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Coordinating even a small publication has its challenges, but they pale in comparison to the joy of working with people who enjoy teaming up. Such collaboration is one of the invisible themes of this issue of Communicate! - the first to appear in this new format as well as online.

Take our first article. Four people made it possible: Roman Matasov, the author; Elisabeth Dadoun, who had the idea of an English version and recruited a team; Tatiana Kaplun, our translator, and Julia Poger who edited the translation.

Every article has a story, one of communicating, exchanging ideas, going one step further. These six pieces may not revolve around a common theme but read them as if they did; you’ll find intertwining threads.

In two articles touching on our history you’ll encounter technology. In guidelines for mixed teams you’ll find a continuation of a collective effort to establish common-sense standards, a cornerstone of quality. In a review of glossary software there’s a nod to ongoing learning. In an overview of a short course in China you’ll experience cooperation across cultures. And in a review of a major new work on interpreter education… well, you’ll get a taste of most everything.

Luigi Luccarelli
EDITOR-IN-CHIEF
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At 00:43 Moscow time on 9th May 1945, the representatives of the German High Command signed the Act of Military Surrender in Karlshorst, Berlin, thus effectively ending World War II. The news came two days after the first Instrument of Surrender was signed in Reims by German General Alfred Jodl, who then famously expressed his hope that “the victors will treat them (the German people and its armed forces – R.M.) with generosity.” (Kynin & Morozova, 2000)

That same year, a conference of the four Allied Powers – the USSR, the USA, the UK, and France – was held in London from June 26th to August 8th. It was during this conference that the parties reached an agreement on the Charter of the International Military Tribunal1.

The Bavarian city of Nuremberg was chosen as the location for the trial of leading Nazi criminals. Apart from being a highly practical decision for a number of reasons, it also was highly symbolic, for it was in Nuremberg that the National Socialist party held its conventions in the 1930s, thus making Nuremberg the cradle of German fascism. The victors decided it would be only fitting to make the city its grave.

Each of the four nations sent its own prosecution team2 to Nuremberg. Lord Justice Colonel Sir Geoffrey Lawrence, Lord Justice of the Court of Appeal of England and Wales, was appointed presiding judge.

Twenty-four leading Nazi criminals3, who held prominent government and military posts in the Third Reich, were indicted on four charges:
1. Conspiracy to commit crimes of peace, war crimes, and crimes against humanity
2. Crimes against peace
3. War crimes
4. Crimes against humanity

The victors did indeed treat their defeated enemy with a certain generosity. The IMT Charter granted broad rights for every defendant, either on a personal basis or through his legal counsel, to present evidence in his own defense. Furthermore, Article 16 of the Charter provided that “a copy of the Indictment and of all the documents lodged with the Indictment, translated into a language which he understands, shall be furnished to the Defendant at a reasonable time before the Trial” [emphasis mine – R.M.]
(Nuremberg Trials of leading Nazi war criminals, 1954:18) and that "a preliminary examination of a Defendant and his Trial shall be conducted in, or translated into, a language which the Defendant understands." [emphasis mine – R.M.] (ibid.)

A challenge thus arose for the organizers: how best to ensure effective interpretation during the sessions of the court to implement the provisions laid out in the last of the aforementioned paragraphs of Article 16, and to ensure understanding among all members of the Trial?

Colonel Léon Dostert, General Eisenhower’s personal interpreter and a member of the OSS [Office of Strategic Services], was tasked with finding a solution to this problem upon his appointment as head of the interpreting division of the IMT Secretariat. Dostert realized that consecutive interpreting, by then widely used in international conferences, would be out of the question in this particular case; it would significantly slow down the trial, already expected to be long because the prosecution had collected extensive evidence to prove the atrocities committed by Nazi leaders against humanity.

This was why the colonel suggested using simultaneous interpreting (SI) during the court hearings. This method of interpretation requires the interpreter to render the speaker’s speech into a foreign language at the same time the speech is being delivered. It should be noted that simultaneous interpretation had been used internationally even before the Nuremberg Trials, but usually consisted of a simultaneous reading of a pre-translated speech, or a consecutive interpretation performed simultaneously by several interpreters working into different languages.

The American IBM Corporation offered to equip the Nuremberg Palace of Justice Courtroom with state-of-the-art equipment – the modernized IBM “Hushphone Filene-Findlay (sic) system4” – at no charge, with the US government only paying for the shipment to Nuremberg and installation in the courtroom.

The simultaneous interpreters’ working area was made up of four three-person booths, one each for English, Russian, German, and French. The “aquarium” was located inside the courtroom, in immediate proximity to the defendants’ benches. This too was suggested by Dostert, who as an experienced interpreter himself understood better than anyone how important it was for the interpreters to keep an eye on the behavior of the court’s villains. The booths were surrounded on three sides by low glass panels. The top remained open; in other words, there was absolutely no question of any kind of soundproofing, now one of the mandatory working conditions for simultaneous interpretation.

The booths could sit three interpreters at a time, and provided three sets of earphones.
and one hand microphone. Earphones were also provided for everyone in the courtroom itself, thus enabling participants to listen to the original speech as well as its interpretation into any of the official languages. The system had five channels: the first channel transmitted the original speech, the second was reserved for English, the third for Russian, the fourth for French, and the fifth for German. The interpreters’ headphones were set only on the original (channel one).

There were six microphones in the courtroom: one for each judge, one on the witness stand, and one on the prosecutor’s podium.

From the beginning, Dostert and his aides decided that each simultaneous interpreter was to interpret the speaker directly into only one other language, thus avoiding a double physical and mental strain.

While working on the technical side of the matter, the organizers were also looking for skilled interpreters who would be able to interpret simultaneously at a highly professional level.

The candidates had to demonstrate an excellent command of the source and target languages, as well as a good knowledge of legal and military terminology and a high level of resilience to stress. Interpreters who had successfully passed a series of tests to determine their potential as simultaneous interpreters, awaited their encounter with the unknown. They would be writing history...

One of the main problems was recruiting and selecting candidates.

By 9:30 local time, members of the prosecution teams and the defense counsel had taken their places, and the 12 interpreters sat ready in the “aquarium.” At 9:45 American Military Police escorted 20 defendants into the courtroom, and the great hall fell silent. The defendants then took their seats on the two rows of benches. At 10:00 the court secretary called the room to order: “Order! Please stand! Court is in Session!” The judges took their seats at the high bench, and the session was declared open. Thus that day, 20th November 1945, may be considered as the official birthday of simultaneous conference interpreting, in its current meaning. The justice machine was set in motion, and the interpreters were, needless to say, one of the main forces driving it forward. The task ahead of them, and the responsibility it entailed, were truly colossal. Extreme physical and emotional concentration would be required, which was why the interpreters had to follow a strict working schedule designed by colonel Dostert and his aides from day one.

The interpretation and translation department was split into five groups:

1. Simultaneous interpreters (36 people);
2. Auxiliary consecutive interpreters (12 interpreters with languages other than the four official languages used during the proceedings);
3. Translators (8 sections with 20-25 people per section; 15-18 translators would prepare “raw” translations, with the remaining 8 later editing and proofreading the translated material; each team was allocated 10 typists);
4. Shorthand reporters (12 people for every working language);
5. Shorthand editors (more than 100 translators were tasked with editing shorthand notes by comparing them to the recordings of the proceedings).

The number of simultaneous interpreters remained constant throughout the trial. Three teams – A, B, and C (12 interpreters per team) – worked in shifts. Their typical work day would look something like this: team A would work for 85 minutes in the “aquarium” in the morning. There were three interpreters per booth, each with an allocated source language, from which they were meant to be interpreting into the language of the booth. While one interpreter was working, the other two waited for their turn.
Whenever there was a change in speaker or source language, the interpreter would pass the microphone to the colleague who worked with that particular language.

During this time, the interpreters from team B sat in the neighbouring Room 606 and followed the proceedings through headphones. They were on standby ready to replace one or more of their colleagues in the courtroom if, for whatever reason, the colleagues were unable to continue interpreting or made serious mistakes in their interpretation. Furthermore, interpreters from team B made their own glossaries, based on the simultaneous interpretation of their colleagues from team A. This ensured that all the teams used the same terminology, and provided continuity in the interpretation.

During the sessions, two auxiliary interpreters were always behind the judges’ bench. The judges resorted to their help whenever they had to communicate urgently with each other. Both interpreters had three working languages (Russian, English, and French).

The team’s head interpreter sat between the English booth and the officers of the court, and was tasked with ensuring that the equipment worked well, and that the interpretation was of good quality. Furthermore, he was the go-between for the judges and the interpreters in the booths. He operated a control switch that would flash a yellow or a red light. The yellow light was used to notify the presiding judge that the speaker was speaking too quickly, or to ask the speaker to stop and repeat what he had just said (the optimal speed for SI was 60 words per minute), and the red light was used to inform the judges of a serious issue, such as one of the interpreters suffering from a coughing fit, or else equipment failure.

After the first 85 minutes were up, the teams would swap places: team A would go to room 606, and team B would take its place in the “aquarium”. At 13:00 the presiding judge would announce an hour-long break, after which the two teams resumed their work according to the same schedule. This would be a rest day for team C. At a later stage the third, resting, team would check the verbatim reports, help their translator colleagues on the documents and interpret at closed IMT sessions.

Thus, every team would spend on average three hours a day working in the aquarium, four days a week (the court sat every day except Sunday, from 10:00 to 17:00, with a one-hour break for lunch). This rotation ensured the most effective results and remained unchanged, even after Colonel Léon Dostert was replaced as Head of the Interpretation and Translation Department by Commander Alfred Steer, U.S.N.R.

One of the main problems, as has already been mentioned above, was that of recruiting and selecting candidates. Only Andre Kaminker (the French delegation senior interpreter) had some experience

---

5 The defendant Ernst Kaltenbrunner was absent from the trial during the first days due to illness.

6 The interpreters had two cards: one had “Slow” written on it, the other had “Stop” written on it. In case any difficulties arose, the interpreter would show the right card to the head interpreter, and he would then press the corresponding light switch.
interpreting simultaneously. Even the Geneva School of Interpreters founded in 1941, and one of the most respected schools in the field, did not yet graduate simultaneous interpreters. The recruitment process was organized in two stages. First, deputy chief interpreters on location (in Paris, London, Geneva, Washington, etc.) would rigorously test candidates to explore their ability to listen to the speaker and interpret the speech at the same time. Those who passed this first round of tests then went to Nuremberg, where they faced a second round of tests to determine whether they were indeed suitable for the task. Patricia van der Elst, who interpreted from French into English during the Nuremberg Trial, recalled how she went through the selection process: “A test was organised at the Geneva University School of Interpreters which, to my surprise, I passed. We had learnt consecutive interpretation only and to find myself speaking into a microphone at the same time that I was listening to a disembodied voice through earphones was thoroughly disconcerting.

“With the ink of my degree scarcely dry, I set out for Nuremberg. It was my first job and, though I did not know it at the time, also my biggest. I went into it with the innocent enthusiasm of my 21 years, looking forward to the freedom from home, the glamour of a foreign assignment and the lure of the unknown... When I did reach Nuremberg, I was billeted at the Grand Hotel where I was allowed to remain for the duration. I spent a week in the public gallery listening to the proceedings in the Court Room. Then, after a brief test in the booth during a lunch-break, I was told I would be starting in earnest the following day. I felt it was a matter of sink or swim. I swam.” (Van der Elst, 2002)

Another interpreter, Elisabeth Heyward, started working in the booth the day after her arrival at Nuremberg, and successfully passed this “baptism by fire”. However, not all candidates had as short a journey to the “aquarium” as Patricia van der Elst or Elisabeth Heyward. Many started out in the translation service, and were transferred to the simultaneous interpreters’ team only after some time (ranging from one week to several months). Occasionally, the opposite happened as well. Some simultaneous interpreters, victims of Nazi concentration camps or children of such victims, could not bear the immense psychological strain and transferred to the translation service. For example, one young graduate of the Geneva school, Jewish by birth, who had shown amazing potential for simultaneous interpreting during the selection process, froze and was unable to utter a single word when she found herself in the booth during the trial. She later said to the senior interpreter that she was simply unable to work, seeing before her the people responsible for the death of so many members of her family.

There was a constant flow of simultaneous interpreters throughout the trial. And the Geneva School was far from the only source of interpreters⁷. Soviet interpreters who were sent either directly from Red Army Headquarters in Karlshorst or through the All-Union Society for Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries (VOKS; Vsesoiuznoe Obschchestvo Kul’turnoi Sviazi s zagranitsei), were educated at Soviet universities. For instance, Evgeniy Abramovitch Gofman, an interpreter from German into Russian, graduated from the Moscow Institute of History, Philosophy, and Literature (MIFLI; Moskovskiy Institut Istorii, Filosofii i Literatury).

However, during the aforementioned selection process, it frequently transpired that a higher degree in linguistics did not always guarantee that a candidate would have real potential for simultaneous interpretation. Along with professional interpreters, talented people from other professions were also recruited to work in the “aquarium”: teachers, lawyers, career military. Yuri Sergeievitch Khlebnikov, a simultaneous interpreter, was a graduate of the HEC business school in Paris (Ecole des Hautes Etudes Commerciales
de Paris), and his colleague Peter Uiberall worked as a stock broker before the war. Many simultaneous interpreters working from Russian came from White Russian émigré families, for instance, Prince George Illarionovitch Vassiltchikov, princess Tatiana Vladimirovna Trubetskaya, who headed the Russian section of the Department, and the aforementioned Yuri Khlebnikov. For many of them two (or in some cases more) languages were native from childhood. Furthermore, not all simultaneous interpreters were involved solely in interpretation and translation work. For example, Richard Sonnenfeldt, a senior interpreter with the American delegation, also acted as assistant to their Chief Investigator, and following a request from prosecutor Robert H. Jackson was awarded a Commendation for services to the US Armed Forces. Oleg Alexandrovitch Troyanovsky (son of Alexander Antonovitch Troyanovsky, the first Soviet ambassador to the USA) and Enver Nazimovich Mamedov were only nominally interpreters, although they did frequently help their colleagues in the “aquarium”. Both were diplomats: Troyanovsky worked as secretary to the Soviet judge Iona Timofeyevich Nikitchenko, while Mamedov was tasked with secretly delivering General Paulus, captured during the Battle of Stalingrad, to Nuremberg to testify at the Trial. The Soviet Union’s Prosecutor General, Roman Andriyonovich Rudenko, later recalled that the appearance of Paulus in the Courtroom had the effect of “a bomb exploding,” as in Germany he was believed to have died in the Stalingrad “cauldron”.

The interpreters’ salaries varied from one delegation to another. Interpreters working for the American delegation had the highest salaries; those working for other delegations were paid considerably less. The American delegation also employed the most interpreters and translators, at least 640 people, while the Soviet delegation, for example, only had 40.

A large number of documents presented during the trial as evidence for the prosecution were in German. Translators prepared translations of these documents, and the team leader would give the translators in special folders to the interpreters before the start of each session, so them while working with various statistical data, full of figures and proper names. However, because of the immense workload, translators did not always have the time to translate all the documents. In this case, the interpreters would receive the documents in their original language for sight translation.

The way the trial’s organizers treated the simultaneous interpreters varied greatly. In the beginning, some well-known consecutive interpreters had spoken out against using simultaneous interpretation, some expressing doubts regarding its quality, and some voicing a well-grounded concern about the new equipment that had not been thoroughly tested before. Some members of the prosecution team were not well disposed to the interpreters, and regarded them only as a “necessary evil”. In his memoirs, Sir Norman Birkett, the British alternate judge at the trial, described in an unflattering light the simultaneous interpreters working at the trial as “a race apart - touchy, vain, unaccountable, full of vagaries, puffed up with self-importance of the most explosive kind, inexpressibly egotistical, and, as a rule, violent opponents of soap and sunlight...” (Morris 2000)

To read the article in full and view all references go to https://aiic.net/page/7943
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Conference Interpreting: A Trainer’s Guide
by R. Setton and A. Dawrant

I found the Trainer’s Guide more complex than the Complete Course, but also more audacious.

KILIAN G. SEEGER

Introduction

A few weeks after finishing the review of Setton and Dawrant’s Complete Course, I started reading its companion volume, the Trainer’s Guide – in order to complete the exercise and to make good on the promise of sharing my definitive opinion on the books but, admittedly, also in an attempt to keep the momentum going, hoping it would carry me through yet another tome of several
hundred pages. At 15 chapters spread over 650 pages this second installment is even more impressive than the first, but that was not going to discourage me. In fact, knowing that I would be interviewing Robin about the books (https://youtu.be/SGN7B0d1sn4) only a few weeks later, I had both the motivation and the resolve to go back to what promised to be an interesting read. What follows, therefore, is an attempt to tie up loose ends and to confirm or refute first impressions. In a way, and in keeping with the wedding metaphor used to frame the first review, this second installment may well be likened to the second part of any wedding. The formalities are over: the words were spoken, the vows taken, and strict protocol adhered to. Now it’s on to the reception and the after-party – which some might argue is the more interesting part of any wedding, if only because of the free food, the (hopefully) open bar, and the less polite but perhaps more genuine whispers you might pick up here and there.

As for expectations, I was reminded that the two volumes were not written symmetrically as is sometimes the case with language learning textbooks, where the student workbook is accompanied by a teacher’s guide that mirrors both its structure and content. Instead, the authors’ objective behind the Trainer’s Guide is to provide extensive additional guidance for trainers, although in the authors’ own words, “it will become clear that there is a lot more to (the trainers’) role than merely following the exercises or methodological suggestions that any textbook, however detailed, may provide”. Setton and Dawrant also candidly admit that in spite of their effort to include and build on findings from cognitive science and expertise research, they largely base their recommendations on experience.

**The usual suspects…**

A bit like at a wedding reception, where you tend to know or at least have a pretty good idea of who will be attending – as opposed to those who will leave right after the ceremony – I started reading the Trainer’s Guide with certain expectations of topics likely to come up or come back. Consequently, I was not surprised to see that the question of what makes a good instructor is addressed early on in the book. Their answer: someone who can do it, who understands it and who can teach it. Trite as it might sound, it very much resonates with me. Of course the authors don’t stop at that, but provide a fairly complete picture of their ideal trainer, along with the role they see for junior (read inexperienced) and senior (read retired) interpreters. If anything, I would tend to caution against the rather strong push in favor of teacher demonstrations. While I appreciate that live demonstrations by trainers can serve the purpose of illustrating a point or giving the trainer more credibility, in the world of professional (sports) coaching the recommendation is to recreate the scenario as closely as possible without actually performing (Ferguson and Moritz, 2016). Perhaps throwing in the odd theory fun fact or simple ad-hoc experiment (e.g., to illustrate priming or anticipation), rather than relegating all theory to the theory class as suggested by the authors, could achieve the same goal of giving us credibility. But I digress. Along with the discussion of teachable moments and a table with effective and ineffective teaching approaches – both found later in the book – this section also provides a good reference for those hiring and evaluating interpreter trainers.

It was also no surprise to see that the progression stages identified in the Complete Course (i.e., initiation, coordination, experimentation, consolidation and reality) permeate the Teacher’s Guide. These stages are modulated by the principles of incremental realism (i.e., incrementally more difficult holistic exercises rather than attempting to separate interpreting into sub-tasks), trainee individuality (i.e., the need to adapt projected progression and learning curves to individual differences) and what the authors dub 3-D teaching (i.e., observing, diagnosing and suggesting treatment).

The comprehensive discussion of concepts and terms used in interpreter training was welcome, particularly after some potentially confusing wording slipped through the editing process of the first book. Not only are concepts defined and described much more succinctly and less ambiguously, the authors also successfully sort out the confusion among natural processes, techniques...
and strategies that is still prevalent in the literature. In a display of academic honesty (not always common in our field), Setton requalifies his original (1999) nomenclature putting forward a much more coherent definition whereby decoding, encoding etc. are seen as a part of natural processes; chunking, waiting, stalling etc. are referred to as techniques; and their deliberate combination or application is called tactics.

Of course the Teacher’s Guide could not get away without a discussion of deliberate practice, which has become a prevalent theme ever since interpreting embraced expertise research (see Ericsson 2000) as the go-to paradigm both for research and training. To complement Ericsson, however, the authors use a comprehensive and very useful table based on Shadrick and Lussier (2009) that they themselves then apply to interpreting. And yet, Setton and Dawrant are not afraid of taking a critical, perhaps even reactionary, stance on peer feedback, reminding us that, “students in the same group will often be experiencing similar problems, to which they have themselves not yet found solutions, and so tend to tell each other what they already know…”.

The sections on teaching different interpreting modalities, from consecutive to simultaneous, are undoubtedly too comprehensive to be done justice to in a short review like this. Suffice it to say that they are replete with helpful advice both for novice and, especially, for experienced trainers. I would venture to guess that the latter will find the progression matrix available for both modalities very helpful, as they cover the different learning stages, learning materials, required skills and class and exercise objectives. This is also where the most common symptoms (in case of incomplete or failed integration of a skill) are diagnosed and possible remedies discussed. In the respective annexes, readers will find worked examples of different interpreting techniques, although I found the model illustrating the “vulnerable points” of the simultaneous interpreting process grafted onto the (already complex) model presented by Setton in 1999 somewhat mystifying.

The final topic I was fairly certain to encounter again was testing, also because it was relatively exhaustively discussed in the first book. Here, too, little is left unsaid and the meticulous description and analysis of exam procedures will stand in good stead of those with little or no experience in organizing what is undoubtedly a complex procedure. I found the scoring rubrics for different tests particularly promising, while the suggestion of calculating the inter-rater reliability among jury members (although well taken) a futile exercise so long as caucus-style holistic deliberations prevail. Finally, the inclusion of parameters such as curiosity, empathy, and coachability in admission exam procedures most likely goes beyond what we can currently measure using validated instrument and metrics, forcing jury members to fall back on their gut feelings – which is exactly what (some, including myself, argue) should be avoided.

**Unexpected guests…**

The intriguing part about the Trainer’s Guide, however, is the unexpected topics and issues that were addressed. And just like unexpected guests at a wedding reception and its after-party, these are the ones that’ll keep you talking about them for a while.

The biggest surprise for me was to see the same authors who for the Complete Course, aimed first and foremost at learners, appeared to profess a fairly uncompromising holistic training approach (in line the “Paris school”), take a much more balanced if not positive approach to the debate on the merits of deconstructing the interpreting process – at least for the purpose of achieving better training results. This change of heart does not come about abruptly, however, as at the beginning of the Trainer’s Guide Setton and Dawrant analyze the component-skills approach to conclude that only some mechanical tasks such as translating abbreviations and converting numbers can be taught independently. It is only after a broad discussion of the arguments brought to bear by both sides that they determine that, “the Interpretive Theory of Translation (…) paints a somewhat over-polarized picture of deverbalized interpreting vs. transcoding that may underestimate the portion of the task that can be more or less automated, especially on some material that is common in everyday practice.” In a later section, fittingly called, “depolarizing ITT, opportunities for...
automation”, they concede that cognitive science supports the idea that the brain is able to automate much more than merely translation equivalents for technical terms, names and numbers. This concession was a welcome surprise, although my excitement slightly abated when reading the authors’ conclusion that, “while some sub-skills could be drilled in isolated or partly-combined but simplified form, provisionally relieving time pressure, or input difficulty, it is safer to stick to ‘incremental realism’ as the dominant principle in training”. It looks like a door opened, even though the authors still show some reluctance to walk through it. I would argue that the challenge of primarily using realistic and representative materials, as suggested by the proponents of the holistic teaching approach, is that if comprehension underlies Bayesian probabilities (Kuperberg and Jaeger 2016) and our brain more easily processes and more quickly anticipates and integrates structures that have been encountered more frequently, then it makes sense to isolate certain lexical, grammatical and syntactic patterns for repeated drill-type practice. Of course they also occur naturally, but their frequency in realistic materials is too low for rapid assimilation of schemas (forcing students to accrue “mileage”). Sports analogies from football, where set plays are part and parcel of every training session, or tennis, where long-line passing shots are set up explicitly and practiced repeatedly, illustrate the rationale behind the argument.

The second welcome surprise and one of the most interesting suggestions in the Trainer’s Guide is the Speech Difficulty Index (SDI), in other words the idea of a metric to assess training and exam materials based on parameters like subject matter, speed of delivery, density, style, accent and prosody. While for everyday training this may be too ambitious, I see a lot of potential for use in exams especially when coupled with analytical assessment criteria (although the authors tend towards a more holistic appreciation of interpreting performance, informed by select analytical parameters). In any case the SDI is likely to generate debate and provide food for thought, if only because the authors’ take on speed reflects reality more closely than previous scholars and thus constitutes somewhat of a departure from the traditional “comfortable” (see Pöchhacker 2016) rate of 100-120 words per minute. Setton and Dawrant posit rates under 100wpm to be artificially slow, whilst labeling discourse presented at 100-120wpm as easy, at 120-140wpm as moderate, at 140-160 as challenging and exceeding 160wpm as difficult.

Another surprise emerged from the discussion about sequencing of consecutive and simultaneous interpreting, where the authors present the option of introducing simultaneous interpreting before the complete acquisition and integration of all consecutive interpreting skills as recommended by the Paris School. This opening-up is welcome and, I would argue, necessary in the face of training programs that have been applying this principle rather successfully for years. If anything, what is perhaps missing is a critical discussion of the validity and reliability of a mid-point exam the assessment criteria of which (immediate, accurate, complete, idiomatic rendition with good presentation skills and not exceeding original length) at first sight cannot be distinguished from those one would apply at proficiency exams. Additionally, the (mathematically) calculated concessions for renditions into a consecutive B language (they are allowed to exceed the length of the original by 20%) and into a simultaneous B language (they are allowed to exceed the original by no more than 10%) appear somewhat simplistic as they reduce the difference between consecutive and simultaneous interpreting potential to a rendition-time difference of 10%.

The entire discussion of B languages, albeit not an unexpected topic, takes an unanticipated turn. Whereas in the Complete Course we are told that in order to qualify for a B-language, applicants need to be proficient users of the language (reference is made to CEFR C2 or exceptionally C1), in the Trainer’s Guide we read about scenarios with a, “B language still needing a lot of work”. Although any learned language will benefit from further improvement, the wording suggests major shortcomings. This is borne out by the authors’ examples of mistakes likely to be made by these students (e.g., countable and uncountable nouns, phrasal verbs etc.) that should be acquired at much lower proficiency levels (between CEFR A2 and B2). I am furthermore not convinced that Setton and Dawrant’s use of What did surprise me, however, was the recommendation of “stop-and-start” coaching.
qualifiers such as “active”, “strong”, and “very good” for B languages is necessarily helpful. Also, for the sake of consistency, one would then have to qualify all languages (A, B and C) accordingly.

The recommendations about feedback, that the authors base on their 3-D principle is very well developed and seeing that the notion itself was mentioned over 50 times in the Complete Course I was not surprised to see it come up another 130 times in the Trainer’s Guide. What did surprise me, however, was the recommendation of “stop-and-start” coaching. Accordingly, Setton and Dawrant suggest that, “some aspects of technique need real-time intervention, or are too complex to describe retrospectively after the entire performance is over, even with the help of playback, and need to be addressed immediately, by interrupting”. They believe this method to be particularly useful for sight translation, early simultaneous interpreting and in general for students working into their B language. Having sat through a fair number of seminars on effective feedback myself, this suggestion does not seem to follow the current trend. But while it might be complicated (perhaps even impossible) to really apply in a simultaneous setting (where the original cannot be stopped for one only one student without affecting everyone else) I am certainly willing to try it and attempt to collect students’ impressions through evaluations afterwards.

The final and probably most appreciated unexpected guest – incidentally also the most entertaining section of the book by far – is to be found in the chapter on testing, where a fictitious nightmare scenario of an exam had me in stitches while outing the authors as Trekkies: they have candidates work from Klingon and Ferengi while external examiners come from the Federation of Planets.

Is it getting late…?

There comes a time at any party when you can’t help but feel that the guy you’re talking to is just trying to impress you – usually through the use of hyperbole, by embellishing, or by giving lots of seemingly random statistics which, if you had a minute to yourself, you’d check on your smartphone. On one occasion in particular I felt like that’s what was happening; maybe because of a cut-and-paste job gone wrong, maybe because someone forgot to double-check the math: when describing the ideal qualifications of candidates, Setton and Dawrant suggest that they should have a good undergraduate degree with high marks, a post-graduate degree in a non-language subject, and several years of work experience. The ideal age for such candidates would be between 22 and 32. If we assume that today’s youths graduate from secondary school at 18, finish their undergrad at 21 and complete their post-grad two years later, however, by the time they acquire several years of work experience, most of them will be flirting with the upper threshold of the indicated age range, while none of them could possibly be under 26. As I am writing this, however, I realize that I might simply be starting to nitpick and that it’s probably time to wrap up.

Conclusion

I scroll through my annotated copy and I realize that there are many more things one could have and probably should have said – many of which could be considered details, most of which are probably only relevant to a small sub-set of readers, but all of which would have once more underlined the extraordinarily comprehensive and meticulous nature of this book.

On the whole I found the Trainer’s Guide more complex than the Complete Course (it will require more coffee to get through), but it is also more audacious. I salute the genuine – and largely successful – attempt to look beyond old ideological divides, especially when it comes to the benefits and shortcomings of deconstructing the interpreting task. Similarly, I am pleased to see indirect criticism leveled against institutional employers for insisting that modalities such as simultaneous interpreting with text feature prominently in training curricula whilst at the same time showing a reluctance to include them in their own professional exams.

For what it’s worth – I am fully aware that humor is very personal – I found the Trainer’s
Guide to be funnier than the Complete Course. For example, the anecdote of the interpreter, who faced with a technical introduction to an unforeseeable and thus unprepared topic resorts to reading out a Wikipedia entry, struck a cord with me – not only because I have come across very similar anecdotes over the years. In fact, it does not really matter whether or not it really happened – what matters is that it might have happened to someone at some point... and that it provides trainers with yet another tool to break up what might otherwise be a long, hard and tedious training session.

This then concludes the most complete review I have written to date and unless someone is toying with the idea of writing a book on training conference interpreters in three or more volumes, it shall remain my personal record. As for the wedding, as usual the guests had fun while for the ones directly involved it was a lot of hard work. And just in case I did not say so before: congratulations! Time to go home – the party is over.
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André Kaminker: une courte biographie


Anne-Marie Widlund-Fantini

Né en France d’une mère autrichienne et d’un père d’origine polonaise, André Kaminker grandit à Anvers, en Belgique, où son père, expert en taille de diamants, s’installe à la fin du XIXe siècle. La petite enfance d’André et de Georges, son frère cadet qui deviendra lui aussi interprète, est marquée tour à tour par l’opulence matérielle et par le dénuement après la faillite de leur père.

La mère d’André Kaminker, germanophone, lui transmet l’allemand, et, grandissant à Anvers, il acquiert le néerlandais, tandis qu’il est scolarisé en français à l’athénée de la ville. C’est aussi pendant ses études secondaires qu’il apprend l’anglais grâce à quelques séjours en Grande-Bretagne.

André Kaminker fait des études de droit et de philosophie à l’Université libre de Bruxelles, avant son service militaire de 1909 à 1911 dans une compagnie d’aérostiers.

Toute sa vie très patriote, étant né en France de parents étrangers, à sa majorité André Kaminker opte pour la nationalité française. En 1914, il est mobilisé, d’abord comme aérostatier, puis il est versé dans l’infanterie, toujours homme de troupe.

Après la guerre, André Kaminker reste dans l’armée française en tant que fonctionnaire civil, stationné pendant trois ans avec les troupes d’occupation de la Rhénanie. Il est affecté au Service de la restitution, chargé de gérer la restitution à la République française des biens saisis en Alsace-Lorraine par les Allemands.

Entre-temps, André Kaminker s’est marié. De son union avec Georgette Signoret naissent trois enfants, d’abord une fille, la future actrice Simone Signoret, à Wiesbaden en 1921, puis deux fils, Alain et Jean-Pierre.

De retour en France en 1921, André Kaminker s’installe à Paris avec sa famille. Il travaille d’abord pour une agence de publicité, l’agence Damour, puis devient journaliste au Petit Parisien. Il finit par y occuper un poste de directeur, chargé de la publicité. Grâce à ses connaissances linguistiques, il commence à la même époque une carrière d’interprète de conférence, à la Société des Nations, et aussi pour la Chambre de commerce internationale et à la radio, au Poste parisien. C’est ainsi qu’il est appelé à interpréter en direct et en simultanée le discours d’Hitler à Nuremberg en 1934.

À la déclaration de la guerre en 1939, André Kaminker est interprète à l’ambassade de Grande-Bretagne à Paris. Après la débâcle, il suit celle-ci lorsqu’elle se replie à Bordeaux à l’instar du gouvernement français.

Quelques jours après l’appel du 18 juin du Général de Gaulle à Londres, André Kaminker quitte Bordeaux sur l’un des derniers navires appareillant pour l’Angleterre et rejoint les Forces françaises libres. Il sert comme interprète aux côtés du Général de Gaulle pendant l’expédition anglo-française vers Dakar à l’automne 1940. Déjà homme de radio avant la guerre, Kaminker est affecté au poste émetteur de la France Libre à Accra (Côte-de-l’Or, Gold Coast, aujourd’hui Ghana), puis en Martinique où il dirige la station après le ralliement de l’île à la France libre.

D’abord sous-lieutenant, puis lieutenant, en 1945 Kaminker est détaché par l’armée française pour interpréter à la conférence fondateure de l’Organisation des Nations Unis à San Francisco. Toujours sous l’uniforme... appelé affectueusement «Sir Boss» par les interprètes.
français, Kaminker est la véritable star de la conférence, et peut-être en raison d’un certain embonpoint, on l’appelle « le Général ».


C’était un grand mélomane, et il lui arrivait, avant une séance de nuit, d’emmener l’équipe d’interprètes chez lui pour écouter un air d’opéra ou un lied pour « apaiser l’esprit avant l’effort ». C’était aussi un homme d’une honnêteté intellectuelle rare. Il n’a pas hésité à décrire, dans le Bulletin ronéotypé de l’AIIC, la mésaventure qui lui était arrivée au Comité des paiements de l’OECE, lorsqu’il a raté l’interprétation consécutive d’un exposé financier. C’est ainsi qu’il a insisté pour l’insertion dans le Code d’honneur de l’article 3.1 : Les membres de l’Association s’interdisent d’accepter un engagement pour lequel ils ne seraient pas qualifiés. Par leur acceptation, ils apportent la garantie morale de la probité de leur prestation.

André Kaminker était Officier de la Légion d’honneur, titulaire de la Médaille de la Résistance et de la Médaille des Forces françaises libres.
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In August 2016 I had the challenge – and the pleasure – of leading an AIIC professional development course at Yanbian University, Yanji, in the Korean Autonomous Prefecture of Jilin Province, People’s Republic of China (20 miles from the border with North Korea; see map below). The mix of cultures proved fascinating and I decided to write about the experience and asked some of the students to do the same.

Course participants came from all over China, as well as South Korea and Germany. All had professional experience working into non-native English. None of the trainees (or the trainer) had visited the region before, but we were ably assisted by local organiser Mr. Mingri Kim, of Yanbian University, the only one among us who spoke all 3 languages (English being the language of instruction in the workshop, while Chinese and Korean were the jointly official, and virtually only, languages spoken in the city itself).

The course covered “retour” skills, English enhancement and role-playing exercises, as well as simultaneous and consecutive interpreting with native-speaker feedback, and sessions on issues specific to the ZH-EN and KO-EN combinations. We also had several opportunities to socialise during meals kindly organised by Mr. Kim. (He even managed to satisfy my unwittingly eccentric European request for a mid-morning cup of coffee, going on a 40-minute round trip).

Three course participants kindly offered to share their thoughts on various topics: Ye Siting (Stine) and Hailong Liu (Leo), both Chinese-English interpreters based in Hong Kong, and Moonsun Choi, a Korean-English interpreter from Seoul.

1. AIIC

Moonsun: Except for a few global companies, most Korean clients, be it private or public, do not know what AIIC is. However, AIIC, as an international professional association, is well placed to organize training events for interpreters from different countries to come together for their own empowerment.

Leo: AIIC is a useful platform where interpreters can exchange ideas on interpreting techniques, working conditions and professional development.

Matthew: One of the most exciting aspects of giving this seminar was the opportunity to work with talented colleagues who seemed to really appreciate a new possibility for professional and pedagogical cooperation in the region.

Stine: On my very first interpreting class, I heard about AIIC and many esteemed AIIC interpreters. So from day one, AIIC has been the monarch of the interpreting world to me. It is my dream to become an AIIC member and I will spare no efforts to get there.

2. Working with a European trainer (and English native speaker) as a “pure customer”

Stine: I have watched a lot of English
programs, but still constantly find myself in awkward situations where I struggle, or say the wrong thing. Sometimes I think the more I try to say things the way natives do, the more unnatural I seem. I don’t know how to find the right balance.

In ordinary interpreting classes, we seldom looked at interpretation from the customer’s perspective. The Yanji workshop was eye-opening and refreshing to me. I learned to judge my interpretation from a listener’s point of view and adjust my output. It was very effective in improving my interpreting.

Matthew: I was aware that they were the experts in the task we were examining, and I was just a facilitator. I was reminded of 19th century philosopher and political advisor Feng Guifen: “A few barbarians should be employed, and Chinese who are good using their minds should be selected so that in turn they may teach ... We should use the instruments of the barbarians, but not adopt the ways of the barbarians.”

Leo: Working from Chinese into English often means dealing with ambiguity and nuances, as well as cultural references and buzzwords. Sometimes the speaker downplays his or her position, or attempts to avoid an expression of disagreement. We assess how “China-savvy” the English-speaking audience at a conference is, and alter our interpretation accordingly.

Moonsun: I found the “Socrates” method Matthew employed – asking us to come up with solutions on our own, that make sense and work for a native speaker– was quite effective, and that is something only native speakers can do.

Delegates, as well as speakers, at events in Korea come from all over the world. We have to accommodate different “Englishes” and cultural expectations. In Yanji I discovered that sometimes the Korean and Chinese trainees understood each other’s English, while Matthew, who’s from Britain, was confused! I was shocked and realized I have a long way to go ...

When I first came onto the interpreting market in the early 2000s, most of my assignments were into Korean. The Koreans were in the “student” side of the room and we interpreted the foreign “teachers”. But things have changed. Korea is no longer just a listener, and people come from other countries to hear what Korea has to say. I am doing my best to cope with the changing trends. The decision to join the Yanji workshop was part of my effort in that direction.

3. Yanji city

Stine: I did not know anything about Yanji. I was reluctant to travel this far before the workshop but when I got there and tried things out, I started to like the city – it is quiet and relaxing, with nice people and great food – the best place for learning.

Leo: It was my first trip to Yanji city. It has a diverse culture and delicious cuisine, and its proximity to North Korea adds interesting features to the atmosphere.

Matthew: The city is a fascinating trading hub, famous for its ginseng, and apparently obsessed with karaoke. It’s one of the few places in the world where South and North Koreans rub shoulders. Vladivostok is also not far away, but the west definitely is.

One member of the hotel staff was keen to practise his English, saying “Hello!” before collapsing into giggles. So I heard this every morning, as I chose my breakfast from a buffet consisting of 9 types of chilli pickle!
We were all suffering culture shock for different reasons, depending on our background, and I was relieved to find that I was not the only one who didn’t know how to eat noodle soup with scissors, or who made the outsider’s faux pas of putting rice in his wine bowl!

Moonsun: I didn’t know there was such a huge population of Korean-speaking people outside the Korean peninsula with their own unique history and territory! Now I view the Korean language as a multinational language, like English, with variants being used in different parts of the world.

4. Future training?

Stine: Definitely open to more training! Suggestion – let’s have Matthew to do it again! LOL

Leo: The Yanji course was informative yet very practical, and I look forward to more training opportunities like that. As for future events, how about: negotiation skills, business management skills as freelancers, how to structure a quote, etc.? A combination of these would help constitute a complete platform for continuous professional development of interpreters.

Moonsun: Yanji really worked for me, firstly because retour interpreting was something I was not getting enough training for. Secondly, as an instructor myself, I wanted to learn from a European interpreting teacher how to teach retour interpreting; thirdly, Yanji was close to Seoul (very important!); and last but not least, I wanted to know more about the Chinese interpreting market and make Chinese interpreter friends. Promising topics for future workshops could include:

- Intensive mock conference sessions, with native speakers, for students: in training, we often resort to reading off a written script instead of having live, spontaneous speech as our input.
- Translation tools: we are seeing an increasing awareness of translation memories and machine translation in Korea. Training institutions are adopting translation memory as part of their curriculum here.

5. Anything to add?

Stine: I am a firm believer in AI and machine translation. To me, interpreters being replaced by something else, something smarter, more reliable and relentless, is inevitable. So, I would like to help push the trend whenever I can.

Moonsun: I’d like to take this opportunity to thank our host, Mr. Kim, for his meticulous arrangements for the workshop. The workshop in Yanji owes a great deal to him, and I realized how important it is to have a great host to create a memorable and pleasant experience for the participants.

Matthew: Hear, hear! Thank you, dear host, participants and contributors, and new friends.

Our thanks should also go to Ms. Hong Jiang of AIIC Trainers in Asia-Pacific for taking the initiative to plan this course.
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Intragloss particularly excels for its glossary-building tools, which make preparing for a conference fast and easy. Its document annotation feature is innovative, but somewhat buggy.

**JOSH GOLDSMITH**

Created by conference interpreter Dan Kenig and software developer Daniel Pohoryles, Intragloss aims to help interpreters "cut their prep time by as much as 50%.”

To do so, Intragloss offers a suite of tools for reading and comparing documents, identifying terms, searching for equivalents online, and creating term lists and multilingual glossaries. Innovative features allow you to quickly generate assignment glossaries from preparation materials and automatically annotate a document with translations of terms from your glossaries.

Intragloss also offers search features to quickly pull up terms while in the booth, but these pale in comparison to other glossary management programs, like Interpreters’ Help or Interplex.

Nevertheless, Intragloss is a versatile, easy-to-use program that significantly decreases my preparation time. Despite a few minor bugs, it’s my go-to tool when preparing for nearly every interpreting assignment.

**The nuts and bolts**

Intragloss is available for Mac computers; a Windows version is in the works. Intragloss supports over 180 languages and is Unicode-
compatible, which means it can handle diacritics, special characters, and non-ASCII languages, like Russian and Hebrew. The software includes a user’s guide and fast customer support via email.

Intragloss is one of the most expensive pieces of interpreting software I use; at $49 per month, $99 for three months or $269 per year, an Intragloss subscription is rather pricey. Rates drop to more manageable levels for renewals, especially if you’re willing to shell out $359 for a three-year subscription. Before you take the plunge, try out the free month-long trial. Intragloss also offers a hefty discount for students enrolled in interpreting programs.

Kenig and Pohoryles argue that “Intragloss is a professional glossary-maker that gives you everything you need to prepare for assignments.” While I find this claim to be slightly hyperbolic – I’ll discuss some shortcomings over the course of this article – Intragloss is indeed a robust, time saving tool.

Kenig’s short video provides a quick visual introduction to Intragloss.

A quick overview

Intragloss is organized hierarchically, into domains and assignments. Domains generally reflect specializations, and assignments usually represent a single interpreting job. In this example from the user’s manual, “Cell Phones,” “Cars,” and “Psychology” are domains, while “Paris Expo 2015” and “Madrid Expo 2015” are examples of individual assignments.

Every Intragloss assignment is by default bilingual, and includes a bilingual assignment glossary. Each assignment glossary has at least two columns, for the source and target language terms. You can customize your assignment glossary to include columns with acronyms and remarks in both the source and target languages.

The Intragloss interface

Every Intragloss assignment is by default bilingual, and includes a bilingual assignment glossary. Each assignment glossary has at least two columns, for the source and target language terms. You can customize your assignment glossary to include columns with acronyms and remarks in both the source and target languages.

Each domain has a domain glossary, which is automatically populated from the individual assignment glossaries in the domain. Since a domain can include assignments with different language pairs, a domain glossary can be multilingual.

In the example above, “Paris Expo 2015” and “Madrid Expo 2015” are two bilingual assignments – an English/French assignment and an English/Spanish assignment. Both are part of the “Cell Phones” domain, which has a trilingual English/Spanish/French glossary including all of the terms from every assignment in the domain.

Every Intragloss assignment can include one or more documents, such as the “Mobile phone.pdf” file in the example above. I usually import everything I receive from conference organizers and any other materials I find while preparing for an assignment into Intragloss, and use these documents to develop term lists and multilingual glossaries. In theory, Intragloss supports several input formats, including PDF, Word, PowerPoint, Pages and Keynote. In my experience, however, the software often struggles with formats other than PDF, so I tend to convert all my documents to PDF format before importing them.

Intragloss has a built-in web browser, which means you can import one or more webpages into a given assignment. This is an especially useful feature, since interpreters often prepare from online sources in addition to the documents provided by conference organizers.

It took me some time to wrap my head around the idea of domains and assignments, and I find it especially confusing when preparing for a multilingual interpreting job.

I’ve also found that Intragloss creates duplicate entries in the domain glossary when the same source language term appears in two assignments. For example, if I input “attachments” --> “pièces jointes” in the English/French “Paris Expo 2015” assignment and “attachments” --> “documentos adjuntos” in the English/Spanish “Madrid Expo 2015” assignment, instead of merging them into a single trilingual entry in the domain glossary, Intragloss creates two separate bilingual entries in the domain glossary. If you work with multilingual assignments often, like I do, this will probably get on your nerves. My workaround is to create a bilingual glossary with Intragloss, download it, add the third language manually, and upload my glossary to another glossary manager for easy reference while on the job.
Building glossaries using the online search function

Building glossaries with Intragloss is quick and easy. Create a new assignment (and a new domain if needed), open any related documents or websites in that assignment, and start reading through your documents and fleshing out your glossary.

Intragloss offers two different tools for building glossaries: online terminology search and terminology extraction from parallel documents.

The screenshot below, from the Intragloss demo video, demonstrates how the online terminology search function works.

Searching for a term

Highlight an unfamiliar term – “bi-metallic” in this example – and click on the “search” button. Intragloss adds the term to your assignment glossary, highlights it in the document, and searches for it using your pre-selected websites – which can include online dictionaries like the Collins multilingual dictionaries or WordReference.com; parallel corpora tools like Linguee; and terminology portals like IATE, Termium or ProZ.

Once you find a good translation, highlight it, click “Translation,” and the translation is automatically added to your bilingual glossary.

You can also highlight acronyms or remarks in the source or target language and add them to your glossary, or manually edit cells to type in translations or remarks by hand.

Overall, Intragloss’ online search feature is a real time-saver. It simplifies the process of searching for, copying and pasting terms and switching between programs, which can be especially time-intensive if you have to search for a term on various terminology sites.

However, the online search tool is not without its flaws. Intragloss struggles with diacritics, multi-word terms, and plural forms. Although IATE pulls up a good translation for a term like “informes periódicos,” the two-word term gets converted into “informesperiodicos” on Collins and the accent gets mangled on its way to Linguee, which normally provides a good translation for this phrase. On ProZ, the source and target languages are not shared with the website, so you see translations in a variety of languages not relevant for your current project. If the way Intragloss handled multi-word terms, diacritics, and plural forms were improved, the program would end up saving you even more time.

To read the article in full and view all references go to https://aiic.net/page/7886

Looking through the various search sites (displayed as orange tabs above), highlight the translation, and click to add it to your glossary.
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Guidelines for spoken language interpreters working in mixed teams

Best practice to assure that all goes well when spoken and sign language conference interpreters work together.

Sign languages are languages that have evolved in much the same way as and have similar linguistic properties to spoken languages. There is no one universal sign language; in fact some countries have more than one sign language or dialect.

However, an auxiliary language often referred to as International Sign (IS) has developed for use at international gatherings. While it is not a fully-fledged language, it is a communication solution when having to provide for a diverse audience. It is not intended to replace national sign languages, but can be an acceptable solution at European and international level meetings and events.

1. Sign language

Sign language interpreters interpret between spoken languages. Sign language interpreters interpret between a spoken and a signed language or between signed languages. These guidelines cover situations where spoken and sign language interpreters are working together in a mixed team.
2. Training and Qualifications

Sign language interpreters are trained to interpret between the national sign language and spoken language of the country in which they work and live. Each European country has a different qualification and registration system for sign language interpreters\(^3\), and other countries around the world also have their own systems. A sign language interpreter is bound by a Code of Ethics, ensuring impartiality, confidentiality, linguistic and professional competence, as well as professional growth and development.

3. Working as a mixed team of sign and spoken language interpreters

Sign language interpreters interpret between spoken language(s) and sign language(s). The sign language interpreter interprets into a national sign language or international sign, depending on the language requested. When working into a spoken language the sign language interpreter provides relay for the spoken language interpreters, and may need to take relay from their spoken language colleagues. Sign language interpreters form part of the interpreting team. Before the meeting starts, the head of team should ensure that all team members know about these relay arrangements, particularly if not indicated on the team sheet. Other items worth touching on are the positioning of the sign language interpreters and that the whole team will have the same breaks. If necessary, the team leader should make these points clear to the Chair. When the head of team signals that the session has ended for the interpreters, this includes the sign language interpreters.

4. Where to position sign language interpreters

Sign language interpreters do not work in the booth like spoken language interpreters. They work in the meeting or conference room, close to where the speakers are, and positioned so that the deaf participants can see them. The sign language interpreters need to be placed so that the deaf participant can see the interpreter as well as the speakers. The sign language interpreters use headphones, to ensure they can hear the spoken language interpreters from whom they may be taking relay, and a hand-held microphone, so that they can be heard when they are providing relay.
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FOOTNOTES

