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*Hanne Skaaden* har via en nätbaserad fokusgruppintervju samlat in erfarenheter från assisterande lärare, en slags grupperade, som arbetar inom tolkutbildningen vid Høgskolen i Oslo og Akershus. Denna är uppbyggd som distansutbildning och grupperna arbetar också delvis nätbaserat med att stötta och vägleda tolkstudenterna. Antalet studenter på kursen är ca 80 och varje studiegrupp består av 12-14 deltagare från 2-3 olika språkgrupper. Kursens grundläggande pedagogiska idé är att det studentaktiva lärandet. Studenterna ska lära sig tolkning genom att producera tolkning, observera tolkning och reflektera kring tolkning. Skaadens bidrag visar att basgrupperna i princip var positiva till kursens uppläggning, samtidigt som de beskriver flera svårigheter med den. Ett tema som gav många kommentarer handlade om hur man bemöter studenters förväntningar på att lärare ska kunna leverera ”de rätta svaren”, när en viktig del av undervisningen
gör ut på att förmedla att det inte finns ett rätt förhållningssätt samt stimulera studenternas förmåga att identifiera och resonera kring möjliga, rimliga lösningar.
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Det sjätte bidraget tar avstamp i kursen Teori och metod för tolklärrare, den hittills ända tolklärrarutbildning på högskolenivå som bedrivits i Sverige. Texten bygger på en fokusgruppsundersökning, som Birgitta Englund Dimitrova och undertecknad gjorde, för att få en inblick i vilka avtryck denna kurs lämnat hos kursdeltagare, framför allt hos dem som är eller varit verksamma tolklärrare. En central fråga gällde i vilken mån deltagarna uppfattade sig som del av en stor tolkgemenskap, eller om de snarare såg sig som företrädare för en speciell bransch bland andra tolkbranscher. Tolklärrarnas svar kan tolkas som att kursen gjorde dem medvetna, eller förstärkte
deras medvetenhet om likheter inom den stora tolkgemenskapen, samtidigt som de utvecklade idéer, inriktade på undervisning i sina respektive undergrupper. Många var entydigt positiva till sitt deltagande i en gemensam kurs för tolklärare med erfarenheter från olika praktiker och utbildningssystem. Samtidigt, kunde vi konstatera, hade de kontakter som knöt via den gemensamma kursen inte odlats i någon större utsträckning i det egna arbetet. Detta, tror vi, kan förklaras av praktiska och strukturella omständigheter. I den mån kontakter mellan tolkutbildare inom olika verksamheter (högskola och folkhögskola; talade språk och teckenspråk) etablerats, har detta skett och upprätthållits helt på informella grunder.
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In the spring of 2011, interpreter trainers from Denmark, Finland, Norway and Sweden met in Oslo for a meeting on interpreter education and testing. A selection of presentations held on that occasion can be found in a report published by the University College in Oslo og Akershus (Skaaden et al, 2012). This was the first in a series of Nordic meetings devoted to public service interpreting. The following year, representatives of the Nordic interpreter trainers’ network gathered for a second meeting. The theme this time was *Training the trainers* and the meeting took place in Stockholm. The six contributions in this report reflect both current and past experience of interpreter teacher training in the Nordic countries. All contributions except for one, which has an English abstract, are written in English. Each of them has a title page of its own, where the name(s) of the author(s) and their affiliation(s) is available.
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Abstract
The article briefly outlines an experiential-dialogic approach to the organization of interpreting exercises. Parallel exercise groups are coached by a number of facilitators to structure observations and peer feedback. The aim here is to explore the facilitators’ reflections on the pedagogical approach, their own roles, group dynamics and student motivations as they discuss their experiences in online focus groups via synchronous chat. The qualitative analysis of the chat discourse shows that although the facilitators embrace the approach, they also experience challenges e.g., by students’ requests for “set answers” and in eliciting feedback that balances students’ self-perception against performance.

Introduction
Suppose you organize interpreter training and rely on several assistant teachers to facilitate parallel interpreting exercises. The learning aim of the exercises is for the students to improve their skills in rendering and coordinating others’ speech during the consecutive interpreting of dialogues. The facilitators leading the exercises are trained interpreters. Their pedagogical training and former teaching experiences vary, however. Background variation is, moreover, a common denominator in the student group in terms of age, previous education and work experience. Some students have practiced as interpreters for several years prior to entering the course, while others are novices at the interpreter function. What pedagogical approach should you choose in order to meet with variation and the students’ need to improve skills? How can you inspire the facilitators to follow a path that leads parallel exercise groups towards a common goal, i.e., the students’ improved strategies in interpreting?

I address these questions, first, by contextualizing the pedagogical approach chosen. Subsequently, the qualitative analysis explores the facilitators’ discourse where they reflect upon their experiences in online focus groups.
The pedagogical approach

A recurrent topic in the training of interpreters is, as Gentile (1995) points out, the integration of theory and practice, or how to organize learning activities that prepare interpreter students for the exercise of discretion in their future practice. The learning aim of our exercises is that the students develop strategies to handle bilingual-translational and relational-coordinating challenges in the interpretation of dialogues. Hence, the aim is to master know-how rather than know-that (Schön 1987:22). The interpreter function is here akin to traditional professions, in that the interpreter must apply knowledge in a multitude of situations, each unique, although they may resemble each other in type. The acquisition of know-how, Schön (1987: 14) emphasizes, involves “how to make decisions under conditions of uncertainty” and this requires “reflection in action”. Therefore, the skills of navigating the “indeterminate zones of practice” cannot be taught, but must be coached (ibid. p. 17). He emphasizes the importance of observation accompanied by reflective dialogue in the acquisition of skills (ibid. p. 18ff). Similarly, Billett (2010) illustrates that learning through observation has proven an effective method in the acquisition of skills in different cultures throughout time.

The pedagogical approach chosen for our course is inspired by models of learning where student involvement is seen as a main vehicle in learning. More specifically, in experiential learning, a basic idea is that students should make their own discoveries firsthand, rather than hear or read about the teacher’s experiences (Kolb 1984: 20ff). Furthermore, the experiences must be observed and reflected upon. Hence, the idea is to organize (1) student activities that (2) create concrete experiences, to be (3) observed and (4) jointly reflected upon. In terms of student involvement, the current approach shares resemblance with models of cooperative learning (e.g., Johnson & Johnson, 1990) or collaborative knowledge building (Driscoll, 2000). Such models accentuate that a group of students can capitalize on each other’s resources and skills. Unlike individual learning models, which can be competitive, the aim is to engage the students in cooperatively considering solutions. In sum, an experiential-dialogic approach regards the students and their experiences as a main resource in the learning process. Hence, the teacher’s task is to encourage and elicit students’ reflections over their experiences and inspire students’ interactivity in their knowledge building. The teacher should provide the right question rather than the answer. Accordingly, the approach has implications for our construal of the teacher role. It opposes an image of the ‘teacher’ as holder of the “set answer”, which is for the students to detect in an Initiative-Response-Evaluation pattern, that includes the teacher’s praise or disapproval according to the students’ suc-

1The reference to Kolb’s model is here made in terms of a way to organize classroom activities, without adhering to its theoretical claims as to how learning takes place. Kolb (1984) builds on the works of John Dewey (as does Schön) and Kurt Lewin (Kolb 1984: 21).
cess in producing the set answer.

Advocates of a constructivist approach to learning, moreover, regard dialogue as an important path to knowledge, in that interaction and the negotiation of meaning are believed necessary for the construction of knowledge to occur (Gee & Green, 1998: 127ff). The value of collaborative knowledge building is emphasized in online learning, where a teacher’s monologue or “lecture” quickly becomes boring (Palloff & Pratt, 2001: 43, cf. Osman & Herring, 2007). Concerned with online learning environments, Palloff & Pratt (2001: 88), emphasize the importance of posing open-ended questions that “relate to their lives” to create student involvement and interaction. In a study of teacher interventions in on-site math classes Chiu (2004) shows that commands statistically have less effect on students’ problem solving efficiency than do interventions of “low level help” or open-ended questions. He suggests that “questions engage an audience more than statements do [...] and are less intrusive than commands, which involve demands on audience members to engage in specific actions.” (ibid., p. 367).

Particular characteristics of the current context support the choice of an experiential-dialogic approach. First, the learning aim is to acquire know-how or skills. Yet, in the course, each student’s time for practice is restricted. Secondly, the course is introductory and the students are not ready to automatize strategies into procedural knowledge, e.g., through repetitive laboratory exercises. They are rather in a phase of detecting what alternatives there are, and their consequences. Finally, the approach suits the target group, who are adult learners with a variety of experiences for the group to capitalize on. The facilitator’s task is to organize the role-play exercises and elicit peer feedback on the performance in the following reflection phase. What are the facilitators’ reflections on the pedagogical approach chosen, on the teacher/facilitator role, on group dynamics and student motivation? How do they adapt to the approach, and what challenges do they experience?

**The exercises**

The course in question is a one-year introductory course on the consecutive interpreting of institutional dialogues. The course is part-time (30 ECTS over one year) and has run at Oslo and Akershus University College (HIOA) since 2007, after a pilot (2004-2005) at the University of Oslo (Skaaden & Wattne, 2009; Skaaden, 2012). Each year class covers 8-10 working languages. Approximately 80 students are admitted each year. Hence, the exercises are organized in groups of 12-14 students from 2-3 language groups. A majority of the students are adult migrants to Norway. Their average age is 35-40. To enter the course all students must pass a bilingual aptitude test (Skaaden 2013). An exception is made for students who already passed a
more extensive accreditation test for interpreters, the NICE test (cf. Mortensen 2012). The course is online-based with five on-campus meets to allow for practical exercise. It is the coaching of the practical exercises that receives attention here.

The facilitators leading the exercise groups are trained interpreters. Some have previous pedagogical education and teaching experience, but not all. The team has a core of group leaders experienced within the current model. However, with 7 parallel groups, new members join the team from time to time. In some classes the group leaders are assisted by bilingual coaches proficient in the specific working languages. The latter also work with the students on bilingual sensitivity and context knowledge in language specific groups. New “bilingual facilitators” join every year, since the languages admitted to the course change.

In order to guide the facilitators in their coaching, several measures are taken. Firstly, the pedagogical approach is outlined and discussed in a kick-off seminar before the first student gathering. Secondly, during each student gathering, follow up meetings are organized where the facilitators discuss their experiences with the approach, time management, group dynamics, etc. Thirdly, the facilitators are provided with a brief guideline including a set of “focus points” for the elicitation of student observations related to the role-plays. The guidelines indicate aspects to draw attention to progressively throughout the gatherings, e.g., the interpreter’s rendition of pronouns; semantic and pragmatic accuracy in terminology, linguistic registers and distinctions; the interpreter’s turn-taking and coordinating strategies; pronunciation in both languages; introduction of the interpreter’s role; etc. Fourth, the facilitators are encouraged to elicit the students’ reflections on what they observe by posing open-ended questions that draw attention to aspects of the performance. Each exercise is, moreover, filmed. Hence, the student who plays the interpreter role can later view his own performance via the online learning platform. Finally, the facilitators have access to an online “staff room”, including an asynchronous forum channel and a chat room. Synchronous text-only chat sessions with group facilitators are organized between campus gatherings.

The below analysis is based on the discourse of three such sessions, each lasting 60-90 minutes and including 5-8 facilitators in addition to the author serving as moderator. The sessions relate to three different year groups of students. Session A took place between the 1st and 2nd student gathering (i.e., mid-February), and sessions B and C between the 3rd and 4th student gathering (i.e., mid-August). The facilitators of interpreting exercises took part in sessions A and B, while the bilingual facilitators took part in session C. An experiential-dialogic approach was applied also in the facilitators’ chats. Hence, the author served as moderator by posing open-ended questions, and opening the floor for topics from the group: “I have prepared
some topics for discussion in the form of questions, but feel free to address other topics as well. …”. The logs from these polylogues were later analyzed in terms of topical episodes or strings of responses where more postings elaborate on the same issue. In online discourse adjacency pairs may appear several postings apart (Holmer, 2008). For the sake of clarity, intermediate postings are omitted in the below renditions. Moreover, all chats were conducted in Norwegian. For the sake of brevity, only English translations of the logs are rendered here. The qualitative analysis pays particular attention to topics that earned attention across groups and were addressed by more participants. Recurrent topics are the facilitators’ reflections on own role, on group dynamics and student motivation. The topic of “focus points” was introduced by the moderator in all groups.

Sharing experiences on the approach

With the aim to release peer feedback and involve the group, the facilitators are encouraged to structure student reflections by posing open-ended questions, e.g., *How was the interpreter’s pronoun choice?*; *What about the register choice?*; *What happened/may happen when …?*; *What alternatives did the interpreter have when…?*; *What may be the consequences if…?* The questions should draw attention to selected aspects of the performance just observed, and preferably follow the progression indicated by the “focus points”. Next, we explore how the facilitators experience this strategy of intervention.

**Feedback and the facilitator role**

The pedagogical approach is outlined for the students both online and during their first gathering. Hence, they are made aware of their responsibility for own learning and that student involvement is considered a main path to learning. Initially students sometimes express frustration with the approach. For instance, comments like “Why do you [the teacher] always answer a question with a question?” or “What does the teacher get paid for here?” mirror expectations of a more traditional teacher role as provider of the “set answer”. This image of the teacher is mirrored in the facilitator’s posting in (1):

(1)
Facilitator: “In my group they often expect me to tell them the correct answer, so I try to have them think about alternatives”

The facilitator in (1) describes how she deals with the challenge. However, not only students but even some facilitators, initially display a “traditional image” of the teacher role, as illustrated by the
forum postings in (2):

(2)
Facilitator: “The main challenge for me was to pose open-ended questions and not always provide the answer.”

Facilitator: “Myself [when a student] I found it frustrating when group leaders just passed the ball back, so I tried to create constructive reflections, and felt that I succeeded”

Both postings in (2) are made by novice facilitators in the beginning of the year. Although skeptics (both students and facilitators) soon come to appreciate the pedagogical model, the set answer issue is discussed well into the course. An illustration is found in excerpt (3) from the discourse of seven bilingual facilitators working with different language groups on bilingual context knowledge and terminology:

(3)
1. FacilC1 18:20> I still think the ”set answer” issues are
2. FacilC1 18:20> very interesting
3. FacilC2 18:21> Yeah, I guess we all have some “Besserwissers” and if the rest just accepts what this one suggests, I would like to challenge the solution
4. FacilC3 18:22> the “set answers” are killers, I feel. Then I ask the students to explicate the context or place the concepts in concrete sentences or contexts.
5. FacilC4 18:22> great idea from FacilC3 :-)
6. FacilC5 18:22> All my students believe they’ve got the “set” answer. Heated discussions arise.
7. FacilC6 18:23> I don’t quite agree about the set answers. Do students who know the answer just like sit and be quiet, for the others to stumble over it or elaborate towards it? Some concepts are simple and quite unambiguous, and then it is better to settle on them quickly, with a set answer. Thus, we are left with time to discuss thoroughly the really difficult ones, or those where there are no perfect solutions at all
8. FacilC6 18:24> because there are concepts where good solutions simply don’t exist
9. FacilC1 18:25> Or that the solution is different in different contexts. We had that discussion, and some of them thought you ALWAYS had to use the same concept once it had been chosen [by the group]...
10. FacilC3 18:25> we have often “prioritized” in the group between the bad and the worst solutions and then discussed the consequences of their application.

11. FacilC7 18:25> FacilC3, great strategy!

The discourse in (3) reveals that the facilitators may have different attitudes towards teacher intervention. As posting 3 indicates, facilitators may wish to “challenge” a student they believe to be wrong. The suggestion in posting 4, “to ask the students to explicate”, illustrates how such situations can be dealt with in a nonintrusive way and without “extinguishing” student involvement. Posting 6, moreover, designates that students’ discussions must be expected and accepted. Why discussions should be encouraged is substantiated in posting 8-9. It illustrates that the “set answer” may vary depending on the context – a type of knowledge that is in itself a useful asset in an interpreter’s competence.

Posting 3’s comment “we all have some ‘Besserwissers’ ['wise-guys’], and if the rest just accepts what this one suggests”, possibly points to a weakness in the approach. If a “strong” student is wrong, the whole group may settle for an incorrect solution to a problem. The observations in 7 point to another possible weakness, linked to the fact that the more dominant member of a group is not necessarily the most knowledgeable. On the other hand, in a discussion on bilingual context knowledge the group as a whole is bound to be more knowledgeable than the individual, simply due to the sum of their experiences. The facilitator, an individual, thus stands to risk his own authority if he settles for a “set answer” that is proven insufficient by the group. The set answer issue is clearly linked to power relations. Discussions over the set answer issue are more prominent among the bilingual facilitators who assist the students’ work on bilingual terminology and context knowledge. However, the issue surfaces in discussions among facilitators of the interpreting exercise groups as well. This is illustrated in (4), which is a direct response to excerpt (1) above:

(4)
FacilA1 20:31> the students often ask for the set answer, but then I return the question to the group by asking them to think of alternative solutions. Often I ask whether they have encountered a similar challenge earlier, and how they then solved it

The discussions in all facilitator groups indicate that the set answer issue is closely linked to group dynamics and student motivation – an explicit topic of the next exchanges in (5)-(7).
Group dynamics and student motivation

A common denominator for the student group is variation along several parameters. While some students have practiced as interpreters for years, and some have even passed an extensive accreditation test for interpreters, others have never worked as an interpreter prior to entering the course. Logically, the more experienced may gain authority in the group. At the same time, these students may have a difficult journey towards new know-how – or changing old routines – and may lack motivation. A problem for the group and its coach may arise if the more experienced student dominates, even though his confidence is not consistent with his actual performance. How to elicit feedback that may adjust self-perception is the topic introduced in (5):

(5)

1. FacilB1 20:10> Any suggestions as to how one may balance reality perceptions, optimism, pessimism?
2. Hanne 20:10> you mean as in a student’s self-perception after the exercise?
3. FacilB2 20:10> Yes
4. FacilB3 20:11> we have to supply what is lacking – i.e., if there is a lot of pessimism with optimism etc. … this is a zen question
5. FacilB4 20:11> When it comes to pessimism you might perhaps try to disentangle the concrete reasons behind it and ask for suggestions on how to improve.
6. FacilB5 20:12 > a difficult one, frequently the student who had the interpreter role [in the role play] will want to defend himself or herself, while the observers can see all that went wrong, or the opposite, «everything was great», when nearly nothing was

The facilitator’s reluctance to provide the set answer does of course not imply that the students should be deprived of proper feedback on their performance. The aim is to elicit appropriate feedback from the peer group, thus making the whole group “owners” of the alternative choices and the reflections over these choices’ consequences. As posting 6 indicates, stating that “everything was great” is not necessarily useful feedback for the learner. In such situations the facilitators are to elicit or “disentangle” more specific feedback, as suggested in posting 5, e.g., by follow-ups to balance confidence against performance. The topic of self-perception is also discussed in group A in an exchange that lasts for several minutes as witnessed in excerpts (6) - (7).
1. FacilA4 20:31> Can I ask the rest about how you handle a heterogeneous group? Sometimes there are students who complain about having to take the course just to advance in the [practicing interpreters’ National] register, while they see themselves as knowing it all already...

2. FacilA3 20:32> the thing about a heterogeneous group is a challenge. I have met the same type of problem as FacilA4 mentions

3. FacilA2 20:33> but they should be brought down to earth. The problem is not the group’s heterogeneity, but that some totally lack self-insight…?

4. FacilaA3 20:34> there is sometimes great variation, from too little self-confidence to the “world champion”, that is normal.

5. FacilA1 20:35> again it is a question of balance, and for us to make sure that certain people do not take up “too much space”

As indicated in posting 2 the challenge is not the group’s heterogeneity, it is rather how to elicit feedback that may help balance self-perception against performance. The topic is followed up in (7) from a different angle.

(7)

1. Hanne 20:54> it might be difficult to digest critique on the spot. How often does it happen that a student argues in favour of the solution he chose – even if it turned out not to be such a great solution?

2. FacilA3 20:54> It might be nice if they write down the feedback from their fellow students, instead of defending themselves. That way they may afterwards view their recording, and check against the feedback

3. FacilA2 20:55> I believe it is more fruitful to try and defend your own choice than to surrender and display low self-esteem. Low self-esteem is often general, not specific, while attempts to explicate your choices tend to be more specific. Hence, it turns into a fruitful discussion

In posting 3 the facilitator makes an important observation of the value in defending a choice, be it good or bad. Such defence may result in concretizations that promote the individual’s and group’s awareness of a solutions’ consequences.

The question of whether you may at all learn from observation is from time to time raised in relation to the current approach, e.g., through statements that the students should be allowed more time to “actually” exercise. The issue is introduced in (8):
1. Hanne 20:49> Recently, I attended a lecture by Stephen Billett on “apprenticeship” and how we learn through observation. What is interesting for us, though, is how one may learn from someone else’s mistakes. To what degree do you see this happening in the groups?

2. FacilA3 20:49> It happens to a high degree, I feel.

3. FacilA3 20:49> I believe in this method

4. FacilA2 20:49> I believe everyone does – both the novice and the experienced, because it is limited how much interpreting even the experienced ones have actually observed – so observing others is a way of observing variations of yourself

5. FacilA120:50> I believe it is the mistakes, and the following discussions they learn from.

6. FacilA3 20:50> And they are not used to getting feedback from someone who is able to “control” what has been rendered and how. But they learn from it.

7. FacilA120:51> I believe most of them experience some epiphanies

8. FacilA3 20:51> Quite a lot of things tend to sink in little by little, even though they may not express it there and then

9. FacilA120:52> I believe most of them get the feedback once they come home and watch their own film in the peace and quiet

10. Hanne 20:52> I was just thinking the same

11. FacilA2 20:53> agree, you see yourself in light of what has been discussed

The facilitators are in agreement that the observations and following reflections are meaningful, and express belief that the approach contributes to the students’ learning. Whether the students do learn, is not a question that can be answered by the current data. The aim here is rather to explore how the approach may create potential for learning. Feedback from students supports the facilitators’ impression that it does. The students anonymously evaluate each on-campus gathering by activity. Judging from their feedback the exercises are a favorite activity. After the second gathering an average 96% were either ‘very satisfied’ or ‘satisfied’ with this activity, while 4% are dissatisfied. One student writes: “the interpreting exercise groups function well – superbly in fact – with a lot of interesting reflections and feedback. I feel that I learnt a lot and became aware of a lot of small things that I was previously unaware of.”
**The focus points**

From the organizer’s vantage point the question is not only whether the approach may provide potential for learning, but also how parallel groups can be synchronized in their progression. The focus points mentioned above aim to guide the facilitators as to which aspects to touch upon progressively. How well do the focus points serve their purpose?

(9)

1. Hanne 20:20> how well do the focus points function in your opinion?
2. FacilB3 20:21> the focus points are useful, in the back of your head at least, but the situation might not always present you with fitting examples. Frequently there are other topics that present themselves for valuable discussions
3. FacilB4 20:22> the focus points have a structuring function; they functioned well in the groups I've had – I sum them up at the end of the week-end gathering ... important to include previous focus points as well ...
4. FacilB4 20:23> the focus points are no hindrance for addressing other topics as well
5. Facil B2 20:23 > I am all for focus points. I use them to distribute observational roles and to structure the discussion, as long as we do not follow them to a T
6. FacilB3 20:24 > Agree, nice to use the focus points to distribute tasks, but not all the time, because you then run the risk of locking both observations and discussions.
7. Facil B2 20:24> agree
8. FacilB4 20:24> agree (now I feel like our students :-))

The facilitators’ discourse shows that the focus points basically serve as intended, i.e., as a loose guide to find parallel paths through the multitude of aspects that may be reflected upon after having observed a role-played interpreting exercise. However, the discourse also reveals that focus points can set limits to the students’ “seeing” or detection of interesting aspects, e.g., if they are distributed in detail beforehand (cf. posting 5). As posting 6 diplomatically points out, “you then run the risk of locking both observations and discussions.” Finally, the observation in posting 8 – “now I feel like our students” – points to the fact that the facilitators’ joint reflections over their experiences and strategies may serve to adjust their own practices as well.
Discussion

In their chat discourse the facilitators embrace the pedagogical model where student involvement is stressed, and believe to witness that the students learn through their observations and subsequent reflections. However, the facilitators also single out challenges related to the approach and own role. The value of student involvement and interactivity, as well as the concretization of experience in learning, is hardly controversial, and has been stressed by pedagogues since Dewey’s “learning by doing” and beyond. The idea that student involvement is a primary asset in learning is not new – the idea is ascribed to Confucius. Accordingly, when our facilitators note the importance of not “locking” student involvement, the observation is in line with ancient pedagogical knowledge. Simultaneously, the set answer issue is recurrently named a challenge. As indicated above, the issue is related to group dynamics and students’ expectations of the teacher role.

In the current approach, rather than acting as a “supplier” of knowledge for students to absorb, a main task for the teacher is to prepare the ground for learning through student involvement and interactivity. In a constructivist approach to learning the teacher’s role is to assist the students in their “linking doing and thinking”, as Dewey put it (cf. Kolb 1984; Schön, 1987). Chiu (2004) finds, that with ‘low level help’ interventions (e.g., in the form of open ended questions) “students accept responsibility for their work, [and] tend to initiate more new ideas and more solution proposals than students who rely on the teacher” (ibid. p. 367). Similarly, in describing ‘reflective practicum’ in the acquisition of skills, Schön (1987) emphasizes the importance of dialogue linked to observations. In doing so, he refers to Dewey’s statement that in the learning of skills the student “has to see on his own behalf and in his own way the relations between means and methods employed”. Moreover, the student “can’t see just by being ‘told’, although the right kind of telling may guide his seeing and thus help him see what he needs to see” (Schön, ibid. p. 17, my italics). “The right kind of telling” may of course take many forms. However, as scholars concerned with learning emphasize, being told a set answer is not necessarily how knowledge in the form of skills is best acquired (cf. Schön 1987; Illeris 2000; Steinsholt & Løvlie 2004; Billett 2010).

In their chat deliberations the facilitators approach the set answer issue from different angles, and indicate this strategy’s pitfalls by pointing to situations “where there are no perfect solutions” or “the solution is different in different contexts” (3). Hence, they communicate phronetic knowledge important in the sort of practice that interpreting students are preparing for. The experiences that the facilitators verbalize as the “set answer issue” in excerpts (1)-(4) resemble an observation made by Schön (ibid. p. 291) that in the learning process “students sometimes respond with demands for sure-
fire technique. [And] may read an instructor’s inability to give them what they crave as a sign of his incompetence”. Schön interprets the student’s demand as a reaction to his detection of shortcomings in own performance or strategy. This may also be the case with the interpreting students.

However, the facilitator’s experiences might just as well mirror that a traditional image of the teacher role is embedded in some students’ expectations of learning. Such an image is sometimes shared even by facilitators, e.g., as witnessed in (2). Simultaneously, the above discourse on group dynamics indicates that the facilitator stands to risk his authority if taking on the teacher role of “holder of the set answer”, as he may soon be challenged by experienced or confident group members.

As the facilitators share strategies on how to meet the students’ requests for set answers, they deliberate on their efforts to elicit feedback that balances the students’ self-perception against their actual performance (5-6). Moreover, they demonstrate the learning potential of peer feedback and reflective dialogue. For instance, responding to a colleague’s suggestion that the student being evaluated should simply “write down the feedback from their fellow students” in (7), a facilitator points out that “it is more fruitful to try to defend your own choice than to surrender” since “attempts to explicate your choices tend to be more specific”. The observation is in line with Gee & Green’s (1998, pp. 148-9) emphasis that learners “through their interactions, are shaping and being shaped by the texts they are jointly constructing”. Hence, new awareness and knowledge is cooperatively built. In this sense, the current data illustrate how the facilitators’ own reflections over their experiences may bring knowledge forward as well.

Closing remarks

The article has explored the facilitators’ experiences with coaching interpreting exercises in an experiential-dialogic approach. The method of observation has proven fruitful in the learning of skills through the centuries in terms of apprenticeship. Still, one may question whether the observation of other students’ performance has a learning effect on the abilities of the observers. The current data do not allow us to answer the question as to whether the students actually learn. Still, the chat discourse examined here supports the idea than an experiential-dialogic approach provides potential for learning. Moreover, as the facilitators verbalize the “balancing” involved in the elicitation of feedback, we witness their joint construction of knowledge on the challenges they experience, as well as the challenges’ sources and solutions.
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Abstract

At Oslo and Akershus University College of Applied Sciences, a new course was introduced to interpreting students in Spring 2010. The course’s title is “The interpreter’s communicative competence.” The course consists of approximately 1,000 pages of linguistic theory. Nevertheless, it was well received by students. One student said at the course’s end, “Now I can describe what it was that went well during an interpreting assignment and what did not go so well. I have got a more thorough understanding of what I do during interpreting.” Feedback from students was in line with the course’s purpose: to provide students with concepts enabling them to discuss linguistic nuances in their renderings from one language to another. The article discusses the skills and competence necessary for teaching and supervising during interpreter students’ role playing in this course. Furthermore, the article sheds light on some ways in which interpreters may benefit from concepts and methods of analysis used by language researchers.

Ved tolkeutdanningen på Høgskolen i Oslo og Akershus ble det opprettet et emne med tittelen «Tolkens kommunikative kompetanse» (Nilsen, 2012b) våren 2010; et emne som skal inngå i Høgskolens fremtidige bachelor.

Emnet er relativt teoritungt med ca. 1000 sider lingvistisk teori, men det ble godt mottatt blant våre studenter. En av studentene sa mot slutten av semesteret at «Nå kan jeg beskrive hva det var som gikk bra under et tolkeoppdrag og hva som ikke gikk så bra. På den måten forstår jeg min tolkevirksomhet bedre.» Tilbakemeldingene fra studentene var i tråd med hensikten; som nettopp var å gi studentene et språk for å kunne snakke om nyanser i sine gjengivelser fra det ene språket til det andre.

I undervisningen av dette emnet engasjeres timelærere som veiledere under mange av tolkeøvelsene, såkalte tolkefaglige veiledere. Disse veiledere tolkestudentene under rollespill. Med utgangspunkt i dette emnet skal jeg i det følgende beskrive den kompetansen en tolkefaglig veileder bør ha. Jeg skal vise at tolkeveilederen og tolken kan ha nytte av mange av språkforskerens begreper og analysemetoder. Men først noen ord om språkbegrepet og kunnskap knyttet til det.
Språket


Til de tre ulike måtene å bruke språkbegrepet på er det knyttet ulik type kunnskap. Det handler om kunnskap om enkeltspråkene, det handler om hvordan forskjellige grupper bruker språket, og det handler om kunnskap som gjelder for alle språk. Alle de tre kunnskapsområdene er viktige for tolken. Under tolkeøvelsene møtes studenter fra ulike språkgrupper, og for tolkeveilederen er det primært kunnskap knyttet til språket som kommunikasjonsmiddel som er viktig. Derav også navnet på emnet: «Tolkens kommunikative kompetanse, et begrep som skriver seg tilbake til Dell Hymes (Hymes, 1974) og sosiolingvistikken der språk studeres som et sosialt fenomen.

Den lingvistiske teoretiske kunnskapen er viktig for å kunne gi konkrete tilbakemeldinger under rollespill, tilbakemeldinger som mest mulig presist beskriver hva det var som gikk bra under tolkingen og hva det var som eventuelt ikke gikk så bra. Det dreier seg om kritikk som er mer konkret enn tilbakemeldinger av typen «Tolken gjenga budskapet», «Tolken var flink» eller «Tolken fikk med seg alt». Det handler om å kunne trekke frem nyansene i språkbruken; om nøyaktighet i tolking, om hvordan det kan beskrives, slik at studentene forstår sin tolkepraksis bedre.

Nå er ikke diskusjonen av rollespillene primært basert på veilederens kritikk og kommentarer. Som en hovedregel diskuterer studentene seg imellom, men en veileder må kunne tre inn i diskusjonen dersom et teoretisk begrep er misforstått, eller dersom studentene ikke får til en diskusjon knyttet til det aktuelle temaet. Veilederen må kunne sette diskusjonen på rett spor. Det forventes dessuten at veilederen bidrar med sin fagkunnskap for å drive diskusjonen videre og dypere inn i tolkeøvelsens lingvistiske detaljer. På samme måte som studentene noterer derfor veilederen undervis i rollespillet, og merker seg sekvenser knyttet til aktuelle teorier. Rollespillene er forsøkt konstruert på en slik måte at aktuell tematikk kommer opp i tolkesituasjonen, for eksempel ulike typer talehandlinger og ulike former for tur-
skiftepunkter.

Emnet «Tolkens kommunikative kompetanse» har retorikk (Bakken, 2009; Kjeldsen, 2006), samtaleanalyse (Svennevig, 2009) og pragmatikk (Kristoffersen et al., 2005) som sine teoretiske hovedkomponenter, samt noe om oversettelse (Behrens & Christensen, 2003). Gjennom semesters teret diskuterer og identifiserer studentene språkbruk og kontrastive trekk knyttet til disse teoretiske aspektene ved språket.

**Kontrastiv språkvitenskap**

Et eksempel på den metaspråklige kompetanse som søkes utviklet hos studentene kan være kunnskap om kontrastiv språkvitenskap, for eksempel kontrast – et fenomen som realiseres på ulik måte i forskjellige språk. På norsk kan kontrast uttrykkes ved å legge trykk på ett ledd i setningen, slik som i setningene under, som alle har litt ulikt innhold. Setningene fremkom under et intervju med grammatikeren Kristine Eide (Nilsen, 2012a):

Ole spiste eplet.

Ole spiste eplet.

Ole spiste eplet.

I den første setningen er trykket lagt på Ole. Det som fremheves i denne setningen er at det var Ole som spiste eplet, og ikke noen andre. I den andre setningen fremheves spiste. Setningen sier at det Ole gjorde med eplet var å spise det, og ikke noe annet. I den siste setningen fremheves eplet. Det betyr at Ole spiste eplet, og ikke noe annet. I norsk kan altså kontrast uttrykkes gjennom trykk. I fransk derimot må man ta i bruk andre virkemidler for å uttrykke det samme. I dette språket må man si noe sånt som:

C’est Ole qui a mangé la pomme.

Det var Ole som spiste eplet. (*Ole spiste eplet*)

Et mer relevant eksempel for tolking er disse setningene som for eksempel kan forekomme i et dommeravhør med et barn:

Mamma har aldri slått meg.

Mamma har aldri slått *meg*.

I den første setningen er det *mamma* og ikke noen andre som aldri har slått.

**Pragmatikk**


---

språkhandlinger, konversasjonelle implikaturer og presupposisjoner, og hvordan dette henger sammen med kunnskap om samtalen og samtaleanalyse.

**Samtaleanalyse**


Kristian Skedsmo ved tegnspråktolkeutdanningen på Høgskolen i Oslo og Akershus sier at en tolk kan kanskje ikke alltid si det samme, men han kan kanskje gjøre det samme (Skedsmo, 2007:143). Tolkeveiledning vil derfor ofte handle om hvordan tolken kan gjøre det samme som primærtal- lerne. Om det dreier seg om å trøste, true eller advare, eller om det dreier seg om andre aspekter ved samtalen, som å la klienten få ut sin frustrasjon eller sinne, eller om å la barnet få fortelle hva det har opplevd.

I tolkeøvelser knyttet til samtalen har emnet fokus på samtalen, dens innhold, organisering og hensikt. Sentrale begreper er turskiftepunkter, presekvenser, sidesekvenser og overlappinger (Lind, 2005). Transkripsjon utgjør dessuten en viktig del av dette emnet.

**Transkripsjon**

Transkripsjon er et viktig bevisstgjøringsverktøy i dette emnet. Studentene har som arbeidskrav først å transkribere fra et lydopptak der de har tolket i språklaboratoriet. Dernest skal de transkribere fra et videoopptak der de har tolket under et rollespill på en tolkeøvelse. Den endelige eksamensoppgaven skal baseres på en av de to transkripsjonene der studentene skal analysere sin tolking ved hjelp av teoretiske begreper fra pensumet.

Eksempler på eksamensoppgaver studentene skriver knyttet til vide-
opptak omhandler for eksempel hvordan tolken bruker blikket i samtalen som en del av sin koordinerende rolle der de tar utgangspunkt i transkripsjonen. Andre beskriver tolkens utnyttning av turtakingspunkter i samtalen. Tolkens gjengivelselser eller manglende gjengivelser av modifiserende uttrykk er også et tema som går igjen i oppgavene.

Med dette skal jeg gå over til noen eksempler fra undervisning i retorikk – teorien om den overbevisende og virkningsfulle tale.

Retorikk

Sentrale begreper i denne delen av pensumet er etos, logos og patos. Under tolkeøvelsene diskuteres i hvilken grad tolken evnet å ivareta samtalepartnernes ulike appeller. Sentrale spørsmål under rollespillene er:

1. Fremtrer den tolkede gjengivelsen med like stor troverdighet som originalytringen?
2. Appellerer den tolkede gjengivelsen til følelsene eller fornuften på samme vis som originalytringen?

Den tolkefaglige chatten knyttet til retorisk teori har følgende spørsmål som utgangspunkt:

3. Hvilke tolkesituasjoner er preget av etos som retorisk virkemiddel, og hvilke utfordringer representerer disse for tolken?
4. Hvilke tolkesituasjoner er preget av patos som retorisk virkemiddel?
5. Hvilke tolkesituasjoner er preget av logos som retorisk virkemiddel?

En krevende oppgave

Å veilede på emnet «Tolkens kommunikative kompetanse» er en krevende oppgave. Det kreves kunnskap om dels komplisert lingvistisk teori. Ikke minst kreves det en evne til raskt å kunne anvende teorien i analyse av rollespillene som spilles under tolkeøvelsene, slik at det skapes aktuelle diskusjoner. Videre kreves det tolkekompetanse og ferdigheter, som gjør veilederen i stand til å forstå rollespillene innenfor den rette konteksten, samt organisere spillene på en slik måte at de blir relevante med hensyn til hvilke tolkeoppdrag en tolk kan møte i sitt virke i offentlig sektor og hvordan disse kan forløpe.
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Abstract

Community interpreting assignments frequently present dilemmas for which a code of ethics presents no obvious answer. Thus, courses on interpreting ethics need to focus on both the meaning of ethical principles and the numerous questions that they raise. In Denmark, the lack of a proper code of ethics for community interpreters presents interpreting trainers with yet another challenge. This paper therefore establishes five essential ethical principles suitable for teaching purposes. The paper also discusses the meaning of the five principles and some relevant questions.

Introduction

Many of the ethical dilemmas that community interpreters encounter during interpreting assignments cannot easily be dealt with by consulting a code of ethics. Instead, the interpreters need to exercise a degree of latitude. Courses in interpreting ethics therefore need to focus on not only established ethical guidelines but also the dilemmas for which ethical guidelines hold no clear-cut answer.

Interpreting trainers in Denmark have a further challenge to overcome: the lack of proper code of ethics. The only official guidelines on the performance of Danish interpreters are a 2-page document, Instructions for Interpreters, which was published by the National Commissioner of the Danish Police in 1994, and a 4-page appendix, Appendix 4: Guidance on interpreting in a court of law in Report on interpreting assistance in court hearings, published by the Danish Court Administration in 2003. Instructions for Interpreters is addressed to police interpreters, but is generally assumed to apply to court interpreters also. Report on interpreting assistance in court hearings presents the findings of a working group established by the Danish Court Administration, which was given the task of examining the status of court interpreting in Denmark and presenting recommendations for improvement (the majority of which have never been implemented). Essentially the guidelines deal with the following five principles: Confidentiality, Conflict of Interest, Competence, Neutrality, and Accuracy and
Completeness.

All five principles are relevant and are stipulated in various codes of ethics around the world, such as the AUSIT Code of Ethics and Code of Conduct, which regulate the conduct of members of the Australian Institute of Interpreters and Translators, and A National Code of Ethics for Interpreters in Healthcare, which regulate the conduct of interpreters working in healthcare institutions which are members of the American National Council on Interpreting in Healthcare.

However, the Danish documents fail to explicate the five principles adequately. Moreover, they refer only to police and court interpreting and merely express the point of view of the Danish police and courts without any regard for the complexities of interpreting (something that might have been remedied, had interpreting experts been consulted). The documents are consequently of little use to Danish community interpreters and the users of their services, or to Danish interpreting trainers, who need to consult other sources to establish a set of principles suitable for training purposes.

Establishing ethical principles

A useful point of departure for establishing ethical principles for training purposes is Schjoldager’s (2008) discussion of the ethics that govern professional translation and interpreting assignments in Chapter 7 of her book Understanding Translation. Schjoldager (2008: 123ff) bases her own discussion on Chesterman’s (1997: 64ff) discussion of professional norms and concludes that two categories of professional norms exist: product norms and process norms.

The product norms regulate target text features such as structure, style, language and discourse conventions (Schjoldager 2008: 123). The norms may vary according to factors such as culture, genre and situation, and possibly they are more relevant to the translation of written texts or subtitling. Producers of those target texts often receive specific instructions, for example that a literary translation or a translation of advertising material must contain little trace of the source text or that a subtitle must consist of a specific number of words, whereas it is difficult to imagine a situation in which an interpreter would receive similar instructions. Nevertheless, interpreting situations are subject to specific discourse rules and conventions which interpreters need to understand and comply with in their target texts. Clearly, the discourse conventions which apply to, for example, a hospital consultation will not be the same as those that apply to, for example, a job interview, and interpreters’ target texts need to observe the different conventions to the same degree that they need to comply with the rules of the rele-
vant linguistic systems.

The process norms regulate the translation and interpreting process, that is, they guide the translator or the interpreter in her decision-making before, during and after the translation or interpreting process. Schjoldager (2008: 125-126) argues that there are three kinds of process norms: the accountability norm (the duty to act professionally) the communication norm (the duty to communicate original utterances neutrally) and the relation norm (the duty to maintain suitable similarity between original utterances and the interpretation of them).

Consequently, based on Schjoldager (2008: 125-126) and with reference to the above five principles, the process norms may be explicated in the following manner:

**The accountability norm:**

*Confidentiality* (Danish: Tavshedspligt): An interpreter is under a duty of confidentiality and cannot disclose information learned during the course of an assignment to a third party.

*Conflict of Interest* (Danish: Habilitet): An interpreter cannot have any personal or professional ties with a primary participant nor any personal or professional interest in the outcome of the interpreting situation.

*Competence* (Danish: Kompetence): An interpreter must only accept assignments which she knows to be within her competence.

**The communication norm:**

*Neutrality* (Danish: Neutralitet): An interpreter must interpret all original utterances neutrally and objectively without any display of emotion, bias or personal opinion and without interfering in any way in the communication between the primary participants.

**The relation norm:**

*Accuracy and Completeness* (Danish: Korrekt og præcis tolkning): An interpreter must translate all original utterances faithfully and in their entirety without changing information in any way.
Teaching interpreting ethics

Once the five ethical principles have been explicated, they can be dealt with one by one, with focus on their specific meaning, the questions they raise and the situations in which interpreters have to exercise a degree of latitude. It may be beneficial to present the situations as case stories and ask interpreting students to discuss the issues involved and possible solutions. In this paper I shall contain myself to a brief discussion of the meaning of the ethical principles, however, as well as a few of the questions they raise.

Confidentiality (Tavshedspligt)

This principle stipulates that an interpreter must keep secret all information learnt during an assignment, including the specific location, the topic of the dialogue and the name, nationality and profession of the primary parties. The requirement for secrecy seems straightforward, but it nevertheless raises at least three questions:

(1) Is debriefing allowed?
(2) How shall the interpreter act if she becomes privy to information which threatens specific individuals or the community at large?
(3) Shall information which is known to the general public or easily available by other means still be kept secret?

The answer to the first question must be that, like all other professionals, interpreters are allowed to debrief, that is, to consult someone, whether a colleague or another professional, on the issues they encounter during assignments, ranging from terminological difficulties to difficulties caused by the behaviour or reaction of primary parties or by the sensitive nature of the topics of communication. But it is of course vital that those consulted understand the need for maintaining confidentiality.

The answer to the second question must depend on the legislation of the relevant country. The Danish Administrative Act which regulates the duties of public employees, including the duty to maintain confidentiality, is regarded as being extended to include interpreters who assist the aforesaid public employees in the execution of their duties. Under Section 152e of the Danish Criminal Code, however, the aforesaid public employees, and the interpreters who assist them, are exempt from the duty of confidentiality if they become privy to information which constitutes a threat to themselves or a to a third party, which relates to a serious crime that potentially affects society at large, such as treason, terrorism or the dumping of toxic waste, or which reveals that a child or a young person under the age of 18 suffers neglect or abuse. In fact, as regards the last kind of information, the duty to maintain confidentiality is replaced by a duty to report the neglect or abuse.
to the relevant authorities.

The answer to the third question presumably depends on the kind of information learnt. For example, some Danish judges take the view that a trial held in open court constitutes information which may be disclosed to a third party, since anyone can enter the courtroom and become privy to it. Other judges take the opposite view, however. Consequently, an interpreter’s strategy should presumably be to maintain confidentiality all times, even if the trial is much publicized, to avoid antagonizing a judge or another primary party and cause problems for herself.

On the other hand, trivial or general information, such as the fact that there is a sale on somewhere, or that there will a change in the weather, or that school teachers are on strike, can presumably be disclosed. Still, it may be in an interpreter’s best interest to keep even this information confidential, or at least avoid disclosing how she became privy to it.

**Conflict of interest (Habilitet)**

This principle stipulates that an interpreter cannot interpret for a relative, a friend or an employer. Again, this may seem a straightforward requirement, but the principle raises at least the following four questions:

1. Can an interpreter interpret for a distant relative with whom she has had no contact for a great number of years or with whom she has never had any contact?
2. Can an interpreter interpret for an acquaintance (assuming that there is a clear-cut distinction between an acquaintance and a friend)?
3. Can an interpreter interpret for a previous employer?
4. Can an interpreter interpret anyway, if there is no other interpreter available in the required language?

The first question raises more questions such as what may be categorized as “distant” and how many years amount to “a great number”. Presumably, if such a situation arises, the interpreter should consider the degree of relationship carefully and whether it will have an impact on her performance. She should also discuss the issue with the primary parties (who may or may not allow her to interpret).

The answer to question number two must also depend on the precise nature of the relationship between the interpreter and the primary party. Again the interpreter should consider whether the relationship will have an impact on her performance, and she should discuss the issue with the primary parties.

The answer to question number three, on the other hand, must be that, if a primary party is no longer an interpreter’s employer, there is no
conflict of interest.

Question number four requires considerations regarding the availability of another interpreter in the relevant language. If one is available, but not within the particular area, will it then be possible to conduct the interview, consultation etc. at a later point in time? If no interpreter is available, will it then be possible to manage without interpreting assistance? In other words, the consequences of waiting for another interpreter or not using one at all must be weighed up against the consequences of disregarding the conflict of interest.

Competence (Kompetence)

This principle stipulates that, before accepting an assignment, an interpreter must determine the precise skills required for handling it, and whether she has those skills. In other words, an interpreter who has specialized in healthcare interpreting should accept only healthcare interpreting assignments etc. The principle assumes, therefore, that all interpreters have received proper training and specialization, which is rarely the case (in fact, the majority of Danish community interpreters have received no training whatsoever). However, even assuming that all interpreters have been properly trained and have proper specialization, the principle raises at least two questions:

(1) Is an interpreter always able to determine the precise skills required for a particular assignment?
(2) Can an interpreter accept assignments outside her area of specialization, if there is no other interpreter available in the required language?

The answer to the first question must be that it is almost impossible to determine exactly which skills are needed for a particular assignment. First of all, consultations, interviews etc. are unscripted, so even though a topic and an overall agenda have been established beforehand, the dialogue may take all kinds of twists and turns depending on the impact that an utterance will have on its end receiver and, in turn, the end receiver’s subsequent her response. Secondly, interpreters are not always given sufficient knowledge of an interpreting situation beforehand to assess competence properly. Very often they are called at the last minute, leaving no time for a thorough briefing on the nature of the assignment and thus on the degree of specialization required.

As regards the second question, an interpreter can accept the assignment provided that she informs the primary parties of her lack of specialization and provided that they still want her to interpret. Presumably, they will frequently want her to interpret rather than conduct the consultation, interview etc. at a later time or without the use of an interpreter. In other words,
the answer to the second question requires considerations similar to those required if the issue was a potential conflict of interest, cf. question (4) above.

**Neutrality (Neutralitet)**

This principle requires an interpreter to maintain a professional distance between herself and the topic of the consultation, interview etc. as well as the parties involved. The interpreter must remember that she is not a party to the communication and therefore cannot interfere in it in any way. The requirement to communicate neutrally raises at least three questions:

1. How should an interpreter handle her own antipathies and sympathies?
2. How should an interpreter handle threats to her neutrality from primary participants?
3. Should an interpreter help primary parties by clearing up misunderstandings?

The answer to the first question must be that antipathies and sympathies are strong emotions which cannot easily be ignored. Consequently, the interpreter’s strategy should be to acknowledge her emotions, while taking pains to ensure that they will not impact on her interpreting performance.

The answer to the second question must depend on the nature of the threat and to what extent it compromises the interpreter’s role. For example, Danish interpreters frequently report that non-Danish-speaking primary participants ask their advice about a number of matters, ranging from how to get to the pharmacy, fill in forms or answer questions to what kind of treatment, sentencing etc. they may expect. But whereas a degree of assistance may be acceptable in some interpreting situations, perhaps even expected (for example in psychiatric consultations), it will be completely unacceptable in others (for example in courtroom proceedings) (cf. e.g. Jacobsen 2009). Thus, in the relevant situation, the interpreter must consider very carefully what her role must be and whether a degree of participation, however insignificant it may seem to be, will potentially compromise her role. In other words, she must consider the consequences of her assistance for herself and for the primary parties.

Similarly, Danish interpreters frequently report that they give various forms of cultural advice because Danish-speaking primary participants expect them to act as cultural experts. The temptation to act as a cultural expert is of course understandable, but it should be avoided. An interpreter is not necessarily a cultural expert, and taking on this additional role may have far-reaching consequences for her, for example if decisions regarding the actions, motives etc. of a non-Danish-speaking participant are
based on her cultural advice.

Danish interpreters also report a different kind of threat: Danish-speaking lawyers try to manipulate them into making mistakes, for example by deliberately asking new questions while the interpreters are still interpreting answers to previous ones. Fortunately, this kind of threat can be handled quite easily by drawing a judge’s attention to it. Because defendants’ and witnesses’ answers to questions from lawyers constitute material evidence in trials, a judge will quickly put a stop to any kind of behaviour which prevents the production of such evidence.

The answer to the third question must be that, as an interpreter cannot interfere in the communication between the primary participants, she must refrain from attempting to clear up misunderstandings, no matter how insignificant they seem to be. Naturally, it will be tempting for an interpreter to interfere if she is in possession of information which could clear up a misunderstanding, for example information that a patient’s previous appointment was in June 2012 and not July 2012, or that a job seeker had already filled in a requisite form. However, the interpreter will have to consider if the misunderstanding is indeed as insignificant as it seems or if it is in fact a misunderstanding and not a deliberate communication strategy. Moreover, she will have to consider whether her interference will potentially compromise her role as well as the potential consequences for herself and for the primary parties.

**Accuracy and Completeness (Korrekt og præcis tolkning)**

This principle stipulates that all utterances spoken in an interpreting situation must be translated without adding, omitting or replacing information. The requirement raises at least the following four questions:

1. Can interpreters avoid adding, omitting or replacing information?
2. Should swear words be translated fully?
3. Should all information be translated?
4. How should interpreters handle interpreting errors?

The answer to the first question must be that the adding, omitting and replacing of information constitute well-known translation strategies, and consequently that some additions, omissions or replacements may be justified, part of the process of conveying the message of an original utterance to the end receiver (see for example the discussion in Jacobsen 2002). Furthermore, humour and irony are expressed differently in different languages and cultures. Consequently, if translated verbatim, ironic and/or humorous utterances
may not have the desired impact.

Similarly, in answer to the second question, swear words may not have the desired impact if translated verbatim. In fact, what constitutes extreme offence in one language may cause only minimum offence in another language. Consequently, a degree of down-toning may be a suitable strategy for all kinds of swear words.

The answer to the third question is presumably that some information does not require translation. For example, if, during a consultation, the doctor is on the telephone discussing something totally unrelated to the patient, it is presumably acceptable for the interpreter to inform the patient of this fact, rather than translate every utterance the doctor makes while speaking on the telephone. Likewise, if the patient engages the interpreter in conversation about a topic not relevant to the consultation during the aforesaid doctor’s telephone call, it is presumably acceptable that their conversation not be translated to the doctor.

The answer to the fourth question must be that, as a rule, all interpreting errors will have to be corrected. There may be exceptions, nevertheless. Presumably, an error which will have no obvious impact on the outcome of the consultation, interview etc., for example because it was made during some initial small talk or in no way relates to the topic of communication, may be ignored. In fact, an attempt at correcting it may have a negative effect, disturbing the flow of communication rather than assisting it. In other words, a suitable strategy for dealing with an interpreting error may be to assess its significance before making a correction.

Final comments

The above five principles are not necessarily the only relevant ethical principles, though they are all extremely important. As revealed by the discussion in this paper, interpreters have to exercise a degree of latitude in their compliance with the principles, while simultaneously taking pains to avoid compromising their professional role. For this reason, courses in interpreting ethics have to focus not only on the meaning of ethical principles but also on answers to the very many questions they raise.
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Abstract

The purpose of this presentation is to present the Further Vocational Qualification for Public Service Interpreters at TAKK (Tampere Adult Education Centre) and the education preparing for it. Our teaching methods exploit effectively digital learning solutions and our students are encouraged to cooperate in the social media-based environment Elgg.

The training of public service interpreters at TAKK consists of a multimodal web-based one-year-study programme. In addition, completing the Further Vocational Qualification takes about four months. The Further Vocational Qualification for public service interpreters consists of three modules: general requirements of an interpreter, skills in two interpreted languages and interpreting skills.

Introduction

Teachers, educators and examiners of public service interpreters met in Stockholm in May 2012 for a Nordic seminar organised by a Swedish partner (Stockholm University Institute for Interpretation and Translation Studies). The purpose was to present and discuss the current state of public service interpreter education, training and examination in the Nordic countries, to compare the systems and to draft plans for future development. The focus was on education of interpreter trainers.

The Finnish participant in the Stockholm seminar on 10-11 May 2012 was Tampereen Aikuiskoulutuskeskus (Tampere Adult Education Centre or TAKK), which has arranged further vocational qualifications for public service interpreters through the competence-based qualifications system since 2004. In Finland, the further vocational qualifications are regarded as secondary-level qualifications, and education preparing for them is provided as vocational adult education.

The purpose of this presentation is to present the Further Vocational Qualification for Public Service Interpreters and the education preparing for it. Our teaching methods effectively exploit digital learning solutions and our students are encouraged to cooperate in the social media-based environment Elgg.
TAKK has systematically developed the education of public service interpreters, particularly by making use of web-based learning environments. Various video conferencing applications are also in daily use during interpreting exercises and in student supervision. For the tests, simulated practical assignments based on working-life needs have been developed.

**Elgg – social media-based learning environment**

At Elgg the student is in charge of his/her learning process. The most attractive features of social media are the sense of community and the chance to share information and comment on it. Teachers encourage students to self-directed learning and to knowledge sharing and collaboration, aiming to develop their meta-cognitive skills. “Give a man a fish and he eats for a day, teach him to fish and he eats for a lifetime.” As a learning environment, Elgg provides the students with various modern possibilities for learning together effectively, such as wikis, blogs and bookmarks. Students can take actions similar to Facebook interaction: add friends, update their statuses and order RSS-feeds. They have their own sites for gathering information, rehearsing and communicating with each other in different ways. Actual and interesting questions are discussed in forums and chats, with and without teachers’ participation, formally and informally. The modern technologies help students to create their own Personal Learning Environment, PLE, which can be very useful for them even after finishing the course programme. Our motto is: “What you give with a little spoon, you’ll get with a ladle in return”.

**Wikis, blogs, Skype and Youtube in education of public service interpreters**

One can create and edit both personal wikis and group wikis at Elgg. The group wikis are used for completing assignments and sharing materials, doing terminology work and discussing ethical guidelines. The group wikis also cover such topics as the Finnish language and society, communication skills, working life and entrepreneurship. They can be used in preparing for the qualification exams and in counselling and supervising the students as well. The group wikis consist of vocabularies, information packs, links, comments etc. Students use their personal wikis for gathering useful material and collecting vocabularies, links and bookmarks. An essential part of the PLE is writing a blog.

The personal blog covers the whole learning history of a person. It is like a diary, which shows the progress in studies, reports on the student’s way of reflecting and problematizing the work of an interpreter and tells about his/her experiences in on-the-job-learning. The Personal Study Plan is
also a “living” document as a part of the blog and not a paper in an archive.

We also utilize Skype and video conference applications in training of interpreting, terminology work, professional ethics, and Finnish language and for instructional conversations. Skype has proved to be the easiest and the most useful application for communication, supervising and practising remote interpreting skills.

In Youtube, on a non-public channel we broadcast videos of interpreting exercises. Each interpreter can watch and analyze his/her own performance. In the group we often use methods of peer assessment.

Educator’s role in social media-based learning environment

The educator is responsible for pedagogical planning. The educator is the one who has to activate the participants, group them and decide which teaching methods to use to reach the aimed goals. The educator has to be genuinely present and available and have close connections to the working life, which ensures that he/she possesses relevant knowledge. The educator is a coordinator, motivator, guide, commentator, equal expert, pedagogical back-up, trainer and coach, among other roles.

Education of public service interpreters and education of interpreter trainers in Finland

In TAKK, we offer a one-year study programme for public service interpreters in different languages also in languages of lesser international diffusion. The multimodal web-based study programme carries 60 credits. In addition, completing the qualification tests takes about four months. Our learning platform is Elgg, which is based on the principles of social media. In addition, we use Skype and Pamela call recorder (for instruction/supervising and exercises and teacher-student and student-student interaction), the Adobe Connect Pro video conferencing application (for lectures and exercises), Internet freeware (such as WavePad for audio recording), wikis and blogs, as well as the information and collaboration website http://asioimistulkki.ning.com. Our pedagogical guidelines are based on progressive inquiry and problem-based learning, as well as cooperative learning.

We use the same methods as described above in training the trainers of the other language (not Finnish). During the interpreters’ study programme these trainers meet with students regularly and discuss terminology issues with them. The induction of trainers consists only of a couple of hours of discussions with the teacher of interpreters and some written material. After all, supporting students’ other working language during their studies is the most challenging issue which needs to be developed.
For more information please feel free to check our Prezi-presentation (http://tinyurl.com/TakkStockholm2012). The presentation also includes video interviews with our students.

More information:
Finnish National Board of Education: http://www.oph.fi/english
Ministry of Education and Culture: http://www.minedu.fi/OPM/?lang=en
The Community Interpreters Qualification Committee (only in Finnish): http://www.oph.fi/koulutus_ja_tutkinnot/ammattikoulutus/tutkintotoimikunnat/kielitieteet
The Finnish Association of Translators and Interpreters (SKTL): http://www.sktl.fi/in-english/
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Abstract
The need for interpreter user training in how to communicate via interpreters in the Norwegian public sector is well documented in five reports commissioned by the Norwegian Directorate of Integration and Diversity (IMDi). This need has been met by various ad-hoc solutions, ranging from short written information to several hours of training, sporadically given to interpreter users. In order to systematize interpreter user training, IMDi financed a project with the aim of developing an introductory course in how to communicate via interpreter for public service employees. This task was given to Oslo and Akershus University College of Applied Sciences (HiOA) with the rationale that the institution which educates future interpreters should also educate interpreter users so as to facilitate similar understandings of interpreters’ and interpreter users’ functions. The course content was developed and tried out during 2011-2012. While developing the course, the need for training trainers (course facilitators) was identified and addressed. In this article I describe the components of the training program developed for the course facilitators, paying particular attention to challenges encountered.

Background
The directorate for integration and diversity (IMDi) published five reports (IMDi 2007, 2008, 2009, 2011a, 2011b) documenting the most important challenges in communication via interpreters in five areas of the public sector in Norway: healthcare, child welfare services, the criminal justice system, primary and lower secondary schools in Oslo and the Norwegian Labor and Welfare Service. The identified challenges include difficulties in obtaining the services of interpreters in acute situations and for certain languages; lack of professional interpreters; financial considerations; using friends, relatives and even children as interpreters; and interpreter users’ lack of knowledge in how to communicate via interpreters. The last challenge mentioned will be the main focus in this article.

The interpreter users reported that they have received little or no
training in communication via interpreters (IMDi 2008: 6, 2009: 5, 2011a: 7, 2011b: 7). They also specified the need to

- obtain more information about the importance of using interpreters,
- find out more about the situations for which interpreters should be used,
- acquire more practical training in communication via interpreters in everyday situations and
- ascertain the actual responsibilities of interpreters and interpreter users in institutional dialogues.

It is encouraging to notice a rising level of awareness among public service employees in Norway about the importance of training in communication via interpreters.

This documented evidence that public employees need to learn more about how to communicate via interpreters led to an allocation of funds to Oslo and Akershus University College for Applied Sciences (HiOA) by IMDi for a development project called “Communication via interpreter for public service employees” (2011-2012). As it was of vital importance to synchronize the training of interpreters and interpreter users, the institution that trains interpreters was chosen to develop training for interpreter users, thus avoiding the possibility of contradictory constructions of interpreters’ and interpreter users’ functions. If both interpreters and interpreter users have a shared understanding of their areas of responsibility, this will facilitate interpretation work and hopefully contribute to an overall increase in job satisfaction for all parties involved.

The main aim of the development project was to systematize interpreter-user training in Norway by developing an introductory course for all public service employees in how to communicate via an interpreter. It was also important to take into account already existing experience from HiOA including e-learning programs for healthcare workers (Felberg, Skaaden & Imsen 2011) and various shorter training courses (two to three hours) developed for the police, child welfare service personnel and social workers. In addition, HiOA is in the unique position of having access to first-hand information from the interpreter students’ side as well. The majority of interpreter students in Norway already work as interpreters in different areas of the public sector. Their experience is valuable for the interpreter-user courses and vice versa.

The development project was divided into three parts: 1. development of an introductory course in communication via interpreters for public service employees, 2. development of a five-credit module in communication via interpreters for employees in the criminal justice system and 3. develop-
ment of a training program for trainers (course facilitators). In this article I will concentrate on the third part.¹

**Training course facilitators**

The following are main components of the introductory course for public employees:

- general information about the field of interpreting in the public sector in Norway,
- the interpreter’s and the interpreter user’s areas of responsibility in interpreter-mediated institutional dialogues,
- the specifics of interpreter-mediated institutional dialogues,
- laws and regulations regulating interpreting in the public sector in Norway,
- interpreting methods,
- information about the Norwegian National Register of Interpreters,
- information about what interpreters learn from interpreter training,
- specifics of telephone interpreting,
- what can go wrong in interpreter-mediated dialogues and why,
- consequences of not using interpreters or using family members, friends or other non-trained interpreters,
- how communication via interpreters can influence the professionalism of public service staff and
- practical tips on how to prepare for successful communication via interpreter.

These components were chosen in cooperation with interpreter users. The cooperation took place before, during and after the actual courses. Such an ambitious content requires capable course facilitators. And indeed, course facilitators are one of the vital resources that can secure that an introductory course in communication via interpreter becomes a useful, standardized tool in the public sector. As there is no tailor-made module for course facilitators, an ad-hoc training program was established. The training program was based on experiential learning, the pedagogical approach chosen for the module “Interpreting in the public sector” (Skaaden & Wattne 2009, Skaaden in this volume). Course facilitators are thus considered the most important resources during the learning process as they use their own experience or the experience of other program participants to reflect upon different problems, solutions and consequences. Course facilitators are also taught to use the same theoretical approach when working with course participants in the introductory course.

¹I have reported on all three components in Norwegian (Felberg, forthcoming a), and on the first component in English (Felberg, forthcoming b).
Having these pedagogical ideas in mind the following outcomes were defined for the ad-hoc training program for course facilitators.

**Learning outcomes of training program**

*Knowledge:*
Course facilitators have knowledge about
- group leadership and structuring of learning activities
- learning processes
- experiential learning – interaction between theory and practice
- interpreters’ and interpreter users’ areas of responsibility

*Skills*
Course facilitators can
- lead and facilitate course in communication via interpreters

*General competence*
Course facilitators can
- facilitate successful learning in mixed groups of learners

**Course facilitators’ qualifications**
The question about course facilitators’ qualifications appeared in the early phase of the project. Thus the following list of qualifications for course facilitators was elaborated:

Course facilitators’ qualifications

Formal qualifications:
- Documented training in interpreting
- Documented relevant practical experience
- Documented pedagogical competence
- Basic computer skills
- Experience from similar jobs can substitute for formal qualifications

Personal qualifications:
- Professional perspective, engagement and motivation
- Very good skills in Norwegian language
- Good communication and cooperation abilities
- Discreetness

Careful examination of the aims for the training program for course facilitators, the proposed facilitators’ qualifications and experience from the project lead us to the first challenge: course facilitator recruiting. Persons with the
above-mentioned qualifications usually already have other jobs and do not always have the capacity to meet the growing need for courses in the public sector in Norway. Furthermore, if they also work as interpreters, the remuneration for course facilitation cannot always compete with the interpreting salary. A possible solution, to establish full-time positions for the course facilitators, is being explored at the time of writing this article (2013).

**Content of training program**

As previously mentioned, the development project lasted from 2011-2012. During the first year the project group, consisting of one project coordinator and two project members, outlined the content of the future courses as well as the training program for the course facilitators. Two course facilitators were then recruited. The course facilitators were encouraged to contribute with their own experience and ideas to fine-tune the project.

During the second year the training program was tried out and adjusted for five additional course facilitators.

The training program consisted of two parts: a theoretical part and a practical part. In practice these two parts overlapped greatly. Each part lasted for a minimum of two days and there was a possibility to add more days according to the needs of each course facilitator. The length of training may seem very short (a minimum of four days plus evaluations), but it is important to bear in mind that almost all course facilitators have already worked for HiOA with interpreter training and have received some training in facilitation before. They all had the qualifications outlined above and some of them already had extensive experience in interpreter user training. If HiOA made a training program for course facilitators without previous experience or pedagogical training, it would have to be a considerably more extensive module corresponding to a minimum 30 ETCS.

The main components of the theoretical part of the training program were the repetition of the pedagogical approach chosen by HiOA and the detailed review of the contents of the introductory course.

The practical part consisted of facilitation/observation of a minimum of two, one-day courses with coaching. Each course facilitator had to first observe one course and then facilitate one course together with a colleague.

Different methods chosen for the course: video, role-play, discussions, case-studies, lectures etc., were discussed both during the theoretical and practical parts of training.

Course facilitators were provided with a PowerPoint presentation with corresponding notes, video clips, role-plays and questions for group work. They had to go through a number of obligatory points during the course, but they were free to adjust the material to their own strengths and
style of teaching. Each course facilitator was observed by a colleague (members from the project group were also observing) resulting in both written and oral evaluations. Each course facilitator was also given a self-evaluation form and a co-facilitator evaluation form to fill out after each course. The evaluation forms consisted of the following questions:

- Have you covered all topics planned?
- Which parts did you not cover and why?
- Suggestions for changes?
- Have you managed to make room for the discussions? How did you do that?
- Have you managed to motivate course participants? In which way?
- Have you managed to build upon course participants’ problems expressed in the beginning of the course?
- How did the cooperation with your colleague function?
- Name things that you did well!
- Name things that you have to continue working on!

All these comments were analyzed and compiled by the project coordinator and later used for discussions and improvement of the course.

The course participants likewise had ample opportunity to evaluate the course both orally and through a written evaluation (before each course, the course participants were informed about the development project and asked to give their comments at any time and in any form). The evaluation form did not include an explicit question about the course facilitators, but course participants often commented on course facilitators, for example:

Flinke kursholdere, god stemning og faglig stoff.

*Good course facilitators, good atmosphere and scientific material.*

Bra styrt fra foreleser.

*Well controlled by lecturer.*

Litt mye avbrytning/innspill mellom foredragsholdere.

*A bit too much interruption/input between course facilitators.*

These comments were discussed after each course and taken into consideration during the adjustment of the courses.

**Blended learning: on-site and on-line solutions**

The training program was organized as a combination of on-site and on-line solutions. Training seminars were organized on-site, at HiOA classrooms, while information sharing and further discussions were organized on-line. The on-line solution used was HiOA’s learning platform Fronter. A virtual
A homeroom was built consisting of several classrooms that follow the system already used for other modules and is thus familiar to the course facilitators (see Figure 1).

![Figure 1. A screenshot of the homeroom of “Communication via an interpreter”](image)

The classrooms (folders, on the left side of Figure 1) developed include Information (informasjon), Teaching Materials (lærestoff), Teachers’ Forum (lærerforum), Teachers’ Chat (lærerchat) and News (nyheter). The word ‘teacher’ in classroom names was used as our course facilitators are used to it from other virtual classrooms. That is something that should be changed in the future, as we insist on the role of facilitation and not on one-way transfer of knowledge. The Information folder consists of administrative information, course dates and minutes from meetings and training sessions. Teaching Materials consists of materials that course facilitators use: PowerPoint presentations, videos, role-plays, evaluation forms (both for course facilitators and course participants), a checklist for course facilitators before each course, compiled evaluations from past courses and a copy of course facilitators’ chat discussions. Teachers’ Forum is the place where teachers can come with their own comments asynchronously while Teachers’ Chat is a place where synchronous, one-hour-long discussions take place. An example of a post in Teachers’ Forum posted by a course facilitator is:

> Vi bør ha en bank vi kan hente ting fra som er tilpasset ulike grupper, f.eks. en film om barn, eventuelt andre ressurser som ikke er faste men etter behov.

*We should have an information database where we can get things adjusted for different groups, for example a film about children,*
possibly other resources that are not needed all the time, but as required.

An example of topics discussed in Teachers’ Chat initiated by the project coordinator but based on a feedback by course facilitators is:


A topic that keeps appearing is “culture” and interpreting. That is the reason why we will devote the coming two meetings to culture. Here is a proposal as to how to approach the topic. In order to get a common starting point I have uploaded chapter 2 from Ingrid Piller’s book “Intercultural Communication, A Critical Introduction” in Fronter. http://www.amazon.co.uk/Intercultural-Communication-Introduction-Ingrid-Piller/dp/0748632840 Even though the book does not specifically treat the topic of culture and interpreting, there are some relevant points that I hope we together will be able to connect to interpreting. Piller’s perspective “to start thinking about intercultural communication in terms of one central research question: Who makes culture relevant to whom in which context for which purposes?” seems appropriate for our field.

The main challenge concerning on-site training reported by the course facilitators was its length. The course facilitators expressed the need for a longer training program where they could go deeper in each of the topics discussed.

The main challenge of on-line training was the course facilitators’ low activity level in Teachers’ Forum (the asynchronous channel). On the other hand, the opposite tendency was noticed in Teachers’ Chat (the synchronous channel), where activity level was very high. The main explanation for not being active in Teachers’ Forum given by the course facilitators themselves was lack of time. The project coordinator’s understanding of the challenges includes two additional perspectives: course facilitators’ affiliation to HiOA and the functionality of HiOA’s learning platform, Fron-
ter. The course facilitators are not employed on permanent bases and even though they are paid for their participation in on-line activities the incentive might be unsatisfactory. Chat sessions are counted as one hour, but time spent on asynchronous channels is more difficult to measure. HiOA’s learning platform has also shown some technical weaknesses, for example, preventing teachers from getting into chat rooms without installing or updating additional software. This constant source of insecurity might influence course participants’ motivation to use certain on-line activities.

Challenges on the part of training organizers

During the training of trainers two particularly challenging questions for the training organizers were discussed:

1. How can we ensure that all the course facilitators give courses of approximately same content and quality?
2. How can we ensure that course facilitators maintain and update their own knowledge?

For the initiator of the project, IMDi, it was very important to ensure a systematic approach to interpreter user training. By developing an introductory one-day course, part of the puzzle was solved. The other part was assuring the quality of the course facilitators’ education, as there is no recognized education for course facilitators in Norway.

The program developed can be described as a minimalist solution. All in all, more time is needed to discuss different components of the course content and the pedagogical model chosen. For example, the explanatory notes for the PowerPoint presentation developed in the first part of the project were not clear enough for all course facilitators involved. More detailed explanation and discussions about different points were needed. By more detailed explanation I mean, for example, explaining the history of particular ideas and a broader context for different choices of topics covered. This issue is being addressed by developing a written guide for course facilitators. Nevertheless, continuous contact between course facilitators and HiOA employees is crucial to ensure a systematic approach to the course content and quality. The contact should include regular evaluations and making needed adjustments to both the content and the quality of the introductory course. The emerging challenge is to find funds to ensure this important function. During the project it was shown that using on-line solutions could cut some expenses. For example, course facilitators can discuss particular topics on-line and thus save travel expenses.

As outlined in the beginning of this article, the introductory course for employees in the Norwegian public sector consist of various topics ran-
ging from general information about interpreting in Norway to specifics of interpreter mediated dialogues and practical information about how to find an interpreter. A great deal of the information is of a dynamic nature, as things change very quickly, resulting in constant need to update courses. As the course facilitators do their job on a freelance basis, they have a limited amount of time to update their knowledge on their own. In the evaluation sessions the course facilitators expressed an explicit wish to get regular ‘updates’ in the field of interpreting from HiOA. Updates were not meant to be only references to new books and articles, but establishing an arena where identified ad-hoc problems could be discussed either on-site or on-line. This was tried out during the second year of the project (2012) when four meetings, two on-site and two on-line, were held with the course facilitators. The frequency and length of these meetings seems to be too low, according to the course facilitators. There is a suggestion to have at least five gatherings per year, a combination of on-site and on-line, in order to ensure continuity.

Concluding remarks

Successful communication via interpreters in the public sector depends on both trained interpreters and trained interpreter users. Interpreter training in Norway is given on a permanent basis, while different models of interpreter user training are being explored. The main long-term aim is to include the topic of communication via interpreter in all professionals’ training. Until that is achieved, ad-hoc training is being conducted all over Norway. In order to systemize interpreter-user training, IMDi financed a development project with the aim of making an introductory course in communication via interpreters for public service employees. HiOA, that is, the provider of interpreter training was given the task to develop interpreter-user training. The need for course facilitators was obvious even before the project began, resulting in defining the part of the project to ‘train trainers’ (course facilitators). The training was organized as on-the-job training, based on the pedagogical model of experiential learning. It consisted of a theoretical and a practical part. The main focus was on observing and leading one-day courses in communication via interpreters. The challenges that appeared during the project include how to find and keep good course facilitators and how to ensure high standards of course quality. Different options of on-site and on-line solutions were explored with the conclusion that training course facilitators requires systematizing training and allowing more time for training. Another important conclusion was that securing a stable source of funding is a prerequisite for both developing a training program (30 ECTS) and for ensuring that courses continue to be given to public service employees in Norway.
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Abstract

This paper reports on participants’ experiences with a university-level course for teachers of interpreting, given three times at Stockholm University, Sweden. An important purpose of the course was to provide a collaborative learning environment and to support and promote a feeling of common ground between educators working within various branches of interpreting.

Drawing primarily upon a focus group interview and on students’ written evaluations, we have indications that the course did promote a sense of similarity between students across traditional borders. Also, an interesting difference between spoken-language interpreting educators and sign-language interpreting educators emerged. Educators with experiences from the first category of courses seemed to be much oriented towards preparing the students for a final exam, similar to the national certification test (basically, a teacher assessed proficiency test), whereas those working in sign-language-interpreting courses seemed to be more oriented to more frequent and other types of assessments of student performance (self-, peer and teacher assessments). Finally, the course seems to have provided a network for informal collaboration between interpreter educators that stayed intact over time.

Introduction – TÖI and interpreter training in Sweden

In Sweden, conference, public service and sign-language interpreting have a tradition of being treated as separate branches, much in line with how these practices generally have been and are described in the literature on interpreting. Obviously, established divides between various types of interpreting (and interpreters) partly follows from the various types of interpreter education (and interpreter teacher education) provided. In Sweden, courses in public-service interpreting and sign-language interpreting have been organised at a type of adult-education and vocational colleges (sometimes translated as folk high schools, see below) and study associations in fairly large numbers since the 1960ies. These courses are part of the so-called folkbildning educational system, a non-academic system:
Swedish folkbildning is the collective name for the activities conducted by the country’s folk high schools and study associations in the form of courses, study circles and cultural activities. Folkbildning is a part of the liberal non-formal educational system. (Folkbildning in Sweden, n.d., page 1)

Between 1986 and 2012, the overall responsibility for all areas of interpreter education (except the training of military interpreters) in Sweden lay with the Institute for Interpretation and Translation Studies at Stockholm University (TÖI), irrespective of interpreting branch or education level. The task of TÖI in relation to the folkbildning interpreter courses and programs was to distribute government grants and to supervise and evaluate the interpreter education. In parallel with this, TÖI also organized academic level courses, both for public service interpreters at Stockholm University and other universities, and, since the mid-1990s, courses in conference interpreting.

From July 1st 2012, TÖI’s organization has changed. Its former task to distribute government grants to non-academic level courses and to supervise and evaluate the interpreter education given in the folkbildning system has been taken over by The Swedish National Agency for Higher Vocational Education (Swedish: Myndigheten för yrkeshögskolan).

Today, TÖI is therefore exclusively a university institute, running, in addition to translator training programs, interpreting courses at the bachelor’s and master’s levels, involving various language combinations. An important premise for organizing these courses is that interpreting is basically seen as one professional field, irrespective of the variety of settings, techniques and challenges implied, a view that has been strengthened by our experiences from the course for interpreter teachers in focus in this paper – the Theory and Methodology Course of Interpreter Trainers (the TMIT course, for short).

For various reasons, the TMIT course was given only three times. TÖI’s recent reorganization, however, reactualizes the needs for interpreting-teacher education, which makes the present study relevant. Arguably, such an education is necessary both for promoting the process of professionalization of interpreters (and translators), and for confirming and strengthening translation studies and interpreting studies as an academic discipline. Within Swedish academia, no more than elsewhere, this relatively new discipline has a relatively weak position. Hence, the education of educators is without doubt needed to also establish the field within the academic world.

**Background – The TMIT course**

The background of those who currently work as interpreter trainers in Sweden is quite diverse, but a common denominator is that they have some
interpreter training as well as extensive experience as interpreters. This implies that interpreter educators often are more of interpreters and less of theoreticians, pedagogues and educators. The TMIT course, a university-level course for teachers of interpreting, was designed precisely to fill assumed gaps in pedagogical training concerning theoretical aspects of relevance to interpreting and to the training of interpreters.

The TMIT course was developed at TÖI in the 1990s and was given in 1999, 2001 and 2004. The targeted students were interpreter educators active in all types of interpreting programs (conference, public service and sign language interpreters and interpreters for the deaf-blind). An important purpose of the course was to provide a collaborative learning environment and to support and promote a feeling of common ground between the various areas of interpreting. An important aspect of the course was the implementation of a research-based course design, answering to modern ideas about education, often phrased as student active learning, based on a sociocultural view of education (e.g. Ellis et al. 2010).

The TMIT course was also research-based in the sense that its syllabus reflected the latest developments in research in (linguistics and) interpreting, and the course literature was selected to give students ample opportunities to orient themselves to this research, dealing with aspects of cognitive processes, interaction, and also the teaching of interpreting. Examples of course literature (from the first time the course was given) are Alexieva (1994), Bell (1997), Gile (1995), Jones (1998), Mikkelson and Mintz (1997), Neumann Solow (1998), Pöchhacker (1992), Seleskovitch and Lederrer (1995), Setton (1994), Tebble (1996) and Wittwer-Merithew and Mills Stuart (1998).

The TMIT course was given at the undergraduate level. Admittance required documented experience as an interpreter trainer or as an interpreter. The whole course consisted of 20 credits and was taken as half-time study during one academic year. (Twenty credits in the pre-Bologna system applied at the time, which corresponds to 30 ECTS in the current system.) The course was divided into 5 modules:

1. Language, communication and interpretation, 4 credits.
2. Language for specific purposes, terminology and lexicography, 3 credits.
3. Teaching the techniques and ethics of interpretation, 5 credits.
4. Assessment of interpretation, 4 credits.
5. Course paper, 4 credits.

The student group met in Stockholm for two days once a month, from September to May, for lectures, seminars, discussions, group work, and so forth. Students read general literature on language and linguistics, as well as spe-
cialized literature on conversation analysis, interaction, and, naturally, on interpreting and on how to teach it. When choosing literature dealing more specifically with interpreting, great care was taken to include more or less an equal amount of literature (books and articles) on all areas of interpreting. The same principle was followed in planning who should give lectures, and on what themes.

A joint course

The TMIT course hence was based on the assumption that interpreter-student have various backgrounds and yet many common interests, concerning both the nature of the professional tasks of interpreters in various settings and the theoretical issues of relevance to them. There is, of course, also a growing awareness worldwide that there are many important aspects in common between what traditionally is sorted into different kinds of interpreting. This is clearly demonstrated for instance in the volumes of papers from the Critical Link conferences (see Carr et al. 1997, Roberts et al. 2000, Brunette et al. 2003, Wadensjö et al. 2007, Hale et al. 2009). Potential similarities, it was assumed, concern such aspects as interpreting techniques, interpreting ethics, memory skills, discourse management and terminology management, a range of competences which have to be taught and trained in any interpreter program. Two important aims of developing the course were:

- To test whether one program will suit interpreter trainers in different areas, and, as a sub-goal, to try to admit as equal numbers as possible of students representing each area of interpreting; and
- To give impetus to development and cooperation in interpreter training across the traditional boundaries between conference, public service and sign language interpreting.

Thinking on education and examination

Until quite recently, the dominating philosophy behind teacher education has been informed by dualistic understandings of the relationship between thought and action. In short, teachers have been thinking about their activities as a transfer of knowledge, of lectures and supervisory feedback as input and students’ learning and classroom results as outputs. In line with a sociocultural tradition, an alternative way of thinking about education is as situated social practices and that people learn by engaging in these practices. The sociocultural school of thought draws extensively on the psychologist Vygotsky’s ideas, concerning e.g. the relationship between human consciousness and practical activity (Vygotsky 1987). Put simply, according to the
sociocultural tradition, learning is impossible without doing.

These ideas go perfectly in line with the current view of interpreting as social practice, implying that interpreters are seen as responsible not just for providing renditions in another language of others’ utterances, but also for coordinating others’ talk-in-interaction (Wadensjö 1998), or, as Cynthia Roy (2000:3) phrases it, for managing “the discourse process between two participants who do not speak the same language”.

Hence, applying sociocultural ideas in a course for interpreter educators, it seems important to have the students engaged in some activity that forces them to think about and comment on the information presented, to synthesize and evaluate facts, ideas and ideals, with other students, through writing and discussions, not simply to listen and memorize.

For this reason, in the TMIT course, each module contained a project, constituting the examination for that module, on a topic selected by student, preferably having a close relation to their own daily or interpreting practice. For instance, the project in Module 3 consisted in the detailed planning of one teaching hour, and the course paper could e.g. be devoted to developing the syllabus of a completely new course, improving the syllabus of an existing one, planning one semester of a course, or developing new teaching and learning materials.

Focus group interview and students’ evaluations

As mentioned, the TMIT course was given three times, recruiting students with background from the various branches of interpreting as shown in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community, health care, court interpreter trainers</th>
<th>Conference interpreter trainers</th>
<th>Sign language interpreter trainers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total 74</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Background of participants.

The total number of students who has taken the course is 74. Forty of these came with experience from public service interpreting education, six from conference interpreting courses and 28 from sign language interpreting programs.

The present paper draws partly on evaluation forms, filled in by students immediately after finishing the course in May 2000 and May 2001 (unfortunately only available from the first two groups), and partly on a focus group interview with six participants representing all three adminis-
trations of the course.

Table 2 shows the scores achieved in students’ evaluations. Following the standard formula, the students evaluated, on a scale from one to five, where five was the highest score, corresponding to “agree completely”, four basic ingredients: the course’s relevance for interpreter teachers, the course as learning environment, the suitability of the course literature and whether they considered a joint course for interpreter teachers representing various branches of interpreting a good idea.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course relevant for interpreter teachers</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall satisfaction with course</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with course literature</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>4.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint course for different interpreter teachers = good idea?</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>3.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. The TMIT courses’ scores in students’ evaluations

The students’ evaluations done immediately after finishing the course show that the first group rated the program much higher than the second group. A possible explanation for this is the background of the students. The first group consisted almost exclusively of students with a substantial experience with teaching who were familiar with teaching problems and teaching routines and were therefore able to integrate knowledge gleaned from the course literature and the seminars and lectures into their knowledge and experience base. This experience also enabled them to participate in discussions, bringing forward examples from their own professional practice. The second group was less well-prepared in this respect. Although all of them are professional interpreters, only a few of them had experience in teaching interpreting.

What is most conspicuous in the written evaluations is that the first group unanimously praised the idea of having a joint course for all kinds of interpreter trainers and its execution, feeling that they had benefited enormously from the exchange of experiences. This was not so in the second group. To be sure, some of the students did think that it is a good idea to have a common course, but most thought that separate training courses are needed for different kinds of interpreter trainers. This was most conspicuous among the sign-language interpreters in that group, who thus, according to the evaluations, did not seem to have established “common ground” with their colleagues, the spoken language community interpreters.
Focus group interview 2010

The interview data was collected in February 2010, i.e. between 6 and 10 years after the students had finished the course. In the interview drawn upon in this paper two sign-language interpreter trainers and four (various) spoken-language community interpreter trainers participated. (For practical reasons, one participant with experience from conference interpreting courses was interviewed separately.) The focus group involved one male and five female participants. Three participants finished the course in 2000, two in 2001, and one in 2004.

When comparing results from the written evaluations with results from the interviews, it becomes clear that those participating in the interviews were all very positive to the idea of a joint course. A few quotes will highlight this.

The names are non-authentic. In our examples, the names of public service interpreters begin with a P, those of sign language interpreters with an S and the conference interpreter is given a name starting with C. The interviews were conducted in Swedish, but the quotes will here be presented in English translation. (For the Swedish original transcripts, see Appendix.)

More or less from the start of the interview, Sally provides an overall positive evaluation of the course, emphasising “the social part”, which she wasn’t the first to do, as can be seen in Excerpt 1.

Excerpt 1

Sally: I thought the education was good. The best, just as Cindy says, was the social part. That we were different languages, where one could get ideas and tips and an exchange that means a whole lot.

Excerpt 2 quotes the interview with the conference-interpreter educator, stating the opportunities for discussions between various types of interpreters as her strongest and most positive memory from the TMIT course.

Excerpt 2

Connie: What I thought was very good, it were these, these discussions between the three groups, that is conference interpreters, community and sign language and interpreters for the deaf-blind. Is that four groups?
Connie’s reply confirms the overall positive image of a shared course, at the same time as it reveals a certain uncertainty concerning possible stratifications of the field of interpreting. Excerpt 3 shows an instance, where Sally, quoted in Excerpt 1, at the end of a longer sequence, wraps up by saying that “the advantage was that we were very... from different language groups”, hence actualising a stratification of the field of interpreting in terms of interpreting involving or not involving signed languages. Interestingly, Sally does not correct herself when asked, but Patty, teacher of public service interpreting, quickly fills in with her interpretation of what Sally must have meant.

**Excerpt 3**

**Sally:** But the advantage was that we were very... from different language groups.

**Q:** Mm. Different language groups?

**Sally:** Yes, with…

**Q:** Different countries? Different language groups?

**Patty:** Different educational background, both community interpreting and sign-language interpreting.

Sarah supports Sally’s positive evaluation, without touching upon, more precisely, how she relates to the talked about branches of interpreting. Without a doubt, she is in favour of mixing groups with people from other educational systems.

**Excerpt 4**

**Sarah:** ’cause sometimes you can feel kind of locked up in a corner, in your own small world. Eh... that you are missing something that others in the business find important. And I felt that mixing was very rewarding. [...] And I think, having worked now as a teacher for some time, I see that what I really need most is input from others.

The positive evaluation of the “joint course” thus seems to remain a salient and shared aspect, many years after finishing the course. Participants’
answers indicated that exchanges of ideas over traditional groups of interpreters were appreciated. Interestingly, we also found that the traditional grouping of branches of interpreting wasn’t altogether similar or clear for all participants.

Another positive aspect specifically mentioned is the project format of the examinations. This allows the students to specialize individually in their respective areas, but also to explore other areas. This meant that, as one participant phrased it, “You had to systematize your thoughts concerning how one can organize education”. Obviously, the fact that this was part of the examination implied that systematic and critical thinking was rewarded. Another participant appreciated the time they could spend on pondering upon teaching strategies and materials, instead of just repeating what they had done before, or experienced themselves as students.

Excerpt 5
Sally: And it was quite fantastic, wasn’t it, that you could put your thoughts about that [your own course] on paper. You first tried to figure out yourself and then discuss it in detail with... with the other participants in this course. You were supposed to present it and then get it criticized as well. And then I mean... that’s a positive thing to receive critique. People ask: why do you say like this and why do you think like that? And you can ask the same question to others.

All project texts were shared among the students of the group and have apparently continued to be a source of inspiration. Paul mentioned this specifically in his evaluation of the TMIT course, in the focus interview.

Excerpt 6
Paul: I still in my courses do the improvised role-play that we did [in the TMIT course] where the students are supposed to invent it all and do Swedish-Swedish interpreting. And it’s appreciated.
Cooperation between students was encouraged (within limits posed by the examination situation). Our hope was that there would be lots of project cooperation “across boundaries”, in accordance with the aims of developing the program. However, students tended largely to keep within the boundaries of their “own” area, or, perhaps more correctly, within the structure of their respective educational system. It should be noted that vocational courses in sign language interpreting are organized as three or four years of full-time studies at folk high schools. The students start by studying sign language, most of the time from scratch. Public service interpreting, on the other hand, is taught by study associations, folk high schools or vocational colleges in the form of part-time, one- or two-year courses and admittance is conditioned by students’ command of Swedish and another language. Mostly, the sign language interpreter programs and the public service interpreter programs/courses are given at different schools.

In the non-university public service interpreting courses, all examination tests are modeled upon the authorization tests and are also geared towards preparing the students to take these tests successfully. In other words, they are constructed as terminology tests and role-play tests, with the character of proficiency test (McNamara & Francis, 2000), checking whether the candidate has a potential to ultimately qualify as interpreter, rather than an achievement test (ibid.).

The issue of examination generated quite some discussion among our interviewees and took a direction we had not fully expected.

Excerpt 7
Sarah: Well, as for now we actually don’t do any exams. Rather, the analysis is done through all exercises, informally. [...]
Question: The analysis?
Sarah: Yes, the analysis. We we... everything is recorded, what the students do. Then us teachers look at it, and the student looks at a classmate[‘s interpretation] and analyzes it and looks it through. Then the whole class is gathered for analysis. First the classmate says her comments, and then the student herself, and then the teacher says her comments. But it’s really no exam, because we are going
through it, exercise by exercise, continuously. 

[...] and all the students watch each other and hear each other’s comments.

The data on which this study is based is of course too limited to draw any conclusions at all concerning people’s attitudes towards examinations. Sarah’s description of how examination is performed (or not performed) might stem from her relatively weak identity as teacher or from the tradition of her college. For interpreter courses within the *folkbildning* system, the checking of the prospective students’ language skills, examinations and graded marks after finishing was introduced relatively recently. All Swedish sign language interpreter education1 with which Sally and Sarah have had their experience has so far been organized within the nationwide educational system of *folkbildning*, where the legitimacy of all kinds of exams has long been rejected, on the grounds that exams create competition and exclude people.

Some conclusions

What about the two important aims of developing the TMIT course that were mentioned in the beginning of this paper? The first aim, to test whether a joint course will suit interpreter trainers in different areas, can be said to be given a cautious but rather enthusiastic ‘yes’. We can see that this type of course has worked especially well when the students already had some teaching experience and were in need of continuing education as educators. Students inexperienced in teaching need a more basic education, in certain respects. They seem to need training of a kind which this course did not foresee. However, that would not, we think, exclude the possibility of having a joint course for interpreter trainers aiming to work within various social settings and domains.

The second aim, to give an impetus to development and cooperation in interpreter training across the traditional boundaries between conference, public service and sign language interpreting seems to have been reached, but mainly on an informal, personal level. Our interviewees attest to keeping up contacts within the group, discussing pedagogical matters and exchanging experiences. However, more formalized cooperation between different kinds of interpreter trainers is a matter which is largely out of their hands, since it does depend on structures higher up in their respective educational systems.

Finally, concerning the overall thinking about teacher education as situated learning, in the interviews, the participants hardly spend any time on even mentioning any of the quite numerous lectures or the course litera-

---

1In the fall of 2013, the first ever bachelors’ course in Interpreting and Swedish sign language will start off at Stockholm University.
turer that were part of the course. Instead, they talk vividly about their interaction with co-students and about their project work. This is what stands out as what they brought back from the course, as the basis of their learning and knowledge. Of course, this does not mean that the course curriculum, as presented in lectures and course literature, was unimportant. It was highly important for those who planned the course and who did lot of the teaching. In choosing literature and planning lessons, we actually expressed our own ideas about interpreting, as one professional area, at a certain level. And the course expressed our conviction that a course designed for interpreter educators should reflect this. Our ideas and ideals are rooted in our own experiences, as interpreters, interpreter trainers, and researchers in this area. This conviction permeated the creation of the course and its curricular design, from overall aspects to the planning of single lessons and seminars. This conviction in the end gave the students a collaborative learning environment: it provided the occasion, the structure and the contents for student active learning.
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Appendix – Excerpts in the Swedish original transcriptions.

Excerpt 1
Sally: Jag tyckte att utbildningen var bra. Det bästa, precis som Cindy säger, det här med det sociala. Att vi var från olika språk, där man kunde få idéer och tips och utbyte som betyder väldigt mycket.

Excerpt 2
Connie: Det första jag tyckte var väldigt bra, det var dessa, dessa diskussioner de tre grupperna emellan, det vill säga konferenstolkar, kontakttolk och teckenspråk och tolkar för dövblinda. Är det fyra grupper?

Excerpt 3
Sally: Men fördelen var ju att vi var väld... från olika språkgrupper.
Fråga: Mm. Olika språkgrupper?
Sally: Ja, med...
Fråga: Olika länder? Olika språkgrupper?
Patty: Olika utbildningar. Både kontaktutbildning och teckenspråk.

Excerpt 4
Sarah: för ibland så kan jag känna att man blir så inlåst i ett hörn i sin egen lilla värld. Eh... att man kan missa något som är viktigt i en annan del. Och det kände jag att det var jättegivande att få blanda sig. [...] Och jag tror, nu när jag jobbat ett tag som lärare, så ser jag att det är just kontakten med andra som jag verkligen behöver.
Excerpt 5
Sally: Och det var ju fantastiskt att få lov att sätta ner det [den egna kursen] på papper. Först sitta och fundera hemma på kammaren, att stöta och blöta det med... med andra som gick utbildningen.
Och få lägga fram det och få det sen kritiserat också. Och då menar jag... det är ju positivt att få det kritiserat, att folk säger: Varför säger ni så här och varför tänker ni så här? Och att man hade möjlighet att fråga andra samma sak.

Excerpt 6
Paul: Jag kör på min utbildning fortfarande det där rollspelet improviserat, när studenterna ska hitta på själva liksom och tolka svenska-svenska. Och det uppskattas.

Excerpt 7
Sarah: Ja, som det är nu så har vi ju egentligen inga prov, utan analysen sker genom alla övningar informellt. [...] Fråga: Analyser?
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