

ETHICAL IMPLICATIONS IN SITUATIONS WHERE THE LANGUAGE OF INTERPRETATION SHIFTS: THE AUSIT CODE OF ETHICS

BY JIM HLAVAC

ABOUT JIM HLAVAC



- Senior Lecturer in Translation and interpreting
 Studies at Monash University (Australia)
- Certified translator and interpreter
- English, Croatian, German
- Has published various works themes of research:
- Pedagogy of interpreting
- Multilinguism in interpreting situations
- Intercultural communication
- Standards and benchmarks of interpreting and translation

STRUCTURE OF THE ARTICLE

- Canguage shifts: what is shifting?
- Examples of language shifts
- Ethical considerations
- Data collection on shifting among a sample of 60 interpreters
- AUSIT Code of Ethics

SHIFTING

- Within a conversation among multilingual speakers → switching from one language to another
- 2 main reasons:
- Perceived language proficiency
 - Every multilingual speaker has a dominant language
- Re-negotiation of personal ethnic, educational and socioeconomic attributes
 - Direct client request or inferences (through LINGUISTIC MONITORING)

EXAMPLES OF SHIFTING

- From Hlavac's personal experience
 - Croatian → German, Ukranian → Russian, Assyrian → Arabic

| For example: | |
|----------------------------------|-----------------|
| Ethnicity | Ashkali |
| Citizenship | Serbian |
| Residence | Kosovo, Germany |
| First language | Albanian |
| Dominant language | German |
| Language choice for interpreting | German |

INTERPRETING SERVICES

- Allocated by institutions
 - Language determined by the client's citizenship/ethnicity
- The client can choose another language (national identity, sense of duty)
- Difficult to gather data about people's linguistic biography
 - Mismatched interpreting services

ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS AND CODES OF CONDUCT

- Formal code distinguished a profession from an occupation (Mikkelson 2000/2001, p.49)
- Categorisation of behaviour as: desirable, neutral or undesirable
- Legal, medical and sign language amongst the first
- Need and validity
- Can such behaviours be universal or will they inevitably remain culturally-specific?

THE AUSIT CODE OF ETHICS

- AUSIT: Australian Institute of Interpreters and Translators, professional association
- Founded in 1987
- AUSIT Code of Ethics (CoE)
- History:
 - First drafted in the early 1990s and completed in 1995
 - Redeveloped and revised in 1999
 - Last update 2012

- Frequently included in contemporary research in Interpreting Studies in Australia
- Contains eight main sections:
 - Professional conduct
 - Confidentiality
 - Competence
 - Impartiality
 - Accuracy
 - Employment
 - Professional development
 - Professional solidarity

THE STUDY (FREQUENCY OF SHIFTING)

- Informants:
 - Accredited, recognised and/or practising interpreters
 - 67 responses, but 7 excluded due to incomplete/missing data
 - Australian-based
- At least tri-lingual
- 44 possess formal accreditation or recognition
- Not included:
 - Interpreters with only two languages
 - Data from clients, agencies or others

- Methodology:
- August and September 2008
- Informants contacted through AUSIT and a training session by NAATI
- Voluntary participation
- Completion of an anonymous questionnaire
 - Settings of acquisition of language
 - Experiences of client shifting or trying to shift
 - Details about experiences
 - Hypothetical situations involving shifts: provide judgements and comments

INCIDENCE OF SHIFTING

| Table 2: Type and details of shifting recorded amongst informants | | |
|---|--------|--|
| Pattern of shifting: languages involved, directions or | Number | |
| motivations | | |
| Language of country of previous migration → Language | 5 | |
| of country of birth | | |
| Spanish → Italian | | |
| Oromo → Somali | | |
| Spanish (→ Italian) → Sicilian | | |
| Japanese → Mandarin | | |
| German → Hungarian | | |
| National language → Regional language ³ | 5 | |
| Mandarin → Cantonese | | |
| Mandarin → Shanghainese | | |
| Urdu → Punjabi | | |
| Amharic → Oromo | | |
| Urdu → Pushto | | |
| Minority language ³ → National language | 3 | |
| $Karen \rightarrow Burmese$ | | |
| Karen → Thai | | |
| Nuer → (Sudanese) Arabic | | |
| National language 1 → National language 2 | 3 | |
| Dari → Pushto | | |
| Croatian → Bosnian | | |
| Bosnian → Croatian | | |
| National language → Minority language | 2 | |
| Indonesian → Hokkien | 2000 | |
| Serbian → Hungarian | | |
| Language of country of birth → Language of country of | 1 | |
| previous migration | | |
| Dinka → Swahili | | |
| Desire to avoid contact with interpreter from L1 | 1 | |
| community | 1000 | |
| French \rightarrow Arabic \rightarrow French | | |
| | | |

- 33% of the informants reported shifts
- Seven categories of shifts
- Status of languages involved
- Motivation for shifting
- Direction of the shift
- Breakdown of shifting
- 12 shifts initiated by client for client's benefit
- 5 cases are not clear about who initiated the shift
- 3 shifts initiated by interpreters

THE ETHICS OF SHIFTING

- Study about hypothetical scenarios
- Acceptable borderline not acceptable no answer
- Language x (in which communication commences)
- Language y (into which shifting occurs)

TYPES OF SHIFTS

1) Client-initiated for the client's own benefit

- Client prefers speaking in y and interpreter can also speak it what to do:
 - Switch is it acceptable? (communication VS performance inconsistency)
 - A: 35, B: 7, N:10, NA: 8
 - Not switch is it acceptable? (lack of proficiency VS accommodating the client's request)
 - A: 19, B: 10, N:23, NA: 8

2) Client-initiated for the interpreter's benefit

- Client knows interpreter also speaks y and offers to shift what to do:
 - Switch is it acceptable? (facilitating communication)
 - A: 25, B: 10, N: 13, NA: 8
 - Not switch is it acceptable? (safer options VS risk of offending VS lack of preparation)
 - A: 28, B: 11, N: 10, NA: 11

TYPES OF SHIFTS

- 3) Interpreter-initiated for the client's benefit 2 options:
- Client struggles with x and interpreter offers to switch to y:
 - Facilitating communication VS implicit evaluation of the client's language skills
 - A: 36, B: 5, N: 9, NA: 10
- Client struggles with x and interpreter suggests/recommends switching to y:
 - Facilitating communication VS possible offense
 - If a switch is possible, should the interpreter inform the other party?
 - A: 31, B: 5, N: 1, NA: 24

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

- Shifting
 - Acceptable:
 - Clients shift and interpreters follow them
 - Interpreters recommend a shift
 - Not acceptable:
 - Clients shift and interpreters don't follow them
 - Justified by a desire to facilitate communication

- Not shifting justifications:
 - No obligation
- Lack of practice or preparedness
 - Suggested by ethical guidelines

FACTORS THAT CO-DETERMINE THE LIKELIHOOD OF SHIFTING

- Not included in the presented hypothetical situations:
 - Reference to specific languages
 - Formal diagnosis of proficiency levels
- Status of the languages
- Relationship between language and external factors (e.g. citizenship, religion)
- Pragmatic and politeness norms
- Vary from language to language careful with different formulations

PROPOSED GUIDELINES FOR SHIFTING

- Accuracy:
- Short conversation and confirmation of the language pair
- Clear uncertainties
- Truth and completeness

- o Professional conduct:
- Offer to shift (non-dominant competence)
- Risk of exercising power/influence over the client
- Accept only assignment you are competent to perform
 - Or inform your client (shift midassignment)
- Risk of encroachment
 - Inform the contracting body of shifts

Thank you for your attention!