Interpreting

In brief

SPA *Interpretación*

Origins

From Latin *interpretatio*, the action and effect of interpreting**.** Made up by the prefix *inter* (between), *pret* (understand, learn), and the suffix *–tatio* (action and effect).

Abstract

Interpreting can be defined generally as the activity of linguistic mediation that consists in transmitting a speech given orally or in sign language into an equivalent speech in a different language, either orally or in sign language. The result of said activity is also called interpretation.

The interpreter is the person who performs this activity of linguistic mediation by observing various factors, such as the register, the information implicit in the message, and the emotions. Starting from the distinction between translation and interpreting, and from their origins, we will explain the modalities and areas in which they are usually practiced in the following sections. We will dedicate a brief section to sign language interpreting and remote interpreting; then, we will call attention to the influence of factors including stress or psychological impact on the interpreter's work. We will conclude by defining a few lines of investigation.

record

Carmen Valero Garcés

2022

Valero Garcés, Carmen. 2022. "Interpretación" @ *ENTI (Encyclopedia of translation & interpreting).* AIETI.

https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6367028

https://www.aieti.eu/enti/interpreting_ENG/

Entry

SPA *Interpretación*

contenido

[Introduction](#) | [The history of interpreting](#) | [Interpreting modalities](#) | [Interpretation settings](#) | [Distance or remote interpreting](#) | [Stress and psychological and emotional impact](#) | [Research potential](#)

📖 Introduction

In areas outside of this field, despite being different activities, the terms "interpreting" and "translation" are used interchangeably, and "interpreters" are referred to as "translators". The term "translation," although sometimes used in a broad sense, usually refers specifically to communication through writing, while the term "interpreting" refers to communication through speech or signs. Thus, translation and interpreting are not synonyms. There are significant differences between the two. For example, interpreting is usually carried out in person—that is, the interpreter is a direct witness of the source speech, either physically or by audiovisual means (video or telephone)—and produces their speech in the other language immediately or simultaneously. In contrast, the translator almost never needs to reproduce the text immediately and can consult various sources (dictionaries, glossaries) or do research before translating. They are distinct processes and, therefore, involve the use of different techniques and resources.

Interpreting demands intense cognitive activity, which leads to working in shifts and with partners, or at least limiting the amount of time spent. However, these principles are not always respected due to a lack of awareness of the profession as well as other reasons (economic, social, political) with consequences that do not only affect the communicative act but also the profession and the individual interpreter (physically and mentally).

The interpreter works with the message as a whole, reproducing the tone and style, and does not focus as much on the meaning of written text as the translator does. As a result, the concepts of precision and accuracy are also treated differently.

To guarantee the message is communicated in the target language without losing information, both the interpreter and the translator must master certain techniques and resources. The interpreter, for example, must be able to establish priorities when faced with factors such as urgency, a speaker who speaks quickly, or a speech that includes a lot of numbers or long lists. These factors do not affect the translator to the same extent.

¶↳ The history of interpreting

One of the first documents testifying to the existence of interpreters can be found in Egypt. Dating from the third millennium BC, a relief on an Elephantine prince's tomb (Figure 1) shows the figure of an interpreter split in two. The figure leans forward to listen to the Syrian ambassador (with his right hand raised), then leans forward even more towards the pharaoh to translate the message with his hand open in a gesture of offering.

This relief shows that even in antiquity interpreting was not a casual activity but a service for the public administration. Governments used the service of interpreters in their military campaigns, diplomatic negotiations, or trade, just as we use it today. In ancient societies like that of Egypt, interpreters were slaves; and in more modern societies like that of medieval Europe, they were nobles.

Egyptian interpreter, one of the first references to the profession. Wikimedia.

Interpreter's work has been essential throughout history to expand empires (Greece and Rome) and religions (the Arab expansion in the East and the colonization of America); to contribute to the consolidation of new languages (the Middle Ages and the Romance languages); to open new trade routes (Marco Polo and his expeditions to China); and to overcome diplomatic obstacles (Stanley's exploration of Africa), to name just a few examples. In Spain, this third person, the interpreter, has been given different names throughout history: *lenguas*, *truchimán* or *trujamán*, *nahuatlato*, *alfaqueque*, and *dragomán* (Alonso, Baigorri, and Payás 2008). In the eighteenth century, the term "interpreter" came into use, but it did not gain recognition nor achieve status as a profession until after the First World War. There were no interpreting schools leading up to and following the conflict; those who worked as interpreters were university professors, journalists, and diplomats. In the negotiations of the Treaty of St. Germain in 1919, consecutive interpreting was used for the first time in Europe (Baigorri 2015).

The proliferation of high-level contacts between nations after the appearance of large international forums led to the birth of simultaneous interpreting, a new form of interpreting that considerably reduced the time required when working with several languages at once in large conversations. Almost simultaneously, Russia and the US began to develop a complicated system of cables, microphones, and headphones to connect the speaker to the interpreter and the latter to the listener. Since then, simultaneous interpreting has continued gaining recognition in international organizations and state meetings, and technology has improved. By contrast, consecutive interpreting is used more often in high-level bilateral trade negotiations that are conversational in nature or take place in the public services.

The Second World War posed a definitive advance for simultaneous interpreting during the well-known [Nuremberg trials](#) (1945–46). Thanks to Lieutenant Léon Dorstet, who organised three teams of twelve interpreters (German, English, French, and Russian), communication was possible, and the simultaneous interpretation was a success. Dorstet put together the first team of interpreters for the UN (Baigorri 2000).

Núremberg (1945-46), the beginnings of consecutive interpreting. [Wikimedia](#).

Until then, there were few training centres for interpreters. The [Moscow Institute for Modern Languages](#), founded in 1930, is widely considered the first translation and interpreting university. In 1941, the *[Ecole d'interprètes de Genève](#)* [Geneva School of Interpreting] was founded at the [University of Geneva](#); the school played a crucial role in training professional interpreters to respond to an increasing demand for this activity from international organizations—for instance, during the aforementioned Nuremberg trials. In 1957, the *[École supérieure d'interprètes et de traducteurs](#)* [Graduate school for interpreting and translation] was founded at [Sorbonne University in Paris](#). From there, translation and interpreting institutes became more common. In Spain, the first university translation and interpreting programs began to emerge in the 1970s at the Autonomous University of Barcelona (1972) and the University of Granada (1979). The European Union ([Directorate-General for Interpretation](#)) and the majority of international organizations also created their own training centres, or they recruited from the centres that had already been established to develop a body of professional interpreters who could meet their needs. From the academic perspective and from research, the publication of *Introducing Interpreting Studies* (Pöchhacker 2004) signified an important step in the shaping of interpreting studies as an independent academic discipline.

[back to top](#)

¶ Interpreting modalities

Classifying and defining the types of interpreting is a complicated task given the varying criteria and overlap that has been used in the past. Jiménez-Ivars (2002) presented one of the first widely accepted differences, which discusses modalities and types. Modalities refers to the moment in which the reformulation is produced with respect to the emission and reception of the source text. Types refers to the situation of use. Mikkelson and Jourdenais (2015) discuss modalities and settings. We can distinguish between consecutive modalities and simultaneous modalities. In the first case, the speaker interrupts their speech every so often so the interpreter can perform their task. In the second case, as the name indicates, the interpreter reproduces the message immediately in the target language while the speaker continues speaking without interruption.

Consecutive interpreting

According to Jiménez-Ivars (2002), we can differentiate between dialogic consecutive interpreting, also known as liaison interpreting or bilateral interpreting, and monologic consecutive interpreting within the consecutive modalities.

As the name suggests, dialogic consecutive interpreting consists in transmitting oral dialogues in real time in such a way that the interpreter orally reformulates what each speaker says once they have finished speaking. In contrast, monologic consecutive interpreting consists in reformulating a

source text delivered as a monologue into the target language during the pauses the speaker makes every so often for this purpose. In both modalities, the interpreter usually relies on note-taking, although this is more common in monological consecutive.

Simultaneous interpreting

In the simultaneous modalities, different classification criteria exist (Harris 1994, Alexieva 1997, Jiménez-Ivars 2002, Ozolins 2014, Seever 2015). Jiménez-Ivars bases this classification on two criteria: 1) the use of electronic equipment and 2) the connection to the source text. The first criterion—use of electronic equipment—differentiates between 1) the use of electronic equipment: audio conference (only sound), videoconference, or audio conference with TV (sound and video); 2) without the use of electronic equipment, or "whispered", in which the interpreter interprets simultaneously, whispering directly into the listener's ear. This form is generally used in bilateral meetings or in small groups where the attendees do not share a common language. The second criterion—the connection to the source text—differentiates between: 1) relay interpreting, a modality of indirect simultaneous interpreting in which one booth interprets from each speaker's original language and the other booths interpret from this first interpretation into the remaining foreign languages; 2) simultaneous with text when the interpreter has a written copy of the speech and interprets at the same time as the speaker, following the text. Crossover between these modalities is common. Often, in whispered interpreting, the third language or the relay language is English or the official language of the location where the communication is takes place. It is usually used in meetings at international organizations such as the UN when, for example, one of the participants speaks an African language but there are no interpreters into French from that language. However, there are interpreters from that African language to English and from English to French, respectively.

Simultaneous interpreting with text shares certain characteristics with sight translation, a hybrid modality of interpreting that combines elements of translation and interpreting. However, the result is a type of interpretation. In this case, the interpreter reads a document written in the source language aloud as if it were written in the target language. Since its start, simultaneous interpreting continues to gain ground and is used in conferences and meetings as well as in the media (radio and television). It is even used in telephone conferences, videoconferences, and other activities or professions that are emerging, sharing modality with new techniques and types (Seever 2015).

Examples of terms that are not interpreting modalities but are used for organizing interpretation in institutions such as the EU Directorate-General for Interpretation (SCIC) include retour interpreting, pivot, and cheval. Retour interpreting, as the name in French indicates, consists in working from the interpreter's mother tongue into another language. Retour interpreting is especially useful for providing relays from lesser-known languages into more common languages. Pivot is the use of a single language for relay interpreting. When there are only one or two interpreters that work in a minority language as a passive language, these interpreters act as a "pivot" for the other booths, who listen to their interpretation via relay. Cheval, the French word for horse, denotes an interpreter who works in two booths in the same meeting—that is, an interpreter who can work into both languages and who changes booths as needed.

Sign language interpreting

According to Mikkelson and Jourdenais (2015), sign language interpreting (SLI) is included as an interpreting modality. SLI is simultaneous interpreting into sign language. Sign language interpreters work in meetings with deaf participants and interpret from a spoken language into sign language or vice versa (Bontempo 2015). The interpreter is seated or standing in front of the deaf participants and is clearly visible. Although many gestures and expressions are universally recognised across national borders and cultures, a universal sign language that everyone can understand does not exist. The interpretation can be performed either simultaneously or consecutively. Sign language interpreters must position themselves in an area that allows them to see and be seen by deaf participants; they must also be able to hear and be heard by hearing participants. In some circumstances, an interpreter can interpret from one sign language into another sign language (Dickinson and Turner 2008; Napier, McKee, and Goswell 2010; Swabey 2012).

In Spain, sign language was officially recognised by Law 27/2007, of 23 October, by which Spanish sign languages are recognised, and speech communication aids for the deaf, hard of hearing, and deafblind are regulated. In 2000, FILSE [*Federación Española de Intérpretes de Lenguas de Signos y Guías-Intérpretes* (Spanish Federation of Sign Language Interpreters and Interpreter-Guides)] was created to increase awareness in society and public institutions around SLI and encourage them to offer SLI services. At times, interpretations are performed by people without specific training, mainly family members or friends. Sign language interpreters continue to have hybrid roles that include substitution in education, mediation, and interpreting itself. Specific training or knowledge are not required for any of these roles, which leads to instability in the quality of service. The most advanced countries are the US with ASL (American Sign Language), which has a directory of certified SLI (Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf), followed by Australia with Auslan (Australian sign language), and Great Britain with BSL (British Sign Language).

Pictogram representative of sign language interpreting. Source: Wikimedia.

back to top

¶ Interpretation settings

Jiménez-Ivars (2002) puts forth the situation of use as the basic criteria for categorizing different types of interpreting. Mikkelson and Jourdenais (2015) refer to settings instead of types, which we will use in this section to refer to the use of different interpreting modalities in specific settings. In this section, we will discuss the following settings: conference interpreting, public service interpreting, medical interpreting, legal interpreting, business interpreting, and interpreting for the media. For information about other specific settings, consult *The Routledge Handbook of Interpreting* (Mikkelson and Jourdenais 2015).

Conference interpreting

Conference interpreting is frequently associated with simultaneous interpreting given it is the technique generally used in conferences (congresses, symposiums, lectures, international political meetings, etc.). Its main objective is to facilitate communication between specialists or politicians who need to acquire or exchange information. The modalities regularly used are audio conference (in soundproof booths) during speeches and monological consecutive for small group meetings or when electronic equipment is not available. This type of interpreting usually occurs in the context of

conferences, lectures, seminars, symposiums, and events characterised by having a fixed duration. Conference interpreting was the first type of interpreting to be regulated. In 1953, the International Association of Conference Interpreters (AIIC), the primary association for conference interpreters worldwide, was founded. Associations in other countries also began to emerge, such as AICE [*Asociación de Intérpretes de Conferencia de España* (Association of Conference Interpreters in Spain)] in Spain. The work of these associations has been essential for the elaboration of standard operating procedures regarding the number of interpreters per booth, interpreting shifts, the number of hours worked, conditions in the booth, and the code of ethics (AIIC 1990).

In general terms, conference interpreting can be divided into two markets: institutional and private. International institutions (EU, UN, NATO, UNESCO, etc.) that hold multilingual meetings usually favour interpretation from different foreign languages into the interpreters' mother tongues (or one-way booths), and they usually have their own interpreting staff. The private market tends to focus more on bilingual meetings, and the interpreters work in both directions—from their mother tongue and into their mother tongue (two-way booths). However, these two markets are not mutually exclusive.

Public service interpreting

Although it has been practiced since the beginning of time, public service interpreting (frequently called community interpreting or, in some cases, social interpreting) began to gain ground towards the end of the twentieth century due to mass migration to Western countries. Its main objective is to facilitate communication between public service providers and people who do not speak the official language or languages of the country in which they are located. In addition, it seeks to provide equal access to legal, medical, educational, governmental, and social services. It is characterised by the social asymmetry between the primary participants, which is marked by inequality between the parties. On one hand, the institutions and service providers have the resources and services. On the other hand, the users and people who request such resources (usually immigrants or asylum seekers) are not familiar with the language, culture, or institutions of the country in which they are seeking help (Wadensjö 1998).

This asymmetry between the parties demands greater involvement from the interpreter to guarantee successful communication in vital matters that help the user integrate into society (access to healthcare, bureaucratic processes to legalise their situation, education, etc.) (Corsellis 2009). This greater involvement from the interpreter results in them taking on more of a linguistic or cultural mediation role in order to balance the knowledge required from both parties for effective communication. This also leads to the use of different resources, such as nonverbal communication or the use of a second language to make up for a lack of fluency. That is, the interpreter must establish communication with a specific audience that represents a cultural and linguistic minority, that generally has less education and economic means than the general public, and that frequently is unfamiliar with the new social reality of the country in which they are located (Valero-Garcés 2008).

Public settings where interpretation is needed are affected by specific factors such as the emotional aspects of the conversation, a polarised or hostile social environment, stress, power relations between the participants, and the degree of responsibility that the interpreter acquires (in many cases, this can be extreme as the life of the other person may depend on the interpreter).

Consecutive interpreting and liaison or bilateral interpreting are used most frequently. Undoubtedly, this is an expanding market; however, it is not given the same level of prestige that conference interpreting has for several reasons. This situation affects the training (or lack thereof) of interpreters, who are frequently family members or friends and whose only training is that they share a language and culture with one of the parties and they are familiar with the other language and culture to a certain extent (Valero-Garcés and Martin 2008, Hale 2007, Corsellis 2009). Ultimately, interpreter's work is not regulated, though we are progressing towards professionalization. The passing of ISO 13611:2014: *Interpreting: Guidelines for Community Interpreting* in 2014 and the review process that was started in 2021 have been significant steps forward (Valero-Garcés 2019).

Medical interpreting

Interpreting in the medical setting is a subtype within public service interpreting that consists in facilitating communication between healthcare professionals and the patient and their family. Considerable differences exist between countries with respect to the quality of interpreting services available. In countries such as Australia or Canada, the interpreter is formally certified and meets the necessary requirements for providing this type of service. Apart from having broad medical knowledge about the most common medical practices, the patient interview process, the medical examination, and daily tasks carried out in the hospital or clinic where they work, interpreters in this setting must frequently serve as a cultural bridge. Two trends can be observed in interpreters' conduct and the existing bibliography gives an account of their advantages and drawbacks (Angelelli 2004). We are referring to the "advocacy" model and the "impartial" model. Cambridge (2002: 119–123) was the first to define these models: "[In the 'advocacy' model,] the interpreter is present to, literally, advocate on behalf of the patient; take sides, ask their own questions, advise the patient, and offer their personal opinion about the topics discussed during the visit." In contrast, according to Cambridge, in the "impartial" model, "the interpreter, equally impartial, repeats everything they hear, and everyone taking part in the conversation speaks and is understood by the other parties at all times. The interpreter's role consists in becoming the alter ego—that is, the other self—of the person whose words they are interpreting. If they are successful, everyone can firmly say the words and emotions they wish exactly as they would if the interpretation were not necessary." The study on healthcare in EU Member States reveals the differences between countries and the lack of regulation of this activity (Angelelli 2015). The passing of ISO 21998:2020 *Interpreting services – Healthcare interpreting – Requirements and recommendations* is a step towards the regulation of the profession.

Legal interpreting

Legal interpreting mainly takes place in courts of law. The right of those who do not speak the language that is spoken in court (especially in criminal law) to have a competent interpreter is considered a basic standard in the justice system. Therefore, this right is frequently protected by national constitutions, declarations of rights, basic laws that establish the judicial system's operations, and through precedents set by the superior courts. In the European Union, the *Directive 2010/64/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 20 October 2010 on the right to interpretation and translation in criminal proceedings*, establishes the minimum common standards for defending the rights of accused persons in criminal matters. These standards guarantee access to written translations of documents that are considered essential to the proceedings, as well as the right to interpretation in hearings and interrogations or during meetings with lawyers.

A report on transposing EU Directive 2010/64/EU in Spain was prepared in 2013 by the Technical Commission acting on behalf of CCDUTI [*Conferencia de Centros y Departamentos de Traducción e Interpretación de la Universidad Española* (Conference of translation and interpreting centres and departments in Spanish universities)]—which in 2021 became AUnETI [*Asociación de Universidades del Estado Español con Titulaciones Oficiales de Traducción e Interpretación* (Association of Spanish public universities with official degrees in translation and interpreting)]. The report [*Informe Transposición Directiva 2013* (Directive implementation report 2013)] gave an account of the difficulties of carrying out said regulations and the diversity of criteria for recognizing interpreters in the courts. In fact, many countries require an official certificate to work as a court interpreter; however, the degree of legal provisions with respect to the interpreter's role varies from country to country. Following the complaint made by EULITA (European Legal Interpreters and Translators Association) regarding the lack of a report by the European Commission on the Member States' compliance with Directive 2010/64/EU, the European Ombudsman published a response on its website in December 2018, highlighting this issue. However, a certain amount of uniformity in existing legal and ethical codes indicates that court interpreters must ensure complete accuracy of the message, both in the content and the form (Ortega Herráez 2010).

Monological and dialogical consecutive and sight translation are the most used modalities given that official documents are critically important in hearings with interpreters where, often, they must promptly be translated orally. The simultaneous modalities (whispered and audio conference) are not used as frequently. Audio conference is commonly used in international courts and in places with a large number of hearings that require interpretation, such as legal processes in which the majority of participants speak a foreign language, for example, in Spain, the trials for the 11 March 2004 attacks in Madrid (Valero-Garcés and Abkari 2010).

In addition to practical fluency in the source and target languages, these interpreters must have broad knowledge of the law, as well as legal and court procedures. Often, interpreters are required to be formally certified to work in the courts, though there is not a common standard. In Spain, according to the *Libro de la Traducción e Interpretación Institucional* [Book of institutional translation and interpreting] (RITAP 2011), the Ministry of Justice, the autonomous bodies responsible for material and personnel resources for the Judiciary and the Ministry of the Interior, has a staff of court and police interpreters that carry out this role daily. In addition, the *Oficina de Interpretación de Lenguas* [Office of Language Interpretation] at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs has certified a large number of sworn translators and interpreters, though they work independently in the private sector. In the document *EU Member States Legal Translation and Interpreting Country Factsheet* (EULITA 2020), EULITA gives an account of the situation in other EU countries. Furthermore, in a globalised world, many administrations and institutions subcontract these services to translation and interpreting companies, which has resulted in many complaints about not being able to perform their work because of the lack of professionalism from the interpreters, the low rates, and the poor conditions (García Beyaert 2015).

Business interpreting

In this setting, the aim of interpretation is to facilitate negotiations, as well as acquire or exchange information between international business professionals, thus the classification of business interpreting. However, this type of interpreting also takes place in a wide range of settings: diplomatic, journalistic, sport, artistic, military, religious, political, academic, technological, scientific,

etc. Dialogical consecutive is the most common interpreting modality, which is often combined with sight translation or whispered consecutive. A subtype within this modality is escort interpreting, which gets its name because the interpreter's role is to accompany the clients as a guide during a tour, visit, meeting, or interview. The most common modality in escort interpreting is dialogical consecutive or liaison interpreting (Ozolins 2014).

Interpreting fot the media

The objective of this type of interpreting is for the public to understand real or fictitious situations shown in film or on television. Generally, the modality used is audio conference with or without text.

In the first case, special cinematographic events such as film festivals, institutional private screenings, specialised press screenings, film archives, etc. usually use simultaneous interpreting for films that have not been dubbed or subtitled. Other modalities gaining ground are "speech-to-text" interpreting and respeaking (Bolaños and Díaz Cintas 2020). The setting and speakers present several differences in relation to other interpretation settings: a) the relevance of the images, b) the virtual setting, c) the variety of oral genres (spontaneous dialogues, interviews, police interrogations, political speeches, narration, etc., d) the use of voice-over that prevents listeners from foreseeing when the sound starts or restarts (Jiménez-Ivars 2012: 103). At film festivals, the interpreter usually has access to the script, which they use to carry out simultaneous interpreting. Quality and accuracy expectations are lower than in the case of conference interpreting or legal interpreting.

In television, interpreting is offered especially for live television coverage, such as press conferences and recorded or live interviews with politicians, musicians, artists, athletes, or business personalities. The most used modality is simultaneous interpreting where the interpreter's voice is superimposed on the speaker's voice so that the speaker's voice can be heard in the background. However, the interpreter's voice dominates; on some occasions, the speaker's voice is almost inaudible while, on others, it can be heard clearly. Sometimes consecutive voice-over interpreting is used with the drawback that the speaker does not interrupt their speech, which requires the intervention of two interpreters. One interpreter takes notes and begins to interpret after a few minutes; the other continues taking notes throughout the rest of the speech while the first interpreter carries out the consecutive interpretation. The speaker is not usually aware that they are being interpreted and do not collaborate, which makes the intervention difficult (Kurz 1997, 2002; Brauri 2006; Castillo 2015)

In the case of interviews recorded outside of a studio and some modern programs, the professional interprets what they see on the television screen. Background noise can be a serious issue. An interpreter working for the media must give the impression that they are as skilful and confident as a television presenter. Interpretation in the media has become more visible and present over the years. Television channels have started to hire staff to perform simultaneous interpretations. An interpreter working in this setting must interpret press conferences, telephone messages, interviews, and similar live coverage. Research in this setting has not yet been conducted extensively in comparison with the practice; however, it is a phenomenon that is worth analysing to train future interpreters (Jiménez-Serrano 2011, Castillo 2015).

back to top

¶ **Distance or remote interpreting (RI)**

Telephone or videoconference interpreting

Rapid technological developments, together with the consequences of the COVID-19 pandemic, have greatly altered the interpreting market. The practice of distance or remote interpreting (RI) has experienced a considerable increase in every modality and setting. Strictly speaking, distance interpreting refers to the use of technologies of communication to access an interpreter that is located in another place (Braun 2015a). Two common modalities that are worth differentiating are telephone interpreting and video remote interpreting (VRI). In sign language interpreting, the term video remote interpreting is also being used. In short, RI is considered an interpreting method and is used with every modality: simultaneous, monological and dialogical consecutive, and liaison interpreting.

Telephone interpreting is a service that connects individuals who wish to speak to each other by telephone but who do not speak the same language. VRI is defined as the type of interpreting that makes use of video and phones able to transmit video so an interpreter in another location can provide interpreting services (either orally or through sign language). VRI commonly makes use of simultaneous interpreting while telephone interpreting makes use of consecutive.

Both modalities provide a solution in those situations where it is not possible to have a face-to-face meeting for economic, time-related, health, or myriad other reasons as they offer a communication service in real time that is important to help resolve issues. They are also a solution for interpreters who are in shrinking markets given that they can offer their services in more prosperous markets with basic equipment (Moser-Mercer 2005, Mouzourakis 2006, Kelly 2008, Braun and Taylor 2011).

Despite initial reservations about its use (AIIC 2000), the rapid development of RI makes it difficult to provide a clear analysis of the situation given the variety of uses in different settings and the interpreting modality used. However, it is clear the viability of distance interpreting depends on a set of factors that go beyond the technical quality of the equipment or the connection; they focus on the interpreter's conduct. In the legal setting, the AVIDICUS projects have developed exhaustive guidelines for video interpreting in legal proceedings (Braun and Taylor 2012, 2014). In the case of sign language video interpreting, Napier establishes a framework of significant differences between traditional interpreting and video remote interpreting. In addition, the author presents a set of guidelines for the use of sign language interpreting via video in legal proceedings (Napier, McKee, and Goswell 2002: 149–150; Napier 2012). Kelly (2008) and Rosenberg (2007) suggest protocols and have provided guidelines for telephone interpreting. Some institutions have also published their own practical guidelines for interpreters and staff that work via telephone or videoconference, which address interpreter conduct and behaviour.

⁋↳ Stress and psychological and emotional impact

In translation and interpreting practices, as in other professions, translators and interpreters are subject to stressful conditions and might be psychologically affected by certain conditions and environments in which they work. This has been shown by several empirical studies (Seleskovitch 1989, Kurz 2002, Moser-Mercer 2005, Valero-Garcés 2006, Valero-Garcés and Alcalde 2021).

According to these studies, the factors that result in these situations for interpreters and translators include, among others, the constant flux of information, time pressure, the enormous amount of concentration required, fatigue, adverse environmental conditions, a lack of preparation to face

certain conditions, lack of time, lack of linguistic and sociocultural knowledge in both working languages, and a lack of information about the topic or the participants. These factors can affect the transfer of information from one language to another and, consequently, the interpreter's work by provoking different types of changes (linguistic and attitudinal) in the transfer of information (errors, omissions, mistranslations, lack of concentration that leads to fatigue, carelessness, health problems, etc.). Studies have been conducted on the influence of stress or emotional impact on the public service interpreter or translator (PSIT) where the interpreting modality used is dialogical consecutive interpreting (or liaison). Some examples include Baistow (2000) and Valero-Garcés (2006), as well as the contributions compiled in Valero-Garcés, Vitalaru, and Mójica (eds.) (2014).

back to top

🗠 Research potential

Research in the interpreting field is relatively recent and started gaining ground steadily in the last decades of the twentieth century. The publication of *Introducing Interpreting Studies* (Pöchhacker 2004) signified—as we have already pointed out—a major advance in both interpreting training and research. Presented as a textbook, it echoed the main research areas at the time and identified future trends that continue to be research topics today. The unquestionable advance of technology and the way in which it affects the development and training of interpreters makes it necessary to research interpreting from different methodological perspectives (cognitive, sociological, cultural, linguistic) (Hale and Napier 2014). Along the same lines, we suggest some potential lines of research:

- The history of interpreting: research on interpreters' conduct in the shaping of peoples, in military conflicts, in trade expansion, and in the twentieth century—a time in which borders have been blurred.
- Telephone or video remote interpreting: research on its impact in different settings, the necessary training, applied technological advances.
- The professionalization of interpreting in settings such as public service or medical interpreting.
- A debate about codes of ethics and guides of best practices and determining the interpreter's role in different settings.
- The influence of external (environmental conditions) and internal (stress, anxiety, work in risk and conflict situations) factors on the interpretation and the interpreter.

back to top

References

Angelelli, Claudia. 2004. *Medical interpreting and cross-cultural communication*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511486616. [+info]

Angelelli, Claudia. 2015. *Study on Public Service Translation in Cross-Border Healthcare*. Luxembourg: European Union. [+info] [quod vide]

Alonso Araguás, Iciar; Jesús Baigorri Jalón, & Gertrudis Payàs. 2008. "Nahuatlatos y familias de intérpretes en el México colonial". @ *1611. Revista de historia de la traducción* 2. [+info] [quod vide]

*Baigorri Jalón, Jesús. 2000. *La interpretación de conferencias. El nacimiento de una profesión. De Paris a Nüremberg.* Granada: Comares. ISBN: 9788484440550. [+info]

Baigorri Jalón, Jesús. 2015. "The History of the Interpreting Profession". @ Mikkelson, Holly & Renée Jourdenais (eds.) 2015. *The Routledge Handbook of Interpreting*, 11-28. London: Routledge. ISBN: 9781315745381. [+info]

Bolaños García-Escribano, Alejandro & Jorge Díaz Cintas. 2019. "Audiovisual translation. Subtitling and revoicing". @ Laviosa, Sara & Maria González-Davies (eds.) 2019. *The Routledge Handbook of Translation and Education*, 207-225. London: Routledge. ISBN 9780815368434. [+info]

Bontempo, Karen. 2015. "Signed language interpreting". @ Mikkelson, Holly & Renée Jourdenais (eds.) 2015. *The Routledge Handbook of Interpreting*, 112-128. London: Routledge. ISBN 9780815368434. [+info]

*Braun, Sabine & Judith L. Taylor (eds.) 2011. *Videoconferencing and remote interpreting in court proceedings*. Guildford: University of Surrey. [+info]

Braun, Sabine. 2015. "Remote Interpreting". @ Mikkelson, Holly & Renée Jourdenais (eds.) 2015. *Routledge Handbook of Interpreting*, 352-367 New York: Routledge. ISBN 9780815368434. [+info]

Braun, Sabine. 2015. "Remote Interpreting". @ Pöchhacker, Franz (ed.) 2015. *The Routledge Encyclopedia of Interpreting Studies*, 346-348. New York: Routledge. ISBN: 9780415634328. [+info]

Burad, Viviana. 2008. *Ética y procedimiento profesional para intérpretes de lenguas de señas*. Mendoza: Universidad Nacional de Cuyo. [+info] [quod vide]

Cambridge, Jan. 2002. "Interlocutor Roles and the Pressures as Interpreters". @ Valero Garcés, Carmen & Guzmán Mancho (eds.) 2002. *Traducción e Interpretación en los Servicios Públicos: Nuevas necesidades para nuevas realidades / New Needs for New Realities,* 121-126. Alcalá de Henares: Universidad de Alcalá. ISBN: 8481384909. [+info] [quod vide]

Cambridge, Jan. 2003. "Unas ideas sobre la interpretación en los centros de salud". @ Valero Garcés, Carmen (ed.) 2003. *Traducción e Interpretación en los Servicios Públicos. Contextualización, actualidad y futuro,* 57-59. Granada: Comares. [+info]

Castillo, Pedro. 2015. "Interpreting for the Mass Media". @ Mikkelson, Holly & Renée Jourdenais (eds.) 2015. *The Routledge Handbook of Interpreting*, 280-301. London: Routledge. ISBN 9780815368434. [+info]

Collados Aís, Angela. 1998. *La evaluación de la calidad en la interpretación simultánea: la importancia de la comunicación no verbal*. Granada: Comares. ISBN: 8481517186. [+info]

*Corsellis, Ann. 2009. *Public Service Interpreting. The First Steps*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan. ISBN: 9781403937995. [Versión española de Carmen Valero Garcés y Rosa Cobas: *La interpretación en los servicios públicos. Primeros Pasos.* Granada: Comares, 2010]. ISBN: 9788498367270. [+info]

Díaz Cintas, Jorge. 2009. "Introduction. Audiovisual translation: An overview of its potential". @ Díaz Cintas, Jorge (ed.) 2009. *New Trends in Audiovisual Translation,* 1-18. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters. ISBN: 1847691544. [+info]

Dickinson, Jules C. & Graham H. Turner. 2008. "Sign Language interpreters and role conflict in the workplace". @ Valero Garcés, Carmen & Anne Martin (eds.) 2008. *Crossing Borders in Community Interpreting: Definitions and Dilemmas*, 231-242. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.76- [+info]

Garcia Beyaert, Sofia. 2015. "Key external players in the development of the interpreting profession". @ Mikkelson, Holly & Renée Jourdenais (eds.) 2015. *The Routledge Handbook of Interpreting*, 45-61. London: Routledge. ISBN: 9780815368434. [+info]

*Gile, Daniel. 1995. *Basic Concepts and models for interpreter and translator training.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.8 [+info]

Hale, Sandra. 2004. *The Discourse of Court Interpreting: Discourse Practices of the Law, the Witness and the Interpreter.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.52 [+info]

Hale, Sandra. 2007. *Community Interpreting,* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan. ISBN 9780230593442. Versión española de Valero Garcés y Rosa Cobas: *La interpretación comunitaria: La interpretación en los sectores jurídico, sanitario y social.* Granada: Comares, 2010. ISBN: 9788498366563. [+info]

*Hale, Sandra & Jemina Napier. 2013. *Research Methods in Interpreting. A Practical Resource*. London: Bloomsbury. ISBN: 9781472524737. [+info]

Inghilleri, Moira. 2011. *Interpreting Justice, Ethics, Politics and Language*. London: Routledge. ISBN: 9780415821698. [+info]

Jiménez Ivars, Amparo. 2012. *Primeros pasos hacia la interpretación. Manual de intrpretación inglés-español.* Castellón: Universitat Jaume I. ISBN: 9788417429157. [+info]

Jiménez Serrano, Oscar. 2011. "Backstage conditions and interpreter's performance in live television interpreting: quality, visibility and exposure". @ *The Interpreter´s Newsletter* 16, 115-136. [+info] [quod vide]

* Kelly, Nataly. 2008. *Telephone Interpreting*. Bloomington: Trafford. ISBN: 1425185010. [+info]

Kelly, Nataly. 2008. *A Medical Interpreter's Guide to Telephone Interpreting*. [+info] [quod vide]

Kurz Ingrid. 1997. "Interpreters: Stress and Situation Dependent Control of Anxiety". @ Klaudy, Kinga & János Kohn (eds.) 1997. *Transferre Necesse EST. Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Current Trends in Studies of Translation and Interpreting*, 201-206. Budapest: Scholastica. [+info]

Kurz Ingrid. 2002. "Physiological stress responses during media and conference interpreting". @ Garzone, Giulia & Maurizio Viezzi (eds.) 2002. *Interpreting in the 21st Century*, 195-202. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: 10.1075/btl.43.19kur [+info]

Mikkelson, Holly. 2000. *Introduction to Court Interpreting.* New York: Routledge. ISBN 9781138916517. [+info]

Moser-Mercer, Barbara. 2005. "Remote interpreting: issues of multi-sensory integration in a multilingual task". *Meta 50/*2, 727-738. https://doi.org/10.7202/011014ar [+info] [quod vide]

Moser-Mercer, Barbara; Alexander Kunzli & Marina Korac. 1998. "Prolonged turns in interpreting: Effects on quality, physiological and psychological stress". *Interpreting,* 3/1, 47-64. https://doi.org/10.1075/intp.3.1.03mos. [+info]

Mouzourakis, Panayotis. 2006. "Remote interpreting: a technical perspective on recent experiments". *Interpreting* 8/1, 45-66. [+info]

[n.n.] 2018. *Decision of the European Ombudsman in case OI/6/2018/LM.* [quod vide]

[n.n.] 2010. *Directiva 2010/64/UE del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, de 20 de octubre, relativa al derecho a interpretación y traducción en los procesos penales.* [quod vide]

[n.n.] (AUNETI). 2013. *Informe Transposición Directiva 2010/64*. [quod vide]

[n.n.] 2020. *EU Member States Legal Translation and Interpreting Country Factsheet*. [quod vide]

[n.n.] (RITAP. Red de Intérpretes y Traductores para la Administración Pública). 2011. *Libro blanco de la traducción y la interpretación institucional.* Madrid: Ministerio de Asuntos Exteriores y Cooperación. [+info] [quod vide]

Napier, Jemina; Rachel McKee & Della Goswell. 2006. *Sign language interpreting: Theory & Practice in Australia and New Zealand*. Sydney: Federation Press, 2010 (2nd. ed.). ISBN: 9781862877801. [+info]

Nolan, James. 2005). *Interpretation: Techniques and Exercises*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters. ISBN: 9781847698094. [+info]

Ortega Herráez, Juan Miguel. 2010. *Interpretar para la Justicia*. Granada: Comares. ISBN: 9788498367010. [+info]

Ozolins, Uldis. 2014. "Descriptions of interpreting and their ethical consequences". *@ FITISPos International Journal* 1, 23-41. [+info] [quod vide]

*Pöchhacker, Franz. 2004. *Introducing Interpreting Studies.* London: Routledge. ISBN: 9780415742726. [+info]

Seleskovitch, Danica & Marianne Lederer. 1989. *Pédagogie raisonnée de l'interprétation.* Paris: Didier, 2002 (2nd revised ed.). ISBN: 2864606402. [+info]

Seeber, Kilian G. 2015. "Simultaneous interpreting". @ Mikkelson, Holly & Renée Jourdenais (eds.) 2015. *The Routledge Handbook of Interpreting*, 79-95. London: Routledge. ISBN 9780815368434. [+info]

Swabey, Laurie & Karen Malcolm (eds.) 2012. *In Our Hands: Educating Healthcare Interpreters*. Washington DC: Gallaudet University. ISBN: 9781563685217. [+info]

Valero Garcés, Carmen. 2006. "El impacto psicológico y emocional en los intérpretes y traductores de los servicios públicos". *Quaderns* 13, 141-154. [+info] [quod vide]

Valero Garcés, Carmen. 2008. *Formas de mediación intercultural e interpretación en los servicios públicos. Conceptos, datos, situaciones y práctica.* Granada: Comares. ISBN: 849836020X. [+info]

Valero Garcés, Carmen & Abderrahim Abkari. 2010. "Learning from practice. Interpreting at the 11M terrorist attack trial". @ *Translation and Interpreting* 2/2, 44-56. [+info] [quod vide]

Valero Garcés, Carmen. 2014. *Communicating Across Cultures. A Coursebook on Interpreting and Translating in Public Services and Institutions.* Lanham: University Press of America. ISBN: 978-0761861546. [+info]

Valero Garcés, Carmen. 2019. "Training public service interpreters and translators: facing challenges". @ *Revista de Llengua i Dret, Journal of Language and Law* 71, 88-105. DOI: https://doi.org/10.2436/rld.i71.2019.3262. [+info] [quod vide]

Valero Garcés, Carmen & Elena Alcalde Peñalver. 2021. "Empathy in PSI: Where we stand and where to go from here". @ *FITISPos-International Journal* 8/1, 17-27. DOI: https://doi.org/10.37536/FITISPos-IJ.2021.8.1.298 [+info] [quod vide]

Valero Garcés, Carmen & Ane Martin (eds.) 2008. *Crossing Borders in Community Interpreting: Definitions and Dilemmas*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: 10.1075/btl.76. [+info]

Valero Garcés, Carmen; Bianca Vitalaru & Esperanza Mójica (eds.) 2014 *(Re)considerando ética e ideología en situaciones de conflicto / (Re)visiting ethics and ideology in situations of conflict.* Alcalá: Universidad de Alcalá (DVD). ISBN: 9788416133086. [+info]

Wadensjö, Cecilia. 1998. *Interpreting as Interaction.* London: Longman. [+info]

Credits

Carmen Valero Garcés

Full Professor of Translation and Interpreting at the University of Alcalá, Madrid (Spain). Director of MA in Conference Interpreting Business Oriented (MICONE) and Co- Director of the Postgraduate Program on Public Service Interpreting and Translation. She has taught and lectured in translation and interpreting programs from several countries. Moreover, she is the coordinator of the Research Group FITISPos® and former managing editor of FITISPos International Journal. She has edited and authored several books and articles.

afiliación

Asociación Ibérica de Estudios de Traducción e Interpretación (AIETI)