

A Study of Student Interpreters' Ability to Manage the Directive and Procedural Elements of Speech in Consecutive Mode

Carol Sykes, Coordinator for Interpreting, University of Sheffield, U.K.

The Objective

In his book *Simultaneous Interpretation: a Cognitive-Pragmatic Analysis* Robin Setton (1999: 92) makes the following statement:

“Our hypothesis, in line with recent work in Relevance Theory, is that hearers do not incorporate the directive and procedural elements in speech, like *but, after all, let's remember that* and stress or word order variations, into their conceptual representations: such elements merely adjust the saliency of the content and direct us to inferences. The natural tendency for interpreters qua hearers (trainees, for example) is therefore not to represent and carry over this pragmatic dimension... Hence many trainees at first either merely report what content they have extracted, losing the ostensive guidance, or translate the source language procedural devices as if they encoded content, with infelicitous results.”

There is some support for this view in the literature on interpreting pedagogy. A number of celebrated teachers of interpreting have placed considerable emphasis on the role of links within discourse and their importance for interpreting. Both Jean Herbert and Jean-François Rozan, authors of the first manuals of conference interpreting, were at pains to underline their importance. And whilst the concepts of ‘links’ does not correspond exactly with the more sophisticated concept of ‘procedural and directive elements of speech’ there are sufficient similarities to make this fact relevant to the current discussion.

The question of whether or not *hearers* “incorporate the directive and procedural elements of speech...into their conceptual representations” is one which I must leave to psycholinguists to elucidate. However, as a teacher of interpreting, I am in a position to examine the question of whether “many trainees at first either merely report what content they have extracted, losing the ostensive guidance, or translate the source language procedural devices as if they encoded content, with infelicitous results”. An answer to this question would make a useful contribution to interpreting pedagogy, perhaps bringing into sharper focus the process whereby learning tends to take place.

Much work has, of course, been done on various aspects of the learning process for consecutive interpreting (see Ficchi 1999 for a useful list of references). Ficchi, for example, analyses the learning process of a group of students from a series of recordings of their performances made at regular intervals over the course of a semester. However, the criteria used in such studies vary and may also include traditional error types which tend to obscure the differences between propositional content and directive and procedural devices posited by Relevance theorists. An error classified as a *faux sens*, for example, may be due to incorrect rendering of either propositional content or of a directive or procedural device. A different approach to the analysis of errors and success was, therefore, required for this project. The

approach adopted was based on the list of procedural and directive devices provided by Setton in the work mentioned above.

Setton and a number of Relevance Theorists posit a distinction between propositional content of language and items or aspects of language which are “référentiellement vides” (Luscher 1994: 181) and are used to direct listeners to relevance. Setton divides the latter into two types: those which “express attitude and intentionality and which indicate the relative importance a Speaker attaches to an item, or direct the hearer to a context in which to process it” (Setton 1999: 199) and those which “function as ‘directives’, or instructions to a hearer on logical or thematic processing” (Setton 1999: 201). The first group includes:

- “1. *overt expressions of belief or desire* and their alleged derivatives (hope, intent, satisfaction etc), such as verbs of believing, hoping, etc., and attitudinal adverbs (*frankly, hopefully, fortunately*);
2. *expressions which imply such beliefs and desires*, such as factive and implicative verbs (*regret that, remember that*), and modal adverbs and auxiliaries;
3. *features which assign relative importance to propositions or their parts*, such as evaluative and evidential adverbs (*especially, most importantly, undoubtedly, probably*) discourse markers and connectives (*however, after all, anyway, since...*) and focusing and contrastive devices.” (Setton 1999: 199)

The second group includes:

- a) *discourse connectives*, like *after all, moreover, and, but, however, anyway, and so, given that..., assuming...*, which are more specialised in guiding co-processing (e.g. contrasting) of propositions and the assumptions contained in them; and
- b) *prosodic devices* like contrastive stress, which specialise in imposing perspective or contrasting at the clause-internal, phrase or word level, as well as expressing a range of attitudes.” (Setton 1999: 201-202)

Setton (1999: 201) acknowledges that “there is a fine and somewhat fuzzy line” between the two and he does not claim to make a clear distinction between them in the analysis of his corpus. In this paper I adopt Setton’s approach and include both indicators of speaker attitude and directives on logical or thematic processing in my analysis of student interpreters’ handling of ostensive guidance.

This paper presents the results of a preliminary study of ten performances by five student interpreters in the consecutive mode. My objective was to answer the following two questions:

1. Is there evidence in the students’ performances that learners ‘merely report what content they have extracted, losing the ostensive guidance’?
2. Is there evidence that learners ‘translate the source language procedural devices as if they encoded content’?

My analysis proceeded in four stages. Firstly, I transcribed the chosen students’ performances together with the original discourse on which they were based. Secondly, I translated the foreign language discourse into English. Thirdly, I placed the original speech and interpretation side-by-side in the form of a table to facilitate comparison of the two pieces of discourse. Sections of the original were matched as

closely as possible with corresponding sections (in terms of meaning) of the interpretation. This was feasible because a structure similar to that of the original speech (or which at least attempted to mirror it) was usually imposed on the interpretations by the students' notes. Finally, I analysed the student's handling of ostensive guidance in the performance and weighed the evidence for and against Setton's assertions.

The Material Analysed

The study was carried out using a collection of video recordings of interpreting examinations conducted at the University of Sheffield in 2003. The students examined were non-specialist fourth-year undergraduate students of Spanish who had taken an optional module in Interpreting Skills over the course of one semester.

Teaching for the module consisted of one one-hour practical session and one preparation session per week. At the beginning of the course, students were briefly introduced to the rudiments of note-taking using Rozan's seven principles and a number of his symbols. Subsequently, a one-hour weekly practise session was dedicated to the interpreting of prepared dialogues. Although they were not scripted in detail, the dialogues were pre-planned and the teachers acting the roles of the interlocutors worked from an agreed outline which guided the development of the exchange. A second weekly session was used for the preparation of the subject to be dealt with at the practice session and involved background reading, compilation of glossaries and discussion of possible translation difficulties. During practical sessions, some attention was given to the importance of reflecting the speaker's attitude towards the content of the speech, the way in which the speaker arranges and links ideas together, and the intentions s/he expresses. It is perhaps worth noting that, since this was an introductory course using the dialogue format common in business and public-service interpreting rather than the prepared speech to an audience more often used in the training of conference interpreters, students were not required to use the first person. The relative merits of the use of both the first and the third person and the prevailing norms of usage among different professional groups were discussed and students were left to make their own choice.

The examination at which the recordings in the corpus were made took a similar form to the practical sessions used for teaching: two teachers (referred to as interlocutors in the transcripts), one with English and one with Spanish mother tongue, enacted a role play and students were expected to act as interpreters for the two interlocutors. Students had the opportunity to research the subject to be dealt with and were permitted to bring glossaries and other documents into the examination room with them. In the examination, each student was asked to interpret approximately four minutes of dialogue divided into two two-minute sections. Each student was required to interpret both from and into his/her mother tongue. The video recording was made during the University's official examination period. There was, therefore, no opportunity to interview students about their performances on completion of the examination since several of them had further examinations scheduled for the same day.

In one examination, the teachers enacted a discussion between a British Conservative politician and a member of the Spanish Socialist Party on the subject of the Israeli/Palestinian conflict. The setting for this debate was a television programme entitled 'International Question Time'. In the second examination, the situation represented was a meeting between a representative of the city council of the town of Granada in Spain and a member of the team which implemented congestion charging in London. The Councillor's purpose was to gather information on London's experience with a view to introducing a congestion-charging scheme in Granada.

Conventions Used in the Transcripts and Tables

<i>Italics</i>	Items which contribute to the procedural/directive framework of the speech are shown in italics.
CAPITALS	Vocal stress NB The standard word-internal vocal stress used in Spanish is not shown in either the transcripts or the tables since it does not contribute to ostensive guidance. In some cases the speaker places vocal stress on the last part of a compound noun or noun adjective combination in the Spanish original where, in the English translation, it is appropriate to place the stress on the whole of the combination or, in the case of noun adjective combinations, on the noun. I have made these changes to the text in the tables (though not the original transcripts).
`	Falling intonation
´	Rising intonation
<u>´</u> Rising intonation symbol at the start of an underlined phrase	Raised pitch lasting for a whole phrase
~	Rising and falling intonation
...full stop. Capital letter...	Falling intonation at the end of sentences is shown by using the traditional symbols for written text: a full stop followed by a capital letter. It was felt that the use of familiar symbols would facilitate the task of the reader.
--	Rhythm. Pauses are indicated using dashes; the more dashes, the longer the pause. Some parts of the discourse are drawn out whilst others are almost glossed over because of the speed and fluency with which they are uttered. Some speakers use pauses and slow speech combined with stress and intonation to emphasize certain ideas over others.
(round brackets)	Items appearing in one text and considered to be implied in the other

Stumbling and false starts were removed from the tables (though not the original transcripts) to make the texts easier to read. Similarly, interpreters' requests for clarification, their answers and the reformulations offered by interpreters as a result were not included in the tables.

Example of a Transcript, a Table and an Analysis

Transcript 1)

Interlocutor 1

Yyy BUENO aparte de que um Ariel Sharon fuera el detonante de esta SEGUNDA INTIFADA tampoco podemos NEGAR yy poner en duda que --Palestina ha utilizado medios INJUSTOS

TAMBIÉN. aaa en la prensa podemos ver últimamente eeun número grandísimo de INMOLACIONES porque es el método que está utilizando Palestina eeem de respuesta contra esta ofensiva IsraelÍ las inmoluciones. yyy --- Pero al MISMO TIEMPO Israel ha puesto también en práctica - una política de asesinatos SELECTIVOS a miembros de HAMÁS eee --- lo cual eem -- no es una de las mej unas de las mejores MEDIDAS que se puede tomar para llegar a una consecuc para llegar a una solución del CONFLICTO. Si echamos un vistazoo a la prensa RECIENTE vemos como el ejército IsraelÍ por ejemplo cerca la franja de GAZA - ey impide la entrada la salida de EXTRANJEROS y esos ee extranjeros van principalmente a Gaza a participar en movimientos PACIFISTAS y ni siquiera se les deja eem em tomar parte en este tipo de ACCIONES eeem hace una semana si mal no recuerdo ee vi en la noticia vi en un periódico español como dos civiles inocentes habían sido eem abatidos por la armada IsraelÍ.

Student 1

Perdona ¿puedo clarificar que fue el ejército IsraelÍ que estaba erm imponiendo que la ge que los extranjeros no podían entrar en la franja de Gaza?

Interlocutor 1

Sí, sí, sí.

Transcript 1)ⁱ

Student 1

Gracias.

Says that em -- as well as Ariel Sharon being the cause of the second antifada we ca intifada we can't DENY that Palestine ha has also used unjust METHODS. In the press we see em a lot of INFORMATION that they're using IMMOLATIONS and at the same time that ISRAEL is putting into practice selected erm ASSASSINATIONS of members of the Hamas MOVEMENT and obviously this isn't a good WAY of of rea reaching a a peaceful culmination of of the situation. And if we take a look at the at what's ha at the press's REPORTING can be seen that the Israeli army in -- on the Gaza strip is preventing FOREIGNERS from going moving in or out of the Israeli TERRITORY and these FOREIGNERS are actually going to - to give peaceful conferences and meetings for peaceful PURPOSES is the the the AIM of their MOVEMENT but they're being impeded by the Israeli ARMY and he says that he read erm a week ago in the Spanish papers that two two innocent civilians were SHOT by the Israeli army.

Table 1

	Original (Spanish)	Interpretation (English - Student's mother tongue)
1	<i>Well</i>	<i>He says that</i>
2	<i>apart from (in addition to)</i>	<i>as well as</i>
3	Ariel Sharon triggering the second intifada	Ariel Sharon being the cause of the second intifada
4	<i>Neither can we DENY or doubt that</i>	<i>we can't DENY that</i>
5	Palestine has used <i>UN'JUST</i> methods <i>TOO</i> .	Palestine has <i>also</i> used unjust <i>METHODS</i> .
6	In the press we have seen a large number of suicide <i>BOMBINGS</i> recently	In the press we see a lot of <i>INFORMATION</i> that they are using <i>IMMOLATIONS</i>
7	<i>because</i> that's the method used by Palestine <i>to respond to Israeli attack</i>	
8	<i>But at the SAME TIME</i>	<i>and at the same time that</i>
9	Israel has also adopted a policy of selective killing of Hamas members	<i>ISRAEL</i> is putting into practice selective <i>ASSASSINATIONS</i> of members of the Hamas <i>MOVEMENT</i>
10		<i>and obviously</i>
11	which is not a good way to resolve the <i>CONFLICT</i> .	this is not a good <i>WAY</i> of reaching a peaceful culmination of the situation.
12	If we look at <i>RECENT</i> press reports we see that the Israeli army has surrounded the <i>GAZA STRIP</i>	And if we take a look at what the press is <i>REPORTING</i> it can be seen that the Israeli army in the Gaza strip
13	and are preventing <i>FOREIGNERS</i> entering or leaving the Gaza strip	is preventing <i>FOREIGNERS</i> from moving in or out of the Israeli <i>TERRITORY</i>
14	and those foreigners go to the Gaza strip primarily to take part in <i>PEACE</i> movements	and these foreigners are <i>actually</i> going to give peaceful conferences and meetings for peaceful <i>PURPOSES</i> (is the <i>AIM</i> of their <i>MOVEMENT</i>)
15	<i>and they are not even</i> being allowed to take part in that type of activity	<i>but</i> they're being impeded by the Israeli army.
16		<i>and he says that</i>
17	a week ago <i>if I remember rightly</i> I saw a report in a Spanish newspaper that two innocent civilians had been killed by the Israeli army.	he read a week ago in the Spanish papers that two innocent civilians were <i>SHOT</i> by the Israeli army.

Analysis of Table 1

Almost all the propositional content and the majority of the directive and procedural devices are correctly carried over into the interpretation. However, at one point the emphasis is changed by removal of one concept and a change to a procedural device (discourse connector combined with stress – ‘*but at the SAME TIME*’ / ‘*and at the same time*’). The original speech contrasts what we see in the press about Palestinian suicide bombings (which the speaker explains as a response to Israeli attack) with Israeli actions. The vocal stress placed on the discourse connector used to introduce the statement about Israel’s actions and the use of ‘but’ rather than ‘and’ suggests that it is Israel’s actions, rather than those of the Palestinians, which are important. In the interpretation, on the other hand, Palestinian and Israeli actions are presented as events happening simultaneously and are given equal weight. There is no suggestion that one group’s activities are more important in the speaker’s argument than those of the other or that one group’s activities are the cause of the actions of the other.

If we consider the overall effect of the piece, though, we find that it is not much affected by this change in emphasis since reference is made later in the discourse to two types of Israeli actions not approved of by the speaker (Rows 12 – 13 and 17).

There are problems with the vocabulary of the field or perhaps calque (immolations) and with propositional content (Gaza strip / Israeli territory)

Overall this interpreter has considerable success in reconstructing both content and ostensive guidance. However, some difficulty with finding procedural devices that will allow her to precisely reconstruct the ostensive guidance in the original is indicated, particularly in the choice of ‘*and at the same time that*’ to represent ‘*but at the SAME TIME*’.

Analysis of the Material

The type of study undertaken here and the small number of performances analysed tended to bring to the fore the individual differences between student interpreters, the different types of problems they face in developing the skills required of them by the exercise and the different ways in which they fail or are successful in their task. However, a number of patterns and common features do emerge.

All of the performances contain at least one instance of difficulty with a procedural or directive device. It is interesting to note, though, that, in all cases except one, the students who had most difficulty with procedural and directive devices also experienced difficulty in rendering propositional content fully and students who coped well with procedural and directive devices also tended to render propositional content well. The performances of Student 1 provide a good illustration of the latter case. The transcript and table for this student's performance into her mother tongue are included above (Transcript 1 and Table 1). The table corresponding to her performance into the foreign language (Table 2) is shown below. As can be seen from table 2, the ordering of ideas in the student's interpretation follows that of the original very closely. Although she occasionally summarizes (Row 22), no idea is entirely absent and the procedural and directive devices linking the propositional content are generally correctly interpreted (e.g. Rows 3, 7, 10, etc.). There is one instance of incorrect interpretation of a directive device in the student's first performance (Table 1) and I shall return to this later.

Table 2 (Student 1)

	Original (Interlocutor speaking English)	Interpretation (Student 1 speaking her foreign language: Spanish)
1	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Well she says firstly that</i>
2	This is a - 'COMPLEX situation	this is a very COMPLEX situation
3	<i>We need to be</i>	<i>and it is necessary to be</i>
4	very careful about -- ESTABLISHING the EXACT FACTS and picking out the RIGHTS and WRONGS - FROM the exact facts once they're established	very CAREFUL <hand gesture expressing precision> to be very clear and precise about the facts before deciding where the TRUTH and falsehood lie, where good and bad lie
5	<i>now -- clearly</i>	<i>and she says that</i>
6	I myself and anybody -- who is a member of the party that I'm a member of <i>would regret sincerely</i> the deaths of innocent civilians -- of WHATEVER persuasion in either Israel or Palestine	SHE and all members of the party of which she is a member the conservative party <i>believe that</i> the DEATHS of innocent civilians if they are Israelis or Palestinians is terrible and no-one wants them
7	<i>and --- clearly</i>	<i>and it's CLEAR that</i>
8	the two civilian deaths of the peace activists	- the death - of people who were working for peace
9	<i>are to be regretted.</i>	<i>is TERRIBLE</i>
10	<i>Although - I don't think it's true</i>	<i>but she doesn't think</i>
11	that they were <i>actually</i> going to attend 'CONFERENCES of any kind in Palestine	that these people were attending PEACE conferences.
12	<i>as I UNDERSTOOD it I think</i>	<i>She thinks that</i>
13	one of the people that was killed was a TELEVISION reporter	one of the <i>people</i> that was killed was a TELEVISION reporter
14	and the other person was part of a peace movement where the members of the peace movement try to put themselves BETWEEN the troops and Palestinians <i>who they think</i> are	and the other person was part of a peace movement where the members of the peace movement try to put themselves BETWEEN the troops and Palestinians <i>who they think</i> are being

	being persecuted by the Israeli troops -- to stop this happening	persecuted threatened (that is their <i>STRATEGY</i>)
15	and this is what happened in this case	
16	<i>I think.</i>	
17	<i>CLEARLY</i>	<i>but it is clear that</i>
18	These deaths <i>are very- regrettable</i>	- these deaths are (unintelligible)
19	<i>I think -- that</i>	<i>but it's believed that</i>
20	the deaths of Hamas leaders <i>are another matter ENTIRELY, quite frankly.</i>	~WHERE it's the ~DEATHS of HA~MAS leaders one is dealing with the situation is different
21		<i>Because</i>
22	To target a person who is <i>INVOLVED</i> in an organisation which has soldiers from your country in its sights militarily speaking or has proclaimed as its aim and its target members of the Israeli army and members of the Israeli civilian population	<i>WHEN</i> a person - is part of an organisation which has said ~OPENLY that its -- aim is to attack your <i>COUNTRY</i>
23	-- <i>THAT I think is a different matter.</i>	<i>in such cases it's a very different situation</i>
24		Interlocutor requests clarification
25	<i>Just very BRIEFLY</i>	<i>And she would like to add very briefly</i>
26	on the question of the closing of borders to foreigners	about the closing of borders to foreigners
27		the closing of borders
28	<i>again that's another matter</i>	
29	<i>and I think that</i>	
30	<i>most people in the UK agree that this is unacceptable</i>	<i>that this is unacceptable in the UNITED ~KINGDOM</i>
31	Interpreter requests clarification	
32	<i>and I believe</i>	
33	It will be raised with the Israeli government by our government	and that the ~GOVERNMENT will <i>probably</i> want to talk about this with the Israeli government.

The performances of Student 3 provide a good example of how difficulties with propositional content and with procedural and directive devices may occur together. The table corresponding to the student's performance into the foreign language (Table 3) is shown below:

Table 3 (Student 3)

	Original (Interlocutor speaking English)	Interpretation (Student 3 speaking her foreign language: Spanish)
1	<i>Well I would CERTAINLY agree with</i>	<i>Professor Sykes agrees with</i>
2	<i>EVERYTHING</i> he says about - <i>BROAD AIMS.</i>	everything ~you have said about the measures
3	<i>Clearly</i>	
4	our aim <i>would be</i> to <i>END</i> the threat against <i>OURSELVES</i>	
5	<i>and</i> the best way to do that <i>would be</i> to <i>END TERRORISM.</i>	that <i>we need to</i> take to reach – the end of these acts of <i>TERROR</i> and to end <i>TERRORISM</i>
6	- <i>I think though</i>	<i>But</i>
7	with regard to the example that - he raises	the example you have <i>GIVEN</i> us
8	- we - <i>SHOULD DISTINGUISH</i> between <i>DIFFERENT</i> types of terrorism and <i>DIFFERENT</i> types of terrorist	<i>we need to</i> make a distinction between different types of <i>TERRORISM</i> of <i>TERRORISTS</i> and <i>TERRORISM</i>
9	-- <i>it's - TRUE of course</i>	
10	that Mandela <i>WAS</i> involved for a <i>SHORT</i> period of time in an <i>ARMED</i> group that <i>did</i> attack - <i>as you say INSTALLATIONS</i>	<i>Nelson Mandela</i> -- and his 'armed group carried out <i>ATTACKS</i> on <i>FA'CILITIES</i>
11	<i>not at any time I believe - or I don't believe</i>	<i>but as far as the professor knows NEVER</i>

12	they ever attacked - <i>SPECIFICALLY</i> unarmed <i>CIVILIANS</i> .	against <i>CIVILIANS</i> never against <i>CIVILIANS</i> who were <i>INNOCENT</i>
13	<i>ALSO</i> we should also remember that	<i>but and</i>
14	the ANC <i>ABANDONED</i> terrorism of its <i>OWN ACCORD</i> without - <i>so to speak</i> being forced to do so by any agreement with the <i>OPPOSING</i> side	the 'ANC stopped its acts of 'VIOLENCE and ended its (unintelligible) type of 'TERRORISM without other forces entering the conflict without other <i>INFLUENCES</i> .
15		<i>--- And I think that since</i>
16	the ANC <i>simply</i> decided that it would no longer <i>USE</i> force that that was <i>NOT</i> the <i>BEST WAY</i> - to - <i>SOLVE</i> the the problem that it <i>ITS</i> people (unintelligible).	the ANC <i>FOUND</i> that it wasn't the best <i>SO LUTION</i> to their <i>PROBLEM</i> to their <i>CONFLICT</i>
17	<i>And ~ALSO</i> of course	<i>she also uses returning to the example of the AN'C she says that it is (unintelligible) that</i>
18	the <i>LEADERS</i> of the ANC were <i>PARTICULARLY</i> - <i>INTELLIGENT</i> men and women	they were in'telligent men and women
19	with - <i>REALLY</i> - <i>UNDENIABLY NOBLE AIMS</i> .	with <i>~NOBLE IDEAS</i>
20	<i>I 'think</i>	<i>so but</i>
21	the 'new terrorists that <i>WE'RE</i> facing are <i>RATHER</i> a <i>DIFFERENT BREED</i> .	this <i>NEW</i> group <i>TYPE</i> of 'TERRORISM and 'TERRORISTS are <i>VERY DIFFERENT</i>
22		That
23	-- <i>One</i> - <i>might argue</i> about how intelligent they are	<i>we can ask questions about</i> their in'telligence the intelligence of these
24	<i>I'm sure</i> there are people that could <i>probably</i> convince me that they're very <i>INTELLIGENT</i>	
25	<i>MEN</i> in this case never women –	<i>MEN</i> because the majority are men <i>the professor doesn't believe</i> there was – <i>ONE</i> woman in this conflict one 'SUICIDE BOMBER
26	<i>HOW~EVER</i>	<i>and we also need to ask questions about</i>
27	in terms of <i>what</i> their <i>DEMANDS</i> or their <i>AIMS</i> would be	their <i>DE'MANDS</i>
28	<i>I think its</i>	
29	very <i>HARD</i> to see any <i>LOGICAL</i> or any sort of <i>NORMAL ~AIM</i> .	whether they are logical demands if they have the right to make these <i>DEMANDS</i>
30	<i>I think that</i>	
31	these new terrorists <i>simply</i> hate the <i>~WEST</i> and their stated aim is to <i>~DESTROY</i> the West.	these new terrorists hate the <i>WEST</i>
32		<i>and she thinks that</i> it is <i>SIMPLY</i>
33	<i>Now</i> - in <i>THAT</i> situation	<i>and in that SITU'ATION</i>
34	<i>I DON'T SEE</i> - <i>HOW</i> - any <i>NEGOTIATION</i> could be of <i>USE</i>	How can we <i>CARRY OUT</i> negotiations? How can we
35	<i>and THIS</i> is where <i>I think that</i> we may possibly <i>~DIFFER</i>	
36	<i>I would say here that</i> a <i>MILITARY</i> solution would be <i>PREFERABLE</i>	<i>whether</i> there <i>ARE</i> military solutions or <i>whether</i> we can arrive at the end to this conflict using military measures
37		<i>or whether</i> we can also do it using negotiations.
38	<i>so perhaps</i>	
39	the Professor and I agree on <i>AIMS</i> but not on <i>METHODS</i> .	

Here, a vital item of propositional content is omitted early in the student's rendition when 'measures' is substituted for 'aims' (Row 2). The word 'aims' is then omitted throughout the interpretation and the speaker's entire final point, which, in the original speech, contrasts aims with methods, is also missing (Row 39). Other items

of propositional content, such as those in row 4, are also omitted. This difficulty is compounded by the interpreter's problems with important elements of the ostensive guidance offered in the original. As a result, the meaning of the speaker's opening point is changed and her conclusion, which refers back to the opening idea, is lost. In the opening argument, the speaker expresses three separate ideas. The second idea (Rows 3 & 4: *Clearly our aim would be to END the threat against OURSELVES*) and the third (Row 5: *and the best way to do that would be to END TERRORISM*), elaborate on the first (Rows 1 & 2: *Well I would CERTAINLY agree with EVERYTHING he says about - BROAD AIMS*). The speaker separates the first from the other two quite clearly using intonation and syntax. The interpreter, on the other hand, subordinates the third idea to the first using a 'that' clause and eliminates the second entirely (Rows 1, 2 & 5: *Professor Sykes agrees with everything ~you have said about the measures that / we need to take to reach the end of the acts of TERROR and to end TERRORISM*).

It is unclear to what degree these problems arise from difficulties with the target language and it should be noted that the student seems to have rather less difficulty, particularly with propositional content, in her interpretation into her mother tongue.

It would be difficult to argue, based on the above performance, that problems with procedural and directive devices should receive special attention during the teaching process. In this instance, they seem to form part of a more complex group of difficulties which the student experiences simultaneously. However, a number of observations from the remaining performances analysed do provide some support for the idea that such devices are particularly problematic.

The first of these is evidence from the performance of Student 2, who had a great deal of difficulty in rendering procedural and directive devices yet experienced relatively few problems with propositional content. Examples of this appear both in her performance into her mother tongue and into the foreign language. The table corresponding to the student's performance into the foreign language is shown below:

Table 4 (Student 2)

	Original (Interlocutor speaking English)	Interpretation (Student 2 speaking her foreign language: Spanish)
1	<i>IN FACT</i>	<i>In fact</i>
2	We began to realise at that point in time --- <i>how</i> --- <i>vulnerable</i> – we were	since the attacks -- on the twin towers -- we have known --- that we are very vulnerable to terrorists
3	<i>and how</i> – <i>well prepared</i> these terrorist - organisations had become	<i>and</i> we didn't know -- how well prepared the terrorist organisations were.
4	And <i>how</i> – and often we <i>FOUND OUT</i> that they were <i>actually in our MIDST</i> when we had no inkling that they were ~there	<i>And</i> we <i>also</i> know now that the terrorists live where we live.
5	<i>I mean it's been a COMPLETE surprise to ME</i>	<i>It's a surprise for Professor Sykes that</i>
6	to realise that <i>BRITAIN and London in particular</i> is - considered <i>really</i> a bit of a terrorist ~haven	in the United Kingdom <i>especially</i> in London there are a load of terrorists.
7	<i>and</i>	<i>And</i>
8	<i>SEVERAL CELLS</i> of terrorists have been	some terrorist cells have been in London.

	discovered in London	
9	<i>not only in London of course</i>	<i>But</i>
10	<i>there've also been cells discovered in the US</i>	there have <i>ALSO</i> been terrorist cells in the United States
11	<i>and in various European countries including in fact SPAIN I think</i>	<i>and also</i> in Spain.
12	<i>there were certainly on the television some arrests in Barcelona over – the CHRISTMAS period</i>	Some terrorists were arrested in Barcelona at Christmas
13	<i>I think it WAS</i>	
14	<i>and these are groups of people that one had no ~IDEA could be involved in this kind of movement</i>	<i>We didn't know</i> that there were groups like these in the countries.
15	<i>~AGAIN just this is really to sort of underline and point up what a huge ~change there's been</i>	
16	-- it had <i>NEVER</i> happened before that a ~ <i>BRITAIN</i> had been involved in a ~ <i>SUICIDE</i> bombing in Israel	It hasn't happened before that an English person has been involved in a suicide attack in Israel.
17	<i>and we've JUST HAD</i> over the last couple of weeks the first – two Britons involved in ~ <i>SUICIDE</i> bombings in Israel	In the last two weeks two – Britons -- have committed suicide attacks in Israel.
18	-- <i>and so I suppose -- what I'm SAYING is that</i>	
19		-- <i>And -- thanks to</i>
20	The 11 th of September was the first time that we all woke up and <i>REALISED</i> how – <i>extensive</i> this network of terror had <i>BECOME</i>	the attacks on the twin towers we now know that there is a very extensive network of terrorists
21	<i>and - it's CLEARLY incumbent upon us ~ALL</i>	<i>and we must</i>
22	to -- put our ~ <i>BEST</i> into - the fight against --- terror	fight the terrorists
23	The <i>WAR</i> on terror as George Bush calls it	in the war on terror as President Bush calls it.
24	- <i>because - I think that</i>	
25	terrorists like these <i>THREATEN</i> our very – <i>SOCIETY</i> our very way of life our very values	The terrorists threaten society
26	<i>and I think it's incumbent upon us ALL</i>	<i>and we must</i>
27	to do our best to <i>fight</i> them	fight them

The interpreter correctly interprets the majority of the propositional content of this piece of discourse (for instance, she correctly renders all of the countries, cities and other proper names mentioned). However, much of the ostensive guidance which is used to construct the argument and to indicate the attitude of the speaker to the content expressed is lost.

Surprise is the emotion that characterizes the original discourse. It is in evidence throughout and is expressed using a variety of devices, including intonation, choice of vocabulary and vocal stress. Clues to this attitude are largely missing from the interpreter's rendition of the piece. The speaker stresses the importance of her feeling of surprise as she introduces the issue of the British suicide bombers (Row 15). This is missing from the interpretation, where the acts of the British suicide bombers are presented as part of a list, the components of which are all given equal importance (Rows 14, 16 & 17).

The speaker's indications of a tentative approach to the presentation of her ideas ('I think' four times, 'I suppose what I'm saying', etc.) are also missing from the interpretation.

Where the interpreter does introduce some ostensive guidance she does so incorrectly. To give one example, in the original discourse, the fact that terrorist cells have been discovered in other Western countries in addition to Britain is expressed parenthetically and to support the principal fact, the one that has shocked Interlocutor 2, that cells have been discovered in the heart of Britain. The parenthetical nature of this section of the discourse is indicated by low pitch, rapid delivery and an introductory phrase to bracket the section off from the main point of the utterance (Row 9). The pitch rises when the speaker returns to her main point at 'and these are groups of people' (Row 14). In contrast, in the interpreted discourse, the interpreter emphasizes the fact that cells have been discovered not only in Britain but also in the US and Spain (Rows 9 - 10) as if to imply that Britain is not at fault or not alone for some reason.

The student's performance into the mother tongue (Table 5 below) shows evidence of similar difficulties with procedural and directive devices.

Table 5 (Student 2)

	Original (Interlocutor speaking Spanish)	Interpretation (Student 2 speaking her mother tongue: English)
1	<i>RIGHT.</i>	<i>NOW</i>
2	<i>I see that my colleague -- has ~brought up the ~idea of</i>	
3	<i>a network of terrorists that is establishing itself in democratic countries</i>	<i>there are a network of terrorists not just in Israel and Palestine but also in all democratic countries.</i>
4	<i>which LINKS IN with</i>	
5	<i>The PREVIOUSLY mentioned idea that</i>	
6	<i>this conflict is IMPORTANT not only for the two countries INVOLVED Israel and Palestine but for the whole WORLD</i>	<i>The conflict is therefore not just in Israel and Palestine but throughout the world.</i>
7	<i>Since</i>	
8	<i>it is a POLITICAL ISSUE that will determine the future of an interlinked INTERNATIONAL network of nations</i>	<i>It's a political question and it refers to the TWO groups</i>
9	<i>Why?</i>	<i>Link provided by speed of run on from above phrase to phrase below and intonation</i>
10	<i>Because it involves TWO CLEARLY DEFINED SIDES: on the one hand the Palestínians who are supported BY the MUSLIM WORLD and on the other the ISRAELIS who are supported by WESTERN countries</i>	<i>the PALESTINIANS are supported by the Muslims in the world while the Israelis are supported by the Western countries.</i>
11	<i>In the final analysis</i>	<i>The real aim is</i>
12	<i>what we want to DO – or I think we want to do ALL of us is to remove the threat to OURSELVES</i>	<i>to end the threat to OURSELVES</i>
13		<i>the threat of terrorism that WE face</i>
14		<i>we need to protect ourselves against the potential terrorist attacks that could occur in our own countries.</i>
15	<i>There are vested interests in OIL</i>	
16	<i>But also</i>	

17	there are interests in fomenting terrorism in our own <i>COUNTRIES</i> .	
----	--	--

In the original Spanish the speaker begins by pointing out a link between an idea his interlocutor has just formulated and an idea that he himself had expressed previously in the discourse (Rows 2, 3, 4 & 5). This is done, presumably, with a view to emphasizing what the two interlocutors have in common and bringing his opposite number round to the speaker's generally more pro-Palestinian view of the conflict and possible solutions to it. Supporting evidence for this is to be found in the fact that the speaker later emphasizes a common aim (Row 12). In the interpretation no such link is explicitly made. Instead, the interpreter begins with vocally stressed 'NOW' (Row 1) and the hearer may infer that the speaker intends this to be understood as contrasting with some previous situation or that he wishes to add urgency to the statement, made later by the interpreter, that 'we need to protect ourselves against the potential terrorist attacks that could occur in our own countries' (Row 14).

The student also has difficulty in rendering the speaker's meaning expressed in rows 8 – 10. However, it should be pointed out that part of her difficulty here probably stems from incorrect intonation used by the speaker, who was working from a list of bullet points and began the phrase in row 8 before he was sure of the intended meaning.

The second observation which could be taken to provide some support for the idea that procedural and directive devices are particularly problematic is to be found in the performances of Students 3 and 5. Both students sometimes use two contrasting directives in quick succession as if unsure which is the right link (Table 3, Rows 13 & 20; Excerpt from Table 5 below, Row 23).

In addition, as I have already stated, all of the students who took part in this study experienced at least one difficulty in rendering ostensive guidance. Even Student 1, who generally managed both propositional content and ostensive guidance well, misinterpreted a directive device of some importance during her performance into her mother tongue (Table 1, Row 8). The original speech compares what we see in the press about Palestinian suicide bombings (which the speaker explains as a response to Israeli attack) with Israeli actions. The vocal stress placed on the discourse connector used to introduce the statement about Israel's actions ('But at the SAME TIME') and the use of 'but' rather than 'and' suggests that it is Israel's actions, rather than those of the Palestinians, which are the cause of the violence. In the interpretation, on the other hand, Palestinian and Israeli actions are presented as events happening simultaneously and are given equal weight. There is no suggestion that one group's activities are the cause of the actions of the other.

It is interesting to note, too, that there is one instance of the interpretation of a procedural device as if it encoded content in the material analysed. An excerpt from the table relating to the performance concerned (by Student 5) is shown below:

Excerpt from Table 5 (Student 5)

	Original (Interlocutor speaking English)	Interpretation (Student 5 speaking foreign language)
23	<i>and in fact</i>	<i>but and</i>

24	<i>if you look at the FACTS</i>	we <i>NEED</i> to see the facts
25	things become a lot <i>CLEARER</i> the <i>REACTIONS</i> of the Israelis become a lot more understandable	
26	<i>For EXAMPLE-- DID you know</i>	<i>She would like to</i> know if you know
27	that over the last decade there have been 250 <i>SUICIDE</i> attacks -- in Israel carried out by Palestinians.	that over the last 10 years there have been 250 suicide attacks in Israel carried out by the Palest'stinians
28	<i>DID you know for example</i>	<i>and</i>
29	that the paramilitary organisations <i>~HIDE</i> - <i>~ARMED AMONGST</i> civilians in refugee camps such as <i>JENIN</i> for example -- on <i>PURPOSE INTENTIONALLY</i>	that 'soldiers from the Palest'stinian army <i>GO</i> to the camps with the refugees
30	which makes it extremely <i>DIFFICULT</i> for the <i>ISRAELI</i> troops to avoid civilian <i>DEATHS</i> as they'd like	<i>and THAT</i> makes it very very <i>'DIFFICULT</i> to avoid deaths

In the expressions '*for EXAMPLE -- DID you know*' and '*DID you know for example*' (Rows 26 & 28), the question '*DID you know*' is rhetorical. In the interpretation, this device becomes a direct question requiring an answer from the interlocutor ('*She would like to* know if you know that' in Row 26).

Conclusion

Detailed analysis of the performances of these students does seem to allow one to pick out aspects which confirm teachers' intuitions regarding the special status of 'links' The use, by two different students, of two directives in quick succession as if uncertain of the link between two concepts is particularly interesting. However, the complexity of the interpreter's task and the difficulties inherent in its study make it difficult to draw any firm conclusions on this subject. As Setton (this volume: 14) says, in *Interpreting Studies* 'the object of study is one of bewildering complexity, (...) so much so that in many cases informed intuition still seems more reliable than sophisticated scientific methodology in picking out significant patterns.'

The inspiration for this paper arose from the perceived confluence of two fields of study. On the one hand, the observations and intuition of teachers of interpreting had led them to identify 'links' as an area of difficulty for students. On the other, Relevance Theorists had proposed a distinction between procedural (that is to say, computational) and propositional (or representational) aspects of language. Our purpose in this paper has been to begin to explore the possibility of applying the concepts developed by Relevance Theory to gain a clearer understanding of the difficulty identified by interpreting teachers. However, the breadth of the definition of procedural and directive devices used in the study proved rather too great, obscuring rather than clarifying the issue. A fruitful avenue for further study might be to focus only on those items which Relevance Theorists consider to fulfil a purely procedural function, that is to say, which make no contribution to the propositional content of utterances. If it is the computational rather than the representational nature of items which presents student interpreters with difficulties, such an approach should produce clearer results.

References

- Ficchi, Velia. 1999. "Learning Consecutive Interpretation: An Empirical Study and an Autonomous Approach." In: *Interpreting: International Journal of Research and Practice in Interpreting*, 4(2), 199-218.
- Herbert, Jean. 1952. *Manuel de l'interprète*. Geneva: Georg.
- Luscher, Jean Marc. 1994. "Les marques de connexion: des guides pour l'interprétation." In: J. Moeschler, A. Reboul, J-M. Luscher and J. Jayez, *Langage et pertinence : Référence temporelle, anaphore, connecteurs et métaphore*. Nancy: Presses Universitaires de Nancy, 175-227.
- Rozan, Jean François. 1959. *La prise de notes en interprétation consecutive*. Geneva: Georg.
- Setton, Robin. 1999. *Simultaneous Interpretation: A Cognitive-Pragmatic Analysis*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Setton, Robin. 2005. "So what is so interesting about simultaneous interpreting?"
- Sperber, Dan and Wilson, Deirdre. 1986/1995. *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*. Oxford: Blackwell.