T.C.
DOKUZ EYLÜL ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ
MÜTERCİM TERCÜMANLIK ANABİLİM DALI
İNGİLİZCE MÜTERCİM TERCÜMANLIK PROGRAMI
YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZİ

(IN)VISIBILITY OF THE INTERPRETER IN CONSECUTIVE INTERPRETING: A DISCUSSION OF NORMS AGAINST ACTUAL PERFORMANCE

Çağlayan SAYHAN

Danışman
Prof. Dr. Gülperi SERT

2010

YÜKSEK LİSANS
TEZ/ PROJE ONAY SAYFASI

2006800762

Üniversite : Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi

Enstitü : Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü

Adı ve Soyadı : Çağlayan SAYHAN

Tez Başlığı : (in) Visibility of the Interpreter in Consecutive Interpreting: A Discussion of Norms Against Actual Performance

Savunma Tarihi : 27.09.2010

Danışmanı : Prof.Dr.Gülperi SERT

JÜRİ ÜYELERİ

Ünvanı, Adı, Soyadı	Üniversitesi	İmza
Prof.Dr.Gülperi SERT	-DOKUZ EYLÜL ÜNİVERSİTESİ	.....
Yrd.Doç.Dr.Müge IŞIKLAR KOÇAK	-DOKUZ EYLÜL ÜNİVERSİTESİ	.....
Yrd.Doç.Dr.Yeşim BAŞARIR	-DOKUZ EYLÜL ÜNİVERSİTESİ	.....

Oybirliği (X)
Oy Çokluğu ( )

Çağlayan SAYHAN tarafından hazırlanmış ve sunulmuş "**(in) Visibility of the Interpreter in Consecutive Interpreting: A Discussion of Norms Against Actual Performance**" başlıklı Tezi( ) / Projesi( ) kabul edilmiştir.

Prof.Dr. Utku UTKULU
Enstitü Müdürü

YEMİN METNİ

Yüksek Lisans Tezi olarak sunduğum **"(In)Visibility of the Interpreter in Consecutive Interpreting: A Discussion of Norms Against Actual Performance**" adlı çalışmanın, tarafımdan, bilimsel ahlak ve geleneklere aykırı düşecek bir yardıma başvurmaksızın yazıldığını ve yararlandığım eserlerin kaynakçada gösterilenlerden oluştuğunu, bunlara atıf yapılarak yararlanılmış olduğunu belirtir ve bunu onurumla doğrularım.

27/08/2010
Çağlayan SAYHAN

ABSTRACT

Master Thesis

(In)Visibility of the Interpreter in Consecutive Interpreting: A Discussion of Norms Against Actual Performance

Çağlayan SAYHAN

Dokuz Eylül University
Graduate School of Social Sciences
Department of Translation and Interpreting

Studies on conference interpreting have revealed conclusions which imply that theories on conference interpreting do not always overlap with real life situations. In order to discuss norms of interpreting and the interpreter's invisibility, it is necessary to explore interpreter behavior in actual interpreting events.

The study, which concerns consecutive interpreting as a mode of conference interpreting, aims at conducting a research on the discursive (in)visibility of the interpreter in consecutive interpreting. In this context, with a view to provide a comparative study, norms in consecutive interpreting have been identified, first. To this end, discourses of professional interpreter organizations and information gathered from academics working at interpreter training institutions in Turkey, through a questionnaire prepared for the purposes of this study, have been utilized so as to identify the norms concerning the (in)visibility of the interpreter in consecutive interpreting. It is an integral part of the research to discover whether these norms are compatible with the interpreter performance observed in a real-life setting. Therefore, the norms which had been identified were compared with a real-life consecutive interpreting performance recorded in an authentic conference setting. Conclusions and discussions based on this comparative study of the micro and macro- contexts of interpreting have been presented in the thesis.

Key Words: Conference interpreting, consecutive interpreting, visibility/ invisibility, norms, context

ÖZET

Yüksek Lisans Tezi

Ardıl Çeviride Çevirmenin Görünürlüğü/ Görünmezliği: Normlar ile Çeviri Performansının Karşılaştırmalı Tartışması

Çağlayan SAYHAN

Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi
Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü
Mütercim Tercümanlık Anabilim Dalı
İngilizce Mütercim Tercümanlık Programı

Konferans Çevirmenliği ile ilgili olarak yapılan çalışmalarda konferans çevirmenliği kuramlarının çevirmenlerin mesleki yaşamlarından alınan gerçek yaşam öyküleriyle birebir örtüşmediğine dair sonuçlar elde edilmiştir. Sözlü çeviriye ilişkin normların ve çevirmenin görünürlüğü/görünmezliğinin tartışılabilmesi için gerçek konferans ortamındaki çevirmen davranışlarının incelenmesi gerekmektedir.

Konferans çevirmenliği türlerinden biri olan ardıl çeviri ile ilgili olarak gerçekleştirilen çalışmada, çevirmenin ardıl çeviri süreci içerisindeki söylemsel görünürlüğü/ görünmezliğinin araştırılması amaçlanmıştır. Bu bağlamda karşılaştırmalı bir çalışma sunabilmek üzere öncelikle ardıl çeviri ile ilgili normların belirlenmesi gerekmiştir. Bu amaç doğrultusunda, uluslar arası konferans çevirmenliği örgütlerinin söylemleri ile Türkiye'de konferans çevirmeni yetiştiren kurumlarda görev yapan öğretim üyelerinden, çalışmanın amaçları doğrultusunda hazırlanmış anket yoluyla, alınan bilgiler ardıl çeviride çevirmenin görünürlüğü/ görünmezliği ile ilgili normların belirlenmesi amacıyla kullanılmıştır. Normların gerçek yaşamda gözlemlenen çevirmen performansı ile uyumlu olup olmadıkları tezin araştırma konusunun bir parçasını oluşturmaktadır. Bu nedenle, belirlenen normlar ile gerçek bir konferans ortamında kamera aracılığıyla kaydedilen ardıl çeviri performansı karşılaştırılmıştır. Sözlü çevirinin mikro ve makro bağlamlarının

karşılaştırmalı bir biçimde incelenmesine dayalı olarak elde edilen sonuç ve öneriler tezde sunulmuştur.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Konferans çevirmenliği, ardıl çeviri, görünürlük/ görünmezlik, normlar, bağlam

(IN)VISIBILITY OF THE INTERPRETER IN CONSECUTIVE INTERPRETING: A DISCUSSION OF NORMS AGAINST ACTUAL PERFORMANCE

TEZ ONAY SAYFASI ii

YEMİN METNİ iii

ABSTRACT iv

ÖZET vi

TABLE OF CONTENTS viii

LIST OF ANNEXES x

INTRODUCTION 1

CHAPTER ONE

LITERATURE REVIEW ON THE (IN)VISIBILITY OF THE INTERPRETER AND RELATED CONCEPTS

1.1. THE CONCEPT OF INVISIBILITY 7

1.2. NORMS 8

1.3. THE ROLE OF THE INTERPRETER 9

1.4. EXPECTATIONS 14

CHAPTER TWO

DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDY AND METHODOLOGY

2.1. RESEARCH QUESTIONS 20

2.2. OVERALL METHODOLOGY 22

2.3. RESEARCH METHODS 24

CHAPTER THREE

THEORETICAL AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK OF THE STUDY

3.1. INVISIBILITY 27

3.2. NORMS 31

3.3. THE CONTEXT 37

CHAPTER FOUR

THE ANALYSIS

4.1. NORMS 40
4.1.1. Norms as set by Professional Organizations 40
4.1.1.1. Norms on Consecutive Interpreting and Invisibility as set by AIIC 41
4.1.1.2. Norms on Consecutive Interpreting and Invisibility as set by TKTD 45
4.1.2. Norms as set by Interpreter Training Institutions, The Universities in Turkey 48
4.1.2.1 Boğaziçi University, Istanbul 49
4.1.2.2. Istanbul University, Istanbul 49
4.1.2.3. Dokuz Eylül Universıty, Izmir 51
4.1.2.4. Izmir University of Economics, Izmir 54
4.2. THE CONTEXT OF THE CONSECUTIVE INTERPRETING EVENT 57
4.3. ANALYSIS OF THE TRANSCRIPTIONS 59
4.3.1. Direct Contact between the Interpreter and the Audience 61
4.3.1.1. Direct Contact to Assist the Interpreter's Performance or to Make Corrections 61
4.3.1.2. Direct Contact to Warn the Audience 65
4.3.1.3. Direct Contact to Find the Correct Terminology and Wording 69
4.3.1.4. Direct Contact to Ask for Clarifications 76
4.3.1.5. Direct Contact Due to Being Included in the Group Work 78
4.3.2. Direct Contact between the Interpreter and the Speaker 85
4.3.2.1. Direct Contact to Summarize Discussions or the Existing Situation 86
4.3.2.2. Direct Contact to Eliminate Misunderstandings 93
4.3.2.3. Direct Contact to Ask for Clarifications 95

CONCLUSION 96
REFERENCES 102
ANNEXES 105

LIST OF ANNEXES

1. AIIC Codes of Professional Ethics
2. TKTD- Professional Principles
3. Transcriptions of one session

INTRODUCTION

The current study aims to problematize the (in)visibility of the interpreter in consecutive interpreting. (In)visibility, a term used by Lawrence Venuti in translational respect and originally intended for translation, is indirectly defined in his words in relation to the fluent discourse of the translated text and Venuti states that "the more fluent the translation, the more invisible the translator […]" (Venuti, 1995: 2). T he term (in)visibility will be applied as a key term in respect of interpreting in this study, since what makes the translator **appear to be invisible** through the text is what actually makes the interpreter **appear to be** invisible through the translated speech; the naturalness of the translated/ interpreted discourse. Although the term has not been used much in respect of interpreting, it is highly related to terms such as norms in interpreting, the role of the interpreters and expectations from the interpreter, which have often been discussed by interpreting scholars.

Thus, to better analyze the (in)visibility of the interpreter in consecutive interpreting, the thesis will look at the norms of consecutive interpreting, what is expected from interpreters and most significantly the active participation of the interpreter in the actual communication process as well as the role of the interpreter in interpreter-mediated interactions. It is an attempt to shed light on the actual practice of consecutive interpreters and such a study may have positive implications for interpreter training.

Correspondingly, the thesis dwells upon consecutive interpreting rather than either simultaneous interpreting or conference interpreting as a whole. In consecutive interpreting, unlike simultaneous interpreting, the interpreter is physically visible to the audience and there is more interaction between the interpreter and the audience as well as between the interpreter and the speaker(s) in many cases. As Wadensjö puts it "the dialogue interpreter takes/ is given a unique, and potentially a powerful, middle position" (Wadensjö, 2002: 368). Therefore, the term (in)visibility can be discussed through more evident arguments with regard to consecutive interpreting. Thus, the

current study attempts to observe the role of interpreters as active participants and coordinators of the interaction as well as facilitators of communication, which can be more explicitly observed in consecutive interpreting. By doing so, the human interpreter will be observed in interactional context, which will help to unveil the various roles adopted by the interpreter in actual practice. The actual interactional context itself will also bring into light the instances where the interpreter speaks in his/her own voice, therefore becoming more visible.

Founded upon a theoretical basis and the actual practice of interpreting, the study aims to see whether some parallelisms can be drawn between theory and practice in this respect. Accordingly, it scrutinizes the norms on consecutive interpreting as well as the role of the interpreter and user expectations on interpreting. With a view to explore norms on interpreting the study will make use of the discourses of professional interpreter organizations in addition to the information gathered from academics working at interpreter training institutions in Turkey, which form the macro-context of the study. Information on norms will be gathered from academics through a questionnaire which has been prepared for the purposes of this study. Thereby, norms as set by professional interpreter organizations and interpreter training academics will be compared against the transcriptions of an actual consecutive interpreting performance recorded in an authentic conference setting, which constitute the micro-context of the study together with information on the specfic setting and interaction.

The current study consists of the following chapters:

Chapter 1 includes the literature review concerning the previous studies on the concept of invisibility, norms, role of the interpreter and expectations. Since the concept of invisibility and norms also constitute the theoretical and conceptual framework of the study, these two concepts have been further dwelled upon in chapter three. In chapter one studies on the role of the interpreter as well as expectations have been included. The term expectations is closely associated with quality in interpreting. Therefore, surveys conducted on the quality of interpreting

with respect to expectations have also been included in this chapter since they are an integral part of the literature review on conference interpreting.

Chapter 2 gives the description of the study and the methodology. As stated earlier, this study compares norms on consecutive interpreting against an actual consecutive interpreting performance in a certain context with a view to better explore the (in)visibility of the interpreter in consecutive interpreting. To this end, the aim of the study and the reserach questions are provided in this chapter. The chapter also covers the overall methodology adopted – ethnography - and the reserach methods utilized so as to find answers to the stated reserach questions.

Chapter 3 consists of the theoretical and conceptual framework of the study. There are three concepts that are comprehensively analyzed in this chapter. These are the concept of invisibility, the norms and the context. What is meant through invisibility in the literature is explained in chapter 3. However, this chapter presents how invisibility is perceived in this study. Additionally, the concept of norms has been presented comprehensively since they form one of the basic concepts of this study. Norms of interpreting in general and norms of consecutive interpreting specifically are taken into consideration. Elaborating on norms as regards interpreting and consecutive interpreting, first and foremost, attention should be given to what determines the norms. For the purposes of this study, studies on the norms of interpreting as put forward by various scholars are taken into consideration The last section of chapter 3 talks about context since context is considered as a determining factor in interpreting. The notion of context as perceived in this study is discussed in this chapter. In order to develop a better understanding of the (in)visibility of the interpreter and discuss it within a broader framework of the role of the interpreter, the thesis aims at presenting actual interpreting data with a view to draw conclusions. These data are not independent or isolated from the context of the study. Thus, chapter 3 also defines the macro and micro contexts since it is important to describe the context of the study for a better and more thorough understanding of an actual interpreting event.

Chapter 4 is devoted to the analysis of the data obtained. The data analyzed in this chapter have been obtained through various methods. They consist of norms on consecutive interpreting and invisibility, which include norms on consecutive interpreting and invisibility as set by professional organizations, namely AIIC and TKTD, as well as norms on consecutive interpreting and invisibility as set by interpreter training institutions. To this end, the two professional organizations' codes of professional ethics and discourses on consecutive intepreting and invisibility published on their websites have been analyzed. So as to gather information from interpreter training organizations, a questionnaire has been devised and sent to the academics training interpreters in such institutions. Answers obtained through the questionnaires and findings gathered through analyzing the codes of professional ethics and discourses of interpreter organizations are utilized so as to explore the norms on the invisibility of the interpreter in consecutive interpreting, which also constitute the macro-context of the study.

Chapter 4 also includes information on the micro-context of study, that is comprehensive data on the consecutive interpreting event. However, chapter 4 is not limited to the abovementioned data. It also presents the data obtained through recordings of an actual consecutive interpreting activity, which enables one to observe the interpreter at work. The recordings have been transcribed and transcriptions obtained have been used for analyzing the actual performance of an interpreter in consecutive interpreting. So as to analyze the (in)visibility of the interpreter instances of direct contact between the interpreter and the audience and instances of direct contact between the interpreter and the expert speaker, who actually delivered the conference, are taken into consideration for the purposes of this study. Direct contact is analyzed in excerpts of excerpts of talk, consisting of the utterances of the speaker, participants and the interpreter and the back-translation of the utterances in Turkish into English. Through these examples this study aims to concretize the active participation of the interpreter, her roles as the coordinator and regulator of the interpreter-mediated action, amongst others. Besides these, the instances where the interpreter deviates from the norms, such as speaking for herself and detaching herself from the speaker's point of view and position as well as

drifting away from being merely the voice of the speaker will be scrutinized. Thus, the interpreter's (in)visibility will be discussed based on the actual performance.

Findings obtained through the comparison of norms and actual performance are discussed in the final chapter of the thesis. The final chapter attempts to draw conclusions from such a comparison hoping to shed light on future studies analyzing the role of the interpreter in relation to norms, invisibility and context.

CHAPTER ONE

LITERATURE REVIEW ON THE (IN)VISIBILITY OF THE INTERPRETER AND RELATED CONCEPTS

This thesis attempts to problematize the (in)visibility of the interpreter through comparing interpreting norms traced in the discourse of training institutions and codes of ethics of professional organizations against actual conference interpreting performance. To do this, one should first and foremost put the terms as clearly as possible. Thus, it is useful to start with the definition of the terms that are used in this chapter. As the thesis will mainly be talking about the interpreter and actual interpreting performance, the concept of interpreting should initially be defined.

Interpreting is mostly referred to as the oral translation of speech and in this respect Pöchhacker stated the distinguishing factor related to interpreting as "interpreting can be distinguished from other types of translational activity most succinctly by its immediacy; in principle interpreting is performed 'here and now' for the benefit of people who want to engage in communication across barriers of language and culture" (Pöchhacker, 2004: 10). The actual interpreting performance analyzed in this study is in the consecutive mode. Consecutive interpreting is a form of conference interpreting which entails interpreters and speakers taking the stage in turns. In consecutive interpreting, the interpreter has to take notes and convey these notes in the target language when his/her turn comes.

This chapter will dwell upon a series of studies undertaken in the field of translation and interpreting studies, although the main focus will always be on the interpreting studies. To problematize the (in)visibility of the interpreter, in consecutive interpreting, in this specific study, one has to consider various points such as norms in interpreting, role of the interpreter and expectations, including expectations by both interpreters themselves and users. To study these concepts which have long been the issues analyzed comprehensively in interpreting studies, this chapter will be divided into four sub-chapters, and these sub-chapters will

address the studies carried out both in translation and interpreting studies in the abovementioned respects. The sub-chapters are organized in the following order;

a- The concept of invisibility (invisibility in translation and invisibility in interpreting)

b- Norms (norms in translation and in interpreting)

c- Role of the interpreter (different role typologies of interpreters)

d- Expectations

Thereby, the following four sub-chapters are aimed at considering and utilizing as a basis what has been done in translation studies and interpreting studies with respect to these four concepts that are crucial in problematizing the (in)visibility of the interpreter, which constitutes the main focus of the current thesis.

1.1. THE CONCEPT OF INVISIBILITY

Merriam-Webster online dictionary defines invisibility as "incapable by nature of being seen or inaccessible to view"(Merriam- Websters Online Dictionary at http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/invisibility). Thus, the term refers to someone or something that is not seen by others.

In order to develop a better understanding of what is meant through the invisibility of the translator/ interpreter, one should first and foremost analyze the term invisibility within the context of translation studies.

Invisibility was studied by some scholars, one of whom is Lawrence Venuti. Lawrence Venuti defined the term broadly in his book titled *The Translator's Invisibility* (1995). In his book, Venuti indirectly defines the concept in relation to the fluent discourse of the translated text and states that "the more fluent the translation, the more invisible the translator […]" (Venuti, 1995: 2).

An in-depth analysis of the term invisilibility used mainly in translation studies as well as mentioned by some authors in interpreting studies is provided in Chapter III- Theoretical Framework of the study. Chapter III also discusses how and in what sense the term is used within the context of the thesis hereby.

1.2. NORMS

So as to provide an objective and translational-context free definition of norms, which has long been analyzed since Gideon Toury introduced them with respect to translation studies, I shall refer to the definition provided by Merriam-Webster's Online Dictionary again. There are four meanings listed for the entry "norm" and the first two can be taken as the general meaning that the term norm conveys. These two are 1: an authoritative standard, 2: a principle of right action binding upon the members of a group and serving to guide, control or regulate proper and acceptable behavior. Thus, from the definition provided above, one can derive that norms consist of a set of principles describing what is right, what is wrong or what is acceptable within a group.

In his book *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond* Toury provides a definition for norms stating,

> "sociologists and social psychologists have long regarded norms as the translation of general values or ideas shared by a community – as to what is right and wrong, adequate and inadequate – into performance instructions appropriate for and applicable to particular situations, specifying what is prescribed and forbidden as well as what is tolerated and permitted in a certain behavioural dimension." (Toury, 1996: 54- 55)

Toury argues in his book that translation is a norm-governed activity and it entails two sets of norms since it requires two languages. These two sets of norms are source-culture norms applicable to the source text and target-culture norms applicable to the target text. Under the term initial norms, Toury talks about two concepts as "adequacy" and "acceptability", which are both related to the translator's choice of norms (Toury, 1995: 56). As Toury puts it "[…] adherence to source norms determines a translation's adequacy as compared to the source text, subscription to

norms originating in the target culture determines its acceptability" (Toury, 1995: 57).

Since the main aim of this study is to compare the norms as set by professional organizations and interpreter training institutions with actual practice, norms constitute the theoretical framework of the thesis. Therefore, a more comprehensive analysis of norms and the concept of norms applied to interpreting studies is provided in chapter III.

1.3. THE ROLE OF THE INTERPRETER

Having a closer look at norms in interpreting, one arrives at another fervently dicussed notion with respect to interpreters and interpreting, which is the role of the interpreter. The role of the interpreter has been discussed by many scholars and it has been the subject of surveys dealing with the quality of interpreting. In this context, in Franz Pöchhacker's words "the notion of 'role', a relational concept defined by sociologists as a set of more or less normative behavioral expextations associated with a 'social position' is therefore pivotal to the analysis of interpreters' performance" (Pöchhacker, 2004: 147). In his book Pöchhacker stated that "the more narrowly construed professional role of the interpreter prescribes accurate, complete and faithful rendition and presribes any discourse initiative on the part of the interpreter, who is conceptualized as a 'non-person'[…]" (ibid). He makes direct reference to the **invisibility**[1] of the interpreter as he mentions metaphors such as 'faithful-echo', 'channel', 'conduit', 'switching device', 'transmission belt', 'modem' or 'input- output robot' initially studied by Cynthia Roy in her article. As Pöchhacker puts it,

> "this view of the interpreter as an **invisible**[2] translating machine would appear to be inspired by the technology-based mode of simultaneous conference interpreting. In fact, however, it is deeply rooted particularly in the field of court interpreting". (ibid)

[1] Emphasis mine
[2] Emphasis in the original

Bruce Anderson, analyzed the role of the interpreter in his article focusing on three aspects of the interpreter's role, which are the interpreter as a bilingual; the interpreter as a man in the middle; the interpreter as a power figure. He states that in any translational setting "[…] the role played by the interpreter is likely to exert considerable influence on the evolution of group structure and on the outcome of interaction" (Anderson 2002: 209). Thus, according to Anderson, the role of the interpreter is crucial in the shaping of the interaction within an interpreting setting. In Anderson's view, the interpreter is the man in the middle as he/she serves two clients at the same time, to each of whom the interpreter has some obligations, and these obligations may not always be compatible. Therefore, role conflict and the interpreter's dilemma on his role may occur occasionally. By the same token, this position of *the man in the middle* has the advantage of power inherent in all positions which control scarce sources. He depicted the interpreter's role as always partially undefined and interpreter's position characterized by role overload (Anderson 2002: 212). In this framework, Anderson asked the following questions regarding the role of the interpreter "should the interpreter be a mere echo, or should he be an advisor and ally? Should he inform his client of whispered, off-the-record remarks made by the other party to the interaction, or should he stick to the text?" (Anderson 2002: 212). Anderson indicates the active role of the interpreter in the shaping of interaction between parties, rather than the passive (invisible) conduit model.

Bistra Alexiava, another scholar having conducted research in field of interpreting, did not intially work on the role of the interpreter but her research on the typology of interpreter-mediated events led her to some conclusions with respect to the role of the interpreter. In her research on the typologies of interpreter mediated events, which she cocluded as "an interpreter-mediated event may be located along a continuum of 'universality' vs. 'cultural specificity' using a number of scales[…]" she said "identifying the degree of culture-specificity associated with a given type of interpreter-mediated event should allow us to make more reliable predictions about the role that the interpreter typically has to play in such an event" (Alexiava, 2002: 230). According to Alexiava, interpreting events located towards the "universal" end of the continuum require the interpreter to act as a simple interlingual mediator,

within which the interpreter does not have to perform any "repair" operations in communication, leading to his/ her presence being largely unnoticed. However, interpreting events located towards the other end of the continuum, which is culture specificity, require the interpreter to play a more important role within communication such as intervening in the interaction, preventing misunderstandings and smoothing out cultural differences, for instance, explaining the differences in the use of culture specific items or institutions, and such a role makes the interpreter more visible (ibid).

Although his works mainly dwelled upon the quality of interpreting Andrej Kopczynski also found some relations to the role of the interpreter in his research conducted with respect to quality in conference interpreting. In his survey addressing two kinds of participants in conferences, namely the receptors and speakers, which included professional groups as humanities, science and technology and diplomats he directed several questions to the addressees on expectations. This survey on expectations will be further mentioned in the next sub-chapter on expectations, but what the results of this survey revealed as regards the role of the interpreter is rather striking. In his survey in Kopczynski's words "[…] all were in favour of empathy with the speaker and considered the ghost role[3] of the interpreter as preferable" (Kopczynski, 1994: 96). But what is actually striking is the further clarifications entailed in his survey which are the following summarized by Kopcyznski as,

> "most claimed that the interpreter should imitate the tempo and intensity of the voice of the speaker but not necessarily the gestures; most respondents would allow corrections of the speaker (with some reservation) and additional explanations, a reply which was in complete contradiction with the ghost role of the interpreter!" (ibid)

On the role of the interpreter and the conduit metaphor ascribed to interpreters in a communicative process Roy stressed that:

> "the conduit metaphors and our underlying belief system mask the active process engaged in by all the participants;[…] ignore the success of interpreters; neglect the roles and relationships between the primary speakers, deny the power of the interpreter; disrupts

[3] The invisible role, which may also be linked to the non-person role suggested

> conversations about the management task of the interpreter" (Roy, 1990: 84)

As regards the role of the interpreter, Roy pointed out to the conflict between norms/ standards and real life situations, in the form of divergence between interpreting norms and anecdotal accounts of interpreters. Roy, accordingly stated that:

> "on the one hand, the field has come to expect relatively rigid standards of professional behaviour; while on the other, many practicing interpreters comment on the differing realities of roles and functions in the smaller 'real-life' situations" (ibid).

Roy further discussed the role of the interpreter, and she touched upon metaphors as well as the descriptions concerning the role of the interpreter. Having regard to descriptions of the role of the interpreter, Roy underlined the conflict presented by such role definitions, which may be assumed to reflect the deviations between the norm and the real-life situations (anecdotal accounts), and clarified that these descriptions attempted to convey the difficulty of the simultaneous tasks in interpreting while reminding everyone that the interpreter is uninvolved at any other level; while at the same time these very descriptions encouraged the interpreters to be flexible (Roy, 2002: 347). She suggested that "interpreters are not simply processing information and passively passing it back and forth", which underlines her emphasis in the active role of the interpreter (Roy 2002: 348). As an alternative to the metaphor concerning the passive/ conduit role of the interpreter she pointed out that in many articles, books and newsletters about interpreting one can find metaphors such as communication facilitator, mediator, linguistic intermediary, bilingual, bicultural communicator with respect to interpreters' role.

The conflict between the norms regarding fidelity and uninvolvement and the real-life situations of practicing interpreters was further linked to the actual roles undertaken by the interpreter. According to Roy, "most interpreters now recognize different interpretations of roles and functions that grow from smaller 'real-life' situations in which the interpreter **must**[4] take an active, participatory stance in the

[4] Emphasis mine

communication between two active participants" (Roy 2002: 352). Like Anderson, Roy also stressed the "man in the middle" role of the interpreter in the interaction keeping an eye on the power and control strategies possessed by interpreters in a bilingual interaction since they are the only participants who can logically maintain, adjust and if necessary repair the differences in structure and use, which means that interpreters are active, third participants with potential influence on both the direction and the outcome of the event (ibid). She added to this saying "[…] the event itself is intercultural and interpersonal rather than simply mechanical and technical" (ibid).

Another scholar who emphasized the interactional aspect of interpreting and defined interpreting as an interaction in itself is Cecilia Wadensjö. In her book titled *Interpreting as Interaction* she refers to the role of the interpreter. As the title of her book suggests she considers interpreting as interaction; thus, she favors the mediator role of the interpreter rather than the passive, mechanical conduit role.

Based on Goffman's notion of role as in itself consisting of three different aspects, namely the *normative role, typical role* and *role performance* Wadensjö stated that "my point of departure was that the literature on interpreting was dominantly normative in character and that ideas of how interpreters 'should' perform partly blocked the sight in investigations of actual cases of interpreting" (Wadensjö, 1998: 83). She defined normative role as commonly shared ideas about a certain activity and what people in general think they are or should be doing when acting in a certain role; whereas the typical role was defined as routines developed by individuals to handle typical situations not foreseen by shared and established norms. Aspects of the individual's behaviour, which does not originate either from the normative or typical standards that must be explained by circumstances in the situation and by the personal style of the performer were explicated as the role performance.

Wadensjö, also mentioned *role distance* in her study. According to Wadensjö, role distance may be defined as the divergence between the obligation and actual

performance, which also represents what has been quoted from Roy with respect to the conflict of norms on the role of the interpreter and the actual/ anecdotal/ real-life situations, experiences of practicing interpreters. She reached an open-ended conclusion, which might have paved the way for further discussions, and her remark definitely underlined the need for comprehensive research with respect to 'real-life' situations of practicing interpreters with a view to better analyze the definition concerning the role of the interpreter. Accordingly, Wadensjö clearly stated that "if a certain kind of 'role distance' is systematically utilized by professionals, this can ultimately lead to a redefinition of their professional role" (Wadensjö, 1998: 86).

Thus, one can derive that within the context of the role of the interpreter reference has been made to metaphors such as *faithful echo, channel* or *a passive conduit.* However, some scholars have not ignored the active role played by the interpreter through making references to interpreter as *the moderator of speech, man in the middle* or *interpreter as a power figure.* The role played by the interpreter has been assumed by some scholars to have a certain impact on the group structure. Regarding these different perspectives on the role of the interpreter, this study and the real-life interpreting event to be analyzed thereunder will contribute to the process of defining the interpreter's role since invisibility, as a concept, is a part of role description. The role distance as mentioned above by Wadensjö will also surface in this study as it attempts to check the authentic performance against the norms (as stated by professional organizations' Codes of Ethics and discourse of interpreter training institutions) and tends to dwell upon the interpreter's invisibility.

1.4. EXPECTATIONS

Exploring the expectations on interpreting and what is expected from interpreter, one arrives at studies on the quality of interpreting. Talking about expectations, a distinction should be made as to what interpreters themselves think about expectations from interpreters and what is expected from the interpreter by the users since surveys applied so far have yielded results underlining that, interpreters

and users may have different expectations. Research has revealed even the fact that different user groups may have distant expectations.

In this respect, Cartellieri stated that "very often, a good interpreter is two quite different people, being one thing to a conference participant and another to a colleague". Accordingly, Pöchhacker stated quality was "in the eye of the beholder" (Pöchhacker, 2001: 413), and he added that,

> "When empirical research on quality criteria in conference interpreting came under way […] a distinction was made between quality assessment from the perspective of the interpreters themselves as opposed to quality as 'viewed' by the listeners ('users') ." (Pöchhacker, 2001: 411).

Research has proven that the abovementioned is and was actually the case. Bühler, under the scope of her study, designed a questionnaire comprising of some criteria (both linguistic and extra-linguistic) and asked AIIC to rate these criteria. Her list of sixteen criteria were to be rated on a four-point scale ('highly important', 'important', 'less important' and 'irrelevant'). She asked fourty-seven respondents to rate interpreter-related qualities such as thorough preparation, endurance, poise, pleasant appearance etc. and nine features of interpreter output, namely, native accent pleasant voice, fluency of delivery, logical cohesion, sense consistency, completeness, correct grammar, correct terminology and appropriation style. Bühler's survey is focused more on output and quality than the role or invisibilility of the interpreter, though. In turn, Bühler found that most of the criteria were rated as 'important', which revealed the high level of expectations posed by the interpreters as regards conference interpreters' performance.

Another scholar, Ingrid Kurz based her study on the criteria identified by Bühler and under the framework of her study she applied those criteria to explore user expectations as she considered target-language receiver or listener an essential element in the process. Since Kurz's study is not explicitly but implicitly related to the role and invisibility of the interpreter. Kurz explains this study briefly and compares the results stating that

> "Delegates to a medical conference were asked to rate the first eight criteria in Bühler's questionnaire as to their significance for the

> quality of interpretation. It was found that some of the criteria which members of the interpreting profession considered highly important, such as native accent, pleasant voice, and correct use of grammar, were given much more lower ratings by the end users participating in this study. ” (Kurz, 2002: 315)

In conclusion, Kurz stated “the demands on the quality of interpretation expressed by the AIIC interpreters in Bühler’s survey were generally higher than those obtained from the delegates participating in the present investigation” (Kurz, 2002: 323).

Another study similar to Kurz’s was carried out by Gile in an opthalmological conference asking the delegates to assess the quality of interpretation provided at the conference. Concerning the results of this study Kurz states that “one of Gile’s findings was that […] quality of voice was considered less important by the respondents in this sample than by the interpreters in Bühler’s survey” (Kurz, 2002: 316). In this study, Gile asked about the performance of the interpreter. Thus, what was done may be assumed as an evaluation rather than a simple exploration of expectations.

Unlike the studies of Bühler and Kurz, Andrzej Kopczynski’s survey on the quality of interpreting had a criterion related to the role of the interpreter. Kopczynski’s survey revealed that users with different positions (as to whether they are a listener or a speaker) may state different views concerning the quality of interpretation, especially concerning the cultural mediator (or intruder as called by Kopczynski) role of the interpreter. In Kopczynski’s survey main differences of answers to his survey were about the irritants and the role of the interpreter. As regards the irritants while speakers gave more importance to the exact rendition of the content of their speech, the receptors (listeners) were sensitive to unfinished sentences and grammaticality. As regards the role of the interpreter, the speakers agreed that mistakes can be corrected whereas the receptors did not agree with the idea. (Kopczynski, 1994: 97).

Finally, user groups from different professional areas may have different quality expectations. Both Kurz and Kopczynski surveyed different user groups. Kurz gave her questionnaire to three different user groups, namely Council of Europe

Delegates, medical doctors and engineers, and compared these with the ratings of the interpreters. As regards the criteria ratings Kurz states that "interpreters gave higher overall ratings than the three other groups. The second higher ratings were given by the Council of Europe (CE) delegates. Medical doctors gave an average rating […] and engineers […] gave the lowest ratings" (Kurz, 2002: 317). In Kopczynski's survey, three different groups were surveyed. These groups were involved in humanities including philologists, historians, lawyers and economists, science and technology including scientists, engineers, doctors, and the last group consisted of diplomats. The three groups gave different ratings to the formal categories that are important in interpreting. As regards the most important function of interpreting, humanities group favoured grammaticality, whereas the science and technology group and diplomats group favoured fluency. As for the irritants in interpreting, incorrect terminology was ranked the first among both groups. Humanities and diplomats group rated unfinished sentences as the second most irritant factor in interpreting, while science and technology group rated incorrect terminology as the second most irritant factor, and while humanities group ranked incomplete sentences as the third most irritant factor, science and technology and diplomat groups considered lack of fluency and ungrammaticality as the third most irritant factor. As regards the cultural mediator role of the interpreter humanities group was the most liberal whereas diplomats group was the most restrictive (Kopczynski, 1994).

As mentioned previously, Diriker, in her PhD thesis, analyzed an actual interpreting event and made interviews with the users of interpreting (speakers and some participants) of that conference as well as the interpreters themselves. She interviewed all the abovementioned parties since in her words "after all, despite the differences in their roles, the organizer, speakers, listeners and interpreters were temporarily parties to the same social and communicative context" (Diriker, 2001: 114). Her interviews yielded some results with respect to what is expected from the interpreter.

In her interview with the organizer of the specific event in question, Diriker found out the organizer had been convinced that with adequate preparation and

former experience, the interpreters could convey the meaning in the original. In this respect she stated,

> "Even though the scholars specializing on these philosophers seemed to disagree on the interpretation of a single word, 'grasping and transferring the meaning' of the speeches delivered at the conference seemed possible for 'competent' interpreters. 'Competent' interpreters were thus **expected**[5] to do what 'competent' scholars apparently could not" (Diriker, 2001: 115).

Supporting the results of surveys conducted by Kurz and Kopczynski as to the fact that user groups of different professional backgrounds may have different expectations from the interpreter Diriker stated that:

> "the task and position of the interpreters were further complicated by the significant differences in the expectations and assessments of the SI users. First of all, the surprising heterogenity of the participants (consisting not only of scholars and students but also a writer, political activist, Publisher and members of a spiritual grop) seemed to tirgger fairly diverse an deven contradictory expectations from the interpreters". (Diriker, 2001: 118)

According to Diriker's interview results, majority of the respondents expected the interpreters to be familiar with the field, and many respondents wanted the interpreters to convey the meaning of the original although there was not an agreed definition of the meaning among the respondents. While some of the respondents were contended that meaning of the original was 'feeling behind the concepts', it was the 'spiritual world of the philosopher' for others. The interview results revealed that some respondents expected the interpreters to summarize and paraphrase the general meaning; on the other hand, some respondents thought that the meaning depended on the exact transfer of words. While some respondents expected the interpreters to find and use new Turkish coinages for the terms used in the speeches, others were contended with daily terms that they were familiar with (Diriker, 2001). Thus, there is no consensus among users as regards conveying the meaning.

An indirect reference to the (in)visibility of the interpreter may be derived from what Diriker's interview results have revealed as regards the different views

[5] Emphasis mine

concerning the gestures of the interpreters, which may be an indication of interpreters' visibility to the audience. In this respect Diriker put the results as "[…] some of the respondents were fascinated with the gestures of the interpreters while others complained they were too distracting" (Diriker, 2001: 119).

Thus, it can be inferred, in general terms, from surveys and research results that expectations may vary with respect to respondents to whom questions on quality parameters and expectations were directed. As regards the (in)visibility of the interpreter, the main focus of this study as regularly emphasized, it may be assumed, mainly from Kurz's and Kopczynski's surveys, that some user groups (namely users with a humanities background) have flexible views, which may be interpreted as the fact that they do not consider the conduit, invisible, *non-person* or *ghost* role of the interpreter as an absolute requirement. On the other hand, the related invisible, *non-person* or *ghost* role of the interpreter was found out to be favored by the diplomats, who most probably have formal meetings which are usually rather strict about interpreter's interventions. But isn't the interpreter the man in middle in diplomatic meetings? It can be discussed whether features like officiality or formality of the event has an influence on interpreting performance. Although much has been written on these issues, there is still a lot to explore through observing real-life interpreting phenomena.

Due to the need to study real-life situations and the significance of making observations in natural environments so as to derive some insight about the invisibility of the interpreter, roles of the interpreter, norms of interpreting and expectations, this study aims to ask some research questions. These research questions aim to contribute to a better understanding concerning the role of the interpreter in consecutive interpreting. Since the interpreter's role is an issue which is too comprehensive and complicated to be dealt in a master's thesis, it will be attempted to narrow the scope by studying only the interpreter's invisibility within the wider issue of role. The study attempts to find out whether invisibility is a norm in consecutive interpreting as actualized in real-life interpreting events.

CHAPTER TWO

DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDY AND METHODOLOGY

2.1. RESEARCH QUESTIONS

As mentioned for several times earlier, this study aims to promlematize the (in)visibility of the interpreter in consecutive interpreting. To do so, the reasons why consecutive interpreting, as a mode of conference interpreting, was opted for shall be clarified first and foremost.

Consecutive interpreting is a type of conference interpreting where the interactivity among the interpreter and the participants is at the highest level. Participants to a conference include two different basic user groups as speakers and the audience. In consecutive interpreting the interpreter's role as the mediator of the speech or "the man in the middle" is in its most obvious form since the interpreter sometimes has the opportunity to clarify misunderstandings by asking the speaker or audience some questions for clarification or intervening in the course of the conference through making additional remarks in order to prevent any kind of misunderstanding by the speakers or by the audience. While it is difficult to determine whether such instances of intervention or asking questions, through which the interpreter speaks his/her own words, are in line with norms of interpreting, such instances were analyzed in studies on interpreting based on actual interpreting events. Roy, with a critical point of view, stated the following observations concerning such instances saying that

> To be specific, interpreters may not introduce topics, change topics, ask questions of their own, interject their opinion and give advice[…]. The performance of this role has been compared to a machine, a window, a bridge and a telephone line among other metaphors trying to compress the complexity of the role to a simple, singular analogy. (Roy, 2002: 347).

Such instances where the interpreter speaks his/her own words may be considered as instances where the interpreter becomes more visible both to the speaker and the audience.

In all forms of conference interpreting the interpreter is expected to fully identify with the speaker. Through the course of interpreting the interpreter identifies fully with the speaker which erases out his/her identity. This norm is referred to as the "honest spokesperson" norm by Brian Haris, who on Miriam Shlesinger's call, commented on professional norms. accordingly he stated that

> […] there is at least one other which is more fundamental and universal. This is the "true interpreter" norm […] or the norm of "honest spokesperson". This norm requires that people who speak on behalf of others, interpreters among them, re-express the original speaker's ideas and the manner of expressing them as accurately as possible without significant omissions, not not mix them up with their own ideas and expressions. (Harris, 1990: 118)

This full identification with the speaker requires the interpreter to behave in a certain way which may be considered as the norms in consecutive interpreting. In consecutive interpreting the intial norm is to interpret source text utterances in the first person as if the speaker was speaking in the target language. In an actual interpreting event, the interpreter even mimes the speaker's mimics and gestures, adopting the same way of intonation, and even making/telling the same jokes, if possible. Thus, the audience comes to think that the interpreter and the speaker are one and the same. In other words the interpreter becomes invisible.

However, such an identification cannot be clearly observed in simultaneous interpreting as the interpreter is located in a booth during the whole course of action. In simultaneous interpreting the interpreter is considered as only a voice by both the speakers and the audience, whereas, in consecutive interpreting the interpreter is both physically and discursively visible in some instances described above.

Under the conditions listed above, the reasons why one should first and foremost start discussing the interpreter's (in)visibility focusing on the actual consecutive interpreting event may be assumed to be that consecutive interpreting,

required by its norms, involves instances which the interpreter is to be invisible and, required by its *modus operandi*, it contains instances which call for the interpreter's intervention, which makes the interpreter visible.

Therefore, the study will attempt to seek answers to the following questions or in other words the study aims to pursue the following research objectives in the form of two main questions described below;

1- In a consecutive interpreting event where the interpreter's role is to ensure that the communication is provided without any misunderstanding, is it possible for the interpreter to be really invisible?
2- To what extent is intervention acceptable in terms of norms of interpreting adopted by professional codes of ethics and interpreter training institutions?

2.2. OVERALL METHODOLOGY

This study adopts ethnography as overall methodology since it will observe an authentic consecutive interpreting event. The term ethnography is defined in its simplest form as a research strategy often used in the social sciences, particularly in anthropology and in some branches of sociology, which is often adopted for gathering empirical data on human societies/cultures. The main characteristic of ethnography is that data collection is often done through participant observation, interviews, questionnaires, etc. and these are fulfilled in a natural environment as opposed to the laboratory settings.

Context plays an important part for ethnography and studies adopting ethnography as methodology. As David Nunan puts it "ethnography […] gives central importance to context in which the variables occur and emphasises the interplay amongst them" (Nunan, 1992;54). Thus, observation in a natural environment plays a vital role, which is further emphasized by Nunan as

> Despite differences of emphasis, different statements all agree that ethnography involves the study of the culture/ characteristics of a group in a real-world rather than laboratory settings. The researcher

> makes no attempt to isolate or manipulate the phenomena under investigation and insights and generalisations emerge from close contact with the date […].(Nunan, 1992: 55)

This study is an observational study, i.e. it involves observing events as they occur without any intervention. Such observations obtained through the transcriptions of an actual interpreting event as well as the questionnaires given to interpreter training institutions will help provide opportunity to compare the norms as shaped by professional interpreter organizations and interpreter training schools against an actual interpreting event. In other words, the (in)visibility of the interpreter as designed by Codes of Professional Ethics and training institutions will be traced in interpreted interactions. Such an attempt will make triangulation possible, which is crucial in ethnography, through comparing and contrasting what happens in real-life and what professional organizations and training institutions say about the norm of (in)visibility. Thus, the study complies with the methodology suggested by Pöchhacker as *watch, ask and record* (Pöchhacker, 2004: 64).

Pöchhacker further clarifies observational methods in his 2004 book as

> In standard methodological terms, this corresponds to observational methods, which range from informal participant observation to highly structured observation with the help of coding schemes; interviews and questionnaires, which can be more or less structured and variously administered; and the collection of documentary material (e.g. corpora of authentic disourse or experimental output) for analysis. (ibid)

The study takes into consideration the observation made in a real-life situation (an actual interpreting event) which is also recorded and it also collects data from interpreter training institutions through a questionnaire by the help of a dedicated questionnaire. All in all, as regards all its research elements this study adopts observational research approach. The difference between observational and experimental approaches was clarified by Pöchhacker as "observational research refers to studying a phenomenon as it occurs, 'naturally', as it were, 'in the field', whereas experimental research makes a phenomenon occur precisely for the purpose of studying it" (ibid: 63).

The interpreting environment, which is problematized in this study so as to analyze the (in)visibility of the interpreter in a consecutive interpreting event was not solely prepared and set up for the purposes of the study concerned. It was an actual, scheduled meeting in which some recordings were made with the permission of both the speaker and the participants. In general terms, the study observed an authentic event within the context in which the interpreting event occured. Thus, ethnography is the overall methodology and an observational approach is adopted with regard to collecting data.

2.3. RESEARCH METHODS

With a view to answering the above listed questions, this study will make use of several research methods so as to achieve the best possible answers in this respect. So as to discuss the (in)visibility of the interpreter one should initially regard the norms concerning the specific area of interest, which is consecutive interpreting in this case. To do this both textual and extratextual sources shall be used in this study to discover and analyze norms applicable to this specific mode of conference interpreting. In this framework, with respect to extratextual sources the study will take into consideration the AIIC Codes of Ethics. AIIC defines itself as "the only worldwide association for conference interpreters. Founded in 1953, it brings together more than 2800 professional conference interpreters in over 250 cities in over 90 countries"[6]. Thus, its codes of ethics are a determining factor on the practice and practitioners'side. To make the study more specific the study will analyze the case of Turkey as regards consecutive interpreting. With a view to discover the norms valid within Turkish context of conference interpreting and consequently consecutive interpreting, the study shall also take into consideration the codes of ethics of a Turkish Interpreters Association (TKTD- Conference Interpreters Association of Turkey), which is a member of AIIC.

[6] Taken from AIIC website at http://www.aiic.net/ViewPage.cfm/article8

However, one should never ignore the role of schools training professional interpreters, both consecutive and simultaneous, in the shaping of norms for interpreting. To this end, a questionnaire was designated and sent to schools experienced in training professional interpreters in Turkey. Translator/interpreter training in Turkey has been undertaken on graduate level (4-year course) at Faculties of Letters in Universities. The questionnaires prepared for such universities attempt to explore the attitude of academics towards the interpreter's invisibility in consecutive interpreting. Futhermore, the questions also aim at discovering whether the interpreter candidates were informed about their roles as the mediator of the interaction, the variety of situations and roles they may be expected to assume as professional interpreters, as well as their position on visibility/ invisibility continuum.

To achieve these objectives the questionnaire consisted of the following questions;

1- *In interpreter training process, do you tell your students about instances where the interpreter has to mediate the interaction/communication?*
2- *In interpreter training process do you tell your students about different roles of the interpreter in various contexts?*
3- *In interpreter training process do you tell your students about the visibility/invisibility of the interpreter and the instances in which these concepts may be assumed as norms?*

Seven questionnaires were sent to Turkish universities prominent in interpreter training, namely Boğaziçi University (İstanbul), İstanbul University (İstanbul), Hacettepe University (Ankara), Izmir University of Economics(İzmir) and Dokuz Eylül University (İzmir). However, only five fully answered questionnaires have been received. These have been answered by Boğaziçi University, İstanbul University, Izmir University of Economics and Dokuz Eylül University. Questionnaires are analyzed in part IV- Analysis.

As regards textual sources shaping the norms, the study shall take into consideration an actual consecutive interpreting event recorded and transcribed. There is no doubt that such a narrow observation can never qualify for discovering or revealing the norms applicable for consecutive interpreting in any context. However, the transcriptions of the recorded interpreting event will nevertheless help to make a comparison between the norms as shaped by professional organizations and schools training professional interpreters, and the actual instances of consecutive interpreting.

Through such a comparison the study aims to draw some conclusions on the (in)visibility of the interpreter via answering the research questions.

CHAPTER THREE

THEORETICAL AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK OF THE STUDY

3.1. INVISIBILITY

The term invisibility plays a key role in this study. Therefore, it is vital for the purposes of this study to state as clearly as possible what the term invisibility entails. To do this, the term *invilibility*, which was comprehensively taken up by Lawrence Venuti, and many references made to it have been scrutinized.

Invisibility was studied by some scholars, one of whom is Lawrence Venuti. Lawrence Venuti defined the term broadly in his book titled *The Translator's Invisibility* (1995). In his book, Venuti indirectly defines the concept in relation to the fluent discourse of the translated text and states that "the more fluent the translation, the more invisible the translator […]" (Venuti, 1995: 2). Since the translation is fluent, it appears to be natural in the sense that, for example Dostoyevski had written *Crime and Punishment* in English, which was never really the case. The fluent discourse (or transparency in other words) adopted by the translator makes the reader forget all about the fact that what she/he is reading is a translation, and this is what exactly makes the translator **seem**[7] invisible through the text. In this respect Venuti puts the case as:

> "the illusion of transparency is an effect of fluent discourse, of the translator's effort to insure easy readability by adhering to current usage, maintaining continuous syntax, fixing a precise meaning. What is so remarkable here is that this **illusory**[8] effect conceals the numerous conditions under which the translation is made, starting with the translator's crucial intervention in the foreign text." (Venuti, 1995: 1- 2).

Theo Hermans and Guiliana Schiavi are the other scholars who also studied the invisibility of translators. In his article Hermans marks the instances when a

[7] Emphasis mine.
[8] Emphasis mine

translator becomes visible in a text stating "the translator's voice is most directly and forcefully present when it breaks through the surface of the text speaking for itself, in its own name, for example in a Translator's Note […]"(Hermans, 1996: 27). Even when the translator never uses the abovementioned tools which make him/her visible in the text, the broad definition of translation is sufficient to mark this visibility since "an (implied) translator organizes the way in which the translation's (implied) reader is informed about the original author's message"[9] (Schiavi, 1996: 16). Even though, the basis of the original message transmitted by the translator to the reader belongs to the original author, it is the translator who organizes the discourse and the way of expression in the target language. Hermans also links the invisibility of the translator with those of interpreters through giving an example from a hypothetical interpreting event stating:

> "when Boris Yeltsin speaks through an interpreter, do we really want to hear the interpreter's voice? We listen surely, because we want to know what Yeltsin has to say […] We regard –or better -: we are prepared to, we have been conditioned to regard – the interpreter's voice as a carrier without a substance of its own, a virtually transparent vehicle." (Hermans, 1996: 24)

What makes the translator appear to be invisible through the text may be assumed as what makes the interpreter appear to be invisible through the interpreted speech, the naturalness of the translated/interpreted discourse. Likewise, the readers assuming as if that translated book had been written in their own language, the audience in Yeltsin's speech "conclude that 'Yeltsin has said so and so'" (Hermans, 1996: 25).

Although Cecilia Wadensjö does not make a direct reference to the invisibility of the interpreter, she indirectly brings the concept forward as she quotes Erving Goffman (1990) in her book *Interpreting as Interaction* where she elaborates on the roles of the interpreter. Wadensjö quotes Goffman as:

> "a discrepant role discussed at some length by Goffman (1990) is that of *non-person.* In his definition, actors who play the role of 'non-person' are present during an encounter but in some respect do not take the role either of a performer or of audience, nor do they pretend

[9] Brackets mine.

> to be what they are not (as informers, decoys, and sometimes detectives would do." (Wadensjö, 1998: 66)

This term of non-person ascribed to the interpreter might be considered to have some links with the (in)visibility of the interpreter. The illusion of transparency as stated by Venuti within the context of translation and translators may be assumed to create the illusion of non-person within the context of interpreting and interpreters since they are physically there but considered discursively absent. To clarify the term Wadensjö provides some more examples of non-persons stating "broadcasting technicians and photographers typically act as 'non-persons' in this respect, during public ceremonies like concerts and debates […]" (ibid). The example of broadcasting technicians and photographers is provided since their role during public ceremonies is identified with that of the interpreter in an interpreting setting/ event. Like those of broadcasting technicians and photographers, the interpreter is indispensible in an interpreting event due to his/her function within that specific setting but this indispensability does not mean that she/he is visible to the audience or the speakers. In other words, the interpreter has a technical role to play within the interpreting process. Therefore, she/he is not supposed to be discursively present, which marks his/her invisibility. Wadensjö puts this as :

> "in many respects, the concept of 'non-person' applies to interpreter in face-to-face interaction. Interpreters play a kind of technical role and are counted as not fully present; there is an expectation that they will contribute nothing to the substance of the current conversation." (Wadensjö, 1998: 67)

This illusionary effect of invisibility may sometimes make both the speakers and the audience forget all about the interpreter. As mentioned above, it is the fluent and transparent rendition which makes the interpreter seem or appear to be invisible. This illusion may result in speakers' unawarely ignoring the presence of interpreters and interpreters' turn in consecutive interpreting, which in most cases causes the speaker to forget that he/she should stop for the interpreting of his/her utterance.

Going even further, some scholars suggested that interpreters should be physically absent, meaning that they should be like a machine producing only a voice that conveys the source language message in the target language. Quoting from

Knapp-Potthof and Knapp and Müller, Wadensjö exposes how the professional interpreter is envisaged by the above-mentioned scholars stating that "Knapp-Potthof and Knapp (as well as Müller (1989)), envisage a 'professional' interpreter first and foremost as someone who is physically absent, providing simultaneous or consecutive interpretation as a voice 'ex-machine from behind the scene'(Müller 1989: 714) […]"(Wadensjö, 1998: 77).

Ebru Diriker, too, makes reference to the (in)visibility of the interpreter in her PhD thesis, where she analyzed an actual simultaneous interpreting performance against various parameters. There are three direct references in her work to the visibility of simultaneous interpreting, the first one of which is in the beginning of her thesis when she talked about simultaneous interpreting stating "simultaneous conference interpreting which I shall refer to as simultaneous interpreting (SI) has definitely been the most 'visible' type of interpreting during the 20th century" (Diriker, 2001:1). The second reference can be seen when, in her thesis, she presented instances when simultaneous interpreting gained 'visibility'. To this end, she concluded that "generally speaking, interpreting seems to have hit the news in Turkey for three main reasons: Big events, Big money and Big mistakes" (Diriker, 2001: 52). Thus, one can derive from her references to visibility that interpreters are not always invisible and they become more visible, especially in media, when the abovementioned three categories are pronounced in relation to their profession. The third reference is taken from her interview with the speakers of the conference under her study. As Diriker puts it:

> "interpreters became more 'visible' for the speakers with the start of the conference. Christina Shües, for instance, mentioned the proximity of the booths as a factor in making her realize the existence of interpreters. The position of the booths apparently also contributed to the interpreter's visibility."(Diriker, 2001: 91).

Taking the abovementioned quote into consideration, one can reach the conclusion that the speakers of the conference analyzed in Diriker's thesis did not regard the fact that they were to work with interpreters in the conference concerned, which is usually the case in many of the conferences where speakers often forget to forward their written documents, PowerPoint presentations or any other documents

related to their speeches. This is directly reinforced through Diriker's observations in that conference, which may be assumed to be an indirect reference to the (in)visibility of the interpreter. Within the framework of her thesis Diriker also interviewed the organizer of the conference to see what sort of preparations he had made with respect to the interpreters to interpret in the related conference. In this regard Diriker says:

> "the organizer who was at the same time one of the speakers at the conference had asked the PR Office of the university to contact 'expert' interpreters and was happy to hear that familiar names would be coming. He believed they were familiar with the topic and could overcome the challenge of interpreting philosophy with adequate preparation. […] Yet, […] he had, for instance, never thought of telling the speakers to take SI into account in their preparations and delivery. As a speaker he had not prepared for the conference with interpreters in mind either." (Diriker, 2001:115).

These instances may be considered to mark the invisibility of the interpreter in a conference setting whereas interpreting in media or actual sight of the booth or the interpreters at work in the conference setting itself may be considered as the instances marking the visibility of the interpreter in other people's eyes.

In this study, the term invisibility is perceived as no intervention by the interpreter. No intervention, in this context means that the interpreter only speaks in the first person, reflects the intentions of the speaker, does not change or in any way modify what has been said by the speaker or the interpreter never has direct contact with either the speaker or the audience. That means that the interpreter is a mere echo of what has been said by the speaker. The invisible interpreter's role is only to put the source text words into target text words. Invisibility to be discussed in this study is not the physical but the discursive invisibility of the interpreter. In this sense, for the purposes of this study, the invisible interpreter means solely a passive conduit.

3.2. NORMS

Another key concept in this thesis is the concept of norms as briefly defined in the Literature Review Chapter through the words of Gideon Toury.

As mentioned earlier Toury argues in his book that translation is a norm-governed activity**.** As regards norms, Toury distinguishes between "preliminary norms" and "operational norms". He describes preliminary norms as those that are concerned with translation policy (governing the choice of text-types) and the directness of translation (tolerance for translating from languages other than the ultimate source) whereas he puts operational norms as those directing the decisions made during the act of translation itself (Toury, 1995). He says norms can change in time and that does not mean that translators are passive in this process. Toury stated:

> "[…] rather, many of them, through their very activity, help in shaping the process, as do translation criticism, translation ideology (including the one emanating from contemporary academe, often in the guise of theory), and of course, various norm setting activities of institutes where, in many societies, translators are now being trained." (Toury, 1995: 62)

Toury says not the norms but the norm-governed instances of behaviour can be observed (Toury,1995). Thus, so as to uncover the translational norms one has to study the products of such norms, which are the norm-governed translations. For the reconstruction of translational norms, Toury suggests two major sources which are textual and extratextual sources. Textual sources are the translated texts themselves whereas the extratextual sources may be assumed as prescriptive theories of translation, statements made by translators, editors, publishers or other persons involved in or connected with the activity, critical appraisals of translations or the activity of a translator or school of translators (ibid).

Toury introduced the concept of norms in translation and stated "[…] the claim that it is basically a norm-governed behavior applies to translation of all kinds […] similar things can even be said of *conference interpreting"* (Toury, 1995: 57).

Norms in interpreting may be assumed to have first been studied by Shlesinger in 1989 when she published an article in the first issue of *Target,* the International Journal of Translation, titled *Extending the Theory of Translation to Interpretation: Norms as a Case in Point*. In her article she talked about some methodological obstacles regarding the difficulty involved when one tries to study

the norms in conference interpreting. She lists these obstacles as the virtual non-existence of interpreting corpora and research based on limited corpus; differences in importance and prestige of an interpreting setting, which may influence the norms; technical, logistical and legal obstacles of recording interpreters; and the possible impact of recording an interpreters behaviour and consequently on the representativity of the corpus to be studied (Shlesinger, 1989). In her words:

> "the limited cadre of interpreters for any given language combination in all but a few places of the world and the relatively short history of interpretation have probably not been conducive to the development of synchronic norms as well as their evolution in time" (Shlesinger, 1989: 112)

Despite such obstacles scholars continued to search for interpreting norms having regard to Toury's words concerning the two major sources to reconstruct translational norms, which were then applied to interpreting in a few studies. To this end, Diriker referred to norms in her study as follows, "since full consistency and systematicity is impossible in any domain of human existence, I will understand norms as regularities of behaviour/views/ expectations and consider them not as absolute […]" (Diriker, 2001: 18) and in her PhD thesis she analyzed both of the abovementioned major sources regarding the reconstruction of interpreting norms and conducted research both on textual and extratextual sources. As regards textual sources she recorded, transcribed and analyzed an actual conference context and compared the source text (which was the original speech as uttered by the speaker) and the target text (which was the interpreted utterance by the interpreters). Diriker also conducted comprehensive research on extratextual sources, which were examplified by Toury as "[…] statements made by translators, editors, publishers or other persons involved in or connected with the activity, critical appraisals of translations or the activity of a translator or school of translators so forth" (Toury, 1996: 65). To do this, she analyzed the discourse with respect to simultaneous interpreting and interpreters in the meta-discourse. Accordingly, she analyzed the discourse in general reference books, discourse of professional institutions and under that discourse of the code of ethics of these professional institutions, the discourse of academic literature, the discourse in the media and the discourse in a popular book published in Turkey in this context. Additionally, she interviewed the organizers and

speakers and users of simultaneous interpreting in the actual conference setting. And finally, she made interviews with the interpreters about the conference and their assessment of individual performances. In her conclusion to the meta-discursive (re)presentation of simultaneous interpreters and interpreting she drew attention to the fact that whereas in the general and de-contextualized discourse, simultaneous interpreters were depicted as competent professionals accessing and transferring the meaning in the original speech without any problems erasing impurities such as heavy accents, grammatical mistakes, regionalisms and flawed formulations etc., in the more specific/ contextualized representations when the interpreters talked about their own professional experiences, their subjective involvement in shaping the meaning to be transferred became very obvious (Diriker, 2001: 68). In anectodal accounts of the interpreters, Diriker said;

> "simultaneous interpreters hinted at the personal **interventions**[10] they made for formulating the 'meaning'and challenged the ease with which the general discourse claimed they accessed and reproduced the meanings intended by the speakers with a transparent, immediately intelligible and fluent delivery" (ibid)

In her concluson on the meta-discourse she underlined the fact that

> "the tension between the 'objectivity' of the interpreter […] in the general/de-contextualized discourse and the 'subjectivity' of the interpreter as implicated in the anecdotal accounts seemed temporarily subdued by the argument that interpreters always 'interpreted' the original utterances and always did so in line with the communicative intentions of the speakers" (Diriker, 2001: 69)

Drawing all that has been quoted above from Diriker's thesis as well as the code of ethics and discourse of professional institutions; one can conclude that although the norm in conference interpreting is speaking in the first person and acting as the voice of the speaker and conveying the meaning intended by the speaker, personal interventions (which may be assumed as instances where the interpreter becomes visible) may always occur in a contextualized actual interpreting environment. This fact is reinforced by her observations in the actual conference environment when Diriker mentioned "I had been intrigued by the personal

[10] Emphasis mine

interventions of the simultaneous interpreters to the 'delivery' (i.e. 'interpretation')" (Diriker, 2001: 124).

Another study aiming at the discovery of norms in interpreting was conducted by Verlee Duflou, whose starting point of research was her own working environment as the interpreting service of the European Parliament and Joint Interpreting Services of European Commission. Duflou's work in her words "[…] does not pretend to treat norms in conference interpreting in general, but focuses on the professional norms relevant in a particular interpreting environment" (Duflou, 2007:4). She based her research on two conference interpreting communities, which were the Dutch booths of the interpreting service of the European Parliament and Joint Interpreting Services of European Commission. Based on these two communities she analyzed the wider context including the services employing the related interpreters in addition to the speakers and audience they work for. She also resorted to some documents and interviews with some key officials of both communities to study the hierarchical structure and procedures governing access, feedback and sanction mechanisms within the two interpreting services. She took into consideration a set of data extracted from documentary sources to reveal indications of norms valid in the communities studied and formulation of one or more provisional hypotheses on the existence of specific professional norms, based on the data she collected. In her quest for interpreting norms, she also analyzed a corpus of interpreters' performances focused on the collection of evidence for the hypotheses in the form of regularities (Duflou, 2007). In her provisory conclusions Duflou touched upon three categories including normative statements. The first one is official texts on conference interpreting as provided by the interpreting services, which was intended for the general public, abound with very general and normative statements entailing what an interpreter should be and the qualities s/he should possess, in reference to which Duflou stated "In these examples quality […] and ideal […] are not casually related, the relation is purely conceptual, which is characteristic of ideal rules" (Duflou, 2007: 7-8). The second category which includes normative statements that Duflou underlined deals with statements by conference interpreters working for the interpreting services intended for the general

public, which contain more concrete information, pointing out difficulties in adhering to ideal rules in real situations. She quotes an example from European Parlimanet website dated 2006

> " ' 'there are times when you can translate, when you find something which is suitable in your language, but it is risky because it can be interpreted differently from the original words and the MEPs listening to your translation can react to your own words rather than to what the speaker said originally' said Bernard Gevaert, a Duth interpreter.' " (Duflou, 2007: 8).

The third category underlined by Duflou concerns the texts written by conference interpreters working for the interpreting services and addressed at their colleagues, which included general and categorical normative statements as well as concrete recommendations and norm formulations such as " 'tell your audience when something happens'- European Parliament Interpretation Directorate website s.d.)" and " '[…] start as soon as possible – even if you say only "Mr. Chairman" – and try to finish soon after the original'- Femming 2003" (Duflou, 2007: 9). Like what Diriker has suggested in her PhD thesis (in the framework of her conlusions about the meta-discourse mentioned above), in her research on interpreting norms Duflou concluded, "the prescriptions quoted above seem to reveal tensions with some of the categorical normative statements found in other texts" (ibid).

Another study for the quest of norms in interpreting was undertaken by Anne Schjoldager. In her work Schjoldager stated "[…] as a behavioural activity, interpreting must also be governed by norms. Naturally, interpreters, too, need norms to help them select solutions to the problems they meet" (Schjoldager, 2002: 302). In her analysis she disregarded preliminary norms and based her study on initial (overall strategy) and operational (actual decisions during the translation process) norms. She searched for these through textual comparison between source and target texts. She took one word in Dutch and problematized some different ways of translating that specific word carrying some culture specific connotations, into English, which yielded five categories of translational relationships as a. repetition; b. permutation; c.addition; d. deletion and e. substition. In the light of these five categories she attempted to look for norms in interpreting at the end of which she consluded as

> "using my own project as an example, I have examplified that this methodology may indeed work on interpreting. Needless to say though, a lot of work in the field is still necessary before we acquire an extensive knowledge of norms governing the interpreting process. By way of conclusion I would like to emphasize that the question of norms in interpreting research is both intriguing and worth our attention […]."(Schjoldager 2002: 310).

Norms to be discussed in this study are extra-textual norms. As extra-textual sources, the discourse of professional organizations as published on their web sites as professional codes of ethics and working conditions have been taken into consideration. However, the concept of norms in this study is not limited to only that, the discourse of interpreter training institutions have also been explored. Norms of interpreting as cited from professional organizations and found out through questionnaires directed at academics training potential interpreters, will provide the basis of this study. These norms have been used as a benchmark, against which an actual consecutive interpreting performance has been checked. Norms derived from professional organizations' codes of ethics and working conditions as well as answers given to the survey are presented in Chapter IV- The Analysis.

3.3 THE CONTEXT

As this study considers context as a determining factor in interpreting, it is necessary to define what is understood from context. Interpreting takes place within context and it is important to remember that "the data used for analysis is part of the larger ethnographic or social organizational context, from which fragments or conversations or large segments of discourse are taken" (Cicourel,1981: 52). In order to develop a better understanding of the (in)visibility of the interpreter and discuss it within a broader framework of the role of the interpreter it is important to describe the context of the study. For the purpose of studying the interpreter in action with the specific objective of (in)visibility some data will be provided in this study. These data are not isolated or independent. They can be assumed as parts of larger social and cultural structures. Thus, such social and cultural structures need to be described.

However, as it is not possible to include all aspects of context, only information that is considered significant for the purposes of the study will be included. According to Cicourel, "the observer is obligated to justify what has been included and what has been excluded according to theoretical goals, methodological studies employed" (Cicourel, 1992: 309). The objectives and methodology of the study has already been defined in the previous chapter. In line with the stated objectives, the study consists of three main pillars. These are invisibility and the norms related thereto, norms as set by interpreter training institutions and professional interpreter organizations, which also form the macro-context, and a real-life performance, which consists of authentic data, that is the micro-context of the study. The comparative analysis of these pillars will help to better explore the interpreter's (in)visibility in consecutive interpreting.

The study comprises both a broader and a narrow context, which, in fact, are not two separate entities. The narrow context consists of the interpreting event and the actual consecutive interpreting performance, which will be analyzed in Chapter IV. The broader context of the study includes interpreter training institutions and professional interpreter organizations. Information on the broader level will be provided through the data obtained from interpreter training institutions through surveys and Codes of Ethics of professional organizations. As mentioned earlier, views of academics concerning the interpreter's (in)visibility in consecutive interpreting have been surveyed through questionnaires and professional interpreter organizations' views on the same subject have been researched through the publications on their websites. The narrow context consists of information on the interactional level – the features of the specific event under study, the project, the participants as well as the analysis of talk.

It is impossible to describe all aspects of a context since both the data and the observations made to acquire those data are bound to be limited. As stated by Cicourel;

> A nagging issue that undoubtedly remains for many readers is the familiar one that an infinite regress can occur whereby the observer presumably must describe "everything" about a context. Such demain

> is of course impossible to satisfy because no one could claim to have specified all of the local and larger sociocultural aspects of a context. (Cicourel, 1992: 309).

All in all, the macro-context of the study, consisting of norms as set by training institutions and professional organizations will be compared to the micro-context, that is the consecutive interpreter's real-life performance in a certain setting with specific features to be described.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE ANALYSIS

This Chapter comprises the analysis of different types of materials in accordance with the aim of this study. In line with the previous chapter, which was the theoretical framework of the study, this chapter will be divided into two main categories. These two main categories are the norms and (in)visibility. To this end, the study attempts to explore norms with respect to consecutive interpreting and the (in)visibility of the interpreter as set by two main bodies, namely professional organizations and interpreter training institutions. Under the main category of (in)visibility of the interpreter, an authentic consecutive interpreting performance recorded and transcribed is analyzed with respect to the (in)visibility of the interpreter in action. Thus, norms as set by professional bodies and interpreter training institutions are compared to the actual performance with a special focus on the (in)visibility of the interpreter.

4.1. NORMS

4.1.1. Norms as set by Professional Organizations

As mentioned earlier two professional organizations have been selected for the purposes of this study and the codes of ethics as well as working conditions as published in their official websites have been analyzed focusing on norms in consecutive interpreting and the invisibility of the interpreter. These two organizations are AIIC (Professional Conference Interpreters Worldwide), which has global coverage, in addition to TKTD (The Conference Interpreters Association of Turkey), which covers Turkey. AIIC has been selected since it is the only interpreter association which has a global coverage with 2800 professional conference interpreters in over 250 cities in over 90 countries (AIIC, 2010). TKTD is also a member of AIIC and it has the widest coverage in Turkey. TKTD has been selected

so as to uncover whether the situation with respect to working conditions and codes of professional ethics is any different from the global one.

4.1.1.1. Norms on Consecutive Interpreting and Invisibility as set by AIIC

With a view to explore the norms for the purposes of this study, Codes of Professional Ethics (CPE) as published by AIIC in its website has been analyzed. However, no reference was made in the Professional Codes of Ethics to the course of interpreting itself. It mainly talks about principles such as confidentiality, refraining from deriving any personal gain, recruitment of conference interpreters, dignity of conference interpreting, publicity and provisions as regards the working conditions of interpreters (AIIC- Code of Professional Ethics- ANNEX 1).

However, direct reference is made to consecutive interpreting itself and the (in)visibility of interpreters in the answers given to the frequently asked questions by budding interpreters published in the organization's website. Answers given to the questions imply norms as to many aspects of interpreting be it the role of the interpreter, expectations or invisibility but for the purposes of this study only those norms implying answers concerning consecutive interpreting and the interpreter's invisibility have been taken into consideration.

As regards the question to *what is conference interpreting* the site provides the following answer

> Consecutive has been described as the 'noblest' mode of interpreting, and there is force in the argument that one who claims to be a fully-fledged conference interpreter must master both simultaneous and consecutive.
>
> [...]
>
> In consecutive, it is all the more important to be a good public speaker. Don't forget to make **eye contact** with the audience, and make sure to project poise and confidence with your **body language**. All the principles of quality interpreting apply, with the additional

> requirements of the visual dimension and non-verbal performance factors. (AIIC, 2010) http://www.aiic.net/ViewPage.cfm/page1669

Thus, the answer very clearly states that in consecutive interpreting the interpreter has to have eye contact with the audience and must at the same time be a good public speaker. Additionally, it explicitly notes that all principles of quality interpreting apply, with some additional requirements of the **visual dimension**[11] and non-verbal performance factors. To my view, this visual dimension may be assumed to have an indirect reference which may implicate that the interpreter is already visible in consecutive interpreting. He must be a good public speaker and have eye contact with the audience. These are the main aspects which may be assumed to mark the interpreter's visibility in consecutive interpreting.

There are some explicit references made to the interpreter's visibility since there is a question as *How visible are interpreters?* The answer provided in the website is as follows:

> Professional interpreters accomplish their exacting task with **discretion**. Ideally, delegates should communicate so effectively that they don't notice the language barrier. (AIIC, 2010) http://www.aiic.net/ViewPage.cfm/page1669

Some indirect references have also been made to the invisibility of the interpreter provided in the definition of quality interpreting. Such references are provided below as follows:

> In a number of respects, good interpreting is like acting. As the speaker's alter ego, you must strive to convey both the substance and the emphasis, tone, and nuance of what is said, so as to **allow your delegates to comprehend the speaker's messages just as clearly and effectively as those who are listening to the original**[12].
>
> Make them forget they are hearing the speaker through an interpreter.
>
> [...] Furthermore, the interpreter must never betray any personal reaction to the speech [...]

[11] Emphasis mine.
[12] Emphasis mine.

> Aim to come across the way the speaker would if s/he were speaking the target language.(ibid)

Words of Theo Hermans as quoted in Theoretical Framework as "when Boris Yeltsin speaks through an interpreter, do we really want to hear the interpreter's voice? […] the interpreter's voice as a carrier without a substance of its own, a virtually transparent vehicle." (Hermans, 1996: 24) have been published by AIIC as norms as clarified to budding interpreters. Thus, the interpreter's voice is seen as mere a conduit aiming at making the audience forget that they are listening to the interpreter. The interpreter's performance, as stated by AIIC, should exclude any personal reaction. On the other hand, however, in crisis management the interpreter is called to be visible through a number of techniqus in the event of a crisis. The Crisis Management sub-title under the same category (frequently asked questions for budding interpreters) states the following as regards the event of crisis:

> If you have not understood something essential, say so over the microphone. [...] Likewise, if a speaker is reading at breakneck speed from a written text that you haven't received a copy of, making it impossible to provide a complete and accurate interpretation, say so over the microphone. [...]If necessary, you may state that you regret that you will have to stop interpreting until reliable interpretation becomes possible again. Turning off your microphone is of course an extreme tactic, but when no interpretation is better than the best interpretation possible under the circumstances, **it is undoubtedly the ethical thing to do[13].** (AIIC, 2010) http://www.aiic.net/ViewPage.cfm/page1669

From the answers provided, it can be concluded that it is the norm as set by AIIC for a conference interpreter to speak as if the speaker is speaking in the target language, making them forget all about the language barriers and also attempting to forget that they are listening to an interpreter. These norms mark the conduit role of the interpreter, with his voice only an echo of the speaker. However, in a crisis situation, it is deemed ethical for an interpreter to ask for clarifications, repetition or even turn off the microphone. Crisis remedies suggested by AIIC may be assumed to refer to instances when the interpreters are discursively visible. Likewise, the translator becoming visible through translator's notes for any purposes, the

[13] Emphasis mine.

interpreter becomes visible through his/her crisis management remedies so as to prevent any misunderstanding or misinterpretation. Thus, such crisis remedies may also be assumed as referring to the mediator role of the interpreter since it is considered ethical to make interventions for clarifications or repetition of utterance, which all in all are attempts to provide the communication that the interpreter is responsible for.

There is one very interesting question which may be indirectly linked to the previously mentioned metaphors as studied by Roy as *'faithful-echo', 'channel', 'conduit', 'switching device', 'transmission belt', 'modem' or 'input- output robot'*. The question is '*will machines replace interpreters?'* It is a very interesting question since metaphors attributed to the role of interpreters have been associated with some mechanical devices as mentioned above. It may be interesting to take the issue from the other side. If the interpreter is considered a mere *switching device,* is it not possible for the rapidly advancing technology to develop such a machine and use that as an interpreter? The answer provided in the website is as follows:

> Machine translation has been the Holy Grail of the language professions since the 1960s. Improvements to existing systems have come incrementally rather than in the form of a major breakthrough. Machine translation lends itself to high volume traffic of the same kind of text, for example the translation of tender documents or weather reports. Spoken language is far more complex than written text. Significant progress has been made on voice recognition, but current technology is still very a long way from being able to replace a human interpreter. (ibid)

It is very explicity stated in the answer that machine translation is used for same kind of texts, such as weather reports and tender documents, which basically have the same nature for each and every item belonging to that category. However, spoken language is far more complex than written texts. To my view, this complex nature of the spoken text detaches the interpreter from being only *a conduit, a channel* or *a switching device.* The machines, as mentioned by the answer above, are still a long way from being able to replace a human interpreter, so why should the interpreter strive hard in his efforts to replace a machine may be the main question that one might ask under this context.

4.1.1.2 Norms on Consecutive Interpreting and Invisibility as set by TKTD

TKTD is a member of AIIC. Thus, its codes of professional ethics and working conditions do not differ in any way from those set by AIIC. Likewise, AIIC documents on codes of professional ethics and working conditions, "professional principles" as mentioned by TKTD and the interpreter's oath as published in the website do not have direct reference to the course of interpreting event (TKTD-Professional Principles-ANNEX 2). Therefore, there are no direct references in such documents as to the invisibility of the interpreter.

There are not any direct references made to consecutive interpreting, either. However, again in other materials provided by TKTD web site the conference interpreter is defined as follows:

> Conference interpreting is not putting one after the other the correspondences of sentences and words in another language, it is the transfer of the uttered content and concepts from one language to another. The interpreter is assumed to have fulfilled his/her duty to the extent that he/she can make the audience forget that they are using an agent so as to speak and that he/she can provide a dialogue which is as close as possible to that of direct communication[14]. http://tktd.org/wp/?page_id=31

Again a reference has been made to the interpreter's efforts so as to make the audience forget that they are listening to an agent. It may be assumed that the interpreter's duty to make himself invisible to the audience since he is assumed to have fulfilled his duty to the extent that he can make his invisibility possible. The interpreter is expected to convey the sense and content of the original utterance and it is emphasized that conference interpreting is not only putting one after another what the sentences or words mean in the target language. Rather, it is something that requires some effort by the interpreter. The interpreter has to infer the message and the content of the utterance and transfer this into the target language, which again is contrary to the *switching device* metaphor attributed to the interpreter. Although, the interpreter is not only a switching device, it is stated firmly both by AIIC and TKTD

[14] Translation mine. Original text in Turkish on TKTD website http://tktd.org/wp/?page_id=31

that the interpreter should make the audience forget that they are listening to an agent (the interpreter), personally setting up the conditions to mask his visibility.

No direct reference has been made in TKTD website to what interpreters should do in crisis situations. There is direct reference neither to visibility nor to invisibility. However, the website has a published article entitled *Is there a Conference Interpreter in Me?* written by Bahar Çotur, a member of TKTD. This article is for interpreter candidates and it says that the article comprises *suggestions for candidate interpreters.* In this article, consecutive interpreting and how an interpreter should behave while working are described. It is interesting to note some phrases which may be assumed as indirect reference to the interpreter's invisibility. Those lines are quoted below:

> For example, when consecutive interpreting is performed on stage, no speaker would like the interpreter to attract more attention than himself, or earn more applause through his showman style or cute attitudes such as a New Year Tv show host
> […]
> The interpreter should never forget that he, in such a social activity, is an "agent", a "transmitter" […] the interpreter should stand one step behind in a professional way, using his discretion. It is for certain that he will be appreciated more with his one step behind position[15]. (TKTD, 2010) http://tktd.org/wp/?page_id=59

Through these words, the position of the interpreter in any interpreting context is normatively stated as *one step behind.* The interpreter is also defined using terms such as an *agent* or *transmitter*.

Now it may be the question to ask whether an interpreter can fulfill his duty as the mediator of communication or speech when he is one step behind the speaker.

I, personally, do not think that it is clear whether the interpreter will still be appreciated more when he is standing one step behind and at the same time is expected to ensure the best communication between the audience and the speaker(s).

[15] Translation mine. Original text in Turkish on TKTD website http://tktd.org/wp/?page_id=59

Putting together the norms as set by AIIC and TKTD, it may be said that the interpreter should make the audience forget that there are language barriers and they are listening to an agent or a transmitter. But, this one is such a transmitter that it is a good public speaker at the same time and it gives importance to making eye contact with the audience in addition to using body language. The interpreter must stand one step behind the speaker. However, he also has to convey both the substance and the emphasis, tone, and nuance of what is said, not forgetting the visual dimension especially in consecutive interpreting. He must behave neither like a showman nor like a tv host and refrain from attracting more attention than the speaker. He must not add to the speaker's words but he should allow his delegates to comprehend the speaker's messages just as clearly and effectively as those who are listening to the original. Contrarily though, in crisis situations the interpreter may speak on behalf of himself with a view to ask for clarifications or repetition of utterance or under extreme situations, he may turn off the microphone should the cicumstances require. This is the **ethical thing to do** for an interpreter since he is responsible for a sound and healthy communication.

All in all, one can derive from the abovementioned conclusions on the norms as set by two professional organizations that an interpreter is both an agent or a transmitter and a moderator of communication, who can cut off the whole communication should the need arise. This is a precautionary measure to prevent any misconception or misunderstanding. Although the two terms (transmitter/ agent and moderator of communication) are quite contrary to each other, tasks required by both terms are included under the definitions on conference interpreting, notably consecutive interpreting, as well as suggestions and frequently asked questions for young, budding interpreters. This points to a conflict even within norms/ definitions. It is to be explored whether norms set by Codes of Ethics coincide with those set by training institutions.

4.1.2. Norms as set by Interpreter Training Institutions, The Universities in Turkey

Interpreter training is undertaken by 4 year under-graduate courses of Translation and Interpreting Departments under the Faculties of Letters of Universities. For the purposes of this study four of these universities were selected, namely Boğaziçi University and İstanbul University in İstanbul, Hacettepe University in Ankara and Dokuz Eylül University and İzmir University of Economics in İzmir. The history of translation and interpreting departments are rather new in Turkey, with the oldest of them being those in Boğaziçi University and Hacettepe University. Although at the moment there are plenty of translator and interpreter training departments, these four have been selected since their they were established before the others and they also have had their graduates.

As mentioned earlier seven questionnaires were sent to the abovementioned and only five of them were answered. Hacettepe University did not reply to the questionnaire, which might be considered as a disadvantage for this study. Questionnaires were were answered by one academic from Boğaziçi University, two academics from Dokuz Eylül University, one academic from İstanbul University and one academic from Izmir University of Economics.

The questions were as follows:

1- *In interpreter training process, do you tell your students about instances where the interpreter has to mediate the interaction/communication?*
2- *In interpreter training process do you tell your students about different roles of the interpreter in various contexts?*
3- *In interpreter training process do you tell your students about the visibility/invisibility of the interpreter and the instances in which these concepts may be assumed as norms?*

The answers given by the academics from various universities are provided in this part of the study. The answers are classified below as to the name of each University.

The original questionnaires have been prepared in Turkish. Therefore, all answers have been provided in Turkish. Translation of all answers is mine.

4.1.2.1. Boğaziçi University, İstanbul

Şehnaz Tahir Gürçağlar is an academic at Boğaziçi University, Department of Translation and Interpreting Studies. She is the Head of Department and also a member of TKTD and AIIC. To the questionnaire she provided the following answer:

> The answer to all your questions is yes. The role of the interpreter in communication, the context in which she/he works, the conference atmosphere is emphasized through being reinforced by observations and experience in Boğaziçi University. Social, cultural and political circumstances embracing the interpreter are described with relevant examples, and it is indicated through real-life examples (since our lecturers are professionals they might sometimes do this on anecdotal level) that **although the ideal status for a conference interpreter is to be invisible, this is impossible, especially in consecutive interpreting.**

Gürçağlar did not answer the questions one by one but are highly significant for the purposes of this study. She mentioned the significance of real-life examples used in interpreter training and most importantly she said that it was impossible for an interpreter to be invisible during consecutive interpreting. Thus, she said that invisibility was the ideal status attributed to the interpreter but it was never the case in actual practice. This statement is significant since it has been stated by an interpreter who is both a TKTD and AIIC member and an interpreter trainer in one of the prominent universities in Turkey. This indicates that invisibility is an issue in question although it is not possible in real-life situations.

4.1.2.2. İstanbul University, İstanbul

The questionnaire was sent to Alev Bulut in İstanbul University, department of Translation Studies.

Bulut provided the following answers to the questions in the questionnaire:

Her answer to question number 1:

> Under the framework of interpreting studies we discuss, the theoretical texts I ask my students to read on real-life examples; therefore, we frequently focus on the role/roles and the identity of the interpreter. **I try to focus on changing roles depending on different interpreting occasions and types. I tell them that they should be aware of the communication expert role the interpreter has to play**. […]

Her answer to question number 2:

> As I mentioned in the previous answer, we work on the changing situations but unchanging interpreting skills. We discuss the differences between experienced and inexperienced interpreters, trained interpreters and interpreters who learnt the profession through practice. All these take place in the form of discussing different practices, and our consecutive interpreting courses are predominantly based on exercises, scenario creation and role-play exercises. In addition to the professional attitude the interpreter has to display and the additional parts of his/her identity, we focus on problem solving capacity which is also included in professionalism. **Changing roles, varying from being more active to standing behind, are identified depending on each situation.** The job/interpreting is a matter of expertise. We indicate or try to indicate how the interpreter's perception as to the role played by the interpreter, **i.e. the social and discursive context of interpreting influences his/her success and the target group's perception about this success while this expertise is displayed with all its components** (language, terminology, situation, communication skills).
>
> My answer to this question overlaps with my answer to the previous question.

Her answer to question number 3:

> Yes. We read the theory and discuss them within the context of translation and interpreting in general. We examine real examples. **Press meetings, public or private meetings, recordings and presentations of which we can obtain, and interpreting experiences give us the opportunity to evaluate interpreters' behaviours through real-life examples and observe different levels of the interpreter's visibility.** To the extent that situations seem to be fixed and unchanging, we see the norms similarly applicable and useful in such situations. From the most uniform conference settings […] to the most variant social situations, we observe that the more interpreting settings become variable, the more subjectivity and irregularity increase, I try to indicate that the interpreter has to regulate/ systematize such situations based on norms and be flexible through taking the initiative. We do not teach irregularities but instead professionalism and problem solving.
>
> This issue is reflected more on discussions and practices regarding Community Interpreting. Because this type of interpreting (predominantly

> consecutive) is where the interpreter's expertise and identity as an individual are tested the most. **Unlike conference settings, the interpreter is exceedingly visible as in all cases of consecutive interpreting but he/she may not be that transparent in other situations.** […]
> Norms are changing, or to put it more accurately translation/ interpreting are redefined to cover its sub-types …

Bulut emphasized different situations under which interpreting has to be performed. In this context, she mentioned that she told her students to be aware of the communication expert role of the interpreter. She considers interpreting an area of expertise with all its components, which consist of language, terminology, situation and communication skills. Thus, it may be inferred that she does not consider the interpreter as *a mere echo* or a *transmitter*. She also mentioned that the interpreter has to regulate variables, irregularity and subjectivity based on norms while being flexible and taking the initiative at the same time. She considers irregularities as contrary to professionalism, and such irregularities, which have not been further clarified need to be erased out so as to achieve professionalism. However, it is not clear what she means by saying irregularities. Whether this term refers to interpreter's interventions remains a question.

There is one thing clear from her words and that is the interpreter is not considered invisible in consecutive interpreting. Contrarily, she thinks the interpreter is exceedingly visible. It again remains a question whether the term "exceedingly" has a negative connotation in this answer.

4.1.2.3. Dokuz Eylül University, Izmir

As regards Dokuz Eylül University, Department of Translation and Interpreting two questionnaires were sent; one to Şeyda Eraslan Gerçek and the other to Alev Balcı. The answers received from the two academics are quoted below, starting from Şeyda Eraslan Gerçek.

Her answer to question number 1:

> Yes, especially in consecutive interpeting classes, I inform my students about the wide variety of situations they may encounter. Talking about such various situations, I mean what the question mentions, **that is situations where the interpreter is expected not only to interpret but also undertake some other roles**. For example, the interpreter may be expected to act as a facilitator, help with the group work and sometimes to act as a second expert speaker asked to answer the questions of participants. **Although it is the ideal role and norm for an interpreter to be invisible, it is not possible to comply with this norm in consecutive interpreting, though it may be more possible in simultaneous interpreting**. I tell my students that they are expected to fulfill many things as regards both language and communication to provide communication and other aspects as I have mentioned above. Through role-play exercises such occasions are observed in class. I try to share with them my experiences which may be considered unexpected while performing the profession. I emphasize that **the interpreter is sometimes responsible for not only ensuring but also directing the communication**.

Her answer to question number 2:

> Yes. Not only do we mention but also we read and reflect on the texts in literature on the role of the interpreter. The aim is not only train them to have the required abilities to carry out interpreting tasks but also prepare them to various situations they might encounter. I have mentioned these include different roles. **The role of the interpreter is a lot different from what has been defined in the literature with 'conduit' or 'channel' metaphors.** Because the interpreter may, for example, aim to approximate cultures in one case, then he is expected to undertake a **cultural mediator or intermediary role**. In another case he may be asked to write on the board or provide assistance in the group work, then his role will be a **facilitator or assistant role**. He might in some situations be expected to answer questions, then he undertakes a **co-expert or leader role**. **None of such roles are invisible. When we talk about interpreting, it means we are talking about a rather slippery ground. Therefore, this concept may be only an ideal one.** One of the basic requirements of being a good interpreter is flexibility, but I also inform my students about professional codes of ethics. It is important that they know where to draw the line, then it is up to them to decide whether to apply these.

Her answer to question number 3:

> Yes. Just as I have mentioned above, I tell them that invisibility is a norm, which may be very complicated in practice at the same time. The invisibility of the translator is widely discussed in translation studies. In the last decade very significant studies have been

> undertaken in interpreting studies with respect to roles, norms and expectations. Of course, such aspects are also associated with visibility/invisibility. **Especially talking about consecutive interpreting, we cannot mention even the physical invisibility of the interpreter. The audience does not listen to and follow the speaker but the interpreter, people's comprehension of the subject depends on the interpreter's performance**. Mediated interaction is already a complicated mode of communication since different cultures and people come into play. Assuming that it is even difficult to communicate for people speaking the same language, it may be useful to think how much communication takes place when another language and another person (the interpreter) are included. The communication taking place under the presence of an interpreter is truly different from that in his absence. **Therefore, the interpreter is not invisible. I tell my students both these concepts and ideal situations and norms. Thus, they can realize that the ideal does not always overlap with our profession in reality**.

Eraslan Gerçek highly emphasized the different roles of the interpreter in addition to different expectations under various circumstances. These are cultural mediator/ intermediary, assistant/facilitator and co-expert role to name but a few. As mentioned by her these are significantly distant to role metaphors such as interpreters as *conduits* or *channels.* Like Gürçağlar she considers invisibility as an ideal role which does not overlap with the profession in reality. She mentioned even the physical invisibility, which cannot be refuted in consecutive interpreting. Flexibility is again mentioned side by side with code of professional ethics, which is similar to the answer provided by Bulut. Interestingly, Bulut also mentioned regulating/ systematizing irregularities based on norms and being flexible through taking the initiative in the same sentence.

Eraslan Gerçek finished by saying "the communication taking place under the presence of an interpreter is truly different from that in his absence. Therefore, the interpreter is not invisible". She repeatedly emphasized that the ideal role assumed for an interpreter might be invisible but the practice is contrary to such an assumption. According to Eraslan Gerçek, the significant difference created by the very presence of an interpreter in a communication process marks the interpreter's visibility.

Another academic delivering conference interpreting classes at Dokuz Eylül University, Alev Balcı, provided the following answers to the questions in the questionnaire:

Her answer to question number 1:

> Yes, we do. Especially within the context of consecutive interpreting we do exercises concerning occasions when the interpreter needs to be in constant contact with the speaker and we significantly emphasize the great role played by the interpreter in communication.

Her answer to question number 2:

> Yes, absolutely. We mention the interpreter's roles as the communication expert, cultural mediator as well as the interpreter's roles as ensuring harmony and preventing conflicts among parties.

Her answer to question number 3:

> We mention the concept of visibility and in what situations this concept manifests itself. However, we do not mention it within the context of "norms".

Since Balcı provided very brief answers, it is not possible to infer a lot of information as to her views about the (in)visibility of the interpreter in consecutive interpreting. Besides, she mentioned that she told her students about the concept of visibility and the situations under which this concept manifested itself but she did not mention this concept within the context of norms.

Despite the scarce information provided, one can infer that she does not consider the interpreter as a *conduit* or *channel* since she told that she mentioned, in class, the "interpreter's roles as the communication expert, cultural mediator as well as the interpreter's roles as ensuring harmony and preventing conflicts among parties".

4.1.2.4. Izmir University of Economics, Izmir

Nihal Yetkin answered the questionnaire sent to Izmir University of Economics, department of Translation and Interpretation. She provided the following answers:

Her answer to question number 1:

> I talk about these based on my personal experiences. I talk about issues such as what attitude an interpreter displays in military or diplomatic settings, how the word selection is done, what strategies he uses so as to make sure he understands everything or avoid missing any significant detail. How an interpreter can eliminate misunderstandings, what things he should pay attention to in recorded settings, courtesy visits, bilateral or multilateral meetings etc.

Her answer to question number 2:

> Yes, different roles may rather be mentioned under the framework of liaison and community interpreting. I generally, provide examples based on my personal experiences. Editor, assistant and communicator roles are predominant in my examples.

Her answer to question number 3:

> I rather mention where the interpreter's initiative starts and where it ends without mentioning such concepts because highly intense terminology may erase out students' interest. We reflect on issues such as how an interpreter becomes visible, when this should happen, when this should never happen, what can be done for incomplete instances of interpreting due to physical deficiencies, how these can be avoided, what are redundant terms, how abrreviations should be used, which approaches should be adopted in the event of jokes etc.

Yetkin also mentioned that she used real-life examples in the training process. She also mentioned different roles predominant in her real-life examples, which are the editor, assistant and communicator roles of the interpreter. It can be inferred from her answer to question number 3 that she considers the interpreter's initiative as a limited matter since she stated "I rather mention where the interpreter's initiative starts and where it ends". The interpreter's initiative has a limit and it has to end somewhere. Through the sole reference she made to the concept of invisibility it can be understood that there are times when it is deemed unacceptable for an interpreter to be visible. Thus, according to Yetkin under certain circumstances the interpreter should be invisible and under some others visible should never be the adjective to be used while referring to the interpreter.

All in all, the answers and comments provided by academics in interpreter training institutions can be summarized as follows:

- all academics having answered the questionnaire mentioned the different roles the interpreter has to undertake, namely the communication expert role, mediator role, editor and assistant roles.
- Eraslan Gerçek and Gürçağlar explicitly stated that invisibility is the ideal status attributed to the interpreter but this is impossible or never the case especially in consecutive interpreting.
- academics stressed that they used real-life examples in interpreter training and different roles of the interpreter are mentioned within real-life examples or exercises such as role-play.
- Bulut mentioned flexibility and taking the initiative, systematizing/regulating irregularities based on norms. Quite similarly, Eraslan Gerçek mentioned flexibility as *one of the basic requirements of being a good interpreter*. However, she balanced, or in Bulut's terms regulated the variability which might occur due to such flexibility, through saying that her students were also informed about the code of professional ethics so as to know *where to draw the line*.
- Yetkin also talked about *where to draw the line* by saying that she discussed with her students the concept of visibility, including situations under which visibility is permitted and also others under which *visibility can never be permitted*.

Answers provided by all academics indicate that different roles to be undertaken by the interpreter have been perceived by interpreter training institutions. These institutions are more flexible about the interpreter's visibility especially in consecutive interpreting as compared to the professional organizations, which have published articles describing the interpreter's role or profession using terms or phrases such as "one step behind" or "transmitter". Such terms were never used within the context of answers provided by interpreter trainers. Instead, Eraslan Gerçek and Gürçağlar clearly stated that it was impossible though ideal in consecutive

interpreting. Academics often referred to the communicator or communication expert role of the interpreter, who has to be flexible and take the initiative at certain times besides knowing where to draw the line between flexibility and the norms, the initiative and the code of professional ethics. Thus, the views of academics confirm that invisibility is a norm. However, almost all agree on the fact that it is not always feasible in real-life interpreting phenomena, which will be explored in the next chapter.

4.2. THE CONTEXT OF THE CONSECUTIVE INTERPRETING EVENT

It is deemed vital for the purposes of this study to provide the details of the conference setting in general in line with the emphasis placed on the notion of context.

The conference event taken under study is concerned with a vocational training project named Human Resources Development through Vocational Education and Training Project[16] financed by the European Commission. The project is financed under the framework of Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance (IPA 2006) and implemented so as to provide assistance both to the Turkish Ministry of National Education and Turkish Council of Higher Education. Project implementation period has been designed as two years.

As its name suggests, the project is aimed at improvement on vocational education and training level. However, this is not the first European Union project whose beneficiaries are institutions delivering or regulating vocational education and training in Turkey. Before this the Ministry implemented two projects aimed at vocational education and training, which were namely Modernization of Vocational Education and Training in Turkey Project on higher education level and Strengthening Vocational Education and Training in Turkey Project on high school level. Under such projects vocational education and training teachers were provided with many training courses as well as conferences, seminars and workshops so as to

[16] For further information see http://ikmep.meb.gov.tr/tr/index.php?option=com_wrapper&view=wrapper&Itemid=56

ensure that their skills are improved in many respects. Such training courses included workshops on Dacum methodology, key skills, project writing and project cycle management, modular curricula preparation and student assessment in modular curricula to name but a few.

Under the framework of Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance, projects are financed through the European Union, and within the scope of such projects a lot of international experts come to Turkey so as to deliver workshops, training courses and seminars. Interpreters are often hired to perform in such kind of settings.

This particular conference setting was a workshop under the Human Resources Development through Vocational Education and Training Project, aimed at vocational school teachers. The workshop goal was to train vocational education and training teachers on Dacum methodology so that they can act as facilitators in subsequent meetings. In these meetings other vocational education and training teachers would review the competencies written under the framework of modular student centered curricula in the selected areas of vocational training. Having received this training on Dacum methodology, the participants in this particular workshop would help others review the curricula previously prepared using Dacum methodology. To this end, the trainer in this workshop opted for allowing them to do a lot of group work on reviewing the curricula, which would then be reviewed by their peers within the framework of subsequent workshops.

As mentioned earlier, the participants in the workshop were vocational education and training teachers (VET teachers), whose age varied between 35 and 45. They were VET teachers working in vocational education and training institutions of different kinds. They were selected to act as facilitators in other workshops to provide assistance and guidance to their peers in their further work. Based on the information that is already provided, one can clearly state that the participants in this workshop did not vary much as regards age and they have a shared professional background in vocational education and training. Besides, in

their daily work routine they personally provide or assist in the provision of vocational education and training.

The abovementioned information was provided with a view to avoid underscoring the importance of specifying the context and the social relationships among the participants. Further references will be made to this part in the analysis of actual interpreting performance since the interpreter's performance is also a part of this interactional context. It is important to emphasize that the intention of the present study is not to make generalizations, but to draw conclusions out of the data obtained with respect to this specific context. Thus, the discussions that follow concern this specific event and performance located within a broader context that consists of the norms set by training institutions and Codes of Ethics of professional organizations.

4.3. ANALYSIS OF THE TRANSCRIPTIONS

Some instances of the above specified conference was recorded through a non-professional handy camera through the observer's own efforts. Thus, the recordings do not start from the very beginning of the conference setting when some senior officials from the Ministry of National Education attended to make some opening speeches in addition to the one minute silence in respect of the great leader Atatürk and the martyrs of the War of Independence, which was followed by the national anthem. The recordings have been transcribed to better discuss the (in)visibility of the interpreter during the related conference setting.

As mentioned earlier, the analysis of the transcriptions aims at exploring instances when the interpreter becomes visible. These are the instances when the interpreter does not stand "one step behind" as prescribed by TKTD on its website. The instances when the interpreter becomes visible include those when the interpreter intervenes in the course of interaction either to make some clarifications, comments or to fix a communication error. To do these, the interpreter establishes direct contact either with the audience, i.e. participants of the workshop or the expert

speaker who was invited to deliver the workshop. Such instances of direct communication may either have emerged due to the interpreter or due to the participants or the expert speaker. However, this study will not dwell further on that and it does not aim to make clarifications on who started the direct contact since it is clearly beyond the aims of this study.

It is important to note in this context that there were some written handouts prepared for the participants. These handouts had been written in English by the expert speaker and translated by the interpreter before the workshop took place. It is important to provide this information since there are instances when the interpreter and participants mentions problems concerning the written translation. Since efforts to find correct terminology in Turkish is of little interest to the expert speaker, he tends to be excluded from such conversation.

This study will analyze the abovementioned situations when the interpreter becomes visible under two main categories which are;

- Instances of direct contact between the interpreter and the audience
- Instances of direct contact between the interpreter and the expert speaker

The findings will be presented as excerpts of talk, consisting of the utterances of the speaker, participants and the interpreter and the back-translation of the utterances in Turkish into English by the author.

As mentioned earlier, this study aims to study and dwell upon the discursive (in)visibility of the interpreter. Therefore, non-verbal communication and signs thereof, such as eye-contact and body language have not been included in this study, since they do not fit in the objectives. In addition to this, factors such as overlap, pause and emphasis have not been deemed eligible to be included in this study, taking into consideration its objectives. For this reason, no transciption convention was used. The interpreter's performance within the consecutive interpreting event was recorded through 30-minute discs. 5 discs were used to record two and a half

hours of the consecutive interpreting event. All recordings have been transcribed. Since the examples concerning the study have been included in this thesis, in the following section, transcriptions of one session will be provided as an annex to this study (ANNEX 3). Through the transcriptions of one session the consecutive interpreting event, the expert speaker's, the interpreter's and the audience's interaction can be observed.

Interaction and the discursive presence have been studied through instances of direct contact so as to analyze how (in)visible the interpreter is in the interaction between the expert speaker and the audience. These instances include both direct contact between the interpreter and the audience, and the direct contact between the interpreter and the expert speaker. Through studying instances of direct contact the study aims at better exploring the discursive (in)visibility of the interpreter in a consecutive conference setting.

4.3.1 Direct Contact between the Interpreter and the Audience

Transcriptions obtained from the recordings contain several instances of direct contact between the interpreter and the audience. These instances sometimes occur during the lecture given by the expert speaker on "how to be a DACUM facilitator". However, such instances more frequently occur when there is intensive interaction, i.e when the audience wants to ask questions and request some clarifications concerning the terminology. Instances of direct contact between the interpreter and the audience, which have been observed in the transcriptions of the authentic performance are analyzed below through categorising the basic aims of such direct contact.

4.3.1.1. Direct Contact to Assist the Interpreter's Performance or to Make Corrections

Such instances occur when the interpreter has forgotten the word or misinterprets the original utterance. Sometimes help is asked by the interpreter but sometimes the

audience feels the urge to provide what they have understood from the expert speaker's words. Examples of direct contact between the interpreter and the audience with a view to assist the interpreter's performance or to make corrections have been provided below;

Example 1:

Speaker: In order to be able, you to be able next week to work into fields cooking and computer assisted machine manufacturing.

Interpreter: Önümüzdeki hafta seçilen alanlarda, sanıyorum bilgisayar destekli makine imalatı ve…

Next week in the selected fields of I think computer assisted machine manufacturing and…

Participant: Aşçılık.

Cooking.

Interpreter: Aşçılık.

Cooking.

In this example, the interpreter asks for the participants help to assist her in finding the target language word, she had probably not understood or forgotten. She does this by pausing there a little, and one of the participants assists her saying "aşçılık", which means cooking. Then the interpreter repeats the word and finishes the interpreted utterance with the assistance she got from the audience.

Example 2:

Speaker: We are going to test on ourselves everything, whole process and through all this circle, through active experimenting to have new value, new concrete experience. That is a level higher. So this circle will turn it into spiral.

Interpreter: Bunlarla ilgili çalışırken yeni tecrübeler edineceğiz ve bu öğrenme döngüsü de bir döngü haline gelmiş olacak.

While working on these, we will gain new experiences and this learning cycle will turn into a cycle.

Speaker: And maybe you…

Participant: Döngü bir spiral haline gelecek aslında diyor. Yani bir önceki şeyden daha yukarıdaki noktada olacaksınız. Spiral örneğini verdi.

In fact he says the cycle will turn into a spiral. So you will be at a higher point than the previous one. He gave the example of a spiral.

Speaker: Going higher and higher and higher because all of us have high expectations.

Interpreter: Çünkü beklentilerimiz yüksek. Teşekkür ederim. Çünkü beklentilerimiz yüksek, o yüzden söylendiği gibi.

Because our expectations are high. Thank you. Because our expectations are high, just as mentioned.

In this example, the interpreter does not interpret the term "spiral" instead of that she bases her interpreted utterance on the word cycle, which causes a loss in the meaning. Upon that, one of the participants feels the urge, without being asked by the interpreter, to asist her through making additional clarifications saying "döngü bir spiral haline gelecek aslında diyor". He uses the word "in fact he says" and contributes to a better understanding of the expert speaker's words. The interpreter thanks him in return for this saying "teşekkür ederim", in her next turn.

Example 3:

Speaker : I do not know your laws; but I know one thing about the legislation in principle. What is not sanctioned or regulated by the law, it is allowed; so if it is not written there, you can write it, into it.

Interpreter: Anladım neden öyle baktığınızı. Şimdi yasada eğer birşeyler varsa onları yapabiliriz demektir. Eğer yasaya eklenmesi gereken Bir şey varsa o zaman eklenir. But the point is the the law says the correct;

I understood why you are looking like that. Now if something is mentioned in the law, then we can do it. If there is something that should be added to the law, then it will be added. But the point is the the law says the correct.

S: Yeah I know.

T: But there are some troubles in the application.

Participant1: Ne dedi biliyor musunuz? Benim yasalarla ilgili bildiğim bir şey var, bilmiyorum Türkiye'de de bu aynı mı dedi. Kanunda yazılı olanlar yapılmalıdır, yazılı olmayanlar da yapılması izin verilen.
You know what he said? He said there is something I know about legislation, I don't know whether it is the same in Turkey. what is written in the law should be done. What is not written in the law is allowed.

In this example, the interpreter did not interpret one sentence uttered by the expert speaker, possibly because she missed it or did not understand it because it was complicated for her. However, that sentence was crucial for what the expert speaker was trying to explain. Therefore, feeling the urge to explain what he understood one of the participants adds the missing sentence starting with the question "do you know what he said?" This instance is another example of direct contact with the interpreter and the audience, i.e. participants with a view to correct the interpreted utterance.

Example 4:
Speaker : We continue; but we used already hour and a half.
Interpreter: Şimdi bir buçuk saatimizi harcadık halihazırda.
Now we have already spent one and a half hour.
Speaker : Are we continuing now or having a break because it is planned to continue.
Participant2: Harcamadık, değerlendirdik.
We haven't spent it, we made use of it.

Here, the problem is probably about the selection of the word "harcamak" by the interpreter. However, "harcamak" can be used as a correspondence for the verb "spend" in English. The interpreter opted for "we have already spent hour and a half". However, one of the participants felt offended. Therefore, he corrected the interpreter saying "we did not spend but we made use of an hour and a half". Although the issue is debatable, the interpreter neither focused nor commented on this correction.

4.3.1.2. Direct Contact to Warn the Audience

Sometimes the interpreter uses her turn to speak as an opportunity to warn the audience. This warning may be of any kind. Opportunities used by the interpreter to warn the audience against various issues are provided below;

Example 5:

Speaker: That is how we identify knowledge, skills, attitudes or traits. Again there will be terminology issue. And on all slides that will follow, there will be attitudes slash trades, traits. Whatever it is.

Participant: Traits.

Speaker: Traits yes, traits.

Interpreter: Şimdi terminolojiyle ilgili mutlaka sıkıntılar olacak. Şimdi ben bahsettiğimde de olacak. Birazdan, ilerleyen slaytlarda da olacak. Bununla ilgili, şimdi bunları ben söylüyorum. Beni de uyarırsanız ben de bundan sonra doğru kullanayım eğer bir yanlışlık olursa. Şimdi bilgi, yani bilginin, becerilerin, tavır ve tutumların belirlenmesi için kullanılan bir yöntem.

Now there will certainly be problems related to terminology when I'm referring to them or soon in the coming slides. Related to this – now I'm saying these – if there is a mistake please warn me, so that I will correct it. Now, it is a method used to determine knowledge, skills, attitudes and traits.

Speaker: Because in different sources…

Before explaining the example provided above, it is important to remind that the interpreter observed at work had also translated the written material prepared by the expert speaker for the workshop. Thus, in the example above, when the speaker mentions the word "terminology", she sees the opportunity and uses it as a means to warn the audience about the mistakes that might have occured in the written materials or that might occur in the workshop in the following period. It is also important that she translated what had been said by the speaker and then started her own words by saying "şimdi bunları ben söylüyorum", i.e. "now I am saying the following words". In her speech she distinguished between the experts speaker's

words and her own words. She drew a line between the two saying “now I am saying the following words”. She had direct contact with the audience and stated “beni de uyarırsanız ben de bundan sonra doğru kullanayım eğer bir yanlışlık olursa”, i.e. “should any mistake happen please warn me so that I can use the correct terms”. Through this opportunity she warned the audience about the terminology and asked for their assistance.

Example 6:

Speaker: I will skip on technically competent because I think we are all aware this is a really important thing, capable of peer recognition.

Interpreter: Can you explain? Because I didn’t understand while I was translating.

Speaker: Aha. Peer is the person sitting around you next to you. Adults, a bit specific when learning, sometimes are not recognizing persons sitting next to him or her as a person one asked, and another thing is not respecting or recognizing proffessional expertise of the person sitting around you. So that is a issue that sometimes adults have problem with.

Interpreter: Şimdi muhtemelen bunun slayttaki çevirisi yanlış olmuştur çünkü anlamadım, anlamamıştım. Şimdi burada akranını ya da yanında oturan kişiyi, diğer kişileri diyelim eğitimde bulunan diğer kişileri belki buna bir terim geliştirebiliriz, tanımak yani yetişkinlerde bu gibi problemler ortaya çıkabiliyor. Öğrenirken daha spesifik davrandıklarından dolayı konuya odaklandıklarından dolayı yanındaki kişinin farkına varmayabiliyorlar. Ya da yanlarındaki kişilerin, beraber çalıştıkları kişilerin mesleki uzmanlığına saygı göstermeyebiliyorlar ya da bunun farkında olmayabiliyorlar. Bu nedenle tanıma yani, eşini, yanındakileri.

Now perhaps the translation of this term in the slide is incorrect because I didn’t understand, I hadn’t understood. Now, maybe we can develop a term for this, it is about recognizing one’s peer, other persons in the traning, adults may have problems with this. As they are specific when

they are learning or they focus on the subject matter, they may not recognize their peers. Or they may ignore or they may not respect the professional expertise of their peers, people they work with. Thus, it is to recognize … one's peers, colleagues.

In the example provided above, there is both direct contact between the interpreter and the expert speaker and between the interpreter and the audience. Direct contact between the interpreter and the expert speaker will be analyzed under the next sub-chapter but it is provided here so as to indicate the origin of the problem, which is about the term used in the previously prepared handouts, i.e. written materials for the workshop audience. In those handouts, the term "peer recognition" was not thoroughly understood by the interpreter, who also translated the written texts. Therefore, when the speaker mentioned this word she asked for clarifications. Upon the clarifications, she understood that it was mistranslated in the written material. Therefore, she warned the audience saying "şimdi muhtemelen bunun slayttaki çevirisi yanlış olmuştur çünkü anlamadım, anlamamıştım", i.e. "here, the translation in the slide is probably wrong since I did not or had not understood it while I was translating". After making this warning, she continued with interpreting the words stated by the expert speaker. Thus, her turn to speak was used as an opportunity to warn the audience against the problems that might emerge due to the mistranslation of the term concerned.

Example 7:
Participant: Ondan bir sonraki şeyde de, içerikte de kısaca geçti
Another thing is, it was briefly mentioned in the content
Interpreter: İsterseniz oraya gelince.
If you like, when we come to that.
Participant: Gelmedik daha değil mi oraya pardon.
We are not there yet, are we? Sorry.

In this example of direct contact, the interpreter warns one of the participants when the participant wants to mention one of the items in the written handouts. The

interpreter warns the participant saying “if you wish, when we come to that point”. In this instance the interpreter both warns the participant that it is not the issue under discussion at that moment and makes an effort to save the conversation/ discussion from being carried away to an irrelevant subject. Upon that the participant apologizes by saying “we are not there yet, are we? sorry”. The participant accepts the interpreter’s warning and stops mentioning the issue that he wants further clarifications on, deciding to wait until the expert speaker comes to that point.

Example 8:

Speaker : Are we continuing now or having a break because it is planned to continue.

Participant2: Harcamadık, değerlendirdik.

We haven’t spent it, we made use of it.

Interpreter Şimdi herkes aynı anda.

Now everybody is talking at a time…

Speaker : If it is an open discussion, we need to wrap up first before you.

Interpreter: Şimdi açık tartışmalar gerçekleştiriyoruz. Herkes aynı anda konuştuğunda benim de dikkatim dağılıyor. Bazı şeyler kaçıyor olabilir**.** Devam edeceksek eğer edelim ama ilerleyeceksek o zaman bir toparlayalım bu konuyu sonra başka konuya geçelim, devam edelim.

Now we are having an open discussion. I am distracted when everybody is talking at a time. Some points might be missed. If we are continuing, let’s go on. If we will proceed let’s wrap up then go on with another topic.

Here again, after the interpreter started interpreting what had been said by the expert speaker, she used her turn to speak as an opportunity to warn the participants since she felt that there was too much noise in the room. Thereby, she warned them by saying “I am distracted when everybody speaks at the same time. I might be missing some things”. Through this, she asked the audience not to speak at the same time stating that such an atmosphere affects her negatively and therefore she might be missing some of the words uttered by the expert speaker, which was of course a loss for the audience.

4.3.1.3. Direct Contact to Find the Correct Terminology and Wording

One of the most frequent instances of direct contact between the interpreter and the audience occur due to the discussions and efforts to find the correct terminology and wording. Some of such instances are concerned with the interpreting event while others are concerned with the translation of the written material/handouts prepared for the workhop, translated by the interpreter in advance. The instances provided below exemplify how the interpreter and the audience work together and cooperate so as to find which term to use in the workshop. In such instances the expert speaker is involved in the dialogue only when it is necessary. The discussions usually occur between the interpreter and the audience.

Example 9:

Participant: Şimdi çeviride problem olacağını ifade ettiniz başlangıçta bu slayta geçildiğinde. Buradaki Türkçe çeviriler tam mı acaba buradakilerle örtüşüyor mu bakabilir miyiz?

When we first started working on this slide, you mentioned that in this part there is a problem with uh the translation. Can we have a look at the Turkish version, is it complete and accurate? Is it faithful to the original?

Interpreter: Ben şunu söyledim bir şeyi anlamamıştım, neydi bakayım?

I said that I hadn't understood something, let me see what that was.

Partcipant: Capable of peer recognition, orası doğru çevrilmemiş burası.

That part was not translated accurately.

Interpreter: Evet orası, anlamadım çünkü.

Yes that part, because I didn't understand.

Partcipant: Meslektaşlarını kabul etme.

Accepting one's peers.

Interpreter: İşte demin anlattığı belki, tanıma, işte

Burda ne yazılmış?

Maybe it is what he has just explained, recognition. What is written here?

Partcipant: Bu ünvanı olan ünvanı olan yerine meslektaşlarını tanıyan.

Instead of this having a title, it should be recognizing peers.

Interpreter: Tanıma

Recognizing.

Speaker: We were talking about this.

Participant: Tanıyan, kabul eden.

Recognizing, accepting.

Participant: Birlikte çalışmayı, ekip halinde çalışmayı isteyip istemedikleri

It is about whether they want to work in cooperation, as a team

Interpreter: O belki çok belirgin olcak ama evet.

Perhaps that will be too explicit but yes.

Participant: O değil de, bu daha çok sanki başkasının uzmanlığını kabullenme, kabul edebilme

No, not that. This is more like being able to accept someone else's expertise.

Interpreter: Ya da tanıma.

Or recognizing.

This example is related to the problem mentioned in the previous sub-chapter, which was about the translation of the term "peer recognition" stated in the slides of the handouts. Based on the previous warning made by the interpreter, one of the participants ask for further clarifications about the phrase "capable of peer recognition". Upon this the audience and the interpreter discuss the possible ways to translate the term "peer recognition" into Turkish. During those discussions the interpreter insists on the term "tanıma" which is the direct translation of the term recognition into Turkish while the participants try to find different alternatives such as "kabul etme", i.e. accept. In this dialogue, the expert speaker is involved only to be involved by saying "we were talking about this", because he simply cannot help or be included in a dialogue which concerns efforts to find the correct terminology in Turkish.

Example 10:

Speaker: Assess, assessment is examination.

Interpreter**:** Eğer, o da o da değerlendirme Türkçe'de ama.

That is also evaluation but in Turkish.

Speaker: They write assess; I write grade afterwards.

Interpreter**:** O, ölçme değerlendirme gibi mi oluyor acaba?

Is it like assessment and evaluation?

Participant1: 4? Dediğin doğru. 4 ne o zaman?

4?You are right. What is 4 then?

Interpreter**:** So what is '4'?

Participant4: O konuyu işlerken değerlendirme.

That is assessment during teaching the subject.

Speaker: In order to be able to know in every moment how students / how much are following me? How much are watching me?

Interpreter**:** Yani beni takip ediyorlar mı? Ve ben hedeflerime ulaşabiliyor muyum süreç içerisinde?

That is to say, are they following me? Can I achieve my goals within the process?

In the example provided above, there is a confusion about how to translate the term "assess" into Turkish. The term "assess" can be used both in the meaning of evaluation, in Turkish "değerlendirme" and measure "ölçme". Therefore, the interpreter and the participants discuss how to find the correct term in Turkish. In this example, the speaker seems to be more actively involved in the discussions since he was asked for further clarifications on the 4th point mentioned in the handouts for participants. After the expert speaker makes the clarifications, the interpreter follows on in the so called invisible mode without entering into direct contact with the audience since there were no questions or comments until the next example.

Example 11:

Participant2: Araya girebilir miyim? Bir şey söyleyeceğim. Şimdi biz genel tekniğimizde, siz öyle mi çevirdiniz bilmiyorum, *Prepare* hazırlamak mı, hazırlanması mı? *Focus* odaklanmak mı, odaklanması mı?

Can I interrupt? I'll say something. In general we use, I don't know if uh you have translated it that way but, is prepare hazırlamak or hazırlanması? Is focus odaklanmak or odaklanması?

Interpreter**:** Ona siz karar verin. İkisi de olabilir çünkü.

You decide. Because it can be both.

Participant2: Şimdi yanlış olmasın yani bizim tekniğimizde hep fiillerimiz '–mek' ve '–mak'tır. Yani mastar haliyle biter.

It should be corrected. Our verbs are always infinitive.

Interpreter**:** Öyle, yani değiştirebiliriz. Çünkü İngilizce ikisini de yapabilirim ben. Siz öyle olacak diyorsanız, öyle olur.

Ok, we can change it. Because I can use both in English. If you say so, we will change it.

Participant2: Biz böyle kullanıyoruz. Bizim için önemli.

We use it that way. It is important to us.

Participant1**:** '-mek', -'mak' yapalım. Önceki çalışmalarımızı desteklesin.

Let's make them infinitive. So that it will be the same with our previous studies.

Interpreter**:** Evet öyle yapın o zaman. Çünkü ikisi de olabilirdi, ben onu tercih etmiştim.

Yes you can do that. Because both were possible, I preferred the other one.

Participant2: Kendisi için fark ediyor mu? Onu isterseniz bir sorun.

Does it make any difference for him? If you like you can ask him

Interpreter**:** İngilizcesi aynı.

It is the same in English.

Participant2: Yok yok. Aynı da, sorunun keskin veya açık bitmesi. Zamanı fark ediyor mu?

No no. It is the same but, does it matter if the question is open or close-ended? Or the tense, does it matter?

Interpreter**:** Yani onu anlatamam, çünkü aynı terimle ifade ediliyor. İsterseniz

arada bir kafa yorayım.
I can't explain it to him, because it is expressed with the same terms. If you like I will think over it during the break.
Participant2: Tamam, kafa yorarsınız.
Ok please think over it.

This example of direct dialogue between the interpreter and the audience is about the wording of the translated text, which is the written material, i.e. handouts prepared. In this example, one of the participants is concerned about the wording of the phrases which start in English in the infinitive form of the verb without a "to". Since "to" had not been included in the phrases the translator/ interpreter did not opt for translating them in the infinitive form, which seems to create a problem for the participants since they used the infinitive forms of the verbs in their previous studies. Therefore, in the example the participant and the interpreter discuss the wording. During the discussion, the participant wants the interpreter to ask the expert speaker if using the infinitive or another form mattered. However, the interpreter says that she made the choice and that it might be a problem about the translation and they could change it in the way that they wished. The participant seems insistant that the interpreter ask the question, but the interpreter has difficulty in how to structure the question since she thinks that the phrases are mistranslated and the phrases in English would be the same in either ways. In the end, the participant and the interpreter makes a compromise after the interpreter says she would elaborate on that issue and ask the question to the expert speaker during the break. During the whole dialogue, the expert speaker is uninformed about and uninvolved in the dialogue that goes on between the audience and the interpreter. The interpreter does not want to focus on that topic since she thinks it is a problem of mistranslation and she succeeds in making a compromise and persuading the speaker to give up on the question.

Example 12:

Participant 2 **:** Mesleki gelişime ilişkin faaliyetleri yürütmek.

To conduct activities related to professional improvement.

Interpreter: To conduct activities related to professional improvement.

Participant 3 **:** Yenilikleri takip etmek.

To follow new trends.

Interpreter: Takip etmek mi yürütmek mi?

To follow or to conduct?

Participant 1 **:** Yürütmek.

To conduct.

This example consists of a small discussion between the interpreter and the audience. In this instance, the group is reading what they have written to the expert speaker while the interpreter is interpreting what they say. Participant 3 says "follow the changes", the interpreter asks for further clarification on the terminology asking "is it follow or conduct". This clarification is asked by the interpreter probably because she was also involved in the group work, working with the groups during the workshop. Direct contact between the audience and the interpreter during group work and examples pertaining thereto will be provided in the following sub-chapters. Upon demand for such a clarification Participant 1 corrects the phrase and rephrases it as "conduct". Afterwards, the interpreter continues interpreting in an (in)visible way again.

Example 13:

Speaker: For managers we need to have standards, for managers and for owners for respecting workforce attitudes.

Interpreter: Yöneticiler ve şirket sahipleri açısından iş gücü tavırlarına saygılı olma mı diyelim?

In terms of managers and owners of companies, shall we say respecting workforce attitudes?

Participant1: Emeğe saygı ister istemez.

Respect for workforce.

Interpreter: Emeğe saygı, evet beklentimiz o yönde olmalı.
Respect for workforce, yes, that should be our expectation.

In the example provided above, the interpreter cannot find the correct terminology herself and asks for assistance from the audience by saying "shall we say respect towards workforce attitudes". Responding to the interpreter's call for help participant 1 says "respect towards labor" and the interpreter accepts the assistance provided by the participant by repeating the phrase as uttered by the participant.

Example 14:
Speaker: Many companies were bought from developed, companies from developed countries and they brought new technology automated robotized lines and there were different jobs like machine mechanics, elecnic installations in machines mechanic, technicians for electronics, technicians for IT let's say and if huge automatic line stops because of something, there is a problem.
Interpreter: Birçok şirket, gelişmiş ülkelerden birçok şirket geldi Makedonya'ya, tabiki kendi gelişmiş ülkelerinin teknolojilerini, yeni teknolojileri de getirdiler ve çok farklı iş alanları, farklı dallar çıktı. Örneğin, şimdi ne diyelim ona, elektronik teknisyenleri, bilgi işlem teknisyenleri, machine mechanics'e ne diyebiliriz, makine?
Many companies, many companies from developed countries came to Macedonia. Of course they brought with them the technologies of developed countries, new technologies. And various fields, various branches have emerged. For instance, what shall we call it, electronic technicians, IT technicians, what can we say for machine mechanics, machine--?
Participant1: Makine mekaniği.
Machine mechanics.
Interpreter: Mekaniği diyelim ve tabiki bilgi teknolojilerinin kullanılmaları, diyelim ki herşey otomasyona dönüştü, bir hat var elektronik bir hat ve bu duruyor.
Mechanics let's say and of course with the use of IT, let's say everything is automated, there is a line, an electronic line and it stops.

In this example, the interpreter has difficulty in finding the correct term for "machine mechanics" while interpreting it into Turkish. Therefore, she asks for the audience's help by saying "what shall we say for machine mechanics". She asks for the audience's assistance since the term is highly technical and the participants involved in the workshop were the experts of technical subjects as they were vocational education and training teachers teaching technical subjects back in their schools. Participant 1 responds to the interpreter's call for assistance by finding the correct term in Turkish as "makine mekaniği". The interpreter agrees by repeating the term and continues with interpreting the rest of the speech made by the expert speaker.

4.3.1.4. Direct Contact to Ask for Clarifications

There are a few, rather short and brief examples of direct contact between the interpreter and the audience when the interpreter asks for clarifications. Demand for clarifications are made by the interpreter when she fails to understand what is meant by the audience or when she finds the utterance too vague and feels the need for some more precise definitions. In such cases she demands further information or directly asks what is meant. Instances of direct contact with a view to obtain clarifications are provided below;

Example 15:
Speaker: Groups are already composed so we do not have reference to this.
Interpreter: Gruplar halihazırda belirlendi di mi?
Have the groups been composed already?
Participant 3: Belirlendi.
Composed.
Speaker: Yeah the groups are already composed.

In the example, although the expert speaker has already told "groups are already composed", for some unknown reason the interpreter feels the need to clarify it with

the audience. Therefore, she asks “the groups have been composed, right?”. Her question is replied by participant 3 as “composed”.

Example 16:

Participant: Bunlar bunu nasıl bulabiliyorlar biz Türkiye’de bulamadık bu şekilde de yani mesela bu test edecek kişileri uzmanları nasıl bulabiliyorlar, yapmışlar mı daha doğrusu?
How can they find these, we couldn’t find them in Turkey in this way, that is to say for example how can they find these people, experts to do testing? To put it more correctly, have they achieved this?
Interpreter: Uygun kişiyi mi?
You mean the right person?
Participant: Uygun kişiyi.
The right person.

In the abovementioned example, the interpreter finds the subject person mentioned in the question asked by the participant too vague. For this reason, she asks “do you mean the right person?”. She wants to clarify the subject so as to have a better interpreting performance with a more precise subject placed in the interpreted utterance. Her question is again replied by the participant as “the right person”.

Example 17:

Participant2: Şeyler girer oraya müşteri ilişkileri.
Those are included there, customer relations.
Interpreter: Müşteri memnuniyeti mi?
Is it customer satisfaction?
Speaker**:** So, customer satisfaction is there.

As mentioned earlier in one of the previous examples, the interpreter has already been involved in the group work and worked with the groups during this process. In this example, the interpreter, who has gained experience on the terminology, asks for further clarifications in order to prevent any mistakes that

might happen due to the incorrect use of terminology by the audience. Therefore, interpreter wants to check the term with the participant who used it. The participant used “customer relations” and in return for this the interpreter asks “do you mean customer satisfaction?” since the already agreed term is customer satisfaction as understood from the terminology used by the speaker saying “so, customer satisfaction is there”.

Example 18:
Participant 1: Bu tiklerde derecelendirme yapılıyor mu?
Is any kind of listing made here?
Interpreter: Derecelendirme derken?
Define listing?
Participant: Önem sırasına göre diyelim.
Let’s say according to their priorities.
Interpreter: Is there a priority listing in the articles?
Speaker: No. No. Arbitrary.

Here, the interpreter finds the term listing too vague and asks the participant for further information in order to prevent any misunderstanding in advance. She says “can you define listing?” and asks for a precise definition concerning the term “listing”. The participant provides further information asked by the interpreter by defining the term; he says “let’s say according to the priorities”. Provided with more information by the participant the interpreter makes a final decision interpreting the initial question by the participant as “is there a priority listing in the articles?”. Through such an effort the interpreter prevents any misunderstanding that might occur due to the use of vague phrases.

4.3.1.5. Direct Contact Due To Being Included in the Group Work

The workshop consisted of two main pillars. It consisted of a lecture, i.e. presentation of previously prepared slides, on how to be a DACUM facilitator and practical hands on exercises. Those practical hands on exercises required group work. Therefore, the

participants were divided into two groups to fulfill the tasks given to the groups. They were asked by the expert speaker to work together and present their work. Like in all other cases, the interpreter was an essential partner during this group work since the expert speaker, once in a while, went around the groups to ask if they needed any help. Apart from that, since they had to present their work to the expert speaker they needed the interpreter to help them in writing what they had produced on flip-chart papers. Through the help of the interpreter, they could give those to the expert speaker in both a legible and a comprehensible e form. Besides, they sometimes had to revise their product, which had been written in English to save time. During those instances they needed a lot of interpreter assistance. Therefore there are a lot of examples of direct contact between the interpreter and the audience during group work. The examples are provided below as follows;

Example 19:
Participant 2: Şu en üstteki ne? To decorate nails.
What is that on the top? To decorate nails?
Interpreter: Tırnak süslemek.
To decorate nails.
Participant 1: O ayrı.
That is another thing.
Participant 2: El ayak bakımı ve tırnak süslemek ayrı.
Hand and foot care and to decorate nails are different things.

In this example, the participant who cannot understand what is written in English asks for the interpreter's help by saying "what is that on the top? to decorate nails". The interpreter translates what is written in to Turkish as demanded by the participant saying "tırnak süslemek".

Example 20:

Interpreter: Şimdi şunlar kaldı o zaman söyleyeyim: Saç ekleme, ondan sonra.

Now these are left, let me say. Attaching hair, then.

Participant 3: Saç ekleme mi bunun içine mi girer o?

Attaching hair, is it included under this?

Interpreter: Bir dakika sayayım mı hepsini? Müşteri memnuniyeti var, bu eklenecek saçların ölçülmesi demişiz, sonra bir de şey kaldı ikram, randevu alma, bir de ne vardı ne vardı, ücret alma, fatura.

One minute, can I list them all? Here there is customer satisfaction, measuring the hair to be attached, we said and one more thing treats, taking appointment and what was more, what was more, taking the fee, invoicing

Participant3: İş organizasyonu.

Organization of the work.

Participant 5: Randevu alma, müşteri memnuniyeti. Onlar hep iş organizasyonunun içine giriyor.

Taking appointments and customer satisfaction. They are all included under organization of the work.

Interpreter: Öyle mi?

Are they?

Participant 2: Müşteri memnuniyeti zaten şeydir tavır, tutum, davranıştır. Bir görev işlem değildir.

Customer satisfaction is already attitude, trait, behaviour. It is not a task or duty.

Interpreter: So customer satisfaction… Where is it? Bu organizasyonda mı?

Is this under the organization?

P2-P3-P5: Organizasyonda. Organizasyonun içine girer.

In the organization. It is included in the organization.

Interpreter: It is included in the organization. It is there.

This example is very typical of direct interaction between the interpreter and the audience. In this example, the interpreter is both a partner cooperating with the group to fulfill its task and an interpreter interpreting the phrases she deems necessary for the expert speaker. She does not interpret all the things that has been

said by the group members, i.e. participants during the dialogue. However, she checks what has been written with the expert speaker so as to avoid any mistakes by the group. The utterances marked as bold indicate the instances when the interpreter has intensive direct contact with the audience discussing how the product should be organized. She reads what has been written in English and waits for the participants in the group to make a decision about the organization of the final product. When she catches a phrase which looks like an agreement within the group, she interprets and checks it with the speaker so as to avoid any mistakes that the group might make.

Example 21:

Speaker: Ok then. Can we go into groups to wrap up these and that will be the day.

Interpreter: Şimdi gruplara ayrılalım isterseniz bu çalışmayı yapalım sonra da bugünü tamamlayalım.

Now if you like, we shall split into groups, we shall do this activity and finish the day.

Participant: Gruplarımız belli zaten.

The groups are already made.

Interpreter: Hı hı şimdi.

Yes, now.

Speaker: Ok than please go to your groups.

Interpreter: Şimdi gruplara ayrılalım lütfen. Ben okuyayım isterseniz.

Please split into groups now. I shall read if you like.

This example starts with the so-called invisible position of the interpreter as she interprets what has been said by the expert speaker without any comments or additions. As one of the participants makes a comment saying “the groups have been formed” the interpreter simply agrees and says “now” meaning that you are going to start with the group work now. The speaker’s utterances support her words and the interpreter interprets what has been said by the expert speaker, but the interpreted utterance is followed by her offer to help. She says “I shall read if you like” and

offers the audience help, which creates another instance of direct contact between the interpreter and the audience.

Example 22:

Interpreter: Bir okuyorum. Saç, bıyık, işte sakal renklendirmek.

One, I am reading. To color hair, moustache and beard.

Participant 1: Saç – bıyık- sakal renklendirmek, Ok mi?

To color hair, moustache and beard. Is it ok?

Participant 2: Tamam. Ikincisi ne?

Okay. What is the second one.

Interpreter: İkincisi.

The second one.

Participant1: Bunu bir yazayım.

Let me write this.

Interpreter: Tamam.

Okay.

Participant 2: Onu ikiyi ben yazacağım.

I will write that, the second one.

Interpreter: Tamam oldu. Saç şekillendirme.

All right. Shaping hair.

Participant 1: Saç şekillendirme.

Shaping hair.

Participant (1): İkiyi sen yaz.

You write the second one.

Participant (2) : İkiyi ben yazacağım

I will write the second one.

Interpreter: Tamam

Okay.

The whole dialogue of direct contact between the interpreter and the audience consists of the interpreter's reading the phrases and the audience's recording wat has been said by the interpreter.

Such cooperative efforts by the interpreter follow on in the next examples.

Example 23:

Participant 3: Sayıları en son koyalım. Yerlerini sonra değiştirmemiz gerekebilir.

Let us leave numbering at the end. We might have to change their places.

Interpreter: Şimdi üçüncüyü söyleyeyim mi?

Shall I say the third one now?

Participant 3: Söyleyin.

Say it.

Interpreter: Bıyık –sakal şekillendirme.

Shaping moustache and beard.

Participant 1: Sakal ve bıyık şekillendirmek.

Shaping moustache and beard.

Participant 5: Dört ?

Four?

Participant 3: Sakal bıyık kaş.

Moustache, beard and eyebrows.

Interpreter: Dört istenmeyen tüylerin alınması

Four removing unwanted hair.

Participant 3: Temizleme.

Clean.

Interpreter: Temizlenmesi

Cleaning

Example 24:

Participant 5: Bir katkıda bulunmak istiyorum müsade ederseniz şimdi burada neydi tam şey?

Let me make a contribution here, what was it exactly?

Interpreter: Cilt bakımı ve masaj.

Skin care and massage.

Participant 5: Cilt bakımı ve masaj. Bu görevleri bir etkinlik olarak ölçmeye kalktığımız zaman şimdi cilt bakımında olsam masaj kalıyor mu? Yani böyle

soruyorum. Masajla cilt bakımını aynı anda ölçebilir miyim? Onu diyorum ikisi aynı anda oluyor mu?

Skin care and massage. If I try to measure these duties as an activity, will massage stay here if I were in massage? *I am asking this. Can I measure skin care and massage at the same time*? *I am saying that is it possible, both at a time*?

Interpreter: Can I measure the two at the same time?

Example 25:

Interpreter: Yedi Profesyonel yani mesleki gelişim faaliyetlerini yürütmek.

Seven, conduct professional development activities.

Participant 1: Mesleki gelişime ilişkin faaliyetleri yürütmek

Conduct activities regarding professional development

Participant 3: O da çok uzun onu da kısaltalım.

That is very long, we shall make it shorter.

Participant 4, Participant 5: Mesleki gelişmeleri takip etmek.

Follow professional developments.

Participant 5: Sekiz?

Eight?

Interpreter: El – ayak bakımı

Hand and foot care.

Example 26:

Interpreter: Şimdi burda okuyorum ama hemen yazılmasın

Now, I am reading here but do not wite immediately.

Participant 1: Şimdi orda güzel bir cümle kuralım çünkü o çok kapsamlı.

Now we should make a good sentence because that is really comprehensive.

Interpreter: Müşteriyle iletişim var, müşteriyle etkileşim var, müşteri ilişkileri var bir de meslektaşlarıyla iletişim var.

There are customer relations, customer interactions, customer relations and communication with colleagues.

Participant 4: Hesap alma –kitap alma da var.

Making calculations is also there.

Example 27:

Interpreter: Evet şimdi sıradakini okuyorum makyaj.

Yes, I am reading the next one, make –up.

Participant 1: Peki vücut bakımını çıkarınca makyajı da çıkaralım mı? Yok olmaz …

Then when we exclude body care shall we exclude make-up, too? No…

Participant 3: Yok olmaz.

No.

Interpreter: Yani meslektaşlarla iletişimi nereye aldık peki?

Then, where have we put communication with colleagues?

Participant 1: O şeyin içine girebilir, meslek gelişimine ilişkin faaliyetlerin.

That can be included in this, activities regarding professional development.

These examples consist of instances of direct contact between the interpreter and the audience. The group discusses on how to organize their final product, and the interpreter provides assistance when asked or when she feels the need that she should be involved. During this dialogue the expert speaker is only involved by the interpreter when she deems necessary, which is quite rare.

Thus, the examples of direct contact between the interpreter and the audience is mainly concentrated on instances of group work as can be observed from the examples provided above. The next sub-chapter lists examples regarding instances of direct contact between the interpreter and the expert speaker.

4.3.2. Direct Contact between the Interpreter and the Speaker

Compared to the instances of direct contact between the interpreter and the audience, instances of direct contact between the interpreter and the expert speaker are rather few. However, some instances of direct contact between the interpreter and the expert speaker seem to serve identical objectives such as elimination of misunderstandings and asking for clarifications or futher information. During the lecturing period when the expert speaker delivers a presentation on how to be a DACUM facilitator, there seems to be either none or very few direct contact between

the interpreter and the expert speaker, which was also the situation as regards the direct contact between interpreter and the audience during the lecture. Instances of direct contact occurred when the audience started asking questions or working in groups. Instances of direct contact between the interpreter and the expert speaker are classified according to their basic aims as follows;

4.3.2.1. Direct Contact to Summarize Discussions or the Existing Situation

Direct contact between the interpreter and the expert speaker was frequently observed during group discussions. The groups were discussing freely on how to organize their final product, which was a list of tasks and duties in the selected areas of profession. In this context, they exchanged views, did brainstorming, wrote on flip chart papers and sometimes agreed sometimes disagreed with each other. During the group work session, the expert speaker went around the groups to see how they were progressing, what was going on with the discussions and how the group performed and to check whether they had understood everything correctly. During such encounter, it was impossible for the interpreter to interpret all the utterances of the participants. Thus, she opted for summarizing the discussions or the existing situation.

The discussions among participants did not only occur during the group work. They sometimes put forward conflicting views, asked questions, answered each other's questions and made comments. In such cases the interpreter again opted for summarizing the discussions or the existing situation with a view to saving time.

Example 1:

Participant: İdeali bu ama çalışır mı çalışmaz mı

This is the ideal but whether it works or not

Speaker: Of course the interviewer is having this... This is it.

Interpreter: This is the ideal.

Speaker: Yes, of course of course

And the last one as you see is indirect...

Interpreter: … there is a problem that they wanted to explain.

Speaker: This one? Size, type?

Interpreter: Yeah that one.

Participant: Orada şu temsili iş demografikleri diyor ya, aslında o iş alanı meslek alanındaki özellikleri dikkate alan özellikleri temsil eden kişilerin olması, örneğin işte küçük ve orta ölçekli bir firmadan da gelsin kişi büyük bir kurumdan da gelsin.

There it mentions the representative business demographics, in fact, availability of people representing, regarding the qualities in that business area, area of profession, for example let people come from a small or medium scale enterprise and also let people come from a large company.

(int. Explains, the speaker answers, int says, yeah yeah that's right)

As the interpreter was involved in the group work assisting the group members in their work, she had been informed about the problems previously. Thus, when that point came she felt the urge to warn the speaker that there was a problem the group wanted to explain. By doing this, she changed the subject of discussion. The group was discussing the selection of DACUM group members and they were talking on which methods to apply and whether the ideal method is really applicable. It was the interpreter in this situation, who changed the subject and carried the topic away to a new one, which was the problem the group already had about the size/ type of the group. Upon this move by the interpreter, the participants started explaining the problem to expert speaker and the interpreter interpreted accordingly.

Example 2:

Participant 1: İşyerini dekore etmek, iş organizasyonu içine girer.

Decorate the shop, included in the organization of work.

Interpreter: Design the decoration of the shop is included under organization.

Speaker: Here?

Interpreter: Organizing. Hı hı. We should cross that one.

In this very short example of direct contact between the interpreter and the expert speaker, the interpreter interprets the participant's utterance but the expert speaker seems to be pretty unsure about that move and he asks "here?". The interpreter does not ask the question to the group members, as she feels that she already knows the answer from previously being involved in the group work. She says "yes" to answer the question and adds a further clarification stating "we should cross that one". She does not ask this to the group members feeling that she already knows what to do as she has been involved in the group work and has worked with the group.

Example 3:

Participant 3: İlişkileri yürütme aslında. Müşteri ve çalışanlarla ilişkileri yürütmek olabilir mi?

Conducting relations, in fact. Can it be conducting relations with customers and employees?

Participant 2: İletişim sağlamak olur mu?

Can it be ensuring communication?

Interpreter: Ensure communication some say, some say to manage customer relations. To arrange, to organize customer relations and …

In the example provided above, instead of interpreting all the discussions and individual views and utterances by the group members during the group work, the interpreter opts for summarizing the current situation so as to ensure that the expert speaker understands what is going on in the group. There is a disagreement within the group concerning the wording of the phrase. The interpreter gives all the ideas in

one sentence and she indicates that there is no compromise by saying “some say….., some say….”. Thereby, the expert speaker is informed about the ongoing discussion and disagreement within the group.

Example 4:

Participant 2: Aslında şöyle: yanında çalışanları eğitmek var, bir işlem. O, mesleki gelişimin altına girer. Veya işbaşı eğitimi yapmak iş organizasyonu içine girer. Yazmadığımız şeyler var**.**

In fact it is like this: training other employees, it is a task. That is under professional development. Or on the job training is included under organization of work. There are things we have not written.

Participant 3: Ben mümkünse buraya eğitim verilme konularının hiç girmemesi gerektiğini düşünüyorum, çünkü eğitim verme deyince biraz üst düzeye gidiyor. Ama bilgi paylaşımı var, evet.

I think that training issues shall never be mentioned here, if possible, because when we say deliver training it goes to a little upper levels. But, there is exchange of information, yes.

Interpreter: They are discussing.

Participant 2: Ama mesela bir kuaförü düşünün: yanındaki kişiye işi öğretiyor, eğitim veriyor.

But think of a hair-dresser: he/she is teaching/training the person working with him/her.

Participant 3: Biz yetişmiş eleman alıyoruz eğitimci yetiştirmiyoruz. Onu meslek elemanına benzetiyoruz.

But we recruit trained staff, we don’t train teachers. We make him/her similar to a professional.

Participant 2: Meslek elemanı yetiştiriyoruz eğitimci yetiştirmiyoruz ki.

We train professionals not teachers.

Interpreter: They are analyzing the job. They are training those who will work in this sector. They are not going to be teachers.

In this example there is a long discussion among the group members. Only the last two lines of this discussion has been quoted here to indicate that there is an ongoing discussion among the participants. Instead of interpreting the whole discussion, the interpreter opts for waiting for the final product of discussion and during this time she also wants to inform the expert speaker about what is going on in the group. To this end, she explains the situation by saying “they are discussing”. After this explanation as regards the ongoing situation within the group, the topic of discussion changes. Upon this the interpreter summarizes the new situation to inform the expert speaker and she says “they are analyzing the job. They are training those who will work in this sector. they are not going to be teachers.”

Example 5:

Participant1: Ne dedi biliyor musunuz? Benim yasalarla ilgili bildiğim bir şey var, bilmiyorum Türkiye'de de bu aynı mı dedi. Kanunda yazılı olanlar yapılmalıdır, yazılı olmayanlar da yapılması izin verilen.

You know what he said? He said there is something I know about legislation, I don’t know whether it is the same in Turkey. What is written in the law should be done. What is not written in the law is allowed

Participant2: Yasak yoksa açıkça.

If there is no prohibition explicitly.

Participant1: Açık yasak yoksa yapılabilir demektir, diyor ama tabi bu.

This means it can be done if there is no explicit prohibition but of course…

Interpreter: He is explaining what you said.

This example is linked to one of the examples provided among instances of direct contact between the interpreter and the audience with a view to correct the interpreter. The problem about interpreting this utterance was that the interpreter did not interpret one sentence uttered by the expert speaker. However, that sentence was crucial for what the expert speaker was trying to explain. Therefore, feeling the urge to explain what he understood, one of the participants adds the missing sentence starting with the question. Upon this, some group members commented on what had

been said. The interpreter did not interpret the whole discussion and opted for summarizing what was going on by saying “he is explaining what you said”.

Example 6:
Participant: O zaman iki kağıda siz okurken iki arkadaş yazsın.
Then two friends shall write on two papers while you are reading.
Interpreter: I will be reading and they will be recording the Turkish version, because nobody wrote when we were listing.

In this example there is both an example of direct contact between the interpreter and the audience and an example of direct contact between the interpreter and the expert speaker. Like the previous example, this one also is linked to one of the previously provided examples under direct contact between the interpreter and the audience during the group work. One of the participants requests the interpreter’s assistance in translating what has been written on paper from English to Turkish. Since this assistance would take some time requiring the interpreter to translate and some participants to record what has been said onto another paper. The interpreter explained the direct contact between her and the participants by stating “I will be reading and they will be recording the Turkish version”. However, the interpreter also added what she thought to be the cause of such effort by saying “because nobody wrote when we were listing”.

Example 7:
Speaker: What will be the new?
Interpreter: Both of them, both of them.
Speaker: No number 5.

In this example again, having been involved in the group work and discussions, the interpreter explains the situation and answers the question directed by the expert speaker without seeing the need to interpret the question and ask the group members about it.

The following examples are very similar. Therefore they can be listed together. The following instances of direct contact between the interpreter and the expert speaker were recorded when the expert speaker wanted to go around the groups to see and check what was going on. During instances of very long discussion, the interpreter opted for summarizing the situation in the following examples:

Examples 8:

Participant 5: Şimdi ne diyeceğiz?

What shall we say now?

Participant 4: İşe hazırlık da giriyor.

Preparations for the job are also included.

Interpreter: They wrote this one and they couldn't decide whether to write…

Example 9:

Participant 4: Çalışanlar da işte iş yerindeki ilişkileri düzenlesin.

Employees shall organize the work place relations.

Participant 1: Çalışanlara iş dağılımı yapmak demek iş organizasyonudur. Müşteri ilişkilerini düzenlemek yapalım.

Distributing tasks to employees means organization of work. We shall make this organization of customer relations.

Interpreter: Ok they are discussing these.

Example 10:

Participant 2: Türkiye'de tamamen ilişkilerle yürüyor bu iş.

In Turkey, this is all done through relations.

Participant 1: Şimdi hizmet sektöründe ilişki – iletişim çok önemli.

Relations and communication are very important in the services sector.

Interpreter: They say communication is very important.

4.3.2.2. Direct Contact to Eliminate Misunderstandings

During the presentation delivered by the expert speaker, there are some intances when the interpreter realizes that she has missed the word or not understood the word correctly. In such a case, the interpreter either repeats the words before that term with a question intonation or repeats the phrase and expects the expert speaker to correct it. There are some other attempts by the interpreter to eliminate misunderstandings. When the interpreter feels that the speaker is going to a wrong direction or that he is stuck at an unintended part of the interpreted utterance, she warns the expert speaker and drags him to the subject that the participants really want to learn about. Examples to both cases aiming at the elimination of misunderstandings are provided below;

Example 11:

Speaker: We adults are a bit not a bit, sometimes are too egoist. We adults all of us.
Interpreter: Too?
Speaker: Too egoist
Interpreter: Bazen çok egoist oluyoruz biz yetişkinler, bazen diyelim
We are sometimes too egoist, we the adults let's say sometimes.

In this dialogue, the interpreter did not quite understand the word "egoist". Therefore, to eliminate any misunderstandings she repeated the word "too" with a questioning intonation and waited for the speaker to complete the phrase. The speaker repeated the word and the interpreter interpreted the utterance afterwards.

Example 12:

S: In five minutes.
I: Five minutes?
S: In five minutes.

Here again, the interpreters wants to check the utterance with the expert speaker to eliminate any misunderstanding. She repeats the phrase with a questioning intonation, and the expert speaker repeats the utterance. The interpreter continues interpreting afterwards.

Example 13:

Participant: Bunu hangi ortamda yapıyoruz? Çalışma ortamında 8-12 kişiyi topladığımız zaman mı yapıyoruz o kişilerle görüşürken?

Where are we doing this? Do we do this at the work placewhile interviewing with people, when we have gathered 8- 12 people?

Interpreter: Are we going to do this for instance in the groups with 12 people, one before or afterwards when do we do this, within the groups when?

Participant: Grubu topladıktan sonraki.

After the group has been gathered.

Speaker: The groups are our groups are already composed.

Interpreter: Ok ok. When do we do this? When we start?

Speaker: Ah at the beginning. This is at the beginning.

Interpreter: İlk başta. İlk başta.

At the beginning. At the beginning.

In the example provided above, one of the participants wants to learn more about the timing of the specific application mentioned by the expert speaker. The participant's question is interpreted by the interpreter accordingly. However, the expert speaker focuses on another aspect of the interpreted utterance, maybe misunderstanding it and says "the groups are our groups are already composed". Knowing that it was not the answer expected by the participant, the interpreter does not interpret this answer but instead she tries to drag the expert speaker into the main point of the question by saying "Ok ok. When do we do this? When we start?". She directly empasizes the intention of the question. Upon this, the expert speaker gets the direct message and answers the question. In this example, the interpreter understood that the expert speaker did not quite get the question. Therefore, she took the initiative, emphasized the real intent of the question, directed the conversation

towards the expected direction and eliminated any further misunderstanding by her efforts.

4.3.2.3 Direct Contact to Ask for Clarifications

There is one example of direct contact between the interpreter and the expert speaker aiming at further information or clarifications. The interpreter asked the expert speaker to provide her with some more information on the term “peer recognition”, which she could not interpret into Turkish. Therefore, she opted for explaining the term through some additional information provided by the expert speaker.

Example 14:

Speaker: I will skip on technically competent because I think we are all aware this is a really important thing, capable of peer recognition.

Interpreter: Can you explain? Because I didn’t understand while I was translating.

This example is linked with what has been previously said about the fact that the interpreter had translated the written materials/handouts prepared for the workshop. It is obvious that the interpreter/ translator has some doubts about her translation due to the use of some terms the meanings of which she could not thoroughly grasp. When those terms are mentioned by the speaker. She asks for further clarifications o eliminate any further misunderstanding. She wants the speaker to provide some more information to help her in interpreting the term “peer recognition” so that she can find a comprehensible correspondence in Turkish.

CONCLUSION

From the examples provided, it can be inferred that during lecturing instances, i.e. the presentation delivered by the expert speaker, when there is minimum or hardly any interaction between the expert speaker and the audience, the interpreter tends to stay "one-step behind" or be invisible. However, the situation changes dramatically during instances of intensive interaction, which occur when participants start asking questions or engage themselves in group discussions.

Having analyzed the instances of direct contact between the interpreter and the audience and those between the interpreter and the expert speaker, it is inevitable to note that the interpreter is clearly visible during such direct contact.

Instances of direct contact may have different aims as mentioned under the previous chapter and in each instance of direct contact the interpreter's role might be changing according to the conditions in each situation. Changin roles that the interpreter might be expected to assume have been mentioned by academics who teach at interpreter training institutions (see 4.4.2 Alev Bulut from İstanbul University). The observed working practices of the interpreter fully overlap with what has been mentioned by academics on the variety of roles and situations interpreters might encounter in professional life. In the interaction analyzed above, direct contact has been used by the interpreter as a tool to ask for further information, clarification and explanation either from the expert speaker or the audience. In this respect the interpreter aims at eliminating any misunderstanding in advance and strives to provide both the expert speaker and the audience with precise and comprehensible interpreted utterances to assist them in understanding each other in a better and improved way. In this case, the interpreter is the communication facilitator or the communication expert. Besides, if the interpreter has not understood something essential he/she is allowed *to say it over the microphone* as prescribed by AIIC on its website since it is stated that "if you have not understood something essential, say so over the microphone" (AIIC, 2010) http://www.aiic.net/ViewPage.cfm/page1669. Therefore, asking for clarifications to

eliminate any misunderstanding is also deemed appropriate by the professional organization AIIC.

Direct contact may also be used by the interpreter so as to change the topic of discussion or draw the attention to a desired point. It has been mentioned in answers to the questionnaire that the interpreter can be expected at times not only to *ensure but also to direct communication*. Proving this role of the interpreter which is far beyond *just translating* direct contact has been established by the interpreter with the participants and/or the speaker to change the topic and carry the communication away to another point. During such instances, it is the interpreter who specifies the topic to be discussed. As observed in the examples provided above, the interpreter might mention another topic such as "there is a problem that they want to explain", which has not yet been mentioned by the group. In the example, this move of the interpreter changed the topic immediately and both the audience and the expert speaker started discussing another subject. As stated by Anderson, the interpreter is the man in the middle as he/she serves two clients at the same time, to each of whom the interpreter has some obligations. Therefore, the interpreter is the *man in the middle*, and this position of *the man in the middle* has the advantage of power inherent in all positions which control scarce sources. Thus, this power can be observed in this example of direct contact.

In some examples, the interpreter does not comply with the norm of the *honest spokesperson,* which required her to always speak in the first person. While summarizing the group discussions or the existing situation when there were several participants speaking one after another or simultaneously, the interpreter used the third person instead of the first person. However, she was not interpreting during such instances. She was either explaining the situation or informing the expert speaker about the current condition. Therefore, the interpreter deemed speaking in the third person more appropriate. Accordingly, Eraslan Gerçek stated in her answers to the questionnaire that "when we talk about interpreting, it means we are talking about a rather slippery ground". Thus, this slippery ground may sometimes require that some norms be violated depending on the context within which the interaction

takes place. Violating the norm of *honest spokesperson* may be deemed an unacceptable practice in conference interpreting. However, one should consider each occasion with its own circumstances, conditions and dynamics due to the importance of context in interpreter-mediated events. During group work, all group members were freely and openly discussing on how to organize the final product in accordance with the highly interactive nature of the event under study. In this context, at various instances, the interpreter opted for summarizing the discussions and speaking in the third person.

Interpreters may have to undertake different roles as required by the circumstances of an event, in other words, the context. Some of these roles such as *cultural mediator or intermediary, facilitator or assistant and co-leader or expert* have been clearly stated by Eraslan Gerçek and their visibility was emphasized.

In some instances which may or may not be specific to this particular workshop, the participants asks the interpreter to assist them in their group work. They demanded that the interpreter translated what had been written on paper from English into Turkish. During such instances of direct contact, the interpreter was involved in the group work as a true partner to the participants undertaking the facilitator or assistant role.

The interpreter may also use her turn to speak as a means to warn the speakers. This warning may aim at preparing them against any mistranslation in the written materials or at requesting them to warn her if there is any mistake in the terminology. For the well-being of her own performance, the interpreter may also warn the audience not to speak simultaneously, justifying her request by saying that she is distracted and might be missing some of the words uttered by the expert speaker.

In some instances of direct contact, the interpreter discusses with the audience, how to interpret the source language terms accurately into the target language. In such cases, an intensive terminology and wording discussion takes place

between the interpreter and the audience until an agreement is reached on the correct word or phrase.

All these instances of direct contact either between the interpreter and the audience or between the interpreter and the expert speaker might be assumed as efforts of the interpreter to ensure an effective communication between the audience and the expert speaker. These efforts to ensure an effective communication has also been mentioned by AIIC again on the website through stating "ideally, delegates should communicate so effectively that they don't notice the language barrier" (AIIC, 2010) http://www.aiic.net/ViewPage.cfm/page1669. Thus, in the transcriptions analyzed in the previous chapter the interpreter makes efforts to ensure that the delegates communicate effectively. Ensuring an effective communication, as can be observed in the examples provided in the analysis part, might sometimes require asking for clarifications, warning the speakers not to speak simultaneously, discussing the terminology, assisting the group in their group work, summarizing discussions within group work and changing the topic. Through such efforts the interpreter tries to ensure that the audience does not notice the language barrier as prescribed by AIIC. However, AIIC also prescribes the interpreter to make them, the audience, forget that they are hearing the speaker through an interpreter. Making the audience forget that they are hearing the speaker through an interpreter requires the interpreter to be invisible. However, putting efforts to ensure an effective communication through lifting barriers before communication does require the interpreter to be visible in consecutive interpreting, as it has already been analyzed in the examples. The audience does not notice the language barrier, but they do notice the person who works hard to lift that barrier.

Likewise on the website of TKTD, the interpreter is advised to stand one step behind. The website warns interpreters that "no speaker would like the interpreter to attract more attention than himself" (TKTD, 2010) http://tktd.org/wp/?page_id=59. However, the interpreter has been observed to be neither invisible nor *one-step behind* in any of the instances of direct contact described above. On the contrary, she is a partner of both the participants and the expert speaker undertaking the requied roles. These roles are the communication facilitator, *the man in the middle*, a partner/

assistant providing assistance during group work to name but a few. A communication facilitator or a partner providing assistance during group work cannot be expected to stay one step behind the speaker. Instead, a communication facilitator is expected to take the initiative to eliminate any misunderstanding and direct the topic to a desired point. Besides, as stated in the previous paragraphs ensuring an effective communication also requires to be visible.

Through these examples, the role of the interpreter in consecutive interpreting is an active one associated with references made to the interpreter such as *the moderator of speech, man in the middle* or *interpreter as a power figure*, rather than metaphors such as *faithful echo, channel* or *a passive conduit, switching device, transmission belt, modem or input- output robot.* The interpreter's voice is not *a carrier without a substance of its own, a virtually transparent vehicle* as stated by Hermans. Rather than that, it is the translator's voice that enables both parties to communicate effectively. It is again the translator's voice that eliminates both language and communication barriers.

As regards the invisibility of the interpreter TKTD states that "the interpreter should never forget that he, in such a social activity, is an "agent", a "transmitter" […] the interpreter should stand one step behind in a professional way, using his discretion. It is for certain that he will be appreciated more with his one step behind position" (TKTD, 2010) http://tktd.org/wp/?page_id=59. However, it can be observed through instances of direct contact that the interpreter is neither a mere *transmitter* nor *an agent* who *stands one step behind in a professional way, using his discretion* as prescribed by TKTD. As mentioned by some academics, invisibility is the ideal role. Accordingly Gürçağlar, who is also a member of TKTD stated that "that although the ideal status for a conference interpreter is to be invisible, this is impossible, especially in consecutive interpreting." Eraslan Gerçek also mentioned a similar fact by saying "although it is the ideal role and norm for an interpreter to be invisible, it is not possible to comply with this norm in consecutive interpreting, though it may be more possible in simultaneous interpreting".

In conclusion, although the interpreter's invisibility or standing one step behind the expert speaker has been prescribed by the two professional organizations, this role is deemed by academics from interpreter training institutions, as an ideal one which does not always overlap with conference interpreting in practice. Accordingly, it has been observed in this study that while the interpreter tends to stay one step behind when there is low interactivity, that is a one-way tarsnfer from the speaker to the participants, she tends to undertake various roles in instances of intensive interaction and communication between the speaker and the audience. The features of the specific context that allow for such intensive interaction also have an influence. Thus the interpreter's visibility should be explored in varşous contexts and different roles the interpreter undertakes as required by the changing dynamics of interaction should be further discussed against norms of interpreting. The norm of visibility as defined by Codes of Ethics of Prıfessional organizations is not valid for every context. The features of the interpreting event have an influence on the roles assumed by the interpreter. The effect of these features need to be sought by other studies in various contexts in the consecutive mode. Thus, it is hoped that the discussions in this study on the complex role of the inetrpreter in relation to the norm of invisibility inspire further research in consecutive interpreting, which still lacks large-scale studies based on real-life interpreting performance.

REFERENCES

Alexiava, B. (2002), A Typology of Interpreter Mediated Events, in Franz Pöchhacker, Miriam Schlesinger (Eds.), *The Interpreting Studies Reader*, (pp.218-233) London: Routledge.

Anderson, R. Bruce W. (2002), Perspectives on the Role of the Interpreter, in Franz Pöchhacker, Miriam Schlesinger (Eds.), *The Interpreting Studies Reader*, (pp.208-217) London: Routledge.

Cicourel, AaronV. (1992) The Interpenetration of Communicative Contexts: Examples from Medical Encounters, in Alessandro Duranti, Charles Goodwin (Eds.), *Rethinking Context*, (pp.291- 310) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cicourel, AaronV. (1981), Notes on the integration of micro- and macro-levels of analysis, in K. Knorr-Cetina, AaronV. Cicourel (Eds.), *Analysis in social theory and methodology: Toward an integration of micro- and macro-sociologies*, (pp. 51-80) Boston, MA: Routledge and Kegan Paul

Diriker, E. (2001) *De-/Re-Contextualizing Simultaneous Interpreting: Interpreters in the Ivory Tower?* PhD Thesis. İstanbul: Boğaziçi University

Duflou, V. (2007) *Norm Research in Conference Interpreting: How can the Study of Documentary Sources Contribute to A Better Understanding of Norms?* http://www.euroconferences.info/proceedings/2007_Proceedings/2007_Duflou_Veerle.pdf (18 February 2010)

Harris, B. (1990) Norms in Interpretation. *Target*, 2:1: 115-119.

Hermans, T. (1996) The Translator's Voice in Translated Narrative, Target 8:1, 23-48

Kopczynski, A. (1994), Quality in Conference Interpreting: Some Pragmatic Problems, in Sylvie Lambert, Barbara Moser-Mercer (Eds.), *Bridging the Gap*, (pp.87-100) Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Kurz, Ingrid. (1989). Conference Interpreting: User Expectations. *In Coming of Age: Proceedings of the 30th Annual Conference of the American Translators Association*, (pp. 143-148) Deanna L. Hammond (ed.), Medford, NJ: Learned Information,

Kurz, I. (2002), Conference Interpretation: Expectations of Different User Groups, in Franz Pöchhacker, Miriam Schlesinger (Eds.), *The Interpreting Studies Reader*, (pp.312-325) London: Routledge.

Marrone, Stefano. (1993). Quality: A Shared Objective. *The Interpreters' Newsletter* No. 5, 35-39

Nunan, D. (1992) Etnography. *Research Methods in Language Learning* (pp.52- 73). United States of America: Cambridge University Press.

Pöchhacker, F. (2001) Quality Assessment in Conference and Community Interpreting, Meta, XLVI, 2, 410-425

Pöchhacker, F. (2004) *Introducing Interpreting Studies.* London: Routledge.

Wadensjö, C. (1998) *Interpreting as Interaction.* New York: Addison Wesley Longman Limited.

Roy, Cynthia B. (2002), The Problem with Definitions, Descriptions, and The Role Metaphors of Interpreters, in Franz Pöchhacker, Miriam Schlesinger (Eds.), *The Interpreting Studies Reader*, (pp.344-353) London: Routledge.

Schiavi, G. (1996) There is Always a Teller in a Tale, Target 8:1, 1-21

Schjoldager, A. (2002), An Exploratory Study of Translational Norms in Simultaneous Interpreting: Methodological Reflections, in Franz Pöchhacker, Miriam Schlesinger (Eds.), *The Interpreting Studies Reader*, (pp.300-311) London: Routledge.

Shlesinger, M. (1989) Extending the Theory of Translation to Interpretation: Norms as a Case in Point. *Target* 1: (1): 111- 115.

Shlesinger, Miriam. (1995). "Stranger in Paradigms: What Lies Ahead for Simultaneous Interpreting Research". Target, Special Issue: Interpreting Research 7 (1): 7-29.

Shlesinger, Miriam. (2002). "Choosing a Research Topic in Interpreting Studies". Korean Journal of Interpreting Studies 4 (1): 25-36.

Toury, G. (1995) The Nature and Role of Norms in Translation. *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond* (pp 53-70) Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Venuti, L. (1995). Invisibility. *The Translator's Invisibility* (pp 1-42). London and New York: Routledge.

Wadensjö, C. (2002), The Double Role of a Dialogue Interpreter, in Franz Pöchhacker, Miriam Schlesinger (Eds.), *The Interpreting Studies Reader*, (pp.354-371) London: Routledge.

ANNEXES

Annex 1 AIIC Codes of Professional Ethics

I. Purpose and Scope

Article 1

a. This Code of Professional Ethics (hereinafter called the "Code") lays down the standards of integrity, professionalism and confidentiality which all members of the Association shall be bound to respect in their work as conference interpreters.
b. Candidates shall also undertake to adhere to the provisions of this Code.
c. The Council, acting in accordance with the Regulation on Disciplinary Procedure, shall impose penalties for any breach of the rules of the profession as defined in this Code.

II. Code of Honour

Article 2

a. Members of the Association shall be bound by the strictest secrecy, which must be observed towards all persons and with regard to all information disclosed in the course of the practice of the profession at any gathering not open to the public.
b. Members shall refrain from deriving any personal gain whatsoever from confidential information they may have acquired in the exercise of their duties as conference interpreters.

Article 3

a. Members of the Association shall not accept any assignment for which they are not qualified. Acceptance of an assignment shall imply a moral undertaking on the member's part to work with all due professionalism.
b. Any member of the Association recruiting other conference interpreters, be they members of the Association or not, shall give the same undertaking.
c. Members of the Association shall not accept more than one assignment for the same period of time.

Article 4

a. Members of the Association shall not accept any job or situation which might detract from the dignity of the profession.
b. They shall refrain from any act which might bring the profession into disrepute.

Article 5

For any professional purpose, members may publicise the fact that they are conference interpreters and members of the Association, either as individuals or as part of any grouping or region to which they belong.

Article 6

a. It shall be the duty of members of the Association to afford their colleagues moral assistance and collegiality.
b. Members shall refrain from any utterance or action prejudicial to the interests of the Association or its members. Any complaint arising out of the conduct of any other member or any disagreement regarding any decision taken by the Association shall be pursued and settled within the Association itself.
c. Any problem pertaining to the profession which arises between two or more members of the Association, including candidates, may be referred to the Council for arbitration, except for disputes of a commercial nature.

III. Working Conditions

Article 7

With a view to ensuring the best quality interpretation, members of the Association:

a. shall endeavour always to secure satisfactory conditions of sound, visibility and comfort, having particular regard to the Professional Standards as adopted by the Association as well as any technical standards drawn up or approved by it;
b. shall not, as a general rule, when interpreting simultaneously in a booth, work either alone or without the availability of a colleague to relieve them should the need arise;
c. shall try to ensure that teams of conference interpreters are formed in such a way as to avoid the systematic use of relay;
d. shall not agree to undertake either simultaneous interpretation without a booth or whispered interpretation unless the circumstances are exceptional and the quality of interpretation work is not thereby impaired;
e. require a direct view of the speaker and the room and therefore will not agree to working from screens except in exceptional circumstances where a direct view is not possible, provided the arrangements comply with the Association's appropriate technical specifications and rules;
f. shall require that working documents and texts to be read out at the conference be sent to them in advance;
g. shall request a briefing session whenever appropriate;
h. shall not perform any other duties except that of conference interpreter at conferences for which they have been taken on as interpreters.

Article 8

Members of the Association shall neither accept nor, a fortiori, offer for themselves or for other conference interpreters recruited through them, be they members of the

Association or not, any working conditions contrary to those laid down in this Code or in the Professional Standards.

IV. Amendment Procedure

Article 9

This Code may be modified by a decision of the Assembly taken with a two-thirds majority of votes cast, provided a legal opinion has been sought on the proposals. (AIIC 2010) http://www.aiic.net/ViewPage.cfm/article24.htm

Annex 2 TKTD Professional Principles

1. **Competency.** The conference interpreter shall shall not accept any assignment for which she/ he is not qualified..
2. **Confidentiality.** The conference interpreter shall not disclose any information, document and etc. acquired in the course of the practice of the profession. Principle of confidentiality is binding on the interpreter even after the expiry or annulment of the contract signed by and between the employer and the interpreter.
3. **Equality.** Interpreters engaged by the employer for the same task shall receive equal payment.
4. **Professionalism.** The conference interpreter shall demand in advance, any kind of document such as the meeting schedule, documents and etc. pertaining to the conference she/he has been recruited for, so that she/ he can get prepared.
5. **Impartiality.** The conference interpreter shall transfer the content of the message to be interpreted completely even if the message does not comply with his/ her philosophical, political, religious or other views. (TKTD 2010) http://tktd.org/wp/?page_id=428

Annex 3 Transcriptions of one session

5- Section 1 (11.03)

1 Speaker:

…here.

2 Interpreter:

Stikerları duvara yapıştıracağız.

3 Speaker: Expectations and concerns.

4 Interpreter:

Beklentiler buraya, endişeler buraya.

5 S

During the break, me and Çağlayan will go through it and … at the beginning of the next session not to spend time now.

6 Interpreter

Şu anda değil ama ara verdiğimizde bizler bunları okuyacağız. Yani biz ikimiz okuyacağız. Daha sonra aradan döndüğümüzde bu konuyla ilgili konuşacağız.

7 Speaker Right after this one, there is another question for you.

8 Interpreter Şimdi yeni bir soru, bu sorulardan sonra.

9 speaker In fact three of them, in one package.

10 I Aslında üç ama bir pakette.

11 S All of you have great comprehensive, overarching experience in occupational standards and qualifications.

12 I

Hepinizin meslek standartları ve niteliklerle ilgili çok kapsamlı ve detaylı tecrübeleriniz olduğunu biliyoruz.

13 S In order to be able to use the best of your experience for this and the following weeks…

14 I Tecrübelerinizi bu hafta ve önümüzdeki haftalarda en iyi şekilde kullanabilmek için…

15 S I will ask you in a similar way to respond on these questions on these stickers.

16 I Şu anda slâytta göreceğimiz -birazdan çevireceğim- sorulara cevaplarınızı bu stikerlar üzerine yazmanızı rica edeceğiz.

17 S

I will just put them here and you just grab one of each.

18 I Şimdi şöyle verelim, baştan herkes birer tane alıp yanındakine versin.

19 S And one…

20I Üç soru var.

Participant 1

21 I Birer tane.

22 S

From each, yes

23 S Your positive experience in doing this work on the greens. Your positive experience.

24 I Olumlu tecrübelerinizi yeşil kağıt üzerine yazıyoruz.

25 S Negative experience will be orange.

26 I	Olumsuz olanları turuncu olanlara…
27 S	And yellow: How did you know that the things you were doing were successful?
28 I	Sarı olanlara da yaptıklarınız, yaptığınız çalışmaların faydalı olduğunu, başarılı olduğunu nasıl anladınız?
29 S	All of them need to be answered on different papers.
30 I	Her birinin farklı kâğıtlara yazılması gerekiyor, yani cevaplarımızdan bahsediyoruz.
31	Where shall we stick these?
Participant 2	
32 S	I am trying to figure out how to pose these papers on the wall. So instead of this we can put them in three different places there. Let's see. Like this.
33 I	Bu seferkilere de bu duvara asıyoruz. Sarı, turuncu ve yeşil. Sarı, turuncu, yeşil.
34 S	But those are quite huge.

Section 2 (18.16)

1S	…..We go through your expectations and concerns. What is it that you are expecting? We read through all of the papers and in principle you are expecting here to some of you clear up with the dacum technology or to go step by step, not to rush up. To go into details but not too detailed.
2I	Şimdi beklentilerinizi okuduk. Beklentiler içerisinde dacum yönteminin öğrenilmesi ve adım adım gedilmesi, detaya inilmesi ama fazla detaylara odaklanmadan adım adım gidilmesi beklentiler

	arasında yer alanlardan.
3S	To have effective apparatus in presentation of dacum, to have it also practical.
4I	Aynı zamanda uygulamaya yönelik, yani dacumla ilgili pratik bir takım egzersizler yapılması da yine beklentiler arasında yer alıyordu.
5 S	And to have it linked to the practice in real life.
6 I	Ve gerçek yaşamdaki uygulamalarla bağlantıların kurulması.
7 S	Expectations are high definitely.
8 I	Beklentiler kesinlikle yüksek.
9S	And it is obvious that all of us are aiming high, so we want to achieve them. But how?
10 I	Çoğumuzun yüksek hedefleri var ve bunlara ulaşmak istiyoruz. Ama nasıl yapacağız bunu?
11 S	Since all of you are expected to do this in the weeks to follow, we are going through the same process during this week as you are going to go in the following weeks.
12 I	Aslında bizim şu anda geçtiğimiz süreç sizin önümüzdeki haftalarda geçeceğiniz süreç.
13 S	And simply you can take this week and replicate it as much as you need.
14 I	Bu haftayı alabilirsiniz ve ihtiyacınız olduğu ölçüde önümüzde haftalarda tekrarlayabilirsiniz.
15 S	Concerns.
16 I	Endişeler.
17 S	There were issues like terminology, translation, understanding, application of terms.
18 I	Terminoloji, kullanılan terimlerin yeterince açıkça ifade edilememesi, kavram kargaşasına sebebiyet verilmesi gibi ifadeler vardı beklentiler arasında endişeler özür diliyorum arasında
19 S	Difference between duty and task…

20 I	Örneğin işlemle görev arasındaki farkın birbirine karıştırılması
21 S	We will have wording, let's see phrase what is duty, what is task. But not only sticking to that we are going to work through it. And all of you will be clear up with ????? or ????? What is duty what is task in order to be able facilitate others.
22 I	Şimdi işlem ve görevin tanımlarını yapacağız. Ancak bunlarla ilgili olarak da konuşacağız. Böylece hepimizin kafasına açıkça oturabilir bu kavramları ne anlamda kullandığımız. Böylece kolaylaştırıcı rolünü üstlendiğimizde de bizde herhangi bir karışıklığa yol açmaksızın kullanabiliriz bu terimleri.
23 S	There are also concerns about usability of dacum, also whether it will be linked to your previous experience, expertise or knowledge.
24 I	Dacumun ne ölçüde faydalı olacağı ya da şu anda yapacak olduğumuz çalışmaların önceki bilgileriniz ve almış olduğunuz eğitimlerle bağlantılandırılıp bağlantılandırılmayacağı konusunda endişeler vardı.
25 S	Also concerns about something that will be redundant or repeating again for you
26 I	Acaba tekrar niteliğinde mi olacak yaptıklarımız. Böyle bir endişe de vardı.
27 S	All of these things are always issues.
28 I	Bunlar her zaman zaten karşımıza çıkan şeyler.
29 S	Therefore we are going to work on them together and to have consensus about things here
30 I	Bu nedenle bunlar üzerinde duracağız ve burada bir uzlaşmaya varacağız.
31 S	Because dictionaries are saying one thing, but practice is saying another thing.
32 I	Çünkü sözlükler bir takım şeyler söylerken uygulamada bunlar farklı şekillerde karşımıza çıkabiliyor.
33 S	And adding application of these in institutions and enterprises. That is something that we all to cope with these days and intention is to

	do it.
34 I	Ve bunların kurumlarda uygulanması ve işletmelerde uygulanması yine karşımıza çıkan konular arasında ve amaçlarımız da bu konular üzerinde durmak.
35 S	So I really do hope that all of us together. My, I myself cannot do anything without you.
36 I	Umuyorum ki hepimiz, çünkü ben tek başıma sizlerin katkısı olmadan hiçbir şey yapamam
37 S	We will overcome these challenges.
38 I	Burada yazmış olduğumuz sıkıntıların üstünden geleceğiz.
39 S	And meet the expectations
40 I	Ve beklentileri karşılayacağız.
41 S	Therefore if you feel unclear or uncomfortable at any point whenever I am talking or somebody is somebody else is presenting, stop us so things are clear at any point.
42 I	Bu nedenle ben bir şey anlatırken ya da herhangi başka bir kişi bir şey anlatırken herhangi bir soru işareti olursa aklınızda ya da anlaşılmayan bir şey olursa lütfen çekinmeden o noktada durdurun ve sorunuzu sorun. Böylece anlaşılmayan, ortada kalmış herhangi bir şey olmasın.
43 S	One quick short note. In your folders you have all these slides in Turkish. I am using this presentation because otherwise I would look at the paper here and that is not how a facilitator should do.
44 I	Şimdi bir uyarı yapalım. Burada görmüş olduğunuz slaytların Türkçesi elinizdeki dosyalarda mevcut. Ben buradan kullanıyorum çünkü aksi takdirde kâğıtlardan takip etmek zorunda kalacaktım. Bir kolaylaştırıcının yapması, yapmak nasıl diyeyim yapmasının iyi olduğu bir şey değil, yapmamalı yani.
45 S	What is this? I think you are recognizing Colb's learning circle of adults. David Colb.
46 I	David Colb'un yetişkinlerin öğrenme döngüsü şu anda gördüğünüz.
47 S	You have concrete experience, you have expertise. You have been

	working on standards.
48 I	Şimdi sizin somut tecrübeleriniz var. Çünkü standartlarla ilgili çalışmalar yaptınız geçmişte.
49 S	In order to be able, you to be able next week to work into fields cooking and computer assisted machine manufacturing.
50 I	Önümüzdeki hafta seçilen alanlarda, sanıyorum bilgisayar destekli makine imalatı ve…
51Participants	Aşçılık.
52 I	Aşçılık.
53 S	We are going to test on ourselves everything, whole process and through all this circle, through active experimenting to have new value, new concrete experience. That is a level higher. So this circle will turn it into spiral.
54 I	Bunlarla ilgili çalışırken yeni tecrübeler edineceğiz ve bu öğrenme döngüsü de bir döngü haline gelmiş olacak.
55 S	And maybe you…
56 Participant 2	Döngü bir spiral haline gelecek aslında diyor. Yani bir önceki şeyden daha yukarıdaki noktada olacaksınız. Spiral örneğini verdi
57 S	Going higher and higher and higher because all of us have high expectations.
58 I	Çünkü beklentilerimiz yüksek. Teşekkür ederim. Çünkü beklentilerimiz yüksek, o yüzden söylendiği gibi.
59 S	Maybe you are asking yourselves, maybe I do not know, you know for yourself why you were doing this and this. I mean writing expectations and concerns and speaking about your experience.
60 I	Beklentilerimizi yazdık, endişelerimizi yazdık ve tecrübelerinizden bahsettik.
61 S	This is not linked with dacum. Not at all. But it is linked to this, how adults are learning.
62 I	Bunlar dacum ile bağlantılı değil. Şu anda slaytta gördüğünüz şeyle, yetişkinler nasıl öğrenir konusuyla ilgili.
63 S	You need to scan expertise, experience and expectations people are

	inputting into this room or rooms you are working in.
64 I	Bu odada olduğu gibi sizin de birlikte çalışacağınız gruplar içerisinde kişilerin sahip olduğu beklentiler, uzmanlık ve tecrübelerin farkında olmanız lazım.
65 S	So you know better to adjust yourself and you consequently plan to the existing knowledge in the room.
66 I	Yani plan ve kavramları hâlihazırda var olan bilgi birikimiyle uyumlu hale getirmemiz gerekiyor.
67 S	So I think I have all necessary inputs now although we have communicated with Besim a long time about things, about how to run things.
68 I	Şu anda girdilerimiz elimizde var. Zaten Besim Beyle de daha önce nasıl ilerlememiz konusunda görüşmüştük.
69 S	Because if I speak about my learning style…
70 I	Çünkü eğer kendi öğrenme tarzımdan bahsedersem,
71 S	I learn the best when I interact with people.
72 I	Ben en iyi kişilerle etkileşim halinde olduğumda öğreniyorum
73 S	Do you know what is your preferred way of learning? What, can you reflect from yourself? Can you think for, two minutes, let's say. What is your preferred way of learning?
74 I	Şimdi bir iki dakika kendi kendimize bunun üzerinde düşünmeye çalışalım. Biz ne şekilde öğrenmeyi tercih ederiz? En iyi ne şekilde öğreniyoruz?
75 S	Maybe somebody wants to read the guidelines but afterwards test or…
76 I	Belki ilk başta kılavuz ilkeleri okuyup ondan sonra test etmek tercih ettiğiniz yöntem olabilir.
77 S	Or without reading the guidelines, put it on and test.
78 I	Belki de herhangi bir şey okumaksızın direkt test etmek.
79 Participant 3	Bizde öyle genelde, yaparak bozarak. I: That's the way we do it, trying again and again.

80 Participant 2	Biraz maliyetli ama.
81 Participant 3	Yaparak bozarak öğrenmek.
82 S	So I got the feeling now, I got the feeling. So it is it is easy to expect because adults' preferred way of learning is to cope with the things by hands, meaning also directly thinking while younger people are always looking for "give me something to read from". We are doing things differently.
83 I	Çünkü yetişkinler genelde böyle yapmayı tercih ediyor, hani kolları sıvayıp işe girişmeyi tercih ediyor. Aynı anda da düşünmeyi tercih ediyor. Ama daha hani gençlere baktığımızda hani bize okuyacak bir şeyler verin de okuyalım dediklerini görüyoruz.
84 S	The structure of this week therefore is today I will do the most of talking and you will do part of the work.
85 I	Bu nedenle bu hafta içerisinde, özellikle bugün çoğunlukla ben konuşacağım ve çalışmaların bazı kısımlarını siz yürüteceksiniz.
86 S	And for the rest of the days you will do most of the work.
87 I	Kalan günlerde ise işin çoğu sizler tarafından yürütülecek.
88 S	We will go through the whole package of orientation in the dacum phase one.
89 I	Dacum birinci aşamada tüm oryantasyon aşamaları üzerinden gideceğiz.
90 S	Starting from duties, task and job analysis, down to performance criteria assessment criteria, assessment… Going through both.
91 I	Görevlerden sonra işlemler, sonra iş analizlerinden başlayacağız. Sonra performans kriterleri, değerlendirme kriterleri şeklinde ilerleyeceğiz.
92 S	I hope it will be interesting and I won't need to stay just behind the door. You see there is the exit.
93 I	Umuyorum ki ilgi çekici bir çalışma olacak ve çıkış yazısının altında, kapıya en yakın olan yerde durmak zorunda kalmayacağım

	umuyorum ki.
94 S	Or fall asleep.
95 I	Ya da uyuyakalmayacaksınız umuyorum.
96 S	I hope that you won't be tired that much.
97 I	Umuyorum bu kadar yorgun da olmazsınız.
98 S	And therefore we are starting with dacum.
99 I	Şimdi başlayalım o zaman dacuma.
100 Prtcpnt 4	Başlayın.
101 S	Because one of your concerns was time.
102 I	Çünkü endişelerden bir tanesi de zamanın yeterli olmamasıydı.
103 S	So we won't spend time anymore. Because everything was to the sake and in the line of our aims. First to get to know each other better and then to work easier.
104 I	Bu nedenle daha fazla zaman harcamayacağız. Amaçlarımız doğrultusunda hareket edeceğiz. Birbirimizi daha iyi tanıma aşamasını geçtik. Şimdi konumuza girelim.
105 S	Things linked to the terms. What is dacum, what is dacum standing for? In different sources you will find two definitions I would say.
106 I	Şimdi terimlere bakalım. Dacum dediğimizde ne ifade ediyor? Farklı kaynaklara baktığımızda dacum'un farklı kelimelerin baş harflerinden geldiğini görebiliriz.
107 S	Some????? it is abbreviation from "developing a curriculum", other authors are saying "designing a curriculum". Bottom-line is, that is a base to do a curriculum, whatever it is developing or designing.
108 I	Şimdi İngilizce söylememiz gerekiyor. Çünkü dacum orada, bazı kaynaklarda "developing a curriculum", yani eğitim programı geliştirilmesi; bazı kaynaklarda da eğitim programı tasarlanması "designing a curriculum". Ama burada eğitim programının temelinin oluşturulmasından aslında bahsediyoruz.
109 S	Only I have a problem. This is not my definition. I use it from a source. Therefore I have a problem with this innovative. I have a problem with the word innovative.

110 I	Şimdi buradaki tanım kaynaktan almış olduğum bir tanım. Bu nedenle burada bu yenilikçi terimiyle ilgili bir takım sıkıntılarım var benim.
111 S	It is not innovative; it is more than twenty years old.
112 I	Bu yenilikçi, aslında yeni değil. Yirmi yıldan fazla süredir kullanılıyor aslında.
113 S	So it is a way to do job analysis in order to be able to do job profiling and to develop a curriculum that is meeting all expectations by employers.
114 I	İş analizleri iş analizleri yapılması, iş profillerinin çıkarılması ve işverenlerin tüm beklentilerini karşılayan bir eğitim programı ortaya koyulması için kullanılmakta.
115 S	What is in fact? That is a tool to do job analysis.
116 I	Dacum nedir dediğimizde bir araç olduğunu söyleyebiliriz. Yani iş analizi yapılabilecek bir araç.
117 S	That is how we identify knowledge, skills, attitudes or traits. Again there will be terminology issue. And on all slides that will follow, there will be attitudes slash trades, traits. Whatever it is.
118 Prtcpnt 2	Traits.
119 S	Traits yes, traits.
120 I	Şimdi terminolojiyle ilgili mutlaka sıkıntılar olacak. Şimdi ben bahsettiğimde de olacak. Birazdan, ilerleyen slaytlarda da olacak. Bununla ilgili, şimdi bunları ben söylüyorum. Beni de uyarırsanız ben de bundan sonra doğru kullanayım eğer bir yanlışlık olursa. Şimdi bilgi, yani bilginin, becerilerin, tavır ve tutumların belirlenmesi için kullanılan bir yöntem.
121 S	Because in different sources…