



Book Review

**Blasco Mayor, M.J., & del Pozo Triviño, M. (Eds.) (2015).
*Legal interpreting at a turning point / La interpretación en
el ámbito judicial en un momento de cambio – MonTI 7***

Reviewed by Jim Hlavac
Monash University, Australia
Jim.Hlavac@monash.edu

DOI: 10.12807/ti.108201.2016.r01

MonTI (*Monographs in Translation and Interpreting*) is an academic, peer-reviewed and international journal series¹ that is published by three Spanish universities with T&I programs (Universitat d'Alacant, Universitat Jaume I de Castelló and Universitat de València). MonTI has a special topic for each issue. In past years these have included 'Multidisciplinarity in Audiovisual Translation' and 'Applied Sociology in Translation'. This issue, MonTI's seventh, is the first one dedicated to legal interpreting.

A key reason for an issue to be dedicated to legal interpreting is what has happened in Europe over the last 10 years or so. Given that some contextualisation of these events is required, where opportune this review will compare the development of the discipline in some European countries to that in predominantly Anglophone countries.

In many if not most countries of continental Europe, *court interpreting*, which refers to inter-lingual transfer performed in a courtroom by a suitably qualified or trained person, has a long history. The code-law tradition of these countries, which purports to provide an exhaustive system of laws in both civil and criminal law jurisdictions, has often included specifications about which types of protagonists can appear in court in an official capacity. This meant that where court proceedings required interpretation, this was not allowed to be provided by just any person with bilingual and interpreting skills, but by an officially sanctioned practitioner, often called a *court sworn interpreter*. In Spain, the title is *traductor/a-intérprete jurado/a* ('sworn interpreter and translator'), in Germany it is *Gerichtliche/r Dolmetscher/in* ('courtroom interpreter') and in Croatia it is *sudski tumač* ('court interpreter').

Traditionally, in European countries of the code law tradition, those wishing to become 'court interpreters' possessed the following, at least as desirable attributes: demonstrated high proficiency in foreign language/s (preferably a university degree); demonstrated knowledge of domestic legal terminology and legal procedures; ability to interpret consecutively. Commonly, candidates wishing to become court interpreters must apply to the relevant country's Ministry of Justice and sit for its interpreting test. However,

¹ About MonTI, <http://dti.ua.es/es/monti-english/monti-contact.html>

² MonTI has the following objective in regard to articles not in English: "Furthermore,

while the code law tradition requires formal credentialing of protagonists in courtroom, it does not contemplate those working outside it. As a result, in many European countries, historically there have been few or no proficiency standards for non-court interpreting, and seldom if ever any formal requirement to provide an interpreter for certain key interactions such as lawyer-client, and even police-suspect or police-witness. National credentialing systems privileged one kind of situation as deserving of certain standards, and had little to say about other ones. Due to mass migration to most parts of Western Europe in the post-WWII period, coupled with increasing levels of European internal migration, the demand for interpreting services Europe-wide has increased greatly. A system which officially sanctioned interpreting in one setting, but not in others, has become untenable.

Moving outside Europe to predominantly Anglophone countries, we find the following situation in the United States. In that country, the certification of court interpreters is loosely co-ordinated by the National Association of Judiciary Interpreters and Translators (NAJIT), which is the professional body for American court interpreters and translators. Various American states have different requirements and different testing authorities that administer the test. Pre-test training is typically offered by private providers and the certification exam is offered individually by a nominated authority in each state – sometimes a university institution, sometimes a court authority, sometimes a private enterprise or agency. The contact details of each state's authority are provided by a US federal government authority: the Consortium for Language Access in the Courts (formerly the 'Consortium for State Court Interpreter Certification'). There is great variation in the training, security screening and formal testing of candidates. For example, for the year 2009 the National Center for State Courts (2009) lists four steps to certification: orientation workshop, security record check, written test and oral test. In some states, all of these four steps are required, in others only some of them (typically the written and oral tests), while in others no testing is planned or available.

In Canada, certification of 'court interpreters' is co-ordinated not by the national body, the CCTTI, but by the professional associations of the various provinces. In British Columbia, for example, the court interpreting exam consists of two components: a written component which comprises three parts (knowledge of the law and court procedures, interpreter professional practice and ethics, translation of terminology or a text); and an oral component that consists of sight translation, consecutive and simultaneous interpretation.

In the UK, a common but not mandatory qualification for court interpreters is the examination-based Diploma of Public Service Interpreting. When sitting the examination, Diploma candidates must choose one of the four thematic pathways, of which two have a legal focus (English law and Scottish law respectively). Candidates must demonstrate the ability to interpret consecutively and simultaneously (*chuchotage*), as well as perform sight translation and written translation bi-directionally.

In Australia, NAATI accreditation at the professional interpreter level is the preferred standard for court interpreting. The test at this level is still a 'generalist' one, although its consecutive interpreting component may – but not necessarily – use content related to courtroom or legal interactions.

The principle that interpreting services *must* be provided to suspects or witnesses who lack sufficient proficiency is applied clearly in some countries, in others less so. Both within and between the predominantly Anglophone countries mentioned above, there is variation in the provision for interpreter tests that include discourse derived from legal settings, and there is variation in the requirement that a person accused or suspected of an offence should be provided with access to interpreting services if s/he lacks adequate proficiency

in English. The common law tradition of these countries has meant that it has often been decisions by judges rather than legislators that have led to the principle of providing court interpreting services in criminal cases. For example, in England, it was *R v Lee Kun* [1916] 1KB337 that established the principle that a defendant should be ‘present’ in the court in the sense that s/he can understand what is being said, and can express him-/herself as well. In Australia, there is a patchwork of decisions and regulations that ‘may’ allow the use of interpreter or for an interpreter to be called ‘so far as it is reasonably practicable to do’. As Ozolins (2014, p. 409) reminds us in relation to Australia, “an increasing body of State and Commonwealth legislation recognises a right to an interpreter; however, often without enforceability provisions or penalties”. On the ground, police officers and judicial staff are now less likely to question the need for an interpreter where parties request this, or proficiency in English is limited, but legislation that clearly and comprehensively guarantees this is still lacking.

This brings us back to issue 7 of MonTI, which is devoted to *legal interpreting*, and not only to *court interpreting*. The need for a broader term becomes evident as the practice of interpreting in the legal sphere encompasses not only the courtroom, but a range of law-related settings.

An issue devoted to legal interpreting in the European context is timely due to two main reasons. The first is legislative. Over the last five years, *directives* from the European Parliament and of the Council have had a direct consequence on the right and access to interpreting in legal proceedings. (To digress briefly, the European Parliament in Strasbourg and the Council of the European Union form the main decision-making body of the EU, and together they amend and adopt laws, and co-ordinate policies. Directives passed by the European Parliament and the Council of the European Union are binding on all EU national governments, each of which is obliged to align its legislation so that the relevant directive becomes part of that country’s national legislation.) The directives of interpreting significance are the following:

Directive 2010/64/EU (of 20 Oct. 2010) on the right to interpretation and translation in criminal proceedings. (Blasco Mayor & Del Pozo, pp.43.)

“The suspect and defendant must be able to understand what is happening and make him/herself understood. The Directive ensures that suspects have the right to interpretation and translation in criminal proceedings, allowing them to fully exercise their right of defence.”)

Directive 2012/13/EU (of 22 May 2012) on the right to information in criminal proceedings. (Blasco Mayor & Del Pozo, pp.44.)

“A person, who is suspected of a crime should get information on his/her basic rights in writing, as well as information about the nature and cause of the accusation against him/her.”)

Directive 2012/29/EU (of 25 Oct. 2012) establishing minimum standards on the rights, support and protection of victims of crime, and replacing Council Framework Decision 2201/220/JHA. (Blasco Mayor & Del Pozo, pp.44)

“Member States shall ensure that victims who do not understand or speak the language of the criminal proceedings concerned are provided, upon request, with interpretation in accordance with their role in the relevant criminal justice system in criminal proceedings, free of charge, at least during any interviews or questioning of the victim during criminal proceedings before investigative and judicial authorities, including during police questioning, and interpretation for their active participation in court hearings and any necessary interim hearings”.

Directive 2013/48/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 22 October 2013. (Blasco Mayor & Del Pozo, pp.45)

(This directive addresses the “right of access to a lawyer in criminal proceedings and in European arrest warrant proceedings, and on the right to have a third party informed upon deprivation of liberty and to communicate with third persons and with consular authorities while deprived of liberty”).

The second reason why an issue devoted to legal interpreting is timely is the work of a number of large-scale and mostly EU-funded research projects that have focused on the practice, description of standards and pedagogy of legal interpreting, such as *Qualitas* – Assessing Legal Interpreting Quality through Testing and Certification (2011-2014); *Avidicus 1, 2 & 3* – Assessing Quality of Videoconference interpreting and remote interpreting for criminal proceedings (2008-2015); *Building Mutual Trust 1 & 2* - Development of Training Programme Templates for the Training of Legal Interpreters and Translators (2007-2013); and *SOS-VICS: Speak Out for Support* – Training of Gender Violence Professional Interpreters (2012-2014). Further information about these projects can be found on the European Legal Interpreters and Translators Association (EULITA) website under: <http://eulita.eu/european-projects>.

The co-authors of the volume, Maribel del Pozo Triviño (Universidade de Vigo, Spain) and María Jesús Blasco Mayor (Universidad Jaume I, Spain) open the issue with a paper entitled *Legal Interpreting in Spain at a Turning Point*. Their paper is a thorough description of how Spain – as a country that has witnessed not only an influx of migrants from North Africa, Eastern Europe and Latin America, but also a proliferation of translation and interpreting programs at university level – is addressing the needs for interpreting services in an increasingly multilingual society. What is evident in Spain is that the T&I courses in a number of universities no longer just feature the major European languages, but also address those spoken by groups of Eastern European and non-European migrants. Del Pozo Triviño and Blasco Mayor’s paper gives a detailed background to the content of the directives from the EU in relation to the provision of legal interpreting services in EU countries, and in Spain in particular.

Del Pozo Triviño and Blasco Mayor remind us that Directive 2010/64/EU sets out that interpreting is not only to be provided inside the courtroom, but “from the moment these persons are informed that they are suspected or accused of a criminal offence, up to the end of the criminal proceedings, including sentencing and ruling on appeal”. Importantly, the Directive goes beyond courtroom interaction, and specifies that interpreting should be provided for person to communicate with their legal counsel, and be provided with a written translation of essential documents.

The Directive also specifies the establishment of “a register or registers of independent translators and interpreters who are appropriately qualified”. The last two words, “appropriately qualified” alludes to the sometimes haphazard attributes displayed by those who have little or even no training, but who present themselves as ‘interpreters’, and by those who are ‘pressed into service’ to interpret. By not specifying what ‘appropriately qualified’ refers to, the Directive can hardly ameliorate, let alone solve this problem. This is a battle yet to be won.

Del Pozo Triviño and Blasco Mayor mention the traditional courtroom practice in Spain of an interpreter with a title (ie. ‘court-sworn’ interpreter) being the first-choice appointment for interpreting services, followed by a ‘teacher of the corresponding language’. At the time of publication, the Directive still had not been transposed into Spanish legislation, and del Pozo Triviño and Blasco Mayor observe the consequences of appointing any person with proficiency in both languages to be an interpreter has further undesirable consequences: a lack of an official register has coincided with a practice now

common in Spain (and well known in other countries as well) of the outsourcing of interpreter services to private agencies that bid for public tenders. The lack of a register does not compel such agencies to employ trained or tested staff, with commensurate consequences on interpreting practices and rates of pay. The authors put forward a model for an interpreter register in Spain, based on large European research projects such as *Qualitas*, and based on attribute standards that are part of the program of academic and non-academic training at the many universities in Spain that have translation and interpreting programs.

Erik Hertog (KU Leuven, Belgium) is the author of the second paper in the issue, entitled *Directive 2010/64/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council on the right to interpretation and translation in criminal proceedings: transposition strategies with regard to interpretation and translation*. The term ‘transposition’ is important as EU Directives themselves are not laws, and can only ‘become law’ or ‘transposed’ when member states pass legislation that reflects the content and intent of the Directives. Hertog provides a detailed survey of the political, social and professional features that pertain to Directive 2010/64/EU, presenting in a chronological way when and how certain procedures were discussed and finally accepted, while others were not accepted. For example, the Directive is an advance on a national ruling that required interpretation services for court rooms only, as it provides for interpreting services from the moment that a person is suspected of a crime to the last point of appeal (against an eventual conviction). And the Directive sets out that “Member States [ie. national, regional or local governments] shall meet the costs of interpretation and translation” and that a grievance procedure is available for parties “to complain that the quality of the interpretation is not sufficient to safeguard the fairness of the proceedings”. But the Directive does not apply to post-trial situations (such as probation or prison) and it does not apply to minor offences that may be settled out of court. Hertog’s article goes on to talk about not only transposition, but also specialist training, remote interpreting via video, the establishment of national registers, and co-operation with executive powers and the judiciary.

Ann Corsellis (CioL, UK) in a paper entitled, *Strategies for Progress: Looking for Firm Ground*, states that “an international consistency of basic standards and approaches is needed” (p. 104) and speaks from experience in her work for previous major EU projects on legal interpreting. Corsellis advocates three circumstances for long-term improvement: a critical mass of qualified competent legal interpreters; awareness and strong support for legal interpreters from front-line public services; and robust academic research.

Melissa Wallace (University of Texas at San Antonio, USA) in her article *Resisting market disorder and ensuring public trust: reimagining national registers for legal interpreters in the United States and the European Union*, puts forward the proposal for a register in the US. In her survey of spoken-language rosters of court and legal interpreters in the US, Wallace finds that “28 states or territories have no publicly searchable lists or databases of court interpreters. Of those that do, 11 have electronic searchable databases and 16 have lists...” (p. 124). While individual courts may have lists, “there is no comprehensive database which marries the information available on individual state courts’ websites”. Wallace advocates that national registers are vital for an improvement in standards and recognition, and that such a register should distinguish level of certification, qualification levels, and experience.

The fifth article is from Jasmina Tatar Andjelic (University of Montenegro, Montenegro), entitled *Legal interpreting in Montenegro in view of its EU accession: diagnosis and proposals of necessary modifications* [in

French] ². Tatar Andjelic reports that in Montenegro there is already legislation that is congruent to the content of Directive 2010/64/EU. A problem that exists in Montenegro is terminological: although Montenegrin distinguishes explicitly between *tumač* ('interpreter'), *tumačenje* ('interpreting'), *prevodilac* ('translator'), and *prevodjenje* ('translation'), the latter two terms are widely used as the generic descriptors for both types of agent/activity. As a result, this leads to a cumbersome and periphrastic distinction made between *usmeno prevodjenje* ('oral translation') and *pismeno prevodjenje* ('written translation'). Tatar Andjelic advocates *tumač* ('interpreter') and *tumačenje* ('interpreting') as the standard forms to be used to refer to spoken- and signed-language interpreting. Tatar Andjelic also talks about training opportunities, quality control and the establishment of a representative professional association.

Sandra Hale (University of New South Wales, Australia) is the author of an article entitled, *Approaching the bench: teaching magistrates and judges how to work effectively with interpreters*. In this article, Hale describes the contents and structure of a workshop designed and delivered by her to Australian magistrates, judges and tribunal members on how to work effectively with interpreters. Hale has developed this workshop as a very effective and successful means to effect change both in attitudes and in procedures amongst the judiciary in New South Wales. It is but one aspect of her efforts toward fostering an improved understanding of legal and courtroom interpreting, and assisting the judiciary and legal/court interpreters to work more effectively together. Evidence of this is the 97-page *Interpreter Policies, Practices and Protocols in Australian Courts and Tribunals: A National Survey*, published in 2011 by the Australasian Institute of Judicial Administration Incorporated, as well as various guidelines that Hale has prepared for different occupational groups – lawyers, magistrates and judges – who work with interpreters in legal settings.

Hale is frank and generous in sharing with us the contents of these workshops that she has been conducting for over 10 years. Hale employs inter-subjectivity as a pedagogical tool in these workshops, where she elicits responses from magistrates and judges, e.g. "What do you expect from interpreters?" and "How have those expectations been met in your experience?" and provides participants with how interpreters see things and how they work. While it is clear to qualified interpreters what the differences are between the locutionary and illocutionary force of an utterance, it is another thing to convey this to non-interpreters. Hale familiarises court participants with linguistic theory, and using real-life examples she explains how we can conceptualise language as consisting of three levels: word, sentence, and discourse. Explanation of this in a model, supported by practical instances, addresses the oft-heard direction from judges that interpreters "should just provide a word-for-word translation" of what is said in the courtroom. Her workshop also deals with the notion of 'accuracy', and participants are provided with brief guidelines to take with them and use in court. Hale's article reminds us of the importance of contact with professionals in effecting change. The professionals that interpreters work with are themselves commonly highly skilled, and workshops on interpreting provided for them need to be relevant, well planned and attuned to understanding their perspective. Hale's paper provides an excellent model for those who may be planning workshops with members of the judiciary or with other professional groups.

² MonTI has the following objective in regard to articles not in English: "Furthermore, an attempt will be made to provide an English-language translation of all articles not submitted in this language."

Claudia Angelelli (Heriot-Watt University, UK) provides a contribution based on empirical data, and entitled *Justice for all? Issues faced by linguistic minorities and border patrol agents during interpreted arraignment interviews*. Angelelli's paper centres on a real-life interaction involving two English-speaking border patrol agents and a Spanish-speaking detainee, who had been caught with methamphetamines. The interaction is noteworthy as it was on the basis of what occurred at this interview that the detainee was given a prison sentence, a decision that was later reversed following an appeal lodged by the Public Defender. The performance of the interpreter, as the title of Angelelli's paper suggests, plays a role in these events.

The setting for this interaction is the US-Mexican border at Tijuana (Mexico) and San Ysidro (US) – the Western Hemisphere's busiest border crossing, between the world's largest (predominantly) Anglophone country and the world's largest Hispanophone country. It has been the policy of the US Border Patrol that its agents on the US-Mexican border are required to acquire proficiency in Spanish, but, as Angelelli points out, the US Department of Homeland Security is unable to offer information on actual proficiency levels amongst border officers. Angelelli provides us with another staggering piece of information: the Tijuana-San Ysidro border crossing has no on-site or in-house Spanish-English interpreters. This is a loud reminder of how inadequately US federal (and state) authorities address interpreting and translation needs. When inter-lingual transfer is required, the services of a telephone interpreting provider are used.

Angelelli employs an easy-to-follow conversationalist analysis approach in presenting the data. She finds that while it is not the duty of an interpreter to determine the structure of an arraignment interview, the transcripts show that not only does the interpreter produce distortions, misinterpretations and omissions, but is also unable to pick up obvious discourse cues that are common in such investigative interviews. Further, the interpreter sometimes interrupts and even hinders communication, so that "almost thirty minutes into the interview and over a hundred and fifty turns of talk the special agents are still seeking the answer to a yes/no question". Angelelli is careful not to blame the interpreter personally, but to point out the grave shortcomings of a system that relies on providers or agencies that employ bilinguals who are untrained and/or untested in interpreting. This, in itself, is a situation that calls for immediate action. Further, as pointed out by the author, this can greatly hinder a judicial system from achieving its supposedly central goal: administering and serving justice.

Adela Ortiz Soriano (University Jaume I, Spain) presents an article entitled *Impartiality in police interpreting* [in Spanish]. Her paper focuses on impartiality as a theoretical postulate and ethical principle, as well as a 'practical' feature evident in five (Spanish-French) interpreted interactions that took place at police stations. Her findings indicate that interpreters often perceive a mismatch between impartiality as a principle, and how they seek to maintain it in practice.

Eva Ng (University of Hong Kong) in her paper, *Teaching and research on legal interpreting: a Hong Kong perspective*, presents the situation of court interpreting in Hong Kong. Since Hong Kong's return to China in 1997, English has remained the dominant court language and the need for English-Cantonese interpreting to serve Cantonese-dominant interlocutors is enormous. Cantonese-English court interpreting has a long history in Hong Kong, and there is a solid infrastructure in the provision of interpreting services for this language pair: 150 Cantonese-English interpreters who are full-time, in-house interpreters with civil servant status, appointed by the Court Language Section of the Judiciary of Hong Kong. There is also a career

path with four rankings ranging from ‘Chief Court Interpreter’ down to ‘Court Interpreter II’.

An audio system that records court proceedings has been in operation in Hong Kong since the 1990s, and is widely used, amongst other things, to perform checks in instances where parties question or challenge an interpretation. Known as the Digital Audio Recording and Transcription System (DARTS), it also serves as an invaluable research and pedagogical resource from which real-life data can be analysed and presented to trainees as examples of good (or not so good) practice.

I will return to this resource later, but there several other features of the Hong Kong setting that deserve separate attention. In most countries in which legal/court interpreting has been researched (e.g. Australia, Austria, Sweden), samples are based on interpreting that is provided to speakers of minority languages (usually migrants) who lack sufficient proficiency in the majority or socially-dominant language of the country that they now live in. The situation of the Cantonese-English interpreters is vastly different. Most of those present in court proceedings have proficiency in both languages, and interpretations are provided for (and followed by) not only one individual such as a witness or a suspect, but by almost all those present in the courtroom, whether they are addressees (direct recipients, e.g. the suspect), auditors (known and ratified listeners, e.g. prosecutor, defence lawyer) or overhearers (members of the public gallery) (cf. Bell, 1984). Ng states that:

[i]n the Hong Kong courtroom, if the examination of a witness is mediated by an interpreter, a bilingual counsel does not listen only to the interpreter’s rendition into English, but can also overhear the interpreter’s rendition of counsel’s question into Cantonese (p. 251).

The proverbial directness of Hongkongers can lead to situations such as the following:

On one occasion, a magistrate fluent both in Cantonese and English said in open court that his interpreter’s poor interpretation “could rob the defendant of a fair trial”. The magistrate’s remarks reduced the court interpreter to tears and as a result the magistrate had to order a five-minute break for the interpreter to “collect herself”, but she was too upset to continue and had to be replaced (p. 247).

The situation of Hong Kong courtrooms, with the large number of bilinguals and a complicated notion of recipientship or audienceship for interpretations, is one that justifies a revised approach in the training of interpreters who will work in this language pair, in courtroom settings. Ng’s data set, derived from DARTS recordings, shows instances of clarifications between the interpreter and the (monolingual English-speaking) judge, interpretations being interrupted by a judge or counsel, the use and suitability of *chuchotage* for one party only when many others can and do ‘listen in’. Apart from being a tremendous pedagogical resource for modelling examples of interpreting practice, the DARTS recordings can sensitise students to the possibility of being challenged by bilingual participants in court proceedings and ways to cope with these challenges. Ng identifies the need for team interpreting to avoid the problem of fatigue that can be the cause of some misinterpretations, and the installation of technology to facilitate simultaneous interpreting to a wider number of recipients.

Beyond this, a challenge for court-interpreting services in Hong Kong will be to replicate such services for residents who are speakers of other languages – e.g. Tagalog, Malay, Indonesian, Mandarin, Punjabi, Tamil, Gujarati, Sindh – but lack sufficient proficiency in Cantonese or English.

In the last article, Ineke Crezee, Jo Anna Burn and Nidar Gailani (Auckland University of Technology, New Zealand) present a paper entitled *Authentic audiovisual resources to actualise legal interpreting education*. Crezee et al. contextualise the setting in which their resources are employed: New Zealand, a Common Law country, with an adversarial system that in criminal proceedings features defence and prosecution lawyers attempting to convince the fact-finder (judge, jury) of the veracity of their version of events. Crezee et al. preface their interest in authentic audio-visual material from courtrooms, with an observation made by others that “carefully chosen questions are often not interpreted accurately in court. This may be because the interpreter fails to divine the subtleties of the question’s pragmatic intent, or simply lacks the linguistic skills to render an accurate interpretation” (pp. 273-274).

The focus of Crezee et al.’s paper is the evaluation of video-clips of real-life courtroom interactions as a pedagogical resource that is beneficial to learners’ understanding of courtroom discourse in general, and specifically to their ability to interpret the speech of the main courtroom ‘players’, namely prosecution and defence lawyers. At present, there is no requirement for interpreters working in the New Zealand courts to undergo formal registration or training. The Ministry of Justice prioritises court interpreting assignments to those interpreters who have registration (full or affiliate) with the New Zealand Society of Translators and Interpreters (NZSTI). This shows that the judiciary is interested in selecting interpreters with some demonstrated level of standard ahead of those without any, but the incidence of unregistered and untrained interpreters working in courts remains.

Crezee et al.’s paper is based on data from a sample of student respondents who are halfway through a university-level, NZSTI-approved interpreting course. The course is ‘language natural’, meaning that students who possess English and one of a variety of other languages all use the same English-language materials together for interpretation into their other language. The use of authentic video-taped clips of courtroom proceedings as a teaching resource will be of interest to many interpreter trainers, and so I provide here the details of how these were used in class: 1) identification of publicly available audiovisual clips of courtroom interaction; 2) transcription of clips and conversion of them from YouTube postings into mp4 files; 3) insertion of pauses and blank screens into the resulting mp4 files to allow students to interpret in the blanks; 4) uploading of the files onto an online learning system; 5) files accessed by students, who add their interpretations between speech segments and upload them on the online management system; 6) feedback on student interpreter performance supplied by language-specific assessors. The sample for the research paper is based on 14 student respondents who completed *pre-intervention* surveys to elicit their responses on their general awareness of the specific nature of courtroom language, and secondly, whether they considered authentic examples of courtroom language to be an important resource. The same student respondents filled out *post-intervention* surveys to see how their views differed after the exercise.

Perhaps unsurprisingly, the responses *before* the exercise showed very high ratings for the importance of authentic materials, and a fairly low awareness of what the specific features of courtroom discourse are. After the exercise, ratings for the importance of authentic materials remained similarly high, while responses on the awareness of courtroom discourse were greatly elevated, and in general, the perceived ‘helpfulness’ of the exercise was also positive. Some responses indicated that students would have liked more briefing on the circumstances of the trial, charges and protagonists etc. These were not provided intentionally, because the provision of a pre-trial brief does

not correspond to the real or ‘authentic’ situation faced by court interpreters in New Zealand – interestingly, and alarmingly, Crezee et al. report that “New Zealand court interpreters never receive any information about the case they are about to interpret for, as this is prohibited by law” (p. 289). Exposure to and structured interpreting of authentic speech samples from a legal setting is a worthwhile pedagogic practice, particular for those interpreters who will work in Anglophone countries that have the Common Law system. In the interpreting classroom the author of this review has used materials from New Zealand, such as videotaped courtroom excerpts from the David Bain murder trial, and students have responded positively to source speech that is both ‘real-life’ and different to that of their instructors.

Overall, this issue of *MonTI* contains a selection of relevant and engaging papers that advance our body of knowledge on legal interpreting.

References

- Bell, A. (1994). Language style as audience design. *Language in Society*, 13(2), 145-204.
- Hale, S. (2011). *Interpreter policies, practices and protocols in Australian courts and tribunals: A national survey*. Melbourne: The Australasian Institute of Judicial Administration Incorporated. Retrieved from <http://aija.org.au/online/Pub%20no89.pdf>
- National Center for State Courts 2009. *Consortium for state interpreter certification. Survey: Certification requirements 2009*. Retrieved from http://www.ncsconline.org/D_Research/CourtInterp/Res_CtInte_ConsortCertRqmntsSurvey2009.pdf
- Ozolins, U. (2014). Social workers, the law and interpreters. In S. Rice & A. Day (Eds.), *Social work in the shadow of the law* (4th ed.) (pp. 406-423). Sydney: Federation Press.