a more natural speed, cadence, etc, that, by watching the body language of the interpreters, seems easier to deal with. (*Quote from delegate open response*)

Our own observations have also shown that, while the CCAMLR Secretariat provides interpreters with all the tabled documents, often in all four official languages, both prior to and during the conference, there were only isolated examples of delegates providing interpreters with the written text of their un-tabled statements before reading them. Furthermore, delegates largely would not adjust their speed when reading from these written statements. Over a period of ten days of observations in 2009, only two delegations who are regular CCAMLR participants provided the interpreters with un-tabled written statements before they read them. Other speakers who made interventions, mostly observers from other organisations, did not provide any documents. Those who adjusted their speed did so either when reminded by the Chair or, as was the case with one of the observers, after the delegates' questionnaire had been distributed. Furthermore, when delegates read directly from reports with numbered paragraphs, only occasionally would they cite the paragraph number before reading it. This occurred more systematically during the adoption of the Reports of the different committees. In these instances, delegates did it for the benefit of both their fellow delegates as well as the interpreters. At times, delegates would signal their awareness of the interpreters by explicitly stating "for the benefit of the interpreters" before citing the text that they were about to read. In most cases, however, after mentioning the document, speakers would not allow time to search for it and started reading immediately. This led to much frustration among the interpreters who wasted time trying to look for the selected paragraphs in order to follow at very

high reading speed. We also observed that some delegates, including the Chair, were very considerate of the interpreters at the beginning of the meeting, but as the meeting progressed and time became of the essence, their speed of delivery increased and their consideration for the interpreters faltered.

Conclusion

This paper reported on the results of a small survey of delegates and interpreters working together in the context of annual international meetings of the Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources (CCAMLR). The response rate was very low and the sample size very small. We therefore do not claim any representativeness and consider this to be a case study. However, since this is the first data-based study to be conducted on interpreting in this very specialised and particular setting, we believe that the results are useful, both to generate further research questions and to inform best practice guidelines for working with interpreters in this setting. The main method of data collection was via a written questionnaire, which consisted of closed and open-ended questions. This was supplemented by a focus group discussion with the interpreters and observations from the authors who were working in the booth. The main aim of the study was to ascertain the delegates' awareness about interpreters and their needs, and their influence on interpreting quality. The study also set out to determine interpreters' perceptions of delegates' awareness and attitudes about them and their work.

The results of this small case study showed that most of the delegates who responded were aware of interpreters' needs and of their influence on the quality of interpreting. Such high levels of awareness seemed to be more likely with those who had had experience with interpreters and whose first language was not English. Their stated tactics for more effective communication through interpreters included modifying the structure, delivery and speed of their speech, and facilitating the interpreters' task by providing written materials and making reference to materials that are read out for ease of understanding. However, the study shows that even when delegates were aware of interpreters' needs

and expressed good will to accommodate them, only occasionally were they able to adhere to their own beliefs and meet these needs. Further, the study shows that there is a discrepancy between the delegates' perceptions of their actions to accommodate interpreters and the interpreters' experience in this regard. Thus, the use of accommodation tactics outlined by the delegates in their questionnaires was not always corroborated by the interpreters' responses or our own observations, which provided only isolated cases of consistent implementation of such tactics. However, as there are many more delegates contributing to the meetings than respondents to the questionnaire, it may very well be that only a minority share this high level of awareness. We therefore believe that more needs to be done to educate delegates on how to effectively work with interpreters. In response to this, we have prepared a fact sheet on working with interpreters in CCAMLR, which contains simple dot points and is added to the delegates' package. In 2014, the Commission had this fact sheet translated in all the four languages of the Commission and displayed it on its Members website. Finally, we suggested that the Chairs of the meetings make an announcement at the start of each session and maintain better control of the pace and speed of the meeting in order to help interpreters perform to their optimum level. Overall, speakers in conference settings must come to the realization that the quality of the interpretation will depend largely on their own speech performance and ability to work with interpreters and therefore they must share the responsibility for effective bilingual communication.

References

- Angelelli, C.V. (2004). *Revisiting the interpreter's role: a study of conference, court, and medical interpreters in Canada, Mexico, and the United States*. Vol. 55: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Bühler, H. (1986). Linguistic (semantic) and extra-linguistic (pragmatic) criteria for the evaluation of conference interpretation and interpreters. *Multilingua*, 5(4), 231-235.
- Colin, J. & Morris, R. (1996). *Interpreters and the legal process*. Winchester: Waterside Press.

- Collados Aís, A. (1998). *La evaluación de la calidad en interpretación simultánea. La importancia de la comunicación no verbal*. Granada: Comares.
- Cooper, C.L., Davies, R. & Tung, R.L. (1982). Interpreting stress: Sources of job stress among conference interpreters. *Multilingua*, 5(4), 97-107.
- Diriker, E. (2011). User Expectation Surveys: Questioning findings and drawing lessons for interpreter training. *IÜ Çeviribilim Dergisi (IU Journal of Translation Studies)*, 2(3).
- Gaiba, F. (1998). *The origins of simultaneous interpretation: The Nuremberg Trial*: University of Ottawa Press.
- Gerver, D. (1969). The effects of source language presentation rate on the performance of simultaneous conference interpreters. Paper read at Proceedings of the 2nd Louisville Conference on rate and/or frequency controlled speech.
- Hajdu, N. (2009). Interpreter visibility in ICTY courtrooms (unpublished). In *International Association of Forensic Linguistics 9th Biennial Conference on Forensic Linguistics/Language and Law*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands.
- Hale, S. (2011). Interpreter policies, practices and protocols in Australian Courts and Tribunals. A national survey. Melbourne: Australian Institute of Judicial Administration.
- Hale, S., Ozolins, U. & Stern, L. (Eds.) (2009). *Critical Link 5. Quality in interpreting: A shared responsibility*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins P/C.
- Hale, Sandra, and L. Stern. (2011). Interpreter quality and working conditions: Comparing Australian and international courts of justice. *Judicial Officers Bulletin*, 23(9), 1.
- Kahane, E. (2000). Thoughts on the Quality of Interpretation. AIIC.
- Kurz, I. (2001). Conference Interpreting: Quality in the Ears of the User. *Journal des Traducteurs*, 42(2), 394-409.
- Mackintosh, J. (1995). Portrait of the 'ideal' interpreter as seen through delegates' eyes. *AIIC Bulletin*, 23(3), 61-63.
- Meuleman, C. & Van Besien, F. (2009). Coping with extreme speech conditions in simultaneous interpreting. *Interpreting* no. 11 (1):20-34.
- Moser, P. (1995). Survey on Expectations of users of conference interpretation. Final report. Vienna: AIIC.

- Neff, J.S. (n/d). *A statistical portrait of AIIC: 2005-06 2008* [cited 2008 Spring]. Available from aiic.net/ViewPage.cfm/article2127.htm.
- Ng, B.C. (1992). End users' subjective reaction to the performance of student interpreters. *The Interpreters' Newsletter* no. 1 (Special Issue):35-41.
- Phelan, M. (2001). *The Interpreter's Resource*. Clevedon; Buffalo: Multilingual Matters.
- Pöchhacker, F. (1994). Quality assurance in simultaneous interpreting. In *Teaching translation and interpreting 2: Insights, aims, visions.*, edited by C. Dollerup and A. Lindegaard, 233-242. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Pochhacker, F. (2001). Quality assessment in conference and community interpreting. *Meta*, 46(2), 410-425.
- Reithofer, K. (2013). Comparing modes of communication. *Interpreting*, 15(1), 48-73.
- Rennert, S. (2010). The impact of fluency on the subjective assessment of interpreting quality. *The Interpreters' Newsletter*, 15, 105-115.
- Shlesinger, M. (2003). Effects of presentation rate on working memory in simultaneous interpreting. *The Interpreters' Newsletter*, 15, 37-49.
- Shlesinger, M., Déjean, K., Kurz, I., Mack, G., Cattaruzza, L., Nilsson, A., Niske, H., Pöchhacker, F. & Viezzi, M. (1997). Quality in simultaneous interpreting. In *Conference interpreting: Current trends in research*, edited by Gambier, Y., Gile, D., & Taylor, C., 123-132. Amsterdam: John Benjamina.
- Stern, L. (1995). Non-English Speaking Witnesses in the Australian legal context: The War Crimes Prosecution as a case study. *Law/Text/Culture*, 2, 6-31.
- Stern, L. (2001). At the Junction of Cultures: Interpreting at the International Criminal tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia in the Light of Other International Interpreting Practices. *The Judicial Review* no. 5 (3):255-274.
- Stern, L. (2012). What Can Domestic Courts Learn from International Courts and Tribunals about Good Practice in Interpreting?: From the Australian War Crimes Prosecutions to the International Criminal Court. *T & I Review*, 2, 7-30.
- van Besien, F. & Meuleman, C. (2004). Dealing with Speakers' Errors

and Speakers' Repairs in Simultaneous Interpretation: A Corpus-based Study. *The Translator*, 10(1), 59-81.

Vuorikoski, A. (1998). User responses to simultaneous interpreting. In *Unity in Diversity? Current Trends in Translation Studies*, edited by Lynne Bowker, Michael Cronin, Dorothy Kenny and Jennifer Pearson, 184-197. Manchester, St. Jerome Publishing.

Zwischenberger, C. (2010). Quality criteria in simultaneous interpreting: an international vs. a national view.