Ethically Challenging Issues in Business Interpreting: Learning How to Face Cultural Quandaries Through Practice and Reflection

Carmen Torrella Gutiérrez

Department of Philology and Translation
Universidad Pablo de Olavide of Seville
ctorgut1@upo.es
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0330-0151

Francisco J. Vigier-Moreno

Department of Philology and Translation
Universidad Pablo de Olavide of Seville
fvigier@upo.es
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0996-2578

Abstract. In business interpreting training, there is the need to train prospective interpreters in professional ethics and conduct, since tenets assumed in other interpreting domains such as impartiality and wholeness may conflict with the interests and needs of the business hiring the interpreter's services and therefore place the interpreter in an ethical dilemma. In this article, we show how examples of ethically challenging elements extracted from a real interpreter-mediated business meeting corpus (in particular, issues related to culture clashes) can be addressed in business interpreting training. Trainee interpreters are exposed to these situations, which are previously introduced in (semi-)structured roleplays that are then used in the training sessions, and the following subsequent feedback and discussion allow trainees and trainers to explore and expound different options that both transmit the correct message and, more importantly, adhere to professional principles and protocols.

Keywords: ethics, business interpreting, interpreter training, culture clash, cultural differences.

Sudėtingi etiniai verslo vertimo žodžiu klausimai: mokymasis spręsti kultūrines problemas per praktiką ir refleksiją

Santrauka. Rengiant verslo vertėjus žodžiu būtinas profesinės etikos kursas, nes kitose vertimo žodžiu srityse taikomi principai – tokie kaip nešališkumas ar siekis perteikti visą informaciją – gali prieštarauti vertėją samdančios įmonės interesams ir poreikiams, todėl vertėjui gali kilti etinių dilemų. Šiame

straipsnyje rodome, kaip rengiant verslo vertėjus žodžiu galima mokytis spręsti etiniu požiūriu sudėtingas situacijas (ypač dėl kultūrų sandūros) naudojantis iš realių verslo susitikimų, kuriuose dirbo vertėjai žodžiu, surinktais pavyzdžiais. Vertimo žodžiu studentams sukuriamos tokios situacijos, kurios pirmiausia pristatomos (pusiau)struktūruotose simuliacijose, vėliau naudojamose per paskaitas. Grįžtamasis ryšys ir aptarimas leidžia studentams ir kursų dėstytojams išnagrinėti ir paaiškinti, kaip tokiose situacijose galima ne tik teisingai perteikti informaciją, bet ir – dar svarbiau – versti laikantis profesinių principų ir etikos reikalavimų.

Pagrindiniai žodžiai: etika, verslo vertimas žodžiu, vertėjų žodžiu rengimas, kultūrų sandūra, kultūriniai skirtumai.

Background: Cultural Intricacies in Business Interpreting Training

In this paper, we explore ethics in business interpreting (BI) training, a particularly compelling field bearing in mind the complexity of preserving ethical conduct in a context constrained by the interests and needs of the main speakers (businesses), consisting in "reaching an agreement through negotiation" (Rudvin and Tomassini 2011: 69). BI takes place at meetings where business-related issues are discussed between two or more participants (Ko 1996; Takimoto 2009), in which economic and strategic interests therefore play a leading role. In this context, the dialogue becomes a negotiation with general and specific objectives aimed at reaching agreements or at resolving past or ongoing problems (Lewicki et al. 2016; Siedel 2014). Consequently, in these communicative exchanges, BI commonly appears in the form of dialogue interpreting, where the interpreter consecutively reproduces the words of both speakers, hence bidirectionally. This task therefore requires the use of two languages (bidirectional interpreting) as well as facing the challenges inherent in this mode of interpreting, namely, turn-taking and the interaction of different cultural backgrounds (Gavioli 2014; Sandrelli 2005; Trovato 2013; Wadensjö 2004). Given its multifaceted character, BI becomes a complex activity necessitating top-performing and flexible professionals (Vigier-Moreno 2020a: 199).

The performance of the interpreting task in this business sphere demands decision-making in response to the quandaries that can arise in the interaction. This decision-making framework is not only shaped by time constraints, which is inherent in all interpreting modes (Pöchhacker 2004: 11), including dialogue interpreting, but it is also strongly influenced by the cultural background of the speakers (Pistillo 2004; Takimoto 2009) and the interests of the businesses in question:

> (…) Business interpreting differs from other sectors (…) as the interpreter is in a purely market situation (…). Business interpreting relates only to the needs of the parties to communicate in order to secure deals, and while the importance of accurate are [sic] as strong here as anywhere, issues such as impartiality or role are often subservient to the needs of the negotiating party. (Ozolins 2014: 30)

Precisely because of the nature of these encounters, in which participants pursue commercial objectives, tenets assumed in other interpreting domains, such as impartiality and wholeness, may clash with the interests and needs of the business hiring the interpreter's services, and the interpreter therefore faces an ethical dilemma. These messages are expected to be faithfully transferred, so meanings and intentions require careful attention in order to determine the most appropriate way of rendering the message. However, how and to what extent the interpreter must intervene is unclear, as there are no clear guidelines to follow. Instead, we find a myriad of codes for different interpreting settings, most still focusing on principles of conference interpreting (Angelelli 2006; Bancroft 2005; Mikkelson 2009; Prunč and Setton 2015), as well as professional interpreters who express their disagreement with these codes (Takimoto 2006; Hale 2007). Moreover, literature on interpreting ethics repeatedly argues that there is a generalised mismatch between the principles in codes and standards of practice (Angelelli 2006; Inghilleri 2005; Ozolins 2014; Pokorn and Južnič 2020). This is particularly evident with regard to BI, as it is a unique format within the interpreting sector "in not having spawned codes of professional ethics" (Ozolins 2014: 30) and in regarding "the requirements of the Codes as less applicable to business situations" (Takimoto 2006: 55).

In light of this scenario, in which the notion of *ethics* appears to be evolving with the interpreting profession, we consider it essential to train prospective interpreters in professional ethics and conduct, i.e. to equip them with tools needed to rise to the challenges that the interpreting task poses in this context and, ultimately, to make decisions to allow for the transfer of the message while remaining completely professional. In order to do this, we consider the value of reflecting upon the decisions from practice, creating a "constructive alignment" (Biggs and Tangs 2011: 97–99), i.e. training the students from their own experience through activities that integrate practice and reflection.

Cultural quandaries in BI must therefore be explored from a pedagogical perspective. Firstly, it is important to prepare students to deal with the real ethical challenges that they may come across when interpreting as professionals in business contexts, since it does "seem helpful to advise novice interpreters that the Codes in their current form might have certain limitations in relation to business situations" (Takimoto 2009: 56). Secondly, we agree that future professional interpreters should be equipped with a profound understanding of ethical issues through critical reflection and experimentation (Baker and Maier 2014). Thirdly, we believe that training can provide trainee interpreters "with an understanding that a professional interpreter is the only conversational participant with the ability to follow both sides of the cross-linguistic discourse" (Binghan and Xia 2018: 15).

Objectives and Methodology

The aim of this paper is to approach the ethical dilemmas that arise within BI contexts as a result of the need to transmit messages in which meanings rely strongly on the speakers' cultural background, framework, and mindset. A training session focused on culture-bound ethical intricacies in BI was designed in order to bring these challenges into the classroom and approach them from an ethical point of view, examining the different options that both allow for the transfer of the message and, more significantly, adhere to professional principles and protocols. This session was designed to be implemented as part of a course in English/Spanish dialogue interpreting in the last year of the 4-year undergraduate degree in Translation and Interpreting offered at the University Pablo de Olavide of Seville (UPO). As previously described (Vigier-Moreno 2020b: 251–263), this module, which is compulsory and worth 6 ECTS credits, is aimed at introducing students to dialogue interpreting by facilitating the acquisition and development of core competences (e.g. oral language and intercultural skills) and focusses on two basic domains: BI and public service interpreting.

The practical seminars on this course are based on a teaching methodology that leads to an interaction that is very similar to the one described by other interpreter trainers, like Gorm Hansen and Schlesinger (2007: 104–105). The session starts with an initial, brief warm-up, in which the translation assignment is contextualised—students are provided in advance with a timeline including briefings and keywords so that they can prepare the weekly sessions (Vigier-Moreno 2020b: 259–260); next, one student interprets in a simulated scenario where two trainers play the role of the two monolingual main interlocutors, while the rest of students either interpret in the interpreting booths or observe and evaluate their peer's performance. This student's interpreting session is then followed by a debriefing and feedback phase through debate and discussion held by all participants, i.e. student interpreter, student observers, and trainers; if time allows, another excerpt of the dialogue—or another dialogue—is performed with a different student interpreting plus another feedback phase; the session finishes with a short wrap-up, in which the main elements related to the interpreter performance discussed in the session are referenced. These dynamics share much common ground with the approach proposed by Baker and Maier (2014) for introducing professional ethics into interpreter training, chiefly based on roleplays (to prepare trainees for situations in which, as professional interpreters, they will need to make on-the-spot decisions) and classroom debates (to allow trainees to think through ethical implications from different perspectives).

For this specific session on BI ethics practice, the first step was to select the material to recreate an interpreter-mediated business negotiation. We believe that it is particu-

larly useful to observe real situations and thus identify specific phenomena requiring *ethical* attention, and subsequently integrate them in training and reflection sessions. To this end, we turned to the Business Interpreting Research Corpus (BIRC), a corpus that captures an authentic interpreter-mediated business meeting between a Spanish factory and a British brand in the luxury leather goods industry where the parties discuss the production of different designs. This was compiled by Torrella (2020) with the aim of identifying the challenges requiring the intervention of the interpreter in BI.

Torrella (2020) defined from this analysis the concept of 'Business Interpreting Intervention Area' (BIIA), which refers to the phenomena that lead the interpreter to a decision-making process to allow for the transmission of the message while preserving the efficiency of the communication in BI. Since the presence of these BIIA in the dialogue means that the interpreter needs to make a decision, we consider them to be of particular interest from an ethical perspective. As a result, for the purpose of reflecting upon the professional conduct of the interpreter in training sessions, we decided to include some of the BIIA identified in BIRC resulting from the interaction of different cultures and business approaches in our teaching materials and examine different manners of responding to these BI challenges.

Specifically, the BIIA included in our teaching materials occur in utterances containing humorous and vulgar or informal language, the use of which is inextricably linked to the speaker's framework of reference (Torrella 2020). As described in the examples below, this is particularly noticeable in the BIIA selected for our training sessions given the different approaches to conversation in Spanish and British business cultures; as the latter focusses on the objectives of the negotiation from a much more formal and exigent perspective (Elías 2009: 94). Likewise, in these phenomena we highlight the strong bond between meaning and the speakers' framework of reference, particularly as far as humour and formality are concerned. In this regard, we consider how humour has specific uses in terms of business strategy—e.g. Spanish culture tends to be friendly and may use humour as a persuasion technique, whereas British culture is stricter and rounds of negotiations are carefully organised (Danciu 2010). In other words, humour is perceived depending on culture (Marra and Holmes 2007), and it is therefore important to examine how it is handled in BI, and in all types of interpreting, for that matter. The same is true of vulgarity or especially direct language, since in less flexible cultures the formulation of abrupt messages can be considered impolite (Martin et al. 2013: 158).

As specialised literature has emphasised, interpreters must convey not only the literal meaning contained in the speakers' utterances but the intended message behind the words spoken, as "any sort of interpreting is far more involved than merely transferring words from the source language (…) to the target language" (Mikkelson 2016:

2). Accordingly, as argued by Setton and Dawrant (2016: 178), the interpreter must be "constantly attuned to the speakers' intent," which implies going beyond the translation of the content of the message.

It is our understanding that this also applies to BI. Since the function of the original message may not be preserved if translated literally (as this verbatim rendering can have an impact different from the one intended by the speaker), the interpreter needs activate a decision-making process in order to avoid potential misunderstandings and face-threatening acts, while remaining faithful to the purpose of the communication (Hale 2007), given the differences in mental models (Žegarac 2007: 33). On this basis, we encourage close examination of these phenomena and the subsequent creation and application of teaching materials based on them in order to foster reflection regarding the ethical decisions to be made by the interpreter in business settings.

Consequently, we used extracts from the BIRC corpus, featuring examples of utterances which result in a culture clash between speakers and present the interpreters with a dilemma from the point of view of professional ethics (hence identified as BIIA, as indicated above). These extracts were the starting material for the production of semi-scripted roleplays to be used in the practical seminar, the underlying idea being that, as suggested by Cirillo and Radicioni (2017), the use of structured roleplays, particularly in BI training, allows trainees to become familiar with linguistic and interactional aspects of business settings, acquire (semi-)specialised content and terminology, practise different interpreting modes and strategies, and also reflect on the complexity of the interpreter's role and performance.

Then the roleplays were prepared, after anonymising the text and adapting the dialogues to the UPO undergraduate students' profile (e.g. they had only been trained in BI for 6 weeks previously) and desired learning outcomes (e.g. providing introductory training in dialogue interpreting in different settings and helping students to develop a basic skillset). Students were then briefed on the interpreting assignment: Manufacturas SL, a fictional Spanish leather producer, has a meeting with Lux from London, a fictional British fashion company, to discuss their business relationship, including specific aspects of product design. The trainees were also given three keywords to guide their preparation: *leather goods, design*, and *materials*. The practical seminar took place in March 2022. It must be noted that the same session was used for three different student groups, i.e. with three different student interpreters, in order to observe whether different decisions were made, and three feedback/discussion phases following each interpreter-mediated interaction. The sessions were also video-recorded, for subsequent detailed analysis.

Results

As explained above, the roleplay used to introduce ethically challenging elements in BI training contained utterances that rely heavily on the main speakers' cultural background and are thus considered BIIA. As speakers' framework of reference in a business interaction is shaped not only by their cultural background, but also by their communicative goals (Kohn and Kalina 1996) and their business strategy (Siedel 2014), the rendering of these utterances into the other language poses a challenge for the interpreter from an ethical perspective. In other words, since different tenets come into conflict as a result of a culture clash, the interpreter needs to make an on-the-spot decision giving preference to (and simultaneously reducing) one particular principle of their professional conduct and set of standards, which sometimes means following the advice we find in Setton and Dawrant (2016: 385): "aim for minimal or basic fidelity: say what you have understood, however simply, avoiding any risk of misrepresentation or distortion of the speaker's basic communicative intent."

The first excerpt (shown below) contains one of the ethically challenging elements found in the BIRC corpus that were adapted for our training sessions in relation to humour:

Lux from London:	So, this model is fine, but the sales team said it is too high. So the height was 40, but we'll reduce it 4 centimetres, to 36.
Manufacturas SL:	*A 36 de alto, ¿no?* [36 centimetres high, right?]
Lux from London:	Yes, that's right. That's the change you can see here in pink [pointing at a drawing]
Manufacturas SL:	*[A la intérprete]. Ah. Y dile que a este le hicimos la nota de que la costura se deja entrever. Queda feísimo así. Vamos, este bolso parece una pandereta…* [To the interpreter – Oh. And tell her that we already noted that the seam is visible. It's very ugly this way. Anyway, this bag looks like a tambourine…]

In this excerpt, the Spanish leather manufacturer drops a comment about one of the bags that they are producing for the British textile company, which is not unacceptable according to the speaker's Spanish cultural business background but might be construed as offensive within the other speaker's British cultural framework. Furthermore, it cannot be fully ascertained to whom the remark is made: The representative of the Spanish manufacturers may have simply made the comment out loud or, on the contrary, may have told the interpreter in confidence, with a humorous intention. In any event, the interpreter is posed with a challenge here and a split-second decision must be made on how to proceed: the interpreter may, for instance, adopt a conduit approach and reproduce in English everything that was uttered in Spanish, regardless

of the consequences for the business negotiations, or he or she may regard this utterance as a face-threatening act and decide to omit it in their rendering into English for the sake of keeping the negotiation on good terms, but in so-doing, failing to observe the wholeness principle.

While performing this roleplay in our session, different approaches were taken by the three student interpreters who mediated at the simulated negotiation:

Interpreter 1:   The changes in the design are not that… er… subtle, and… er… as beautiful as it could be if it were not… er… visible.

Interpreter 2:   [Titter] The needlework is too visible. Er… and it doesn't look really okay.

Interpreter 3:   The model is very good, but the… er… sewing [sic] must be improved in another model.

As can be seen from the above, Interpreter 1 decided to partially omit the original utterance made by the Spanish speaker and modulate the content of the message and accordingly tone down the criticism expressed by the Spanish manufacturer. Conversely, Interpreter 2 showed a paralinguistic reaction to the comment made by the Spanish interlocutor, and after tittering and making a facial expression, the interpreter decided to also leave out the most sensitive part of the message and somehow redress the situation. Lastly, Interpreter 3 omitted in English the most negative elements expressed by the Spanish speaker, but also distorted the general message, firstly by adding a positive element such as "the model is really good" (which was not intended by the main speaker) and secondly by making an unsuccessful attempt to convey part of the Spanish speaker's disagreement with the model put forward by the British designers ("must be improved in another model"), which clearly deviates, however, from the original utterance.

These interpretations were discussed and debated in the feedback phase. It must be stressed that this was not a prescriptive discussion (focusing on what professional interpreters *must do*), but a reflective one (debating what professional interpreters *can do* and the possible consequences of their choices), in line with previously described teaching methodologies such as that of Lázaro Gutiérrez (2009). Accordingly, different approaches were taken into consideration, making reference to principles contained in professional codes of ethics (such as wholeness, accuracy, integrity and impartiality), which lead to different courses of action in the interpretations. For instance, it was argued that if the interpreter had been adamant about observing the wholeness principle, pursuant to which interpreters must faithfully render the source-language message in the target language reproducing *all* the elements found in the original message, the interpreter would have simply offered an English literal translation of the Spanish speaker's utterances; it was also pointed out that, bearing in mind that inter-

preters must abide by the principle of integrity or professionalism, according to which interpreters must behave professionally, interpreters must not react to any humorous comment that is not clearly intended for the other main speaker, or engage in a private parallel conversation with one specific party.

However, during the discussion, it was also highlighted how other aspects such as the successful development of the business negotiation, the interpreter's role as an intercultural broker and a possible bias due to the interpreter being hired by one of the parties (whose main intention is to close as beneficial a deal with their partner as possible) also need to be taken into account when assessing ways to proceed as an interpreter in situations like the one faced by these student interpreters. Consequently, if the interpreter believed that their role as cultural mediator prevailed over the standards of wholeness or impartiality, they might have, for example, advised the Spanish speaker to refrain from making such remarks—as they might be perceived to be unacceptable by the British interlocutors and consequently had a negative impact on the negotiation.

Similarly, the roleplays created for this session included the following dialogue, extracted and adapted from BIRC, in which a speaker from a Spanish background expresses himself without the formality and courtesy generally expected in the British (business) culture. In the following excerpt we can observe the use of more abrupt language by Manufacturas SL:

Lux from London	Oh, we don't want a more expensive bag. The one quoted was fine. So, we won't change the leather and we will add instead a shoulder strap, so that the weight doesn't make the seam visible. And, also, we are adding one more stud, here.
Manufacturas SL	*Vale. Bueno. Vamos, y decía que iba a ser simple la cosa… Eso es justo lo que habían pedido al principio. Nos están volviendo locos.* [Ok. Well, and she said it would be easy… This is exactly what they asked for at the very beginning. They are driving us crazy]
Lux from London	And, just one more thing. The keyring with the pompom that we said at the beginning… we need to see that after lunch.
Manufacturas SL	*Ok. Venga, pues vámonos a comer. [A la intérprete] Dile que me voy a comer un crêpe… [A todos] Hasta luego.* [Okay, it's time to have lunch.—To the interpreter—Tell her I am going to eat a crêpe.—To everyone—I'll see you later].

These examples show the direct and abrupt language used by the speaker from Manufacturas SL. As we can see, this speaker not only expresses herself in an informal way that might be acceptable in Spanish culture but not necessarily so in the British one, but she also attempts to be *funny* while freely speaking her mind, especially when joking about going to eat a crêpe. These excerpts were interpreted by our students as follows:

(1) Manufacturas SL *Vale. Bueno. Vamos, y decía que iba a ser simple la cosa… Eso es justo lo que habían pedido al principio. Nos están volviendo locos.* [Ok. Well, and she said it would be easy… This is exactly what they asked for at the very beginning. They are driving us crazy]

Interpreter 1: [Titters] It's okay, we will add one more stud at the bottom. Er… this is becoming a little bit more complicated than we thought it would be.

Interpreter 2: At the beginning you said this was going to be easy and, maybe, I don't agree with you.

Interpreter 3: So the thing that the shoulder… Er…
[Lux from London: The strap?]
Yes. it can be done, as you said the first time that you made, the… er… [titters] that you tell us about the bag [sic], what we can do is to add another thing here [points at the bottom of the bag].

(2) Manufacturas SL *Ok. Venga pues vámonos a comer. [A la intérprete] Dile que me voy a comer un crêpe… [A todos] Hasta luego.* [Okay, it's time to have lunch.—To the interpreter—Tell her I am going to eat a crêpe.—To everyone—I'll see you later].

Interpreter 1: It's okay. [Titters] We will talk about it later. I'm going to eat now. Goodbye.

Interpreter 2: Yes, I'm very hungry, so let's talk about that after lunch.

In the third group, with Interpreter 3, the roleplay had to be adjusted because the interpreter's reformulations altered the course of the conversation and trainers performing roleplay in interpreter training must "respond to what students say, even though it may mean straying from the script" (Sandrelli 2011: 213):

Manufacturas SL: *Ea, vale, pues yo creo que ya está, nos podemos ir a comer.* [Ok, I think that's it. We can go have lunch.]

Interpreter 3: So I think that… er… it's right for now… er… what about going to [titters] eat something? [hesitant tone]

Lux from London: Lunch?

Interpreter 3: Yes, to go lunch? [sic]

Lux from London: Yeah, yeah. Oh, sorry, I forgot about the keyring with pompom. Okay, maybe we can have a look at that after lunch, okay?

Interpreter 3: *Sí, perfecto, podemos irnos a comer. Ay, perdón, lo siento, se me ha olvidado comentarle el llavero del pompón, si usted lo ve bien podríamos hacerlo después de comer.* [Yes, perfect, we can go to have lunch. Oh, sorry I forgot to tell you about the keyring of the pompom [sic], we can talk about it after lunch if you agree.]

Manufacturas SL:	*Venga sí, lo vemos después de comer, eh. [A la intérprete] Dile que me voy a comer un crêpe, que estoy muerta de hambre. [A todos] Hasta luego.* [Ok, we can talk about it after lunch, eh.—To the interpreter—Tell him I am going to eat a crêpe because I'm so hungry.—To everyone—I'll see you later.]
Interpreter 3:	Okay, okay, we can see it later… er… and I am going to have lunch.
Lux from London:	Yes, we are going to have lunch together, right? As you said…
Interpreter 3:	*Sí, sí, nos vamos a comer juntos, ¿no?* [Yes, yes, we are having lunch together, right?]
Manufacturas SL:	*[A la intérprete] Ah, bueno, yo la verdad que no lo había pensado. Me deja un poquito así. Pero bueno, le puedo preguntar al señor González, que es el dueño de la fábrica, si quiere ir con él. Yo es que tengo que volver al trabajo.* [To the interpreter—Honestly, I wasn't planning to. I'm a bit surprised. But, well, I can ask Mr González, the owner of the factory. He may be willing to have lunch with him. I have to go back to work.]
Interpreter 3:	I cannot go to have lunch with you, but I can ask Mr González, er, the productor [sic], producer of the company if he would like to go with you.
Lux from London:	But I mean, you just asked me whether I thought it was a good idea to go for lunch together. Oh, I think there was a misunderstanding here.
Interpreter 3:	Sorry, the interpreter made a mistake. And she was referring that she… er… was going to eat… er… alone. Sorry.
Lux from London:	Oh. Okay, okay. See you later then.

In these interpretations of the students, we can observe that Interpreter 1 decided to neutralise the messages, transferring the content with a polite reformulation first (1), while capturing the irony regarding the 'crêpe' and omitting this part of the message in the second utterance (2) made by Manufacturas SL. In both decisions, we observe the intervention of the interpreter as a *mediator,* thus focusing on the content and the intention of the speaker. Interpreter 2, however, transmitted the first message (1) maintaining the abrupt tone of the speaker, which the student tries later to soften with the addition of 'maybe.' In this reformulation it is of note that the part of the message in which the speaker from Manufacturas SL says *"vale" [okay]* is omitted, which may result in a more aggressive message with this partial omission. In the case of the second utterance made by Manufacturas SL, in this excerpt, Interpreter 2 also opted to omit the humorous reference to the 'crêpe.' which is the same decision taken by Interpreter 1 and 3. Finally, Interpreter 3 tried in both instances to formulate a more polite message; however, there is poor use of the English language that results in a direct and unintel-

ligible message. Additionally, it is also of note that the speaker from Lux from London is forced to clarify the messages for Interpreter 3 and complete her reformulations. We can see that the reason for this is that this student (Interpreter 3) tries to convey the message with gestures, such as pointing at the bag, and resorts to the general word "thing" instead of the terms required to (wholly) preserve the message, namely, 'strap' and 'stud.'

Finally, this third case exposes the consequences of poor language use. Through the omission of "I am going to eat a crêpe" and the alteration of the meaning of the sentence *"nos podemos ir a comer"* [we can go to have lunch] (which Interpreter 3 conveyed as "what about going to [titters] eat something?"), which could be interpreted as an offering for a plan together, we can see an important misunderstanding until Interpreter 3 realises her mistake and clarifies "Sorry, the interpreter made a mistake. And she was referring that she, er, was going to eat, er, alone, sorry," as well as a hesitant tone that reveals the student's doubts about the content of her interpretation.

In light of these decisions, we reflected with the students upon this direct and informal language used by the Spanish speaker, which would probably be interpreted as rude and inappropriate from a British perspective, thus clashing with the function of the message pursued by the speaker. Hence the neutralisation may be considered to align with the function intended by the speaker, even though such a decision contradicts the principle of wholeness (and accuracy) contained in current codes of ethics for interpreters. Lastly, we debated the use of the third person, as it is noteworthy that the speaker from Manufacturas SL is not directly addressing his British counterpart at the end of the dialogue (using the third person), but rather the interpreter. Nevertheless, all three students decided to redirect the message to the other party (the British company), thus prioritising the efficiency of the dialogue. This decision may seem controversial if we consider the ethical principle of *faithfully* reproducing the utterances, since the interpreter decides to change the original message from a linguistic point of view. However, advocating for the efficiency of the conversation can also be regarded as being *loyal* to the speakers' needs and objectives, bringing them closer by using the second person and, in this way, adopting a less *invasive* role.

Furthermore, the misunderstanding caused by Interpreter 3 led us to reflect not only upon the importance of careful use of language, but also upon the need to maintain professional conduct by admitting errors, hence correcting misunderstandings and accepting responsibility for such errors. In this regard, Interpreter 3 realised that she might have altered the message of the speaker from Manufacturas SL, apologising and resolving the confusion. However, she only realised her mistake after the speaker from Lux from London repeated that he thought he had been invited to lunch, which resulted in a loss of efficiency of dialogue and led to a rather crude farewell. Through this

example, the group also had the chance to observe the consequences of not preserving actual meanings as the business relationships may be affected by these errors, and this clearly must be avoided to professionally convey the messages.

Another interesting element that arose during the feedback stage was the use of non-verbal language by the interpreter. Interpreter 1 reacted to the humorous comments made by the Spanish interlocutor ("they are driving us crazy" and "I am going to eat a crêpe") by tittering, but decided to modulate (and omit) them in their rendering in English. Interpreter 3 also tittered and made use of facial expression and body language alongside her interpretation. During the debate, it was stressed that interpreters' conduct must be professional and interpreters must be extremely cautious in trying to remain neutral in terms of non-verbal communication: tittering may give the other speaker a poor impression, potentially making them feel excluded from the conversation (and thus question the interpreter's impartiality or neutrality).

In essence, this methodology allowed us to take our trainees out of their comfort zone—of *principally* reproducing the messages in the other language—with situations based on real-life interpreted-mediated interactions which somehow *forced* them to face BIIA based on professional and ethical principles. In this sense, we achieved our main goal, as we managed to foster the students' reflection on and understanding of the ethical issues faced by interpreters in business settings through their own experience and observation. It must also be added that our students actively participated in the debate, suggesting different perspectives and questioning the applicability of the codes of ethics to specific situations in BI, which can be interpreted as indicative of their commitment and motivation.

Conclusions

Including ethically challenging issues extracted from an authentic BI corpus in interpreter training undoubtedly helps students to acquire a more situated and profound learning in terms of the dilemmas that may arise in BI. In the training experience described above, students were first exposed to quandaries resulting from the culture clash resulting from remarks made by the main speakers with different cultural (business) backgrounds (British and Spanish) in the context of a business negotiation. Next, they were encouraged to reflect on the decision made by the interpreter as well as the other available options in such situations, taking into account not only professional standards and the communicative situation and the interlocutors' needs and expectations but also the interpreter's role, between "strict adherence to the linguistic elements of the message" and intervention "in bridging cultural and social gaps" (Mikkelson 2016:

3). This allowed the students to deepen their understanding of professional ethics as applied to real-life BI scenarios.

Working with simulations based on structured, semi-scripted roleplays replicating real quandaries that can be found in BI practice, which *push* students into playing the role of interpreter to make on-the-spot decisions, and the ensuing feedback and discussion phase, which allows all participants—interpreters and observers—to expound upon the intricacies of preserving an ethical and professional conduct while conveying the intended meaning, "enables trainees to prepare themselves for real-life practice" (Binghan and Xia 2018: 24). Furthermore, as shown above, interpreter trainers and trainees can question the conduit model, which seems to prevail in most codes of professional ethics for interpreters, which very often emphasise faithfulness, accuracy and impartiality as main tenets, and therefore champion a more participatory role in communication for the interpreter on the basis of their role as intercultural mediators, particularly when culture clashes may jeopardise the development of the business negotiation (thus giving way to loyalty to communicative efficacy and intercultural competence as pillars in BI).

Using examples from a real interpreter-mediated BI corpus was also a motivating exercise for our trainees. The students demonstrated this motivation with their enhanced participation in the debates on their peers' decisions when faced with ethical dilemmas in real time. However, while the group found these roleplays interesting, they were also considered particularly challenging. We therefore believe that the students' level (in terms of both language competence and stage of interpreter training) should be assessed in order to create roleplays presenting these quandaries but aligned with the syllabus.

In conclusion, we believe that this activity raises awareness of BI ethical intricacies and stimulates interpreter trainees to delve into the consequences of interpreter attitudes and to understand the impact of their choices in the business relationship in comparison to other interpreting settings. This type of training therefore prepares them to make more informed decisions from an ethical perspective in BI contexts. We believe in the value of using real-life interpreting and training material, and, given the scarcity of material available, we trust that the further compilation and use of real interpreter-mediated interactions within the business sector would help BI trainers to create materials better adapted to training needs and the reality of the profession. Compiling interpreter-mediated corpora to identify new BI quandaries and providing trainers with further examples to apply to their training will be most useful.

References

Angelelli, Claudia V. 2006. Validating Professional Standards and Codes: Challenges and Opportunities. *Interpreting* 8 (2): 175–193. https://doi.org/10.1075/intp.8.2.04ang.

Baker, Mona and Carol Maier. 2011. Ethics in Interpreter and Translator Training. Critical Perspectives. *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer,* 5 (1), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1080/13556509.2011.10798809.

Bancroft, Marjory. 2005. *The Interpreter's World Tour: An Environmental Scan of Standards of Practice for Interpreters*. Woodland Hills: The California Endowment.

Biggs, John and Catherine Tangs. 2011. *Teaching for Quality Learning at University.* 4th Ed. Maidenhead: McGraw Hill.

Binghan, Zheng and Xia Xiang. 2018. Between Invisibility and Over-visibility. Self-perception and User Expectations of Liaison Interpreters in Business Settings. *Babel,* 64 (1), 1–32. https://doi.org/10.1075/babel.00023.zhe.

Cirillo, Letizia and Maura Radicioni. 2017. (Role-)playing Fair(s). Introducing Interpreting Students to Business Negotiations. In *Teaching Dialogue Interpreting. Research-Based Proposals for Higher Education*, edited by Letizia Cirillo and Natacha Niemants, 119-135. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Danciu, Victor. 2010. The Impact of the Culture on the International Negociations: An Analysis Based on Contextual Comparaisons. *Theoretical and Applied Economics*, vol. XVII, 8 (549), 87–102. Accessed December 12, 2022: http://store.ectap.ro/articole/493.pdf.

Elías, Jorge E. 2009. La comunicación intercultural: Oportunidad u obstáculo para las organizaciones [Intercultural Communication: Opportunity or Burden for Organisations]. In *Cultura y Sociedad. Orientaciones para el ser humano en las organizaciones*, edited by Jorge E. Elías, 56–122. Distrito Turístico, Cultural e Histórico de Santa Marta: UniMagdalena.

Gavioli, Laura. 2014. Negotiating Renditions in and Through Talk: Some Notes on the Contribution of Conversation Analysis to the Study of Interpreter-mediated Interaction. *Lingue Culture Mediazioni-Languages Cultures Mediation (LCM Journal)*, 1 (1-2), 37–55. Accessed January 3, 2023: https://www.ledonline.it/index.php/LCM-Journal/article/view/726.

Gorm Hansen, Inge and Miriam Shlesinger. 2007. The Silver Lining. Technology and Self-study in the Interpreting Classroom. *Interpreting,* 9 (1), 95–118. https://doi.org/10.1075/intp.9.1.06gor.

Hale, Sandra B. 2007. *Community Interpreting*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Inghilleri, Moira. 2005. Mediating Zones of Uncertainty. Interpreter Agency, the Interpreting Habitus and Political Asylum Adjudication. *The Translator* 11 (1), 69–85. https://doi.org/10.1080/13556509.2005.10799190.

Ko, Leong. 1996. Business Interpreting. In *Liaison Interpreting, A Handbook,* edited by Adolfo Gentile, Uldis Ozolins and Mary Vasilakakos, 116–124. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press.

Kohn, Kurt and Sylvia Kalina. 1996. The Strategic Dimension of Interpreting. *Meta,* 41(1), 118–138. https://doi.org/10.7202/003333ar.

Lázaro Gutiérrez, Raquel. 2009. Dilemas éticos del traductor/intérprete en los servicios públicos. *I Foro Internacional de Traducción/Interpretación y Compromiso Social.*

Lewicki, Roy J., Bruce Barry and David M. Saunders. 2016. *Essentials of Negotiation* (6th Ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Marra, Meredith and Janet Holmes. 2007. Humour Across Cultures: Joking in the Multicultural Workplace. In *Handbook of Intercultural Communication, 7*, edited by Helga Kotthoff and Helen Spencer-Oatey, 153–172. New York/Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Martin, Judith, Thomas K. Nakayama, G.P. Van Rheede van Oudtshoorn and Paul J. Schutte. 2013. *EBOOK: Experiencing Intercultural Communication: An Introduction*. Maidenhead: McGraw Hill.

Mikkelson, Holly. 2009. Interpreting is Interpreting—or Is It? *The Aiic Webzine.* Accessed December 12, 2022: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/41373508_Interpreting_Is_Interpreting_-_Or_Is_It.

Mikkelson, Holly. 2016. Introduction to Court Interpreting. London/New York: Routledge.

Ozolins, Uldis. 2014. Descriptions of Interpreting and Their Ethical Consequences. *FITISPos International Journal* 1 (1): 23–41. https://doi.org/10.37536/FITISPos-IJ.2014.1.0.9.

Pistillo, Giovanna. 2004. The Interpreter as Cultural Mediator. *Journal of Intercultural Communication,* 6. Accessed January 3, 2023: https://immi.se/oldwebsite/nr6/pistillo.pdf.

Pöchhacker, Franz. 2004. *Introducing Interpreting Studies.* London: Routledge.

Pokorn, Nike K. and Tamara M. Južnič. 2020. Community Interpreters Versus Intercultural Mediators: Is it Really all About Ethics? *Translation and Interpreting Studies. The Journal of the American Translation and Interpreting Studies Association*, 15 (1), 80–107. https://doi.org/10.1075/tis.20027.koc.

Prunč, Erich and Robin Setton. 2015. Neutrality. In *Routledge Encyclopedia of Interpreting Studies*, edited by Frank Pöchhacker, 273–276. Oxon/ New York: Routledge.

Rudvin, Mette and Elena Tomassini. 2011. *Interpreting at the Community and the Workplace.* Basingstoke/ New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Sandrelli, Annalisa. 2005. La trattativa d'affari: osservazione generali e strategie didattiche [Liaison in Business Negotiations: General Observations and Didactic Strategies]. In *Interpretazione di Trattativa. La mediazione linguistico-culturale nel contesto formativo e professionale*, edited by Mariachiara Russo and Gabriele Mack, 77–91. Milan: Hoepli.

Sandrelli, Annalisa. 2011. Training in Business Interpreting and the Role of Technology. In *Interpretazione e mediazione. Un'opposizione inconciliabile?* [Interpreting and Mediation, an Irreconcilable Opposition?], edited by José Francisco Medina Montero and Sarah Tripepi Winteringham, 209–233. Rome: Aracne.

Setton, Robin and Andrew Dawrant. 2016. *Conference Interpreting—A Complete Course.* Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Siedel, George. 2014. *Negotiating for Success: Essential Strategies and Skills.* University of Michigan: Van Rye Publishing.

Takimoto, Masato. 2006. Interpreters' Role Perceptions in Business Dialogue Interpreting Situations. *Monash University Linguistics Papers*, 5 (1), 47–57. Accessed January 3, 2023: https://bridges.monash.edu/articles/journal_contribution/Interpreters_role_perceptions_in_business_dialogue_interpreting_situations/5063695.

Takimoto, Masato. 2009. Characteristics of an Interpreted Situation with Multiple Participants: Implications for Pedagogy. *International Journal of Interpreter Education,* 1, 33–44. Accessed January 3, 2023: https://tigerprints.clemson.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1181&context=ijie.

Torrella, Carmen. 2020. *La interpretación en el ámbito empresarial: estudio de caso para la conceptualización de la zona de intervención en interpretación en el corpus BIRC* [Interpreting in Business Settings: Case Study Conceptualising the Business Interpreting Intervention Area in the BIRC Corpus]. Doctoral dissertation. University Pablo de Olavide, Seville.

Trovato, Giuseppe. 2013. El papel de intérprete en el ámbito ferial y de negocios: actividades y propuestas didácticas [The Role of the Interpreter in Trade fairs and Business: Training Activities and Proposals]. *Entreculturas* 5, 75–97. Accessed January 3, 2023: http://hdl.handle.net/10630/7159.

Wadensjö, Cecilia. 2004. Dialogue Interpreting: A Monologising Practice in a Dialogically Organised World. *Target. International Journal of Translation Studies*, 16 (1), 105–124. https://doi.org/10.1075/target.16.1.06wad.

Vigier-Moreno, Francisco J. 2020a. *Strategies and Analyses of Language and Communication in Multilingual and International Contexts*, edited by David Levey, 197–204. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Vigier-Moreno, Francisco J. 2020b. Let's strike a deal! Meeting the challenge of undergraduate business interpreter training. *Current Trends in Translation Teaching and Learning E,* 7, 239–275. Accessed January 4, 2023. 10.51287/cttl_e_2020_8_francisco_j_vigier_ moreno.pdf.

Žegarac, Vladimir. 2007. A Cognitive Pragmatic Perspective on Communication and Culture. In *Handbook of Intercultural Communication*, edited by Helga Kotthoff and Helen Spencer-Oatey, 31–53. New York/ Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.