

ББК 71.4я43
В 11

Published by approval of the St Petersburg School
of Conference Interpreting and Translation, and the Inter-
national Publications Council of the Herzen State Peda-
gogical University of Russia

English text edited by William Hackett-Jones, Eclectic Translations

Взаимопонимание в многоязычном мире: культура, язык,
B11 перевод: Сб. статей в честь профессора И. С. Алексеевой /
Под ред. С. А. Гончарова и А. М. Антоновой. СПб.: Изд-во РГПУ
им. А. И. Герцена, 2014. — 184 с. Fighting the Fog in Multilingual-
ism / Ed. by Sergey Goncharov and Angelique Antonova. St. Pe-
tersburg: Herzen University Press, 2014. — 184 p

ISBN 978-5-8064-9080-5

This collection of articles and essays, dedicated to Professor Irina Alexeeva,
reflects the combination of her areas of interest — cultural, applied, and gen-
re-specific. It covers both the general principles and specific techniques of
translator & interpreter education, and may be used in a variety of profes-
sional training programmes.

ББК 71.4я43

© Authors, 2014

© S. A. Goncharov, O. V. Girdova, cover design, 2014

© Herzen University Press, 2014

ISBN 978-5-8064-9080-5

CONTENT

<i>Foreword by Sergey Goncharov</i>	5	
SECTION 1.		
Intellectual and Social Dimensions of Linguistic Mediation		12
Dorel Myulle. <i>Cultural Environment and the Art of Linguistic Mediation</i>	12	
Irina Alexeeva. <i>Перевод как интеллектуальная игра (Linguistic Mediation as a Mind Game)</i>	17	
Barbara Moser Mercer. <i>Interpreter Training and Adaptive Expertise — Learning from and with our Brain</i>	24	
Екатерина Водрова-Gogenmos. <i>Отработка навыков выражения смысла на этапе перевода на занятиях по устному переводу в ESIT (Teaching Expression Skills in Interpreting Classes at ESIT)</i>	31	
SECTION 2.		
New Approaches to Interpreter Training		48
Constantin Ivanov, Kate Davies, Boris Naimushin. <i>Teaching Simultaneous Interpretation with Text</i>	48	
Magdalena Olivera Tovar-Espada. <i>Peer Supervised Training of Conference Interpreters in the Context of Deliberate Practice</i>	62	
Angelique Antonova. <i>Quality Assurance System in Training Translators and Interpreters for International Organizations developed in the St. Petersburg School of Conference Interpreting and Translation</i>	67	
SECTION 3.		
The New Face of the Profession		73
Victor E. Babachev. <i>Translators Fighting the Fog of the 'Russia vs the West' Ideological Confrontation</i>	73	
Vladimir Kashkin. <i>From Analysis to Translation: a Roundtrip Journey?</i>	84	
Michim Titus. <i>Visualización Reconstructiva Verbal Como Un Instrumento De La Reduccion Post Traduccion</i>	92	
Oxana Yakimenko. <i>Crowdsourcing in Translation: Global Trends and the Way it Works in Russia</i>	95	
Igor' Shvachkov. <i>Nombres Antiguos EN EL Ruso Y EL Español</i>	106	



THE HERZEN STATE PEDAGOGICAL UNIVERSITY
OF RUSSIA

ВЗАИМОПОНИМАНИЕ В МНОГОЯЗЫЧНОМ МИРЕ: КУЛЬТУРА, ЯЗЫК, ПЕРЕВОД

Сборник статей в честь профессора
И. С. Алексеевой

Под редакцией С. А. Гончарова и А. М. Антоновой

FIGHTING THE FOG IN MULTILINGUALISM

A Festschrift in Honour of Irina S. Alekseeva

*Edited by
Sergey Goncharov and Angelique Antonova*

St Petersburg
Herzen University Press
2014

SECTION 2.

New Approaches to Interpreter Training

*Konstantin Ivanov, Kate Davies, Boris Naimushin*¹

TEACHING SIMULTANEOUS INTERPRETATION WITH TEXT

Summary

Proceeding from the ever-growing use of simultaneous interpretation with text (SI+T) at international conferences and on the private market and the need to teach it to future interpreters, this paper touches upon the following issues: what is SI+T; types of SI+T (running texts vs. Power Point slides vs. real-time captioning, etc.); theoretical foundations of SI+T; four time-related scenarios in SI+T, i. e. (1) ideal (text given to interpreter well in advance), (2) normal (text given 10–20 minutes in advance), (3) rush (text given just before the speaker starts), and (4) crisis (text given after the speaker starts); SI with or without text: which is easier?; cognitive constraints and benefits in SI+T (e.g., dual input vs. increased precision); interpreting strategies in dealing with text in SI under four time-related scenarios, including (1) strategic decision on whether or not to use the text, and (2) text preparation strategies and techniques; current and recommended approaches to teaching SI+T; cognitive foundation for teaching SI+T with selected methodological recommendations; and sample progression scale for teaching SI+T.

¹ This presentation is, to a large extent, based on the findings of a study on Simultaneous Interpretation with Text (SI+T) carried out by a group of MAS students in fulfillment of their MAS degree 2008/2009 FTI (formerly ETI) in Interpreter Training: Ms. Rawdha Cammoun, a Geneva-based freelance interpreter and teacher at FTI, Ms. Kate Davies, a staff interpreter and trainer at the European Commission (DG-SCIC), Mr. Boris Naimushin, Ph.D., a Sofia-based freelance interpreter and Associate Professor of Translation and Interpretation at the New Bulgarian University, and Mr. Konstantin Ivanov, a Geneva-based freelance interpreter and teacher at FTI. That is why R. Cammoun, K. Davies and B. Naimushin are considered co-authors of this presentation together with K. Ivanov who made the actual presentation at the Conference.

Introduction

In 2009, four conference interpreters also involved in interpreter training — Rawdha Cammoun (Arabic booth, Geneva), Kate Davies (English booth, DG-SCIC, Brussels), Konstantin Ivanov (Russian booth, Geneva), and Boris Naimushin (Bulgarian and Russian booths, Sofia) — completed the Advanced Master's degree in Interpreter Training (MAS) at the *École* (now *Faculté*) de Traduction et d'Interprétation, University of Geneva. The MAS course was designed to provide experienced professional conference interpreters with the necessary theoretical and pedagogical foundation that would enable them to develop a sound methodology for teaching interpreting at university level.

In their final Seminar Paper entitled *Simultaneous Interpretation with text — Is the Text 'Friend' or 'Foe'?* Laying Foundations for a Teaching Module, the authors focused on the way in which conference interpreters handled the written texts of speeches to be delivered at conferences or meetings where they were working.

In the above-mentioned Seminar Paper the authors covered the following elements: (1) SI+T scientific literature review; (2) an email/interview survey among various conference interpretation schools to study their approaches to the teaching of SI+T; and (3) a special SI+T survey run mostly among interpreters who worked at the June 2009 International Labor Conference held at the ILO in Geneva, and at a World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) meeting, also held in Geneva in late June 2009, with a total number of approximately 100 questionnaires distributed, of which 50 valid questionnaires were returned. The general methodological framework of the survey was based on the training the authors received as MAS students in Module 4 — *Design and Implementation of Research Projects* — of the MAS curriculum, and, in particular, on the article by Moser-Mercer (2009) entitled *Constructing Quality* devoted to developing survey instruments.

In the Introduction to the Seminar Paper the authors state that nowadays interpreters often have to perform what is known as Simultaneous Interpretation with Text (SI+T) [...]. Initially a regular feature of scientific and technical symposia, the practice of speakers and delegates reading pre-prepared statements into the microphone has been imposed, generally with their tacit consent, on interpreters in virtually all major international for a replacing, to a large extent, the ad lib speeches and spontaneous discussion that used to be the main substance of an interpreter's professional activity. As a result, SI+T accounts today for a large

part of a conference interpreter's workload, whether it be in international organizations and institutions or on the private market. Since SI+T has become such an integral part of the professional activity undertaken by conference interpreters, there is obviously a need for future interpreters to be trained in the particular skills needed to provide the highest quality results possible in this type of interpretation. (Cammoun et al. 2009: 8)

1. What is Simultaneous Interpretation with Text?

But what exactly is SI+T? This question is of particular relevance when talking to a mostly Russian audience, as is the case at this Conference. As a matter of fact, the Russian school of interpreting studies does not actually know this term, using instead the notion of 'simultaneous sight translation', which, together with 'pure SI' and 'simultaneous reading out of a pre-translated text', constitute the three types of SI, as initially proposed by Shiryayev (Shiryayev 1979: 4–5) and later confirmed by Nelubin (Nelubin 1993) and many other Russian authors. Chernov initially also used the term 'sight translation' (without 'simultaneous') to refer to SI+T (Chernov 1978: 10–11), although later, in his classic *Introduction to Simultaneous Interpretation* (Chernov 1987: 8), he opted for the Western term of 'SI with text'. Alekseeva, Director of the SCIT, also refers to SI+T as 'oral sight translation' (Alekseeva 2008 [2000]: 97–98).

In our opinion, the term 'simultaneous/oral sight translation' is confusing because it does not distinguish between the two different processes or modes of interpretation where a written text is involved, i. e. 'sight translation' (ST) proper and 'SI with text' (SI+T). Seeber 2010 described SI+T as follows: "ST involves the transposition of a message WRITTEN in one language into a message delivered ORALLY in another language, while SI+T is simultaneous interpretation where the [source] message is presented both ORALLY and VISUALLY" [to be delivered only ORALLY in the target language — addition by the authors]. This was a direct citation of a definition of ST and SI+T most commonly used in the West (Lambert 2004: 298–299).

Thus, the Western typology of SI includes SI of improvised or ad lib speeches (Sim Impro, for short) and SI+T (Sim Text), considering ST as a separate category, a distinction that is convenient for research, teaching and professional practice purposes.

2. Types of Simultaneous Interpretation with Text

Using the term SI+T that is larger in its scope than the Russian term 'simultaneous/oral sight translation', enables us to cover virtually all situations in SI where a textual visual input is involved. These situations can also be referred to as types of SI+T. A non-exhaustive list of such types is proposed below:

(1) Working with 'running' written texts of speeches, which is by far the most common type of SI+T.

(2) Using Power Point slides (PPs), which is the second most common type of SI+T and the importance of which keeps growing.

(3) So called 'reading out of pre-translated speeches' which can be quite a challenging exercise when the translation provided to interpreters is of poor quality and, even more so, when the interpreter does not know the source language, especially if there is no pacer (a person speaking the source language and showing to the interpreter the sentence that is being read out at any given moment by the original speaker).

(4) The use of working documents, e.g. reports, draft resolutions, etc., that are non-oralized texts, which, although in frequent use, require different and specific skills.

(5) Real-time captioning (RTC) on a big screen and/or individual monitors (visible also to interpreters) of the speech that is being delivered. This practice has recently been introduced at some major international meetings, notably in the International Telecommunication Union (ITU), for the benefit of the hearing-impaired and those whose command of the source language (mostly, if not exclusively, English) is relatively poor, but who prefer not to listen to interpretation¹. Thanks to the use of special teachable software by an RTC operator the quality of the output is often very high, thus making this tool a true support for the interpreter. But, for reasons that are not analyzed here, this is a very hazardous exercise, especially if the operator makes a major mistake, e.g. writes that a draft resolution or proposal was adopted when in fact it was not, which then puts the interpreter on the spot who (orally) understood and interpreted it right! SI+T with RTC requires special study, which would go beyond the scope of this paper.

The research reported here focuses only on the first type of SI+T (running text).

¹ For more information about RTC the reader is referred to the interview with an RTC operator at the *ITU World Telecommunications Standardization Assembly (WTSa-12) News Blog* at <http://wtsa12.wordpress.com/2012/11/21/a-word-with-heidi-thomas-broadcast-captioner-at-wtsa/>

3. Theoretical Foundation of SI+T Study

From a theoretical point of view, the FTI MAS research in question and this presentation are based mainly on process research in SI. Our approach thus draws on 'the concept of processing capacity and its finite availability' and uses 'the basic assumption underlying the Effort Models [...], namely the existence of distinct operations in interpreting, which compete for a limited, often insufficient amount of processing capacity' (Gile, 1997: 197, 211). Gile bundled these complex operations into four efforts (the name was chosen to underscore their non-automatic nature), i. e. (1) listening and analysis effort, (2) production effort, (3) memory effort, and (4) coordination effort (*op. cit.*, pp.197–198). Gile preferred this cognitive approach to more traditional product research in SI, since the former offers 'methodologically more possibilities for deducing strategies from [research] data' (Künzli & Moser-Mercer 1995), which [was] exactly one of the aims of this study.' (*op. cit.*: 12–13)

4. Time-Related Scenarios in Simultaneous Interpretation with Text

The review of the limited SI+T scientific literature showed that the time factor in SI+T was not duly taken into consideration. The only exception to this was found in Calamita (2008). In designing her SI+T intensive training course, the author identified three possible time-related options, i. e. 'two-day preparation option', 'twenty-minute preparation option' and 'zero-minute preparation option'. Based on their own observation and experience, Cammoun *et al.*, 2009 decided to base their research on four scenarios, instead of three, i. e. (1) ideal (text given to interpreter well in advance), (2) normal (text given 10–20 minutes in advance), (3) rush (text given just before the speaker starts), and (4) crisis (text given after the speaker starts).

5. Simultaneous Interpretation with or without Text: Which is Easier? — Cognitive Constraints and Benefits of Having a Text in SI

Some authors tend to think that having a text in SI facilitates interpretation (e.g., Alekseeva 2008 [2000]: 97–98). Some practicing interpreters share this position. But the majority of researchers, and interpreters, at least those working in the West and involved in studying SI+T are of a dif-

ferent opinion (e. g., Seleskovitch & Lederer 2002 [1989]: 205–214; Gile 1997: 204; Lambert 2004: 300; Dejean Le Féal 1982:237; Chernov 1987: 47–54). Cammoun *et al.*, 2009 share the latter opinion and explain this as follows:

Since [...] the interpreter's cognitive capacity is finite, while several operations (bundled into four efforts by Gile) compete for their share of it, in a demanding situation (and SI+T is considered one of these) it is quite conceivable to arrive at what has been termed 'cognitive overload', or 'general saturation', where the interpreter's total cognitive resources are not sufficient to deal with all of these operations or 'efforts' at one and the same time. It is also conceivable to arrive at an operation/effort-specific cognitive shortage resulting from a 'bad' cognitive management decision whereby too many resources are applied to a 'wrong' operation/effort thus leaving the 'right' operation/effort in a deficit situation. In both cases, this will result in errors and failures in SI. In SI in general and in SI+T in particular, there are certain factors that lead to increased processing capacity (or cognitive resources) requirements. They impose additional limitations on already scarce cognitive resources and may lead to the emergence of a general saturation or operation/effort-specific cognitive shortage. We call these factors, or limitations, 'cognitive constraints'. The words 'difficulty' or 'disadvantage' are sometimes used as a synonym of 'cognitive constraint'. (*op. cit.*: 57)

Most often, researchers and practicing interpreters identify the following cognitive constraints, or difficulties of SI+T:

(1) Dual input (aural and visual), i. e. the difficulty of coordinating both listening to the speaker and reading the text while interpreting it.

(2) Higher speed, i. e. accelerated speed of the reader, as compared to an *ad lib* speaker, i. e. higher delivery rate of the speech, be it real or only perceived as such by interpreters, as is claimed by Dejean Le Féal (1978) and Chernov (1987: 47–54).

(3) Lack of language redundancy which is understood as "the availability in language of elements carrying repetitive information, i. e. information already transmitted by other language elements" (Nelubin 1993: 58).

(4) Monotonous oral delivery i. e. lack of expression or intonation in the speaker's voice that makes it more difficult to identify the logical structure of the speech and to use chunking techniques in rendering the interpretation of it.

(5) Negative interference from the SL that refers to the interpreter's applying knowledge from the first/source language to a second/target language.

(6) Risk of missing the speaker's digressions from the written text.

But having a text in SI also has its advantages, or cognitive benefits, that have not been sufficiently studied in the scientific literature. Cammoun et al., 2009 identified four such advantages:

(1) Using the text for developing the knowledge base for each particular meeting, the assumption [being] that preparing the text in advance or, at least, skimming through it if the time available is very limited, would enable interpreters to understand the subject matter of the meeting, to familiarize themselves with the key concepts, facts and stakeholders involved, to grasp the gist of the range of existing positions on the issues under discussion, etc., all of which would be instrumental in enhancing the quality of their performance.

(2) Increased precision and accuracy in output, since having a text makes it possible to be accurate in delivering numbers, dates, personal and institutional names, geographical indications, document titles, citations, etc., all of which are more easily grasped by reading than by listening.

(3) [...] Easier anticipation, even if the speaker digresses from the initial text, as the overall thrust of the speech is already known.

(4) [...] Facilitating the interpreter's understanding of a speaker with a heavy accent, since the interpreter can check what the speaker is saying, or was supposed to say, against the text. In certain circumstances, when the accent is not just heavy but absolutely unintelligible, having the text may be the only way for the interpreter to 'survive' by, exceptionally, sight translating the corresponding fragment of the text, bearing in mind the inherent risks of using such a technique, i. e., forgetting to 'listen' rather than 'read', thus omitting additions and including omissions, racing ahead of the speaker, etc.' (*op. cit.*: 60–61).

Interestingly, if not paradoxically, the results of our SI+T survey show that having a text is considered by interpreters as a useful instrument to deal with the difficulties resulting from the use of a written text by the speaker, i. e. (1) higher speed, (2) lack of language redundancy, and (3) monotonous oral delivery. One possible — and partial — explanation of this situation may be the fact that survey questions relating to cognitive constraints or benefits were intentionally drafted in such a way as not to indicate which element was considered by the authors to be a constraint and which a benefit.

The survey covered all four time-related scenarios in SI+T and showed a certain degree of variability in interpreters' perception of both cognitive constraints and benefits of having a text in SI depending on the time scenario. For a more detailed discussion the reader may refer directly to Cammoun et al. (2009).

6. Interpreting strategies in dealing with text in SI

The discussion of this issue is based on Kirchhoff's (1976) definition of the notion of interpreting strategies:

'SI is a complex cognitive process. The individual steps in problem solving (processing of segments) can be divided into component operations which must occur in a certain sequence [...] and in a predetermined timeframe. Each component operation has an impact on the over-all solution, because the output of one processing stage serves as the input condition for the next one. The results of problem-solving operations [in SI] are determined by the efficiency of the strategies employed. **Strategies indicate which decisions must be taken in a given situation or in view of certain probabilities so as to reach a goal within a behavioral plan.** SI strategies determine, among other things, decisions on the timing of the start of processing operations (segmentation), decisions to delay operations or keep data (parts of segments) available, decisions concerning the types of necessary operations (information selection and reduction), and decisions concerning processing speed and the overall load sustainable at a given time. Interpreting strategies are subject to continuous improvement until they become optimized and, if possible, automatic.' (Kirchhoff 1976: 114)

As can be seen from the text above in bold print (added for emphasis by this author), the key element in this definition is the word 'decisions', which implies making choices.

With regard to SI+T, this paper concentrates only on two major strategic decisions or choices that need to be made by interpreters: (1) to use or not to use the text in SI depending on the time-related scenario, and (2) which technique of text preparation to use in the first three scenarios (in the fourth scenario, the crisis situation, preparation is practically impossible).

6.1. Strategic Decision on Whether or Not to Use the Text in SI

With regard to strategic decision on whether or not to use the text in SI, Cammoun et al., 2009 note that

'the overwhelming majority of [SI+T survey] respondents said that they used the text either 'always' or 'sometimes'. Only one respondent uses it only for figures, dates and proper names. In other words, whether trained in SI+T or not, and irrespective of their length of experience in working with the text, interpreters use it in one way or another (whether or not they enjoy using the text is another matter). This result stands in direct

contradiction to the claim that has become commonplace in academic writings and professional discussions among colleagues that, because of the inherent difficulties of SI+T, many interpreters do not use the text. Even in the fourth scenario, the majority of the respondents indicated that they do choose to use the text one way or another, even when the text is provided after the speaker has already started delivering the speech. This proves the authors' working hypothesis that the text is useful in all circumstances, even in a 'crisis' situation.

Having said that, a note of caution must be added, as one third of respondents indicated, in response to the general question [of the Survey Questionnaire on how often they use the text of a speech], that they use the text only 'sometimes'. It is intriguing to note that this share (1/3) is exactly the same as the proportion of those who prefer not to use the text in the fourth scenario. We would assume that it is quite possible that when the respondents answered 'sometimes' to the general question about the use of the text in SI, consciously or subconsciously, they were referring to the fourth, or 'crisis', scenario.' (op. cit.: 125-126).

6.2. Strategic Decisions Relating to the Preparation of the Text in SI

With regard to strategic decisions relating to the preparation of the text in SI, Cammoun et al., 2009 state that

'in the first scenario, the three most important elements focused upon by the surveyed interpreters when preparing the text are, in descending order: (1) complex syntax; (2) idiomatic expressions; and (3) sayings, proverbs and quotations. In the second scenario, interpreters look at (1) the main idea, (2) complex syntax and (3) idiomatic expressions, with (4) sayings, proverbs and quotations following them closely behind. In the third scenario, interpreters (1) circle/highlight/underline some key elements, (2) skim through the text to grasp the whole picture and the main idea, e. g. positive/supportive vs. negative/critical, and (3) look at the opening and closing paragraphs.' (op. cit.: 126)

The most striking and pedagogically useful feature of the survey results regarding text preparation is the importance practicing interpreters attach to complex syntax. The absence of the main idea in the first scenario is due to the fact that the authors did not include the option 'main idea' in the first scenario assuming that, with ample time for preparation, the main idea would undoubtedly be gleaned from the text. In retrospect, this is thought to have been a methodologically wrong survey design decision.

7. Current and Recommended Approaches to Teaching SI+T

The research under review 'revealed an increasing recognition of the need to train students of interpretation, and even some experienced interpreters, in the strategies and techniques which could help them to make appropriate use of the text in SI+T.

Currently many, if not most, of the [Western] schools and universities offering Masters degrees in interpreting do include training in the use of the text in SI. This training is offered either as a separate module or, as is more often the case, due to budgetary, legal and administrative reasons, incorporated into advanced SI modules. At ESIT (Paris) and ETI [now FTI, Geneva], a two-pronged approach is used, whereby the curriculum provides both specific training in SI+T as well as practice of it in general (master classes) and language-pair-specific SI classes as well. Both curricula include SI+T in their final exams.' (op. cit.: 122-123).

The Monterey Institute of International Studies (USA) also used to have a SI+T test as part of their final exams, but this practice was discontinued due mainly to time constraints and the sheer volume of numbers of test candidates.

In the three-semester FTI Master's Degree in Conference Interpreting, SI+T is taught in the third (and last) semester, but it is preceded by intensive sight translation (ST) practice in the second semester. In the end of the second semester, one theoretical and one practical SI+T introduction class are organized, with students being instructed afterwards to actively practice ST during the summer break.

In terms of SI+T types, FTI concentrates on SI with 'running' texts of speeches and Power Point presentations (PPs). An introduction to working with non-oralized texts, e. g. text of a resolution, and voluminous working documents is also provided. The first three time-related scenarios are regularly covered in all SI classes, while SI+T in a 'crisis situation' is hardly ever addressed. For the purposes of final SI+T exams, FTI has chosen the second (normal) scenario with 20 minutes for preparation of a speech (running text) that is then read out at normal speed without digressions (a recording of said speech is used for practical and administrative reasons). This choice was made on the assumption that it is one of the most frequent SI+T situations encountered in the profession.

In other university curricula for conference interpreter training 'it seems that [in most cases] a rather ad hoc approach has been adopted with most, if not all of the responsibility for devising teaching methods for SI+T being left to each individual teacher or group of teachers.' (op. cit.: 123).

There are also many university curricula that do not offer any systematic or, at the least, sporadic training in SI+T, which is most notably the case in Russian linguistic universities and conference interpretation schools.

A similar situation prevails in the main international organizations that employ large numbers of staff or free-lance conference interpreters but do not provide any SI+T training for them, with only one exception known to the authors, the EU Directorate General for Interpretation (see below).

In terms of improving organizational approaches to teaching SI+T, the authors believe that the following ideas, based on the findings of their research, may prove to be useful:

(1) If solutions can be found to the existing budgetary, legal and administrative problems in those conference interpreting schools affected, we would recommend that a separate SI+T training module, accompanied by an SI+T eliminatory final examination be introduced. The existing experience of ESIT and, partially, ETI [now FTI] could be useful in this regard.

(2) A major incentive is necessary to encourage this to happen: i. e. international organizations and European institutions whose officials sometimes refer to the importance of the text in SI, but which do not have any qualifying examinations in SI+T for interpreters wishing to work for them as freelancers or staff members, should consider introducing such an element in their tests.

(3) Special enhancement courses in SI+T should be established for, and promoted among freelance and staff conference interpreters, following the example of the EU Directorate General for Interpretation, which has been running a one-day intensive SI+T course for its staff two to three times per year since 2005. (*op. cit.*: 131)

8. Cognitive Foundations for Teaching SI+T with Selected Methodological Recommendations

The main advantage of using a cognitive approach to teaching SI+T is that to acquire expertise in the SI+T process the focus needs to be, to a large extent, on ensuring optimal management of the scarce and finite cognitive resources of the interpreter; thus the main thrust of SI+T training must be teaching how to minimize the interpreter's efforts in dealing with all of the above-mentioned six cognitive constraints and on how to capitalize on all of the above-mentioned four cognitive benefits of having a text in SI initially identified by the authors and three additional benefits of having a text specified by surveyed interpreters. For each of these

constraints and benefits special techniques, rules and exercises could and should be developed.

For example, when dealing with dual input, it is advisable to 'concentrate on improving reading skills with different exercises (skim reading, developing techniques to read faster, stopping and focusing on one word for several seconds, learning how to read in blocks instead of reading single words, [...] and text analysis, learning what you do with different kinds of text, what you look for, etc.)' (excerpt from an interview the authors conducted within the framework of the research reported in this paper). Of course, the importance of practicing sight translation cannot be overemphasized in this respect.

In the same vein, when dealing with possible digressions of the speaker from the written text, three golden SI+T rules of one of the co-authors should be taught: Rule 1 — Listen! Rule 2 — Listen! Rule 3 — Listen!

When teaching SI+T, special attention must be paid to mastering text preparation techniques and strategies mentioned in Section 6.2 above.

'In teaching SI+T, it is vital to cover all four possible time-related scenarios, reflecting the moment at which interpreters receive the text [...]. While doing so, special attention should be paid to scenario 4, which presents special challenges in dealing with the text in SI. [...] When dealing with the fourth scenario, special emphasis should be placed on collective SI+T strategies.' (*op. cit.*: 131–132)

'When discussing with SI students such strategic decisions as to whether or not to use the text in general, or in any of the four scenarios in particular, the main aim should be to convince them that in simultaneous interpretation, the text is always a friend' (*op. cit.*: 131), which was the main general conclusion of our study.

9. Sample Progression Schedule in Teaching SI+T

As a follow-up to their MAS research on SI+T, one of the co-authors has developed and successfully piloted in his SI (Fr>Ru) classes at FTI the following progression scale for SI with running text based on three criteria, i. e. time-frame scenarios, digressions vs. no digressions, and oralized vs. non-oralized texts (text written as a speech vs., for example, text of a resolution):

(1) Ideal time-related scenario (text given well in advance), no digressions, oralized text.

(2) Normal scenario (text given 20 minutes in advance), no digressions, oralized text — model used at FTI final exams.

- (3) Rush scenario (text given 2-3 minutes in advance), no digressions, oralized text.
- (4) Ideal scenario with digressions, oralized text.
- (5) Normal scenario with digressions, oralized text.
- (6) Crisis scenario (text given after the speaker has started), no digressions, oralized text.
- (7) Ideal scenario, no digressions, non-oralized text (draft resolution, official statement, etc.).
- (8) Rush scenario, no digressions, non-oralized text.
- Clearly, not all combinations of the above three criteria are represented, because some are rare, if not artificial (e. g. crisis scenario, with digressions, non-oralized text), and teaching time constraints add an additional challenge.
- This progression schedule has been considered by a number of trainer colleagues as too prescriptive and detailed. However, the purposes of this paper is just to show the logic for designing a better progression schedule not only for SI+T with running text, but also for SI+T with PPs

Conclusion

As the authors said elsewhere (Cammoun et al., 2009), they 'hope, with all modesty, that their research findings, together with the suggestions and recommendations outlined [therein and in the present paper], will not only provide a foundation for the design of a sound SI+T module, but will also encourage further research, observation, and experimentation so that, in future, the strategies for overcoming the cognitive constraints and taking advantage of the cognitive benefits, in order to make use of the text in SI in an efficient manner, will be thoroughly understood and mastered by all professional conference interpreters.' (op. cit.: 134)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

(for a more extensive bibliography, see also Cammoun et al., 2009: 160-162)

1. Alekseyeva, I. *Professional'nyi trening perevodchika : Uchebnoe posobie p... tnomu I pis'mennomu perevodu. (Professional Training of Interpreters and Translators: A Handbook of Interpreting and Translation)*. — Moskva: Soyuz, 2009.
2. Calamita, O. *Teaching Simultaneous Interpretation with Text: Analysis of the Learning Process and Syllabus Design*. Seminar Paper — Continuing Education Certificate for Interpreter Trainers. — École de Traduction et d'Interprétation, Université de Genève, 2006.
3. Cammoun, R., Davis, K., Ivanov, K., Naimushin, B. *Simultaneous Interpretation with Text: Is the Text 'Friend' or 'Foe'? Laying Foundations for a Teaching Module*. Seminar Paper — Master of Advance Studies in Interpreter Training. — École de Traduction et d'Interprétation, Université de Genève, 2009.
4. Chernov, G. V. *Teoriya I praktika sinhronnogo perevoda (Theory and Practice of Simultaneous Interpretation)*. — Moskva: Mezhdunarodnyie otnosheniya, 1978.
5. Chernov, G. V. *Osnovy sinhronnogo perevoda (Fundamentals of Simultaneous Interpreting)*. — Moskva: Vysshaya shkola, 1987.
6. Dejean Le Féal, K. *Lectures et improvisations: incidencé de la forme de l'énonciation sur la traduction simultanée*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. — University of Paris III, 1978.
7. Dejean Le Féal, K. *Why impromptu speech is easy to understand*. // *Impromptu Speech: A Symposium*. Ed. by N.L. Enkvist. — Abo, Abo Akademi, 1982.
8. Gile, D. *Conference Interpreting as a Cognitive Management Problem*. // Joseph E. Danks, Gregory M. Shreve, Stephen B. Fountain, Michael K. Mc Beath (eds), *Cognitive Processes in Translation and Interpreting*. — Thousand Oaks, London and New Delhi, Sage Publications, 1997. — P. 196-214.
9. Kirchhoff, H. *Das Simultandolmetschen: Interdependenz der Variablen im Dolmetschprozess, Dolmetschmodelle und Dolmetschstrategien*. // H.W. Cahiers de Linguistique Française 2396 Drescher (éd.), *Theorie und Praxis des Übersetzens und Dolmetschens*, Frankfurt, Lang, 1976. — P. 59-71.
10. Künzli, A., Moser-Mercer, B. *Human strategies for translation and interpretation*. // L. Dreschler-Fischer & S. Pribbenow (Eds.), *KI-95 activities: Workshops, posters, demos*. Bonn, Germany: Gesellschaft für Informatik, 1995. — P. 304-306
1. Lambert, S. *Shared Attention during Sight Translation, Sight Interpretation and Simultaneous Interpretation*. // *Meta* 49:2, 2004. — P. 294-306.
2. Moser-Mercer, B. *Construct-ing quality*. // *Efforts and Models in Interpreting and Translation Research*, Hansen, Gyde, Andrew Chesterman and Heidrun Gerzymisch-Arbogast (eds.), 2009. — P. 143-156.
3. Nelubin, L. *Tolkovyj perevodovedcheskiy slovar (Explanatory Dictionary of Translatology)*. — Moskva: Flinta — Nauka, 1993.
4. Seeber, K. *Simultaneous Interpretation with Text*. Unpublished presentation at FTI Interpretation Department Faculty Retreat'. — École de Traduction et d'Interprétation, Université de Genève, 2010

One SCIT teacher, Mr. Sergey Yakovlev, was able to attend the Retreat within the framework of cooperation between FTI and SCIT.

15. Seleskovitch, D., Lederer, M. *Pédagogie raisonnée de l'interprétation*. 2^e édition corrigée et augmentée. — France: Didier Érudition — Office des publications officielles des Communautés Européennes, 2002.
16. Shiryayev, A.F. *Sinhronnyi perevod: deyatel'nost' sinhronnogo perevodchika i metodika prepodavaniya sinhronnogo perevoda*. (*Simultaneous Interpreting: Performance of Simultaneous Interpreter and Methodology of Teaching Simultaneous Interpreting*). — Moskva: Voenizdat, 1979.

Magdalena Olivera Tovar-Espada

**PEER SUPERVISED TRAINING
OF CONFERENCE INTERPRETERS
IN THE CONTEXT OF DELIBERATE PRACTICE**

Summary

At FTI's Interpreting Department, Peer supervised training (PST) is a learning environment in which students practice with their peers, sometimes on their own and sometimes supervised by assistant teachers. PST is different from general master classes (designed for all students) and from specific language-pair interpretation courses (designed for a specific language combination). In PST, students work together in small multilingual groups without teachers and without being formally evaluated. 8 hours/week of PST are required in the curriculum of the MA in Conference Interpreting. This paper covers the following aspects of PST: preparation of speeches, structure of a PST session, peer feedback, journaling (tracking one's progress). Special emphasis will be given to deliberate practice.

Acknowledgements

The content of this presentation emerges from the collaborative work at the Interpreting Department. The author would like to thank her colleagues who have contributed to the development of PST sessions: Manuela Motta, Jennifer Drummond, Ana Pleite, Gabriel Cordova, Grégoire Bali, Sophie Hengl, Cindy Barbara, Nathalie Loiseau, Carmen Delgado, Laura

Keller, Marta Lumbreras and Françoise Landgraf. Without them this paper could not have been written.

Introduction to Deliberate Practice

Ericsson (2000, p. 193) provides a list of characteristics that describe deliberate practice:

"Based on a review of laboratory studies of learning and skills acquisition during the last century, we found that improvement of performance was uniformly observed when individuals, who were motivated to improve their performance, were given well-defined tasks, were provided with feedback, and had ample opportunities for repetition. Individuals were often able to keep improving during a series of training sessions as long as the sessions were limited to around an hour — the time that college students could maintain sufficient concentration to make active efforts to improve."

This description allows us to identify elements which help us analyse deliberate practice in the context of conference interpretation:

1. Motivation to improve: focus on goals;
2. Definition of tasks;
3. Feedback (from peer or teachers);
4. Opportunities of rehearsal;
5. Time spent in rehearsal.

1. Regarding training goals, it is important to underline that the process of skill acquisition is very different from the process of acquiring declarative knowledge. Successful skill acquisition is thus different from the way to acquire knowledge.

2. Regarding the definition of tasks, the approach chosen at the Interpreting Department involves the setting up of concrete objectives, followed by defining adapted exercises to reach these objectives. Skill acquisition is achieved through the repetition of these adapted exercises.

3. Regarding feedback, the approach is based on self-assessment, followed by formative peer assessment, followed by formative assessment from the teaching assistants (in this particular order). This enables both the student to think about his/her performance and peers to contribute. Finally the assistant also provides feedback, which is designed to synthesize all previous feedback and to complement it.