

# The Impact of Intercultural Complications on Interpreting

<sup>1</sup>Saadaoui Majda & <sup>2</sup>Azmi Nourredine

<sup>1&2</sup>Cadi Ayyad University, Marrakesh, Morocco

Email1 : [majda\\_saadaoui@um5.ac.ma](mailto:majda_saadaoui@um5.ac.ma)

Received	Accepted	Published
15/6/2023	12/7/2022	30/7/2022

DOI: 10.17613/cmh2-cd86

Cite this article as : Saadaoui, M., & Azmi, N. (2023). The Impact of Intercultural Complications on Interpreting. *Arabic Journal for Translation Studies*, 2(4), 51-82.

## Abstract

The aim of this graduation research thesis, The Impact of Intercultural Complications on Interpreting, is to introduce future interpreters to some strategies that they could use in case they are faced with intercultural differences during the process of simultaneous interpretation from English into Arabic and vice versa . The research paper is organized into two parts. The first part includes two chapters: The first chapter reviews relevant theories about cultural differences in translation studies, while the second one highlights previous relevant research, the second part also contains two chapters. The third chapter brings out methods used in the process of data collection and the fourth one includes a detailed presentation and discussion of the research findings.

**Keywords:** Interpreting, Intercultural Complications, Translation Technology

© 2023, Saadaoui & Azmi, licensee Democratic Arab Center. This article is published under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0), which permits non-commercial use of the material, appropriate credit, and indication if changes in the material were made. You can copy and redistribute the material in any medium or format as well as remix, transform, and build upon the material, provided the original work is properly cited.

## Introduction

### Research area and context

The increase of globalization, the growth of multicultural societies, the disappearance of borders, and the advancement of technologies are all undoubtedly occurrences which characterize the 21st century. Although the world seems to be a global village, culture comes across new challenges and evolutions that necessarily modify each kind of intervention. These matters are all areas of growing interest within the field of Translation and Interpreting studies. Cultural studies have shaped the world wherein we live. It does not only influence humans' lifestyle, but also impacts the language they speak. As a result, interpreting from one language to another is also impacted.

### Significance and purpose of the research study

This research paper intends to explore the experiences of interpreters; how they do deal with cultural differences while rendering speeches or sentences in simultaneous interpreting. Their experience is a real-life one that could reveal the importance of taking into consideration the culture of both the speaker and audience. In other words, the study is an attempt to show the cultural challenges that interpreters might face while having distinctive cultures. The thesis also concerns the use of new technologies in interpreting –specifically speaking: machine interpretation and its delineations within the cultural framework.

This thesis attempts to focus on two main objectives. To begin with, it will share interpreters' experiences so that future interpreters could benefit from them and pay attention to the cultural aspects, the strategies used to face lack of cultural equivalence. Besides, it would raise the point of limitations of real-time interpreting and highlight some suggested solutions. Finally, by doing that, it will introduce the upcoming interpreters to interpreting techniques they could use in case they are involved in similar situations.

### Statement of the research problem

One of the major problems that my research paper attempts to throw light on is the way interpreters manage to render the text or speech in real-time interpreting, despite cultural differences. Another important issue is cultural equivalence. In another way, how do they cope-up with the lack of equivalence of the source speech (SS) culture in the target speech (TS) culture. These challenges and complications that interpreters face are the main problems which this research paper would address. The last crucial issue that the research tackles is the use of machine interpreting and its limitations within cultural interpretation.

## Research questions and hypotheses

In this research paper, I will try to answer the following questions:

- To what extent do cultural differences affect interpreting?
- To what extent does lack of cultural equivalence impact interpreting?

## Research methodology

The research study will focus on data that is collected from a focus group. I am going to conduct an in-depth one, which is in the form of structured call interviews (WhatsApp group). This method allows more freedom for both the interviewer (me) and the interviewee (Interpreters) to get more points about the topic and change direction, if necessary. My participants will be interpreters preferably conference interpreters and graduates of King Fahd School whose major is interpreting.

## Positionality

Firstly, I am privileged since I am a graduate from two different departments, English & Applied Foreign Languages departments. This will help me to find participants among my former classmates who opted for interpreting as a major of an M.A program, in addition to my previous professors of translation who work as interpreters. As a volunteer of AIESEC Morocco and Vice president of AIESEC India, I have gained a large network which includes both foreign and Moroccan interpreters and journalists. I may also use the skills learned within organizing an interview for AIESEC to go to interpreters' offices and ask them if they would like to participate. I am also lucky to have contacts with my previous colleagues from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Morocco when I was an intern. Thus; I might invite the interpreters for the focus group interview.

## Part one: Review of relevant literature

### Chapter 1: Theories, approaches and models of cultural translation

#### 1.1. What is culture?

“Culture” is a hard concept to define, since it may have various numbers of definitions based on the contexts used in. Nevertheless, the concept that is at the heart of cultural studies, it might be found very much in cultural anthropology. Therefore, it remains away from any interest in high culture<sup>1</sup>. It also implies realization that “all human beings live in a world that is created by human

beings, and in which they find meaning". Culture is the complicated things in the world we everyday face and through which we all circulate. Culture starts once human beings exceed whatever is given in their natural inheritance. The production of the natural world, in agriculture and horticulture, is thus a crucial component of a culture. Thus, the two most essential or vague elements of culture may be the capacity of humans to construct and build, and to utilize language; to grasp all sorts of sign systems (Edgar& Sedgwick, 1999).

Newmark states in his book, *A Textbook of Translation*, that culture is defined as the way of life and its manifestations, which are unique to a society that uses a particular language as a means of expression. For him, distinguishing between cultural and personal language is important. He is; thus, explicitly pointing out that each language system has its own cultural specificities (Newmark, 1988). On the other hand, culture could be seen as a number of convictions, which controls the behavior patterns of a community. These convictions contain politics, economy, religions, literary products and language. Therefore, language is an intrinsic component of culture, and translation involves two cultures: The culture of the SL (original culture) and the culture of the TL (target culture) (Aziz and Muftah, 2000).

## 1.2. What is translation?

Translation is considered as a crucial part of communication between humans and its essentialism emerged in the 20th century i.e. the number of exchanging ideas and information among different languages has developed. However, the growth of translation as a career comparatively new which is yet enclosed with contradictions most of which derived from emotions (Citroen, 1966:12). The state that translation has been doomed to continuous controversy and that many scholars have various opinions about it, has led to different definitions of its process.

Jeremy Munday mentions its origin as being derived either from Old French *translation* or Latin *transalito* that is coming from the participle of the verb 'to carry over.' According to him, translation attested first in around 1340c and it has several meanings today in the major of languages; 1. It can be seen as a general subject field when it comes to University; 2. It might be a product which means the text that has been translated; 3. It is the service of producing translation.

Translation is defined by Hatim and Munday as the procedure of converting a written text from source language (SL) to target language (TL). In this definition they do not explicitly convey that the object being translated is meaning or message. They put emphasis on translation as a procedure. Catford describes it as a process and a product. In other words, replacing a textual

material in one language (SL) by its equivalent textual material in another language (TL). This latter indicates that translation is an activity that is carried out by people gradually. The fact that expressions are translated into simpler formulas in the same language (Rewording and paraphrasing), It could be also done from one language into another which is different. On the other side of the coin, translation is a product because it provides us with other various cultures, ancient communities and civilizations when the meanings of translated texts reach us (Yowell and Mutfah, 1999).

### 1.3. Cultural translation

Cultural translation is a post-colonial concept that developed with its first academic appearance in 1985 (Maitland, 2017). Sarah Maitland's book, *What Is Cultural Translation*, is an attempt to define culture that is considered in the field of translation studies to be ambiguous. The author points out in her preface that cultural translation could be seen as an "evocative and frustratingly abstruse" one (Maitland, 2017: Preface, vii), she then sets out to persuade the reader that it is also an urgent matter because differences between people across the globe are articulated.

The term "cultural translation"—first presented by the anthropologist Roger Keesing (1985)—is labeled as an emerging field of study among anthropologists and other social scholars. This field of study is seen as being vaguer than just the interlingual translation of texts done by professional translators. Cultural translation is concerned with what people do, or have to do, so as to accept and understand other people or different kinds of cultures, grasping at hand the total meaning of the word. According to Maitland, in today's world where various ideologies, distinct modes of life, and different kinds of human beings and activities are taking place more and sometimes resulted to disputes or splits, cultural translation of customs, inscriptions, and institutes is desperately required (Maitland, 2017: Preface, i). Cultural translation insights could be of great help to surmount the aforementioned social and political matters. However; cultural translation is more concerned with developing ourselves through interacting with those who are different from us.

Cultural translation, as introduced by Maitland, is built on the belief that several cultures are "distinct" from one another and that their significations cannot be understood by others. Thus, it is impossible to transmit meanings of a text set for translation into the translation. The original text is extrinsic, so its meanings cannot be reached due to the shifts in time, place, and culture. Signification is not spotted in the text or culture, or in reading behind lines (The intention of the writer). However, it is created in the mind of the reader translator depending on the targeted

meaning that is communicated through the text. During the translation process, meaning is not disseminated from one language to another. It is, in fact, constructed by the reader translator who interchanges with the source text. As Maitland mentions: “When pen meets page, the resulting translation reveals more about the translator’s own subjectivity than the reality of the translation’s object itself” (Maitland, 2017). Indeed, all translation-among linguistic interlingual translations-signifies interpretation, mediation, and transformation.

Anthony Pym gives in his book, *Exploring Translation Theories*, a various number of cultural translation definitions by many scholars and theorists. He mentions that the concept of cultural translation is broad that could be used to deal with issues in postmodern sociology, post colonialism, migration, cultural hybridity <sup>2</sup>and much more. He also defines cultural translation as “a process in which there is no start text and usually no fixed target text. The focus is on cultural processes rather than products” (Pym, 2017: 138). He sees movement of people (subjects) rather than movement of texts (objects) as the first reason for cultural translation.

According to Pym, the concepts linked to cultural translation could fit other positions by paying careful attention to the paradigm of the translator and the cultural hybridity that could shape it besides the cross-cultural movements that structure the spots where translators work, and the problematic nature of the cultural borders get over by all translations. For him, cultural translation can call on many broad notions of translation, especially as emerged in: 1. Social anthropology is where the task of the ethnographer is to describe the foreign culture. 2. Actor-network theory (translation sociology) is where the interactions that form networks are seen as translations. 3. Sociologies that study communication between groups in complex, fragmented societies, particularly those shaped by migration (Pym, 2017).

#### 1.4. The Influence of Culture on Translation and Interpretation

“Some Thoughts on the Influence of Culture on Translation in Literary Translation” is an article written by Min Zhang who is an associate professor in Northwest University in China. She discusses the influence of culture on translation. According to her, Hui-Hong L I<sup>3</sup> points out in the journal of Huaihua’s university that translation is the activity expressed through a language in another language by the translator. It is the semantic expression of the language and the interpretation of culture. Therefore, translation is a very active language and culture system composed of many elements. As a bridge to disseminate knowledge and culture, translation is inevitably influenced by culture. There are two main aspects of the influence of culture on

<sup>2</sup>

<sup>3</sup>

Translation: One is the influence on the translator, and the two is the influence on the translation activities. Culture can not only promote translation activities, but also influence and even restrict translation activities to some extent (Zhang, 2018:400).

On the influence of culture on the translator, Zhang stresses on the fact that translation is the bridge that links the information and the cultural exchange between the languages. It could be seen during the process of text conversion and the translator is the key note. His or her knowledge, experience, and living environment will be so crucial in this process. Thus; the choice of the translator is often unconsciously influenced by many cultural factors. According to her the translator cultural communication's view and the text of translation should be considered as a part of the broad social and cultural background. The translator should also spot the cultural components in the source text to translate into the translation that is understood by the reader. A successful translator should possess the following qualities when dealing with the cultural factors in Translation: two cultures are well-known; an expert on cultural understanding; flexible transformation of cultural orientation; high cross-cultural sensitivity; a level of cultural evaluation (Zhang, 2017).

For her, "translation is the conversion of two languages. Understanding is of great importance, but the final result of translation is to be expressed. As a cultural individual, it is sometimes impossible to realize that we are affected by the culture. Therefore, in spite of the efforts to overcome the subjective factors in the process of translation, the result is still imprinted with the culture of the target language" (Zhang, 2017). She states that the choice of the translator during the process of translating is affected by cultural features unconsciously because when a translator absorbs a foreign culture; his attitude is either open or constative towards it which affects enormously the content and style of the translation.

Companies are aware of this and are cynical about the use of university trained interpreters and are becoming more confident at handing over translating tasks to their own department. There is the need for a new style of interpreter who becomes an obstacle to communication which the translator cannot solve. Last but not least, informal (out-of-awareness) culture: At the informal level, the mediator should be able to intervene and mediate. The training programmers should be oriented to the production of intercultural mediators: People who are able to do rather more than just to translate. The potential role of a translator as cultural mediator is that he is able to mediate the non-converging world-views or maps of the world. Thus, allowing the participants to cooperate to the degree they wish.



The cultural interpreter is a community or public service interpreter, working to ensure that the client receives full and equal access to public services. A cultural mediator is a person who facilitates communication, understanding and action between persons who differ with respect to language and culture. The role of mediator is performed by interpreting the expressions, intentions, perceptions and expectation by establishing and balancing the communication between them. He must be able to participate to both cultures so be bicultural. A mediator must have:

- Knowledge about society (History, folklore, customs, value, prohibitions)
- Communication skills
- Technical skills (Computer literacy)
- Social skills (Rules that govern social relation, self-control).

He must be flexible in switching his cultural orientation, have a high degree of intercultural sensitivity, and reach a level of contextual evaluation (Katan, 2003).

### 1.5. Cultural translation theory

The implication of theories could be related to translation practices. Indeed, translators are using theories every time they are working on translation. They always produce possible translations and then have to pick up one of them. This means that a number of ideas are called upon about what a translation is, and how it should be done. Therefore, they are theorizing. As mentioned by Pym, there have been and still are debates over various ways of translating. At the beginning, this has caused arguments related to practical theorization. Then, they have become denotative theories with names and an illustration for many characteristics of translation (Pym, 2014). One of those theories is cultural translation. This theory could be seen as a new theory, because it takes into consideration points that other translation theories miss and construct valid points (Pym, 2014) which are crucial to focus on, while dealing with translation as intercultural communication. These points concern the introduction of a human dimension and approach to translation as a cultural process (Pym, 2014:154). This is further explained by Bhabha and others.

Cultural translation idea is introduced by Bhabha. It is an approach that does not label translations as limited texts, but sees translations as a general activity of communication between cultures. It could be interpreted as a cultural process where there is no fixed target text (Pym, 2014). No fixed target text can be illustrated through the concept of "Untranslatability". In other words, the impossibility to find equivalence between the source and target text may lead to a translation, wherein a word is lost through creative improvisation and hybridization. Thus; the source text may change in transit, supporting the procedure of no fixed target text. This is because of multiple meanings linked to translations. Besides, the subjective position of the translator who



knows two languages which are located on or in the borders between cultures. Here, cultural hybridity may emerge. Approving that cultural hybridity and untranslatability might appear in a translation process and that translator must choose between many meanings in addition to the concept of cultural translation permits translators to pass over binarisms (Pym, 2014).

Zeng mentions that the cultural approach stresses particularly on the crucial status of culture in translation and the cultural impact of translation in the receptor-language region, treating translation as independent literature but not just copy of source texts. The cultural approach is distinct from the traditional approaches which its purpose is to transfer the message or function. It localizes translation into the large cultural environment, emphasizing on the cultural factors, history and the standards (Zeng, 2006). It gives a new perspective of translation studies. Polysystem theory is one typical example of cultural approach, though it was introduced before the birth of culture. Polysystem theory focuses on the whole cultural environment to decide which strategy the translator should use. In the 1990s, cultural turn moved to be political then improved to the feminist, cannibalism and post-colonialism approaches. They, on the other side, went after the functionalist approach whose roles differ. However, the cultural approach at that time just had one role, propagating their political tendency. Clearly, those theorists misinterpreted the meaning of the cultural approach.

### 1.6. Culture and translation

Morena Braçaj mentions in one of the journals on culture and translation that many theorists see translation goes hand in hand with culture. It is derived from the fact that translation is a

### 1.3. Cultural translation

Cultural translation is a post-colonial concept that developed with its first academic appearance in 1985 (Maitland, 2017). Sarah Maitland's book, *What Is Cultural Translation*, is an attempt to define culture that is considered in the field of translation studies to be ambiguous. The author points out in her preface that cultural translation could be seen as an "evocative and frustratingly abstruse" one (Maitland, 2017: Preface, vii), she then sets out to persuade the reader that it is also an urgent matter because differences between people across the globe are articulated.

The term "cultural translation"—first presented by the anthropologist Roger Keesing (1985)—is labeled as an emerging field of study among anthropologists and other social scholars. This field of study is seen as being vaguer than just the interlingual translation of texts done by professional translators. Cultural translation is concerned with what people do, or have to do, so as to accept and understand other people or different kinds of cultures, grasping at hand the total meaning of

the word. According to Maitland, in today's world where various ideologies, distinct modes of life, and different kinds of human beings and activities are taking place more and sometimes resulted to disputes or splits, cultural translation of customs, inscriptions, and institutes is desperately required (Maitland, 2017: Preface, i). Cultural translation insights could be of great help to surmount the aforementioned social and political matters. However; cultural translation is more concerned with developing ourselves through interacting with those who are different from us.

Cultural translation, as introduced by Maitland, is built on the belief that several cultures are "distinct" from one another and that their significations cannot be understood by others. Thus, it is impossible to transmit meanings of a text set for translation into the translation. The original text is extrinsic, so its meanings cannot be reached due to the shifts in time, place, and culture. Signification is not spotted in the text or culture, or in reading behind lines (The intention of the writer). However, it is created in the mind of the reader translator depending on the targeted meaning that is communicated through the text. During the translation process, meaning is not disseminated from one language to another. It is, in fact, constructed by the reader translator who interchanges with the source text. As Maitland mentions: "When pen meets page, the resulting translation reveals more about the translator's own subjectivity than the reality of the translation's object itself" (Maitland, 2017). Indeed, all translation-among linguistic interlingual translations-signifies interpretation, mediation, and transformation.

Anthony Pym gives in his book, *Exploring Translation Theories*, a various number of cultural translation definitions by many scholars and theorists. He mentions that the concept of cultural translation is broad that could be used to deal with issues in postmodern sociology, post colonialism, migration, cultural hybridity <sup>4</sup>and much more. He also defines cultural translation as "a process in which there is no start text and usually no fixed target text. The focus is on cultural processes rather than products" (Pym, 2017: 138). He sees movement of people (subjects) rather than movement of texts (objects) as the first reason for cultural translation.

According to Pym, the concepts linked to cultural translation could fit other positions by paying careful attention to the paradigm of the translator and the cultural hybridity that could shape it besides the cross-cultural movements that structure the spots where translators work, and the problematic nature of the cultural borders get over by all translations. For him, cultural translation can call on many broad notions of translation, especially as emerged in: 1. Social

anthropology is where the task of the ethnographer is to describe the foreign culture. 2. Actor-network theory (translation sociology) is where the interactions that form networks are seen as translations. 3. Sociologies that study communication between groups in complex, fragmented societies, particularly those shaped by migration (Pym, 2017).

#### 1.4. The Influence of Culture on Translation and Interpretation

“Some Thoughts on the Influence of Culture on Translation in Literary Translation” is an article written by Min Zhang who is an associate professor in Northwest University in China. She discusses the influence of culture on translation. According to her, Hui-Hong L I<sup>5</sup> points out in the journal of Huaihua’s university that translation is the activity expressed through a language in another language by the translator. It is the semantic expression of the language and the interpretation of culture. Therefore, translation is a very active language and culture system composed of many elements. As a bridge to disseminate knowledge and culture, translation is inevitably influenced by culture. There are two main aspects of the influence of culture on Translation: One is the influence on the translator, and the two is the influence on the translation activities. Culture can not only promote translation activities, but also influence and even restrict translation activities to some extent (Zhang, 2018:400).

On the influence of culture on the translator, Zhang stresses on the fact that translation is the bridge that links the information and the cultural exchange between the languages. It could be seen during the process of text conversion and the translator is the key note. His or her knowledge, experience, and living environment will be so crucial in this process. Thus; the choice of the translator is often unconsciously influenced by many cultural factors. According to her, the translator's cultural communication’s view and the text of translation should be considered as a part of the broad social and cultural background. The translator should also spot the cultural components in the source text to translate into the translation that is understood by the reader. A successful translator should possess the following qualities when dealing with the cultural factors in Translation: two cultures are well-known; an expert on cultural understanding; flexible transformation of cultural orientation; high cross-cultural sensitivity; a level of cultural evaluation (Zhang, 2017).

For her, “translation is the conversion of two languages. Understanding is of great importance, but the final result of translation is to be expressed. As a cultural individual, it is sometimes impossible to realize that we are affected by the culture. Therefore, in spite of the efforts to

overcome the subjective factors in the process of translation, the result is still imprinted with the culture of the target language” (Zhang, 2017). She states that the choice of the translator during the process of translating is affected by cultural features unconsciously because when a translator absorbs a foreign culture; his attitude is either open or constative towards it which affects enormously the content and style of the translation.

Companies are aware of this and are cynical about the use of university trained interpreters and are becoming more confident at handing over translating tasks to their own department. There is the need for a new style of interpreter who becomes an obstacle to communication which the translator cannot solve. Last but not least, informal (out-of-awareness) culture: At the informal level, the mediator should be able to intervene and mediate. The training programmers should be oriented to the production of intercultural mediators: People who are able to do rather more than just to translate. The potential role of a translator as cultural mediator is that he is able to mediate the non-converging world-views or maps of the world. Thus, allowing the participants to cooperate to the degree they wish.

The cultural interpreter is a community or public service interpreter, working to ensure that the client receives full and equal access to public services. A cultural mediator is a person who facilitates communication, understanding and action between persons who differ with respect to language and culture. The role of mediator is performed by interpreting the expressions, intentions, perceptions and expectation by establishing and balancing the communication between them. He must be able to participate to both cultures so be bicultural. A mediator must have:

- Knowledge about society (History, folklore, customs, value, prohibitions)
- Communication skills
- Technical skills (Computer literacy)
- Social skills (Rules that govern social relation, self-control).

He must be flexible in switching his cultural orientation, have a high degree of intercultural sensitivity, and reach a level of contextual evaluation (Katan, 2003).

### 1.5. Cultural translation theory

The implication of theories could be related to translation practices. Indeed, translators are using theories every time they are working on translation. They always produce possible translations and then have to pick up one of them. This means that a number of ideas are called upon about what a translation is, and how it should be done. Therefore, they are theorizing. As mentioned by Pym, there have been and still are debates over various ways of translating. At the

beginning, this has caused arguments related to practical theorization. Then, they have become denotative theories with names and an illustration for many characteristics of translation (Pym, 2014). One of those theories is cultural translation. This theory could be seen as a new theory, because it takes into consideration points that other translation theories miss and construct valid points (Pym, 2014) which are crucial to focus on, while dealing with translation as intercultural communication. These points concern the introduction of a human dimension and approach to translation as a cultural process (Pym, 2014:154). This is further explained by Bhabha and others.

Cultural translation idea is introduced by Bhabha. It is an approach that does not label translations as limited texts, but sees translations as a general activity of communication between cultures. It could be interpreted as a cultural process where there is no fixed target text (Pym, 2014). No fixed target text can be illustrated through the concept of "Untranslability". In other words, the impossibility to find equivalence between the source and target text may lead to a translation, wherein a word is lost through creative improvisation and hybridization. Thus; the source text may change in transit, supporting the procedure of no fixed target text. This is because of multiple meanings linked to translations. Besides, the subjective position of the translator who knows two languages which are located on or in the borders between cultures. Here, cultural hybridity may emerge. Approving that cultural hybridity and untranslatability might appear in a translation process and that translator must choose between many meanings in addition to the concept of cultural translation permits translators to pass over binarisms (Pym, 2014).

Zeng mentions that the cultural approach stresses particularly on the crucial status of culture in translation and the cultural impact of translation in the receptor-language region, treating translation as independent literature but not just copy of source texts. The cultural approach is distinct from the traditional approaches which its purpose is to transfer the message or function. It localizes translation into the large cultural environment, emphasizing on the cultural factors, history and the standards (Zeng, 2006). It gives a new perspective of translation studies. Polysystem theory is one typical example of cultural approach, though it was introduced before the birth of culture turn. Polysystem theory focuses on the whole cultural environment to decide which strategy the translator should use. In the 1990s, cultural turn moved to be political then improved to the feminist, cannibalism and post-colonialism approaches. They, on the other side, went after the functionalist approach whose roles differ. However, the cultural approach at that time just had one role, propagating their political tendency. Clearly, those theorists misinterpreted the meaning of the cultural approach.

### 1.6. Culture and translation

Morena Braçaj mentions in one of the journals on culture and translation that many theorists see translation goes hand in hand with culture. It is derived from the fact that translation is a process of transfer not only between two languages, but also between two cultures. Both source language and target language are grounded in communicative situations with respect to their cultures (Braçaj,2014).

On the interchange between culture and translation, House points out that: “Translation is not only a linguistic act; it is also a cultural one, an act of communication across cultures. Translation always involves both language and culture simply because the two cannot really be separated. Language is culturally embedded: It both expresses and shapes cultural reality, and the meanings of linguistic items, be they words or larger segments of text, can only be understood when considered together with the cultural context in which these linguistic items are used. “She concludes with this statement:” In the process of translation, therefore, not only the two languages but also the two cultures come into contact. In this sense, it can be said that translating is a form of intercultural communication...” (House,2009).

According to Braçaj (Braçaj,2014), whoever has tried to translate a text discovers that knowing only languages is not enough and does not give a successful outcome. Peter Newmark (1995, p.79) mentions that: “any old fool can learn a language [...] but it takes an intelligent person to become a translator”. For Venutie, the quality of a translation is based on its relationship to the cultural and social conditions under which the translation is produced and read. So now, it is clearly spread in the majority of translation scholar the fact of not ignoring the cultural aspect while translating. Nida and Taber view cultural translation as “a translation in which the content of the message is changed to conform to the receptor culture in some way, and/or in which information is introduced which is not linguistically implicit in the original” (Nida and Taber, 1982).

### 1.7. Interpretation as a sub-branch of translation studies

Translation studies as an academic discipline that is divided into two branches: Translation and interpretation. The first is concerned mainly with written texts while the second deals with oral speeches. Translators usually choose to work in one of them. However, Interpretation seems to be more complicated than translation because of its links with other academic branches. It deals with oral transferring of a speech with its sense to another language. Therefore, literature and linguistic spheres are not the only elements that should be taken into consideration by interpreters, but also the rhetoric and cultural ones.



Inkeri Vehmas-Lehto mentions in her article which is entitled “Translation Studies: In search of rigor and relevance” that translation studies as a discipline has relationships with other fields of study such as: Contrastive and Applied Linguistics. Hence, it constructs a branch of knowledge on its own and with the implementation of theories and procedures, translation and interpretation become products of the discipline (Vehmas-Lehto, 2008).

Shuttleworth and Cowie suggest that interpreting is “a term used to refer to the oral translation of a spoken message or text.” For them, the history of interpretation is not well documented despite the general consensus that it is as an activity is older than written translation. Interpreting is distinct from the latter in many crucial regards. First, the communication skills which it needs are obviously different, interpreters should be expert in communication and fluent orally. Second, interpreters have to deliver a well-done speech in “real time” without the capability of going back and revising it. Third, interpreters have to be sure of their acquisition of any background in knowledge which they may need at the process of interpretation. Last but not least, they experience much more stress than translators because they are “performers”, in Gile’s term, who make split-second decisions.

In the same realm, Gentile, Ozolins and Vasilakakos indicate that interpreting is the oral transfer of messages between speakers of different languages. Therefore, interpreting is rendering the messages from source language into target language orally. Franz Pöchhacker states that “Interpreting is a form of Translation in which a first and final rendition in another language is produced on the basis of a one-time presentation of an utterance in a source language.” Additionally, Otto Kade defines interpreting as a form of translation in which the origin-language text is given only once that cannot be reviewed or replayed. He mentions that the target-language text is produced under pressure, which does not give a chance for correction or revision (Pöchhacker, 2004).

## 1.8. Modes of interpretation

### a) Simultaneous interpretation

According to Andrew Erickson, simultaneous interpretation is the transferring of one spoken language into another when running renditions are needed at the same time as the English language communication. The interpreter speaks virtually at the same time as the LEP person. When done properly, it is a true and accurate interpretation of one language to another, done without omissions or embellishments, so that the parties can understand one another quickly.



In *the Routledge Handbook of Interpreting*, simultaneous interpreting is defined by comparing it to consecutive one. Herbert sets (1952) three forms of simultaneous interpreting: The first is “whispering” wherein interpreters are sitting nearby conference representatives and whisper the interpretation to the receiver. The second is “telephonic simultaneous” in which interpreters listen to the speech through earphones and deliver the interpretation via microphones and the third “translation at sight”, whereby interpreters have the ST written in the source language and interpret it loudly in the target language.



Figure.1: A woman in the booth for simultaneous translation in a conference in Turin, Italy

### b) Consecutive Interpreting

Andrew Erickson points out that in consecutive interpreting “the interpreter waits until the speaker has finished before rendering speech into another language. Consecutive interpreting is a true and accurate interpretation of one language to another, spoken in brief sound bites successively, without omissions or embellishments, so that the parties can understand each other slowly and deliberately”(Erickson, 2006).

Russell’s definition of consecutive interpreting, in *the Routledge Handbook of Interpreting*, shows that it is a process wherein the speaker or signer has finished first one or more ideas in the source language and then gives some time for the interpreter to render that information in the target language. González and other authors illustrate that the duration of consecutive interpreting usage in the court setting does not exceed a few minutes. In this process, the interpreters use the phrases “Long consc” and “Short consc” to know the duration they have to interpret. The first phrase means they have a lengthy passage while the second refers to a smaller one.



Figure.2: Chinese-English consecutive interpreting with presidents Barack Obama and Xi Jinping

### c) Signed Language interpreting

Singed language interpretation is a broader discipline of interpreting studies. It has been an evolved field that mainly concerns deaf people as a target audience. The growth in the profession of signed language interpreters, the academic innovation conducted in the field and the beginning of a revolutionized era within the teaching domain of signed language interpretation have shifted both theory and practice clearly in recent years.

Karen Bontempo first points out that signed languages are visual-gestural languages that are innate within Deaf communities and singers who use signs which are widely approved upon, so as to communicate with one another. These languages have their own grammar, lexicon and they are neither local nor universal. They have their linguistic features and significations that are as complex as any natural spoken language.

Karen defines signed language interpreting as “the facilitation of communication between parties who do not share the same language” (Bontempo,2015). The interpretation is often used between signed and spoken language users (deaf and hearing people). According to her, 112 signed language interpreters could interpret between various sign languages. She cites the example of interpreting between two languages: Auslan (Australian Sign Language) to ASL (American Sign Language), or trilingual between two spoken languages and a signed language (e.g. between English, Maori, and NZSL – New Zealand Sign Language) (Bontempo, 2015).



Sign language interpreter at a protest in Badajoz, Spain

#### d) Sight translation

Xiangdong Li points out that sight translation is a new horizon in translation and interpreting research since it has common ground between translation and interpretation. Nevertheless, there has not been much research done on this mode of interpretation in comparison with consecutive and simultaneous interpretation. He mentions names of scholars who agree on the point of neglect of this field of study like: Viezzi (1989), Angelelli (1999), Agrifoglio (2004), and Sampaio (2007) .

Sight translation (sight interpretation) is the oral translation of a written text in Wallace Chen terms. She explains the process of sight translation as follow: During performing the task of sight translation, sight translator first skims through the written text, understands the meanings, and orally interprets them while the text is still being read. Sight translation includes visual input of a written message and oral output of its meaning, a hybrid form of language mediation that partially resembles both the translation and the interpretation processes (Chen, 2015:144).



Figure.3: A sight translator is interpreting <sup>6</sup>

## Chapter 2: Presentation and discussion of previous research on the impact of cultural complications on interpreting

### 2.1. Presentation of previous research

The impact of cultural complications on interpreting (English ⇔ Arabic) is rarely discussed by researchers. There are some studies that have been so far done on interpretation and culture, but none of them have tackled the influence of cultural complications on interpretation—particularly interpreting from English to Arabic and vice versa. This topic is an important one to future interpreters specifically in the MENA region.

The first research that I am going to review is entitled as: “Cultural Mediator” or “Scrupulous Translator”, Revisiting Role, Context and Culture in Consecutive Conference Interpreting by Seyda Eraslan Gercek from the Turkish University of Dokuz Eylul. The second one is a theoretical approach to the impact of culture on interpretation. Its title: Understanding the Impact of Culture on Interpretation: A Relevance Theoretic Perspective by Qiufen Yu from University of Chester, UK. The last one is named: Interpreting culture: Dealing with cross-cultural issues in court interpreting by Sandra Hale.

### 2.2. Discussion of previous research

#### **Cultural Mediator” or “Scrupulous Translator”, Revisiting Role, Context and Culture in Consecutive Conference Interpreting**

This research paper provides a study about the role of the interpreter and cultural differences in consecutive interpreting conferences. It links to the micro and macro-contexts wherein the interchange happens. The goal of this study is to emphasize on these problems and place the

<sup>6</sup> The source of photos used is in the reference section

interpreter and consecutive conference interpreting within the Turkish socio-cultural context. The methodology used is triangulating, i.e., comparing and contrasting data gathered from different sources. Among them: meetings recordings and questionnaires that were handed to participants in the conference. The aim of analyzing this data is to know if and how the interpreters' role diverse from the way it is defined by distinct parties, and how they cope up with cultural differences in a conference.

What motivates Eraslan Gercek for this study are groundbreaking studies in dialogue interpreting (Wadensjö 1998, Roy 2000) and (simultaneous) conferences interpreting (Pöchhacker 1994, Diriker 2001) which could be placed within the dialogic discourse-based interaction paradigm. Locating the interpreter and interpreting, as a social practice is crucial for both the theory and practice of interpreting. Thus, there will be a need to examine the relationship between the micro and macro contexts through further study of ethnography wherein the process of interpreting happens.

- How end-users and interpreters see the interpreter's role
- How end-users and interpreters expect the interpreter to perform in particular situations
- What interpreters do in real-time situations
- How interpreters deal with cultural differences
- How interpreting is linked to various layers of contexts

All of those objectives will contribute to the analysis of the role of interpreters and the problem of cultural differences.

Eraslan Gercek begins her research paper with definitions of key terms; conference interpreter, consecutive and simultaneous interpreting from the AIIC glossary. She mentions the difference between consecutive and simultaneous interpreting through these definitions. For her consecutive interpreting is when "the interpreter is closer to the participants. As conference participants and the interpreter are in direct eye contact of each other, it may be easier for them to establish contact, which could make it easier for the interpreter to intervene and become more active in the interaction. The interpreter, in direct contact with the participants and the speakers, is more ostensibly in-between in consecutive interpreting." While in simultaneous interpreting, the interpreter is rather isolated from the setting.

Cecilia Wadensjöin views "interpreter-mediated conversations as a mode of communication" (Wadensjö 1998). For her, interpretation is more related to different social, cultural and subcultural 'contexts' (Wadensjö 1998). Claudia Angelelli has gathered data on the



role of the interpreter through conferences and interviews and based her study on sociological theories. Pöchhacker has also argued that there are other approaches to examine this issue like Ebru Diriker analysis of discourse interpreting. Moira Inghilleri followed the footsteps of Driker and analyzed the macro-micro dimensions of interpreting as a social activity. Toury and Inghilleri share the same point of view (Gercek: 2008). Gercek mentions many other theorists who carried out studies on the aforementioned topic based on surveys such as: Stefano Marrone and Franz Pöchhacker. She also gives names and works of those who focused on the quality of interpretation in different settings, among them: Ingrid Kurz 2001, Marrone 1993, Vuorikoski 1993, Kopczynski 1994, Morris 1995, Pöchhacker 2000, and Riccardi 2002 (Gercek: 2008).

To begin with her pilot study wherein the socio-cultural context is Turkish, Gercek describes the geography and history of Turkey, besides its conflict of European Union membership. Consecutive English –Turkish Interpretation of meetings, conferences and training seminars organized by ministries, non-governmental organizations, and universities and funded by the EU and other international organizations are subjected to this study's analysis. To specify more about the setting, Gercek mentions that it is a training seminar on vocational education. It is organized by the European Commission and the Turkish Ministry of Education, namely the Project of Strengthening the Vocational Education and Training System in Turkey. In addition to the consecutive interpretation, questionnaires were given to conference participants and interpreters so as to know their expectations regarding the interpreter's role. There was a training session for the interpreters for two years.

The questions of the questionnaire are composed of Goffman's "normative role" and "typical role" to get answers about the role of the interpreter. In the discussion of the answers, Gercek finds out that almost half of the users define the interpreter's task as "translating as faithfully as possible". The other questions which are related to the normative role of the interpreter are explained in percentages or scales using diagrams or tables. However, the findings on typical roles seem to explain the opposite. Users seem to prefer an interpreter who illustrates foreign institutions or culture-specific items. He or she could refer to the target cultural system and correct the speaker's mistakes and clarifies misunderstandings. In a nutshell, users expect the interpreter to be active and interfere whenever it is needed (Gercek, 2008).

This study is considered as a primary attempt within a broader study. It analyzes the role of the interpreter and interpreting in relation to context, the network of expectations and relationships. According to Gercek, Turkey's unique position at the doorstep of the EU highlights the issue of cultural differences, and interpreter-mediated conferences designed to promote the

adaptation process. This may serve as a test case for the role of conference interpreters as cultural mediators (Gercek, 2008).

### **Understanding the Impact of Culture on Interpretation. A Relevance Theoretic Perspective**

This research paper studies the impact of culture on interpretation from a relevance theoretical perspective. Hypothesizing about cultural differences in communication has been hegemonized till now by the 'trait' approach (e.g. Hong and Mallorie, 2004, 60), and yet the dependence on this approach has been seen as not taking into consideration the process of communication which would illustrate how culture influences people's communicative behavior (Casmir, 1999).

This paper briefly reviews the previous work that has theorized cultural differences from a trait perspective and discusses that Relevance Theory proposed by Sperber and Wilson (1986/1995) has an aim of clarifying what actually happens in the process of communication and permits to explain the relationship between people's achievements to the interpretation process, and the impact of culture on interpretation.

Qiufen Yu mentions that among Hofstede's model, culture has been seen as a set of static, fixed values and norms shared among a social group. Such as national, ethnic or racial groups (e.g. Gudykunst and Kim 2003; Hofstede 1980; Lindsey *et al.* 1999; Lustig and Koester 1999; Spencer-Oatey 2008; Triandis 1995). For example, Spencer-Oatey (2008) Conceptualizes culture is a set of basic assumptions and values, orientations to life, beliefs, policies, procedures and behavioral conventions. They are shared by a group of people, and that influence (but not determine) each member's behavior and his or her interpretation of the 'meaning' of other people's behavior (Yu, 2014).

To begin with, She defines culture based on constructivist approach to culture suggested by Hong and her colleagues (e.g. Hong, 2009; Hong & Chiu, 2001; Hong *et al.*, 2000; Hong *et al.*, 2003; Hong & Mallorie, 2004). This approach gives a new assumption to culture "as being internalized in smaller pieces, in the knowledge structures or mental constructs that social perceivers use to interpret ambiguous stimuli" (Hong *et al.*, 2003). In addition, this theory to culture throws attentions to its dynamic aspect of the time and procedure by which culture practices influences on human behavior. Basically, this approach defines culture as a shared cultural system of meaning. Qiufen Yu keeps mentioning the contributions of Hong *et al* to culture through pointing out the impact of cultural shared meaning system on human behavior, the influence of conceptualizing culture has on making intra- and intercultural communication



possible, and the indication that the dynamic constructivist approach to culture is a meaning-based approach (Yu, 2014).

Qiufen Yu moves to interpret the Relevance theory (Sperber & Wilson, 1986/1995). This theory is a reasoning approach to pragmatics. On one hand, it sees human communication as intentional. In Wilson's words, the audience must get the intention that the speaker wants to convey a certain message because the audience easily recognizes the meaning. Thus; communication is a cognitive process and is guided by the concept of relevance i.e. more attention is given to the important information. However, there is an urgent need of understanding the context and not only which is linguistic to achieve communication and get the right interpretation by the listener.

Interview of focus groups (Two groups: English-Chinese) and her own interpretation are the two methods she follows to collect data. She believes that the findings from her interpretation would not be sufficient to add a value to the research while doing the interview will prove her statement of intent. She will compare what the Chinese and British groups understand from the talk to know if they use the same contextual assumptions or not. If the findings of their understanding are the same, she will indicate that they generate the same interpretation. However, if they get the meaning differently, then she will indicate that either the British or Chinese culture influence the interpretation. Both groups are bicultural: British participants who deal with Chinese mandarin for years and Chinese participants who study English for years. The setting is a language center where Yu plays extracts from Radio talk data. Her interview is conducted in English.

The answers are similar in terms of understanding the core of the problem in relationships. However, they differ when it comes to the assessment of the problem about having sexual intercourse out of the marriage circle. Yu states that the differences in their interpretations come from the varied contextual assumptions each group used. She summarized that there is a distinction between and within the group in understanding the meaning from the caller's issue. The English group's answer is that the caller's aim is to solve the problem. The Chinese, on the other hand, sees him as an expression of anger towards his girlfriend's unforgiven act.

After she continues to interview the groups, Yu's analysis has revealed the following (Yu, 2014):

- "When hearers of one culture activated assumptions that were not available to hearers of the other culture, their understanding of the relevance of what a caller said is radically different."

- "When hearers in one culture activated contextual assumptions that hearers of the

other culture also had access to, their understanding of the relevance of what a caller was saying is similar.”

-“My respondents were flexible in using their bicultural knowledge, in that they sometimes depended on their knowledge about a culture foreign to their own, but sometimes they depended on their cultural specific knowledge, to draw the inference.”

In the conclusion, Qiufen Yu restates the main points she has argued in her paper: The trait approach does not give any illustration for the communication between members who belong to different cultural backgrounds. Thus, it is unclear how culture might influence their communication behavior. She also discusses Sperber and Wilson’s (1986/1995) relevance theory that describes precisely the way that process functions, thus giving an opportunity to discover the sociocultural phenomenon.

## **Part two: The impact of intercultural complications on interpreting**

### **Chapter 3: Research design and methods**

#### **3.1. Qualitative VS Quantitative**

In his book, *Practical research*, Paul D.Leddy defines research methodology as “the specific procedures or techniques used to identify, select, process, and analyze information about a topic. In a research paper, the methodology section allows the reader to critically evaluate a study’s overall validity and reliability. The methodology section answers two main questions: How were the data collected or generated? How was it analyzed? In this perspective, it is crucial to differentiate between qualitative and quantitative methodologies.

Qualitative research methodology’s purpose is to understand and interpret social interactions. It targets smaller and not randomly selected group study and is not limited to certain variables, but it studies all of them. Type of data collected is words, images, or objects. Besides, the form of the data is qualitative one such as: open- ended responses, interviews, participant observations, field notes, and reflections and is analyzed through identifying patterns, features, themes. In addition that the research should be subjective, the researcher and their biases may be known to be participants in the study.

On the other hand, the aim of the Quantitative methodology is to test hypotheses, look at cause, effect, and make predictions. It addresses larger & randomly selected group study and has specific variables to work on. The kinds of data collected are numbers and statistics. As for the form, Quantitative data based on precise measurements using structured & validated data collection instruments. This methodology analyses data through identification of statistical

relationships. It criticizes objectivity and the role of the researcher and their biases are unknown to participate in the study, and participants are deliberately hidden from the researcher (double blind studies).

### 3.2. Frequently used research methods

According to Creswell (2014), it is important to differentiate between a research design and research methods. A research design is a plan to answer research questions. On the other hand, a research method is a technique used to employ that plan. Research design and methods are distinct but closely interlinked; because a good research design guarantees that the data the researcher collect will help him or her answer the research questions more effectively.

Creswell states that the choice of a research method depends on the aim behind the research paper. He gives the example of conducting research about what makes people happy, to clarify the importance of choosing the right method, so as to collect the data needed for the aforementioned research topic. He also highlights the essentiality of knowing the most frequently used methods. According to him, the following are the most common methods used:

1. Observation / Participant Observation
2. Surveys
3. Interviews
4. Focus Groups
5. Experiments
6. Secondary Data Analysis / Archival Study
7. Mixed Methods (combination of some of the above)

Observation method is used to collect data through observing the behavior of individuals, groups and organizations or their products/ outcomes. It is not only an essential aspect of human life, but it also forms a basic method of scientific research in behavioral sciences. Specifically, it is useful in such fields as Developmental Psychology, Anthropology, Behavior Modification, Social Psychology and Evaluation Research (Kothari, 2004:96).

Interview method could be defined as a way of collecting data through presentation of oral-verbal stimuli and reply in terms of oral-verbal responses. This method is achieved through various types of interviews like: Personal interviews are structured ones that require a face-to-face interaction between the interviewer and interviewee, Focused interviews that target to focus

attention on the given experience of the respondent and its effect and wherein the interviewer guides the interview in terms of asking questions (Kothari, 2004).

Secondary data are usually defined in opposition to primary data. The latter are directly collected from first-hand sources by means of a questionnaire, observation, focus group, or in-depth interviews, while the former refer to data collected by someone other than the user. In other words, secondary data refer to data that have already been collected for some other purpose. Yet, such data may be very useful for one's research purpose (Allen, 2017).

### 3.3 Research methods

Focus group is a methodology used for social sciences research paper. It is a kind of in-depth interview done in a group, whose meetings present characteristics defined with respect to the proposal, size, composition, and interview procedures. The purpose of analysis is to create interaction within the group. The interviewers impact each other through their answers and contributions during the meeting. The moderator takes care of stimulating the discussion with topics or commentaries. The essential data given by this methodology are the raw data of the group discussions and the moderator's observations.

What characterizes the focus group is people's engagement, a number of interviews, liberating participants with taking into consideration research areas, the management of qualitative data, and discussion related to the topic, which is specified by the goal behind the research. This FG<sup>7</sup> the research method is useful for organizing ideas for meetings in emerging fields, for managing proposals based upon the interviewees' conceptualization, to analyze various types of research situations or study populations, or to improve raw data of meetings and formats; and for managing extra information for a study on a wide range.

I have chosen the qualitative research approach, in order to use the focus group Interview method to collect data for my research paper. I have worked with a focus group because of the following reasons: I have a limited number of participants (Interpreters), I could better get in-depth answers for my questions, and I could do the interviews in a very short period of time.

## Chapter 4: Presentation and analysis of results

### 4.1. Presentation of focus group data

#### ➤ Questions

In order to get my data, I have first prepared a list of questions to ask my participants during the group calls. These questions are “sub-questions” to answer on the major hypotheses mentioned before. You could find it in the appendices of this research.

#### ➤ Answers

In this section, I am going to transcribe the answers gathered from recordings of my focus group interview.

### 4.2. Analysis of focus group interviews

Most of the participants (Six interpreters) answer that they deal with cultural differences while they interpret from English to Arabic or the opposite through globalization strategy of translation (Davies, 2003:83). In other words, they look for many general terms to convey the meaning of the source speech in the target culture. However; two interpreters say that they do both; using the globalization strategy or looking for cultural equivalence.

Among the examples of idioms that are given by the interpreters, there is the cultural expression: “خير يتلج الصدر” that they translate as “Heart-warming news”. This example shows that cultural equivalence is possible as they mentioned before. The Interpreters(Arabs) belong to ecological conditions of the Arabian Desert which structure and create their cultural background, however; they manage to handle this cultural-bound expression that originally comes from a cold-oriented culture (English).

As for the most common complications that interpreters face while interpreting from English⇔Arabic, six of the interviewees state cultural-specific terms, idiomatic expressions, and technical terms. At the level of speech, they encounter the fast pace of speakers or their strong accents. The other two interviewees see that the religious excerpts in general and Quranic verses in specific are what challenge them the most.

Seven of the participants in the interview point out that the hardest dialects that they have interpreted from are: Egyptian, Sudanese (Juba), and Hassaniya Arabic. According to them, the toughest parts about this kind of interpretation are; understanding the meaning of words uttered by speakers, taking too much time to be familiar with the speakers’ strong accent, choosing the right terminology in the target language (English).To get rid of these matters, they try to understand the general meaning and interpret it as well as to concentrate with the speech.

In regard to whether culture impacts interpretation or not and how it does, interpreters emphasize that culture has a strong influence on their interpretation. They point out that if an interpreter includes his own culture while interpreting and does not study well the target culture, he or she will absolutely give a mistaken outcome or misinterpret the message.

### 4.3. Discussion of findings

The principal goal of the analysis of the focus group interview is to answer the two major questions raised in the research paper. In this section, I shall try to show to what extent cultural differences do affect the interpretation. I first highlight the complications of cultural differences and suggested solutions given by the participants. Then, I move to state the findings of the focus group interviews concerning to what extent does lack of cultural equivalence have an impact on the interpretation. I also discuss the findings on the light of the cultural translation and equivalence theories and cultural turn approach.

The approach of cultural turn to translation, introduced by Basnett and Lefevere, emphasizes on the impact of cultural and social backgrounds on translators. It sheds light on the importance on moving from the linguistic focus to the cultural one. This approach is mentioned connotatively in the suggested solutions by my participants. They stress on being acknowledged about the target culture because it is a crucial element for them to decide on the right target speech.

In regard to the impact of lack of cultural equivalence on interpretation, the data demonstrate two contradictory opinions about cultural equivalence. A group sees it as possible under the pretext that cultures have shared grounds. In addition, the other indicates that cultural equivalence is not always possible because of the specificities that each culture holds. The outcome of the analysis reveals that all the interviewees interpret the cultural expression “It warms my heart into Arabic” by its equivalence in the target culture (Arabic culture). All of them also agree on the difficulty of finding equivalence for idioms. Thus; to solve it, they opt for alternative strategies like omission, domestication, foreignization, calque or sometimes globalization. This contradictory result means the strategy of interpreting chosen by the interpreter determines if there is a lack of cultural equivalence or not in the targeted speech.

According to the dynamic equivalence translation theory of Nida as mentioned in the theoretical part, some types of adjustments in form are going to be necessary to convey the intended meaning –Especially in the translation between languages with an enormous cultural distance like Arabic – English. One of the participants gives the example of an idiom that he interpreted in a conference. “To be in the doghouse” is the idiom that he interpreted into Arabic as

“في ورطة / في مواجهة مشكلة”. He opted for the globalization (To be in trouble) strategy to interpret the target speech because in this case he could not find an equivalence in the target culture Arabic.

It is important to note that the findings of the three previous researches represent the impact of cultural challenges on interpretation in different settings (Turkish, Chinese, and Australian). My outcomes cover gaps on the influence of cultural complications on interpreters who use Arabic and English. All the findings of papers reviewed about this topic emphasize on the role of interpreters when they encounter cultural differences. My outcomes also highlight with a small distinction that is the same suggested solutions by my interviewees. However, none of the studies shed light on the cultural equivalence and its impact on interpretation or the use of machine interpretation by interpreters.

## Conclusion

This research paper sets out to examine major problems in interpreting studies. First, the way interpreters deal with cultural differences during the process of interpreting (English↔Arabic). Second, the strategies used by interpreters when they encounter lack of equivalence in the target culture. Finally yet importantly, how machine interpreting is used by interpreters, and its limitations in cultural interpretation.

The findings reveal that there are a number of problems interpreters encounter during the interpreting process culturally and which lead to misinterpretation such as: The difficulty in understanding some Arabic dialects, the inclusion of the interpreter's own culture, and the cultural terminologies used in conferences. Thus, the focus group interviewees have suggested strategies like: Concentration (on the source speech), cultural acknowledgement, and globalization.

The results of cultural equivalence suggest that there are two contradictory opinions about the possibility of finding an equivalent of a source speech in the target culture. However, the participants give alternatives in case of the lack of cultural equivalence. These alternatives are techniques used in translation like omission, domestication, foreignization, and calque or globalization. Moreover, they highlight the fact that the interpreters' understanding of the target speech determines if there is a cultural equivalence or not. The data add to the knowledge of future interpreters that machine interpreting could not be of great help while interpreting simultaneously- especially with the existence of cultural differences; however, it is useful in consecutive interpretation.



## Bibliography List

- Abdo,N.(2016).Chinese-English consecutive interpretation with president Obama, [Photograph]
- Allen,M. (2017). *Encyclopedia of Sage Research Methods*, The United States: Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, p.10.
- Arias,A.(2011).Sight translation.[Photograph].  
<<https://sites.google.com/a/cetys.net/proyecto-final/sight-translation>>
- Aunion,J.(2012).Sign language woman interpreter gestures during a meeting that protests against austerity cuts.[Photograph].< <https://www.shutterstock.com/image-photo/badajoz-spain-march-29-2012-sign-411767245>>
- Catford, J.(1995) .*A linguistic Theory of Translation*,p.20.The United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.
- Citroen,I. (1966).*The Myth of the Two Professions: Literary and Non- Literary*, Taiwan :Babel,p.12.
- Edgar, A & Sedgwick, P, (1999).*Key Concepts in Cultural Theory*, The United Kingdom: Routledge,68-69.
- Erickson,A.(2006). Modes of Interpreting: Simultaneous, Consecutive, & Sight Translation.*The National Association of Judiciary Interpreters & Translators, Volume XV*, 1-3.
- Finto.fi.(n.d).Juba Arabic. *In Finto dictionary* .Retrieved June 15, 2021 from  
<<http://finto.fi/lexvo/en/page/pgs>>
- Gentil,A.Ozolins and U.Vasilakakos,M.(1996). *Liaison interpreting: a handbook*,Australia: Melbourne University Press,p.5.
- Gercek,E.S.(2008). “Cultural Mediator or Scrupulous Translator? Revisiting Role, Context and Culture in Consecutive Conference Interpreting, Selected Papers of *the CETRA Research Seminar in Translation Studies Ku Leuven Journal*, 1-33.

- Hale.S.(2013). Interpreting culture. Dealing with cross-cultural issues in court interpreting. *Perspectives Studies in Translatology Journal*,322-329.
- Hatim.B and Mason.I.(2009). *Discourse and the translator*,The United States of America: Longman.
- Hatim,B and Munday.J .(2004). *Translation, An Advanced Resource Book*, The United Kingdom ,London: Routledge,p.6.
- Haviland, W et al. (1975).*Cultural Anthropology: Human Challenges*.The United States: The Thomson Corporation, p.9.  
<[http://courseresources.mit.usf.edu/sgs/ang6469/canvas/module\\_1/read/haviland95613\\_0495095613\\_02.01\\_chapter01.pdf](http://courseresources.mit.usf.edu/sgs/ang6469/canvas/module_1/read/haviland95613_0495095613_02.01_chapter01.pdf)>
- Heath,J.(2004). *Hassaniya Arabic (Mali) - English - French Dictionary (Semitica Viva)*,Germany: Harrassowitz , viii.
- Johnson, B. & Christensen, L. (2008). *Educational research: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed approaches* . The United States :Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications,p.34.
- Lichtman, M. (2006). *Qualitative research in education: A user's guide*,The United States: Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications,82-83.
- Munday,J.(2016).*Introducing Translation Studies*, The United States, New York, Routledge.
- Newmark, P. (1988). *A Textbook of Translation*. The United States, Englewood Cliffs: PrenticeHall,p.94.
- <[https://www.academia.edu/25420034/A\\_TEXTBOOK\\_OF\\_TRANSLATION\\_Peter\\_Newmark](https://www.academia.edu/25420034/A_TEXTBOOK_OF_TRANSLATION_Peter_Newmark)>
- Nida, E.and Taber, J. (1974).*The Theory and Practice of Translation*, p.12 Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Nida, E.and De Wrad,J. (1981). *From One Language to Another: Functional Equivalence in Bible Translation*. Tennessee: Thomas Nelson Publishers.

- Öztemel.F and Kurt.M .(2017). Transmission of Cultural Specific Items Into English Translation Of “Dear Shameless Death” By Latife Tekin. *International Journal of Languages’ Education and Teaching*, Volume 5, 10.18298/ijlet.1678.
- Pym, A.(2017). *Exploring Translation Theories*, The United states and United Kingdom:
- Soanes, C .et al, (2006).*Oxford Dictionary of Current English*.The United States: Oxford University Press,p.213.
- Pöschhacker,F.(2008). *Introducing Interpreting Studies*,The united Kingdom : Routledge,9-11.
- Shuttleworth,M. and Cowie,M.(2004). *Dictionary of Translation Studies*. The United Kingdom , London: Routledge Publications,82-83.
- Tashakkiri,A. and Teddlie, C. (2013).*Handbook of mixed methods in social & behavioral research*,p.11. The United States:Thousand Oaks, Calif.: SAGE Publications.
- Vehmas-Lehto.I .(2008).Translation Studies: In search for vigour and relevance, Finland: *Language and globalization Journal*,978-951-9388-54-0.
- Yowell, A. and Muftan, S. L .(1999). *Principles of Translation*. Libya;Benghazi: Dar Annahda Alarabiy.
- Yowell, A. and Muftah,S.(2000): *Principles of Translation*,Libya; Benghazi: Department of English, University of Garyounis, p.85.
- Yu.Q.(2014). Understanding the Impact of Culture on Interpretation. A Relevance Theoretic Perspective. *Intercultural Communication Studies*, Volume XXIII, 83-102.
- process of transfer not only between two languages, but also between two cultures. Both source language and target language are grounded in communicative situations with respect to their cultures (Braçaj,2014).