Abstract

In the last decade, attention in interpreting studies has focused on both the issues of expertise and of professionalisation. In view of the substantive changes taking place in the profession today, this article advocates the need for a new type of relationship between the two approaches in which both interact and enrich each other. It examines the interaction between the two dimensions of expertise – cognitive and sociocultural – to shed more light on what professional interpreting means and to gain a better understanding of the complex nature of interpreting expertise today.

1. Introduction

Who becomes an expert? How does one become an expert? What is the nature of the knowledge and skills embodied by experts? These questions concerning the nature, locus and development of expertise have been posed and approached from two different, independently developing academic approaches in modern times.

The first approach is propounded by cognitive psychologists and knowledge systems researchers working in the burgeoning field of psychology of expertise (Ericsson et al. 2006). The locus of expertise and the subject of research under the expert performance approach (Ericsson and Smith 1991) is the individual. Its methodological commitments have been rooted in the positivist tradition and despite its initial interest in
personal accounts of experts, it generally eschews phenomenological descriptions in favour of a decontextualized, asocial account from a third person perspective. The expertise performance approach emphasizes the need to identify and account for (cf. Ericsson and Smith 1991) generalizable characteristics of experts’ cognition (memory involvement, knowledge organization and access, metacognition) that are extrapolated from large-scale studies of experts or expert-novice comparisons.

The second approach construes expertise as an emergent property of communities of practice and concerns itself with the “contextual conditions for the development of expertise and its functions in modern societies” (Evetts et al. 2006). The sociological approach emphasizes the role of the professions as a form of institutionalization of expertise (Abbott 1988, Mieg 2006: 751).

In the last decade, attention in interpreting studies has focused on both the issues of expertise and of professionalisation. The research on these two topics, however, has been developing in a situation of a methodological parallelism. As we shall see in the section below, the cognitive approach has generated claims about the cognitive basis of expert performance extolling interpreters’ skills in coping with multitasking, time constraints, and language switching. The attribution of expertise, however, remains largely under-researched. On the other hand, more recently, the professionalization of interpreting has emerged as a topic in research discourse, with trainers and practisearchers actively involved in generating a “discourse of professionalization”.

At the present time, with substantive changes taking place in the profession, we advocate the need for a new type of relationship between the two approaches in which both interact and enrich each other. The sociological approach can indicate the direction of changing perceptions of expert interpreters, highlight problems with the social attribution of expert status and consider the importance of enculturation for fostering career development along an expertise path. Cognitive research on interpreting expertise, on the other hand, has the potential to articulate a description and a developmental model of interpreting-specific skills and knowledge. In doing so, it can be instrumental in formulating professional standards and in supporting accreditation. A developmental model of skill acquisition can help identify the specific needs of professionals at different phases of the process and promote training across the entire career span to ensure continual advancement of competence.

2. Cognitive studies of expertise

Ever since modern experimental psychology established itself as a scientific discipline, expertise has been an item on its research agenda.
While early interest focused on specific (even unique) abilities of experts, the late 1980s saw the rise of the idea that research on superior performance can proceed at an even higher level of abstraction – that of expertise. With it the focus of research shifted from single individuals and the abilities, skills and knowledge that underline their subjective outstanding performance, to generalizable features of performance. This was suggested by findings that expert performance in different domains reflect the acquisition of similar mediating mechanisms (Ericsson 1996). The expert performance approach, advocated by Ericsson and his colleagues, emphasizes the role of objectively measurable superior performance to identify experts and argues that its causes should be sought in training and practice, rather than personality traits. In other words, “expert performance reflects the mastery of the available knowledge or current performance standards and relates to skills that master teachers and coaches know how to train” (Ericsson et al. 1993: 392). Ericsson (1996) further argues that the quantity and quality of deliberate practice (an individualized training with corrective feedback) accumulated by a person in a specific domain is directly related to the attained level of performance.

The topic of expertise first entered interpreting research a decade ago when theoretical (e.g. Moser-Mercer 2000) and experimental interest (Kalina 1998, Ivanova 1999, Liu 2001) addressed the need to provide a description of interpreting expertise. However, it should be pointed out that IR has traditionally focused on differentiating individuals from a specified group (bilinguals, novices or student interpreters) from professionals (for a review, see Liu 2009). In the section that follows we offer a meta-analysis of individual differences studies and SI expertise research in an attempt to provide a picture of the processes underlying superior performance.

2.1. Quantitative differences in performance

A robust, albeit not surprising, finding is that professional experience leads to substantial improvement in performance, as measured either by accuracy (Dillinger 1989, Ivanova 1999) or holistic rating (Liu 2001), or measures of intelligibility and informativeness (Tiselius 2009). The presence or absence of professional experience appears to be a significant factor in determining performance quality. Liu (ibid.) reports no significant differences between two student groups at the end of first and second year of training, but a significant one between the student subjects and the professionals (minimum two years of experience). Tiselius (ibid.) also finds changes that are not statistically significant in the intelligibility and informativeness rating between professionals of limited (two years) and extensive (over 20 years) experience. However, both groups scored
significantly higher than her student subjects. In general, these quantitative findings support a view of interpreting as an acquired skill rather than an extension of L1 or L2 skills, although clearly the effects of practice in the two more recent studies call for a careful distinction between practice as it takes place in the training process or as part of a membership of the interpreting occupation.

2.2. Component processes of SI

Taking a component processes approach to interpreting, we can find studies providing evidence for the existence of qualitative difference in comprehension, translation and production as a function of experience. Regarding comprehension, Ivanova (1999) and Liu (2001) find evidence for the selective processing of task-important information: both studies emphasize the effect of semantic factors in guiding professionals’ allocation of attention to idea-units (Liu) or informational nuclei (Ivanova). Conversely, the processing of professionals appears to be less dependent on syntactic cues (Hild, forthcoming) and consequently relatively unaffected by measures of syntactic complexity. In comparison, translation as an element of the interpreting process, has received very limited empirical attention. Evidence for translation comes from retrospective studies which demonstrate that experts engage in criterion-guided search for contextually appropriate equivalents, rather than rely exclusively on automatic retrieval of pairs of translation equivalents (Ivanova 1999; Sunnari forthcoming). Concerning the processes underlying TT production, convergent findings from studies using retrospective and quantitative methods indicate that with extended practice interpreters become more attentive to their TT production and engage actively in monitoring (Ivanova 2000, Liu 2001).

At first sight, this appears to contradict the results obtained from a series of suppressed articulation/delayed auditory feedback (SA/DAF) studies (e.g. Fabbro and Darò 1995, Moser-Mercer et al. 2000) which concluded that professionals with longer experience are less susceptible to SA/DAF effects than interpreting subjects with shorter experience. The findings were interpreted as evidence of the fact that professional interpreters do not need to monitor their output. However, these two findings are not mutually exclusive. If one considers Gervers’ model of SI (Gerver 1976), monitoring is said to occur at two cycles: pre-articulatory (comparison of TT and ST at the level of “deep” or semantic structure) and post-articulatory (which will be susceptible to DAF effects). It is therefore plausible that the two sets of findings address different aspects of the same process – one looks at monitoring for semantic cohesion and translation equivalence of inner speech, while DAF studies address post-articulatory processes. Another critically important aspect of production is prosody, which plays
a pivotal role in structuring the TT and renders extralinguistic information, e.g. emphasis, expressiveness (Brown 1977). Studies of TT prosody (Shlesinger 1994; Ahrens 2005) have focused on analysis of professionals’ output and concluded that even interpreters with experience of five and more years still display atypical prosodic patterns (in terms of length, frequency and distribution of pauses; mismatch between intonation contour and underlying syntactic structures, preponderance of stress patterns that are not semantically or syntactically motivated). It would appear, then, that in terms of cognitive changes, the improved control over the delivery of the TT could emerge relatively late in one’s professional development and as such could serve to distinguish interpreters at various levels of skill development.

2.3. Working memory involvement in SI

To account for the range of changes attributed to training and practice, interpreting research has turned to theories of memory and attention. This has resulted in a relatively prolific line of experimental research focusing on expert-novice differences in working memory involvement. An up-to-date and comprehensive discussion of the methodological assumptions, tools and findings emerging from these studies is offered by Köpke and Nespoulous (2006). The authors draw attention to the inconclusive nature of the findings emerging from both previous studies and their own research and suggest that expertise-related changes may not have an effect on general cognitive mechanisms (e.g. increased memory capacity in the sense proposed by Just and Carpenter 1992), which could be experimentally accessed by simple tasks such as those traditionally used in memory research (comprehension of decontextualised isolated sentences; recall of word lists). Similar to the previous findings discussed above, they suggest that an experiential advantage could be captured by using more complex tasks involving semantic processing. This is in line with the idea introduced by Ericsson and Kintsch (1995) of the domain-specificity of acquired memory skills, which, they argue, effectively extends their WM capacity. The skills, however, rely on the experts’ ability to predict and anticipate and consequently can be demonstrated only when experts are confronted with familiar stimuli and tasks.

2.4. Interpreting strategies

Consistent differences between experts and novices have been demonstrated in terms of their analysis of problems and the strategies they used in response to them. This line of research has used a variety of
methods: retrospective protocols focusing on differentiating between trainees and professional/expert interpreters (Ivanova 2000; Tiselius 2006); performance of professional and trainee interpreters (Kalina 1998; Riccardi 2005; Sunnari 1995a, 1995b, forthcoming); interpreting students at various stages of their training (Bartłomiejczyk 2006) as well as longitudinal studies of student interpreters (Moser-Mercer 2000).

2.4.1. Adaptive vs. routine expertise

Ivanova (1999) correlated strategies and problems and concluded that professionals apply a variety of strategies to the solution of problem-types; by varying the redundancy of the input text, she also demonstrated that strategy use and selectivity adapt to changes in the task content. She concluded, based on these findings, that interpreting expertise is best characterized and described as “adaptive expertise” (Hatano and Inagaki 1986).

Similarly, in a study analyzing the simultaneous interpreting performances of eight trainee and eight professional interpreters, Sunnari (forthcoming) found that the distinction between routine and adaptive experts could also be applied to the participants of the study. The work of professional interpreters did not always comply with the definition of expertise as “consistently superior performance” (e.g. Ericsson and Smith 1991). Some of the professionals could be characterized as routine experts or experienced non-experts, because their work was clearly based on practiced routines and fixed solutions, which often resulted in less than ideal rendering. In quantitative terms, the information content was accurately conveyed, but there were other problems of quality, such as rather clumsy sentence structures, redundant corrections as well as abundant repetitions and corrections. This suggests that these experienced professionals had stagnated to a level once reached and abandoned their continuing effort to reach a higher standard, which is considered a hallmark of genuine expertise.

Although it is not possible to measure the effort invested in interpreting performance in absolute terms, it is safe to assume that an analysis of the interpreting input does reveal something about the nature of the interpreting process and about the processing load. While it is true that expert-level simultaneous interpreting sounds fluent and effortless, it could be concluded from the performance analysis that underlying the smooth rendering of adaptive expert interpreters there is a sophisticated array of comprehension and production skills and strategies. An expert performance that complies with the established quality requirements of

1 Similar findings have been made in studies on written translation. See a recent discussion in Jääskeläinen (2010).
professional interpreting (e.g. accuracy of content, fluency and economy of delivery) enables the listener to follow the presentation with minimum effort but is highly effortful from the perspective of the interpreter. In other words, it takes a great deal of effort to create the impression of effortlessness. By contrast, trainees (and professionals acting as routine experts) tended to resort to strategies and solutions that are easy and effortless from their own perspective but resulted in a fragmented output that the listeners may find hard to follow. Finally, it is worth noting that the routine-adaptive distinction was also present when the trainees and professionals had met the limits of their cognitive constraints. In the words of Feltovich et al. (2006: 56) “Experts fail graciously but novices crash”.

Moreover, it is worth noting in this context that expert-novice differences found in, e.g. reading and writing, have challenged the notion that an increase in knowledge, skill, or experience allows effortless performance. In their discussion on studies on literate expertise, Scardamalia and Bereiter (1991) list a number of findings that show that “[e]xpert writers are generally found to work harder at the same assigned tasks than nonexperts, engaging in more planning and problem solving, and in general more agonizing about the task” (ibid.: 172). Their results also show that the more accomplished readers do more work, which “takes the form of more backtracking in the text to pick up missed information, reading more slowly at points of difficulty, and putting more effort to summarize the text” (ibid.: 173).

In assessing this research, we would like to refer back to the opening questions, viz how can we identify experts in the field of interpreting. The majority of the studies discussed above equate expertise with professionalism. For example, in the study by Köpke and Nespoulous (2006), the group of experts consisted of interpreters whose professional experience ranged from 4 to 35 years. In her meta-analysis of expert SI processing, Liu (2001) eschews distinctions between professional, experienced and expert interpreters or between novices (individuals, unfamiliar with the task) and interpreting students (at various stages of training). Such approaches do not take into account empirical models of skill progression established for a variety of domains (Ericsson 1996) and proffered in interpreting research most prominently by Moser-Mercer (2008, 2010). This evidence suggests that the skill progression is best understood in terms of discrete phases characterized by clusters of specific cognitive mechanisms (skills and knowledge), context sensitivity and emotive factors. At present, it is not quite clear how a developmental progression can be applied to interpreting, and the lack of terminological sensitivity does hamper the consolidation of results across empirical studies and the development of models which could specify concrete thresholds for all maturation phases. Furthermore, there is a general lack of objective performance-related indexes of expertise which could be
applied to designate expert interpreters. Instead, studies tend to rely on length of experience as a primary criterion in identifying experts. Some studies have used composite indexes – a combination of length of experience, professional accreditation, membership of professional organization and peer designation. Even so, they do not reliably predict performance in our experience. In Ivanova (1999), one of the experts selected by composite criteria had to be excluded from the study because the performance measures of accuracy and recall were markedly worse than those of the other eight interpreters.

Furthermore, as the above meta-analysis shows, the preferred method employed in the majority of the studies is expert-novice comparison. It is both easy to underrate and overrate what they tell us about the nature of expertise. The central problem of the comparative method lies in the fact that by sampling two groups, maximally different in terms of their skills, the comparison can only provide a static picture at the moment when the study is conducted. It does not allow researchers to attribute causality, although the clear presumption is that the changes emerge through a combination of training and practice.

3. The socio-cultural approach to SI expertise

In their discussion on the changes taking place during the transformation of expertise from novice status to higher levels, Boshuizen et al. (2004: 3-8) point out that expertise and professional learning involve two processes: a change within an individual (acquisition of knowledge, skills, practices and attitudes) and a process of becoming a member of the professional culture and community in question. They maintain that in order to understand how professional expertise develops, it is necessary to consider both of these aspects in more detail. In this section, therefore, we shall introduce further elements of expertise and discuss their relationship to cognitive research as well as their relevance for training and professional development.

This is considered necessary, because a number of authors, especially those looking at the development of professional expertise have emphasized the need to extend the current approach beyond that offered by the traditional theories of expertise. For example, Mieg (2006: 756) argues that as the acquisition of expertise is based on deliberate practice and long-term training, socialization (i.e. social influence through which a person acquires the culture or sub-culture of his/her group) can be expected to have a strong influence on expertise development. Within this frame of reference, expertise has been studied from the perspective of a community pursuing a certain activity, or as a process of enculturation (e.g. Boshuizen et al. 2004: 6-7; Hakkarainen et al. 2004: 11).
The issue of acquiring membership of a professional culture is also linked with the question of attribution, i.e. how and why do professional interpreters obtain expert status? (cf. Mieg 2006). One answer to this question is given by Sternberg and Freusch (1992: 194-195) who discuss what they term “the attributed aspect” of expertise. They maintain that in the real world, a person is an expert because s/he is regarded as such by others. In other words, expertise is, to a great extent, an attribution. Within this framework, expertise can be examined as a social role in a community. In addition, there is a further approach which focuses on the social aspects of expertise, such as the norms governing the definition of expert behaviour and the identification of experts by their peers within a community or domain. Accordingly, expertise is regarded as something that is socially constructed, i.e. development of expertise is perceived as being dependent on participation in expert culture and becoming acquainted with the domain, its best practices and socially negotiated norms (Hakkarainen et al. 2004: 11). Therefore, an account of expertise must look at both its social-attributional and its cognitive side.

In sum, the social perspective extends the analysis from individuals to professional fields and groups. This means adopting a more relativistic view of expertise. In other words, rather than presenting an absolute definition for what counts as expertise (see also Chi 2006), those advocating the socially oriented approach maintain that expertise is often socially negotiated, for example, within a professional group formed to defend the status of the members, and their right to determine the requirements for acceptable competence and performance in the domain (Hakkarainen et al. 2004: 18-20). Additionally, this means that gaining expertise is not only a cognitive process but it also involves a social process in which beginners become fully qualified members of the community of professional practitioners. Thus, while expertise depends on individual knowledge, skills and performance, individuals can draw on and benefit from knowledge and practices of other members of their professional community.

3.1. Perceptions of professionalism and expertise in conference interpreting

The social perspective appears to be particularly relevant to interpreting studies, since the notions of professional performance and quality feature prominently in the descriptions of the common core of knowledge, skills and competences that are considered necessary in the practice of conference interpreting. Furthermore, interpreting developed and became a profession through insights gained in practice, or, as Setton (2007: 54) puts it: “In interpreting, practice always came first, informing training and theory.” The first publication to contain a guide for beginners, Jean
Herbert’s *Manuel de l’interprète*, was based on his own experience as an interpreter and interpreter trainer. According to Stelling-Michaud (1952: xi), the manual presents in substance and completes in a number of details the course Herbert gave to the UN interpreters at Lake Success in 1946. As the original French version was soon translated into English, German, Dutch, Italian and Chinese, and was also used in the Soviet Union in the early 1950s (Chernov 1999: 43), it can be assumed that his training model and the professional practices introduced in the manual were adopted by other conference interpreters and interpreter trainers. It can also be assumed that his approach had a major impact on the formulation of the set of rules concerning the conference interpreter’s task and responsibilities adopted and advocated by AIIC from the very beginning of its existence. Mackintosh (1995: 119-20) points out that the creation of AIIC in 1953 in itself seems to suggest that there was a basic agreement on the parameters defining the professional practice of conference interpreting. In other words, the tacit knowledge accumulated among conference interpreters during the first three decades of the profession had been developed, by the 1950s, into a concrete set of rules and recommendations. Another point worth making in this context is that Herbert’s guide explicitly states that interpreting is teamwork and that cooperation between team members may result in substantial improvement in the quality of their performance, or as he himself puts it: “An interpreter who is not good in teamwork is not a good interpreter” (Herbert 1952: 81).

When discussing professionalism and expertise in conference interpreting it is therefore useful to consider how interpreting has become a profession and which are its defining features. A review compiled for a biography of conference interpreting by Sunnari (forthcoming) shows that three trends can be distinguished in how the professional skill of conference interpreting and its practitioners have been perceived over the last 90 years. Firstly, the early conference interpreters were language experts who entered the profession by chance, mainly thanks to their language skills, whereas the recruitment of today’s professional interpreters is based on a more broadly-based aptitude and training. Secondly, the first pioneers were regarded as a miracle with an innate gift that only a few possessed, while today’s professionals are required to have a university level training and competences built on practice and research. The third major change in the perception of the profession involves a shift of focus from individual performance to teamwork carried out within the professional community with its established norms and best practices. Thus, the conceptualization of the interpreting profession has gradually evolved from mystification and marvel into a view in which interpreting is understood as an acquired expert skill, developed through systematically organized training. In other
words, what used to be regarded as a spin-off of language skills is now considered a specialized profession (Sunnari, forthcoming).

To illustrate this gradual shift of emphasis from a skilled individual to a professional community, we can look at how the United Nations refers to their interpreters in the legends of pictures displayed in the UN photo archives. For example, a picture with the date 29 March, 1948 shows a single interpreter referred to as “Susanna Wieniawa of the Interpretation Division, Department of Conference and General Services, who interprets from French and Spanish into English.” The legend of a later photograph dated 9 March 1965 reads: “Some fifty highly skilled interpreters perform a vital service at United Nations meetings. Miss Maria Luisa Araujo, a United Nations Interpreter at work.” Yet another picture taken some thirty years later carries the following description: “The United Nations Interpretation Service provides simultaneous interpretation for UN meetings. Two UN interpreters at work 9 August 1991.” These descriptions indicate that not only has the interpreter become an anonymous figure, but s/he is also considered a member of a larger unit that provides interpreting as a service to the delegates.

3.2. Does professionalism equal expertise?

As was mentioned above, the topics of professional performance and professionalization have also received an increasing amount of attention both among practising interpreters and those involved in the study of interpreting. In both contexts, however, the concepts of ‘profession’, ‘professional’, and ‘professionalize’ have been examined from different angles and defined in different ways; Mackintosh (2007: 51) points out that they remain rather imprecise in the discussions on the topic. As a representative of AIIC conference interpreters, Luccarelli (2004: 1) proposes that the profession of interpreting be viewed as comprising two aspects, i.e. “a field of work that requires specialized knowledge and training” and “the body of qualified practitioners”. Interestingly, Luccarelli’s view of professionalism also contains a further dimension:

[M]any people understand the word [professionalism] in its narrowest sense, restricting it to the performance of a discrete task. But it is actually much broader and embraces complete knowledge of and adherence to ethics and standards of practice. And since professionalism is related to how we participate in a career field over a long period of time, it also implies keeping up to date with the latest developments and technologies, and the state of the world in general. It demands preparation and ongoing learning. Needless to say, it also requires collegiality, the will and willingness to get along with

---

2 http://www.unmultimedia.org/photo/gallery.jsp?query=Interpreting
colleagues. In other words, it goes far beyond the necessary skill to transmit a message from one language to another. (Luccarelli 2004: 2)

The above perception of professionalism with a long-term dimension is related to the concept of expertise as a process that requires a continuing effort to reach a higher standard. This view is in line with that proposed by Bereiter and Scardamalia (1993) who emphasize the importance of progressive problem solving and the need to surpass oneself by continuously expanding one’s competencies when aiming at expertise. It also tallies with the notion of dynamic development of expertise, which results from working at the edge of one’s competence as discussed in Hakkarainen et al. (2004: 37-41). They conclude that people with long work experience tend to differ from each other in that some remain dynamic and flexible, whereas others fall into routines (also termed adaptive and routine experts, respectively, by Hatano and Inagaki (1986)). While routines are useful in many situations, excessive reliance on routine solutions may have a negative impact on performance, because they enable a person to stagnate at a certain acceptable level of work. Thus, routines may impede further development of expertise and fail to provide sufficient means for coping with new or unexpected situations. In the same vein, Ericsson and colleagues (e.g. Ericsson and Charness 1994; Ericsson 2006) emphasize the role of deliberate practice, or activities focussing specifically on improving one’s skills. Improvement in individual performance requires work on clear practice goals, repetitions, and informative feedback from a teacher or coach. This results in performance changes, which are linked to refinements in processes with problem solving (Ericsson 2009: 8-9).

4. Implications for training

There seems to be a consensus in interpreting studies literature that the general goal of interpreter training is to produce interpreters who are able to work reliably on the market. Thus, the programme graduate is expected to possess the skills and competencies needed in professional work. Likewise, there seems to be widespread agreement in the professional community of conference interpreters that graduates must be able to work independently in the profession (Sawyer 2004: 56-58). This is considered particularly important, because the new entrants to the profession are immediately and solely responsible for the quality of their output (Déjean Le Féal 1998: 363).

However, as Kintsch points out (2009: 230) schools, generally, do not produce real experts, but strive to move students closer to expertise and provide them with the tools to develop further on their own. Often discussed in terms of conceptual metaphors such as ‘journey’, ‘way’ or ‘road’, professional expertise involves a development process and is
constructed in two environments: while the prerequisites for it are created in educational contexts, it mainly develops and grows in authentic working life and is often socially negotiated. This means that there is an intrinsic relationship between individual strength and group acknowledgement: skilful people do not acquire expertise on their own but are guided by other members of the social system.

Throughout its existence, one of the leading principles of conference interpreter training has been that it should be given by professional interpreters. The main justification for the strong professional basis was the conviction that outsiders could not understand what the task and the training for professional competence involve. An obvious benefit of working with professionals is that it offers the learner an opportunity to become acquainted with the practices of the interpreting community, to participate in its culture, adopt its values, norms and identities, and become one of its members. The participation perspective focuses on interactive processes of enculturation and socialization that mediate development of individual expertise (Hakkarainen et al. 2004: 14). However, expertise is domain-specific, which means that expertise of one domain does not transfer to another domain. Therefore, it should be noted that professional interpreters are not automatically qualified trainers nor automatically qualified assessors. Training is needed for both tasks.

The perspectives on expertise discussed above are not mutually exclusive; instead, they complement each other and contribute to our understanding of expertise in general and interpreting expertise in particular. We need all these different approaches and perspectives for professional work and training. What we are aiming at is dynamic and adaptive expertise – perhaps related to the notion of ‘mental agility’ (Gaiba 1998: 46-49), which was already listed as one of the criteria of aptitude when the very first simultaneous interpreter trainees were tested and recruited for the Nuremberg Trials.
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