

Blasco Mayor, M. J. and del Pozo Triviño, M. 2015. *Legal interpreting at a turning point / La interpretación en el ámbito judicial en un momento de cambio. MonTI (Monografías de Traducción e Interpretación)*, issue No. 7. San Vicent del Raspeig: Publicacions de la Universitat d'Alacant. 293 pages.

Reviewed by Juan Miguel Ortega Herráez

Department of Translation and Interpreting Studies, University of Alicante

It is not a coincidence that the 2015 issue of *MonTI (Monographs in Translation and Interpreting)* issue is devoted to legal interpreting. This field has attracted a growing interest within the Translation and Interpreting Studies community in recent years and has allowed the discipline to widen the scope of interpreting research, which had traditionally revolved essentially around conference interpreting.

MonTI is a result of the joint commitment by the three public higher education centres in the region of Valencia (Spain) that offer degrees in Translation and Interpreting (Universities of Alicante, Valencia and Jaume I). Ever since its first issue saw the light of day back in 2009, *MonTI* has published an annual monograph covering highly-specific aspects within Translation Studies, and thus developing its own niche with regard other peer-reviewed national and international journals. As such, despite its young age, the journal has gained significant international academic recognition and is listed in indexes such as Scopus, Web of Science (ISI), Carhus Plus, Dialnet, ISOC, Latindex and Redalyc. Another salient feature of this refereed journal is its commitment to language diversity, allowing for the publication of contributions in five languages (Spanish, Catalan, French, German and English). Its goal is to produce wide international dissemination of research results and academic debate which it does by producing a hard-copy and online versions in which articles not written in English are accompanied by an English translation.

The 2015 issue is the first monograph entirely devoted to interpreting matters. Contrary to the usual expectations in this field, this issue does not address conference interpreting, but focuses on legal interpreting. Although it can be argued that, from a purely professional standpoint, the origin of both genres, conference interpreting and legal interpreting, can be traced back to the same historical event, i.e., the Nuremberg Trials, they have both followed different paths and reached different degrees of professionalization and recognition. The title of this monograph, *Legal interpreting at a turning point*, illustrates the crossroads at which this genre currently finds itself. This issue contains a broad panorama of contributions made by scholars, researchers and practitioners from Europe (Belgium, Montenegro, Spain and the United Kingdom), Asia (Hong Kong), Oceania (Australia and New Zealand) and America (the United States).

Guest editors María Jesús Blasco (Jaume I University – Castellón) and Maribel del Pozo (University of Vigo) are experienced trainers and researchers in the field of translation and interpreting. They are also active members of the Comunica Network, which acts as an academic observatory on Public Service Interpreting in Spain. In addition, Dr del Pozo has co-ordinated the EU-funded Criminal Justice project SOS-

VICS (Speak out for Support) on interpreting for gender-based violence victims, which has obtained significant impact among stakeholders in the field, while Dr Blasco is actively involved in research projects on interpreting quality. Both have been appointed by the Spanish Conference of Translation and Interpreting University Departments and Schools (CCDUTI) to serve on the academic working group that oversees the transposition of *Directive 2010/64/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council on the right to interpretation and translation in criminal proceedings* into Spanish legislation. In this context, they have liaised with legal interpreter and translator (LIT) professional organisations, ministerial representatives, policy makers and other legal stakeholders, and therefore have a privileged background and insight into the intricacies of legal interpreting which can be clearly seen in the selection of contributions for the issue under review and the topics covered.

Is legal interpreting really at a turning point? If so, where? And in what terms? The first three articles help readers gain overall understanding of the topic under discussion and set the basis for further analysis and debate.

The adoption of the EU Directive 64/2010 is certainly the cornerstone that supports any move for change and progress in legal interpreting, at least in the European Union context. With this idea in mind Erik Hertog, emeritus professor at KU Leuven (Belgium), provides an in-depth and thorough analysis of this Directive that enshrines interpreting and translation in criminal proceedings as a fundamental and procedural right that needs to be safeguarded. He begins with an overview of the EU legislative background and the long and complex process that ultimately led to the adoption of the Directive in its present form. He then analyses the Directive and highlights the challenges its different articles may pose to Member States vis-à-vis its appropriate transposition into national legislation. In this regard, he identifies four sets of hurdles that need to be overcome: 1) Challenges in terms of the rights enshrined (translation and interpreting); 2) Cost issues; 3) Assurance of quality and 4) Administrative challenges that the new regulation may pose, and briefly evokes the transposition procedure, acknowledging that “it is an illusion to think that in most Member States the transposition of the Directive will change the LIT landscape overnight”. Consequently, he encourages the adoption of a long-term approach covering eight incremental steps that will attain the goals defined and respect the spirit of the Directive (working group on LIT; overall strategy and quality chain in LIT; implementing good practice information on Directive; training in LIT; videoconferencing; registers; cost management; involving legal operators in training). Prof Hertog concludes by referring to other EU instruments that enshrine fair trial rights, all of which expressly mention the provision of translation and interpreting services. This paper gives us an idea of the importance of Directive 64/2010 and the triggering and mirroring effect that it may produce in jurisdictions and legal settings other than criminal proceedings.

Unlike what is customary in other journals and special issues of a monographic nature, the guest editors of this issue do not contribute a mere introductory overview of the volume, presenting its general goals and the main ideas contained in the articles submitted by the contributing authors, but offer an in-depth contribution entitled “*Legal*

Interpreting in Spain at a Turning Point”, mirroring the general title of the volume. Their aim is to provide an updated overview of the Spanish situation vis-à-vis legal interpreting against the backdrop of Directive 64/2010. They address issues such as the legal framework prior to the transposition of the Directive and the arrangements made for legal interpreting provision, besides reviewing, bringing together and putting forward various proposals that would eventually contribute to attain the ultimate goal of the Directive, i.e., the right to quality translation and interpreting in criminal proceedings. To that end, Blasco and del Pozo’s paper offers valuable and tangible ideas that academics and trainers, court and legal administrators, policymakers and political authorities could jointly implement when it comes to training (both LITs and legal operators working with LITs) and setting up a sound accreditation system and a register of legal interpreters. They acknowledge the relative complexity of some of these endeavours but are confident of success due to the solid research already conducted. To conclude, they highlight that the main issue still missing is the political will to set up a new system that will fully comply with the mandate of the Directive and truly defend fundamental rights.

Under the title “Strategies for Progress: Looking for Firm Ground”, Ann Corsellis, Vice-President of the Chartered Institute of Linguists (UK) presents a general account of the current situation regarding legal interpreting and indicates the best way forward. Corsellis, who has been at the forefront of initiatives deployed in the United Kingdom to professionalize Public Service Interpreting in the past 30 years, advocates a retrospective strategic analysis to determine which approaches have moved the profession forward and which have not. Given the turning point that legal interpreting is experiencing, at least at EU level, Corsellis recommends, in a fairly pragmatic way and presumably based on her own experience setting up the National Register of Public Service Interpreters, to build the profession on solid ground. She suggests that the robust foundations on which legal interpreting must rest should be composed of three fundamental building blocks: 1) LITs as a community of practice; 2) Public services at “local” level, i.e. the public service employees who need quality language services to accomplish their daily tasks and are in a better position to request the provision of such service from their political authorities; and 3) Academia, through rigorous training and research. These three blocks cannot act independently as if they were watertight compartments and collaboration is crucial to allow for a move forward in the field of legal interpreting. Such a move will undoubtedly be of a bottom-up nature and should be made subject to continuous evaluation to ensure an on-going process.

After this initial contextualisation, the issue continues with a series of articles that cover different aspects of legal interpreting, from the state of affairs in specific countries to the role played by interpreters and legal operators in interpreter-mediated legal encounters, as well as the crucial position of administrative instruments such as LIT registers in the professionalization process.

LIT registers are identified by many as the touchstone for ensuring quality and, subsequently, equality under the law in multilingual criminal proceedings, a principle enshrined in the mandate of section 5 of Directive 64/2010/EU. In this respect, the

contribution by Dr Melissa Wallace (University of Texas at San Antonio, United States) is particularly pertinent, as it provides a thorough overview and analysis of the concept of professional register and related matters on both sides of the Atlantic. The article presents a comparison of the different options, either already implemented or at development stage, both in the United States and in the European Union. According to Wallace, appropriate professional registers have a twofold purpose in the process of professionalization: fighting market disorder/disorientation and ensuring public trust. Registers are an invaluable tool in resolving Catch-22 situations whereby unqualified *ad hoc* interpreters providing low quality services for low fees prevent qualified practitioners from entering the market, thus generating and perpetuating among clients and users a general distrust on the ability of practitioners to provide quality services. Further potential usage for well-constructed and transparent registers may be their utility towards the resistance to outsourcing policies in the procurement of LIT services, which have proven to have undesired effects in many countries, and their potential as ladders for career progression among interpreters. Dr Melissa Wallace calls for setting up and rethinking national registers and places professional LITs, as a community of practice, in the centre of the battlefield to achieve this objective and prevent the profession from being shaped by the unilateral decisions adopted by others.

Dr Jasmina Tatar Andjelic, from the University of Montenegro at Nikšić, discusses legal interpreting in Montenegro analysed against a backdrop of negotiations and requirements for future EU accession. Learning about the LIT situation in smaller countries which, on many occasions, may have not received the merit they deserve, is always insightful. After her detailed presentation of the legal framework regulating legal interpreting and translation both in Montenegro and in the neighbouring Balkan countries, Andjelic highlights the elements that need to be amended to fully comply with the current stipulations and, more importantly, with the spirit of EU law. Some of the elements she identifies are the need for a clearer terminological distinction between the two close but distinct domains of legal translation and legal interpreting; improvement in the selection criteria of aspiring LITs and reconfiguration of certification exams so that translation and interpreting skills are tested; setting up specific training both for LITs and for professionals working with them; introducing a quality control system and fostering the creation of a professional association with all its implications. The diagnosis and suggestions for improvement proposed by Dr Andjelic follow elements of the pattern described in previous contributions, thus confirming that in most countries there are similar problems and similar human and intellectual capacities ready to play a role in taking the profession forward.

The two following sections, authored by Angelelli and Ortiz Soriano, adopt a different approach and focus on the role played by interpreters in very dissimilar legal communicative events. Although court interpreting tends to receive greater attention, there are several other legal settings that are equally challenging and can help gain better understanding of the challenging role played by interpreters in ensuring equality before the law. Part of the value of these two contributions lies in the fact that exploring

interpreter-mediated legal proceedings, other than open court hearings, is not an easy task and access to transcripts, records, etc. is not always possible.

Under the somewhat provocative title “Justice for All? Issues Faced by Linguistic Minorities and Border Patrol Agents during Interpreted Arraignment Interviews”, Professor Claudia Angelelli, now based at Heriot-Watt University (Edinburgh, United Kingdom), explores one particular interpreter-mediated communicative event within the US Border Patrol Agency in San Diego (USA). The case presented stems from a professional assignment in which Dr Angelelli was involved as expert witness. We therefore have the unique opportunity of gaining insight into an interpreted-mediated encounter that normally occurs behind closed doors and would have been, as such, of limited access. The article gives an account of the use of inadequate interpreting solutions and analyses the serious consequences that such an approach may entail. The video-recorded interpreter-mediated event and the official all-English non-verbatim written transcript that resulted from the interpreter’s renditions are subjective to a comparative analysis and, not surprisingly, important discrepancies between them are found. Amongst other factors, Dr Angelelli pays special attention to power differentials between primary speakers in the encounter and how the interpreter interferes in the way such power is portrayed and perceived by the interlocutors involved. It must be noted, with respect to this particular case, that the detention resulting from the interpreted interview was later reversed in the appeal process, partly thanks to the conclusions of the expert report where the performance of the interpreter was called into question. Unfortunately, situations like the one described may occur more often than one would expect – which is all the more shocking if one takes into account the bicultural and bilingual nature of the region analysed, the efforts deployed by the US Border Patrol to increase and improve its language capacity and the experience gained in the US in credentialing judiciary interpreters. Professor Claudia Angelelli acknowledges that one isolated situation may not be representative enough to extract definitive conclusions but argues, nevertheless, that in the case at hand equality before the law was not assured simply because quality interpreting and linguistic diversity were not taken into account.

Adela Ortiz Soriano, benefiting from the wider perspective obtained from her role as practicing interpreter, trainer and graduate student at Universitat Jaume I (Castellón, Spain), embarks on the challenging task of discussing interpreter impartiality during police interrogations in her article entitled “Impartiality in police interpreting”. Police interpreting is still an uncharted field in the Spanish context since accessing data has proven time-consuming and unsuccessful for many researchers. Studies in this particular field of legal interpreting are therefore scarce and rarely discuss interpreter-mediated encounters, brings added value to Ortiz’s contribution. She first discusses the concept of impartiality in Public Service Interpreting, against the backdrop of the existing literature, professional codes of ethics and recommendations issued by different instances. She also provides an overview of working conditions in police interpreting. To overcome the problem of data access, Ortiz decided to carry out an introspective, self-analysis of her performance as a police interpreter during 5 different police interrogations of French speaking sub-Saharan and French detainees assisted by duty

lawyers. She is clearly aware of the limitations and risk of subjectivity and bias the approach taken presents, to the point of admitting, from the outset, that she was not impartial during the assignments. Despite such reservations, this contribution sheds light on the reasons behind the author's own behaviour as police interpreter. Ortiz explores aspects that challenge the impartial model of interpreting and —throughout her admittedly introspective analysis— finds several examples that reveal the existing deviation between what theory and codes of conduct propose, on the one hand, and the daily practice of interpreting in a police station, on the other. Ortiz Soriano, a trained conference interpreter herself, attributes her deviations from the impartial model to one common denominator: the lack of specific training regarding both the interpreter and the police officers. Although she acknowledges that she has not found an answer to the ethical dilemmas that led her to conduct this study, she has been able to highlight the shortcomings of the impartial model of interpreting when it comes to police interpreting in Spain.

Training is an element that has been frequently discussed in Interpreting Studies. As we have seen, the need for specific training in legal interpreting at various levels and with different target audiences is a recurrent element which identified in some, if not all, of the contributions reviewed so far. The third large section of the present volume is composed of articles that specifically address LIT-related teaching and training issues.

The first of these papers provides a smooth transition from professional practice and court interpreters' role to the applicability of research findings to training. Dr Eva Ng (The University of Hong Kong) presents "Teaching and Research on Legal Interpreting: A Hong Kong Perspective", in which she provides a detailed account of the idiosyncratic bilingual nature of the Hong Kong court system (use of both English and Chinese as language of proceedings, interpreting provided for the linguistic majority, presence of many bilingual professionals other than the interpreter). Another peculiarity highlighted is the deployment of a bilingual court reporting system, which undoubtedly adds significant quality control to interpreted proceedings and can provide data and real material for both research and training. In her article, Dr Ng presents the findings of a study in which she explored aspects such as the complexity of delimiting the notion of audienceship, which undoubtedly influences the roles each professional may adopt at given moments. Interactional dynamics and power relations are also impacted by this fact. Likewise, the interpreting techniques resorted to in this atypical bilingual courtroom, especially the use of whispered simultaneous interpreting or *chuchotage*, also influence actors' participation, especially in the case of jury members who are not proficient in English which presents a serious risk as to the proper administration of justice. Based on her findings, Eva Ng presents a number of interesting and timely implications for interpreter training in the Hong Kong context. She also proposes a set of recommendations for court administrators that calls for the introduction of solutions —such as team interpreting and simultaneous interpreting equipment—and which would mitigate the implications of having different bilingual actors in the courtroom. More importantly, a specific call is made for the training of court personnel on how to best work through an interpreter. Dr Eva Ng concludes by highlighting that "quality in

interpreting is a shared responsibility among all parties involved”, thus paraphrasing Ozolins and Sandra Hale (2009). It is Sandra Hale who authors the following contribution, precisely on training for legal operators.

Professor Sandra Hale, University of New South Wales (Australia), is well known for her research into the discourse of court interpreting. Under the title “Approaching the Bench: Teaching Magistrates and Judges How to Work Effectively with Interpreters”, Hale’s article addresses a topic that is key for legal interpreting status recognition. Although her proposal has been developed for the Australian context, it could be easily adapted to the specific situation of other countries or legal systems, hence its usefulness and timeliness within the turning point that the profession is experiencing in the European Union. As discussed in the initial contextualising sections of this volume, the training of court personnel on the specificities of interpreter-mediated proceedings is paramount in the quest for interpreting quality. It is with good reason that Section 6 of Directive 64/2010/EU provides for “those responsible for the training of judges, prosecutors and judicial staff [...] to pay special attention to the particularities of communicating with the assistance of an interpreter so as to ensure efficient and effective communication”. Hale begins by evoking some of the misunderstandings that prevail regarding the interpreting process and setting out some successful ways for interpreting researchers to get their message across to legal professionals. She then proceeds to present and discuss the structure of a 90-minute workshop that she delivered to new magistrates and judges. Although one may think that little can be done or said in 90 minutes given the complexity of legal interpreting, the format suggested by Hale takes attendees straight to the crucial points and provides them with food for thought. According to Hale, this type of action is not just rewarding but also very productive in professional terms, as they have contributed to raising awareness about legal interpreting among those professionals that are in a better position to trigger effective change. She points to collaborative work between different professions as an element that would undoubtedly contribute to quality interpreting.

However quality interpreting also requires future interpreters to be adequately trained, a task that can prove equally challenging as access to data for research. In the last contribution of the volume “Authentic Audiovisual Resources to Actualise Legal Interpreting Education”, Ineke Crezee, Jo Anna Burn and Nidar Gailani, from the Auckland University of Technology (New Zealand) present the results of a small-scale study carried out among their own legal interpreting students to evaluate the usefulness of audiovisual clips during their training. The study is carried out within the framework of a non-language specific training course that makes extensive use of new technologies in an attempt to achieve situated-learning. This paper provides many tips for trainers that need to accommodate different language profiles in the same classroom and who may have difficulties in accessing real court material. The authors’ proposal to confront students with real-life situations revolves around the use of different audiovisual clips of authentic courtroom interactions available on YouTube, each of which illustrates specific points of the course syllabus. As expected, the experiment proved successful since students reported that their awareness about the nature of authentic courtroom

language had increased with the use of the audiovisual clips, and that they preferred these materials to the previous audio-only interpreting clips used in their training. Such a conclusion reinforces the authors' commitment to situated learning through which students have the opportunity to experience everything that might be said, heard or seen in a courtroom.

Legal interpreting at a turning point has been published at the right moment. Guest editors Blasco and del Pozo, with the invaluable support of the MonTI editorial team and an outstanding panel of referees, have assembled a must-read volume which will provide food for thought to a wide audience. It provides researchers in the field of Interpreting in general, and Public Service Interpreting in particular, access to relevant and inspiring research findings, and offers teachers and trainers proposals coming from the different corners of the world. But more importantly, it is a valuable and reliable source of information for public officials and authorities with decision-making powers. This will hopefully lead to legal interpreting being given the status it deserves and benefiting society as a whole. Last but not the least, aspiring and practising LITs, if they truly envisage becoming part of a professional community of practice, will benefit enormously from the diverse and varied contributions that *MonTI* has put together.