TRANSKULTURALITÄT – TRANSLATION – TRANSFER

To Know How to Suggest …

Approaches to Teaching Conference Interpreting

Dörte Andres/Martina Behr (eds.)

Frank & Timme

Verlag für wissenschaftliche Literatur

Dörte Andres / Martina Behr (eds.)
To Know How to Suggest …

Transkulturalität – Translation – Transfer, Band 16
Herausgegeben von
Dörte Andres / Martina Behr / Larisa Schippel / Cornelia Zwischenberger

Dörte Andres / Martina Behr (eds.)

To Know How to Suggest …

Approaches to Teaching Conference Interpreting

Frank & Timme
Verlag für wissenschaftliche Literatur

Umschlagabbildung: © Maren Dingfelder Stone

CIUTI

Die Publikation wurde von CIUTI gefördert.

ISBN 978-3-7329-0114-2
ISSN 2196-2405

Herstellung durch Frank & Timme GmbH,
Wittelsbacherstraße 27a, 10707 Berlin.
Printed in Germany.
Gedruckt auf säurefreiem, alterungsbeständigem Papier.

www.frank-timme.de

To know how to suggest is the art of teaching.
(Henri-Frédéric Amiel)

Contents

Foreword by Daniel Gile

Remarkable, highly talented personalities, who became interpreters because of historical circumstances but could probably have had brilliant careers in other fields as well, set high standards for conference interpreting around the middle of the twentieth century, when it became a prestigious professional career. Their personal influence was such that their ideas about training were adopted readily in the most prestigious schools where they taught and in association with certain ideals as set out by AIIC, the International Association of Conference Interpreters.

As time passed, the interpreting environment changed and became highly diversified. Today's conference interpreters face speeches, working conditions and expectations which sometimes differ considerably from those encountered by their illustrious predecessors. The background and aptitudes of many interpreting students are also quite different from those of the first- and second-generation conference interpreters. Finally, the didactic and institutional environments of interpreter training programs have changed considerably over time.

Ideas about training therefore had to be re-examined with a view to optimize programs and to comply with local academic and professional requirements. Moreover, scientific research about interpreting, and in particular about interpreting cognition, brought new insights which also had potential implications on the best teaching and learning practices. Finally, globalization and communication and information technology have been opening up new possibilities for knowledge and skills acquisition.

This could be one explanation of the reason why interpreter training has been and remains a central focal point in the interpreting literature, both professional and academic. A single, idealized model of the highly gifted 'born interpreter' no longer seems adequate. Neither does a simplistic, insensitive 'practice and sink or swim' philosophy of training. Not only because the stress-induced suffering in students who will not make it appears unnecessarily cruel, but also because it makes sense to assume that more systematic investigation into aptitudes, training methods and learning processes could lead to improvements and to better output, including successful training of candidates

who might fail if their particular idiosyncrasies are not taken on board through appropriate tools and policies.

Canonical science (e.g. experiments, correlational studies etc.) may help in advancing towards better training, though due to variability and the numerous interacting variables, combined with technical difficulties in quantifying them meaningfully, it is not reasonable to expect it to yield many clear-cut answers with direct applications at this time. Theoretical reflection may also contribute: even without 'solid' evidence as required by canonical research, critical reflection and discussion among many scholars is likely to identify relevant issues and perhaps open up avenues for improvement. Experiential knowledge gained in the field, that is, classroom experience, is equally valuable. Maximum cross-fertilization could be achieved when the input of each is fed into a common pool of knowledge and ideas, to be discussed and evaluated.

This collective volume is a case in point: input from various sources and under various angles is provided as food for thought. This includes overviews of theories, discussions of related issues and examples of training practice and tools, including the most recent technological tools. Not on a prescriptive mode, but as a set of resources. I believe such resources could be useful to trainers who are only familiar with the training model which they experienced as students, perhaps with some reservations.

The publication in English of a collection of papers by authors from the German-speaking world (most of the authors in this volume are) is also welcome. Their research, reflection and training endeavours are less visible to the Interpreting Studies community at large than they deserve to be because they tend to publish more in German than in English. This book is a good opportunity for readers not familiar with them to get acquainted with their work and experience.

Daniel Gile

Preface by the Editors

In May 2011, at the General Assembly Meeting of the *Conférence Internationale des Universités de Traduction et d'Interprétation* (CIUTI) in Beijing, the members reinforced their goal of sharing expertise among the CIUTI member institutions. They agreed upon the creation of different work groups to develop and implement train-the-trainers schemes for interpreters and translators. Dörte Andres (University of Mainz/FTSK Germersheim) agreed to head a work group for conference interpreting. She developed an initial concept for a train-the-trainers workshop in cooperation with her colleagues Martina Behr, Catherine Chabasse and Sabine Seubert, all also from the University of Mainz/FTSK Germersheim, and distributed it to the other members of the CIUTI work group: Martina Behr (also for Saarland University, Germany), Bart Defranq (University College Ghent, Belgium), Catherine Chabasse (University of Mainz/FTSK Germersheim, Germany), Lena Menhem (ETIB Beirut, Lebanon), Marie Mériaud (ISIT Paris, France), Alessandra Riccardi (SSLMIT Trieste, Italy), Isabelle Seguela (ISIT Paris, France) and Olga Zharkova (MSU Moscow, Russia). These members met at a kick-off meeting in November 2011 at ISIT, Paris, which was organised by Marie Mériaud. The concept was discussed and revised in detail during the one-day meeting. Thanks to the valuable contributions of the colleagues involved, a template for a train-the-trainers workshop was created and later finalised by the Germersheim team in autumn 2011.

On the basis of this template, six interpreting trainers (Dörte Andres, Martina Behr, Catherine Chabasse, Stephanie Kader, Maren Dingfelder Stone and Sabine Seubert) developed a week long train-the-trainers seminar. It was held for the first time in August 2012 at the FTSK in Germersheim in the context of the *Germersheim International Summer School* (ISG), organised by Wini Kern. It was attended by ten Interpreting trainers from four countries. The success of this seminar led to a second workshop in September 2014.

The idea of publishing the contents of the seminar arose with the motivation to reach non-German-speaking educators. The teachers involved wrote one article per teaching unit. This publication comprises these articles, togeth-

er with additional contributions from Sylvia Kalina (FH Köln), Marc Orlando (Monash University) and Jacquy Neff (FTSK Germersheim).

The importance of didactic training in conference interpreting has become the subject of increased discussion due to the differentiation of interpreter training, such as in the novel concepts for imparting fundamental court interpreting as well as specialist interpreting skills. The number of interpreter-training offerings in non-European countries has risen as well. New institutions are being created that could benefit from a didactic approach to the development of interpreting competence. This also means that an increased exchange of information between training centres must occur in order to make the didactics of (conference) interpreting an integral part of training. This fulfils a demand already articulated by the conference interpreter and renowned expert on the didactics of interpreting Daniel Gile in 1982:

Les cours d'interprétation dispensés dans les écoles spécialisées, universitaires, et autres établissements sont nombreux, mais le détail des démarches, techniques et méthodes utilisées reste largement inconnu, faute d'un échange d'information suffisant. […] Dans cette optique, les échanges d'information entre enseignants, notamment par le biais d'articles […], sont susceptibles d'apporter une contribution importante en permettant à tous de profiter des initiatives de chacun. (Gile 1982: 350f)[1]

Didactically oriented publications have existed since the early days of conference interpreting, when practicing interpreters such as Jean Herbert, Jean Francois Rozan and Henri van Hoof expressed initial reflections on this profession and its training. The theoretical elaboration of the phenomenon of interpreting in the context of interpreting studies has also provided us with insights into the processes that occur during interpreting. This allows us to divide the overall interpreting process into individual components during training, which can then be practiced in a focused manner. An essential requirement based on insights from the psychology of cognition and learning is

1 There are numerous interpreting courses offered by specialised schools and university departments as well as other institutions, but details about the procedures, techniques and methods used remain largely obscure due to an inadequate exchange of information. […] Given this situation, the exchange of information between teachers, particularly in the form of articles […], is likely to make a significant contribution and to allow everyone to benefit from the efforts of each individual. (Translation: Yann Kiraly)

that the student be at the centre of the learning process. The CIUTI, which, at its general assembly meeting in Shanghai in May 2014, declared that "Teaching quality means putting the student in the centre", shares this goal.

This volume does not aim to present in-depth scientific theories. Individual theoretical perspectives are discussed where they provide the basis for a specific application in interpreter training and if exercise types can be derived from them, which are then explained in detail. Some of the resulting concepts introduced here already have a longer tradition within training institutions. Others are based on new developments that will influence both interpreting training and practice.

The contributions in this volume are meant to serve as suggestions for experienced interpreter training practitioners who may not have received theory-based training in this domain during their studies. It may provide them with a new perspective on various topics. Their current teaching activities can be complemented by and confirmed through new explanations. This volume also includes discussions on the relative usefulness of various exercise types as well as suggestions for making teaching in the days of short master's degree programmes even more efficient and student-oriented.

At the same time, this book is also geared towards teachers just starting out in conference interpreter training, either at an existing institution or in the context of the creation of new ones in countries that may lack a long tradition of interpreter training. As editors and authors we are well aware that this volume has an inevitable Eurocentric perspective. The views and ideas presented here can certainly not adequately account for all countries, language combinations and culturally specific forms of teaching. We hope, however, that it can still provide encouragement to consider new approaches with a view toward adapting them to individual requirements.

In the first contribution in this volume, **Sylvia Kalina** describes the long development from the beginnings of (conference) interpreting and on-the-job training to a didactically well-founded form of interpreter training. The author also discusses new insights gained in the increasingly interdisciplinary field of interpreting studies and illustrates their importance. Kalina ends her discussion with thoughts on the future of training and practice in these times of new technologies, evolving study habits and the changing relevance of bodies of knowledge.

The institutionalisation of conference interpreting and therefore the abandonment of the idea of a natural aptitude for interpreting increasingly pose the question of which abilities students must have in order to complete their interpreting studies successfully. In her contribution, **Catherine Chabasse** explains the necessary competencies and skills for performing simultaneous as well as consecutive interpreting. She shows which examination methods can be used in the context of aptitude tests and therefore provides a scientific basis for an improved prediction of a student's future performance.

There is a consensus in the interpreting studies literature that it is important to introduce students to the process of interpreting in a step-by-step manner and initially to familiarise them with sub-competencies. Preliminary exercises are the ideal teaching technique for this purpose. As these exercises are the subject of controversial discussions in the relevant literature, **Dörte Andres, Sophia Boden** and **Claudia Fuchs** discuss the didactic relevance of preliminary exercises for the development of skills relevant to interpreting, which have been developed by researchers and teachers in order to provide an easier entry into the field of simultaneous interpreting.

Attention is of great importance in conference interpreting. **Catherine Chabasse** and **Maren Dingfelder Stone** explain Daniel Gile's Effort Models and apply them to the topics of directionality and language pair specificity. They provide practical didactic suggestions for various learning stages and language pairs. The primary goals are to increase the students' sensitivity to capacity allocation shifts and therefore to facilitate their acquisition of the necessary problem-solving skills.

Comprehension is a basic prerequisite for successful interpreting and is dependent on the level of difficulty of the source text. Interpreting didactics has so far not paid much attention to the difficulty level of texts and effective text selection. **Dörte Andres** therefore discusses text-internal and presentation-based difficulty parameters and examines the didactic relevance of exploring interpreting texts and their difficulties (under consideration of the master's thesis completed by Henriette Kilger at the FTSK on text comprehension and text difficulties in interpreter training).

Student-oriented learning in interpreting means that students must be able to reflect critically on the skills they have acquired. This requires the conscious use of interpreting strategies. **Stephanie Kader** and **Sabine Seubert** collect various interpreting strategies in their contribution and illustrate their complex interaction in the interpreting process. The description of the strategies

shows the importance and function of these strategies in simultaneous and consecutive interpreting. The specific examples of teaching the strategies in courses take the different learning levels of the students into account.

Systematic note-taking was one of the first topics in conference interpreting to be dealt with didactically. Over time a number of significantly different opinions emerged on whether a note-taking system should be taught and, if so, how this should be done. **Maren Dingfelder Stone** evaluates the various approaches in her contribution and highlights the most important and generally accepted recommendations in note taking training. She explains how the systematic and structured as well as language-independent teaching of systematic note-taking can be made an integral part of conference interpreter training.

Digital interpreting facilities, which emulate real-life interpreting situations, for example with the digital audio and video recording of interpretations, are increasingly being integrated into interpreter-training courses. The digital pen is also one of these interpreter-training tools. **Marc Orlando** discusses its application in the development of note-taking systems. He uses specific examples to show that the digital pen technology provides students and teachers with insights into the process of note taking. This illustrates the relationship between note taking, comprehension, analysis and the memorisation of a source speech.

High-quality interpreter training ensures adherence to high quality standards in interpreting practice. This training involves very regular and frequent evaluation of the students. **Martina Behr** describes the relevant quality criteria for interpreting practice and presents evaluation sheets for use in training. She also provides a detailed discussion of the contribution of good feedback to helping students learn in a motivated and goal-oriented way, while also providing specific hints on how to phrase such feedback in a fair and performance-enhancing manner.

The demand for employability, a topic of constantly increasing importance, is also geared towards interpreter training institutions. In his contribution, **Jacquy Neff** shows that teaching market-relevant skills is often neglected, even though professional associations do emphasise this topic. He shows what knowledge students must possess in order to compete on the current conference interpreting market by describing his course on professionalisation.

Teaching units in conference interpreter training aim to guide students in an efficient and goal-oriented manner. The acquisition of interpreting competence is largely achieved through intensive self-study. Digital media and in-

formation technologies offer new possibilities in this domain. In the final contribution, **Maren Dingfelder Stone** presents the *Moodle Online Platform, Self-Study in Interpreting* (MOPSI) platform that she has developed. She explains how this mode of self-study allows the students to correct their individual weaknesses with appropriate exercises.

We would like to thank everyone who has contributed to the creation of this volume. We would like to mention the CIUTI, which provided the funding for this publication. We would also like to thank the authors for their contributions as well as the translators for their efforts. Special thanks go to Flora Boegel for the careful formatting and the thorough review of the articles and to Charlotte Kieslich for supporting her.

Karlsruhe, December 2014
The editors, Dörte Andres and Martina Behr

Translated from German by Yann Kiraly

Interpreter Training and Interpreting Studies – Which is the Chicken and which is the Egg?

Sylvia Kalina
sylvia.kalina@fh-koeln.de
Cologne University of Applied Science, Germany
Sylvia.kalina@iued.uni-heidelberg.de
Heidelberg University, Germany

1. Early Interpreting and Interpreter Schools: On-the-job Training

The history of conference interpreting is full of impressive, self-trained personalities who interpreted in the consecutive mode and whose extensive knowledge and language skills provided an excellent basis for their interpreting activities. One might therefore assume that training in conference interpreting only began with the advent of the simultaneous mode. But a look at the history of this profession reveals that interpreters had been receiving some kind of training long before.

There is evidence that there must have been some training of professional interpreters in the ancient world. As early as the 9th century, boys were sent to missionary and other schools for the purpose of learning other languages, which they used later as interpreters (Schneider 2012). Their training included the mastery of foreign languages, but also specific interpreting skills (Wiotte-Franz 2001), whatever they may have consisted of at the time. From the 12th century on, highly qualified *dragomans* (the Egyptian and then Turkish term for interpreters) assisted in the negotiation of contacts between authorities and consulates (in Arabic, Turkish and Persian) in Egypt (Schneider 2012), and groups of boys were instructed in these languages so that they could become dragomans.

During the Roman Empire, interpreters were regularly used for high-level negotiations after military conflicts (Hermann 1956). These very first 'conference interpreters' with a command of scholarly languages enjoyed high aca-

demic status, whereas other interpreters were widely regarded as irresponsible rogues and potential traitors (Gässer 1956). Clerical institutions explicitly obliged their interpreters to keep the information they obtained confidential and heed the principles of fidelity and correctness (Schneider 2012). At that time, consecutive interpreting (CI) was mostly expected to render the sense of an utterance in a compressed version, although at times there was a need for word-for-word renderings (Schneider 2012). Since then, the great debate about literal/free renderings, compression and completeness has never ceased.

Efforts to train interpreters at scholarly institutions can be traced back to the 13th century, when the Chancellor of the University of Paris was requested to establish a so-called Oriental College where students were taught languages, law, sciences, mathematics, theology and medicine (Thieme 1956). Christopher Columbus requested training for the native Indian-Americans he brought back from his voyages (cf. Moser-Mercer 2005a, Kurz 2012), hoping that once they had learned Spanish, they would be able to act as interpreters. In the 17th century Ottoman Empire, apprentice dragomans were trained for seven years in Istanbul (AIIC 2005), and another Oriental Academy was set up in Austria (Joukova 2002), while the Turkish Translation Chamber started their own training of Muslim dragomans in 1833, suspecting that Greek interpreters might falsify the intended meaning with their translations (Adams 2014). Interpreting for high-level contacts was practised long before the profession of the conference interpreter developed, and in some places it was taught as a skill long before university courses started offering specific training to aspiring conference interpreters.

The first exponents of consecutive interpreting to appear at an international level had become professionals because of their bi- or multilingual and -cultural upbringing and experience. They had devised CI techniques of their own, and many of them relied on their phenomenal memories. It was only during and after the Paris Peace Conference (1919) and the establishment of the League of Nations that there turned out not to be enough of these natural and multilingual talents. To cover the growing need for conference interpreters, some sort of formal training had to be provided.

In the late 1920s, the International Labour Organisation (ILO) in Geneva introduced ad hoc sessions for consecutive training (Baigorri-Jalón 2004). Initial trials with early equipment for simultaneous interpreting (SI) were organised in 1928, both by ILO in Geneva and the Comintern Congress in Moscow (Moser-Mercer 2005a), and when, after the end of World War II, SI

was used systematically at the Nuremberg trials, it became evident that even if consecutive had been practised largely without any formal and specific training, working in the simultaneous mode required a certain degree of prior instruction. For the Nuremberg trials, this training took place under the aegis of Colonel Leon Dostert, himself an interpreter for U.S. President Eisenhower, on an ad hoc basis (Gaiba 1998). However, before any interpreters could be trained for simultaneous work during the trials, they had to undergo a selection procedure. It became apparent that testing for the ability to work in the simultaneous mode would have to be more demanding than testing for consecutive.

In addition to language proficiency, resilience to stress, and the ability to concentrate, mental agility to find equivalents under pressure, physical stamina to keep up high-level performance over time, as well as good voice quality, and clear enunciation were required. (Moser-Mercer 2005a: 207)

Most of the subsequent training can best be described as 'learning by doing', or, as Baigorri-Jalón (2004) put it, "on-the-job" training. Training methods were as yet unknown, and "trial and error were the order of the day" (Moser-Mercer 2005b: 62).

One of the questions that was debated at that early stage of SI and is still a matter of controversy today was whether the interpreters chosen should work into their A- or their B- language; a number of them actually worked into their B-language (cf. Moser-Mercer 2005a, see Seubert & Kader in this volume).

Texts used for practising SI were often taken from newspapers, as there was no awareness of the criteria determining whether a text was appropriate for interpreting in the simultaneous mode. Later, speeches were read or improvised by one person with gradually increasing speed and complexity, the interpreters translated into a telephone-like device and another person listened and reviewed the interpreter's output (Baigorri-Jalón 2004). Mock conferences and trials were held and interpreted; other components were the writing of summary reports of meetings, studying thematic subjects, and translation, especially at sight. The two crucial criteria for evaluation during courses and at examinations were accuracy and clarity of the message (Baigorri-Jalón 2004).

Léon Dostert turned to the Geneva School of Translation and Interpretation (ETI), where conference interpreting was already being taught, though

only in the consecutive mode. He recruited some of his interpreters from the students and teachers he met there. Only two to three weeks were available to prepare the future SI interpreters for the Nuremberg trials, and when simultaneous was introduced at the United Nations (again by Dostert) and the Council of Europe a few years later, two to three months had to suffice.

2. Practice and Theory: Training and Reflection

Despite the reluctance of many professional CI interpreters to go simultaneous, for fear of being unable to maintain the quality of their work (cf. Baigorri-Jalón 2004: 50), some of the 'grand old' consecutive interpreters agreed to work in the booth, where some of them even managed without any further training. This may explain why the Paris school has always held the view that once a student fully masters consecutive, simultaneous will be no hurdle for him/her and will be learned quite naturally.

Soon it became obvious that interpreters working at high-level meetings needed training even for CI, and as a result universities, mainly in Europe, developed courses for conference interpreting. There was no doubt that universities were the only institutions where such highly specialised training could be provided. The School of Translation and Interpretation (now ETI) in Geneva was founded in 1941; SI was introduced there officially only in 1949 and did not become an integral part of the curriculum before 1953, after students had introduced it unofficially with their own technical equipment in 1947 (Moser-Mercer 2005a). In the years thereafter, other schools followed in Heidelberg, Vienna, Mainz (Germersheim), Saarbruecken, Graz, Paris and other places. The courses offered were mostly postgraduate or were combined translation and interpreting courses. Fully-fledged conference interpreter degrees with SI were introduced in the 1950s and 1960s. Here, as before, simultaneous was accepted only after a tough battle with the defenders of CI (Baigorri-Jalón 2004) who were the great interpreters and teachers of the time.

Even before SI was widely taught in university courses, the first contributions to what was to become the discipline of interpreting studies (IS) came from teachers of the famous Geneva school, all of them experienced high-level conference interpreters. Apart from passing on their own experience to their students, some of them soon started to reflect upon their teaching methods. Until then, interpreting had been practised without anyone caring much about

how and why it worked; but as soon as full university courses were set up, the first handbooks with recommendations for future conference interpreters were published. One pioneering figure was Jean Herbert, who penned a famous handbook (Herbert 1952), in which he sets out what an aspiring conference interpreter needs, why and how interpreting is different from translation, and which kind of challenges must be confronted. It also contains a few judgements on appropriate interpreter behaviour in cases of uncertainty, e.g. whether and when to correct a speaker's error, how to handle ambiguities, and note-taking in CI. It is interesting to note that most of his recommendations have remained valid to this day and are quoted frequently by contemporary interpreting teachers. Rozan taught CI and put together the principles and methods of note-taking (1956). Though few in number, they continue to form the basis for note-taking today. Research has meanwhile shown what mental processes are at work during note-taking and target-text production in the consecutive mode (Albl-Mikasa 2007; Andres 2002), and its results have proved Rozan's method to be correct. Gérard Ilg described not only what he had observed while working as a consecutive interpreter himself but also sketched out a framework for the teaching of it, with references to, and critical comments on, the articles published by teachers at other schools. He thus laid the groundwork for a scholarly discussion of training methods (Ilg 1959, 1980/1988).

These conference interpreting teachers all described regularities they had observed in their own and their colleagues' interpreting practice; they concluded that those regularities provided a model for quality interpreting and should therefore be taught. They explained the ways in which professional interpreters solved typical interpreting problems and compared their methods with those chosen by students. From their findings, they derived hypotheses regarding interpreting processes.

With translation studies gradually developing into the overall discipline of translation and interpreting (T&I), Otto Kade (1968) attempted to derive a theory of interpreting from translation theory based, at that time, on an early information-theoretical approach which held that equivalence in the communicative content of texts drafted in different codes is the core of translation. According to this view, the operations performed include substitution of code signs, grammatical transformation, lexical-semantic modulation, interpretation and paraphrase (as a result of a recoding operation). Though anchored in the theoretical thinking of the period and based on a conception of languages as codes, this approach provides some early references to strategic processing

and therefore paved the way for subsequent research on interpreting. Hella Kirchhoff (1976) took up Kade's ideas and defined interpreting as a complex and multiple problem-solving task to be tackled with sequences of strategic operations. It is a multi-phase process, where segments of the target text are produced in phase shift as against the production of the source text. Crucial factors are situation-determining conditions (such as source text delivery rate), the principle of economy (i.e. formal reduction in interpreter output) and automatisation of routine operations. These automatisms and operations have to be trained.

As the interpreting school in Paris (ESIT) started to develop its postgraduate course under the aegis of an outstanding interpreter and committed teacher, Danica Seleskovitch, some (pre-)theoretical concepts of university training for conference interpreters were developed. As Seleskovitch herself had mainly amassed her interpreting experience in the consecutive mode, she focused on that mode and developed a first theoretical model of how, in her opinion, it worked. This resulted in her well-known theory of deverbalisation, or *théorie du sens*. For Seleskovitch (1975), comprehension is the crucial process, and analysis of what a speaker has said should enable the interpreter to find out what his/her intention is. Seleskovitch (1968) regarded this as interpreting proper based on deverbalisation, whereas proceeding word-for-word was transcoding and not really interpreting. In the teaching of interpreting proper (in the consecutive mode) she deemed it unnecessary to provide systematic note-taking training, as comprehension of the *sens* in the deverbalised mode is the only requirement. Her focus on CI led her to suggest that SI, though proceeding more on a word-for-word level, is not different from CI, except for the temporal factor, and that it should only be taught after students had fully mastered consecutive.

An even more important contribution made by Seleskovitch was her insistence on IS as a discipline in its own right that needed cooperation from other disciplines beyond the confines of translation studies. She invited her most ambitious students to engage in theoretical work and established the famous Paris *cycle de doctorat* which was to become the cradle of conference interpreting studies. Meanwhile, most university courses havetheoretical modules as part of their conference interpreting curricula.

Seleskovitch's *théorie du sens* has been criticised for many reasons, among them for being purely speculative and pre-scientific with no empirical evidence furnished to prove the statements made (cf. Gile 1990, Kalina 1998,

Dam 1998, Pöchhacker 2000). Dam, one of the critical voices, studied the choices made by student and professional interpreters for lexical items and found that when the choice was between form-based and meaning-based equivalents (transcoding vs. deverbalisation), professional interpreters also tended to produce a high number of form-based solutions, even when the mode was consecutive. Her conclusion was that if professionals behaved that way, they probably had good reasons for doing so, one of them being that technical source texts are frequently presented fast, with many figures and enumerations. This meant that students should be acquainted with types of processing where lexical similarity figures more often than lexical dissimilarity.

Notwithstanding this criticism, the deverbalisation approach is very useful as a teaching model, as students need to be told over and again to forget about the wording of a source text and instead express the meaning they have understood in their own words in the target language. Seleskovitch's approach to note-taking contrasted starkly with the systematic teaching of note-taking in Germany established by Matyssek (1989), and there ensued a heated debate on the appropriateness of note-taking instruction, including when it should be taught and whether notes should be SL, TL or symbolic/iconic (cf. Meister 1970; Andres 2002, Ahrens 2005; Albl-Mikasa 2008; see Dingfelder Stone (07) in this volume). The note-taking issue is a good example of how the practical experience of a few may lead to generalised teaching approaches that need to be reflected on in methodological terms if they are to become the basis for sound academic training.

Somewhat later, Marianne Lederer (1981), another teacher of the Paris school who cooperated with Seleskovitch but focused on SI, published one of the first empirical studies based on authentic interpreting data. She did not have the technological tools available today (see Orlando in this volume) but nevertheless transcribed and analysed comparatively large volumes of data. The result was a description of the different ways interpreters choose to solve problems raised by enumerations of figures and names, complicated syntax etc., and she found that for some of these problems transcoding, which – according to Seleskovitch – could not be regarded as interpreting proper, was in fact what interpreters did.

3. Extra- and Interdisciplinarity: Approaches to Explaining Interpreting

The phenomena at work during simultaneous interpreting subsequently aroused the interest of other disciplines, and a number of extra-disciplinary studies cast light on how interpreting, above all SI, actually functioned. Selective attention was investigated by Lawson (1967), input segmentation to facilitate SI by Goldman-Eisler (1972), while Treisman (1965) was interested in measuring *décalage* (time-lag, ear-voice span); this latter was also measured by Oléron & Nanpon (1965) with authentic interpreting products.

Professional interpreter and teacher interest and criticism was triggered by a linguistic study by Barik on error typologies (1971), which compares written texts, i.e. transcripts of texts read to test subjects and transcripts of the interpreted versions. Although the method used by Barik was not genuinely representative of interpreting products, its result, a categorisation of types of errors, was an instrument that could be used by teachers to enhance students' insight into the many things that could go wrong. The study prompted the interpreting community to make explicit the factors they found important but which were missing in Barik's purely product-oriented approach. These included paraverbal and nonverbal communication, the preferences and expectations of speakers and listeners, situational and processing conditions, and the fact that an omission is not always the same as an error but may, in some cases, even prove to be the optimum solution. Error research then became an important field in IS (cf. Gile 1985, 1990; Kalina 1998 (process and product) and others).

David Gerver, a psychologist, pointed out the relation between errors and a high input rate and the latter's influence on ear-voice span; after his test subjects (who were professional interpreters) had interpreted a text, he also questioned them about their comprehension of the text and their mnemonic capacity; the results confirmed that interpreting is a highly demanding cognitive task (Gerver 1969, 1976). Somewhat later, a very important contribution by a linguist to interpreting studies was made by Hildegund Bühler. Her survey (1986) aimed at identifying quality characteristics, and for this purpose she questioned interpreters themselves, not their users. The criticism of this method from interpreting professionals led to a number of user surveys with rather heterogeneous results, but again the attention of interpreting teachers to user preferences had been raised, and the categories defined by Bühler are used in conference interpreting classes everywhere.

Information processing and psycholinguistics were subjects that continued to show an interest in SI processes. As the interpreting community itself was more and more attracted by research on such questions, cases of interdisciplinary cooperation became more numerous. Moser's early flow chart model (1978) of the interpreting process is based on Massaro's (1978) psychological approach, and both Shlesinger (1989, 1990) and Kalina (1998) have cooperated with discourse studies scholars to establish categories of phenomena that need to be explained if one is interested in analysing interpreter comprehension as well as interpreting products.

Interpreting studies as an established subdiscipline of T&I has made use of models of translation (example: Pöchhacker (1994) who tested the functionalist Skopos theory for its ability to explain phenomena encountered in conference interpreting) and has meanwhile been seeking cooperation with other disciplines, such as psychology and neurophysiology, and with intercultural communication studies. Interdisciplinary research projects are the order of the day, and volumes such as Gran & Dodds (1989), Kurz (1996), Danks et al. (1997) and Englund Dimitrova & Hyltenstam (2000) demonstrate the wealth and depth of interdisciplinary research. Accordingly, the question to be addressed now is what effect all these research efforts have had on conference interpreting training.

4. Interpreting Studies: A Foundation for Training

Teachers who take their job seriously will undoubtedly be curious about how interpreting processes work, what differences can be identified between translating, CI and SI and what errors appear most frequently in which mode. They will not necessarily consult theoretical publications dealing with the most recent research results but look for advice on how to proceed in training. Although there is no such thing as a coursebook from which students can learn all the skills needed to become a good conference interpreter, a number of training manuals aimed at teachers have indeed been published. Some of them are collections of practical classroom experience and are useful especially for the less experienced trainer who, after having gained professional interpreting experience, sets about to share that experience with the younger generation; they include Matyssek (1989), Szabó (2003), Kautz (2000), Gillies (2001), Jones (1998). Others are the result of theoretical or empirical research and discuss

