

**THE ROLE AND PROFESSIONAL IDENTITY OF THE
COURTROOM INTERPRETER IN THE LEGAL SYSTEM OF
ENGLAND AND WALES: A SOCIAL CONSTRUCTIONIST
PERSPECTIVE**

VOL III

LIUBOV GREEN

Doctor of Philosophy

ASTON UNIVERSITY

January 2024

© Liubov Green, 2024

Liubov Green asserts her moral right to be identified as the author of this thesis

This copy of the thesis has been supplied on condition that anyone who consults it is understood to recognise that its copyright belongs to its author and that no quotation from the thesis and no information derived from it may be published without appropriate permission or acknowledgement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPENDIX 11: AUDIO TRANSCRIPTS	4
<i>11.1 Interviews with interpreters</i>	4
11.1.1 Respondent 4: interview transcript.....	4
11.1.2 Respondent 6: interview transcript.....	16
11.1.3 Respondent 7: interview transcript.....	22
11.1.4 Respondent 13: interview transcript.....	30
11.1.5 Respondent 16: interview transcript.....	40
11.1.6 Respondent 18: interview transcript.....	47
11.1.7 Respondent 21: interview transcript.....	59
11.1.8 Respondent 58: interview transcript.....	72
<i>11.2 Interviews with legal professionals</i>	107
11.2.1 Respondent 1: interview transcript.....	107
11.2.2 Respondent 12: interview transcript.....	117
11.2.3 Respondent 25: interview transcript.....	122
11.2.4 Respondent 26: interview transcript.....	151
11.2.5 Respondent 27: interview transcript.....	160
APPENDIX 12: AUDIO TRANSCRIPTS ANALYSIS OF INTERVIEWS WITH INTERPRETERS	168
<i>12.1 Colour codes used for In Vivo Coding: interviews with interpreters</i>	168
<i>12.2 Coding and thematic analysis of audio transcripts: interviews with interpreters</i>	169
12.2.1 Respondent 4: first stage coding	169
12.2.2 Respondent 4: second stage coding.....	178
12.2.3 Respondent 4: codes and themes from survey	183
12.2.4 Respondent 6: first stage coding	187
12.2.5 Respondent 6: second stage coding.....	189
12.2.6 Respondent 6: codes and themes from survey	193
12.2.7 Respondent 7: first stage coding	196
12.2.8 Respondent 7: second stage coding.....	199
12.2.9 Respondent 7: codes and themes from survey	204
12.2.10 Respondent 13: first stage coding	206
12.2.11 Respondent 13: codes and themes from survey	208

12.2.12 Respondent 16: first stage coding	213
12.2.13 Respondent 16: second stage coding.....	216
12.2.14 Respondent 16: codes and themes from survey	219
12.2.15 Respondent 18: first stage coding	221
12.2.16 Respondent 18: second stage coding.....	226
12.2.17 Respondent 18: codes and themes from survey	233
12.2.18 Respondent 21: first stage coding	236
12.2.19 Respondent 21: second stage coding.....	242
12.2.20 Respondent 21: codes and themes from survey	250
12.2.21 Respondent 58: first stage coding	253
12.2.22 Respondent 58: second stage coding.....	274
12.2.23 Respondent 58: codes and themes from survey	291
12.3 Identified themes across the interviews and survey with interpreters.....	298
APPENDIX 13: AUDIO TRANSCRIPTS ANALYSIS OF INTERVIEWS WITH	
LEGAL PROFESSIONALS	308
13.1 Colour codes used for In Vivo Coding: interviews with legal professionals	308
13.2 Coding and thematic analysis of audio transcripts: interviews with legal professionals.....	309
13.2.1 Respondent 1: first stage coding	309
13.2.2 Respondent 1: second stage coding.....	313
13.2.3 Respondent 12: first stage coding	318
13.2.4 Respondent 12: second stage coding.....	321
13.2.5 Respondent 12: codes and themes from survey	326
13.2.6 Respondent 25: first stage coding	329
13.2.7 Respondent 25: second stage coding.....	341
13.2.8 Respondent 25: codes and themes from survey	362
13.2.9 Respondent 26: first stage coding	365
13.2.10 Respondent 26: second stage coding.....	368
13.2.11 Respondent 26: codes and themes from survey	373
13.2.12 Respondent 27: first stage coding	375
13.2.12 Respondent 27: second stage coding.....	377
13.2.13 Respondent 27: codes and themes from survey	382
13.3 Identified themes across the interviews and survey with legal professionals	384

APPENDIX 11: AUDIO TRANSCRIPTS

11.1 Interviews with interpreters

11.1.1 Respondent 4: interview transcript

File name: Interview with Respondent 4
Audio Length: 0:25:27
Date transcribed: 14 August 2021

Interviewer: Okay, another attempt. So today is the 20th of May and here I have one of the court room interpreters on the line, who will be discussing the questionnaire with regards to my research into court room interpreting.

So, because you have already completed most of the questions, I will not be going through all of them, I will just ask a couple to clarify a few things. Question number two, as far as I understand, caused difficulties in understanding, right, so you put it down as you did not understand?

Respondent: Yes, I've got my document, I've got my replies here in front of me. So, the question is does the court type have a bearing on your professional practice? If so, in what way? That's the question, correct?

Interviewer: Yes. I meant by this question, is that for example, when you interpret for the county court, or for immigration court, or for magistrates' or for Crown, do you alter your interpreting techniques? For example, the whole concept of a different court type, does it have any effect on the way you do your job? Does it make sense?

Respondent: I would say no. The only thing you have to do is adapt your physical circumstances, that's what you have to change, because not every court has the same type of layout. So sometimes in county court, for example, you're sitting next to the client, or whoever is there, so it's

easier that way, because you can very easily do whispered simultaneous and consecutive.

Whereas, in say an immigration tribunal, but especially if they do video link, that's basically impossible. If the solicitors or barristers are talking to one another, not to one another but to the judge, that is the point where you, the interpreter, start to do whispered simultaneous. But if it's via video link, that is completely out of the question, you cannot do it, because the appellant is sitting in a detention centre and you're sitting in the tribunal court room looking at them on a video screen.

So, it's adapting yourself to your physical environment, rather than changing the way you work as an interpreter, if you know what I mean?

Interviewer: Yes.

Respondent: It's the physical environment, rather than the professional practice.

Interviewer: And what about the atmosphere, the whole atmosphere or psychological environment, put it that way? For example, in a Crown court does it feel more pressure, more hostile, adverse atmosphere? Or does it matter...?

Respondent: No. There was one Crown court case I did about four or so years ago, which was quite a serious matter, I mean, they all have to be serious in order to be in Crown court, but this was an incredibly sensitive matter. And that one, it was a huge court room, and I was interpreting for several witnesses, who all gave their evidence from behind these very, very big curtains.

Because the ceilings were so high, the curtains were very thick, very heavy and quite imposing, and actually I was directly opposite the jury, so they were all looking at the witnesses and at me. And it was only on the last day that I saw it was all being recorded, it totally slipped my mind that, of course, something would be recorded.

But other than that, I don't know, I've never found a court room actually to be adversarial at all, they are... not imposing, but, you know, you don't go to court every day, so it's not something you're used to doing, so there is a kind of effect that they have. But once you're in there and you're doing your work, you kind of forget, but you don't forget where you are, but you forget that you're in a court room, you're just there to do your work. So, you forget the environment and you're concentrating on doing your job, if that makes sense?

Interviewer: Yes. Yes, of course. So you were with a witness, was the curtain between you and the witness? Or the curtain was between the witness, you and everyone else except the jury?

Respondent: No, the curtain was there to shield the witnesses from the defendant in the case. So, the jury and the barristers could see the witnesses, and me, I was standing next to the witnesses and interpreting for them. And there was a curtain to the right of us, and they had positioned the defendant in such a way that he could hear but could not see who was being questioned. So, there you go.

Interviewer: Yes, I see.

Respondent: So that's how it was. It wasn't completely covered; the person was not completely covered.

Interviewer: Okay, thank you. Yeah, I was thinking whether you were behind the curtain, that that could seriously impact the quality to hear, how to say it...?

Respondent: I was in a way behind the curtain, but you have to also have an ability to project your voice without talking too loudly, so that's why speaking clearly is very important, whatever language you're using, whether it's English or whatever is the other language that you're using. You have to speak clearly, there is a way of projecting your voice without being loud, and that's what I try and do.

Interviewer: Okay, thank you. You also mentioned that that case was recorded.

- Respondent: Yes.
- Interviewer: But you also said that because you're there, you forget, and you just do your job. But at the beginning do you feel it added an extra pressure on you to perform to your best?
- Respondent: Well, it didn't in a way (Laughs), because what do you call it? I didn't realise until the last day, as I said. But what happened, I can't even remember what made me notice it, but one thing I do remember is that one of the witnesses said something, which in the language she was using could have been interpreted one of two ways in English, and I remember making it a point to state this. And that's the point I remember seeing the machine doing the recording, but I was not told this, the proceedings were being recorded.
- Interviewer: But they should have told you.
- Respondent: No, I was not told, I was booked by CPS for that one, I was not told.
- Interviewer: That was before Capita took over?
- Respondent: Yes, yes, this is back in 2010.
- Interviewer: Okay, I see. Yeah, but they should have told you anyway, it's...
- Respondent: I know. I know, I should have been told, but there you go, what can you do? (laughs).
- Interviewer: Yeah. The video link, it's interesting because now you mentioned this, and I'm actually thinking whether it's worth probably exploring the whole concept further. I know that Dr Yvonne Fowler did a dissertation on this, but...
- Respondent: Who was that? Who was that?
- Interviewer: Yvonne Fowler.
- Respondent: Yvonne, yes, yes.
- Interviewer: Yvonne. She did it solely on video links, but...

Respondent: Yes.

Interviewer: ... from the perspective whether it works or not.

Respondent: Yes.

Interviewer: I'm just now thinking whether it's worth exploring as part of my research from the interpreter's perspective.

Respondent: Yes. Yes, I mean, do you have her details? Do you have Yvonne's details?

Interviewer: Yeah, I have her details. Because now you brought this up, no one else has brought it up so far.

Respondent: (Laughs) There you go.

Interviewer: And now I'm interested to dig a bit more into that. So what interpreting is like when you have to do it from a video link, how does that alter, if anything happens in that process? Does it make sense?

Respondent: Yes. I personally, I've done many video links where the appellant or the defendant, or whoever, is on the other side of the video on the screen, that is to say they're in a detention centre or somewhere else. But one time I did interpreting where it was a case of domestic violence, so I was actually sitting in a court room locally with the victim, and the court case was being heard in London somewhere. And then I was sitting with the victim in this minutely small video link room, had to interpret.

So, they could see, or I think they could either hear us, definitely, and/or maybe also see us on a TV screen. We certainly could see the court room. But that I've only done once, where I'm actually sitting physically next to somebody, but that was not a defendant, it was not an appellant, it was the victim in a case. And the victim was brought outside London for safety purposes, but the court case was heard in London.

But generally I am not a fan of video link interpreting because, for me, I think, I feel I think I cannot do my job as an interpreter if I cannot do for example, whispered simultaneous, when the other parties – not the appellant, not the defendant, not the victim and not the witness – they're not talking to that person. That is when I would usually do whispered simultaneous.

And in fact, one time I remember I was doing an immigration tribunal hearing, a video link was used, the appellant was sitting in a detention centre, and the judge, after they had asked the appellant some questions, they were some kind of questions and answer-type thing going on between the judge and the barristers. And the judge immediately said to me, "There's no need for you to..." because he saw me open my mouth, and he said, "There's no need for you to do that, to interpret right now."

And afterwards, I said to the judge, when they had finished, I said, "That may be the case, but I am falling down on the job if I cannot do my job properly and fully." So, you know, they need to be educated.

Interviewer: When did it happen? What year was it?

Respondent: This would have been no more than about, say, three years or so ago.

Interviewer: So basically, it's still happening, that the court officials, they are not fully aware of the interpreter's role, this is what I'm looking for. These are the clues I'm looking for.

Respondent: No, they're not, they're not fully aware, they really don't know that they do not know.

Interviewer: Yeah, these are clues I'm looking for, because this is why I also now extend my research into...

Respondent: [Crosstalk 0:13:03] Sorry, he said it's not necessary for you to do that, right.

Interviewer: Yes, exactly.

Respondent: Can I also just tell you one thing, my very, very, very first court case was in a Crown court, it was, actually, a funny thing, it was an immigration matter, but it was also the immigration matter was an extra bit, but it was to do with using a false passport, and this and that. Anyway, to the Crown court matter, and what happened was, that as in many Crown courts, I was sitting next to the defendant right at the back of the court, it is an incredibly old court room, courthouse, and very big, very old court room.

So, all I could see was the back of the barristers, I couldn't hear what they were saying a lot of the time. What I could hear, I was doing whispered simultaneous, and also, I could hear what the police officers were saying in their testimony, in their evidence, and everything. And what was happening is, as I'm doing the whispered simultaneous, the defendant was saying, "No, no, no, the police never came to see me on that day. No, no, no, the police never gave me the documents, they just said they gave me."

So, I was doing, as per my training, raising my hand to, sort of, intervene and to say this is what is being said. Because, to me, people around would see he was talking to me, and it would seem like we were having a conversation, whereas, we were not, he was just reacting to what I was interpreting to him. And after about the third time the judge told me that if I didn't sit down, he was going to have me thrown out of his court room (laughs).

And afterwards, the barrister, his barrister was quite patronising, and said, "You learn what it's like," you know, "you can't do what you were doing." And I just said, "Really. So, what if people who don't know the language I was using, and those people would not have understood it, thinking that he and I are having a conversation and I'm not telling anyone what he's saying. Whereas, it was not the case, and I'm trying to make the court aware that he is reacting to what he is hearing people say on the stand."

The barrister had no answer when I told him... you see, they don't think, they don't think things through. And they don't see how the interpreter is put in a very, as they say in English, invidious position, that is to say the interpreter cannot win whatever they do.

Interviewer: Yes, I understand. It's just extremely difficult, because...

Respondent: Yes.

Interviewer: ... on the one hand, yes, if it was a witness, an English speaker, he wouldn't be allowed to react, he wouldn't be.

Respondent: No.

Interviewer: He could just mumble in his own dock (laughs) with himself, but he wouldn't be...

Respondent: No, but this guy was saying it out quite loud as well. Yes, exactly.

Interviewer: ... but they wouldn't be allowed to speak, when it's not their turn.

Respondent: No. But you see, sorry, the judge's reaction was to say he was going to throw me, the interpreter out of court.

Interviewer: Yes, exactly. And then in this case they see you interfering, not him.

Respondent: Correct, correct. Yes, you are the interfering interpreter, or the interpreter who thinks they know too much, or whatever, but you are there to do your job. And, as I say, as we all say, we are there to interpret truly and faithfully, everything that is said, so if you're going to tell me to shut up, then I'm not being true and faithful to the oath I've taken in court.

It's so funny, it's ironic, it's ironic that they are making us go against legal court oath, so telling me: don't bother, or shut up, if you don't be quiet, I'm going to have you thrown out of my court room. So, okay, so, fair enough.

Interviewer: Yes. I see, because now I do observe court cases as well with interpreters, and I am looking for what's happening in the court room

itself, and I also observe very interesting things (laughs). Okay, just let me have a look quickly through your questionnaire. I think...

Respondent: I'm just looking at my document again, sorry.

Interviewer: It's okay.

Respondent: Sorry, I don't know if that all answered your question at all?

Interviewer: Pardon? Sorry?

Respondent: I don't know if what I said answered your question?

Interviewer: I'm just looking through if there is anything else I want to ask.

Respondent: Okay.

Interviewer: Right, actually I think you've answered everything else in very good detail. Yeah, I was very, very pleased to read your responses.

Respondent: (Laughs).

Interviewer: A lot of effort you put in, some people just put one line (Laughter) to get rid of me.

Respondent: Okay, I've done research, I've actually done a PhD, so I know, I actually went the other way, and I had way too much information, and in fact I got lost in it, so the trick is knowing when to stop drowning in information, to avoid drowning in information.

But I also had the other opposite of the drowning in information, where people either refused to talk to me because of the nature of the research I was doing, or gave, yes, as you said, one word or one-line answers, and that doesn't help you either. You need full answers, you don't need them to go on for, you know, pages and pages, but you need as complete an answer as possible.

Interviewer: Yes. Yes, and you've done very well, thank you very much for that. Okay, do you have anything else to add, just maybe anything from your experience?

Respondent: No, not that I can think of right now. The one I wanted to tell you about, which I think it wasn't relevant for the questions you were asking, your questionnaire, was the fact of my very, very first court case, where (Laughs) the judge threatened to throw me out of court when I was doing exactly what my code of conduct told me, and continues to tell me to do, which is to intervene, you know, in these kinds of situations...

Interviewer: [Crosstalk 0:20:03] So it leaves a greater discrepancy then. It leaves a greater discrepancy between the code of conduct, or the interpreter and the code of conduct and the court room?

Respondent: Well, yes. But, I mean, you know, okay that time I was very new to that type of work, but over the years as you get more confident, you stand up and say, "No, your Honour," or "No, your Worship," you know, to the magistrate or whatever, or to the judge, "this is my job, this is what my..." I've quoted my code of conduct, or I refer to it, and the moment you say I follow the interpreter's code of conduct as set out by all these professional associates, they can't say anything, what can they say?

They cannot go against... it's your code of conduct, and I made sure I memorised a few sections (laughs) and try and repeat them word for word, they can't say anything to you. Because the code of conduct is there for a reason, and whether the court likes it or not, it is there for a reason. People don't like the law, certain laws, but I don't know, people don't like speed limits, but there is a speed limit on roads of certain types for a reason, so that is what you have to follow, and that's how I view it anyway.

And the other one is the immigration judge who told me about three years ago not to bother doing whispered simultaneous because it wasn't necessary.

Interviewer: Yes, yes, that's a good one.

Respondent: (Laughs).

Interviewer: That's a very good example, very good example.

Respondent: So, my very first court case, where I was threatened with being ejected by the judge (Laughs), and I remember the court room being absolutely full, and I just felt so embarrassed, but I was also angry at the same time. And I thought, well, I've made my presence known in trying to let the court know what is being said by the defendant, but if they're not interested to hear, that's their problem, I'm not responsible for anything anymore now, I've done my duty, that's how I view it.

You do your duty, if they choose to ignore it, that is their issue, you have done your duty as the interpreter. Because the first person they want to blame, in any situation, is the interpreter.

Interviewer: The interpreter, yes. (Laughs)

Respondent: Of course.

Interviewer: Absolutely.

Respondent: The interpreter's the easiest scapegoat in the whole situation.

Interviewer: Yes. Yes, always, always been like that.

Respondent: And another... before I go, before I leave you, my pet... well, one of the things I dislike is when you go to a court, let's say a magistrates' court, and you're sitting outside the court room in the general waiting area, and you're sitting there, and the person, the usher comes up and points to you and says to somebody standing next to the usher, "There's *your* interpreter." No, I've put that, I know I've put that in my replies, I am not...

And the other thing is because of certain colleagues, I can't name them, I don't know who they are, but because of their way of dealing with people, either in police stations or in court, whether it's with the judiciary, whether it's with police staff, whether it's a defendant, a person, a suspect, a person in custody, appellant, whatever, a lot of

them think you're their friend, and they want to come and talk to you about everything and nothing, and their case and that.

And so, I devised a technique, because I said to myself, most of the people around cannot understand the language that is being used, and they cannot understand that I'm saying to this person, "Please do not talk to me, I cannot talk to you..." No, I don't say you don't talk to me, I just say, "My role is such that I cannot talk to you, or discuss matters with you at all, except with your solicitor or when it comes to court." I'm saying this in the language, but 99.9% of the people around us cannot understand this.

So, I took to doing both a verbal and non-verbal things, which is I would say, "I am not allowed to talk to you," but I would also put my hands up, palms facing towards the person, so that's a non-verbal, sort of sign to say don't, please, you know. Because I thought if ever anything happens, at least people in the general area might say, "Well, we couldn't understand what was being said, but the interpreter or that person put her hands up as though to stop the person. So that was the technique I developed over time.

Interviewer: Okay. Thank you very much...

Respondent: You're very welcome.

Interviewer: ...very interesting. Okay, I will stop recording at this point now.

Respondent: Okay, no problem.

Interviewer: Thank you very much again.

END OF AUDIO

11.1.2 Respondent 6: interview transcript

File name: Interview with Respondent 6
Audio Length: 0:14:37
Date transcribed: 17 August 2021

Interviewer: I think it's started. Okay. Today is 31 May and here I have one of the interpreters. I don't say names. And this is a follow-up conversation with regards to the questionnaire which has been completed for my research.

So, I understand that you have experience mainly with magistrates' and civil courts.

Respondent: Yes, that's true.

Interviewer: And did you have any experience with civil court or Crown court?

Respondent: No, I don't.

Interviewer: No, just magistrates'?

Respondent: Just magistrates', yeah.

Interviewer: And mainly it was around the London area?

Respondent: Yes, it was in London.

Interviewer: Okay. Thank you. You say that you feel that the court type does not have any impact on the interpreting. By this question I meant, for example, if you interpret for the criminal court and for the civil court, there could be a difference in atmosphere. Like criminal court usually is more hostile and adversarial. Does that have an effect in comparison to when you're in civil court? Or you don't feel any difference.

Respondent: I don't feel any difference because I feel that my role as an interpreter should be impartial, and I try to distance myself from any kind of emotional involvement or influences from within. Even if I sense that the atmosphere is tense in the courtroom, I don't feel that it affects

me personally as an interpreter. I don't mean personally as an individual, but personally as an interpreter.

And from my experience both judges and my clients or the clients – by the clients I mean people I interpreted for; be it witnesses or claimants – I don't feel that this hostility or negativity affected me. So, everybody treated me with respect, with due respect.

Interviewer: Okay. Thank you. So, you also commented on the facilities, that you feel that they're mostly adequate and you don't require anything more than you're already provided in court.

Respondent: Yes. I was not in a situation in a courtroom when any equipment for simultaneous interpreting was required, but the microphone was available if I needed. Yes. They asked me if I needed anything else and normally it was sufficient. Yeah.

Interviewer: Okay. Good, thank you. As for your role, I already understand that you describe your role as being like you facilitate communication and being impartial and just interpret accurately. Do you feel that there could be situations when you can transcend your role and take on some additional roles? Say if you happen to talk to your client while you are waiting for the hearing, can the client ask you some questions, how do you respond to that, do you feel that you can be attributed other roles despite what you feel your role is by other courtroom [actors 0:03:44]. Does it make sense?

Respondent: Yeah, it does make sense. Sometimes it's tempting, as you say, especially if you feel that something is not going the way it should be in the courtroom and you feel that if, say, that person or that claimant said that the course of the court hearing would turn 180°, if you like or whatever.

And sometimes clients asked my opinion. But you know what, I just don't want to have this additional role, and I don't think it is my job. And I think that it's not me. My job is the best when it's not seen as an additional person in the process.

- Interviewer: Yes.
- Respondent: So, it's like makeup if you want, the best makeup is makeup you don't see. The best interpreter who is not seen or heard metaphorically. So, I don't want to, and I don't think I'm entitled to, my opinion. And that's why sometimes if I feel that two parties, two sides, do not understand each other, I try to clarify by asking, "Could I say it again the same thing that everybody has the same understanding what was said and what was understood by the other party?"
- Interviewer: Do you think that court officials, say the judge, the solicitors in the court, do they understand your role?
- Respondent: I think they do, yes. Maybe I was fortunate enough, but I think they do, and they try to help the situation because interpreter... and interpreting a courtroom is some kind of an additional person in the process, but they do understand that, and they do understand what interpreters are there for really. Yes. To help the whole process for them to make the right decisions, to take the right decisions, to... basically, yes, to make the right decisions, yeah. Interpreter is to help to make the right decision.
- Interviewer: Do you feel you belong to the legal system, or you rather are like outside? [Crosstalk 0:06:21]
- Respondent: No. No. I... no, no, definitely not. I don't have that feeling that I belong to the legal system. No.
- Interviewer: So, you're like an outsider who just...?
- Respondent: Yes, I'm a neutral person. I am a device, if you like. Yes. A transmitting device. A transmitter.
- Interviewer: Okay, that's interesting. (Laughter) That's an interesting description of the role. I will put it here. Transmitting device. Okay. And you do feel recognised and valued?

- Respondent: Yes, yes, I even had a situation one month, a judge complimented me publicly by the end of the hearing that I showed high professionalism, a quality of high professionalism how I handled questions and interpretation. And it was a kind of a public thank you and public appreciation which was really nice.
- Interviewer: Yes, of course, yes. And what about clients? You also give an example where once you had a situation with a client who did not fully understand your role and who probably were thinking that you are there to help in a way.
- Respondent: Yeah, he asked me if I could tell him what I thought about the question asked and give him an idea how he should answer the question. But, again, he lost the case, but I don't think it was my fault. Though I thought that sometimes I could have helped this client to have a better verdict in the end of the court, but if...
- Interviewer: In what way help? You mean because...?
- Respondent: Because I thought that he basically didn't help his case at all. So, he sometimes went to a large extent explaining different details which were not asked of him. And the explanation, any further explanation there was working basically against his case.
- Interviewer: And you could see that, but you wouldn't say...?
- Respondent: I could see that, but I didn't say anything.
- Interviewer: Yeah, this is exactly what your role is because you are not supposed to kind of transcend that role, you're just there to interpret what he says.
- Respondent: Yeah, exactly.
- Interviewer: Though you feel personally that actually maybe you... as a human being, maybe you want to step in and say something, but you can't.
- Respondent: Yeah, yeah, yeah. We are all human beings but, as I say, I'd rather be seen as a transmitter, as a device, in this situation.

- Interviewer: Okay, it's amazing. Thank you. Yeah, and the next question is about the status. This is due to recent changes in the Ministry of Justice and how things, like, that the whole interpreting provision has been outsourced to a private company. So, do you think that has changed things in interpreting, in legal interpreting?
- Respondent: I think it did change because I think the best interpreters do not want to be a part of this campaign, so they basically boycott any jobs from that agency because the state of play is unfair basically. There are different terms and conditions which are worse than the interpreters before, good interpreters, highly qualified interpreters, had before.
- So, I think that it should be basically both. I think that, okay, we're living in a material world, and economic factors are very important. I think there should be an option for interpreters to be hired directly, by the clients or by the court system or by whoever needs, solicitors, whoever needs interpreters. [Crosstalk 0:10:57]
- Interviewer: The way it used to be, there was a... [Crosstalk 0:10:58]
- Respondent: So, there should be a database or an agency which is the first, kind of, point of call. But there should be some other mechanisms how interpreters could be part of court interpreting or legal interpreting process.
- Interviewer: Like it used to be the national register when people were on the list?
- Respondent: Yeah, but now it's an agency. So, what I'm saying, one agency is fine, but there should be some other mechanisms how interpreters could be...
- Interviewer: Hired, yeah.
- Respondent: ... hired with no prejudice or no, kind of, if you want, sacrifice to their own pay, or whatever.
- Interviewer: Yeah. Yeah. Okay. Thank you. Yeah, I think this is all. This is all I wanted to ask, but if you have anything else to add, if you want to

expand on, if you have any ideas on this new provision then please feel free to share them. If you have any other ideas maybe about the process, how it could be improved, or if there are any flaws which could be addressed, anything.

Respondent: I think maybe briefing for interpreters could be more specific. So, nothing like exact details, but maybe a briefing in terms of what an interpreter should anticipate in terms of preparation. So sometimes you go blindly to meet the client, and you are there in the courtroom interpreting for them. Maybe, yeah, in terms of not disclosing unnecessarily or illegally some details, more specific briefing for the interpreters what [is] to be expected. (Pause)

Interviewer: You mean on a particular case?

Respondent: I mean in terms of terminology, for example, if it's an economic crime, there should be some kind of specific preparation for that.

Interviewer: Yeah. At least if they could point you in the right direction where...

Respondent: Yes, exactly. What kind of case it's going to be without disclosing any details.

Interviewer: Yes, I understand what you mean. So, they don't do this? You just turn up on the day?

Respondent: Well, mainly... I didn't have any. Maybe I was unlucky. But I think it should be an important part of the process in each and every case. To give an interpreter any valid pointers. (Pause)

Interviewer: Okay. Thank you. So then if...

Respondent: Thank you very much. And good luck.

Interviewer: Thank you very much. (Laughter)

END OF AUDIO

11.1.3 Respondent 7: interview transcript

File name: Interview with Respondent 7
Audio Length: 0:17:59
Date transcribed: 14 August 2021

Interviewer: I started recording. Today is the 13 of June and I here have one of the interpreters with me and I just want to follow up some questions in my questionnaire. The question number two, which I understand you didn't understand what it was about.

Respondent: What it meant.

Interviewer: Basically, does the court type have a bearing on your professional practice and if so, in what ways? By this question I meant, there are different court types in the UK legal systems. You have criminal, you have civil, and there are tribunals. Depending on where you go for your assignment, say if you go to civil court or if you go to criminal court, does it feel different and does it affect your performance or your technique or anything to do with your interpreting practice?

For example, maybe if in Crown court it may be a bit more adversarial, hostile, and it adds an extra layer of pressure and stress maybe. Or in a family court it could be more relaxed, or not necessarily or you feel...

Respondent: Yes, I understand. In terms of my professional ethics and my conduct and my professional discipline, I don't see any difference. I still have to perform well. I still have to be faithful and committed to either side, whoever is speaking, it doesn't matter. In terms of stress, I think I find Crown court is easier because if you have...

Interviewer: [** 0:02:00]

Respondent: Yeah, then it's much easier, you don't have to keep everything in your memory, so it's much easier for me to just go do it in a synchronous way.

I like a little bit of stress. So, if, say, a witness is giving evidence in court, in the courtroom, then I enjoy it because first of all, there is quite a good contact with the client, because you establish a certain rapport. I think it is important to exchange some words, just have a little chat before you go in the court together with the witness.

You can feel, it's a different dynamic. You can feel what the person... First of all, you get adjusted to him in the way, whether he speaks fast or slow. Also, you may sometimes, you may realise that sometimes people say what they say, is not exactly what they mean. So, a lot of people...

Interviewer: The pragmatics.

Respondent: Yes, there is a lot of things where you think, did he say that because he meant it, or he said it because he doesn't know how to put it better?

Interviewer: How do you deal with situations like that? Do you interpret exactly what he said, or you try to understand what he was trying to say, and you interpret that version?

Respondent: There are two lines. Both actually, can have some negative effect on the performance or impression of how the interpreter could be perceived. You see, this is the problem. Some interpreters... do you want to know what I do or what I notice some interpreters do? Okay, I just can give you... some interpreters, I notice, some interpreters just say exactly, almost word-for-word what the person is saying. So thus, they give a chance for the solicitor, whoever in court, to actually challenge the statement, to ask, "What do you mean by that?"

Interviewer: Yes, so they leave that responsibility to the legal...

Respondent: For the legal side, yes. But sometimes some people go too far. They completely cloud and obscure the meaning. You know what the person meant, he just put it in an awkward native tongue. So sometimes if you know the person is not very eloquent, if you feel, if

you have 90% certainty that actually you can do it... you don't have to edit it or do it in a more... you don't have to put frills, you know what I mean?

[*In Russian* 0:05:14 - 0:05:18] But if you can just, if it's a very simple thing, you can just say it in straightforward English without making it so corrupt that people would be wondering. Because the more... especially where it is not very important, but in fact it's not true, everything is important. Every sentence the person says is important, so it's not the interpreter's role to think, oh, this is probably not important.

Whatever the person says you have to be completely committed and faithful to the meaning and to the period as well, hopefully, of the sentence.

Interviewer: Register.

Respondent: Yes, yeah, of course, register as well. If the person uses sort of [^{**} 0:06:03], then of course you have to do it, just exactly what the person says. If he uses some F-words etc. whatever, you have to render it as close to the original as possible. So, it's still very vague, isn't it? My explanation is very vague, because all depends upon how well you understand the person.

Interviewer: But the court, as such, does not affect you?

Respondent: No, it doesn't.

Interviewer: It doesn't matter whether you're in civil court, whether you're in Crown court?

Respondent: It doesn't, who affects you first is the person with whom you're working, is the one. Because okay, if you interpret for the solicitor, they're usually quite eloquent, very well prepared, they have 10 times to prepare all their questions. Their questions are well formulated, structured. Quite often you can see where they're leading, just going through the questions, you already know. It's clear. What is

completely unclear and unknown territory, what the person, how the person is going to answer the questions.

Of course, you don't want to let down that individual because if you get confused or misunderstand, then you can do some damage or cause some harm to his case. Now, sometimes you think, oh, it's absolutely clear what he just said, absolutely clear. And suddenly you realise that the person doesn't mean what he said. He thought he said it, what he meant, but in fact, no.

In this case, if the interpreter, if I realise, I misunderstood him, I just say straight away to the court, "Apologies, correction, the interpreter misunderstood the last sentence and the interpreter now wants to clarify or repeat the sentence again." But the more you do it... there are some guys who I think deliberately sometimes try to confuse the interpreter. The more you do it, the more there is a danger that the interpreter will be perceived as not very professional, not a very competent, professional worker.

This is the problem with this culture because people don't realise, a lot of people, the English... because English language, well, the thing is, a lot of foreigners speak English language. But not many English people speak sufficiently fluently other foreign languages.

Interviewer: Or any at all.

Respondent: Yeah, so therefore it has an effect because there's a lot of solicitors just expect the interpreter just to do it like a machine gun, just automatically, but it's not automatic is it?

Interviewer: No.

Respondent: Also, it also depends, another thing is, if you work in the magistrate court, they don't have that kind of rigorous attention in the magistrate court because the cases are quite simple. But if you work in Crown court, it's much more demanding on the part of the interpreter. You have to be absolutely clear when you work with a client. You have to

be absolutely clear what the client said, how he said it, so that's it. Anything else?

Family court is different, as well. The problem with family court... to all courts, any court, interpreters quite often come unprepared, not because they're lazy, just because nobody is bothered to give them sufficient information about the case. And this is typical for family court cases. You come, social services come with these huge documents, they read them quickly. It's so difficult to get a copy from social services. There is a solicitor as well.

So, it just becomes, how do I say...? It becomes very stressful. There is no need to be stressed. And again, they're not bothered to give you documents, under false pretext or false excuse that it is confidential. Rubbish! So, we all know that we don't disclose information. Secondly, out of laziness, that's how I think of it. And thirdly, because they're not aware that the interpreter needs as much time as they do when they prepare their own document.

You can't just read from the list, it's very complicated. Especially if you turn up in court, you've never seen the client, you don't know what the case is about, no, that's the problem.

Interviewer: Absolutely.

Respondent: So, family court cases are the most difficult ones.

Interviewer: You find them most difficult.

Respondent: Yeah.

Interviewer: From my own observation, to be honest with you, I actually agree with you. I did observation in the magistrates' court and family court, and what I found in family court, I had only one chance to actually go into a family case, because they usually don't allow... I was very lucky they allowed me. And then I sat down and the solicitor on the lady's side, because it was a family dispute, a divorce matter, the solicitor just went off straight to the judge, through her notes, very fast.

Respondent: Yes, just like that.

Interviewer: With no notice that actually there is an interpreter in the room and the interpreter needs to do their job. The interpreter, she was quiet, I think, experienced, because she managed, somehow, she just got on the job and started to interpret simultaneously, very, very quickly. But when I kind of put myself into that situation I was thinking, I wouldn't be able to do that. I personally would be stuck, I would just sit there, and I wouldn't know what to do.

Respondent: Did you ask the interpreter whether she knows the case? If you know the case, it's much easier. [^{**} 0:12:19] And there is another thing which they do family court cases, because they use so often agencies. Every time, agency sends a new interpreter for the old case. This is the same ongoing case, quite often they invite a new interpreter. So, the new interpreter arrives in the middle, this has been after several hearings, the interpreter turns up, new interpreter and doesn't know what is going on. And so that's you know, no, no.

So, I think family court probably is the most difficult, only because they don't look that the interpreter needs as much time as the solicitor, and the social worker to get the...

Interviewer: From this perspective then, there is maybe a difference then which can have an effect, to any extent, on...

Respondent: Yes, external factors, yes.

Interviewer: External factors, lack of preparation. So, we would probably then say that we can say that the court type can have an effect on your performance as an external factor, due to differences in, say, presentation, for example, that maybe one court can come across as a bit more formal in part than the other one. Or lack of time given, or lack of consideration is given to the interpreter to do their job?

Respondent: No, no, I think the only one thing is, is the material you're working with. The client is the material you're working with. Yes, if you

understand the client, if you're on the same radio wave, or you assess what is his level of... how he commands his vocabulary, if you understand, all that is, this is material. Another one is the material which is in the paperwork. If they don't give you material to get ready and at least to know what it's about, so in fact nothing else has an effect on the performance of the interpreter, that's my opinion.

Interviewer: When you work for criminal court, do they supply materials in advance?

Respondent: No, but what they do, while you wait, very often the solicitor discusses the matter with the client for the consultation. So, the consultation time or the time in custody, that's where you hectically prepare all the material, you more or less become prepared, but no.

Interviewer: But family court cases just happen on the spot.

Respondent: Yeah. That's absolutely the idiotic scheme. You just can't operate, to operate professionally and effectively, you need to have a good amount of material and a good time to prepare. Not a long time, but you need to read through, that's the main thing.

Interviewer: I agree and what is the role of the interpreter in this current moment do you think, given all the...?

Respondent: You're talking about the present climate?

Interviewer: Yes, present climate?

Respondent: Taxi driver! If one can't do it, if Mrs H can't do it, then Mr D can do it, yeah. As long as they're cheap, that's it.

Interviewer: Is it where you see the status of the interpreter's profession and the role, a professional role...

Respondent: Yeah, I don't think interpreters have got any status, not now. I don't know, I may be a bit pessimistic, but it's... I don't know. In the time when the agencies started operating, and while interpreters from national registers were still working in court, the court clerks would

always say, "Thank God, a National Register interpreter is here, because yesterday we had a problem with the agency interpreter."

And they would always be grateful and say, "Thank you for turning up." But now I don't know because I'm not working now, I don't work for Capita, so I'm not aware what happens.

Interviewer: But when you arrived to, other social matters, you do interpreting within social sector rather than the legal sector.

Respondent: Social services.

Interviewer: Social services, so they appreciate that you're registered, NRPSI registered.

Respondent: I think they do. Some of them even come out with certain positive comments, or complimentary comments. I think they see the difference because National Register interpreters work in a slightly different way.

Interviewer: How they still can be contacted, just out of interest?

Respondent: Who?

Interviewer: National Register interpreters?

Respondent: I haven't got a clue; everything became so obscure. In the past everything was clear, everything. Nothing... and now at the moment everything is hidden somewhere, as if somebody... with agencies everything changed.

Interviewer: The landscape has changed.

Respondent: Yes, completely.

Interviewer: That's it, thank you very much.

END OF AUDIO

11.1.4 Respondent 13: interview transcript

File name: Interview with Respondent 13
Audio Length: 0:29:36
Date transcribed: 18 August 2021

Interviewer: Okay, so today is 17th April and you have completed the questionnaire for court interpreters.

Respondent: Yes.

Interviewer: And this a questionnaire regarding the courtroom interpreting.

Okay. Right, so, yeah, we discuss question number two. Does the court type have a bearing on your professional practice? If so, in what ways. And you say it does because they are different environments.

Respondent: Exactly, yes. And also due to the seriousness of different offences.

Of course they can directly, they can have direct impacts on your responsibility.

Interviewer: On interpreter's responsibility?

Respondent: Yes.

Interviewer: In what way?

Respondent: Because it's also about your confidence as well. You have to be very confident because even if you are a good interpreter, if you're not confident enough to interpret let's say in the Crown court environment then due to the pressure you are under at the time, you could misinterpret.

Interviewer: Okay. So, misinterpretation can happen because of the pressure? Yeah, I agree with this actually.

Respondent: And also in some courts, like let's say in tribunals...

Interviewer: I have a quick look.

In tribunals?

Respondent: Okay, in tribunals you only interpret consecutively, whereas in Crown court you have to interpret simultaneously.

Interviewer: Is it most of the time it is not [** 0:02:51]?

Respondent: Yes. I think that's the hardest part. It's really essential as well to listen to what is being said in the court to convey that conversation to your client without any additional [omission 0:03:31].

Yeah, that's... I think, in my opinion these are them.

Interviewer: Thank you.

Respondent: It's no problem.

Interviewer: How do you find the facilities in the courtroom? So, are they, do you think they're sufficient, adequate for you to perform your job to the best of your ability? And do they differ from court to court? It is just like two questions in one. So, first is whether you think the facilities are enough and sufficient, and the second is whether they're different from court to court?

Respondent: It's different from court to court. Let's say, for instance, in tribunals you're always sat on the chair.

Interviewer: The chair?

Respondent: The chair. Basically, you are sat at all times, and you're relaxed whilst interpreting. But in criminal matters in magistrates' and Crown courts, during your client's cross-examination you have to stand with your client in the witness box.

And, of course, that makes you tired because in some cases you have to wait for days. And as a result, you get tired and that can again affect your performance.

Interviewer: Anything else?

- Respondent: I think that's it because in some courts the environment is more relaxed and whereas in some... it's again the seriousness of the offence or the case. Considering the nature of the case, yeah.
- Interviewer: So, in some environments it's more adversarial?
- Respondent: Yes.
- Interviewer: And what about the facilities say like hearing loops or in magistrates' courts I noticed interpreters don't usually have that equipment, so they usually speak through the box. Does that impact?
- Respondent: Because usually it's only a single client in magistrate courts. It very rarely happens that there could be more than one client at the same time because they deal with only minor matters, whereas in Crown courts usually they deal with serious offences and mainly that happens like gang related offences which is basically multiple defendants.
- Interviewer: When you interpret multiple defendants, if you say like this case where there were multiple defendants, do you interpret usually only for one client?
- Respondent: Usually, yes. But in some cases, like this one, if the dock is not big enough to facilitate all the interpreters and defendants at the same time... so they could use, they usually use this.
- Interviewer: Conference interpreting?
- Respondent: Conference interpreting, yes.
- And I think I prefer, I personally prefer conference interpreting because you are away from the defendant.
- Interviewer: I put it as a quote. (Laughs)
- Respondent: Firstly, they cannot pose you any threats. And secondly because you are away from them, they can't ask you any questions which usually happens.

- Interviewer: It usually happens. What sort of questions do they usually ask? Do they ask when they don't understand something, or they ask you to clarify? Or they ask for actually for advice or say...?
- Respondent: They ask for advice as well sometimes, or sometimes for clarification. Or sometimes they even want to make comments. And that's due to the lack of knowledge, they don't have the knowledge about the court proceedings.
- Interviewer: They want to make comments?
- Respondent: For example, if the prosecutor... the prosecutor is presenting evidence, of course that's against him or her. So, they immediately want to respond to that not knowing that he will be given a chance later. And for his legal team to put his case forward.
- Interviewer: So, they feel the urge, they want to say something now?
- Respondent: Exactly, yeah.
- Interviewer: And then you need to explain that your turn will be later.
- Respondent: Yes, you have to tell them to just wait, and you will be given a chance later.
- Interviewer: Okay. So, in that case when you do conference interpreting that kind of protects you from these situations where you have to step over your interpreting boundaries and explain something to them, even like simply saying that your turn will be later. So, you need to – it's still kind of slightly oversteps [Crosstalk 0:13:29].
- Respondent: Yeah, it distracts from your actual duty which is interpreting.
- Interviewer: Yeah, because you have to shift the attention.
- Respondent: Yeah, exactly.
- Interviewer: Okay. Is there anything else you'd like to add to this question?
- Respondent: No, I think that's it.

- Interviewer: Okay. Thank you very much. So how would you describe your role in the courtroom? This is, I read your [** 0:13:54] of the role.
- Respondent: Yes. Basically, my role is just, it has a sole purpose which is interpreting from one language to another without any omission or addition.
- And basically, we have to remember the three fundamental rules of interpreting at all times, which is professionalism...
- Interviewer: Just a second. Three fundamentals. Professional. What?
- Respondent: Professionalism.
- Interviewer: Professionalism.
- Respondent: Second is confidentiality.
- Interviewer: Confidentiality.
- Respondent: And impartiality.
- Interviewer: Impartiality. Good. Anything else?
- Respondent: That's all.
- Interviewer: And do you feel recognised and appreciated as a professional by the court officials? Do you feel that you belong to the courtroom as part of the team?
- Respondent: We used to be. In the old system. But now when the contract has been taken over by a private agency therefore, we don't get any respect for the very hard job you do for them basically.
- Interviewer: Agency. They didn't leave enough space for the questions. Agency. And therefore, you don't think you have any respect?
- Respondent: Yes.
- Interviewer: Why do you think this happens? Why do you think that under the old system you had more respect than now?

Respondent: Due to the... because due to the fact that a lot of unqualified interpreters are being recruited by the agency.

Interviewer: And what happens? Do you think that's...?

Respondent: Because if someone is unqualified and he goes to the Crown court for a very serious matter, in most cases it happens they are not able to interpret and leave the case in the middle or leaves the case in the beginning before it starts. And that can adversely affect the reputation of all interpreters.

Interviewer: As a profession?

Respondent: Mm-hmm.

Interviewer: Okay.

Respondent: [I think that's the reason why 0:18:59].

Interviewer: So, yeah, you feel that the standards have kind of dropped?

Respondent: Absolutely, yes.

Interviewer: Thanks, is there anything else you'd like to add?

Respondent: No, that's all, I think.

Interviewer: Okay, thank you. Next one is how do the clients usually view your role in the courtroom? So, you do need to establish your role with them from the very beginning? Do they accept your explanation?

Respondent: Yes, that's what I do from my experience, because most of the clients have never been to the court proceedings before. So, it's better that you establish your role in the beginning so to avoid future problems in a way.

Interviewer: What problems do you think can happen?

Respondent: I think it's better to remind them the three fundamental rules of interpreting as I mentioned earlier. That you are impartial basically

and if they seek any advice from you, you're not able to give them any advice and everything is confidential.

Sometimes you... you're involved in a case that you have to interpret for both parties. But you cannot disclose information from one to another. Like prosecution and defendant.

Interviewer: I see. So, you can't disclose anything to the prosecution side?

Respondent: Yes. So, it has to be kept confidential, yeah.

Interviewer: So, the prosecution and defence, do they do their own investigation?

Respondent: Yes.

Interviewer: Separately.

Respondent: When they want to, like take the defence, because they don't want to disclose and sometimes, they... I don't know how to put it. Basically, within themselves they can disclose lots of information which they don't want those information to be disclosed to the prosecution. So, our job is to not be as a witness but to simply interpret what's being said.

Interviewer: Yeah, but do they accept your explanation? So, if you explain the role from the beginning, is it what usually stops them from asking questions, or sometimes it doesn't stop them, they still?

Respondent: It depends on the person, yeah. But if they don't stop, we have to raise this point in the court before the judge. So, they could get a firm direction from the...

Interviewer: From your practice. From your own experience. So, when you explain this role to them, so in a certain way, what is their reaction usually? Do they accept it? Do they perceive you as a professional body rather than someone to help them?

Respondent: Mainly they do accept it but it depends on their level of their education and their common sense.

- Interviewer: Okay. Anything else?
- Respondent: That's all, I think.
- Interviewer: And how do you evaluate the status of the interpreter in the UK legal system at the current moment? So, we've already touched on this. So, this is just a bit... we talked about role. This is about status.
- Respondent: The whole system, yeah. I don't think it's working effectively because the system has been privatised and the government and everyone just cares about saving money rather than delivering effective and quality services.
- Interviewer: Effective and quality services. How do you think that affected the status of the profession? The status of the interpreter in the legal system in the UK?
- Respondent: Because since the system has been privatised, most of the professional qualified interpreters, they don't get enough jobs, so they left the profession. So, one day we will come to a point that there will be no professional interpreters, just anyone being recruited by this agency and...
- Interviewer: That's it you think?
- Respondent: That's it. Yes.
- Interviewer: And just very quick questions. When you work as an interpreter which kind of languages do you work with? So, it's [** 0:27:34] this one.
- Respondent: Pashto.
- Interviewer: How do you spell?
- Respondent: P-A-S-H-T-O.
- Interviewer: T?
- Respondent: O.
- Interviewer: O.

Respondent: And it's Dari, D-A-R-I. And the third one is Farsi.

Interviewer: [** 0:27:51]

Respondent: S-I, yes. That's correct, yeah.

Interviewer: And your qualifications?

Respondent: It's Diploma in Police Interpreting.

Interviewer: Interpreting...

Respondent: Registered Public Service Interpreter.

Interviewer: [** 0:28:19]

Respondent: RPSI, yeah.

Interviewer: Okay. Anything else? Even if it's not interpreting.

Respondent: Yes, I have and MEng.

Interviewer: MEng?

Respondent: Yeah.

Interviewer: How you spell it?

Respondent: M.

Interviewer: M?

Respondent: Yes, and capital E. And small N-G. It's a master's in engineering.

Interviewer: Oh.

Respondent: Yes.

Interviewer: Master of engineering. [** 0:28:59] (Laughter)

Number of years of experience in court interpreting?

Respondent: Court interpreting? Five years.

Interviewer: Five years. [^{**} 0:29:17]?

Respondent: The first one.

Interviewer: First one?

Respondent: Yes.

Interviewer: Okay. And... it's done.

Respondent: Yeah, okay. Great.

Interviewer: Thank you so much for your time.

Respondent: No problem.

END OF AUDIO

11.1.5 Respondent 16: interview transcript

File name: Interview with Respondent 16
Audio Length: 0:15:56
Date transcribed: 18 August 2021

Interviewer: Okay, so today is 15th of May and I am here with the Romanian interpreter to go through the questions in the questionnaire. Don't worry, I'm not going to say your name.

All right, because you already answered the questions, I just wanted to expand a bit more on your answers.

So, when we are talking about the court type, whether it has a bearing on your professional practice, and you say that the different types of court they differ in level of formality and this, what can be more complicated or not. Can you expand a bit more on this statement?

Respondent: I think the higher the court is the more challenging it is for the interpreter. The pressure we feel is a bit higher when there is a more complicated case involving maybe rape or murder. Whereas in a family case or when we are dealing just with fraud or stealing things, there is not so much pressure. But, of course, there is always the pressure to interpret accurately, because the entire case depends on us.

But sometimes, yeah, I find it really intimidating to just stand in front of the judge and everybody's looking at me and everybody's recording what I say. But, yeah, it's part of our profession and I think it is very rewarding at the end and so especially we feel that we managed to facilitate communication, and we managed to help people solve a case. It's really worth all this effort and pressure.

Interviewer: Okay. Thank you. So, you mainly were working at Crown court and family court. So, what are the main differences between these two courts?

- Respondent: Well, the family court mainly deals with family matters, for example, children being placed with somebody else, parents separated, parents who neglected their children. And the most, the longest case I interpreted for was... (Interruption 0:02:38) the longest case I interpreted for was a family case about a family with six children who are all being in foster care and, yeah, it was very complex, it was a decision about whether to place the children, with their parents, grandparents or foster carers.
- And the Crown court can deal with more complex matters. I don't have very much experience of interpreting for different types of courts. But the family court is the one I'm most familiar with.
- Interviewer: Is it less stressful, the family court? Do you feel it's less complex in terms of...?
- Respondent: Yes, I think so because the terminology is mostly related to the family, relationships. Of course, there are always legal terms, but they aren't as complex as in other types of court. And I think there aren't that many people involved. It's usually the family and, of course, it totally depends on how many defendants there are, but usually it's not that complex as in other types of courts.
- Interviewer: Okay. Thank you. You already you mentioned about the facilities. The facilities you don't find them very good. Interpreters are not usually provided with the necessary equipment to do the job. Okay.
- Respondent: Yeah, you don't even have a microphone. You have to speak in front of everybody and we have to speak up and make sure everybody can hear and understand you. Yes.
- Interviewer: Okay. And how would you describe your role in the courtroom? You say that you describe it as a very important role. So, you make emphasis about the importance of the role of interpreter. Can you tell me a bit more about what the role involves itself? The role of interpreter, what does it... what is it about?

Respondent: I think when interpreting for the court every word matters. All the nuances, you have to interpret very accurately in finding that word. I think there's no room for thinking too much about something. You also have to be very precise and very quick because the judge and all the solicitors are making notes about what you are saying.

And every word matters. For example, if I was not very clear because maybe the person, I interpreted for was not very clear, the judge would ask again to make sure exactly what was going on because all the words can have crucial significance for the outcome of the case.

So, I think our role is really important and we have to be very focused. Yeah, we can't, it's not a literary translation. We can't be creative, we should not add anything because it is exactly what the person is saying.

So, I think we have a very important role and fortunately most of the solicitors I worked with, and the judges really acknowledge this important role and are aware of this, yeah.

Interviewer: Would you say that the role is like to facilitate communication? So, is it to facilitate the communication? Is it so the best descriptor?

Respondent: It's almost a legal role because...

Interviewer: A legal role?

Respondent: Yeah. We are involved in the legal process as well. I mean what we say is very important for the outcome of the case. We cannot add anything, and we also have to swear an oath which is also a moral duty I would say. So, it's a very complex role.

But of course, facilitator of communication but also a moral duty I would say. Yeah.

Interviewer: That's interesting. Thank you. Yes, about recognition, you said that you feel valued in the courtroom.

Respondent: Yeah, most of the time people are...

Interviewer: Sorry. Pause. So, you feel that you've been appreciated and valued in the courtroom and the judge thanked you several times?

Respondent: Yes, I had a nice experience with the judge who really, was really aware of the important role of the interpreter and of the effort the interpreter has to make. But, on the other hand, another judge, maybe she was not very familiar with... didn't have a lot of experience working with interpreters. She complained about the fact that there was a lot of noise in the courtroom or because there were two interpreters interpreting for different clients.

But, of course, I mean some of the clients were a bit older, grandparents, and the other interpreter had to raise her voice so and this is why it was causing a bit of confusion.

But I mean it depends on the person. Some people have less knowledge or maybe less experience working with interpreters, are not very aware of what we do and how important and difficult it is. But most of the people I worked with, yeah, I felt recognised, and my role was appreciated, yeah.

Interviewer: Okay. And I understand the part you said about recognition and that you being valued for your skills and for the role you perform. But this question, I mean do the clients understand that you are there to communicate for them, to facilitate communication, but not to advise them or not to give them any recommendations or any advice or any, even like personal conversations. So, did you have situations where you had to state this clearly to the client because otherwise, they tend to breach that and they tend to see you more as a helper or as an advocate for them and ask for your advice, ask for your help, as even just exchanging some personal information with you?

Respondent: I think it really depends on the client. Some know very well what the interpreter's role is, probably because they worked with interpreters a lot and they were told this. But some are not very familiar, and they may perceive us as an advisor, or they may want personal advice.

I didn't encounter the situation in the court. I was not asked for advice, or the client knew that I have to interpret only what they are saying and I'm not there to give them advice. The solicitor is the one who does that.

But in other, on other occasions, like when I was interpreting for the social services or for the youth offending team or probation or in medical settings, sometimes a client would ask for my advice or want to exchange personal details. But I would have to state it very clearly that it's not my role and I am bound by a contract, and I cannot exchange personal details [Crosstalk 0:11:10].

Interviewer: Code of conduct as well.

Respondent: Yes. Exactly. A code of conduct. And usually when I tell them this they understand. Once I had this situation I was in a hospital and I interpreted for a client and then some other person, another Romanian person wanted me to interpret for them and they said, "Oh but I will pay you, I will pay you." But, of course, we have a code of conduct, and we cannot just do it informally and establish other [Crosstalk 0:11:42].

Interviewer: Do they accept that explanation? So, when you explain this to them, does it stop them from going further and transcending those frontiers that you said? Or they don't take any notice, and they continue to push?

Respondent: I think it depends on the person because some people might not understand, might insist, for example, this person they insisted, they said, "Oh but just once," or "Forget about the code of conduct." But I have to take this very sincerely. Yeah.

Interviewer: Really?

Respondent: Once it happened to me. And I told them, I had to make something up, well [Crosstalk 0:12:23].

Interviewer: Was it in court?

Respondent: No, no, this was a medical setting. In court it didn't happen to me. Yeah, I just told them that I'm in a hurry, I have to go to another assignment because they don't understand. Yeah. We cannot just breach the code of conduct because somebody doesn't understand.

Interviewer: Okay. Thank you. Yeah, about the status of the interpreter. You mentioned that because you don't have much experience with court interpreters yourself, but you hear from colleagues that the status of the interpreter has changed for worse over the last few years. Can you [^{**} 0:13:11] to that?

Respondent: Yeah, I have a colleague who has been working as a court interpreter for many years, and she also took part in the protests against all these...

Interviewer: So, it's question number seven. About the status of the interpreter in the UK, how it has changed over the last few years.

Respondent: Yes, in the last few years I noticed that many companies appeared. They pay very low rates, or the companies that already existed reduced their rates because I've been interpreting since 2009, and I noticed this worsening of sort of conditions and of the status of the interpreter. And I have a colleague who has been working as an interpreter for eight or nine years and she took part in these movements against Capita and all these companies that... and she's also very disappointed with what it is going on and she feels that the status of the interpreter in the UK has worsened. She's even considering work in a different field, which is a real pity because I feel interpreters are crucial, especially in the court. And I think their status should be different.

But I hope maybe in the future people will realise how important the role of the interpreter is and maybe things will get better. I hope.

Interviewer: Okay. Thank you very much. Is there anything else you would like to add to your comments?

- Respondent: No, about the breaking the code of conduct, I was in some situations where, for example, not in court, in other cases, for example, when you go for a home visit the code of conduct says you should not enter the house, you should wait for the officer outside. And people invite you in. Some people don't understand that you are an interpreter, you are a professional, not their friend or their neighbour. But you have to state it very clearly and I think people get used to it and understand in the end. Even the less educated ones, they will understand what the interpreter is for and what their role is.
- Interviewer: Okay. Thank you very much.
- Respondent: Okay, no problem.

END OF AUDIO

11.1.6 Respondent 18: interview transcript

File name: Interview with Respondent 18
Audio Length: 0:29:53
Date transcribed: 16 August 2021

Interviewer: Okay, so I'm recording this now, and today is the 13th of June, and here I have one of the interpreters with me to follow up the answers in my questionnaire.

Okay, so my first question is, it's regarding the different court types, so how does that affect your performance? What you have told me in your answer is that there are subtle differences between different court types, like you mentioned the physical setting of a magistrates' and criminal court, how that differs and how it can have an effect on your performance, on your role.

And also, you mentioned the tribunals, again, the physical setting and the fact that there is no need to take an oath, which makes things slightly different. So, what you say here is that there are subtle differences in what is expected of the interpreter, so do you think that these differences, in different court types, are sufficient for us to talk about different types of court room interpreting?

Because at the current moment, if you look in literature and in theory, court room interpreting is presented as a homogenous phenomenon, we don't talk about different types of courts and court room interpreting, so this is why I'm looking into that, differences. Do they actually have a court room interpreter as a homogenous phenomenon, or we actually have differences which are sufficient enough to talk about different types of court room interpreting? Do you know what I mean by this?

Respondent: I understand what you mean. If we start from the kind of, bottom-up approach for this, if you look at the interpreters in general the situation is never twice the same, it's always different, because there are different participants there are different settings.

So, if you now go into more detail in terms of courts, then in the courts there are also different situations, different participants every time, and usually different court rooms. Different institutions, different judges, different prosecutors, there are too many variables that change for it to be all the time the same.

And because of that the expectation changes all the time. For example, today I was in a court when I was interpreting right after another interpreter was running... there was a case with another interpreter in Chinese. And he was very, very slow, because he was all... in terms of consecutive interpreting, so everything that was being said they were pausing after every sentence, so she was able to interpret in a consecutive manner. And because of that, it was very, very slow.

So once that case finished, and they brought my defendant, the pressure was up to increase the speed. So, they, kind of, hinted am I okay to do simultaneous to catch on time a little bit, so talk at the same time as the participants are talking. So, in theory if the Chinese interpreter wouldn't be before me, so the Chinese case wouldn't be heard before my case, maybe I would be given more time and they wouldn't be so stressed about the time, because it is a Saturday today as well, and everyone wanted to go home a little bit quicker.

So, these little subtle changes always make a difference, so I don't think you can say that interpreting in general is very homogenous, because the treatment changes all the time.

Interviewer: So many variables?

Respondent: There are, yeah, there are just too many variables.

Interviewer: It's interesting what you're saying about they actually asked you if you are okay to do simultaneous, because that by itself suggests that they gave you an option of choosing your mode of interpreting, rather than just assuming that this is what you will be doing regardless. Is it right?

- Respondent: They had not given me a choice. The court doesn't ask whether you can do one or another, they hint on this. So, they said, "Are you a little bit faster?" Because I knew the magistrates' court already, I knew the people that were sitting there, they knew me before as well, we saw each other in the past, so they knew what they could expect from me, and they knew that I prefer to do... I do simultaneous interpreting when it's not directed to the defendant. So, they knew that they could up the expectation towards me.
- Interviewer: So, you're already known to the court, and they know that you can do simultaneous, and they already assume...?
- Respondent: I was known to the legal advisor, yes. Well, she said, "You're a little bit faster," [** 0:05:57]. So it was more of a question that everybody knew the answer to.
- Interviewer: Right, okay. But did they actually mention the term "simultaneous"?
- Respondent: No.
- Interviewer: Or they just said you are faster? This is what your assumption was by doing simultaneous, because they said you are faster. What I'm trying to understand here is that how much the court officials also are aware of different modes of interpreting? Because also that affects how they work with interpreters and what the expectations they put on them, and from what you're saying to me, I also can make it's probably slightly off side of my questionnaire, but it's still part of my research, so it's very relevant what you're saying and it's very, very valuable and very important information for me as well.
- So, from what you're saying to me, what I can see is that in that situation today the people who were in that room, they are probably not as much aware of methods of modes of interpreting, but they just know they are faster, is it correct?
- Respondent: Yeah, yeah, definitely. Actually, I think judges and court staff, whether it's solicitors, legal advisors, ushers, probation, they go through so

many foreign speakers, and they use interpreters on such a regular basis, that they can see the differences themselves, in my opinion. That some people would just go sentence by sentence, and some interpreters go more at the same time. Actually, I think they are able to spot this difference.

I don't know, maybe some are able to say that this is called simultaneous, this called whispering, I'm sure some of them are able to do so. But, on the other hand, some just realise that there are different ways of doing this. I remember a case when the judge actually said that the defendant... because it was the second hearing that I wasn't available, I wasn't present at the second hearing, at the first hearing, sorry.

I was present at the second hearing when the judge told me straightaway that the defendant or appellant said that he would prefer for the consecutive style of interpreting. So that judge was very aware of the modes that he wanted me to use.

So, I think you can, as in any trade, you can find people that are a little bit more knowledgeable about other things as well, and some that are not, I think they can see the difference between them.

Interviewer:

But do you think, in your opinion – also it's not the question on the questionnaire, it's just a separate question – do you think in your opinion that in general awareness needs to be raised amongst legal professions on what actually interpreting involves, what the interpreter's role is, and how to work with interpreters, and what they can expect from interpreters? Whether they actually put realistic expectations on the interpreters, do you think that they need to be educated about that, there is a lack of knowledge, of understanding, lack of awareness?

Respondent:

Well, again, it depends, from person to person. I have worked with people who are very skilled in using the interpreter, and they knew exactly how to use the interpreter, and, as a result, they were able to

achieve better results. Because effectively you can look at the interpreter as a tool, and if you know how to use that tool, then you can achieve better results.

If you don't know how to use that tool, then you're still... obviously the interpreter most of the time tries to do their best, so you're still going to get results, but they might be not as efficient, or not as good. And education is always good, it doesn't matter what you're doing or what profession it is, the more you know the job or the person that you are working with, the better you are able to use that person, and it's in any trade really.

So, in terms of education, I don't think you can be forced to on them, that they have to have this education, or they have to have this knowledge, but if they do, then it's to their benefit.

Interviewer: Yes, I agree, okay. I will not ask you about the facilities in the court room, because I think you gave me quite clear, sufficient answers that they differ from court to court, and sometimes the court staff does not put enough effort into checking whether the equipment is sufficient or it's working, is that right, yeah? Is that correct?

Respondent: Yes.

Interviewer: Is there anything else you would like to add on that?

Respondent: No, it depends, it depends, from court room to court room. If you go to youth court, there is no dock, so you're sitting directly with the person. For example, if you go into a witness box then you can sit next to the person. If you have an accused and someone is standing in the dock and there is glass in between you and the offender, that makes it difficult, because obviously in that moment the person that is accused cannot sit down, they have to stand in front of the glass all the time.

So even if the judge says you can sit down, the person still has to stand most of the time, because the interpreter is in front of that glass and he's talking to you, so if you sit down, you cannot hear anything.

But then if you come to crown courts, then mostly likely you'll have the headphones, so you'll have something like a tour guide, and you'll be given the headphones, and you can hear what people are saying. But that's not always the case as well, because sometimes the batteries are flat, or something else is happening. So, it can be difficult and tricky, but it just depends on the court.

Interviewer: Okay, thank you. So also, as for your role as an interpreter in the court room, you say it's mainly linguistic support to the participants, it also depends on the situation, and on the time, you interact with participants, so that also can affect your role. Are there aspects of the role you can reflect on or think about? So how would you construct the role of the interpreter in the court room? Are there any other aspects to that?

Respondent: Are there what, sorry?

Interviewer: The role of the interpreter in the court room, is there anything else attached to that role except just linguistics?

Respondent: Well, the people, the clients they usually expect a little bit more, and they try sometimes to get a little bit more. So, I frequently face the situation after the, let's say, consultation between the solicitor and the client, he would go into the court room, and then he says, "You know all the stuff, you speak instead of me."

So, because the clients are usually not aware of what is the role of the interpreter, and even if you tell them what is your role – and you always do that, right – they still don't really acknowledge that and take that into their heart, they just do whatever they feel is the best.

And it's frequent that you end up sitting with a person one-to-one and they ask you for advice, they'll ask you, "What do you think? Do you

think this might happen? What do you think about how this might evolve, the situation, what might happen?" What are they facing, for example, in terms of sentence? And all sorts of stuff. And it's sometimes difficult to detach and say, "Well, I'm not going to talk to you," or "I cannot tell you anything about this, because I'm just an interpreter."

Because it boils down to another thing, if you're rude to them, and you would just tell them, no, I'm not going to talk, I'm not going to talk, they might turn around and stop trusting you, you want them to feel comfortable to some extent talking to you as well. So, you have to kind of judge a little bit either way, saying... so you have to talk, but you cannot give them any advice, but you have to talk in a way that they think that they're getting more of an understanding, I suppose.

Interviewer: Okay, that's a good point. So, you basically say you need to find the kind of golden mean where...?

Respondent: Yes.

Interviewer: ... between not telling them too much, over-stepping your role boundaries, but at the same time, maintain enough communication to preserve their trust in you?

Respondent: Yeah, it's not about telling them just about enough, it's about talking to them with no substance in fact, okay, so they feel that they have this support, but actually you're not giving them any, they just have the impression that you're there for them.

Interviewer: I'm just putting this down. (Pause)

Okay, overall, do you feel recognised and appreciated as a professional by the court officials? So, you said yes, in this case could you expand a little bit on that answer, in what way? How does that manifest in the court room? How does it come across to you that you are respected, that you are recognised? What signs if you can say that you can tell by that you are respected and recognised?

Respondent: I think the kind of a label the court interpreter in itself makes you seen by other people that you are [^{**} 0:18:08] you're professional, and I think that's one of the first things. But in general, the court always has been very polite towards me, I always have good comments from the court saying thank you, always, you can always hear thank you, you can always hear, you know, you have been very helpful. And they're always very polite towards you and your job and what you do.

So, I never had anything like oh you're just this and that, or no, never happened anything like this. That's why when I go to court I feel obviously there is all this kind of parading about in the court when you bow and you do all this, but once you follow the etiquette of the courts, they recognise you as being a part of the courts, and they accept that you're there to help them and to support them rather than to do anything else, and you're being recognised for that.

Interviewer: The next question is about how your clients view your role in the court room, I think we already discussed it in a previous [^{**} 0:19:18] that they don't always accept your role, so I think we can miss that one.

Respondent: On that, it's usually because the clients do not understand how they're supposed to behave in a court. So, it's very common that in court you don't speak at all, the defendant might say two sentences, and then he's not allowed to speak at all, okay.

Very often they will try and talk, they will talk to you, but then they will talk to you as the interpreter, and you think what should I do? Should I interpret this aloud, or he's just talking towards me? But that's not because they think you're supposed to be doing something else, that's more because they do not know how to behave.

Interviewer: Okay, thank you. And also, I understand that you entered this profession fairly recently, 2015, so you can't comment on how things have changed over time. This probably was a leading question, to an extent, leading to the particular agency, as you know how things have

changed when Capita took over the Minister of Justice contract, and this question was directed to that.

Basically, how are things different in comparison? How it was before the system changed, and how it is now? So what changes, not just in terms of pay, but also in terms of the status of the interpreter, the attitude towards the interpreter? But you didn't...

Respondent: I entered the profession in 2013, well, I started working for courts, let's put it that way, started working for courts in November 2013. But I had my qualification since... I have qualifications that allow me to go into court since November 2012 or 2011 even. So basically, the moment when I got my qualifications Capita came in, so I resisted working for them for two years, because I knew what was happening over there.

But in terms of how it's changed and how it was before, it is difficult for me to comment. Although I found most of the staff in the court being very supportive towards the interpreters, saying that Capita isn't good and it's a mess. So, I'm sure that the court staff is more on our side, in terms of on the side of the interpreters than on the side of the company, of Capita.

Interviewer: The court is on the side of the interpreters?

Respondent: Yeah. Yeah, the staff definitely is, yes. I have regular conversations with the legal advisors on how it would change and things like this, and they're always on our side.

Interviewer: That's very interesting. Legal advisors, did you get this opinion from anybody else in the court, from magistrates or from...?

Respondent: I do not hold conversations with the magistrates, you know, you do not talk to the judge...

Interviewer: Maybe they made comments, maybe just...

- Respondent: I don't think so. I remember I was talking to a legal advisor when she was mentioning that the judge got upset about Capita, and they were looking into some review.
- Hold on a second please. Can you just hold on the line, I have to pick another call, okay, one second.
- Interviewer: Yeah, that's okay, yeah.
- Respondent: I have a customer on the way to pick up some translation, so I had to tell him how to get in. You can hear me all right, yes?
- Interviewer: Yeah.
- Respondent: Yeah, sorry, I had to pick up the phone.
- Interviewer: That's okay, that's fine, that's fine. Okay, yeah, that's a very interesting opinion that court professionals also comment on, and that they're actually on the interpreters' side, quite interesting. So, you took a Metropolitan Police test in 2013 according to your notes, or it's 2011?
- Respondent: Yeah. Yeah, I think it's 2013. It's 2013 when I got the paper, but I was given the pass a little bit earlier, so I wasn't [**** 0:24:29**] exactly, but you know it's 2013.
- Interviewer: You registered on the National Register?
- Respondent: Just excuse me one moment, okay, just hold on the line.
- Interviewer: Yeah, yeah.
- Respondent: Yes, the court is always... I always had a very good response from them, in terms of they were more on our side than Capita's side, saying that the situation that happened with the company taking over the contract just put all this difficulty for them with getting the interpreters. This is always what they say, they have a difficulty in getting the interpreters because they don't turn up sometimes, and they just don't know what's going on.

- Interviewer: Okay. But you also registered on the National Register, right?
- Respondent: Yes, I am on the National Register.
- Interviewer: And just out of interest now really, is there any point of the National Register now that Capita does all the provision of interpreting?
- Respondent: Of course. There are a number of reasons. One, your name is out there, so you're still on the register so you can, for example, if anyone questions whether you have your [**** 0:25:50**] to interpret, you can say, yes, I'm on the National Register of Public Service Interpreters, it's a recognised, recognition is what it gives. It's just [**** 0:26:01**] being a member of ITI it doesn't mean anything but there is a point of being a member of professional bodies.
- I have other work coming from the National Register of Public Service Interpreters, there are other institutions that found me through the National Register and regularly use my service and the pay is a lot higher.
- Interviewer: So, it's worth going then. Before I finish that, is there anything else you would like to add to the questionnaire and what we have already discussed if you have any ideas, any concerns or anything you would like to express on how the profession of the interpreter...? Just before we finish this?
- Respondent: From what I understood from your side as well, is that you are looking a little bit into the study of how the interpreting changed because of Capita, is that right?
- Interviewer: It's not my main angle, but I will touch upon that, yes. It's one of the aspects I'm looking at, but not the necessarily... I'm not going to base my thesis around Capita...
- Respondent: I understand.
- Interviewer: ... but I will bring it as a context.

- Respondent: The one thing about them, I don't like working for them in terms of the amount of money they pay, and things like this. But in terms of the speed and fluency of payments, they improved, it's unbelievable what they done. They've created a really good IT system for the courts and interpreters, just because all the rest is a shambles, it doesn't mean that the system isn't good.
- So, it's true, I agree that they are not the best and they cause a lot of trouble, but they also have showed, in my opinion, to the world of the interpreters, that there are things that we are not doing and we're supposed to be doing in terms of managing large clients like this.
- Interviewer: I'm not sure I quite understand what you mean by that.
- Respondent: So, back in the day, before Capita, the court would have to ring individual interpreters until they found one. Now you receive an email if you would like to take a job, you click on a link and click and accept, and then you get all the details straight away, and once you go to the courts you just fill out the piece of paper and then the court closes the system automatically, or you can do it at a certain time.
- So, it improves the paperwork, I'm sure, it improves the speed of payments, because the payments are now on a very regular basis.
- Interviewer: The admin side is improved?
- Respondent: Yes, the admin side, they solved some of the admin side problems that were there, I think the interpreters should acknowledge that this has happened. But then work towards, you know, doing that themselves, rather than letting Capita or any other agency that will take over from them in the future do that for them.
- Interviewer: Okay, yeah, I see. Yeah, I think, yeah, I understand what you're saying now. Is there anything else or shall we just finish?
- Respondent: No, I think that's all.
- Interviewer: Okay. Thank you very much. Just can you hold the line a second..

11.1.7 Respondent 21: interview transcript

File name: Interview with Respondent 21
Audio Length: 0:27:54
Date transcribed: 15 August 2021

Interviewer: Today is the 11th of September and I have an interpreter her with me and we will discuss the questions on my survey. The first question, because you have completed the questionnaire and there are some questions which require further clarification. The question I asked, does a court type have a bearing on your professional practice, if so, in what ways? And I understand that you didn't quite understand the question?

By this question I meant there are different court types, so if you interpret for Crown, for magistrates' or for family court. Do you feel any difference in those courts that would affect directly/indirectly somehow your professional practice? Not only in choice of vocabulary, which is obvious that would be different, but say in an atmosphere that can feel different and therefore you can act differently. Does that make sense?

Respondent: Yeah, the atmosphere is significantly different between magistrates' court and Crown court. Because in magistrates' court you've got the magistrates and they usually have no idea what they're doing, especially when it comes to interpreters.

Interviewer: Magistrates?

Respondent: Yeah. District judges are fine; magistrates are a massive issue and surprisingly, quite often even legal advisors. So, you get that typical, tell him/ask him/explain to him, both from magistrate and [**** 0:01:53**] magistrate. But also, from legal advisors who are actually legally qualified, and they should know what the interpreter's role is.

Interviewer: So how does that affect you as an interpreter?

Respondent: Well, you get an awkward position when you have to ask them to stop it, as politely as possible. And it's embarrassing for you because basically you look like an idiot. You look like somebody who is trying to patronise the court, which is not what you're doing, but that's how many people will perceive it on the other end.

Like I did it once at the magistrates', where they started talking and the defendant, not like they should be, but telling me what to tell him. So, I politely asked them to just speak to the defendant and I would be interpreting what they were saying to each other. I was complained about for being rude by the legal advisor.

Interviewer: So basically, they complained, they considered your behaviour rude.

Respondent: Yes.

Interviewer: Because you tried to act in accordance with the code of conduct?

Respondent: I didn't quite get what they considered rude, but I did ask politely as I could. I felt embarrassed for them, that they didn't know. There's one book I've got at home about court interpreting, this is outlining exactly what to do in these situations and this is what we should do. Just say, "I'm here to interpret, so whatever you say to the defendant, I will happily interpret."

Interviewer: How often do you think you have to explain your role to the judiciaries?

Respondent: Frankly, now I'm scared to do it because I don't want to have any more complaints like that. So, it's very difficult right now because more and more courts are doing this because they think that's the way. I see interpreters not behaving properly. For example, once at Braxton Magistrates', there was this defendant, I don't know what the language was, I just know that I didn't understand it, it was an Asian language.

So that is the defendant and his interpreter. The defendant said something and then the interpreter addresses the court like, "Oh, by

the way, he brought this paper with him,” and he just hands it over for him.” And the court thinks that’s what the interpreter should be doing. Nobody says anything.

Interviewer: The interpreter takes a paper from the defendant and gives it directly to the court?

Respondent: Yeah, this is what he’s brought.

Interviewer: Actually, his defence should do that.

Respondent: He didn’t have a solicitor; he was just representing himself.

Interviewer: He self-represented.

Respondent: Quite often we have to stand next to the defendant, so the magistrate usually, because they don’t know, they usually see us as somebody who is representing them and being there with them and for them. So, where we stand is kind of for them, determining our role. Like we’re standing there with them, so we are with them on their side.

Interviewer: Yes, I understand. Would you say that actually the court, because they’re not the same in hierarchy or in the way they operate within the court and if you take into account linguistic differences, would you say that your interpreting stays absolutely exactly the same in all different courts? Or would you say that does affect your professional performance, depending on the type of court you go to?

Respondent: The embarrassment is kind of a strain; it puts you under more pressure because you feel stupid by having to say that. So, it kind of makes me nervous, more nervous, and it can affect your performance. So, in that way, that’s how I put it. Because Crown court, that’s hardly ever an issue. That’s sometimes barristers will do this, like tell him, explain to him or...

Interviewer: In Crown court you’re behind, you’re in the docks with the defendant, they don’t see you anyway, they only see you when you...

Respondent: No, I was talking about the consultations before the actual hearing. I've never ever, in my whole life, have seen a Crown court judge who would talk to me, giving me instructions what to tell the defendant. That's no issue with the Crown court judges because they talk to the defendants, they talk to the victims, they talk to the people, they are talking to. So, Crown court there's no issue. Most barristers are a lot more...

Interviewer: What about family court or county court?

Respondent: I don't really do that many family hearings but there's a bit different situation because with family hearings you have more interpreters. Because you've got interpreters for consultations, that comes out with solicitors, that solicitors pay for. And then you've got interpreters booked by the court. So, they will be interpreting for the same people but they're interpreting inside a courtroom, so you've got double the number of interpreters.

So, in that case you don't really know what it's about really. Usually, you learn about the case during the consultation and then you know what to expect during the hearing. But during family hearings, you're not there for the consultations because there's this privately booked interpreter. And then you just go into the courtroom, and you just try. But I don't really do that many family hearings.

Interviewer: On the whole, if you say does it have a bearing on your performance, would you say yes or no, if you think about it? Do you think...?

Respondent: I wouldn't say it's the court time, I would say it's the behaviour of the staff or the English speakers directly. As I said, the magistrates are usually lost and barristers are told in bar school how to work with interpreters and Crown court judges know, [I don't have issues there 0:08:49].

Interviewer: Okay, how would you describe your role in the courtroom? Your answer is basically, 'put a non-English speaker onto the same footing as an English speaker', is it right?

- Respondent: Yeah.
- Interviewer: So, you see your role as a professional communication agent there?
- Respondent: Yeah, channel, yeah.
- Interviewer: But how do you think... we touched upon that today, you already told me that how your role is seen by other actors of the communication, say by defendants and by the court personnel.
- Respondent: Well, the court are quite often lost, and I often get instructions to tell somebody something and explain it and *make* somebody understand something. I can't make them understand if they don't explain it properly.
- Interviewer: But also, you're not there to make them understand something, you're there just... exactly what you said, to understand what the English speaker would understand. It's not your role to explain to them something they don't understand.
- Respondent: Yeah, but the court staff often expect this to happen. And they completely misunderstand this and the police as well, while we're at it.
- Interviewer: And the defendants or the non-English speaker?
- Respondent: It depends how well they know the system (Laughs), how many times have they been arrested and been to court. But I try to speak as little to them as possible, for many reasons really. Sometimes, if they start telling you about their case, once they're in the courtroom they get confused, what have they told you already and what still hasn't been explained to court. And that's bad for them because then they can't put forward their full story and they're all confused about what's been explained and what hasn't yet.
- But basically, sometimes I need to fill out some forms with them, like the means form or something. So, I have to talk to them, but I try to

stick to the point. Like we've got some columns there we have to fill them in, so just, this is this, I need to say, to write it down.

And if I don't know them – because sometimes I come across the same ones, not often – but if I don't know them, I just tell them, "We'll go in the courtroom; probably I will be speaking for a while first because I need to say my oath and afterwards the court will be speaking to you. They'll ask your name, date of birth, your address and then they'll put the charge forward..."

Interviewer: Do you explain this before you go to the courtroom...?

Respondent: Just this first bit because I don't want them to start overlapping in their speech. I want them not to panic, why am I talking so much all of a sudden, once we got inside. So, I don't want them to think that I'm saying something, and they don't know what it is. Even though after I say my oath in English, I always interpret it into Slovak. But I don't want them to start panicking. When we get there, I want them to know that I'm saying something I have to say as a professional.

And then I want them to understand that there will be a short exchange and that they will get a chance to speak afterwards. But I do it so that I can do my job. If the defendant starts interrupting the court, then it makes my job difficult.

Interviewer: Is it your own initiative to instruct them on that?

Respondent: I don't really instruct them, I just tell them, "Don't..."

Interviewer: You kind of explain what's going to happen, but...

Respondent: I'll tell them, "You'll get a chance to speak, but some other people will be speaking first, and I need to interpret that for you, so just listen to that and wait for your turn."

Interviewer: Basically, what you're doing, you instantiate your role with them, you kind of explain what you're there for, what your role is.

Respondent: Yeah.

Interviewer: And then you interpret that to the court personnel, so they know what you're talking about with him, yes?

Respondent: I do it before we go in, but I try to keep it really short. And when they start, try to start telling me their version of events, I tell them what I've just told you, don't tell me that because you'll get confused and you will not remember inside the courtroom what you've said already and what you haven't. I just try not to listen to whatever they want to say and if they really want to tell me something, I just make some excuse and I go inside the courtroom where they can't talk to me.

Interviewer: Okay, the question, do you recognise and appreciate it as professional by the court officials? You said that the grand courts do acknowledge interpreters, but magistrates' court and police stations vary. And this is what you told me today, that first have massive confusion with the role of the interpreter, so they don't always understand what the interpreter is there for. So, they will give you instructions which are not pertinent to your job description basically?

Respondent: Yeah.

Interviewer: If you [** 0:14:34], of course, you can give me any examples of this happening, for the record?

Respondent: Yeah, so many things, to pick one. One of those I've mentioned maybe? Like I come to police custody and I'm told by the custody officer, "Tell him, he has the right to have a solicitor, ask him whether he wants one." Or sometimes... and the worst things that can happen is when the custody staff and the detainee start arguing. And on one side you've got a custody officer, not really shouting at you, but it's not very comfortable the way he's talking to you, and he/she is telling you, "Just tell him that he's going to have an interview and he can explain then, but I'm not going to listen to him now."

And you [are being 0:15:33] talked to like that. And on the other hand, you've got the detainee who is like, "Oh well, tell him that I've got things to say, and I want him to listen to me because I didn't do it."

And you're caught in the middle of that. And if the two of them are arguing between themselves, I've got no issue, they can argue the whole night long and I'll be interpreting that, I don't mind. But if they're both talking to me in this manner, that's not something I'm comfortable with.

Interviewer: Yes, of course. And how do you go with the situation, what do you do? Would you explain to both sides what your role is, or would you continue the way it goes, but then you explain afterwards? Or you'll try and interfere in the process and kind of establish...?

Respondent: Once they start arguing, you can't do anything, because nobody will listen to you. It's very nicely explained on the [Cambridgeshire 0:16:29] website that the officer should be the one explaining to the non-English speaker. It's two of us who are talking, the interpreter is independent, don't ask him/her for advice, just talk to me as if we share the same language. Because if I start explaining that, then I'm talking and I'm not supposed to be talking, I'm supposed to be interpreting.

Interviewer: In this case you kind of show your own voice.

Respondent: Yeah.

Interviewer: This is not what the interpreter should do.

Respondent: And then again, it confuses them because I am talking to them, explaining them something...

Interviewer: And then you need to interpret both ways to make both sides aware?

Respondent: Yes.

Interviewer: As for the client, here by the 'client' I meant, because by the client I understand is the person who foots the bill. 'Client' is probably not the correct reference, you're right.

Respondent: Many people get it wrong. I come to court, and they tell me, “Your client hasn’t arrived yet.” And I’m like, “The court is my client, and the court is definitely here.”

Interviewer: By the client I mean the defendant, the non-native English speaker.

Respondent: Non-English speaker. So, the question is...?

Interviewer: How do the clients usually view your role in the courtroom? By the ‘client’ I mean the non-English speaker?

Respondent: It depends. Sometimes they do understand it, sometimes they don’t. That’s why I kind of... if I don’t know them, I try to tell them, because there’s nobody else who can tell them. I’m there independently; I can’t speak for you, whatever you tell me, I can’t say it in your defence, so you need to speak for yourself. But whatever you say, I’ll interpret it, and whatever they tell you, I’ll interpret too. Because the court will not do it, and if they don’t understand it, that can create confusion.

Interviewer: How often do you encounter the situation when the client, the non-English speaker, will see you as a friend or as a saviour and in advocate mode?

Respondent: I’ll be unspecific, but I’ll say too often (Laughs). It’s varied because sometimes you’ve got people who are in custody, so you’ll never meet them before the hearing starts. And then you’ve got defendants with solicitors and when you’ve got a consultation with a solicitor before the hearing, then you kind of... that’s where they kind of get it, what’s happening. That it’s them and the English speaker talking and the interpreter is not talking but interpreting what you’re saying to each other. Unless you’ve got an incompetent solicitor who doesn’t know either.

And then you sometimes encounter defendants who are on bail, so they’re there before they go inside the courtroom, physically, somewhere in the corridor, and they don’t have a solicitor. And then the usher hands you the means form and tells you, just go and fill it

out with him. So, you need to talk to them for the purposes of filling out the means form, but I kind of try to use it to explain to them what I'm there for. If I'm talking to them, I just talk about what I'm there to do and I always try to keep it to a minimum and just stick to the relevant bit.

Like I'm here, but I'm not defending you, I'm not here to have a chat with you, I'll be interpreting for you for the court.

Interviewer: Do they take that, do they stop any kind of advances to make friends with you?

Respondent: Oh yeah, I've been asked out for coffees and to add people on Facebook and phone numbers and stuff like that. That's where I really, really, really leave immediately (laughs) or make up an excuse I have to go somewhere, or I have my paperwork signed and I really have to stay to have that done and I can't go. But it's not that often, sometimes it happens.

Interviewer: The last question is about the status, the personal status of the interpreter in the UK, especially following the changes.

Respondent: I can't compare it because I haven't...

Interviewer: Even if you don't compare, just your opinion, because you gave me quite a few examples today which kind of make me... infer that the status of the interpreter is first, not everybody understands that it's a profession and also there's no high social status attached to that profession.

Respondent: Not anymore, no.

Interviewer: It seems to me, from what you told me today, it's a bit like on the low side status?

Respondent: Yeah, if you're not good enough to be a cleaner, as a foreigner, then you'll become an interpreter. Sometimes I really get that feeling; this is how they perceive it.

Interviewer: Do you have any particular examples or linguistic references to where it was explicitly compared; your role was compared to that of a cleaner or any other low status...?

Respondent: Oh, I clearly recall a recent one with the custody inspector.

Interviewer: Any other examples where there would be an implication of the interpreter being not at the same level as a court personnel or even a police officer?

Respondent: I'd have to think. The only thing I can recall now is another incident. I was at Crown court; there was this consultation. So, it was four of us present: the defendant; her solicitor; her barrister, and me. And the barrister, being a proper barrister, started explaining to the defendant what her position and situation was. It was quite complicated in that case. She only said a few words to her when the solicitor stopped the barrister and he said to her, "Madam Barrister, the defendant doesn't speak English, so you need to tell it to the interpreter so she could tell her."

And I just sat there in disbelief, how can a solicitor assume they're so stupid and the barrister looked really bemused. I told her, "No, don't worry, this is what we should be doing, just speak to the defendant and I'll be interpreting." I thought okay, the [biggest shit 0:24:07] is over and nothing worse can happen. And then when the barrister finished talking to her, what she wanted to tell her, then the solicitor wanted to say something to the defendant as well.

So, he told me to tell her, even though I've just explained that no, you're talking to the defendant and I'm interpreting. And he just like... it just left me speechless. I just didn't even know what to tell him.

Interviewer: Again, it's another example where they confuse your role, they don't understand what you're there for.

Respondent: But he even corrected another professional who was doing exactly what she was supposed to be doing.

- Interviewer: What I'm asking is more on the status, so the attitude of the court personnel or maybe wider members of public? Where you could feel that your profession is somehow inferior to say law professions or...
- Respondent: I will need to think about that. If I can think...
- Interviewer: Or if it's the other way around, if you feel that you're respected also, I don't try to manipulate your answer to support that claim. You may have a different view, you may say...
- Respondent: You often get Crown court judges really finding the time to thank the interpreters, especially after a long trial. They really want to make sure that the interpreters know that their work is valued. So, if you have a several day long trial, then you can be sure that the Crown court judge will find some time to...
- Interviewer: To acknowledge you.
- Respondent: Yes. I've never had a Crown court trial when this wouldn't happen.
- Interviewer: Would you say, let's say in Crown court, somehow you feel like your work is valued/acknowledged, and it's a bit of a high status attached there to your professional work, than say in a lower level court?
- Respondent: Yeah, definitely.
- Interviewer: Would you also say that the way you feel about your profession and the status depends on the level of court? So, the higher the court, then...
- Respondent: You can get proper magistrate court, proper legal advisors and proper judges and then there's no issue. But that's not always the case.
- Interviewer: But on the whole...
- Respondent: On the whole, Crown courts are better.
- Interviewer: Crown court is better. Okay, if you have anything else to add or any other examples?

- Respondent: The only issue, when there is an issue with Crown courts and barristers, that's kind of an opposite issue. It's not like they talk to us what to tell the defendants, they skip us completely. They're like, "No, we don't need interpreters," and they just go and speak to the defendant even though the defendant has limited English. Because they think no, no, his/her English will do.
- Interviewer: So, they kind of assume a linguist role and they have enough expertise to assess someone's language.
- Respondent: Yeah. It doesn't happen that often, but if something happens, if there's an issue at Crown court, this is the issue.
- Interviewer: Okay, thank you very much.
- Respondent: You're welcome.
- Interviewer: I don't have any more questions, so we'll finish there.

END OF AUDIO

11.1.8 Respondent 58: interview transcript

File name: Interview with Respondent 58
Audio Length: 2:01:06
Date transcribed: 16 August 2021

Interviewer: It's now on record and today is 15 February 2021. [REDACTED]
[REDACTED], who is a legal linguist and also immigration lawyer, practicing immigration lawyer who is participating in my research. The role and identity of the legal interpreter in the UK. Thank you very much for taking part in this research.

My first question would be, as we now go through the interpreter/translator questionnaire, what source and target languages you work with when you work as an interpreter?

Respondent: Farsi.

Interviewer: It's the only language or any other languages?

Respondent: I speak five languages, but they are not up to the level of interpreting, for legal purposes.

Interviewer: So, Farsi is the only one, so Farsi and English are your main language pair?

Respondent: Yes.

Interviewer: Great, thank you, you already said you've been practicing interpreting over 10 years, so you have been like 20 years now. Which courts have you interpreted for, magistrates' yes?

Respondent: I've been interpreting for all the courts and tribunals all over the UK.

Interviewer: Does it include coroner's court or youth court?

Respondent: All of them.

- Interviewer: Great, thank you. You already said you have a BA in interpreting from an Iranian university?
- Respondent: Yes, I studied translation in Iran for four years, this is 2001 to 2005.
- Interviewer: Then you have DPSI as well, is it DPSI in law module or any other modules?
- Respondent: It was translation. We were taught and prepared to do any kind of interpreting in any field.
- Interviewer: I see, just out of interest, it's not part of the research, just off the records; do you know Yvonne Fowler by any chance? She was a major contributor to DPSI training?
- Respondent: Who?
- Interviewer: Yvonne Fowler. Maybe you came across that name?
- Respondent: I've heard the name but no, I'm sorry.
- Interviewer: That's okay.
- Respondent: I can't remember.
- Interviewer: She's a major contributor. She actually was a student at my university with my supervisor; she did a PhD in a similar subject with my supervisor as well. This is how I met her, but she has done a lot of work on DPSI and training and police interpreters.
- Interviewer: Are you registered with the National Register, the NRPSI?
- Respondent: No, I'm not.
- Interviewer: Any particular reason? You just didn't want the hassle of going through? Because you're qualified enough to have a very easy registration there. I'm just interested, is it something you were interested, or you just didn't consider it, the National Register?
- Respondent: The reason I didn't apply to the register, on the National Register was that I felt I didn't need to because I was already interpreting for courts,

for tribunals, for the police and all the government and non-government organisations that needed language services. I didn't feel the need to register with them.

Interviewer: I see. I'm similar in that respect because I also did interpreting in the legal sector, but I'm not on the register. I just have a BA in translation in interpreting and MA in applied linguistics, but I didn't feel the need to register myself. But it's still interesting because people have different reasons and there may be sometimes more in it. Thank you. Do you mind me asking about your age group; is it 30-39, 40-49, 50-59, your age group, if you don't mind me asking?

Respondent: I'm 40, I was born in 1980.

Interviewer: So, from 40-49, thank you. The next question is about how would you describe the role in the courtroom, the role of the interpreter in the courtroom? I think you answered that question in the previous questionnaire for the legal professionals, what is the role of the interpreter in the courtroom, you covered that. You said it's very crucial to make sure everyone understands what is being said, otherwise it restricts access to justice.

Also, what I wanted to talk about a bit more with you is that you're saying, it's an interesting point you raise, this is a point of debate. You're saying that the interpreter should make an assessment and it's easy to make an assessment when you talk to a native speaker, how educated they are and their education level, whether they will be able to understand the legal language.

And then the level where they will struggle with understanding the legal language, then the interpreter role includes adjusting their talk to the defendant, so for them to understand. Could you please elaborate a little more because this is a very interesting point? This is a particular point of heated debate, if you know about this, in academic literature and amongst solicitors and lawyers as well.

Respondent: Well, what I was trying to say is that when you enter a court or a tribunal as an interpreter, you need to be able to first locate yourself. And then try to understand what's happening and what you're exactly going to do. Then you'll have to try to somehow communicate with the defendant, with the witnesses, with the non-English speaker and also the most important thing, if you speak, or at least can understand the accent of the non-English speaker.

For any language there are lots of accents. Maybe the basic of... For example, in Farsi there are several accents, and the basics are the same, but the legal terms and some special words are different. So, the interpreter has to make an assessment whether the non-English speaker is able to understand the interpreter's accent. And also, more important than that, is that some non-English speakers have never been to court in their own countries and don't even understand legal equivalence in their mother tongue, in their mother languages.

So even if you interpret very well, translate the words very precisely and exactly, they won't be able to understand it. The interpreter has to be able to make things understood by someone who is [doing it adequately 0:09:50]. So that's a [**] which is built up on experience. Who can convey the meaning of the legal words, in an understandable and comprehensible way for the non-English speaker.

And also, the fact that you are the only one who can communicate with the non-English speaker, sometimes you need to help them understand the court, the procedure, the process, when they can talk, when they are not allowed to talk. I believe it's a failure by some solicitors and legal professionals who do not prepare their clients before coming to court. They don't know what happened to them and as an interpreter, as soon as I see them; I see they are petrified or extremely worried of what's going to happen to them.

So sometimes interpreters need to be able to calm the witnesses or dependents down in a few words, only in [a few 0:12:03] words.

Sometimes that's needed. Interpreting, in my view, is not only being able to translate the words from one language to another. For legal interpreters it requires much experience and capability.

Interviewer: So, it's more to achieve understanding and comprehension of all parties.

Respondent: Yes, yes. If you'd like to have more explanation on that?

Interviewer: Do you think in this case the role of the interpreter would fall into established category just called 'facilitator of communication'? Would you agree with that? So, the interpreter's role is to be a facilitator of communication?

Respondent: Sorry, could you repeat the question, we got disconnected?

Interviewer: Would you agree in this case, from how you're describing the interpreter's role in the courtroom, I would say that it would fall into the category... because in academic literature there are a few established categories of the interpreters' role and one of them is 'facilitator of communication'. What you're telling me, I see that it can fall into that category, would you agree with that? So, it's facilitator of communication?

Respondent: Exactly. An interpreter is the only person who can understand the language and also the [** 0:14:13]. Their role is to be able to make communication possible between two parties. It goes beyond that and what I wanted to tell you is that unfortunately some interpreters are not adequately experienced.

Interviewer: Or even trained.

Respondent: Or capable to be able to do that. And it has [** 0:14:56] issues [**]. For example, I can remember, I was in a court in [**], direct Farsi speaking parties, some of them spoke English. One of them was a witness, the other was the defendant. I was interpreting for the defendant; another gentleman, Farsi speaking interpreter, was interpreting for the third party. I heard that the interpreter not only was

making several mistakes in interpreting while the questions were put from the prosecutor to the witness. He also said some other things, such as the prosecutor is going to catch you out, or some other things like that.

It's not allowed anyway, but that's why I'm saying they are not adequately prepared. Legal interpreters apart from [** 0:16:33] DPSI minimum. They do not do training, as far as I know, before they appear in court or start interpreting. They are not prepared for the unexpected situations that may occur anytime, anywhere. From one point of view, they need to look and sound professional. From another point of view... from the other side they need to be helpful in cases that solicitors haven't been able to do their job. I can [state adequately 0:17:31].

Interviewer:

Very interesting, so about training, do you think... we probably will get back to this point a bit later to see how things have changed in your view, I think that probably will be one of the issues that have changed in the last decade that interpreters, with all the changes that took place following outsourcing, public service interpreting to local agencies and to particularly some agencies like thebigword now and Capita before. This is where we started to experience these issues where more and more untrained interpreters appear before court and people who lack qualifications and training in interpreting. We will talk a little bit more about this.

My question here would be, if I may play a bit of devil's advocate. On the one hand I agree with you that the role of the interpreter is to make sure that all parties can communicate and achieve understanding, which is a crucial part of the interpreter's role. The on the other hand, if you look at it from the other point of view, from the other perspective, for example native speakers defendants who appear in court.

I don't want to make assumptions or generalisations, but there are defendants in English court, when native speakers can't understand legalese and legal language because they lack education as well, but

then they don't have that advantage of someone who will be explaining it to them or making them understand or comprehend what's going on in court. The main argument is raised about this position here, that an interpreter can put the defendant into a more advantageous position than the native speaker. What do you think about this? Do you see what I mean?

Respondent: Yes, I understand, I understand what you mean. I can't say that having an interpreter in court will give some kind of... I don't agree will give some kind of advantage over the other parties. But lacking the ability of an interpreter for making the conversations and what's being said, what is being said or written possible, can cause many other issues. If the defendant, the witness is a non-English speaker and cannot understand what's being said, then the whole purpose of justice would be questioned.

Interviewer: Of course, thank you very much. My next question here would be, how do non-English speaking litigants usually view your role in the courtroom? Do you need to establish your role with them from the very beginning or do they accept your explanation? How do they usually see you?

Respondent: One of the assessments, one of the most important points the interpreter has to be able to do when they enter the courtroom, I have seen many court staff who don't know enough about the role of the interpreter. And many of the court staff I've seen, they are already aware of what's going to happen to the interpreter and what kind of job he's going to do. But it is anyway up to the interpreter to be able to establish their presence and let everybody know what they want to do and how they are going to do it.

I'll give you an example. Sometimes during hearings, I was asked to interpret consecutively. Sometimes I was asked to interpreter simultaneously, I mean whispering. [That executive 0:22:59] from the judge called the staff to explain to me when I arrived in the courtroom what to do. Sometimes courts and court members are struggling

without even giving the slightest attention to the presence of the interpreter and not taking me into consideration, that what is being said there has to be interpreted to the non-English speaker.

Sometimes they are not aware, sometimes they pay attention, sometimes they don't. Whenever I attended hearings, I just left all these to the members of the court, to the judge and the court clerk, to decide what they want me to do. These may seem little issues but can create serious obstacles for the interpreters to be able to do their job properly.

Interviewer: Okay...

Respondent: I remember, sorry, I just remember examples that will help me make my points understood. I just remembered a court hearing I attended. There was a defendant, and the witnesses talked to the judge and the court members through video call. And they were used slang – I think it was in Liverpool – which I didn't understand completely. Because when they were speaking, they were giving evidence, they used slang, and it wasn't standard English. And I had to interrupt the video, the person who was playing the video and ask them to stop-stop-stop, wait for me to interpret, wait for me to interpret.

Sometimes I didn't understand what was going on. So, what I told the judge later was that I expected to be aware of what was going to happen, and I expected to be asked if I understood a slang Liverpool accent.

Interviewer: Slang and legal language.

Respondent: For that hearing I tried my best. I can say assertively that the issue of not being able to understand slang accent did not affect much the hearing, did not affect the hearing and the process and the purpose of justice. However, I felt it was a kind of failure for me.

Interviewer: I can understand that. So basically, we're talking here about unrealistic expectations from the court officials, placed on the interpreter. Was that the right summary?

Respondent: Mm-hmm.

Interviewer: Unrealistic expectations, which also suggests to us exactly what you said, that the court professionals are very often unaware of the role, or they have some conflicted expectations or conflicted views and that affects in the end of the day, the end result is that the process, interpreting process becomes affected. Is that right? How you see your role is affected.

Respondent: Exactly. Can I give you another example please?

Interviewer: Of course.

Respondent: I can remember I was in Manchester, an immigration tribunal, first year tribunal and I was interpreting for a gentleman who was not from a very educated background. He struggled to understand legal terms, but I did my best to convey the meaning and the gist of what was being said. However, during the court there is a time limit that the witness can give evidence. At the end of court, during submissions, when the representative of the Home Office and the gentleman's representative could give their arguments, the witness is not allowed to talk.

When I told him that he couldn't speak and he was not allowed to do so, he was very upset with me. At the end of the court, I can remember he told me, "I will sue you if my case is dismissed because you didn't allow me to talk."

Interviewer: Wow!

Respondent: It was at that point, the judge was leaving the room, I asked the judge, "Your honour, the gentleman says he's going to sue me for not allowing him to speak during submission." He said to the witness, "No, you are not allowed, you are not allowed to speak, you had whatever

you had to say during your evidence.” I believe that it was the duty of the judge, the court to stop, or at least the witnesses advocate to explain to them what was going to happen.

Interviewer: It wasn’t explained, okay, a very good example, thank you very much Masoud. We were talking here about the views on your role as an interpreter by the court professionals and court officials. What about your clients, defendants, witnesses who you interpret for? How do you think they view your role? Do they see you as a professional? Do they see you as your own advocate or any other roles they may ascribe to you which kind of fall outside your competence or your range of services or the roles you perform there?

And how do you deal with those situations, how do you explain your role to your customers, to your clients, the litigants? And do you establish it from the very beginning, and do they accept it or do they still try to violate your role or violate the boundaries and push for a bit more help. Could you tell me a bit more about that kind of experience, if you don’t mind?

Respondent: Actually, I heard the question, “Please help me on that question,” from witnesses and defendants, a lot when I’m in court. But I wasn’t allowed to do anything or answer, even answer that question. As I said, if somebody has missed their responsibility before bringing a witness to court, it’s my role to give a little bit of information about what’s going to happen in court and give them a rough idea of how long it’s going to take or things like that.

But what I’ve been trying to do all these years is to avoid answering the questions or give answers that were not prescribed in my code of conduct as an interpreter. Sometimes when we hear a certain question from a witness about what’s going to happen next, you have to answer it anyway.

So, interpreting for the Ministry of Justice is not an easy job to do, at all. It sometimes involves being able to calm people down, make

assessment of their education, level of understanding, their cultural background.

And sometimes you have to give information that is absolutely not expected from you. As an interpreter you need to be very careful about giving or explaining about something you don't have to. And you shouldn't have to.

But there are other issues as well, if I may say. A defendant goes to court, they see one interpreter, for the next day they see another one and interpreters are speaking the same language for the witness or the defendant to understand.

But sometimes the equivalents interpreters use are different from... It is a very big failure of the ministers. I mean the interpreting industry, if I may say, that there is no integrity between interpreters. And to give one certain word... for example, in Farsi the statement has more than three or four meanings, totally different. The first interpreter comes into court and uses the first equivalent. The second one comes into court and uses another equivalent, which is totally different from the first one.

And we cannot expect the non-English speaker to understand both of them. It's a really big issue. Even interpreters have the same qualifications, but they use different equivalents at times. Even the interpreting courses that interpreters attend, for the qualification, I believe there are many issues with them. Because most of these interpreting courses teach them English rather than helping them learn to translate properly into the other language.

Interviewer: Okay.

Respondent: For [** 0:38:53] courses for DPSI are held at nearly every college and university in the UK. The tutor comes in and without even knowing what the student is talking about, while they are practicing interpreting, gives some lessons and then goes away. It's up to the interpreter to practice and gain adequate experience to prepare

themselves for the job. The exams, they do not test the interpreter on every aspect of their job.

And I know it's impossible for an exam to take more than four or five hours, but some people, some interpreters have very good qualifications and lack the most crucial knowledge about some certain legal words. And I've seen it myself many times in court. I was with another gentleman, an interpreter in Birmingham again. I counted his errors during a three-hour hearing. He made more than 72 errors during interpreting.

Interviewer: Wow.

Respondent: And even the judge asked me to stand up and stop the process and tell the judge and the other people of the court wherever there was a mistake, but it wasn't possible. Three or four times I stood up and said, "The interpreter is not interpreting correctly, that word has to be interpreted this way." And it wasn't a correct translation. Three or four times I stood up, but 72 times, it wasn't possible.

Interviewer: Wow, that's very interesting. How do you think...? You mentioned that the litigants you're interpreting for very often ask you to help or ask you for some questions. Do you think they see you more as their advocate rather than a neutral professional who is there to do the job or ensuring understanding and communication, but not there to help them with their case. How often do you come across these situations, how do you explain this to them, and do they accept it or do they still keep pushing it?

Respondent: They keep pushing. In most cases when they are not prepared at all for the legal process and in simple words, they don't know what's going to happen during the hearings, they push over and over and ask questions [** 0:42:59]. Even during the evidence. I told you one of the questions, "How am I going to answer that question?" I heard that a lot. Or "What do you think I should say?" Or "I don't like this

court, can I come back later?" (Laughs) Things like that, many things like that.

Interviewer: I don't like it (Laughs). Nobody likes me here, I'm not coming back!

Respondent: They are not educated enough to know what's going to happen in the court of law. They should be prepared five minutes... it takes only five minutes for the legal advocate to tell them...

Interviewer: To brief them.

Respondent: Exactly, this is going to happen. Your interpreter is there just to interpret. They're not going to represent you, they're not going to give answers in your place, they're not going to do anything other than translating what is being said by you or by any other one, so that everybody understands each other. There was also another issue, [court clerks 0:44:31], as I explained to you, some court members are not prepared how to deal with interpreters.

I have [^{**} 0:44:58] with regards to court clerks who have not had any kind of briefing with the presence of the interpreter. And in many courts, I was requested, properly, to introduce myself, to take the oath and to speak a little bit about both languages that are going to be second languages spoken in court. And also, to confirm that I could communicate [^{**} 0:45:45]. I had to do it myself.

Interviewer: So, you had to introduce yourself...

Respondent: Yes, everything was in place. Sometimes before the hearings I was not given the opportunity to make sure that I could communicate with the non-English speaker. So, when I entered the court, I didn't know what language or what accent the non-English speaker speaks.

Interviewer: Do you think it's a failing of the party who booked the interpreter, so that would be the agency or that would be the court clerk who made the booking and not providing you with enough information?

Respondent: All of them. For example, for Farsi, most of my bookings were registered as Farsi-Afghan, but when I appeared in court, I could see that they spoke Persian accent or Dari accent. So, I mentioned it many times to the thebigword but I don't know if they tried their best to sort out this issue or not, I don't know. But the issue still exists, I believe.

Interviewer: I heard this, I actually did attend a hearing, before the pandemic, I also attended court hearings with interpreter mediated trials and I do the observation about what's going on. And I observed the situation also with the Farsi interpreters, and it was a big case. There were a few interpreters engaged, and they were working simultaneously with the headsets. And there was a big issue there, they realised that they were using different accents.

If was Afghan interpreters, but it actually wasn't Afghan, it was different variation of Farsi and the interpreter wasn't capable of doing that and there were lots of mistakes to the point where they submitted the appeal in the end, on the grounds that the interpreter did mistakes. I think the interpreter was dismissed from that position.

Respondent: Yeah, had to be.

Interviewer: I know what you mean by saying that the differences are so drastic and then people who make the bookings, they have absolutely no understanding that leads to these major issues. For example, you may be qualified for a few accents, but another interpreter may not, and they may be only competent in one or the other. I understand they're quite different. Then that can cause massive issues.

I remember I also interviewed an interpreter in that case, and I remember we discussed this; it was a similar example, a similar situation. Okay, thank you very much. I have a couple more questions if you don't mind? How would you evaluate the status of the interpreter in the UK legal system at the current moment and has it changed over the last few years?

Respondent: Well, to be honest, I can say the situation has deteriorated and it's getting worse. It is true that I left my role as a linguist for the Ministry of Justice about a year ago. But I am still in contact with my friends who are still working for the Ministry of Justice as interpreters. The issues still exist. The first is obviously the payment issue, the payment issue that for example with Capita, I had to wait, I can remember about 15 days or something, for the payment to go through.

But for thebigword I have in some cases, I waited 60 to 70 days, or 60 to 80 days for the payment to reach my account. But I had to go with one because I didn't know any other jobs (laughs) to do. And the other issues with the bookings is the cancellations. The Ministry of Justice, if you are an interpreter, if you are booked for a hearing that will last for one month, you are actually booked for one month. And 24 hours before the hearing the court or thebigword is allowed to cancel it and I experienced many cancellations like this.

Interviewer: To cancel without payment, you mean?

Respondent: Yes, because you know, if it is within 24 hours prior to the start of the hearing, you were to be paid some amount, £50 or something. No matter how much your time had been wasted.

Interviewer: Just £50 a standard cancellation fee?

Respondent: Yes, a cancellation fee. But if it is cancelled not within the 24-hour period of time, prior to the hearing, then you will get nothing. Even if you are booked for two years for a hearing, you won't get anything.

Interviewer: Is it a recent change, was it different...?

Respondent: This is one of the issues. Even sometimes I appeared in court, I arrived there, after half an hour, one hour, I was told that the court session had been cancelled. I had been booked for a three hour [** 0:53:06]. Okay, I counted on that income and so I was very upset because I had a lot of loss. In 2016 my losses, because of

cancellations, were over £4,000 and in 2017 my losses were about £4,500.

That was one of the reasons that I had to leave the role because I couldn't predict anything. Whenever I mentioned this to the people, they say the Ministry of Justice has made these decisions and we couldn't challenge the Ministry of Justice. And also, there is said that it's in your contract. When I mentioned that the contract was pre-printed, I wasn't happy with all the articles, and I wasn't happy with everything. But I had to sign the contract to be able to provide my services. They said they can't do anything about that.

And also again, I've heard some problems, so my colleagues that [** 0:55:18] for travel have reduced. That is a very big issue.

Interviewer: Of course it is.

Respondent: There are hearings all over the UK. I had to go to Newcastle for two days, I can remember. I was on the way for five hours. The payment for the travel was about £40 or £60. I booked the hotel for the night, but as soon as I arrived in Newcastle the court took about one hour and they said, "We don't require your services anymore." So, I had lost everything.

And interpreters, what I wanted to say, interpreters do not count on the 'payment' of the hours they work. They count on the mileage payment that is promised. Because mileage is certain, the payment for mileage, for the travel is certain; they will be getting it definitely. But for the work it's not, it's not predictable.

Interviewer: For example, if you travel, so from Birmingham to Newcastle, do you usually travel by car or by public transport?

Respondent: No, by public transport. If I wanted to use my car I'm going to have to pay a lot more, for insurance, for fuel, for everything.

Interviewer: But do they cover your expense, for example, for your train tickets, do they cover at least that?

- Respondent: The payment system for the interpreters, the Ministry of Justice does not consider how much you have paid for your travel.
- Interviewer: I see, so they only will pay for how many miles you travelled, but not how much you paid.
- Respondent: Yeah, apologies, I should have explained that earlier. Yes, so there is a certain amount for a job that you have expected, that you have been booked, on mileage. And the interpreter, I can say poor, humble interpreter has to get himself there, has to arrive there by the means that has cost him minimum. Sometimes, I remember, the hearing has started at 10:00; it was a very small town in the East of England. I don't remember the name of the city.
- The hearing started at 10:00, I arrived there, you might not believe it, I arrived there at 2:00 in the morning and I slept in the park next to the court, there was no hotel, there was no service, there was no service after that, there was no transport. I didn't drive, so I had to stay in the park for about eight hours. As I was leaving the court I was even insulted by one of the court staff, I don't know why. Sometimes some court staff think the interpreter is exactly, I don't know why, they consider the interpreter is as criminal as a defendant.
- Interviewer: That's a very interesting view.
- Respondent: Yes, sometimes they say they are from the same country, they have the same culture. I was insulted, abused and I heard many unpleasant things about my culture, about my background, many times by court staff.
- Interviewer: Did you make any complaints about this? Did you try to escalate this?
- Respondent: Well, I can't give you the number of times that I experienced this. I did minimal 15 hearings during the month for the Ministry of Justice, minimum 15, so 15 days I was busy. And every month it happened, and I heard something unpleasant from a court staff.

Interviewer: So, they would assume that your kind of coming on the same footing with the criminal only because based on your... Because you share the same culture, the same country, the same language? Unbelievable.

Respondent: Exactly.

Interviewer: That's unbelievable. Would it be coming more from...? What position in court, if you don't mind me asking? I just want to understand if there is a link between status in the court. Would, for example, a judge say something like that or the prosecution side or it's more low-level court staff?

Respondent: Low level court staff, most of the time. The court clerk or people who don't have a very important role in the court. However, I have once or twice experienced being... where others behaved in a way that I felt I was being insulted in a very bad way. It was the beginning of my interpreting experience in the UK, it was 2013. I attended a court in Bolton. When we went inside the court I saw the defendant, it was a magistrates' court, I think. The magistrate started shouting at the defendant, why he couldn't speak English.

And asked over and over, in the most impolite way, why he hasn't been to school since he has been in the UK. I can remember that the gentleman explained, I've been in the UK for about three/four years, and I don't understand legal language. I've been to college, but legal language is just very difficult for me to understand. That's why I have requested.

The reason I gave you this... actually I was shouted at as well. Exactly what I told you. Some court staff don't know what they are going to do with the interpreter. They don't know if the interpreter has to interpret consecutively, with pauses or simultaneously. When I was sitting, after the shouting at the defendant, when I was sitting, I waited for the prosecutor to start and then I started interpreting what was

being said. However, I received a very loud yell, at me, saying, "You're supposed to interpret, you're here to interpret."

Interviewer: You can't win! (Laughs)

Respondent: I could see the court staff was looking at me, she was very sorry, and I could see it in her look, that she felt sorry for me. I experienced this a lot. I heard, "Go away," I heard, "Get lost," I heard, "Why do we have to pay interpreters?" I heard sentences like, when I asked the court usher once, it was a very early morning when I arrived, "Where is Court 20?" He said something, he answered me in a slang and when I asked my native friends about what he said, they said it wasn't pleasant at all, it was very rude, and you have been abused. I can remember it was Wigan, a city near Bolton, in Greater Manchester...

Interviewer: It's very interesting, I'm actually quoting this, they exactly said, "Why do we have to pay interpreters," right?

Respondent: Yes, yes.

Interviewer: If you don't mind, I will use this quote.

Respondent: That's fine, that's fine, it's the reality. I can remember I went Wigan, the hearing was supposed to start at 10:00; I was there at 9:30. But the non-English speaker didn't attend court at all. I asked the court staff, I sat outside the court, three/four times I went in and asked the clerk to come out, we want to talk to him, because I didn't want to disturb the process, the other hearings. I asked him, "What would you like me to do? Would you like me to stay, or would you like me to go? If you're think the defendant is coming, then I can wait," because I had been booked for the whole day.

He kept saying, "It's up to you," whatever that means. I went there to provide my professional services, to work as an interpreter and the court clerk tells me, "It's up to you." They wouldn't tell me whether they need me, or they don't. It was 4:00 in the afternoon, I was very tired, I had been sitting all day. I was very tired and when I went

downstairs the staff member downstairs asked me to sign my time sheet and give it back to her, for her to sign. I thought it was a little bit strange because I usually sign it after they put the time and their signature on the time sheet. I signed it and gave it to her. She put 'one hour' on the time sheet and signed it and gave it back to me.

I said, "No, I have been here all day, you didn't tell me to go or stay, I've been booked for the whole day." They said, "You should be grateful that we are paying you one hour."

Interviewer: Unbelievable.

Respondent: It wasn't nice at all. That was the last time that I went to Wigan. I didn't accept any other bookings for that court. I complained to thebigword about it, but I can't remember the outcome. You know, about abuse, unpleasant behaviour and other things that I told you, a few examples. I thought as an interpreter, I am working for the Ministry of Justice and if I go there, if I go to them, every month or every two weeks and complain about the behaviour of their staff members, they won't like it, of course.

And I didn't want to rock the boat, as it is said, and bring issues under my name. So, I kept silent about it, and I had not told anyone, anyone, including my family about it, until now.

Interviewer: This is very sad that you can't even openly talk about these things because this is why, I think, they continue to happen. And I'm sure that you're far not the only interpreter, I'm sure that many interpreters are in a similar position and have to face these challenges and sometimes abusive behaviour from the court staff and there is no way to question it. Yeah, I hear you; this is why I am looking into the status because I would like to make a comparison.

For example, would they dare talk like that to a solicitor? Would they dare talk like that to a doctor? Why is it allowed, why is it acceptable to talk like that to the interpreter? An interpreter is the same profession, no less than other professions like doctors or solicitors,

lawyers, teachers or something like that. But why...? To me it suggests that the interpreter in the recent years has attracted a low status, as part of all this process. This is my view, my theory.

And this is why I'm asking this question, to see other views on this, what is your view on the status; do you think it has changed? And you have given me a very comprehensive answer, that it has changed because I hear interpreters... I spoke to interpreters who interpreted before all these changes took place and you yourself. It wasn't like this before 2011, do you remember this?

Respondent: Yes.

Interviewer: Before 2011 is when outsourcing happened, the status of the profession was different, do you agree with this?

Respondent: Yes, in 2011 it was very valued.

Interviewer: Yeah, it was valued.

Respondent: And everybody cooperated with the interpreters, and they were very kind, they were very polite, but [** 1:13:44]. In an abusive situation, no good payment, the continuous cancellations, issues during hearings, racial abuse, insult, over and over. You mentioned doctor, I told my doctor about that, that I was depressed, but I couldn't completely express the reason why I hated my situation working as an interpreter.

When you said the role of the interpreter, level of professionalism is not less than other people who attend court, I agree completely with you. And even sometimes I believe their role is a little bit harder than, for example, a solicitor, because obviously they need to put themselves in the shoes of different people in court. When the judges [** 1:15:29] witness, the non-English speaker, then the judge says that. Because sometimes the pace is very fast and advocates and the judge and the court clerks are making their case too fast.

And if there is no proper interpreting service available for the non-native speaker, then the whole purpose of justice would be jeopardised. And I have seen, I have witnessed that due to the issues, more and more professional interpreters leave, that's true.

Like me, I have translated 13 books; I have about 20 years of experience of interpreting and translation. I've got my own students. I am a kind of lawyer, an immigration case worker. And I have left the industry and when the new ones come, they are not trained enough. They are not adequately experienced. They are not aware of the roles they need to play because it's more than one role sometimes, interpreting.

Interviewer: Yeah, it's wearing many hats at the same time. Like you said, sometimes you even have to be, to an extent, a counsellor, to calm them down because at the end of the day...

Respondent: Sorry, we were disconnected, could you repeat again please?

Interviewer: As an interpreter, your role is harder, because when the prosecutor comes or judge or solicitor, defence, they have one role to carry there. An interpreter has to carry many, many hats and so on top of that sometimes you have to... because we're all human beings at the end of the day and if you see someone is distressed, you may have to calm them down, even if it is outside your role. But we can't completely remove human factor, and we can't completely stay indifferent to someone who is in distress and that also falls on an interpreters' shoulders.

Respondent: I can remember I was in the prison cell, I was interpreting for a defendant who was a drug addict, and he was in a prison cell, in [Birmingham 1:18:48]. He couldn't communicate with the prison officer. That's why he got very angry, and he had handcuffs on his hands and he's [** 1:19:10] on his head, the handcuff, and there was blood all over. And I don't know what would have happened if I wasn't

there to help the officers and for the staff, and also this gentleman, who was very upset about not being able to communicate.

It happened many times that at the end of the day, when I did interpreting on that day, I came to the conclusion, when I thought about it, that I saved a life, I had saved a life. I was very happy about it. Yet the next day I was abused by a court staff, and I forget about any triumph or something.

Interviewer: Yes, it's very sad, it shouldn't be happening, but unfortunately yeah. How do you feel about agencies? That's probably another topic. (Laughs) Heated.

Respondent: Yes, if you just bear with me a second, my device is running out of battery.

Interviewer: Sure, of course.

Respondent: Also, I need to apologise for the view, because I'm renovating.

Interviewer: It's fine, I thought you're somewhere, like in the office.

Respondent: The room is almost empty, I'm sorry about that.

Interviewer: That's totally fine, it doesn't matter at all for this. For the purpose of this research, it doesn't matter. (Laughs)

But thank you so much, you provided a lot of useful information for me and some of the quotes I've made... I ask your permission of course, and I will use some of the quotes, of course without your name attached. I'll just use them; this is what happens basically, as an example.

Okay, how do you feel about agencies?

Respondent: You can use my name, that's fine, I've already left them.

Interviewer: No, I can't, it would be against ethics. It would be against research ethics.

Respondent: They better not know my name anyway (laughs).

Interviewer: No names will be disclosed, don't worry about that. So, what is your view on the agencies?

Respondent: I believe agencies have to be present. The reason is that someone has to organise the service anyway. But I believe most of the funding from the Ministry of Justice is going to them rather than the interpreters. And they claim some crazy amounts of money for one hour of service and pay maybe only one-third of it to the interpreter. They don't care about the quality of the service, they don't care if you're being abused, they don't care about the issues.

I just remembered another issue, which I will tell you after this question.

They don't care about the future of the industry...

Interviewer: That's an interesting perspective.

Respondent: They don't care what happens to the interpreter and they don't care what's going to happen to the Ministry of Justice of the UK civilised country. And it's a very sad truth that the only thing they are interested in is to get the booking, make money and then be gone. I believe thebigword is not an English company. The main office is in the US. It's a gentleman called Mr Gary Gould...

Typist note: The name is Joshua Gould, CEO of thebigword.

Interviewer: That rings a bell.

Respondent: I don't mean American companies shouldn't be allowed to come to provide [** 1:24:48] at all, to comment about such things, that is in the hands of the government and British people. But I believe such an important role of organising in language services in the UK, has to start from the UK and remain in the UK.

Interviewer: Especially the legal sector.

Respondent: Exactly. My experience about telling them about how I have been treated, the issues I had to face during a hearing or inside the court building, hearing that wouldn't make them happy. And they really don't like to hear about these things, rather than getting into depth of what happened. They really don't like that. Of course, about the payments, they hate to hear any complaints about payments.

Interviewer: Yes, I hear a lot of complaints about thebigword, a lot. Before all this outsourcing took place, I did a couple of jobs with thebigword and I quit myself because I didn't like their approach. But then when they took over Capita, I was thinking oh my god, it just can't get any worse! Because Capita did things not in the best way for the interpreters, but thebigword is even surpassing Capita on that front, as far as I understand.

I speak to the interpreters a lot who work for thebigword or have some relations with them, unfortunately, yes, that's another issue. Thank you. My next question is how do you feel about professional organisations like [** 1:27:24] Linguists or ITI, if you're a member and do you feel they help at all or what their role is in this industry, in your view, are they helpful or not really?

Respondent: The short answer is no, no, they wouldn't, otherwise I would have registered with them.

Interviewer: You're not a member?

Respondent: Before applying to be registered with any professional body, you need to see the benefits of paying them or being registered on the list. I didn't feel they were going to defend my rights, and I didn't feel they were going to ask the Ministry of Justice not to behave with interpreters like that. I wasn't sure if I told them about cancellations, or such cancellations and the losses that [** 1:28:50] and other interpreters have made as well would help at all. Because I'm sure they are aware of the contract thebigword signs with every interpreter in the United Kingdom. They're already [** 1:29:13]

- Interviewer: What do you think is their role then? Do they provide them with standard business, so like more commercial organisation?
- Respondent: Exactly.
- Interviewer: Thank you.
- Respondent: [**** 1:29:39**] to take their name on the register. The register is full of people [******] people ready my CV. Yes, that's true, that's true. But it doesn't help me get many jobs.
- Interviewer: To be honest with you, I left ITI last year; I left ITI myself last year because I just can't see the benefit of paying money to them. But yes, it's still interesting because all these trends in the industry, what's happening.
- Okay, thank you. Another question I have: What is the source of your professional standards? When you do your interpreting, what are you guided with? What is your source of standards?
- Respondent: I don't understand the question, sorry.
- Interviewer: During your interpreting, when you do interpreting, because now we are more focused on your interpreter role. What is your source, what is the source of your professional standards? So, are you guided by any particular code of conduct or maybe you have brilliant interpreting as an example, or maybe you will refer to previous training?
- Respondent: [**** 1:31:05**], is it okay if I call you back in two minutes?
- Interviewer: Yes, of course, sure. I know it's been a long conversation.
- Respondent: I'm sorry. I gave you very comprehensive answers so as not to waste our time.
- Interviewer: 10 minutes you say?
- Respondent: No, two/three minutes.
- Interviewer: All right, thank you.

The question was about the source of your professional standards, basically what you're referring to as an interpreter, what is your golden standard you're using for your role as an interpreter?

Respondent: We were disconnected again, apologies. Would you explain a little bit what you said?

Interviewer: When you work as an interpreter, or when you worked as an interpreter, now that you say you left the industry, so you mainly practice now as an immigration lawyer, but when you worked as an interpreter, what did you refer to as a source of your professional standards? Do you have any kinds of guidelines or code of conduct or maybe training you received, or maybe you have a tutor, a friend who is a brilliant interpreter and you refer to him/her as a standard, for your role? Do you know what I mean? Do you see where I'm coming from with this question?

Respondent: Yes, I understand. Well, there is a code of conduct predicted in any company. I mean in any agency who has the role of providing language services. Who the Ministry of Justice, other government organisations, there are some common... I can say subjects or matters between them. It's confidentiality, the other one is politeness, behaving politely. The other one is to remind the interpreter of their role. They don't have permission to add or omit anything from what's being said. They need to look professional. They need to sound professional.

But as I explained to you earlier, for interpreting there is no [coherence 1:34:50] and integrity and interpreters who appear in court to do interpreting, you can't find two interpreters whose job is exactly similar in terms of the equivalents they use, in terms of how they appear, in how they look and how they speak. Sometimes they are very friendly, so the interpreter, regardless of the personal issues, they try to speak friendly, they try to be kind, they try to be helpful, but sometimes they are not in a good mood.

The problem is, I believe, that there is no integrity, as I said, or coherence between the work of interpreters, with regards to how they should look, what exactly professionalism is. What they should do...

Interviewer: Like no standards, no consistency in requirements.

Respondent: Literally there is no standard, as you said. And unfortunately, it has caused many issues. As I gave you an example, the first day of a hearing one interpreter goes into the room, into the courtroom to interpret for the defendant, the other day, another one. It causes many complexities, complications and so many other issues that I strongly believe it affects the purpose of justice.

Interviewer: Okay, thank you very much.

Respondent: If I may, I just remembered a very important issue. As far as I know, The Language Shop, it's an agency responsible for assessments of interpreting services for the Ministry of Justice.

Interviewer: The Language Shop?

Respondent: The Language Shop, yes. I don't know about recently, but they were for four years, they were responsible for making sure that interpretive services are of a standard quality. Exactly what I told you about. The assessor is with the interpreter, for their work, they have their own standards, they have their own equivalents and a single word, for example, the word of a 'statement' I told you, and the word of 'submissions,' two interpreters may use two equivalents. One of them is correct, one of them is less correct.

For the Ministry of Justice interpreters, they need to be trained after their qualifications, prior to attending any hearing. And non-English speaker has to hear only one certain equivalent for one certain word, not two or three different ones. Assessors basically they have to attend court while the interpreting service is being provided without making their presence known to the interpreter.

Interviewer: Like undercover.

- Respondent: Yes, but sometimes it happens that they approach the interpreter outside and they know each other. Even sometimes it happens that they don't know each other, but they meet outside the court and if they have a kind of disagreement over something, it would end up the interpreter becoming redundant. It's happened a lot.
- Interviewer: But would they be qualified in that language to make those kinds of decisions?
- Respondent: Sorry, could you repeat that question?
- Interviewer: Would they usually be qualified and competent in that language?
- Respondent: Yes, yes, but as I explained to you, sometimes they speak with different accents. They speak the same language but sometimes they speak different accents. And even... maybe the interpreter or the assessor does not understand the accent that the other one uses.
- Interviewer: Okay, thank you very much.
- Respondent: For example, a Farsi guy goes into court and says that the witness is speaking Dari accent or Afghani accent, but the assessor knows only Persian accent. And the assessors report you can see that due to not understanding what was going on they don't give true and accurate and correct information of their assessment.
- Interviewer: I think I heard about this issue. Actually, I think my supervisor did similar research into this particular area of legal interpreting and he coined the term 'adversarial interpreting' and he published a paper about this particular issue, so he did the research into this. My topic is slightly different, but it also overlaps with this issue as well. Thank you very much.
- My next question would be: What do you find most attractive and inspirational in court interpreting, if anything? (Laughs)
- Respondent: Yes, yes. I believe for the people to be able to provide a proper service to the service users, they need to love what they're doing; they need

to love their jobs. And I loved it. And it didn't make me tired; it didn't wear me out at all. I was enjoying myself when I was doing interpreting. It has to be like this for a successful career.

Interviewer: Just like a passion, a passion for interpreting, a passion for languages.

Respondent: Yes, yes, exactly. An interpreter needs to know a language and then be trained and qualified for translation. Knowing a language, I know, I speak a few languages, but to be able to translate is something totally different.

Interviewer: Yes, of course, of course.

Respondent: Many people, unfortunately in the UK, there is no... that's my experience and my point of view as we just discussed. There is no standard, literally and practically and interpreters have to stick to their own standards based on their own knowledge, experience and feelings.

Interviewer: Thank you and what do you find most challenging in court interpreting?

Respondent: Most challenging? Well actually I don't think there is anything challenging, if everything is in place. But the most challenging that I can mention is difference in accent, first of all. And then the background, the cultural background and the educational background of the non-English speaker, the interpreter has to get to that.

Interviewer: Okay, thank you. The next question is the same as you already answered, in a different questionnaire, what an interpreter should or shouldn't do. I think you've covered that very, very comprehensively. And we already touched upon some of this, we already discussed some of the bits I was interested in, where the interpreter... you believe the main role is to achieve understanding, but at the same time we discussed previously that it can provide advantage to non-native speaking litigants over native speaking litigants who don't have

that advantage of someone explaining to them the legal terms and making them understand the process.

This is where we have a bit of a split into two camps, put it that way. Some academics and professional interpreters believe that it shouldn't be the case that the interpreter is there not to make sure they understand. The interpreter is there to make sure they have the same access to legal justice, to the legal system and to justice as if they were a native speaker. The other camp is that the non-native speaker is already at a disadvantage, by default and that interpreter is there to kind of bridge that gap. That includes making them understand.

This is a bit of a debate generally in the literature as well; I read different points of view. We discussed that, but if there is anything else you would want to add to these... you answered very detailed, I see your answers, so I can just use these answers here, but if you have anything else to add that's fine, if not, we move to the next question.

Respondent: I think we've discussed nearly everything and I'm sorry if I've been very talkative.

Interviewer: Don't be sorry, please, I'm really grateful.

Respondent: I really felt I really need to tell you about everything that I have experienced. But there are so many interpreters better than me, much more experienced and I hope they will be able to tell you more.

Interviewer: Okay thank you. I just have a couple more questions. One is that are you a member of any trade union?

Respondent: No.

Interviewer: Okay, and...

Respondent: I keep myself away from being...

Interviewer: Why?

Respondent: ... involved in such organisations. I may do in the future, but I haven't.

Interviewer: So it's just like lack of trust or lack of need or both?

Respondent: Both.

Interviewer: I see a lot of interpreters, more and more interpreters now join... I can't remember the name of the union, it escapes me. They do some events for interpreters, and it would be interesting to see if they can progress interpreters' rights. I'm kind of observing that situation to see where it will lead to in the end. It looks like they do some work to defend interpreter's rights.

Respondent: I hope so because...

Interviewer: NUPIT, I think it's called, NUPIT

Respondent: The whole of the nation, not only non-English speakers, but keeping the whole nation safe.

Interviewer: Yes, and the last one, do you feel you receive enough feedback? You kind of covered some of it. When you did your job as an interpreter, did you receive any feedback from the court staff or from your agency you booked through, any kind of feedback? I don't mean insults or abuse, I mean more did you receive any constructive feedback from anyone that could help you professionally?

Respondent: No, no, no. That's a very big issue actually. I believe there has to be assessments of the quality of the language services provided by the interpreters. And if they are doing their job good enough and they are representing the agency well, they have to be [rewarded verbally 1:51:35] by the company. I myself, I received a lot of very good feedback for my service when I was in court, from judges, prosecution, from defendants' side, from court staff, especially from journalists.

I didn't expect to be paid anything by my agency, by thebigword or the Ministry of Justice. I just expected a letter of acknowledgement,

thank you. That is special to me, it would really boost my spirits up. It would cheer me up and it would help me tolerate the issues and difficulties interpreters have to experience and go through every day. But nothing at all, nothing at all. Maybe just an email every three months sent to all. 'Dear X, thanks for the good work,' and that's all.

Interviewer: Okay, that's not really feedback. You mentioned this Language Shop, so their role is to ensure the quality standards but they're actually not doing it?

Respondent: Yes, it's [^{**} 1:53:32] training that brings integrity and coherence.

Interviewer: But it's not working.

Respondent: Help new interpreters integrate into the system more and more.

Interviewer: But do you believe...?

Respondent: The behaviour of some court staff is bad because they have experienced poor, they have received poor quality interpreting services from interpreters, sometimes because there are issues with payments. Some interpreters after the hearing, they go to the clerk and ask them to put more hours on their time sheet. I don't want to comment on that, whose fault is it, but it doesn't have to be like that.

Interviewer: Yes, it's a system fault.

Respondent: Yes, it's a system fault, yes. I was once told by a court member that, "This is your time sheet, I can't help you more than that." I didn't mention anything, I didn't have any requests. I didn't ask for anything, what do you mean? Because the previous interpreters had asked them put more hours on it. thebigword knows that, and the Ministry of Justice as well, I believe. I don't think they have done anything about it.

Interviewer: Okay. I will probably do a bit more research into this Language Shop because you touched upon another interesting issue that I probably may investigate a little bit more about this Language Shop. So what's

their role and how...? Because apparently the original idea was to ensure integrity, like you say, but it looks like they're not doing a good job.

Respondent: No, not at all, not at all, because the system is faulty from the beginning, from the start.

Interviewer: Yeah.

Respondent: And until interpreters and court staff know what they are going to do, exactly, bringing different [ages 1:56:28] to the business, it's just a waste of taxpayers' money and doesn't bring any good. It has resulted in many false reports, untrue things. The assessor didn't even hear what was being said or didn't even understand that the non-English speaker could not understand legal terms properly, so the interpreter had to make them understand another way, rephrase them. So, it's a difference of opinion between assessors and interpreters.

Interviewer: Yeah, this is where we go back to the original question. Until we know, until they understand what is the interpreter's role, what is their identity, what is the status of the profession, so they're quite fundamental issues and from what I see, what's happening, it's like disintegration of the role. It's like the role is kind of collapsing at the moment.

The identity of the interpreter is very mixed up and it's contracted from so many different angles and so little positive contribution to those angles that the overall image of the interpreter, as you said, the status of the profession has changed. Because poor interpreters, then that reflects badly on everyone else and then the interpreting profession itself is seen negatively, it's viewed negatively by the court staff because they had a bad experience.

This has like a snowball effect, and it affects other aspects of the role and then professional interpreters do leave. And that brings in more unprofessional people into the industry and the process all kind of

goes worse and worse. That's kind of the summary of the situation do you think?

Respondent: Exactly, it's very sad, it's very sad and I have been very upset that I had to leave the industry in my career. I had a very successful career, and I left it because of those issues.

Interviewer: Yes, and I've seen quite a few people like yourself who left the industry because of these issues, unfortunately.

Respondent: Yes, yes. If I want to give you a rough number. In my language, about eight or nine... They are older than me, as I said, and much more experienced than me, they've already left and they started their own businesses in other industries, totally different. I got a job that is somehow relevant to legal language services, but they started jobs that were very different.

Interviewer: Okay Masoud, thank you ever so much for your time. I think this is all I wanted to ask. Do you have any questions for me?

Respondent: No, thank you very much. I'm very grateful, I'm sorry if I talked to much.

Interviewer: No, not at all, I'm grateful.

Respondent: I try to avoid using words that are complicated. It was for me to be able to explain everything in a more simple...

Interviewer: Neutral way.

END OF AUDIO

11.2 Interviews with legal professionals

11.2.1 Respondent 1: interview transcript

File name: Interview with Respondent 1 (Criminal Barrister Chamber N5)
Audio Length: 0:28:06
Date transcribed: 15 August 2021

Interviewer: Today is the 14th of April and we are discussing questions in the questionnaire for the court officials. How long and in what capacity have you been working for court?

Respondent: I have been a criminal barrister working in the courts for 29 years.

Interviewer: Wow! That's a very long time. You mainly practice at Crown Court?

Respondent: Crown Court, yeah.

Interviewer: How long have you been using interpreters in your legal practice?

Respondent: I used interpreters throughout the 29 years.

Interviewer: For 29 years?

Respondent: Yeah.

Interviewer: That's interesting. Do you think things have been changing during that time, from when you started your career until today?

Respondent: In what way?

Interviewer: Any way, provision of the interpreting, standard services, quality, attitudes, status, anything like that?

Respondent: No, I mean not really because interpreters are not at the forefront of the legal proceeding and so have, they changed in status? I don't think so. Have they got more professional? Again... there hasn't been a noticeable change or shift as far as I'm concerned really.

Interviewer: Okay, thank you. What is the role of the interpreter then in the courtroom, in your view?

- Respondent: Simply to, one, interpret, I mean to sit... well, if you've got an interpreter for a defendant in court, I mean it's to sit in the dock with the defendant and translate the evidence as it's said. And then if the defendant gives evidence, to simply translate what he/she says.
- Interviewer: Is this second or it's still part of the first one?
- Respondent: This is the second bit. I mean simply to translate/interpret the questions asked by the barristers and the replies to the questions. I mean in other words it is simply no more or no less than a job of interpretation.
- Interviewer: Would you say that they facilitate communication in the courtroom or they're rather like a neutral conduit...
- Respondent: Yeah, they're a neutral; they should be an entirely neutral conduit.
- Interviewer: Is there anything in particular the interpreter should or shouldn't do, in your opinion?
- Respondent: What he should do is interpret, just interpret. And what he shouldn't do is he shouldn't offer any opinion of the evidence or any assistance to the defendant.
- Interviewer: Anything else?
- Respondent: No.
- Interviewer: Thank you. Does the presence of an interpreter have an impact on your work in the courtroom and if it does, in what way? It means for example, if you're aware that the interpreter is present, would you slow down...?
- Respondent: I think the quality of the interpreter is important and the barrister's job is made a lot easier by a good articulate interpreter. The job becomes much more difficult with a less good interpreter.
- Interviewer: Is there any other way it could impact the way you work, for example, if you would compare a trial with an interpreter, if the defendant is not

English speaking, or a trial with an English-speaking defendant? Are there any differences just because of the interpreter? Do you feel that changes any... not the atmosphere, the discourse?

Respondent: Yeah, I mean there is a difference because if you don't have an interpreter the jury are getting a direct response to questions from the defendant. So, there is a more direct form of communication. And if there is an interpreter, obviously it is indirect, it comes through the interpreter. And so, the interpreter's role is very important because obviously the performance of the interpreter will have some impact on the way that a jury approaches any defendant's evidence.

Interviewer: What about if you talk for yourself, say, I understand what you mean by the impact of the interpreter on the jury for the indirect communication. But would you feel the difference yourself? Would you have to change the speed, for example, the delivery?

Respondent: It's a slower process; it's obviously a slow process. I think the communication between the barrister and the interpreter is important. I mean sometimes you can work very well with interpreters and sometimes it's a lot more difficult. The interpreter's role is very important. It's not about simply interpreting, it's about the relationship the interpreter has with the barrister, the relationship the interpreter has with the defendant. But the skill, I guess, in interpreting, is making a difficult exercise appear to be fairly straightforward.

Interviewer: By the way, the relationship the interpreter has with the barrister and defendant, what do you mean by that?

Respondent: Meaning that it doesn't have to be a relationship as such, but what I simply mean is that the personality of the interpreter is important. Without necessarily having any particular kind of relationship, as such, with that interpreter, if the personality of the interpreter is something that's easy to engage with and is responsive and open, that makes it a lot easier in court.

Sometimes you get interpreters who, just by way of personality, are quite retiring people and it makes it more difficult. I think what's important is for an interpreter to be very engaged in the process, very alive to the process and really a good interpreter is alive to... there are lots of nuances and just getting the meaning of what is being said.

Interviewer: To be alert?

Respondent: Yeah, very alert. I mean very alert, yeah. They should be alert and quick and responsive and engaged. I think it's hard work being an interpreter.

Interviewer: Okay, thank you very much. The next question, do you think is the interpreter part of the legal process or outside of it, in your view? It's about the state of an interpreter, but I think you already touched upon this when you started...

Respondent: Yes, gosh, the legal process. I mean the interpreter is part of the process of what's happening in court. I think it's a sort of... I'm not sure it's the right way of approaching it. Is the interpreter outside or inside the process? I mean if an interpreter is used, an interpreter is part of the process that is adopted in a courtroom.

So, you could say, in terms of status, although an interpreter is not a lawyer and is not involved in questions of law, the interpreter is very much part of the evidential process. And so, it plays an important role.

I don't think it helps to put a hierarchy; I don't think it helps to have questions of status. The judge plays a role, the barristers play a role, they play different roles. The interpreter plays a role, the defendant is playing a role and the jury plays... you know, everyone is performing different roles. Where they appear on a hierarchy, I don't see it that way.

Interviewer: You would say that the interpreter, although they're not part of the profession, as you said...

- Respondent: They're not part of the legal profession, but they are professional people playing a part in the trial process, and an important part because they are making the evidence accessible to the jury.
- Interviewer: And I asked this question at the beginning, has the status of the interpreter in the UK legal system changed over the last few years?
- Respondent: I mean I haven't really thought about status of an interpreter. I don't think so, particularly. I think an interpreter is always actually usually, I mean again there are... I'm trying to think. Usually, an interpreter is treated by the court with respect, always. Because they have an important role to play. If they weren't there, you couldn't have a trial. I mean I have seen interpreters treated with disrespect when they've been very late or things like that, late for court, or haven't appeared or stuff like that.
- But on the whole... I mean I think they're not bowed down to and people don't... no one treats them with inordinate respect. But I think as a profession they are respected, yeah. I don't think they're looked down upon. I think they're treated with respect as professional people usually are.
- Interviewer: This question probably refers to these recent changes when Capita took over and then that changed the whole system...
- Respondent: The what?
- Interviewer: Capita is an agency.
- Respondent: I don't know about that.
- Interviewer: What happened, all the interpreters used to be employed by court directly from the national register. But now it's been taken away. Now the agency came into play and they provide interpreters and this is why this research took place because there was a lot of complaints of quality dropping in interpreters because of that, because they used lots of unqualified interpreters.

Respondent: Oh, right.

Interviewer: And that changed the attitude to them, and this is where we see, I'm asking about status.

Respondent: I think the status...

Interviewer: The whole perception has changed.

Respondent: I can see that. What I have said, I have intimated to you, is that I think to some extent, like everybody else in the court, whether it be the judge or the barrister, or indeed the defendant, how they perform affects the respect that they are accorded, that they are given. I think that if you get interpreters who, for instance, come to court, one, they don't come on time. Two, they don't look smart; some interpreters are very smart, look good. If you don't look good, if you're not efficient and alert and so forth, yeah, I think courts, people will get pissed off, yeah.

I think it's a very difficult job. You're there aren't you, in a way, representing the defendant. You're there as a conduit of communication for a defendant. And so you should look good, you should do it efficiently and well and look as if you're alive to the job.

What I'm saying is that it should be expected that they'd be of good quality. I mean they should be a good quality, for the reasons I've said. One, because in fairness to the defendant. Two, it makes life much easier for the barrister. And three, for just the court process goes much easier if there is a good interpreter.

Interviewer: Did you meet a large proportion of good quality interpreters, or recently has it changed in any way?

Respondent: Actually, I haven't used an interpreter for a bit. But on the whole my interpreters have been pretty good actually, on the whole.

Interviewer: So, you didn't really have bad experiences...

Respondent: I haven't had a really bad experience. I've had some that have been a bit slow or a bit... but on the whole they've been okay.

Interviewer: Okay, good and what do you think, what does the interpreting process involve in your view?

Respondent: Well, the process involves, as I say, making accessible to the jury the defendant's case in the clearest possible way. And making accessible to the defendant questions asked of him by the barrister, if he gives evidence, and the evidence in the case as a whole. And so therefore it involves a high degree of competence and a high degree of responsibility as the interpreter is the conduit of communication for the defendant in the trial process and a vital ingredient in the fairness of the trial. Their work lies right at the heart of questions of fairness and justice and all the rest of it. So it's a very important role.

Interviewer: Do you think it involves also knowledge of maybe legislation or legal terminology at least?

Respondent: Not really. I mean maybe, but not really, no.

Interviewer: Do you work at [Court 12 0:23:14]? What I wanted to ask if you know anything about conference interpreting there because I've seen people do conference interpreting and I just wondered who arranges that in court, if you know anything just on the side of this?

Respondent: What do you mean court?

Interviewer: A conference... I just notice at Court 12, this is what usually happens, interpreters do conference interpreting with the special conference equipment and they're not in the dock, they're outside the dock. And the defendant sits in the dock, and they have headsets and that was a very interesting finding.

Respondent: Oh, I see, they weren't in court?

Interviewer: They were not in the docks of the defendant.

Respondent: They weren't in the dock with the defendant?

- Interviewer: No.
- Respondent: But they were outside court?
- Interviewer: They were outside the docks. They were in the courtroom but outside the dock.
- Respondent: But linked up with the defendant?
- Interviewer: Through their headsets. I'm just wondering who arranges that?
- Respondent: I don't know, you could ask in court. If you go into court, you can ask. You can go to the court clerk and make an enquiry.
- Interviewer: Okay, this question is not on the list, it just occurred to me today to ask, what do you generally think about the equipment for the interpreters in the courtroom? When they, for example, sit in the dock and if they can't hear very well what is said. Do you think it's enough provision made to make sure...?
- Respondent: Well, they do have these headphones, these things they put in their ear. I mean yes, I think adequate provision is made so they can at least hear, yeah.
- Interviewer: Okay, is there anything else you would like to add in, other points?
- Respondent: No, I don't think so, no. Is there anything else you want to ask me?
- Interviewer: Mainly it's about the provision for interpreters. Like for example when an interpreter has to interpret simultaneously for a full day, this is what is called simultaneous interpreting, in other terms, conference interpreting. In conference interpreters are supplied in pairs, they change each other because the interpreter can only maintain concentration for so long.
- Respondent: Yeah.
- Interviewer: I can't see this happening in the court very much.
- Respondent: Yeah, it's very hard work, no, there isn't that. It's an all-day affair.

- Interviewer: This is what I wanted to ask, if there was anything done for the interpreters to make their job, not easier, but at least facilitate them in any way?
- Respondent: No, no.
- Interviewer: Do you think that...?
- Respondent: It's something that should be looked at. No, I think it's very hard. I think if they're interpreting all day, I think that's very tough.
- Interviewer: And they don't really have any provisions, like snacks or...
- Respondent: Well, there's the usual court hours at 10:30, that might be a break of 15 minutes and then you have lunch break for an hour and then you have from 2:00 until about 4:15, there might be a small break of 10 minutes, 15-minute break.
- Interviewer: You think that there is something that could be improved from that perspective to make their job better in a way? Because that can affect quality. If they lose concentration during the day, then that can affect...
- Respondent: Yeah, sure, yeah, of course. Yes, I think that is something that could be looked at. I think the interpreters would be against it because they'd be getting less money.
- Interviewer: Why, do you think it will be...?
- Respondent: Because it's only a limited amount of money. I think if you said, in fairness to the defendant he should have two interpreters each day, working for two hours or whatever, I think...
- Interviewer: We will have shared costs.
- Respondent: Yeah, I think to the interpreter that would be difficult most probably, I don't know.
- Interviewer: I see what you mean.

L. Green, PhD Thesis, Aston University, 2024.

Respondent: But it's difficult, it's very wearying for an interpreter to be going all day.

Interviewer: Okay, thank you very much.

Respondent: No problem. You can turn the tape off.

END OF AUDIO

11.2.2 Respondent 12: interview transcript

File name: Interview with Respondent 12 (Solicitor)
Audio Length: 0:17:01
Date transcribed: 14 August 2021

Interviewer: Today is the 18 of March and do you want to state...?

Respondent: Oh yes, sorry, yes of course. The question of who pays for an interpreter's services, absolutely, it must be absolutely irrelevant in terms of the way that they perform their role. And those who pay, it used to be the police service, if it were a case at a police station where there was an interview after caution, for example, or of course, if the interpreters have been asked to interpret for a witness in the case, for a prosecution witness.

Now, when it comes to the court, then the Ministry of Justice, in effect, would pay. Yes, they would pay because it's for the court to provide an interpreter for both parties to the proceedings. In other words, any complainant or any defendant. And if there were prosecution witnesses, then it would be for the prosecution to arrange and pay for an interpreter, because it might not be the same language, of course. I mean sometimes you have cases, particularly with trials where there might be, obviously English, but also one or two or even three different languages for various parties, various witnesses in the case.

And then it's for the prosecution to pay for those witnesses. For the defendant, the court pays for any interpreting services where it's to do with the defendant before the court, but it's for defence solicitors to arrange to engage an interpreter for any defence witnesses. Now, in reality, that would normally mean that the payment would be out of public funds because most cases, most serious cases, involve representation out of public funds through Legal Aid. It is in effect an agency within the Ministry of Justice that pays for the interpreter again.

But it's a question of whose the responsibility is. The complication under the framework agreement that came into being in 2010, the additional strand of complication is that the Ministry of Justice outsourced their core activity, as I would say, to arrange for interpreters by court staff contacting the interpreters directly, by reference to the national register.

Interviewer: Yeah, I know that, yeah.

Respondent: And so, you have this filter of, as it happens, Capita, the outsource company. They actually pay the interpreters, they actually pay them far, far less than used to be the case before the framework agreement, but that's another story. And so, the paymaster, in a direct sense, has shifted. But the responsibility to arrange it all is still that of the Ministry of Justice. You can't contract out the responsibility for there being interpreting services provided. You can contract out the function, but not the responsibility.

And so in effect they're paying because they pay Capita, who then pay the interpreters. But the very real concern is that interpreters must always remain independent of all parties. And that's a key professional obligation.

Now, somewhere, we would have to look for it, as part of the training course, more or less directly at the beginning of it for legal interpreters, interpreter students, Yvonne and I devised an optional... a number of options, in answer to the question, "What is the role of the defence solicitor and what is the role of the interpreter?"

And there's some overlap, but there's some dissimilarities as well. And that's why I said that the role of the interpreter is to communicate, to strive to communicate as completely as possible, to enable communication. I forget what I said now. It's not to help the, for example, the defendant. It's certainly not to help the police, or the prosecution, or the court. But nonetheless there are obligations to all participants in the system.

As a professional you have obligations to the system. And there are various things you certainly shouldn't do. You shouldn't give advice. I think, again, I might have covered this. You shouldn't give legal advice. You shouldn't fraternise with the person, the defendant or witness for whom you're interpreting. Clearly, you're polite to them, but you should not fraternise, although I'm afraid it happens all the time. You should certainly interpret as faithfully as you can according to your abilities and your training.

You should certainly in no way improve upon or embellish what the party, such as the defendant, is being asked and indeed, how the other party or the defendant responds. And you shouldn't add things or in any way seek to refine what's being said.

Interviewer: Yeah, I understand.

Respondent: Also, what you should certainly not do is try and make sense of something that doesn't make sense. Because sometimes in general conversation, let alone in giving evidence or in answering questions, or even asking questions, the participants don't make sense in what they're asking or what they're answering. It's not for the interpreter to make sense of it.

And so, it's perfectly appropriate for an interpreter to be left in position where the answer is given from the... let's say the defendant, and the court or the advocate asking the question says, "Well, that doesn't make any sense." To which the straightforward answer is, "It's not for me to make sense of it, that's what the witness said."

Interviewer: Yes, absolutely.

Respondent: So, it's quite a complex philosophical, and indeed, it's a complex process of communication and of knowing your role, which is just as onerous, really, as any other party to the proceedings. But it's different. The defence advocate's role is to advance his or her client's case to an optimum level. But equally that obligation carries any number of qualifications, and we have professional rules.

Well, so actually there is a code for interpreters. There are certain things you should certainly never do. It follows from that, for example, that if an interpreter had already interpreted for a complainant in the case, then that interpreter shouldn't ever interpret in court for the defendant.

Interviewer: Yes, because there will be conflict of interest.

Respondent: Absolutely and equally, what is said, and I absolutely agree with this, is that an interpreter who has interpreted during the police station phase should, on no account, be the interpreter who performs that service for the suspect, [then] the defendant in the court. Should under no circumstances interpret for the defendant in court. Because if at some stage, and it might not be immediate, it might be on an appeal of whatever kind, the correctness, the accuracy, or the probity of the interpreting task at the police station were to be challenged by the defendant or the defence on his or her behalf.

Then clearly if the same interpreter has performed the services of interpreter in the magistrates' court, then clearly there can be no challenge, or at least there can be no effective challenge, because it's the same interpreter, who can hardly be expected to scrutinise his or her own work at the police station. The other thing that I fear to this day almost certainly happens is that police officers will ask or even instruct interpreters to go to a prosecution witness's house and interview the witness and take a statement. Well, that's clearly wrong.

Interviewer: Under what capacity they can do that?

Respondent: Well, exactly, but they do. And equally the officer shouldn't just introduce the interpreter and the witness to each other, and then just sit there staring out of the window. The officer should be asking the questions, and the interpreter should be conveying the answers.

Interviewer: I never came across situations like that where the interpreter acts...

Respondent: As a surrogate police officer.

Interviewer: Yes, exactly, best term to describe it.

Respondent: Well, it is. I claim no credit, it's just that I've had many years to think about this. And that's really what I mean about the professional status and role of an interpreter. Status, here, and role are opposite sides of the coin. You have the status, and you deserve it, if you behave as a professional should. But with the status comes the obligation of the role. And sometimes it's very difficult. You might come from a similar part of the country that the defendant comes from, or the complainant comes from. It might be very tempting to identify and take on...

Interviewer: To ally himself and things.

Respondent: Yeah, to ally yourself, exactly, that is a very good phrase, I think. And so that's what the role is largely about and that's what Yvonne's course used to train.

So, I'm so used to mingling with truly professional interpreters that I know that there are many who are even more horrified than I am when they come across examples of interpreters who act as a surrogate police officer. But the fact remains that it does happen.

And so, I think nothing fundamental will change for the better, unless and until all other professional agency personnel give interpreters the professional recognition they deserve. And look to interpreters to deliver on the obligations of their role. Now I'm sorry to have to tell you that I blame my lawyer colleagues. I think they are in a position really to make a difference, but most of them...

Interviewer: What difference do you think they can make?

Respondent: Well, they can, as I used to, here's Rafael. We may have to pause for a moment, sorry about this. They would help them to apply for...

END OF AUDIO

11.2.3 Respondent 25: interview transcript

File name: Interview with Respondent 25 (Criminal Solicitor)
Audio length: 0:47:50
Date transcribed: 9 July 2022

Interviewer: Okay, I think it's now on.

Respondent: Excellent.

Interviewer: Hopefully. (Laughs) Right, so I'll just... okay. So, today is 7 June 2022.
(Laughs)

Respondent: Correct.

Interviewer: And I'm here with a criminal practitioner, solicitor and advocate. It is a follow-up interview based on the questionnaire that you completed for me online.

Respondent: [That's right 0:00:32].

Interviewer: And, of course, thank you very much for that.

Respondent: [It's my pleasure 0:00:35].

Interviewer: It's really, really appreciated. And the interview will be based on the answers you have already provided, but I just want to follow up...

Respondent: [** 0:00:44].

Interviewer: ...maybe just ask more details on what you already said.

Respondent: By all means.

Interviewer: All right, thank you very much for your time. And to start with, so you said that you've been working in your current position since 2011, as a criminal practitioner, and in this role, you do come across cases where interpreters are required for your clients.

- Respondent: That's correct. Some of my criminal clients... in fact, all of my clients are criminal clients; I don't have any other ones.
- Interviewer: [****** 0:01:18] [side/aside 0:01:19].
- Respondent: Sure. I'll try to speak a bit louder.
- Interviewer: Okay.
- Respondent: So, some of my criminal clients are immigrants, either refugees or asylum seekers. That's not why I represent them; I represent them because they committed some sort of crime. But along the way, we struggle to communicate, so we do invite interpreters to our meetings and conduct through, or rather with the assistance of, an interpreter.
- Interviewer: Mm-hmm. Thank you. Also, interestingly, you noted that you have an interpreting background yourself, that you've been working as a court interpreter in 1999 and 2002.
- Respondent: That's correct. That's when I first arrived in this country. I believe Russian language was in massive demand, and I already spoke English. So, I immediately, as soon as I arrived, (Laughs) made my way to interpreting services, and I worked as a registered interpreter for the Refugee Council. Those days, I think it was called Migrants Refugee Council. And also, further, I worked for courts, solicitors, primarily legal background, but also went to hospitals and all other [authorities 0:02:23] that you can imagine.
- Interviewer: But you already had a legal background before you arrived to the UK...
- Respondent: Yes, yes.
- Interviewer: ...[so 0:02:28] [****** 0:02:29].
- Respondent: I was a lawyer back home, but as you know, it's quite hard to transmit your knowledge immediately.
- Interviewer: Yeah.

Respondent: So as soon as I figured out that the system is quite different and I would need to take another degree here, I put all those plans on hold, and I just lived my life for a few years before I actually got around doing legal stuff again.

Interviewer: And when you worked as an interpreter, did you get any qualifications for that, or you just, your legal background and knowledge of English helped you to...?

Respondent: I believe I was combined that; I think it's called DPS, DPSI...

Interviewer: DPSI, yes.

Respondent: I believe so, that was at the time.

Interviewer: Yeah, that was DPSI. Interesting. It's particularly interesting because what I wanted to ask you is, did you have situations where the interpreter, you could understand the language what the interpreter's saying, and then you could kind of make your own assessment of how the interpreting's going on?

Respondent: You can always see through the clients, whether they are happy or not. And in fact, routinely we do ask whether they are happy with the interpreting, and by means of sign language they can always tell you whether they're happy, whether the language is actually meeting their expectations.

And quite a few times, we had to cancel the appointments and say, "We're really sorry, but we have to find the particular dialect." Often it applied to Sorani Kurdish. Kurdish interpreters do turn up, and they're different dialects, and we had to swap them to the original ones. So, we, yes, we did come across. And the clients managed to express their dissatisfaction during the appointments, and we managed to swap them around.

Interviewer: Yeah, you did mention in one of your responses that it's very important to find the common language that the participant and the interpreter speak. Basically, I think that you referred to a particular

dialect of the language, so it has to be very accurate in terms of the dialect.

Respondent: Indeed. And also, it comes from personal knowledge. I'm coming from Azerbaijan, and they speak Azerbaijanian language, which is very similar to Turkish. And in the past, I often translated for Turkish clients, and it's not always I was successfully translating information, and I was not happy with myself.

And from those days, I managed to remember that sometimes clients might be establishing certain contact with you and they don't want to say, but I personally knew that I had not delivered well enough, and I did not meet the satisfaction of the client, and I just got away purely on the background of interpersonal relationship with them, and I sort of calmed them down, in an interpreting way (Laughs) as much as I could.

So that knowledge stuck with me, and I knew that sometimes you have to watch out for, especially in criminal cases, for particular language or the way the clients express themselves. And that makes a massive difference to their cases or can make.

Interviewer: Yeah. Absolutely, yes. Thank you. You say you mostly work at magistrate courts. Did you have any experience with the other courts: criminal or family courts, and [other courts 0:05:37].

Respondent: Yes. Occasionally, we have to go to, or rather we undertake work that involves going to, family court. A couple of times, I've been to employment tribunal. It's not something that I enjoy, but yes, I've been there a few times. County court in particular, I've been a few times, [in front of 0:05:55] district judges with some civil matters. Again, did not enjoy much, cannot say I'm an expert. But I've been there, and I've done it.

Interviewer: Do you feel that interpreting... I understand that the legal side of things will be, of course, different between different courts, but did

you notice any difference, does it have an impact on interpreters, different court settings?

Respondent: Yes. I have actually attended some appointments with our immigration team. Or rather, I replaced them when they were not available. So, I would sit in appointments, instead of our immigration lawyers, and I would take instructions with the help of the interpreter. And I could see their attitude was much more relaxed than [our 0:06:38] interpreters who [** 0:06:40].

Interviewer: You mean immigration?

Respondent: Immigration interpreters, they were a lot more at ease, probably. They knew what they were talking about a little bit more, but also, they were a lot more casual, [where 0:06:49] our interpreters try to conduct themselves in a sort of more efficient and more proficient manner, if I could say.

Interviewer: I see. Okay, that's interesting, thank you. So, my next question... so, yes, you already mentioned that you work with interpreters, not frequently but on a regular basis. Could you tell me a little bit more about your experience with interpreters when you have to work with an interpreter and the client? How does that affect your own practice?

Respondent: Usually, we would have interpreters that we know already. We have an in-house interpreter who provides all the interpretations as well: not because of his own knowledge, but because he runs a company, and he employs interpreters of different languages. So, when we actually have an issue and we need an interpreter, we go through him.

So, it is something that we are already accustomed to, and is rarely someone, some outsider. So usually, I would know the interpreters that we work with, because it's a particular language. It's either Kurdish, Farsi, Arabic, sometimes Urdu, sometimes Punjabi, Romanian, Polish. So, those, I come across more often than others.

- Interviewer: Mm-hmm. Like, more common.
- Respondent: And that would be people I usually know and have come across before, so I cannot really say that something has taken me by surprise as such.
- Interviewer: So that's interesting, so you source interpreters from a private local agency?
- Respondent: Yes, yes, indeed. Our immigration department conducts routinely Farsi speakers, and we have a person who is a director of a company who provides interpreting services. So not only we have him in house, but also when we need for other languages, we can go through him and he provides us with his, I would say, sub-interpreters, just to provide the different languages. So, I rarely pick up a phone and call to some interpreting agencies, because we do have him on board, and we do have this facility in house.
- Interviewer: And why I'm asking this is because I know that most courtroom interpreters are now supplied by thebigword, [as/that's 0:09:07] the kind of main agency who has got the current tender from the Ministry of Justice. Do you have any experience working with thebigword?
- Respondent: Yes, indeed. When we are in court and the interpreter... I mean, the only way the interpreter could be in court is when court calls through these big companies. So we would not employ them ourselves; it is a court who pays, and it is a court who provides interpreting services, so... and again, it would be similar languages, because as you would appreciate, if I'm taking instructions for a particular client with particular language needs, the same interpreter goes to, the same client goes to court and [it is 0:09:48] the same languages.
- So again, I got to know some of the interpreters who work for the courts. We do not have a close relationship, but I do recognise them, they recognise me. So, I do have some experience with that. Not employing them directly or rather contracting them directly but being

in a position to use them with the court's permission, or with being facilitated by the court.

Interviewer: Did you notice any differences in their professionalism or their practices, between interpreters hired from thebigword and interpreters that were sourced by the local agency?

Respondent: My personal experience, local agencies or other agencies that I work with... let's be fair, it's probably two or three agencies that I work with closely, and their interpreters, maybe because I got used to them, their interpreters are much better, more efficient, on time. Court interpreters can be very money-watching, let's put it that way, so money is a key for them. They come, they clock in, they watch the time. They're extremely pleased when the time overruns.

It's not the best way, sometimes, for the client. You want someone who appears, who interprets, but also has some personal input in terms of ability to finish the job: as soon as it becomes available, to finish, rather than just stretching it because they are putting in more hours and they are getting paid more. And I know they're getting paid, probably, well. I have no idea how much.

But yes, court interpreters, they are a bit different. They come on the dot, literally. I do expect them to come a bit earlier to provide assistance. They don't do that; they come on time, and if they are booked for 10:00, they would appear at 10:00, sometimes over-run. Again, [the related 0:11:44] excuses I've heard why they come so late. Often, they're stuck in some other room; you need to go and find them. So, it's not ideal. You would have thought it's better, but it isn't. It isn't actually better, because it feels like they're going to get paid anyway, whether they're going to do the job to the best of their ability or not.

Interviewer: Did you have experience with employing interpreters directly from the national register?

Respondent: I'm afraid not.

Interviewer: No? All right, okay. Thank you. So, the next question, it's about the role. That's the key question of my research: around the role. And you mentioned that there are three main factors that comprise a role [of 0:12:29] the interpreter, and that the interpreter must be accurate and do the job in an accurate and [advised 0:12:37] manner, assist legal proceedings, and competence. So, there is competence is pivotal.

And this is where I wanted to talk a little bit more about how do you understand competence? What do you think constitutes competence of the interpreter?

Respondent: First and foremost, obviously, an ability to communicate freely in both languages: the one that's being translated to, and from. Secondly, staying impartial. Obviously, not [jump to 0:13:17] [defences 0:13:18], and not trying to assist the client in their own language, purely because they want to, because their job is to translate or transmit information that is being passed to them, and not make their own, and not assist in any way.

And probably the way they do it is very important as well. That falls into the competence part of it. So, they have to stay almost invisible in a room. They have to conduct translation of the language and nothing else. Not to try to explain any concepts, because it is my job, and not to try to relay their feelings from the clients to me, because again, it is my job to understand that, and if it's something not clear, I would clarify, and that should be understood by the interpreter.

And obviously, timing is important as well. They have to be on time, too. They don't have to give this impression that they're rushing somewhere, they have to pick up their kids, because that's often the case. "I'm sorry, I need to go; I have to pick up my kids," you know, "from the nursery." "Okay, you've been booked, so..." (Laughs) With all due respect, that happens often, and that's not acceptable, and that doesn't go into the competence part of it, I would have thought.

Interviewer: That's interesting, yeah. And if you could describe the role of the interpreter, say, in one word or in maybe in a few words, how would you describe... say, the interpreter is a tool, or is a transmitter, is a machine, is a facilitator of communication, or is anything else?

Respondent: I'd say he is a facilitator. He/she (Laughs) is a facilitator of communication. He is absolutely paramount to good communication between two people who do not speak the same language. So, they're essential in some circumstances, when there is no other way to communicate with the client. From my point of view, I'm sure the same for the client, who cannot communicate or understand me.

So, they really are people that we cannot be without, [but 0:15:21] they are paramount to some parts of our job that cannot be conducted without them, and they have to appreciate that, and they have to conduct themselves accordingly.

And again, as I say, they have to be impartial, as much as possible. We're all human; we all have feelings; and we all try to emphasise, whether we want it or not. But as much as emotions is taken out of the context, it's better for both sides.

Interviewer: So, would you say it's an important role?

Respondent: Extremely important. Extremely important. For someone who doesn't speak the language, there is no other way to transmit the information from their side to mine, and from mine to them. It's one of those things that you can't be without. You can be without legal assistance, if you understand the language, because somebody can help you. But without language, you cannot understand anything at all.

Interviewer: Yeah. Yeah, and you already noted that it's an integral part of the human rights, as well, that....

Respondent: Precisely. Precisely.

Interviewer: ...it's the right to a fair trial. Yes, thank you very much. And the next question about, again, continuing on the role of the interpreter is, is

there anything particular, do you think, that interpreters should or should not do? And you said that they should withdraw from challenging their own views. So, I understand that they should not... because again, it's reiterating what you just said about being impartial...

Respondent: [Impartiality 0:16:52].

Interviewer: ... being impartial. Is there anything else you could think of about their role, what they should do and what they shouldn't do?

Respondent: Probably it's very difficult sometimes, but they should draw the line, because they are there to interpret. If they want to help someone in their own time, they are open to that and they can do it, but not within the vicinity of the office, and not within the context of our job, because then they interfere with the process and they're not helpful. So as long as it's being done on a human basis and to their own time, somewhere else, but without sort of compromising what's being said, and without...

Because often, they want to help but they actually relay very wrong information. "Oh, don't worry. She said like that; she meant like that; it's going to be like that." But that's not what I said, because if I wanted to say that I would have said that for them to translate that.

So not to impact their own views or their own impression of what's being said and translated to the client, who has no ability to understand what I said. And they fully rely on the interpreter.

Interviewer: This is very interesting. Do you have any particular examples of where that happened, where the interpreter would influence the process by relaying their own views or making summaries of their own understandings? Did you have that [kind of 0:18:19]?

Respondent: I had a number of things going on. I cannot recall now, but I specifically remember a time when I had an interpreter, and in fact, it wasn't a local interpreter; it was a court interpreter.

Interviewer: Booked from thebigword?

Respondent: Booked through thebigword, that's right. He was in court; he came late; he was utterly unprofessional. That's one example that I remember so, so well. (Laughs) So, my client spoke no English whatsoever. He barged in...

Interviewer: What language was it?

Respondent: I'm just trying to recall. It was some time ago. I'm pretty sure it was Farsi, 100%. He barged in later than the actual hearing started, and we sort of hold on and the client himself came with someone who spoke English, so we explained that to the magistrates that we will hold on, seeing whether the interpreter is arriving or not, but in the meantime, we can start some preliminary proceedings, which we have done.

So, he literally walked into the room, where everything is already being said. The client is in a box, in a witness box. I am where I should be; prosecutor where he should be; magistrates, legal advisor, everybody in their own places. He comes in, obviously out of his comfort zone because proceedings, as he sees it, started. It hasn't started, actually; it's just been prepared to start, but that's how he understood.

And his literally first or second sentence, "Oh, he doesn't understand anything. He's criticising someone." And I could see the client completely confused, and he's looking at his relative who was there, who spoke some English; I'm not saying great English, but some English. (Laughs) And I can see all this confusion, and I said, "Could we just postpone the proceedings?" So, we need to clarify whether the client understands the interpreter, what is going on.

So, we had to adjourn, and I took quick instructions, and we had to cancel that particular booking because we thought he's not doing any justice to the client, and it was one of those cases when the client should have been explained really well, in a few moments, whether

he chose this magistrates court or crown court. And that's not a chance I could take.

And I said, "Based on the body language, based how he is and what he tells me," instead of saying something else completely, "I can see that he is just not right for this particular moment. And to start with, he is late, so I am not wrong to call it off."

So, we had to rebook it, and we adjourned it to another day, with another interpreter attending. So, I did have a situation where unprofessionalism was so high that even my tolerance couldn't take it. (Laughs)

Interviewer: Wow. So, he had had an impact, that you actually had to cancel the...

Respondent: Yes.

Interviewer: ...the hearing, and rebook it?

Respondent: I had to [ask for 0:21:02] it. I couldn't possibly cancel it myself, but I had to ask for permission from the magistrates to adjourn it, based on the fact that I could see there was no good communication between the interpreter and the client, because the interpreter came so negative. Literally, from first words, he started criticising one, second, and third thing, and that was just completely inappropriate. And I could see from the client he wasn't comfortable, and since the client faced quite serious allegations of sexual assault, I could not take a chance. It was one of those.

Interviewer: Wow. That's very interesting. If you have any other examples of something like...

Respondent: (Laughs) I do not remember, but if I do recall something, I will let you know.

Interviewer: Great, thank you. Yeah, so to summarise here, so, yes, the interpreter definitely should not relay any personal views, yeah? And...

Respondent: That's right.

- Interviewer: ...be impartial. Is there anything else you could think of?
- Respondent: Probably honesty is a good thing, because often, as I said, I myself was in a position where my dialect wasn't matching the dialect of the person whom I was translating for. So, you have to withdraw from translation if you don't understand, or if you feel you haven't been understood correctly.
- Because what you're doing is, you're really playing with someone's life, and that's not permitted, under any circumstances. The fact that you want to earn your money does not justify ruining theirs, and that should be penalised really. It has to be watched so carefully, and I know sometimes you're in a situation where any interpreter is better than none, but not in a criminal proceeding, for sure.
- Interviewer: So, sometimes it's better not to have an interpreter...
- Respondent: Not to have an interpreter, [and a 0:22:38]...
- Interviewer: ...than to have a bad interpreter, yes.
- Respondent: Absolutely. It could lead you somewhere wrong.
- Interviewer: Yes. Yes. Thank you. And, yeah, next question is about the presence of the interpreter and any impact it has on the work in the courtroom. And as you said that of course, it does slow the process. You also mentioned that it leads to an emotional detachment of the witness. Could you please elaborate on these points, a little bit more?
- Respondent: Yes, sometimes... again, in criminal proceedings, we have situations where we have an interpreter, but we also have a client who is not fully [**** 0:23:17**] to English language. And sometimes his personality, you can feel he can win judges. And by being translated to and from, unless it's done in such a perfect and professional manner, you can take the emotion out of it, and you can monotonously translate something that is extremely important.

“No, I haven’t done that” – you can say it in so many ways, but if the interpreter isn’t good enough, doesn’t actually repeat exactly what’s being said to him with the tone that’s being pronounced, you might take an emotion out of it. So, the client might lose a simple touch of personal attribution to judges, and he might lose his case on that.

Interviewer: So, yes, basically, one of the major impacts that interpreting makes on the process is that if the interpreter does not render accurately, say, the register and the intonation and relays emotional aspect of the client’s speech then that can have an effect against the client.

Interviewer: Absolutely. And likewise, it can win something that was not possible to win. So, it’s one of those things that you have to take a chance on. For example, just recently... not recently, but yesterday, I’ve been to prison, and one of my clients is a Kurdish client, and I’ve been with him for a while, because he’s got a number of offences that we sort of looked after him for.

And he said to me, “On the next occasion, in crown court, I don’t want an interpreter.” I said, “Last time, you said you misunderstood something, so we asked for an interpreter specifically. I know you speak English, but your English is not of a legal standard, so we got you an interpreter through the court system.”

“It made things worse for me. Please, I don’t want an interpreter.” So, I am thinking today, how I’m going to make an application for the next hearing, which is in July, on 20th. And I explained that to the court, that initially I asked for an interpreter to help him, and how am I going to say, now, that no, we don’t want an interpreter?

So, it’s one of those things you have to [clear about 0:25:31] all the time. But you also have to take clients’ wishes into account, and again, I’m talking about the clients who can speak English, some of it. I’m not talking about those who cannot speak; they have no choice. It’s always... I mean, out of choice, you have to have an interpreter, you have to be able to communicate. And again, there, it’s even more

important, because if the interpreter whom you're relying on fully because you don't know exactly what's being translated, you cannot stop him, you cannot interfere, if that interpreter is not doing his job well, everything that you put into it might go against you.

So, it's one of those things that that's why they have legal professionals who have to pick up on it. It's an issue of professional privilege, and you have to conduct it in such a manner that... you don't want to postpone proceedings any further, but if you feel that it has an impact and it's a negative impact, you have to stop it somehow. You have to intervene; you have to ask for adjournment.

It's not ideal. It's never ideal, because everybody wants to conclude the proceedings as soon as possible, and it is time-consuming. So yes, I think good interpreting is a key. Once you rely on them, they have to be good. There's just no two ways around it. (Laughs)

Probably like with any other profession, but more so with interpreting.

Interviewer: Could you think of a situation where it works the other way around, that the client benefits from...

Respondent: [Absolutely 0:26:55].

Interviewer: ...the interpreter...

Respondent: [Absolutely 0:26:57].

Interviewer: ...making the case to their advantage?

Respondent: Absolutely, absolutely, because interpreting gives them time if they don't understand what's going on, especially. They hide behind this translating period, because it gives them additional advantage of time, and as we know, same as with people who suffer with all sorts of illnesses, they've been given extra time to respond. And that is the key sometimes, because sometimes on the spot, if you are put in a witness box, you have to reply there and then.

But if you've been given these few seconds to think about your answer, it can benefit you in a big way, absolutely.

Interviewer: Mm-hmm, mm-hmm.

Respondent: So...

Interviewer: And that kind of goes against the legal system, I guess.

Respondent: It does, it does. But there is nothing perfect, as we know.

Interviewer: Yes.

Respondent: Yes. So, you cannot overcome that, really. And, well, since I am a defence lawyer, I'm only happy when my clients benefit. Whether they are guilty or not, I don't mind. (Laughs)

Interviewer: Yeah, fair enough. Is there anything else you can think of it terms of impact that the interpreter can make on the process or in the courtroom?

Respondent: I think at the moment, the system is so limited to what can be done, how you can expand your help or assistance. In old, good times (Laughs) I remember, yes, interpreters were people with whom foreigners could relate to and could ask for help. Not necessarily in relation to a case ongoing, whether it's immigration, criminal, or any other case, but just generally for help, because people were more helpful in those days, I think. (Laughs)

But now it's all commercial, so it's very difficult to be on top of it and actually provide assistance without wanting money for that. If somebody does it, it's just benefiting the system, isn't it? For free. (Laughs)

Interviewer: Yeah.

Respondent: How many people are prepared to do that nowadays? I don't know. I'm sure there are.

Interviewer: Volunteers.

- Respondent: Precisely.
- Interviewer: Okay, thank you. And the next question is about the interpreter as part of the legal process. How do you see the interpreter? Do you think they're an integral part of the legal process, or they're more like an outsider?
- Respondent: I'd say they're more like outsiders, but in a certain situation they can be a necessary, integral part, and that's why they're there.
- Interviewer: And what's the difference? What are the situations?
- Respondent: It's not necessarily they know what's going on. It's not necessarily they know what situation is being discussed, what offence. Even so, we do give them a heads-up, and we do usually let them know what the charges they faced, and what stage the proceedings reached, so they don't just come in and start translating from nothing. They know exactly what is going on, but they don't know the facts: they don't know who is right, who is wrong, what are the witnesses' comments. So, they, in that regard, they are not...
- Interviewer: Part of the process.
- Respondent:an integral part of the process. But they can become, during the proceedings. You do become involved. You do hear things [being emphasised 0:30:00]; you relate to them. You might know someone; you might recognise someone. Not necessarily they stop and say, "Oh, I actually know that person." It's not happening.
- Interviewer: So, to be an integral part of the process, that they need to share a common knowledge with the rest of the group?
- Respondent: I believe so. I believe, say in a courtroom, legal advisor, judges, prosecutor, defence lawyer, everybody knows what's going on, and what...
- Interviewer: They're like part of the team?

- Respondent: Yes. Whether we are on opposite sides or not, it doesn't matter. The interpreter does not have all the knowledge for that to be an integral part, but if the process is long enough, by the end...
- Interviewer: So, they...
- Respondent: ...of it you become integrated.
- Interviewer: ...so they get, they kind of get, like...
- Respondent: Exactly.
- Interviewer: ...involved...
- Respondent: Exactly.
- Interviewer: ...and they become an integral part.
- Respondent: And since he's got an advantage of knowing what is going on with the client, directly from the client, he becomes quicker involved than any of us, probably. So, it's one of those.
- Interviewer: Do you think the longer the interpreter is involved in the process, the more biased they can become? Can you think that can impact their impartiality?
- Respondent: Absolutely, it can be. Then again, that's why we have competence issues. The interpreter, if he is a professional enough, if he knows what he does, what needs to be achieved, what the objectives are, he will stay impartial from the beginning until an end. I've seen interpreters like that. They conduct the same case, day in, day out, till it's completed.
- And in fact, in crown court, sometimes there are cases that go for three, four, five weeks with the help of the same interpreter. They do not become, or they are not expected to become, involved in any shape or form, and they continue to conduct it impartially and without showing their own emotions, whether... even if it's absolutely crystal clear to everyone the client is guilty as hell, they still remain impartial,

without disclosing their feelings, without passing information from one side to another. It is possible. It is achievable. But it is a skill.

Interviewer: So, impartiality is one of the key skills and competences that an interpreter must have?

Respondent: I would have thought so. I would have thought probably the main.

Interviewer: The main. Mm-hmm. Okay.

Respondent: Because it goes against human nature. We are becoming...

Interviewer: Yes.

Respondent: ...involved...

Interviewer: Yes. Yeah, this is why, this is why...

Respondent: ...whether we want or not.

Interviewer: ...this is why I ask that question because, yeah, the more someone gets involved in the process, they...

Respondent: Yes. We're all human.

Interviewer: ...this impartiality can...

Respondent: Absolutely..

Interviewer: ...kind of...

Respondent: Absolutely.

Interviewer: ...[give in a little bit 0:32:25].

Respondent: So that's why some are better than others.

Interviewer: Mm-hmm. (Silence) So yeah, just... (Silence) Also, you mentioned if the interpretation is contested then they might become a witness.

Respondent: Yes.

Interviewer: Did you have a situation where that happened, where interpretation was contested? How, and by whom, and what was the situation?

Respondent: Yes, absolutely. For example, not long ago I had a client who contested what was being said. Because once you are at a police station and interpreter attends, this is all being recorded on a tape, or nowadays I think it's CDs. Or one of those, anyway; some sort of device. Then it goes into the core of the case, because what you said at your interview is absolutely crucial to the rest of the case (Laughs) or what defence you're going to put forward.

And the client said, "Well, actually, I didn't say like that. The interpreter got it wrong; I did not, I never, mentioned anything like that." And I said, "Look, okay, if you truly believe that I will have to [lift 0:33:41] those recordings and I will challenge him." And the only way to do it is to invite another interpreter to listen to the recordings, so that procedure has to be conducted, and it's been conducted, and the client has been proven wrong. (Laughs)

But yes, it's one of those, and if he was not proven wrong and the interpreter was at fault, I would have called this interpreter to give a witness statement in court, absolutely, because what he said potentially could ruin my client.

Interviewer: Yeah.

Respondent: But since it didn't come to that, he was lucky to escape. Yes, there are situations like that.

Interviewer: That's interesting, yeah. So that would be usually initiated by the client, if they deny that something that has been said...

Respondent: Yes.

Interviewer: ...and that can be... they're just trying to manipulate the situation to their advantage. Or it could be...

Respondent: Yes.

- Interviewer: ...the genuine fault of the interpreter.
- Respondent: Yes, it could be. I personally come across only when the clients raise it. I'm sure there are other situations, it's just I only come across them, because I'm mainly working with clients, rather than any other authorities.
- Interviewer: That's interesting, thank you. There's something else I wanted to ask here. (Silence) Yeah, you also mentioned that good interpreters are when no... participant may pay almost no attention to the interpreter and instead fully concentrate on the facts of the case. So, this is like, they become invisible.
- Respondent: Yes.
- Interviewer: Is it like a good interpreter is an invisible interpreter?
- Respondent: To the extent, yes. You don't have to feel [impression 0:35:16] that you are going through a middleman, say. Because at the end of the day, if it wasn't a language problem, you would have been...
- Interviewer: Yes.
- Respondent: ...one-to-one with your client.
- Interviewer: Exactly.
- Respondent: It's only language that makes sure that somebody else is next to you. And it's not ideal, because sometimes we're discussing such sensitive issues.
- Interviewer: Mm-hmm.
- Respondent: Sexual assaults are one of those, when clients have to dig very, very deep to talk about something that they don't want to talk to anyone, let alone another person sitting there and translating all that. So especially in these cases, it's so crucial that the interpreter stays really unbiased and not expressing any negative or positive emotions,

[say 0:35:53], “Whoa,” some sort of exclamation of surprise. “Oh, he raped her.”

That is something that usually causes concern to any normal person, but you have to withhold. You have to withhold the emotions, just like we pretend that it’s all normal. It’s not, but we have to pretend that we’ve heard it before. “It’s okay; you can talk, you can say your piece.” Otherwise, we’re never going to have clients.

Interviewer: Mm-hmm. Mm-hmm. Yes.

Respondent: The same is applicable to interpreters.

Interviewer: Yes. Thank you. Also, my next question was about the status of the interpreter in the UK legal system, and has it changed the last few years? And you brought a very interesting point about global recognition of the profession, which is very interesting, because I do touch upon that as well, in my research, that the global processes, they also play a very important role in the shaping of the role of the interpreter, and the status as well.

But could you tell me a little bit more about your understanding of what is the status of the interpreter, a courtroom interpreter, as a profession in the UK?

Respondent: I would have thought just being an interpreter is important enough. For example, translating in medical practices, when people discuss their very intimate issues. And that is very important and is being recognised throughout, I think. But in terms of political and legal system, I think interpreters play a lot stronger role and it’s more prominent now, especially with all the conferences that we have all over the world: on Zoom, on Skype, [just name it 0:37:37].

So people used to travel everywhere to meet other people, and they would have some sort of assistance there. Questionable; sometimes it’s a professional interpreter, sometimes you just try to speak the language yourself. Nowadays, in all the official meetings, you would

have an interpreter who officially translates and has got a role, prominent position, in that meeting. And without him, the meeting would not even start.

So, I believe the status of the interpreter for these official meetings has been upgraded quite significantly. And yes, we all rely on them. (Laughs)

Interviewer: But what about legal system, I mean?

Respondent: Likewise...

Interviewer: ...justice system.

Respondent: ...especially with the pandemic. Since we started having all these hearings remotely, we have interpreters who have a position, and without the interpreter, the hearing cannot go ahead. Especially remote hearing: nobody would allow that. When there was a face-to-face hearing, you would potentially, if somebody saw [** 0:38:37], say, he speaks a bit of English, there is a possibility that somebody is going to allow that in some respect, at some hearings, depending on the severity of the hearing or which stage the proceedings are.

But with the remote hearings, which took place all over the UK, for example... I'm sure that the same is exactly applicable to all other countries, but since I only know what's going on here... official interpreter has to be booked well in advance, with a notice. He appears on screen. Without him, the hearing is not going ahead. All the judges and all the legal system, they will just back off and reschedule it for the availability of the interpreter who also participates remotely.

Interviewer: This is a really interesting observation. So, the pandemic also contributed into the...

Respondent: I believe so.

- Interviewer: ...into this change. So, if before the pandemic, interpreters could not appear in court, and the court and the hearing still would go ahead, but...
- Respondent: Not all of them, but some.
- Interviewer: Sometimes.
- Respondent: I've been to some.
- Interviewer: But now it's completely, like, a no-no.
- Respondent: [Yes, yes 0:39:39] [** 0:39:40].
- Interviewer: And, yeah, so the interpreter must...
- Respondent: Must turn up.
- Interviewer: ...turn up, yeah, must attend.
- Respondent: He must be notified in advance. Sometimes you hear, for example, barristers send me attendance note: "Could not go ahead, even so, interpreter has been booked. He has not appeared, so there is some problem with the system. They did not provide the interpreter; it's been adjourned in a month's time." That's it. Why? The whole hearing, all these people were there. The interpreter wasn't there, so it couldn't go ahead.
- Interviewer: How often does it happen when interpreters do not attend?
- Respondent: It's not very uncommon. It is...
- Interviewer: Quite common.
- Respondent: It does happen. I wouldn't say it's very common, but it does happen. We do not know where the fault lies. We don't know whether it's the interpreter, or whether the agency, or maybe some clerk didn't pass the information. But when they check the system, they say, "Well, we booked an interpreter. The interpreter should have been here." Or

should have appeared remotely. "It didn't happen, so we cannot go ahead."

And because these remote hearings, and all the hearings nowadays, they are sort of logged in properly, and it's all minutes of every hearing...

Interviewer: [Recorded down 0:40:45].

Respondent: So, you cannot really twist the system and say, "Well, the interpreter is not here." He actually... we think he understands we cannot do that anymore. It is a lot more pressure on the legal system to make sure the defendant understands what's going on with him, especially if he enters a plea. Something like that would not be jeopardised.

Interviewer: So, in remote hearings it's even more crucial...

Respondent: Yes.

Interviewer: ...to have an interpreter.

Respondent: Absolutely, absolutely.

Interviewer: Mm-hmm. Interesting. And do you think in that respect, the status of the interpreters has upgraded?

Respondent: Absolutely.

Interviewer: [Whereas 0:41:17] they...

Respondent: Absolutely.

Interviewer: ...became even more...

Respondent: Legal interpreters, definitely, definitely. Their status is much more prominent nowadays, I would have thought, than before.

Interviewer: Interesting. [** 0:41:24].

Respondent: I am sure there are other areas is the same but just talking about the area that I'm aware of, 100%.

Interviewer: Thank you. Yeah, that's very interesting. And the last (Laughs) question for today is about the interpreting process itself. What does it involve, particularly given your own background as an interpreter? Again, you mentioned three main aspects of it as speaking a common language, being impartial, and to be in a position to appropriately assist the court.

Is there anything else you could think of about the process, interpreting process: what it involves, maybe, from the linguistic, as well, point?

Respondent: I think the... again, I may be repeating myself, but it's very important when you turn up, from interpreter's point of view, you make sure that the client actually understands you, speaks your dialect, he is comfortable with you.

For example, in many cultures if the woman is a defendant and a man comes to translate and there are some sensitive issues that the woman doesn't want to discuss in detail with a man, you would actually intervene, and probably the interpreter himself should question the client whether he is, or she is, happy to go ahead with sharing intimate things with an interpreter of a different gender.

Different cultures apply different things, but that is a crucial point, that the client can actually communicate freely with the interpreter, without feeling embarrassed in any way, whether it's a cultural, whether it's a female/male sex issue, or anything else. So not only the language itself, but also mentality point of view is being covered. So, I think it's an ethic issue of just being able to freely translate exactly what's being said to you, without thinking, "Oh, actually, I think she just didn't say it because she was embarrassed with me." So that should be avoided. If there is any feel of that, probably the interpreter should withdraw. However, [disadvantageous 0:43:38] [as well 0:43:39].

Interviewer: So would you say that trust between the interpreter and the client...

Respondent: Yes, absolutely.

Interviewer: ...has to be [^{**} 0:43:46].

Respondent: Absolutely. The client has to be able to say his piece without feeling that he's being judged in any way. But also, to feel like the interpreter actually translates what he or she says, because that's the main thing. And as I say, many cultures have different sort of customs.

Interviewer: Yeah.

Respondent: And you have to monitor that, really. From our point of view, we have to monitor. And I would never allow, for a sexual offence case, for a woman to come and translate. I would actually stop, because primarily my clients are male, being accused of some sort of sexual assault, and I would actually try to intervene and make sure that the client is happy to go ahead with this particular interpreter.

If suddenly a young, attractive female comes and discusses with the defendant, male, issue of the size of his penis, it's not something that he's going to feel comfortable about. But that is his case. He's got to discuss it, so he's got to be able to freely talk about it, and if it means to change the interpreter to a male, or to old, or to anything that he's feeling comfortable with, [we're going to 0:44:59] do that.

Interviewer: Yes, I understand. Yes, thank you. Do you think that there are situations where the interpreter has to intervene with cultural remarks to the courts?

Respondent: Sometimes the interpreter might say, "He means like that because that's how it is in our country," or something like that, but that is not an appropriate way, because the court is there for themselves to decide what is appropriate and what is not, and they are knowledgeable enough to apply their own expertise.

Interviewer: Cultural knowledge. So, you don't think that interpreters should be a kind of cultural broker...

Respondent: No.

- Interviewer: ...in this process?
- Respondent: No, I don't think so.
- Interviewer: So, even if the...
- Respondent: I don't think so. Unless it's something so specific, applicable only to this region, and without explanations you wouldn't understand. And it's, like, very few moments in [life 0:45:49] when you come to that. Usually everything sensitive, of this sort of nature, already been heard and seen in court, so I think interpreters should withdraw from making any sort of remark of this kind, unless he's been specifically asked to do that.
- Interviewer: And if...
- Respondent: [If 0:46:04] possible.
- Interviewer: ...if the interpreter, as you say, there is something very specific and they intervene, how should they do that, do you think? How should they provide...?
- Respondent: Probably... it depends whether it is an interpreter for a court. He's going to ask the usher to communicate this information to the legal advisor. The legal advisor is the person who decides how the court is being conducted, and they should know that, because that's the whole point that they have a training for legal system, that they know who is conductor in court, and that is the legal advisor, not the judges, not the solicitors, not the barristers, but the actual legal advisor, who would address accordingly. He could just raise his point and say, "May I ask a question?" That is [what/point/word 0:46:47] being raised with me, and do you think I should translate that? Or should I...?"
- So, there are points of clarifications, and there are people to ask. Not necessarily in open court, you would ask that...
- Interviewer: So, the interpreter, if they have some cultural remarks, they should speak to the legal advisor...

- Respondent: And ask whether they should...
- Interviewer: ...outside the courtroom?
- Respondent: I would have thought so.
- Interviewer: Not during the court hearing?
- Respondent: I wouldn't think so.
- Interviewer: Okay. Yeah, that's fine.
- Respondent: Unless it's something... always, common sense helps. Something that is so common that needs to be said can be said, but I think he is not there to transmit the cultural element of it; it's just the language. He is a translator. He is an interpreter. That is his role.
- Interviewer: That's...
- Respondent: Not more than that.
- Interviewer: That's very interesting, and that's very important, yes. Thank you very much. Is there anything else you would like to add about your experience with interpreters?
- Respondent: Not really. I think I said all I could think of. However, if I come across anything or if you have any further questions, by all means do ask me and I will try to help as much as I can.
- Interviewer: Okay, thank you very much. And I'll stop the recording.

END OF AUDIO

11.2.4 Respondent 26: interview transcript

File name: Interview with Respondent 26
Audio Length: 0:19:47
Date transcribed: 5 July 2022

Interviewer: I think it's started recording. I think it's going now. Thank you very much for agreeing to take part in my doctoral research on courtroom interpreting. Today is 30 June 2022 and I'm here with [REDACTED], who is a defence barrister. Is that right?

Respondent: No, I'm a defence clerk. I support solicitors and barristers in work.

Interviewer: Defence clerk?

Respondent: Yes. Well, case worker, I suppose.

Interviewer: Case worker?

Respondent: Yes.

Interviewer: Fantastic, thank you. You say that you mainly work for Crown Courts?

Respondent: Crown Courts and Magistrates', but yes, I predominantly do Crown Court preparation stuff.

Interviewer: Okay, great. Magistrates' as well. I understand that you do have experience working with interpreters in your legal practice?

Respondent: Yes.

Interviewer: How many years or how much experience do you have working with interpreters?

Respondent: I've probably been doing this job for about 30 years, but it's difficult to say how much experience really. I can't remember exactly how many clients I've used interpreters for. It may be as little as 10 or 15 over the years. A lot of interpreters, if they go into court, then the court will

provide a court interpreter. The reason I would use them is if I need to take their instructions.

Interviewer: I see. So, you say that 10, 15 cases are where you had to hire interpreters for the case, right?

Respondent: Yes, that's probably.

Interviewer: Yeah, and other times you go to court where the interpreter is already provided for the case?

Respondent: Yeah, if there's a court hearing, then the court provides interpreters.

Interviewer: I see. Okay, great. What I mean here is not so much about your personal recruitment of interpreters, it's about your experience of having an interpreter present in the case. So, that's about 30 years of practice that you have that kind of experience?

Respondent: Yes. Obviously, not everybody needs an interpreter.

Interviewer: Yes, of course. Okay, I understand. Thank you very much. Also, talking about the role of the interpreter in the courtroom, you say that an interpreter is integral to court proceedings when the defendant's first language is not English.

Respondent: Yes.

Interviewer: Is there anything else you could add on that in terms of the role of the interpreter? Is there anything else an interpreter should be doing, or shouldn't be doing?

Respondent: The only thing that they should be doing is interpreting exactly what's asked of them. They are told the question that's required to be given to the defendant, or their client, and they must interpret it exactly, and the response exactly. What you don't need is, some interpreters elaborating or trying to put their side of things, trying to make things sound better or worse.

I know there's not an exact translation because it doesn't work like that, but you need to have the trust that the translation is as close as possible to the question that needs to be translated, and of course, the answer has to be translated exactly. That is their only role really. They're not there to give evidence or anything like that.

Interviewer: Okay, yes, great. Thank you very much. What is your understanding of 'exact translation', when you say that the interpreter should interpret exactly what is said? What does it mean to you? What do you mean by that?

Respondent: Well, say if I ask the question, "Where were you on 8 June?", he may not actually interpret it. To say it in another language, he might say, "On June 8, where were you?" It's the same question but it might have to be put in a different way to make sense of its interpretation. That's obviously the language difficulty. But they mustn't add to that question. They must just translate that question.

Interviewer: Yeah, I see what you mean. Thank you. The next question is about the impact of the interpreter's presence on your work in the courtroom.

Respondent: [The what? 0:05:33]

Interviewer: Yeah, you say that it does extend the court time, but it's still a very important part of the process.

Respondent: Yes.

Interviewer: Could you please elaborate a little bit more about what impact does an interpreter have, or may have on your work in the courtroom when the interpreter is present? Is there anything else you could add to that?

Respondent: Yeah, without an interpreter it wouldn't be a fair trial unless we did everything possible to assist somebody whose first language is not English with their language barrier. So, although things take a little time because you have to ask the interpreter, then the interpreter will

ask the defendant, then the defendant replies, and then it comes back – it does take longer – but it does enable there to be a fair trial. Without them, it just wouldn't be fair to expect somebody whose language is not English to understand fully the process.

Interviewer: Yeah, okay. Thank you. My next question was about if the interpreter is an integral part of the legal process or they're kind of outsiders to the legal process, and you say that the interpreter is extremely important, it enables the defendant to put forward their case, but what I'm looking for in this question is how you see the interpreter? Is it part of the legal system, part of the legal process, or it's someone who is an outsider to the process and just adds the additional services but they're not integral to the legal system, if you know what I mean?

Respondent: I don't think it can work without them, to be honest. Obviously, they have to be totally independent and have no links with the defendant, but I think without them some cases couldn't go ahead purely because some people cannot understand. People may be able to speak the language, but they may not understand fully the meaning of some things.

So, although you think, this person can speak English, and you can have a chat with them, it doesn't mean to say that they understand the legalities of a case and the process of a case. Through an interpreter that can be put to them and explained to them in a language that they understand, so I think, yes, they're very important to the legal system.

Interviewer: So, you see them as more integral to the system?

Respondent: Yes, I think I do.

Interviewer: Okay, great. Thank you. My next question was about the status of the interpreter in the UK legal system. Do you think it's changed over the years? You said on the survey that they're instructed more to get a fair and just trial for a defendant. Could you please elaborate a little bit on this? What do you mean?

Interviewer: I don't know how to elaborate. Yes, you have to instruct the interpreters, and there are more interpreters available as time has gone by. It was very difficult when I first started, you'd probably have one or two companies that would have three or four different languages. Now there are more companies that offer that service and, I think, every language is covered.

Because we're such a diverse country, there's so many different people living here from all walks of life and different parts of the world, so I think it's important that there is that diversity in the interpreting business. I think they're more respected now. I think times have moved on and people understand that people need interpreters, and they are an important part of the criminal justice system.

Interviewer: Do you think that they have become more respected and more valued as a profession over the years?

Respondent: I think they've always been respected by the legal profession. I don't think they've ever not been. I think they're more widely used now. I think there's a greater understanding of people, whereas, like I said, before you can have a chat and you think somebody understands, but there's one thing having a chat with somebody and then conducting your case and understanding the process of the case and what they're saying and what the meaning of it is. I think there is a greater understanding and respect for interpreters now.

Interviewer: Thank you. You also mentioned that there are more agencies providing interpreting services compared to how it was before.

Respondent: Yeah.

Interviewer: Could you tell me a little bit more about your experience with recruiting interpreters via agencies? Do you go via local agencies, or is there any particular big agency, or do you use the National Register for Public Service Interpreters, which is a national register where professionals are registered for their services? What sources do you use in your practice?

Respondent: I used to use, I think it's called [BIT, B-I-T 0:11:37]. Something Interpreting and Translation, I think it was called. I can't remember off the top of my head. There were very limited companies that would do that, but now, yes, there is a national register, or you can go online and ask for local interpreters. Say if you've got a case in Bradford or Cardiff or something, I would Google a local firm because obviously there's the cost of travelling and getting people to and from court.

So, you can Google them now, and you've got a reputable company, and you just check them out them out to make sure they are reputable, and they are used by the courts. There are [^{**} 0:12:18] services and there are more available now.

Interviewer: What checks would you do? What is important to you when you do your own checks and vetting interpreters for the job? What kind of criteria are you looking for? Are you looking at their qualifications, experience in the legal system? Is there anything in particular you're looking for when you recruit interpreters for your case?

Respondent: I tend to trust the companies, that they're employing people that they have done checks on, and they're CRB checked, and things like that. I think we have to trust the companies, that they're doing their proper checks. You can go on their experience. If you've somebody in the past and they've done a satisfactory job, then you would tend to go back to that person or that company. I've tried to keep to the same company where I can because they've become reliable and they know you, and they provide a good service.

We also have to keep an 'Experts' folder - with all professions, not just the interpreting but barristers, etc. - we have to keep a record of whether they were good, they integrated with the clients okay, if we've had a bad service. I keep a folder like that, and I tend to go back and use the same people again, if I can, if they offer a good service. But, obviously, if it's a Birmingham company and I'm out at Cardiff, then I would look for either a recommendation or go through Google and check the company.

- Interviewer: I see, yeah. Thank you. Another question is about, you said that sometimes the court provides interpreters, so when you go to court the interpreters are already provided by the court.
- Respondent: Yeah.
- Interviewer: The interpreters provided by the court, are they usually good quality professionals, compared to the local companies you use?
- Respondent: Yeah, they are as good as. They may even be from the same companies. I don't know where they recruit their interpreting staff from. I suspect that they have several companies that they use, that are approved by the courts. I've not experienced a bad interpreter. I think maybe once an interpreter was doing too much chatting to the defendant, which was clearly not the questions.
- Interviewer: That's interesting. Do you think this is what interpreters should not be doing, then?
- Respondent: No, they shouldn't be chatting away. They're there to do a job and they have to be professional. As I said, they're not there to guide them with their answer or anything like that; they just ask the question and give the response. It's perhaps only once that that's happened to me. It was unsure as to whether they were actually really interpreting what they were supposed to be interpreting, but that was a long time ago. I don't think that happens anymore.
- Interviewer: Have you had any experiences where the interpreting didn't go very well, in your opinion, or that it had a negative impact on the case, where the case would have been adjourned or maybe they would have appealed as a result of poor interpreting, something like that? Do you have any experience of that?
- Respondent: No, only that one where it was clear that he wasn't doing the job. He was trying to be too friendly and over-chatty and reassuring, and it was difficult. But as the family members are normally around the court

and they can sort of work out if it's not going right, and they will alert you to it. Generally speaking, I think they do a pretty good job.

Interviewer: Okay, yeah. Thank you. My last question, what does the interpreting process involve, in your view? You answered, "Listening to the question to be asked of the defendant and interpreting the exact response. I think the attention to detail is important." Is there anything else, do you think, that the interpreting process involves?

Respondent: No, that's it. They're not there to give the defendant or the client advice. They're not there to give their opinion. If they ask a question and the defendant doesn't understand it, it's not for the interpreter to try and explain what the barrister is trying to say. The interpreter should come back and say, "This person doesn't understand the question. Can you phrase it a different way, please?" and that's all.

Yes, they're there to assist the court, but with the questions because obviously barristers phrase questions in certain ways to get certain answers. It's not the interpreter's job to try and assess that. If the person doesn't understand the question, he should just come back and say, "Look, they don't understand what you're asking of them. Is there another way you can put it?" That's all. They're not there to try and elaborate and do the case themselves effectively.

Interviewer: Yeah, I see what you mean. Do you have an experience where the defendant would clearly use the presence of the interpreter to their advantage, to think more about their answers or try to deliberately confuse the court or mislead them with their answers, or something like that?

Respondent: [Delays. 0:18:41].

Interviewer: Yeah, did you notice things like that?

Respondent: Things take a little longer, so if you're cynical, you could say they're thinking about it, which gives them more time to give an answer, but you couldn't possibly say that for sure.

Interviewer: Yeah, I see what you mean.

Respondent: I couldn't say what a defendant is thinking.

Interviewer: Yeah.

Respondent: [If they feel that they need 0:19:08] more time to give an answer, that's a difficult one to say.

Interviewer: Yeah, I see what you mean. Okay. But overall, your experience with interpreters over the years was positive?

Respondent: Yeah, [very 0:19:24].

Interviewer: Okay, great. Is there anything else you would like to add?

Respondent: No, I just don't think the courts could run efficiently without them. I think they do need interpreters to have fair and just trials.

Interviewer: Yeah, great. Thank you very much. I'll finish recording now.

Respondent: All right.

END OF AUDIO

11.2.5 Respondent 27: interview transcript

File name: Interview with Respondent 27 (Solicitor)
Audio Length: 0:19:25
Date transcribed: 9 July 2022

Interviewer: Okay, yes, it's started now. Today is 5 July 2022 and I'm here with [REDACTED]. Is that the correct pronunciation of your name?

Respondent: Yes, that's correct.

Interviewer: Thank you. You are a case worker in Family Court mainly, right?

Respondent: I'm a trainee solicitor.

Interviewer: Trainee solicitor.

Respondent: And I predominantly work in the Family Courts, yes.

Interviewer: Fantastic, thank you. You say you've been working in this capacity about four years?

Respondent: I've been a trainee solicitor for almost coming up to a year and a half now. Before that I was a paralegal.

Interviewer: Thank you. You say Family Court mainly. Do you have experience with any other courts, like magistrates' or maybe criminal court?

Respondent: I have been to the Magistrates', and I've seen in the Magistrates' interpretation being conducted, but I've never advocated at these other courts.

Interviewer: All right, I see.

Respondent: Yeah, I've only advocated at the Family Courts.

Interviewer: Thank you. You say you've had experience working with interpreters in your practice?

Respondent: Yeah.

Interviewer: How does it usually go for you? How do you find having an interpreter on your case?

Respondent: I think it's really helpful, especially when the interpreter knows how to effectively explain things. I think with interpretation, the key message of what you're trying to advise your client, or the options that you're trying to give your client, they sometimes can get lost in translation. But I find that if you have a good interpreter, they can ensure that they interpret what you're trying to get across to your client in the most effective way. I've dealt with some interpreters who have been amazing, who have been great, and other interpreters who have been not so great.

Interviewer: What makes the difference? What makes an interpreter a good interpreter or a bad interpreter?

Respondent: Honestly, I think some knowledge about the legal processes, but also which language to use. The bad experience I had wasn't in a court setting, it was in a prenuptial agreement negotiation and settlement. What happened in this instance was we didn't really have a good interpreter and what ended up happening was that my advice and what I was trying to explain about the contract was getting lost in translation and the client ended up having more questions than they initially did have.

Interviewer: Do you think that the interpreter must have misinterpreted something and then that confused your client?

Respondent: Completely, yes.

Interviewer: Do you think the interpreter should explain any legal concepts or the situation, or should they just stick to exactly what is said by the legal side?

Respondent: I think they should try as much as possible to stick with what we are trying to advise our clients, and it's up to the legal professional to explain the legal processes to the interpreter. But, again, if the

interpreter doesn't understand what we're asking, because sometimes it can be very complex, especially when it comes to providing your client with options which are financial in nature, sometimes the interpreter may not understand exactly what you're asking them to interpret.

Interviewer: Yeah.

Respondent: So, it's important in those circumstances to have an interpreter that does perhaps understand more about some of the legal jargon, some of the legal terminology, how to explain them to a lay client.

Interviewer: Thank you very much. The next question was about the role of the interpreter in the courtroom in your view, and you said that the interpreter should accurately translate technical legal terminology to the client and ensure the client is able to give an informed decision on the instructions to you as a legal professional.

Respondent: Yeah.

Interviewer: Could you expand a little bit more on this if you can? If not, we will move on to the next question.

Respondent: I don't really know how to expand. Their role is to ensure that the message we're trying to get across and the advice that we're trying to get across doesn't get lost in translation. I would say that that is the biggest key point of an interpreter. I think it's all part and parcel with achieving the [** 0:05:50] of justice.

Interviewer: Yeah. Thank you. Would you say that in this case the interpreter acts as a bridge of the gap, facilitating communication between two sides, or is it more like a device, like a machine that just converts words from one language into another?

Respondent: No, I would say the former.

Interviewer: Communication facilitator?

Respondent: Yeah.

Interviewer: Thank you. Is there anything in particular the interpreter should or shouldn't do, in your opinion? You say that they should not provide their opinion to the client, and I absolutely agree with that.

Respondent: Yeah.

Interviewer: Is there anything else you could think of that interpreters should be doing, or shouldn't be doing?

Respondent: Let me have a think, just give me a moment. (Pause)

If the client is having difficulty in understanding something, perhaps if they could let the legal professional know. Reading body language as well, I think that's a good way to indicate whether a client understands. Because the issue is – and I've found this myself – sometimes clients may not completely understand because the interpreter maybe hasn't explained it properly, or the interpreter sometimes doesn't understand exactly how to explain the complex legal jargon, if you could call it that.

So, when they're there to bridge the gap, I'd say, if the legal professional doesn't really know whether the client is understanding because the client is just nodding and agreeing with everything, I would say that's something that they should do, the interpreter should perhaps let the legal professional know, "Look, I'm perhaps not explaining this as much. Can you explain this part to me again so I can...?" I guess it's all just communication, isn't it, effective communication.

Interviewer: Do you think interpreters should pick up on signs of misunderstanding of the client and report to the legal professional?

Respondent: Yeah, absolutely.

Interviewer: Okay, thank you. Is there anything else you can think of that they should or shouldn't be doing?

Respondent: (Pause) I don't think so. I can't really think of anything. I guess those are the main key points.

Interviewer: Yeah, that's fine. Thank you. The next question was about the impact that the interpreter may have on your work in the courtroom, what kind of impact is that? You say, again, to reiterate the previous statement, that interpreters should interpret everything carefully in the remit of what was asked so that it doesn't get lost in translation, so that you don't have to then get your client out of misunderstanding and confusion.

Respondent: Yeah.

Interviewer: Is there anything in particular you can think of where it has an impact on your work? Does the presence of the interpreter affect the way you work with your client?

Respondent: That's a good question. I guess when I speak to clients directly, I'm able to explain a lot more. When I speak through an interpreter, I try to make my points as basic as possible, I try to dim them down as much as possible, I make shorter, more bullet-point points of advice. The pace is a lot slower. I know that I'm going to be spending quite a lot of time with the client if there's an interpreter involved, just to make sure that the communication is going at a steady standard, in the right standard, in the right way.

For example, if you have a meeting with clients and everything gets wrapped up in about half an hour, all is well. But when you have an interpreter, you know you may be there for about an hour or two just explaining certain things and understanding what the client really wants, deducing what the client really wants.

Interviewer: Yes, absolutely. It certainly makes things at least twice as long.

Respondent: Yeah.

Interviewer: Also, an interesting point, you said that you in a way adjust your language and the way you communicate your points to the client, so

you simplify things a little bit so that the interpreter can explain them or interpret them to the client. Is that right?

Respondent: Yeah.

Interviewer: So, you kind of adjust the language, if you know what I mean?

Respondent: Yeah.

Interviewer: That's a very important point. That's very interesting. Thank you. Okay. In the next question I asked if, in your opinion, the interpreter is seen as part of the legal process or they are more like an outsider, and do you think that the interpreter is not a part of the legal process.

Respondent: I didn't really understand that question. When you say, 'part of the legal process', what do you mean?

Interviewer: Okay. When you go to the court and you see the court team, the prosecution, the defence, if it's criminal court or if it's any other type of court, but they all work as a team on the same case, and then the interpreter joins that case, are they seen as part of the team or are they an outsider who just interferes, if you want? Does that make sense?

Respondent: I guess, you could say that they are an intervening party. I would say that they are there to achieve some sort of justice, and if that means that they will become part of the legal process, then I guess that would be true.

Interviewer: But they're not an integral part?

Respondent: It depends on the client, really, and it depends on the case. If I was to go and speak to a client without an interpreter, I think that I would have a very difficult time, and so, I think that they are integral when it comes to client communication. Whether they are part of the legal process, perhaps. It depends on the circumstances; it depends on what I'm asking of the interpreter to speak to my client about. If I want them to give me instructions, then I would say yes, part of the legal

process. But again, it's your own interpretation of what the legal process is.

Interviewer: Yes, I understand. Thank you very much. Also, I had a question about the status of the interpreter in the UK legal system. What I was looking to see is if you think anything has changed in particular to interpreters over the last few years, if you've noticed any changes in this profession, in their professional status, in the attitude toward interpreters?

Respondent: I guess, for me, it's only been a few years since I've been in the profession. Whether I think that attitudes have changed about interpreters, I'm genuinely not too sure. I think that it depends on where you work, which firm you work for or who your colleagues are because, of course, everything is very subjective when it comes to determining the status of a profession.

When you are working within a team or with a solicitor who doesn't think anything of interpreters, that would be largely different and a very different contrast to a team that values interpreters a lot more and really sees their use within the justice system. So, I think it's a very subjective question. I wouldn't really know how to answer that, but I would think that they have a very important role within the courts.

Interviewer: So, you see them as a...?

Respondent: I think that they don't really necessarily just help and assist their instructed legal representative, but they also assist the courts as well. They heavily assist the courts.

Interviewer: Yeah. Thank you very much. The last question was about the interpreting process itself. What do you think that involves? If you think about the interpreting process, what do you think it involves, like linguistically, maybe even cognitively? If you've thought about this – I know it's probably not a question you get asked every day.

Respondent: That's okay. Can you repeat the question?

- Interviewer: Yeah, what do you think the interpreting process involves? When one person interprets from one language into another, how does it work? What does it involve? What knowledge you may need?
- Respondent: I would say that it involves comprehension, linguistic skills, and articulation skills. Yeah, that's what I would say.
- Interviewer: Do you think that having a background in the subject would help, like, say, having a legal background?
- Respondent: Yeah, I think it would help, definitely. I really do think it would help, either some knowledge of the background or even just being good within their communication skills or just being well-spoken and knowing technical words and how to deduce them into simpler words sometimes.
- Interviewer: Yeah. Okay, brilliant. Thank you very much. I think that's all. If you have anything else to add, if you have any particular examples that you would like to share, or is there anything else, that would be great. If not, then we can just leave it there.
- Respondent: No worries. Thank you so much for your time, Liubov.
- Interviewer: Thank you very much for your time. It's very, very valuable.
- Respondent: Oh, no, it's completely fine.

END OF AUDIO

APPENDIX 12: AUDIO TRANSCRIPTS ANALYSIS OF INTERVIEWS WITH INTERPRETERS

12.1 Colour codes used for In Vivo Coding: interviews with interpreters

Colour	Name of code/theme/meaning
	Challenges, pressures of courtroom interpreting
	Role perceptions by interpreters/valuation of the role
	Differences between courts
	Interpreter is part of legal system/perceptions/expectations of legal professionals
	Interpreter as facilitator of communication
	Perceptions of clients
	About current system/status
	Suggestions for future/hopes
	Role performance
	Factors affecting performance
	About interpreter's status
	establishing rapport with the client
	Professional/ethical dilemmas of the interpreter
	interpreter as a tool/device
	Interpreter feels recognised and valued in the courtroom
	Modes of interpreting
	impact of physical settings
	Deviation from the role - to interpret (taking on additional responsibilities, stepping over the boundaries of the role)
	Interpreter's background
	Interpreter as a friend to witness/defendant etc.
	Critical valuation of other interpreters
	critical valuation of the system/industry
	Interpreter's wellbeing
	the role of agencies
	the role of professional bodies and trade unions

12.2 Coding and thematic analysis of audio transcripts: interviews with interpreters

12.2.1 Respondent 4: first stage coding

Respondent 4 (from the first round of questionnaires for interpreters)

File name (transcript): Interview with Respondent 4

Audio length – 0:25:27

Interview took place on:20/05/2015

First cycle coding methods: initial coding, process coding, in vivo coding

Identified initial codes (58 in total):

1. "I WOULD SAY NO. THE ONLY THING YOU HAVE TO DO IS ADAPT YOUR **PHYSICAL CIRCUMSTANCES**, THAT'S WHAT YOU HAVE TO CHANGE, BECAUSE NOT EVERY COURT HAS THE SAME TYPE OF LAYOUT".
2. "SO SOMETIMES IN **COUNTY COURT**, FOR EXAMPLE, YOU'RE SITTING NEXT TO THE CLIENT, OR WHOEVER IS THERE, SO IT'S EASIER THAT WAY, BECAUSE YOU CAN VERY EASILY DO **WHISPERED SIMULTANEOUS AND CONSECUTIVE**. WHEREAS, IN SAY AN **IMMIGRATION TRIBUNAL**, BUT ESPECIALLY IF THEY DO **VIDEO LINK**, THAT'S BASICALLY IMPOSSIBLE."
3. "IF THE SOLICITORS OR BARRISTERS ARE TALKING TO ONE ANOTHER, NOT TO ONE ANOTHER BUT TO THE JUDGE, THAT IS THE POINT WHERE YOU, THE INTERPRETER, START TO DO **WHISPERED SIMULTANEOUS**. BUT IF IT'S **VIA VIDEO LINK**, THAT IS COMPLETELY **OUT OF THE QUESTION**, YOU CANNOT DO IT, BECAUSE THE APPELLANT IS SITTING IN A DETENTION CENTRE AND YOU'RE SITTING IN THE TRIBUNAL COURT ROOM LOOKING AT THEM ON A VIDEO SCREEN".
4. "SO IT'S ADAPTING YOURSELF TO YOUR **PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT**, RATHER THAN CHANGING THE WAY YOU WORK AS AN INTERPRETER"

5. "IT'S THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT, RATHER THAN THE PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE".
6. "THERE WAS ONE CROWN COURT CASE I DID ABOUT FOUR OR SO YEARS AGO, WHICH WAS QUITE A SERIOUS MATTER, I MEAN, THEY ALL HAVE TO BE SERIOUS IN ORDER TO BE IN CROWN COURT, BUT THIS WAS AN INCREDIBLY SENSITIVE MATTER. AND THAT ONE, IT WAS A HUGE COURT ROOM, AND I WAS INTERPRETING FOR SEVERAL WITNESSES, WHO ALL GAVE THEIR EVIDENCE FROM BEHIND THESE VERY, VERY BIG CURTAINS"
7. BECAUSE THE CEILINGS WERE SO HIGH, THE CURTAINS WERE VERY THICK, VERY HEAVY AND QUITE IMPOSING, AND ACTUALLY I WAS DIRECTLY OPPOSITE THE JURY, SO THEY WERE ALL LOOKING AT THE WITNESSES AND AT ME. AND IT WAS ONLY ON THE LAST DAY THAT I SAW IT WAS ALL BEING RECORDED, IT TOTALLY SLIPPED MY MIND THAT, OF COURSE, SOMETHING WOULD BE RECORDED"
8. "BUT OTHER THAN THAT, I DON'T KNOW, I'VE NEVER FOUND A COURT ROOM ACTUALLY TO BE ADVERSARIAL AT ALL"
9. "THEY ARE... NOT IMPOSING, BUT, YOU KNOW, YOU DON'T GO TO COURT EVERY DAY, SO IT'S NOT SOMETHING YOU'RE USED TO DOING, SO THERE IS A KIND OF EFFECT THAT THEY HAVE".
10. "BUT ONCE YOU'RE IN THERE AND YOU'RE DOING YOUR WORK, YOU KIND OF FORGET, BUT YOU DON'T FORGET WHERE YOU ARE, BUT YOU FORGET THAT YOU'RE IN A COURT ROOM"
11. "YOU'RE JUST THERE TO DO YOUR WORK"
12. "SO YOU FORGET THE ENVIRONMENT AND YOU'RE CONCENTRATING ON DOING YOUR JOB"

13. "THE CURTAIN WAS THERE TO SHIELD THE WITNESSES FROM THE DEFENDANT IN THE CASE. SO THE JURY AND THE BARRISTERS COULD SEE THE WITNESSES, AND ME, I WAS STANDING NEXT TO THE WITNESSES AND INTERPRETING FOR THEM. AND THERE WAS A CURTAIN TO THE RIGHT OF US, AND THEY HAD POSITIONED THE DEFENDANT IN SUCH A WAY THAT HE COULD HEAR, BUT COULD NOT SEE WHO WAS BEING QUESTIONED."
14. "SO THAT'S HOW IT WAS. IT WASN'T COMPLETELY COVERED, THE PERSON WAS NOT COMPLETELY COVERED"
15. "I WAS IN A WAY BEHIND THE CURTAIN, BUT YOU HAVE TO ALSO HAVE AN **ABILITY TO PROJECT YOUR VOICE WITHOUT TALKING TOO LOUDLY**, SO THAT'S WHY **SPEAKING CLEARLY IS VERY IMPORTANT**, WHATEVER LANGUAGE YOU'RE USING, WHETHER IT'S ENGLISH OR WHATEVER IS THE OTHER LANGUAGE THAT YOU'RE USING".
16. "**YOU HAVE TO SPEAK CLEARLY**, THERE IS A WAY OF **PROJECTING YOUR VOICE WITHOUT BEING LOUD**, AND THAT'S WHAT I TRY AND DO".
17. "I DIDN'T REALISE UNTIL THE LAST DAY, AS I SAID. BUT WHAT HAPPENED, I CAN'T EVEN REMEMBER WHAT MADE ME NOTICE IT, BUT ONE THING I DO REMEMBER IS THAT ONE OF THE WITNESSES SAID SOMETHING, WHICH IN THE LANGUAGE SHE WAS USING **COULD HAVE BEEN INTERPRETED ONE OF TWO WAYS IN ENGLISH, AND I REMEMBER MAKING IT A POINT TO STATE THIS**".
18. "**AND THAT'S THE POINT I REMEMBER SEEING THE MACHINE DOING THE RECORDING**, BUT I WAS NOT TOLD THIS, THE PROCEEDINGS WERE BEING RECORDED.
19. "I PERSONALLY, I'VE DONE MANY **VIDEO LINKS** WHERE THE APPELLANT OR THE DEFENDANT, OR WHOEVER, IS ON THE OTHER SIDE OF THE VIDEO ON THE SCREEN, THAT IS TO SAY THEY'RE IN A DETENTION CENTRE OR SOMEWHERE ELSE".

20. "BUT ONE TIME I DID INTERPRETING WHERE IT WAS A CASE OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, SO I WAS ACTUALLY SITTING IN A COURT ROOM LOCALLY WITH THE VICTIM, AND THE COURT CASE WAS BEING HEARD IN LONDON SOMEWHERE. AND THEN I WAS SITTING WITH THE VICTIM IN THIS MINUTELY SMALL VIDEO LINK ROOM, HAD TO INTERPRET".
21. "SO THEY COULD SEE, OR I THINK THEY COULD EITHER HEAR US, DEFINITELY, AND/OR MAYBE ALSO SEE US ON A TV SCREEN".
22. "WE CERTAINLY COULD SEE THE COURT ROOM. BUT THAT I'VE ONLY DONE ONCE, WHERE I'M ACTUALLY **SITTING PHYSICALLY NEXT TO SOMEBODY**, BUT THAT WAS NOT A DEFENDANT, IT WAS NOT A APPELLANT, IT WAS THE VICTIM IN A CASE".
23. "THE VICTIM WAS BROUGHT OUTSIDE LONDON FOR SAFETY PURPOSES, BUT THE COURT CASE WAS HEARD IN LONDON".
24. "BUT GENERALLY I **AM NOT A FAN OF VIDEO LINK INTERPRETING** BECAUSE, FOR ME, I THINK, I FEEL I THINK I CANNOT **DO MY JOB AS AN INTERPRETER** IF I CANNOT DO FOR EXAMPLE, **WHISPERED SIMULTANEOUS**, WHEN THE OTHER PARTIES – NOT THE APPELLANT, NOT THE DEFENDANT, NOT THE VICTIM AND NOT THE WITNESS – THEY'RE NOT TALKING TO THAT PERSON. THAT **IS WHEN I WOULD USUALLY DO WHISPERED SIMULTANEOUS**".
25. AND IN FACT, ONE TIME I REMEMBER I WAS DOING AN **IMMIGRATION TRIBUNAL HEARING, A VIDEO LINK WAS USED**, THE APPELLANT WAS **SITTING IN A DETENTION CENTRE**, AND THE JUDGE, AFTER THEY HAD ASKED THE APPELLANT SOME QUESTIONS, THEY WAS SOME KIND OF QUESTIONS AND ANSWER-TYPE THING GOING ON BETWEEN THE JUDGE AND THE BARRISTERS. AND THE JUDGE IMMEDIATELY SAID TO ME, **"THERE'S NO NEED FOR YOU TO..." BECAUSE HE SAW ME OPEN MY MOUTH, AND HE SAID, "THERE'S NO NEED FOR YOU TO DO THAT, TO INTERPRET RIGHT NOW."**

26. “AND AFTERWARDS, I SAID TO THE JUDGE, WHEN THEY HAD FINISHED, I SAID, **“THAT MAY BE THE CASE, BUT I AM FALLING DOWN ON THE JOB IF I CANNOT DO MY JOB PROPERLY AND FULLY.”**
27. “SO, YOU KNOW, **THEY NEED TO BE EDUCATED”**.”
28. “NO, THEY’RE NOT, THEY’RE NOT FULLY AWARE, **THEY REALLY DON’T KNOW THAT, THEY DO NOT KNOW”**!.
29. “CAN I ALSO JUST TELL YOU ONE THING, MY VERY, VERY, VERY FIRST **COURT CASE WAS IN A CROWN COURT**, IT WAS, **ACTUALLY, A FUNNY THING**, IT WAS AN **IMMIGRATION MATTER**, BUT IT WAS ALSO THE IMMIGRATION MATTER WAS AN EXTRA BIT, BUT IT WAS TO DO WITH USING A FALSE PASSPORT, AND THIS AND THAT. ANYWAY, TO **THE CROWN COURT MATTER**, AND WHAT HAPPENED WAS, THAT **AS IN MANY CROWN COURTS**, I WAS SITTING NEXT TO THE DEFENDANT **RIGHT AT THE BACK OF THE COURT**, IT IS AN INCREDIBLY OLD COURT ROOM, COURT HOUSE, AND VERY BIG, VERY OLD COURT ROOM. SO ALL I COULD SEE WAS THE BACK OF THE BARRISTERS, I **COULDN’T HEAR WHAT THEY WERE SAYING A LOT OF THE TIME.**”
30. “WHAT I COULD HEAR, I WAS DOING **WHISPERED SIMULTANEOUS**, AND ALSO I COULD HEAR WHAT THE POLICE OFFICERS WERE SAYING IN THEIR TESTIMONY, IN THEIR EVIDENCE, AND EVERYTHING. AND WHAT WAS HAPPENING IS, AS **I’M DOING THE WHISPERED SIMULTANEOUS**, THE DEFENDANT WAS SAYING, “NO, NO, NO, THE POLICE NEVER CAME TO SEE ME ON THAT DAY. NO, NO, NO, THE POLICE NEVER GAVE ME THE DOCUMENTS, THEY JUST SAID THEY GAVE ME. SO I WAS DOING, **AS PER MY TRAINING, RAISING MY HAND TO, SORT OF, INTERVENE AND TO SAY THIS IS WHAT IS BEING SAID.** BECAUSE, TO ME, PEOPLE AROUND WOULD SEE HE WAS TALKING TO ME, AND IT WOULD SEEM LIKE **WE WERE HAVING A CONVERSATION**, WHEREAS, WE WERE NOT, HE WAS JUST REACTING TO WHAT I WAS INTERPRETING TO HIM.”

31. “AND AFTER ABOUT THE THIRD TIME THE JUDGE TOLD ME THAT IF I DIDN’T SIT DOWN **HE WAS GOING TO HAVE ME THROWN OUT OF HIS COURT ROOM**”
32. AND AFTERWARDS, THE BARRISTER, HIS BARRISTER WAS **QUITE PATRONISING**, AND SAID, “YOU LEARN WHAT IT’S LIKE,” YOU KNOW, “YOU CAN’T DO WHAT YOU WERE DOING.” AND I JUST SAID, “REALLY. SO WHAT IF PEOPLE WHO DON’T KNOW THE LANGUAGE I WAS USING, AND THOSE PEOPLE WOULD NOT HAVE UNDERSTOOD IT, THINKING THAT HE AND I ARE HAVING A CONVERSATION AND I’M NOT TELLING ANYONE WHAT HE’S SAYING. WHEREAS, IT WAS NOT THE CASE, AND I’M TRYING TO MAKE THE COURT AWARE THAT HE IS REACTING TO WHAT HE IS HEARING PEOPLE SAY ON THE STAND.”
33. “THE BARRISTER **HAD NO ANSWER WHEN I TOLD HIM...** “
34. “YOU SEE, **THEY DON’T THINK, THEY DON’T THINK THINGS THROUGH.**
35. “AND THEY DON’T SEE HOW THE INTERPRETER IS PUT IN A VERY, AS THEY SAY IN ENGLISH, INVIDIOUS POSITION, THAT IS TO SAY **THE INTERPRETER CANNOT WIN WHATEVER THEY DO.**”
36. “THIS GUY WAS SAYING IT OUT QUITE LOUD AS WELL. BUT YOU SEE, SORRY, THE JUDGE’S REACTION WAS TO SAY HE WAS GOING TO THROW ME, THE INTERPRETER OUT OF COURT.”
37. “YES, **YOU ARE THE INTERFERING INTERPRETER, OR THE INTERPRETER WHO THINKS THEY KNOW TOO MUCH, OR WHATEVER, BUT YOU ARE THERE TO DO YOUR JOB.**”
38. “AS I SAY, AS WE ALL SAY, **WE ARE THERE TO INTERPRET TRULY AND FAITHFULLY, EVERYTHING THAT IS SAID**, SO IF YOU’RE GOING TO TELL ME TO SHUT UP, THEN I’M NOT BEING TRUE AND FAITHFUL TO THE OATH I’VE TAKEN IN COURT.”

39. **"IT'S SO FUNNY, IT'S IRONIC, IT'S IRONIC THAT THEY ARE MAKING US GO AGAINST LEGAL COURT OATH"**
40. "SO TELLING ME: DON'T BOTHER, OR SHUT UP, IF YOU DON'T BE QUIET, I'M GOING TO HAVE YOU THROWN OUT OF MY COURT ROOM. SO, OKAY, SO, FAIR ENOUGH."
41. "THE ONE I WANTED TO TELL YOU ABOUT, WHICH I THINK IT WASN'T RELEVANT FOR THE QUESTIONS YOU WERE ASKING, YOUR QUESTIONNAIRE, WAS THE FACT OF MY VERY, VERY FIRST COURT CASE, WHERE (LAUGHS) **THE JUDGE THREATENED TO THROW ME OUT OF COURT** WHEN I WAS DOING EXACTLY WHAT MY CODE OF CONDUCT TOLD ME, AND CONTINUES TO TELL ME TO DO, WHICH IS TO INTERVENE, YOU KNOW, IN THESE KINDS OF SITUATIONS..."
42. "OKAY THAT TIME I WAS VERY NEW TO THAT TYPE OF WORK, BUT OVER THE YEARS AS **YOU GET MORE CONFIDENT**, YOU STAND UP AND SAY, **"NO, YOUR HONOUR," OR "NO, YOUR WORSHIP," YOU KNOW, TO THE MAGISTRATE OR WHATEVER, OR TO THE JUDGE, "THIS IS MY JOB, THIS IS WHAT MY..." I'VE QUOTED MY CODE OF CONDUCT OR I REFER TO IT, AND THE MOMENT YOU SAY I FOLLOW THE INTERPRETER'S CODE OF CONDUCT AS SET OUT BY ALL THESE PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATES, THEY CAN'T SAY ANYTHING, WHAT CAN THEY SAY?"**
43. "THEY CANNOT GO AGAINST... IT'S **YOUR CODE OF CONDUCT**"
44. "I MADE SURE I MEMORISED A FEW SECTIONS AND TRY AND REPEAT THEM WORD FOR WORD, THEY CAN'T SAY ANYTHING TO YOU. BECAUSE **THE CODE OF CONDUCT IS THERE FOR A REASON**, AND WHETHER THE COURT LIKES IT OR NOT, **IT IS THERE FOR A REASON.**"
45. "PEOPLE DON'T LIKE THE LAW, CERTAIN LAWS, BUT I DON'T KNOW, PEOPLE DON'T LIKE SPEED LIMITS, BUT THERE IS A SPEED LIMIT ON ROADS OF CERTAIN TYPES FOR A REASON, **SO THAT IS WHAT YOU HAVE TO FOLLOW**, AND THAT'S HOW I VIEW IT ANYWAY."

46. "AND THE OTHER ONE IS **THE IMMIGRATION JUDGE** WHO TOLD ME ABOUT THREE YEARS AGO **NOT TO BOTHER DOING WHISPERED SIMULTANEOUS BECAUSE IT WASN'T NECESSARY.**"
47. "SO MY VERY FIRST COURT CASE, **WHERE I WAS THREATENED WITH BEING EJECTED BY THE JUDGE**, AND I REMEMBER THE COURT ROOM BEING ABSOLUTELY FULL, AND I JUST **FELT SO EMBARRASSED, BUT I WAS ALSO ANGRY AT THE SAME TIME.**"
48. "AND I THOUGHT, WELL, **I'VE MADE MY PRESENCE KNOWN** IN TRYING TO LET THE COURT KNOW WHAT IS BEING SAID BY THE DEFENDANT, BUT **IF THEY'RE NOT INTERESTED TO HEAR, THAT'S THEIR PROBLEM**, I'M NOT RESPONSIBLE FOR ANYTHING ANYMORE NOW, **I'VE DONE MY DUTY**, THAT'S HOW I VIEW IT."
49. "**YOU DO YOUR DUTY**, IF THEY CHOOSE TO IGNORE IT, THAT IS THEIR ISSUE, YOU HAVE DONE YOUR DUTY AS THE INTERPRETER."
50. "**BECAUSE THE FIRST PERSON THEY WANT TO BLAME, IN ANY SITUATION, IS THE INTERPRETER.**"
51. "**THE INTERPRETER'S THE EASIEST SCAPEGOAT IN THE WHOLE SITUATION.**"
52. WELL, ONE OF THE THINGS I DISLIKE IS WHEN YOU GO TO A COURT, LET'S SAY A MAGISTRATES' COURT, AND YOU'RE SITTING OUTSIDE THE COURT ROOM IN THE GENERAL WAITING AREA, AND YOU'RE SITTING THERE, AND THE PERSON, THE USHER COMES UP AND POINTS TO YOU AND SAYS TO SOMEBODY STANDING NEXT TO THE USHER, "**THERE'S YOUR INTERPRETER.**" NO, I'VE PUT THAT, I KNOW I'VE PUT THAT IN MY REPLIES, I AM NOT..."
53. "AND THE OTHER THING IS BECAUSE OF CERTAIN COLLEAGUES, I CAN'T NAME THEM, I DON'T KNOW WHO THEY ARE, BUT **BECAUSE OF THEIR WAY OF DEALING WITH PEOPLE**, EITHER IN POLICE STATIONS OR IN COURT, WHETHER IT'S WITH THE JUDICIARY, WHETHER IT'S WITH

POLICE STAFF, WHETHER IT'S A DEFENDANT, A PERSON, A SUSPECT, A PERSON IN CUSTODY, APPELLANT, WHATEVER, **A LOT OF THEM THINK YOU'RE THEIR FRIEND, AND THEY WANT TO COME AND TALK TO YOU ABOUT EVERYTHING AND NOTHING, AND THEIR CASE AND THAT.**"

54. AND SO I **DEvised A TECHNIQUE**, BECAUSE I SAID TO MYSELF, MOST OF THE PEOPLE AROUND CANNOT UNDERSTAND THE LANGUAGE THAT IS BEING USED, AND THEY CANNOT UNDERSTAND THAT I'M SAYING TO THIS PERSON, "**PLEASE DO NOT TALK TO ME, I CANNOT TALK TO YOU...**"

55. "NO, I DON'T SAY YOU DON'T TALK TO ME, I JUST SAY, "**MY ROLE IS SUCH THAT I CANNOT TALK TO YOU, OR DISCUSS MATTERS WITH YOU AT ALL, EXCEPT WITH YOUR SOLICITOR OR WHEN IT COMES TO COURT.**"

56. "I'M SAYING THIS IN THEIR LANGUAGE, BUT 99.9% OF THE PEOPLE AROUND US CANNOT UNDERSTAND THIS."

57. "SO I TOOK TO DOING **BOTH A VERBAL AND NON-VERBAL THINGS**, WHICH IS I WOULD SAY, "**I AM NOT ALLOWED TO TALK TO YOU,**" BUT I WOULD ALSO PUT MY HANDS UP, PALMS FACING TOWARDS THE PERSON, SO THAT'S A **NON-VERBAL, SORT OF SIGN TO SAY DON'T, PLEASE**, YOU KNOW".

58. "BECAUSE I THOUGHT IF EVER ANYTHING HAPPENS, AT LEAST PEOPLE IN THE GENERAL AREA MIGHT SAY, "WELL, WE COULDN'T UNDERSTAND WHAT WAS BEING SAID, BUT THE INTERPRETER OR THAT PERSON PUT HER HANDS UP AS THOUGH TO STOP THE PERSON. **SO THAT WAS THE TECHNIQUE I DEVELOPED OVER TIME.**"

12.2.2 Respondent 4: second stage coding

Respondent N4 (from the first round of questionnaires for interpreters)

File name (transcript): interview with Respondent 4

Audio length – 0:25:27

Interview took place on: 20/05/2015

Second cycle coding: clustering initial codes, searching for themes

1. “IT’S THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT, RATHER THAN THE PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE”.

- “I WOULD SAY NO. THE ONLY THING YOU HAVE TO DO IS **ADAPT YOUR PHYSICAL CIRCUMSTANCES**, THAT’S WHAT YOU HAVE TO CHANGE, BECAUSE NOT EVERY COURT HAS THE SAME TYPE OF LAYOUT”.
- “SO IT’S **ADAPTING YOURSELF TO YOUR PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT, RATHER THAN CHANGING THE WAY YOU WORK AS AN INTERPRETER**”
- “THERE WAS ONE CROWN COURT CASE I DID ABOUT FOUR OR SO YEARS AGO, WHICH WAS QUITE A SERIOUS MATTER, I MEAN, THEY ALL HAVE TO BE SERIOUS IN ORDER TO BE IN CROWN COURT, BUT THIS WAS AN INCREDIBLY SENSITIVE MATTER. AND THAT ONE, IT WAS A HUGE COURT ROOM, AND I WAS INTERPRETING FOR SEVERAL WITNESSES, **WHO ALL GAVE THEIR EVIDENCE FROM BEHIND THESE VERY, VERY BIG CURTAINS**”
- “BUT OTHER THAN THAT, I DON’T KNOW, I’VE NEVER FOUND A COURT ROOM ACTUALLY TO BE ADVERSARIAL AT ALL”
- “THEY ARE... NOT IMPOSING, BUT, YOU KNOW, YOU DON’T GO TO COURT EVERY DAY, SO IT’S NOT SOMETHING YOU’RE USED TO DOING, SO **THERE IS A KIND OF EFFECT THAT THEY HAVE**”.
- “BUT ONCE YOU’RE IN THERE AND YOU’RE DOING YOUR WORK, YOU KIND OF FORGET, BUT YOU DON’T FORGET WHERE YOU ARE, BUT **YOU FORGET THAT YOU’RE IN A COURT ROOM**”
- “**THE CURTAIN WAS THERE TO SHIELD THE WITNESSES FROM THE DEFENDANT IN THE CASE.** SO THE JURY AND THE BARRISTERS COULD SEE THE WITNESSES, AND ME, I WAS STANDING NEXT TO THE WITNESSES AND INTERPRETING FOR THEM. AND THERE WAS A CURTAIN TO THE RIGHT OF US, AND THEY HAD POSITIONED THE DEFENDANT IN SUCH A WAY THAT HE COULD HEAR, BUT COULD NOT SEE WHO WAS BEING QUESTIONED.”
- “SO THAT’S HOW IT WAS. **IT WASN’T COMPLETELY COVERED, THE PERSON WAS NOT COMPLETELY COVERED**”

- **"I WAS IN A WAY BEHIND THE CURTAIN, BUT YOU HAVE TO ALSO HAVE AN ABILITY TO PROJECT YOUR VOICE WITHOUT TALKING TOO LOUDLY, SO THAT'S WHY SPEAKING CLEARLY IS VERY IMPORTANT, WHATEVER LANGUAGE YOU'RE USING, WHETHER IT'S ENGLISH OR WHATEVER IS THE OTHER LANGUAGE THAT YOU'RE USING".**
- **"YOU HAVE TO SPEAK CLEARLY, THERE IS A WAY OF PROJECTING YOUR VOICE WITHOUT BEING LOUD, AND THAT'S WHAT I TRY AND DO".**
- "WE CERTAINLY COULD SEE THE COURT ROOM. BUT THAT I'VE ONLY DONE ONCE, WHERE I'M ACTUALLY SITTING PHYSICALLY NEXT TO SOMEBODY, BUT THAT WAS NOT A DEFENDANT, IT WAS NOT AN APPELLANT, IT WAS THE VICTIM IN A CASE".

Subtheme:

"I AM NOT A FAN OF VIDEO LINK INTERPRETING BECAUSE, FOR ME, I THINK, I FEEL I THINK I CANNOT DO MY JOB AS AN INTERPRETER"

- "I PERSONALLY, I'VE DONE MANY VIDEO LINKS WHERE THE APPELLANT OR THE DEFENDANT, OR WHOEVER, IS ON THE OTHER SIDE OF THE VIDEO ON THE SCREEN, THAT IS TO SAY THEY'RE IN A DETENTION CENTRE OR SOMEWHERE ELSE".
- "IF THE SOLICITORS OR BARRISTERS ARE TALKING TO ONE ANOTHER, NOT TO ONE ANOTHER BUT TO THE JUDGE, THAT IS THE POINT WHERE YOU, THE INTERPRETER, START TO DO WHISPERED SIMULTANEOUS. **BUT IF IT'S VIA VIDEO LINK, THAT IS COMPLETELY OUT OF THE QUESTION, YOU CANNOT DO IT,** BECAUSE THE APPELLANT IS SITTING IN A DETENTION CENTRE AND YOU'RE SITTING IN THE TRIBUNAL COURT ROOM LOOKING AT THEM ON A VIDEO SCREEN".
- "BUT ONE TIME I DID INTERPRETING WHERE IT WAS A CASE OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, SO I WAS ACTUALLY SITTING IN A COURT ROOM LOCALLY WITH THE VICTIM, AND THE COURT CASE WAS BEING HEARD IN LONDON SOMEWHERE. AND THEN I WAS SITTING WITH THE VICTIM IN THIS MINUTELY SMALL VIDEO LINK ROOM, HAD TO INTERPRET".
- "SO THEY COULD SEE, OR I THINK THEY COULD EITHER HEAR US, DEFINITELY, AND/OR MAYBE ALSO SEE US ON A TV SCREEN".
- "THE VICTIM WAS BROUGHT OUTSIDE LONDON FOR SAFETY PURPOSES, BUT THE COURT CASE WAS HEARD IN LONDON".

2. "YOU'RE JUST THERE TO DO YOUR WORK" - Role performance

- **"SO YOU FORGET THE ENVIRONMENT AND YOU'RE CONCENTRATING ON DOING YOUR JOB"**
- "AND AFTERWARDS, I SAID TO THE JUDGE, WHEN THEY HAD FINISHED, I SAID, "THAT MAY BE THE CASE, **BUT I AM FALLING DOWN ON THE JOB IF I CANNOT DO MY JOB PROPERLY AND FULLY.**"

- **"AS PER MY TRAINING, RAISING MY HAND TO, SORT OF, INTERVENE AND TO SAY THIS IS WHAT IS BEING SAID.**
- **"AS I SAY, AS WE ALL SAY, WE ARE THERE TO INTERPRET TRULY AND FAITHFULLY, EVERYTHING THAT IS SAID, SO IF YOU'RE GOING TO TELL ME TO SHUT UP, THEN I'M NOT BEING TRUE AND FAITHFUL TO THE OATH I'VE TAKEN IN COURT."**

Subtheme 1:

"THE CODE OF CONDUCT IS THERE FOR A REASON"

- **"OKAY THAT TIME I WAS VERY NEW TO THAT TYPE OF WORK, BUT OVER THE YEARS AS YOU GET MORE CONFIDENT, YOU STAND UP AND SAY, "NO, YOUR HONOUR," OR "NO, YOUR WORSHIP," YOU KNOW, TO THE MAGISTRATE OR WHATEVER, OR TO THE JUDGE, "THIS IS MY JOB, THIS IS WHAT MY..." I'VE QUOTED MY CODE OF CONDUCT OR I REFER TO IT, AND THE MOMENT YOU SAY I FOLLOW THE INTERPRETER'S CODE OF CONDUCT AS SET OUT BY ALL THESE PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATES, THEY CAN'T SAY ANYTHING, WHAT CAN THEY SAY?"**
- **"THEY CANNOT GO AGAINST... IT'S YOUR CODE OF CONDUCT"**
- **"I MADE SURE I MEMORISED A FEW SECTIONS AND TRY AND REPEAT THEM WORD FOR WORD, THEY CAN'T SAY ANYTHING TO YOU. BECAUSE THE CODE OF CONDUCT IS THERE FOR A REASON, AND WHETHER THE COURT LIKES IT OR NOT, IT IS THERE FOR A REASON."**
- **"PEOPLE DON'T LIKE THE LAW, CERTAIN LAWS, BUT I DON'T KNOW, PEOPLE DON'T LIKE SPEED LIMITS, BUT THERE IS A SPEED LIMIT ON ROADS OF CERTAIN TYPES FOR A REASON, SO THAT IS WHAT YOU HAVE TO FOLLOW, AND THAT'S HOW I VIEW IT ANYWAY."**
- **"YOU DO YOUR DUTY, IF THEY CHOOSE TO IGNORE IT, THAT IS THEIR ISSUE, YOU HAVE DONE YOUR DUTY AS THE INTERPRETER."**
- **"WE ARE THERE TO INTERPRET TRULY AND FAITHFULLY, EVERYTHING THAT IS SAID"**
- **"I DIDN'T REALISE UNTIL THE LAST DAY, AS I SAID. BUT WHAT HAPPENED, I CAN'T EVEN REMEMBER WHAT MADE ME NOTICE IT, BUT ONE THING I DO REMEMBER IS THAT ONE OF THE WITNESSES SAID SOMETHING, WHICH IN THE LANGUAGE SHE WAS USING COULD HAVE BEEN INTERPRETED ONE OF TWO WAYS IN ENGLISH, AND I REMEMBER MAKING IT A POINT TO STATE THIS".**

Subtheme 2:

"SO THAT WAS THE TECHNIQUE I DEVELOPED OVER TIME."

- **"BECAUSE I THOUGHT IF EVER ANYTHING HAPPENS, AT LEAST PEOPLE IN THE GENERAL AREA MIGHT SAY, "WELL, WE COULDN'T UNDERSTAND WHAT WAS BEING SAID, BUT THE INTERPRETER OR THAT PERSON PUT HER HANDS UP AS THOUGH TO STOP THE PERSON. SO THAT WAS THE TECHNIQUE I DEVELOPED OVER TIME."**

3. **"SO, YOU KNOW, THEY NEED TO BE EDUCATED". - lack of awareness and understanding of interpreters' role by the court personnel and law professionals.**
 - **"NO, THEY'RE NOT, THEY'RE NOT FULLY AWARE, THEY REALLY DON'T KNOW THAT, THEY DO NOT KNOW"!**
 - **"IT'S SO FUNNY, IT'S IRONIC, IT'S IRONIC THAT THEY ARE MAKING US GO AGAINST LEGAL COURT OATH"**
 - **"THERE'S NO NEED FOR YOU TO..." BECAUSE HE SAW ME OPEN MY MOUTH, AND HE SAID, "THERE'S NO NEED FOR YOU TO DO THAT, TO INTERPRET RIGHT NOW."**
 - **AND AFTERWARDS, THE BARRISTER, HIS BARRISTER WAS QUITE PATRONISING, AND SAID, "YOU LEARN WHAT IT'S LIKE," YOU KNOW, "YOU CAN'T DO WHAT YOU WERE DOING." AND I JUST SAID, "REALLY. SO WHAT IF PEOPLE WHO DON'T KNOW THE LANGUAGE I WAS USING, AND THOSE PEOPLE WOULD NOT HAVE UNDERSTOOD IT, THINKING THAT HE AND I ARE HAVING A CONVERSATION AND I'M NOT TELLING ANYONE WHAT HE'S SAYING. WHEREAS, IT WAS NOT THE CASE, AND I'M TRYING TO MAKE THE COURT AWARE THAT HE IS REACTING TO WHAT HE IS HEARING PEOPLE SAY ON THE STAND."**
 - **"THE BARRISTER HAD NO ANSWER WHEN I TOLD HIM..."**
 - **"YOU SEE, THEY DON'T THINK, THEY DON'T THINK THINGS THROUGH.**
 - **"AND THEY DON'T SEE HOW THE INTERPRETER IS PUT IN A VERY, AS THEY SAY IN ENGLISH, INVIDIOUS POSITION, THAT IS TO SAY THE INTERPRETER CANNOT WIN WHATEVER THEY DO."**
 - **"THIS GUY WAS SAYING IT OUT QUITE LOUD AS WELL. BUT YOU SEE, SORRY, THE JUDGE'S REACTION WAS TO SAY HE WAS GOING TO THROW ME, THE INTERPRETER OUT OF COURT."**
 - **"AND THE OTHER ONE IS THE IMMIGRATION JUDGE WHO TOLD ME ABOUT THREE YEARS AGO NOT TO BOTHER DOING WHISPERED SIMULTANEOUS BECAUSE IT WASN'T NECESSARY."**
4. **"YOU ARE THE INTERFERING INTERPRETER, OR THE INTERPRETER WHO THINKS THEY KNOW TOO MUCH, OR WHATEVER, BUT YOU ARE THERE TO DO YOUR JOB." – about status and attitude towards interpreters**
 - **"THE JUDGE THREATENED TO THROW ME OUT OF COURT" – Status of interpreters in the courtroom**
 - **"AND AFTER ABOUT THE THIRD TIME THE JUDGE TOLD ME THAT IF I DIDN'T SIT DOWN HE WAS GOING TO HAVE ME THROWN OUT OF HIS COURT ROOM"**
 - **HIS BARRISTER WAS QUITE PATRONISING, AND SAID, "YOU LEARN WHAT IT'S LIKE," YOU KNOW, "YOU CAN'T DO WHAT YOU WERE DOING."**

- "SO TELLING ME: **DON'T BOTHER, OR SHUT UP, IF YOU DON'T BE QUIET, I'M GOING TO HAVE YOU THROWN OUT OF MY COURT ROOM. SO, OKAY, SO, FAIR ENOUGH.**"
- "SO MY VERY FIRST COURT CASE, WHERE I WAS THREATENED WITH BEING EJECTED BY THE JUDGE, AND I REMEMBER THE COURT ROOM BEING ABSOLUTELY FULL, **AND I JUST FELT SO EMBARRASSED, BUT I WAS ALSO ANGRY AT THE SAME TIME.**"
- "AND I THOUGHT, WELL, **I'VE MADE MY PRESENCE KNOWN IN TRYING TO LET THE COURT KNOW WHAT IS BEING SAID BY THE DEFENDANT, BUT IF THEY'RE NOT INTERESTED TO HEAR, THAT'S THEIR PROBLEM, I'M NOT RESPONSIBLE FOR ANYTHING ANYMORE NOW, I'VE DONE MY DUTY, THAT'S HOW I VIEW IT.**"

Subtheme:

"THE INTERPRETER'S THE EASIEST SCAPEGOAT IN THE WHOLE SITUATION."

- **"BECAUSE THE FIRST PERSON THEY WANT TO BLAME, IN ANY SITUATION, IS THE INTERPRETER."**
- **"AND THEY DON'T SEE HOW THE INTERPRETER IS PUT IN A VERY, AS THEY SAY IN ENGLISH, INVIDIOUS POSITION, THAT IS TO SAY THE INTERPRETER CANNOT WIN WHATEVER THEY DO."**

5. "A LOT OF THEM THINK YOU'RE THEIR FRIEND"

- "AND THE OTHER THING IS BECAUSE OF CERTAIN COLLEAGUES, I CAN'T NAME THEM, I DON'T KNOW WHO THEY ARE, BUT BECAUSE OF THEIR WAY OF DEALING WITH PEOPLE, EITHER IN POLICE STATIONS OR IN COURT, WHETHER IT'S WITH THE JUDICIARY, WHETHER IT'S WITH POLICE STAFF, WHETHER IT'S A DEFENDANT, A PERSON, A SUSPECT, A PERSON IN CUSTODY, APPELLANT, WHATEVER, A LOT OF THEM THINK YOU'RE THEIR FRIEND, AND THEY WANT TO COME AND TALK TO YOU ABOUT EVERYTHING AND NOTHING, AND THEIR CASE AND THAT."

Subtheme:

"PLEASE DO NOT TALK TO ME, I CANNOT TALK TO YOU..."

- AND SO I **DEvised A TECHNIQUE**, BECAUSE I SAID TO MYSELF, MOST OF THE PEOPLE AROUND CANNOT UNDERSTAND THE LANGUAGE THAT IS BEING USED, AND THEY CANNOT UNDERSTAND THAT I'M SAYING TO THIS PERSON, **"PLEASE DO NOT TALK TO ME, I CANNOT TALK TO YOU..."**
- "NO, I DON'T SAY YOU DON'T TALK TO ME, I JUST SAY, "MY ROLE IS SUCH THAT I CANNOT TALK TO YOU, OR DISCUSS MATTERS WITH YOU AT ALL, EXCEPT WITH YOUR SOLICITOR OR WHEN IT COMES TO COURT."
- "I'M SAYING THIS IN THEIR LANGUAGE, BUT 99.9% OF THE PEOPLE AROUND US CANNOT UNDERSTAND THIS."
- "SO I TOOK TO DOING BOTH A VERBAL AND NON-VERBAL THINGS, WHICH IS I WOULD SAY, "I AM NOT ALLOWED TO TALK TO YOU," BUT I WOULD ALSO PUT MY HANDS UP,

PALMS FACING TOWARDS THE PERSON, SO THAT'S A NON-VERBAL, SORT OF SIGN TO SAY DON'T, PLEASE, YOU KNOW".

12.2.3 Respondent 4: codes and themes from survey

Respondent 4: Codes and themes from Survey

1. "HOWEVER, **MY PROFESSIONAL TRAINING AND CODE OF PRACTICE REQUIRE ME TO MAINTAIN CONFIDENTIALITY, REMAIN OBJECTIVE/NEUTRAL** AND DO MY JOB TO THE BEST OF MY ABILITY."
2. "...THE **LAYOUT OF THE COURT ROOMS IN WHICHEVER TRIBUNAL OR COURT, IS NOT ADAPTED FOR THE PRESENCE OF AN INTERPRETER.**"
3. "SOME COURTS HAVE GLASS SCREENS WITH SLATS (OPENINGS) THROUGH WHICH AN INTERPRETER MUST TRANSMIT WHATEVER IS BEING SAID. THIS IS IMPRACTICAL AND QUITE OFTEN THE DEFENDANT, FOR EXAMPLE, CANNOT HEAR."
4. "OR THE PLACE FOR THE DEFENDANT TO SIT IS RIGHT AT THE BACK OF THE COURT SO THAT THE INTERPRETER SEES THE BACKS OF THE SOLICITORS/BARRISTERS AND SO CANNOT HEAR MOST OF WHAT IS BEING SAID."
5. "**VIDEO LINK SITUATIONS ARE TRICKY** BECAUSE MOSTLY THE INTERPRETER IS IN THE COURT AND THE APPELLANT IS IN A DETENTION CENTRE. **IT MAKES COMMUNICATING DIFFICULT; IT IS IMPOSSIBLE TO DO WHISPERED SIMULTANEOUS** TO TRANSMIT WHAT IS BEING SAID WHILE THE APPELLANT IS NOT BEING ASKED QUESTIONS."
6. "SOME COURTS HAVE THE SPACE AND FACILITIES TO INCLUDE AN INTERPRETER IN THE COURTROOM."
7. "AN ESSENTIAL PART OF THE PROCESS, JUST AS THE MAGISTRATES/JUDGE + SOLICITORS/BARRISTERS ARE VITAL TO THE PROCESS."
8. "HOWEVER, SOME MEMBERS OF THE JUDICIARY DO NOT VIEW AN INTERPRETER AS A POSITIVE ADDITION, MORE OF A NECESSARY YET EXPENSIVE NUISANCE."
9. "NOT ALWAYS, BUT FOR THE MOST PART MY ROLE AS THE INTERPRETER IS RECOGNIZED AND APPRECIATED."
10. "IF THE "CLIENT" IS THE DEFENDANT/VICTIM/WITNESS, QUITE OFTEN THEY VIEW THE INTERPRETER AS THEIR "FRIEND".
11. "I NEVER GET INTO DISCUSSION WITH ANYONE IN THESE CATEGORIES IN ORDER NOT TO COMPROMISE MY POSITION OF NEUTRALITY (ESPECIALLY IF WAITING IN THE MAIN WAITING AREA)."
12. "THE SITUATION IS NOT HELPED WHEN THE USHER POINTS TO THE INTERPRETER STATING "HERE'S YOUR INTERPRETER". I'M NOT THEIR INTERPRETER, RATHER THE COURT-APPOINTED INTERPRETER."

13. "IN COURT, I ALWAYS ESTABLISH WHO I AM, WHAT LANGUAGE, MY REGISTRATION NUMBER AND MY ROLE AS AN INTERPRETER (TO INTERPRET EVERYTHING THAT IS SAID)."
14. "THOSE WORKING IN THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM USUALLY SEE THE INTERPRETER IN A POSITIVE LIGHT"
15. "ALTHOUGH MY EXPLANATIONS MAY BE LONG, THEY ARE ALWAYS ACCEPTED."
16. "FOR POLICE STATIONS, I HAVE AN INTERPRETER'S INTRODUCTION IN 2 LANGUAGES; ONE I SHOW TO THE POLICE OFFICERS AND USE THE OTHER TO READ OUT ALOUD TO THE WITNESS/VICTIM/PERSON IN CUSTODY."
17. "THE STATUS OF THE INTERPRETER IN THE LEGAL SYSTEM IN THE UK WAS ALWAYS A TENUOUS ONE."
18. "NO GOVERNMENT HAS EVER RECOGNIZED THIS AS A PROFESSION. ADDED TO THIS, THERE WAS (& STILL IS) A (FALSE) PERCEPTION THAT INTERPRETERS EARNED VAST SUMS OF MONEY SO A NEGATIVE CONNOTATION WAS ATTRIBUTED TO MY CHOSEN PROFESSION."
19. "IN THE LAST FOUR YEARS, OUTSOURCING HAS DAMAGED THIS PROFESSION AND IT IS IN REAL DANGER OF BEING ANNIHILATED."
20. "USING UNQUALIFIED, INEXPERIENCED AND INCOMPETENT SO-CALLED "INTERPRETERS" HAS SET THE PROFESSION BACK IMMEASURABLY."
21. "THE USE OF A TIER CATEGORIES IN THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM IS BEYOND LUDICROUS. ONE IS EITHER QUALIFIED TO INTERPRET IN ALL SETTINGS OF THE CJS OR ONE IS NOT."

Identified themes:

1. **"...THE LAYOUT OF THE COURT ROOMS IN WHICHEVER TRIBUNAL OR COURT, IS NOT ADAPTED FOR THE PRESENCE OF AN INTERPRETER."** - the impact of physical settings.
 - "SOME COURTS HAVE GLASS SCREENS WITH SLATS (OPENINGS) THROUGH WHICH AN INTERPRETER MUST TRANSMIT WHATEVER IS BEING SAID. THIS IS IMPRACTICAL AND QUITE OFTEN THE DEFENDANT, FOR EXAMPLE, CANNOT HEAR."
 - "OR THE PLACE FOR THE DEFENDANT TO SIT IS RIGHT AT THE BACK OF THE COURT SO THAT THE INTERPRETER SEES THE BACKS OF THE SOLICITORS/BARRISTERS AND SO CANNOT HEAR MOST OF WHAT IS BEING SAID."
 - "VIDEO LINK SITUATIONS ARE TRICKY BECAUSE MOSTLY THE INTERPRETER IS IN THE COURT AND THE APPELLANT IS IN A DETENTION CENTRE. IT MAKES COMMUNICATING DIFFICULT; IT IS IMPOSSIBLE TO DO WHISPERED SIMULTANEOUS TO TRANSMIT WHAT IS BEING SAID WHILE THE APPELLANT IS NOT BEING ASKED QUESTIONS."
 - "SOME COURTS HAVE THE SPACE AND FACILITIES TO INCLUDE AN INTERPRETER IN THE COURTROOM."

2. “AN ESSENTIAL PART OF THE PROCESS, JUST AS THE MAGISTRATES/JUDGE + SOLICITORS/BARRISTERS ARE VITAL TO THE PROCESS.” (Interpreter’s role and role performance)

- “NOT ALWAYS, BUT FOR THE MOST PART MY ROLE AS THE INTERPRETER IS RECOGNIZED AND APPRECIATED.”
- “IN COURT, I ALWAYS ESTABLISH WHO I AM, WHAT LANGUAGE, MY REGISTRATION NUMBER AND MY ROLE AS AN INTERPRETER (**TO INTERPRET EVERYTHING THAT IS SAID**).”
- “MY PROFESSIONAL TRAINING AND CODE OF PRACTICE REQUIRE ME TO MAINTAIN CONFIDENTIALITY, REMAIN OBJECTIVE/NEUTRAL AND DO MY JOB TO THE BEST OF MY ABILITY.”
- “FOR POLICE STATIONS, I HAVE AN INTERPRETER’S INTRODUCTION IN 2 LANGUAGES; ONE I SHOW TO THE POLICE OFFICERS AND USE THE OTHER TO READ OUT ALOUD TO THE WITNESS/VICTIM/PERSON IN CUSTODY.”

3. “A NECESSARY YET EXPENSIVE NUISANCE.” – (the perception of interpreters by legal professionals)

- “HOWEVER, SOME MEMBERS OF THE JUDICIARY DO NOT VIEW AN INTERPRETER AS A POSITIVE ADDITION, MORE OF A NECESSARY YET EXPENSIVE NUISANCE.”
- “THOSE WORKING IN THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM USUALLY SEE THE INTERPRETER IN A POSITIVE LIGHT”
- “THE SITUATION IS NOT HELPED WHEN THE USHER POINTS TO THE INTERPRETER STATING “HERE’S YOUR INTERPRETER”. I’M NOT THEIR INTERPRETER, RATHER THE COURT-APPOINTED INTERPRETER.”

4. “QUITE OFTEN THEY VIEW THE INTERPRETER AS THEIR “FRIEND”. (Perceptions of the non-English speaking litigants)

- “IF THE “CLIENT” IS THE DEFENDANT/VICTIM/WITNESS, QUITE OFTEN THEY VIEW THE INTERPRETER AS THEIR “FRIEND”.
- “I NEVER GET INTO DISCUSSION WITH ANYONE IN THESE CATEGORIES IN ORDER NOT TO COMPROMISE MY POSITION OF NEUTRALITY (ESPECIALLY IF WAITING IN THE MAIN WAITING AREA).”
- “THE SITUATION IS NOT HELPED WHEN THE USHER POINTS TO THE INTERPRETER STATING “HERE’S YOUR INTERPRETER”. I’M NOT THEIR INTERPRETER, RATHER THE COURT-APPOINTED INTERPRETER.”

5. “THE STATUS OF THE INTERPRETER IN THE LEGAL SYSTEM IN THE UK WAS ALWAYS A TENUOUS ONE.”

- “NO GOVERNMENT HAS EVER RECOGNIZED THIS AS A PROFESSION. ADDED TO THIS, THERE WAS (& STILL IS) A (FALSE) PERCEPTION THAT INTERPRETERS EARNED VAST SUMS OF MONEY SO A NEGATIVE CONNOTATION WAS ATTRIBUTED TO MY CHOSEN PROFESSION.”
- “IN THE LAST FOUR YEARS, OUTSOURCING HAS DAMAGED THIS PROFESSION AND IT IS IN REAL DANGER OF BEING ANNIHILATED.”
- “USING UNQUALIFIED, INEXPERIENCED AND INCOMPETENT SO-CALLED “INTERPRETERS” HAS SET THE PROFESSION BACK IMMEASURABLY.”
- “THE USE OF A TIER CATEGORIES IN THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM IS BEYOND LUDICROUS. ONE IS EITHER QUALIFIED TO INTERPRET IN ALL SETTINGS OF THE CJS OR ONE IS NOT.”

The themes in the survey complement and overlap and with the following identified themes in the corresponding transcript of the follow-up interview:

1. **“IT’S THE PHYSICAL ENVORINMENT, RATHER THAN THE PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE”** – about the impact of physical setting and how they differ from court to court.
2. **“YOU’RE JUST THERE TO DO YOUR WORK”** – Role performance.
3. **“YOU ARE THE INTERFERING INTERPRETER, OR THE INTERPRETER WHO THINKS THEY KNOW TOO MUCH, OR WHATEVER, BUT YOU ARE THERE TO DO YOUR JOB.”** – perceptions of court personnel and their attitude towards interpreters.
4. **“A LOT OF THEM THINK YOU’RE THEIR FRIEND”** – perceptions of non-English speaking litigants.

Additional theme from the survey has emerged:

5. **“THE STATUS OF THE INTERPRETER IN THE LEGAL SYSTEM IN THE UK WAS ALWAYS A TENUOUS ONE.”**

12.2.4 Respondent 6: first stage coding

Respondent N6 (from the first round of questionnaires for interpreters)

File name (transcript): interview with Respondent 6

Audio length – 0:14:37

Interview took place on: 31/05/2015

First cycle coding methods: Initial coding, process coding, In Vivo coding

Identified initial codes (33):

1. "I DON'T FEEL ANY DIFFERENCE BECAUSE I FEEL THAT **MY ROLE AS AN INTERPRETER SHOULD BE IMPARTIAL**"
2. "I TRY TO DISTANCE MYSELF FROM ANY KIND OF EMOTIONAL INVOLVEMENT OR INFLUENCES FROM WITHIN"
3. "EVEN IF I SENSE THAT THE ATMOSPHERE IS TENSE IN THE COURTROOM, I DON'T FEEL THAT IT AFFECTS ME PERSONALLY AS AN INTERPRETER. I DON'T MEAN PERSONALLY AS AN INDIVIDUAL, BUT PERSONALLY AS AN INTERPRETER"
4. "AND FROM MY EXPERIENCE BOTH JUDGES AND MY CLIENTS OR THE CLIENTS – BY THE CLIENTS I MEAN PEOPLE I INTERPRETED FOR, BE IT WITNESSES OR CLAIMANTS – I DON'T FEEL THAT THIS HOSTILITY OR NEGATIVITY AFFECTED ME. SO EVERYBODY TREATED ME WITH RESPECT, WITH DUE RESPECT"
5. "I WAS NOT IN A SITUATION IN A COURTROOM WHEN ANY EQUIPMENT FOR SIMULTANEOUS INTERPRETING WAS REQUIRED, BUT THE MICROPHONE WAS AVAILABLE IF I NEEDED. YES"
6. "THEY ASKED ME IF I NEEDED ANYTHING ELSE AND NORMALLY IT WAS SUFFICIENT. YEAH"
7. "SOMETIMES IT'S TEMPTING, AS YOU SAY, ESPECIALLY IF YOU FEEL THAT SOMETHING IS NOT GOING THE WAY IT SHOULD BE IN THE COURTROOM AND YOU FEEL THAT IF, SAY, THAT PERSON OR THAT CLAIMANT SAID THAT, THE COURSE OF THE COURT HEARING WOULD TURN 180°, IF YOU LIKE OR WHATEVER"
8. "AND SOMETIMES CLIENTS ASKED MY OPINION. BUT YOU KNOW WHAT, I JUST DON'T WANT TO HAVE THIS ADDITIONAL ROLE AND I DON'T THINK IT IS MY JOB. AND I THINK THAT IT'S NOT ME"
9. "MY JOB IS THE BEST WHEN IT'S NOT SEEN AS AN ADDITIONAL PERSON IN THE PROCESS"
10. "SO IT'S LIKE MAKEUP IF YOU WANT, THE BEST MAKEUP IS MAKEUP YOU DON'T SEE. THE BEST INTERPRETER WHO IS NOT SEEN OR HEARD METAPHORICALLY"
11. "SO I DON'T WANT TO, AND **I DON'T THINK I'M ENTITLED TO MY OPINION**"
12. "AND THAT'S WHY SOMETIMES IF I FEEL THAT TWO PARTIES, TWO SIDES, DO NOT UNDERSTAND EACH OTHER, I TRY TO CLARIFY BY ASKING, "COULD I SAY IT AGAIN THE

SAME THING THAT EVERYBODY HAS THE SAME UNDERSTANDING WHAT WAS SAID AND WHAT WAS UNDERSTOOD BY THE OTHER PARTY?"

13. "I THINK THEY DO, YES. MAYBE I WAS FORTUNATE ENOUGH, BUT I THINK THEY DO AND THEY TRY TO HELP THE SITUATION BECAUSE INTERPRETER... AND INTERPRETING A COURTROOM IS SOME KIND OF AN ADDITIONAL PERSON IN THE PROCESS, BUT THEY DO UNDERSTAND THAT AND THEY DO UNDERSTAND WHAT INTERPRETERS ARE THERE FOR REALLY. YES. TO HELP THE WHOLE PROCESS FOR THEM TO MAKE THE RIGHT DECISIONS, TO TAKE THE RIGHT DECISIONS, TO... BASICALLY, YES, TO MAKE THE RIGHT DECISIONS, YEAH"
14. "INTERPRETER IS TO HELP TO MAKE THE RIGHT DECISION"
15. "NO. NO. I... NO, NO, DEFINITELY NOT. I DON'T HAVE THAT FEELING THAT I BELONG TO THE LEGAL SYSTEM. NO"
16. "YES, I'M A NEUTRAL PERSON. I AM A DEVICE, IF YOU LIKE. YES. A TRANSMITTING DEVICE. A TRANSMITTER"
17. "YES, YES, I EVEN HAD A SITUATION ONE MONTH, A JUDGE COMPLIMENTED ME PUBLICLY BY THE END OF THE HEARING THAT I SHOWED HIGH PROFESSIONALISM, A QUALITY OF HIGH PROFESSIONALISM HOW I HANDLED QUESTIONS AND INTERPRETATION. AND IT WAS A KIND OF A PUBLIC THANK YOU AND PUBLIC APPRECIATION WHICH WAS REALLY NICE"
18. "YEAH, HE ASKED ME IF I COULD TELL HIM WHAT I THOUGHT ABOUT THE QUESTION ASKED AND GIVE HIM AN IDEA HOW HE SHOULD ANSWER THE QUESTION. BUT, AGAIN, HE LOST THE CASE BUT I DON'T THINK IT WAS MY FAULT. THOUGH I THOUGHT THAT SOMETIMES I COULD HAVE HELPED THIS CLIENT TO HAVE A BETTER VERDICT IN THE END OF THE COURT, BUT IF..."
19. "BECAUSE I THOUGHT THAT HE BASICALLY DIDN'T HELP HIS CASE AT ALL. SO, HE SOMETIMES WENT TO A LARGE EXTENT EXPLAINING DIFFERENT DETAILS WHICH WERE NOT ASKED OF HIM. AND THE EXPLANATION, ANY FURTHER EXPLANATION THERE WAS WORKING BASICALLY AGAINST HIS CASE"
20. "I COULD SEE THAT BUT I DIDN'T SAY ANYTHING"
21. "YEAH, YEAH, YEAH. WE ARE ALL HUMAN BEINGS BUT, AS I SAY, I'D RATHER BE SEEN AS A TRANSMITTER, AS A DEVICE, IN THIS SITUATION"
22. "I THINK IT DID CHANGE BECAUSE I THINK THE BEST INTERPRETERS DO NOT WANT TO BE A PART OF THIS CAMPAIGN, SO THEY BASICALLY BOYCOTT ANY JOBS FROM THAT AGENCY BECAUSE THE STATE OF PLAY IS UNFAIR BASICALLY"
23. "THERE ARE DIFFERENT TERMS AND CONDITIONS WHICH ARE WORSE THAN THE INTERPRETERS BEFORE, GOOD INTERPRETERS, HIGHLY QUALIFIED INTERPRETERS, HAD BEFORE"
24. "SO I THINK THAT IT SHOULD BE BASICALLY BOTH. I THINK THAT, OKAY, WE'RE LIVING IN A MATERIAL WORLD AND ECONOMIC FACTORS ARE VERY IMPORTANT. I THINK THERE SHOULD BE AN OPTION FOR INTERPRETERS TO BE HIRED DIRECTLY, BY THE CLIENTS OR BY THE COURT SYSTEM OR BY WHOEVER NEEDS, SOLICITORS, WHOEVER NEEDS INTERPRETERS"

25. "SO THERE SHOULD BE A DATABASE OR AN AGENCY WHICH IS THE FIRST, KIND OF, POINT OF CALL"
26. "BUT THERE SHOULD BE SOME OTHER MECHANISMS HOW INTERPRETERS COULD BE PART OF COURT INTERPRETING OR LEGAL INTERPRETING PROCESS"
27. "YEAH, BUT NOW IT'S AN AGENCY. SO WHAT I'M SAYING, ONE AGENCY IS FINE, BUT THERE SHOULD BE SOME OTHER MECHANISMS HOW INTERPRETERS COULD BE... **HIRED WITH NO PREJUDICE** OR NO, KIND OF, IF YOU WANT, **SACRIFICE TO THEIR OWN PAY**, OR WHATEVER"
28. "I THINK MAYBE BRIEFING FOR INTERPRETERS COULD BE MORE SPECIFIC. SO NOTHING LIKE EXACT DETAILS, BUT MAYBE A BRIEFING IN TERMS OF WHAT AN INTERPRETER SHOULD ANTICIPATE IN TERMS OF PREPARATION"
29. "SO SOMETIMES YOU GO BLINDLY TO MEET THE CLIENT AND YOU ARE THERE IN THE COURTROOM INTERPRETING FOR THEM"
30. "MAYBE, YEAH, IN TERMS OF NOT DISCLOSING UNNECESSARILY OR ILLEGALLY SOME DETAILS, MORE SPECIFIC BRIEFING FOR THE INTERPRETERS WHAT [IS] TO BE EXPECTED"
31. "I MEAN IN TERMS OF TERMINOLOGY, FOR EXAMPLE, IF IT'S AN ECONOMIC CRIME, THERE SHOULD BE SOME KIND OF SPECIFIC PREPARATION FOR THAT"
32. "YES, EXACTLY. WHAT KIND OF CASE IT'S GOING TO BE WITHOUT DISCLOSING ANY DETAILS"
33. "WELL, MAINLY... I DIDN'T HAVE ANY. MAYBE I WAS UNLUCKY. BUT I THINK IT SHOULD BE AN IMPORTANT PART OF THE PROCESS IN EACH AND EVERY CASE. TO GIVE AN INTERPRETER ANY VALID POINTERS"

12.2.5 Respondent 6: second stage coding

Respondent N6 (from the first round of questionnaires for interpreters)

File name (transcript): interview with Respondent 6

Audio length – 0:14:37

Interview took place on: 31/05/2015

Second cycle coding: clustering initial codes, searching for themes

1. "MY ROLE AS AN INTERPRETER SHOULD BE IMPARTIAL"

- "I DON'T FEEL ANY DIFFERENCE BECAUSE I FEEL THAT MY ROLE AS AN INTERPRETER SHOULD BE IMPARTIAL"
- "I TRY TO DISTANCE MYSELF FROM ANY KIND OF EMOTIONAL INVOLVEMENT OR INFLUENCES FROM WITHIN"
- "EVEN IF I SENSE THAT THE ATMOSPHERE IS TENSE IN THE COURTROOM, I DON'T FEEL THAT IT AFFECTS ME PERSONALLY AS AN INTERPRETER. I DON'T MEAN PERSONALLY AS AN INDIVIDUAL, BUT PERSONALLY AS AN INTERPRETER"
- "AND THAT'S WHY SOMETIMES IF I FEEL THAT TWO PARTIES, TWO SIDES, DO NOT UNDERSTAND EACH OTHER, I TRY TO CLARIFY BY ASKING, "COULD I SAY IT AGAIN THE SAME THING THAT EVERYBODY HAS THE SAME UNDERSTANDING WHAT WAS SAID AND WHAT WAS UNDERSTOOD BY THE OTHER PARTY?""

2. "I JUST DON'T WANT TO HAVE THIS ADDITIONAL ROLE AND I DON'T THINK IT IS MY JOB"

- "SOMETIMES IT'S TEMPTING, AS YOU SAY, ESPECIALLY IF YOU FEEL THAT SOMETHING IS NOT GOING THE WAY IT SHOULD BE IN THE COURTROOM AND YOU FEEL THAT IF, SAY, THAT PERSON OR THAT CLAIMANT SAID THAT, THE COURSE OF THE COURT HEARING WOULD TURN 180°, IF YOU LIKE OR WHATEVER"
- "AND SOMETIMES CLIENTS ASKED MY OPINION. BUT YOU KNOW WHAT, I JUST DON'T WANT TO HAVE THIS ADDITIONAL ROLE AND I DON'T THINK IT IS MY JOB. AND I THINK THAT IT'S NOT ME"
- "SO I DON'T WANT TO, AND **I DON'T THINK I'M ENTITLED TO MY OPINION**"
- "YEAH, HE ASKED ME IF I COULD TELL HIM WHAT I THOUGHT ABOUT THE QUESTION ASKED AND GIVE HIM AN IDEA HOW HE SHOULD ANSWER THE QUESTION. BUT, AGAIN, HE LOST THE CASE BUT I DON'T THINK IT WAS MY FAULT. THOUGH I THOUGHT THAT SOMETIMES I COULD HAVE HELPED THIS CLIENT TO HAVE A BETTER VERDICT IN THE END OF THE COURT, BUT IF..."
- "BECAUSE I THOUGHT THAT HE BASICALLY DIDN'T HELP HIS CASE AT ALL. SO, HE SOMETIMES WENT TO A LARGE EXTENT EXPLAINING DIFFERENT DETAILS WHICH WERE NOT ASKED OF HIM. AND THE EXPLANATION, ANY FURTHER EXPLANATION THERE WAS WORKING BASICALLY AGAINST HIS CASE"
- "I COULD SEE THAT BUT I DIDN'T SAY ANYTHING"
- "YEAH, YEAH, YEAH. WE ARE ALL HUMAN BEINGS BUT, AS I SAY, I'D RATHER BE SEEN AS A TRANSMITTER, AS A DEVICE, IN THIS SITUATION"

3. "INTERPRETER IS TO HELP TO MAKE THE RIGHT DECISION"

- "I THINK THEY DO, YES. MAYBE I WAS FORTUNATE ENOUGH, BUT I THINK THEY DO AND THEY TRY TO HELP THE SITUATION BECAUSE INTERPRETER... AND INTERPRETING A COURTROOM IS SOME KIND OF AN ADDITIONAL PERSON IN THE PROCESS, BUT THEY DO

UNDERSTAND THAT AND THEY DO UNDERSTAND WHAT INTERPRETERS ARE THERE FOR REALLY. YES. TO HELP THE WHOLE PROCESS FOR THEM TO MAKE THE RIGHT DECISIONS, TO TAKE THE RIGHT DECISIONS, TO... BASICALLY, YES, TO MAKE THE RIGHT DECISIONS, YEAH"

- **"NO. NO. I... NO, NO, DEFINITELY NOT. I DON'T HAVE THAT FEELING THAT I BELONG TO THE LEGAL SYSTEM. NO"**

4. I'M A NEUTRAL PERSON. I AM A DEVICE, IF YOU LIKE. YES. A TRANSMITTING DEVICE. A TRANSMITTER"

- "MY JOB IS THE BEST WHEN IT'S NOT SEEN AS AN ADDITIONAL PERSON IN THE PROCESS"
- "SO IT'S LIKE MAKEUP IF YOU WANT, THE BEST MAKEUP IS MAKEUP YOU DON'T SEE. THE BEST INTERPRETER WHO IS NOT SEEN OR HEARD METAPHORICALLY"
- "SO I DON'T WANT TO, AND **I DON'T THINK I'M ENTITLED TO MY OPINION**"
- "YEAH, YEAH, YEAH. WE ARE ALL HUMAN BEINGS BUT, AS I SAY, I'D RATHER BE SEEN AS A TRANSMITTER, AS A DEVICE, IN THIS SITUATION"

5. "EVERYBODY TREATED ME WITH RESPECT, WITH DUE RESPECT" (Recognition)

- "AND FROM MY EXPERIENCE BOTH JUDGES AND MY CLIENTS OR THE CLIENTS – BY THE CLIENTS I MEAN PEOPLE I INTERPRETED FOR, BE IT WITNESSES OR CLAIMANTS – I DON'T FEEL THAT THIS HOSTILITY OR NEGATIVITY AFFECTED ME. SO EVERYBODY TREATED ME WITH RESPECT, WITH DUE RESPECT"
- "YES, YES, I EVEN HAD A SITUATION ONE MONTH, A JUDGE COMPLIMENTED ME PUBLICLY BY THE END OF THE HEARING THAT I SHOWED HIGH PROFESSIONALISM, A QUALITY OF HIGH PROFESSIONALISM HOW I HANDLED QUESTIONS AND INTERPRETATION. AND IT WAS A KIND OF A PUBLIC THANK YOU AND PUBLIC APPRECIATION WHICH WAS REALLY NICE"

6. "I THINK THE BEST INTERPRETERS DO NOT WANT TO BE A PART OF THIS CAMPAIGN, SO THEY BASICALLY BOYCOTT ANY JOBS FROM THAT AGENCY BECAUSE THE STATE OF PLAY IS UNFAIR BASICALLY"

- "I THINK IT DID CHANGE BECAUSE I THINK THE BEST INTERPRETERS DO NOT WANT TO BE A PART OF THIS CAMPAIGN, SO THEY BASICALLY BOYCOTT ANY JOBS FROM THAT AGENCY BECAUSE THE STATE OF PLAY IS UNFAIR BASICALLY"
- "THERE ARE DIFFERENT TERMS AND CONDITIONS WHICH ARE WORSE THAN THE INTERPRETERS BEFORE, GOOD INTERPRETERS, HIGHLY QUALIFIED INTERPRETERS, HAD BEFORE"

7. “SO, WHAT I’M SAYING, ONE AGENCY IS FINE, BUT THERE SHOULD BE SOME OTHER MECHANISMS HOW INTERPRETERS COULD BE... HIRED WITH NO PREJUDICE OR SACRIFICE TO THEIR OWN PAY...”

- “SO I THINK THAT IT SHOULD BE BASICALLY BOTH. I THINK THAT, OKAY, WE’RE LIVING IN A MATERIAL WORLD AND ECONOMIC FACTORS ARE VERY IMPORTANT. I THINK THERE SHOULD BE AN OPTION FOR INTERPRETERS TO BE HIRED DIRECTLY, BY THE CLIENTS OR BY THE COURT SYSTEM OR BY WHOEVER NEEDS, SOLICITORS, WHOEVER NEEDS INTERPRETERS”
- “SO THERE SHOULD BE A DATABASE OR AN AGENCY WHICH IS THE FIRST, KIND OF, POINT OF CALL”
- “BUT THERE SHOULD BE SOME OTHER MECHANISMS HOW INTERPRETERS COULD BE PART OF COURT INTERPRETING OR LEGAL INTERPRETING PROCESS”
- “YEAH, BUT NOW IT’S AN AGENCY. SO WHAT I’M SAYING, ONE AGENCY IS FINE, BUT THERE SHOULD BE SOME OTHER MECHANISMS HOW INTERPRETERS COULD BE... **HIRED WITH NO PREJUDICE** OR NO, KIND OF, IF YOU WANT, **SACRIFICE TO THEIR OWN PAY**, OR WHATEVER”
- “I THINK MAYBE BRIEFING FOR INTERPRETERS COULD BE MORE SPECIFIC. SO NOTHING LIKE EXACT DETAILS, BUT MAYBE A BRIEFING IN TERMS OF WHAT AN INTERPRETER SHOULD ANTICIPATE IN TERMS OF PREPARATION”
- “SO SOMETIMES YOU GO BLINDLY TO MEET THE CLIENT AND YOU ARE THERE IN THE COURTROOM INTERPRETING FOR THEM”
- “MAYBE, YEAH, IN TERMS OF NOT DISCLOSING UNNECESSARILY OR ILLEGALLY SOME DETAILS, MORE SPECIFIC BRIEFING FOR THE INTERPRETERS WHAT [IS] TO BE EXPECTED”
- “I MEAN IN TERMS OF TERMINOLOGY, FOR EXAMPLE, IF IT’S AN ECONOMIC CRIME, THERE SHOULD BE SOME KIND OF SPECIFIC PREPARATION FOR THAT”
- “YES, EXACTLY. WHAT KIND OF CASE IT’S GOING TO BE WITHOUT DISCLOSING ANY DETAILS”
- “WELL, MAINLY... I DIDN’T HAVE ANY. MAYBE I WAS UNLUCKY. BUT I THINK IT SHOULD BE AN IMPORTANT PART OF THE PROCESS IN EACH AND EVERY CASE. TO GIVE AN INTERPRETER ANY VALID POINTERS”

So, based on the above we can identify the following themes:

1. I’M A NEUTRAL PERSON. I AM A DEVICE, IF YOU LIKE. YES. A TRANSMITTING DEVICE. A TRANSMITTER” (The role of interpreter is that of a transmitting device).

Subthemes:

- “MY ROLE AS AN INTERPRETER SHOULD BE IMPARTIAL” (focus on impartiality)
- “INTERPRETER IS TO HELP TO MAKE THE RIGHT DECISION” (facilitator of communication – contradiction to the device idea)
- “I JUST DON’T WANT TO HAVE THIS ADDITIONAL ROLE AND I DON’T THINK IT IS MY JOB”
- I DON’T THINK I’M ENTITLED TO MY OPINION”

- "MY JOB IS THE BEST WHEN IT'S NOT SEEN AS AN ADDITIONAL PERSON IN THE PROCESS"
- "SO IT'S LIKE MAKEUP IF YOU WANT, THE BEST MAKEUP IS MAKEUP YOU DON'T SEE. THE BEST INTERPRETER WHO IS NOT SEEN OR HEARD METAPHORICALLY"

2. "EVERYBODY TREATED ME WITH RESPECT, WITH DUE RESPECT" (Recognition)

- "IT WAS A KIND OF A PUBLIC THANK YOU AND PUBLIC APPRECIATION WHICH WAS REALLY NICE"

3. "SO, WHAT I'M SAYING, ONE AGENCY IS FINE, BUT THERE SHOULD BE SOME OTHER MECHANISMS HOW INTERPRETERS COULD BE... HIRED WITH NO PREJUDICE OR SACRIFICE TO THEIR OWN PAY..." (about the current situation and changes that have taken place in the system)

12.2.6 Respondent 6: codes and themes from survey

Respondent 6: Codes and themes from the Survey

1. "THE ROLE OF INTERPRETERS AND PROCEDURES ARE STANDARD."
2. "I HAVE INTERPRETED IN COURTS CONSECUTIVELY, MICROPHONES HAVE ALWAYS BEEN AVAILABLE, I DON'T NEED ANY OTHER EQUIPMENT. PENS AND PAPER WERE ALSO AVAILABLE."
3. "OVERALL, I WOULD SAY THE FACILITIES WERE ADEQUATE AND SUFFICIENT FOR INTERPRETING."
4. "MY ROLE IN COURT IS TO FACILITATE COMMUNICATION AND INTERPRET FAITHFULLY AND IMPARTIALLY WHAT IS SAID BY EITHER PARTY, AS ACCURATELY AS POSSIBLE."
5. "SOMETIMES I EVEN INTERPRET LITERALLY TO AVOID ANY MISINTERPRETATION AND I AM ALWAYS STRIVING FOR ACCURACY AS IMPORTANT DECISION ARE MADE."
6. "IN MOST CASES I WAS BOOKED INDEPENDENTLY, BY AGENCIES."
7. "IN ONE CASE I WAS BOOKED DIRECTLY BY A CLAIMANT AND HE EXPECTED ME TO BE ON HIS SIDE AND ASKED FOR MY ADVICE (WHETHER HE SHOULD MENTION AND DISCLOSE CERTAIN THINGS)"
8. " THEN HE ASKED ABOUT MY OPINION HOW THE PROCEEDINGS WERE GOING DESPITE OF MY BRIEFING FROM THE BEGINNING THAT I WOULD REMAIN NEUTRAL AND INTERPRET EVERYTHING WHAT WAS SAID BY ANYBODY. IF HE DID NOT WANT ANYTHING TO BE INTERPRETED, HE SHOULD NOT HAVE SAID SO."

9. **"FROM MY POINT OF VIEW, INTERPRETERS ARE VALUED."**
10. "THE RECENT TENDENCY IS AUSTERITY MEASURES AND CUTTING COSTS, INCLUDING INTERPRETERS' FEES BUT IT IS NEGOTIABLE AND A COMPROMISE COULD BE SUCCESSFULLY ACHIEVED."

Identified themes:

1. **"MY ROLE IN COURT IS TO FACILITATE COMMUNICATION AND INTERPRET FAITHFULLY AND IMPARTIALLY WHAT IS SAID BY EITHER PARTY, AS ACCURATELY AS POSSIBLE."**
 - "SOMETIMES I EVEN INTERPRET LITERALLY TO AVOID ANY MISINTERPRETATION AND I AM ALWAYS STRIVING FOR ACCURACY AS IMPORTANT DECISION ARE MADE."
2. **"IN ONE CASE I WAS BOOKED DIRECTLY BY A CLAIMANT AND HE EXPECTED ME TO BE ON HIS SIDE AND ASKED FOR MY ADVICE"**
 - " THEN HE ASKED ABOUT MY OPINION HOW THE PROCEEDINGS WERE GOING DESPITE OF MY BRIEFING FROM THE BEGINNING THAT I WOULD REMAIN NEUTRAL AND INTERPRET EVERYTHING WHAT WAS SAID BY ANYBODY. IF HE DID NOT WANT ANYTHING TO BE INTERPRETED, HE SHOULD NOT HAVE SAID SO."
3. **"FROM MY POINT OF VIEW, INTERPRETERS ARE VALUED."**
 - "THE RECENT TENDENCY IS AUSTERITY MEASURES AND CUTTING COSTS, INCLUDING INTERPRETERS' FEES BUT IT IS NEGOTIABLE AND A COMPROMISE COULD BE SUCCESSFULLY ACHIEVED."
4. **"OVERALL, I WOULD SAY THE FACILITIES WERE ADEQUATE AND SUFFICIENT FOR INTERPRETING."**
 - "THE ROLE OF INTERPRETERS AND PROCEDURES ARE STANDARD."
 - "I HAVE INTERPRETED IN COURTS CONSECUTIVELY, MICROPHONES HAVE ALWAYS BEEN AVAILABLE, I DON'T NEED ANY OTHER EQUIPMENT. PENS AND PAPER WERE ALSO AVAILABLE."

The themes in the survey complement and overlap and with the following identified themes in the corresponding transcript of the follow-up interview:

1. **I'M A NEUTRAL PERSON. I AM A DEVICE, IF YOU LIKE. YES. A TRANSMITTING DEVICE. A TRANSMITTER"** (The role of interpreter is that of a transmitting device).

Subthemes:

- **“MY ROLE AS AN INTERPRETER SHOULD BE IMPARTIAL”** (focus on impartiality)
- **“INTERPRETER IS TO HELP TO MAKE THE RIGHT DECISION”** (facilitator of communication – contradiction to the device idea)
- **“I JUST DON’T WANT TO HAVE THIS ADDITIONAL ROLE AND I DON’T THINK IT IS MY JOB”**
- **I DON’T THINK I’M ENTITLED TO MY OPINION”**
- **“MY JOB IS THE BEST WHEN IT’S NOT SEEN AS AN ADDITIONAL PERSON IN THE PROCESS”**
- **“SO IT’S LIKE MAKEUP IF YOU WANT, THE BEST MAKEUP IS MAKEUP YOU DON’T SEE. THE BEST INTERPRETER WHO IS NOT SEEN OR HEARD METAPHORICALLY”**

2. “EVERYBODY TREATED ME WITH RESPECT, WITH DUE RESPECT” (Recognition)

- **“IT WAS A KIND OF A PUBLIC THANK YOU AND PUBLIC APPRECIATION WHICH WAS REALLY NICE”**

Additional theme from the survey has emerged:

3. “OVERALL, I WOULD SAY THE FACILITIES WERE ADEQUATE AND SUFFICIENT FOR INTERPRETING.”

- **“THE ROLE OF INTERPRETERS AND PROCEDURES ARE STANDARD.”**
- **“I HAVE INTERPRETED IN COURTS CONSECUTIVELY, MICROPHONES HAVE ALWAYS BEEN AVAILABLE, I DON’T NEED ANY OTHER EQUIPMENT. PENS AND PAPER WERE ALSO AVAILABLE.”**

4“IN ONE CASE I WAS BOOKED DIRECTLY BY A CLAIMANT AND HE EXPECTED ME TO BE ON HIS SIDE AND ASKED FOR MY ADVICE”

12.2.7 Respondent 7: first stage coding

Respondent N7 (from the first round of the questionnaires for interpreters)

File name (transcript): interview with Respondent 7

Audio length – 0:17:59

Interview took place on:

First cycle coding methods: Initial coding, process coding, In Vivo coding

Identified initial codes (53):

1. "IN TERMS OF MY PROFESSIONAL ETHICS AND MY CONDUCT AND MY PROFESSIONAL DISCIPLINE, I DON'T SEE ANY DIFFERENCE. I STILL HAVE TO PERFORM WELL. I STILL HAVE TO BE FAITHFUL AND COMMITTED TO EITHER SIDE, WHOEVER IS SPEAKING, IT DOESN'T MATTER."
2. "IN TERMS OF STRESS, I THINK I FIND CROWN COURT IS EASIER YEAH, THEN IT'S MUCH EASIER, YOU DON'T HAVE TO KEEP EVERYTHING IN YOUR MEMORY, SO IT'S MUCH EASIER FOR ME TO JUST GO DO IT IN A SYNCHRONOUS WAY"
3. "I LIKE A LITTLE BIT OF STRESS. SO IF, SAY, A WITNESS IS GIVING EVIDENCE IN COURT, IN THE COURTROOM, THEN I ENJOY IT BECAUSE FIRST OF ALL, THERE IS QUITE A GOOD CONTACT WITH THE CLIENT, BECAUSE YOU ESTABLISH A CERTAIN RAPPORT"
4. "I THINK IT IS IMPORTANT TO EXCHANGE SOME WORDS, JUST HAVE A LITTLE CHAT BEFORE YOU GO IN THE COURT TOGETHER WITH THE WITNESS"
5. "YOU CAN FEEL, IT'S A DIFFERENT DYNAMIC. FIRST OF ALL, YOU GET ADJUSTED TO HIM IN THE WAY, WHETHER HE SPEAKS FAST OR SLOW. ALSO, YOU MAY SOMETIMES, YOU MAY REALISE THAT SOMETIMES PEOPLE SAY WHAT THEY SAY, IS NOT EXACTLY WHAT THEY MEAN"
6. "YES, THERE IS A LOT OF THINGS WHERE YOU THINK, DID HE SAY THAT BECAUSE HE MEANT IT, OR HE SAID IT BECAUSE HE DOESN'T KNOW HOW TO PUT IT BETTER"
7. "THERE ARE TWO LINES. BOTH ACTUALLY, CAN HAVE SOME NEGATIVE EFFECT ON THE PERFORMANCE OR IMPRESSION OF HOW THE INTERPRETER COULD BE PERCEIVED. YOU SEE, THIS IS THE PROBLEM... I NOTICE, SOME INTERPRETERS JUST SAY EXACTLY, ALMOST WORD-FOR-WORD WHAT THE PERSON IS SAYING. SO THUS THEY GIVE A CHANCE FOR THE SOLICITOR, WHOEVER IN COURT, TO ACTUALLY CHALLENGE THE STATEMENT, TO ASK, "WHAT DO YOU MEAN BY THAT?""
8. "BUT SOMETIMES SOME PEOPLE GO TOO FAR. THEY COMPLETELY CLOUD AND OBSCURE THE MEANING"

9. "YOU KNOW WHAT THE PERSON MEANT, HE JUST PUT IT IN AN AWKWARD NATIVE TONGUE. SO SOMETIMES IF YOU KNOW THE PERSON IS NOT VERY ELOQUENT, IF YOU FEEL, IF YOU HAVE 90% CERTAINTY THAT ACTUALLY YOU CAN DO IT... YOU DON'T HAVE TO EDIT IT [OR DO IT IN A MORE...] YOU DON'T HAVE TO PUT FRILLS, YOU KNOW WHAT I MEAN?. BUT IF YOU CAN JUST, IF IT'S A VERY SIMPLE THING, YOU CAN JUST SAY IT IN STRAIGHTFORWARD ENGLISH WITHOUT MAKING IT SO CORRUPT THAT PEOPLE WOULD BE WONDERING"
10. "BECAUSE THE MORE... ESPECIALLY WHERE IT IS NOT VERY IMPORTANT, BUT IN FACT IT'S NOT TRUE, EVERYTHING IS IMPORTANT"
11. "EVERY SENTENCE THE PERSON SAYS IS IMPORTANT, SO IT'S NOT THE INTERPRETER'S ROLE TO THINK, OH, THIS IS PROBABLY NOT IMPORTANT"
12. "WHATEVER THE PERSON SAYS YOU HAVE TO BE COMPLETELY COMMITTED AND FAITHFUL TO THE MEANING AND TO THE SPIRIT AS WELL, HOPEFULLY, OF THE SENTENCE"
13. "YES, YEAH, OF COURSE, REGISTER AS WELL"
14. "IF THE PERSON USES SORT OF [** 0:06:03], THEN OF COURSE YOU HAVE TO DO IT, JUST EXACTLY WHAT THE PERSON SAYS. IF HE USES SOME F-WORDS ETC. WHATEVER, YOU HAVE TO RENDER IT AS CLOSE TO THE ORIGINAL AS POSSIBLE"
15. "WHO AFFECTS YOU FIRST IS THE PERSON WITH WHOM YOU'RE WORKING, IS THE ONE"
16. "BECAUSE OKAY, IF YOU INTERPRET FOR THE SOLICITOR, THEY'RE USUALLY QUITE ELOQUENT, VERY WELL PREPARED, THEY HAVE 10 TIMES TO PREPARE ALL THEIR QUESTIONS. THEIR QUESTIONS ARE WELL FORMULATED, STRUCTURED. QUITE OFTEN YOU CAN SEE WHERE THEY'RE LEADING, JUST GOING THROUGH THE QUESTIONS, YOU ALREADY KNOW. IT'S CLEAR"
17. "WHAT IS COMPLETELY UNCLEAR AND UNKNOWN TERRITORY, WHAT THE PERSON, HOW THE PERSON IS GOING TO ANSWER THE QUESTIONS"
18. "OF COURSE YOU DON'T WANT TO LET DOWN THAT INDIVIDUAL BECAUSE IF YOU GET CONFUSED OR MISUNDERSTAND, THEN YOU CAN DO SOME DAMAGE OR CAUSE SOME HARM TO HIS CASE"
19. "NOW, SOMETIMES YOU THINK, OH, IT'S ABSOLUTELY CLEAR WHAT HE JUST SAID, ABSOLUTELY CLEAR. AND SUDDENLY YOU REALISE THAT THE PERSON DOESN'T MEAN WHAT HE SAID. HE THOUGHT HE SAID IT, WHAT HE MEANT, BUT IN FACT, NO"
20. "IN THIS CASE, IF THE INTERPRETER, IF I REALISE I MISUNDERSTOOD HIM, I JUST SAY STRAIGHT AWAY TO THE COURT, "APOLOGIES, CORRECTION, THE INTERPRETER MISUNDERSTOOD THE LAST SENTENCE AND THE INTERPRETER NOW WANTS TO CLARIFY OR REPEAT THE SENTENCE AGAIN""
21. "THERE ARE SOME GUYS WHO I THINK DELIBERATELY SOMETIMES TRY TO CONFUSE THE INTERPRETER"
22. "THE MORE YOU DO IT, THE MORE THERE IS A DANGER THAT THE INTERPRETER WILL BE PERCEIVED AS NOT VERY PROFESSIONAL, NOT A VERY COMPETENT, PROFESSIONAL WORKER"
23. "THIS IS THE PROBLEM WITH THIS CULTURE BECAUSE PEOPLE DON'T REALISE, A LOT OF PEOPLE, THE ENGLISH... BECAUSE ENGLISH LANGUAGE, WELL, THE THING IS, A LOT OF

FOREIGNERS SPEAK ENGLISH LANGUAGE. BUT NOT MANY ENGLISH PEOPLE SPEAK SUFFICIENTLY FLUENTLY OTHER FOREIGN LANGUAGES”

24. “YEAH, SO THEREFORE IT HAS AN EFFECT BECAUSE THERE’S A LOT OF SOLICITORS JUST EXPECT THE INTERPRETER JUST TO DO IT LIKE A MACHINE GUN, JUST AUTOMATICALLY, BUT IT’S NOT AUTOMATIC IS IT?”
25. “ALSO, IT ALSO DEPENDS, ANOTHER THING IS, IF YOU WORK IN THE MAGISTRATE COURT, THEY DON’T HAVE THAT KIND OF RIGOROUS ATTENTION IN THE MAGISTRATE COURT BECAUSE THE CASES ARE QUITE SIMPLE”
26. “BUT IF YOU WORK IN CROWN COURT, IT’S MUCH MORE DEMANDING ON THE PART OF THE INTERPRETER”
27. “YOU HAVE TO BE ABSOLUTELY CLEAR WHEN YOU WORK WITH A CLIENT. YOU HAVE TO BE ABSOLUTELY CLEAR WHAT THE CLIENT SAID, HOW HE SAID IT, SO THAT’S IT”
28. “FAMILY COURT IS DIFFERENT, AS WELL”
29. “THE PROBLEM WITH FAMILY COURT... TO ALL COURTS, ANY COURT, INTERPRETERS QUITE OFTEN COME UNPREPARED, NOT BECAUSE THEY’RE LAZY, JUST BECAUSE NOBODY IS BOTHERED TO GIVE THEM SUFFICIENT INFORMATION ABOUT THE CASE. AND THIS IS TYPICAL FOR FAMILY COURT CASES”
30. “YOU COME, SOCIAL SERVICES COME WITH THESE HUGE DOCUMENTS, THEY READ THEM QUICKLY. IT’S SO DIFFICULT TO GET A COPY FROM SOCIAL SERVICES. THERE IS A SOLICITOR AS WELL”
31. “SO IT JUST BECOMES, HOW DO I SAY...? IT BECOMES VERY STRESSFUL”
32. “THERE IS NO NEED TO BE STRESSED”
33. “AND AGAIN, THEY’RE NOT BOTHERED TO GIVE YOU DOCUMENTS, UNDER FALSE PRETEXT OR FALSE EXCUSE THAT IT IS CONFIDENTIAL. RUBBISH! SO WE ALL KNOW THAT WE DON’T DISCLOSE INFORMATION”
34. “SECONDLY, OUT OF LAZINESS, THAT’S HOW I THINK OF IT”
35. “AND THIRDLY, BECAUSE THEY’RE NOT AWARE THAT THE INTERPRETER NEEDS AS MUCH TIME AS THEY DO WHEN THEY PREPARE THEIR OWN DOCUMENT”
36. “YOU CAN’T JUST READ FROM THE LIST, IT’S VERY COMPLICATED. ESPECIALLY IF YOU TURN UP IN COURT, YOU’VE NEVER SEEN THE CLIENT, YOU DON’T KNOW WHAT THE CASE IS ABOUT, NO, THAT’S THE PROBLEM”
37. “SO FAMILY COURT CASES ARE THE MOST DIFFICULT ONES”
38. “IF YOU KNOW THE CASE, IT’S MUCH EASIER”
39. “AND THERE IS ANOTHER THING WHICH THEY DO FAMILY COURT CASES, BECAUSE THEY USE SO OFTEN AGENCIES. EVERY TIME, AGENCY SENDS A NEW INTERPRETER FOR THE OLD CASE. THIS IS THE SAME ONGOING CASE, QUITE OFTEN THEY INVITE A NEW INTERPRETER”
40. “SO THE NEW INTERPRETER ARRIVES IN THE MIDDLE, THIS HAS BEEN AFTER SEVERAL HEARINGS, THE INTERPRETER TURNS UP, NEW INTERPRETER AND DOESN’T KNOW WHAT IS GOING ON. AND SO THAT’S YOU KNOW, NO, NO”
41. “SO I THINK FAMILY COURT PROBABLY IS THE MOST DIFFICULT, ONLY BECAUSE THEY DON’T LOOK THAT THE INTERPRETER NEEDS AS MUCH TIME AS THE SOLICITOR, AND THE SOCIAL WORKER TO GET THE...”

42. "I THINK THE ONLY ONE THING IS, IS THE MATERIAL YOU'RE WORKING WITH. THE CLIENT IS THE MATERIAL YOU'RE WORKING WITH. YES, IF YOU UNDERSTAND THE CLIENT, IF YOU'RE ON THE SAME RADIO WAVE, OR YOU ASSESS WHAT IS HIS LEVEL OF... HOW HE COMMANDS HIS VOCABULARY, IF YOU UNDERSTAND, ALL THAT IS, THIS IS MATERIAL"
43. "ANOTHER ONE IS THE MATERIAL WHICH IS IN THE PAPERWORK"
44. "IF THEY DON'T GIVE YOU MATERIAL TO GET READY AND AT LEAST TO KNOW WHAT IT'S ABOUT, SO IN FACT NOTHING ELSE HAS AN EFFECT ON THE PERFORMANCE OF THE INTERPRETER, THAT'S MY OPINION"
45. "NO, BUT WHAT THEY DO, WHILE YOU WAIT, VERY OFTEN THE SOLICITOR DISCUSSES THE MATTER WITH THE CLIENT FOR THE CONSULTATION. SO THE CONSULTATION TIME OR THE TIME IN CUSTODY, THAT'S WHERE YOU HECTICALLY PREPARE ALL THE MATERIAL, YOU MORE OR LESS BECOME PREPARED, BUT NO."
46. "YEAH. THAT'S ABSOLUTELY THE IDIOTIC SCHEME. YOU JUST CAN'T OPERATE, TO OPERATE PROFESSIONALLY AND EFFECTIVELY, YOU NEED TO HAVE A GOOD AMOUNT OF MATERIAL AND A GOOD TIME TO PREPARE. NOT A LONG TIME, BUT YOU NEED TO READ THROUGH, THAT'S THE MAIN THING"
47. "TAXI DRIVER! IF ONE CAN'T DO IT, IF MRS H CAN'T DO IT, THEN MR D CAN DO IT, YEAH. AS LONG AS THEY'RE CHEAP, THAT'S IT"
48. "I DON'T THINK INTERPRETERS HAVE GOT ANY STATUS, NOT NOW. I DON'T KNOW, I MAY BE A BIT PESSIMISTIC, BUT IT'S... I DON'T KNOW."
49. "IN THE TIME WHEN THE AGENCIES STARTED OPERATING, AND WHILE INTERPRETERS FROM NATIONAL REGISTERS WERE STILL WORKING IN COURT, THE COURT CLERKS WOULD ALWAYS SAY, "THANK GOD, A NATIONAL REGISTER INTERPRETER IS HERE, BECAUSE YESTERDAY WE HAD A PROBLEM WITH THE AGENCY INTERPRETER.""
50. AND THEY WOULD ALWAYS BE GRATEFUL AND SAY, "THANK YOU FOR TURNING UP."
51. "I THINK THEY DO. SOME OF THEM EVEN COME OUT WITH CERTAIN POSITIVE COMMENTS, OR COMPLIMENTARY COMMENTS. I THINK THEY SEE THE DIFFERENCE BECAUSE NATIONAL REGISTER INTERPRETERS WORK IN A SLIGHTLY DIFFERENT WAY"
52. "I HAVEN'T GOT A CLUE, EVERYTHING BECAME SO OBSCURE. IN THE PAST EVERYTHING WAS CLEAR, EVERYTHING. AND NOW AT THE MOMENT EVERYTHING IS HIDDEN SOMEWHERE"
53. "WITH AGENCIES EVERYTHING CHANGED"

12.2.8 Respondent 7: second stage coding

Respondent N7 (from the first round of questionnaires for interpreters)

File name (transcript): interview with Respondent 7

Audio length – 0:17:59

Interview took place on:

Second cycle coding: clustering initial codes, searching for themes

1. “EVERYTHING IS IMPORTANT” (Role performance)

Subthemes:

a) Establishing good rapport with the client

- “I THINK IT IS IMPORTANT TO EXCHANGE SOME WORDS, JUST HAVE A LITTLE CHAT BEFORE YOU GO IN THE COURT TOGETHER WITH THE WITNESS”
- “YOU CAN FEEL, IT’S A DIFFERENT DYNAMIC. FIRST OF ALL, YOU GET ADJUSTED TO HIM IN THE WAY, WHETHER HE SPEAKS FAST OR SLOW.
- “I LIKE A LITTLE BIT OF STRESS. SO IF, SAY, A WITNESS IS GIVING EVIDENCE IN COURT, IN THE COURTROOM, THEN I ENJOY IT BECAUSE FIRST OF ALL, THERE IS QUITE A GOOD CONTACT WITH THE CLIENT, **BECAUSE YOU ESTABLISH A CERTAIN RAPPORT**”

b) Dealing with misunderstandings/ “awkward” language (professional dilemmas)

- ALSO, YOU MAY SOMETIMES, YOU MAY REALISE THAT SOMETIMES PEOPLE SAY WHAT THEY SAY, IS NOT EXACTLY WHAT THEY MEAN”
- “YES, THERE IS A LOT OF THINGS WHERE YOU THINK, DID HE SAY THAT BECAUSE HE MEANT IT, OR HE SAID IT BECAUSE HE DOESN’T KNOW HOW TO PUT IT BETTER”
- “THERE ARE TWO LINES. BOTH ACTUALLY, CAN HAVE SOME NEGATIVE EFFECT ON THE PERFORMANCE OR IMPRESSION OF HOW THE INTERPRETER COULD BE PERCEIVED. YOU SEE, **THIS IS THE PROBLEM**...”
- I NOTICE, SOME INTERPRETERS JUST SAY EXACTLY, ALMOST WORD-FOR-WORD WHAT THE PERSON IS SAYING. SO THUS THEY GIVE A CHANCE FOR THE SOLICITOR, WHOEVER IN COURT, TO ACTUALLY CHALLENGE THE STATEMENT, TO ASK, “WHAT DO YOU MEAN BY THAT?””
- “BUT SOMETIMES SOME PEOPLE GO TOO FAR. THEY COMPLETELY CLOUD AND OBSCURE THE MEANING”
- “YOU KNOW WHAT THE PERSON MEANT, HE JUST PUT IT IN AN AWKWARD NATIVE TONGUE. SO SOMETIMES IF YOU KNOW THE PERSON IS NOT VERY ELOQUENT, IF YOU FEEL, IF YOU HAVE 90% CERTAINTY THAT ACTUALLY YOU CAN DO IT... YOU DON’T

HAVE TO EDIT IT [OR DO IT IN A MORE...] YOU DON'T HAVE TO PUT FRILLS, YOU KNOW WHAT I MEAN?. BUT IF YOU CAN JUST, IF IT'S A VERY SIMPLE THING, YOU CAN JUST SAY IT IN STRAIGHTFORWARD ENGLISH WITHOUT MAKING IT SO CORRUPT THAT PEOPLE WOULD BE WONDERING"

- "IN THIS CASE, IF THE INTERPRETER, IF I REALISE I MISUNDERSTOOD HIM, I JUST SAY STRAIGHT AWAY TO THE COURT, "APOLOGIES, CORRECTION, THE INTERPRETER MISUNDERSTOOD THE LAST SENTENCE AND THE INTERPRETER NOW WANTS TO CLARIFY OR REPEAT THE SENTENCE AGAIN""
- "THE MORE YOU DO IT, THE MORE THERE IS A DANGER THAT THE INTERPRETER WILL BE PERCEIVED AS NOT VERY PROFESSIONAL, NOT A VERY COMPETENT, PROFESSIONAL WORKER"
- "OF COURSE YOU DON'T WANT TO LET DOWN THAT INDIVIDUAL BECAUSE IF YOU GET CONFUSED OR MISUNDERSTAND, THEN YOU CAN DO SOME DAMAGE OR CAUSE SOME HARM TO HIS CASE"

c) Accuracy of rendition

- "BECAUSE THE MORE... ESPECIALLY WHERE IT IS NOT VERY IMPORTANT, BUT IN FACT IT'S NOT TRUE, EVERYTHING IS IMPORTANT"
- "EVERY SENTENCE THE PERSON SAYS IS IMPORTANT, SO IT'S NOT THE INTERPRETER'S ROLE TO THINK, OH, THIS IS PROBABLY NOT IMPORTANT"
- **"WHATEVER THE PERSON SAYS YOU HAVE TO BE COMPLETELY COMMITTED AND FAITHFUL TO THE MEANING AND TO THE SPIRIT AS WELL, HOPEFULLY, OF THE SENTENCE"**
- "YES, YEAH, OF COURSE, REGISTER AS WELL"
- "IF THE PERSON USES SORT OF [** 0:06:03], THEN OF COURSE YOU HAVE TO DO IT, JUST EXACTLY WHAT THE PERSON SAYS. IF HE USES SOME F-WORDS ETC. WHATEVER, YOU HAVE TO RENDER IT AS CLOSE TO THE ORIGINAL AS POSSIBLE"
- "YOU HAVE TO BE ABSOLUTELY CLEAR WHEN YOU WORK WITH A CLIENT. YOU HAVE TO BE ABSOLUTELY CLEAR WHAT THE CLIENT SAID, HOW HE SAID IT, SO THAT'S IT"

2. "IF YOU KNOW THE CASE, IT'S MUCH EASIER"

Subthemes:

a) Challenges interpreters face in the courtroom

- "BECAUSE OKAY, IF YOU INTERPRET FOR THE SOLICITOR, THEY'RE USUALLY QUITE ELOQUENT, VERY WELL PREPARED, THEY HAVE 10 TIMES TO PREPARE ALL THEIR

QUESTIONS. THEIR QUESTIONS ARE WELL FORMULATED, STRUCTURED. QUITE OFTEN YOU CAN SEE WHERE THEY'RE LEADING, JUST GOING THROUGH THE QUESTIONS, YOU ALREADY KNOW. IT'S CLEAR"

- "WHAT IS COMPLETELY UNCLEAR AND UNKNOWN TERRITORY, WHAT THE PERSON, HOW THE PERSON IS GOING TO ANSWER THE QUESTIONS"
- "NOW, SOMETIMES YOU THINK, OH, IT'S ABSOLUTELY CLEAR WHAT HE JUST SAID, ABSOLUTELY CLEAR. AND SUDDENLY YOU REALISE THAT THE PERSON DOESN'T MEAN WHAT HE SAID. HE THOUGHT HE SAID IT, WHAT HE MEANT, BUT IN FACT, NO"
- "THERE ARE SOME GUYS WHO I THINK DELIBERATELY SOMETIMES TRY TO CONFUSE THE INTERPRETER"
- "SO IT JUST BECOMES, HOW DO I SAY...? IT BECOMES VERY STRESSFUL"
- "THERE IS NO NEED TO BE STRESSED"

b) Factors affecting interpreter's performance

- **"AND AGAIN, THEY'RE NOT BOTHERED TO GIVE YOU DOCUMENTS, UNDER FALSE PRETEXT OR FALSE EXCUSE THAT IT IS CONFIDENTIAL. RUBBISH! SO WE ALL KNOW THAT WE DON'T DISCLOSE INFORMATION"**
- "SECONDLY, OUT OF LAZINESS, THAT'S HOW I THINK OF IT"
- **"AND THIRDLY, BECAUSE THEY'RE NOT AWARE THAT THE INTERPRETER NEEDS AS MUCH TIME AS THEY DO WHEN THEY PREPARE THEIR OWN DOCUMENT"**
- **"YOU CAN'T JUST READ FROM THE LIST, IT'S VERY COMPLICATED. ESPECIALLY IF YOU TURN UP IN COURT, YOU'VE NEVER SEEN THE CLIENT, YOU DON'T KNOW WHAT THE CASE IS ABOUT, NO, THAT'S THE PROBLEM"**
- **"IF YOU KNOW THE CASE, IT'S MUCH EASIER"**

- "AND THERE IS ANOTHER THING WHICH THEY DO FAMILY COURT CASES, BECAUSE THEY USE SO OFTEN AGENCIES. EVERY TIME, AGENCY SENDS A NEW INTERPRETER FOR THE OLD CASE. THIS IS THE SAME ONGOING CASE, QUITE OFTEN THEY INVITE A NEW INTERPRETER"
- "SO THE NEW INTERPRETER ARRIVES IN THE MIDDLE, THIS HAS BEEN AFTER SEVERAL HEARINGS, THE INTERPRETER TURNS UP, NEW INTERPRETER AND DOESN'T KNOW WHAT IS GOING ON. AND SO THAT'S YOU KNOW, NO, NO"
- **"SO I THINK FAMILY COURT PROBABLY IS THE MOST DIFFICULT, ONLY BECAUSE THEY DON'T LOOK THAT THE INTERPRETER NEEDS AS MUCH TIME AS THE SOLICITOR, AND THE SOCIAL WORKER TO GET THE..."**
- "NO, BUT WHAT THEY DO, WHILE YOU WAIT, VERY OFTEN THE SOLICITOR DISCUSSES THE MATTER WITH THE CLIENT FOR THE CONSULTATION. SO THE CONSULTATION TIME OR THE TIME IN CUSTODY, THAT'S WHERE YOU HECTICALLY PREPARE ALL THE MATERIAL, YOU MORE OR LESS BECOME PREPARED, BUT NO."

- "THIS IS THE PROBLEM WITH THIS CULTURE BECAUSE PEOPLE DON'T REALISE, A LOT OF PEOPLE, THE ENGLISH... BECAUSE ENGLISH LANGUAGE, WELL, THE THING IS, A LOT OF FOREIGNERS SPEAK ENGLISH LANGUAGE. BUT NOT MANY ENGLISH PEOPLE SPEAK SUFFICIENTLY FLUENTLY OTHER FOREIGN LANGUAGES. SO THEREFORE, IT HAS AN EFFECT BECAUSE THERE'S A LOT OF SOLICITORS JUST EXPECT THE INTERPRETER JUST TO DO IT LIKE A MACHINE GUN, JUST AUTOMATICALLY, BUT IT'S NOT AUTOMATIC IS IT?"
- "YEAH. **THAT'S ABSOLUTELY THE IDIOTIC SCHEME.** YOU JUST CAN'T OPERATE, TO OPERATE PROFESSIONALLY AND EFFECTIVELY, **YOU NEED TO HAVE A GOOD AMOUNT OF MATERIAL AND A GOOD TIME TO PREPARE.** NOT A LONG TIME, BUT YOU NEED TO READ THROUGH, THAT'S THE MAIN THING"
- "I THINK THE ONLY ONE THING IS, IS THE MATERIAL YOU'RE WORKING WITH. THE CLIENT IS THE MATERIAL YOU'RE WORKING WITH. YES, IF YOU UNDERSTAND THE CLIENT, IF YOU'RE ON THE SAME RADIO WAVE, OR YOU ASSESS WHAT IS HIS LEVEL OF... HOW HE COMMANDS HIS VOCABULARY, IF YOU UNDERSTAND, ALL THAT IS, THIS IS MATERIAL"
- "ANOTHER ONE IS THE MATERIAL WHICH IS IN THE PAPERWORK"
- "IF THEY DON'T GIVE YOU MATERIAL TO GET READY AND AT LEAST TO KNOW WHAT IT'S ABOUT, SO IN FACT NOTHING ELSE HAS AN EFFECT ON THE PERFORMANCE OF THE INTERPRETER, THAT'S MY OPINION"

3. "SO FAMILY COURT CASES ARE THE MOST DIFFICULT ONES"

- "IN TERMS OF MY PROFESSIONAL ETHICS AND MY CONDUCT AND MY PROFESSIONAL DISCIPLINE, I DON'T SEE ANY DIFFERENCE. I STILL HAVE TO PERFORM WELL. I STILL HAVE TO BE FAITHFUL AND COMMITTED TO EITHER SIDE, WHOEVER IS SPEAKING, IT DOESN'T MATTER".
- IN TERMS OF STRESS, I THINK I FIND CROWN COURT IS EASIER, "YEAH, THEN IT'S MUCH EASIER, YOU DON'T HAVE TO KEEP EVERYTHING IN YOUR MEMORY, SO IT'S MUCH EASIER FOR ME TO JUST GO DO IT IN A SYNCHRONOUS WAY"
- "ALSO, IT ALSO DEPENDS, ANOTHER THING IS, IF YOU WORK IN THE MAGISTRATE COURT, THEY DON'T HAVE THAT KIND OF RIGOROUS ATTENTION IN THE MAGISTRATE COURT BECAUSE THE CASES ARE QUITE SIMPLE"
- "BUT IF YOU WORK IN CROWN COURT, IT'S MUCH MORE DEMANDING ON THE PART OF THE INTERPRETER"
- "FAMILY COURT IS DIFFERENT, AS WELL"
- "THE PROBLEM WITH FAMILY COURT... TO ALL COURTS, ANY COURT, INTERPRETERS QUITE OFTEN COME UNPREPARED, NOT BECAUSE THEY'RE LAZY, JUST BECAUSE

NOBODY IS BOTHERED TO GIVE THEM SUFFICIENT INFORMATION ABOUT THE CASE. AND THIS IS TYPICAL FOR FAMILY COURT CASES”

- “YOU COME, SOCIAL SERVICES COME WITH THESE HUGE DOCUMENTS, THEY READ THEM QUICKLY. IT’S SO DIFFICULT TO GET A COPY FROM SOCIAL SERVICES. THERE IS A SOLICITOR AS WELL”

4. “TAXI DRIVER!”

- “TAXI DRIVER! IF ONE CAN’T DO IT, IF MRS H CAN’T DO IT, THEN MR D CAN DO IT, YEAH. AS LONG AS THEY’RE CHEAP, THAT’S IT”
- “I DON’T THINK INTERPRETERS HAVE GOT ANY STATUS, NOT NOW. I DON’T KNOW, I MAY BE A BIT PESSIMISTIC, BUT IT’S... I DON’T KNOW.”
- “IN THE TIME WHEN THE AGENCIES STARTED OPERATING, AND WHILE INTERPRETERS FROM NATIONAL REGISTERS WERE STILL WORKING IN COURT, THE COURT CLERKS WOULD ALWAYS SAY, “THANK GOD, A NATIONAL REGISTER INTERPRETER IS HERE, BECAUSE YESTERDAY WE HAD A PROBLEM WITH THE AGENCY INTERPRETER.””
- AND THEY WOULD ALWAYS BE GRATEFUL AND SAY, “THANK YOU FOR TURNING UP.”
- “I THINK THEY DO. SOME OF THEM EVEN COME OUT WITH CERTAIN POSITIVE COMMENTS, OR COMPLIMENTARY COMMENTS. I THINK THEY SEE THE DIFFERENCE BECAUSE NATIONAL REGISTER INTERPRETERS WORK IN A SLIGHTLY DIFFERENT WAY”
- “I HAVEN’T GOT A CLUE, EVERYTHING BECAME SO OBSCURE. IN THE PAST EVERYTHING WAS CLEAR, EVERYTHING. AND NOW AT THE MOMENT EVERYTHING IS HIDDEN SOMEWHERE”
- “WITH AGENCIES EVERYTHING CHANGED”

12.2.9 Respondent 7: codes and themes from survey

Respondent 7: Codes and themes from the Survey

1. “I AM THE SERVANT OF THE COURT”
2. “I AM A FACILITATOR / A CHANNEL FOR COMMUNICATION ONLY. NOT INTERESTED IN THE OUTCOME OF THE CASE.”
3. “YES, VERY MUCH SO – THAT IS I HOW I USED TO FEEL (BEFORE CAPITA AND OTHER AGENCIES STEPPED IN).”
4. “I ALWAYS EXPLAIN MY ROLE AND MY POSITION TO CLIENTS. AND HOPEFULLY THEY VIEW ME IN THAT ROLE.”

5. "WHATEVER I DO IN COURT SHOULD BE TRANSPARENT TO ALL SIDES (ON VERBAL AND NON-VERBAL LEVEL) THAT I AM NEUTRAL AND THAT I AM ONLY COMMITTED TO ACCURACY AND CLARITY IN MY INTERPRETING – THAT IS WHAT I AM THERE FOR."
6. "THE ROLE AND PERCEPTION OF THE COURT INTERPRETER HAS CHANGED DRAMATICALLY SINCE CAPITA AND OTHER AGENCIES HAVE TAKEN OVER."
7. "AT PRESENT IT SEEMS THAT AN ORDINARY (PREFERABLE NOT VERY EDUCATED) AND UNTRAINED NATIVE SPEAKER HAS BEEN ACCEPTED BY THE COURTS/ MOJ AS A SUITABLE PERSON TO WORK IN COURTS."
8. "THE MAIN VALUE THE COURT INTERPRETER HAS AT THE MOMENT – IT'S PERCEIVED LOW FINANCIAL COST. QUALITY DOES NOT COME INTO THE EQUATION."

Identified themes:

1. **"I AM THE SERVANT OF THE COURT"**
 - "WHATEVER I DO IN COURT SHOULD BE TRANSPARENT TO ALL SIDES (ON VERBAL AND NON-VERBAL LEVEL) THAT I AM NEUTRAL AND THAT I AM ONLY COMMITTED TO ACCURACY AND CLARITY IN MY INTERPRETING – THAT IS WHAT I AM THERE FOR."
2. **"I AM A FACILITATOR / A CHANNEL FOR COMMUNICATION ONLY. NOT INTERESTED IN THE OUTCOME OF THE CASE."**
3. **"I ALWAYS EXPLAIN MY ROLE AND MY POSITION TO CLIENTS. AND HOPEFULLY THEY VIEW ME IN THAT ROLE."**
4. **"THE ROLE AND PERCEPTION OF THE COURT INTERPRETER HAS CHANGED DRAMATICALLY SINCE CAPITA AND OTHER AGENCIES HAVE TAKEN OVER."**
 - "YES, VERY MUCH SO – THAT IS I HOW I USED TO FEEL (BEFORE CAPITA AND OTHER AGENCIES STEPPED IN)."
 - "AT PRESENT IT SEEMS THAT AN ORDINARY (PREFERABLE NOT VERY EDUCATED) AND UNTRAINED NATIVE SPEAKER HAS BEEN ACCEPTED BY THE COURTS/ MOJ AS A SUITABLE PERSON TO WORK IN COURTS."
 - "THE MAIN VALUE THE COURT INTERPRETER HAS AT THE MOMENT – IT'S PERCEIVED LOW FINANCIAL COST. QUALITY DOES NOT COME INTO THE EQUATION."

Only last theme N4 overlaps with the theme from the follow-up interview, that is the theme N4 referring to the change of the interpreter's status: **"TAXI DRIVER!"**

The first three themes from the survey are additional to the themes identified in the follow-up interview.

12.2.10 Respondent 13: first stage coding

Respondent N13 (from the first round of the questionnaire for interpreters)

File name (transcript): interview with Respondent 13

Audio length – 0:29:36

Interview took place on: 17/04/2015

First cycle coding methods: initial coding, process coding, in vivo coding

Identified initial codes (30 in total):

1. “EXACTLY, YES. AND ALSO DUE TO THE SERIOUSNESS OF DIFFERENT OFFENCES. OF COURSE THEY CAN DIRECTLY, THEY CAN HAVE DIRECT IMPACTS ON YOUR RESPONSIBILITY.”
2. “BECAUSE IT’S ALSO ABOUT YOUR **CONFIDENCE** AS WELL. YOU HAVE TO BE VERY **CONFIDENT** BECAUSE EVEN IF YOU ARE A GOOD INTERPRETER, IF YOU’RE NOT **CONFIDENT** ENOUGH TO INTERPRET LET’S SAY IN THE CROWN COURT ENVIRONMENT **THEN DUE TO THE PRESSURE YOU ARE UNDER AT THE TIME, YOU COULD MISINTERPRET.**”
3. “AND ALSO IN SOME COURTS, LIKE LET’S SAY IN TRIBUNALS... **OKAY, IN TRIBUNALS YOU ONLY INTERPRET CONSECUTIVELY** WHEREAS IN CROWN COURT YOU HAVE TO **INTERPRET SIMULTANEOUSLY.**”
4. “I THINK THAT’S THE **HARDEST PART**. IT’S REALLY ESSENTIAL AS WELL **TO LISTEN TO** WHAT IS BEING SAID IN THE COURT TO CONVEY THAT CONVERSATION TO YOUR CLIENT WITHOUT ANY ADDITIONAL...YEAH, THAT’S... I THINK, IN MY OPINION THESE ARE THEM.
5. “IT’S DIFFERENT FROM COURT TO COURT. LET’S SAY, FOR INSTANCE, **IN TRIBUNALS YOU’RE ALWAYS SAT ON THE CHAIR. THE CHAIR**. BASICALLY YOU ARE SAT AT ALL TIMES AND YOU’RE RELAXED WHILST INTERPRETING. BUT IN CRIMINAL MATTERS IN MAGISTRATES’ AND CROWN COURTS, DURING YOUR CLIENT’S CROSS-EXAMINATION YOU HAVE TO STAND WITH YOUR CLIENT IN THE WITNESS BOX.”
6. “AND, OF COURSE, THAT MAKES YOU TIRED BECAUSE IN SOME CASES YOU HAVE TO WAIT FOR DAYS. AND AS A RESULT YOU GET TIRED AND THAT CAN AGAIN AFFECT YOUR PERFORMANCE.”
7. “I THINK THAT’S IT BECAUSE IN **SOME COURTS THE ENVIRONMENT IS MORE RELAXED** AND WHEREAS IN SOME... IT’S AGAIN **THE SERIOUSNESS OF THE OFFENCE OR THE CASE. CONSIDERING THE NATURE OF THE CASE, YEAH.**”
8. “BECAUSE USUALLY IT’S ONLY A SINGLE CLIENT **IN MAGISTRATE COURTS**. IT VERY RARELY HAPPENS THAT THERE COULD BE MORE THAN ONE CLIENT AT THE SAME TIME BECAUSE THEY **DEAL WITH ONLY MINOR MATTERS, WHEREAS IN CROWN COURTS USUALLY THEY**

DEAL WITH SERIOUS OFFENCES AND MAINLY THAT HAPPENS LIKE GANG RELATED OFFENCES WHICH IS BASICALLY MULTIPLE DEFENDANTS."

9. "...BUT IN SOME CASES LIKE THIS ONE, IF THE DOCK IS NOT BIG ENOUGH TO FACILITATE ALL THE INTERPRETERS AND DEFENDANTS AT THE SAME TIME... SO THEY COULD USE, THEY USUALLY USE THIS. **CONFERENCE INTERPRETING**, YES."
10. "AND I THINK I PREFER, I PERSONALLY PREFER **CONFERENCE INTERPRETING** BECAUSE YOU ARE AWAY FROM THE DEFENDANT."
11. "FIRSTLY **THEY CANNOT POSE YOU ANY THREATS**. AND SECONDLY **BECAUSE YOU ARE AWAY FROM THEM, THEY CAN'T ASK YOU ANY QUESTIONS WHICH USUALLY HAPPENS.**"
12. "THEY ASK FOR ADVICE AS WELL SOMETIMES, OR SOMETIMES FOR CLARIFICATION. OR SOMETIMES THEY EVEN WANT TO MAKE COMMENTS. AND THAT'S DUE TO THE LACK OF KNOWLEDGE, THEY DON'T HAVE THE KNOWLEDGE ABOUT THE COURT PROCEEDINGS."
13. "FOR EXAMPLE, IF THE PROSECUTOR... THE PROSECUTOR IS PRESENTING EVIDENCE, OF COURSE THAT'S AGAINST HIM OR HER. SO THEY IMMEDIATELY WANT TO RESPOND TO THAT NOT KNOWING THAT HE WILL BE GIVEN A CHANCE LATER. AND FOR HIS LEGAL TEAM TO PUT HIS CASE FORWARD".
14. "YOU HAVE TO TELL THEM TO JUST WAIT AND YOU WILL BE GIVEN A CHANCE LATER. IT DISTRACTS FROM YOUR ACTUAL DUTY WHICH IS INTERPRETING."
15. "BASICALLY MY ROLE IS JUST, IT HAS A SOLE PURPOSE WHICH IS INTERPRETING FROM ONE LANGUAGE TO ANOTHER WITHOUT ANY OMISSION OR ADDITION."
16. AND BASICALLY WE HAVE TO REMEMBER THE THREE FUNDAMENTAL RULES OF INTERPRETING AT ALL TIMES, WHICH IS PROFESSIONALISM..., SECOND IS CONFIDENTIALITY... AND IMPARTIALITY."
17. "WE USED TO BE. IN THE OLD SYSTEM. BUT NOW WHEN THE CONTRACT HAS BEEN TAKEN OVER BY A PRIVATE AGENCY THEREFORE WE DON'T GET ANY RESPECT FOR THE VERY HARD JOB YOU DO FOR THEM BASICALLY."
18. "BECAUSE DUE TO THE FACT THAT A LOT OF UNQUALIFIED INTERPRETERS ARE BEING RECRUITED BY THE AGENCY."
19. "BECAUSE IF SOMEONE IS UNQUALIFIED AND HE GOES TO THE CROWN COURT FOR A VERY SERIOUS MATTER, IN MOST CASES IT HAPPENS THEY ARE NOT ABLE TO INTERPRET AND LEAVE THE CASE IN THE MIDDLE OR LEAVES THE CASE IN THE BEGINNING BEFORE IT STARTS. AND THAT CAN ADVERSELY AFFECT THE REPUTATION OF ALL INTERPRETERS. I THINK THAT'S THE REASON WHY"
20. "ABSOLUTELY, YES"
21. "YES, THAT'S WHAT I DO FROM MY EXPERIENCE, BECAUSE MOST OF THE CLIENTS HAVE NEVER BEEN TO THE COURT PROCEEDINGS BEFORE. SO IT'S BETTER THAT YOU ESTABLISH YOUR ROLE IN THE BEGINNING SO TO AVOID FUTURE PROBLEMS IN A WAY."
22. "I THINK IT'S BETTER TO REMIND THEM THE THREE FUNDAMENTAL RULES OF INTERPRETING AS I MENTIONED EARLIER. THAT YOU ARE IMPARTIAL BASICALLY AND IF THEY SEEK ANY ADVICE FROM YOU YOU'RE NOT ABLE TO GIVE THEM ANY ADVICE AND EVERYTHING IS CONFIDENTIAL."

23. "SOMETIMES YOU... YOU'RE INVOLVED IN A CASE THAT YOU HAVE TO INTERPRET FOR BOTH PARTIES. BUT YOU CANNOT DISCLOSE INFORMATION FROM ONE TO ANOTHER. LIKE PROSECUTION AND DEFENDANT... **SO IT HAS TO BE KEPT CONFIDENTIAL, YEAH.**"
24. WHEN THEY WANT TO, LIKE TAKE THE DEFENCE, BECAUSE THEY DON'T WANT TO DISCLOSE AND SOMETIMES THEY... I DON'T KNOW HOW TO PUT IT. BASICALLY WITHIN THEMSELVES THEY CAN DISCLOSE LOTS OF INFORMATION WHICH THEY DON'T WANT THOSE INFORMATION TO BE DISCLOSED TO THE PROSECUTION. **SO OUR JOB IS TO NOT BE AS A WITNESS BUT TO SIMPLY INTERPRET WHAT'S BEING SAID.**"
25. "IT DEPENDS ON THE PERSON, YEAH. BUT IF THEY DON'T STOP **WE HAVE TO RAISE THIS POINT IN THE COURT BEFORE THE JUDGE.** SO THEY COULD GET A FIRM DIRECTION FROM THE..."
26. "MAINLY THEY DO ACCEPT IT BUT IT DEPENDS ON THEIR LEVEL OF THEIR EDUCATION AND THEIR COMMON SENSE."
27. "THE WHOLE SYSTEM, YEAH. **I DON'T THINK IT'S WORKING EFFECTIVELY BECAUSE THE SYSTEM HAS BEEN PRIVATISED**"
28. "THE GOVERNMENT AND EVERYONE JUST CARES ABOUT SAVING MONEY RATHER THAN DELIVERING EFFECTIVE AND QUALITY SERVICES."
29. "BECAUSE SINCE THE SYSTEM HAS BEEN PRIVATISED, MOST OF THE PROFESSIONAL QUALIFIED INTERPRETERS, THEY DON'T GET ENOUGH JOBS **SO THEY LEFT THE PROFESSION.**"
30. "SO ONE DAY WE WILL COME TO A POINT THAT THERE WILL BE **NO PROFESSIONAL INTERPRETERS,** JUST ANYONE BEING RECRUITED BY THIS AGENCY AND..."

12.2.11 Respondent 13: codes and themes from survey

Respondent N13 (from the first round of the questionnaire for interpreters)

File name (transcript): interview with Respondent 13

Audio length – 0:29:36

Interview took place on: 17/04/2015

Second cycle coding: clustering initial codes, searching for themes

1. "IT'S DIFFERENT FROM COURT TO COURT"

- "EXACTLY, YES. AND ALSO DUE TO THE SERIOUSNESS OF DIFFERENT OFFENCES. OF COURSE THEY CAN DIRECTLY, THEY CAN HAVE DIRECT IMPACTS ON YOUR RESPONSIBILITY."
- "AND ALSO IN SOME COURTS, LIKE LET'S SAY IN TRIBUNALS... OKAY, **IN TRIBUNALS YOU ONLY INTERPRET CONSECUTIVELY, WHEREAS IN CROWN COURT YOU HAVE TO INTERPRET SIMULTANEOUSLY.**"
- "IT'S DIFFERENT FROM COURT TO COURT. LET'S SAY, FOR INSTANCE, IN TRIBUNALS YOU'RE ALWAYS SAT ON THE CHAIR. THE CHAIR. BASICALLY YOU ARE SAT AT ALL TIMES AND YOU'RE RELAXED WHILST INTERPRETING. BUT IN CRIMINAL MATTERS IN MAGISTRATES' AND CROWN COURTS, DURING YOUR CLIENT'S CROSS-EXAMINATION YOU HAVE TO STAND WITH YOUR CLIENT IN THE WITNESS BOX."
- "AND, OF COURSE, THAT MAKES YOU TIRED BECAUSE IN SOME CASES YOU HAVE TO WAIT FOR DAYS. AND AS A RESULT YOU GET TIRED AND THAT CAN AGAIN AFFECT YOUR PERFORMANCE."
- "I THINK THAT'S IT BECAUSE IN SOME COURTS THE ENVIRONMENT IS MORE RELAXED AND WHEREAS IN SOME... IT'S AGAIN THE SERIOUSNESS OF THE OFFENCE OR THE CASE. CONSIDERING THE NATURE OF THE CASE, YEAH."
- "BECAUSE USUALLY IT'S ONLY A SINGLE CLIENT IN MAGISTRATE COURTS. IT VERY RARELY HAPPENS THAT THERE COULD BE MORE THAN ONE CLIENT AT THE SAME TIME BECAUSE THEY DEAL WITH ONLY MINOR MATTERS, WHEREAS IN CROWN COURTS USUALLY THEY DEAL WITH SERIOUS OFFENCES AND MAINLY THAT HAPPENS LIKE GANG RELATED OFFENCES WHICH IS BASICALLY MULTIPLE DEFENDANTS."

2. "DUE TO THE PRESSURE YOU ARE UNDER AT THE TIME, YOU COULD MISINTERPRET."

- "I THINK THAT'S THE HARDEST PART. IT'S REALLY ESSENTIAL AS WELL TO LISTEN TO WHAT IS BEING SAID IN THE COURT TO CONVEY THAT CONVERSATION TO YOUR CLIENT WITHOUT ANY ADDITIONAL...YEAH, THAT'S... I THINK, IN MY OPINION THESE ARE THEM."
- "AND, OF COURSE, THAT MAKES YOU TIRED BECAUSE IN SOME CASES YOU HAVE TO WAIT FOR DAYS. AND AS A RESULT YOU GET TIRED AND THAT CAN AGAIN AFFECT YOUR PERFORMANCE."
- "FIRSTLY THEY CANNOT POSE YOU ANY THREATS. AND SECONDLY BECAUSE YOU ARE AWAY FROM THEM, THEY CAN'T ASK YOU ANY QUESTIONS WHICH USUALLY HAPPENS."

3. "YOU HAVE TO BE VERY CONFIDENT"

- "BECAUSE IT'S ALSO ABOUT YOUR CONFIDENCE AS WELL. YOU HAVE TO BE VERY CONFIDENT BECAUSE EVEN IF YOU ARE A GOOD INTERPRETER, IF YOU'RE NOT CONFIDENT ENOUGH TO INTERPRET LET'S SAY IN THE CROWN COURT ENVIRONMENT THEN DUE TO THE PRESSURE YOU ARE UNDER AT THE TIME, YOU COULD MISINTERPRET."

4. “AND I THINK, I PERSONALLY PREFER CONFERENCE INTERPRETING BECAUSE YOU ARE AWAY FROM THE DEFENDANT.”

- “...BUT IN SOME CASES LIKE THIS ONE, IF THE DOCK IS NOT BIG ENOUGH TO FACILITATE ALL THE INTERPRETERS AND DEFENDANTS AT THE SAME TIME... SO THEY COULD USE, THEY USUALLY USE THIS. CONFERENCE INTERPRETING, YES.”
- “FIRSTLY **THEY CANNOT POSE YOU ANY THREATS**. AND SECONDLY BECAUSE YOU ARE AWAY FROM THEM, THEY CAN’T ASK YOU ANY QUESTIONS WHICH USUALLY HAPPENS.”

5. “THE THREE FUNDAMENTAL RULES OF INTERPRETING AT ALL TIMES”

- “BASICALLY MY ROLE IS JUST, IT HAS A SOLE PURPOSE WHICH IS INTERPRETING FROM ONE LANGUAGE TO ANOTHER WITHOUT ANY OMISSION OR ADDITION.”
- AND BASICALLY WE HAVE TO REMEMBER THE THREE FUNDAMENTAL RULES OF INTERPRETING AT ALL TIMES, WHICH IS PROFESSIONALISM..., SECOND IS CONFIDENTIALITY... AND IMPARTIALITY.”

6. “THEY ASK FOR ADVICE”

- “THEY ASK FOR ADVICE AS WELL SOMETIMES, OR SOMETIMES FOR CLARIFICATION. OR SOMETIMES THEY EVEN WANT TO MAKE COMMENTS.”
- “AND THAT’S DUE TO THE LACK OF KNOWLEDGE, **THEY DON’T HAVE THE KNOWLEDGE ABOUT THE COURT PROCEEDINGS.**”
- “FOR EXAMPLE, IF THE PROSECUTOR... THE PROSECUTOR IS PRESENTING EVIDENCE, OF COURSE THAT’S AGAINST HIM OR HER. SO THEY IMMEDIATELY WANT TO RESPOND TO THAT NOT KNOWING THAT HE WILL BE GIVEN A CHANCE LATER. AND FOR HIS LEGAL TEAM TO PUT HIS CASE FORWARD”.
- “**YOU HAVE TO TELL THEM TO JUST WAIT AND YOU WILL BE GIVEN A CHANCE LATER. IT DISTRACTS FROM YOUR ACTUAL DUTY WHICH IS INTERPRETING.**”
- “YES, THAT’S WHAT I DO FROM MY EXPERIENCE, BECAUSE MOST OF THE CLIENTS HAVE NEVER BEEN TO THE COURT PROCEEDINGS BEFORE. **SO IT’S BETTER THAT YOU ESTABLISH YOUR ROLE IN THE BEGINNING SO TO AVOID FUTURE PROBLEMS IN A WAY.**”
- “**I THINK IT’S BETTER TO REMIND THEM THE THREE FUNDAMENTAL RULES OF INTERPRETING AS I MENTIONED EARLIER.** THAT YOU ARE IMPARTIAL BASICALLY AND IF THEY SEEK ANY ADVICE FROM YOU YOU’RE NOT ABLE TO GIVE THEM ANY ADVICE AND EVERYTHING IS CONFIDENTIAL.”
- “IT DEPENDS ON THE PERSON, YEAH. BUT **IF THEY DON’T STOP WE HAVE TO RAISE THIS POINT IN THE COURT BEFORE THE JUDGE.** SO THEY COULD GET A FIRM DIRECTION FROM THE...”

- **"MAINLY THEY DO ACCEPT IT BUT IT DEPENDS ON THEIR LEVEL OF THEIR EDUCATION AND THEIR COMMON SENSE."**

7. "SO OUR JOB IS TO NOT BE AS A WITNESS BUT TO SIMPLY INTERPRET WHAT'S BEING SAID"

- "SOMETIMES YOU... YOU'RE INVOLVED IN A CASE THAT YOU HAVE TO INTERPRET FOR BOTH PARTIES. BUT YOU CANNOT DISCLOSE INFORMATION FROM ONE TO ANOTHER. LIKE PROSECUTION AND DEFENDANT... SO IT HAS TO BE KEPT CONFIDENTIAL, YEAH."
- WHEN THEY WANT TO, LIKE TAKE THE DEFENCE, BECAUSE THEY DON'T WANT TO DISCLOSE AND SOMETIMES THEY... I DON'T KNOW HOW TO PUT IT. BASICALLY WITHIN THEMSELVES THEY CAN DISCLOSE LOTS OF INFORMATION WHICH THEY DON'T WANT THOSE INFORMATION TO BE DISCLOSED TO THE PROSECUTION. SO OUR JOB IS TO NOT BE AS A WITNESS BUT TO SIMPLY INTERPRET WHAT'S BEING SAID."

8. "WE DON'T GET ANY RESPECT FOR THE VERY HARD JOB YOU DO FOR THEM BASICALLY"

- WE USED TO BE. IN THE OLD SYSTEM. BUT NOW WHEN THE CONTRACT HAS BEEN TAKEN OVER BY A PRIVATE AGENCY THEREFORE WE DON'T GET ANY RESPECT FOR THE VERY HARD JOB YOU DO FOR THEM BASICALLY."
- "BECAUSE DUE TO THE FACT THAT A LOT OF UNQUALIFIED INTERPRETERS ARE BEING RECRUITED BY THE AGENCY."
- "BECAUSE IF SOMEONE IS UNQUALIFIED AND HE GOES TO THE CROWN COURT FOR A VERY SERIOUS MATTER, IN MOST CASES IT HAPPENS THEY ARE NOT ABLE TO INTERPRET AND LEAVE THE CASE IN THE MIDDLE OR LEAVES THE CASE IN THE BEGINNING BEFORE IT STARTS. AND THAT CAN ADVERSELY AFFECT THE REPUTATION OF ALL INTERPRETERS. I THINK THAT'S THE REASON WHY"
- "ABSOLUTELY, YES"

9. "THE GOVERNMENT AND EVERYONE JUST CARES ABOUT SAVING MONEY RATHER THAN DELIVERING EFFECTIVE AND QUALITY SERVICES."

- **"THE WHOLE SYSTEM, YEAH. I DON'T THINK IT'S WORKING EFFECTIVELY** BECAUSE THE SYSTEM HAS BEEN PRIVATISED"
- "BECAUSE SINCE THE SYSTEM HAS BEEN PRIVATISED, MOST OF THE PROFESSIONAL QUALIFIED INTERPRETERS, THEY DON'T GET ENOUGH JOBS SO THEY LEFT THE PROFESSION."
- "SO ONE DAY WE WILL COME TO A POINT THAT THERE WILL BE NO PROFESSIONAL INTERPRETERS, JUST ANYONE BEING RECRUITED BY THIS AGENCY AND..."

So, based on the above we can identify the following themes:

1. "IT'S DIFFERENT FROM COURT TO COURT"

- Different physical settings of different courts have a bearing on interpreters' performance;
- Different modes of interpreting required;
- Different level of formality and seriousness of offence/case adds to pressure and challenges;
- Amount of people the interpreter works with also differs between different courts.

2. "DUE TO THE PRESSURE YOU ARE UNDER AT THE TIME, YOU COULD MISINTERPRET."

- pressures and challenges interpreters face in the courtroom.

Subthemes:

- **"YOU HAVE TO BE VERY CONFIDENT"**
- **"AND I THINK, I PERSONALLY PREFER CONFERENCE INTERPRETING BECAUSE YOU ARE AWAY FROM THE DEFENDANT."** - dealing with challenges

3. "THE THREE FUNDAMENTAL RULES OF INTERPRETING AT ALL TIMES"

Subthemes:

- **"SO OUR JOB IS TO NOT BE AS A WITNESS BUT TO SIMPLY INTERPRET WHAT'S BEING SAID"**
- **"THEY ASK FOR ADVICE"**

4. "WE DON'T GET ANY RESPECT FOR THE VERY HARD JOB YOU DO FOR THEM BASICALLY"

Subthemes:

- **"THE GOVERNMENT AND EVERYONE JUST CARES ABOUT SAVING MONEY RATHER THAN DELIVERING EFFECTIVE AND QUALITY SERVICES."**
- **"THE WHOLE SYSTEM, YEAH. I DON'T THINK IT'S WORKING EFFECTIVELY BECAUSE THE SYSTEM HAS BEEN PRIVATISED"**

12.2.12 Respondent 16: first stage coding

Respondent N16 (from the first round of questionnaires for interpreters)

File name (transcript): interview with Respondent 16

Audio length – 0:15:56

Interview took place on 15/05/2015

First cycle coding methods: Initial coding, process coding, In Vivo coding

Identified initial codes (82 in total):

1. "THE HIGHER THE COURT IS THE MORE **CHALLENGING** IT IS FOR THE INTERPRETER"
2. "**THE PRESSURE** WE FEEL IS A BIT HIGHER WHEN THERE IS A MORE COMPLICATED CASE INVOLVING MAYBE RAPE OR MURDER"
3. "WHEREAS IN A FAMILY CASE OR WHEN WE ARE DEALING JUST WITH FRAUD OR STEALING THINGS, THERE IS NOT SO MUCH **PRESSURE**"
4. "ALWAYS **THE PRESSURE** TO INTERPRET ACCURATELY"
5. "**THE ENTIRE CASE DEPENDS ON US**"
6. "**REALLY INTIMIDATING**"
7. "**JUST STAND IN FRONT OF THE JUDGE AND EVERYBODY'S LOOKING AT ME AND RECORDING WHAT I SAY**", BUT YEAH, ITS PART OF OUR PROFESSION"
8. "IT IS **VERY REWARDING**"
9. "WE FEEL THAT WE MANAGED TO **FACILITATE COMMUNICATION**"
10. "WE MANAGED TO **HELP PEOPLE SOLVE THE CASE**"
11. "**IT'S REALLY WORTH ALL THIS EFFORT AND PRESSURE**"
12. "**IT WAS VERY COMPLEX**"
13. "THE CROWN COURT CAN DEAL WITH MORE **COMPLEX MATTERS**"
14. "THERE ARE ALWAYS LEGAL TERMS BUT THEY AREN'T AS **COMPLEX** AS IN OTHER TYPES OF COURT" – **about family court**
15. "USUALLY IT'S NOT THAT **COMPLEX** AS IN OTHER TYPES OF COURTS" – **repetition about family court**
16. "YEAH, YOU DON'T EVEN HAVE A MICROPHONE"
17. "YOU HAVE TO SPEAK IN FRONT OF EVERYBODY AND WE HAVE TO SPEAK UP AND MAKE SURE EVERYBODY CAN HEAR AND UNDERSTAND YOU. YES"
18. "I THINK WHEN INTERPRETING FOR THE COURT EVERY WORD MATTERS. ALL THE NUANCES"
19. "YOU HAVE TO INTERPRET VERY ACCURATELY"
20. "I THINK THERE IS NO ROOM FOR THINKING TOO MUCH ABOUT SOMETHING"
21. "YOU ALSO HAVE TO BE VERY PRECISE AND VERY QUICK"

22. "THE JUDGE AND ALL THE SOLICITORS ARE MAKING NOTES ABOUT WHAT YOU ARE SAYING"
23. "AND EVERY WORD MATTERS"
24. "ALL THE WORDS CAN HAVE CRUCIAL SIGNIFICANCE FOR THE CASE"
25. "I THINK OUR ROLE IS REALLY IMPORTANT AND WE HAVE TO BE VERY FOCUSED"
26. "IT'S NOT A LITERARY TRANSLATION"
27. "WE CAN'T BE CREATIVE"
28. "WE SHOULD NOT ADD ANYTHIGN"
29. "IT IS EXACTLY WHAT THE PERSON IS SAYING"
30. "A VERY IMPORTANT ROLE"
31. "FORTUNATELY MOST OF THE SOLICITORS I WORKED WITH AND THE JUDGES REALLY ACKNOWLEDGE THIS IMPORTANT ROLE AND ARE AWARE OF THIS, YEAH"
32. "ALMOST LEGAL ROLE"
33. "WE ARE INVOLVED IN THE LEGAL PROCESS AS WELL"
34. "WHAT WE SAY IS VERY IMPORTANT FOR THE OUTCOME OF THE CASE"
35. "WE CANNOT ADD ANYTHING"
36. "WE ALSO HAVE TO SWEAR AN OATH WHICH IS A MORAL DUTY"
37. "SO IT'S A VERY COMPLEX ROLE"
38. "BUT OF COURSE FACILITATOR OF COMMUNICATION"
39. "BUT ALSO A MORAL DUTY I WOULD SAY, YEAH"
40. FEELING VALUED - "YEAH, MOST OF THE TIME..." – process coding plus In Vivo
41. "I HAD A NICE EXPEREINCE WITH THE JUDGE WHO REALLY, WAS REALLY AWARE OF THE IMPORTANT ROLE OF THE INTERRPETER AND OF THE EFFORT THE INTERPRETER HAS TO MAKE"
42. "ANOTHER JUDGE COMPLAINED ABOUT THE FACT THAT THERE WAS A LOT OF NOISE IN THE COURTROOM OR BECAUSE THERE WERE TWO INTERPRETERS INTERPRETING FOR DIFFERENT CLIENTS" – depending on judge's experience
43. "THE OTHER INTERPRETER HAD TO RAISE HER VOICE"
44. "IT WAS CAUSING A BIT OF CONFUSION"
45. "IT DEPENDS ON THE PERSON"
46. "SOME PEOPLE HAVE LESS KNOWLEDGE AND MAYBE LESS EXPEREINCE WORKING WITH INTERPRETERS, ARE NOT VERY AWARE OF WHAT WE DO AND HOW IMPORTANT AND DIFFICULT IT IS"
47. "I FELT RECOGNISED"
48. "MY ROLE WAS APPRECIATED"
49. "IT REALLY DEPENDS ON THE CLIENT" - About the client's understanding of the interpreter's role
50. "SOME KNOW VERY WELL WHAT THE INTERPRETER'S ROLE IS"
51. "PROBABLY BECAUSE THEY WORKED WITH INTERPRETERS A LOT AND THEY WERE TOLD THIS"
52. "SOME ARE NOT VERY FAMILIAR"
53. "THEY MAY PERCIEVE US AS AN ADVISOR"

54. "THEY MAY WANT PERSONAL **ADVICE**"
55. "I WAS NOT ASKED FOR **ADVICE**"
56. "THE CLIENT KNEW THAT I HAVE **TO INTERPRET ONLY**"
57. "I AM NOT THERE TO GIVE THEM **ADVICE**"
58. "**THE SOLICITOR IS THE ONE WHO DOES THAT**"
59. "WHEN I WAS INTERPRETING FOR THE SOCIAL SERVICES OR FOR THE YOUTH OFFENDING TEAM OR PROBATION OR IN MEDICAL SETTINGS, SOMETIMES A CLIENT WOULD ASK FOR MY **ADVICE** OR WANT TO EXCHANGE PERSONAL DETAILS"
60. "I WOULD HAVE TO STATE IT VERY CLEARLY ITS NOT MY ROLE AND I AM BOUND BY A CONTRACT AND I CANNOT EXCHNAGE PERSONAL DETAILS"
61. "YES. EXACTLY. **A CODE OF CONDUCT**", "**WE HAVE A CODE OF CONDUCT**" – **FEELING BOUND BY A CONTRACT AND A CODE OF CONDUCT**
62. "USUALLY WHEN I TELL THEM THIS THEY UNDERSTAND"
63. "I THINK IT DEPENDS ON THE PERSON"
64. SOME PEOPLE MIGHT **NOT UNDERSTAND, MIGHT INSIST**"
65. "**FORGET ABOUT THE CODE OF CONDUCT**" – **client to the interpreter**
66. "**BUT I HAVE TO TAKE IT VERY SINCERELY**"
67. "ONCE IT HAPPENED TO ME. AND I TOLD THEM, **I HAD TO MAKE SOMETHING UP**"
68. "THIS WAS IN MEDICAL SETTING. IN COURT IT DIDN'T HAPPEN TO ME"
69. "**WE CANNOT JUST BREACH THE CODE OF CONDUCT BECAUSE SOMEBODY DOESN'T UNDERSTAND**"
70. "A COLLEAUGE WHO HAS BEEN WORKIGN AS A COURT INTERPRETER FOR MANY YEARS AND SHE ALSO TOOK PART IN THE PROTESTS AGAINST ALL THESE..." - **About status of the interpreter:**
71. "YEAH, IN THE LAST FEWS YEARS I NOTICED MANY COMPANIES APPEARED. "THEY **PAY VERY LOW RATES**"
72. "**COMPANIES THAT ALREADY EXISTED REDUCED THEIR RATES**"
73. "**SINCE 2009 I NOTICED THIS WORSENNING OF SORT OF CONDITIONS AND OF THE STATUS OF THE INTERPRETER**"
74. "A COLLEAUGE WHO HAS BEEN WORKING AS AN INTERPRETER FOR EIGHT NINE YEARS AND SHE TOOK PART IN THESE **MOVEMENTS AGAINST** CAPITA AND ALL **THESE COMPANIES...**"
75. "**SHE'S ALSO VERY DISAPPOINTED WITH WHAT IS GOING ON**"
76. "**SHE FEELS THAT THAT THE STATUS OF THE INTERPRETER IN THE UK HAS WORSENE**"
77. "**SHE IS EVEN CONSIDERING WORK IN A DIFFERENT FIELD WHICH IS A REAL PITY**"
78. "**I FEEL INTERPRETERS ARE CRUCIAL, ESPECIALLY IN COURT**"
79. "**I THINK THEIR STATUS SHOULD BE DIFFERENT**"
80. "**I HOPE** MAYBE IN THE FUTUTE PEOPLE WILL REALISE HOW IMPORTANT THE ROLE OF THE INTERPRETER IS"
81. "MAYBE **THINGS WILL GET BETTER. "I HOPE."**
82. "**ABOUT BREAKING THE CODE OF CONDUCT**" – not in court settings, the respondent is saying that clients often invite interpreters into their house which is against the code of

conduct because they often don't understand the interpreter's role (see last paragraph on page 6 in the audio transcript).

12.2.13 Respondent 16: second stage coding

Respondent N16 (from the first round of questionnaires for interpreters)

File name (transcript): interview with Respondent 16

Audio length – 0:15:56

Interview took place on 15/05/2015

Second cycle coding: clustering initial codes, searching for themes

1. "THE PRESSURE WE FEEL"

- "THE HIGHER THE COURT IS THE MORE CHALLENGING IT IS FOR THE INTERPRETER"
- "THE PRESSURE WE FEEL IS A BIT HIGHER WHEN THERE IS A MORE COMPLICATED CASE INVOLVING MAYBE RAPE OR MURDER"
- "WHEREAS IN A FAMILY CASE OR WHEN WE ARE DEALING JUST WITH FRAUD OR STEALING THINGS, THERE IS NOT SO MUCH PRESSURE"
- "ALWAYS THE PRESSURE TO INTERPRET ACCURATELY"
- "THE ENTIRE CASE DEPENDS ON US"
- "REALLY INTIMIDATING"
- "JUST STAND IN FRONT OF THE JUDGE AND EVERYBODY'S LOOKING AT ME AND RECORDING WHAT I SAY", BUT YEAH, ITS PART OF OUR PROFESSION"

2. "IT WAS VERY COMPLEX"

- "THE CROWN COURT CAN DEAL WITH MORE **COMPLEX** MATTERS"
- "THERE ARE ALWAYS LEGAL TERMS BUT THEY AREN'T AS **COMPLEX** AS IN OTHER TYPES OF COURT" – about family court

3. "YOU HAVE TO INTERPRET VERY ACCURATELY"

- "ALL THE WORDS CAN HAVE CRUCIAL SIGNIFICANCE FOR THE CASE"
- "AND EVERY WORD MATTERS"
- "THE JUDGE AND ALL THE SOLICITORS ARE MAKING NOTES ABOUT WHAT YOU ARE SAYING"
- "YOU ALSO HAVE TO BE VERY PRECISE AND VERY QUICK"

- "I THINK WHEN INTERPRETING FOR THE COURT EVERY WORD MATTERS. ALL THE NUANCES"
- "IT'S NOT A LITERARY TRANSLATION"
- "WE CAN'T BE CREATIVE"
- "WE SHOULD NOT ADD ANYTHING"
- "IT IS EXACTLY WHAT THE PERSON IS SAYING"

4. "YEAH, YOU DON'T EVEN HAVE A MICROPHONE"

- "YOU HAVE TO SPEAK IN FRONT OF EVERYBODY AND WE HAVE TO SPEAK UP AND MAKE SURE EVERYBODY CAN HEAR AND UNDERSTAND YOU. YES"

5. "IT IS VERY REWARDING"

- "IT'S REALLY WORTH ALL THIS EFFORT AND PRESSURE"
- "WE FEEL THAT WE MANAGED TO FACILITATE COMMUNICATION"
- "WE MANAGED TO HELP PEOPLE SOLVE THE CASE"
- **FEELING VALUED** - "YEAH, MOST OF THE TIME..."
- "I FELT RECOGNISED"
- "MY ROLE WAS APPRECIATED"

6. "A VERY IMPORTANT ROLE"

- "I THINK OUR ROLE IS REALLY IMPORTANT AND WE HAVE TO BE VERY FOCUSED"
- "FORTUNATELY MOST OF THE SOLICITORS I WORKED WITH AND THE JUDGES REALLY ACKNOWLEDGE THIS IMPORTANT ROLE AND ARE AWARE OF THIS, YEAH"
- "I HAD A NICE EXPERIENCE WITH THE JUDGE WHO REALLY, WAS REALLY AWARE OF THE IMPORTANT ROLE OF THE INTERPRETER AND OF THE EFFORT THE INTERPRETER HAS TO MAKE"
- "I FEEL INTERPRETERS ARE CRUCIAL, ESPECIALLY IN COURT"

7. "ALMOST LEGAL ROLE"

- "WE ARE INVOLVED IN THE LEGAL PROCESS AS WELL"
- "WHAT WE SAY IS VERY IMPORTANT FOR THE OUTCOME OF THE CASE"
- **"WE CANNOT ADD ANYTHING"**
- "WE ALSO HAVE TO SWEAR AN OATH WHICH IS **A MORAL DUTY**"
- **"SO IT'S A VERY COMPLEX ROLE"**
- "BUT ALSO A **MORAL DUTY** I WOULD SAY, YEAH"
- "BUT OF COURSE **FACILITATOR OF COMMUNICATION**"

8. "THEY MAY PERCEIVE US AS AN ADVISOR"

- "IT REALLY DEPENDS ON THE CLIENT"
- "SOME KNOW VERY WELL WHAT THE INTERPRETER'S ROLE IS"
- "PROBABLY BECAUSE THEY WORKED WITH INTERPRETERS A LOT AND THEY WERE TOLD THIS"
- "SOME ARE NOT VERY FAMILIAR"
- "THEY MAY WANT PERSONAL ADVICE"
- "I WAS NOT ASKED FOR ADVICE"
- "THE CLIENT KNEW THAT I HAVE TO INTERPRET ONLY"
- "I AM NOT THERE TO GIVE THEM ADVICE"
- "THE SOLICITOR IS THE ONE WHO DOES THAT"
- "WHEN I WAS INTERPRETING FOR THE SOCIAL SERVICES OR FOR THE YOUTH OFFENDING TEAM OR PROBATION OR IN MEDICAL SETTINGS, SOMETIMES A CLIENT WOULD ASK FOR MY ADVICE OR WANT TO EXCHANGE PERSONAL DETAILS"
- "I WOULD HAVE TO STATE IT VERY CLEARLY ITS NOT MY ROLE AND I AM BOUND BY A CONTRACT AND I CANNOT EXCHANGE PERSONAL DETAILS"
- **"YES. EXACTLY. A CODE OF CONDUCT", "WE HAVE A CODE OF CONDUCT"**
- "USUALLY WHEN I TELL THEM THIS THEY UNDERSTAND"
- "I THINK IT DEPENDS ON THE PERSON"
- SOME PEOPLE MIGHT NOT UNDERSTAND, MIGHT INSIST"
- **"FORGET ABOUT THE CODE OF CONDUCT"** – client to the interpreter
- "BUT I HAVE TO TAKE IT VERY SINCERELY"
- "ONCE IT HAPPENED TO ME. AND I TOLD THEM, I HAD TO MAKE SOMETHING UP"
- "THIS WAS IN MEDICAL SETTING. IN COURT IT DIDN'T HAPPEN TO ME"
- "WE CANNOT JUST BREACH **THE CODE OF CONDUCT** BECAUSE SOMEBODY DOESN'T UNDERSTAND"

9. "I THINK THEIR STATUS SHOULD BE DIFFERENT"

- "A COLLEAGUE WHO HAS BEEN WORKING AS A COURT INTERPRETER FOR MANY YEARS AND SHE ALSO TOOK PART IN **THE PROTESTS AGAINST ALL THESE...**"
- "YEAH, IN THE LAST FEW YEARS I NOTICED MANY COMPANIES APPEARED. **"THEY PAY VERY LOW RATES"**
- "COMPANIES THAT ALREADY EXISTED **REDUCED THEIR RATES"**
- "SINCE 2009 I NOTICED THIS **WORSENING** OF SORT OF **CONDITIONS** AND OF THE **STATUS OF THE INTERPRETER"**
- "A COLLEAGUE WHO HAS BEEN WORKING AS AN INTERPRETER FOR EIGHT NINE YEARS AND SHE TOOK PART IN THESE **MOVEMENTS AGAINST** CAPITAL AND ALL THESE COMPANIES..."
- "SHE'S ALSO VERY DISAPPOINTED WITH WHAT IS GOING ON"
- "SHE FEELS THAT THAT **THE STATUS OF THE INTERPRETER IN THE UK HAS WORSENE**D"

- "SHE IS EVEN CONSIDERING WORK IN A DIFFERENT FIELD WHICH IS A REAL PITY"
- "I HOPE MAYBE IN THE FUTUTE PEOPLE WILL REALISE HOW IMPORTANT THE ROLE OF THE INTERPRETER IS"
- "MAYBE THINGS WILL GET BETTER. "I HOPE."

10. "IT DEPENDS ON THE PERSON": ATTITUDE OF SOME LEGAL PROFESSIONALS TOWARDS INTERPRETERS

- "ANOTHER JUDGE COMPLAINED ABOUT THE FACT THAT THERE WAS A LOT OF NOISE IN THE COURTROOM OR BECAUSE THERE WERE TWO INTERPRETERS INTERPRETING FOR DIFFERENT CLIENTS" – depending on judge's experience
- "THE OTHER INTERPRETER HAD TO RAISE HER VOICE"
- "IT WAS CAUSING A BIT OF CONFUSION"
- "SOME PEOPLE HAVE LESS KNOWLEDGE AND MAYBE LESS EXPEREINCE WORKING WITH INTERPRETERS, ARE NOT VERY AWARE OF WHAT WE DO AND HOW IMPORTANT AND DIFFICULT IT IS"

The first four categories (clusters of codes) can be further collapsed into a larger group – **theme – Challenges and pressures of interpreters in court.**

So, based on the above we can identify the following themes:

1. **"THE PRESSURE WE FEEL"**: Challenges and pressures of interpreters in court.
2. **"A VERY IMPORTANT ROLE"**: Role perceptions
3. **"IT IS VERY REWARDING"**: Job satisfaction
4. **"IT DEPENDS ON THE PERSON"**: Attitude of some legal professionals towards interpreters
5. **"I THINK THEIR STATUS SHOULD BE DIFFERENT"**: changes in the status of the profession

12.2.14 Respondent 16: codes and themes from survey

Respondent 16: Codes and themes from the first-round questionnaire

1. "THERE ARE SOME TYPES OF COURTS THAT ARE MORE FORMAL AND IMPLY A HUGE RESPONSIBILITY, THEREFORE MAXIMUM ATTENTION HAS TO BE PAID WHEN INTERPRETING"
2. "CROWN COURTS, MAGISTRATE'S COURTS CAN BE MORE STRESSFUL"

3. "USUALLY THERE ARE NO SPECIAL FACILITIES FOR INTERPRETERS AND SOMETIMES BEING IN FRONT OF EVERYBODY (AND ESPECIALLY OF THE JUDGE) CAN BE A BIT INTIMIDATING"
4. "WHEN INTERPRETING FOR THE CLIENTS (WHEN THE WITNESS SPEAKS ENGLISH), I HAVE TO DO WHISPERED SIMULTANEOUS INTERPRETING, WHICH CAN BE QUITE CHALLENGING."
5. "THERE SHOULD BE MORE APPROPRIATE FACILITIES IN PLACE."
6. "VERY IMPORTANT, AS THE SOLICITORS AND THE JUDGES TAKE NOTE OF WHAT I AM SAYING AT ALL TIMES AND WHAT I AM INTERPRETING CAN HAVE A SIGNIFICANT IMPACT ON THE OUTCOME OF THE PROCEEDINGS."
7. "EVERY WORD MATTERS."
8. "THE JUDGE THANKED ME ON SEVERAL OCCASIONS, SO I FELT APPRECIATED, BUT IT DEPENDS – SOME OFFICIALS ARE MORE AWARE OF AND CONSIDERATE TOWARDS INTERPRETERS THAN OTHERS"
9. "MOST OF THEM ARE AWARE OF THE IMPORTANCE OF INTERPRETING IN THE COURTROOM, BUT NOT ALL."
10. "THERE ARE CLIENTS WHO THINK THEY KNOW ENGLISH AND THINK THEY DON'T NEED AN INTERPRETER; THEY DON'T REALISE HOW DIFFICULT LEGAL LANGUAGE IS AND HOW IMPORTANT IT IS TO CONVEY THE CORRECT MEANING AND UNDERSTAND EVERY WORD."
11. "I AM NOT 100% FAMILIAR, AS I DO NOT WORK AS A COURT INTERPRETER ALL THE TIME, BUT I HAVE HEARD FROM COLLEAGUES THAT THE STATUS OF COURT INTERPRETERS CONSIDERABLY WORSENERED IN THE LAST FEW YEARS AND RATES HAVE DECREASED."

Identified Themes

1. Stress, pressure and challenges - codes 1, 2 and 3
2. Poor facilities - 5
3. Important role – 6, 7, 8
4. Understanding the role of interpreters by non-English speaking litigants. – codes 4, 9, and 10.
5. Rates have decreased, status of interpreters have worsened. – 11

The themes in the survey overlap with the following identified themes in the corresponding transcript of the follow-up interview:

1. "THE PRESSURE WE FEEL"
2. "YEAH, YOU DON'T EVEN HAVE A MICROPHONE"
3. "A VERY IMPORTANT ROLE"
4. "THEY MAY PERCEIVE US AS AN ADVISOR"
5. "I THINK THEIR STATUS SHOULD BE DIFFERENT"

12.2.15 Respondent 18: first stage coding

Respondent N18 (from the first round of the questionnaire for interpreters)

File name (transcript): interview with Respondent 18

Audio length – 0:29:53

Interview took place on:

First cycle coding methods: Initial coding, process coding, In Vivo coding

Identified initial codes (69 in total):

1. "IF YOU LOOK AT THE INTERPRETERS IN GENERAL THE SITUATION IS NEVER THE SAME TWICE, IT'S ALWAYS DIFFERENT, BECAUSE THERE ARE DIFFERENT PARTICIPANTS HERE ARE DIFFERENT SETTINGS"
2. "IN THE COURTS THERE ALWAYS DIFFERENT SITUATIONS, DIFFERENT PARTICIPANTS EVERY TIME, AND USUALLY DIFFERENT COURT ROOMS"
3. "DIFFERENT INSTITUTIONS, DIFFERENT JUDGES, DIFFERENT PROSECUTORS, THERE ARE TOO MANY VARIABLES THAT CHANGE FOR IT TO BE ALL THE TIME THE SAME"
4. "AND BECAUSE OF THAT THE EXPECTATION CHANGES ALL THE TIME"
5. "THERE WAS A CASE WITH ANOTHER INTERPRETER IN CHINESE. AND HE WAS VERY, VERY SLOW. SO EVERYTHING THAT WAS BEING SAID THEY WERE PAUSING AFTER EVERY SENTENCE, SO SHE WAS ABLE TO INTERPRET IN A CONSECUTIVE MANNER. AND BECAUSE OF THAT, IT WAS VERY, VERY SLOW"
6. SO ONCE THAT CASE FINISHED, AND THEY BROUGHT MY DEFENDANT, THE PRESSURE WAS UP TO INCREASE THE SPEED"
7. "SO THEY, KIND OF, HINTED AM I OKAY TO DO SIMULTANEOUS TO CATCH ON TIME A LITTLE BIT, SO TALK AT THE SAME TIME AS THE PARTICIPANTS ARE TALKING"
8. "SO IN THEORY IF THE CHINESE CASE WOULDN'T BE HEARD BEFORE MY CASE, MAYBE I WOULD BE GIVEN MORE TIME AND THEY WOULDN'T BE SO STRESSED ABOUT THE TIME, BECAUSE IT IS A SATURDAY TODAY AS WELL, AND EVERYONE WANTED TO GO HOME A LITTLE BIT QUICKER"
9. "SO THESE LITTLE SUBTLE CHANGES ALWAYS MAKE A DIFFERENCE, SO I DON'T THINK YOU CAN SAY THAT INTERPRETING IN GENERAL IS VERY HOMOGENOUS, BECAUSE THE TREATMENT CHANGES ALL THE TIME"
10. "THERE ARE JUST TOO MANY VARIABLES"
11. "THEY HAD NOT GIVEN ME A CHOICE. THE COURT DOESN'T ASK WHETHER YOU CAN DO ONE OR ANOTHER, THEY HINT ON THIS. SO THEY SAID, "ARE YOU A LITTLE BIT FASTER?""

12. "BECAUSE I KNEW THE MAGISTRATES' COURT ALREADY, I KNEW THE PEOPLE THAT WERE SITTING THERE, THEY KNEW ME BEFORE AS WELL, WE SAW EACH OTHER IN THE PAST, SO THEY KNEW WHAT THEY COULD EXPECT FROM ME, AND THEY KNEW THAT I PREFER TO DO...I DO SIMULTANEOUS INTERPRETING WHEN IT'S NOT DIRECTED TO THE DEFENDANT. SO THEY KNEW THAT THEY COULD UP THE EXPECTATION TOWARDS ME"
13. "I WAS KNOWN TO THE LEGAL ADVISOR, YES. WELL, SHE SAID, "YOU'RE A LITTLE BIT FASTER" SO IT WAS MORE OF A QUESTION THAT EVERYBODY KNEW THE ANSWER TO"
14. "ACTUALLY I THINK JUDGES AND COURT STAFF, WHETHER IT'S SOLICITORS, LEGAL ADVISORS, USHERS, PROBATION, THEY GO THROUGH SO MANY FOREIGN SPEAKERS, AND THEY USE INTERPRETERS ON SUCH A REGULAR BASIS, THAT THEY CAN SEE THE DIFFERENCES THEMSELVES, IN MY OPINION. THAT SOME PEOPLE WOULD JUST GO SENTENCE BY SENTENCE, AND SOME INTERPRETERS GO MORE AT THE SAME TIME. ACTUALLY I THINK THEY ARE ABLE TO SPOT THIS DIFFERENCE"
15. "I DON'T KNOW, MAYBE SOME ARE ABLE TO SAY THAT THIS IS CALLED SIMULTANEOUS, THIS CALLED WHISPERING, I'M SURE SOME OF THEM ARE ABLE TO DO SO"
16. "BUT, ON THE OTHER HAND, SOME JUST REALISE THAT THERE ARE DIFFERENT WAYS OF DOING THIS"
17. "I WAS PRESENT AT THE SECOND HEARING WHEN THE JUDGE TOLD ME STRAIGHTAWAY THAT THE DEFENDANT OR APPELLANT SAID THAT HE WOULD PREFER FOR THE CONSECUTIVE STYLE OF INTERPRETING. SO THAT JUDGE WAS VERY AWARE OF THE MODES THAT HE WANTED ME TO USE"
18. "SO I THINK YOU CAN, AS IN ANY TRADE, YOU CAN FIND PEOPLE THAT ARE A LITTLE BIT MORE KNOWLEDGEABLE ABOUT OTHER THINGS AS WELL, AND SOME THAT ARE NOT, I THINK THEY CAN SEE THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THEM"
19. "WELL, AGAIN, IT DEPENDS, FROM PERSON TO PERSON. I HAVE WORKED WITH PEOPLE WHO ARE VERY SKILLED IN USING THE INTERPRETER, AND THEY KNEW EXACTLY HOW TO USE THE INTERPRETER, AND, AS A RESULT, THEY WERE ABLE TO ACHIEVE BETTER RESULTS"
20. "BECAUSE EFFECTIVELY YOU CAN LOOK AT THE INTERPRETER AS A TOOL, AND IF YOU KNOW HOW TO USE THAT TOOL, THEN YOU CAN ACHIEVE BETTER RESULTS"
21. "IF YOU DON'T KNOW HOW TO USE THAT TOOL, THEN YOU'RE STILL... OBVIOUSLY THE INTERPRETER MOST OF THE TIME TRIES TO DO THEIR BEST, SO YOU'RE STILL GOING TO GET RESULTS, BUT THEY MIGHT BE NOT AS EFFICIENT, OR NOT AS GOOD"
22. "AND EDUCATION IS ALWAYS GOOD, IT DOESN'T MATTER WHAT YOU'RE DOING OR WHAT PROFESSION IT IS, THE MORE YOU KNOW THE JOB OR THE PERSON THAT YOU ARE WORKING WITH, THE BETTER YOU ARE ABLE TO USE THAT PERSON, AND IT'S IN ANY TRADE REALLY"
23. "IN TERMS OF EDUCATION, I DON'T THINK YOU CAN BE FORCED TO ON THEM, THAT THEY HAVE TO HAVE THIS EDUCATION, OR THEY HAVE TO HAVE THIS KNOWLEDGE, BUT IF THEY DO, THEN IT'S TO THEIR BENEFIT"

24. IT DEPENDS, FROM COURT ROOM TO COURT ROOM. IF YOU GO TO YOUTH COURT, **THERE IS NO DOCK, SO YOU'RE SITTING DIRECTLY WITH THE PERSON**. FOR EXAMPLE, IF YOU GO INTO A WITNESS BOX THEN YOU CAN SIT NEXT TO THE PERSON"
25. "IF YOU HAVE AN ACCUSED AND SOMEONE IS STANDING IN THE DOCK AND THERE IS GLASS IN BETWEEN YOU AND THE OFFENDER, **THAT MAKES IT DIFFICULT**, BECAUSE OBVIOUSLY IN THAT MOMENT THE PERSON THAT IS ACCUSED CANNOT SIT DOWN, THEY HAVE TO STAND IN FRONT OF THE GLASS ALL THE TIME"
26. "SO EVEN IF THE JUDGE SAYS YOU CAN SIT DOWN, THE PERSON STILL HAS TO STAND MOST OF THE TIME, BECAUSE THE INTERPRETER IS IN FRONT OF THAT GLASS AND HE'S TALKING TO YOU, **SO IF YOU SIT DOWN, YOU CANNOT HEAR ANYTHING**"
27. "BUT THEN IF YOU COME TO **CROWN COURTS**, THEN MOSTLY LIKELY YOU'LL HAVE THE **HEADPHONES**, SO YOU'LL HAVE SOMETHING LIKE A TOUR GUIDE, AND YOU'LL BE GIVEN THE HEADPHONES **AND YOU CAN HEAR WHAT PEOPLE ARE SAYING**"
28. "**BUT THAT'S NOT ALWAYS THE CASE AS WELL**, BECAUSE **SOMETIMES THE BATTERIES ARE FLAT, OR SOMETHING ELSE IS HAPPENING. SO IT CAN BE DIFFICULT AND TRICKY**, BUT IT JUST DEPENDS ON THE COURT"
29. "WELL, **THE PEOPLE, THE CLIENTS THEY USUALLY EXPECT A LITTLE BIT MORE, AND THEY TRY SOMETIMES TO GET A LITTLE BIT MORE. SO I FREQUENTLY FACE THE SITUATION AFTER THE, LET'S SAY, CONSULTATION BETWEEN THE SOLICITOR AND THE CLIENT, HE WOULD GO INTO THE COURT ROOM, AND THEN HE SAYS, "YOU KNOW ALL THE STUFF, YOU SPEAK INSTEAD OF ME."**
30. "SO BECAUSE **THE CLIENTS ARE USUALLY NOT AWARE OF WHAT IS THE ROLE OF THE INTERPRETER**, AND EVEN IF YOU TELL THEM WHAT IS YOUR ROLE – AND YOU ALWAYS DO THAT, RIGHT – **THEY STILL DON'T REALLY ACKNOWLEDGE THAT AND TAKE THAT INTO THEIR HEART, THEY JUST DO WHATEVER THEY FEEL IS THE BEST**"
31. "AND IT'S FREQUENT THAT YOU END UP SITTING WITH A PERSON ONE-TO-ONE AND THEY **ASK YOU FOR ADVICE**"
32. "THEY'LL ASK YOU, **"WHAT DO YOU THINK? DO YOU THINK THIS MIGHT HAPPEN? WHAT DO YOU THINK ABOUT HOW THIS MIGHT EVOLVE, THE SITUATION, WHAT MIGHT HAPPEN?"** WHAT ARE THEY FACING, FOR EXAMPLE, IN TERMS OF SENTENCE? AND ALL SORTS OF STUFF"
33. "AND **IT'S SOMETIMES DIFFICULT TO DETACH AND SAY**, "WELL, I'M NOT GOING TO TALK TO YOU," OR, "I CANNOT TELL YOU ANYTHING ABOUT THIS, BECAUSE I'M JUST AN INTERPRETER."
34. "BECAUSE **IT BOILS DOWN TO ANOTHER THING**, IF YOU'RE RUDE TO THEM, AND YOU WOULD JUST TELL THEM, NO, I'M NOT GOING TO TALK, I'M NOT GOING TO TALK, **THEY MIGHT TURN AROUND AND STOP TRUSTING YOU, YOU WANT THEM TO FEEL COMFORTABLE TO SOME EXTENT TALKING TO YOU AS WELL**"
35. "SO YOU HAVE TO KIND OF JUDGE A LITTLE BIT EITHER WAY, SAYING... **SO YOU HAVE TO TALK, BUT YOU CANNOT GIVE THEM ANY ADVICE, BUT YOU HAVE TO TALK IN A WAY THAT THEY THINK THAT THEY'RE GETTING MORE OF AN UNDERSTANDING, I SUPPOSE**"

36. "YEAH, IT'S NOT ABOUT TELLING THEM JUST ABOUT ENOUGH, IT'S ABOUT TALKING TO THEM WITH NO SUBSTANCE IN FACT"
37. "SO THEY FEEL THAT THEY HAVE THIS SUPPORT, BUT ACTUALLY YOU'RE NOT GIVING THEM ANY, THEY JUST HAVE THE IMPRESSION THAT YOU'RE THERE FOR THEM"
38. "I THINK THE KIND OF A LABEL THE COURT INTERPRETER IN ITSELF MAKES YOU SEEN BY OTHER PEOPLE THAT YOU'RE PROFESSIONAL, AND I THINK THAT'S ONE OF THE FIRST THINGS"
39. BUT IN GENERAL, THE COURT ALWAYS HAS BEEN VERY POLITE TOWARDS ME, I ALWAYS HAVE GOOD COMMENTS FROM THE COURT SAYING THANK YOU, ALWAYS, YOU CAN ALWAYS HEAR THANK YOU"
40. "YOU CAN ALWAYS HEAR, YOU KNOW, YOU HAVE BEEN VERY HELPFUL. AND THEY'RE ALWAYS VERY POLITE TOWARDS YOU AND YOUR JOB AND WHAT YOU DO"
41. "SO I NEVER HAD ANYTHING LIKE OH YOU'RE JUST THIS AND THAT, OR NO, NEVER HAPPENED ANYTHING LIKE THIS"
42. THAT'S WHY WHEN I GO TO COURT I FEEL OBVIOUSLY THERE IS ALL THIS KIND OF PARADING ABOUT IN THE COURT WHEN YOU BOW AND YOU DO ALL THIS"
43. "BUT ONCE YOU FOLLOW THE ETIQUETTE OF THE COURTS, THEY RECOGNISE YOU AS BEING A PART OF THE COURTS, AND THEY ACCEPT THAT YOU'RE THERE TO HELP THEM AND TO SUPPORT THEM RATHER THAN TO DO ANYTHING ELSE, AND YOU'RE BEING RECOGNISED FOR THAT"
44. "ON THAT, IT'S USUALLY BECAUSE THE CLIENTS DO NOT UNDERSTAND HOW THEY'RE SUPPOSED TO BEHAVE IN A COURT"
45. "SO IT'S VERY COMMON THAT IN COURT YOU DON'T SPEAK AT ALL, THE DEFENDANT MIGHT SAY TWO SENTENCES, AND THEN HE'S NOT ALLOWED TO SPEAK AT ALL, OKAY"
46. "VERY OFTEN THEY WILL TRY AND TALK, THEY WILL TALK TO YOU"
47. BUT THEN THEY WILL TALK TO YOU AS THE INTERPRETER, AND YOU THINK WHAT SHOULD I DO? SHOULD I INTERPRET THIS ALOUD, OR HE'S JUST TALKING TOWARDS ME?"
48. "BUT THAT'S NOT BECAUSE THEY THINK YOU'RE SUPPOSED TO BE DOING SOMETHING ELSE, THAT'S MORE BECAUSE THEY DO NOT KNOW HOW TO BEHAVE"
49. "SO BASICALLY THE MOMENT WHEN I GOT MY QUALIFICATIONS CAPITA CAME IN, SO I RESISTED WORKING FOR THEM FOR TWO YEARS, BECAUSE I KNEW WHAT WAS HAPPENING OVER THERE. BUT IN TERMS OF HOW IT'S CHANGED AND HOW IT WAS BEFORE, IT IS DIFFICULT FOR ME TO COMMENT"
50. "ALTHOUGH I FOUND MOST OF THE STAFF IN THE COURT BEING VERY SUPPORTIVE TOWARDS THE INTERPRETERS, SAYING THAT CAPITA ISN'T GOOD AND IT'S A MESS"
51. "SO I'M SURE THAT THE COURT STAFF IS MORE ON OUR SIDE, IN TERMS OF ON THE SIDE OF THE INTERPRETERS THAN ON THE SIDE OF THE COMPANY, OF CAPITA."
52. "YEAH, THE STAFF DEFINITELY IS, YES. I HAVE REGULAR CONVERSATIONS WITH THE LEGAL ADVISORS ON HOW IT WOULD CHANGE AND THINGS LIKE THIS, AND THEY'RE ALWAYS ON OUR SIDE"
53. "I DO NOT HOLD CONVERSATIONS WITH THE MAGISTRATES, YOU KNOW, YOU DO NOT TALK TO THE JUDGE..."

54. "I REMEMBER I WAS TALKING TO A LEGAL ADVISOR WHEN SHE WAS MENTIONING THAT THE JUDGE GOT UPSET ABOUT CAPITA, AND THEY WERE LOOKING INTO SOME REVIEW"
55. "YES, THE COURT IS ALWAYS... I ALWAYS HAD A VERY GOOD RESPONSE FROM THEM, IN TERMS OF THEY WERE MORE ON OUR SIDE THAN CAPITA'S SIDE, SAYING THAT THE SITUATION THAT HAPPENED WITH THE COMPANY TAKING OVER THE CONTRACT JUST PUT ALL THIS DIFFICULTY FOR THEM WITH GETTING THE INTERPRETERS"
56. "THIS IS ALWAYS WHAT THEY SAY, THEY HAVE A DIFFICULTY IN GETTING THE INTERPRETERS BECAUSE THEY DON'T TURN UP SOMETIMES, AND THEY JUST DON'T KNOW WHAT'S GOING ON"
57. OF COURSE. THERE ARE A NUMBER OF REASONS. ONE, YOUR NAME IS OUT THERE, SO YOU'RE STILL ON THE REGISTER SO YOU CAN, FOR EXAMPLE, **IF ANYONE QUESTIONS WHETHER YOU HAVE YOUR QUALIFICATIONS TO INTERPRET, YOU CAN SAY, YES, I'M ON THE NATIONAL REGISTER OF PUBLIC SERVICE INTERPRETERS**"
58. "IT'S RECOGNITION IS WHAT IT GIVES"
59. "IT'S JUST BEING A MEMBER OF ITI IT DOESN'T MEAN ANYTHING BUT THERE IS A POINT OF BEING A MEMBER OF PROFESSIONAL BODIES"
60. "I HAVE OTHER WORK COMING FROM THE NATIONAL REGISTER OF PUBLIC SERVICE INTERPRETERS"
61. "THERE ARE OTHER INSTITUTIONS THAT FOUND ME THROUGH THE NATIONAL REGISTER AND REGULARLY USE MY SERVICE AND THE PAY IS A LOT HIGHER"
62. "THE ONE THING ABOUT THEM, I DON'T LIKE WORKING FOR THEM IN TERMS OF THE AMOUNT OF MONEY THEY PAY, AND THINGS LIKE THIS"
63. "BUT IN TERMS OF THE SPEED AND FLUENCY OF PAYMENTS, THEY IMPROVED, IT'S UNBELIEVABLE WHAT THEY DONE"
64. "THEY'VE CREATED A REALLY GOOD IT SYSTEM FOR THE COURTS AND INTERPRETERS, JUST BECAUSE ALL THE REST IS A SHAMBLES, IT DOESN'T MEAN THAT THE SYSTEM ISN'T GOOD"
65. "SO IT'S TRUE, I AGREE THAT THEY ARE NOT THE BEST AND THEY CAUSE A LOT OF TROUBLE"
66. "BUT THEY ALSO HAVE SHOWED, IN MY OPINION, TO THE WORLD OF THE INTERPRETERS, THAT THERE ARE THINGS THAT WE ARE NOT DOING AND WE'RE SUPPOSED TO BE DOING IN TERMS OF MANAGING LARGE CLIENTS LIKE THIS"
67. "SO, BACK IN THE DAY, BEFORE CAPITA, THE COURT WOULD HAVE TO RING INDIVIDUAL INTERPRETERS UNTIL THEY FOUND ONE. NOW YOU RECEIVE AN EMAIL IF YOU WOULD LIKE TO TAKE A JOB, YOU CLICK ON A LINK AND CLICK AND ACCEPT, AND THEN YOU GET ALL THE DETAILS STRAIGHT AWAY, AND ONCE YOU GO TO THE COURTS YOU JUST FILL OUT THE PIECE OF PAPER AND THEN THE COURT CLOSES THE SYSTEM AUTOMATICALLY, OR YOU CAN DO IT AT A CERTAIN TIME"
68. "YES, THE ADMIN SIDE, THEY SOLVED SOME OF THE ADMIN SIDE PROBLEMS THAT WERE THERE. I THINK THE INTERPRETERS SHOULD ACKNOWLEDGE THAT THIS HAS HAPPENED."

69. "BUT THEN WORK TOWARDS, YOU KNOW, DOING THAT THEMSELVES, RATHER THAN LETTING CAPITA OR ANY OTHER AGENCY THAT WILL TAKE OVER FROM THEM IN THE FUTURE DO THAT FOR THEM"

12.2.16 Respondent 18: second stage coding

Respondent N18 (from the first round of questionnaires for interpreters)

File name (transcript): interview with Respondent 18

Audio length – 0:29:53

Interview took place on:

Second cycle coding: clustering initial codes, searching for themes

1. "I DON'T THINK YOU CAN SAY THAT INTERPRETING IN GENERAL IS VERY HOMOGENOUS: THERE ARE JUST TOO MANY VARIABLES"

- "IF YOU LOOK AT THE INTERPRETERS IN GENERAL THE SITUATION IS NEVER THE SAME TWICE, IT'S ALWAYS DIFFERENT, BECAUSE THERE ARE DIFFERENT PARTICIPANTS HERE ARE DIFFERENT SETTINGS"
- "IN THE COURTS THERE ALWAYS DIFFERENT SITUATIONS, DIFFERENT PARTICIPANTS EVERY TIME, AND USUALLY DIFFERENT COURT ROOMS"
- "AND BECAUSE OF THAT THE EXPECTATION CHNAGES ALL THE TIME"
- "THERE WAS A CASE WITH ANOTHER INTERPRETER IN CHINESE. AND HE WAS VERY, VERY SLOW. SO EVERYTHING THAT WAS BEING SAID THEY WERE PAUSING AFTER EVERY SENTENCE, SO SHE WAS ABLE TO INTERPRET IN A CONSECUTIVE MANNER. AND BECAUSE OF THAT, IT WAS VERY, VERY SLOW"
- "SO THESE LITTLE SUBTLE CHANGES ALWAYS MAKE A DIFFERENCE, SO I DON'T THINK YOU CAN SAY THAT INTERPRETING IN GENERAL IS VERY HOMOGENOUS, BECAUSE THE TREATMENT CHANGES ALL THE TIME"
- "THERE ARE JUST TOO MANY VARIABLES"

Overlapping with the theme "challenges and pressures":

- IT DEPENDS, FROM COURT ROOM TO COURT ROOM. IF YOU GO TO YOUTH COURT, THERE IS NO DOCK, SO YOU'RE SITTING DIRECTLY WITH THE PERSON. FOR EXAMPLE, IF YOU GO INTO A WITNESS BOX THEN YOU CAN SIT NEXT TO THE PERSON"

- "BUT THEN IF YOU COME TO CROWN COURTS, THEN MOSTLY LIKELY YOU'LL HAVE THE HEADPHONES, SO YOU'LL HAVE SOMETHING LIKE A TOUR GUIDE, AND YOU'LL BE GIVEN THE HEADPHONES AND YOU CAN HEAR WHAT PEOPLE ARE SAYING"
- "BUT THAT'S NOT ALWAYS THE CASE AS WELL, BECAUSE SOMETIMES THE BATTERIES ARE FLAT, OR SOMETHING ELSE IS HAPPENING. SO IT CAN BE DIFFICULT AND TRICKY, BUT IT JUST DEPENDS ON THE COURT"

2. **"THEY HAD NOT GIVEN ME A CHOICE"** (expectations of the court)

- **"THE COURT DOESN'T ASK WHETHER YOU CAN DO ONE OR ANOTHER, THEY HINT ON THIS . SO THEY SAID, "ARE YOU A LITTLE BIT FASTER?""**
- "SO IN THEORY IF THE CHINESE CASE WOULDN'T BE HEARD BEFORE MY CASE, MAYBE I WOULD BE GIVEN MORE TIME AND THEY WOULDN'T BE SO STRESSED ABOUT THE TIME, BECAUSE IT IS A SATURDAY TODAY AS WELL, AND EVERYONE WANTED TO GO HOME A LITTLE BIT QUICKER"
- "SO ONCE THAT CASE FINISHED, AND THEY BROUGHT MY DEFENDANT, THE PRESSURE WAS UP TO INCREASE THE SPEED"
- "BECAUSE I KNEW THE MAGISTRATES' COURT ALREADY, I KNEW THE PEOPLE THAT WERE SITTING THERE, THEY KNEW ME BEFORE AS WELL, WE SAW EACH OTHER IN THE PAST, SO THEY KNEW WHAT THEY COULD EXPECT FROM ME, AND THEY KNEW THAT I PREFER TO DO...I DO SIMULTANEOUS INTERPRETING WHEN IT'S NOT DIRECTED TO THE DEFENDANT. **SO THEY KNEW THAT THEY COULD UP THE EXPECTATION TOWARDS ME"**
- "I WAS KNOWN TO THE LEGAL ADVISOR, YES. WELL, SHE SAID, **"YOU'RE A LITTLE BIT FASTER"** SO IT WAS MORE OF **A QUESTION THAT EVERYBODY KNEW THE ANSWER TO"**

3. **"ACTUALLY I THINK THEY ARE ABLE TO SPOT THIS DIFFERENCE"/ "THEY KNEW EXACTLY HOW TO USE THE INTERPRETER"** (court personnel knowledge and awareness of different types of interpreting and how to work with interpreters)

- "ACTUALLY I THINK JUDGES AND COURT STAFF, WHETHER IT'S SOLICITORS, LEGAL ADVISORS, USHERS, PROBATION, THEY GO THROUGH SO MANY FOREIGN SPEAKERS, AND THEY USE INTERPRETERS ON SUCH A REGULAR BASIS, THAT THEY CAN SEE THE DIFFERENCES THEMSELVES, IN MY OPINION. THAT SOME PEOPLE WOULD JUST GO SENTENCE BY SENTENCE, AND SOME INTERPRETERS GO MORE AT THE SAME TIME. ACTUALLY I THINK THEY ARE ABLE TO SPOT THIS DIFFERENCE"
- "I DON'T KNOW, MAYBE SOME ARE ABLE TO SAY THAT THIS IS CALLED SIMULTANEOUS, THIS CALLED WHISPERING, I'M SURE SOME OF THEM ARE ABLE TO DO SO"

- "BUT, ON THE OTHER HAND, SOME JUST REALISE THAT THERE ARE DIFFERENT WAYS OF DOING THIS"
- "I WAS PRESENT AT THE SECOND HEARING WHEN THE JUDGE TOLD ME STRAIGHTAWAY THAT THE DEFENDANT OR APPELLANT SAID THAT HE WOULD PREFER FOR THE CONSECUTIVE STYLE OF INTERPRETING. **SO THAT JUDGE WAS VERY AWARE OF THE MODES THAT HE WANTED ME TO USE**"
- "SO I THINK YOU CAN, AS IN ANY TRADE, YOU CAN FIND PEOPLE THAT ARE A LITTLE BIT MORE KNOWLEDGEABLE ABOUT OTHER THINGS AS WELL, AND SOME THAT ARE NOT, I THINK THEY CAN SEE THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THEM"
- "WELL, AGAIN, IT DEPENDS, FROM PERSON TO PERSON. I HAVE WORKED WITH PEOPLE WHO ARE VERY SKILLED IN USING THE INTERPRETER, AND **THEY KNEW EXACTLY HOW TO USE THE INTERPRETER**, AND, AS A RESULT, THEY WERE ABLE TO ACHIEVE BETTER RESULTS"
- "IN TERMS OF EDUCATION, I DON'T THINK YOU CAN BE FORCED TO ON THEM, THAT THEY HAVE TO HAVE THIS EDUCATION, OR THEY HAVE TO HAVE THIS KNOWLEDGE, BUT IF THEY DO, THEN IT'S TO THEIR BENEFIT"
-

4. "THE INTERPRETER AS A TOOL"

- "BECAUSE EFFECTIVELY YOU CAN LOOK AT THE INTERPRETER AS A TOOL , AND IF YOU KNOW HOW TO USE THAT TOOL, THEN YOU CAN ACHIEVE BETTER RESULTS"
- "IF YOU DON'T KNOW HOW TO USE THAT TOOL, THEN YOU'RE STILL... OBVIOUSLY THE INTERPRETER MOST OF THE TIME TRIES TO DO THEIR BEST, SO YOU'RE STILL GOING TO GET RESULTS, BUT THEY MIGHT BE NOT AS EFFICIENT, OR NOT AS GOOD"
- "AND EDUCATION IS ALWAYS GOOD, IT DOESN'T MATTER WHAT YOU'RE DOING OR WHAT PROFESSION IT IS, THE MORE YOU KNOW THE JOB OR THE PERSON THAT YOU ARE WORKING WITH, **THE BETTER YOU ARE ABLE TO USE THAT PERSON**, AND IT'S IN ANY TRADE REALLY"

5. "THAT MAKES IT DIFFICULT" (challenges and pressures of interpreters in court)

- IT DEPENDS, FROM COURT ROOM TO COURT ROOM. IF YOU GO TO YOUTH COURT, THERE IS NO DOCK, SO YOU'RE SITTING DIRECTLY WITH THE PERSON. FOR EXAMPLE, IF YOU GO INTO A WITNESS BOX THEN YOU CAN SIT NEXT TO THE PERSON"
- "IF YOU HAVE AN ACCUSED AND SOMEONE IS STANDING IN THE DOCK AND THERE IS GLASS IN BETWEEN YOU AND THE OFFENDER, THAT MAKES IT DIFFICULT, BECAUSE OBVIOUSLY IN THAT MOMENT THE PERSON THAT IS ACCUSED CANNOT SIT DOWN, THEY HAVE TO STAND IN FRONT OF THE GLASS ALL THE TIME"

- "SO EVEN IF THE JUDGE SAYS YOU CAN SIT DOWN, THE PERSON STILL HAS TO STAND MOST OF THE TIME, BECAUSE THE INTERPRETER IS IN FRONT OF THAT GLASS AND HE'S TALKING TO YOU, SO IF YOU SIT DOWN, YOU CANNOT HEAR ANYTHING"
- "BUT THEN IF YOU COME TO CROWN COURTS, THEN MOSTLY LIKELY YOU'LL HAVE THE HEADPHONES, SO YOU'LL HAVE SOMETHING LIKE A TOUR GUIDE, AND YOU'LL BE GIVEN THE HEADPHONES AND YOU CAN HEAR WHAT PEOPLE ARE SAYING"
- "BUT THAT'S NOT ALWAYS THE CASE AS WELL, BECAUSE SOMETIMES THE BATTERIES ARE FLAT, OR SOMETHING ELSE IS HAPPENING. SO IT CAN BE DIFFICULT AND TRICKY, BUT IT JUST DEPENDS ON THE COURT"

6. "I DO NOT HOLD CONVERSATIONS WITH THE MAGISTRATES, YOU KNOW, YOU DO NOT TALK TO THE JUDGE..." (power imbalance in the courtroom)

- "THEY HAD NOT GIVEN ME A CHOICE. THE COURT DOESN'T ASK WHETHER YOU CAN DO ONE OR ANOTHER, THEY HINT ON THIS . SO THEY SAID, "ARE YOU A LITTLE BIT FASTER?""
- "I WAS KNOWN TO THE LEGAL ADVISOR, YES. WELL, SHE SAID, "YOU'RE A LITTLE BIT FASTER" SO IT WAS MORE OF A QUESTION THAT EVERYBODY KNEW THE ANSWER TO"

7. "YOU KNOW ALL THE STUFF, YOU SPEAK INSTEAD OF ME" (expectations of the client)

- "WELL, THE PEOPLE, THE CLIENTS THEY USUALLY EXPECT A LITTLE BIT MORE, AND THEY TRY SOMETIMES TO GET A LITTLE BIT MORE. SO I FREQUENTLY FACE THE SITUATION AFTER THE, LET'S SAY, CONSULTATION BETWEEN THE SOLICITOR AND THE CLIENT, HE WOULD GO INTO THE COURT ROOM, AND THEN HE SAYS, "YOU KNOW ALL THE STUFF, YOU SPEAK INSTEAD OF ME."
- "SO BECAUSE THE CLIENTS ARE USUALLY NOT AWARE OF WHAT IS THE ROLE OF THE INTERPRETER, AND EVEN IF YOU TELL THEM WHAT IS YOUR ROLE – AND YOU ALWAYS DO THAT, RIGHT – THEY STILL DON'T REALLY ACKNOWLEDGE THAT AND TAKE THAT INTO THEIR HEART, THEY JUST DO WHATEVER THEY FEEL IS THE BEST"
- "AND IT'S FREQUENT THAT YOU END UP SITTING WITH A PERSON ONE-TO-ONE AND THEY ASK YOU FOR ADVICE"
- "THEY'LL ASK YOU, "WHAT DO YOU THINK? DO YOU THINK THIS MIGHT HAPPEN? WHAT DO YOU THINK ABOUT HOW THIS MIGHT EVOLVE, THE SITUATION, WHAT MIGHT HAPPEN?" WHAT ARE THEY FACING, FOR EXAMPLE, IN TERMS OF SENTENCE? AND ALL SORTS OF STUFF"
- "ON THAT, IT'S USUALLY BECAUSE THE CLIENTS DO NOT UNDERSTAND HOW THEY'RE SUPPOSED TO BEHAVE IN A COURT"
- "BUT THAT'S NOT BECAUSE THEY THINK YOU'RE SUPPOSED TO BE DOING SOMETHING ELSE, THAT'S MORE BECAUSE THEY DO NOT KNOW HOW TO BEHAVE"

- "SO IT'S VERY COMMON THAT IN COURT YOU DON'T SPEAK AT ALL, THE DEFENDANT MIGHT SAY TWO SENTENCES, AND THEN HE'S NOT ALLOWED TO SPEAK AT ALL, OKAY"
- "VERY OFTEN THEY WILL TRY AND TALK, THEY WILL TALK TO YOU"
- "BUT THEN THEY WILL TALK TO YOU AS THE INTERPRETER, AND YOU THINK WHAT SHOULD I DO? SHOULD I INTERPRET THIS ALOUD, OR HE'S JUST TALKING TOWARDS ME?"
- "YOU WANT THEM TO FEEL COMFORTABLE TO SOME EXTENT TALKING TO YOU AS WELL"
- "SO YOU HAVE TO KIND OF JUDGE A LITTLE BIT EITHER WAY, SAYING... SO YOU HAVE TO TALK, BUT YOU CANNOT GIVE THEM ANY ADVICE, BUT YOU HAVE TO TALK IN A WAY THAT THEY THINK THAT THEY'RE GETTING MORE OF AN UNDERSTANDING, I SUPPOSE"

8. "IT'S SOMETIMES DIFFICULT TO DETACH AND SAY , "WELL, I'M NOT GOING TO TALK TO YOU" (ethical and professional dilemmas faced by interpreters in court)

- "AND IT'S SOMETIMES DIFFICULT TO DETACH AND SAY , "WELL, I'M NOT GOING TO TALK TO YOU," OR, "I CANNOT TELL YOU ANYTHING ABOUT THIS, BECAUSE I'M JUST AN INTERPRETER."
- "BECAUSE IT BOILS DOWN TO ANOTHER THING, IF YOU'RE RUDE TO THEM, AND YOU WOULD JUST TELL THEM, NO, I'M NOT GOING TO TALK, I'M NOT GOING TO TALK, THEY MIGHT TURN AROUND AND STOP TRUSTING YOU, YOU WANT THEM TO FEEL COMFORTABLE TO SOME EXTENT TALKING TO YOU AS WELL"
- "SO YOU HAVE TO KIND OF JUDGE A LITTLE BIT EITHER WAY, SAYING... SO YOU HAVE TO TALK, BUT YOU CANNOT GIVE THEM ANY ADVICE, BUT YOU HAVE TO TALK IN A WAY THAT THEY THINK THAT THEY'RE GETTING MORE OF AN UNDERSTANDING, I SUPPOSE"
- YEAH, IT'S NOT ABOUT TELLING THEM JUST ABOUT ENOUGH, IT'S ABOUT TALKING TO THEM WITH NO SUBSTANCE IN FACT"
- "SO THEY FEEL THAT THEY HAVE THIS SUPPORT, BUT ACTUALLY YOU'RE NOT GIVING THEM ANY, THEY JUST HAVE THE IMPRESSION THAT YOU'RE THERE FOR THEM"
- "BUT THEN THEY WILL TALK TO YOU AS THE INTERPRETER, AND YOU THINK WHAT SHOULD I DO? SHOULD I INTERPRET THIS ALOUD, OR HE'S JUST TALKING TOWARDS ME?"

9. "A LABEL THE COURT INTERPRETER IN ITSELF MAKES YOU SEEN BY OTHER PEOPLE THAT YOU'RE PROFESSIONAL" (Recognition of the profession)

- BUT IN GENERAL, THE COURT ALWAYS HAS BEEN VERY POLITE TOWARDS ME, I ALWAYS HAVE GOOD COMMENTS FROM THE COURT SAYING THANK YOU, ALWAYS, YOU CAN ALWAYS HEAR THANK YOU"

- "YOU CAN ALWAYS HEAR, YOU KNOW, YOU HAVE BEEN VERY HELPFUL. AND THEY'RE ALWAYS VERY POLITE TOWARDS YOU AND YOUR JOB AND WHAT YOU DO"
- "SO I NEVER HAD ANYTHING LIKE OH YOU'RE JUST THIS AND THAT, OR NO, NEVER HAPPENED ANYTHING LIKE THIS"
- THAT'S WHY WHEN I GO TO COURT I FEEL OBVIOUSLY THERE IS ALL THIS KIND OF PARADING ABOUT IN THE COURT WHEN YOU BOW AND YOU DO ALL THIS "
- "BUT ONCE YOU FOLLOW THE ETIQUETTE OF THE COURTS, THEY RECOGNISE YOU AS BEING A PART OF THE COURTS, AND THEY ACCEPT THAT YOU'RE THERE TO HELP THEM AND TO SUPPORT THEM RATHER THAN TO DO ANYTHING ELSE, AND YOU'RE BEING RECOGNISED FOR THAT"

10. "ALTHOUGH I FOUND MOST OF THE STAFF IN THE COURT BEING VERY SUPPORTIVE TOWARDS THE INTERPRETERS, SAYING THAT CAPITA ISN'T GOOD AND IT'S A MESS"

- "SO BASICALLY THE MOMENT WHEN I GOT MY QUALIFICATIONS CAPITA CAME IN, SO I RESISTED WORKING FOR THEM FOR TWO YEARS, BECAUSE I KNEW WHAT WAS HAPPENING OVER THERE. BUT IN TERMS OF HOW IT'S CHANGED AND HOW IT WAS BEFORE, IT IS DIFFICULT FOR ME TO COMMENT"
- "SO I'M SURE THAT THE COURT STAFF IS MORE ON OUR SIDE, IN TERMS OF ON THE SIDE OF THE INTERPRETERS THAN ON THE SIDE OF THE COMPANY, OF CAPITA.
- "YEAH, THE STAFF DEFINITELY IS, YES. I HAVE REGULAR CONVERSATIONS WITH THE LEGAL ADVISORS ON HOW IT WOULD CHANGE AND THINGS LIKE THIS, AND THEY'RE ALWAYS ON OUR SIDE"
- "I REMEMBER I WAS TALKING TO A LEGAL ADVISOR WHEN SHE WAS MENTIONING THAT THE JUDGE GOT UPSET ABOUT CAPITA, AND THEY WERE LOOKING INTO SOME REVIEW"
- "YES, THE COURT IS ALWAYS... I ALWAYS HAD A VERY GOOD RESPONSE FROM THEM, IN TERMS OF THEY WERE MORE ON OUR SIDE THAN CAPITA'S SIDE, SAYING THAT THE SITUATION THAT HAPPENED WITH THE COMPANY TAKING OVER THE CONTRACT JUST PUT ALL THIS DIFFICULTY FOR THEM WITH GETTING THE INTERPRETERS"
- "THIS IS ALWAYS WHAT THEY SAY, THEY HAVE A DIFFICULTY IN GETTING THE INTERPRETERS BECAUSE THEY DON'T TURN UP SOMETIMES, AND THEY JUST DON'T KNOW WHAT'S GOING ON"
- "THE ONE THING ABOUT THEM, I DON'T LIKE WORKING FOR THEM IN TERMS OF THE AMOUNT OF MONEY THEY PAY, AND THINGS LIKE THIS"
- "SO IT'S TRUE, I AGREE THAT THEY ARE NOT THE BEST AND THEY CAUSE A LOT OF TROUBLE"

11. “BUT IN TERMS OF THE SPEED AND FLUENCY OF PAYMENTS, THEY IMPROVED, IT’S UNBELIEVABLE WHAT THEY DONE” (positive change that came with privatisation: significant improvement on admin side)

- **“THEY’VE CREATED A REALLY GOOD IT SYSTEM FOR THE COURTS AND INTERPRETERS, JUST BECAUSE ALL THE REST IS A SHAMBLES, IT DOESN’T MEAN THAT THE SYSTEM ISN’T GOOD”**
- **“BUT THEY ALSO HAVE SHOWED, IN MY OPINION, TO THE WORLD OF THE INTERPRETERS, THAT THERE ARE THINGS THAT WE ARE NOT DOING AND WE’RE SUPPOSED TO BE DOING IN TERMS OF MANAGING LARGE CLIENTS LIKE THIS”**
- **“SO, BACK IN THE DAY, BEFORE CAPITA, THE COURT WOULD HAVE TO RING INDIVIDUAL INTERPRETERS UNTIL THEY FOUND ONE. NOW YOU RECEIVE AN EMAIL IF YOU WOULD LIKE TO TAKE A JOB, YOU CLICK ON A LINK AND CLICK AND ACCEPT, AND THEN YOU GET ALL THE DETAILS STRAIGHT AWAY, AND ONCE YOU GO TO THE COURTS YOU JUST FILL OUT THE PIECE OF PAPER AND THEN THE COURT CLOSES THE SYSTEM AUTOMATICALLY, OR YOU CAN DO IT AT A CERTAIN TIME”**
- **“YES, THE ADMIN SIDE, THEY SOLVED SOME OF THE ADMIN SIDE PROBLEMS THAT WERE THERE. I THINK THE INTERPRETERS SHOULD ACKNOWLEDGE THAT THIS HAS HAPPENED.**
- **“BUT THEN WORK TOWARDS, YOU KNOW, DOING THAT THEMSELVES, RATHER THAN LETTING CAPITA OR ANY OTHER AGENCY THAT WILL TAKE OVER FROM THEM IN THE FUTURE DO THAT FOR THEM”**

12. “IT’S RECOGNITION IS WHAT IT GIVES” (professional memberships and NRPSI register)

- **OF COURSE. THERE ARE A NUMBER OF REASONS. ONE, YOUR NAME IS OUT THERE, SO YOU’RE STILL ON THE REGISTER SO YOU CAN, FOR EXAMPLE, IF ANYONE QUESTIONS WHETHER YOU HAVE YOUR QUALIFICATIONS TO INTERPRET, YOU CAN SAY, YES, I’M ON THE NATIONAL REGISTER OF PUBLIC SERVICE INTERPRETERS”**
- **“IT’S JUST BEING A MEMBER OF ITI IT DOESN’T MEAN ANYTHING BUT THERE IS A POINT OF BEING A MEMBER OF PROFESSIONAL BODIES”**
- **“I HAVE OTHER WORK COMING FROM THE NATIONAL REGISTER OF PUBLIC SERVICE INTERPRETERS”**
- **“THERE ARE OTHER INSTITUTIONS THAT FOUND ME THROUGH THE NATIONAL REGISTER AND REGULARLY USE MY SERVICE AND THE PAY IS A LOT HIGHER”**

So, based on the above we can identify the following themes:

1. **“THAT MAKES IT DIFFICULT”** (challenges and pressures of interpreters in court)
Subthemes:
 - “THEY HAD NOT GIVEN ME A CHOICE” (expectations of the court)
 - “IT’S SOMETIMES DIFFICULT TO DETACH AND SAY , “WELL, I’M NOT GOING TO TALK TO YOU” (ethical and professional dilemmas faced by interpreters in court)
 - “I DO NOT HOLD CONVERSATIONS WITH THE MAGISTRATES, YOU KNOW, YOU DO NOT TALK TO THE JUDGE...” (power imbalance in the courtroom)
2. **“THE INTERPRETER AS A TOOL”**
Subthemes:
 - “ACTUALLY I THINK THEY ARE ABLE TO SPOT THIS DIFFERENCE”/ “THEY KNEW EXACTLY HOW TO USE THE INTERPRETER” (court personnel knowledge and awareness of different types of interpreting and how to work with interpreters)
3. **“YOU KNOW ALL THE STUFF, YOU SPEAK INSTEAD OF ME”** (expectations of the client)
4. **“A LABEL THE COURT INTERPRETER IN ITSELF MAKES YOU SEEN BY OTHER PEOPLE THAT YOU’RE PROFESSIONAL”** (Recognition of the profession)
Subthemes:
 - “IT’S RECOGNITION IS WHAT IT GIVES” (professional memberships and NRPSI register)
5. **“ALTHOUGH I FOUND MOST OF THE STAFF IN THE COURT BEING VERY SUPPORTIVE TOWARDS THE INTERPRETERS, SAYING THAT CAPITA ISN’T GOOD AND IT’S A MESS”**
Subthemes:
 - “BUT IN TERMS OF THE SPEED AND FLUENCY OF PAYMENTS, THEY IMPROVED, IT’S UNBELIEVABLE WHAT THEY DONE” (positive change that came with privatisation: significant improvement on admin side)
 - “THEY’VE CREATED A REALLY GOOD IT SYSTEM FOR THE COURTS AND INTERPRETERS, JUST BECAUSE ALL THE REST IS A SHAMBLES, IT DOESN’T MEAN THAT THE SYSTEM ISN’T GOOD”

12.2.17 Respondent 18: codes and themes from survey

Respondent 18: Codes and themes from the first-round questionnaire

1. “IT DOES. THERE ARE DIFFERENT EXPECTATIONS FROM THE DIFFERENT INSTITUTIONS. E.G. MAGISTRATE AND CROWN HAVE COMPLETELY DIFFERENT JUDGES LEADING THEM.

CROWN IS MORE MECHANICAL AND THE EXPECTATIONS ARE HIGHER AS YOU HAVE TO KEEP UP.”

2. “IN ADDITION YOU ARE MOST LIKELY TO SIT IN THE DOCK WITH ACCUSED THAT LIMITS YOUR ABILITY TO HEAR WHAT IS HAPPENING BETWEEN THE PARTIES.”
3. “IN MAGISTRATE YOU ARE IN FRONT OF DOCK AND HAVE LOWER ABILITY TO INTERACT WITH ACCUSED. IN TRIBUNALS THERE ROOM IS MUCH SMALLER THERE IS NO OATH TO TAKE AND YOU DO NOT HAVE TO STAND WHEN INTERPRETING. THERE ARE SUBTLE DIFFERENCES IN WHAT IS EXPECTED.”
4. “IT DEPENDS, **MOST OF THE TIME FACILITIES ARE AWFUL, NO ONE CARES ABOUT IF YOU HEAR WHAT IS GOING ON.** SOME PEOPLE CARE MORE THAN OTHERS AND THAT HELPS A LOT BUT OTHER THAN IT CAN BE VERY DIFFICULT.”
5. “THEY DO DIFFER, MOST OF THE TIME THEY ARE AVAILABLE BUT USHER MIGHT OR MIGHT NOT BOTHER TO CHECK IF IT IS WORKING.”
6. “**MAINLY LINGUISTIC SUPPORT TO PARTICIPANTS.**”
7. “THIS VERY MUCH DEPENDS ON THE SITUATION I AM PLACED IN, WITNESS, DEFENDANT, ON BAIL OR FROM CUSTODY THE AMOUNT OF TIME YOU HAVE TO INTERACT WITH PARTICIPANT MIGHT AFFECT THE ROLE.”
8. “YES”
9. “**MOST OF THE TIME THEY UNDERSTAND AND AGREE THAT MY ROLE IS LINGUISTIC SUPPORT, THAT I TAKE NO SIDE AND INTERPRET EVERYTHING SAID. HOWEVER, OFTEN THEY ACT OUTSIDE WHAT IS EXPECTED FROM THEM AND TRY TO PUSH THE BOUNDARIES SET INITIALLY, SOMETIMES BEING SUCCESSFUL IN THAT.**”

Identified themes:

1. “**MAINLY LINGUISTIC SUPPORT TO PARTICIPANTS.**” (interpreter’s role)
 - “THIS VERY MUCH DEPENDS ON THE SITUATION I AM PLACED IN, WITNESS, DEFENDANT, ON BAIL OR FROM CUSTODY THE AMOUNT OF TIME YOU HAVE TO INTERACT WITH PARTICIPANT MIGHT AFFECT THE ROLE.”
2. “**MOST OF THE TIME THEY UNDERSTAND AND AGREE THAT MY ROLE IS LINGUISTIC SUPPORT, THAT I TAKE NO SIDE AND INTERPRET EVERYTHING SAID. HOWEVER, OFTEN THEY ACT OUTSIDE WHAT IS EXPECTED FROM THEM AND TRY TO PUSH THE BOUNDARIES SET INITIALLY, SOMETIMES BEING SUCCESSFUL IN THAT.**” (Expectations of the client)
3. “**MOST OF THE TIME FACILITIES ARE AWFUL**”

- "IT DEPENDS, MOST OF THE TIME FACILITIES ARE AWFUL, NO ONE CARES ABOUT IF YOU HEAR WHAT IS GOING ON. SOME PEOPLE CARE MORE THAN OTHERS AND THAT HELPS A LOT BUT OTHER THAN IT CAN BE VERY DIFFICULT."
- "THEY DO DIFFER, MOST OF THE TIME THEY ARE AVAILABLE BUT USHER MIGHT OR MIGHT NOT BOTHER TO CHECK IF IT IS WORKING."

4. "THERE ARE DIFFERENT EXPECTATIONS FROM THE DIFFERENT INSTITUTIONS" (about differences between courts)

- "IT DOES. THERE ARE DIFFERENT EXPECTATIONS FROM THE DIFFERENT INSTITUTIONS. E.G. MAGISTRATE AND CROWN HAVE COMPLETELY DIFFERENT JUDGES LEADING THEM. CROWN IS MORE MECHANICAL AND THE EXPECTATIONS ARE HIGHER AS YOU HAVE TO KEEP UP."
- "IN ADDITION, YOU ARE MOST LIKELY TO SIT IN THE DOCK WITH ACCUSED THAT LIMITS YOUR ABILITY TO HEAR WHAT IS HAPPENING BETWEEN THE PARTIES."
- "IN MAGISTRATE YOU ARE IN FRONT OF DOCK AND HAVE LOWER ABILITY TO INTERACT WITH ACCUSED. IN TRIBUNALS THEIR ROOM IS MUCH SMALLER THERE IS NO OATH TO TAKE AND YOU DO NOT HAVE TO STAND WHEN INTERPRETING. THERE ARE SUBTLE DIFFERENCES IN WHAT IS EXPECTED."

There is an overlap with 2 themes from the follow-up interview:

Theme N2: **"THE INTERPRETER AS A TOOL"** (interpreter's role)

ThemeN3: **"YOU KNOW ALL THE STUFF, YOU SPOEAK INSTEAD OF ME"** (expectations of the client)

Additional themes have emerged from the survey:

3. "MOST OF THE TIME FACILITIES ARE AWFUL"

4. "THERE ARE DIFFERENT EXPECTATIONS FROM THE DIFFERENT INSTITUTIONS" (about differences between courts)

12.2.18 Respondent 21: first stage coding

Respondent N21 (from the first round of the questionnaire for interpreters)

File name (transcript): interview with Respondent 21

Audio length – 0:27:54

Interview took place on: 11/09/2015

First cycle coding methods: initial coding, process coding, in vivo coding

Identified initial codes **(68 in total)**:

1. “YEAH, THE **ATMOSPHERE IS SIGNIFICANTLY DIFFERENT BETWEEN MAGISTRATES’ COURT AND CROWN COURT.**”
2. “BECAUSE IN MAGISTRATES’ COURT YOU’VE GOT THE MAGISTRATES AND **THEY USUALLY HAVE NO IDEA WHAT THEY’RE DOING, ESPECIALLY WHEN IT COMES TO INTERPRETERS.**”
3. “DISTRICT JUDGES ARE FINE; MAGISTRATES ARE A MASSIVE ISSUE AND SURPRISINGLY, **QUITE OFTEN EVEN LEGAL ADVISORS.**”
4. “SO YOU GET THAT TYPICAL, TELL HIM/ASK HIM/EXPLAIN TO HIM, BOTH FROM MAGISTRATE AND BUT ALSO FROM LEGAL ADVISORS WHO ARE ACTUALLY LEGALLY QUALIFIED AND THEY SHOULD KNOW WHAT THE INTERPRETER’S ROLE IS.”
5. “WELL, **YOU GET IN AN AWKWARD POSITION WHEN YOU HAVE TO ASK THEM TO STOP IT, AS POLITELY AS POSSIBLE. AND IT’S EMBARRASSING FOR YOU BECAUSE BASICALLY YOU LOOK LIKE AN IDIOT. YOU LOOK LIKE SOMEBODY WHO IS TRYING TO PATRONISE THE COURT, WHICH IS NOT WHAT YOU’RE DOING, BUT THAT’S HOW MANY PEOPLE WILL PERCEIVE IT ON THE OTHER END.**”
6. “LIKE I DID IT ONCE **AT THE MAGISTRATES’**, WHERE THEY STARTED TALKING AND THE DEFENDANT, NOT LIKE THEY SHOULD BE, BUT TELLING ME WHAT TO TELL HIM. SO I POLITELY ASKED THEM TO JUST SPEAK TO THE DEFENDANT AND I WOULD BE INTERPRETING WHAT THEY WERE SAYING TO EACH OTHER. **I WAS COMPLAINED ABOUT FOR BEING RUDE BY THE LEGAL ADVISOR.**”
7. “I DIDN’T QUITE GET WHAT THEY CONSIDERED RUDE BUT I DID ASK POLITELY AS I COULD.”
8. “**I FELT EMBARRASSED FOR THEM, THAT THEY DIDN’T KNOW.**”
9. “THERE’S ONE BOOK I’VE GOT AT HOME ABOUT COURT INTERPRETING, THIS IS OUTLINING EXACTLY WHAT TO DO IN THESE SITUATIONS AND THIS IS WHAT WE SHOULD DO. JUST SAY, **“I’M HERE TO INTERPRET, SO WHATEVER YOU SAY TO THE DEFENDANT, I WILL HAPPILY INTERPRET.”**
10. “FRANKLY, NOW **I’M SCARED TO DO IT** BECAUSE I DON’T WANT TO HAVE ANY MORE COMPLAINTS LIKE THAT.”

11. "SO **IT'S VERY DIFFICULT RIGHT NOW** BECAUSE MORE AND MORE COURTS ARE DOING THIS BECAUSE THEY THINK THAT'S THE WAY"
12. "I **SEE INTERPRETERS NOT BEHAVING PROPERLY**. FOR EXAMPLE ONCE AT BRAXTON MAGISTRATES', THERE WAS THIS DEFENDANT, I DON'T KNOW WHAT THE LANGUAGE WAS, I JUST KNOW THAT I DIDN'T UNDERSTAND IT, IT WAS AN ASIAN LANGUAGE. SO THAT IS THE DEFENDANT AND HIS INTERPRETER. THE DEFENDANT SAID SOMETHING AND THEN THE INTERPRETER ADDRESSES THE COURT LIKE, "**OH, BY THE WAY, HE BROUGHT THIS PAPER WITH HIM,**" AND HE JUST HANDS IT OVER FOR HIM." **AND THE COURT THINKS THAT'S WHAT THE INTERPRETER SHOULD BE DOING. NOBODY SAYS ANYTHING.**" (YEAH, THIS IS WHAT HE'S BROUGHT. HE DIDN'T HAVE A SOLICITOR, HE WAS JUST REPRESENTING HIMSELF.)
13. "QUITE OFTEN WE HAVE TO STAND NEXT TO THE DEFENDANT, SO THE MAGISTRATE USUALLY, BECAUSE THEY DON'T KNOW, **THEY USUALLY SEE US AS SOMEBODY WHO IS REPRESENTING THEM AND BEING THERE WITH THEM AND FOR THEM.**"
14. "SO WHERE WE STAND IS KIND OF FOR THEM, DETERMINING OUR ROLE. LIKE WE'RE STANDING THERE WITH THEM, **SO WE ARE WITH THEM ON THEIR SIDE.**"
15. "**THE EMBARRASSMENT IS KIND OF A STRAIN; IT PUTS YOU UNDER MORE PRESSURE BECAUSE YOU FEEL STUPID BY HAVING TO SAY THAT. SO IT KIND OF MAKES ME NERVOUS, MORE NERVOUS, AND IT CAN AFFECT YOUR PERFORMANCE.**"
16. "SO IN THAT WAY, THAT'S HOW I PUT IT. BECAUSE CROWN COURT, THAT'S HARDLY EVER AN ISSUE. THAT'S SOMETIMES BARRISTERS WILL DO THIS, LIKE TELL HIM, EXPLAIN TO HIM OR..."
17. "I WAS TALKING ABOUT THE CONSULTATIONS BEFORE THE ACTUAL HEARING. I'VE NEVER EVER, IN MY WHOLE LIFE, HAVE SEEN A CROWN COURT JUDGE WHO WOULD TALK TO ME, GIVING ME INSTRUCTIONS WHAT TO TELL THE DEFENDANT."
18. "THAT'S NO ISSUE WITH THE CROWN COURT JUDGES BECAUSE THEY TALK TO THE DEFENDANTS, THEY TALK TO THE VICTIMS, THEY TALK TO THE PEOPLE, THEY ARE TALKING TO. SO CROWN COURT THERE'S NO ISSUE..."
19. "I DON'T REALLY DO THAT MANY FAMILY HEARINGS BUT **THERE'S A BIT DIFFERENT SITUATION BECAUSE WITH FAMILY HEARINGS YOU HAVE MORE INTERPRETERS.** BECAUSE YOU'VE GOT INTERPRETERS FOR CONSULTATIONS, THAT COMES OUT WITH SOLICITORS, THAT SOLICITORS PAY FOR. AND THEN YOU'VE GOT INTERPRETERS BOOKED BY THE COURT. SO THEY WILL BE INTERPRETING FOR THE SAME PEOPLE BUT THEY'RE INTERPRETING INSIDE A COURTROOM, **SO YOU'VE GOT DOUBLE THE NUMBER OF INTERPRETERS.**"
20. "SO IN THAT CASE YOU DON'T REALLY KNOW WHAT IT'S ABOUT REALLY. USUALLY YOU LEARN ABOUT THE CASE DURING THE CONSULTATION AND THEN YOU KNOW WHAT TO EXPECT DURING THE HEARING. **BUT DURING FAMILY HEARINGS, YOU'RE NOT THERE FOR THE CONSULTATIONS** BECAUSE THERE'S THIS PRIVATELY BOOKED INTERPRETER. **AND THEN YOU JUST GO INTO THE COURTROOM AND YOU JUST TRY.** BUT I DON'T REALLY DO THAT MANY FAMILY HEARINGS."

21. "I WOULDN'T SAY IT'S THE COURT TIME, I WOULD SAY IT'S THE BEHAVIOUR OF THE STAFF OR THE ENGLISH SPEAKERS DIRECTLY."
22. "AS I SAID, THE MAGISTRATES ARE USUALLY LOST AND BARRISTERS ARE TOLD IN BAR SCHOOL HOW TO WORK WITH INTERPRETERS AND CROWN COURT JUDGES KNOW, I DON'T HAVE ISSUES THERE..."
23. "YEAH, CHANNEL, YEAH."
24. WELL, THE COURT ARE QUITE OFTEN LOST AND I OFTEN GET INSTRUCTIONS TO TELL SOMEBODY SOMETHING AND EXPLAIN IT AND MAKE SOMEBODY UNDERSTAND SOMETHING. I CAN'T MAKE THEM UNDERSTAND IF THEY DON'T EXPLAIN IT PROPERLY.
25. "YEAH, BUT THE COURT STAFF OFTEN EXPECT THIS TO HAPPEN. AND THEY COMPLETELY MISUNDERSTAND THIS AND THE POLICE AS WELL, WHILE WE'RE AT IT"
26. "IT DEPENDS HOW WELL THEY KNOW THE SYSTEM (LAUGHS), HOW MANY TIMES HAVE THEY BEEN ARRESTED AND BEEN TO COURT. **BUT I TRY TO SPEAK AS LITTLE TO THEM AS POSSIBLE, FOR MANY REASONS REALLY.**"
27. "SOMETIMES, IF THEY START TELLING YOU ABOUT THEIR CASE, ONCE THEY'RE IN THE COURTROOM THEY GET CONFUSED, WHAT HAVE THEY TOLD YOU ALREADY AND WHAT STILL HASN'T BEEN EXPLAINED TO COURT. AND THAT'S BAD FOR THEM BECAUSE THEN THEY CAN'T PUT FORWARD THEIR FULL STORY AND THEY'RE ALL CONFUSED ABOUT WHAT'S BEEN EXPLAINED AND WHAT HASN'T YET."
28. "BUT BASICALLY **SOMETIMES I NEED TO FILL OUT SOME FORMS WITH THEM**, LIKE THE MEANS FORM OR SOMETHING."
29. "SO I HAVE TO TALK TO THEM BUT I TRY TO STICK TO THE POINT. LIKE WE'VE GOT SOME COLUMNS THERE WE HAVE TO FILL THEM IN, SO JUST, THIS IS THIS, I NEED TO SAY, TO WRITE IT DOWN."
30. AND IF I DON'T KNOW THEM – BECAUSE SOMETIMES I COME ACROSS THE SAME ONES, NOT OFTEN – BUT IF I DON'T KNOW THEM I JUST TELL THEM, "WE'LL GO IN THE COURTROOM; PROBABLY I WILL BE SPEAKING FOR A WHILE FIRST BECAUSE I NEED TO SAY MY OATH AND AFTERWARDS THE COURT WILL BE SPEAKING TO YOU. THEY'LL ASK YOUR NAME, DATE OF BIRTH, YOUR ADDRESS AND THEN THEY'LL PUT THE CHARGE FORWARD..."
31. "JUST THIS FIRST BIT BECAUSE I DON'T WANT THEM TO START OVERLAPPING IN THEIR SPEECH."
32. **I WANT THEM NOT TO PANIC, WHY AM I TALKING SO MUCH ALL OF A SUDDEN, ONCE WE GOT INSIDE. SO I DON'T WANT THEM TO THINK THAT I'M SAYING SOMETHING AND THEY DON'T KNOW WHAT IT IS.**"
33. "EVEN THOUGH AFTER I SAY MY OATH IN ENGLISH I ALWAYS INTERPRET IT INTO SLOVAK. BUT I DON'T WANT THEM TO START PANICKING. WHEN WE GET THERE I WANT THEM TO KNOW THAT I'M SAYING SOMETHING I HAVE TO SAY AS A PROFESSIONAL."
34. AND THEN I WANT THEM TO UNDERSTAND THAT THERE WILL BE A SHORT EXCHANGE AND THAT THEY WILL GET A CHANCE TO SPEAK AFTERWARDS. BUT I DO IT SO THAT I CAN DO MY JOB. IF THE DEFENDANT STARTS INTERRUPTING THE COURT, THEN IT MAKES MY JOB DIFFICULT.

35. **I DON'T REALLY INSTRUCT THEM, I JUST TELL THEM, "DON'T..."**
36. I'LL TELL THEM, "YOU'LL GET A CHANCE TO SPEAK, BUT SOME OTHER PEOPLE WILL BE SPEAKING FIRST AND I NEED TO INTERPRET THAT FOR YOU, SO JUST LISTEN TO THAT AND WAIT FOR YOUR TURN."
37. "I DO IT BEFORE WE GO IN, BUT I TRY TO KEEP IT REALLY SHORT. **AND WHEN THEY START, TRY TO START TELLING ME THEIR VERSION OF EVENTS**, I TELL THEM WHAT I'VE JUST TOLD YOU, **DON'T TELL ME THAT BECAUSE YOU'LL GET CONFUSED AND YOU WILL NOT REMEMBER INSIDE THE COURTROOM WHAT YOU'VE SAID ALREADY AND WHAT YOU HAVEN'T.**"
38. "I JUST TRY NOT TO LISTEN TO WHATEVER THEY WANT TO SAY AND IF THEY REALLY WANT TO TELL ME SOMETHING, I JUST MAKE SOME EXCUSE AND I GO INSIDE THE COURTROOM WHERE THEY CAN'T TALK TO ME."
39. "YEAH, SO MANY THINGS, TO PICK ONE. ONE OF THOSE I'VE MENTIONED MAYBE? LIKE I COME TO POLICE CUSTODY AND I'M TOLD BY THE CUSTODY OFFICER, "TELL HIM, HE HAS THE RIGHT TO HAVE A SOLICITOR, ASK HIM WHETHER HE WANTS ONE."
40. "OR SOMETIMES... **AND THE WORST THINGS THAT CAN HAPPEN IS WHEN THE CUSTODY STAFF AND THE DETAINEE START ARGUING**. AND ON ONE SIDE YOU'VE GOT A CUSTODY OFFICER, NOT REALLY SHOUTING AT YOU, BUT IT'S NOT VERY COMFORTABLE THE WAY HE'S TALKING TO YOU AND HE/SHE IS TELLING YOU, "JUST TELL HIM THAT HE'S GOING TO HAVE AN INTERVIEW AND HE CAN EXPLAIN THEN, BUT I'M NOT GOING TO LISTEN TO HIM NOW. AND YOU [ARE BEING 0:15:33] TALKED TO LIKE THAT. AND ON THE OTHER HAND YOU'VE GOT THE DETAINEE WHO IS LIKE, "OH WELL, TELL HIM THAT I'VE GOT THINGS TO SAY AND I WANT HIM TO LISTEN TO ME BECAUSE I DIDN'T DO IT. **AND YOU'RE CAUGHT IN THE MIDDLE OF THAT**".
41. "AND IF THE TWO OF THEM ARE ARGUING BETWEEN THEMSELVES, I'VE GOT NO ISSUE, THEY CAN ARGUE THE WHOLE NIGHT LONG AND I'LL BE INTERPRETING THAT, I DON'T MIND. **BUT IF THEY'RE BOTH TALKING TO ME IN THIS MANNER, THAT'S NOT SOMETHING I'M COMFORTABLE WITH.**"
42. "ONCE THEY START ARGUING, YOU CAN'T DO ANYTHING, BECAUSE NOBODY WILL LISTEN TO YOU."
43. IT'S VERY NICELY EXPLAINED ON THE [CAMBRIDGESHIRE 0:16:29] WEBSITE THAT THE OFFICER SHOULD BE THE ONE EXPLAINING TO THE NON-ENGLISH SPEAKER. IT'S TWO OF US WHO ARE TALKING, "**THE INTERPRETER IS INDEPENDENT, DON'T ASK HIM/HER FOR ADVICE, JUST TALK TO ME AS IF WE SHARE THE SAME LANGUAGE.**" BECAUSE IF I START EXPLAINING THAT, THEN I'M TALKING AND I'M NOT SUPPOSED TO BE TALKING, I'M SUPPOSED TO BE INTERPRETING."
44. "AND THEN AGAIN, **IT CONFUSES THEM** BECAUSE I AM TALKING TO THEM, EXPLAINING THEM SOMETHING..."
45. **MANY PEOPLE GET IT WRONG**. I COME TO COURT AND THEY TELL ME, "**YOUR CLIENT HASN'T ARRIVED YET.**" AND I'M LIKE, "**THE COURT IS MY CLIENT AND THE COURT IS DEFINITELY HERE.**"

46. IT DEPENDS. SOMETIMES THEY DO UNDERSTAND IT, SOMETIMES THEY DON'T. THAT'S WHY I KIND OF... IF I DON'T KNOW THEM, I TRY TO TELL THEM, BECAUSE THERE'S NOBODY ELSE WHO CAN TELL THEM. **I'M THERE INDEPENDENTLY**; I CAN'T SPEAK FOR YOU, WHATEVER YOU TELL ME, I CAN'T SAY IT IN YOUR DEFENCE, **SO YOU NEED TO SPEAK FOR YOURSELF. BUT WHATEVER YOU SAY, I'LL INTERPRET IT, AND WHATEVER THEY TELL YOU, I'LL INTERPRET TOO.** BECAUSE THE COURT WILL NOT DO IT, AND IF THEY DON'T UNDERSTAND IT, **THAT CAN CREATE CONFUSION."**
47. "I'LL BE UNSPECIFIC, BUT I'LL SAY TOO OFTEN IT'S VARIED BECAUSE SOMETIMES YOU'VE GOT PEOPLE WHO ARE IN CUSTODY, SO YOU'LL NEVER MEET THEM BEFORE THE HEARING STARTS. AND THEN YOU'VE GOT DEFENDANTS WITH SOLICITORS AND WHEN YOU'VE GOT A CONSULTATION WITH A SOLICITOR BEFORE THE HEARING, THEN YOU KIND OF... THAT'S WHERE THEY KIND OF GET IT, WHAT'S HAPPENING. **THAT IT'S THEM AND THE ENGLISH SPEAKER TALKING AND THE INTERPRETER IS NOT TALKING, BUT INTERPRETING WHAT YOU'RE SAYING TO EACH OTHER. UNLESS YOU'VE GOT AN INCOMPETENT SOLICITOR WHO DOESN'T KNOW EITHER."**
48. "AND THEN YOU SOMETIMES ENCOUNTER DEFENDANTS WHO ARE ON BAIL, SO THEY'RE THERE BEFORE THEY GO INSIDE THE COURTROOM, PHYSICALLY, SOMEWHERE IN THE CORRIDOR, AND THEY DON'T HAVE A SOLICITOR. **AND THEN THE USHER HANDS YOU THE MEANS FORM AND TELLS YOU, "JUST GO AND FILL IT OUT WITH HIM".**
49. **"SO YOU NEED TO TALK TO THEM FOR THE PURPOSES OF FILLING OUT THE MEANS FORM"**
50. **"BUT I KIND OF TRY TO USE IT TO EXPLAIN TO THEM WHAT I'M THERE FOR. IF I'M TALKING TO THEM, I JUST TALK ABOUT WHAT I'M THERE TO DO AND I ALWAYS TRY TO KEEP IT TO A MINIMUM AND JUST STICK TO THE RELEVANT BIT. LIKE I'M HERE, BUT I'M NOT DEFENDING YOU, I'M NOT HERE TO HAVE A CHAT WITH YOU, I'LL BE INTERPRETING FOR YOU FOR THE COURT."**
51. **"OH YEAH, I'VE BEEN ASKED OUT FOR COFFEES AND TO ADD PEOPLE ON FACEBOOK AND PHONE NUMBERS AND STUFF LIKE THAT.** THAT'S WHERE I REALLY, REALLY, REALLY LEAVE IMMEDIATELY (LAUGHS) OR MAKE UP AN EXCUSE I HAVE TO GO SOMEWHERE OR I HAVE MY PAPERWORK SIGNED AND I REALLY HAVE TO STAY TO HAVE THAT DONE AND I CAN'T GO. BUT IT'S NOT THAT OFTEN, SOMETIMES IT HAPPENS."
52. **"NOT ANYMORE, NO"**
53. **"YEAH, IF YOU'RE NOT GOOD ENOUGH TO BE A CLEANER, AS A FOREIGNER, THEN YOU'LL BECOME AN INTERPRETER. SOMETIMES I REALLY GET THAT FEELING; THIS IS HOW THEY PERCEIVE IT."**
54. "OH, I CLEARLY RECALL A RECENT ONE WITH THE CUSTODY INSPECTOR."
55. "I'D HAVE TO THINK. THE ONLY THING I CAN RECALL NOW IS ANOTHER INCIDENT. I WAS AT **CROWN COURT**; THERE WAS THIS CONSULTATION. SO IT WAS FOUR OF US PRESENT: THE DEFENDANT; HER SOLICITOR; HER BARRISTER, AND ME. AND THE BARRISTER, **BEING A PROPER BARRISTER, STARTED EXPLAINING TO THE DEFENDANT WHAT HER POSITION AND SITUATION WAS. IT WAS QUITE COMPLICATED IN THAT CASE.** SHE ONLY SAID A FEW

WORDS TO HER WHEN THE SOLICITOR STOPPED THE BARRISTER AND HE SAID TO HER,
“MADAM BARRISTER, THE DEFENDANT DOESN’T SPEAK ENGLISH, SO YOU NEED TO TELL
IT TO THE INTERPRETER SO SHE COULD TELL HER.”

56. “AND I JUST SAT THERE IN DISBELIEF, HOW CAN A SOLICITOR ASSUME THEY’RE SO STUPID AND THE BARRISTER LOOKED REALLY BEMUSED. I TOLD HER, “NO, DON’T WORRY, THIS IS WHAT WE SHOULD BE DOING, JUST SPEAK TO THE DEFENDANT AND I’LL BE INTERPRETING.””
57. “I THOUGHT OKAY, THE [BIGGEST SHIT 0:24:07] IS OVER AND NOTHING WORSE CAN HAPPEN. AND THEN WHEN THE BARRISTER FINISHED TALKING TO HER, WHAT SHE WANTED TO TELL HER, THEN THE SOLICITOR WANTED TO SAY SOMETHING TO THE DEFENDANT AS WELL. SO HE TOLD ME TO TELL HER, EVEN THOUGH I’VE JUST EXPLAINED THAT NO, YOU’RE TALKING TO THE DEFENDANT AND I’M INTERPRETING. AND HE JUST LIKE... IT JUST LEFT ME SPEECHLESS. I JUST DIDN’T EVEN KNOW WHAT TO TELL HIM.”
58. “BUT HE EVEN CORRECTED ANOTHER PROFESSIONAL WHO WAS DOING EXACTLY WHAT SHE WAS SUPPOSED TO BE DOING.”
59. “I WILL NEED TO THINK ABOUT THAT. IF I CAN THINK...”
60. “YOU OFTEN GET CROWN COURT JUDGES REALLY FINDING THE TIME TO THANK THE INTERPRETERS, ESPECIALLY AFTER A LONG TRIAL.”
61. “THEY REALLY WANT TO MAKE SURE THAT THE INTERPRETERS KNOW THAT THEIR WORK IS VALUED.”
62. “SO IF YOU HAVE A SEVERAL DAY LONG TRIAL, THEN YOU CAN BE SURE THAT THE CROWN COURT JUDGE WILL FIND SOME TIME TO...”
63. “YES. I’VE NEVER HAD A CROWN COURT TRIAL WHEN THIS WOULDN’T HAPPEN.”
64. “YEAH, DEFINITELY.”
65. “YOU CAN GET PROPER MAGISTRATE COURT, PROPER LEGAL ADVISORS AND PROPER JUDGES AND THEN THERE’S NO ISSUE. BUT THAT’S NOT ALWAYS THE CASE.”
66. “ON THE WHOLE, CROWN COURTS ARE BETTER.”
67. “THE ONLY ISSUE, WHEN THERE IS AN ISSUE WITH CROWN COURTS AND BARRISTERS, THAT’S KIND OF AN OPPOSITE ISSUE. IT’S NOT LIKE THEY TALK TO US WHAT TO TELL THE DEFENDANTS, THEY SKIP US COMPLETELY. THEY’RE LIKE, “NO, WE DON’T NEED INTERPRETERS,” AND THEY JUST GO AND SPEAK TO THE DEFENDANT EVEN THOUGH THE DEFENDANT HAS LIMITED ENGLISH. BECAUSE THEY THINK NO, NO, HIS/HER ENGLISH WILL DO.”
68. “YEAH. IT DOESN’T HAPPEN THAT OFTEN, BUT IF SOMETHING HAPPENS, IF THERE’S AN ISSUE AT CROWN COURT, THIS IS THE ISSUE.”

12.2.19 Respondent 21: second stage coding

Respondent N21 (from the first-round questionnaire for interpreters)

File name (transcript): interview with Respondent 21

Audio length – 0:27:54

Interview took place on: 11/09/2015

Second cycle coding: clustering initial codes, searching for themes

1. “ATMOSPHERE IS SIGNIFICANTLY DIFFERENT BETWEEN MAGISTRATES’ COURT AND CROWN COURT.”

- “BECAUSE IN MAGISTRATES’ COURT YOU’VE GOT THE MAGISTRATES AND THEY USUALLY HAVE NO IDEA WHAT THEY’RE DOING, ESPECIALLY WHEN IT COMES TO INTERPRETERS.”

Subtheme:

“ON THE WHOLE, CROWN COURTS ARE BETTER.”

- “DISTRICT JUDGES ARE FINE; MAGISTRATES ARE A MASSIVE ISSUE AND SURPRISINGLY, QUITE OFTEN EVEN LEGAL ADVISORS.”
- “SO IN THAT WAY, THAT’S HOW I PUT IT. BECAUSE CROWN COURT, THAT’S HARDLY EVER AN ISSUE. THAT’S SOMETIMES BARRISTERS WILL DO THIS, LIKE TELL HIM, EXPLAIN TO HIM OR...”
- “I WAS TALKING ABOUT THE CONSULTATIONS BEFORE THE ACTUAL HEARING. **I’VE NEVER EVER, IN MY WHOLE LIFE, HAVE SEEN A CROWN COURT JUDGE WHO WOULD TALK TO ME, GIVING ME INSTRUCTIONS WHAT TO TELL THE DEFENDANT.**”
- “THAT’S NO ISSUE WITH THE CROWN COURT JUDGES BECAUSE THEY TALK TO THE DEFENDANTS, THEY TALK TO THE VICTIMS, THEY TALK TO THE PEOPLE, THEY ARE TALKING TO.”
- **“SO CROWN COURT THERE’S NO ISSUE...”**
- “I DON’T REALLY DO THAT MANY FAMILY HEARINGS BUT THERE’S A BIT DIFFERENT SITUATION BECAUSE WITH FAMILY HEARINGS YOU HAVE MORE INTERPRETERS. BECAUSE YOU’VE GOT INTERPRETERS FOR CONSULTATIONS, THAT COMES OUT WITH SOLICITORS, THAT SOLICITORS PAY FOR. AND THEN YOU’VE GOT INTERPRETERS BOOKED BY THE COURT. SO THEY WILL BE INTERPRETING FOR THE SAME PEOPLE BUT THEY’RE INTERPRETING INSIDE A COURTROOM, SO YOU’VE GOT DOUBLE THE NUMBER OF INTERPRETERS.

- "SO IN THAT CASE YOU DON'T REALLY KNOW WHAT IT'S ABOUT REALLY. USUALLY YOU LEARN ABOUT THE CASE DURING THE CONSULTATION AND THEN YOU KNOW WHAT TO EXPECT DURING THE HEARING. BUT DURING FAMILY HEARINGS, YOU'RE NOT THERE FOR THE CONSULTATIONS BECAUSE THERE'S THIS PRIVATELY BOOKED INTERPRETER. **AND THEN YOU JUST GO INTO THE COURTROOM AND YOU JUST TRY.** BUT I DON'T REALLY DO THAT MANY FAMILY HEARINGS."
- "I WOULDN'T SAY IT'S THE COURT TIME, I WOULD SAY IT'S THE BEHAVIOUR OF THE STAFF OR THE ENGLISH SPEAKERS DIRECTLY."
- "AS I SAID, THE MAGISTRATES ARE USUALLY LOST AND BARRISTERS ARE TOLD IN BAR SCHOOL HOW TO WORK WITH INTERPRETERS AND CROWN COURT JUDGES KNOW, I DON'T HAVE ISSUES THERE..."
- "YOU OFTEN GET CROWN COURT JUDGES REALLY FINDING THE TIME TO THANK THE INTERPRETERS, ESPECIALLY AFTER A LONG TRIAL."
- "THEY REALLY WANT TO MAKE SURE THAT THE INTERPRETERS KNOW THAT THEIR WORK IS VALUED."
- "SO IF YOU HAVE A SEVERAL DAY LONG TRIAL, THEN YOU CAN BE SURE THAT THE CROWN COURT JUDGE WILL FIND SOME TIME TO..."
- "YES. I'VE NEVER HAD A CROWN COURT TRIAL WHEN THIS WOULDN'T HAPPEN."
- IT DOESN'T HAPPEN THAT OFTEN, BUT IF SOMETHING HAPPENS, IF THERE'S AN ISSUE AT CROWN COURT, THIS IS THE ISSUE."

2. "I FELT EMBARRASSED FOR THEM, THAT THEY DIDN'T KNOW."

- "BECAUSE IN MAGISTRATES' COURT YOU'VE GOT THE MAGISTRATES AND **THEY USUALLY HAVE NO IDEA WHAT THEY'RE DOING, ESPECIALLY WHEN IT COMES TO INTERPRETERS.**"
- "ON THE WHOLE, CROWN COURTS ARE BETTER."
- "SO YOU GET THAT TYPICAL, **TELL HIM/ASK HIM/EXPLAIN TO HIM, BOTH FROM MAGISTRATE AND BUT ALSO FROM LEGAL ADVISORS WHO ARE ACTUALLY LEGALLY QUALIFIED AND THEY SHOULD KNOW WHAT THE INTERPRETER'S ROLE IS.**"
- "LIKE I DID IT ONCE AT THE MAGISTRATES, WHERE THEY STARTED TALKING AND THE DEFENDANT, NOT LIKE THEY SHOULD BE, BUT TELLING ME WHAT TO TELL HIM. **SO I POLITELY ASKED THEM TO JUST SPEAK TO THE DEFENDANT AND I WOULD BE INTERPRETING WHAT THEY WERE SAYING TO EACH OTHER. I WAS COMPLAINED ABOUT FOR BEING RUDE BY THE LEGAL ADVISOR.**"
- "I DIDN'T QUITE GET WHAT THEY CONSIDERED RUDE BUT I DID ASK POLITELY AS I COULD."
- "SO IT'S VERY DIFFICULT RIGHT NOW BECAUSE **MORE AND MORE COURTS ARE DOING THIS BECAUSE THEY THINK THAT'S THE WAY**"
- "QUITE OFTEN WE HAVE TO STAND NEXT TO THE DEFENDANT, SO THE MAGISTRATE USUALLY, **BECAUSE THEY DON'T KNOW, THEY USUALLY SEE US AS SOMEBODY WHO IS REPRESENTING THEM AND BEING THERE WITH THEM AND FOR THEM.**"

- "SO WHERE WE STAND IS KIND OF FOR THEM, DETERMINING OUR ROLE. **LIKE WE'RE STANDING THERE WITH THEM, SO WE ARE WITH THEM ON THEIR SIDE.**"
- **I'VE NEVER EVER, IN MY WHOLE LIFE, HAVE SEEN A CROWN COURT JUDGE WHO WOULD TALK TO ME, GIVING ME INSTRUCTIONS WHAT TO TELL THE DEFENDANT.**
- "AS I SAID, THE MAGISTRATES ARE USUALLY LOST **AND BARRISTERS ARE TOLD IN BAR SCHOOL HOW TO WORK WITH INTERPRETERS AND CROWN COURT JUDGES KNOW, I DON'T HAVE ISSUES THERE...**"
- WELL, THE COURT ARE QUITE OFTEN LOST AND I OFTEN GET INSTRUCTIONS TO TELL SOMEBODY SOMETHING AND EXPLAIN IT AND MAKE SOMEBODY UNDERSTAND SOMETHING. I CAN'T MAKE THEM UNDERSTAND IF THEY DON'T EXPLAIN IT PROPERLY.
- "YEAH, **BUT THE COURT STAFF OFTEN EXPECT THIS TO HAPPEN. AND THEY COMPLETELY MISUNDERSTAND THIS AND THE POLICE AS WELL, WHILE WE'RE AT IT**"
- "YEAH, SO MANY THINGS, TO PICK ONE. ONE OF THOSE I'VE MENTIONED MAYBE? LIKE I COME TO POLICE CUSTODY AND I'M TOLD BY THE CUSTODY OFFICER, **"TELL HIM, HE HAS THE RIGHT TO HAVE A SOLICITOR, ASK HIM WHETHER HE WANTS ONE."**
- MANY PEOPLE GET IT WRONG. I COME TO COURT AND THEY TELL ME, **"YOUR CLIENT HASN'T ARRIVED YET."** AND I'M LIKE, **"THE COURT IS MY CLIENT AND THE COURT IS DEFINITELY HERE."**
- **"UNLESS YOU'VE GOT AN INCOMPETENT SOLICITOR WHO DOESN'T KNOW EITHER."**
- **AND THEN THE USHER HANDS YOU THE MEANS FORM AND TELLS YOU, "JUST GO AND FILL IT OUT WITH HIM".**
- "THE ONLY THING I CAN RECALL NOW IS ANOTHER INCIDENT. I WAS AT CROWN COURT; THERE WAS THIS CONSULTATION. SO IT WAS FOUR OF US PRESENT: THE DEFENDANT; HER SOLICITOR; HER BARRISTER, AND ME. AND THE BARRISTER, BEING A PROPER BARRISTER, STARTED EXPLAINING TO THE DEFENDANT WHAT HER POSITION AND SITUATION WAS. IT WAS QUITE COMPLICATED IN THAT CASE. SHE ONLY SAID A FEW WORDS TO HER WHEN THE SOLICITOR STOPPED THE BARRISTER AND HE SAID TO HER, "MADAM BARRISTER, THE DEFENDANT DOESN'T SPEAK ENGLISH, SO YOU NEED TO TELL IT TO THE INTERPRETER SO SHE COULD TELL HER."
- "AND I JUST SAT THERE IN DISBELIEF, HOW CAN A SOLICITOR ASSUME THEY'RE SO STUPID AND THE BARRISTER LOOKED REALLY BEMUSED. I TOLD HER, "NO, DON'T WORRY, THIS IS WHAT WE SHOULD BE DOING, JUST SPEAK TO THE DEFENDANT AND I'LL BE INTERPRETING.""
- "I THOUGHT OKAY, THE [BIGGEST SHIT 0:24:07] IS OVER AND NOTHING WORSE CAN HAPPEN. AND THEN WHEN THE BARRISTER FINISHED TALKING TO HER, WHAT SHE WANTED TO TELL HER, THEN THE SOLICITOR WANTED TO SAY SOMETHING TO THE DEFENDANT AS WELL. SO HE TOLD ME TO TELL HER, EVEN THOUGH I'VE JUST EXPLAINED THAT NO, YOU'RE TALKING TO THE DEFENDANT AND I'M INTERPRETING. AND HE JUST LIKE... **IT JUST LEFT ME SPEECHLESS. I JUST DIDN'T EVEN KNOW WHAT TO TELL HIM.**"
- "BUT HE EVEN CORRECTED ANOTHER PROFESSIONAL WHO WAS DOING EXACTLY WHAT SHE WAS SUPPOSED TO BE DOING."

- "YOU CAN GET PROPER MAGISTRATE COURT, PROPER LEGAL ADVISORS AND PROPER JUDGES AND THEN THERE'S NO ISSUE. BUT THAT'S NOT ALWAYS THE CASE."
- "THE ONLY ISSUE, WHEN THERE IS AN ISSUE WITH CROWN COURTS AND BARRISTERS, THAT'S KIND OF AN OPPOSITE ISSUE. IT'S NOT LIKE THEY TALK TO US WHAT TO TELL THE DEFENDANTS, **THEY SKIP US COMPLETELY. THEY'RE LIKE, "NO, WE DON'T NEED INTERPRETERS," AND THEY JUST GO AND SPEAK TO THE DEFENDANT EVEN THOUGH THE DEFENDANT HAS LIMITED ENGLISH. BECAUSE THEY THINK NO, NO, HIS/HER ENGLISH WILL DO."**
-

3. "THE EMBARRASSMENT IS KIND OF A STRAIN; IT PUTS YOU UNDER MORE PRESSURE"

- "THE EMBARRASSMENT IS KIND OF A STRAIN; IT PUTS YOU UNDER MORE PRESSURE BECAUSE YOU FEEL STUPID BY HAVING TO SAY THAT. **SO IT KIND OF MAKES ME NERVOUS, MORE NERVOUS, AND IT CAN AFFECT YOUR PERFORMANCE.**
- "WELL, YOU GET IN AN AWKWARD POSITION WHEN YOU HAVE TO ASK THEM TO STOP IT, AS POLITELY AS POSSIBLE. **AND IT'S EMBARRASSING FOR YOU BECAUSE BASICALLY YOU LOOK LIKE AN IDIOT.** YOU LOOK LIKE SOMEBODY WHO IS TRYING TO PATRONISE THE COURT, WHICH IS NOT WHAT YOU'RE DOING, BUT THAT'S HOW MANY PEOPLE WILL PERCEIVE IT ON THE OTHER END."
- "FRANKLY, **NOW I'M SCARED TO DO IT BECAUSE I DON'T WANT TO HAVE ANY MORE COMPLAINTS LIKE THAT."**
- "SO IT'S VERY DIFFICULT RIGHT NOW BECAUSE MORE AND MORE COURTS ARE DOING THIS BECAUSE THEY THINK THAT'S THE WAY"
- "OR SOMETIMES... **AND THE WORST THINGS THAT CAN HAPPEN IS WHEN THE CUSTODY STAFF AND THE DETAINEE START ARGUING.** AND ON ONE SIDE YOU'VE GOT A CUSTODY OFFICER, NOT REALLY SHOUTING AT YOU, BUT IT'S NOT VERY COMFORTABLE THE WAY HE'S TALKING TO YOU AND HE/SHE IS TELLING YOU, "JUST TELL HIM THAT HE'S GOING TO HAVE AN INTERVIEW AND HE CAN EXPLAIN THEN, BUT I'M NOT GOING TO LISTEN TO HIM NOW. AND YOU [ARE BEING 0:15:33] TALKED TO LIKE THAT. AND ON THE OTHER HAND YOU'VE GOT THE DETAINEE WHO IS LIKE, "OH WELL, TELL HIM THAT I'VE GOT THINGS TO SAY AND I WANT HIM TO LISTEN TO ME BECAUSE I DIDN'T DO IT. **AND YOU'RE CAUGHT IN THE MIDDLE OF THAT"**.
- "AND IF THE TWO OF THEM ARE ARGUING BETWEEN THEMSELVES, I'VE GOT NO ISSUE, THEY CAN ARGUE THE WHOLE NIGHT LONG AND I'LL BE INTERPRETING THAT, I DON'T MIND. **BUT IF THEY'RE BOTH TALKING TO ME IN THIS MANNER, THAT'S NOT SOMETHING I'M COMFORTABLE WITH."**
- "ONCE THEY START ARGUING, YOU CAN'T DO ANYTHING, BECAUSE NOBODY WILL LISTEN TO YOU."
- "AND I JUST SAT THERE IN DISBELIEF HOW CAN A SOLICITOR ASSUME THEY'RE SO STUPID AND THE BARRISTER LOOKED REALLY BEMUSED. I TOLD HER, "NO, DON'T WORRY, THIS IS

WHAT WE SHOULD BE DOING, JUST SPEAK TO THE DEFENDANT AND I'LL BE INTERPRETING.'"

-

4. **"I'M HERE TO INTERPRET, SO WHATEVER YOU SAY TO THE DEFENDANT, I WILL HAPPILY INTERPRET."**

- "THERE'S ONE BOOK I'VE GOT AT HOME ABOUT COURT INTERPRETING, THIS IS OUTLINING EXACTLY WHAT TO DO IN THESE SITUATIONS AND THIS IS WHAT WE SHOULD DO. JUST SAY, "I'M HERE TO INTERPRET, **SO WHATEVER YOU SAY TO THE DEFENDANT, I WILL HAPPILY INTERPRET.**"

- "YEAH, CHANNEL, YEAH."

-

5. **"I'M THERE INDEPENDENTLY"**

- IT'S VERY NICELY EXPLAINED ON THE [CAMBRIDGESHIRE 0:16:29] WEBSITE THAT THE OFFICER SHOULD BE THE ONE EXPLAINING TO THE NON-ENGLISH SPEAKER. IT'S TWO OF US WHO ARE TALKING, "THE INTERPRETER IS INDEPENDENT, DON'T ASK HIM/HER FOR ADVICE, JUST TALK TO ME AS IF WE SHARE THE SAME LANGUAGE." BECAUSE IF I START EXPLAINING THAT, THEN I'M TALKING AND I'M NOT SUPPOSED TO BE TALKING, I'M SUPPOSED TO BE INTERPRETING."

- "IT DEPENDS HOW WELL THEY KNOW THE SYSTEM (LAUGHS), HOW MANY TIMES HAVE THEY BEEN ARRESTED AND BEEN TO COURT. BUT I TRY TO SPEAK AS LITTLE TO THEM AS POSSIBLE, FOR MANY REASONS REALLY."

- "SOMETIMES, IF THEY START TELLING YOU ABOUT THEIR CASE, ONCE THEY'RE IN THE COURTROOM THEY GET CONFUSED, WHAT HAVE THEY TOLD YOU ALREADY AND WHAT STILL HASN'T BEEN EXPLAINED TO COURT. AND THAT'S BAD FOR THEM BECAUSE THEN THEY CAN'T PUT FORWARD THEIR FULL STORY AND THEY'RE ALL CONFUSED ABOUT WHAT'S BEEN EXPLAINED AND WHAT HASN'T YET."

- "BUT BASICALLY SOMETIMES I NEED TO FILL OUT SOME FORMS WITH THEM, LIKE THE MEANS FORM OR SOMETHING."

- "SO I HAVE TO TALK TO THEM BUT I TRY TO STICK TO THE POINT. LIKE WE'VE GOT SOME COLUMNS THERE WE HAVE TO FILL THEM IN, SO JUST, THIS IS THIS, I NEED TO SAY, TO WRITE IT DOWN."

- "AND IF I DON'T KNOW THEM – BECAUSE SOMETIMES I COME ACROSS THE SAME ONES, NOT OFTEN – BUT IF I DON'T KNOW THEM I JUST TELL THEM, "WE'LL GO IN THE COURTROOM; PROBABLY I WILL BE SPEAKING FOR A WHILE FIRST BECAUSE I NEED TO SAY MY OATH AND AFTERWARDS THE COURT WILL BE SPEAKING TO YOU. THEY'LL ASK YOUR NAME, DATE OF BIRTH, YOUR ADDRESS AND THEN THEY'LL PUT THE CHARGE FORWARD..."

- "JUST THIS FIRST BIT BECAUSE I DON'T WANT THEM TO START OVERLAPPING IN THEIR SPEECH."

- "AND THEN AGAIN, IT CONFUSES THEM BECAUSE I AM TALKING TO THEM, EXPLAINING THEM SOMETHING..."

- IT DEPENDS. SOMETIMES THEY DO UNDERSTAND IT, SOMETIMES THEY DON'T. THAT'S WHY I KIND OF... IF I DON'T KNOW THEM, I TRY TO TELL THEM, BECAUSE THERE'S NOBODY ELSE WHO CAN TELL THEM. I'M THERE INDEPENDENTLY; I CAN'T SPEAK FOR YOU, WHATEVER YOU TELL ME, I CAN'T SAY IT IN YOUR DEFENCE, SO YOU NEED TO SPEAK FOR YOURSELF. BUT WHATEVER YOU SAY, I'LL INTERPRET IT, AND WHATEVER THEY TELL YOU, I'LL INTERPRET TOO. BECAUSE THE COURT WILL NOT DO IT, AND IF THEY DON'T UNDERSTAND IT, THAT CAN CREATE CONFUSION."
- "I'LL BE UNSPECIFIC, BUT I'LL SAY TOO OFTEN IT'S VARIED BECAUSE SOMETIMES YOU'VE GOT PEOPLE WHO ARE IN CUSTODY, SO YOU'LL NEVER MEET THEM BEFORE THE HEARING STARTS. AND THEN YOU'VE GOT DEFENDANTS WITH SOLICITORS AND WHEN YOU'VE GOT A CONSULTATION WITH A SOLICITOR BEFORE THE HEARING, THEN YOU KIND OF... THAT'S WHERE THEY KIND OF GET IT, WHAT'S HAPPENING. THAT IT'S THEM AND THE ENGLISH SPEAKER TALKING AND THE INTERPRETER IS NOT TALKING, BUT INTERPRETING WHAT YOU'RE SAYING TO EACH OTHER. **UNLESS YOU'VE GOT AN INCOMPETENT SOLICITOR WHO DOESN'T KNOW EITHER.**"
- "AND THEN YOU SOMETIMES ENCOUNTER DEFENDANTS WHO ARE ON BAIL, SO THEY'RE THERE BEFORE THEY GO INSIDE THE COURTROOM, PHYSICALLY, SOMEWHERE IN THE CORRIDOR, AND THEY DON'T HAVE A SOLICITOR. AND THEN THE USHER HANDS YOU THE MEANS FORM AND TELLS YOU, "JUST GO AND FILL IT OUT WITH HIM".
- "SO YOU NEED TO TALK TO THEM FOR THE PURPOSES OF FILLING OUT THE MEANS FORM"
- "OH YEAH, I'VE BEEN ASKED OUT FOR COFFEES AND TO ADD PEOPLE ON FACEBOOK AND PHONE NUMBERS AND STUFF LIKE THAT. THAT'S WHERE I REALLY, REALLY, REALLY LEAVE IMMEDIATELY (LAUGHS) OR MAKE UP AN EXCUSE I HAVE TO GO SOMEWHERE OR I HAVE MY PAPERWORK SIGNED AND I REALLY HAVE TO STAY TO HAVE THAT DONE AND I CAN'T GO. BUT IT'S NOT THAT OFTEN, SOMETIMES IT HAPPENS."
-

6. I DON'T REALLY INSTRUCT THEM, I JUST TELL THEM, "DON'T..." – dealing with non-English speaking litigants

- "I WANT THEM NOT TO PANIC, WHY AM I TALKING SO MUCH ALL OF A SUDDEN, ONCE WE GOT INSIDE. SO I DON'T WANT THEM TO THINK THAT I'M SAYING SOMETHING AND THEY DON'T KNOW WHAT IT IS."
- "EVEN THOUGH AFTER I SAY MY OATH IN ENGLISH I ALWAYS INTERPRET IT INTO SLOVAK. BUT I DON'T WANT THEM TO START PANICKING. WHEN WE GET THERE I WANT THEM TO KNOW THAT I'M SAYING SOMETHING I HAVE TO SAY AS A PROFESSIONAL."
- AND THEN I WANT THEM TO UNDERSTAND THAT THERE WILL BE A SHORT EXCHANGE AND THAT THEY WILL GET A CHANCE TO SPEAK AFTERWARDS. BUT I DO IT SO THAT I CAN DO MY JOB. IF THE DEFENDANT STARTS INTERRUPTING THE COURT, THEN IT MAKES MY JOB DIFFICULT.

- I'LL TELL THEM, "YOU'LL GET A CHANCE TO SPEAK, BUT SOME OTHER PEOPLE WILL BE SPEAKING FIRST AND I NEED TO INTERPRET THAT FOR YOU, SO JUST LISTEN TO THAT AND WAIT FOR YOUR TURN."
- "I DO IT BEFORE WE GO IN, BUT I TRY TO KEEP IT REALLY SHORT. AND WHEN THEY START, TRY TO START TELLING ME THEIR VERSION OF EVENTS, I TELL THEM WHAT I'VE JUST TOLD YOU, DON'T TELL ME THAT BECAUSE YOU'LL GET CONFUSED AND YOU WILL NOT REMEMBER INSIDE THE COURTROOM WHAT YOU'VE SAID ALREADY AND WHAT YOU HAVEN'T."
- "I JUST TRY NOT TO LISTEN TO WHATEVER THEY WANT TO SAY AND IF THEY REALLY WANT TO TELL ME SOMETHING, I JUST MAKE SOME EXCUSE AND I GO INSIDE THE COURTROOM WHERE THEY CAN'T TALK TO ME."
- "BUT I KIND OF TRY TO USE IT TO EXPLAIN TO THEM WHAT I'M THERE FOR. IF I'M TALKING TO THEM, I JUST TALK ABOUT WHAT I'M THERE TO DO AND I ALWAYS TRY TO KEEP IT TO A MINIMUM AND JUST STICK TO THE RELEVANT BIT. LIKE I'M HERE, BUT I'M NOT DEFENDING YOU, I'M NOT HERE TO HAVE A CHAT WITH YOU, I'LL BE INTERPRETING FOR YOU FOR THE COURT."

7. "I SEE INTERPRETERS NOT BEHAVING PROPERLY"

- "I SEE INTERPRETERS NOT BEHAVING PROPERLY. FOR EXAMPLE ONCE AT BRAXTON MAGISTRATES', THERE WAS THIS DEFENDANT, I DON'T KNOW WHAT THE LANGUAGE WAS, I JUST KNOW THAT I DIDN'T UNDERSTAND IT, IT WAS AN ASIAN LANGUAGE. SO THAT IS THE DEFENDANT AND HIS INTERPRETER. THE DEFENDANT SAID SOMETHING AND THEN THE INTERPRETER ADDRESSES THE COURT LIKE, "OH, BY THE WAY, HE BROUGHT THIS PAPER WITH HIM," AND HE JUST HANDS IT OVER FOR HIM." **AND THE COURT THINKS THAT'S WHAT THE INTERPRETER SHOULD BE DOING.** NOBODY SAYS ANYTHING." (YEAH, THIS IS WHAT HE'S BROUGHT. HE DIDN'T HAVE A SOLICITOR, HE WAS JUST REPRESENTING HIMSELF.)

8. "IF YOU'RE NOT GOOD ENOUGH TO BE A CLEANER, AS A FOREIGNER, THEN YOU'LL BECOME AN INTERPRETER."

- **"NOT ANYMORE, NO"**
- "YEAH, IF YOU'RE NOT GOOD ENOUGH TO BE A CLEANER, AS A FOREIGNER, THEN YOU'LL BECOME AN INTERPRETER. SOMETIMES I REALLY GET THAT FEELING; THIS IS HOW THEY PERCEIVE IT."

The following Themes have been identified:

1. "ATMOSPHERE IS SIGNIFICANTLY DIFFERENT BETWEEN MAGISTRATES' COURT AND CROWN COURT."

- **"ON THE WHOLE, CROWN COURTS ARE BETTER."**
- I'VE NEVER EVER, IN MY WHOLE LIFE, HAVE SEEN A CROWN COURT JUDGE WHO WOULD TALK TO ME, GIVING ME INSTRUCTIONS WHAT TO TELL THE DEFENDANT."
- "SO CROWN COURT THERE'S NO ISSUE..."
- "YOU OFTEN GET CROWN COURT JUDGES REALLY FINDING THE TIME TO THANK THE INTERPRETERS, ESPECIALLY AFTER A LONG TRIAL."
- "THEY REALLY WANT TO MAKE SURE THAT THE INTERPRETERS KNOW THAT THEIR WORK IS VALUED."

2. "I FELT EMBARRASSED FOR THEM, THAT THEY DIDN'T KNOW." – attitude and perceptions of legal professionals

- "BECAUSE IN MAGISTRATES' COURT YOU'VE GOT THE MAGISTRATES AND THEY USUALLY HAVE NO IDEA WHAT THEY'RE DOING, ESPECIALLY WHEN IT COMES TO INTERPRETERS."
- "SO YOU GET THAT TYPICAL, TELL HIM/ASK HIM/EXPLAIN TO HIM, BOTH FROM MAGISTRATE AND BUT ALSO FROM LEGAL ADVISORS WHO ARE ACTUALLY LEGALLY QUALIFIED AND THEY SHOULD KNOW WHAT THE INTERPRETER'S ROLE IS."
- "BECAUSE THEY DON'T KNOW, THEY USUALLY SEE US AS SOMEBODY WHO IS REPRESENTING THEM AND BEING THERE WITH THEM AND FOR THEM."
- "LIKE WE'RE STANDING THERE WITH THEM, SO WE ARE WITH THEM ON THEIR SIDE."
- "TELL HIM, HE HAS THE RIGHT TO HAVE A SOLICITOR, ASK HIM WHETHER HE WANTS ONE."
- "AND THEN THE USHER HANDS YOU THE MEANS FORM AND TELLS YOU, "JUST GO AND FILL IT OUT WITH HIM".
- "THE ONLY ISSUE, WHEN THERE IS AN ISSUE WITH CROWN COURTS AND BARRISTERS, THAT'S KIND OF AN OPPOSITE ISSUE. IT'S NOT LIKE THEY TALK TO US WHAT TO TELL THE DEFENDANTS, THEY SKIP US COMPLETELY. THEY'RE LIKE, "NO, WE DON'T NEED INTERPRETERS," AND THEY JUST GO AND SPEAK TO THE DEFENDANT EVEN THOUGH THE DEFENDANT HAS LIMITED ENGLISH. BECAUSE THEY THINK NO, NO, HIS/HER ENGLISH WILL DO."

3. "THE EMBARRASSMENT IS KIND OF A STRAIN; IT PUTS YOU UNDER MORE PRESSURE"

- "THE EMBARRASSMENT IS KIND OF A STRAIN; IT PUTS YOU UNDER MORE PRESSURE BECAUSE YOU FEEL STUPID BY HAVING TO SAY THAT. SO IT KIND OF MAKES ME NERVOUS, MORE NERVOUS, AND IT CAN AFFECT YOUR PERFORMANCE.
- "WELL, YOU GET IN AN AWKWARD POSITION WHEN YOU HAVE TO ASK THEM TO STOP IT, AS POLITELY AS POSSIBLE. **AND IT'S EMBARRASSING FOR YOU BECAUSE**

BASICALLY YOU LOOK LIKE AN IDIOT. YOU LOOK LIKE SOMEBODY WHO IS TRYING TO PATRONISE THE COURT, WHICH IS NOT WHAT YOU'RE DOING, BUT THAT'S HOW MANY PEOPLE WILL PERCEIVE IT ON THE OTHER END."

- **"FRANKLY, NOW I'M SCARED TO DO IT BECAUSE I DON'T WANT TO HAVE ANY MORE COMPLAINTS LIKE THAT."**
- **"AND THE WORST THINGS THAT CAN HAPPEN IS WHEN THE CUSTODY STAFF AND THE DETAINEE START ARGUING... AND YOU'RE CAUGHT IN THE MIDDLE OF THAT".**
- **"AND IF THE TWO OF THEM ARE ARGUING BETWEEN THEMSELVES, I'VE GOT NO ISSUE, THEY CAN ARGUE THE WHOLE NIGHT LONG AND I'LL BE INTERPRETING THAT, I DON'T MIND. BUT IF THEY'RE BOTH TALKING TO ME IN THIS MANNER, THAT'S NOT SOMETHING I'M COMFORTABLE WITH."**
- **"ONCE THEY START ARGUING, YOU CAN'T DO ANYTHING, BECAUSE NOBODY WILL LISTEN TO YOU."**

4. "I'M HERE TO INTERPRET, SO WHATEVER YOU SAY TO THE DEFENDANT, I WILL HAPPILY INTERPRET."

- **"YEAH, CHANNEL, YEAH."**
- **"I'M THERE INDEPENDENTLY"**
- **I DON'T REALLY INSTRUCT THEM, I JUST TELL THEM, "DON'T..." – dealing with non-English speaking litigants**
- **"I SEE INTERPRETERS NOT BEHAVING PROPERLY" – stepping out of their role and breach code of conduct.**

-

5. "IF YOU'RE NOT GOOD ENOUGH TO BE A CLEANER, AS A FOREIGNER, THEN YOU'LL BECOME AN INTERPRETER."

- **"NOT ANYMORE, NO"**
- **"YEAH, IF YOU'RE NOT GOOD ENOUGH TO BE A CLEANER, AS A FOREIGNER, THEN YOU'LL BECOME AN INTERPRETER. SOMETIMES I REALLY GET THAT FEELING; THIS IS HOW THEY PERCEIVE IT."**

12.2.20 Respondent 21: codes and themes from survey

Respondent 21: Codes and themes from the first-round questionnaire

1. **"WHEN YOU SAY "FACILITIES", THE ONLY THING THAT I CAN THINK OF ARE THE HEADPHONES THAT ARE USED DURING LONGER HEARINGS (USUALLY TRIALS) AT CROWN**

COURTS. IF THEY ARE GOOD, THEY CAN HELP **BUT THE COURTS NEVER PROVIDE THEM AUTOMATICALLY**, WE ALWAYS HAVE TO ASK FOR THEM.”

2. “MY ROLE IS TO MAKE SURE THAT THE NON-ENGLISH SPEAKER UNDERSTANDS EVERYTHING THAT AN ENGLISH SPEAKING PERSON WOULD UNDERSTAND. AND ALSO THAT HE/SHE CAN EXPRESS EVERYTHING THE WAY HE/SHE WANTS WITHOUT BEING LIMITED BY INSUFFICIENT VOCABULARY OR FAULTY GRAMMAR.”
3. “THE CROWN COURTS STAFF DO ACKNOWLEDGE INTERPRETERS AS PROFESSIONALS AND EDUCATED PEOPLE. MY EXPERIENCE FROM MAGISTRATES’ COURTS AND POLICE STATION VARY.”
4. “BY “CLIENT” I UNDERSTAND THE PERSON WHO “FOOTS THE BILL” AND BOOKS ME, I.E. THE COURT/THE POLICE. THEY OFTEN LACK EVEN THE VERY BASIC UNDERSTANDING OF THE INTERPRETERS’ ROLE.”
5. “I HAVE ONLY BEEN WORKING AS INTERPRETER FOR FOUR YEARS; I STARTED DOING THIS JOB AFTER THE BIG CHANGES CAUSED BY MOJ. HOWEVER MANY PROFESSIONALS (MAGISTRATES, LEGAL ADVISORS, SOLICITORS) TREAT INTERPRETERS AS INFERIORS WHO ARE THERE TO “ASSIST AND HELP THOSE OTHER STUPID FOREIGNERS WHO CAN’T SPEAK ENGLISH”. IT’S REALLY DEMEANING.”

Identified themes:

1. **“MY ROLE IS TO MAKE SURE THAT THE NON-ENGLISH SPEAKER UNDERSTANDS EVERYTHING THAT AN ENGLISH SPEAKING PERSON WOULD UNDERSTAND. AND ALSO THAT HE/SHE CAN EXPRESS EVERYTHING THE WAY HE/SHE WANTS WITHOUT BEING LIMITED BY INSUFFICIENT VOCABULARY OR FAULTY GRAMMAR.”**
2. **“THEY OFTEN LACK EVEN THE VERY BASIC UNDERSTANDING OF THE INTERPRETERS’ ROLE.”**
 - **“THE CROWN COURTS STAFF DO ACKNOWLEDGE INTERPRETERS AS PROFESSIONALS AND EDUCATED PEOPLE. MY EXPERIENCE FROM MAGISTRATES’ COURTS AND POLICE STATION VARY.”**
 - **“BY “CLIENT” I UNDERSTAND THE PERSON WHO “FOOTS THE BILL” AND BOOKS ME, I.E. THE COURT/THE POLICE. THEY OFTEN LACK EVEN THE VERY BASIC UNDERSTANDING OF THE INTERPRETERS’ ROLE.”**
 - **“I HAVE ONLY BEEN WORKING AS INTERPRETER FOR FOUR YEARS; I STARTED DOING THIS JOB AFTER THE BIG CHANGES CAUSED BY MOJ.**
3. **“IT’S REALLY DEMEANING.”**

- **HOWEVER MANY PROFESSIONALS (MAGISTRATES, LEGAL ADVISORS, SOLICITORS) TREAT INTERPRETERS AS INFERIORS WHO ARE THERE TO “ASSIST AND HELP THOSE OTHER STUPID FOREIGNERS WHO CAN’T SPEAK ENGLISH”.**
- 4. **“WHEN YOU SAY “FACILITIES”, THE ONLY THING THAT I CAN THINK OF ARE THE HEADPHONES THAT ARE USED DURING LONGER HEARINGS (USUALLY TRIALS) AT CROWN COURTS. IF THEY ARE GOOD, THEY CAN HELP BUT THE COURTS NEVER PROVIDE THEM AUTOMATICALLY, WE ALWAYS HAVE TO ASK FOR THEM.”**

Themes overlapping with themes identified in follow-up interview:

1. **“I’M HERE TO INTERPRET, SO WHATEVER YOU SAY TO THE DEFENDANT, I WILL HAPPILY INTERPRET.”** (Theme number 4 in the interview overlaps with the theme N1 from the survey”:

“MY ROLE IS TO MAKE SURE THAT THE NON-ENGLISH SPEAKER UNDERSTANDS EVERYTHING THAT AN ENGLISH SPEAKING PERSON WOULD UNDERSTAND. AND ALSO THAT HE/SHE CAN EXPRESS EVERYTHING THE WAY HE/SHE WANTS WITHOUT BEING LIMITED BY INSUFFICIENT VOCABULARY OR FAULTY GRAMMAR.”

2. **“I FELT EMBARRASSED FOR THEM, THAT THEY DIDN’T KNOW.”** – attitude and perceptions of legal professionals = theme N2 from the survey
3. **“IF YOU’RE NOT GOOD ENOUGH TO BE A CLEANER, AS A FOREIGNER, THEN YOU’LL BECOME AN INTERPRETER.”** = theme N3 from the survey

Additional theme has emerged from the survey:

4. **“WHEN YOU SAY “FACILITIES”, THE ONLY THING THAT I CAN THINK OF ARE THE HEADPHONES THAT ARE USED DURING LONGER HEARINGS (USUALLY TRIALS) AT CROWN COURTS. IF THEY ARE GOOD, THEY CAN HELP BUT THE COURTS NEVER PROVIDE THEM AUTOMATICALLY, WE ALWAYS HAVE TO ASK FOR THEM.”**

12.2.21 Respondent 58: first stage coding

Respondent 58 (Online Survey for Interpreters)

File name (transcript): interview with Respondent 58

Audio length – 2:01:06

Interview took place on: 15/02/2021

First cycle coding methods: initial coding, process coding, in vivo coding

Identified initial codes (**170 in total**)

1. "I SPEAK FIVE LANGUAGES, BUT THEY ARE NOT UP TO THE LEVEL OF INTERPRETING, FOR LEGAL PURPOSES.
2. "I'VE BEEN INTERPRETING FOR ALL THE COURTS AND TRIBUNALS ALL OVER THE UK."
3. "YES, I STUDIED TRANSLATION IN IRAN FOR FOUR YEARS, THIS IS 2001 TO 2005."
4. "IT WAS TRANSLATION. WE WERE TAUGHT AND PREPARED TO DO ANY KIND OF INTERPRETING IN ANY FIELD."
5. "THE REASON I DIDN'T APPLY TO THE REGISTER, ON THE NATIONAL REGISTER WAS THAT I FELT I DIDN'T NEED TO BECAUSE I WAS ALREADY INTERPRETING FOR COURTS, FOR TRIBUNALS, FOR THE POLICE AND ALL THE GOVERNMENT AND NON-GOVERNMENT ORGANISATIONS THAT NEEDED LANGUAGE SERVICES. **I DIDN'T FEEL THE NEED TO REGISTER WITH THEM.**"
6. "WELL, WHAT I WAS TRYING TO SAY IS THAT WHEN YOU ENTER A COURT OR A TRIBUNAL AS AN INTERPRETER, **YOU NEED TO BE ABLE TO FIRST LOCATE YOURSELF. AND THEN TRY TO UNDERSTAND WHAT'S HAPPENING AND WHAT YOU'RE EXACTLY GOING TO DO.**"
7. "THEN YOU'LL HAVE TO TRY TO SOMEHOW COMMUNICATE WITH THE DEFENDANT, WITH THE WITNESSES, WITH THE NON-ENGLISH SPEAKER AND ALSO THE MOST IMPORTANT THING, IF YOU SPEAK, OR AT LEAST CAN UNDERSTAND THE ACCENT OF THE NON-ENGLISH SPEAKER."

8. "FOR ANY LANGUAGE THERE ARE LOTS OF ACCENTS. MAYBE THE BASIC OF... FOR EXAMPLE IN FARSI THERE ARE SEVERAL ACCENTS AND THE BASICS ARE THE SAME, BUT THE LEGAL TERMS AND SOME SPECIAL WORDS ARE DIFFERENT. **SO THE INTERPRETER HAS TO MAKE AN ASSESSMENT WHETHER THE NON-ENGLISH SPEAKER IS ABLE TO UNDERSTAND THE INTERPRETER'S ACCENT.**"
9. "AND ALSO, MORE IMPORTANT THAN THAT, IS THAT SOME NON-ENGLISH SPEAKERS HAVE NEVER BEEN TO COURT IN THEIR OWN COUNTRIES AND DON'T EVEN UNDERSTAND LEGAL EQUIVALENCE IN THEIR MOTHER TONGUE, IN THEIR MOTHER LANGUAGES."
10. "SO EVEN IF YOU INTERPRET VERY WELL, TRANSLATE THE WORDS VERY PRECISELY AND EXACTLY, THEY WON'T BE ABLE TO UNDERSTAND IT. THE **INTERPRETER HAS TO BE ABLE TO MAKE THINGS UNDERSTOOD BY SOMEONE WHO IS NOT ABLE TO IT ADEQUATELY.**"
11. "SO THAT'S A [**] WHICH IS BUILT UP ON EXPERIENCE. WHO CAN CONVEY THE MEANING OF THE LEGAL WORDS, IN AN UNDERSTANDABLE AND COMPREHENSIBLE WAY FOR THE NON-ENGLISH SPEAKER."
12. "AND ALSO, THE FACT THAT YOU ARE THE ONLY ONE WHO CAN COMMUNICATE WITH THE NON-ENGLISH SPEAKER, **SOMETIMES YOU NEED TO HELP THEM UNDERSTAND THE COURT, THE PROCEDURE, THE PROCESS,** WHEN THEY CAN TALK, WHEN THEY ARE NOT ALLOWED TO TALK."
13. "I BELIEVE IT'S A FAILURE BY SOME SOLICITORS AND LEGAL PROFESSIONALS WHO DO NOT PREPARE THEIR CLIENTS BEFORE COMING TO COURT. THEY DON'T KNOW WHAT HAPPENED TO THEM **AND AS AN INTERPRETER, AS SOON AS I SEE THEM, I SEE THEY ARE PETRIFIED OR EXTREMELY WORRIED OF WHAT'S GOING TO HAPPEN TO THEM.**"
14. "SO **SOMETIMES INTERPRETERS NEED TO BE ABLE TO CALM THE WITNESSES OR DEFENDENTS DOWN IN A FEW WORDS,** ONLY IN A FEW WORDS. SOMETIMES THAT'S NEEDED."
15. "**INTERPRETING, IN MY VIEW, IS NOT ONLY BEING ABLE TO TRANSLATE THE WORDS FROM ONE LANGUAGE TO ANOTHER. FOR LEGAL INTERPRETERS IT REQUIRES MUCH EXPERIENCE AND CAPABILITY.**"

16. "EXACTLY. AN INTERPRETER IS THE ONLY PERSON WHO CAN UNDERSTAND THE LANGUAGE... THEIR ROLE IS TO BE ABLE TO MAKE COMMUNICATION POSSIBLE BETWEEN TWO PARTIES. IT GOES BEYOND THAT AND WHAT I WANTED TO TELL YOU IS THAT UNFORTUNATELY **SOME INTERPRETERS ARE NOT ADEQUATELY EXPERIENCED**, OR CAPABLE TO BE ABLE TO DO THAT. AND IT HAS ISSUES"
17. "FOR EXAMPLE, I CAN REMEMBER, I WAS IN A COURT IN [**], DIRECT FARSI SPEAKING PARTIES, SOME OF THEM SPOKE ENGLISH. ONE OF THEM WAS A WITNESS, THE OTHER WAS THE DEFENDANT. I WAS INTERPRETING FOR THE DEFENDANT; ANOTHER GENTLEMAN, FARSI SPEAKING INTERPRETER, WAS INTERPRETING FOR THE THIRD PARTY. **I HEARD THAT THE INTERPRETER NOT ONLY WAS MAKING SEVERAL MISTAKES IN INTERPRETING WHILE THE QUESTIONS WERE PUT FROM THE PROSECUTOR TO THE WITNESS. HE ALSO SAID SOME OTHER THINGS, SUCH AS THE PROSECUTOR IS GOING TO CATCH YOU OUT, OR SOME OTHER THINGS LIKE THAT.**"
18. "IT'S NOT ALLOWED ANYWAY, BUT THAT'S WHY I'M SAYING THEY ARE NOT ADEQUATELY PREPARED."
19. "LEGAL INTERPRETERS APART FROM [** 0:16:33] DPSI MINIMUM. THEY DO NOT DO TRAINING, AS FAR AS I KNOW, BEFORE THEY APPEAR IN COURT OR START INTERPRETING. THEY ARE NOT PREPARED FOR THE UNEXPECTED SITUATIONS THAT MAY OCCUR ANYTIME, ANYWHERE. FROM ONE POINT OF VIEW THEY NEED TO LOOK AND SOUND PROFESSIONAL.
20. "FROM ANOTHER POINT OF VIEW... FROM THE OTHER SIDE THEY NEED TO BE HELPFUL IN CASES THAT SOLICITORS HAVEN'T BEEN ABLE TO DO THEIR JOB."
21. "I CAN'T SAY THAT HAVING AN INTERPRETER IN COURT WILL GIVE SOME KIND OF... I DON'T AGREE WILL GIVE SOME KIND OF ADVANTAGE OVER THE OTHER PARTIES."
22. "BUT LACKING THE ABILITY OF AN INTERPRETER FOR MAKING THE CONVERSATIONS AND WHAT'S BEING SAID, WHAT IS BEING SAID OR WRITTEN POSSIBLE, CAN CAUSE MANY OTHER ISSUES. IF THE DEFENDANT, THE WITNESS IS A NON-ENGLISH SPEAKER AND CANNOT UNDERSTAND

WHAT'S BEING SAID, THEN **THE WHOLE PURPOSE OF JUSTICE WOULD BE QUESTIONED.**"

23. "ONE OF THE ASSESSMENTS, ONE OF THE MOST IMPORTANT POINTS THE INTERPRETER HAS TO BE ABLE TO DO WHEN THEY ENTER THE COURTROOM, I HAVE SEEN MANY COURT STAFF WHO DON'T KNOW ENOUGH ABOUT THE ROLE OF THE INTERPRETER. AND MANY OF THE COURT STAFF I'VE SEEN, THEY ARE ALREADY AWARE OF WHAT'S GOING TO HAPPEN TO THE INTERPRETER AND WHAT KIND OF JOB HE'S GOING TO DO."
24. "BUT IT IS ANYWAY UP TO THE INTERPRETER TO BE ABLE TO ESTABLISH THEIR PRESENCE AND LET EVERYBODY KNOW WHAT THEY WANT TO DO AND HOW THEY ARE GOING TO DO IT."
25. "I'LL GIVE YOU AN EXAMPLE. SOMETIMES DURING HEARINGS I WAS ASKED TO INTERPRET CONSECUTIVELY. SOMETIMES I WAS ASKED TO INTERPRETER SIMULTANEOUSLY, I MEAN WHISPERING. [THAT EXECUTIVE 0:22:59] FROM THE JUDGE CALLED THE STAFF TO EXPLAIN TO ME WHEN I ARRIVED IN THE COURTROOM WHAT TO DO.
26. "SOMETIMES COURTS AND COURT MEMBERS ARE STRUGGLING WITHOUT EVEN **GIVING THE SLIGHTEST ATTENTION TO THE PRESENCE OF THE INTERPRETER AND NOT TAKING ME INTO CONSIDERATION**, THAT WHAT IS BEING SAID THERE HAS TO BE INTERPRETED TO THE NON-ENGLISH SPEAKER."
27. "SOMETIMES THEY ARE NOT AWARE, SOMETIMES THEY PAY ATTENTION, SOMETIMES THEY DON'T."
28. "WHENEVER I ATTENDED HEARINGS I JUST LEFT ALL THESE TO THE MEMBERS OF THE COURT, TO THE JUDGE AND THE COURT CLERK, TO DECIDE WHAT THEY WANT ME TO DO. THESE MAY SEEM LITTLE ISSUES BUT CAN CREATE SERIOUS OBSTACLES FOR THE INTERPRETERS TO BE ABLE TO DO THEIR JOB PROPERLY."
29. "I REMEMBER, SORRY, I JUST REMEMBER EXAMPLES THAT WILL HELP ME MAKE MY POINTS UNDERSTOOD. I JUST REMEMBERED A COURT HEARING I ATTENDED. THERE WAS A DEFENDANT AND THE WITNESSES TALKED TO THE JUDGE AND THE COURT MEMBERS THROUGH VIDEO CALL. AND THEY WERE USED SLANG – I THINK IT WAS IN LIVERPOOL – WHICH I DIDN'T UNDERSTAND COMPLETELY. BECAUSE WHEN THEY WERE SPEAKING, THEY

WERE GIVING EVIDENCE, THEY USED SLANG AND IT WASN'T STANDARD ENGLISH. **AND I HAD TO INTERRUPT THE VIDEO**, THE PERSON WHO WAS PLAYING THE VIDEO **AND ASK THEM TO STOP-STOP-STOP, WAIT FOR ME TO INTERPRET, WAIT FOR ME TO INTERPRET.**

30. "SOMETIMES I DIDN'T UNDERSTAND WHAT WAS GOING ON. SO WHAT I TOLD THE JUDGE LATER WAS THAT I EXPECTED TO BE AWARE OF WHAT WAS GOING TO HAPPEN AND I EXPECTED TO BE ASKED IF I UNDERSTOOD A SLANG LIVERPOOL ACCENT."

31. "FOR THAT HEARING I TRIED MY BEST. I CAN SAY ASSERTIVELY THAT THE ISSUE OF NOT BEING ABLE TO UNDERSTAND SLANG ACCENT DID NOT AFFECT MUCH THE HEARING, DID NOT AFFECT THE HEARING AND THE PROCESS AND THE PURPOSE OF JUSTICE. **HOWEVER, I FELT IT WAS A KIND OF FAILURE FOR ME.**"

32. "I CAN REMEMBER I WAS IN MANCHESTER, AN IMMIGRATION TRIBUNAL, FIRST YEAR TRIBUNAL AND I WAS INTERPRETING FOR A GENTLEMAN WHO WAS NOT FROM A VERY EDUCATED BACKGROUND. **HE STRUGGLED TO UNDERSTAND LEGAL TERMS BUT I DID MY BEST TO CONVEY THE MEANING AND THE GIST OF WHAT WAS BEING SAID.** HOWEVER, DURING THE COURT THERE IS A TIME LIMIT THAT THE WITNESS CAN GIVE EVIDENCE. AT THE END OF COURT, DURING SUBMISSIONS, WHEN THE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE HOME OFFICE AND THE GENTLEMAN'S REPRESENTATIVE COULD GIVE THEIR ARGUMENTS, THE WITNESS IS NOT ALLOWED TO TALK.

33. "WHEN I TOLD HIM THAT HE COULDN'T SPEAK AND HE WAS NOT ALLOWED TO DO SO, HE WAS VERY UPSET WITH ME. AT THE END OF THE COURT I CAN REMEMBER HE TOLD ME, **"I WILL SUE YOU IF MY CASE IS DISMISSED BECAUSE YOU DIDN'T ALLOW ME TO TALK."**

34. "IT WAS AT THAT POINT, THE JUDGE WAS LEAVING THE ROOM, I ASKED THE JUDGE, "YOUR HONOUR, THE GENTLEMAN SAYS HE'S GOING TO SUE ME FOR NOT ALLOWING HIM TO SPEAK DURING SUBMISSION." HE SAID TO THE WITNESS, "NO, YOU ARE NOT ALLOWED, YOU ARE NOT ALLOWED TO SPEAK, YOU HAD WHATEVER YOU HAD TO SAY DURING YOUR EVIDENCE." I BELIEVE THAT IT WAS THE DUTY OF THE JUDGE, THE COURT TO STOP, OR AT LEAST THE WITNESSES ADVOCATE TO EXPLAIN TO THEM WHAT WAS GOING TO HAPPEN."

35. "ACTUALLY I HEARD THE QUESTION, "PLEASE HELP ME ON THAT QUESTION," FROM WITNESSES AND DEFENDANTS, A LOT WHEN I'M IN COURT."
36. "BUT I WASN'T ALLOWED TO DO ANYTHING OR ANSWER, EVEN ANSWER THAT QUESTION."
37. "AS I SAID, IF SOMEBODY HAS MISSED THEIR RESPONSIBILITY BEFORE BRINGING A WITNESS TO COURT, IT'S MY ROLE TO GIVE A LITTLE BIT OF INFORMATION ABOUT WHAT'S GOING TO HAPPEN IN COURT AND GIVE THEM A ROUGH IDEA OF HOW LONG IT'S GOING TO TAKE OR THINGS LIKE THAT."
38. "BUT WHAT I'VE BEEN TRYING TO DO ALL THESE YEARS IS TO AVOID ANSWERING THE QUESTIONS OR GIVE ANSWERS THAT WERE NOT PRESCRIBED IN MY CODE OF CONDUCT AS AN INTERPRETER."
39. "SOMETIMES WHEN WE HEAR A CERTAIN QUESTION FROM A WITNESS ABOUT WHAT'S GOING TO HAPPEN NEXT, YOU HAVE TO ANSWER IT ANYWAY."
40. "SO INTERPRETING FOR THE MINISTRY OF JUSTICE IS NOT AN EASY JOB TO DO, AT ALL. IT SOMETIMES INVOLVES BEING ABLE TO CALM PEOPLE DOWN, MAKE ASSESSMENT OF THEIR EDUCATION, LEVEL OF UNDERSTANDING, THEIR CULTURAL BACKGROUND."
41. "AND SOMETIMES YOU HAVE TO GIVE INFORMATION THAT IS ABSOLUTELY NOT EXPECTED FROM YOU."
42. "AS AN INTERPRETER YOU NEED TO BE VERY CAREFUL ABOUT GIVING OR EXPLAINING ABOUT SOMETHING YOU DON'T HAVE TO. AND YOU SHOULDN'T HAVE TO."
43. "BUT THERE ARE OTHER ISSUES AS WELL, IF I MAY SAY. A DEFENDANT GOES TO COURT, THEY SEE ONE INTERPRETER, FOR THE NEXT DAY THEY SEE ANOTHER ONE AND INTERPRETERS ARE SPEAKING THE SAME LANGUAGE FOR THE WITNESS OR THE DEFENDANT TO UNDERSTAND. BUT SOMETIMES THE EQUIVALENTS INTERPRETERS USE ARE DIFFERENT FROM..."
44. "IT IS A VERY BIG FAILURE OF THE MINISTERS. I MEAN THE INTERPRETING INDUSTRY, IF I MAY SAY, THAT **THERE IS NO INTEGRITY BETWEEN INTERPRETERS**. AND TO GIVE ONE CERTAIN WORD... FOR EXAMPLE, IN FARSI THE STATEMENT HAS MORE THAN THREE OR FOUR MEANINGS,

TOTALLY DIFFERENT. THE FIRST INTERPRETER COMES INTO COURT AND USES THE FIRST EQUIVALENT. THE SECOND ONE COMES INTO COURT AND USES ANOTHER EQUIVALENT, WHICH IS TOTALLY DIFFERENT FROM THE FIRST ONE. AND WE CANNOT EXPECT THE NON-ENGLISH SPEAKER TO UNDERSTAND BOTH OF THEM.”

45. “IT’S A REALLY BIG ISSUE. EVEN INTERPRETERS HAVE THE SAME QUALIFICATIONS, BUT THEY USE DIFFERENT EQUIVALENTS AT TIMES.”

46. “EVEN THE INTERPRETING COURSES THAT INTERPRETERS ATTEND, FOR THE QUALIFICATION, I BELIEVE THERE ARE MANY ISSUES WITH THEM. BECAUSE MOST OF THESE INTERPRETING COURSES TEACH THEM ENGLISH RATHER THAN HELPING THEM LEARN TO TRANSLATE PROPERLY INTO THE OTHER LANGUAGE.”

47. “FOR [** 0:38:53] COURSES FOR DPSI ARE HELD AT NEARLY EVERY COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY IN THE UK. THE TUTOR COMES IN AND WITHOUT EVEN KNOWING WHAT THE STUDENT IS TALKING ABOUT, WHILE THEY ARE PRACTICING INTERPRETING, GIVES SOME LESSONS AND THEN GOES AWAY.”

48. **“IT’S UP TO THE INTERPRETER TO PRACTICE AND GAIN ADEQUATE EXPERIENCE TO PREPARE THEMSELVES FOR THE JOB.”**

49. “THE EXAMS, THEY DO NOT TEST THE INTERPRETER ON EVERY ASPECT OF THEIR JOB.”

50. “AND I KNOW IT’S IMPOSSIBLE FOR AN EXAM TO TAKE MORE THAN FOUR OR FIVE HOURS, BUT SOME PEOPLE, SOME INTERPRETERS HAVE VERY GOOD QUALIFICATIONS AND LACK THE MOST CRUCIAL KNOWLEDGE ABOUT SOME CERTAIN LEGAL WORDS. AND I’VE SEEN IT MYSELF MANY TIMES IN COURT.”

51. “I WAS WITH ANOTHER GENTLEMAN, AN INTERPRETER IN BIRMINGHAM AGAIN. I COUNTED HIS ERRORS DURING A THREE HOUR HEARING. HE MADE MORE THAN 72 ERRORS DURING INTERPRETING.”

52. “AND EVEN THE JUDGE ASKED ME TO STAND UP AND STOP THE PROCESS AND TELL THE JUDGE AND THE OTHER PEOPLE OF THE COURT WHEREVER THERE WAS A MISTAKE, BUT IT WASN’T POSSIBLE. THREE OR FOUR TIMES I STOOD UP AND SAID, “THE INTERPRETER IS NOT INTERPRETING CORRECTLY, THAT WORD HAS TO BE INTERPRETED THIS WAY.” AND IT

WASN'T A CORRECT TRANSLATION. THREE OR FOUR TIMES I STOOD UP, BUT 72 TIMES, IT WASN'T POSSIBLE."

53. **"THEY KEEP PUSHING.** IN MOST CASES WHEN THEY ARE NOT PREPARED AT ALL FOR THE LEGAL PROCESS AND IN SIMPLE WORDS, THEY DON'T KNOW WHAT'S GOING TO HAPPEN DURING THE HEARINGS, THEY PUSH OVER AND OVER AND ASK QUESTIONS [**** 0:42:59**]. EVEN DURING THE EVIDENCE. I TOLD YOU ONE OF THE QUESTIONS, "HOW AM I GOING TO ANSWER THAT QUESTION?" I HEARD THAT A LOT. OR, "WHAT DO YOU THINK I SHOULD SAY?" OR, "I DON'T LIKE THIS COURT, CAN I COME BACK LATER?" (LAUGHS) THINGS LIKE THAT, MANY THINGS LIKE THAT."
54. **"THEY ARE NOT EDUCATED ENOUGH TO KNOW WHAT'S GOING TO HAPPEN IN THE COURT OF LAW.** THEY SHOULD BE PREPARED FIVE MINUTES... IT TAKES ONLY FIVE MINUTES FOR THE LEGAL ADVOCATE TO TELL THEM..."
55. "EXACTLY, THIS IS GOING TO HAPPEN. YOUR INTERPRETER IS THERE JUST TO INTERPRET. THEY'RE NOT GOING TO REPRESENT YOU, THEY'RE NOT GOING TO GIVE ANSWERS IN YOUR PLACE, THEY'RE NOT GOING TO DO ANYTHING OTHER THAN TRANSLATING WHAT IS BEING SAID BY YOU OR BY ANY OTHER ONE, SO THAT EVERYBODY UNDERSTANDS EACH OTHER."
56. "THERE WAS ALSO ANOTHER ISSUE, [COURT CLERKS 0:44:31], AS I EXPLAINED TO YOU, **SOME COURT MEMBERS ARE NOT PREPARED HOW TO DEAL WITH INTERPRETERS.**"
57. "I HAVE [**** 0:44:58**] WITH REGARDS TO COURT CLERKS WHO HAVE NOT HAD ANY KIND OF BRIEFING WITH THE PRESENCE OF THE INTERPRETER. **AND IN MANY COURTS I WAS REQUESTED, PROPERLY, TO INTRODUCE MYSELF, TO TAKE THE OATH AND TO SPEAK A LITTLE BIT ABOUT BOTH LANGUAGES THAT ARE GOING TO BE SECOND LANGUAGES SPOKEN IN COURT. AND ALSO TO CONFIRM THAT I COULD COMMUNICATE [**** 0:45:45**]. I HAD TO DO IT MYSELF.**
58. "YES, EVERYTHING WAS IN PLACE. SOMETIMES BEFORE THE HEARINGS I WAS NOT GIVEN THE OPPORTUNITY TO MAKE SURE THAT I COULD COMMUNICATE WITH THE NON-ENGLISH SPEAKER. SO WHEN I ENTERED THE COURT, I DIDN'T KNOW WHAT LANGUAGE OR WHAT ACCENT THE NON-ENGLISH SPEAKER SPEAKS."

59. "ALL OF THEM. FOR EXAMPLE FOR FARSI, MOST OF MY BOOKINGS WERE REGISTERED AS FARSI-AFGHAN, BUT WHEN I APPEARED IN COURT I COULD SEE THAT THEY SPOKE PERSIAN ACCENT OR DARI ACCENT. SO I MENTIONED IT MANY TIMES **TO THE THEBIGWORD** BUT I DON'T KNOW IF THEY TRIED THEIR BEST TO SORT OUT THIS ISSUE OR NOT, I DON'T KNOW. BUT THE ISSUE STILL EXISTS, I BELIEVE."
60. "**WELL, TO BE HONEST, I CAN SAY THE SITUATION HAS DETERIORATED AND IT'S GETTING WORSE.**"
61. "IT IS TRUE THAT **I LEFT MY ROLE AS A LINGUIST FOR THE MINISTRY OF JUSTICE ABOUT A YEAR AGO.**"
62. BUT I AM STILL IN CONTACT WITH MY FRIENDS WHO ARE STILL WORKING FOR THE MINISTRY OF JUSTICE AS INTERPRETERS. THE ISSUES STILL EXIST. THE **FIRST IS OBVIOUSLY THE PAYMENT ISSUE**, THE PAYMENT ISSUE THAT FOR EXAMPLE WITH CAPITA, I HAD TO WAIT, I CAN REMEMBER ABOUT 15 DAYS OR SOMETHING, FOR THE PAYMENT TO GO THROUGH."
63. "BUT **FOR THEBIGWORD** I HAVE IN SOME CASES, I WAITED 60 TO 70 DAYS, OR 60 TO 80 DAYS FOR THE PAYMENT TO REACH MY ACCOUNT. BUT I HAD TO GO WITH ONE BECAUSE I DIDN'T KNOW ANY OTHER JOBS (LAUGHS) TO DO. AND **THE OTHER ISSUES WITH THE BOOKINGS IS THE CANCELLATIONS.**"
64. "THE MINISTRY OF JUSTICE, IF YOU ARE AN INTERPRETER, IF YOU ARE BOOKED FOR A HEARING THAT WILL LAST FOR ONE MONTH, YOU ARE ACTUALLY BOOKED FOR ONE MONTH. AND 24 HOURS BEFORE THE HEARING THE COURT OR THEBIGWORD IS ALLOWED TO CANCEL IT AND I EXPERIENCED MANY CANCELLATIONS LIKE THIS."
65. "YES, BECAUSE YOU KNOW, **IF IT IS WITHIN 24 HOURS PRIOR TO THE START OF THE HEARING, YOU WERE TO BE PAID SOME AMOUNT, £50 OR SOMETHING. NO MATTER HOW MUCH YOUR TIME HAD BEEN WASTED.**"
66. "YES, A CANCELLATION FEE. BUT **IF IT IS CANCELLED NOT WITHIN THE 24 HOUR PERIOD OF TIME, PRIOR TO THE HEARING, THEN YOU WILL GET NOTHING.** EVEN IF YOU ARE BOOKED FOR TWO YEARS FOR A HEARING, YOU WON'T GET ANYTHING."
67. "THIS IS ONE OF THE ISSUES. EVEN SOMETIMES I APPEARED IN COURT, I ARRIVED THERE, AFTER HALF AN HOUR, ONE HOUR, I WAS TOLD THAT THE

COURT SESSION HAD BEEN CANCELLED. I HAD BEEN BOOKED FOR A THREE HOUR **[** 0:53:06]**. OKAY, **I COUNTED ON THAT INCOME AND SO I WAS VERY UPSET BECAUSE I HAD A LOT OF LOSS.**"

68. "IN 2016 MY LOSSES, BECAUSE OF CANCELLATIONS, WERE OVER £4,000 AND IN 2017 MY LOSSES WERE ABOUT £4,500."

69. "THAT WAS ONE OF THE REASONS THAT I HAD TO LEAVE THE ROLE BECAUSE I COULDN'T PREDICT ANYTHING."

70. "WHENEVER I MENTIONED THIS TO THE PEOPLE, THEY SAY THE MINISTRY OF JUSTICE HAS MADE THESE DECISIONS AND WE COULDN'T CHALLENGE THE MINISTRY OF JUSTICE."

71. "AND ALSO, THERE IS SAID THAT IT'S IN YOUR CONTRACT. WHEN I MENTIONED THAT THE CONTRACT WAS PRE-PRINTED, I WASN'T HAPPY WITH ALL THE ARTICLES AND I WASN'T HAPPY WITH EVERYTHING. BUT I HAD TO SIGN THE CONTRACT TO BE ABLE TO PROVIDE MY SERVICES. THEY SAID THEY CAN'T DO ANYTHING ABOUT THAT."

72. "AND ALSO AGAIN, I'VE HEARD SOME PROBLEMS, SO MY COLLEAGUES THAT **[** 0:55:18]** FOR TRAVEL HAVE REDUCED. THAT IS A VERY BIG ISSUE."

73. "THERE ARE HEARINGS ALL OVER THE UK. I HAD TO GO TO NEWCASTLE FOR TWO DAYS, I CAN REMEMBER. I WAS ON THE WAY FOR FIVE HOURS. THE PAYMENT FOR THE TRAVEL WAS ABOUT £40 OR £60. I BOOKED THE HOTEL FOR THE NIGHT, BUT AS SOON AS I ARRIVED IN NEWCASTLE THE COURT TOOK ABOUT ONE HOUR AND THEY SAID, "WE DON'T REQUIRE YOUR SERVICES ANYMORE." SO I HAD LOST EVERYTHING."

74. "AND INTERPRETERS, WHAT I WANTED TO SAY, INTERPRETERS DO NOT COUNT ON THE 'PAYMENT' OF THE HOURS THEY WORK. THEY COUNT ON THE MILEAGE PAYMENT THAT IS PROMISED. BECAUSE MILEAGE IS CERTAIN, THE PAYMENT FOR MILEAGE, FOR THE TRAVEL IS CERTAIN; THEY WILL BE GETTING IT DEFINITELY. **BUT FOR THE WORK IT'S NOT, IT'S NOT PREDICTABLE.**"

75. "NO, BY PUBLIC TRANSPORT. IF I WANTED TO USE MY CAR I'M GOING TO HAVE TO PAY A LOT MORE, FOR INSURANCE, FOR FUEL, FOR EVERYTHING."

76. "THE PAYMENT SYSTEM FOR THE INTERPRETERS, **THE MINISTRY OF JUSTICE DOES NOT CONSIDER HOW MUCH YOU HAVE PAID FOR YOUR TRAVEL.**"

77. "YEAH, APOLOGIES, I SHOULD HAVE EXPLAINED THAT EARLIER. YES, SO THERE IS A CERTAIN AMOUNT FOR A JOB THAT YOU HAVE EXPECTED, THAT YOU HAVE BEEN BOOKED, ON MILEAGE. AND THE INTERPRETER, I CAN SAY **POOR, HUMBLE INTERPRETER** HAS TO GET HIMSELF THERE, HAS TO ARRIVE THERE BY THE MEANS THAT HAS COST HIM MINIMUM."
78. "SOMETIMES, I REMEMBER, THE HEARING HAS STARTED AT 10:00; IT WAS A VERY SMALL TOWN IN THE EAST OF ENGLAND. I DON'T REMEMBER THE NAME OF THE CITY. THE HEARING STARTED AT 10:00, I ARRIVED THERE, YOU MIGHT NOT BELIEVE IT, **I ARRIVED THERE AT 2:00 IN THE MORNING AND I SLEPT IN THE PARK NEXT TO THE COURT**, THERE WAS NO HOTEL, THERE WAS NO SERVICE, THERE WAS NO SERVICE AFTER THAT, THERE WAS NO TRANSPORT. **I DIDN'T DRIVE, SO I HAD TO STAY IN THE PARK FOR ABOUT EIGHT HOURS.**"
79. "**AS I WAS LEAVING THE COURT, I WAS EVEN INSULTED BY ONE OF THE COURT STAFF, I DON'T KNOW WHY.**"
80. "SOMETIMES SOME COURT STAFF THINK THE INTERPRETER IS EXACTLY, I DON'T KNOW WHY, **THEY CONSIDER THE INTERPRETER IS AS CRIMINAL AS A DEFENDANT.**"
81. "**YES, SOMETIMES THEY SAY THEY ARE FROM THE SAME COUNTRY, THEY HAVE THE SAME CULTURE.**"
82. "**I WAS INSULTED, ABUSED AND I HEARD MANY UNPLEASANT THINGS ABOUT MY CULTURE, ABOUT MY BACKGROUND, MANY TIMES BY COURT STAFF.**"
83. "WELL, I CAN'T GIVE YOU THE NUMBER OF TIMES THAT I EXPERIENCED THIS. I DID MINIMAL 15 HEARINGS DURING THE MONTH FOR THE MINISTRY OF JUSTICE, MINIMUM 15, SO 15 DAYS I WAS BUSY. **AND EVERY MONTH IT HAPPENED AND I HEARD SOMETHING UNPLEASANT FROM A COURT STAFF.**"
84. "EXACTLY. "
85. "LOW LEVEL COURT STAFF, MOST OF THE TIME. THE COURT CLERK OR PEOPLE WHO DON'T HAVE A VERY IMPORTANT ROLE IN THE COURT."
86. "HOWEVER, I HAVE ONCE OR TWICE EXPERIENCED BEING... WHERE OTHERS BEHAVED IN A WAY THAT I FELT I WAS BEING INSULTED IN A VERY BAD WAY."

87. "IT WAS THE BEGINNING OF MY INTERPRETING EXPERIENCE IN THE UK, IT WAS 2013. I ATTENDED A COURT IN BOLTON. WHEN WE WENT INSIDE THE COURT I SAW THE DEFENDANT, IT WAS A MAGISTRATES' COURT, I THINK. THE MAGISTRATE STARTED SHOUTING AT THE DEFENDANT, WHY HE COULDN'T SPEAK ENGLISH. AND ASKED OVER AND OVER, IN THE MOST IMPOLITE WAY, WHY HE HASN'T BEEN TO SCHOOL SINCE HE HAS BEEN IN THE UK. I CAN REMEMBER THAT THE GENTLEMAN EXPLAINED, I'VE BEEN IN THE UK FOR ABOUT THREE/FOUR YEARS AND I DON'T UNDERSTAND LEGAL LANGUAGE. I'VE BEEN TO COLLEGE BUT LEGAL LANGUAGE IS JUST VERY DIFFICULT FOR ME TO UNDERSTAND. THAT'S WHY I HAVE REQUESTED."
88. **"THE REASON I GAVE YOU THIS... ACTUALLY I WAS SHOUTED AT AS WELL."**
89. "EXACTLY WHAT I TOLD YOU. SOME COURT STAFF DON'T KNOW WHAT THEY ARE GOING TO DO WITH THE INTERPRETER. THEY DON'T KNOW IF THE INTERPRETER HAS TO INTERPRET CONSECUTIVELY, WITH PAUSES OR SIMULTANEOUSLY."
90. " WHEN I WAS SITTING, AFTER THE SHOUTING AT THE DEFENDANT, WHEN I WAS SITTING I WAITED FOR THE PROSECUTOR TO START AND THEN I STARTED INTERPRETING WHAT WAS BEING SAID. HOWEVER, I RECEIVED A VERY LOUD YELL, AT ME, SAYING, **"YOU'RE SUPPOSED TO INTERPRET, YOU'RE HERE TO INTERPRET."**
91. "I COULD SEE THE COURT STAFF WAS LOOKING AT ME, SHE WAS VERY SORRY AND I COULD SEE IT IN HER LOOK, THAT SHE FELT SORRY FOR ME. I EXPERIENCED THIS A LOT."
92. **"I HEARD, "GO AWAY," I HEARD, "GET LOST," I HEARD, "WHY DO WE HAVE TO PAY INTERPRETERS?"**
93. "I HEARD SENTENCES LIKE, WHEN I ASKED THE COURT USHER ONCE, IT WAS A VERY EARLY MORNING WHEN I ARRIVED, "WHERE IS COURT 20?" HE SAID SOMETHING, HE ANSWERED ME IN A SLANG AND WHEN I ASKED MY NATIVE FRIENDS ABOUT WHAT HE SAID, THEY SAID IT WASN'T PLEASANT AT ALL, **IT WAS VERY RUDE AND YOU HAVE BEEN ABUSED.** I CAN REMEMBER IT WAS WIGAN, A CITY NEAR BOLTON, IN GREATER MANCHESTER..."
94. "THAT'S FINE, THAT'S FINE, **IT'S THE REALITY.**"
95. I CAN REMEMBER I WENT WIGAN, THE HEARING WAS SUPPOSED TO START AT 10:00; I WAS THERE AT 9:30. BUT THE NON-ENGLISH SPEAKER DIDN'T

ATTEND COURT AT ALL. I ASKED THE COURT STAFF, I SAT OUTSIDE THE COURT, THREE/FOUR TIMES I WENT IN AND ASKED THE CLERK TO COME OUT, WE WANT TO TALK TO HIM, BECAUSE I DIDN'T WANT TO DISTURB THE PROCESS, THE OTHER HEARINGS. I ASKED HIM, "WHAT WOULD YOU LIKE ME TO DO? WOULD YOU LIKE ME TO STAY OR WOULD YOU LIKE ME TO GO? IF YOU'RE THINK THE DEFENDANT IS COMING, THEN I CAN WAIT," BECAUSE I HAD BEEN BOOKED FOR THE WHOLE DAY. **HE KEPT SAYING, "IT'S UP TO YOU," WHATEVER THAT MEANS."**

96. I WENT THERE TO PROVIDE MY PROFESSIONAL SERVICES, TO WORK AS AN INTERPRETER AND **THE COURT CLERK TELLS ME, "IT'S UP TO YOU."**

97. "THEY WOULDN'T TELL ME WHETHER THEY NEED ME OR THEY DON'T. IT WAS 4:00 IN THE AFTERNOON, I WAS VERY TIRED, I HAD BEEN SITTING ALL DAY. I WAS VERY TIRED AND WHEN I WENT DOWNSTAIRS THE STAFF MEMBER DOWNSTAIRS ASKED ME TO SIGN MY TIME SHEET AND GIVE IT BACK TO HER, FOR HER TO SIGN. I THOUGHT IT WAS A LITTLE BIT STRANGE BECAUSE I USUALLY SIGN IT AFTER THEY PUT THE TIME AND THEIR SIGNATURE ON THE TIME SHEET. I SIGNED IT AND GAVE IT TO HER. **SHE PUT 'ONE HOUR' ON THE TIME SHEET AND SIGNED IT AND GAVE IT BACK TO ME.**

98. "I SAID, "NO, I HAVE BEEN HERE ALL DAY, YOU DIDN'T TELL ME TO GO OR STAY, I'VE BEEN BOOKED FOR THE WHOLE DAY." THEY SAID, "**YOU SHOULD BE GRATEFUL THAT WE ARE PAYING YOU ONE HOUR."**"

99. **"IT WASN'T NICE AT ALL. THAT WAS THE LAST TIME THAT I WENT TO WIGAN. I DIDN'T ACCEPT ANY OTHER BOOKINGS FOR THAT COURT.**

100. "I **COMPLAINED TO THE BIG WORD ABOUT IT, BUT I CAN'T REMEMBER THE OUTCOME.** YOU KNOW, ABOUT ABUSE, UNPLEASANT BEHAVIOUR AND OTHER THINGS THAT I TOLD YOU, A FEW EXAMPLES.

101. "I THOUGHT AS AN INTERPRETER, I AM WORKING FOR THE MINISTRY OF JUSTICE AND IF I GO THERE, IF I GO TO THEM, EVERY MONTH OR EVERY TWO WEEKS AND COMPLAIN ABOUT THE BEHAVIOUR OF THEIR STAFF MEMBERS, THEY WON'T LIKE IT, OF COURSE. AND I DIDN'T WANT TO ROCK THE BOAT, AS IT IS SAID, AND BRING ISSUES UNDER MY NAME. **SO I KEPT SILENT ABOUT IT AND I HAD NOT TOLD ANYONE, ANYONE, INCLUDING MY FAMILY ABOUT IT, UNTIL NOW.**

102. "YES, IN 2011 IT WAS VERY VALUED."
103. "AND **EVERYBODY COOPERATED WITH THE INTERPRETERS AND THEY WERE VERY KIND, THEY WERE VERY POLITE,**
104. "BUT [**** 1:13:44**]. IN AN ABUSIVE SITUATION, NO GOOD PAYMENT, THE CONTINUOUS CANCELLATIONS, ISSUES DURING HEARINGS, RACIAL ABUSE, INSULT, OVER AND OVER."
105. "YOU MENTIONED DOCTOR, I TOLD MY DOCTOR ABOUT THAT, THAT I WAS DEPRESSED, BUT I COULDN'T COMPLETELY EXPRESS THE REASON WHY I HATED MY SITUATION WORKING AS AN INTERPRETER."
106. "WHEN YOU SAID THE ROLE OF THE INTERPRETER, LEVEL OF PROFESSIONALISM IS NOT LESS THAN OTHER PEOPLE WHO ATTEND COURT, I AGREE COMPLETELY WITH YOU."
107. " AND EVEN **SOMETIMES I BELIEVE THEIR ROLE IS A LITTLE BIT HARDER THAN, FOR EXAMPLE, A SOLICITOR, BECAUSE OBVIOUSLY THEY NEED TO PUT THEMSELVES IN THE SHOES OF DIFFERENT PEOPLE IN COURT.** "WHEN THE JUDGES [**** 1:15:29**] WITNESS, THE NON-ENGLISH SPEAKER, THEN THE JUDGE SAYS THAT. BECAUSE SOMETIMES THE PACE IS VERY FAST AND ADVOCATES AND THE JUDGE AND THE COURT CLERKS ARE MAKING THEIR CASE TOO FAST"
108. "IF THERE IS NO PROPER INTERPRETING SERVICE AVAILABLE FOR THE NON-NATIVE SPEAKER, THEN THE WHOLE PURPOSE OF JUSTICE WOULD BE JEOPARDISED."
109. "AND I HAVE SEEN, I HAVE WITNESSED THAT DUE TO THE ISSUES, MORE AND MORE PROFESSIONAL INTERPRETERS LEAVE, THAT'S TRUE."
110. "LIKE ME, I HAVE TRANSLATED 13 BOOKS; I HAVE ABOUT 20 YEARS OF EXPERIENCE OF INTERPRETING AND TRANSLATION. I'VE GOT MY OWN STUDENTS. I AM A KIND OF LAWYER, AN IMMIGRATION CASE WORKER. **AND I HAVE LEFT THE INDUSTRY.**"
111. "AND WHEN THE NEW ONES COME, THEY ARE NOT TRAINED ENOUGH. THEY ARE NOT ADEQUATELY EXPERIENCED. THEY ARE NOT AWARE OF THE ROLES THEY NEED TO PLAY BECAUSE IT'S MORE THAN ONE ROLE SOMETIMES, INTERPRETING."
112. "I CAN REMEMBER I WAS IN THE PRISON CELL, I WAS INTERPRETING FOR A DEFENDANT WHO WAS A DRUG ADDICT AND HE WAS IN A PRISON

CELL, IN [BIRMINGHAM 1:18:48]. HE COULDN'T COMMUNICATE WITH THE PRISON OFFICER. THAT'S WHY HE GOT VERY ANGRY AND HE HAD HANDCUFFS ON HIS HANDS AND HE'S [^{**} 1:19:10] ON HIS HEAD, THE HANDCUFF, AND THERE WAS BLOOD ALL OVER. AND I DON'T KNOW WHAT WOULD HAVE HAPPENED IF I WASN'T THERE TO HELP THE OFFICERS AND FOR THE STAFF, AND ALSO THIS GENTLEMAN, WHO WAS VERY UPSET ABOUT NOT BEING ABLE TO COMMUNICATE."

113. "IT HAPPENED MANY TIMES THAT AT THE END OF THE DAY, WHEN I DID INTERPRETING ON THAT DAY, I **CAME TO THE CONCLUSION, WHEN I THOUGHT ABOUT IT, THAT I SAVED A LIFE, I HAD SAVED A LIFE. I WAS VERY HAPPY ABOUT IT.**"

114. **"YET THE NEXT DAY I WAS ABUSED BY A COURT STAFF AND I FORGET ABOUT ANY TRIUMPH OR SOMETHING."**

115. "YOU CAN USE MY NAME, THAT'S FINE, I'VE ALREADY LEFT THEM."

116. "THEY BETTER NOT KNOW MY NAME ANYWAY (LAUGHS)."

117. "I BELIEVE AGENCIES HAVE TO BE PRESENT. THE REASON IS THAT SOMEONE HAS TO ORGANISE THE SERVICE ANYWAY. BUT I BELIEVE MOST OF THE FUNDING FROM THE MINISTRY OF JUSTICE IS GOING TO THEM RATHER THAN THE INTERPRETERS. AND THEY CLAIM SOME CRAZY AMOUNTS OF MONEY FOR ONE HOUR OF SERVICE AND PAY MAYBE ONLY ONE-THIRD OF IT TO THE INTERPRETER. **THEY DON'T CARE ABOUT THE QUALITY OF THE SERVICE, THEY DON'T CARE IF YOU'RE BEING ABUSED, THEY DON'T CARE ABOUT THE ISSUES.**

118. **"THEY DON'T CARE ABOUT THE FUTURE OF THE INDUSTRY..."**

119. THEY DON'T CARE WHAT HAPPENS TO THE INTERPRETER AND THEY DON'T CARE WHAT'S GOING TO HAPPEN TO THE MINISTRY OF JUSTICE OF THE UK CIVILISED COUNTRY."

120. **"AND IT'S A VERY SAD TRUTH THAT THE ONLY THING THEY ARE INTERESTED IN IS TO GET THE BOOKING, MAKE MONEY AND THEN BE GONE."**

121. "I BELIEVE THEBIGWORD IS NOT AN ENGLISH COMPANY. THE MAIN OFFICE IS IN THE US. IT'S A GENTLEMAN CALLED MR GARY GOULD..."

TYPIST NOTE: THE NAME IS JOSHUA GOULD, CEO OF THEBIGWORD.

122. “I DON’T MEAN AMERICAN COMPANIES SHOULDN’T BE ALLOWED TO COME TO PROVIDE [** 1:24:48] AT ALL, TO COMMENT ABOUT SUCH THINGS, THAT IS IN THE HANDS OF THE GOVERNMENT AND BRITISH PEOPLE. **BUT I BELIEVE SUCH AN IMPORTANT ROLE OF ORGANISING IN LANGUAGE SERVICES IN THE UK, HAS TO START FROM THE UK AND REMAIN IN THE UK.**”

123. “EXACTLY. MY EXPERIENCE ABOUT TELLING THEM ABOUT HOW I HAVE BEEN TREATED, THE ISSUES I HAD TO FACE DURING A HEARING OR INSIDE THE COURT BUILDING, HEARING THAT WOULDN’T MAKE THEM HAPPY. AND THEY REALLY DON’T LIKE TO HEAR ABOUT THESE THINGS, RATHER THAN GETTING INTO DEPTH OF WHAT HAPPENED. THEY REALLY DON’T LIKE THAT.”

124. “ OF COURSE, ABOUT THE PAYMENTS, THEY HATE TO HEAR ANY COMPLAINTS ABOUT PAYMENTS.”

125. “THE SHORT ANSWER IS NO, NO, THEY WOULDN’T, OTHERWISE I WOULD HAVE REGISTERED WITH THEM.”

126. “BEFORE APPLYING TO BE REGISTERED WITH ANY PROFESSIONAL BODY, YOU NEED TO SEE THE BENEFITS OF PAYING THEM, OR BEING REGISTERED ON THE LIST. **I DIDN’T FEEL THEY WERE GOING TO DEFEND MY RIGHTS AND I DIDN’T FEEL THEY WERE GOING TO ASK THE MINISTRY OF JUSTICE NOT TO BEHAVE WITH INTERPRETERS LIKE THAT.**”

127. “I WASN’T SURE IF I TOLD THEM ABOUT CANCELLATIONS, OR SUCH CANCELLATIONS AND THE LOSSES THAT [** 1:28:50] AND OTHER INTERPRETERS HAVE MADE AS WELL WOULD HELP AT ALL. BECAUSE I’M SURE THEY ARE AWARE OF THE CONTRACT THEBIGWORD SIGNS WITH EVERY INTERPRETER IN THE UNITED KINGDOM. THEY’RE ALREADY [** 1:29:13]

128. “[** 1:29:39] TO TAKE THEIR NAME ON THE REGISTER. THE REGISTER IS FULL OF PEOPLE [**] **PEOPLE READ MY CV. YES, THAT’S TRUE, THAT’S TRUE. BUT IT DOESN’T HELP ME GET MANY JOBS.**”

129. “WELL, THERE IS A CODE OF CONDUCT PREDICTED IN ANY COMPANY. I MEAN IN ANY AGENCY WHO HAS THE ROLE OF PROVIDING LANGUAGE SERVICES. **WHO THE MINISTRY OF JUSTICE, OTHER GOVERNMENT**

ORGANISATIONS, THERE ARE SOME COMMON... I CAN SAY SUBJECTS OR MATTERS BETWEEN THEM.”

130. “IT’S **CONFIDENTIALITY**, THE OTHER ONE IS **POLITENESS, BEHAVING POLITELY. THE OTHER ONE IS TO REMIND THE INTERPRETER OF THEIR ROLE. THEY DON’T HAVE PERMISSION TO ADD OR OMIT ANYTHING FROM WHAT’S BEING SAID. THEY NEED TO LOOK PROFESSIONAL. THEY NEED TO SOUND PROFESSIONAL.**”

131. “BUT AS I EXPLAINED TO YOU EARLIER, FOR INTERPRETING THERE IS NO [COHERENCE 1:34:50] AND INTEGRITY AND INTERPRETERS WHO APPEAR IN COURT TO DO INTERPRETING, YOU CAN’T FIND TWO INTERPRETERS WHOSE JOB IS EXACTLY SIMILAR IN TERMS OF THE EQUIVALENTS THEY USE, IN TERMS OF HOW THEY APPEAR, IN HOW THEY LOOK AND HOW THEY SPEAK.”

132. “SOMETIMES THEY ARE VERY FRIENDLY, SO THE INTERPRETER, REGARDLESS OF THE PERSONAL ISSUES, THEY TRY TO SPEAK FRIENDLY, THEY TRY TO BE KIND, THEY TRY TO BE HELPFUL, BUT SOMETIMES THEY ARE NOT IN A GOOD MOOD.”

133. “THE PROBLEM IS, I BELIEVE, THAT **THERE IS NO INTEGRITY**, AS I SAID, OR COHERENCE BETWEEN THE WORK OF INTERPRETERS, WITH REGARDS TO HOW THEY SHOULD LOOK, WHAT EXACTLY PROFESSIONALISM IS. WHAT THEY SHOULD DO...”

134. “**LITERALLY THERE IS NO STANDARD**, AS YOU SAID. AND UNFORTUNATELY IT HAS CAUSED MANY ISSUES.”

135. “AS I GAVE YOU AN EXAMPLE, THE FIRST DAY OF A HEARING ONE INTERPRETER GOES INTO THE ROOM, INTO THE COURTROOM TO INTERPRET FOR THE DEFENDANT, THE OTHER DAY, ANOTHER ONE. IT CAUSES MANY COMPLEXITY, COMPLICATIONS AND SO MANY OTHER ISSUES THAT I **STRONGLY BELIEVE IT AFFECTS THE PURPOSE OF JUSTICE.**”

136. “IF I MAY, I JUST REMEMBERED A VERY IMPORTANT ISSUE. AS FAR AS I KNOW, THE **LANGUAGE SHOP, IT’S AN AGENCY RESPONSIBLE FOR ASSESSMENTS OF INTERPRETING SERVICES FOR THE MINISTRY OF JUSTICE.**”

137. "THE LANGUAGE SHOP, YES. I DON'T KNOW ABOUT RECENTLY, BUT THEY WERE FOR FOUR YEARS, **THEY WERE RESPONSIBLE FOR MAKING SURE THAT INTERPRETIVE SERVICES ARE OF A STANDARD QUALITY.** EXACTLY WHAT I TOLD YOU ABOUT. THE ASSESSOR IS WITH THE INTERPRETER, FOR THEIR WORK, THEY HAVE THEIR OWN STANDARDS, THEY HAVE THEIR OWN EQUIVALENTS AND A SINGLE WORD, FOR EXAMPLE, THE WORD OF A 'STATEMENT' I TOLD YOU, AND THE WORD OF 'SUBMISSIONS,' TWO INTERPRETERS MAY USE TWO EQUIVALENTS. ONE OF THEM IS CORRECT, ONE OF THEM IS LESS CORRECT."
138. "FOR THE MINISTRY OF JUSTICE INTERPRETERS, THEY NEED TO BE TRAINED AFTER THEIR QUALIFICATIONS, PRIOR TO ATTENDING ANY HEARING. AND NON-ENGLISH SPEAKER HAS TO HEAR ONLY ONE CERTAIN EQUIVALENT FOR ONE CERTAIN WORD, NOT TWO OR THREE DIFFERENT ONES."
139. **"ASSESSORS BASICALLY THEY HAVE TO ATTEND COURT WHILE THE INTERPRETING SERVICE IS BEING PROVIDED WITHOUT MAKING THEIR PRESENCE KNOWN TO THE INTERPRETER."**
140. "YES, BUT SOMETIMES IT HAPPENS THAT THEY APPROACH THE INTERPRETER OUTSIDE AND THEY KNOW EACH OTHER. EVEN SOMETIMES IT HAPPENS THAT THEY DON'T KNOW EACH OTHER, BUT THEY MEET OUTSIDE THE COURT AND IF THEY HAVE A KIND OF DISAGREEMENT OVER SOMETHING, **IT WOULD END UP THE INTERPRETER BECOMING REDUNDANT. IT'S HAPPENED A LOT."**
141. "YES, YES, BUT AS I EXPLAINED TO YOU, SOMETIMES THEY SPEAK WITH DIFFERENT ACCENTS. THEY SPEAK THE SAME LANGUAGE BUT SOMETIMES THEY SPEAK DIFFERENT ACCENTS. AND EVEN... MAYBE THE INTERPRETER OR THE ASSESSOR DOES NOT UNDERSTAND THE ACCENT THAT THE OTHER ONE USES."
142. "FOR EXAMPLE, A FARSI GUY GOES INTO COURT AND SAYS THAT THE WITNESS IS SPEAKING DARI ACCENT OR AFGHANI ACCENT, BUT THE ASSESSOR KNOWS ONLY PERSIAN ACCENT. **AND THE ASSESSORS REPORT YOU CAN SEE THAT DUE TO NOT UNDERSTANDING WHAT WAS GOING ON THEY DON'T GIVE TRUE AND ACCURATE AND CORRECT INFORMATION OF THEIR ASSESSMENT."**

143. "YES, YES. I BELIEVE FOR THE PEOPLE TO BE ABLE TO PROVIDE A PROPER SERVICE TO THE SERVICE USERS, **THEY NEED TO LOVE WHAT THEY'RE DOING; THEY NEED TO LOVE THEIR JOBS. AND I LOVED IT.** AND IT DIDN'T MAKE ME TIRED; IT DIDN'T WEAR ME OUT AT ALL. I WAS ENJOYING MYSELF WHEN I WAS DOING INTERPRETING. IT HAS TO BE LIKE THIS FOR A SUCCESSFUL CAREER."
144. "YES, YES, EXACTLY. **AN INTERPRETER NEEDS TO KNOW A LANGUAGE AND THEN BE TRAINED AND QUALIFIED FOR TRANSLATION.**"
145. "KNOWING A LANGUAGE, I KNOW, I SPEAK A FEW LANGUAGES, BUT TO BE ABLE TO TRANSLATE IS SOMETHING TOTALLY DIFFERENT."
146. "MANY PEOPLE, UNFORTUNATELY IN THE UK, THERE IS NO... THAT'S MY EXPERIENCE AND MY POINT OF VIEW AS WE JUST DISCUSSED. **THERE IS NO STANDARD, LITERALLY AND PRACTICALLY AND INTERPRETERS HAVE TO STICK TO THEIR OWN STANDARDS BASED ON THEIR OWN KNOWLEDGE, EXPERIENCE AND FEELINGS.**
147. "MOST CHALLENGING? **WELL ACTUALLY I DON'T THINK THERE IS ANYTHING CHALLENGING, IF EVERYTHING IS IN PLACE.**"
148. "BUT THE MOST CHALLENGING THAT I CAN MENTION IS **DIFFERENCE IN ACCENT, FIRST OF ALL. AND THEN THE BACKGROUND, THE CULTURAL BACKGROUND AND THE EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND OF THE NON-ENGLISH SPEAKER, THE INTERPRETER HAS TO GET TO THAT.**"
149. "**I REALLY FELT I REALLY NEED TO TELL YOU ABOUT EVERYTHING THAT I HAVE EXPERIENCED.** BUT THERE ARE SO MANY INTERPRETERS BETTER THAN ME, MUCH MORE EXPERIENCED AND I HOPE THEY WILL BE ABLE TO TELL YOU MORE."
150. "I KEEP MYSELF AWAY FROM BEING... INVOLVED IN SUCH ORGANISATIONS. I MAY DO IN THE FUTURE, BUT I HAVEN'T"
151. "BOTH."
152. "THE WHOLE OF THE NATION, NOT ONLY NON-ENGLISH SPEAKERS, BUT KEEPING THE WHOLE NATION SAFE."
153. "NO, NO, NO. THAT'S A VERY BIG ISSUE ACTUALLY. I BELIEVE THERE HAS TO BE ASSESSMENTS OF THE QUALITY OF THE LANGUAGE SERVICES PROVIDED BY THE INTERPRETERS. AND IF THEY ARE DOING THEIR JOB

GOOD ENOUGH AND THEY ARE REPRESENTING THE AGENCY WELL, THEY HAVE TO BE [REWARDED VERBALLY 1:51:35] BY THE COMPANY.”

154. “I MYSELF, I RECEIVED A LOT OF VERY GOOD FEEDBACK FOR MY SERVICE WHEN I WAS IN COURT, FROM JUDGES, PROSECUTION, FROM DEFENDANTS’ SIDE, FROM COURT STAFF, ESPECIALLY FROM JOURNALISTS.”

155. “I DIDN’T EXPECT TO BE PAID ANYTHING BY MY AGENCY, BY THEBIGWORD OR THE MINISTRY OF JUSTICE. I JUST EXPECTED A LETTER OF ACKNOWLEDGEMENT, THANK YOU. THAT IS SPECIAL TO ME, IT WOULD REALLY BOOST MY SPIRITS UP. IT WOULD CHEER ME UP AND IT WOULD HELP ME TOLERATE THE ISSUES AND DIFFICULTIES INTERPRETERS HAVE TO EXPERIENCE AND GO THROUGH EVERY DAY. **BUT NOTHING AT ALL, NOTHING AT ALL.** MAYBE JUST AN EMAIL EVERY THREE MONTHS SENT TO ALL. ‘DEAR X, THANKS FOR THE GOOD WORK,’ AND THAT’S ALL.”

156. “IT’S [^{**} 1:53:32] TRAINING THAT BRINGS INTEGRITY AND COHERENCE.”

157. “HELP NEW INTERPRETERS INTEGRATE INTO THE SYSTEM MORE AND MORE.”

158. “THE BEHAVIOUR OF SOME COURT STAFF IS BAD BECAUSE THEY HAVE EXPERIENCED POOR, THEY HAVE RECEIVED POOR QUALITY INTERPRETING SERVICES FROM INTERPRETERS, SOMETIMES BECAUSE THERE ARE ISSUES WITH PAYMENTS.”

159. “SOME INTERPRETERS AFTER THE HEARING, THEY GO TO THE CLERK AND ASK THEM TO PUT MORE HOURS ON THEIR TIME SHEET. I DON’T WANT TO COMMENT ON THAT, WHOSE FAULT IS IT, BUT IT DOESN’T HAVE TO BE LIKE THAT.”

160. “YES, IT’S A SYSTEM FAULT, YES.”

161. “I WAS ONCE TOLD BY A COURT MEMBER THAT, “THIS IS YOUR TIME SHEET, I CAN’T HELP YOU MORE THAN THAT.” I DIDN’T MENTION ANYTHING, I DIDN’T HAVE ANY REQUESTS. I DIDN’T ASK FOR ANYTHING, WHAT DO YOU MEAN? BECAUSE THE PREVIOUS INTERPRETERS HAD ASKED THEM PUT MORE HOURS ON IT. THEBIGWORD KNOWS THAT, AND THE MINISTRY OF JUSTICE AS WELL, I BELIEVE. I DON’T THINK THEY HAVE DONE ANYTHING ABOUT IT.”

162. “NO, NOT AT ALL, NOT AT ALL, **BECAUSE THE SYSTEM IS FAULTY FROM THE BEGINNING, FROM THE START.**”

163. “AND UNTIL INTERPRETERS AND COURT STAFF KNOW WHAT THEY ARE GOING TO DO, EXACTLY, BRINGING DIFFERENT [AGENCIES 1:56:28] TO THE BUSINESS, **IT’S JUST A WASTE OF TAXPAYERS’ MONEY AND DOESN’T BRING ANY GOOD.**”

164. “**IT HAS RESULTED IN MANY FALSE REPORTS, UNTRUE THINGS. THE ASSESSOR DIDN’T EVEN HEAR WHAT WAS BEING SAID OR DIDN’T EVEN UNDERSTAND THAT THE NON-ENGLISH SPEAKER COULD NOT UNDERSTAND LEGAL TERMS PROPERLY, SO THE INTERPRETER HAD TO MAKE THEM UNDERSTAND ANOTHER WAY, REPHRASE THEM. SO IT’S A DIFFERENCE OF OPINION BETWEEN ASSESSORS AND INTERPRETERS.**”

165. “EXACTLY, IT’S VERY SAD, IT’S VERY SAD AND **I HAVE BEEN VERY UPSET THAT I HAD TO LEAVE THE INDUSTRY IN MY CAREER.**”

166. “**I HAD A VERY SUCCESSFUL CAREER AND I LEFT IT BECAUSE OF THOSE ISSUES.**”

167. “YES, YES. IF I WANT TO GIVE YOU A ROUGH NUMBER. IN MY LANGUAGE, ABOUT EIGHT OR NINE... THEY ARE OLDER THAN ME, AS I SAID, AND MUCH MORE EXPERIENCED THAN ME, **THEY’VE ALREADY LEFT AND THEY STARTED THEIR OWN BUSINESSES IN OTHER INDUSTRIES, TOTALLY DIFFERENT.**”

168. “I GOT A JOB THAT IS SOMEHOW RELEVANT TO LEGAL LANGUAGE SERVICES, BUT THEY STARTED JOBS THAT WERE VERY DIFFERENT.”

169. “NO, THANK YOU VERY MUCH. I’M VERY GRATEFUL, I’M SORRY IF I TALKED TO MUCH.”

170. “I TRY TO AVOID USING WORDS THAT ARE COMPLICATED. IT WAS FOR ME TO BE ABLE TO EXPLAIN EVERYTHING IN A MORE SIMPLE...”

12.2.22 Respondent 58: second stage coding

Respondent 58

File name (transcript): interview with Respondent 58

Audio length – 2:01:06

Interview took place on: 15/02/2021

Second cycle coding: clustering initial codes, searching for themes

1. IT'S MY ROLE TO GIVE A LITTLE BIT OF INFORMATION ABOUT WHAT'S GOING TO HAPPEN IN COURT"

a) Subtheme:

"THE INTERPRETER HAS TO BE ABLE TO MAKE THINGS UNDERSTOOD BY SOMEONE WHO IS NOT ABLE TO DO IT ADEQUATELY."

- "THEY ARE NOT EDUCATED ENOUGH TO KNOW WHAT'S GOING TO HAPPEN IN THE COURT OF LAW."
- "AND ALSO, MORE IMPORTANT THAN THAT, IS THAT SOME NON-ENGLISH SPEAKERS HAVE NEVER BEEN TO COURT IN THEIR OWN COUNTRIES AND DON'T EVEN UNDERSTAND LEGAL EQUIVALENCE IN THEIR MOTHER TONGUE, IN THEIR MOTHER LANGUAGES."
- "SO EVEN IF YOU INTERPRET VERY WELL, TRANSLATE THE WORDS VERY PRECISELY AND EXACTLY, THEY WON'T BE ABLE TO UNDERSTAND IT. **THE INTERPRETER HAS TO BE ABLE TO MAKE THINGS UNDERSTOOD BY SOMEONE WHO IS NOT ABLE TO DO IT ADEQUATELY.**"
- "SO THAT'S A [**] WHICH IS BUILT UP ON EXPERIENCE. WHO CAN CONVEY THE MEANING OF THE LEGAL WORDS, IN AN UNDERSTANDABLE AND COMPREHENSIBLE WAY FOR THE NON-ENGLISH SPEAKER."
- "AND ALSO, THE FACT THAT YOU ARE THE ONLY ONE WHO CAN COMMUNICATE WITH THE NON-ENGLISH SPEAKER, SOMETIMES YOU NEED TO HELP THEM UNDERSTAND THE COURT, THE PROCEDURE, THE PROCESS, WHEN THEY CAN TALK, WHEN THEY ARE NOT ALLOWED TO TALK."
- **"THEY NEED TO BE HELPFUL IN CASES THAT SOLICITORS HAVEN'T BEEN ABLE TO DO THEIR JOB."**
- "I CAN'T SAY THAT HAVING AN INTERPRETER IN COURT WILL GIVE SOME KIND OF... I DON'T AGREE WILL GIVE SOME KIND OF ADVANTAGE OVER THE OTHER PARTIES."

- "I CAN REMEMBER I WAS IN MANCHESTER, AN IMMIGRATION TRIBUNAL, FIRST YEAR TRIBUNAL AND I WAS INTERPRETING FOR A GENTLEMAN WHO WAS NOT FROM A VERY EDUCATED BACKGROUND. **HE STRUGGLED TO UNDERSTAND LEGAL TERMS BUT I DID MY BEST TO CONVEY THE MEANING AND THE GIST OF WHAT WAS BEING SAID.** HOWEVER, DURING THE COURT THERE IS A TIME LIMIT THAT THE WITNESS CAN GIVE EVIDENCE. AT THE END OF COURT, DURING SUBMISSIONS, WHEN THE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE HOME OFFICE AND THE GENTLEMAN'S REPRESENTATIVE COULD GIVE THEIR ARGUMENTS, THE WITNESS IS NOT ALLOWED TO TALK.
- "AND SOMETIMES YOU HAVE TO GIVE INFORMATION THAT IS ABSOLUTELY NOT EXPECTED FROM YOU."

b) Subtheme:

"SOMETIMES INTERPRETERS NEED TO BE ABLE TO CALM THE WITNESSES OR DEFENDENTS DOWN IN A FEW WORDS"

- "I BELIEVE IT'S A FAILURE BY SOME SOLICITORS AND LEGAL PROFESSIONALS WHO DO NOT PREPARE THEIR CLIENTS BEFORE COMING TO COURT. THEY DON'T KNOW WHAT HAPPENED TO THEM AND AS AN INTERPRETER, AS SOON AS I SEE THEM, I SEE THEY ARE PETRIFIED OR EXTREMELY WORRIED OF WHAT'S GOING TO HAPPEN TO THEM."
- "SO SOMETIMES INTERPRETERS NEED TO BE ABLE TO CALM THE WITNESSES OR DEFENDENTS DOWN IN A FEW WORDS, ONLY IN A FEW WORDS. SOMETIMES THAT'S NEEDED."

-

2. "INTERPRETING, IN MY VIEW, IS NOT ONLY BEING ABLE TO TRANSLATE THE WORDS FROM ONE LANGUAGE TO ANOTHER. FOR LEGAL INTERPRETERS IT REQUIRES MUCH EXPERIENCE AND CAPABILITY."

- "WELL, WHAT I WAS TRYING TO SAY IS THAT WHEN YOU ENTER A COURT OR A TRIBUNAL AS AN INTERPRETER, YOU NEED TO BE ABLE TO FIRST LOCATE YOURSELF. AND THEN TRY TO UNDERSTAND WHAT'S HAPPENING AND WHAT YOU'RE EXACTLY GOING TO DO."
- "THEN YOU'LL HAVE TO TRY TO SOMEHOW COMMUNICATE WITH THE DEFENDANT, WITH THE WITNESSES, WITH THE NON-ENGLISH SPEAKER AND ALSO THE MOST IMPORTANT THING, IF YOU SPEAK, OR AT LEAST CAN UNDERSTAND THE ACCENT OF THE NON-ENGLISH SPEAKER."
- **"SO THE INTERPRETER HAS TO MAKE AN ASSESSMENT WHETHER THE NON-ENGLISH SPEAKER IS ABLE TO UNDERSTAND THE INTERPRETER'S ACCENT."**

- **"AN INTERPRETER IS THE ONLY PERSON WHO CAN UNDERSTAND THE LANGUAGE... THEIR ROLE IS TO BE ABLE TO MAKE COMMUNICATION POSSIBLE BETWEEN TWO PARTIES. IT GOES BEYOND THAT"**
- **"BUT LACKING THE ABILITY OF AN INTERPRETER FOR MAKING THE CONVERSATIONS AND WHAT'S BEING SAID, WHAT IS BEING SAID OR WRITTEN POSSIBLE, CAN CAUSE MANY OTHER ISSUES. IF THE DEFENDANT, THE WITNESS IS A NON-ENGLISH SPEAKER AND CANNOT UNDERSTAND WHAT'S BEING SAID, THEN THE WHOLE PURPOSE OF JUSTICE WOULD BE QUESTIONED."**
- **"BUT IT IS ANYWAY UP TO THE INTERPRETER TO BE ABLE TO ESTABLISH THEIR PRESENCE AND LET EVERYBODY KNOW WHAT THEY WANT TO DO AND HOW THEY ARE GOING TO DO IT."**
- **"BUT WHAT I'VE BEEN TRYING TO DO ALL THESE YEARS IS TO AVOID ANSWERING THE QUESTIONS OR GIVE ANSWERS THAT WERE NOT PRESCRIBED IN MY CODE OF CONDUCT AS AN INTERPRETER".**
- **"AS AN INTERPRETER YOU NEED TO BE VERY CAREFUL ABOUT GIVING OR EXPLAINING ABOUT SOMETHING YOU DON'T HAVE TO. AND YOU SHOULDN'T HAVE TO."**
- **"WHEN YOU SAID THE ROLE OF THE INTERPRETER, LEVEL OF PROFESSIONALISM IS NOT LESS THAN OTHER PEOPLE WHO ATTEND COURT, I AGREE COMPLETELY WITH YOU."**
- **"YES, YES. I BELIEVE FOR THE PEOPLE TO BE ABLE TO PROVIDE A PROPER SERVICE TO THE SERVICE USERS, THEY NEED TO LOVE WHAT THEY'RE DOING; THEY NEED TO LOVE THEIR JOBS. AND I LOVED IT. AND IT DIDN'T MAKE ME TIRED; IT DIDN'T WEAR ME OUT AT ALL. I WAS ENJOYING MYSELF WHEN I WAS DOING INTERPRETING. IT HAS TO BE LIKE THIS FOR A SUCCESSFUL CAREER."**
- **"YES, YES, EXACTLY. AN INTERPRETER NEEDS TO KNOW A LANGUAGE AND THEN BE TRAINED AND QUALIFIED FOR TRANSLATION."**
- **"KNOWING A LANGUAGE, I KNOW, I SPEAK A FEW LANGUAGES, BUT TO BE ABLE TO TRANSLATE IS SOMETHING TOTALLY DIFFERENT."**
- **"AN INTERPRETER NEEDS TO KNOW A LANGUAGE AND THEN BE TRAINED AND QUALIFIED FOR TRANSLATION"**
- **"IF THERE IS NO PROPER INTERPRETING SERVICE AVAILABLE FOR THE NON-NATIVE SPEAKER, THEN THE WHOLE PURPOSE OF JUSTICE WOULD BE JEOPARDISED."**

3. “IT’S UP TO THE INTERPRETER TO PRACTICE AND GAIN ADEQUATE EXPERIENCE TO PREPARE THEMSELVES FOR THE JOB.”

- “THE EXAMS, THEY DO NOT TEST THE INTERPRETER ON EVERY ASPECT OF THEIR JOB.”
- “AND I KNOW IT’S IMPOSSIBLE FOR AN EXAM TO TAKE MORE THAN FOUR OR FIVE HOURS, BUT SOME PEOPLE, SOME INTERPRETERS HAVE VERY GOOD QUALIFICATIONS AND LACK THE MOST CRUCIAL KNOWLEDGE ABOUT SOME CERTAIN LEGAL WORDS. AND I’VE SEEN IT MYSELF MANY TIMES IN COURT.”

4. “UNFORTUNATELY SOME INTERPRETERS ARE NOT ADEQUATELY EXPERIENCED”

- “FOR EXAMPLE, I CAN REMEMBER, I WAS IN A COURT, DIRECT FARSI SPEAKING PARTIES, SOME OF THEM SPOKE ENGLISH. ONE OF THEM WAS A WITNESS, THE OTHER WAS THE DEFENDANT. I WAS INTERPRETING FOR THE DEFENDANT; AND ANOTHER GENTLEMAN, FARSI SPEAKING INTERPRETER, WAS INTERPRETING FOR THE THIRD PARTY. I HEARD THAT THE INTERPRETER NOT ONLY WAS MAKING SEVERAL MISTAKES IN INTERPRETING WHILE THE QUESTIONS WERE PUT FROM THE PROSECUTOR TO THE WITNESS. HE ALSO SAID SOME OTHER THINGS, SUCH AS THE PROSECUTOR IS GOING TO CATCH YOU OUT, OR SOME OTHER THINGS LIKE THAT. IT’S NOT ALLOWED ANYWAY, BUT THAT’S WHY I’M SAYING THEY ARE NOT ADEQUATELY PREPARED.”
- “LEGAL INTERPRETERS APART FROM GETTING THE DPSI MINIMUM. THEY DO NOT DO TRAINING, AS FAR AS I KNOW, BEFORE THEY APPEAR IN COURT OR START INTERPRETING.”
- “THEY ARE NOT PREPARED FOR THE UNEXPECTED SITUATIONS THAT MAY OCCUR ANYTIME, ANYWHERE.”
- “FROM ONE POINT OF VIEW, THEY NEED TO LOOK AND SOUND PROFESSIONAL. FROM ANOTHER POINT OF VIEW... FROM THE OTHER SIDE **THEY NEED TO BE HELPFUL IN CASES THAT SOLICITORS HAVEN’T BEEN ABLE TO DO THEIR JOB.**”
- “AND EVEN THE JUDGE ASKED ME TO STAND UP AND STOP THE PROCESS AND TELL THE JUDGE AND THE OTHER PEOPLE OF THE COURT WHEREVER THERE WAS A MISTAKE, BUT IT WASN’T POSSIBLE. THREE OR FOUR TIMES I STOOD UP AND SAID, “THE INTERPRETER IS NOT INTERPRETING CORRECTLY, THAT WORD HAS TO BE INTERPRETED THIS WAY.” AND IT WASN’T A CORRECT TRANSLATION. THREE OR FOUR TIMES I STOOD UP, BUT 72 TIMES, IT WASN’T POSSIBLE.”
- “AND WHEN THE NEW ONES COME, THEY ARE NOT TRAINED ENOUGH. **THEY ARE NOT ADEQUATELY EXPERIENCED.** THEY ARE NOT AWARE OF THE ROLES THEY NEED TO PLAY BECAUSE **IT’S MORE THAN ONE ROLE SOMETIMES, INTERPRETING.**”

- **“SOMETIMES THEY ARE VERY FRIENDLY, SO THE INTERPRETER, REGARDLESS OF THE PERSONAL ISSUES, THEY TRY TO SPEAK FRIENDLY, THEY TRY TO BE KIND, THEY TRY TO BE HELPFUL, BUT SOMETIMES THEY ARE NOT IN A GOOD MOOD.”**
- “SOME INTERPRETERS AFTER THE HEARING, THEY GO TO THE CLERK AND ASK THEM TO PUT MORE HOURS ON THEIR TIME SHEET. I DON’T WANT TO COMMENT ON THAT, WHOSE FAULT IS IT, BUT IT DOESN’T HAVE TO BE LIKE THAT.”
- “I WAS ONCE TOLD BY A COURT MEMBER THAT, “THIS IS YOUR TIME SHEET, I CAN’T HELP YOU MORE THAN THAT.” I DIDN’T MENTION ANYTHING, I DIDN’T HAVE ANY REQUESTS. I DIDN’T ASK FOR ANYTHING, WHAT DO YOU MEAN? BECAUSE THE PREVIOUS INTERPRETERS HAD ASKED THEM PUT MORE HOURS ON IT. THEBIGWORD KNOWS THAT, AND THE MINISTRY OF JUSTICE AS WELL, I BELIEVE. I DON’T THINK THEY HAVE DONE ANYTHING ABOUT IT.”

5. “THEIR ROLE IS TO BE ABLE TO MAKE COMMUNICATION POSSIBLE BETWEEN TWO PARTIES”

- “I CAN REMEMBER I WAS IN THE PRISON CELL, I WAS INTERPRETING FOR A DEFENDANT WHO WAS A DRUG ADDICT AND HE WAS IN A PRISON CELL, IN [BIRMINGHAM 1:18:48]. HE COULDN’T COMMUNICATE WITH THE PRISON OFFICER. THAT’S WHY HE GOT VERY ANGRY AND HE HAD HANDCUFFS ON HIS HANDS AND HE’S [** 1:19:10] ON HIS HEAD, THE HANDCUFF, AND THERE WAS BLOOD ALL OVER. AND I DON’T KNOW WHAT WOULD HAVE HAPPENED IF I WASN’T THERE TO HELP THE OFFICERS AND FOR THE STAFF, AND ALSO THIS GENTLEMAN, WHO WAS VERY UPSET ABOUT NOT BEING ABLE TO COMMUNICATE.”
- **“IT HAPPENED MANY TIMES THAT AT THE END OF THE DAY, WHEN I DID INTERPRETING ON THAT DAY, I CAME TO THE CONCLUSION, WHEN I THOUGHT ABOUT IT, THAT I SAVED A LIFE, I HAD SAVED A LIFE. I WAS VERY HAPPY ABOUT IT.”**

6. “INTERPRETING FOR THE MINISTRY OF JUSTICE IS NOT AN EASY JOB TO DO, AT ALL”

- “ AND EVEN SOMETIMES I BELIEVE THEIR ROLE IS A LITTLE BIT HARDER THAN, FOR EXAMPLE, A SOLICITOR, BECAUSE OBVIOUSLY THEY NEED TO PUT THEMSELVES IN THE SHOES OF DIFFERENT PEOPLE IN COURT. “WHEN THE JUDGES [** 1:15:29] WITNESS, THE NON-ENGLISH SPEAKER, THEN THE JUDGE SAYS THAT. BECAUSE SOMETIMES THE PACE IS VERY FAST AND ADVOCATES AND THE JUDGE AND THE COURT CLERKS ARE MAKING THEIR CASE TOO FAST”

- "MOST CHALLENGING? WELL ACTUALLY I DON'T THINK THERE IS ANYTHING CHALLENGING, IF EVERYTHING IS IN PLACE."
- "BUT THE MOST CHALLENGING THAT I CAN MENTION IS DIFFERENCE IN ACCENT, FIRST OF ALL. AND THEN THE BACKGROUND, THE CULTURAL BACKGROUND AND THE EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND OF THE NON-ENGLISH SPEAKER, THE INTERPRETER HAS TO GET TO THAT."
- **"HOWEVER, I FELT IT WAS A KIND OF FAILURE FOR ME." (Unrealistic expectations of the court)**

7. "THEY KEEP PUSHING" (about non-English speaking litigants)

- **"ACTUALLY I HEARD THE QUESTION, "PLEASE HELP ME ON THAT QUESTION," FROM WITNESSES AND DEFENDANTS, A LOT WHEN I'M IN COURT. BUT I WASN'T ALLOWED TO DO ANYTHING OR ANSWER, EVEN ANSWER THAT QUESTION."**
- "SOMETIMES WHEN WE HEAR A CERTAIN QUESTION FROM A WITNESS ABOUT WHAT'S GOING TO HAPPEN NEXT, YOU HAVE TO ANSWER IT ANYWAY."
- "THEY KEEP PUSHING. IN MOST CASES WHEN THEY ARE NOT PREPARED AT ALL FOR THE LEGAL PROCESS AND IN SIMPLE WORDS, THEY DON'T KNOW WHAT'S GOING TO HAPPEN DURING THE HEARINGS, THEY PUSH OVER AND OVER AND ASK QUESTIONS [** 0:42:59]. EVEN DURING THE EVIDENCE. I TOLD YOU ONE OF THE QUESTIONS, "HOW AM I GOING TO ANSWER THAT QUESTION?" I HEARD THAT A LOT. OR, "WHAT DO YOU THINK I SHOULD SAY?" OR, "I DON'T LIKE THIS COURT, CAN I COME BACK LATER?" (LAUGHS) THINGS LIKE THAT, MANY THINGS LIKE THAT."
- **"I WILL SUE YOU IF MY CASE IS DISMISSED BECAUSE YOU DIDN'T ALLOW ME TO TALK."**

8. "SOME COURT MEMBERS ARE NOT PREPARED HOW TO DEAL WITH INTERPRETERS."

- "ONE OF THE ASSESSMENTS, ONE OF THE MOST IMPORTANT POINTS THE INTERPRETER HAS TO BE ABLE TO DO WHEN THEY ENTER THE COURTROOM, I HAVE SEEN MANY COURT STAFF WHO DON'T KNOW ENOUGH ABOUT THE ROLE OF THE INTERPRETER. AND MANY OF THE COURT STAFF I'VE SEEN, THEY ARE ALREADY AWARE OF WHAT'S GOING TO HAPPEN TO THE INTERPRETER AND WHAT KIND OF JOB HE'S GOING TO DO."
- "I'LL GIVE YOU AN EXAMPLE. SOMETIMES DURING HEARINGS, I WAS ASKED TO INTERPRET CONSECUTIVELY. SOMETIMES I WAS ASKED TO INTERPRETER SIMULTANEOUSLY, I MEAN WHISPERING. [THAT EXECUTIVE 0:22:59] FROM THE JUDGE CALLED THE STAFF TO EXPLAIN TO ME WHEN I ARRIVED IN THE COURTROOM WHAT TO DO."

- "SOMETIMES COURTS AND COURT MEMBERS ARE STRUGGLING WITHOUT EVEN GIVING THE SLIGHTEST ATTENTION TO THE PRESENCE OF THE INTERPRETER AND NOT TAKING ME INTO CONSIDERATION, THAT WHAT IS BEING SAID THERE HAS TO BE INTERPRETED TO THE NON-ENGLISH SPEAKER."
- **"SOMETIMES THEY ARE NOT AWARE, SOMETIMES THEY PAY ATTENTION, SOMETIMES THEY DON'T."**
- "WHENEVER I ATTENDED HEARINGS, I JUST LEFT ALL THESE TO THE MEMBERS OF THE COURT, TO THE JUDGE AND THE COURT CLERK, TO DECIDE WHAT THEY WANT ME TO DO. **THESE MAY SEEM LITTLE ISSUES BUT CAN CREATE SERIOUS OBSTACLES FOR THE INTERPRETERS TO BE ABLE TO DO THEIR JOB PROPERLY.**"
- "I REMEMBER, SORRY, I JUST REMEMBER EXAMPLES THAT WILL HELP ME MAKE MY POINTS UNDERSTOOD. I JUST REMEMBERED A COURT HEARING I ATTENDED. THERE WAS A DEFENDANT AND THE WITNESSES TALKED TO THE JUDGE AND THE COURT MEMBERS THROUGH VIDEO CALL. AND THEY WERE USED SLANG – I THINK IT WAS IN LIVERPOOL – WHICH I DIDN'T UNDERSTAND COMPLETELY. BECAUSE WHEN THEY WERE SPEAKING, THEY WERE GIVING EVIDENCE, THEY USED SLANG AND IT WASN'T STANDARD ENGLISH. **AND I HAD TO INTERRUPT THE VIDEO, THE PERSON WHO WAS PLAYING THE VIDEO AND ASK THEM TO STOP-STOP-STOP, WAIT FOR ME TO INTERPRET, WAIT FOR ME TO INTERPRET.**"
- "SOMETIMES I DIDN'T UNDERSTAND WHAT WAS GOING ON. SO, WHAT I TOLD THE JUDGE LATER WAS THAT I EXPECTED TO BE AWARE OF WHAT WAS GOING TO HAPPEN AND I EXPECTED TO BE ASKED IF I UNDERSTOOD A SLANG LIVERPOOL ACCENT."
- "FOR THAT HEARING I TRIED MY BEST. I CAN SAY ASSERTIVELY THAT THE ISSUE OF NOT BEING ABLE TO UNDERSTAND SLANG ACCENT DID NOT AFFECT MUCH THE HEARING, DID NOT AFFECT THE HEARING AND THE PROCESS AND THE PURPOSE OF JUSTICE . HOWEVER, I FELT IT WAS A KIND OF FAILURE FOR ME."
- "IT WAS AT THAT POINT, THE JUDGE WAS LEAVING THE ROOM, I ASKED THE JUDGE, "YOUR HONOUR, THE GENTLEMAN SAYS HE'S GOING TO SUE ME FOR NOT ALLOWING HIM TO SPEAK DURING SUBMISSION." HE SAID TO THE WITNESS, "NO, YOU ARE NOT ALLOWED, YOU ARE NOT ALLOWED TO SPEAK, YOU HAD WHATEVER YOU HAD TO SAY DURING YOUR EVIDENCE." I BELIEVE THAT IT WAS THE DUTY OF THE JUDGE, THE COURT TO STOP, OR AT LEAST THE WITNESSES ADVOCATE TO EXPLAIN TO THEM WHAT WAS GOING TO HAPPEN."
- "EXACTLY, THIS IS GOING TO HAPPEN. YOUR INTERPRETER IS THERE JUST TO INTERPRET. THEY'RE NOT GOING TO REPRESENT YOU, THEY'RE NOT GOING TO

GIVE ANSWERS IN YOUR PLACE, THEY'RE NOT GOING TO DO ANYTHING OTHER THAN TRANSLATING WHAT IS BEING SAID BY YOU OR BY ANY OTHER ONE, SO THAT EVERYBODY UNDERSTANDS EACH OTHER."

- "I HAVE [** 0:44:58] WITH REGARDS TO COURT CLERKS WHO HAVE NOT HAD ANY KIND OF BRIEFING WITH THE PRESENCE OF THE INTERPRETER. AND IN MANY COURTS I WAS REQUESTED, PROPERLY, TO INTRODUCE MYSELF, TO TAKE THE OATH AND TO SPEAK A LITTLE BIT ABOUT BOTH LANGUAGES THAT ARE GOING TO BE SECOND LANGUAGES SPOKEN IN COURT. AND ALSO TO CONFIRM THAT I COULD COMMUNICATE [** 0:45:45]. I HAD TO DO IT MYSELF.
- "LOW LEVEL COURT STAFF, MOST OF THE TIME. THE COURT CLERK OR PEOPLE WHO DON'T HAVE A VERY IMPORTANT ROLE IN THE COURT."
- "HOWEVER, I HAVE ONCE OR TWICE EXPERIENCED BEING... WHERE OTHERS BEHAVED IN A WAY THAT I FELT I WAS BEING INSULTED IN A VERY BAD WAY."
- "IT WAS THE BEGINNING OF MY INTERPRETING EXPERIENCE IN THE UK, IT WAS 2013. I ATTENDED A COURT IN BOLTON. WHEN WE WENT INSIDE THE COURT I SAW THE DEFENDANT, IT WAS A MAGISTRATES' COURT, I THINK. THE MAGISTRATE STARTED SHOUTING AT THE DEFENDANT, WHY HE COULDN'T SPEAK ENGLISH. AND ASKED OVER AND OVER, IN THE MOST IMPOLITE WAY, WHY HE HASN'T BEEN TO SCHOOL SINCE HE HAS BEEN IN THE UK. I CAN REMEMBER THAT THE GENTLEMAN EXPLAINED, I'VE BEEN IN THE UK FOR ABOUT THREE/FOUR YEARS AND I DON'T UNDERSTAND LEGAL LANGUAGE. I'VE BEEN TO COLLEGE BUT LEGAL LANGUAGE IS JUST VERY DIFFICULT FOR ME TO UNDERSTAND. THAT'S WHY I HAVE REQUESTED."
- **"THE REASON I GAVE YOU THIS... ACTUALLY I WAS SHOUTED AT AS WELL."**
- "EXACTLY WHAT I TOLD YOU. SOME COURT STAFF DON'T KNOW WHAT THEY ARE GOING TO DO WITH THE INTERPRETER. THEY DON'T KNOW IF THE INTERPRETER HAS TO INTERPRET CONSECUTIVELY, WITH PAUSES OR SIMULTANEOUSLY."
- " WHEN I WAS SITTING, AFTER THE SHOUTING AT THE DEFENDANT, WHEN I WAS SITTING I WAITED FOR THE PROSECUTOR TO START AND THEN I STARTED INTERPRETING WHAT WAS BEING SAID. HOWEVER, I RECEIVED A VERY LOUD YELL, AT ME, SAYING, **"YOU'RE SUPPOSED TO INTERPRET, YOU'RE HERE TO INTERPRET."**
- "I COULD SEE THE COURT STAFF WAS LOOKING AT ME, SHE WAS VERY SORRY AND I COULD SEE IT IN HER LOOK, THAT SHE FELT SORRY FOR ME. I EXPERIENCED THIS A LOT."

- **"YET THE NEXT DAY I WAS ABUSED BY A COURT STAFF AND I FORGET ABOUT ANY TRIUMPH OR SOMETHING."**

9. **"WELL, TO BE HONEST, I CAN SAY THE SITUATION HAS DETERIORATED AND IT'S GETTING WORSE."**

a) **Subtheme: "IT'S THE REALITY."**

- I DIDN'T DRIVE, SO I HAD TO STAY IN THE PARK FOR ABOUT EIGHT HOURS."
"AS I WAS LEAVING THE COURT, I WAS EVEN INSULTED BY ONE OF THE COURT STAFF, I DON'T KNOW WHY."
- **"IT IS TRUE THAT I LEFT MY ROLE AS A LINGUIST FOR THE MINISTRY OF JUSTICE ABOUT A YEAR AGO."**
- BUT I AM STILL IN CONTACT WITH MY FRIENDS WHO ARE STILL WORKING FOR THE MINISTRY OF JUSTICE AS INTERPRETERS. THE ISSUES STILL EXIST. THE FIRST IS OBVIOUSLY THE PAYMENT ISSUE, THE PAYMENT ISSUE THAT FOR EXAMPLE WITH CAPITA, I HAD TO WAIT, I CAN REMEMBER ABOUT 15 DAYS OR SOMETHING, FOR THE PAYMENT TO GO THROUGH."
- "THE MINISTRY OF JUSTICE, IF YOU ARE AN INTERPRETER, IF YOU ARE BOOKED FOR A HEARING THAT WILL LAST FOR ONE MONTH, YOU ARE ACTUALLY BOOKED FOR ONE MONTH. AND 24 HOURS BEFORE THE HEARING THE COURT OR THEBIGWORD IS ALLOWED TO CANCEL IT AND I EXPERIENCED MANY CANCELLATIONS LIKE THIS."
- "YES, BECAUSE YOU KNOW, IF IT IS WITHIN 24 HOURS PRIOR TO THE START OF THE HEARING, YOU WERE TO BE PAID SOME AMOUNT, £50 OR SOMETHING. NO MATTER HOW MUCH YOUR TIME HAD BEEN WASTED."
- **"YES, A CANCELLATION FEE. BUT IF IT IS CANCELLED NOT WITHIN THE 24 HOUR PERIOD OF TIME, PRIOR TO THE HEARING, THEN YOU WILL GET NOTHING. EVEN IF YOU ARE BOOKED FOR TWO YEARS FOR A HEARING, YOU WON'T GET ANYTHING."**
- "THIS IS ONE OF THE ISSUES. EVEN SOMETIMES I APPEARED IN COURT, I ARRIVED THERE, AFTER HALF AN HOUR, ONE HOUR, I WAS TOLD THAT THE COURT SESSION HAD BEEN CANCELLED. I HAD BEEN BOOKED FOR A THREE HOUR [** 0:53:06].
OKAY, I COUNTED ON THAT INCOME AND SO I WAS VERY UPSET BECAUSE I HAD A LOT OF LOSS."
- **"THAT WAS ONE OF THE REASONS THAT I HAD TO LEAVE THE ROLE BECAUSE I COULDN'T PREDICT ANYTHING."**

- "WHENEVER I MENTIONED THIS TO THE PEOPLE, THEY SAY THE MINISTRY OF JUSTICE HAS MADE THESE DECISIONS AND WE COULDN'T CHALLENGE THE MINISTRY OF JUSTICE."
- "AND ALSO, THERE IS SAID THAT IT'S IN YOUR CONTRACT. WHEN I MENTIONED THAT THE CONTRACT WAS PRE-PRINTED, I WASN'T HAPPY WITH ALL THE ARTICLES AND I WASN'T HAPPY WITH EVERYTHING. BUT I HAD TO SIGN THE CONTRACT TO BE ABLE TO PROVIDE MY SERVICES. THEY SAID THEY CAN'T DO ANYTHING ABOUT THAT."
- **"AND ALSO AGAIN, I'VE HEARD SOME PROBLEMS, SO MY COLLEAGUES THAT [** 0:55:18] FOR TRAVEL HAVE REDUCED. THAT IS A VERY BIG ISSUE."**
- "THERE ARE HEARINGS ALL OVER THE UK. I HAD TO GO TO NEWCASTLE FOR TWO DAYS, I CAN REMEMBER. I WAS ON THE WAY FOR FIVE HOURS. THE PAYMENT FOR THE TRAVEL WAS ABOUT £40 OR £60. I BOOKED THE HOTEL FOR THE NIGHT, BUT AS SOON AS I ARRIVED IN NEWCASTLE THE COURT TOOK ABOUT ONE HOUR AND THEY SAID, **"WE DON'T REQUIRE YOUR SERVICES ANYMORE."** SO I HAD **LOST EVERYTHING."**
- "AND INTERPRETERS, WHAT I WANTED TO SAY, INTERPRETERS DO NOT COUNT ON THE 'PAYMENT' OF THE HOURS THEY WORK. THEY COUNT ON THE MILEAGE PAYMENT THAT IS PROMISED. BECAUSE MILEAGE IS CERTAIN, THE PAYMENT FOR MILEAGE, FOR THE TRAVEL IS CERTAIN; THEY WILL BE GETTING IT DEFINITELY. BUT FOR THE WORK IT'S NOT, IT'S NOT PREDICTABLE."
- "NO, BY PUBLIC TRANSPORT. IF I WANTED TO USE MY CAR I'M GOING TO HAVE TO PAY A LOT MORE, FOR INSURANCE, FOR FUEL, FOR EVERYTHING."
- "THE PAYMENT SYSTEM FOR THE INTERPRETERS, THE MINISTRY OF JUSTICE DOES NOT CONSIDER HOW MUCH YOU HAVE PAID FOR YOUR TRAVEL."
- "YEAH, APOLOGIES, I SHOULD HAVE EXPLAINED THAT EARLIER. YES, SO THERE IS A CERTAIN AMOUNT FOR A JOB THAT YOU HAVE EXPECTED, THAT YOU HAVE BEEN BOOKED, ON MILEAGE. AND THE INTERPRETER, I CAN SAY POOR, HUMBLE INTERPRETER HAS TO GET HIMSELF THERE, HAS TO ARRIVE THERE BY THE MEANS THAT HAS COST HIM MINIMUM."
- "SOMETIMES, I REMEMBER, THE HEARING HAS STARTED AT 10:00; IT WAS A VERY SMALL TOWN IN THE EAST OF ENGLAND. I DON'T REMEMBER THE NAME OF THE CITY. THE HEARING STARTED AT 10:00, I ARRIVED THERE, YOU MIGHT NOT BELIEVE IT, I ARRIVED THERE AT 2:00 IN THE MORNING AND I SLEPT IN THE PARK NEXT TO THE COURT, THERE WAS NO HOTEL, THERE WAS NO SERVICE, THERE WAS NO SERVICE AFTER THAT, THERE WAS NO TRANSPORT. **I DIDN'T DRIVE, SO I HAD TO STAY IN THE PARK FOR ABOUT EIGHT HOURS."**

- **"AND I HAVE SEEN, I HAVE WITNESSED THAT DUE TO THE ISSUES, MORE AND MORE PROFESSIONAL INTERPRETERS LEAVE, THAT'S TRUE."**
- "LIKE ME, I HAVE TRANSLATED 13 BOOKS; I HAVE ABOUT 20 YEARS OF EXPERIENCE OF INTERPRETING AND TRANSLATION. I'VE GOT MY OWN STUDENTS. I AM A KIND OF LAWYER, AN IMMIGRATION CASE WORKER. **AND I HAVE LEFT THE INDUSTRY.**"
- "THE BEHAVIOUR OF SOME COURT STAFF IS BAD BECAUSE THEY HAVE EXPERIENCED POOR, THEY HAVE RECEIVED POOR QUALITY INTERPRETING SERVICES FROM INTERPRETERS, SOMETIMES BECAUSE THERE ARE ISSUES WITH PAYMENTS."

b) Subtheme: "WHY DO WE HAVE TO PAY INTERPRETERS?"

- **"I HEARD, "GO AWAY," I HEARD, "GET LOST," I HEARD, "WHY DO WE HAVE TO PAY INTERPRETERS?"**
- "I HEARD SENTENCES LIKE, WHEN I ASKED THE COURT USHER ONCE, IT WAS A VERY EARLY MORNING WHEN I ARRIVED, "WHERE IS COURT 20?" HE SAID SOMETHING, HE ANSWERED ME IN A SLANG AND WHEN I ASKED MY NATIVE FRIENDS ABOUT WHAT HE SAID, THEY SAID IT WASN'T PLEASANT AT ALL, **IT WAS VERY RUDE AND YOU HAVE BEEN ABUSED.** I CAN REMEMBER IT WAS WIGAN, A CITY NEAR BOLTON, IN GREATER MANCHESTER..."
- I CAN REMEMBER I WENT WIGAN, THE HEARING WAS SUPPOSED TO START AT 10:00; I WAS THERE AT 9:30. BUT THE NON-ENGLISH SPEAKER DIDN'T ATTEND COURT AT ALL. I ASKED THE COURT STAFF, I SAT OUTSIDE THE COURT, THREE/FOUR TIMES I WENT IN AND ASKED THE CLERK TO COME OUT, WE WANT TO TALK TO HIM, BECAUSE I DIDN'T WANT TO DISTURB THE PROCESS, THE OTHER HEARINGS. I ASKED HIM, "WHAT WOULD YOU LIKE ME TO DO? WOULD YOU LIKE ME TO STAY OR WOULD YOU LIKE ME TO GO? IF YOU'RE THINK THE DEFENDANT IS COMING, THEN I CAN WAIT," BECAUSE I HAD BEEN BOOKED FOR THE WHOLE DAY. **HE KEPT SAYING, "IT'S UP TO YOU," WHATEVER THAT MEANS."**
- I WENT THERE TO PROVIDE MY PROFESSIONAL SERVICES, TO WORK AS AN INTERPRETER AND **THE COURT CLERK TELLS ME, "IT'S UP TO YOU."**
- "THEY WOULDN'T TELL ME WHETHER THEY NEED ME OR THEY DON'T. IT WAS 4:00 IN THE AFTERNOON, I WAS VERY TIRED, I HAD BEEN SITTING ALL DAY. I WAS VERY TIRED AND WHEN I WENT DOWNSTAIRS THE STAFF MEMBER DOWNSTAIRS ASKED ME TO SIGN MY TIME SHEET AND GIVE IT BACK TO HER, FOR HER TO SIGN. I THOUGHT IT WAS A LITTLE BIT STRANGE BECAUSE I USUALLY SIGN IT AFTER THEY PUT THE TIME AND THEIR SIGNATURE ON THE TIME SHEET. I SIGNED IT AND GAVE

IT TO HER. **SHE PUT 'ONE HOUR' ON THE TIME SHEET AND SIGNED IT AND GAVE IT BACK TO ME.**

- "I SAID, "NO, I HAVE BEEN HERE ALL DAY, YOU DIDN'T TELL ME TO GO OR STAY, I'VE BEEN BOOKED FOR THE WHOLE DAY." THEY SAID, **"YOU SHOULD BE GRATEFUL THAT WE ARE PAYING YOU ONE HOUR."**
- **"IT WASN'T NICE AT ALL. THAT WAS THE LAST TIME THAT I WENT TO WIGAN. I DIDN'T ACCEPT ANY OTHER BOOKINGS FOR THAT COURT.**
- "I COMPLAINED TO THEBIGWORD ABOUT IT, BUT I CAN'T REMEMBER THE OUTCOME. YOU KNOW, ABOUT ABUSE, UNPLEASANT BEHAVIOUR AND OTHER THINGS THAT I TOLD YOU, A FEW EXAMPLES.
- **"BUT [** 1:13:44]. IN AN ABUSIVE SITUATION, NO GOOD PAYMENT, THE CONTINUOUS CANCELLATIONS, ISSUES DURING HEARINGS, RACIAL ABUSE, INSULT, OVER AND OVER."**

c) Subtheme: "THEY CONSIDER THE INTERPRETER IS AS CRIMINAL AS A DEFENDANT."

- "SOMETIMES SOME COURT STAFF THINK THE INTERPRETER IS EXACTLY, I DON'T KNOW WHY, THEY CONSIDER THE INTERPRETER IS AS CRIMINAL AS A DEFENDANT."
- YES, SOMETIMES THEY SAY THEY ARE FROM THE SAME COUNTRY, THEY HAVE THE SAME CULTURE.
- "I WAS INSULTED, ABUSED AND I HEARD MANY UNPLEASANT THINGS ABOUT MY CULTURE, ABOUT MY BACKGROUND, MANY TIMES BY COURT STAFF."
- "WELL, I CAN'T GIVE YOU THE NUMBER OF TIMES THAT I EXPERIENCED THIS. I DID MINIMAL 15 HEARINGS DURING THE MONTH FOR THE MINISTRY OF JUSTICE, MINIMUM 15, SO 15 DAYS I WAS BUSY. AND EVERY MONTH IT HAPPENED AND I HEARD SOMETHING UNPLEASANT FROM A COURT STAFF."

d) "THE REASON I GAVE YOU THIS... ACTUALLY I WAS SHOUTED AT AS WELL."

- "I THOUGHT AS AN INTERPRETER, I AM WORKING FOR THE MINISTRY OF JUSTICE AND IF I GO THERE, IF I GO TO THEM, EVERY MONTH OR EVERY TWO WEEKS AND COMPLAIN ABOUT THE BEHAVIOUR OF THEIR STAFF MEMBERS, THEY WON'T LIKE IT, OF COURSE. AND I DIDN'T WANT TO ROCK THE BOAT, AS IT IS SAID, AND BRING ISSUES UNDER MY NAME. **SO I KEPT SILENT ABOUT IT AND I HAD NOT TOLD ANYONE, ANYONE, INCLUDING MY FAMILY ABOUT IT, UNTIL NOW.**

- "YOU MENTIONED DOCTOR, I TOLD MY DOCTOR ABOUT THAT, THAT I WAS DEPRESSED, **BUT I COULDN'T COMPLETELY EXPRESS THE REASON WHY I HATED MY SITUATION WORKING AS AN INTERPRETER.**
- "I REALLY FELT I REALLY NEED TO TELL YOU ABOUT EVERYTHING THAT I HAVE EXPERIENCED."
- "EXACTLY, IT'S VERY SAD, IT'S VERY SAD AND I HAVE BEEN VERY UPSET THAT I HAD TO LEAVE THE INDUSTRY IN MY CAREER."
- "I HAD A VERY SUCCESSFUL CAREER AND I LEFT IT BECAUSE OF THOSE ISSUES."
- "YES, YES. IF I WANT TO GIVE YOU A ROUGH NUMBER. IN MY LANGUAGE, ABOUT EIGHT OR NINE... THEY ARE OLDER THAN ME, AS I SAID, AND MUCH MORE EXPERIENCED THAN ME, THEY'VE ALREADY LEFT AND THEY STARTED THEIR OWN BUSINESSES IN OTHER INDUSTRIES, TOTALLY DIFFERENT."

10. "AND IT'S A VERY SAD TRUTH THAT THE ONLY THING THEY ARE INTERESTED IN IS TO GET THE BOOKING, MAKE MONEY AND THEN BE GONE." (about agencies)

- "BUT FOR THEBIGWORD I HAVE IN SOME CASES, I WAITED 60 TO 70 DAYS, OR 60 TO 80 DAYS FOR THE PAYMENT TO REACH MY ACCOUNT. BUT I HAD TO GO WITH ONE BECAUSE I DIDN'T KNOW ANY OTHER JOBS (LAUGHS) TO DO. AND THE OTHER ISSUES WITH THE BOOKINGS IS THE CANCELLATIONS."
- "I BELIEVE AGENCIES HAVE TO BE PRESENT. THE REASON IS THAT SOMEONE HAS TO ORGANISE THE SERVICE ANYWAY. BUT I BELIEVE MOST OF THE FUNDING FROM THE MINISTRY OF JUSTICE IS GOING TO THEM RATHER THAN THE INTERPRETERS. AND THEY CLAIM SOME CRAZY AMOUNTS OF MONEY FOR ONE HOUR OF SERVICE AND PAY MAYBE ONLY ONE-THIRD OF IT TO THE INTERPRETER. THEY DON'T CARE ABOUT THE QUALITY OF THE SERVICE, THEY DON'T CARE IF YOU'RE BEING ABUSED, THEY DON'T CARE ABOUT THE ISSUES."
- **"THEY DON'T CARE ABOUT THE FUTURE OF THE INDUSTRY..."**
- **"I BELIEVE THEBIGWORD IS NOT AN ENGLISH COMPANY. THE MAIN OFFICE IS IN THE US. IT'S A GENTLEMAN CALLED MR GOULD..."**
- "EXACTLY. MY EXPERIENCE ABOUT TELLING THEM ABOUT HOW I HAVE BEEN TREATED, THE ISSUES I HAD TO FACE DURING A HEARING OR INSIDE THE COURT BUILDING, HEARING THAT WOULDN'T MAKE THEM HAPPY. AND THEY REALLY

DON'T LIKE TO HEAR ABOUT THESE THINGS, RATHER THAN GETTING INTO DEPTH OF WHAT HAPPENED. THEY REALLY DON'T LIKE THAT."

- "OF COURSE, ABOUT THE PAYMENTS, THEY HATE TO HEAR ANY COMPLAINTS ABOUT PAYMENTS."
- "THE LANGUAGE SHOP, YES. I DON'T KNOW ABOUT RECENTLY, BUT THEY WERE FOR FOUR YEARS, THEY WERE RESPONSIBLE FOR MAKING SURE THAT INTERPRETIVE SERVICES ARE OF A STANDARD QUALITY. EXACTLY WHAT I TOLD YOU ABOUT. THE ASSESSOR IS WITH THE INTERPRETER, FOR THEIR WORK, THEY HAVE THEIR OWN STANDARDS, THEY HAVE THEIR OWN EQUIVALENTS AND A SINGLE WORD, FOR EXAMPLE, THE WORD OF A 'STATEMENT' I TOLD YOU, AND THE WORD OF 'SUBMISSIONS,' TWO INTERPRETERS MAY USE TWO EQUIVALENTS. ONE OF THEM IS CORRECT, ONE OF THEM IS LESS CORRECT."
- "ASSESSORS BASICALLY THEY HAVE TO ATTEND COURT WHILE THE INTERPRETING SERVICE IS BEING PROVIDED WITHOUT MAKING THEIR PRESENCE KNOWN TO THE INTERPRETER."
- "YES, BUT SOMETIMES IT HAPPENS THAT THEY APPROACH THE INTERPRETER OUTSIDE AND THEY KNOW EACH OTHER. EVEN SOMETIMES IT HAPPENS THAT THEY DON'T KNOW EACH OTHER, BUT THEY MEET OUTSIDE THE COURT AND IF THEY HAVE A KIND OF DISAGREEMENT OVER SOMETHING, IT WOULD END UP THE INTERPRETER BECOMING REDUNDANT. IT'S HAPPENED A LOT."
- "YES, YES, BUT AS I EXPLAINED TO YOU, SOMETIMES THEY SPEAK WITH DIFFERENT ACCENTS. THEY SPEAK THE SAME LANGUAGE BUT SOMETIMES THEY SPEAK DIFFERENT ACCENTS. AND EVEN... MAYBE THE INTERPRETER OR THE ASSESSOR DOES NOT UNDERSTAND THE ACCENT THAT THE OTHER ONE USES."
- "FOR EXAMPLE, A FARSI GUY GOES INTO COURT AND SAYS THAT THE WITNESS IS SPEAKING DARI ACCENT OR AFGHANI ACCENT, BUT THE ASSESSOR KNOWS ONLY PERSIAN ACCENT. AND THE ASSESSORS REPORT YOU CAN SEE THAT DUE TO NOT UNDERSTANDING WHAT WAS GOING ON THEY DON'T GIVE TRUE AND ACCURATE AND CORRECT INFORMATION OF THEIR ASSESSMENT."
- "I DIDN'T EXPECT TO BE PAID ANYTHING BY MY AGENCY, BY THEBIGWORD OR THE MINISTRY OF JUSTICE. I JUST EXPECTED A LETTER OF ACKNOWLEDGEMENT, THANK YOU. THAT IS SPECIAL TO ME, IT WOULD REALLY BOOST MY SPIRITS UP. IT WOULD CHEER ME UP AND IT WOULD HELP ME TOLERATE THE ISSUES AND DIFFICULTIES INTERPRETERS HAVE TO EXPERIENCE AND GO THROUGH EVERY DAY. BUT NOTHING AT ALL, NOTHING AT ALL. MAYBE JUST AN EMAIL EVERY THREE

MONTHS SENT TO ALL. 'DEAR X, THANKS FOR THE GOOD WORK,' AND THAT'S ALL."

- "IT HAS RESULTED IN MANY FALSE REPORTS, UNTRUE THINGS. THE ASSESSOR DIDN'T EVEN HEAR WHAT WAS BEING SAID OR DIDN'T EVEN UNDERSTAND THAT THE NON-ENGLISH SPEAKER COULD NOT UNDERSTAND LEGAL TERMS PROPERLY, SO THE INTERPRETER HAD TO MAKE THEM UNDERSTAND ANOTHER WAY, REPHRASE THEM. SO IT'S A DIFFERENCE OF OPINION BETWEEN ASSESSORS AND INTERPRETERS.

11. "I DIDN'T FEEL THEY WERE GOING TO DEFEND MY RIGHTS AND I DIDN'T FEEL THEY WERE GOING TO ASK THE MINISTRY OF JUSTICE NOT TO BEHAVE WITH INTERPRETERS LIKE THAT."

- "THE SHORT ANSWER IS NO, NO, THEY WOULDN'T, OTHERWISE I WOULD HAVE REGISTERED WITH THEM."
- "BEFORE APPLYING TO BE REGISTERED WITH ANY PROFESSIONAL BODY, YOU NEED TO SEE THE BENEFITS OF PAYING THEM, OR BEING REGISTERED ON THE LIST. **I DIDN'T FEEL THEY WERE GOING TO DEFEND MY RIGHTS AND I DIDN'T FEEL THEY WERE GOING TO ASK THE MINISTRY OF JUSTICE NOT TO BEHAVE WITH INTERPRETERS LIKE THAT.**"
- "I WASN'T SURE IF I TOLD THEM ABOUT CANCELLATIONS, OR SUCH CANCELLATIONS AND THE LOSSES THAT [** 1:28:50] AND OTHER INTERPRETERS HAVE MADE AS WELL WOULD HELP AT ALL. BECAUSE I'M SURE THEY ARE AWARE OF THE CONTRACT THEBIGWORD SIGNS WITH EVERY INTERPRETER IN THE UNITED KINGDOM. THEY'RE ALREADY [** 1:29:13]
- "[** 1:29:39] TO TAKE THEIR NAME ON THE REGISTER. THE REGISTER IS FULL OF **PEOPLE [**] PEOPLE READ MY CV. YES, THAT'S TRUE, THAT'S TRUE. BUT IT DOESN'T HELP ME GET MANY JOBS.**"
- **"I KEEP MYSELF AWAY FROM BEING... INVOLVED IN SUCH ORGANISATIONS. I MAY DO IN THE FUTURE, BUT I HAVEN'T"**
- **"BOTH."**

12. "BECAUSE THE SYSTEM IS FAULTY FROM THE BEGINNING, FROM THE START."

- "BUT THERE ARE OTHER ISSUES AS WELL, IF I MAY SAY. A DEFENDANT GOES TO COURT, THEY SEE ONE INTERPRETER, FOR THE NEXT DAY THEY SEE ANOTHER ONE AND INTERPRETERS ARE SPEAKING THE SAME LANGUAGE FOR THE WITNESS OR THE DEFENDANT TO UNDERSTAND. BUT SOMETIMES THE EQUIVALENTS INTERPRETERS USE ARE DIFFERENT FROM..."

- "IT IS A VERY BIG FAILURE OF THE MINISTERS. I MEAN THE INTERPRETING INDUSTRY, IF I MAY SAY, THAT **THERE IS NO INTEGRITY BETWEEN INTERPRETERS.** AND TO GIVE ONE CERTAIN WORD... FOR EXAMPLE, IN FARSI THE STATEMENT HAS MORE THAN THREE OR FOUR MEANINGS, TOTALLY DIFFERENT. THE FIRST INTERPRETER COMES INTO COURT AND USES THE FIRST EQUIVALENT. THE SECOND ONE COMES INTO COURT AND USES ANOTHER EQUIVALENT, WHICH IS TOTALLY DIFFERENT FROM THE FIRST ONE. AND WE CANNOT EXPECT THE NON-ENGLISH SPEAKER TO UNDERSTAND BOTH OF THEM."
- "IT'S A REALLY BIG ISSUE. EVEN INTERPRETERS HAVE THE SAME QUALIFICATIONS, BUT THEY USE DIFFERENT EQUIVALENTS AT TIMES."
- "EVEN THE INTERPRETING COURSES THAT INTERPRETERS ATTEND, FOR THE QUALIFICATION, I BELIEVE THERE ARE MANY ISSUES WITH THEM. BECAUSE MOST OF THESE INTERPRETING COURSES TEACH THEM ENGLISH RATHER THAN HELPING THEM LEARN TO TRANSLATE PROPERLY INTO THE OTHER LANGUAGE."
- **"FOR [** 0:38:53] COURSES FOR DPSI ARE HELD AT NEARLY EVERY COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY IN THE UK. THE TUTOR COMES IN AND WITHOUT EVEN KNOWING WHAT THE STUDENT IS TALKING ABOUT, WHILE THEY ARE PRACTICING INTERPRETING, GIVES SOME LESSONS AND THEN GOES AWAY."**
- "YES, EVERYTHING WAS IN PLACE. SOMETIMES BEFORE THE HEARINGS I WAS NOT GIVEN THE OPPORTUNITY TO MAKE SURE THAT I COULD COMMUNICATE WITH THE NON-ENGLISH SPEAKER. SO WHEN I ENTERED THE COURT, I DIDN'T KNOW WHAT LANGUAGE OR WHAT ACCENT THE NON-ENGLISH SPEAKER SPEAKS."
- **"ALL OF THEM.** FOR EXAMPLE, FOR FARSI, MOST OF MY BOOKINGS WERE REGISTERED AS FARSI-AFGHAN, BUT WHEN I APPEARED IN COURT I COULD SEE THAT THEY SPOKE PERSIAN ACCENT OR DARI ACCENT. SO I MENTIONED IT MANY TIMES TO THE THEBIGWORD BUT I DON'T KNOW IF THEY TRIED THEIR BEST TO SORT OUT THIS ISSUE OR NOT, I DON'T KNOW. BUT THE ISSUE STILL EXISTS, I BELIEVE."
- **"BUT AS I EXPLAINED TO YOU EARLIER, FOR INTERPRETING THERE IS NO [COHERENCE 1:34:50] AND INTEGRITY AND INTERPRETERS WHO APPEAR IN COURT TO DO INTERPRETING,** YOU CAN'T FIND TWO INTERPRETERS WHOSE JOB IS EXACTLY SIMILAR IN TERMS OF THE EQUIVALENTS THEY USE, IN TERMS OF HOW THEY APPEAR, IN HOW THEY LOOK AND HOW THEY SPEAK."
- "THE PROBLEM IS, I BELIEVE, **THAT THERE IS NO INTEGRITY, AS I SAID, OR COHERENCE BETWEEN THE WORK OF INTERPRETERS, WITH REGARDS TO HOW**

THEY SHOULD LOOK, WHAT EXACTLY PROFESSIONALISM IS. WHAT THEY SHOULD DO..."

- **"LITERALLY THERE IS NO STANDARD, AS YOU SAID. AND UNFORTUNATELY IT HAS CAUSED MANY ISSUES."**
- "AS I GAVE YOU AN EXAMPLE, THE FIRST DAY OF A HEARING ONE INTERPRETER GOES INTO THE ROOM, INTO THE COURTROOM TO INTERPRET FOR THE DEFENDANT, THE OTHER DAY, ANOTHER ONE. IT CAUSES MANY COMPLEXITY, COMPLICATIONS AND SO MANY OTHER ISSUES THAT I STRONGLY BELIEVE IT AFFECTS THE PURPOSE OF JUSTICE."
- "IF I MAY, I JUST REMEMBERED A VERY IMPORTANT ISSUE. AS FAR AS I KNOW, THE LANGUAGE SHOP, IT'S AN AGENCY RESPONSIBLE FOR ASSESSMENTS OF INTERPRETING SERVICES FOR THE MINISTRY OF JUSTICE."
- "MANY PEOPLE, UNFORTUNATELY IN THE UK, THERE IS NO... THAT'S MY EXPERIENCE AND MY POINT OF VIEW AS WE JUST DISCUSSED. **THERE IS NO STANDARD, LITERALLY AND PRACTICALLY AND INTERPRETERS HAVE TO STICK TO THEIR OWN STANDARDS BASED ON THEIR OWN KNOWLEDGE, EXPERIENCE AND FEELINGS.**
- "NO, NO, NO. THAT'S A VERY BIG ISSUE ACTUALLY. I BELIEVE THERE HAS TO BE ASSESSMENTS OF THE QUALITY OF THE LANGUAGE SERVICES PROVIDED BY THE INTERPRETERS. AND IF THEY ARE DOING THEIR JOB GOOD ENOUGH AND THEY ARE REPRESENTING THE AGENCY WELL, THEY HAVE TO BE [REWARDED VERBALLY 1:51:35] BY THE COMPANY."
- **"YES, IT'S A SYSTEM FAULT, YES."**
- "I WAS ONCE TOLD BY A COURT MEMBER THAT, "THIS IS YOUR TIME SHEET, I CAN'T HELP YOU MORE THAN THAT." I DIDN'T MENTION ANYTHING, I DIDN'T HAVE ANY REQUESTS. I DIDN'T ASK FOR ANYTHING, WHAT DO YOU MEAN? BECAUSE THE PREVIOUS INTERPRETERS HAD ASKED THEM PUT MORE HOURS ON IT. THEBIGWORD KNOWS THAT, AND THE MINISTRY OF JUSTICE AS WELL, I BELIEVE. I DON'T THINK THEY HAVE DONE ANYTHING ABOUT IT."
- **"AND UNTIL INTERPRETERS AND COURT STAFF KNOW WHAT THEY ARE GOING TO DO, EXACTLY, BRINGING DIFFERENT [AGENCIES 1:56:28] TO THE BUSINESS, IT'S JUST A WASTE OF TAXPAYERS' MONEY AND DOESN'T BRING ANY GOOD."**

13. “YES, IN 2011 IT WAS VERY VALUED.”

- “AND EVERYBODY COOPERATED WITH THE INTERPRETERS AND THEY WERE VERY KIND, THEY WERE VERY POLITE.
- “I MYSELF, I RECEIVED A LOT OF VERY GOOD FEEDBACK FOR MY SERVICE WHEN I WAS IN COURT, FROM JUDGES, PROSECUTION, FROM DEFENDANTS’ SIDE, FROM COURT STAFF, ESPECIALLY FROM JOURNALISTS.”

12.2.23 Respondent 58: codes and themes from survey

Respondent 58 – Online Survey

So, based on further coding analysis the following themes can be identified:

1. **“INTERPRETING, IN MY VIEW, IS NOT ONLY BEING ABLE TO TRANSLATE THE WORDS FROM ONE LANGUAGE TO ANOTHER. FOR LEGAL INTERPRETERS IT REQUIRES MUCH EXPERIENCE AND CAPABILITY.”** (Multiple facets of the interpreter’s role)

Subthemes:

- a) **IT’S MY ROLE TO GIVE A LITTLE BIT OF INFORMATION ABOUT WHAT’S GOING TO HAPPEN IN COURT”**
 - “THE INTERPRETER HAS TO BE ABLE TO MAKE THINGS UNDERSTOOD BY SOMEONE WHO IS NOT ABLE TO DO IT ADEQUATELY.”
 - “THEY NEED TO BE HELPFUL IN CASES THAT SOLICITORS HAVEN’T BEEN ABLE TO DO THEIR JOB.”
- b) **“SOMETIMES INTERPRETERS NEED TO BE ABLE TO CALM THE WITNESSES OR DEFENDENTS DOWN IN A FEW WORDS”**
 - “SO THE INTERPRETER HAS TO MAKE AN ASSESSMENT WHETHER THE NON-ENGLISH SPEAKER IS ABLE TO UNDERSTAND THE INTERPRETER’S ACCENT.”
 - “AN INTERPRETER IS THE ONLY PERSON WHO CAN UNDERSTAND THE LANGUAGE... THEIR ROLE IS TO BE ABLE TO MAKE COMMUNICATION POSSIBLE BETWEEN TWO PARTIES. IT GOES BEYOND THAT”

- "IF THE DEFENDANT, THE WITNESS IS A NON-ENGLISH SPEAKER AND CANNOT UNDERSTAND WHAT'S BEING SAID, THEN THE WHOLE PURPOSE OF JUSTICE WOULD BE QUESTIONED."
- "THE INTERPRETER, LEVEL OF PROFESSIONALISM IS NOT LESS THAN OTHER PEOPLE WHO ATTEND COURT"
- "THEY NEED TO LOVE WHAT THEY'RE DOING; THEY NEED TO LOVE THEIR JOBS"
- "AN INTERPRETER NEEDS TO KNOW A LANGUAGE AND THEN BE TRAINED AND QUALIFIED FOR TRANSLATION."
- "KNOWING A LANGUAGE, I KNOW, I SPEAK A FEW LANGUAGES, BUT TO BE ABLE TO TRANSLATE IS SOMETHING TOTALLY DIFFERENT."
- "AN INTERPRETER NEEDS TO KNOW A LANGUAGE AND THEN BE TRAINED AND QUALIFIED FOR TRANSLATION"
- "IF THERE IS NO PROPER INTERPRETING SERVICE AVAILABLE FOR THE NON-NATIVE SPEAKER, THEN THE WHOLE PURPOSE OF JUSTICE WOULD BE JEOPARDISED."

c) **"THEIR ROLE IS TO BE ABLE TO MAKE COMMUNICATION POSSIBLE BETWEEN TWO PARTIES"**

- "IT HAPPENED MANY TIMES THAT AT THE END OF THE DAY, WHEN I DID INTERPRETING ON THAT DAY, I CAME TO THE CONCLUSION, WHEN I THOUGHT ABOUT IT, THAT I SAVED A LIFE, I HAD SAVED A LIFE. I WAS VERY HAPPY ABOUT IT."

2. **"UNFORTUNATELY SOME INTERPRETERS ARE NOT ADEQUATELY EXPERIENCED"**

(criticism of some professionals in PSI industry)

- "AND WHEN THE NEW ONES COME, THEY ARE NOT TRAINED ENOUGH. THEY ARE NOT ADEQUATELY EXPERIENCED. THEY ARE NOT AWARE OF THE ROLES THEY NEED TO PLAY BECAUSE IT'S MORE THAN ONE ROLE SOMETIMES, INTERPRETING."
- "SOMETIMES THEY ARE VERY FRIENDLY, SO THE INTERPRETER, REGARDLESS OF THE PERSONAL ISSUES, THEY TRY TO SPEAK FRIENDLY, THEY TRY TO BE KIND, THEY TRY TO BE HELPFUL, BUT SOMETIMES THEY ARE NOT IN A GOOD MOOD."
- "IT'S UP TO THE INTERPRETER TO PRACTICE AND GAIN ADEQUATE EXPERIENCE TO PREPARE THEMSELVES FOR THE JOB."

3. “INTERPRETING FOR THE MINISTRY OF JUSTICE IS NOT AN EASY JOB TO DO, AT ALL”

(Challenges and pressures of interpreters in court.)

- “AND EVEN SOMETIMES I BELIEVE THEIR ROLE IS A LITTLE BIT HARDER THAN, FOR EXAMPLE, A SOLICITOR, BECAUSE OBVIOUSLY THEY NEED TO PUT THEMSELVES IN THE SHOES OF DIFFERENT PEOPLE IN COURT. “WHEN THE JUDGES [** 1:15:29] WITNESS, THE NON-ENGLISH SPEAKER, THEN THE JUDGE SAYS THAT. BECAUSE SOMETIMES THE PACE IS VERY FAST AND ADVOCATES AND THE JUDGE AND THE COURT CLERKS ARE MAKING THEIR CASE TOO FAST”
- “MOST CHALLENGING? WELL ACTUALLY I DON’T THINK THERE IS ANYTHING CHALLENGING, IF EVERYTHING IS IN PLACE.”
- “BUT THE MOST CHALLENGING THAT I CAN MENTION IS DIFFERENCE IN ACCENT, FIRST OF ALL. AND THEN THE BACKGROUND, THE CULTURAL BACKGROUND AND THE EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND OF THE NON-ENGLISH SPEAKER, THE INTERPRETER HAS TO GET TO THAT.”
- “HOWEVER, I FELT IT WAS A KIND OF FAILURE FOR ME.” (Unrealistic expectations of the court)

4. “THEY KEEP PUSHING” (about non-English speaking litigants asking for help, advice etc.)

- “ACTUALLY I HEARD THE QUESTION, “PLEASE HELP ME ON THAT QUESTION,” FROM WITNESSES AND DEFENDANTS, A LOT WHEN I’M IN COURT. BUT I WASN’T ALLOWED TO DO ANYTHING OR ANSWER, EVEN ANSWER THAT QUESTION.”
- “SOMETIMES WHEN WE HEAR A CERTAIN QUESTION FROM A WITNESS ABOUT WHAT’S GOING TO HAPPEN NEXT, YOU HAVE TO ANSWER IT ANYWAY.”
- “THEY KEEP PUSHING. IN MOST CASES WHEN THEY ARE NOT PREPARED AT ALL FOR THE LEGAL PROCESS AND IN SIMPLE WORDS, THEY DON’T KNOW WHAT’S GOING TO HAPPEN DURING THE HEARINGS, THEY PUSH OVER AND OVER AND ASK QUESTIONS [** 0:42:59]. EVEN DURING THE EVIDENCE. I TOLD YOU ONE OF THE QUESTIONS, “HOW AM I GOING TO ANSWER THAT QUESTION?” I HEARD THAT A LOT. OR, “WHAT DO YOU THINK I SHOULD SAY?” OR, “I DON’T LIKE THIS COURT, CAN I COME BACK LATER?” (LAUGHS) THINGS LIKE THAT, MANY THINGS LIKE THAT.”
- “I WILL SUE YOU IF MY CASE IS DISMISSED BECAUSE YOU DIDN’T ALLOW ME TO TALK.”

5. **“SOME COURT MEMBERS ARE NOT PREPARED HOW TO DEAL WITH INTERPRETERS.”**

(how court staff see interpreters’ role, their perceptions manifested in their attitude and actions).

- “SOMETIMES THEY ARE NOT AWARE, SOMETIMES THEY PAY ATTENTION, SOMETIMES THEY DON’T.”
- “AND I HAD TO INTERRUPT THE VIDEO, THE PERSON WHO WAS PLAYING THE VIDEO AND ASK THEM TO STOP-STOP-STOP, WAIT FOR ME TO INTERPRET, WAIT FOR ME TO INTERPRET.”
- “ WHEN I WAS SITTING, AFTER THE SHOUTING AT THE DEFENDANT, WHEN I WAS SITTING I WAITED FOR THE PROSECUTOR TO START AND THEN I STARTED INTERPRETING WHAT WAS BEING SAID. HOWEVER, I RECEIVED A VERY LOUD YELL, AT ME, SAYING, “YOU’RE SUPPOSED TO INTERPRET, YOU’RE HERE TO INTERPRET.”
- “YET THE NEXT DAY I WAS ABUSED BY A COURT STAFF AND I FORGET ABOUT ANY TRIUMPH OR SOMETHING.”
- “EXACTLY, THIS IS GOING TO HAPPEN. YOUR INTERPRETER IS THERE JUST TO INTERPRET. THEY’RE NOT GOING TO REPRESENT YOU, THEY’RE NOT GOING TO GIVE ANSWERS IN YOUR PLACE, THEY’RE NOT GOING TO DO ANYTHING OTHER THAN TRANSLATING WHAT IS BEING SAID BY YOU OR BY ANY OTHER ONE, SO THAT EVERYBODY UNDERSTANDS EACH OTHER.”
- “THE REASON I GAVE YOU THIS... ACTUALLY I WAS SHOUTED AT AS WELL.”
- “I THOUGHT AS AN INTERPRETER, I AM WORKING FOR THE MINISTRY OF JUSTICE AND IF I GO THERE, IF I GO TO THEM, EVERY MONTH OR EVERY TWO WEEKS AND COMPLAIN ABOUT THE BEHAVIOUR OF THEIR STAFF MEMBERS, THEY WON’T LIKE IT, OF COURSE. AND I DIDN’T WANT TO ROCK THE BOAT, AS IT IS SAID, AND BRING ISSUES UNDER MY NAME. SO I KEPT SILENT ABOUT IT AND I HAD NOT TOLD ANYONE, ANYONE, INCLUDING MY FAMILY ABOUT IT, UNTIL NOW.

6. **“WELL, TO BE HONEST, I CAN SAY THE SITUATION HAS DETERIORATED AND IT’S GETTING WORSE.”**

Subthemes:

a) **“IT’S THE REALITY.”**

- “IT IS TRUE THAT I LEFT MY ROLE AS A LINGUIST FOR THE MINISTRY OF JUSTICE ABOUT A YEAR AGO.”

- "YES, A CANCELLATION FEE. BUT IF IT IS CANCELLED NOT WITHIN THE 24 HOUR PERIOD OF TIME, PRIOR TO THE HEARING, THEN YOU WILL GET NOTHING. EVEN IF YOU ARE BOOKED FOR TWO YEARS FOR A HEARING, YOU WON'T GET ANYTHING."
- "THIS IS ONE OF THE ISSUES. EVEN SOMETIMES I APPEARED IN COURT, I ARRIVED THERE, AFTER HALF AN HOUR, ONE HOUR, I WAS TOLD THAT THE COURT SESSION HAD BEEN CANCELLED. I HAD BEEN BOOKED FOR A THREE HOUR [** 0:53:06]. OKAY, I COUNTED ON THAT INCOME AND SO I WAS VERY UPSET BECAUSE I HAD A LOT OF LOSS."
- "WE DON'T REQUIRE YOUR SERVICES ANYMORE." SO I HAD LOST EVERYTHING."
- "THAT WAS ONE OF THE REASONS THAT I HAD TO LEAVE THE ROLE BECAUSE I COULDN'T PREDICT ANYTHING."
- "I DIDN'T DRIVE, SO I HAD TO STAY IN THE PARK FOR ABOUT EIGHT HOURS."
- "I HAVE WITNESSED THAT DUE TO THE ISSUES, MORE AND MORE PROFESSIONAL INTERPRETERS LEAVE, THAT'S TRUE."

- "LIKE ME, I HAVE TRANSLATED 13 BOOKS; I HAVE ABOUT 20 YEARS OF EXPERIENCE OF INTERPRETING AND TRANSLATION. I'VE GOT MY OWN STUDENTS. I AM A KIND OF LAWYER, AN IMMIGRATION CASE WORKER. AND I HAVE LEFT THE INDUSTRY."

b) "WHY DO WE HAVE TO PAY INTERPRETERS?"

- "I HEARD, "GO AWAY," I HEARD, "GET LOST," I HEARD, "WHY DO WE HAVE TO PAY INTERPRETERS?"
- "THEY WOULDN'T TELL ME WHETHER THEY NEED ME OR THEY DON'T. IT WAS 4:00 IN THE AFTERNOON, I WAS VERY TIRED, I HAD BEEN SITTING ALL DAY. I WAS VERY TIRED AND WHEN I WENT DOWNSTAIRS THE STAFF MEMBER DOWNSTAIRS ASKED ME TO SIGN MY TIME SHEET AND GIVE IT BACK TO HER, FOR HER TO SIGN. I THOUGHT IT WAS A LITTLE BIT STRANGE BECAUSE I USUALLY SIGN IT AFTER THEY PUT THE TIME AND THEIR SIGNATURE ON THE TIME SHEET. I SIGNED IT AND GAVE IT TO HER. SHE PUT 'ONE HOUR' ON THE TIME SHEET AND SIGNED IT AND GAVE IT BACK TO ME".
- "I SAID, "NO, I HAVE BEEN HERE ALL DAY, YOU DIDN'T TELL ME TO GO OR STAY, I'VE BEEN BOOKED FOR THE WHOLE DAY." THEY SAID, "YOU SHOULD BE GRATEFUL THAT WE ARE PAYING YOU ONE HOUR.""
- "IT WASN'T NICE AT ALL. THAT WAS THE LAST TIME THAT I WENT TO WIGAN. I DIDN'T ACCEPT ANY OTHER BOOKINGS FOR THAT COURT."

c) "THEY CONSIDER THE INTERPRETER IS AS CRIMINAL AS A DEFENDANT."

- "SOMETIMES SOME COURT STAFF THINK THE INTERPRETER IS EXACTLY, I DON'T KNOW WHY, THEY CONSIDER THE INTERPRETER IS AS CRIMINAL AS A DEFENDANT."
- YES, SOMETIMES THEY SAY THEY ARE FROM THE SAME COUNTRY, THEY HAVE THE SAME CULTURE.
- "I WAS INSULTED, ABUSED AND I HEARD MANY UNPLEASANT THINGS ABOUT MY CULTURE, ABOUT MY BACKGROUND, MANY TIMES BY COURT STAFF."

7. "AND IT'S A VERY SAD TRUTH THAT THE ONLY THING THEY ARE INTERESTED IN IS TO GET THE BOOKING, MAKE MONEY AND THEN BE GONE." (about agencies)

- "THEY DON'T CARE ABOUT THE FUTURE OF THE INDUSTRY..."

8. "BECAUSE THE SYSTEM IS FAULTY FROM THE BEGINNING, FROM THE START."

- "IT IS A VERY BIG FAILURE OF THE MINISTERS. I MEAN THE INTERPRETING INDUSTRY, IF I MAY SAY, THAT THERE IS NO INTEGRITY BETWEEN INTERPRETERS.
- "THE PROBLEM IS, I BELIEVE, THAT THERE IS NO INTEGRITY, AS I SAID, OR COHERENCE BETWEEN THE WORK OF INTERPRETERS, WITH REGARDS TO HOW THEY SHOULD LOOK, WHAT EXACTLY PROFESSIONALISM IS. WHAT THEY SHOULD DO..."
- "LITERALLY THERE IS NO STANDARD, AS YOU SAID. AND UNFORTUNATELY IT HAS CAUSED MANY ISSUES."
- THERE IS NO STANDARD, LITERALLY AND PRACTICALLY AND INTERPRETERS HAVE TO STICK TO THEIR OWN STANDARDS BASED ON THEIR OWN KNOWLEDGE, EXPERIENCE AND FEELINGS.
- "YES, IT'S A SYSTEM FAULT, YES."
- "AND UNTIL INTERPRETERS AND COURT STAFF KNOW WHAT THEY ARE GOING TO DO, EXACTLY, BRINGING DIFFERENT [AGENCIES 1:56:28] TO THE BUSINESS, IT'S JUST A WASTE OF TAXPAYERS' MONEY AND DOESN'T BRING ANY GOOD."

Additional less common themes:

1. "I DIDN'T FEEL THEY WERE GOING TO DEFEND MY RIGHTS AND I DIDN'T FEEL THEY WERE GOING TO ASK THE MINISTRY OF JUSTICE NOT TO BEHAVE WITH INTERPRETERS LIKE THAT."

- "I KEEP MYSELF AWAY FROM BEING... INVOLVED IN SUCH ORGANISATIONS. I MAY DO IN THE FUTURE, BUT I HAVEN'T"

2. “YES, IN 2011 IT WAS VERY VALUED.”

- “AND EVERYBODY COOPERATED WITH THE INTERPRETERS AND THEY WERE VERY KIND, THEY WERE VERY POLITE.
- “I MYSELF, I RECEIVED A LOT OF VERY GOOD FEEDBACK FOR MY SERVICE WHEN I WAS IN COURT, FROM JUDGES, PROSECUTION, FROM DEFENDANTS’ SIDE, FROM COURT STAFF, ESPECIALLY FROM JOURNALISTS.”

12.3 Identified themes across the interviews and survey with interpreters

Respondent 6.

4. **"I'M A NEUTRAL PERSON. I AM A DEVICE, IF YOU LIKE. YES. A TRANSMITTING DEVICE. A TRANSMITTER"** (The role of interpreter is that of a transmitting device). – from the interview transcript

Overlap with:

"MY ROLE IN COURT IS TO FACILITATE COMMUNICATION AND INTERPRET FAITHFULLY AND IMPARTIALLY WHAT IS SAID BY EITHER PARTY, AS ACCURATELY AS POSSIBLE." – from survey

Subthemes:

- "MY ROLE AS AN INTERPRETER SHOULD BE IMPARTIAL" (focus on impartiality)
- "INTERPRETER IS TO HELP TO MAKE THE RIGHT DECISION" (facilitator of communication – contradiction to the device idea)
- "I JUST DON'T WANT TO HAVE THIS ADDITIONAL ROLE AND I DON'T THINK IT IS MY JOB"
- "I DON'T THINK I'M ENTITLED TO MY OPINION"
- "MY JOB IS THE BEST WHEN IT'S NOT SEEN AS AN ADDITIONAL PERSON IN THE PROCESS"
- "SO IT'S LIKE MAKEUP IF YOU WANT, THE BEST MAKEUP IS MAKEUP YOU DON'T SEE. THE BEST INTERPRETER WHO IS NOT SEEN OR HEARD METAPHORICALLY"

5. **"EVERYBODY TREATED ME WITH RESPECT, WITH DUE RESPECT"** (Recognition) – from the interview transcript

Overlap with:

"FROM MY POINT OF VIEW, INTERPRETERS ARE VALUED." – from the survey

- "IT WAS A KIND OF A PUBLIC THANK YOU AND PUBLIC APPRECIATION WHICH WAS REALLY NICE"

6. **"SO, WHAT I'M SAYING, ONE AGENCY IS FINE, BUT THERE SHOULD BE SOME OTHER MECHANISMS HOW INTERPRETERS COULD BE... HIRED WITH NO PREJUDICE OR**

SACRIFICE TO THEIR OWN PAY...” (about the current situation and changes that have taken place in the system)

Additional themes emerged from the survey:

“IN ONE CASE I WAS BOOKED DIRECTLY BY A CLAIMANT AND HE EXPECTED ME TO BE ON HIS SIDE AND ASKED FOR MY ADVICE”

“OVERALL, I WOULD SAY THE FACILITIES WERE ADEQUATE AND SUFFICIENT FOR INTERPRETING.”

Respondent 7

5. “EVERYTHING IS IMPORTANT” (Role performance)

Subthemes:

- d) Establishing good rapport with the client
- e) Dealing with misunderstandings/ “awkward” language (professional dilemmas)
- f) Accuracy of rendition

6. “IF YOU KNOW THE CASE, IT’S MUCH EASIER”

Subthemes:

- c) Challenges interpreters face in the courtroom
- d) Factors affecting interpreter’s performance

7. “SO FAMILY COURT CASES ARE THE MOST DIFFICULT ONES”

8. “TAXI DRIVER!” – from the interview transcript

Overlap with:

- **“THE ROLE AND PERCEPTION OF THE COURT INTERPRETER HAS CHANGED DRAMATICALLY SINCE CAPITA AND OTHER AGENCIES HAVE TAKEN OVER.” – from the survey**

Additional themes have emerged from the survey:

1. "I AM THE SERVANT OF THE COURT"

"WHATEVER I DO IN COURT SHOULD BE TRANSPARENT TO ALL SIDES (ON VERBAL AND NON-VERBAL LEVEL) THAT I AM NEUTRAL AND THAT I AM ONLY COMMITTED TO ACCURACY AND CLARITY IN MY INTERPRETING – THAT IS WHAT I AM THERE FOR."

2. "I AM A FACILITATOR / A CHANNEL FOR COMMUNICATION ONLY. NOT INTERESTED IN THE OUTCOME OF THE CASE."

3. "I ALWAYS EXPLAIN MY ROLE AND MY POSITION TO CLIENTS. AND HOPEFULLY THEY VIEW ME IN THAT ROLE."

Respondent 13

5. "IT'S DIFFERENT FROM COURT TO COURT"

- Different physical settings of different courts have a bearing on interpreters' performance;
- Different modes of interpreting required;
- Different level of formality and seriousness of offence/case adds to pressure and challenges;
- Amount of people the interpreter works with also differs between different courts.

6. "DUE TO THE PRESSURE YOU ARE UNDER AT THE TIME, YOU COULD MISINTERPRET."
– pressures and challenges interpreters face in the courtroom.

Subthemes:

- "YOU HAVE TO BE VERY CONFIDENT"
- "AND I THINK, I PERSONALLY PREFER CONFERENCE INTERPRETING BECAUSE YOU ARE AWAY FROM THE DEFENDANT." - dealing with challenges

7. "THE THREE FUNDAMENTAL RULES OF INTERPRETING AT ALL TIMES"

Subthemes:

- "SO OUR JOB IS TO NOT BE AS A WITNESS BUT TO SIMPLY INTERPRET WHAT'S BEING SAID"
- "THEY ASK FOR ADVICE"

8. “WE DON’T GET ANY RESPECT FOR THE VERY HARD JOB YOU DO FOR THEM BASICALLY”

Subthemes:

- “THE GOVERNMENT AND EVERYONE JUST CARES ABOUT SAVING MONEY RATHER THAN DELIVERING EFFECTIVE AND QUALITY SERVICES.”
- “THE WHOLE SYSTEM, YEAH. I DON’T THINK IT’S WORKING EFFECTIVELY BECAUSE THE SYSTEM HAS BEEN PRIVATISED”

Respondent 4

6. “IT’S THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT, RATHER THAN THE PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE”. – from the interview transcript

Overlap with:

“...THE LAYOUT OF THE COURT ROOMS IN WHICHEVER TRIBUNAL OR COURT, IS NOT ADAPTED FOR THE PRESENCE OF AN INTERPRETER.” - the impact of physical settings – from survey)

Subtheme:

“I AM NOT A FAN OF VIDEO LINK INTERPRETING BECAUSE, FOR ME, I THINK, I FEEL I THINK I CANNOT DO MY JOB AS AN INTERPRETER”

7. “YOU’RE JUST THERE TO DO YOUR WORK” - Role performance – from the interview transcript

Overlap with:

“AN ESSENTIAL PART OF THE PROCESS, JUST AS THE MAGISTRATES/JUDGE + SOLICITORS/BARRISTERS ARE VITAL TO THE PROCESS.” (Interpreter’s role and role performance – from survey)

Subtheme 1:

“THE CODE OF CONDUCT IS THERE FOR A REASON”

Subtheme 2:

“SO THAT WAS THE TECHNIQUE I DEVELOPED OVER TIME.”

8. **“SO, YOU KNOW, THEY NEED TO BE EDUCATED”**. - lack of awareness and understanding of interpreters’ role by the court personnel and law professionals.
9. **“YOU ARE THE INTERFERING INTERPRETER, OR THE INTERPRETER WHO THINKS THEY KNOW TOO MUCH, OR WHATEVER, BUT YOU ARE THERE TO DO YOUR JOB.”** – about status and attitude towards interpreters – from the interview transcript

Overlap with:

“A NECESSARY YET EXPENSIVE NUISANCE.” – (the perception of interpreters by legal professionals) – from survey

- **“THE JUDGE THREATENED TO THROW ME OUT OF COURT”** – Status of interpreters in the courtroom

Subtheme:

“THE INTERPRETER’S THE EASIEST SCAPEGOAT IN THE WHOLE SITUATION.”

- **“BECAUSE THE FIRST PERSON THEY WANT TO BLAME, IN ANY SITUATION, IS THE INTERPRETER.”**
- **“AND THEY DON’T SEE HOW THE INTERPRETER IS PUT IN A VERY, AS THEY SAY IN ENGLISH, INVIDIOUS POSITION, THAT IS TO SAY THE INTERPRETER CANNOT WIN WHATEVER THEY DO.”**

10. **“A LOT OF THEM THINK YOU’RE THEIR FRIEND”** – from the interview transcript

Overlap with:

“QUITE OFTEN THEY VIEW THE INTERPRETER AS THEIR “FRIEND”. – from survey

Subtheme:

“PLEASE DO NOT TALK TO ME, I CANNOT TALK TO YOU...”

Additional theme from the survey has emerged:

- **“THE STATUS OF THE INTERPRETER IN THE LEGAL SYSTEM IN THE UK WAS ALWAYS A TENUOUS ONE.”**

Respondent 16

6. **“THE PRESSURE WE FEEL”**: Challenges and pressures of interpreters in court.
7. **“A VERY IMPORTANT ROLE”**: Role perceptions

8. **“IT IS VERY REWARDING”**: Job satisfaction
9. **“IT DEPENDS ON THE PERSON”**: Attitude of some legal professionals towards interpreters
10. **“I THINK THEIR STATUS SHOULD BE DIFFERENT”**: changes in the status of the profession

Themes from the survey completely overlap with the themes from the follow-up interview:

Identified Themes

6. **Stress, pressure and challenges - codes 1, 2 and 3**
7. **Poor facilities - 5**
8. **Important role – 6, 7, 8**
9. **Understanding the role of interpreters by non-English speaking litigants. – codes 4, 9, and 10.**
10. **Rates have decreased, status of interpreters have worsened. – 11**

Respondent 18

6. **“THAT MAKES IT DIFFICULT”** (challenges and pressures of interpreters in court)

Subthemes:

- “THEY HAD NOT GIVEN ME A CHOICE” (expectations of the court)
- “IT’S SOMETIMES DIFFICULT TO DETACH AND SAY , “WELL, I’M NOT GOING TO TALK TO YOU” (ethical and professional dilemmas faced by interpreters in court)
- “I DO NOT HOLD CONVERSATIONS WITH THE MAGISTRATES, YOU KNOW, YOU DO NOT TALK TO THE JUDGE...” (power imbalance in the courtroom)

7. **“THE INTERPRETER AS A TOOL”** – from the transcript

Overlap with:

“MAINLY LINGUISTIC SUPPORT TO PARTICIPANTS.” (interpreter’s role) – from the survey

Subthemes:

- “ACTUALLY I THINK THEY ARE ABLE TO SPOT THIS DIFFERENCE”/ “THEY KNEW EXACTLY HOW TO USE THE INTERPRETER” (court personnel knowledge and awareness of different types of interpreting and how to work with interpreters)

8. **“YOU KNOW ALL THE STUFF, YOU SPEAK INSTEAD OF ME”** (expectations of the client)
– from the transcript

Overlap with

“MOST OF THE TIME THEY UNDERSTAND AND AGREE THAT MY ROLE IS LINGUISTIC SUPPORT, THAT I TAKE NO SIDE AND INTERPRET EVERYTHING SAID. HOWEVER, OFTEN THEY ACT OUTSIDE WHAT IS EXPECTED FROM THEM AND TRY TO PUSH THE BOUNDARIES SET INITIALLY, SOMETIMES BEING SUCCESSFUL IN THAT.” (Expectations of the client) – from the survey

9. **“A LABEL THE COURT INTERPRETER IN ITSELF MAKES YOU SEEN BY OTHER PEOPLE THAT YOU’RE PROFESSIONAL”** (Recognition of the profession)

Subthemes:

- **“IT’S RECOGNITION IS WHAT IT GIVES”** (professional memberships and NRPSI register)

10. **“ALTHOUGH I FOUND MOST OF THE STAFF IN THE COURT BEING VERY SUPPORTIVE TOWARDS THE INTERPRETERS, SAYING THAT CAPITA ISN’T GOOD AND IT’S A MESS”**

Subthemes:

- **“BUT IN TERMS OF THE SPEED AND FLUENCY OF PAYMENTS, THEY IMPROVED, IT’S UNBELIEVABLE WHAT THEY DONE”** (positive change that came with privatisation: significant improvement on admin side)
- **“THEY’VE CREATED A REALLY GOOD IT SYSTEM FOR THE COURTS AND INTERPRETERS, JUST BECAUSE ALL THE REST IS A SHAMBLES, IT DOESN’T MEAN THAT THE SYSTEM ISN’T GOOD”**

Additional themes have emerged from the survey:

“MOST OF THE TIME FACILITIES ARE AWFUL”

“THERE ARE DIFFERENT EXPECTATIONS FROM THE DIFFERENT INSTITUTIONS” (about differences between courts)

Respondent 21

6. **“ATMOSPHERE IS SIGNIFICANTLY DIFFERENT BETWEEN MAGISTRATES’ COURT AND CROWN COURT.”**

- **“ON THE WHOLE, CROWN COURTS ARE BETTER.”**

- I'VE NEVER EVER, IN MY WHOLE LIFE, HAVE SEEN A CROWN COURT JUDGE WHO WOULD TALK TO ME, GIVING ME INSTRUCTIONS WHAT TO TELL THE DEFENDANT."
- "SO CROWN COURT THERE'S NO ISSUE..."
- "YOU OFTEN GET CROWN COURT JUDGES REALLY FINDING THE TIME TO THANK THE INTERPRETERS, ESPECIALLY AFTER A LONG TRIAL."
- "THEY REALLY WANT TO MAKE SURE THAT THE INTERPRETERS KNOW THAT THEIR WORK IS VALUED."

7. **"I FELT EMBARRASSED FOR THEM, THAT THEY DIDN'T KNOW."** – attitude and perceptions of legal professionals – from the interview transcript

Overlap with:

"THEY OFTEN LACK EVEN THE VERY BASIC UNDERSTANDING OF THE INTERPRETERS' ROLE." – from the survey.

- "BECAUSE IN MAGISTRATES' COURT YOU'VE GOT THE MAGISTRATES AND THEY USUALLY HAVE NO IDEA WHAT THEY'RE DOING, ESPECIALLY WHEN IT COMES TO INTERPRETERS."
- "SO YOU GET THAT TYPICAL, TELL HIM/ASK HIM/EXPLAIN TO HIM, BOTH FROM MAGISTRATE AND BUT ALSO FROM LEGAL ADVISORS WHO ARE ACTUALLY LEGALLY QUALIFIED AND THEY SHOULD KNOW WHAT THE INTERPRETER'S ROLE IS."
- "BECAUSE THEY DON'T KNOW, THEY USUALLY SEE US AS SOMEBODY WHO IS REPRESENTING THEM AND BEING THERE WITH THEM AND FOR THEM."
- "LIKE WE'RE STANDING THERE WITH THEM, SO WE ARE WITH THEM ON THEIR SIDE."
- "TELL HIM, HE HAS THE RIGHT TO HAVE A SOLICITOR, ASK HIM WHETHER HE WANTS ONE."
- "AND THEN THE USHER HANDS YOU THE MEANS FORM AND TELLS YOU, "JUST GO AND FILL IT OUT WITH HIM".
- "THE ONLY ISSUE, WHEN THERE IS AN ISSUE WITH CROWN COURTS AND BARRISTERS, THAT'S KIND OF AN OPPOSITE ISSUE. IT'S NOT LIKE THEY TALK TO US WHAT TO TELL THE DEFENDANTS, THEY SKIP US COMPLETELY. THEY'RE LIKE, "NO, WE DON'T NEED INTERPRETERS," AND THEY JUST GO AND SPEAK TO THE DEFENDANT EVEN THOUGH

THE DEFENDANT HAS LIMITED ENGLISH. BECAUSE THEY THINK NO, NO, HIS/HER ENGLISH WILL DO.”

8. “THE EMBARRASSMENT IS KIND OF A STRAIN; IT PUTS YOU UNDER MORE PRESSURE”

- “THE EMBARRASSMENT IS KIND OF A STRAIN; IT PUTS YOU UNDER MORE PRESSURE BECAUSE YOU FEEL STUPID BY HAVING TO SAY THAT. SO IT KIND OF MAKES ME NERVOUS, MORE NERVOUS, AND IT CAN AFFECT YOUR PERFORMANCE.
- “WELL, YOU GET IN AN AWKWARD POSITION WHEN YOU HAVE TO ASK THEM TO STOP IT, AS POLITELY AS POSSIBLE. AND IT’S EMBARRASSING FOR YOU BECAUSE BASICALLY YOU LOOK LIKE AN IDIOT. YOU LOOK LIKE SOMEBODY WHO IS TRYING TO PATRONISE THE COURT, WHICH IS NOT WHAT YOU’RE DOING, BUT THAT’S HOW MANY PEOPLE WILL PERCEIVE IT ON THE OTHER END.”
- “FRANKLY, NOW I’M SCARED TO DO IT BECAUSE I DON’T WANT TO HAVE ANY MORE COMPLAINTS LIKE THAT.”
- “AND THE WORST THINGS THAT CAN HAPPEN IS WHEN THE CUSTODY STAFF AND THE DETAINEE START ARGUING... AND YOU’RE CAUGHT IN THE MIDDLE OF THAT”.
- “AND IF THE TWO OF THEM ARE ARGUING BETWEEN THEMSELVES, I’VE GOT NO ISSUE, THEY CAN ARGUE THE WHOLE NIGHT LONG AND I’LL BE INTERPRETING THAT, I DON’T MIND. BUT IF THEY’RE BOTH TALKING TO ME IN THIS MANNER, THAT’S NOT SOMETHING I’M COMFORTABLE WITH.”
- “ONCE THEY START ARGUING, YOU CAN’T DO ANYTHING, BECAUSE NOBODY WILL LISTEN TO YOU.”

9. “I’M HERE TO INTERPRET, SO WHATEVER YOU SAY TO THE DEFENDANT, I WILL HAPPILY INTERPRET.” – from the interview transcript

Overlap with:

“MY ROLE IS TO MAKE SURE THAT THE NON-ENGLISH SPEAKER UNDERSTANDS EVERYTHING THAT AN ENGLISH SPEAKING PERSON WOULD UNDERSTAND. AND ALSO THAT HE/SHE CAN EXPRESS EVERYTHING THE WAY HE/SHE WANTS WITHOUT BEING LIMITED BY INSUFFICIENT VOCABULARY OR FAULTY GRAMMAR.” – from the survey

- “YEAH, CHANNEL, YEAH.”
- “I’M THERE INDEPENDENTLY”
- I DON’T REALLY INSTRUCT THEM, I JUST TELL THEM, “DON’T...” – dealing with non-English speaking litigants
- “I SEE INTERPRETERS NOT BEHAVING PROPERLY” – stepping out of their role and breach code of conduct.

10. “IF YOU’RE NOT GOOD ENOUGH TO BE A CLEANER, AS A FOREIGNER, THEN YOU’LL BECOME AN INTERPRETER.” – from the interview transcript

Overlap from the survey:

- **“IT’S REALLY DEMEANING.” (HOWEVER MANY PROFESSIONALS (MAGISTRATES, LEGAL ADVISORS, SOLICITORS) TREAT INTERPRETERS AS INFERIORS WHO ARE THERE TO “ASSIST AND HELP THOSE OTHER STUPID FOREIGNERS WHO CAN’T SPEAK ENGLISH”).) – from the survey**
- “YEAH, IF YOU’RE NOT GOOD ENOUGH TO BE A CLEANER, AS A FOREIGNER, THEN YOU’LL BECOME AN INTERPRETER. SOMETIMES I REALLY GET THAT FEELING; THIS IS HOW THEY PERCEIVE IT.”

Additional theme has emerged from the survey:

“WHEN YOU SAY “FACILITIES”, THE ONLY THING THAT I CAN THINK OF ARE THE HEADPHONES THAT ARE USED DURING LONGER HEARINGS (USUALLY TRIALS) AT CROWN COURTS. IF THEY ARE GOOD, THEY CAN HELP BUT THE COURTS NEVER PROVIDE THEM AUTOMATICALLY, WE ALWAYS HAVE TO ASK FOR THEM.”

Overlapping themes (access points):

1. Pressure/Strain
2. Respect/Lack of respect
3. Physical settings/environment
4. “They don’t know” (about the law professionals’ view of interpreters’ role)
5. Interpreter as a friend
6. Interpreter as device/tool
7. Interpreter as a channel (facilitator of communication?)

APPENDIX 13: AUDIO TRANSCRIPTS ANALYSIS OF INTERVIEWS WITH LEGAL PROFESSIONALS

13.1 Colour codes used for In Vivo Coding: interviews with legal professionals

Colour	Name of code/theme/meaning
	Interpreters are outside/inside of the legal process
	About status
	Interpreter's role is to interpret/neutral conduit
	expectations of the interpreter
	Quality of interpreters matters
	impact of the interpreter on the process
	Importance of the interpreters' role
	challenges of interpreters
	Interpreters must be independent
	Sourcing, recruiting and provision of interpreters
	Negative evaluation of interpreters
	Positive valuation of interpreters
	Interpreter as a facilitator of communication
	Issues of pay and responsibility
	Obligations of professionals (interpreters, what they should or should not do)
	Interpreter as a "friend"
	Recommendation for improvement
	feedback on interpreting from non-English speaking clients

13.2 Coding and thematic analysis of audio transcripts: interviews with legal professionals

13.2.1 Respondent 1: first stage coding

Respondent 1 (Criminal barrister from chamber N5)

File name (transcript): interview with Criminal Barrister Chamber N5)

Audio length – 0:28:06

Interview took place on 14/04/2015

Number of codes: 58

First cycle coding methods: Initial coding, process coding, In Vivo coding

1. “NO, I MEAN NOT REALLY BECAUSE INTERPRETERS ARE NOT AT THE FOREFRONT OF THE LEGAL PROCEEDING”
2. “AND SO HAVE THEY CHANGED IN STATUS? I DON’T THINK SO”
3. “HAVE THEY GOT MORE PROFESSIONAL? AGAIN... THERE HASN’T BEEN A NOTICEABLE CHANGE OR SHIFT AS FAR AS I’M CONCERNED REALLY”
4. “SIMPLY TO, ONE, INTERPRET”
5. “WELL, IF YOU’VE GOT AN INTERPRETER FOR A DEFENDANT IN COURT, I MEAN IT’S TO SIT IN THE DOCK WITH THE DEFENDANT AND TRANSLATE THE EVIDENCE AS IT’S SAID”
6. “AND THEN IF THE DEFENDANT GIVES EVIDENCE, TO SIMPLY TRANSLATE WHAT HE/SHE SAYS”
7. “I MEAN SIMPLY TO TRANSLATE/INTERPRET THE QUESTIONS ASKED BY THE BARRISTERS AND THE REPLIES TO THE QUESTIONS”
8. “I MEAN IN OTHER WORDS IT IS SIMPLY NO MORE OR NO LESS THAN A JOB OF INTERPRETATION”
9. “YEAH, THEY’RE A NEUTRAL”
10. “THEY SHOULD BE AN ENTIRELY NEUTRAL CONDUIT”
11. “WHAT HE SHOULD DO IS INTERPRET, JUST INTERPRET”
12. “AND WHAT HE SHOULDN’T DO IS HE SHOULDN’T OFFER ANY OPINION OF THE EVIDENCE OR ANY ASSISTANCE TO THE DEFENDANT”
13. “I THINK THE QUALITY OF THE INTERPRETER IS IMPORTANT AND THE BARRISTER’S JOB IS MADE A LOT EASIER BY A GOOD ARTICULATE INTERPRETER”
14. “THE JOB BECOMES MUCH MORE DIFFICULT WITH A LESS GOOD INTERPRETER”
15. YEAH, I MEAN THERE IS A DIFFERENCE BECAUSE IF YOU DON’T HAVE AN INTERPRETER THE JURY ARE GETTING A DIRECT RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS FROM THE DEFENDANT. SO THERE IS A MORE DIRECT FORM OF COMMUNICATION”
16. “AND IF THERE IS AN INTERPRETER, OBVIOUSLY IT IS INDIRECT, IT COMES THROUGH THE INTERPRETER.”

17. "AND SO THE **INTERPRETER'S ROLE IS VERY IMPORTANT** BECAUSE OBVIOUSLY THE PERFORMANCE OF THE INTERPRETER WILL HAVE SOME IMPACT ON THE WAY THAT A JURY APPROACHES ANY DEFENDANT'S EVIDENCE"
18. "IT'S A SLOWER PROCESS; IT'S OBVIOUSLY A SLOW PROCESS"
19. "I THINK THE COMMUNICATION BETWEEN THE BARRISTER AND THE INTERPRETER IS IMPORTANT. I MEAN SOMETIMES YOU CAN WORK VERY WELL WITH INTERPRETERS AND SOMETIMES IT'S A LOT MORE DIFFICULT."
20. "**THE INTERPRETER'S ROLE IS VERY IMPORTANT**"
21. "IT'S NOT ABOUT SIMPLY INTERPRETING, IT'S ABOUT THE RELATIONSHIP THE INTERPRETER HAS WITH THE BARRISTER, THE RELATIONSHIP THE INTERPRETER HAS WITH THE DEFENDANT."
22. "BUT THE SKILL, I GUESS, IN INTERPRETING, IS MAKING A DIFFICULT EXERCISE APPEAR TO BE FAIRLY STRAIGHTFORWARD"
23. "MEANING THAT IT DOESN'T HAVE TO BE A RELATIONSHIP AS SUCH, BUT WHAT I SIMPLY MEAN IS THAT THE PERSONALITY OF THE INTERPRETER IS IMPORTANT"
24. "WITHOUT NECESSARILY HAVING ANY PARTICULAR KIND OF RELATIONSHIP, AS SUCH, WITH THAT INTERPRETER, IF THE PERSONALITY OF THE INTERPRETER IS SOMETHING THAT'S EASY TO ENGAGE WITH AND IS RESPONSIVE AND OPEN, THAT MAKES IT A LOT EASIER IN COURT"
25. "SOMETIMES YOU GET INTERPRETERS WHO, JUST BY WAY OF PERSONALITY, ARE QUITE RETIRING PEOPLE AND IT MAKES IT MORE DIFFICULT"
26. "I THINK WHAT'S IMPORTANT IS FOR AN INTERPRETER TO BE VERY ENGAGED IN THE PROCESS, VERY ALIVE TO THE PROCESS AND REALLY A GOOD INTERPRETER IS ALIVE TO... THERE ARE LOTS OF NUANCES AND JUST GETTING THE MEANING OF WHAT IS BEING SAID"
27. "YEAH, VERY ALERT. I MEAN VERY ALERT, YEAH. **THEY SHOULD BE ALERT AND QUICK AND RESPONSIVE AND ENGAGED**"
28. "**I THINK IT'S HARD WORK BEING AN INTERPRETER**"
29. "YES, GOSH, THE LEGAL PROCESS. I MEAN THE INTERPRETER IS PART OF THE PROCESS OF WHAT'S HAPPENING IN COURT. I THINK IT'S A SORT OF... I'M NOT SURE IT'S THE RIGHT WAY OF APPROACHING IT. IS THE INTERPRETER OUTSIDE OR INSIDE THE PROCESS? I MEAN IF AN INTERPRETER IS USED, AN INTERPRETER IS PART OF THE PROCESS THAT IS ADOPTED IN A COURTROOM"
30. "SO YOU COULD SAY, IN TERMS OF STATUS, ALTHOUGH AN INTERPRETER IS NOT A LAWYER AND IS NOT INVOLVED IN QUESTIONS OF LAW, THE INTERPRETER IS VERY MUCH PART OF THE EVIDENTIAL PROCESS. **AND SO IT PLAYS AN IMPORTANT ROLE**"
31. "I DON'T THINK IT HELPS TO PUT A HIERARCHY; I DON'T THINK IT HELPS TO HAVE QUESTIONS OF STATUS. THE JUDGE PLAYS A ROLE, THE BARRISTERS PLAY A ROLE, THEY PLAY DIFFERENT ROLES. THE INTERPRETER PLAYS A ROLE, THE DEFENDANT IS PLAYING A ROLE AND THE JURY PLAYS... YOU KNOW, EVERYONE IS PERFORMING DIFFERENT ROLES. WHERE THEY APPEAR ON A HIERARCHY, I DON'T SEE IT THAT WAY"

32. "THEY'RE NOT PART OF THE LEGAL PROFESSION, BUT THEY ARE PROFESSIONAL PEOPLE PLAYING A PART IN THE TRIAL PROCESS, AND AN IMPORTANT PART BECAUSE THEY ARE MAKING THE EVIDENCE ACCESSIBLE TO THE JURY"
33. I MEAN I HAVEN'T REALLY THOUGHT ABOUT STATUS OF AN INTERPRETER. I DON'T THINK SO, PARTICULARLY. I THINK AN INTERPRETER IS ALWAYS ACTUALLY USUALLY, I MEAN AGAIN THERE ARE... I'M TRYING TO THINK.
34. "USUALLY AN INTERPRETER IS TREATED BY THE COURT WITH RESPECT, ALWAYS. BECAUSE THEY HAVE AN IMPORTANT ROLE TO PLAY. IF THEY WEREN'T THERE, YOU COULDN'T HAVE A TRIAL"
35. "I MEAN I HAVE SEEN INTERPRETERS TREATED WITH DISRESPECT WHEN THEY'VE BEEN VERY LATE OR THINGS LIKE THAT, LATE FOR COURT, OR HAVEN'T APPEARED OR STUFF LIKE THAT"
36. "BUT ON THE WHOLE... I MEAN I THINK THEY'RE NOT BOWED DOWN TO AND PEOPLE DON'T... NO ONE TREATS THEM WITH INORDINATE RESPECT"
37. "BUT I **THINK AS A PROFESSION THEY ARE RESPECTED, YEAH.**"
38. "I DON'T THINK THEY'RE LOOKED DOWN UPON. I THINK THEY'RE TREATED WITH RESPECT AS PROFESSIONAL PEOPLE USUALLY ARE."
39. "I CAN SEE THAT. WHAT I HAVE SAID, I HAVE INTIMATED TO YOU, IS THAT I THINK TO SOME EXTENT, LIKE EVERYBODY ELSE IN THE COURT, WHETHER IT BE THE JUDGE OR THE BARRISTER, OR INDEED THE DEFENDANT, HOW THEY PERFORM AFFECTS THE RESPECT THAT THEY ARE ACCORDED, THAT THEY ARE GIVEN"
40. "I THINK THAT IF YOU GET INTERPRETERS WHO, FOR INSTANCE, COME TO COURT, ONE, THEY DON'T COME ON TIME. TWO, THEY DON'T LOOK SMART; SOME INTERPRETERS ARE VERY SMART, LOOK GOOD. IF YOU DON'T LOOK GOOD, IF YOU'RE NOT EFFICIENT AND ALERT AND SO FORTH, YEAH, I THINK COURTS, PEOPLE WILL GET PISSSED OFF, YEAH"
41. "I THINK IT'S A VERY DIFFICULT JOB"
42. "YOU'RE THERE AREN'T YOU, IN A WAY, REPRESENTING THE DEFENDANT"
43. "YOU'RE THERE **AS A CONDUIT OF COMMUNICATION FOR A DEFENDANT.** AND SO YOU SHOULD LOOK GOOD, YOU SHOULD DO IT EFFICIENTLY AND WELL AND LOOK AS IF YOU'RE ALIVE TO THE JOB"
44. "WHAT I'M SAYING IS THAT **IT SHOULD BE EXPECTED THAT THEY'D BE OF GOOD QUALITY.** I MEAN THEY SHOULD BE A GOOD QUALITY, FOR THE REASONS I'VE SAID. ONE, BECAUSE IN FAIRNESS TO THE DEFENDANT. TWO, IT MAKES LIFE MUCH EASIER FOR THE BARRISTER. AND THREE, FOR JUST THE COURT PROCESS GOES MUCH EASIER IF THERE IS A GOOD INTERPRETER"
45. "ACTUALLY, I HAVEN'T USED AN INTERPRETER FOR A BIT. BUT ON THE WHOLE MY INTERPRETERS HAVE BEEN PRETTY GOOD ACTUALLY, ON THE WHOLE"
46. "I HAVEN'T HAD A REALLY BAD EXPERIENCE. I'VE HAD SOME THAT HAVE BEEN A BIT SLOW OR A BIT... BUT ON THE WHOLE THEY'VE BEEN OKAY"
47. "WELL, THE PROCESS **INVOLVES, AS I SAY, MAKING ACCESSIBLE TO THE JURY THE DEFENDANT'S CASE IN THE CLEAREST POSSIBLE WAY.** AND MAKING ACCESSIBLE TO THE

DEFENDANT QUESTIONS ASKED OF HIM BY THE BARRISTER, IF HE GIVES EVIDENCE, AND THE EVIDENCE IN THE CASE AS A WHOLE.”

48. “AND SO THEREFORE IT INVOLVES A HIGH DEGREE OF COMPETENCE AND A HIGH DEGREE OF RESPONSIBILITY AS **THE INTERPRETER IS THE CONDUIT OF COMMUNICATION FOR THE DEFENDANT IN THE TRIAL PROCESS AND A VITAL INGREDIENT IN THE FAIRNESS OF THE TRIAL.**
49. **“THEIR WORK LIES RIGHT AT THE HEART OF QUESTIONS OF FAIRNESS AND JUSTICE AND ALL THE REST OF IT. SO IT’S A VERY IMPORTANT ROLE”**
50. “NOT REALLY. I MEAN MAYBE, BUT NOT REALLY, NO.”
51. “WELL, THEY DO HAVE THESE HEADPHONES, THESE THINGS THEY PUT IN THEIR EAR. I MEAN YES, I THINK ADEQUATE PROVISION IS MADE SO THEY CAN AT LEAST HEAR, YEAH”
52. **“YEAH, IT’S VERY HARD WORK, NO, THERE ISN’T THAT. IT’S AN ALL-DAY AFFAIR”**
53. **“IT’S SOMETHING THAT SHOULD BE LOOKED AT. NO, I THINK IT’S VERY HARD. I THINK IF THEY’RE INTERPRETING ALL DAY, I THINK THAT’S VERY TOUGH”**
54. “WELL, THERE’S THE USUAL COURT HOURS AT 10:30, THAT MIGHT BE A BREAK OF 15 MINUTES AND THEN YOU HAVE LUNCH BREAK FOR AN HOUR AND THEN YOU HAVE FROM 2:00 UNTIL ABOUT 4:15, THERE MIGHT BE A SMALL BREAK OF 10 MINUTES, 15 MINUTE BREAK”
55. “YEAH, SURE, YEAH, OF COURSE. YES, I THINK THAT IS SOMETHING THAT COULD BE LOOKED AT. I THINK THE INTERPRETERS WOULD BE AGAINST IT BECAUSE THEY’D BE GETTING LESS MONEY”
56. “BECAUSE IT’S ONLY A LIMITED AMOUNT OF MONEY. I THINK IF YOU SAID, IN FAIRNESS TO THE DEFENDANT HE SHOULD HAVE TWO INTERPRETERS EACH DAY, WORKING FOR TWO HOURS OR WHATEVER, I THINK...”
57. “YEAH, I THINK TO THE INTERPRETER THAT WOULD BE DIFFICULT MOST PROBABLY, I DON’T KNOW”
58. **“BUT IT’S DIFFICULT, IT’S VERY WEARYING FOR AN INTERPRETER TO BE GOING ALL DAY”**

Note from the researcher: The interview was recorded at the time of completing the Survey by the researcher during the interview with the respondent. Therefore, the transcript reflects exactly what is stated in the survey, so there is no need to identify themes from the survey separately as there will be 100% overlap.

13.2.2 Respondent 1: second stage coding

Respondent 1 (criminal barrister from the chamber N5)

File name (transcript): interview with Respondent 1 (Criminal Barrister, Chamber 5)

Audio length – 0:28:06

Interview took place on 14/04/2015

Number of codes: 58

Second cycle coding: clustering initial codes, searching for themes

1. “INTERPRETERS ARE NOT AT THE FOREFRONT OF THE LEGAL PROCEEDING” -

- “NO, I MEAN NOT REALLY BECAUSE INTERPRETERS ARE NOT AT THE FOREFRONT OF THE LEGAL PROCEEDING”
- “YES, GOSH, THE LEGAL PROCESS. **I MEAN THE INTERPRETER IS PART OF THE PROCESS OF WHAT’S HAPPENING IN COURT.** I THINK IT’S A SORT OF... I’M NOT SURE IT’S THE RIGHT WAY OF APPROACHING IT. IS THE INTERPRETER OUTSIDE OR INSIDE THE PROCESS? I MEAN IF AN INTERPRETER IS USED, AN INTERPRETER IS PART OF THE PROCESS THAT IS ADOPTED IN A COURTROOM”

2. “AND SO HAVE THEY CHANGED IN STATUS? I DON’T THINK SO” – on the status of the profession

- “HAVE THEY GOT MORE PROFESSIONAL? AGAIN... THERE HASN’T BEEN A NOTICEABLE CHANGE OR SHIFT AS FAR AS I’M CONCERNED REALLY”
- “I DON’T THINK IT HELPS TO PUT A HIERARCHY; I DON’T THINK IT HELPS TO HAVE QUESTIONS OF STATUS. THE JUDGE PLAYS A ROLE, THE BARRISTERS PLAY A ROLE, THEY PLAY DIFFERENT ROLES. THE INTERPRETER PLAYS A ROLE, THE DEFENDANT IS PLAYING A ROLE AND THE JURY PLAYS... YOU KNOW, EVERYONE IS PERFORMING DIFFERENT ROLES. WHERE THEY APPEAR ON A HIERARCHY, I DON’T SEE IT THAT WAY”
- “I MEAN I HAVE SEEN INTERPRETERS TREATED WITH DISRESPECT WHEN THEY’VE BEEN VERY LATE OR THINGS LIKE THAT, LATE FOR COURT, OR HAVEN’T APPEARED OR STUFF LIKE THAT”
- “BUT ON THE WHOLE... I MEAN I THINK THEY’RE NOT BOWED DOWN TO AND PEOPLE DON’T... NO ONE TREATS THEM WITH INORDINATE RESPECT”
- “BUT I THINK AS A PROFESSION THEY ARE RESPECTED, YEAH.”
- “I DON’T THINK THEY’RE LOOKED DOWN UPON. I THINK THEY’RE TREATED WITH RESPECT AS PROFESSIONAL PEOPLE USUALLY ARE.”

- "I CAN SEE THAT. WHAT I HAVE SAID, I HAVE INTIMATED TO YOU, IS THAT I THINK TO SOME EXTENT, LIKE EVERYBODY ELSE IN THE COURT, WHETHER IT BE THE JUDGE OR THE BARRISTER, OR INDEED THE DEFENDANT, HOW THEY PERFORM AFFECTS THE RESPECT THAT THEY ARE ACCORDED, THAT THEY ARE GIVEN"
- "I THINK THAT IF YOU GET INTERPRETERS WHO, FOR INSTANCE, COME TO COURT, ONE, THEY DON'T COME ON TIME. TWO, THEY DON'T LOOK SMART; SOME INTERPRETERS ARE VERY SMART, LOOK GOOD. IF YOU DON'T LOOK GOOD, IF YOU'RE NOT EFFICIENT AND ALERT AND SO FORTH, YEAH, I THINK COURTS, PEOPLE WILL GET PISSSED OFF, YEAH"

3. **"THEY SHOULD BE AN ENTIRELY NEUTRAL CONDUIT"** – how the role of interpreters is seen by legal professionals

- **"SIMPLY TO, ONE, INTERPRET"**
- "WELL, IF YOU'VE GOT AN INTERPRETER FOR A DEFENDANT IN COURT, I MEAN IT'S TO SIT IN THE DOCK WITH THE DEFENDANT AND TRANSLATE THE EVIDENCE AS IT'S SAID"
- "AND THEN IF THE DEFENDANT GIVES EVIDENCE, TO SIMPLY TRANSLATE WHAT HE/SHE SAYS"
- "I MEAN SIMPLY TO TRANSLATE/INTERPRET THE QUESTIONS ASKED BY THE BARRISTERS AND THE REPLIES TO THE QUESTIONS"
- "I MEAN IN OTHER WORDS IT IS SIMPLY NO MORE OR NO LESS THAN A JOB OF INTERPRETATION"
- **"YEAH, THEY'RE A NEUTRAL"**
- "WHAT HE SHOULD DO IS INTERPRET, JUST INTERPRET"
- **"YOU'RE THERE AREN'T YOU, IN A WAY, REPRESENTING THE DEFENDANT"**
- "YOU'RE THERE **AS A CONDUIT OF COMMUNICATION FOR A DEFENDANT**. AND SO YOU SHOULD LOOK GOOD, YOU SHOULD DO IT EFFICIENTLY AND WELL AND LOOK AS IF YOU'RE ALIVE TO THE JOB"
- "WELL, THE PROCESS INVOLVES, AS I SAY, MAKING ACCESSIBLE TO THE JURY THE DEFENDANT'S CASE IN THE clearest possible way. AND MAKING ACCESSIBLE TO THE DEFENDANT QUESTIONS ASKED OF HIM BY THE BARRISTER, IF HE GIVES EVIDENCE, AND THE EVIDENCE IN THE CASE AS A WHOLE."
- "AND SO THEREFORE IT INVOLVES A HIGH DEGREE OF COMPETENCE AND A HIGH DEGREE OF RESPONSIBILITY AS **THE INTERPRETER IS THE CONDUIT OF COMMUNICATION FOR THE DEFENDANT IN THE TRIAL PROCESS AND A VITAL INGREDIENT IN THE FAIRNESS OF THE TRIAL.**"

4. **"I THINK THE QUALITY OF THE INTERPRETER IS IMPORTANT AND THE BARRISTER'S JOB IS MADE A LOT EASIER BY A GOOD ARTICULATE INTERPRETER"** – expectations

- "THE JOB BECOMES MUCH MORE DIFFICULT WITH A LESS GOOD INTERPRETER"
- "BUT THE SKILL, I GUESS, IN INTERPRETING, IS MAKING A DIFFICULT EXERCISE APPEAR TO BE FAIRLY STRAIGHTFORWARD"

- "WHAT I'M SAYING IS THAT IT SHOULD BE EXPECTED THAT THEY'D BE OF GOOD QUALITY. I MEAN THEY SHOULD BE A GOOD QUALITY, FOR THE REASONS I'VE SAID. ONE, BECAUSE IN FAIRNESS TO THE DEFENDANT. TWO, IT MAKES LIFE MUCH EASIER FOR THE BARRISTER. AND THREE, FOR JUST THE COURT PROCESS GOES MUCH EASIER IF THERE IS A GOOD INTERPRETER"
- "ACTUALLY, I HAVEN'T USED AN INTERPRETER FOR A BIT. BUT ON THE WHOLE MY INTERPRETERS HAVE BEEN PRETTY GOOD ACTUALLY, ON THE WHOLE"
- "I HAVEN'T HAD A REALLY BAD EXPERIENCE. I'VE HAD SOME THAT HAVE BEEN A BIT SLOW OR A BIT... BUT ON THE WHOLE THEY'VE BEEN OKAY"

5. "THE INTERPRETER'S ROLE IS VERY IMPORTANT" – on importance of the interpreter's role in court.

- "AND SO THE INTERPRETER'S ROLE IS VERY IMPORTANT BECAUSE OBVIOUSLY THE PERFORMANCE OF THE INTERPRETER WILL HAVE SOME IMPACT ON THE WAY THAT A JURY APPROACHES ANY DEFENDANT'S EVIDENCE"
- "MEANING THAT IT DOESN'T HAVE TO BE A RELATIONSHIP AS SUCH, BUT WHAT I SIMPLY MEAN IS THAT THE PERSONALITY OF THE INTERPRETER IS IMPORTANT"
- "SO YOU COULD SAY, IN TERMS OF STATUS, ALTHOUGH AN INTERPRETER IS NOT A LAWYER AND IS NOT INVOLVED IN QUESTIONS OF LAW, THE INTERPRETER IS VERY MUCH PART OF THE EVIDENTIAL PROCESS. AND SO IT PLAYS AN IMPORTANT ROLE"
- "THEY'RE NOT PART OF THE LEGAL PROFESSION, BUT THEY ARE PROFESSIONAL PEOPLE PLAYING A PART IN THE TRIAL PROCESS, AND AN IMPORTANT PART BECAUSE THEY ARE MAKING THE EVIDENCE ACCESSIBLE TO THE JURY"
- "USUALLY AN INTERPRETER IS TREATED BY THE COURT WITH RESPECT, ALWAYS. BECAUSE THEY HAVE AN IMPORTANT ROLE TO PLAY. IF THEY WEREN'T THERE, YOU COULDN'T HAVE A TRIAL"
- "THEIR WORK LIES RIGHT AT THE HEART OF QUESTIONS OF FAIRNESS AND JUSTICE AND ALL THE REST OF IT. SO IT'S A VERY IMPORTANT ROLE"

6. "I THINK IT'S HARD WORK BEING AN INTERPRETER" – how the challenges of interpreters in court are seen by legal professionals.

- "I THINK IT'S A VERY DIFFICULT JOB"
- "YEAH, IT'S VERY HARD WORK, NO, THERE ISN'T THAT. IT'S AN ALL-DAY AFFAIR"
- "IT'S SOMETHING THAT SHOULD BE LOOKED AT. NO, I THINK IT'S VERY HARD. I THINK IF THEY'RE INTERPRETING ALL DAY, I THINK THAT'S VERY TOUGH"
- "BUT IT'S DIFFICULT, IT'S VERY WEARYING FOR AN INTERPRETER TO BE GOING ALL DAY"
- "WELL, THERE'S THE USUAL COURT HOURS AT 10:30, THAT MIGHT BE A BREAK OF 15 MINUTES AND THEN YOU HAVE LUNCH BREAK FOR AN HOUR AND THEN YOU HAVE FROM

2:00 UNTIL ABOUT 4:15, THERE MIGHT BE A SMALL BREAK OF 10 MINUTES, 15 MINUTE BREAK”

- “YEAH, SURE, YEAH, OF COURSE. YES, I THINK THAT IS SOMETHING THAT COULD BE LOOKED AT. I THINK THE INTERPRETERS WOULD BE AGAINST IT BECAUSE THEY’D BE GETTING LESS MONEY”
- “BECAUSE IT’S ONLY A LIMITED AMOUNT OF MONEY. I THINK IF YOU SAID, IN FAIRNESS TO THE DEFENDANT HE SHOULD HAVE TWO INTERPRETERS EACH DAY, WORKING FOR TWO HOURS OR WHATEVER, I THINK...”
- “YEAH, I THINK TO THE INTERPRETER THAT WOULD BE DIFFICULT MOST PROBABLY, I DON’T KNOW”

7. “THEY SHOULD BE ALERT AND QUICK AND RESPONSIVE AND ENGAGED” – expectations of legal professionals of the interpreters.

- “WITHOUT NECESSARILY HAVING ANY PARTICULAR KIND OF RELATIONSHIP, AS SUCH, WITH THAT INTERPRETER, IF THE PERSONALITY OF THE INTERPRETER IS SOMETHING THAT’S EASY TO ENGAGE WITH AND IS RESPONSIVE AND OPEN, THAT MAKES IT A LOT EASIER IN COURT”
- “SOMETIMES YOU GET INTERPRETERS WHO, JUST BY WAY OF PERSONALITY, ARE QUITE RETIRING PEOPLE AND IT MAKES IT MORE DIFFICULT”
- “I THINK WHAT’S IMPORTANT IS FOR AN INTERPRETER TO BE VERY ENGAGED IN THE PROCESS, VERY ALIVE TO THE PROCESS AND REALLY A GOOD INTERPRETER IS ALIVE TO... THERE ARE LOTS OF NUANCES AND JUST GETTING THE MEANING OF WHAT IS BEING SAID”
- “YEAH, VERY ALERT. I MEAN VERY ALERT, YEAH. THEY SHOULD BE ALERT AND QUICK AND RESPONSIVE AND ENGAGED”
- **“AND WHAT HE SHOULDN’T DO IS HE SHOULDN’T OFFER ANY OPINION OF THE EVIDENCE OR ANY ASSISTANCE TO THE DEFENDANT”**
- “IT’S NOT ABOUT SIMPLY INTERPRETING, IT’S ABOUT THE RELATIONSHIP THE INTERPRETER HAS WITH THE BARRISTER, THE RELATIONSHIP THE INTERPRETER HAS WITH THE DEFENDANT.”
- **“NOT REALLY. I MEAN MAYBE, BUT NOT REALLY, NO.”**

8. “IT’S A SLOWER PROCESS; IT’S OBVIOUSLY A SLOW PROCESS” – the impact of interpreters on the legal process and on work of legal professionals.

- YEAH, I MEAN THERE IS A DIFFERENCE BECAUSE IF YOU DON’T HAVE AN INTERPRETER THE JURY ARE GETTING A DIRECT RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS FROM THE DEFENDANT. SO THERE IS A MORE DIRECT FORM OF COMMUNICATION”

- “AND IF THERE IS AN INTERPRETER, OBVIOUSLY IT IS INDIRECT, IT COMES THROUGH THE INTERPRETER.”

So, based on the above we can identify the following themes:

1. **“I THINK IT’S HARD WORK BEING AN INTERPRETER”** - Challenges and pressures of interpreters in court as seen and recognised by the legal professionals.
2. **“THEY SHOULD BE AN ENTIRELY NEUTRAL CONDUIT”** - how the role of interpreters is seen by legal professionals.
3. **“THEY SHOULD BE ALERT AND QUICK AND RESPONSIVE AND ENGAGED”** - expectations
4. **“THE INTERPRETER’S ROLE IS VERY IMPORTANT”** – appreciation of interpreters/their role and status in the courtroom.
5. **“IT’S A SLOWER PROCESS; IT’S OBVIOUSLY A SLOW PROCESS”** – the impact of interpreters on the legal proceeding/process.

13.2.3 Respondent 12: first stage coding

Respondent 12 (Solicitor)

File name (transcript): interview with Respondent 12

Audio length – 0:17:01

Interview took place on 18/03/2016

First cycle coding methods: Initial coding, process coding, In Vivo coding

Number of codes in total: 56

1. "THE QUESTION OF WHO PAYS FOR AN INTERPRETER'S SERVICES, ABSOLUTELY, IT MUST BE ABSOLUTELY IRRELEVANT IN TERMS OF THE WAY THAT THEY PERFORM THEIR ROLE."
2. "THOSE WHO PAY, IT USED TO BE THE POLICE SERVICE, IF IT WERE A CASE AT A POLICE STATION WHERE THERE WAS AN INTERVIEW AFTER CAUTION, FOR EXAMPLE, OR OF COURSE, IF THE INTERPRETERS HAVE BEEN ASKED TO INTERPRET FOR A WITNESS IN THE CASE, FOR A PROSECUTION WITNESS."
3. "NOW, WHEN IT COMES TO THE COURT, THEN THE MINISTRY OF JUSTICE, IN EFFECT, WOULD PAY. YES, THEY WOULD PAY BECAUSE IT'S FOR THE COURT TO PROVIDE AN INTERPRETER FOR BOTH PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDINGS. IN OTHER WORDS, ANY COMPLAINANT OR ANY DEFENDANT."
4. "AND IF THERE WERE PROSECUTION WITNESSES, THEN IT WOULD BE FOR THE PROSECUTION TO ARRANGE AND PAY FOR AN INTERPRETER, BECAUSE IT MIGHT NOT BE THE SAME LANGUAGE, OF COURSE. I MEAN SOMETIMES YOU HAVE CASES, PARTICULARLY WITH TRIALS WHERE THERE MIGHT BE, OBVIOUSLY ENGLISH, BUT ALSO ONE OR TWO OR EVEN THREE DIFFERENT LANGUAGES FOR VARIOUS PARTIES, VARIOUS WITNESSES IN THE CASE."
5. "AND THEN IT'S FOR THE PROSECUTION TO PAY FOR THOSE WITNESSES."
6. "FOR THE DEFENDANT, THE COURT PAYS FOR ANY INTERPRETING SERVICES WHERE IT'S TO DO WITH THE DEFENDANT BEFORE THE COURT"
7. "BUT IT'S FOR DEFENCE SOLICITORS TO ARRANGE TO ENGAGE AN INTERPRETER FOR ANY DEFENCE WITNESSES."
8. "NOW, IN REALITY, THAT WOULD NORMALLY MEAN THAT THE PAYMENT WOULD BE OUT OF PUBLIC FUNDS BECAUSE MOST CASES, MOST SERIOUS CASES, INVOLVE REPRESENTATION OUT OF PUBLIC FUNDS THROUGH LEGAL AID. IT IS IN EFFECT AN AGENCY WITHIN THE MINISTRY OF JUSTICE THAT PAYS FOR THE INTERPRETER AGAIN."
9. "BUT IT'S A QUESTION OF WHOSE THE RESPONSIBILITY IS."
10. "THE COMPLICATION UNDER THE FRAMEWORK AGREEMENT THAT CAME INTO BEING IN 2010, THE ADDITIONAL STRAND OF COMPLICATION IS THAT THE MINISTRY OF JUSTICE OUTSOURCED THEIR CORE ACTIVITY, AS I WOULD SAY, TO ARRANGE FOR INTERPRETERS"

BY COURT STAFF CONTACTING THE INTERPRETERS DIRECTLY, BY REFERENCE TO THE NATIONAL REGISTER.”

11. “AND SO YOU HAVE THIS FILTER OF, AS IT HAPPENS, CAPITA, THE OUTSOURCE COMPANY. THEY ACTUALLY PAY THE INTERPRETERS, THEY ACTUALLY PAY THEM FAR, FAR LESS THAN USED TO BE THE CASE BEFORE THE FRAMEWORK AGREEMENT, BUT THAT’S ANOTHER STORY.”
12. “AND SO THE PAYMASTER, IN A DIRECT SENSE, HAS SHIFTED. BUT THE RESPONSIBILITY TO ARRANGE IT ALL IS STILL THAT OF THE MINISTRY OF JUSTICE.”
13. “YOU CAN’T CONTRACT OUT THE RESPONSIBILITY FOR THERE BEING INTERPRETING SERVICES PROVIDED.”
14. **“YOU CAN CONTRACT OUT THE FUNCTION, BUT NOT THE RESPONSIBILITY.”**
15. “AND SO IN EFFECT THEY’RE PAYING BECAUSE THEY PAY CAPITA, WHO THEN PAY THE INTERPRETERS.”
16. **“BUT THE VERY REAL CONCERN IS THAT INTERPRETERS MUST ALWAYS REMAIN INDEPENDENT OF ALL PARTIES. AND THAT’S A KEY PROFESSIONAL OBLIGATION.”**
17. “NOW, SOMEWHERE, WE WOULD HAVE TO LOOK FOR IT, AS PART OF THE TRAINING COURSE, MORE OR LESS DIRECTLY AT THE BEGINNING OF IT FOR LEGAL INTERPRETERS, INTERPRETER STUDENTS”
18. “AND THERE’S SOME OVERLAP, BUT THERE’S SOME DISSIMILARITIES AS WELL. AND THAT’S WHY I SAID THAT **THE ROLE OF THE INTERPRETER IS TO COMMUNICATE, TO STRIVE TO COMMUNICATE AS COMPLETELY AS POSSIBLE, TO ENABLE COMMUNICATION.**”
19. **“IT’S NOT TO HELP THE, FOR EXAMPLE, THE DEFENDANT.”**
20. **“IT’S CERTAINLY NOT TO HELP THE POLICE, OR THE PROSECUTION, OR THE COURT.”**
21. **“BUT NONETHELESS THERE ARE OBLIGATIONS TO ALL PARTICIPANTS IN THE SYSTEM.”**
22. **“AS A PROFESSIONAL YOU HAVE OBLIGATIONS TO THE SYSTEM.”**
23. **“AND THERE ARE VARIOUS THINGS YOU CERTAINLY SHOULDN’T DO.”**
24. **“YOU SHOULDN’T GIVE ADVICE.”**
25. **“I THINK, AGAIN, I MIGHT HAVE COVERED THIS. YOU SHOULDN’T GIVE LEGAL ADVICE.”**
26. **“YOU SHOULDN’T FRATERNISE WITH THE PERSON, THE DEFENDANT OR WITNESS FOR WHOM YOU’RE INTERPRETING.”**
27. **“CLEARLY YOU’RE POLITE TO THEM, BUT YOU SHOULD NOT FRATERNISE, ALTHOUGH I’M AFRAID IT HAPPENS ALL THE TIME.”**
28. **“YOU SHOULD CERTAINLY INTERPRET AS FAITHFULLY AS YOU CAN ACCORDING TO YOUR ABILITIES AND YOUR TRAINING.”**
29. **“YOU SHOULD CERTAINLY IN NO WAY IMPROVE UPON OR EMBELLISH WHAT THE PARTY, SUCH AS THE DEFENDANT, IS BEING ASKED AND INDEED, HOW THE OTHER PARTY OR THE DEFENDANT RESPONDS.”**
30. **“AND YOU SHOULDN’T ADD THINGS OR IN ANY WAY SEEK TO REFINE WHAT’S BEING SAID.”**
31. **“ALSO, WHAT YOU SHOULD CERTAINLY NOT DO IS TRY AND MAKE SENSE OF SOMETHING THAT DOESN’T MAKE SENSE.”**

32. "BECAUSE SOMETIMES IN GENERAL CONVERSATION, LET ALONE IN GIVING EVIDENCE OR IN ANSWERING QUESTIONS, OR EVEN ASKING QUESTIONS, THE PARTICIPANTS DON'T MAKE SENSE IN WHAT THEY'RE ASKING OR WHAT THEY'RE ANSWERING. **IT'S NOT FOR THE INTERPRETER TO MAKE SENSE OF IT.**"
33. "AND SO IT'S PERFECTLY APPROPRIATE FOR AN INTERPRETER TO BE LEFT IN POSITION WHERE THE ANSWER IS GIVEN FROM THE... LET'S SAY THE DEFENDANT, AND THE COURT OR THE ADVOCATE ASKING THE QUESTION SAYS, "WELL, THAT DOESN'T MAKE ANY SENSE." TO WHICH THE STRAIGHTFORWARD ANSWER IS, "IT'S NOT FOR ME TO MAKE SENSE OF IT, THAT'S WHAT THE WITNESS SAID."
34. "SO IT'S QUITE A COMPLEX PHILOSOPHICAL, AND INDEED, **IT'S A COMPLEX PROCESS OF COMMUNICATION AND OF KNOWING YOUR ROLE**, WHICH IS JUST AS ONEROUS, REALLY, AS ANY OTHER PARTY TO THE PROCEEDINGS. BUT IT'S DIFFERENT."
35. "THE DEFENCE ADVOCATE'S ROLE IS TO ADVANCE HIS OR HER CLIENT'S CASE TO AN OPTIMUM LEVEL. BUT EQUALLY THAT OBLIGATION CARRIES ANY NUMBER OF QUALIFICATIONS AND WE HAVE PROFESSIONAL RULES."
36. "WELL, SO ACTUALLY THERE IS A CODE FOR INTERPRETERS."
37. "THERE ARE CERTAIN THINGS YOU SHOULD CERTAINLY NEVER DO."
38. "IT FOLLOWS FROM THAT, FOR EXAMPLE, THAT IF AN INTERPRETER HAD ALREADY INTERPRETED FOR A COMPLAINANT IN THE CASE, THEN THAT INTERPRETER SHOULDN'T EVER INTERPRET IN COURT FOR THE DEFENDANT."
39. "ABSOLUTELY AND EQUALLY, WHAT IS SAID, AND I ABSOLUTELY AGREE WITH THIS, IS THAT AN INTERPRETER WHO HAS INTERPRETED DURING THE POLICE STATION PHASE SHOULD, ON NO ACCOUNT, BE THE INTERPRETER WHO PERFORMS THAT SERVICE FOR THE SUSPECT, [THEN] THE DEFENDANT IN THE COURT. SHOULD UNDER NO CIRCUMSTANCES INTERPRET FOR THE DEFENDANT IN COURT."
40. "BECAUSE IF AT SOME STAGE, AND IT MIGHT NOT BE IMMEDIATE, IT MIGHT BE ON AN APPEAL OF WHATEVER KIND, **THE CORRECTNESS, THE ACCURACY, OR THE PROBITY OF THE INTERPRETING TASK AT THE POLICE STATION WERE TO BE CHALLENGED BY THE DEFENDANT OR THE DEFENCE ON HIS OR HER BEHALF.**"
41. "THEN CLEARLY IF THE SAME INTERPRETER HAS PERFORMED THE SERVICES OF INTERPRETER IN THE MAGISTRATES' COURT, THEN CLEARLY THERE CAN BE NO CHALLENGE, OR AT LEAST THERE CAN BE NO EFFECTIVE CHALLENGE, BECAUSE IT'S THE SAME INTERPRETER, WHO CAN HARDLY BE EXPECTED TO SCRUTINISE HIS OR HER OWN WORK AT THE POLICE STATION."
42. "THE OTHER THING THAT I FEAR TO THIS DAY ALMOST CERTAINLY HAPPENS IS THAT POLICE OFFICERS WILL ASK, OR EVEN INSTRUCT INTERPRETERS TO GO TO A PROSECUTION WITNESS'S HOUSE AND INTERVIEW THE WITNESS AND TAKE A STATEMENT. WELL, THAT'S CLEARLY WRONG."
43. "WELL, EXACTLY, BUT THEY DO."
44. "AND EQUALLY THE OFFICER SHOULDN'T JUST INTRODUCE THE INTERPRETER AND THE WITNESS TO EACH OTHER, AND THEN JUST SIT THERE STARING OUT OF THE WINDOW."

45. "THE OFFICER SHOULD BE ASKING THE QUESTIONS AND THE INTERPRETER SHOULD BE CONVEYING THE ANSWERS."
46. **"AS A SURROGATE POLICE OFFICER."**
47. "WELL, IT IS. I CLAIM NO CREDIT, IT'S JUST THAT I'VE HAD MANY YEARS TO THINK ABOUT THIS."
48. "AND THAT'S REALLY WHAT I MEAN ABOUT THE PROFESSIONAL STATUS AND ROLE OF AN INTERPRETER. STATUS, HERE, AND ROLE ARE OPPOSITE SIDES OF THE COIN."
49. "YOU HAVE THE STATUS AND YOU DESERVE IT, IF YOU BEHAVE AS A PROFESSIONAL SHOULD."
50. "BUT WITH THE STATUS COMES THE OBLIGATION OF THE ROLE. AND SOMETIMES IT'S VERY DIFFICULT."
51. "YOU MIGHT COME FROM A SIMILAR PART OF THE COUNTRY THAT THE DEFENDANT COMES FROM, OR THE COMPLAINANT COMES FROM. IT MIGHT BE VERY TEMPTING TO IDENTIFY AND TAKE ON..."
52. "YEAH, TO ALLY YOURSELF, EXACTLY, THAT IS A VERY GOOD PHRASE, I THINK. AND SO THAT'S WHAT THE ROLE IS LARGELY ABOUT AND THAT'S WHAT YVONNE'S COURSE USED TO TRAIN."
53. "SO, I'M SO USED TO MINGLING WITH TRULY PROFESSIONAL INTERPRETERS THAT I KNOW THAT THERE ARE MANY WHO ARE EVEN MORE HORRIFIED THAN I AM WHEN THEY COME ACROSS EXAMPLES OF **INTERPRETERS WHO ACT AS A SURROGATE POLICE OFFICER**. BUT THE FACT REMAINS THAT IT DOES HAPPEN."
54. "AND SO I THINK NOTHING FUNDAMENTAL WILL CHANGE FOR THE BETTER, UNLESS AND UNTIL ALL OTHER PROFESSIONAL AGENCY PERSONNEL GIVE INTERPRETERS THE PROFESSIONAL RECOGNITION THEY DESERVE."
55. "AND LOOK TO INTERPRETERS TO DELIVER ON THE OBLIGATIONS OF THEIR ROLE."
56. "NOW I'M SORRY TO HAVE TO TELL YOU THAT I BLAME MY LAWYER COLLEAGUES. I THINK THEY ARE IN A POSITION REALLY TO MAKE A DIFFERENCE, BUT MOST OF THEM..."

13.2.4 Respondent 12: second stage coding

Respondent 12 (Solicitor)

File name (transcript): interview with Respondent 12

Audio length – 0:17:01

Interview took place on 18/03/2016

First cycle coding methods: Initial coding, process coding, In Vivo coding

Number of codes in total: 56

Second cycle coding: clustering initial codes, searching for themes

1. "YOU CAN CONTRACT OUT THE FUNCTION, BUT NOT THE RESPONSIBILITY."

- "THE QUESTION OF WHO PAYS FOR AN INTERPRETER'S SERVICES, ABSOLUTELY, IT MUST BE ABSOLUTELY IRRELEVANT IN TERMS OF THE WAY THAT THEY PERFORM THEIR ROLE."
- "THOSE WHO PAY, IT USED TO BE THE POLICE SERVICE, IF IT WERE A CASE AT A POLICE STATION WHERE THERE WAS AN INTERVIEW AFTER CAUTION, FOR EXAMPLE, OR OF COURSE, IF THE INTERPRETERS HAVE BEEN ASKED TO INTERPRET FOR A WITNESS IN THE CASE, FOR A PROSECUTION WITNESS."
- "NOW, WHEN IT COMES TO THE COURT, THEN THE MINISTRY OF JUSTICE, IN EFFECT, WOULD PAY. YES, THEY WOULD PAY BECAUSE IT'S FOR THE COURT TO PROVIDE AN INTERPRETER FOR BOTH PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDINGS. IN OTHER WORDS, ANY COMPLAINANT OR ANY DEFENDANT."
- "AND IF THERE WERE PROSECUTION WITNESSES, THEN IT WOULD BE FOR THE PROSECUTION TO ARRANGE AND PAY FOR AN INTERPRETER, BECAUSE IT MIGHT NOT BE THE SAME LANGUAGE, OF COURSE. I MEAN SOMETIMES YOU HAVE CASES, PARTICULARLY WITH TRIALS WHERE THERE MIGHT BE, OBVIOUSLY ENGLISH, BUT ALSO ONE OR TWO OR EVEN THREE DIFFERENT LANGUAGES FOR VARIOUS PARTIES, VARIOUS WITNESSES IN THE CASE."
- "AND THEN IT'S FOR THE PROSECUTION TO PAY FOR THOSE WITNESSES."
- "FOR THE DEFENDANT, THE COURT PAYS FOR ANY INTERPRETING SERVICES WHERE IT'S TO DO WITH THE DEFENDANT BEFORE THE COURT"
- "BUT IT'S FOR DEFENCE SOLICITORS TO ARRANGE TO ENGAGE AN INTERPRETER FOR ANY DEFENCE WITNESSES."
- "NOW, IN REALITY, THAT WOULD NORMALLY MEAN THAT THE PAYMENT WOULD BE OUT OF PUBLIC FUNDS BECAUSE MOST CASES, MOST SERIOUS CASES, INVOLVE REPRESENTATION OUT OF PUBLIC FUNDS THROUGH LEGAL AID. IT IS IN EFFECT AN AGENCY WITHIN THE MINISTRY OF JUSTICE THAT PAYS FOR THE INTERPRETER AGAIN."
- "BUT IT'S A QUESTION OF WHOSE THE RESPONSIBILITY IS."
- "THE COMPLICATION UNDER THE FRAMEWORK AGREEMENT THAT CAME INTO BEING IN 2010, THE ADDITIONAL STRAND OF COMPLICATION IS THAT THE MINISTRY OF JUSTICE OUTSOURCED THEIR CORE ACTIVITY, AS I WOULD SAY, TO ARRANGE FOR INTERPRETERS BY COURT STAFF CONTACTING THE INTERPRETERS DIRECTLY, BY REFERENCE TO THE NATIONAL REGISTER."
- "AND SO YOU HAVE THIS FILTER OF, AS IT HAPPENS, CAPITA, THE OUTSOURCE COMPANY. THEY ACTUALLY PAY THE INTERPRETERS, THEY ACTUALLY PAY THEM FAR, FAR LESS THAN USED TO BE THE CASE BEFORE THE FRAMEWORK AGREEMENT, BUT THAT'S ANOTHER STORY."

- "AND SO THE PAYMASTER, IN A DIRECT SENSE, HAS SHIFTED. BUT THE RESPONSIBILITY TO ARRANGE IT ALL IS STILL THAT OF THE MINISTRY OF JUSTICE."
- "YOU CAN'T CONTRACT OUT THE RESPONSIBILITY FOR THERE BEING INTERPRETING SERVICES PROVIDED."
- "AND SO IN EFFECT THEY'RE PAYING BECAUSE THEY PAY CAPITA, WHO THEN PAY THE INTERPRETERS."

2. "INTERPRETERS MUST ALWAYS REMAIN INDEPENDENT OF ALL PARTIES"/ "AS A PROFESSIONAL YOU HAVE OBLIGATIONS TO THE SYSTEM."

- "BUT THE VERY REAL CONCERN IS THAT INTERPRETERS MUST ALWAYS REMAIN INDEPENDENT OF ALL PARTIES. AND THAT'S A KEY PROFESSIONAL OBLIGATION."
- "NOW, SOMEWHERE, WE WOULD HAVE TO LOOK FOR IT, AS PART OF THE TRAINING COURSE, MORE OR LESS DIRECTLY AT THE BEGINNING OF IT FOR LEGAL INTERPRETERS, INTERPRETER STUDENTS"
- "IT'S NOT TO HELP THE, FOR EXAMPLE, THE DEFENDANT."
- "IT'S CERTAINLY NOT TO HELP THE POLICE, OR THE PROSECUTION, OR THE COURT."
- "BUT NONETHELESS THERE ARE OBLIGATIONS TO ALL PARTICIPANTS IN THE SYSTEM."
- "AS A PROFESSIONAL YOU HAVE OBLIGATIONS TO THE SYSTEM."
- "AND THERE ARE VARIOUS THINGS YOU CERTAINLY SHOULDN'T DO."
- "YOU SHOULDN'T GIVE ADVICE."
- "I THINK, AGAIN, I MIGHT HAVE COVERED THIS. YOU SHOULDN'T GIVE LEGAL ADVICE."
- "YOU SHOULDN'T FRATERNISE WITH THE PERSON, THE DEFENDANT OR WITNESS FOR WHOM YOU'RE INTERPRETING."
- "CLEARLY YOU'RE POLITE TO THEM, BUT YOU SHOULD NOT FRATERNISE, ALTHOUGH I'M AFRAID IT HAPPENS ALL THE TIME."
- "YOU SHOULD CERTAINLY INTERPRET AS FAITHFULLY AS YOU CAN ACCORDING TO YOUR ABILITIES AND YOUR TRAINING."
- "YOU SHOULD CERTAINLY IN NO WAY IMPROVE UPON OR EMBELLISH WHAT THE PARTY, SUCH AS THE DEFENDANT, IS BEING ASKED AND INDEED, HOW THE OTHER PARTY OR THE DEFENDANT RESPONDS."
- "AND YOU SHOULDN'T ADD THINGS OR IN ANY WAY SEEK TO REFINE WHAT'S BEING SAID."
- "ALSO, WHAT YOU SHOULD CERTAINLY NOT DO IS TRY AND MAKE SENSE OF SOMETHING THAT DOESN'T MAKE SENSE."
- "THE DEFENCE ADVOCATE'S ROLE IS TO ADVANCE HIS OR HER CLIENT'S CASE TO AN OPTIMUM LEVEL. BUT EQUALLY THAT OBLIGATION CARRIES ANY NUMBER OF QUALIFICATIONS AND WE HAVE PROFESSIONAL RULES."
- "WELL, SO ACTUALLY THERE IS A CODE FOR INTERPRETERS."
- "THERE ARE CERTAIN THINGS YOU SHOULD CERTAINLY NEVER DO."

- "IT FOLLOWS FROM THAT, FOR EXAMPLE, THAT IF AN INTERPRETER HAD ALREADY INTERPRETED FOR A COMPLAINANT IN THE CASE, THEN THAT INTERPRETER SHOULDN'T EVER INTERPRET IN COURT FOR THE DEFENDANT."
- "ABSOLUTELY AND EQUALLY, WHAT IS SAID, AND I ABSOLUTELY AGREE WITH THIS, IS THAT AN INTERPRETER WHO HAS INTERPRETED DURING THE POLICE STATION PHASE SHOULD, ON NO ACCOUNT, BE THE INTERPRETER WHO PERFORMS THAT SERVICE FOR THE SUSPECT, [THEN] THE DEFENDANT IN THE COURT. SHOULD UNDER NO CIRCUMSTANCES INTERPRET FOR THE DEFENDANT IN COURT."

3. "THE ROLE OF THE INTERPRETER IS TO COMMUNICATE, TO STRIVE TO COMMUNICATE AS COMPLETELY AS POSSIBLE, TO ENABLE COMMUNICATION."

- "BECAUSE SOMETIMES IN GENERAL CONVERSATION, LET ALONE IN GIVING EVIDENCE OR IN ANSWERING QUESTIONS, OR EVEN ASKING QUESTIONS, THE PARTICIPANTS DON'T MAKE SENSE IN WHAT THEY'RE ASKING OR WHAT THEY'RE ANSWERING. IT'S NOT FOR THE INTERPRETER TO MAKE SENSE OF IT."
- "AND SO IT'S PERFECTLY APPROPRIATE FOR AN INTERPRETER TO BE LEFT IN POSITION WHERE THE ANSWER IS GIVEN FROM THE... LET'S SAY THE DEFENDANT, AND THE COURT OR THE ADVOCATE ASKING THE QUESTION SAYS, "WELL, THAT DOESN'T MAKE ANY SENSE." TO WHICH THE STRAIGHTFORWARD ANSWER IS, "IT'S NOT FOR ME TO MAKE SENSE OF IT, THAT'S WHAT THE WITNESS SAID."
- "YOU SHOULD CERTAINLY INTERPRET AS FAITHFULLY AS YOU CAN ACCORDING TO YOUR ABILITIES AND YOUR TRAINING."
- "YOU SHOULD CERTAINLY IN NO WAY IMPROVE UPON OR EMBELLISH WHAT THE PARTY, SUCH AS THE DEFENDANT, IS BEING ASKED AND INDEED, HOW THE OTHER PARTY OR THE DEFENDANT RESPONDS."
- "AND YOU SHOULDN'T ADD THINGS OR IN ANY WAY SEEK TO REFINE WHAT'S BEING SAID."
- "ALSO, WHAT YOU SHOULD CERTAINLY NOT DO IS TRY AND MAKE SENSE OF SOMETHING THAT DOESN'T MAKE SENSE."
- "THE OFFICER SHOULD BE ASKING THE QUESTIONS AND THE INTERPRETER SHOULD BE CONVEYING THE ANSWERS."
- "YOU MIGHT COME FROM A SIMILAR PART OF THE COUNTRY THAT THE DEFENDANT COMES FROM, OR THE COMPLAINANT COMES FROM. IT MIGHT BE VERY TEMPTING TO IDENTIFY AND TAKE ON..."
- "YEAH, TO ALLY YOURSELF, EXACTLY, THAT IS A VERY GOOD PHRASE, I THINK. AND SO THAT'S WHAT THE ROLE IS LARGELY ABOUT AND THAT'S WHAT YVONNE'S COURSE USED TO TRAIN."

4. "AS A SURROGATE POLICE OFFICER"

- "BECAUSE IF AT SOME STAGE, AND IT MIGHT NOT BE IMMEDIATE, IT MIGHT BE ON AN APPEAL OF WHATEVER KIND, THE CORRECTNESS, THE ACCURACY, OR THE PROBITY OF THE INTERPRETING TASK AT THE POLICE STATION WERE TO BE CHALLENGED BY THE DEFENDANT OR THE DEFENCE ON HIS OR HER BEHALF."
- "THEN CLEARLY IF THE SAME INTERPRETER HAS PERFORMED THE SERVICES OF INTERPRETER IN THE MAGISTRATES' COURT, THEN CLEARLY THERE CAN BE NO CHALLENGE, OR AT LEAST THERE CAN BE NO EFFECTIVE CHALLENGE, BECAUSE IT'S THE SAME INTERPRETER, WHO CAN HARDLY BE EXPECTED TO SCRUTINISE HIS OR HER OWN WORK AT THE POLICE STATION."
- "THE OTHER THING THAT I FEAR TO THIS DAY ALMOST CERTAINLY HAPPENS IS THAT POLICE OFFICERS WILL ASK, OR EVEN INSTRUCT INTERPRETERS TO GO TO A PROSECUTION WITNESS'S HOUSE AND INTERVIEW THE WITNESS AND TAKE A STATEMENT. WELL, THAT'S CLEARLY WRONG."
- "WELL, EXACTLY, BUT THEY DO."
- "AND EQUALLY THE OFFICER SHOULDN'T JUST INTRODUCE THE INTERPRETER AND THE WITNESS TO EACH OTHER, AND THEN JUST SIT THERE STARING OUT OF THE WINDOW."
- "WELL, IT IS. I CLAIM NO CREDIT, IT'S JUST THAT I'VE HAD MANY YEARS TO THINK ABOUT THIS."
- "SO, I'M SO USED TO MINGLING WITH TRULY PROFESSIONAL INTERPRETERS THAT I KNOW THAT THERE ARE MANY WHO ARE EVEN MORE HORRIFIED THAN I AM WHEN THEY COME ACROSS EXAMPLES OF INTERPRETERS WHO ACT AS A SURROGATE POLICE OFFICER. BUT THE FACT REMAINS THAT IT DOES HAPPEN."

5. "STATUS, HERE, AND ROLE ARE OPPOSITE SIDES OF THE COIN."

- "AND THAT'S REALLY WHAT I MEAN ABOUT THE PROFESSIONAL STATUS AND ROLE OF AN INTERPRETER. STATUS, HERE, AND ROLE ARE OPPOSITE SIDES OF THE COIN."
- "YOU HAVE THE STATUS AND YOU DESERVE IT, IF YOU BEHAVE AS A PROFESSIONAL SHOULD."
- **"BUT WITH THE STATUS COMES THE OBLIGATION OF THE ROLE. AND SOMETIMES IT'S VERY DIFFICULT."**
- "AND SO I THINK NOTHING FUNDAMENTAL WILL CHANGE FOR THE BETTER, UNLESS AND UNTIL ALL OTHER PROFESSIONAL AGENCY PERSONNEL GIVE INTERPRETERS THE PROFESSIONAL RECOGNITION THEY DESERVE."
- "AND LOOK TO INTERPRETERS TO DELIVER ON THE OBLIGATIONS OF THEIR ROLE."
- "NOW I'M SORRY TO HAVE TO TELL YOU THAT I BLAME MY LAWYER COLLEAGUES. I THINK THEY ARE IN A POSITION REALLY TO MAKE A DIFFERENCE, BUT MOST OF THEM..."

- SO IT'S QUITE A COMPLEX PHILOSOPHICAL, AND INDEED, **IT'S A COMPLEX PROCESS OF COMMUNICATION AND OF KNOWING YOUR ROLE, WHICH IS JUST AS ONEROUS, REALLY, AS ANY OTHER PARTY TO THE PROCEEDINGS. BUT IT'S DIFFERENT."**

13.2.5 Respondent 12: codes and themes from survey

Respondent 12: Codes and themes identified in the Survey

1. "I HOPE THAT I HAVE NEVER USED AN INTERPRETER IN ANY CONCEIVABLE SENSE OF THAT WORD. IN MY LEGALLY AIDED AND THEREFORE PUBLICLY FUNDED WORLD I HAVE INDEED RETAINED INTERPRETERS **AT PUBLIC EXPENSE FOR THE PURPOSES OF SECURING INSTRUCTIONS FROM CLIENTS OR DEFENCE WITNESSES**, GENERALLY SPEAKING AT MY OFFICE BUT SOMETIMES AT MY CLIENTS' OR THE WITNESSES' HOMES."
2. "AT COURT I HAVE ALSO **AT PUBLIC EXPENSE** RETAINED INTERPRETERS FOR DEFENCE WITNESSES WHERE THEY WERE TO GIVE EVIDENCE IN COURT BUT OTHERWISE FOR PROSECUTION WITNESSES"
3. "IT HAS ALWAYS BEEN THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE PROSECUTING AUTHORITY THROUGH THE AGENCY OF THE POLICE IN REALITY TO SECURE AN INTERPRETER'S SERVICES."
4. "FOR THE DEFENDANTS AS PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDINGS **IT HAS ALWAYS BEEN THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE COURT TO SECURE SUCH SERVICES."**
5. "NOW, SUBJECT TO THAT QUALIFICATION, I HAVE BEEN DEFENDING IN CASES WHICH HAVE REQUIRED THE SERVICES OF AN INTERPRETER FOR AT LEAST FORTY FIVE OF THOSE FORTY EIGHT YEARS, ALTHOUGH AS MIGHT READILY BE IMAGINED **THE FREQUENCY OF SUCH EXPERIENCES HAS INCREASED EXPONENTIALLY OVER THE LAST THREE DECADES."**
6. "WHEN MY LIFE AS A DEFENCE ADVOCATE WAS IN ITS RELATIVE INFANCY, EVERYONE WOULD GATHER TOGETHER IN THE COURT IN QUESTION TO WITNESS THE PROCEEDINGS; NOWADAYS, SUCH CASES ARE A DAILY OCCURRENCE, CERTAINLY IN WEST MIDLANDS COURTS."
7. "I SHOULD ADD THAT MY EXPERIENCE OF WORKING THROUGH THE MEDIUM OF AN INTERPRETER HAS ALSO EXTENSIVELY EMBRACED POLICE INTERVIEWS AFTER CAUTION AND OTHER PROCEDURES FOLLOWING THE ARREST OR VOLUNTARY ATTENDANCE OF SUSPECTS. **THE RESPONSIBILITY FOR ARRANGING AND PAYING FOR INTERPRETERS IN SUCH SCENARIOS HAS ALWAYS BEEN THAT OF THE POLICE."**
8. "I RESPECTFULLY BUT STRONGLY RECOMMEND THAT YOU ADJUST ALSO THE FRAMING OF THIS QUESTION FOR REASONS EXPLAINED ABOVE."
9. **"TO STRIVE FOR OPTIMUM COMMUNICATION AMONGST ALL PARTICIPANTS."**

DO'S:

10. "INTERPRET FAITHFULLY ALL THAT IS SAID IN COURT BY WHICHEVER PARTICIPANT FROM THE MOMENT OF THE CALLING ON OF THE CASE UNTIL ITS CONCLUSION;"
11. "MAKE HER/HIMSELF AVAILABLE FOR BOTH PRE- AND POST-HEARING CONFERENCES BETWEEN THE DEFENDANT AND HER/HIS DEFENCE ADVOCATE AND/OR OTHER DEFENCE LEGAL ADVISER;"
12. "BE RECEPTIVE TO QUESTIONS PRE-HEARING FROM THE DEFENCE ADVOCATE AND/OR LEGAL ADVISER OVER HER/HIS LANGUAGE MATCH WITH THE DEFENDANT; OVER ANY PREVIOUS INVOLVEMENT IN THE CASE, FOR EXAMPLE AS INTERPRETER FOR THE DEFENDANT WHILST A SUSPECT AT THE POLICE STATION OR FOR A COMPLAINANT OR WITNESS IN THE CASE;"
13. "BE EQUALLY RECEPTIVE TO QUESTIONS FROM THE ADVOCATE OR ADVISER PRE-HEARING OVER FULL NAME AND CONTACT DETAILS AND INTERPRETING EXPERIENCE AND CREDENTIALS, HAVING AVAILABLE AT ALL TIMES PROOF OF CURRENT ACCREDITATION ;"
14. "IN THOSE PRE- AND POST-HEARING SCENARIOS INTERPRET ALL EXCHANGES BETWEEN DEFENCE ADVOCATE/ADVISER AND THE DEFENDANT."

DON'T'S:

15. "ADD TO, EMBELLISH OR ATTEMPT TO IMPROVE UPON OR EXPLAIN QUESTIONS AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS DURING THE EXTENT OF THE HEARING;"
16. "ENTER INTO DISCUSSIONS WITH THE DEFENDANT AND/OR HER/HIS FRIENDS AND RELATIVES IN THE ABSENCE OF THE DEFENCE ADVOCATE/ADVISER, SAVE TO ESTABLISH THE IDENTITY OF THE DEFENDANT AND A COMPLETE LANGUAGE MATCH;"
17. "AT ANY TIME OR IN ANY CIRCUMSTANCES OFFER A LEGAL OR ANY OTHER ADVICE TO THE DEFENDANT AND/OR ANY THIRD PARTY;"
18. "DIVULGE WHAT MAY HAVE TRANSPIRED IN PRE- OR POST- HEARING CONFERENCES TO ANY THIRD PARTY;"
19. "ABSENT HER/HIMSELF FROM COURT UNTIL THE HEARING ITSELF AND ANY POST- HEARING CONFERENCE OBLIGATION SHOULD HAVE BEEN FINALISED."
20. "THE NEEDS OF THE INTERPRETER NEED TO BE RESPECTED AND ACCOMMODATED"
21. "CONSIDERATIONS OF THE INTERPRETER'S SAFETY, COMFORT, NEED FOR BREAKS, ABILITY TO HEAR AND OPPORTUNITY TO INTERPRET WILL OF NECESSITY REQUIRE ADJUSTMENTS TO THE ADVOCATE'S POSITION AND SPEED OF DELIVERY AND A READINESS TO CALL UPON THE TRIBUNAL AND/OR LEGAL ADVISER TO ADDRESS THE DEFENDANT IN THE FIRST PERSON."
22. "THE STATUS OF THE INTERPRETER IS THAT OF A PROFESSIONAL PARTICIPANT OF EQUAL STANDING TO ALL OTHER PARTICIPANTS IN THE PROCEEDINGS. SHE/HE IS PART OF THE LEGAL PROCESS AS WITH ALL OTHER PARTICIPANTS."
23. **"YES, ALTHOUGH A FULL RECOGNITION OF THAT PROFESSIONAL ROLE AND STATUS IS STILL VERY MUCH WORK IN PROGRESS."**
24. **"IN THE TIMES WHEN INTERPRETED HEARINGS WERE A RARITY-AND UNDERSTANDABLY-ENGAGEMENT WAS USUALLY AD HOC AND NO OR LITTLE THOUGHT WAS EVER GIVEN TO**

LANGUAGE MATCHES OR QUALIFICATIONS OTHER THAN AN APPARENT GRASP OF THE INSTANT LANGUAGE."

- 25. "THINGS HAVE MOVED ON BUT ANY RELIABLE, STILL LESS HOLISTIC, APPROACH TO TRAINING, ACCREDITATION AND CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT REMAINS A CHIMERA."**
- 26. "WHAT IT MOST CERTAINLY DOES NOT INVOLVE IS THE INTERPRETER AS A MERE CONDUIT."**
- 27. "IRRESPECTIVE OF PAYMASTER, THE TASK OF THE INTERPRETER IS TO ENABLE TO THE BEST OF HER/HIS ABILITY COMPLETE COMPREHENSION FOR ALL RELEVANT PARTIES."**
- 28. "THAT PROCESS ITSELF REQUIRES THE CONVEYANCE OF MEANING WHERE THAT OF NECESSITY PRECLUDES ANY ATTEMPT AT A WORD FOR WORD INTERPRETATION."**
- 29. "ALSO, THERE MUST BE SCOPE FOR AN AWARENESS OF SERIOUS IMPROPRIETY ON THE PART OF OTHER PARTICIPANTS IN THE PROCESS JUST AS WITH ANY OTHER CITIZEN."**

The following themes have been identified:

- 1) Responsibility of the provision of interpreting services and pay; (IT HAS ALWAYS BEEN THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE COURT TO SECURE SUCH SERVICES."**
- 2) Th role of the interpreter is to "TO STRIVE FOR OPTIMUM COMMUNICATION AMONGST ALL PARTICIPANTS."**
- 3) Recognition of role and status: "YES, ALTHOUGH A FULL RECOGNITION OF THAT PROFESSIONAL ROLE AND STATUS IS STILL VERY MUCH WORK IN PROGRESS."**
- 4) Expectations of the role (do's and don't's)**
- 5) Suggestions for improvement: "THINGS HAVE MOVED ON BUT ANY RELIABLE, STILL LESS HOLISTIC, APPROACH TO TRAINING, ACCREDITATION AND CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT REMAINS A CHIMERA."**

Overlap with the following themes from the follow-up interview:

- 1. Theme 1: "YOU CAN CONTRACT OUT THE FUNCTION, BUT NOT THE RESPONSIBILITY."**
- 2. Theme 2: "INTERPRETERS MUST ALWAYS REMAIN INDEPENDENT OF ALL PARTIES"/ "AS A PROFESSIONAL YOU HAVE OBLIGATIONS TO THE SYSTEM."**
- 3. Theme 3: "THE ROLE OF THE INTERPRETER IS TO COMMUNICATE, TO STRIVE TO COMMUNICATE AS COMPLETELY AS POSSIBLE, TO ENABLE COMMUNICATION."**
- 4. Theme 5: "STATUS, HERE, AND ROLE ARE OPPOSITE SIDES OF THE COIN."**

Anew theme has emerged in the Survey: Suggestions for improvement: "THINGS HAVE MOVED ON BUT ANY RELIABLE, STILL LESS HOLISTIC, APPROACH TO TRAINING, ACCREDITATION AND CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT REMAINS A CHIMERA."

13.2.6 Respondent 25: first stage coding

Respondent 25

File name (transcript): interview with Respondent 25

Audio length – 0:47:50

Interview took place on 07/06/2022

First cycle coding methods: Initial coding, process coding, In Vivo coding

Number of codes in total: 136

1. "SO, SOME OF MY CRIMINAL CLIENTS ARE IMMIGRANTS, EITHER REFUGEES OR ASYLUM SEEKERS. THAT'S NOT WHY I REPRESENT THEM; I REPRESENT THEM BECAUSE THEY COMMITTED SOME SORT OF CRIME. BUT ALONG THE WAY, **WE STRUGGLE TO COMMUNICATE, SO WE DO INVITE INTERPRETERS TO OUR MEETINGS AND CONDUCT THROUGH, OR RATHER WITH THE ASSISTANCE OF, AN INTERPRETER.**"
2. "THAT'S CORRECT. THAT'S WHEN I FIRST ARRIVED IN THIS COUNTRY. I BELIEVE RUSSIAN LANGUAGE WAS IN MASSIVE DEMAND, AND I ALREADY SPOKE ENGLISH. SO I IMMEDIATELY, AS SOON AS I ARRIVED, (LAUGHS) MADE MY WAY TO INTERPRETING SERVICES, AND I WORKED AS A REGISTERED INTERPRETER FOR THE REFUGEE COUNCIL."
3. "THOSE DAYS, I THINK IT WAS CALLED MIGRANTS REFUGEE COUNCIL. AND ALSO, FURTHER, I WORKED FOR COURTS, SOLICITORS, PRIMARILY LEGAL BACKGROUND, BUT ALSO WENT TO HOSPITALS AND ALL OTHER THAT YOU CAN IMAGINE."
4. **"I WAS A LAWYER BACK HOME, BUT AS YOU KNOW, IT'S QUITE HARD TO TRANSMIT YOUR KNOWLEDGE IMMEDIATELY."**
5. "SO AS SOON AS I FIGURED OUT THAT THE SYSTEM IS QUITE DIFFERENT AND I WOULD NEED TO TAKE ANOTHER DEGREE HERE, I PUT ALL THOSE PLANS ON HOLD AND I JUST LIVED MY LIFE FOR A FEW YEARS BEFORE I ACTUALLY GOT AROUND DOING LEGAL STUFF AGAIN."
6. **"I BELIEVE I WAS COMBINED THAT; I THINK IT'S CALLED DPS, DPSI..."**
7. "YOU CAN ALWAYS SEE THROUGH THE CLIENTS, WHETHER THEY ARE HAPPY OR NOT. AND IN FACT, ROUTINELY WE DO ASK WHETHER THEY ARE HAPPY WITH THE INTERPRETING, AND BY MEANS OF SIGN LANGUAGE THEY CAN ALWAYS TELL YOU WHETHER THEY'RE HAPPY, WHETHER THE LANGUAGE IS ACTUALLY MEETING THEIR EXPECTATIONS."
8. "AND QUITE A FEW TIMES, WE HAD TO CANCEL THE APPOINTMENTS AND SAY, "WE'RE REALLY SORRY, BUT WE HAVE TO FIND THE PARTICULAR DIALECT." OFTEN IT APPLIED TO SORANI KURDISH."
9. "KURDISH INTERPRETERS DO TURN UP, AND THEY'RE DIFFERENT DIALECTS, AND WE HAD TO SWAP THEM TO THE ORIGINAL ONES. SO WE, YES, WE DID COME ACROSS. AND THE

CLIENTS MANAGED TO EXPRESS THEIR DISSATISFACTION DURING THE APPOINTMENTS, AND WE MANAGED TO SWAP THEM AROUND.”

10. “INDEED. AND ALSO, IT COMES FROM PERSONAL KNOWLEDGE. I’M COMING FROM AZERBAIJAN, AND THEY SPEAK AZERBAIJANIAN LANGUAGE, WHICH IS VERY SIMILAR TO TURKISH. AND IN THE PAST, I OFTEN TRANSLATED FOR TURKISH CLIENTS, AND IT’S NOT ALWAYS I WAS SUCCESSFULLY TRANSLATING INFORMATION, AND I WAS NOT HAPPY WITH MYSELF.”
11. “AND FROM THOSE DAYS, I MANAGED TO REMEMBER THAT SOMETIMES CLIENTS MIGHT BE ESTABLISHING CERTAIN CONTACT WITH YOU AND THEY DON’T WANT TO SAY, BUT I PERSONALLY KNEW THAT I HAD NOT DELIVERED WELL ENOUGH, AND I DID NOT MEET THE SATISFACTION OF THE CLIENT, AND I JUST GOT AWAY PURELY ON THE BACKGROUND OF INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIP WITH THEM, AND I SORT OF CALMED THEM DOWN, IN AN INTERPRETING WAY (LAUGHS) AS MUCH AS I COULD.”
12. “SO THAT KNOWLEDGE STUCK WITH ME, AND I KNEW THAT SOMETIMES YOU HAVE TO WATCH OUT FOR, ESPECIALLY IN CRIMINAL CASES, FOR PARTICULAR LANGUAGE OR THE WAY THE CLIENTS EXPRESS THEMSELVES. AND THAT MAKES A MASSIVE DIFFERENCE TO THEIR CASES, OR CAN MAKE.”
13. “YES. I HAVE ACTUALLY ATTENDED SOME APPOINTMENTS WITH OUR IMMIGRATION TEAM. OR RATHER, I REPLACED THEM WHEN THEY WERE NOT AVAILABLE. SO I WOULD SIT IN APPOINTMENTS, INSTEAD OF OUR IMMIGRATION LAWYERS, AND I WOULD TAKE INSTRUCTIONS WITH THE HELP OF THE INTERPRETER. AND **I COULD SEE THEIR ATTITUDE WAS MUCH MORE RELAXED THAN OUR INTERPRETERS...**
14. “IMMIGRATION INTERPRETERS, THEY WERE A LOT MORE AT EASE, PROBABLY. THEY KNEW WHAT THEY WERE TALKING ABOUT A LITTLE BIT MORE, BUT ALSO THEY WERE A LOT MORE CASUAL, [WHERE 0:06:49] OUR INTERPRETERS TRY TO CONDUCT THEMSELVES IN A SORT OF MORE EFFICIENT AND MORE PROFICIENT MANNER, IF I COULD SAY.”
15. “USUALLY WE WOULD HAVE INTERPRETERS THAT WE KNOW ALREADY. WE HAVE AN IN-HOUSE INTERPRETER WHO PROVIDES ALL THE INTERPRETATIONS AS WELL: NOT BECAUSE OF HIS OWN KNOWLEDGE, BUT BECAUSE HE RUNS A COMPANY, AND HE EMPLOYS INTERPRETERS OF DIFFERENT LANGUAGES. SO WHEN WE ACTUALLY HAVE AN ISSUE AND WE NEED AN INTERPRETER, WE GO THROUGH HIM.”
16. “SO, IT IS SOMETHING THAT WE ARE ALREADY ACCUSTOMED TO, AND IS RARELY SOMEONE, SOME OUTSIDER. SO USUALLY, I WOULD KNOW THE INTERPRETERS THAT WE WORK WITH, BECAUSE IT’S A PARTICULAR LANGUAGE. IT’S EITHER KURDISH, FARSI, ARABIC, SOMETIMES URDU, SOMETIMES PUNJABI, ROMANIAN, POLISH. SO, THOSE, I COME ACROSS MORE OFTEN THAN OTHERS.”
17. “AND THAT WOULD BE PEOPLE I USUALLY KNOW AND HAVE COME ACROSS BEFORE, SO I CANNOT REALLY SAY THAT SOMETHING HAS TAKEN ME BY SURPRISE AS SUCH.”
18. “YES, YES, INDEED. OUR IMMIGRATION DEPARTMENT CONDUCTS ROUTINELY FARSI SPEAKERS, AND WE HAVE A PERSON WHO IS A DIRECTOR OF A COMPANY WHO PROVIDES INTERPRETING SERVICES. SO NOT ONLY WE HAVE HIM IN HOUSE, BUT ALSO WHEN WE

- NEED FOR OTHER LANGUAGES, WE CAN GO THROUGH HIM AND HE PROVIDES US WITH HIS, I WOULD SAY, SUB-INTERPRETERS, JUST TO PROVIDE THE DIFFERENT LANGUAGES.
19. SO I RARELY PICK UP A PHONE AND CALL TO SOME INTERPRETING AGENCIES, BECAUSE WE DO HAVE HIM ON BOARD, AND WE DO HAVE THIS FACILITY IN HOUSE.”
20. “YES, INDEED. WHEN WE ARE IN COURT AND THE INTERPRETER... I MEAN, THE ONLY WAY THE INTERPRETER COULD BE IN COURT IS WHEN COURT CALLS THROUGH THESE BIG COMPANIES. SO WE WOULD NOT EMPLOY THEM OURSELVES; IT IS A COURT WHO PAYS, AND IT IS A COURT WHO PROVIDES INTERPRETING SERVICES, SO... AND AGAIN, IT WOULD BE SIMILAR LANGUAGES, BECAUSE AS YOU WOULD APPRECIATE, IF I’M TAKING INSTRUCTIONS FOR A PARTICULAR CLIENT WITH PARTICULAR LANGUAGE NEEDS, THE SAME INTERPRETER GOES TO, THE SAME CLIENT GOES TO COURT AND [IT IS 0:09:48] THE SAME LANGUAGES.”
21. “SO AGAIN, I GOT TO KNOW SOME OF THE INTERPRETERS WHO WORK FOR THE COURTS. WE DO NOT HAVE A CLOSE RELATIONSHIP, BUT I DO RECOGNISE THEM, THEY RECOGNISE ME. SO I DO HAVE SOME EXPERIENCE WITH THAT. NOT EMPLOYING THEM DIRECTLY OR RATHER CONTRACTING THEM DIRECTLY, BUT BEING IN A POSITION TO USE THEM WITH THE COURT’S PERMISSION, OR WITH BEING FACILITATED BY THE COURT.”
22. “MY PERSONAL EXPERIENCE, LOCAL AGENCIES OR OTHER AGENCIES THAT I WORK WITH... LET’S BE FAIR, IT’S PROBABLY TWO OR THREE AGENCIES THAT I WORK WITH CLOSELY, AND THEIR INTERPRETERS, MAYBE BECAUSE I GOT USED TO THEM, THEIR INTERPRETERS ARE MUCH BETTER, MORE EFFICIENT, ON TIME”
23. “COURT INTERPRETERS CAN BE VERY MONEY-WATCHING, LET’S PUT IT THAT WAY, SO MONEY IS A KEY FOR THEM. THEY COME, THEY CLOCK IN, THEY WATCH THE TIME. THEY’RE EXTREMELY PLEASED WHEN THE TIME OVERRUNS.”
24. “IT’S NOT THE BEST WAY, SOMETIMES, FOR THE CLIENT. YOU WANT SOMEONE WHO **APPEARS, WHO INTERPRETS, BUT ALSO HAS SOME PERSONAL INPUT IN TERMS OF ABILITY TO FINISH THE JOB:** AS SOON AS IT BECOMES AVAILABLE, TO FINISH, RATHER THAN JUST STRETCHING IT BECAUSE THEY ARE PUTTING IN MORE HOURS AND THEY ARE GETTING PAID MORE. AND I KNOW THEY’RE GETTING PAID, PROBABLY, WELL. I HAVE NO IDEA HOW MUCH.”
25. “BUT YES, **COURT INTERPRETERS, THEY ARE A BIT DIFFERENT.** THEY COME ON THE DOT, LITERALLY. I DO EXPECT THEM TO COME A BIT EARLIER TO PROVIDE ASSISTANCE. THEY DON’T DO THAT; THEY COME ON TIME, AND IF THEY ARE BOOKED FOR 10:00, THEY WOULD APPEAR AT 10:00, SOMETIMES OVER-RUN.”
26. “AGAIN, [THE RELATED 0:11:44] EXCUSES I’VE HEARD WHY THEY COME SO LATE. OFTEN, THEY’RE STUCK IN SOME OTHER ROOM; YOU NEED TO GO AND FIND THEM. SO IT’S NOT IDEAL.”
27. “YOU WOULD HAVE THOUGHT IT’S BETTER, BUT IT ISN’T. IT ISN’T ACTUALLY BETTER, BECAUSE **IT FEELS LIKE THEY’RE GOING TO GET PAID ANYWAY, WHETHER THEY’RE GOING TO DO THE JOB TO THE BEST OF THEIR ABILITY OR NOT.**”
28. “**FIRST AND FOREMOST, OBVIOUSLY, AN ABILITY TO COMMUNICATE FREELY IN BOTH LANGUAGES: THE ONE THAT’S BEING TRANSLATED TO, AND FROM.**”

29. **SECONDLY, STAYING IMPARTIAL.** OBVIOUSLY, NOT [JUMP TO 0:13:17] [DEFENCES 0:13:18], AND NOT TRYING TO ASSIST THE CLIENT IN THEIR OWN LANGUAGE, PURELY BECAUSE THEY WANT TO, BECAUSE THEIR JOB IS TO TRANSLATE OR TRANSMIT INFORMATION THAT IS BEING PASSED TO THEM, AND NOT MAKE THEIR OWN, AND NOT ASSIST IN ANY WAY.”
30. **“AND PROBABLY THE WAY THEY DO IT IS VERY IMPORTANT AS WELL. THAT FALLS INTO THE COMPETENCE PART OF IT. SO, THEY HAVE TO STAY ALMOST INVISIBLE IN A ROOM. THEY HAVE TO CONDUCT TRANSLATION OF THE LANGUAGE AND NOTHING ELSE. NOT TO TRY TO EXPLAIN ANY CONCEPTS, BECAUSE IT IS MY JOB, AND NOT TO TRY TO RELAY THEIR FEELINGS FROM THE CLIENTS TO ME, BECAUSE AGAIN, IT IS MY JOB TO UNDERSTAND THAT, AND IF IT’S SOMETHING NOT CLEAR, I WOULD CLARIFY, AND THAT SHOULD BE UNDERSTOOD BY THE INTERPRETER.”**
31. “AND OBVIOUSLY, TIMING IS IMPORTANT AS WELL. THEY HAVE TO BE ON TIME, TOO. THEY DON’T HAVE TO GIVE THIS IMPRESSION THAT THEY’RE RUSHING SOMEWHERE, THEY HAVE TO PICK UP THEIR KIDS, BECAUSE THAT’S OFTEN THE CASE. “I’M SORRY, I NEED TO GO; I HAVE TO PICK UP MY KIDS,” YOU KNOW, “FROM THE NURSERY.” “OKAY, YOU’VE BEEN BOOKED, SO...” (LAUGHS) WITH ALL DUE RESPECT, THAT HAPPENS OFTEN, AND THAT’S NOT ACCEPTABLE, AND THAT DOESN’T GO INTO THE COMPETENCE PART OF IT, I WOULD HAVE THOUGHT.”
32. **“I’D SAY HE IS A FACILITATOR. HE/SHE (LAUGHS) IS A FACILITATOR OF COMMUNICATION.”**
33. **“HE IS ABSOLUTELY PARAMOUNT TO GOOD COMMUNICATION BETWEEN TWO PEOPLE WHO DO NOT SPEAK THE SAME LANGUAGE.**
34. “SO THEY’RE ESSENTIAL IN SOME CIRCUMSTANCES, WHEN THERE IS NO OTHER WAY TO COMMUNICATE WITH THE CLIENT. FROM MY POINT OF VIEW; I’M SURE THE SAME FOR THE CLIENT, WHO CANNOT COMMUNICATE OR UNDERSTAND ME.”
35. **“SO THEY REALLY ARE PEOPLE THAT WE CANNOT BE WITHOUT”**
36. **“THEY ARE PARAMOUNT TO SOME PARTS OF OUR JOB THAT CANNOT BE CONDUCTED WITHOUT THEM,** AND THEY HAVE TO APPRECIATE THAT, AND THEY HAVE TO CONDUCT THEMSELVES ACCORDINGLY.”
37. **“AND AGAIN, AS I SAY, THEY HAVE TO BE IMPARTIAL, AS MUCH AS POSSIBLE.** WE’RE ALL HUMAN; WE ALL HAVE FEELINGS; AND WE ALL TRY TO EMPHASISE, WHETHER WE WANT IT OR NOT. BUT AS MUCH AS EMOTIONS IS TAKEN OUT OF THE CONTEXT, IT’S BETTER FOR BOTH SIDES.”
38. **“EXTREMELY IMPORTANT. EXTREMELY IMPORTANT. FOR SOMEONE WHO DOESN’T SPEAK THE LANGUAGE, THERE IS NO OTHER WAY TO TRANSMIT THE INFORMATION FROM THEIR SIDE TO MINE, AND FROM MINE TO THEM”**
39. **“IT’S ONE OF THOSE THINGS THAT YOU CAN’T BE WITHOUT.** YOU CAN BE WITHOUT LEGAL ASSISTANCE, IF YOU UNDERSTAND THE LANGUAGE, BECAUSE SOMEBODY CAN HELP YOU. BUT WITHOUT LANGUAGE, YOU CANNOT UNDERSTAND ANYTHING AT ALL.”
40. **“PROBABLY IT’S VERY DIFFICULT SOMETIMES, BUT THEY SHOULD DRAW THE LINE, BECAUSE THEY ARE THERE TO INTERPRET”**

41. "IF THEY WANT TO HELP SOMEONE IN THEIR OWN TIME, THEY ARE OPEN TO THAT AND THEY CAN DO IT, BUT NOT WITHIN THE VICINITY OF THE OFFICE, AND NOT WITHIN THE CONTEXT OF OUR JOB, BECAUSE THEN THEY INTERFERE WITH THE PROCESS AND THEY'RE NOT HELPFUL. SO AS LONG AS IT'S BEING DONE ON A HUMAN BASIS AND TO THEIR OWN TIME, SOMEWHERE ELSE, BUT WITHOUT SORT OF COMPROMISING WHAT'S BEING SAID..."
42. "BECAUSE OFTEN, THEY WANT TO HELP BUT THEY ACTUALLY RELAY VERY WRONG INFORMATION. "OH, DON'T WORRY. SHE SAID LIKE THAT; SHE MEANT LIKE THAT; IT'S GOING TO BE LIKE THAT." BUT THAT'S NOT WHAT I SAID, BECAUSE IF I WANTED TO SAY THAT, I WOULD HAVE SAID THAT FOR THEM TO TRANSLATE THAT."
43. **"SO NOT TO IMPACT THEIR OWN VIEWS OR THEIR OWN IMPRESSION OF WHAT'S BEING SAID AND TRANSLATED TO THE CLIENT, WHO HAS NO ABILITY TO UNDERSTAND WHAT I SAID. AND THEY FULLY RELY ON THE INTERPRETER."**
44. "I HAD A NUMBER OF THINGS GOING ON. I CANNOT RECALL NOW, BUT I SPECIFICALLY REMEMBER A TIME WHEN I HAD AN INTERPRETER, AND IN FACT, IT WASN'T A LOCAL INTERPRETER; **IT WAS A COURT INTERPRETER."**
45. **"BOOKED THROUGH THEBIGWORD, THAT'S RIGHT. HE WAS IN COURT; HE CAME LATE; HE WAS UTTERLY UNPROFESSIONAL.** THAT'S ONE EXAMPLE THAT I REMEMBER SO, SO WELL. (LAUGHS) SO, MY CLIENT SPOKE NO ENGLISH WHATSOEVER. HE BARGED IN..."
46. "I'M JUST TRYING TO RECALL. IT WAS SOME TIME AGO. I'M PRETTY SURE IT WAS FARSI, 100%. HE BARGED IN LATER THAN THE ACTUAL HEARING STARTED, AND WE SORT OF HOLD ON AND THE CLIENT HIMSELF CAME WITH SOMEONE WHO SPOKE ENGLISH, SO WE EXPLAINED THAT TO THE MAGISTRATES THAT WE WILL HOLD ON, SEEING WHETHER THE INTERPRETER IS ARRIVING OR NOT, BUT IN THE MEANTIME, WE CAN START SOME PRELIMINARY PROCEEDINGS, WHICH WE HAVE DONE."
47. "SO HE LITERALLY WALKED INTO THE ROOM, WHERE EVERYTHING IS ALREADY BEING SAID. THE CLIENT IS IN A BOX, IN A WITNESS BOX. I AM WHERE I SHOULD BE; PROSECUTOR WHERE HE SHOULD BE; MAGISTRATES, LEGAL ADVISOR, EVERYBODY IN THEIR OWN PLACES. HE COMES IN, OBVIOUSLY OUT OF HIS COMFORT ZONE BECAUSE PROCEEDINGS, AS HE SEES IT, STARTED. IT HASN'T STARTED, ACTUALLY; IT'S JUST BEEN PREPARED TO START, BUT THAT'S HOW HE UNDERSTOOD."
48. "AND HIS LITERALLY FIRST OR SECOND SENTENCE, "OH, HE DOESN'T UNDERSTAND ANYTHING. HE'S CRITICISING SOMEONE." **AND I COULD SEE THE CLIENT COMPLETELY CONFUSED,** AND HE'S LOOKING AT HIS RELATIVE WHO WAS THERE, WHO SPOKE SOME ENGLISH; I'M NOT SAYING GREAT ENGLISH, BUT SOME ENGLISH. (LAUGHS) AND I CAN SEE ALL THIS CONFUSION, AND I SAID, "COULD WE JUST POSTPONE THE PROCEEDINGS?" SO, WE NEED TO CLARIFY WHETHER THE CLIENT UNDERSTANDS THE INTERPRETER, WHAT IS GOING ON."
49. **"SO WE HAD TO ADJOURN, AND I TOOK QUICK INSTRUCTIONS, AND WE HAD TO CANCEL THAT PARTICULAR BOOKING BECAUSE WE THOUGHT HE'S NOT DOING ANY JUSTICE TO THE CLIENT, AND IT WAS ONE OF THOSE CASES WHEN THE CLIENT SHOULD**

- HAVE BEEN EXPLAINED REALLY WELL, IN A FEW MOMENTS, WHETHER HE CHOSE THIS MAGISTRATES' COURT OR CROWN COURT. AND THAT'S NOT A CHANCE I COULD TAKE."**
50. "AND I SAID, "BASED ON THE BODY LANGUAGE, BASED HOW HE IS AND WHAT HE TELLS ME," INSTEAD OF SAYING SOMETHING ELSE COMPLETELY, **"I CAN SEE THAT HE IS JUST NOT RIGHT FOR THIS PARTICULAR MOMENT. AND TO START WITH, HE IS LATE, SO I AM NOT WRONG TO CALL IT OFF."**
51. "SO WE HAD TO REBOOK IT, AND WE ADJOURNED IT TO ANOTHER DAY, WITH ANOTHER INTERPRETER ATTENDING. **SO I DID HAVE A SITUATION WHERE UNPROFESSIONALISM WAS SO HIGH THAT EVEN MY TOLERANCE COULDN'T TAKE IT"**
52. "I HAD TO IT. I COULDN'T POSSIBLY CANCEL IT MYSELF, BUT I HAD TO ASK FOR PERMISSION FROM THE MAGISTRATES TO ADJOURN IT, BASED ON THE FACT THAT I **COULD SEE THERE WAS NO GOOD COMMUNICATION BETWEEN THE INTERPRETER AND THE CLIENT, BECAUSE THE INTERPRETER CAME SO NEGATIVE."**
53. "LITERALLY, FROM FIRST WORDS, HE STARTED CRITICISING ONE, SECOND, AND THIRD THING, AND THAT WAS JUST COMPLETELY INAPPROPRIATE. AND I COULD SEE FROM THE CLIENT HE WASN'T COMFORTABLE, AND SINCE THE CLIENT FACED QUITE SERIOUS ALLEGATIONS OF SEXUAL ASSAULT, I COULD NOT TAKE A CHANCE. IT WAS ONE OF THOSE."
54. **"PROBABLY HONESTY IS A GOOD THING, BECAUSE OFTEN, AS I SAID, I MYSELF WAS IN A POSITION WHERE MY DIALECT WASN'T MATCHING THE DIALECT OF THE PERSON WHOM I WAS TRANSLATING FOR. SO, YOU HAVE TO WITHDRAW FROM TRANSLATION IF YOU DON'T UNDERSTAND, OR IF YOU FEEL YOU HAVEN'T BEEN UNDERSTOOD CORRECTLY."**
55. **"BECAUSE WHAT YOU'RE DOING IS, YOU'RE REALLY PLAYING WITH SOMEONE'S LIFE, AND THAT'S NOT PERMITTED, UNDER ANY CIRCUMSTANCES. THE FACT THAT YOU WANT TO EARN YOUR MONEY DOES NOT JUSTIFY RUINING THEIRS, AND THAT SHOULD BE PENALISED REALLY"**
56. **"IT HAS TO BE WATCHED SO CAREFULLY, AND I KNOW SOMETIMES YOU'RE IN A SITUATION WHERE ANY INTERPRETER IS BETTER THAN NONE, BUT NOT IN A CRIMINAL PROCEEDINGS, FOR SURE."**
57. **"ABSOLUTELY. IT COULD LEAD YOU SOMEWHERE WRONG."**
58. "YES, SOMETIMES... AGAIN, IN CRIMINAL PROCEEDINGS, WE HAVE SITUATIONS WHERE WE HAVE AN INTERPRETER, BUT WE ALSO HAVE A CLIENT WHO IS NOT FULLY [**** 0:23:17**] TO ENGLISH LANGUAGE. AND SOMETIMES HIS PERSONALITY, YOU CAN FEEL HE CAN WIN JUDGES. AND BY BEING TRANSLATED TO AND FROM, UNLESS IT'S DONE IN SUCH A PERFECT AND PROFESSIONAL MANNER, YOU CAN TAKE THE EMOTION OUT OF IT, AND YOU CAN MONOTONOUSLY TRANSLATE SOMETHING THAT IS EXTREMELY IMPORTANT."
59. "NO, I HAVEN'T DONE THAT" – YOU CAN SAY IT IN SO MANY WAYS, BUT IF THE INTERPRETER ISN'T GOOD ENOUGH, DOESN'T ACTUALLY REPEAT EXACTLY WHAT'S BEING SAID TO HIM WITH THE TONE THAT'S BEING PRONOUNCED, YOU MIGHT TAKE AN EMOTION OUT OF IT. SO THE CLIENT MIGHT LOSE A SIMPLE TOUCH OF PERSONAL ATTRIBUTION TO JUDGES, AND HE MIGHT LOSE HIS CASE ON THAT."

60. "ABSOLUTELY. AND LIKEWISE, IT CAN WIN SOMETHING THAT WAS NOT POSSIBLE TO WIN."
61. "SO IT'S ONE OF THOSE THINGS THAT YOU HAVE TO TAKE A CHANCE ON. FOR EXAMPLE, JUST RECENTLY... NOT RECENTLY, BUT YESTERDAY, I'VE BEEN TO PRISON, AND ONE OF MY CLIENTS IS A KURDISH CLIENT, AND I'VE BEEN WITH HIM FOR A WHILE, BECAUSE HE'S GOT A NUMBER OF OFFENCES THAT WE SORT OF LOOKED AFTER HIM FOR."
62. "AND HE SAID TO ME, **"ON THE NEXT OCCASION, IN CROWN COURT, I DON'T WANT AN INTERPRETER."** I SAID, "LAST TIME, YOU SAID YOU MISUNDERSTOOD SOMETHING, SO WE ASKED FOR AN INTERPRETER SPECIFICALLY. I KNOW YOU SPEAK ENGLISH, BUT YOUR ENGLISH IS NOT OF A LEGAL STANDARD, SO WE GOT YOU AN INTERPRETER THROUGH THE COURT SYSTEM."
63. **"IT MADE THINGS WORSE FOR ME. PLEASE, I DON'T WANT AN INTERPRETER."**
64. SO I AM THINKING TODAY, HOW I'M GOING TO MAKE AN APPLICATION FOR THE NEXT HEARING, WHICH IS IN JULY, ON 20TH. AND I EXPLAINED THAT TO THE COURT, THAT INITIALLY I ASKED FOR AN INTERPRETER TO HELP HIM, **AND HOW AM I GOING TO SAY, NOW, THAT NO, WE DON'T WANT AN INTERPRETER?**
65. "SO IT'S ONE OF THOSE THINGS YOU HAVE TO CLEAR ABOUT ALL THE TIME. BUT YOU ALSO HAVE TO TAKE CLIENTS' WISHES INTO ACCOUNT, AND AGAIN, I'M TALKING ABOUT THE CLIENTS WHO CAN SPEAK ENGLISH, SOME OF IT. I'M NOT TALKING ABOUT THOSE WHO CANNOT SPEAK; THEY HAVE NO CHOICE."
66. "IT'S ALWAYS... I MEAN, OUT OF CHOICE, **YOU HAVE TO HAVE AN INTERPRETER, YOU HAVE TO BE ABLE TO COMMUNICATE.**
67. "AND AGAIN, THERE, IT'S EVEN MORE IMPORTANT, BECAUSE IF THE INTERPRETER WHOM YOU'RE RELYING ON FULLY BECAUSE YOU DON'T KNOW EXACTLY WHAT'S BEING TRANSLATED, YOU CANNOT STOP HIM, YOU CANNOT INTERFERE, **IF THAT INTERPRETER IS NOT DOING HIS JOB WELL, EVERYTHING THAT YOU PUT INTO IT MIGHT GO AGAINST YOU.**
68. **"SO IT'S ONE OF THOSE THINGS THAT THAT'S WHY THEY HAVE LEGAL PROFESSIONALS WHO HAVE TO PICK UP ON IT. IT'S AN ISSUE OF PROFESSIONAL PRIVILEGE, AND YOU HAVE TO CONDUCT IT IN SUCH A MANNER THAT... YOU DON'T WANT TO POSTPONE PROCEEDINGS ANY FURTHER, BUT IF YOU FEEL THAT IT HAS AN IMPACT AND IT'S A NEGATIVE IMPACT, YOU HAVE TO STOP IT SOMEHOW. YOU HAVE TO INTERVENE; YOU HAVE TO ASK FOR ADJOURNMENT."**
69. "IT'S NOT IDEAL. IT'S NEVER IDEAL, BECAUSE EVERYBODY WANTS TO CONCLUDE THE PROCEEDINGS AS SOON AS POSSIBLE, AND IT IS TIME-CONSUMING. **SO YES, I THINK GOOD INTERPRETING IS A KEY"**
70. **"ONCE YOU RELY ON THEM, THEY HAVE TO BE GOOD. THERE'S JUST NO TWO WAYS AROUND IT. (LAUGHS) PROBABLY LIKE WITH ANY OTHER PROFESSION, BUT MORE SO WITH INTERPRETING."**
71. "ABSOLUTELY, ABSOLUTELY, BECAUSE INTERPRETING GIVES THEM TIME IF THEY DON'T UNDERSTAND WHAT'S GOING ON, ESPECIALLY. THEY HIDE BEHIND THIS TRANSLATING PERIOD, BECAUSE IT GIVES THEM ADDITIONAL ADVANTAGE OF TIME, AND AS WE KNOW,

SAME AS WITH PEOPLE WHO SUFFER WITH ALL SORTS OF ILLNESSES, THEY'VE BEEN GIVEN EXTRA TIME TO RESPOND. AND THAT IS THE KEY SOMETIMES, BECAUSE SOMETIMES ON THE SPOT, IF YOU ARE PUT IN A WITNESS BOX, YOU HAVE TO REPLY THERE AND THEN"

72. "BUT IF YOU'VE BEEN GIVEN THESE FEW SECONDS TO THINK ABOUT YOUR ANSWER, IT CAN BENEFIT YOU IN A BIG WAY, ABSOLUTELY"

73. "IT DOES, IT DOES. BUT THERE IS NOTHING PERFECT, AS WE KNOW."

74. "YES. SO YOU CANNOT OVERCOME THAT, REALLY. AND, WELL, SINCE I AM A DEFENCE LAWYER, I'M ONLY HAPPY WHEN MY CLIENTS BENEFIT. WHETHER THEY ARE GUILTY OR NOT, I DON'T MIND"

75. I THINK AT THE MOMENT, **THE SYSTEM IS SO LIMITED** TO WHAT CAN BE DONE, HOW YOU CAN EXPAND YOUR HELP OR ASSISTANCE"

76. "IN OLD, GOOD TIMES I REMEMBER, YES, INTERPRETERS WERE PEOPLE WITH WHOM FOREIGNERS COULD RELATE TO AND COULD ASK FOR HELP. NOT NECESSARILY IN RELATION TO A CASE ONGOING, WHETHER IT'S IMMIGRATION, CRIMINAL, OR ANY OTHER CASE, BUT JUST GENERALLY FOR HELP, BECAUSE PEOPLE WERE MORE HELPFUL IN THOSE DAYS, I THINK"

77. "BUT NOW IT'S ALL COMMERCIAL, SO IT'S VERY DIFFICULT TO BE ON TOP OF IT AND ACTUALLY PROVIDE ASSISTANCE WITHOUT WANTING MONEY FOR THAT. IF SOMEBODY DOES IT, IT'S JUST BENEFITING THE SYSTEM, ISN'T IT? FOR FREE"

78. "HOW MANY PEOPLE ARE PREPARED TO DO THAT NOWADAYS? I DON'T KNOW. I'M SURE THERE ARE"

79. "I'D SAY THEY'RE MORE LIKE OUTSIDERS, BUT IN A CERTAIN SITUATION THEY CAN BE A NECESSARY, INTEGRAL PART, AND THAT'S WHY THEY'RE THERE"

80. "IT'S NOT NECESSARILY THEY KNOW WHAT'S GOING ON. IT'S NOT NECESSARILY THEY KNOW WHAT SITUATION IS BEING DISCUSSED, WHAT OFFENCE. EVEN SO, WE DO GIVE THEM A HEADS-UP, AND WE DO USUALLY LET THEM KNOW WHAT THE CHARGES THEY FACED, AND WHAT STAGE THE PROCEEDINGS REACHED, SO THEY DON'T JUST COME IN AND START TRANSLATING FROM NOTHING. THEY KNOW EXACTLY WHAT IS GOING ON, BUT THEY DON'T KNOW THE FACTS: THEY DON'T KNOW WHO IS RIGHT, WHO IS WRONG, WHAT ARE THE WITNESSES' COMMENTS. SO THEY, IN THAT REGARD, THEY ARE NOT..."

81. "....AN INTEGRAL PART OF THE PROCESS. BUT THEY CAN BECOME, DURING THE PROCEEDINGS. YOU DO BECOME INVOLVED. YOU DO HEAR THINGS [BEING EMPHASISED 0:30:00]; YOU RELATE TO THEM. YOU MIGHT KNOW SOMEONE; YOU MIGHT RECOGNISE SOMEONE. NOT NECESSARILY THEY STOP AND SAY, "OH, I ACTUALLY KNOW THAT PERSON." IT'S NOT HAPPENING"

82. "I BELIEVE SO. I BELIEVE, SAY IN A COURTROOM, LEGAL ADVISOR, JUDGES, PROSECUTOR, DEFENCE LAWYER, EVERYBODY KNOWS WHAT'S GOING ON, AND WHAT..."

83. "YES. WHETHER WE ARE ON OPPOSITE SIDES OR NOT, IT DOESN'T MATTER. THE INTERPRETER DOES NOT HAVE ALL THE KNOWLEDGE FOR THAT TO BE AN INTEGRAL PART, BUT IF THE PROCESS IS LONG ENOUGH, BY THE END...OF IT YOU BECOME INTEGRATED."

84. "AND SINCE HE'S GOT AN ADVANTAGE OF KNOWING WHAT IS GOING ON WITH THE CLIENT, DIRECTLY FROM THE CLIENT, HE BECOMES QUICKER INVOLVED THAN ANY OF US, PROBABLY. SO IT'S ONE OF THOSE"
85. "ABSOLUTELY, IT CAN BE"
86. "THEN AGAIN, **THAT'S WHY WE HAVE COMPETENCE ISSUES.** THE INTERPRETER, IF HE IS A PROFESSIONAL ENOUGH, IF HE KNOWS WHAT HE DOES, WHAT NEEDS TO BE ACHIEVED, WHAT THE OBJECTIVES ARE, **HE WILL STAY IMPARTIAL FROM THE BEGINNING UNTIL AN END.** I'VE SEEN INTERPRETERS LIKE THAT. THEY CONDUCT THE SAME CASE, DAY IN, DAY OUT, TILL IT'S COMPLETED"
87. "AND IN FACT IN CROWN COURT, SOMETIMES THERE ARE CASES THAT GO FOR THREE, FOUR, FIVE WEEKS WITH THE HELP OF THE SAME INTERPRETER. THEY DO NOT BECOME, OR THEY ARE NOT EXPECTED TO BECOME, INVOLVED IN ANY SHAPE OR FORM, AND THEY CONTINUE TO CONDUCT IT IMPARTIALLY AND WITHOUT SHOWING THEIR OWN EMOTIONS, WHETHER... EVEN IF IT'S ABSOLUTELY CRYSTAL CLEAR TO EVERYONE THE CLIENT IS GUILTY AS HELL, THEY STILL REMAIN IMPARTIAL, WITHOUT DISCLOSING THEIR FEELINGS, WITHOUT PASSING INFORMATION FROM ONE SIDE TO ANOTHER. **IT IS POSSIBLE. IT IS ACHIEVABLE. BUT IT IS A SKILL.**"
88. "I WOULD HAVE THOUGHT SO. I WOULD HAVE THOUGHT PROBABLY THE MAIN"
89. "BECAUSE IT GOES AGAINST HUMAN NATURE. WE ARE COMING...**INVOLVED.....WHETHER WE WANT OR NOT**"
90. "SO THAT'S WHY SOME ARE BETTER THAN OTHERS"
91. "YES"
92. "YES, ABSOLUTELY. FOR EXAMPLE, NOT LONG AGO I HAD **A CLIENT WHO CONTESTED WHAT WAS BEING SAID.** BECAUSE ONCE YOU ARE AT A POLICE STATION AND INTERPRETER ATTENDS, THIS IS ALL BEING RECORDED ON A TAPE, OR NOWADAYS I THINK IT'S CDS. OR ONE OF THOSE, ANYWAY; SOME SORT OF DEVICE. THEN IT GOES INTO THE CORE OF THE CASE, BECAUSE WHAT YOU SAID AT YOUR INTERVIEW IS ABSOLUTELY CRUCIAL TO THE REST OF THE CASE (LAUGHS) OR WHAT DEFENCE YOU'RE GOING TO PUT FORWARD"
93. "AND THE CLIENT SAID, **WELL, ACTUALLY, I DIDN'T SAY LIKE THAT. THE INTERPRETER GOT IT WRONG; I DID NOT, I NEVER, MENTIONED ANYTHING LIKE THAT.**" AND I SAID, "LOOK, OKAY, IF YOU TRULY BELIEVE THAT, I WILL HAVE TO LIFT THOSE RECORDINGS AND I WILL CHALLENGE HIM." AND THE ONLY WAY TO DO IT IS TO INVITE ANOTHER INTERPRETER TO LISTEN TO THE RECORDINGS, SO THAT PROCEDURE HAS TO BE CONDUCTED, AND IT'S BEEN CONDUCTED, **AND THE CLIENT HAS BEEN PROVEN WRONG**"
94. "BUT YES, IT'S ONE OF THOSE, AND IF HE WAS NOT PROVEN WRONG AND THE INTERPRETER WAS AT FAULT, I WOULD HAVE CALLED THIS INTERPRETER TO GIVE A WITNESS STATEMENT IN COURT, ABSOLUTELY, BECAUSE WHAT HE SAID POTENTIALLY COULD RUIN MY CLIENT"
95. "BUT SINCE IT DIDN'T COME TO THAT, HE WAS LUCKY TO ESCAPE. YES, THERE ARE SITUATIONS LIKE THAT"

96. "YES, IT COULD BE. **I PERSONALLY COME ACROSS ONLY WHEN THE CLIENTS RAISE IT. I'M SURE THERE ARE OTHER SITUATIONS, IT'S JUST I ONLY COME ACROSS THEM, BECAUSE I'M MAINLY WORKING WITH CLIENTS, RATHER THAN ANY OTHER AUTHORITIES**"
97. "TO THE EXTENT, YES. YOU DON'T HAVE TO FEEL [IMPRESSION 0:35:16] THAT YOU ARE GOING THROUGH A MIDDLEMAN, SAY. BECAUSE AT THE END OF THE DAY, IF IT WASN'T A LANGUAGE PROBLEM, YOU WOULD HAVE BEEN... ONE-TO-ONE WITH YOUR CLIENT"
98. "IT'S ONLY LANGUAGE THAT MAKES SURE THAT SOMEBODY ELSE IS NEXT TO YOU. AND IT'S NOT IDEAL, BECAUSE SOMETIMES WE'RE DISCUSSING SUCH SENSITIVE ISSUES"
99. "SEXUAL ASSAULTS ARE ONE OF THOSE, WHEN CLIENTS HAVE TO DIG VERY, VERY DEEP TO TALK ABOUT SOMETHING THAT THEY DON'T WANT TO TALK TO ANYONE, LET ALONE ANOTHER PERSON SITTING THERE AND TRANSLATING ALL THAT"
100. "SO ESPECIALLY IN THESE CASES, **IT'S SO CRUCIAL THAT THE INTERPRETER STAYS REALLY UNBIASED AND NOT EXPRESSING ANY NEGATIVE OR POSITIVE EMOTIONS, SAY, "WHOA," SOME SORT OF EXCLAMATION OF SURPRISE. "OH, HE RAPED HER."**"
101. "THAT IS SOMETHING THAT USUALLY CAUSES CONCERN TO ANY NORMAL PERSON, BUT YOU HAVE TO WITHHOLD. YOU HAVE TO WITHHOLD THE EMOTIONS, JUST LIKE WE PRETEND THAT IT'S ALL NORMAL. IT'S NOT, BUT WE HAVE TO PRETEND THAT WE'VE HEARD IT BEFORE. "IT'S OKAY; YOU CAN TALK, YOU CAN SAY YOUR PIECE." OTHERWISE, WE'RE NEVER GOING TO HAVE CLIENTS. **THE SAME IS APPLICABLE TO INTERPRETERS**"
102. "I WOULD HAVE THOUGHT JUST BEING AN INTERPRETER IS IMPORTANT ENOUGH. FOR EXAMPLE, TRANSLATING IN MEDICAL PRACTICES, WHEN PEOPLE DISCUSS THEIR VERY INTIMATE ISSUES. **AND THAT IS VERY IMPORTANT, AND IS BEING RECOGNISED THROUGHOUT, I THINK**"
103. "BUT IN TERMS OF POLITICAL AND LEGAL SYSTEM, **I THINK INTERPRETERS PLAY A LOT STRONGER ROLE AND IT'S MORE PROMINENT NOW, ESPECIALLY WITH ALL THE CONFERENCES THAT WE HAVE ALL OVER THE WORLD: ON ZOOM, ON SKYPE**"
104. "SO PEOPLE USED TO TRAVEL EVERYWHERE TO MEET OTHER PEOPLE, AND THEY WOULD HAVE SOME SORT OF ASSISTANCE THERE. QUESTIONABLE; SOMETIMES IT'S A PROFESSIONAL INTERPRETER, SOMETIMES YOU JUST TRY TO SPEAK THE LANGUAGE YOURSELF. NOWADAYS, IN ALL THE OFFICIAL MEETINGS, **YOU WOULD HAVE AN INTERPRETER WHO OFFICIALLY TRANSLATES AND HAS GOT A ROLE, PROMINENT POSITION, IN THAT MEETING. AND WITHOUT HIM, THE MEETING WOULD NOT EVEN START**"
105. "SO I BELIEVE THE STATUS OF THE INTERPRETER FOR THESE OFFICIAL MEETINGS **HAS BEEN UPGRADED QUITE SIGNIFICANTLY. AND YES, WE ALL RELY ON THEM**"
106. "ESPECIALLY WITH THE PANDEMIC. SINCE WE STARTED HAVING ALL THESE HEARINGS REMOTELY, **WE HAVE INTERPRETERS WHO HAVE A POSITION, AND WITHOUT THE INTERPRETER, THE HEARING CANNOT GO AHEAD. ESPECIALLY REMOTE HEARING; NOBODY WOULD ALLOW THAT**"
107. "WHEN THERE WAS A FACE TO FACE HEARING, YOU WOULD POTENTIALLY, IF SOMEBODY SAW, SAY, HE SPEAKS A BIT OF ENGLISH, THERE IS A POSSIBILITY THAT

SOMEBODY IS GOING TO ALLOW THAT IN SOME RESPECT, AT SOME HEARINGS, DEPENDING ON THE SEVERITY OF THE HEARING OR WHICH STAGE THE PROCEEDINGS ARE”

108. “BUT WITH THE REMOTE HEARINGS, WHICH TOOK PLACE ALL OVER THE UK, FOR EXAMPLE... I’M SURE THAT THE SAME IS EXACTLY APPLICABLE TO ALL OTHER COUNTRIES, BUT SINCE I ONLY KNOW WHAT’S GOING ON HERE... **OFFICIAL INTERPRETER HAS TO BE BOOKED WELL IN ADVANCE, WITH A NOTICE. HE APPEARS ON SCREEN. WITHOUT HIM, THE HEARING IS NOT GOING AHEAD**”

109. “ALL THE JUDGES AND ALL THE LEGAL SYSTEM, THEY WILL JUST BACK OFF AND RESCHEDULE IT FOR THE AVAILABILITY OF THE INTERPRETER WHO ALSO PARTICIPATES REMOTELY”

110. “HE MUST BE NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE. SOMETIMES YOU HEAR, FOR EXAMPLE, BARRISTERS SEND ME ATTENDANCE NOTE: “COULD NOT GO AHEAD, EVEN SO, INTERPRETER HAS BEEN BOOKED. HE HAS NOT APPEARED, SO THERE IS SOME PROBLEM WITH THE SYSTEM. THEY DID NOT PROVIDE THE INTERPRETER; IT’S BEEN ADJOURNED IN A MONTH’S TIME.” THAT’S IT. WHY? THE WHOLE HEARING, ALL THESE PEOPLE WERE THERE. THE INTERPRETER WASN’T THERE, SO IT COULDN’T GO AHEAD”

111. “IT DOES HAPPEN. I WOULDN’T SAY IT’S VERY COMMON, BUT IT DOES HAPPEN. WE DO NOT KNOW WHERE THE FAULT LIES. **WE DON’T KNOW WHETHER IT’S THE INTERPRETER, OR WHETHER THE AGENCY, OR MAYBE SOME CLERK DIDN’T PASS THE INFORMATION. BUT WHEN THEY CHECK THE SYSTEM, THEY SAY,** “WELL, WE BOOKED AN INTERPRETER. THE INTERPRETER SHOULD HAVE BEEN HERE.” OR SHOULD HAVE APPEARED REMOTELY. “IT DIDN’T HAPPEN, SO WE CANNOT GO AHEAD.”

112. “AND BECAUSE THESE REMOTE HEARINGS, AND ALL THE HEARINGS NOWADAYS, THEY ARE SORT OF LOGGED IN PROPERLY, AND IT’S ALL MINUTES OF EVERY HEARING...”

113. “SO YOU CANNOT REALLY TWIST THE SYSTEM AND SAY, “WELL, THE INTERPRETER IS NOT HERE.” HE ACTUALLY... **WE THINK HE UNDERSTANDS WE CANNOT DO THAT ANY MORE**”

114. “IT IS A LOT MORE PRESSURE ON THE LEGAL SYSTEM TO MAKE SURE THE DEFENDANT UNDERSTANDS WHAT’S GOING ON WITH HIM, ESPECIALLY IF HE ENTERS A PLEA. SOMETHING LIKE THAT WOULD NOT BE JEOPARDISED”

115. “YES, ABSOLUTELY, ABSOLUTELY”

116. “ABSOLUTELY”

117. “LEGAL INTERPRETERS, DEFINITELY, DEFINITELY. **THEIR STATUS IS MUCH MORE PROMINENT NOWADAYS, I WOULD HAVE THOUGHT, THAN BEFORE**”

118. “I AM SURE THERE ARE OTHER AREAS IS THE SAME, BUT JUST TALKING ABOUT THE AREA THAT I’M AWARE OF, 100%”

119. “I THINK THE... AGAIN, I MAY BE REPEATING MYSELF, BUT IT’S VERY IMPORTANT WHEN YOU TURN UP, FROM INTERPRETER’S POINT OF VIEW, YOU MAKE SURE THAT THE CLIENT ACTUALLY UNDERSTANDS YOU, SPEAKS YOUR DIALECT, HE IS COMFORTABLE WITH YOU”

120. "FOR EXAMPLE, IN MANY CULTURES IF THE WOMAN IS A DEFENDANT AND A MAN COMES TO TRANSLATE AND THERE ARE SOME SENSITIVE ISSUES THAT THE WOMAN DOESN'T WANT TO DISCUSS IN DETAIL WITH A MAN, YOU WOULD ACTUALLY INTERVENE, AND PROBABLY THE INTERPRETER HIMSELF SHOULD QUESTION THE CLIENT WHETHER HE IS, OR SHE IS, HAPPY TO GO AHEAD WITH SHARING INTIMATE THINGS WITH AN INTERPRETER OF A DIFFERENT GENDER"
121. "DIFFERENT CULTURES APPLY DIFFERENT THINGS, **BUT THAT IS A CRUCIAL POINT, THAT THE CLIENT CAN ACTUALLY COMMUNICATE FREELY WITH THE INTERPRETER,** WITHOUT FEELING EMBARRASSED IN ANY WAY, WHETHER IT'S A CULTURAL, WHETHER IT'S A FEMALE/MALE SEX ISSUE, OR ANYTHING ELSE"
122. "SO NOT ONLY THE LANGUAGE ITSELF, BUT ALSO MENTALITY POINT OF VIEW IS BEING COVERED. SO I THINK IT'S AN ETHIC ISSUE OF JUST BEING ABLE TO FREELY TRANSLATE EXACTLY WHAT'S BEING SAID TO YOU, WITHOUT THINKING, "OH, ACTUALLY, I THINK SHE JUST DIDN'T SAY IT BECAUSE SHE WAS EMBARRASSED WITH ME." SO THAT SHOULD BE AVOIDED. IF THERE IS ANY FEEL OF THAT, **PROBABLY THE INTERPRETER SHOULD WITHDRAW.** HOWEVER, DISADVANTAGEOUS"
123. "YES, ABSOLUTELY".
124. "ABSOLUTELY. THE CLIENT HAS TO BE ABLE TO SAY HIS PIECE WITHOUT FEELING THAT HE'S BEING JUDGED IN ANY WAY. BUT ALSO, TO FEEL LIKE THE INTERPRETER ACTUALLY TRANSLATES WHAT HE OR SHE SAYS, BECAUSE THAT'S THE MAIN THING. AND AS I SAY, MANY CULTURES HAVE DIFFERENT SORT OF CUSTOMS"
125. "AND YOU HAVE TO MONITOR THAT, REALLY. FROM OUR POINT OF VIEW, WE HAVE TO MONITOR. AND I WOULD NEVER ALLOW, FOR A SEXUAL OFFENCE CASE, FOR A WOMAN TO COME AND TRANSLATE. I WOULD ACTUALLY STOP, BECAUSE PRIMARILY MY CLIENTS ARE MALE, BEING ACCUSED OF SOME SORT OF SEXUAL ASSAULT, **AND I WOULD ACTUALLY TRY TO INTERVENE AND MAKE SURE THAT THE CLIENT IS HAPPY TO GO AHEAD WITH THIS PARTICULAR INTERPRETER"**
126. "IF SUDDENLY A YOUNG, ATTRACTIVE FEMALE COMES AND DISCUSSES WITH THE DEFENDANT, MALE, ISSUE OF THE SIZE OF HIS PENIS, IT'S NOT SOMETHING THAT HE'S GOING TO FEEL COMFORTABLE ABOUT. BUT THAT IS HIS CASE. HE'S GOT TO DISCUSS IT, SO HE'S GOT TO BE ABLE TO FREELY TALK ABOUT IT, AND IF IT MEANS TO CHANGE THE INTERPRETER TO A MALE, OR TO OLD, OR TO ANYTHING THAT HE'S FEELING COMFORTABLE WITH, WE'RE GOING TO DO THAT"
127. "SOMETIMES THE INTERPRETER MIGHT SAY, "HE MEANS LIKE THAT BECAUSE THAT'S HOW IT IS IN OUR COUNTRY," OR SOMETHING LIKE THAT, BUT **THAT IS NOT AN APPROPRIATE WAY, BECAUSE THE COURT IS THERE FOR THEMSELVES TO DECIDE WHAT IS APPROPRIATE AND WHAT IS NOT,** AND THEY ARE KNOWLEDGEABLE ENOUGH TO APPLY THEIR OWN EXPERTISE"
128. "NO, I DON'T THINK SO"
129. "I DON'T THINK SO. UNLESS IT'S SOMETHING SO SPECIFIC, APPLICABLE ONLY TO THIS REGION, AND WITHOUT EXPLANATIONS YOU WOULDN'T UNDERSTAND. AND IT'S, LIKE, VERY FEW MOMENTS IN [LIFE 0:45:49] WHEN YOU COME TO THAT"

130. "USUALLY EVERYTHING SENSITIVE, OF THIS SORT OF NATURE, ALREADY BEEN HEARD AND SEEN IN COURT, **SO I THINK INTERPRETERS SHOULD WITHDRAW FROM MAKING ANY SORT OF REMARK OF THIS KIND, UNLESS HE'S BEEN SPECIFICALLY ASKED TO DO THAT**"
131. "PROBABLY... IT DEPENDS WHETHER IT IS AN INTERPRETER FOR A COURT. HE'S GOING TO ASK THE USHER TO COMMUNICATE THIS INFORMATION TO THE LEGAL ADVISOR. THE LEGAL ADVISOR IS THE PERSON WHO DECIDES HOW THE COURT IS BEING CONDUCTED, AND THEY SHOULD KNOW THAT, BECAUSE THAT'S THE WHOLE POINT THAT THEY HAVE A TRAINING FOR LEGAL SYSTEM, THAT THEY KNOW WHO IS CONDUCTOR IN COURT, AND THAT IS THE LEGAL ADVISOR, NOT THE JUDGES, NOT THE SOLICITORS, NOT THE BARRISTERS, BUT THE ACTUAL LEGAL ADVISOR, WHO WOULD ADDRESS ACCORDINGLY. HE COULD JUST RAISE HIS POINT AND SAY, "MAY I ASK A QUESTION?" THAT IS [WHAT/POINT/WORD 0:46:47] BEING RAISED WITH ME, AND DO YOU THINK I SHOULD TRANSLATE THAT? OR SHOULD I...?"
132. "SO THERE ARE POINTS OF CLARIFICATIONS, AND THERE ARE PEOPLE TO ASK. NOT NECESSARILY IN OPEN COURT, YOU WOULD ASK THAT..."
133. "AND ASK WHETHER THEY SHOULD..."
134. "I WOULD HAVE THOUGHT SO. "
135. "I WOULDN'T THINK SO."
136. "UNLESS IT'S SOMETHING... ALWAYS, COMMON SENSE HELPS. SOMETHING THAT IS SO COMMON THAT NEEDS TO BE SAID CAN BE SAID, **BUT I THINK HE IS NOT THERE TO TRANSMIT THE CULTURAL ELEMENT OF IT; IT'S JUST THE LANGUAGE. HE IS A TRANSLATOR. HE IS AN INTERPRETER. THAT IS HIS ROLE. NOT MORE THAN THAT**"

13.2.7 Respondent 25: second stage coding

Respondent 25

File name (transcript): interview with Respondent 25

Audio length – 0:47:50

Interview took place on 07/06/2022

First cycle coding methods: Initial coding, process coding, In Vivo coding

Number of codes in total: 136

Second cycle coding: clustering initial codes, searching for themes

1. "I'D SAY HE IS A FACILITATOR. HE/SHE IS A FACILITATOR OF COMMUNICATION."

- "SO, SOME OF MY CRIMINAL CLIENTS ARE IMMIGRANTS, EITHER REFUGEES OR ASYLUM SEEKERS. THAT'S NOT WHY I REPRESENT THEM; I REPRESENT THEM BECAUSE THEY COMMITTED SOME SORT OF CRIME. BUT ALONG THE WAY, **WE STRUGGLE TO COMMUNICATE, SO WE DO INVITE INTERPRETERS TO OUR MEETINGS AND CONDUCT THROUGH, OR RATHER WITH THE ASSISTANCE OF, AN INTERPRETER.**"
- **"HE IS ABSOLUTELY PARAMOUNT TO GOOD COMMUNICATION BETWEEN TWO PEOPLE WHO DO NOT SPEAK THE SAME LANGUAGE"**
- **"IT'S ALWAYS... I MEAN, OUT OF CHOICE, YOU HAVE TO HAVE AN INTERPRETER, YOU HAVE TO BE ABLE TO COMMUNICATE"**
- "DIFFERENT CULTURES APPLY DIFFERENT THINGS, **BUT THAT IS A CRUCIAL POINT, THAT THE CLIENT CAN ACTUALLY COMMUNICATE FREELY WITH THE INTERPRETER,** WITHOUT FEELING EMBARRASSED IN ANY WAY, WHETHER IT'S A CULTURAL, WHETHER IT'S A FEMALE/MALE SEX ISSUE, OR ANYTHING ELSE"

2. "I WAS A LAWYER BACK HOME, BUT AS YOU KNOW, IT'S QUITE HARD TO TRANSMIT YOUR KNOWLEDGE IMMEDIATELY."

- "THAT'S CORRECT. THAT'S WHEN I FIRST ARRIVED IN THIS COUNTRY. I BELIEVE RUSSIAN LANGUAGE WAS IN MASSIVE DEMAND, AND I ALREADY SPOKE ENGLISH. SO I IMMEDIATELY, AS SOON AS I ARRIVED, (LAUGHS) MADE MY WAY TO INTERPRETING SERVICES, AND I WORKED AS A REGISTERED INTERPRETER FOR THE REFUGEE COUNCIL."
- "THOSE DAYS, I THINK IT WAS CALLED MIGRANTS REFUGEE COUNCIL. AND ALSO, FURTHER, I WORKED FOR COURTS, SOLICITORS, PRIMARILY LEGAL BACKGROUND, BUT ALSO WENT TO HOSPITALS AND ALL OTHER THAT YOU CAN IMAGINE."
- "SO AS SOON AS I FIGURED OUT THAT THE SYSTEM IS QUITE DIFFERENT AND I WOULD NEED TO TAKE ANOTHER DEGREE HERE, I PUT ALL THOSE PLANS ON HOLD AND I JUST LIVED MY LIFE FOR A FEW YEARS BEFORE I ACTUALLY GOT AROUND DOING LEGAL STUFF AGAIN."
- **"I BELIEVE I WAS COMBINED THAT; I THINK IT'S CALLED DPS, DPSI..."**
- "INDEED. AND ALSO, IT COMES FROM PERSONAL KNOWLEDGE. I'M COMING FROM AZERBAIJAN, AND THEY SPEAK AZERBAIJANIAN LANGUAGE, WHICH IS VERY SIMILAR TO TURKISH. AND IN THE PAST, I OFTEN TRANSLATED FOR TURKISH CLIENTS, AND IT'S NOT ALWAYS I WAS SUCCESSFULLY TRANSLATING INFORMATION, AND I WAS NOT HAPPY WITH MYSELF."
- "AND FROM THOSE DAYS, I MANAGED TO REMEMBER THAT SOMETIMES CLIENTS MIGHT BE ESTABLISHING CERTAIN CONTACT WITH YOU AND THEY DON'T WANT TO SAY, BUT I PERSONALLY KNEW THAT I HAD NOT DELIVERED WELL ENOUGH, AND I DID NOT MEET THE SATISFACTION OF THE CLIENT, AND I JUST GOT AWAY PURELY ON THE

BACKGROUND OF INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIP WITH THEM, AND I SORT OF CALMED THEM DOWN, IN AN INTERPRETING WAY (LAUGHS) AS MUCH AS I COULD.”

- **“SO THAT KNOWLEDGE STUCK WITH ME, AND I KNEW THAT SOMETIMES YOU HAVE TO WATCH OUT FOR, ESPECIALLY IN CRIMINAL CASES, FOR PARTICULAR LANGUAGE OR THE WAY THE CLIENTS EXPRESS THEMSELVES. AND THAT MAKES A MASSIVE DIFFERENCE TO THEIR CASES, OR CAN MAKE.”**

3. “USUALLY WE WOULD HAVE INTERPRETERS THAT WE KNOW ALREADY”

- “USUALLY WE WOULD HAVE INTERPRETERS THAT WE KNOW ALREADY. WE HAVE AN IN-HOUSE INTERPRETER WHO PROVIDES ALL THE INTERPRETATIONS AS WELL: NOT BECAUSE OF HIS OWN KNOWLEDGE, BUT BECAUSE HE RUNS A COMPANY, AND HE EMPLOYS INTERPRETERS OF DIFFERENT LANGUAGES. SO WHEN WE ACTUALLY HAVE AN ISSUE AND WE NEED AN INTERPRETER, WE GO THROUGH HIM.”
- “SO, IT IS SOMETHING THAT WE ARE ALREADY ACCUSTOMED TO, AND IS RARELY SOMEONE, SOME OUTSIDER. SO USUALLY, I WOULD KNOW THE INTERPRETERS THAT WE WORK WITH, BECAUSE IT’S A PARTICULAR LANGUAGE. IT’S EITHER KURDISH, FARSI, ARABIC, SOMETIMES URDU, SOMETIMES PUNJABI, ROMANIAN, POLISH. SO, THOSE, I COME ACROSS MORE OFTEN THAN OTHERS.”
- “AND THAT WOULD BE PEOPLE I USUALLY KNOW AND HAVE COME ACROSS BEFORE, SO I CANNOT REALLY SAY THAT SOMETHING HAS TAKEN ME BY SURPRISE AS SUCH.”
- “YES, YES, INDEED. OUR IMMIGRATION DEPARTMENT CONDUCTS ROUTINELY FARSI SPEAKERS, AND WE HAVE A PERSON WHO IS A DIRECTOR OF A COMPANY WHO PROVIDES INTERPRETING SERVICES. SO NOT ONLY WE HAVE HIM IN HOUSE, BUT ALSO WHEN WE NEED FOR OTHER LANGUAGES, WE CAN GO THROUGH HIM AND HE PROVIDES US WITH HIS, I WOULD SAY, SUB-INTERPRETERS, JUST TO PROVIDE THE DIFFERENT LANGUAGES.
- SO I RARELY PICK UP A PHONE AND CALL TO SOME INTERPRETING AGENCIES, BECAUSE WE DO HAVE HIM ON BOARD, AND WE DO HAVE THIS FACILITY IN HOUSE.”
- “YES, INDEED. WHEN WE ARE IN COURT AND THE INTERPRETER... I MEAN, THE ONLY WAY THE INTERPRETER COULD BE IN COURT IS WHEN COURT CALLS THROUGH THESE BIG COMPANIES. SO WE WOULD NOT EMPLOY THEM OURSELVES; IT IS A COURT WHO PAYS, AND IT IS A COURT WHO PROVIDES INTERPRETING SERVICES, SO... AND AGAIN, IT WOULD BE SIMILAR LANGUAGES, BECAUSE AS YOU WOULD APPRECIATE, IF I’M TAKING INSTRUCTIONS FOR A PARTICULAR CLIENT WITH PARTICULAR LANGUAGE NEEDS, THE SAME INTERPRETER GOES TO, THE SAME CLIENT GOES TO COURT AND [IT IS 0:09:48] THE SAME LANGUAGES.”
- “SO AGAIN, I GOT TO KNOW SOME OF THE INTERPRETERS WHO WORK FOR THE COURTS. WE DO NOT HAVE A CLOSE RELATIONSHIP, BUT I DO RECOGNISE THEM, THEY RECOGNISE ME. SO I DO HAVE SOME EXPERIENCE WITH THAT. NOT EMPLOYING THEM DIRECTLY OR RATHER CONTRACTING THEM DIRECTLY, BUT BEING IN A

POSITION TO USE THEM WITH THE COURT'S PERMISSION, OR WITH BEING FACILITATED BY THE COURT."

- "MY PERSONAL EXPERIENCE, LOCAL AGENCIES OR OTHER AGENCIES THAT I WORK WITH... LET'S BE FAIR, IT'S PROBABLY TWO OR THREE AGENCIES THAT I WORK WITH CLOSELY, AND THEIR INTERPRETERS, MAYBE BECAUSE I GOT USED TO THEM, THEIR INTERPRETERS ARE MUCH BETTER, MORE EFFICIENT, ON TIME"

4. **"BUT YES, COURT INTERPRETERS, THEY ARE A BIT DIFFERENT"**

- **"COURT INTERPRETERS CAN BE VERY MONEY-WATCHING**, LET'S PUT IT THAT WAY, SO MONEY IS A KEY FOR THEM. THEY COME, THEY CLOCK IN, THEY WATCH THE TIME. THEY'RE EXTREMELY PLEASED WHEN THE TIME OVERRUNS."
- **"BUT YES, COURT INTERPRETERS, THEY ARE A BIT DIFFERENT. THEY COME ON THE DOT, LITERALLY. I DO EXPECT THEM TO COME A BIT EARLIER TO PROVIDE ASSISTANCE**. THEY DON'T DO THAT; THEY COME ON TIME, AND IF THEY ARE BOOKED FOR 10:00, THEY WOULD APPEAR AT 10:00, SOMETIMES OVER-RUN."
- "AGAIN, THE RELATED EXCUSES I'VE HEARD WHY THEY COME SO LATE. OFTEN, THEY'RE STUCK IN SOME OTHER ROOM; YOU NEED TO GO AND FIND THEM. SO IT'S NOT IDEAL."
- "YOU WOULD HAVE THOUGHT IT'S BETTER, BUT IT ISN'T. IT ISN'T ACTUALLY BETTER, BECAUSE IT FEELS LIKE THEY'RE GOING TO GET PAID ANYWAY, WHETHER THEY'RE GOING TO DO THE JOB TO THE BEST OF THEIR ABILITY OR NOT."
- "YES. I HAVE ACTUALLY ATTENDED SOME APPOINTMENTS WITH OUR IMMIGRATION TEAM. OR RATHER, I REPLACED THEM WHEN THEY WERE NOT AVAILABLE. SO I WOULD SIT IN APPOINTMENTS, INSTEAD OF OUR IMMIGRATION LAWYERS, AND I WOULD TAKE INSTRUCTIONS WITH THE HELP OF THE INTERPRETER. **AND I COULD SEE THEIR ATTITUDE WAS MUCH MORE RELAXED THAN OUR INTERPRETERS...**"
- **"IMMIGRATION INTERPRETERS, THEY WERE A LOT MORE AT EASE, PROBABLY**. THEY KNEW WHAT THEY WERE TALKING ABOUT A LITTLE BIT MORE, BUT ALSO THEY WERE A LOT MORE CASUAL, WHERE OUR INTERPRETERS TRY TO CONDUCT THEMSELVES IN A SORT OF MORE EFFICIENT AND MORE PROFICIENT MANNER, IF I COULD SAY."

5. **"IT MADE THINGS WORSE FOR ME. PLEASE, I DON'T WANT AN INTERPRETER."**

- **"YOU CAN ALWAYS SEE THROUGH THE CLIENTS, WHETHER THEY ARE HAPPY OR NOT**. AND IN FACT, ROUTINELY WE DO ASK WHETHER THEY ARE HAPPY WITH THE INTERPRETING, AND BY MEANS OF SIGN LANGUAGE THEY CAN ALWAYS TELL YOU WHETHER THEY'RE HAPPY, WHETHER THE LANGUAGE IS ACTUALLY MEETING THEIR EXPECTATIONS."

- **"AND QUITE A FEW TIMES, WE HAD TO CANCEL THE APPOINTMENTS AND SAY, "WE'RE REALLY SORRY, BUT WE HAVE TO FIND THE PARTICULAR DIALECT." OFTEN IT APPLIED TO SORANI KURDISH."**
- **"KURDISH INTERPRETERS DO TURN UP, AND THEY'RE DIFFERENT DIALECTS, AND WE HAD TO SWAP THEM TO THE ORIGINAL ONES. SO WE, YES, WE DID COME ACROSS. AND THE CLIENTS MANAGED TO EXPRESS THEIR DISSATISFACTION DURING THE APPOINTMENTS, AND WE MANAGED TO SWAP THEM AROUND."**
- **"SO IT'S ONE OF THOSE THINGS THAT YOU HAVE TO TAKE A CHANCE ON. FOR EXAMPLE, JUST RECENTLY... NOT RECENTLY, BUT YESTERDAY, I'VE BEEN TO PRISON, AND ONE OF MY CLIENTS IS A KURDISH CLIENT, AND I'VE BEEN WITH HIM FOR A WHILE, BECAUSE HE'S GOT A NUMBER OF OFFENCES THAT WE SORT OF LOOKED AFTER HIM FOR."**
- **"AND HE SAID TO ME, "ON THE NEXT OCCASION, IN CROWN COURT, I DON'T WANT AN INTERPRETER." I SAID, "LAST TIME, YOU SAID YOU MISUNDERSTOOD SOMETHING, SO WE ASKED FOR AN INTERPRETER SPECIFICALLY. I KNOW YOU SPEAK ENGLISH, BUT YOUR ENGLISH IS NOT OF A LEGAL STANDARD, SO WE GOT YOU AN INTERPRETER THROUGH THE COURT SYSTEM."**
- **"SO I AM THINKING TODAY, HOW I'M GOING TO MAKE AN APPLICATION FOR THE NEXT HEARING, WHICH IS IN JULY, ON 20TH. AND I EXPLAINED THAT TO THE COURT, THAT INITIALLY I ASKED FOR AN INTERPRETER TO HELP HIM, AND HOW AM I GOING TO SAY, NOW, THAT NO, WE DON'T WANT AN INTERPRETER?"**
- **"SO IT'S ONE OF THOSE THINGS YOU HAVE TO CLEAR ABOUT ALL THE TIME. BUT YOU ALSO HAVE TO TAKE CLIENTS' WISHES INTO ACCOUNT, AND AGAIN, I'M TALKING ABOUT THE CLIENTS WHO CAN SPEAK ENGLISH, SOME OF IT. I'M NOT TALKING ABOUT THOSE WHO CANNOT SPEAK; THEY HAVE NO CHOICE."**
- **"YES, ABSOLUTELY. FOR EXAMPLE, NOT LONG AGO I HAD A CLIENT WHO CONTESTED WHAT WAS BEING SAID. BECAUSE ONCE YOU ARE AT A POLICE STATION AND INTERPRETER ATTENDS, THIS IS ALL BEING RECORDED ON A TAPE, OR NOWADAYS I THINK IT'S CDS. OR ONE OF THOSE, ANYWAY; SOME SORT OF DEVICE. THEN IT GOES INTO THE CORE OF THE CASE, BECAUSE WHAT YOU SAID AT YOUR INTERVIEW IS ABSOLUTELY CRUCIAL TO THE REST OF THE CASE OR WHAT DEFENCE YOU'RE GOING TO PUT FORWARD"**
- **"AND THE CLIENT SAID, "WELL, ACTUALLY, I DIDN'T SAY LIKE THAT. THE INTERPRETER GOT IT WRONG; I DID NOT, I NEVER, MENTIONED ANYTHING LIKE THAT." AND I SAID, "LOOK, OKAY, IF YOU TRULY BELIEVE THAT, I WILL HAVE TO LIFT THOSE RECORDINGS AND I WILL CHALLENGE HIM." AND THE ONLY WAY TO DO IT IS TO INVITE ANOTHER INTERPRETER TO LISTEN TO THE RECORDINGS, SO THAT PROCEDURE HAS TO BE CONDUCTED, AND IT'S BEEN CONDUCTED, AND THE CLIENT HAS BEEN PROVEN WRONG"**
- **"BUT YES, IT'S ONE OF THOSE, AND IF HE WAS NOT PROVEN WRONG AND THE INTERPRETER WAS AT FAULT, I WOULD HAVE CALLED THIS INTERPRETER TO GIVE A**

WITNESS STATEMENT IN COURT, ABSOLUTELY, BECAUSE WHAT HE SAID POTENTIALLY COULD RUIN MY CLIENT”

- **“BUT SINCE IT DIDN’T COME TO THAT, HE WAS LUCKY TO ESCAPE. YES, THERE ARE SITUATIONS LIKE THAT”**
- **“YES, IT COULD BE. I PERSONALLY COME ACROSS ONLY WHEN THE CLIENTS RAISE IT. I’M SURE THERE ARE OTHER SITUATIONS, IT’S JUST I ONLY COME ACROSS THEM, BECAUSE I’M MAINLY WORKING WITH CLIENTS, RATHER THAN ANY OTHER AUTHORITIES”**

6. “YOU WANT SOMEONE WHO APPEARS, WHO INTERPRETS, BUT ALSO HAS SOME PERSONAL INPUT IN TERMS OF ABILITY TO FINISH THE JOB”

- **“IT’S NOT THE BEST WAY, SOMETIMES, FOR THE CLIENT. YOU WANT SOMEONE WHO APPEARS, WHO INTERPRETS, BUT ALSO HAS SOME PERSONAL INPUT IN TERMS OF ABILITY TO FINISH THE JOB: AS SOON AS IT BECOMES AVAILABLE, TO FINISH, RATHER THAN JUST STRETCHING IT BECAUSE THEY ARE PUTTING IN MORE HOURS AND THEY ARE GETTING PAID MORE. AND I KNOW THEY’RE GETTING PAID, PROBABLY, WELL. I HAVE NO IDEA HOW MUCH.”**
- **“FIRST AND FOREMOST, OBVIOUSLY, AN ABILITY TO COMMUNICATE FREELY IN BOTH LANGUAGES: THE ONE THAT’S BEING TRANSLATED TO, AND FROM.**
- **“PROBABLY HONESTY IS A GOOD THING, BECAUSE OFTEN, AS I SAID, I MYSELF WAS IN A POSITION WHERE MY DIALECT WASN’T MATCHING THE DIALECT OF THE PERSON WHOM I WAS TRANSLATING FOR. SO, YOU HAVE TO WITHDRAW FROM TRANSLATION IF YOU DON’T UNDERSTAND, OR IF YOU FEEL YOU HAVEN’T BEEN UNDERSTOOD CORRECTLY.”**
- **“BECAUSE WHAT YOU’RE DOING IS, YOU’RE REALLY PLAYING WITH SOMEONE’S LIFE, AND THAT’S NOT PERMITTED, UNDER ANY CIRCUMSTANCES. THE FACT THAT YOU WANT TO EARN YOUR MONEY DOES NOT JUSTIFY RUINING THEIRS, AND THAT SHOULD BE PENALISED REALLY”**
- **“I THINK THE... AGAIN, I MAY BE REPEATING MYSELF, BUT IT’S VERY IMPORTANT WHEN YOU TURN UP, FROM INTERPRETER’S POINT OF VIEW, YOU MAKE SURE THAT THE CLIENT ACTUALLY UNDERSTANDS YOU, SPEAKS YOUR DIALECT, HE IS COMFORTABLE WITH YOU”**

Subtheme 1: “THEY HAVE TO STAY ALMOST INVISIBLE IN A ROOM”

- **“AND PROBABLY THE WAY THEY DO IT IS VERY IMPORTANT AS WELL. THAT FALLS INTO THE COMPETENCE PART OF IT. SO, THEY HAVE TO STAY ALMOST INVISIBLE IN A ROOM.”**
- **“THEY HAVE TO CONDUCT TRANSLATION OF THE LANGUAGE AND NOTHING ELSE. NOT TO TRY TO EXPLAIN ANY CONCEPTS, BECAUSE IT IS MY JOB, AND NOT TO TRY TO RELAY THEIR FEELINGS FROM THE CLIENTS TO ME, BECAUSE AGAIN, IT IS MY JOB**

TO UNDERSTAND THAT, AND IF IT'S SOMETHING NOT CLEAR, I WOULD CLARIFY, AND THAT SHOULD BE UNDERSTOOD BY THE INTERPRETER."

- **"TO THE EXTENT, YES. YOU DON'T HAVE TO FEEL IMPRESSION THAT YOU ARE GOING THROUGH A MIDDLEMAN, SAY. BECAUSE AT THE END OF THE DAY, IF IT WASN'T A LANGUAGE PROBLEM, YOU WOULD HAVE BEEN... ONE-TO-ONE WITH YOUR CLIENT"**
- **"IT'S ONLY LANGUAGE THAT MAKES SURE THAT SOMEBODY ELSE IS NEXT TO YOU. AND IT'S NOT IDEAL, BECAUSE SOMETIMES WE'RE DISCUSSING SUCH SENSITIVE ISSUES"**
- **"SEXUAL ASSAULTS ARE ONE OF THOSE, WHEN CLIENTS HAVE TO DIG VERY, VERY DEEP TO TALK ABOUT SOMETHING THAT THEY DON'T WANT TO TALK TO ANYONE, LET ALONE ANOTHER PERSON SITTING THERE AND TRANSLATING ALL THAT"**
-

Subtheme 2: "AND OBVIOUSLY, TIMING IS IMPORTANT AS WELL. THEY HAVE TO BE ON TIME, TOO."

- **"THEY DON'T HAVE TO GIVE THIS IMPRESSION THAT THEY'RE RUSHING SOMEWHERE, THEY HAVE TO PICK UP THEIR KIDS, BECAUSE THAT'S OFTEN THE CASE. "I'M SORRY, I NEED TO GO; I HAVE TO PICK UP MY KIDS," YOU KNOW, "FROM THE NURSERY." "OKAY, YOU'VE BEEN BOOKED, SO..." WITH ALL DUE RESPECT, THAT HAPPENS OFTEN, AND THAT'S NOT ACCEPTABLE, AND THAT DOESN'T GO INTO THE COMPETENCE PART OF IT, I WOULD HAVE THOUGHT."**
- **"THEY ARE PARAMOUNT TO SOME PARTS OF OUR JOB THAT CANNOT BE CONDUCTED WITHOUT THEM, AND THEY HAVE TO APPRECIATE THAT, AND THEY HAVE TO CONDUCT THEMSELVES ACCORDINGLY."**

Subtheme 3: "HE WILL STAY IMPARTIAL FROM THE BEGINNING UNTIL AN END"

- **"SECONDLY, STAYING IMPARTIAL. OBVIOUSLY, NOT JUMP TO DEFENCES, AND NOT TRYING TO ASSIST THE CLIENT IN THEIR OWN LANGUAGE, PURELY BECAUSE THEY WANT TO, BECAUSE THEIR JOB IS TO TRANSLATE OR TRANSMIT INFORMATION THAT IS BEING PASSED TO THEM, AND NOT MAKE THEIR OWN, AND NOT ASSIST IN ANY WAY."**
- **"AND AGAIN, AS I SAY, THEY HAVE TO BE IMPARTIAL, AS MUCH AS POSSIBLE. WE'RE ALL HUMAN; WE ALL HAVE FEELINGS; AND WE ALL TRY TO EMPHASISE, WHETHER WE WANT IT OR NOT. BUT AS MUCH AS EMOTIONS IS TAKEN OUT OF THE CONTEXT, IT'S BETTER FOR BOTH SIDES."**
- **"PROBABLY IT'S VERY DIFFICULT SOMETIMES, BUT THEY SHOULD DRAW THE LINE, BECAUSE THEY ARE THERE TO INTERPRET"**
- **"IF THEY WANT TO HELP SOMEONE IN THEIR OWN TIME, THEY ARE OPEN TO THAT AND THEY CAN DO IT, BUT NOT WITHIN THE VICINITY OF THE OFFICE, AND NOT WITHIN THE CONTEXT OF OUR JOB, BECAUSE THEN THEY INTERFERE WITH THE PROCESS AND THEY'RE NOT HELPFUL. SO AS LONG AS IT'S BEING DONE ON A HUMAN**

- BASIS AND TO THEIR OWN TIME, SOMEWHERE ELSE, BUT WITHOUT SORT OF COMPROMISING WHAT'S BEING SAID..."
- **"SO NOT TO IMPACT THEIR OWN VIEWS OR THEIR OWN IMPRESSION OF WHAT'S BEING SAID AND TRANSLATED TO THE CLIENT, WHO HAS NO ABILITY TO UNDERSTAND WHAT I SAID. AND THEY FULLY RELY ON THE INTERPRETER."**
 - **"SO ESPECIALLY IN THESE CASES, IT'S SO CRUCIAL THAT THE INTERPRETER STAYS REALLY UNBIASED AND NOT EXPRESSING ANY NEGATIVE OR POSITIVE EMOTIONS, SAY, "WHOA," SOME SORT OF EXCLAMATION OF SURPRISE. "OH, HE RAPED HER.""**
 - **"THAT IS SOMETHING THAT USUALLY CAUSES CONCERN TO ANY NORMAL PERSON, BUT YOU HAVE TO WITHHOLD. YOU HAVE TO WITHHOLD THE EMOTIONS, JUST LIKE WE PRETEND THAT IT'S ALL NORMAL. IT'S NOT, BUT WE HAVE TO PRETEND THAT WE'VE HEARD IT BEFORE. "IT'S OKAY; YOU CAN TALK, YOU CAN SAY YOUR PIECE." OTHERWISE, WE'RE NEVER GOING TO HAVE CLIENTS. THE SAME IS APPLICABLE TO INTERPRETERS"**
 - **"I THINK THE... AGAIN, I MAY BE REPEATING MYSELF, BUT IT'S VERY IMPORTANT WHEN YOU TURN UP, FROM INTERPRETER'S POINT OF VIEW, YOU MAKE SURE THAT THE CLIENT ACTUALLY UNDERSTANDS YOU, SPEAKS YOUR DIALECT, HE IS COMFORTABLE WITH YOU"**
 - **"AND IN FACT IN CROWN COURT, SOMETIMES THERE ARE CASES THAT GO FOR THREE, FOUR, FIVE WEEKS WITH THE HELP OF THE SAME INTERPRETER. THEY DO NOT BECOME, OR THEY ARE NOT EXPECTED TO BECOME, INVOLVED IN ANY SHAPE OR FORM, AND THEY CONTINUE TO CONDUCT IT IMPARTIALLY AND WITHOUT SHOWING THEIR OWN EMOTIONS, WHETHER... EVEN IF IT'S ABSOLUTELY CRYSTAL CLEAR TO EVERYONE THE CLIENT IS GUILTY AS HELL, THEY STILL REMAIN IMPARTIAL, WITHOUT DISCLOSING THEIR FEELINGS, WITHOUT PASSING INFORMATION FROM ONE SIDE TO ANOTHER. IT IS POSSIBLE. IT IS ACHIEVABLE. BUT IT IS A SKILL."**
 - **"I WOULD HAVE THOUGHT SO. I WOULD HAVE THOUGHT PROBABLY THE MAIN"**

Subtheme 4: "PROBABLY THE INTERPRETER SHOULD WITHDRAW. HOWEVER, DISADVANTAGEOUS"

- **"FOR EXAMPLE, IN MANY CULTURES IF THE WOMAN IS A DEFENDANT AND A MAN COMES TO TRANSLATE AND THERE ARE SOME SENSITIVE ISSUES THAT THE WOMAN DOESN'T WANT TO DISCUSS IN DETAIL WITH A MAN, YOU WOULD ACTUALLY INTERVENE, AND PROBABLY THE INTERPRETER HIMSELF SHOULD QUESTION THE CLIENT WHETHER HE IS, OR SHE IS, HAPPY TO GO AHEAD WITH SHARING INTIMATE THINGS WITH AN INTERPRETER OF A DIFFERENT GENDER"**
- **"DIFFERENT CULTURES APPLY DIFFERENT THINGS, BUT THAT IS A CRUCIAL POINT, THAT THE CLIENT CAN ACTUALLY COMMUNICATE FREELY WITH THE INTERPRETER, WITHOUT FEELING EMBARRASSED IN ANY WAY, WHETHER IT'S A CULTURAL, WHETHER IT'S A FEMALE/MALE SEX ISSUE, OR ANYTHING ELSE"**

- **"SO NOT ONLY THE LANGUAGE ITSELF, BUT ALSO MENTALITY POINT OF VIEW IS BEING COVERED. SO I THINK IT'S AN ETHIC ISSUE OF JUST BEING ABLE TO FREELY TRANSLATE EXACTLY WHAT'S BEING SAID TO YOU, WITHOUT THINKING, "OH, ACTUALLY, I THINK SHE JUST DIDN'T SAY IT BECAUSE SHE WAS EMBARRASSED WITH ME." SO THAT SHOULD BE AVOIDED. IF THERE IS ANY FEEL OF THAT, PROBABLY THE INTERPRETER SHOULD WITHDRAW. HOWEVER, DISADVANTAGEOUS"**
- **"YES, ABSOLUTELY"**
- **"ABSOLUTELY. THE CLIENT HAS TO BE ABLE TO SAY HIS PIECE WITHOUT FEELING THAT HE'S BEING JUDGED IN ANY WAY. BUT ALSO, TO FEEL LIKE THE INTERPRETER ACTUALLY TRANSLATES WHAT HE OR SHE SAYS, BECAUSE THAT'S THE MAIN THING. AND AS I SAY, MANY CULTURES HAVE DIFFERENT SORT OF CUSTOMS"**
- **"AND YOU HAVE TO MONITOR THAT, REALLY. FROM OUR POINT OF VIEW, WE HAVE TO MONITOR. AND I WOULD NEVER ALLOW, FOR A SEXUAL OFFENCE CASE, FOR A WOMAN TO COME AND TRANSLATE. I WOULD ACTUALLY STOP, BECAUSE PRIMARILY MY CLIENTS ARE MALE, BEING ACCUSED OF SOME SORT OF SEXUAL ASSAULT, AND I WOULD ACTUALLY TRY TO INTERVENE AND MAKE SURE THAT THE CLIENT IS HAPPY TO GO AHEAD WITH THIS PARTICULAR INTERPRETER"**
- **"IF SUDDENLY A YOUNG, ATTRACTIVE FEMALE COMES AND DISCUSSES WITH THE DEFENDANT, MALE, ISSUE OF THE SIZE OF HIS PENIS, IT'S NOT SOMETHING THAT HE'S GOING TO FEEL COMFORTABLE ABOUT. BUT THAT IS HIS CASE. HE'S GOT TO DISCUSS IT, SO HE'S GOT TO BE ABLE TO FREELY TALK ABOUT IT, AND IF IT MEANS TO CHANGE THE INTERPRETER TO A MALE, OR TO OLD, OR TO ANYTHING THAT HE'S FEELING COMFORTABLE WITH, WE'RE GOING TO DO THAT"**
-

Subtheme 5: "BUT I THINK HE IS NOT THERE TO TRANSMIT THE CULTURAL ELEMENT OF IT; IT'S JUST THE LANGUAGE. HE IS A TRANSLATOR. HE IS AN INTERPRETER. THAT IS HIS ROLE. NOT MORE THAN THAT"

- **"SOMETIMES THE INTERPRETER MIGHT SAY, "HE MEANS LIKE THAT BECAUSE THAT'S HOW IT IS IN OUR COUNTRY," OR SOMETHING LIKE THAT, BUT THAT IS NOT AN APPROPRIATE WAY, BECAUSE THE COURT IS THERE FOR THEMSELVES TO DECIDE WHAT IS APPROPRIATE AND WHAT IS NOT, AND THEY ARE KNOWLEDGEABLE ENOUGH TO APPLY THEIR OWN EXPERTISE"**
- **"NO, I DON'T THINK SO"**
- **"I DON'T THINK SO. UNLESS IT'S SOMETHING SO SPECIFIC, APPLICABLE ONLY TO THIS REGION, AND WITHOUT EXPLANATIONS YOU WOULDN'T UNDERSTAND. AND IT'S, LIKE, VERY FEW MOMENTS IN LIFE WHEN YOU COME TO THAT"**
- **"USUALLY EVERYTHING SENSITIVE, OF THIS SORT OF NATURE, ALREADY BEEN HEARD AND SEEN IN COURT, SO I THINK INTERPRETERS SHOULD WITHDRAW FROM MAKING ANY SORT OF REMARK OF THIS KIND, UNLESS HE'S BEEN SPECIFICALLY ASKED TO DO THAT"**

- "PROBABLY... IT DEPENDS WHETHER IT IS AN INTERPRETER FOR A COURT. HE'S GOING TO ASK THE USHER TO COMMUNICATE THIS INFORMATION TO THE LEGAL ADVISOR. THE LEGAL ADVISOR IS THE PERSON WHO DECIDES HOW THE COURT IS BEING CONDUCTED, AND THEY SHOULD KNOW THAT, BECAUSE THAT'S THE WHOLE POINT THAT THEY HAVE A TRAINING FOR LEGAL SYSTEM, THAT THEY KNOW WHO IS CONDUCTOR IN COURT, AND THAT IS THE LEGAL ADVISOR, NOT THE JUDGES, NOT THE SOLICITORS, NOT THE BARRISTERS, BUT THE ACTUAL LEGAL ADVISOR, WHO WOULD ADDRESS ACCORDINGLY. HE COULD JUST RAISE HIS POINT AND SAY, "MAY I ASK A QUESTION?" THAT IS WHAT BEING RAISED WITH ME, AND DO YOU THINK I SHOULD TRANSLATE THAT? OR SHOULD I...?"
- "SO THERE ARE POINTS OF CLARIFICATIONS, AND THERE ARE PEOPLE TO ASK. NOT NECESSARILY IN OPEN COURT, YOU WOULD ASK THAT..."
- "AND ASK WHETHER THEY SHOULD..."
- "I WOULD HAVE THOUGHT SO. "
- "I WOULDN'T THINK SO. "
- "UNLESS IT'S SOMETHING... ALWAYS, COMMON SENSE HELPS. SOMETHING THAT IS SO COMMON THAT NEEDS TO BE SAID CAN BE SAID, **BUT I THINK HE IS NOT THERE TO TRANSMIT THE CULTURAL ELEMENT OF IT; IT'S JUST THE LANGUAGE. HE IS A TRANSLATOR. HE IS AN INTERPRETER. THAT IS HIS ROLE. NOT MORE THAN THAT**"

7. "SO THEY REALLY ARE PEOPLE THAT WE CANNOT BE WITHOUT"

- **"SO THEY'RE ESSENTIAL IN SOME CIRCUMSTANCES, WHEN THERE IS NO OTHER WAY TO COMMUNICATE WITH THE CLIENT.** FROM MY POINT OF VIEW; I'M SURE THE SAME FOR THE CLIENT, WHO CANNOT COMMUNICATE OR UNDERSTAND ME."
- **"THEY ARE PARAMOUNT TO SOME PARTS OF OUR JOB THAT CANNOT BE CONDUCTED WITHOUT THEM, AND THEY HAVE TO APPRECIATE THAT, AND THEY HAVE TO CONDUCT THEMSELVES ACCORDINGLY."**
- **"EXTREMELY IMPORTANT. EXTREMELY IMPORTANT. FOR SOMEONE WHO DOESN'T SPEAK THE LANGUAGE, THERE IS NO OTHER WAY TO TRANSMIT THE INFORMATION FROM THEIR SIDE TO MINE, AND FROM MINE TO THEM"**
- **"IT'S ONE OF THOSE THINGS THAT YOU CAN'T BE WITHOUT.** YOU CAN BE WITHOUT LEGAL ASSISTANCE, IF YOU UNDERSTAND THE LANGUAGE, BECAUSE SOMEBODY CAN HELP YOU. BUT WITHOUT LANGUAGE, YOU CANNOT UNDERSTAND ANYTHING AT ALL."
- "BUT IN TERMS OF POLITICAL AND LEGAL SYSTEM, I THINK INTERPRETERS PLAY A LOT STRONGER ROLE AND IT'S MORE PROMINENT NOW, ESPECIALLY WITH ALL THE CONFERENCES THAT WE HAVE ALL OVER THE WORLD: ON ZOOM, ON SKYPE"
- "SO PEOPLE USED TO TRAVEL EVERYWHERE TO MEET OTHER PEOPLE, AND THEY WOULD HAVE SOME SORT OF ASSISTANCE THERE. QUESTIONABLE; SOMETIMES IT'S A PROFESSIONAL INTERPRETER, SOMETIMES YOU JUST TRY TO SPEAK THE LANGUAGE YOURSELF. NOWADAYS, IN ALL THE OFFICIAL MEETINGS, YOU WOULD HAVE AN

INTERPRETER WHO OFFICIALLY TRANSLATES AND HAS GOT A ROLE, PROMINENT POSITION, IN THAT MEETING. AND WITHOUT HIM, THE MEETING WOULD NOT EVEN START”

- “ESPECIALLY WITH THE PANDEMIC. SINCE WE STARTED HAVING ALL THESE HEARINGS REMOTELY, WE HAVE INTERPRETERS WHO HAVE A POSITION, AND WITHOUT THE INTERPRETER, THE HEARING CANNOT GO AHEAD. ESPECIALLY REMOTE HEARING; NOBODY WOULD ALLOW THAT”
- “WHEN THERE WAS A FACE TO FACE HEARING, YOU WOULD POTENTIALLY, **IF SOMEBODY SAW, SAY, HE SPEAKS A BIT OF ENGLISH, THERE IS A POSSIBILITY THAT SOMEBODY IS GOING TO ALLOW THAT IN SOME RESPECT, AT SOME HEARINGS,** DEPENDING ON THE SEVERITY OF THE HEARING OR WHICH STAGE THE PROCEEDINGS ARE”
- “BUT WITH THE REMOTE HEARINGS, WHICH TOOK PLACE ALL OVER THE UK, FOR EXAMPLE... I’M SURE THAT THE SAME IS EXACTLY APPLICABLE TO ALL OTHER COUNTRIES, BUT SINCE I ONLY KNOW WHAT’S GOING ON HERE... OFFICIAL INTERPRETER HAS TO BE BOOKED WELL IN ADVANCE, WITH A NOTICE. HE APPEARS ON SCREEN. **WITHOUT HIM, THE HEARING IS NOT GOING AHEAD”**
- “ALL THE JUDGES AND ALL THE LEGAL SYSTEM, THEY WILL JUST BACK OFF AND RESCHEDULE IT FOR THE AVAILABILITY OF THE INTERPRETER WHO ALSO PARTICIPATES REMOTELY”
- “YES, ABSOLUTELY, ABSOLUTELY”
- “ABSOLUTELY”

Subtheme 1: “I WOULD HAVE THOUGHT JUST BEING AN INTERPRETER IS IMPORTANT ENOUGH”

- “I WOULD HAVE THOUGHT JUST BEING AN INTERPRETER IS IMPORTANT ENOUGH. FOR EXAMPLE, TRANSLATING IN MEDICAL PRACTICES, WHEN PEOPLE DISCUSS THEIR VERY INTIMATE ISSUES. AND THAT IS VERY IMPORTANT, AND IS BEING RECOGNISED THROUGHOUT, I THINK”
- **“SO I BELIEVE THE STATUS OF THE INTERPRETER FOR THESE OFFICIAL MEETINGS HAS BEEN UPGRADED QUITE SIGNIFICANTLY. AND YES, WE ALL RELY ON THEM”**
- “HE MUST BE NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE. SOMETIMES YOU HEAR, FOR EXAMPLE, BARRISTERS SEND ME ATTENDANCE NOTE: “COULD NOT GO AHEAD, EVEN SO, INTERPRETER HAS BEEN BOOKED. HE HAS NOT APPEARED, SO THERE IS SOME PROBLEM WITH THE SYSTEM. THEY DID NOT PROVIDE THE INTERPRETER; IT’S BEEN ADJOURNED IN A MONTH’S TIME.” THAT’S IT. WHY? THE WHOLE HEARING, ALL THESE PEOPLE WERE **THERE. THE INTERPRETER WASN’T THERE, SO IT COULDN’T GO AHEAD”**
- **“LEGAL INTERPRETERS, DEFINITELY, DEFINITELY. THEIR STATUS IS MUCH MORE PROMINENT NOWADAYS, I WOULD HAVE THOUGHT, THAN BEFORE”**
- “I AM SURE THERE ARE OTHER AREAS IS THE SAME, BUT JUST TALKING ABOUT THE AREA THAT I’M AWARE OF, 100%”

8. "I DID HAVE A SITUATION WHERE UNPROFESSIONALISM WAS SO HIGH THAT EVEN MY TOLERANCE COULDN'T TAKE IT"

- **"AND OBVIOUSLY, TIMING IS IMPORTANT AS WELL. THEY HAVE TO BE ON TIME, TOO"**
- **"THEY DON'T HAVE TO GIVE THIS IMPRESSION THAT THEY'RE RUSHING SOMEWHERE, THEY HAVE TO PICK UP THEIR KIDS, BECAUSE THAT'S OFTEN THE CASE. "I'M SORRY, I NEED TO GO; I HAVE TO PICK UP MY KIDS," YOU KNOW, "FROM THE NURSERY." "OKAY, YOU'VE BEEN BOOKED, SO..." WITH ALL DUE RESPECT, THAT HAPPENS OFTEN, AND THAT'S NOT ACCEPTABLE, AND THAT DOESN'T GO INTO THE COMPETENCE PART OF IT, I WOULD HAVE THOUGHT."**
- **"BECAUSE OFTEN, THEY WANT TO HELP BUT THEY ACTUALLY RELAY VERY WRONG INFORMATION. "OH, DON'T WORRY. SHE SAID LIKE THAT; SHE MEANT LIKE THAT; IT'S GOING TO BE LIKE THAT." BUT THAT'S NOT WHAT I SAID, BECAUSE IF I WANTED TO SAY THAT, I WOULD HAVE SAID THAT FOR THEM TO TRANSLATE THAT."**
- **"I HAD A NUMBER OF THINGS GOING ON. I CANNOT RECALL NOW, BUT I SPECIFICALLY REMEMBER A TIME WHEN I HAD AN INTERPRETER, AND IN FACT, IT WASN'T A LOCAL INTERPRETER; IT WAS A COURT INTERPRETER."**
- **"BOOKED THROUGH THEBIGWORD, THAT'S RIGHT. HE WAS IN COURT; HE CAME LATE; HE WAS UTTERLY UNPROFESSIONAL. THAT'S ONE EXAMPLE THAT I REMEMBER SO, SO WELL. SO, MY CLIENT SPOKE NO ENGLISH WHATSOEVER. HE BARGED IN..."**
- **"I'M JUST TRYING TO RECALL. IT WAS SOME TIME AGO. I'M PRETTY SURE IT WAS FARSI, 100%. HE BARGED IN LATER THAN THE ACTUAL HEARING STARTED, AND WE SORT OF HOLD ON AND THE CLIENT HIMSELF CAME WITH SOMEONE WHO SPOKE ENGLISH, SO WE EXPLAINED THAT TO THE MAGISTRATES THAT WE WILL HOLD ON, SEEING WHETHER THE INTERPRETER IS ARRIVING OR NOT, BUT IN THE MEANTIME, WE CAN START SOME PRELIMINARY PROCEEDINGS, WHICH WE HAVE DONE."**
- **"SO HE LITERALLY WALKED INTO THE ROOM, WHERE EVERYTHING IS ALREADY BEING SAID. THE CLIENT IS IN A BOX, IN A WITNESS BOX. I AM WHERE I SHOULD BE; PROSECUTOR WHERE HE SHOULD BE; MAGISTRATES, LEGAL ADVISOR, EVERYBODY IN THEIR OWN PLACES. HE COMES IN, OBVIOUSLY OUT OF HIS COMFORT ZONE BECAUSE PROCEEDINGS, AS HE SEES IT, STARTED. IT HASN'T STARTED, ACTUALLY; IT'S JUST BEEN PREPARED TO START, BUT THAT'S HOW HE UNDERSTOOD."**
- **"AND HIS LITERALLY FIRST OR SECOND SENTENCE, "OH, HE DOESN'T UNDERSTAND ANYTHING. HE'S CRITICISING SOMEONE." AND I COULD SEE THE CLIENT COMPLETELY CONFUSED, AND HE'S LOOKING AT HIS RELATIVE WHO WAS THERE, WHO SPOKE SOME ENGLISH; I'M NOT SAYING GREAT ENGLISH, BUT SOME ENGLISH. AND I CAN SEE ALL THIS CONFUSION, AND I SAID, "COULD WE JUST POSTPONE THE PROCEEDINGS?" SO, WE NEED TO CLARIFY WHETHER THE CLIENT UNDERSTANDS THE INTERPRETER, WHAT IS GOING ON."**

- **"SO WE HAD TO ADJOURN, AND I TOOK QUICK INSTRUCTIONS, AND WE HAD TO CANCEL THAT PARTICULAR BOOKING BECAUSE WE THOUGHT HE'S NOT DOING ANY JUSTICE TO THE CLIENT, AND IT WAS ONE OF THOSE CASES WHEN THE CLIENT SHOULD HAVE BEEN EXPLAINED REALLY WELL, IN A FEW MOMENTS, WHETHER HE CHOSE THIS MAGISTRATES' COURT OR CROWN COURT. AND THAT'S NOT A CHANCE I COULD TAKE."**
 - **"AND I SAID, "BASED ON THE BODY LANGUAGE, BASED HOW HE IS AND WHAT HE TELLS ME," INSTEAD OF SAYING SOMETHING ELSE COMPLETELY, "I CAN SEE THAT HE IS JUST NOT RIGHT FOR THIS PARTICULAR MOMENT. AND TO START WITH, HE IS LATE, SO I AM NOT WRONG TO CALL IT OFF."**
 - **"SO WE HAD TO REBOOK IT, AND WE ADJOURNED IT TO ANOTHER DAY, WITH ANOTHER INTERPRETER ATTENDING. SO I DID HAVE A SITUATION WHERE UNPROFESSIONALISM WAS SO HIGH THAT EVEN MY TOLERANCE COULDN'T TAKE IT"**
 - **"I HAD TO DO IT. I COULDN'T POSSIBLY CANCEL IT MYSELF, BUT I HAD TO ASK FOR PERMISSION FROM THE MAGISTRATES TO ADJOURN IT, BASED ON THE FACT THAT I COULD SEE THERE WAS NO GOOD COMMUNICATION BETWEEN THE INTERPRETER AND THE CLIENT, BECAUSE THE INTERPRETER CAME SO NEGATIVE."**
 - **"LITERALLY, FROM FIRST WORDS, HE STARTED CRITICISING ONE, SECOND, AND THIRD THING, AND THAT WAS JUST COMPLETELY INAPPROPRIATE. AND I COULD SEE FROM THE CLIENT HE WASN'T COMFORTABLE, AND SINCE THE CLIENT FACED QUITE SERIOUS ALLEGATIONS OF SEXUAL ASSAULT, I COULD NOT TAKE A CHANCE. IT WAS ONE OF THOSE."**
 - **"AND AGAIN, THERE, IT'S EVEN MORE IMPORTANT, BECAUSE IF THE INTERPRETER WHOM YOU'RE RELYING ON FULLY BECAUSE YOU DON'T KNOW EXACTLY WHAT'S BEING TRANSLATED, YOU CANNOT STOP HIM, YOU CANNOT INTERFERE, IF THAT INTERPRETER IS NOT DOING HIS JOB WELL, EVERYTHING THAT YOU PUT INTO IT MIGHT GO AGAINST YOU"**
 - **"SO IT'S ONE OF THOSE THINGS THAT THAT'S WHY THEY HAVE LEGAL PROFESSIONALS WHO HAVE TO PICK UP ON IT. IT'S AN ISSUE OF PROFESSIONAL PRIVILEGE, AND YOU HAVE TO CONDUCT IT IN SUCH A MANNER THAT... YOU DON'T WANT TO POSTPONE PROCEEDINGS ANY FURTHER, BUT IF YOU FEEL THAT IT HAS AN IMPACT AND IT'S A NEGATIVE IMPACT, YOU HAVE TO STOP IT SOMEHOW. YOU HAVE TO INTERVENE; YOU HAVE TO ASK FOR ADJOURNMENT."**
9. **"ANY INTERPRETER IS BETTER THAN NONE, BUT NOT IN A CRIMINAL PROCEEDINGS, FOR SURE."**
- **"IT HAS TO BE WATCHED SO CAREFULLY, AND I KNOW SOMETIMES YOU'RE IN A SITUATION WHERE ANY INTERPRETER IS BETTER THAN NONE, BUT NOT IN A CRIMINAL PROCEEDINGS, FOR SURE."**

- **"ABSOLUTELY. IT COULD LEAD YOU SOMEWHERE WRONG."**
- **"IT'S NOT IDEAL. IT'S NEVER IDEAL, BECAUSE EVERYBODY WANTS TO CONCLUDE THE PROCEEDINGS AS SOON AS POSSIBLE, AND IT IS TIME-CONSUMING. SO YES, I THINK GOOD INTERPRETING IS A KEY"**
- **"ONCE YOU RELY ON THEM, THEY HAVE TO BE GOOD. THERE'S JUST NO TWO WAYS AROUND IT. PROBABLY LIKE WITH ANY OTHER PROFESSION, BUT MORE SO WITH INTERPRETING."**
- **"THEN AGAIN, THAT'S WHY WE HAVE COMPETENCE ISSUES. THE INTERPRETER, IF HE IS A PROFESSIONAL ENOUGH, IF HE KNOWS WHAT HE DOES, WHAT NEEDS TO BE ACHIEVED, WHAT THE OBJECTIVES ARE, HE WILL STAY IMPARTIAL FROM THE BEGINNING UNTIL AN END. I'VE SEEN INTERPRETERS LIKE THAT. THEY CONDUCT THE SAME CASE, DAY IN, DAY OUT, TILL IT'S COMPLETED"**
- **"BECAUSE IT GOES AGAINST HUMAN NATURE. WE ARE COMING...INVOLVED.....WHETHER WE WANT OR NOT"**
- **"SO THAT'S WHY SOME ARE BETTER THAN OTHERS"**

10. "I THINK AT THE MOMENT, THE SYSTEM IS SO LIMITED TO WHAT CAN BE DONE"

- **"YES. SO YOU CANNOT OVERCOME THAT, REALLY. AND, WELL, SINCE I AM A DEFENCE LAWYER, I'M ONLY HAPPY WHEN MY CLIENTS BENEFIT. WHETHER THEY ARE GUILTY OR NOT, I DON'T MIND"**
- **"I THINK AT THE MOMENT, THE SYSTEM IS SO LIMITED TO WHAT CAN BE DONE, HOW YOU CAN EXPAND YOUR HELP OR ASSISTANCE"**
- **"IT DOES HAPPEN. I WOULDN'T SAY IT'S VERY COMMON, BUT IT DOES HAPPEN. WE DO NOT KNOW WHERE THE FAULT LIES. WE DON'T KNOW WHETHER IT'S THE INTERPRETER, OR WHETHER THE AGENCY, OR MAYBE SOME CLERK DIDN'T PASS THE INFORMATION. BUT WHEN THEY CHECK THE SYSTEM, THEY SAY, "WELL, WE BOOKED AN INTERPRETER. THE INTERPRETER SHOULD HAVE BEEN HERE." OR SHOULD HAVE APPEARED REMOTELY. "IT DIDN'T HAPPEN, SO WE CANNOT GO AHEAD."**
- **"AND BECAUSE THESE REMOTE HEARINGS, AND ALL THE HEARINGS NOWADAYS, THEY ARE SORT OF LOGGED IN PROPERLY, AND IT'S ALL MINUTES OF EVERY HEARING..."**
- **"SO YOU CANNOT REALLY TWIST THE SYSTEM AND SAY, "WELL, THE INTERPRETER IS NOT HERE." HE ACTUALLY... WE THINK HE UNDERSTANDS WE CANNOT DO THAT ANY MORE"**
- **"IT IS A LOT MORE PRESSURE ON THE LEGAL SYSTEM TO MAKE SURE THE DEFENDANT UNDERSTANDS WHAT'S GOING ON WITH HIM, ESPECIALLY IF HE ENTERS A PLEA. SOMETHING LIKE THAT WOULD NOT BE JEOPARDISED"**

11. "I'D SAY THEY'RE MORE LIKE OUTSIDERS, BUT IN A CERTAIN SITUATION THEY CAN BE A NECESSARY, INTEGRAL PART, AND THAT'S WHY THEY'RE THERE"

- "IT'S NOT NECESSARILY THEY KNOW WHAT'S GOING ON. IT'S NOT NECESSARILY THEY KNOW WHAT SITUATION IS BEING DISCUSSED, WHAT OFFENCE. EVEN SO, WE DO GIVE THEM A HEADS-UP, AND WE DO USUALLY LET THEM KNOW WHAT THE CHARGES THEY FACED, AND WHAT STAGE THE PROCEEDINGS REACHED, SO THEY DON'T JUST COME IN AND START TRANSLATING FROM NOTHING. **THEY KNOW EXACTLY WHAT IS GOING ON, BUT THEY DON'T KNOW THE FACTS: THEY DON'T KNOW WHO IS RIGHT, WHO IS WRONG, WHAT ARE THE WITNESSES' COMMENTS. SO THEY, IN THAT REGARD, THEY ARE NOT...**"
- "...AN INTEGRAL PART OF THE PROCESS. **BUT THEY CAN BECOME, DURING THE PROCEEDINGS. YOU DO BECOME INVOLVED.** YOU DO HEAR THINGS BEING EMPHASISED; YOU RELATE TO THEM. YOU MIGHT KNOW SOMEONE; YOU MIGHT RECOGNISE SOMEONE. NOT NECESSARILY THEY STOP AND SAY, "OH, I ACTUALLY KNOW THAT PERSON." IT'S NOT HAPPENING"
- "I BELIEVE SO. I BELIEVE, SAY IN A COURTROOM, LEGAL ADVISOR, JUDGES, PROSECUTOR, DEFENCE LAWYER, EVERYBODY KNOWS WHAT'S GOING ON, AND WHAT"
- "YES. WHETHER WE ARE ON OPPOSITE SIDES OR NOT, IT DOESN'T MATTER. **THE INTERPRETER DOES NOT HAVE ALL THE KNOWLEDGE FOR THAT TO BE AN INTEGRAL PART, BUT IF THE PROCESS IS LONG ENOUGH, BY THE END...OF IT YOU BECOME INTEGRATED**"
- "AND SINCE HE'S GOT AN ADVANTAGE OF KNOWING WHAT IS GOING ON WITH THE CLIENT, DIRECTLY FROM THE CLIENT, HE BECOMES QUICKER INVOLVED THAN ANY OF US, PROBABLY. SO IT'S ONE OF THOSE"
- "ABSOLUTELY, IT CAN BE"

12. "BUT IF YOU'VE BEEN GIVEN THESE FEW SECONDS TO THINK ABOUT YOUR ANSWER, IT CAN BENEFIT YOU IN A BIG WAY, ABSOLUTELY"

- "ABSOLUTELY, ABSOLUTELY, **BECAUSE INTERPRETING GIVES THEM TIME IF THEY DON'T UNDERSTAND WHAT'S GOING ON, ESPECIALLY. THEY HIDE BEHIND THIS TRANSLATING PERIOD, BECAUSE IT GIVES THEM ADDITIONAL ADVANTAGE OF TIME,** AND AS WE KNOW, SAME AS WITH PEOPLE WHO SUFFER WITH ALL SORTS OF ILLNESSES, THEY'VE BEEN GIVEN EXTRA TIME TO RESPOND. AND THAT IS THE KEY SOMETIMES, BECAUSE SOMETIMES ON THE SPOT, IF YOU ARE PUT IN A WITNESS BOX, YOU HAVE TO REPLY THERE AND THEN"
- "IT DOES, IT DOES. BUT THERE IS NOTHING PERFECT, AS WE KNOW"
- "IN OLD, GOOD TIMES I REMEMBER, YES, INTERPRETERS WERE PEOPLE WITH WHOM FOREIGNERS COULD RELATE TO AND COULD ASK FOR HELP. NOT

NECESSARILY IN RELATION TO A CASE ONGOING, WHETHER IT'S IMMIGRATION, CRIMINAL, OR ANY OTHER CASE, BUT JUST GENERALLY FOR HELP, BECAUSE PEOPLE WERE MORE HELPFUL IN THOSE DAYS, I THINK"

- **"BUT NOW IT'S ALL COMMERCIAL**, SO IT'S VERY DIFFICULT TO BE ON TOP OF IT AND ACTUALLY PROVIDE ASSISTANCE WITHOUT WANTING MONEY FOR THAT. IF SOMEBODY DOES IT, IT'S JUST BENEFITING THE SYSTEM, ISN'T IT? FOR FREE"
- "HOW MANY PEOPLE ARE PREPARED TO DO THAT NOWADAYS? I DON'T KNOW. I'M SURE THERE ARE"
- **"BECAUSE OFTEN, THEY WANT TO HELP BUT THEY ACTUALLY RELAY VERY WRONG INFORMATION.** "OH, DON'T WORRY. SHE SAID LIKE THAT; SHE MEANT LIKE THAT; IT'S GOING TO BE LIKE THAT." BUT THAT'S NOT WHAT I SAID, BECAUSE IF I WANTED TO SAY THAT, I WOULD HAVE SAID THAT FOR THEM TO TRANSLATE THAT."

So, based on the above we can identify the following themes:

Theme 1: "YOU WANT SOMEONE WHO APPEARS, WHO INTERPRETS, BUT ALSO HAS SOME PERSONAL INPUT IN TERMS OF ABILITY TO FINISH THE JOB"

Subtheme 1): "I'D SAY HE IS A FACILITATOR. HE/SHE IS A FACILITATOR OF COMMUNICATION."

- "WE STRUGGLE TO COMMUNICATE, SO WE DO INVITE INTERPRETERS TO OUR MEETINGS AND CONDUCT THROUGH, OR RATHER WITH THE ASSISTANCE OF, AN INTERPRETER"
- "HE IS ABSOLUTELY PARAMOUNT TO GOOD COMMUNICATION BETWEEN TWO PEOPLE WHO DO NOT SPEAK THE SAME LANGUAGE"
- "IT'S ALWAYS... I MEAN, OUT OF CHOICE, YOU HAVE TO HAVE AN INTERPRETER, YOU HAVE TO BE ABLE TO COMMUNICATE"
- "FIRST AND FOREMOST, OBVIOUSLY, AN ABILITY TO COMMUNICATE FREELY IN BOTH LANGUAGES: THE ONE THAT'S BEING TRANSLATED TO, AND FROM.

Subtheme 2) "THEY HAVE TO STAY ALMOST INVISIBLE IN A ROOM"

- "AND PROBABLY THE WAY THEY DO IT IS VERY IMPORTANT AS WELL. THAT FALLS INTO THE COMPETENCE PART OF IT. SO, THEY HAVE TO STAY ALMOST INVISIBLE IN A ROOM."
- "THEY HAVE TO CONDUCT TRANSLATION OF THE LANGUAGE AND NOTHING ELSE. NOT TO TRY TO EXPLAIN ANY CONCEPTS, BECAUSE IT IS MY JOB, AND NOT TO TRY TO RELAY THEIR FEELINGS FROM THE CLIENTS TO ME, BECAUSE AGAIN, IT IS MY JOB TO UNDERSTAND THAT, AND IF IT'S SOMETHING NOT CLEAR, I WOULD CLARIFY, AND THAT SHOULD BE UNDERSTOOD BY THE INTERPRETER."

- TO THE EXTENT, YES. YOU DON'T HAVE TO FEEL IMPRESSION THAT YOU ARE GOING THROUGH A MIDDLEMAN, SAY. BECAUSE AT THE END OF THE DAY, IF IT WASN'T A LANGUAGE PROBLEM, YOU WOULD HAVE BEEN... ONE-TO-ONE WITH YOUR CLIENT"
- "IT'S ONLY LANGUAGE THAT MAKES SURE THAT SOMEBODY ELSE IS NEXT TO YOU. AND IT'S NOT IDEAL, BECAUSE SOMETIMES WE'RE DISCUSSING SUCH SENSITIVE ISSUES"

Subtheme 3) "HE WILL STAY IMPARTIAL FROM THE BEGINNING UNTIL AN END"

- "SECONDLY, STAYING IMPARTIAL. OBVIOUSLY, NOT JUMP TO DEFENCES, AND NOT TRYING TO ASSIST THE CLIENT IN THEIR OWN LANGUAGE, PURELY BECAUSE THEY WANT TO, BECAUSE THEIR JOB IS TO TRANSLATE OR TRANSMIT INFORMATION THAT IS BEING PASSED TO THEM, AND NOT MAKE THEIR OWN, AND NOT ASSIST IN ANY WAY."
- "AND AGAIN, AS I SAY, THEY HAVE TO BE IMPARTIAL, AS MUCH AS POSSIBLE. WE'RE ALL HUMAN; WE ALL HAVE FEELINGS; AND WE ALL TRY TO EMPHASISE, WHETHER WE WANT IT OR NOT. BUT AS MUCH AS EMOTIONS IS TAKEN OUT OF THE CONTEXT, IT'S BETTER FOR BOTH SIDES."
- "SO NOT TO IMPACT THEIR OWN VIEWS OR THEIR OWN IMPRESSION OF WHAT'S BEING SAID AND TRANSLATED TO THE CLIENT, WHO HAS NO ABILITY TO UNDERSTAND WHAT I SAID. AND THEY FULLY RELY ON THE INTERPRETER."
- "SO ESPECIALLY IN THESE CASES, IT'S SO CRUCIAL THAT THE INTERPRETER STAYS REALLY UNBIASED AND NOT EXPRESSING ANY NEGATIVE OR POSITIVE EMOTIONS, SAY, "WHOA," SOME SORT OF EXCLAMATION OF SURPRISE. "OH, HE RAPED HER."
- "PROBABLY IT'S VERY DIFFICULT SOMETIMES, BUT THEY SHOULD DRAW THE LINE, BECAUSE THEY ARE THERE TO INTERPRET"

Subtheme 4) "PROBABLY THE INTERPRETER SHOULD WITHDRAW. HOWEVER,

DISADVANTAGEOUS"/ "PROBABLY HONESTY IS A GOOD THING" – ethics of interpreters

- "AND PROBABLY THE INTERPRETER HIMSELF SHOULD QUESTION THE CLIENT WHETHER HE IS, OR SHE IS, HAPPY TO GO AHEAD WITH SHARING INTIMATE THINGS WITH AN INTERPRETER OF A DIFFERENT GENDER"
- "SO NOT ONLY THE LANGUAGE ITSELF, BUT ALSO MENTALITY POINT OF VIEW IS BEING COVERED. SO I THINK IT'S AN ETHIC ISSUE OF JUST BEING ABLE TO FREELY TRANSLATE EXACTLY WHAT'S BEING SAID TO YOU, WITHOUT THINKING, "OH, ACTUALLY, I THINK SHE JUST DIDN'T SAY IT BECAUSE SHE WAS EMBARRASSED WITH ME." SO THAT SHOULD BE AVOIDED. IF THERE IS ANY FEEL OF THAT, PROBABLY THE INTERPRETER SHOULD WITHDRAW. HOWEVER, DISADVANTAGEOUS"
- "THE CLIENT HAS TO BE ABLE TO SAY HIS PIECE WITHOUT FEELING THAT HE'S BEING JUDGED IN ANY WAY"

- "AND I WOULD ACTUALLY TRY TO INTERVENE AND MAKE SURE THAT THE CLIENT IS HAPPY TO GO AHEAD WITH THIS PARTICULAR INTERPRETER"
-

Subtheme 5) "BUT I THINK HE IS NOT THERE TO TRANSMIT THE CULTURAL ELEMENT OF IT; IT'S JUST THE LANGUAGE. HE IS A TRANSLATOR. HE IS AN INTERPRETER. THAT IS HIS ROLE. NOT MORE THAN THAT"

- "SOMETIMES THE INTERPRETER MIGHT SAY, "HE MEANS LIKE THAT BECAUSE THAT'S HOW IT IS IN OUR COUNTRY," OR SOMETHING LIKE THAT, BUT THAT IS NOT AN APPROPRIATE WAY, BECAUSE THE COURT IS THERE FOR THEMSELVES TO DECIDE WHAT IS APPROPRIATE AND WHAT IS NOT, AND THEY ARE KNOWLEDGEABLE ENOUGH TO APPLY THEIR OWN EXPERTISE"
- "I DON'T THINK SO. UNLESS IT'S SOMETHING SO SPECIFIC, APPLICABLE ONLY TO THIS REGION, AND WITHOUT EXPLANATIONS YOU WOULDN'T UNDERSTAND. AND IT'S, LIKE, VERY FEW MOMENTS IN LIFE WHEN YOU COME TO THAT"
- "USUALLY EVERYTHING SENSITIVE, OF THIS SORT OF NATURE, ALREADY BEEN HEARD AND SEEN IN COURT, SO I THINK INTERPRETERS SHOULD WITHDRAW FROM MAKING ANY SORT OF REMARK OF THIS KIND, UNLESS HE'S BEEN SPECIFICALLY ASKED TO DO THAT"
- "SO I THINK INTERPRETERS SHOULD WITHDRAW FROM MAKING ANY SORT OF REMARK OF THIS KIND, UNLESS HE'S BEEN SPECIFICALLY ASKED TO DO THAT"
- "SOMETHING THAT IS SO COMMON THAT NEEDS TO BE SAID CAN BE SAID, BUT I THINK HE IS NOT THERE TO TRANSMIT THE CULTURAL ELEMENT OF IT; IT'S JUST THE LANGUAGE. HE IS A TRANSLATOR. HE IS AN INTERPRETER. THAT IS HIS ROLE. NOT MORE THAN THAT"

Subtheme 6) "AND OBVIOUSLY, TIMING IS IMPORTANT AS WELL. THEY HAVE TO BE ON TIME, TOO."

- "THEY DON'T HAVE TO GIVE THIS IMPRESSION THAT THEY'RE RUSHING SOMEWHERE, THEY HAVE TO PICK UP THEIR KIDS, BECAUSE THAT'S OFTEN THE CASE. "I'M SORRY, I NEED TO GO; I HAVE TO PICK UP MY KIDS," YOU KNOW, "FROM THE NURSERY." "OKAY, YOU'VE BEEN BOOKED, SO..." WITH ALL DUE RESPECT, THAT HAPPENS OFTEN, AND THAT'S NOT ACCEPTABLE, AND THAT DOESN'T GO INTO THE COMPETENCE PART OF IT, I WOULD HAVE THOUGHT."
- "THEY ARE PARAMOUNT TO SOME PARTS OF OUR JOB THAT CANNOT BE CONDUCTED WITHOUT THEM, AND THEY HAVE TO APPRECIATE THAT, AND THEY HAVE TO CONDUCT THEMSELVES ACCORDINGLY."

Theme 2: “IT MADE THINGS WORSE FOR ME. PLEASE, I DON’T WANT AN INTERPRETER.”

- “AND HE SAID TO ME, “ON THE NEXT OCCASION, IN CROWN COURT, I DON’T WANT AN INTERPRETER.” I SAID, “LAST TIME, YOU SAID YOU MISUNDERSTOOD SOMETHING, SO WE ASKED FOR AN INTERPRETER SPECIFICALLY. I KNOW YOU SPEAK ENGLISH, BUT YOUR ENGLISH IS NOT OF A LEGAL STANDARD, SO WE GOT YOU AN INTERPRETER THROUGH THE COURT SYSTEM.”
- “SO I AM THINKING TODAY, HOW I’M GOING TO MAKE AN APPLICATION FOR THE NEXT HEARING, WHICH IS IN JULY, ON 20TH. AND I EXPLAINED THAT TO THE COURT, THAT INITIALLY I ASKED FOR AN INTERPRETER TO HELP HIM, AND HOW AM I GOING TO SAY, NOW, THAT NO, WE DON’T WANT AN INTERPRETER?”
- “SO IT’S ONE OF THOSE THINGS YOU HAVE TO CLEAR ABOUT ALL THE TIME. BUT YOU ALSO HAVE TO TAKE CLIENTS’ WISHES INTO ACCOUNT, AND AGAIN, I’M TALKING ABOUT THE CLIENTS WHO CAN SPEAK ENGLISH, SOME OF IT. I’M NOT TALKING ABOUT THOSE WHO CANNOT SPEAK; THEY HAVE NO CHOICE.”
- “YES, ABSOLUTELY. FOR EXAMPLE, NOT LONG AGO I HAD A CLIENT WHO CONTESTED WHAT WAS BEING SAID. BECAUSE ONCE YOU ARE AT A POLICE STATION AND INTERPRETER ATTENDS, THIS IS ALL BEING RECORDED ON A TAPE, OR NOWADAYS I THINK IT’S CDS. OR ONE OF THOSE, ANYWAY; SOME SORT OF DEVICE. THEN IT GOES INTO THE CORE OF THE CASE, BECAUSE WHAT YOU SAID AT YOUR INTERVIEW IS ABSOLUTELY CRUCIAL TO THE REST OF THE CASE OR WHAT DEFENCE YOU’RE GOING TO PUT FORWARD”
- “AND THE CLIENT SAID, “WELL, ACTUALLY, I DIDN’T SAY LIKE THAT. THE INTERPRETER GOT IT WRONG; I DID NOT, I NEVER, MENTIONED ANYTHING LIKE THAT.” AND I SAID, “LOOK, OKAY, IF YOU TRULY BELIEVE THAT, I WILL HAVE TO LIFT THOSE RECORDINGS AND I WILL CHALLENGE HIM.” AND THE ONLY WAY TO DO IT IS TO INVITE ANOTHER INTERPRETER TO LISTEN TO THE RECORDINGS, SO THAT PROCEDURE HAS TO BE CONDUCTED, AND IT’S BEEN CONDUCTED, AND THE CLIENT HAS BEEN PROVEN WRONG”
- “BUT YES, IT’S ONE OF THOSE, AND IF HE WAS NOT PROVEN WRONG AND THE INTERPRETER WAS AT FAULT, I WOULD HAVE CALLED THIS INTERPRETER TO GIVE A WITNESS STATEMENT IN COURT, ABSOLUTELY, BECAUSE WHAT HE SAID POTENTIALLY COULD RUIN MY CLIENT”

Theme 3: “I DID HAVE A SITUATION WHERE UNPROFESSIONALISM WAS SO HIGH THAT EVEN MY TOLERANCE COULDN’T TAKE IT”

- “BECAUSE OFTEN, THEY WANT TO HELP BUT THEY ACTUALLY RELAY VERY WRONG INFORMATION. “OH, DON’T WORRY. SHE SAID LIKE THAT; SHE MEANT LIKE THAT; IT’S GOING TO BE LIKE THAT.” BUT THAT’S NOT WHAT I SAID, BECAUSE IF I WANTED TO SAY THAT, I WOULD HAVE SAID THAT FOR THEM TO TRANSLATE THAT.”

- **"I HAD A NUMBER OF THINGS GOING ON. I CANNOT RECALL NOW, BUT I SPECIFICALLY REMEMBER A TIME WHEN I HAD AN INTERPRETER, AND IN FACT, IT WASN'T A LOCAL INTERPRETER; IT WAS A COURT INTERPRETER."**
- **"BOOKED THROUGH THEBIGWORD, THAT'S RIGHT. HE WAS IN COURT; HE CAME LATE; HE WAS UTTERLY UNPROFESSIONAL. THAT'S ONE EXAMPLE THAT I REMEMBER SO, SO WELL. SO, MY CLIENT SPOKE NO ENGLISH WHATSOEVER. HE BARGED IN..."**
- **"AND HIS LITERALLY FIRST OR SECOND SENTENCE, "OH, HE DOESN'T UNDERSTAND ANYTHING. HE'S CRITICISING SOMEONE." AND I COULD SEE THE CLIENT COMPLETELY CONFUSED, AND HE'S LOOKING AT HIS RELATIVE WHO WAS THERE, WHO SPOKE SOME ENGLISH; I'M NOT SAYING GREAT ENGLISH, BUT SOME ENGLISH. AND I CAN SEE ALL THIS CONFUSION, AND I SAID, "COULD WE JUST POSTPONE THE PROCEEDINGS?"**
- **"SO WE HAD TO ADJOURN, AND I TOOK QUICK INSTRUCTIONS, AND WE HAD TO CANCEL THAT PARTICULAR BOOKING BECAUSE WE THOUGHT HE'S NOT DOING ANY JUSTICE TO THE CLIENT, AND IT WAS ONE OF THOSE CASES WHEN THE CLIENT SHOULD HAVE BEEN EXPLAINED REALLY WELL, IN A FEW MOMENTS, WHETHER HE CHOSE THIS MAGISTRATES' COURT OR CROWN COURT. AND THAT'S NOT A CHANCE I COULD TAKE."**
- **"AND I SAID, "BASED ON THE BODY LANGUAGE, BASED HOW HE IS AND WHAT HE TELLS ME," INSTEAD OF SAYING SOMETHING ELSE COMPLETELY, "I CAN SEE THAT HE IS JUST NOT RIGHT FOR THIS PARTICULAR MOMENT. AND TO START WITH, HE IS LATE, SO I AM NOT WRONG TO CALL IT OFF."**
- **"SO WE HAD TO REBOOK IT, AND WE ADJOURNED IT TO ANOTHER DAY, WITH ANOTHER INTERPRETER ATTENDING. SO I DID HAVE A SITUATION WHERE UNPROFESSIONALISM WAS SO HIGH THAT EVEN MY TOLERANCE COULDN'T TAKE IT"**
- **"AND AGAIN, THERE, IT'S EVEN MORE IMPORTANT, BECAUSE IF THE INTERPRETER WHOM YOU'RE RELYING ON FULLY BECAUSE YOU DON'T KNOW EXACTLY WHAT'S BEING TRANSLATED, YOU CANNOT STOP HIM, YOU CANNOT INTERFERE, IF THAT INTERPRETER IS NOT DOING HIS JOB WELL, EVERYTHING THAT YOU PUT INTO IT MIGHT GO AGAINST YOU"**
- **"YOU DON'T WANT TO POSTPONE PROCEEDINGS ANY FURTHER, BUT IF YOU FEEL THAT IT HAS AN IMPACT AND IT'S A NEGATIVE IMPACT, YOU HAVE TO STOP IT SOMEHOW. YOU HAVE TO INTERVENE; YOU HAVE TO ASK FOR ADJOURNMENT."**
- **"IT HAS TO BE WATCHED SO CAREFULLY, AND I KNOW SOMETIMES YOU'RE IN A SITUATION WHERE ANY INTERPRETER IS BETTER THAN NONE, BUT NOT IN A CRIMINAL PROCEEDINGS, FOR SURE."**
- **"ABSOLUTELY. IT COULD LEAD YOU SOMEWHERE WRONG."**
- **"IT'S NOT IDEAL. IT'S NEVER IDEAL, BECAUSE EVERYBODY WANTS TO CONCLUDE THE PROCEEDINGS AS SOON AS POSSIBLE, AND IT IS TIME-CONSUMING. SO YES, I THINK GOOD INTERPRETING IS A KEY"**

Theme 4: “SO THEY REALLY ARE PEOPLE THAT WE CANNOT BE WITHOUT”

- **“SO THEY’RE ESSENTIAL IN SOME CIRCUMSTANCES, WHEN THERE IS NO OTHER WAY TO COMMUNICATE WITH THE CLIENT. FROM MY POINT OF VIEW; I’M SURE THE SAME FOR THE CLIENT, WHO CANNOT COMMUNICATE OR UNDERSTAND ME.”**
- **“THEY ARE PARAMOUNT TO SOME PARTS OF OUR JOB THAT CANNOT BE CONDUCTED WITHOUT THEM, AND THEY HAVE TO APPRECIATE THAT, AND THEY HAVE TO CONDUCT THEMSELVES ACCORDINGLY.”**
- **“EXTREMELY IMPORTANT. EXTREMELY IMPORTANT. FOR SOMEONE WHO DOESN’T SPEAK THE LANGUAGE, THERE IS NO OTHER WAY TO TRANSMIT THE INFORMATION FROM THEIR SIDE TO MINE, AND FROM MINE TO THEM”**
- **“IT’S ONE OF THOSE THINGS THAT YOU CAN’T BE WITHOUT. YOU CAN BE WITHOUT LEGAL ASSISTANCE, IF YOU UNDERSTAND THE LANGUAGE, BECAUSE SOMEBODY CAN HELP YOU. BUT WITHOUT LANGUAGE, YOU CANNOT UNDERSTAND ANYTHING AT ALL.”**
- **“WHEN THERE WAS A FACE TO FACE HEARING, YOU WOULD POTENTIALLY, IF SOMEBODY SAW, SAY, HE SPEAKS A BIT OF ENGLISH, THERE IS A POSSIBILITY THAT SOMEBODY IS GOING TO ALLOW THAT IN SOME RESPECT, AT SOME HEARINGS, DEPENDING ON THE SEVERITY OF THE HEARING OR WHICH STAGE THE PROCEEDINGS ARE”**
- **“BUT WITH THE REMOTE HEARINGS, WHICH TOOK PLACE ALL OVER THE UK, FOR EXAMPLE... I’M SURE THAT THE SAME IS EXACTLY APPLICABLE TO ALL OTHER COUNTRIES, BUT SINCE I ONLY KNOW WHAT’S GOING ON HERE... OFFICIAL INTERPRETER HAS TO BE BOOKED WELL IN ADVANCE, WITH A NOTICE. HE APPEARS ON SCREEN. WITHOUT HIM, THE HEARING IS NOT GOING AHEAD”**

Theme 5: “USUALLY WE WOULD HAVE INTERPRETERS THAT WE KNOW ALREADY”

- **“USUALLY WE WOULD HAVE INTERPRETERS THAT WE KNOW ALREADY. WE HAVE AN IN-HOUSE INTERPRETER WHO PROVIDES ALL THE INTERPRETATIONS AS WELL: NOT BECAUSE OF HIS OWN KNOWLEDGE, BUT BECAUSE HE RUNS A COMPANY, AND HE EMPLOYS INTERPRETERS OF DIFFERENT LANGUAGES. SO WHEN WE ACTUALLY HAVE AN ISSUE AND WE NEED AN INTERPRETER, WE GO THROUGH HIM.”**
- **“SO AGAIN, I GOT TO KNOW SOME OF THE INTERPRETERS WHO WORK FOR THE COURTS. WE DO NOT HAVE A CLOSE RELATIONSHIP, BUT I DO RECOGNISE THEM, THEY RECOGNISE ME. SO I DO HAVE SOME EXPERIENCE WITH THAT. NOT EMPLOYING THEM DIRECTLY OR RATHER CONTRACTING THEM DIRECTLY, BUT BEING IN A POSITION TO USE THEM WITH THE COURT’S PERMISSION, OR WITH BEING FACILITATED BY THE COURT.”**
- **“MY PERSONAL EXPERIENCE, LOCAL AGENCIES OR OTHER AGENCIES THAT I WORK WITH... LET’S BE FAIR, IT’S PROBABLY TWO OR THREE AGENCIES THAT I WORK WITH**

CLOSELY, AND THEIR INTERPRETERS, MAYBE BECAUSE I GOT USED TO THEM, THEIR INTERPRETERS ARE MUCH BETTER, MORE EFFICIENT, ON TIME”

Theme 6: “I’D SAY THEY’RE MORE LIKE OUTSIDERS, BUT IN A CERTAIN SITUATION THEY CAN BE A NECESSARY, INTEGRAL PART, AND THAT’S WHY THEY’RE THERE”

- THEY KNOW EXACTLY WHAT IS GOING ON, BUT THEY DON’T KNOW THE FACTS: THEY DON’T KNOW WHO IS RIGHT, WHO IS WRONG, WHAT ARE THE WITNESSES’ COMMENTS. SO THEY, IN THAT REGARD, THEY ARE NOT...”
- “....AN INTEGRAL PART OF THE PROCESS. BUT THEY CAN BECOME, DURING THE PROCEEDINGS. YOU DO BECOME INVOLVED.
- THE INTERPRETER DOES NOT HAVE ALL THE KNOWLEDGE FOR THAT TO BE AN INTEGRAL PART, BUT IF THE PROCESS IS LONG ENOUGH, BY THE END...OF IT YOU BECOME INTEGRATED”

Additional themes: “I WAS A LAWYER BACK HOME, BUT AS YOU KNOW, IT’S QUITE HARD TO TRANSMIT YOUR KNOWLEDGE IMMEDIATELY.”

13.2.8 Respondent 25: codes and themes from survey

Respondent 25: Codes and themes identified in the Survey

1. “I HAVE BEEN WORKING AS A COURT INTERPERTER AROUND 1999-2002. BETWEEN 2002 AND 2004 I WORKED AS A CRIMINAL CASE WORKER. SINCE 2011 I WORK AS A CRIMINAL PRACTITIONER/SOLICITOR/ADVOCATE”
2. “I WOULD SAY I COME ACROSS CRIMINAL CLIENTS WHO REQUIRE SERVICES OF INTERPERTERS ON A REGULAR BUT NOT FREQUENT BASIS”
3. “THE ROLE OF THE INTERPETER IN THE COURTROOM IS ORALLY TRANSLATING THE SPOKEN WORD BETWEEN TWO LANGUAGES IN A COMPLETELY ACCURATE AND UNBIASED MANNER”
4. “A COURTROOM INTERPRETER WILL ASSIST LEGAL PROCEEDINGS TO RUN SMOOTHLY BY ENSURINNG THAT THE PARTICIPANT CAN BE UNDERSTOOD”
5. “IN CRIMINAL COURTS, THE RIGHT TO AN INTERPERTER IS AN INTEGRAL PART OF THE RIGHT TO A FAIR TRIAL. IT IS A PRINCIPLE OF ENGLISH COMMON LAW THAT THE DEFENDANT MUST BE ABLE TO UNDERSTAND THE CHARGES MADE AGANST THEM AND

- BE ABLE TO PROPERLY DEFEND THEMSELVES. WHERE THE NEED FOR AN INTERPRETER ARISES, HIS/HER COMPETENCE IS PIVOTAL TO AN OUTCOME OF THE PROCEEDINGS"
6. "AS HUMAN, WE ARE PRONE TO DEVELOP OUR OWN UNDERSTANDING OF THE SITUATION AND SOMETIMES WITHHELDING OUR VIEWS AND OPINIONS IS CHALLENGING. THE INTERPRETER IS AT THE RECEIVING END OF TRUTH AND LIE AND AS THUS SHOULD **WITHDRAW FROM CHANNELLING HIS VIEWS** AS IT MIGHT LEAD TO CONSEQUENCES DETERMINING THE OUTCOME"
 7. "OF COURSE, PRESENCE OF AN ADDITIONAL PARTY ALWAYS HAS ITS IMPACT. HOWEVER NECESSARY IT IS TO HAVE AN INTERPRETER, IT DOES SLOW THE PROCESS DOWN AND OFTEN LEADS TO AN EMOTIONAL DETACHMENT OF THE WITNESS. IN TURN, IT MAY LEAD TO DIFFERENT PICTURE OF THE ACCOUNT TO BE CREATED"
 8. **"THE INTERPRETER IS A PART OF LEGAL PROCESS AND HAS PHYSICAL AND VISUAL PRESENCE. IF THE INTERPRETATION IS CONTESTED, THE INTERPRETER HIMSELF MIGHT BECOME A WITNESS AT COURT"**
 9. "HOWEVER, THE MOST EFFICIENT INTERPRETERS WOULD ENSURE THE INTERPRETATION RUNS SO SMOOTHLY THAT THE COURT/COURT PARTICIPANTS PAY ALMOST NO ATTENTION TO THE INTERPRETER AND INSTEAD FULLY CONCENTRATE ON THE FACTS OF THE CASE"
 10. **"I THINKS THE FIELD OF INTERPRETATION RECEIVED A GLOBAL RECOGNITION AS A FAST GROWING INDUSTRY WHICH IS APPLICABLE TO LEGAL SYSTEM IN THE UK. MAIN CHANGE, IN MY OPINION, DERIVES FROM THE FACT THAT A GREAT VOLUME OF INTERPRETING IS NOW CONDUCTED REMOTELY WHICH AFFECTS OVERALL RUNNING OF CRIMINAL PROCEEDINGS AS WE SEE IT AT POLICE STATIONS AND COURTS"**
 11. "PROBABLY ASSESSING AND UNDERSTANDING THAT FIRSTLY THE INTERPRETING IS TO BE CONDUCTED IN A COMMONLY SPOKEN LANGUAGE BETWEEN THE INTERPRETER AND THE RECIPIENT OF THE INTERPRETING SERVICES"
 12. "SECONDLY, THAT THE INTERPRETING CAN BE CONDUCTED IMPARTIALLY"
 13. "THIRDLY, THE INTERPRETER CAN DEMONSTRATE HIGH PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS FOR COURTROOM DEMEANOR AND IS IN A POSITION TO APPROPRIATELY ASSIST THE COURT"

Identified themes:

1. **"THE INTERPRETER IS A PART OF LEGAL PROCESS AND HAS PHYSICAL AND VISUAL PRESENCE"** - interpreters are part of the legal process
2. **"A COURTROOM INTERPRETER WILL ASSIST LEGAL PROCEEDINGS TO RUN SMOOTHLY BY ENSURING THAT THE PARTICIPANT CAN BE UNDERSTOOD"** – interpreter's role, expectations of the interpreter.
3. **"WHERE THE NEED FOR AN INTERPRETER ARISES, HIS/HER COMPETENCE IS PIVOTAL TO AN OUTCOME OF THE PROCEEDINGS"** – the importance of interpreters' competence can not be overemphasised, interpreters are very important in legal proceedings.

4. **“THE INTERPRETER IS AT THE RECEIVING END OF TRUTH AND LIE AND AS THUS SHOULD WITHDRAW FROM CHANNELLING HIS VIEWS”** – obligations/expectations of the interpreter, impartiality is key.
5. **“I THINKS THE FIELD OF INTERPRETATION RECEIVED A GLOBAL RECOGNITION AS A FAST GROWING INDUSTRY WHICH IS APPLICABLE TO LEGAL SYSTEM IN THE UK.** – about recognition and status of interpreters;
6. **“HOWEVER NECESSARY IT IS TO HAVE AN INTERPRETER, IT DOES SLOW THE PROCESS DOWN AND OFTEN LEADS TO AN EMOTIONAL DETACHMENT OF THE WITNESS”** – impact on the process.

The themes in the survey overlap with the following identified themes in the corresponding transcript of the follow-up interview (Themes 1, subthemes 2&3; themes 4, and 6):

Theme 1. “YOU WANT SOMEONE WHO APPEARS, WHO INTERPRETS, BUT ALSO HAS SOME PERSONAL INPUT IN TERMS OF ABILITY TO FINISH THE JOB”

Subtheme 2) “THEY HAVE TO STAY ALMOST INVISIBLE IN A ROOM”

Subtheme 3) “HE WILL STAY IMPARTIAL FROM THE BEGINNING UNTIL AN END”

Theme 4: “SO THEY REALLY ARE PEOPLE THAT WE CANNOT BE WITHOUT”

Theme 6: “I’D SAY THEY’RE MORE LIKE OUTSIDERS, BUT IN A CERTAIN SITUATION THEY CAN BE A NECESSARY, INTEGRAL PART, AND THAT’S WHY THEY’RE THERE”

13.2.9 Respondent 26: first stage coding

Respondent 26

File name (transcript): interview with Respondent 26

Audio length – 0:19:47

Interview took place on 30/06/2022

First cycle coding methods: Initial coding, process coding, In Vivo coding

Total number of codes: 52

1. "A LOT OF INTERPRETERS, IF THEY GO INTO COURT, THEN THE COURT WILL PROVIDE A COURT INTERPRETER"
2. "THE REASON I WOULD USE THEM IS IF I NEED TO TAKE THEIR INSTRUCTIONS"
3. "YEAH, IF THERE'S A COURT HEARING, THEN THE COURT PROVIDES INTERPRETERS"
4. "THE ONLY THING THAT THEY SHOULD BE DOING IS INTERPRETING EXACTLY WHAT'S ASKED OF THEM."
5. "THEY ARE TOLD THE QUESTION THAT'S REQUIRED TO BE GIVEN TO THE DEFENDANT, OR THEIR CLIENT, AND THEY MUST INTERPRET IT EXACTLY, AND THE RESPONSE EXACTLY"
6. "WHAT YOU DON'T NEED IS, SOME INTERPRETERS ELABORATING OR TRYING TO PUT THEIR SIDE OF THINGS, TRYING TO MAKE THINGS SOUND BETTER OR WORSE"
7. "I KNOW THERE'S NOT AN EXACT TRANSLATION BECAUSE IT DOESN'T WORK LIKE THAT, BUT YOU NEED TO HAVE THE TRUST THAT THE TRANSLATION IS AS CLOSE AS POSSIBLE TO THE QUESTION THAT NEEDS TO BE TRANSLATED, AND OF COURSE, THE ANSWER HAS TO BE TRANSLATED EXACTLY. THAT IS THEIR ONLY ROLE REALLY. THEY'RE NOT THERE TO GIVE EVIDENCE OR ANYTHING LIKE THAT"
8. "WELL, SAY IF I ASK THE QUESTION, "WHERE WERE YOU ON 8 JUNE?", HE MAY NOT ACTUALLY INTERPRET IT. TO SAY IT IN ANOTHER LANGUAGE, HE MIGHT SAY, "ON JUNE 8, WHERE WERE YOU?" IT'S THE SAME QUESTION BUT IT MIGHT HAVE TO BE PUT IN A DIFFERENT WAY TO MAKE SENSE OF ITS INTERPRETATION. THAT'S OBVIOUSLY THE LANGUAGE DIFFICULTY. BUT THEY MUSTN'T ADD TO THAT QUESTION. THEY MUST JUST TRANSLATE THAT QUESTION"
9. "YEAH, WITHOUT AN INTERPRETER IT WOULDN'T BE A FAIR TRIAL UNLESS WE DID EVERYTHING POSSIBLE TO ASSIST SOMEBODY WHOSE FIRST LANGUAGE IS NOT ENGLISH WITH THEIR LANGUAGE BARRIER"
10. "SO, ALTHOUGH THINGS TAKE A LITTLE TIME BECAUSE YOU HAVE TO ASK THE INTERPRETER, THEN THE INTERPRETER WILL ASK THE DEFENDANT, THEN THE DEFENDANT REPLIES, AND THEN IT COMES BACK – IT DOES TAKE LONGER – BUT IT DOES ENABLE THERE TO BE A FAIR TRIAL"

11. "WITHOUT THEM, IT JUST WOULDN'T BE FAIR TO EXPECT SOMEBODY WHOSE LANGUAGE IS NOT ENGLISH TO UNDERSTAND FULLY THE PROCESS"
12. "I DON'T THINK IT CAN WORK WITHOUT THEM, TO BE HONEST"
13. "OBVIOUSLY, **THEY HAVE TO BE TOTALLY INDEPENDENT AND HAVE NO LINKS WITH THE DEFENDANT**, BUT I THINK WITHOUT THEM SOME CASES COULDN'T GO AHEAD PURELY BECAUSE SOME PEOPLE CANNOT UNDERSTAND. PEOPLE MAY BE ABLE TO SPEAK THE LANGUAGE, BUT THEY MAY NOT UNDERSTAND FULLY THE MEANING OF SOME THINGS"
14. "SO, ALTHOUGH YOU THINK, THIS PERSON CAN SPEAK ENGLISH, AND YOU CAN HAVE A CHAT WITH THEM, IT DOESN'T MEAN TO SAY THAT THEY UNDERSTAND THE LEGALITIES OF A CASE AND THE PROCESS OF A CASE. THROUGH AN INTERPRETER THAT CAN BE PUT TO THEM AND EXPLAINED TO THEM IN A LANGUAGE THAT THEY UNDERSTAND, SO I **THINK, YES, THEY'RE VERY IMPORTANT TO THE LEGAL SYSTEM**"
15. "YES, YOU HAVE TO INSTRUCT THE INTERPRETERS, AND THERE ARE MORE INTERPRETERS AVAILABLE AS TIME HAS GONE BY"
16. "IT WAS VERY DIFFICULT WHEN I FIRST STARTED, YOU'D PROBABLY HAVE ONE OR TWO COMPANIES THAT WOULD HAVE THREE OR FOUR DIFFERENT LANGUAGES. NOW THERE ARE MORE COMPANIES THAT OFFER THAT SERVICE AND, I THINK, EVERY LANGUAGE IS COVERED"
17. "BECAUSE WE'RE SUCH A DIVERSE COUNTRY, THERE'S SO MANY DIFFERENT PEOPLE LIVING HERE FROM ALL WALKS OF LIFE AND DIFFERENT PARTS OF THE WORLD, SO I THINK IT'S IMPORTANT THAT THERE IS THAT DIVERSITY IN THE INTERPRETING BUSINESS"
18. "I THINK THEY'RE MORE RESPECTED NOW. I THINK TIMES HAVE MOVED ON AND PEOPLE UNDERSTAND THAT PEOPLE NEED INTERPRETERS, **AND THEY ARE AN IMPORTANT PART OF THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM**"
19. "**I THINK THEY'VE ALWAYS BEEN RESPECTED BY THE LEGAL PROFESSION**. I DON'T THINK THEY'VE EVER NOT BEEN"
20. "I THINK THEY'RE MORE WIDELY USED NOW. I THINK THERE'S A GREATER UNDERSTANDING OF PEOPLE, WHEREAS, LIKE I SAID, BEFORE YOU CAN HAVE A CHAT AND YOU THINK SOMEBODY UNDERSTANDS, BUT THERE'S ONE THING HAVING A CHAT WITH SOMEBODY AND THEN CONDUCTING YOUR CASE AND UNDERSTANDING THE PROCESS OF THE CASE AND WHAT THEY'RE SAYING AND WHAT THE MEANING OF IT IS"
21. "I THINK THERE IS A GREATER UNDERSTANDING AND RESPECT FOR INTERPRETERS NOW"
22. "I USED TO USE, I THINK IT'S CALLED [BIT, B-I-T 0:11:37]. SOMETHING INTERPRETING AND TRANSLATION, I THINK IT WAS CALLED. I CAN'T REMEMBER OFF THE TOP OF MY HEAD. THERE WERE VERY LIMITED COMPANIES THAT WOULD DO THAT, BUT NOW, YES, THERE IS A NATIONAL REGISTER, OR YOU CAN GO ONLINE AND ASK FOR LOCAL INTERPRETERS"
23. "SAY IF YOU'VE GOT A CASE IN BRADFORD OR CARDIFF OR SOMETHING, I WOULD GOOGLE A LOCAL FIRM BECAUSE OBVIOUSLY THERE'S THE COST OF TRAVELLING AND GETTING PEOPLE TO AND FROM COURT"
24. "SO, YOU CAN GOOGLE THEM NOW, AND YOU'VE GOT A REPUTABLE COMPANY AND YOU JUST CHECK THEM OUT TO MAKE SURE THEY ARE REPUTABLE, AND THEY ARE USED BY THE COURTS. THERE ARE [**** 0:12:18**] SERVICES AND THERE ARE MORE AVAILABLE NOW"

25. "I TEND TO TRUST THE COMPANIES, THAT THEY'RE EMPLOYING PEOPLE THAT THEY HAVE DONE CHECKS ON, AND THEY'RE CRB CHECKED, AND THINGS LIKE THAT"
26. "I THINK WE HAVE TO TRUST THE COMPANIES, THAT THEY'RE DOING THEIR PROPER CHECKS. YOU CAN GO ON THEIR EXPERIENCE"
27. "IF YOU'VE USED SOMEBODY IN THE PAST AND THEY'VE DONE A SATISFACTORY JOB, THEN YOU WOULD TEND TO GO BACK TO THAT PERSON OR THAT COMPANY"
28. "I'VE TRIED TO KEEP TO THE SAME COMPANY WHERE I CAN BECAUSE THEY'VE BECOME RELIABLE AND THEY KNOW YOU, AND THEY PROVIDE A GOOD SERVICE"
29. "WE ALSO HAVE TO KEEP AN 'EXPERTS' FOLDER - WITH ALL PROFESSIONS, NOT JUST THE INTERPRETING BUT BARRISTERS, ETC. - WE HAVE TO KEEP A RECORD OF WHETHER THEY WERE GOOD, THEY INTEGRATED WITH THE CLIENTS OKAY, IF WE'VE HAD A BAD SERVICE. I KEEP A FOLDER LIKE THAT, AND I TEND TO GO BACK AND USE THE SAME PEOPLE AGAIN, IF I CAN, IF THEY OFFER A GOOD SERVICE"
30. "BUT, OBVIOUSLY, IF IT'S A BIRMINGHAM COMPANY AND I'M OUT AT CARDIFF, THEN I WOULD LOOK FOR EITHER RECOMMENDATION OR GO THROUGH GOOGLE AND CHECK THE COMPANY"
31. "YEAH, THEY ARE AS GOOD AS. THEY MAY EVEN BE FROM THE SAME COMPANIES. I DON'T KNOW WHERE THEY RECRUIT THEIR INTERPRETING STAFF FROM. I SUSPECT THAT THEY HAVE SEVERAL COMPANIES THAT THEY USE, THAT ARE APPROVED BY THE COURTS"
32. "I'VE NOT EXPERIENCED A BAD INTERPRETER"
33. "I THINK MAYBE ONCE AN INTERPRETER WAS DOING TOO MUCH CHATTING TO THE DEFENDANT, WHICH WAS CLEARLY NOT THE QUESTIONS"
34. "NO, THEY SHOULDN'T BE CHATTING AWAY. **THEY'RE THERE TO DO A JOB AND THEY HAVE TO BE PROFESSIONAL**"
35. "AS I SAID, THEY'RE NOT THERE TO GUIDE THEM WITH THEIR ANSWER OR ANYTHING LIKE THAT"
36. "THEY JUST ASK THE QUESTION AND GIVE THE RESPONSE"
37. "IT'S PERHAPS ONLY ONCE THAT THAT'S HAPPENED TO ME. I WAS UNSURE AS TO WHETHER THEY WERE ACTUALLY REALLY INTERPRETING WHAT THEY WERE SUPPOSED TO BE INTERPRETING, BUT THAT WAS A LONG TIME AGO. I DON'T THINK THAT HAPPENS ANYMORE"
38. "NO, ONLY THAT ONE WHERE IT WAS CLEAR THAT HE WASN'T DOING THE JOB. HE WAS TRYING TO BE TOO FRIENDLY AND OVER-CHATTY AND REASSURING, AND IT WAS DIFFICULT"
39. "BUT AS THE FAMILY MEMBERS ARE NORMALLY AROUND THE COURT AND THEY CAN SORT OF WORK OUT IF IT'S NOT GOING RIGHT, AND THEY WILL ALERT YOU TO IT"
40. "GENERALLY SPEAKING, I THINK THEY DO A PRETTY GOOD JOB"
41. "THEY'RE NOT THERE TO GIVE THE DEFENDANT OR THE CLIENT ADVICE"
42. "THEY'RE NOT THERE TO GIVE THEIR OPINION"
43. "IF THEY ASK A QUESTION AND THE DEFENDANT DOESN'T UNDERSTAND IT, **IT'S NOT FOR THE INTERPRETER TO TRY AND EXPLAIN WHAT THE BARRISTER IS TRYING TO SAY**"

44. "THE INTERPRETER SHOULD COME BACK AND SAY, "THIS PERSON DOESN'T UNDERSTAND THE QUESTION. CAN YOU PHRASE IT A DIFFERENT WAY, PLEASE?" AND THAT'S ALL"
45. "YES, **THEY'RE THERE TO ASSIST THE COURT**, BUT WITH THE QUESTIONS BECAUSE OBVIOUSLY BARRISTERS PHRASE QUESTIONS IN CERTAIN WAYS TO GET CERTAIN ANSWERS"
46. "IT'S NOT THE INTERPRETER'S JOB TO TRY AND ASSESS THAT. IF THE PERSON DOESN'T UNDERSTAND THE QUESTION, HE SHOULD JUST COME BACK AND SAY, "LOOK, THEY DON'T UNDERSTAND WHAT YOU'RE ASKING OF THEM. IS THERE ANOTHER WAY YOU CAN PUT IT?" THAT'S ALL. THEY'RE NOT THERE TO TRY AND ELABORATE AND DO THE CASE THEMSELVES EFFECTIVELY"
47. **"THINGS TAKE A LITTLE LONGER, SO IF YOU'RE CYNICAL, YOU COULD SAY THEY'RE THINKING ABOUT IT, WHICH GIVES THEM MORE TIME TO GIVE AN ANSWER, BUT YOU COULDN'T POSSIBLY SAY THAT FOR SURE"**
48. "I COULDN'T SAY WHAT A DEFENDANT IS THINKING"
49. **"IF THEY FEEL THAT THEY NEED 0:19:08] MORE TIME TO GIVE AN ANSWER, THAT'S A DIFFICULT ONE TO SAY"**
50. "YEAH, [VERY 0:19:24]"
51. **"NO, I JUST DON'T THINK THE COURTS COULD RUN EFFICIENTLY WITHOUT THEM"**
52. **"I THINK THEY DO NEED INTERPRETERS TO HAVE FAIR AND JUST TRIALS"**

13.2.10 Respondent 26: second stage coding

Respondent 26

File name (transcript): interview with Respondent 26

Audio length – 0:19:47

Interview took place on 30/06/2022

Number of codes: 52

Second cycle coding: clustering initial codes, searching for themes

1. **"THE ONLY THING THAT THEY SHOULD BE DOING IS INTERPRETING EXACTLY WHAT'S ASKED OF THEM."**
 - "THE REASON I WOULD USE THEM IS IF I NEED TO TAKE THEIR INSTRUCTIONS"

- "THEY ARE TOLD THE QUESTION THAT'S REQUIRED TO BE GIVEN TO THE DEFENDANT, OR THEIR CLIENT, **AND THEY MUST INTERPRET IT EXACTLY, AND THE RESPONSE EXACTLY**"
- "WHAT YOU DON'T NEED IS, SOME INTERPRETERS ELABORATING OR TRYING TO PUT THEIR SIDE OF THINGS, TRYING TO MAKE THINGS SOUND BETTER OR WORSE"
- "I KNOW THERE'S NOT AN EXACT TRANSLATION BECAUSE IT DOESN'T WORK LIKE THAT, BUT YOU NEED TO HAVE THE TRUST THAT THE TRANSLATION IS AS CLOSE AS POSSIBLE TO THE QUESTION THAT NEEDS TO BE TRANSLATED, AND OF COURSE, THE ANSWER HAS TO BE TRANSLATED EXACTLY. THAT IS THEIR ONLY ROLE REALLY. THEY'RE NOT THERE TO GIVE EVIDENCE OR ANYTHING LIKE THAT"
- "WELL, SAY IF I ASK THE QUESTION, "WHERE WERE YOU ON 8 JUNE?", HE MAY NOT ACTUALLY INTERPRET IT. TO SAY IT IN ANOTHER LANGUAGE, HE MIGHT SAY, "ON JUNE 8, WHERE WERE YOU?" IT'S THE SAME QUESTION BUT IT MIGHT HAVE TO BE PUT IN A DIFFERENT WAY TO MAKE SENSE OF ITS INTERPRETATION. THAT'S OBVIOUSLY THE LANGUAGE DIFFICULTY. BUT THEY MUSTN'T ADD TO THAT QUESTION. THEY MUST JUST TRANSLATE THAT QUESTION"
- "AS I SAID, THEY'RE NOT THERE TO GUIDE THEM WITH THEIR ANSWER OR ANYTHING LIKE THAT"
- "THEY JUST ASK THE QUESTION AND GIVE THE RESPONSE"
- **"THEY'RE NOT THERE TO GIVE THE DEFENDANT OR THE CLIENT ADVICE"**
- **"THEY'RE NOT THERE TO GIVE THEIR OPINION"**
- "IF THEY ASK A QUESTION AND THE DEFENDANT DOESN'T UNDERSTAND IT, **IT'S NOT FOR THE INTERPRETER TO TRY AND EXPLAIN WHAT THE BARRISTER IS TRYING TO SAY**"
- "THE INTERPRETER SHOULD COME BACK AND SAY, "THIS PERSON DOESN'T UNDERSTAND THE QUESTION. CAN YOU PHRASE IT A DIFFERENT WAY, PLEASE?" AND THAT'S ALL"
- "YES, **THEY'RE THERE TO ASSIST THE COURT**, BUT WITH THE QUESTIONS BECAUSE OBVIOUSLY BARRISTERS PHRASE QUESTIONS IN CERTAIN WAYS TO GET CERTAIN ANSWERS"
- "IT'S NOT THE INTERPRETER'S JOB TO TRY AND ASSESS THAT. IF THE PERSON DOESN'T UNDERSTAND THE QUESTION, HE SHOULD JUST COME BACK AND SAY, "LOOK, THEY DON'T UNDERSTAND WHAT YOU'RE ASKING OF THEM. IS THERE ANOTHER WAY YOU CAN PUT IT?" THAT'S ALL. THEY'RE NOT THERE TO TRY AND ELABORATE AND DO THE CASE THEMSELVES EFFECTIVELY"

2. **"IF THERE'S A COURT HEARING, THEN THE COURT PROVIDES INTERPRETERS"**

- "A LOT OF INTERPRETERS, IF THEY GO INTO COURT, THEN THE COURT WILL PROVIDE A COURT INTERPRETER"
- "YES, YOU HAVE TO INSTRUCT THE INTERPRETERS, AND THERE ARE MORE INTERPRETERS AVAILABLE AS TIME HAS GONE BY"

- "IT WAS VERY DIFFICULT WHEN I FIRST STARTED, YOU'D PROBABLY HAVE ONE OR TWO COMPANIES THAT WOULD HAVE THREE OR FOUR DIFFERENT LANGUAGES. NOW THERE ARE MORE COMPANIES THAT OFFER THAT SERVICE AND, I THINK, EVERY LANGUAGE IS COVERED"
- "SAY IF YOU'VE GOT A CASE IN BRADFORD OR CARDIFF OR SOMETHING, I WOULD GOOGLE A LOCAL FIRM BECAUSE OBVIOUSLY THERE'S THE COST OF TRAVELLING AND GETTING PEOPLE TO AND FROM COURT"
- "SO, YOU CAN GOOGLE THEM NOW, AND YOU'VE GOT A REPUTABLE COMPANY AND YOU JUST CHECK THEM OUT TO MAKE SURE THEY ARE REPUTABLE, AND THEY ARE USED BY THE COURTS. THERE ARE [** 0:12:18] SERVICES AND THERE ARE MORE AVAILABLE NOW"
- "I TEND TO TRUST THE COMPANIES, THAT THEY'RE EMPLOYING PEOPLE THAT THEY HAVE DONE CHECKS ON, AND THEY'RE CRB CHECKED, AND THINGS LIKE THAT"
- "I THINK WE HAVE TO TRUST THE COMPANIES, THAT THEY'RE DOING THEIR PROPER CHECKS. YOU CAN GO ON THEIR EXPERIENCE"
- "IF YOU'VE USED SOMEBODY IN THE PAST AND THEY'VE DONE A SATISFACTORY JOB, THEN YOU WOULD TEND TO GO BACK TO THAT PERSON OR THAT COMPANY"
- "I'VE TRIED TO KEEP TO THE SAME COMPANY WHERE I CAN BECAUSE THEY'VE BECOME RELIABLE AND THEY KNOW YOU, AND THEY PROVIDE A GOOD SERVICE"
- "WE ALSO HAVE TO KEEP AN 'EXPERTS' FOLDER - WITH ALL PROFESSIONS, NOT JUST THE INTERPRETING BUT BARRISTERS, ETC. - WE HAVE TO KEEP A RECORD OF WHETHER THEY WERE GOOD, THEY INTEGRATED WITH THE CLIENTS OKAY, IF WE'VE HAD A BAD SERVICE. I KEEP A FOLDER LIKE THAT, AND I TEND TO GO BACK AND USE THE SAME PEOPLE AGAIN, IF I CAN, IF THEY OFFER A GOOD SERVICE"
- "BUT, OBVIOUSLY, IF IT'S A BIRMINGHAM COMPANY AND I'M OUT AT CARDIFF, THEN I WOULD LOOK FOR EITHER RECOMMENDATION OR GO THROUGH GOOGLE AND CHECK THE COMPANY"
- "YEAH, THEY ARE AS GOOD AS. THEY MAY EVEN BE FROM THE SAME COMPANIES. I DON'T KNOW WHERE THEY RECRUIT THEIR INTERPRETING STAFF FROM. I SUSPECT THAT THEY HAVE SEVERAL COMPANIES THAT THEY USE, THAT ARE APPROVED BY THE COURTS"
- "I USED TO USE, I THINK IT'S CALLED [BIT, B-I-T 0:11:37]. SOMETHING INTERPRETING AND TRANSLATION, I THINK IT WAS CALLED. I CAN'T REMEMBER OFF THE TOP OF MY HEAD. THERE WERE VERY LIMITED COMPANIES THAT WOULD DO THAT, BUT NOW, YES, THERE IS A NATIONAL REGISTER, OR YOU CAN GO ONLINE AND ASK FOR LOCAL INTERPRETERS"

3. "WITHOUT AN INTERPRETER IT WOULDN'T BE A FAIR TRIAL"

- "YEAH, **WITHOUT AN INTERPRETER IT WOULDN'T BE A FAIR TRIAL** UNLESS WE DID EVERYTHING POSSIBLE TO ASSIST SOMEBODY WHOSE FIRST LANGUAGE IS NOT ENGLISH WITH THEIR LANGUAGE BARRIER"
- "SO, ALTHOUGH THINGS TAKE A LITTLE TIME BECAUSE YOU HAVE TO ASK THE INTERPRETER, THEN THE INTERPRETER WILL ASK THE DEFENDANT, THEN THE DEFENDANT REPLIES, AND THEN IT COMES BACK – **IT DOES TAKE LONGER – BUT IT DOES ENABLE THERE TO BE A FAIR TRIAL**"
- "WITHOUT THEM, IT JUST WOULDN'T BE FAIR TO EXPECT SOMEBODY WHOSE LANGUAGE IS NOT ENGLISH TO UNDERSTAND FULLY THE PROCESS"
- **"I DON'T THINK IT CAN WORK WITHOUT THEM, TO BE HONEST"**
- "OBVIOUSLY, THEY HAVE TO BE TOTALLY INDEPENDENT AND HAVE NO LINKS WITH THE DEFENDANT, BUT I THINK WITHOUT THEM SOME CASES COULDN'T GO AHEAD PURELY BECAUSE SOME PEOPLE CANNOT UNDERSTAND. PEOPLE MAY BE ABLE TO SPEAK THE LANGUAGE, BUT THEY MAY NOT UNDERSTAND FULLY THE MEANING OF SOME THINGS"
- "SO, ALTHOUGH YOU THINK, THIS PERSON CAN SPEAK ENGLISH, AND YOU CAN HAVE A CHAT WITH THEM, IT DOESN'T MEAN TO SAY THAT THEY UNDERSTAND THE LEGALITIES OF A CASE AND THE PROCESS OF A CASE. THROUGH AN INTERPRETER THAT CAN BE PUT TO THEM AND EXPLAINED TO THEM IN A LANGUAGE THAT THEY UNDERSTAND, **SO I THINK, YES, THEY'RE VERY IMPORTANT TO THE LEGAL SYSTEM**"
- **"NO, I JUST DON'T THINK THE COURTS COULD RUN EFFICIENTLY WITHOUT THEM"**
- **"I THINK THEY DO NEED INTERPRETERS TO HAVE FAIR AND JUST TRIALS"**
- **"THEY ARE AN IMPORTANT PART OF THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM"**

4. **"I THINK THEY'VE ALWAYS BEEN RESPECTED BY THE LEGAL PROFESSION. I DON'T THINK THEY'VE EVER NOT BEEN"**

- **"I THINK THEY'RE MORE RESPECTED NOW.** I THINK TIMES HAVE MOVED ON AND PEOPLE UNDERSTAND THAT PEOPLE NEED INTERPRETERS, **AND THEY ARE AN IMPORTANT PART OF THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM"**
- "I THINK THEY'VE ALWAYS BEEN RESPECTED BY THE LEGAL PROFESSION. I DON'T THINK THEY'VE EVER NOT BEEN"
- "I THINK THEY'RE MORE WIDELY USED NOW. I THINK THERE'S A GREATER UNDERSTANDING OF PEOPLE, WHEREAS, LIKE I SAID, BEFORE YOU CAN HAVE A CHAT AND YOU THINK SOMEBODY UNDERSTANDS, BUT THERE'S ONE THING HAVING A CHAT WITH SOMEBODY AND THEN CONDUCTING YOUR CASE AND UNDERSTANDING THE PROCESS OF THE CASE AND WHAT THEY'RE SAYING AND WHAT THE MEANING OF IT IS"
- **"I THINK THERE IS A GREATER UNDERSTANDING AND RESPECT FOR INTERPRETERS NOW"**

5. “THEY’RE THERE TO DO A JOB AND THEY HAVE TO BE PROFESSIONAL”

- “I THINK MAYBE ONCE AN INTERPRETER WAS DOING TOO MUCH CHATTING TO THE DEFENDANT, WHICH WAS CLEARLY NOT THE QUESTIONS”
- “NO, THEY SHOULDN’T BE CHATTING AWAY. **THEY’RE THERE TO DO A JOB AND THEY HAVE TO BE PROFESSIONAL**”
- “IT’S PERHAPS ONLY ONCE THAT THAT’S HAPPENED TO ME. I WAS UNSURE AS TO WHETHER THEY WERE ACTUALLY REALLY INTERPRETING WHAT THEY WERE SUPPOSED TO BE INTERPRETING, BUT THAT WAS A LONG TIME AGO. I DON’T THINK THAT HAPPENS ANYMORE”
- “NO, ONLY THAT ONE WHERE IT WAS CLEAR THAT HE WASN’T DOING THE JOB. HE WAS TRYING TO BE TOO FRIENDLY AND OVER-CHATTY AND REASSURING, AND IT WAS DIFFICULT”
- “BUT AS THE FAMILY MEMBERS ARE NORMALLY AROUND THE COURT AND THEY CAN SORT OF WORK OUT IF IT’S NOT GOING RIGHT, AND THEY WILL ALERT YOU TO IT”
- **“THEY HAVE TO BE TOTALLY INDEPENDENT AND HAVE NO LINKS WITH THE DEFENDANT”**
- **“I’VE NOT EXPERIENCED A BAD INTERPRETER”**
- **“GENERALLY SPEAKING, I THINK THEY DO A PRETTY GOOD JOB”**

6. “THINGS TAKE A LITTLE LONGER”

- “THINGS TAKE A LITTLE LONGER, SO IF YOU’RE CYNICAL, YOU COULD SAY THEY’RE THINKING ABOUT IT, WHICH GIVES THEM MORE TIME TO GIVE AN ANSWER, BUT YOU COULDN’T POSSIBLY SAY THAT FOR SURE”
- “I COULDN’T SAY WHAT A DEFENDANT IS THINKING”
- “IF THEY FEEL THAT THEY NEED 0:19:08] MORE TIME TO GIVE AN ANSWER, THAT’S A DIFFICULT ONE TO SAY”
- **“SO, ALTHOUGH THINGS TAKE A LITTLE TIME BECAUSE YOU HAVE TO ASK THE INTERPRETER, THEN THE INTERPRETER WILL ASK THE DEFENDANT, THEN THE DEFENDANT REPLIES, AND THEN IT COMES BACK – IT DOES TAKE LONGER – BUT IT DOES ENABLE THERE TO BE A FAIR TRIAL”**

So, based on the above we can identify the following themes:

- 1. “IF THERE’S A COURT HEARING, THEN THE COURT PROVIDES INTERPRETERS”** – provision and sourcing the interpreters.
- 2. “THE ONLY THING THAT THEY SHOULD BE DOING IS INTERPRETING EXACTLY WHAT’S ASKED OF THEM.”** - how the role of interpreters is seen by legal professionals.

3. **“THEY’RE THERE TO DO A JOB AND THEY HAVE TO BE PROFESSIONAL”** – expectations of the role as seen by the legal professionals.
4. **“WITHOUT AN INTERPRETER IT WOULDN’T BE A FAIR TRIAL”** - appreciation of interpreters/their role and status in the courtroom.

Subtheme:

“I THINK THEY’VE ALWAYS BEEN RESPECTED BY THE LEGAL PROFESSION. I DON’T THINK THEY’VE EVER NOT BEEN”

5. **“THINGS TAKE A LITTLE LONGER”** - the impact of interpreters on the legal proceeding/process.

13.2.11 Respondent 26: codes and themes from survey

Respondent 26: Codes and themes from the Survey

1. **“AN INTERPRETER IS INTEGRAL TO COURT PROCEEDINGS WHEN THE CASE IS NOT IN THE DEFENDANTS FIRST LANGUAGE, IT IS NECESSARY FOR A FAIR LEGAL SYSTEM”**
2. **“THE INTERPRETER SHOULD NOT TRY TO ASSIST WITH AN INTERPRETATION OF THE ANSWER, THEY SHOULD INTERPRET EXACTLY WHAT IS SAID”**
3. **“IT WOULD EXTEND THE COURT TIME, BUT I WOULD CONSIDER THIS NECESSARY AND IMPORTANT”**
4. **“THE INTERPRETER IS EXTREMELY IMPORTANT, ENABLES THE DEFENDANT TO PUT FORWARD HIS CASE”**
5. **“THEY ARE INSTRUCTED MORE TO GET A FAIR AND JUST TRIAL FOR A DEFENDANT”**
6. **“LISTENING TO THE QUESTION TO BE ASKED OF THE DEFENDANT AND INTERPRETING THE EXACT RESPONSE, I THINK ATTENTION TO DETAIL IS IMPORTANT”**

Identified themes:

1. **“AN INTERPRETER IS INTEGRAL TO COURT PROCEEDINGS WHEN THE CASE IS NOT IN THE DEFENDANTS FIRST LANGUAGE”** – interpreters are part of the legal process
2. **“THEY SHOULD INTERPRET EXACTLY WHAT IS SAID”** – the role of the interpreter as seen by legal professionals
3. **“IT WOULD EXTEND THE COURT TIME, BUT I WOULD CONSIDER THIS NECESSARY AND IMPORTANT”** – the impact of the interpreter on the legal process
4. **“THE INTERPRETER IS EXTREMELY IMPORTANT”** – recognition of interpreters
5. **“LISTENING TO THE QUESTION TO BE ASKED OF THE DEFENDANT AND INTERPRETING THE EXACT RESPONSE”** – expectations of the interpreters

The themes in the survey overlap with the following identified themes in the corresponding transcript of the follow-up interview (Themes 2, 3, 4, and 5):

“THE ONLY THING THAT THEY SHOULD BE DOING IS INTERPRETING EXACTLY WHAT’S ASKED OF THEM.” - how the role of interpreters is seen by legal professionals. **(Theme 2)**

“THEY’RE THERE TO DO A JOB AND THEY HAVE TO BE PROFESSIONAL” – expectations of the role as seen by the legal professionals. **(Theme 3)**

“WITHOUT AN INTERPRETER IT WOULDN’T BE A FAIR TRIAL” - appreciation of interpreters/their role and status in the courtroom. **(Theme 4)**

“THINGS TAKE A LITTLE LONGER” - the impact of interpreters on the legal proceeding/process. **(Theme 5)**

Additional theme emerged:

1 “AN INTERPRETER IS INTEGRAL TO COURT PROCEEDINGS WHEN THE CASE IS NOT IN THE DEFENDANTS FIRST LANGUAGE” – interpreters are part of the legal process

Note: Although this this theme may be seen as additional, in fact it is not as it is further repeated and supported by the follow-up interview:

“I THINK THEY’RE MORE RESPECTED NOW. I THINK TIMES HAVE MOVED ON AND PEOPLE UNDERSTAND THAT PEOPLE NEED INTERPRETERS, AND THEY ARE AN IMPORTANT PART OF THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM” – **CODE 18 in the initial coding round clustered into Theme 4 (see above).**

This theme effectively reiterates themes 4 from Survey and interview stating the extreme importance on the interpreters to the legal process as they help to ensure the fair trial.

13.2.12 Respondent 27: first stage coding

Respondent 27

File name (transcript): interview with Respondent 27

Audio length – 0:19:25

Interview took place on 05/07/2022

First cycle coding methods: Initial coding, process coding, In Vivo coding

Total number of codes: 31

1. "I THINK IT'S REALLY HELPFUL, **ESPECIALLY WHEN THE INTERPRETER KNOWS HOW TO EFFECTIVELY EXPLAIN THINGS**"
2. "I THINK WITH INTERPRETATION, THE KEY MESSAGE OF WHAT YOU'RE TRYING TO ADVISE YOUR CLIENT, OR THE OPTIONS THAT YOU'RE TRYING TO GIVE YOUR CLIENT, THEY **SOMETIMES CAN GET LOST IN TRANSLATION**"
3. "**BUT I FIND THAT IF YOU HAVE A GOOD INTERPRETER, THEY CAN ENSURE THAT THEY INTERPRET WHAT YOU'RE TRYING TO GET ACROSS TO YOUR CLIENT IN THE MOST EFFECTIVE WAY**"
4. "I'VE DEALT WITH SOME INTERPRETERS WHO HAVE BEEN AMAZING, WHO HAVE BEEN GREAT, AND OTHER INTERPRETERS WHO HAVE BEEN NOT SO GREAT"
5. "HONESTLY, I THINK SOME KNOWLEDGE ABOUT THE LEGAL PROCESSES, BUT ALSO WHICH LANGUAGE TO USE"
6. "THE BAD EXPERIENCE I HAD WASN'T IN A COURT SETTING, IT WAS IN A PRENUPTIAL AGREEMENT NEGOTIATION AND SETTLEMENT. WHAT HAPPENED IN THIS INSTANCE WAS WE DIDN'T REALLY HAVE A GOOD INTERPRETER AND WHAT ENDED UP HAPPENING WAS THAT MY ADVICE AND WHAT I WAS TRYING TO EXPLAIN ABOUT THE CONTRACT WAS GETTING LOST IN TRANSLATION AND THE CLIENT ENDED UP HAVING MORE QUESTIONS THAN THEY INITIALLY DID HAVE"
7. "COMPLETELY, YES"
8. "I THINK THEY SHOULD TRY AS MUCH AS POSSIBLE TO STICK WITH WHAT WE ARE TRYING TO ADVISE OUR CLIENTS, AND IT'S UP TO THE LEGAL PROFESSIONAL TO EXPLAIN THE LEGAL PROCESSES TO THE INTERPRETER"
9. "BUT, AGAIN, IF THE INTERPRETER DOESN'T UNDERSTAND WHAT WE'RE ASKING, BECAUSE SOMETIMES IT CAN BE VERY COMPLEX, ESPECIALLY WHEN IT COMES TO PROVIDING YOUR CLIENT WITH OPTIONS WHICH ARE FINANCIAL IN NATURE, SOMETIMES THE INTERPRETER MAY NOT UNDERSTAND EXACTLY WHAT YOU'RE ASKING THEM TO INTERPRET"

10. "SO, IT'S IMPORTANT IN THOSE CIRCUMSTANCES TO HAVE AN INTERPRETER THAT DOES PERHAPS UNDERSTAND MORE ABOUT THE SOME OF THE LEGAL JARGON, SOME OF THE LEGAL TERMINOLOGY, **HOW TO EXPLAIN THEM TO A LAY CLIENT**"
11. "THEIR ROLE IS TO ENSURE THAT THE MESSAGE WE'RE TRYING TO GET ACROSS AND THE ADVICE THAT WE'RE TRYING TO GET ACROSS DOESN'T GET LOST IN TRANSLATION"
12. **"I WOULD SAY THAT THAT IS THE BIGGEST KEY POINT OF AN INTERPRETER. I THINK IT'S ALL PART AND PARCEL WITH ACHIEVING JUSTICE"**
13. "NO, I WOULD SAY THE FORMER"
14. "YEAH"
15. "IF THE CLIENT IS HAVING DIFFICULTY IN UNDERSTANDING SOMETHING, PERHAPS IF THEY COULD LET THE LEGAL PROFESSIONAL KNOW"
16. "READING BODY LANGUAGE AS WELL, I THINK THAT'S A GOOD WAY TO INDICATE WHETHER A CLIENT UNDERSTANDS. BECAUSE THE ISSUE IS – AND I'VE FOUND THIS MYSELF – SOMETIMES CLIENTS MAY NOT COMPLETELY UNDERSTAND BECAUSE **THE INTERPRETER MAYBE HASN'T EXPLAINED IT PROPERLY**, OR THE INTERPRETER SOMETIMES DOESN'T UNDERSTAND EXACTLY HOW TO EXPLAIN THE COMPLEX LEGAL JARGON, IF YOU COULD CALL IT THAT"
17. "SO, WHEN THEY'RE THERE TO BRIDGE THE GAP, I'D SAY, IF THE LEGAL PROFESSIONAL DOESN'T REALLY KNOW WHETHER THE CLIENT IS UNDERSTANDING BECAUSE THE CLIENT IS JUST NODDING AND AGREEING WITH EVERYTHING, I WOULD SAY THAT'S SOMETHING THAT THEY SHOULD DO, THE INTERPRETER SHOULD PERHAPS LET THE LEGAL PROFESSIONAL KNOW, "LOOK, I'M PERHAPS NOT EXPLAINING THIS AS MUCH. CAN YOU EXPLAIN THIS PART TO ME AGAIN SO I CAN...?"
18. "I GUESS IT'S ALL JUST COMMUNICATION, ISN'T IT, EFFECTIVE COMMUNICATION"
19. "YEAH, ABSOLUTELY"
20. "I GUESS WHEN I SPEAK TO CLIENTS DIRECTLY I'M ABLE TO EXPLAIN A LOT MORE. WHEN I SPEAK THROUGH AN INTERPRETER, I TRY TO MAKE MY POINTS AS BASIC AS POSSIBLE, I TRY TO BREAK THEM DOWN AS MUCH AS POSSIBLE, I MAKE SHORTER, MORE BULLET-POINT POINTS OF ADVICE. **THE PACE IS A LOT SLOWER**"
21. "I KNOW THAT I'M GOING TO BE SPENDING QUITE A LOT OF TIME WITH THE CLIENT IF THERE'S AN INTERPRETER INVOLVED, JUST TO MAKE SURE THAT THE COMMUNICATION IS GOING AT A STEADY STANDARD, IN THE RIGHT STANDARD, IN THE RIGHT WAY"
22. "FOR EXAMPLE, IF YOU HAVE A MEETING WITH CLIENTS AND EVERYTHING GETS WRAPPED UP IN ABOUT HALF AN HOUR, ALL IS WELL. BUT WHEN YOU HAVE AN INTERPRETER YOU KNOW YOU MAY BE THERE FOR ABOUT AN HOUR OR TWO JUST EXPLAINING CERTAIN THINGS AND UNDERSTANDING WHAT THE CLIENT REALLY WANTS, DEDUCING WHAT THE CLIENT REALLY WANTS"
23. "I GUESS, YOU COULD SAY THAT **THEY ARE AN INTERVENING PARTY**"
24. "I WOULD SAY THAT **THEY ARE THERE TO ACHIEVE SOME SORT OF JUSTICE**, AND IF THAT MEANS THAT **THEY WILL BECOME PART OF THE LEGAL PROCESS**, THEN I GUESS THAT WOULD BE TRUE"

25. "IT DEPENDS ON THE CLIENT, REALLY, AND IT DEPENDS ON THE CASE. IF I WAS TO GO AND SPEAK TO A CLIENT WITHOUT AN INTERPRETER, I THINK THAT I WOULD HAVE A VERY DIFFICULT TIME, AND SO, **I THINK THAT THEY ARE INTEGRAL WHEN IT COMES TO CLIENT COMMUNICATION**"
26. "WHETHER THEY ARE PART OF THE LEGAL PROCESS, PERHAPS. IT DEPENDS ON THE CIRCUMSTANCES; IT DEPENDS ON WHAT I'M ASKING OF THE INTERPRETER TO SPEAK TO MY CLIENT ABOUT. IF I WANT THEM TO GIVE ME INSTRUCTIONS, THEN I WOULD SAY YES, PART OF THE LEGAL PROCESS. BUT AGAIN, IT'S YOUR OWN INTERPRETATION OF WHAT THE LEGAL PROCESS IS"
27. "I GUESS, FOR ME, IT'S ONLY BEEN A FEW YEARS SINCE I'VE BEEN IN THE PROFESSION. WHETHER I THINK THAT ATTITUDES HAVE CHANGED ABOUT INTERPRETERS, I'M GENUINELY NOT TOO SURE. I THINK THAT IT DEPENDS ON WHERE YOU WORK, WHICH FIRM YOU WORK FOR OR WHO YOUR COLLEAGUES ARE BECAUSE, OF COURSE, **EVERYTHING IS VERY SUBJECTIVE WHEN IT COMES TO DETERMINING THE STATUS OF A PROFESSION**"
28. "WHEN YOU ARE WORKING WITHIN A TEAM OR WITH A SOLICITOR WHO DOESN'T THINK ANYTHING OF INTERPRETERS, THAT WOULD BE LARGELY DIFFERENT AND A VERY DIFFERENT CONTRAST TO A TEAM THAT VALUES INTERPRETERS A LOT MORE AND REALLY SEES THEIR USE WITHIN THE JUSTICE SYSTEM. SO, I THINK IT'S A VERY SUBJECTIVE QUESTION. I WOULDN'T REALLY KNOW HOW TO ANSWER THAT, BUT **I WOULD THINK THAT THEY HAVE A VERY IMPORTANT ROLE WITHIN THE COURTS**"
29. "I THINK THAT THEY DON'T REALLY NECESSARILY JUST HELP AND ASSIST THEIR INSTRUCTED LEGAL REPRESENTATIVE, BUT THEY ALSO ASSIST THE COURTS AS WELL. **THEY HEAVILY ASSIST THE COURTS**"
30. "I WOULD SAY THAT IT INVOLVES COMPREHENSION, LINGUISTIC SKILLS, AND ARTICULATION SKILLS. YEAH, THAT'S WHAT I WOULD SAY"
31. "YEAH, I THINK IT WOULD HELP, DEFINITELY. I REALLY DO THINK IT WOULD HELP, EITHER SOME KNOWLEDGE OF THE BACKGROUND OR EVEN JUST BEING GOOD WITHIN THEIR COMMUNICATION SKILLS OR JUST BEING WELL-SPOKEN AND KNOWING TECHNICAL WORDS AND HOW TO DEDUCE THEM INTO SIMPLER WORDS SOMETIMES"

13.2.12 Respondent 27: second stage coding

Respondent 27

File name (transcript): interview with Respondent 27

Audio length – 0:19:25

Interview took place on 05/07/2022

Number of codes: 31

Second cycle coding: clustering initial codes, searching for themes

1. "THEIR ROLE IS TO ENSURE THAT THE MESSAGE WE'RE TRYING TO GET ACROSS AND THE ADVICE THAT WE'RE TRYING TO GET ACROSS DOESN'T GET LOST IN TRANSLATION"

- "I THINK IT'S REALLY HELPFUL, **ESPECIALLY WHEN THE INTERPRETER KNOWS HOW TO EFFECTIVELY EXPLAIN THINGS**"
- "I THINK THEY SHOULD TRY AS MUCH AS POSSIBLE **TO STICK WITH WHAT WE ARE TRYING TO ADVISE OUR CLIENTS, AND IT'S UP TO THE LEGAL PROFESSIONAL TO EXPLAIN THE LEGAL PROCESSES TO THE INTERPRETER**"
- "I WOULD SAY THAT THAT IS THE BIGGEST KEY POINT OF AN INTERPRETER. I THINK **IT'S ALL PART AND PARCEL WITH ACHIEVING JUSTICE**"
- "SO, WHEN **THEY'RE THERE TO BRIDGE THE GAP**, I'D SAY, IF THE LEGAL PROFESSIONAL DOESN'T REALLY KNOW WHETHER THE CLIENT IS UNDERSTANDING BECAUSE THE CLIENT IS JUST NODDING AND AGREEING WITH EVERYTHING, I WOULD SAY THAT'S SOMETHING THAT THEY SHOULD DO, **THE INTERPRETER SHOULD PERHAPS LET THE LEGAL PROFESSIONAL KNOW**, "LOOK, I'M PERHAPS NOT EXPLAINING THIS AS MUCH. CAN YOU EXPLAIN THIS PART TO ME AGAIN SO I CAN...?"
- "I THINK THAT THEY DON'T REALLY NECESSARILY JUST HELP AND ASSIST THEIR INSTRUCTED LEGAL REPRESENTATIVE, BUT THEY ALSO ASSIST THE COURTS AS WELL. **THEY HEAVILY ASSIST THE COURTS**"
- "I GUESS IT'S ALL JUST COMMUNICATION, ISN'T IT, **EFFECTIVE COMMUNICATION**"

2. "THE INTERPRETER SHOULD PERHAPS LET THE LEGAL PROFESSIONAL KNOW"

- "IF THE CLIENT IS HAVING DIFFICULTY IN UNDERSTANDING SOMETHING, **PERHAPS IF THEY COULD LET THE LEGAL PROFESSIONAL KNOW**"
- "BUT, AGAIN, IF THE INTERPRETER DOESN'T UNDERSTAND WHAT WE'RE ASKING, BECAUSE SOMETIMES IT CAN BE VERY COMPLEX, ESPECIALLY WHEN IT COMES TO PROVIDING YOUR CLIENT WITH OPTIONS WHICH ARE FINANCIAL IN NATURE, SOMETIMES THE INTERPRETER MAY NOT UNDERSTAND EXACTLY WHAT YOU'RE ASKING THEM TO INTERPRET"
- "SO, IT'S IMPORTANT IN THOSE CIRCUMSTANCES TO HAVE AN INTERPRETER **THAT DOES PERHAPS UNDERSTAND MORE ABOUT THE SOME OF THE LEGAL JARGON, SOME OF THE LEGAL TERMINOLOGY, HOW TO EXPLAIN THEM TO A LAY CLIENT**"
- "SO, WHEN **THEY'RE THERE TO BRIDGE THE GAP**, I'D SAY, IF THE LEGAL PROFESSIONAL DOESN'T REALLY KNOW WHETHER THE CLIENT IS UNDERSTANDING BECAUSE THE CLIENT IS JUST NODDING AND AGREEING WITH EVERYTHING, I WOULD

SAY THAT'S SOMETHING THAT THEY SHOULD DO, THE INTERPRETER SHOULD **PERHAPS LET THE LEGAL PROFESSIONAL KNOW**, "LOOK, I'M PERHAPS NOT EXPLAINING THIS AS MUCH. CAN YOU EXPLAIN THIS PART TO ME AGAIN SO I CAN...?"

- "I WOULD SAY THAT IT INVOLVES COMPREHENSION, LINGUISTIC SKILLS, AND ARTICULATION SKILLS. YEAH, THAT'S WHAT I WOULD SAY"
- "HONESTLY, I **THINK SOME KNOWLEDGE ABOUT THE LEGAL PROCESSES, BUT ALSO WHICH LANGUAGE TO USE**"
- "YEAH, I THINK IT WOULD HELP, DEFINITELY. I **REALLY DO THINK IT WOULD HELP, EITHER SOME KNOWLEDGE OF THE BACKGROUND OR EVEN JUST BEING GOOD WITHIN THEIR COMMUNICATION SKILLS OR JUST BEING WELL-SPOKEN AND KNOWING TECHNICAL WORDS AND HOW TO DEDUCE THEM INTO SIMPLER WORDS SOMETIMES**"

3. "I FIND THAT IF YOU HAVE A GOOD INTERPRETER, THEY CAN ENSURE THAT THEY INTERPRET WHAT YOU'RE TRYING TO GET ACROSS TO YOUR CLIENT IN THE MOST EFFECTIVE WAY"

- "I THINK WITH INTERPRETATION, THE KEY MESSAGE OF WHAT YOU'RE TRYING TO ADVISE YOUR CLIENT, OR THE OPTIONS THAT YOU'RE TRYING TO GIVE YOUR CLIENT, THEY SOMETIMES CAN GET LOST IN TRANSLATION"
- "BUT I FIND THAT IF YOU HAVE A GOOD INTERPRETER, THEY CAN ENSURE THAT THEY INTERPRET WHAT YOU'RE TRYING TO GET ACROSS TO YOUR CLIENT IN THE MOST EFFECTIVE WAY"
- "I'VE DEALT WITH SOME INTERPRETERS WHO HAVE BEEN AMAZING, WHO HAVE BEEN GREAT, AND OTHER INTERPRETERS WHO HAVE BEEN NOT SO GREAT"
- "THE BAD EXPERIENCE I HAD WASN'T IN A COURT SETTING, IT WAS IN A PRENUPTIAL AGREEMENT NEGOTIATION AND SETTLEMENT. WHAT HAPPENED IN THIS INSTANCE WAS WE DIDN'T REALLY HAVE A GOOD INTERPRETER AND WHAT ENDED UP HAPPENING WAS THAT MY ADVICE AND WHAT I WAS TRYING TO EXPLAIN ABOUT THE CONTRACT WAS GETTING LOST IN TRANSLATION AND THE CLIENT ENDED UP HAVING MORE QUESTIONS THAN THEY INITIALLY DID HAVE"
- "**COMPLETELY, YES**"
- "READING BODY LANGUAGE AS WELL, I THINK THAT'S A GOOD WAY TO INDICATE WHETHER A CLIENT UNDERSTANDS. BECAUSE THE ISSUE IS – AND I'VE FOUND THIS MYSELF – SOMETIMES CLIENTS MAY NOT COMPLETELY UNDERSTAND BECAUSE THE INTERPRETER MAYBE HASN'T EXPLAINED IT PROPERLY, OR THE INTERPRETER SOMETIMES DOESN'T UNDERSTAND EXACTLY HOW TO EXPLAIN THE COMPLEX LEGAL JARGON, IF YOU COULD CALL IT THAT"

4. "THE PACE IS A LOT SLOWER"

- "I GUESS WHEN I SPEAK TO CLIENTS DIRECTLY I'M ABLE TO EXPLAIN A LOT MORE. WHEN I SPEAK THROUGH AN INTERPRETER, I TRY TO MAKE MY POINTS AS BASIC AS POSSIBLE, I TRY TO BREAK THEM DOWN AS MUCH AS POSSIBLE, I MAKE SHORTER, MORE BULLET-POINT POINTS OF ADVICE. THE PACE IS A LOT SLOWER"
- "I KNOW THAT I'M GOING TO BE SPENDING QUITE A LOT OF TIME WITH THE CLIENT IF THERE'S AN INTERPRETER INVOLVED, JUST TO MAKE SURE THAT THE COMMUNICATION IS GOING AT A STEADY STANDARD, IN THE RIGHT STANDARD, IN THE RIGHT WAY"
- "FOR EXAMPLE, IF YOU HAVE A MEETING WITH CLIENTS AND EVERYTHING GETS WRAPPED UP IN ABOUT HALF AN HOUR, ALL IS WELL. BUT WHEN YOU HAVE AN INTERPRETER YOU KNOW YOU MAY BE THERE FOR ABOUT AN HOUR OR TWO JUST EXPLAINING CERTAIN THINGS AND UNDERSTANDING WHAT THE CLIENT REALLY WANTS, DEDUCING WHAT THE CLIENT REALLY WANTS"
- "I THINK IT'S REALLY HELPFUL, ESPECIALLY WHEN THE INTERPRETER KNOWS HOW TO EFFECTIVELY EXPLAIN THINGS"

5. "THEY ARE AN INTERVENING PARTY"

- "I GUESS, YOU COULD SAY THAT THEY ARE AN INTERVENING PARTY"
- "I WOULD SAY THAT THEY ARE THERE TO ACHIEVE SOME SORT OF JUSTICE, AND IF THAT MEANS THAT THEY WILL BECOME PART OF THE LEGAL PROCESS, THEN I GUESS THAT WOULD BE TRUE"
- "WHETHER THEY ARE PART OF THE LEGAL PROCESS, PERHAPS. IT DEPENDS ON THE CIRCUMSTANCES; IT DEPENDS ON WHAT I'M ASKING OF THE INTERPRETER TO SPEAK TO MY CLIENT ABOUT. IF I WANT THEM TO GIVE ME INSTRUCTIONS, THEN I WOULD SAY YES, PART OF THE LEGAL PROCESS. BUT AGAIN, IT'S YOUR OWN INTERPRETATION OF WHAT THE LEGAL PROCESS IS"

6. "BUT I WOULD THINK THAT THEY HAVE A VERY IMPORTANT ROLE WITHIN THE COURTS"

- "IT DEPENDS ON THE CLIENT, REALLY, AND IT DEPENDS ON THE CASE. IF I WAS TO GO AND SPEAK TO A CLIENT WITHOUT AN INTERPRETER, I THINK THAT I WOULD HAVE A VERY DIFFICULT TIME, AND SO, I THINK THAT THEY ARE INTEGRAL WHEN IT COMES TO CLIENT COMMUNICATION"
- "I GUESS, FOR ME, IT'S ONLY BEEN A FEW YEARS SINCE I'VE BEEN IN THE PROFESSION. WHETHER I THINK THAT ATTITUDES HAVE CHANGED ABOUT INTERPRETERS, I'M GENUINELY NOT TOO SURE. I THINK THAT IT DEPENDS ON WHERE YOU WORK, WHICH FIRM YOU WORK FOR OR WHO YOUR COLLEAGUES ARE BECAUSE, OF COURSE, EVERYTHING IS VERY SUBJECTIVE WHEN IT COMES TO DETERMINING THE STATUS OF A PROFESSION"

- “WHEN YOU ARE WORKING WITHIN A TEAM OR WITH A SOLICITOR WHO DOESN’T THINK ANYTHING OF INTERPRETERS, THAT WOULD BE LARGELY DIFFERENT AND A VERY DIFFERENT CONTRAST TO A TEAM THAT VALUES INTERPRETERS A LOT MORE AND REALLY SEES THEIR USE WITHIN THE JUSTICE SYSTEM. SO, I THINK IT’S A VERY SUBJECTIVE QUESTION. I WOULDN’T REALLY KNOW HOW TO ANSWER THAT, BUT I WOULD THINK THAT THEY HAVE A VERY IMPORTANT ROLE WITHIN THE COURTS”

So, based on the above we can identify the following themes:

1. **“THEIR ROLE IS TO ENSURE THAT THE MESSAGE WE’RE TRYING TO GET ACROSS AND THE ADVICE THAT WE’RE TRYING TO GET ACROSS DOESN’T GET LOST IN TRANSLATION”** – Role perceptions by legal professionals.

Subthemes:

- **“THEY’RE THERE TO BRIDGE THE GAP”/ “I GUESS IT’S ALL JUST COMMUNICATION, ISN’T IT, EFFECTIVE COMMUNICATION”** – interpreter as facilitator of communication
- **“THEY HEAVILY ASSIST THE COURTS”** – interpreters as court “helpers”/assistants”
- **“I THINK IT’S REALLY HELPFUL, ESPECIALLY WHEN THE INTERPRETER KNOWS HOW TO EFFECTIVELY EXPLAIN THINGS”** – interpreters are to explain “things”
- **“THE INTERPRETER SHOULD PERHAPS LET THE LEGAL PROFESSIONAL KNOW”** – interpreters are to monitor the level of the clients understanding and inform the legal professionals if in their opinion the client doesn’t understand?

2. **“THE INTERPRETER SHOULD PERHAPS LET THE LEGAL PROFESSIONAL KNOW”**

Subthemes:

- **“I THINK SOME KNOWLEDGE ABOUT THE LEGAL PROCESSES, BUT ALSO WHICH LANGUAGE TO USE”**
- **“THE INTERPRETER SHOULD PERHAPS LET THE LEGAL PROFESSIONAL KNOW”** – the respondent has positively confirmed that in her opinion the interpreters should pick up on signs of misunderstanding of the client and report to the legal professional.

3. **“I FIND THAT IF YOU HAVE A GOOD INTERPRETER, THEY CAN ENSURE THAT THEY INTERPRET WHAT YOU’RE TRYING TO GET ACROSS TO YOUR CLIENT IN THE MOST**

EFFECTIVE WAY” – what makes an interpreter “good” interpreter, quality matters and what is expected of “good” interpreters.

4. **“THE PACE IS A LOT SLOWER”** – the impact of the presence of the interpreter on the legal proceeding.
5. **“THEY ARE AN INTERVENING PARTY”/ “BUT I WOULD THINK THAT THEY HAVE A VERY IMPORTANT ROLE WITHIN THE COURTS”** – the importance of interpreters in court proceedings.

13.2.13 Respondent 27: codes and themes from survey

Respondent 27: Codes and themes from Survey

1. “TO ACCURATELY TRANSLATE TECHNICAL LEGAL TERMINOLOGY TO THE CLIENT AND ENSURE THE CLIENT IS ABLE TO GIVE AN INFORMED DECISION ON THEIR INSTRUCTIONS TO ME”
2. “SHOULD NOT PROVIDE THEIR OPINION ON WHAT THE CLIENT SHOULD DO IF THE CLIENT HAS A LIST OF OPTIONS TO CHOOSE FROM”
3. “ITS HELPFUL IF THE INTERPRETER STICKS TO THEIR REMIT OF WHAT THEY ARE ASKED TO INTERPRET”
4. “SOMETIMES INTERPRETATION CAN GET LOST IN TRANSLATION AND I HAVE TO THEN CHOOSE MY WORDS CAREFULLY FOR THE INTERPRETER TO INTERPRET TO THE CLIENT.”
5. “IT IS HELPFUL WHEN THE INTERPRETER HAS EXTENSIVE LEGAL KNOWLEDGE OF THE PROCESSES AND THEREFORE ABLE TO INTERPRET TO THE CLIENT ACCURATELY”
6. “I WOULDN'T SAY AN INTERPRETER IS PART OF THE LEGAL PROCESS”
7. “I THINK IT IS JUST TO HAVE AN INTERPRETER. THEIR STATUS IN THE COURT ROOM IS PIVOTAL IN ACHIEVING A JUST AND EQUITABLE RESULT”
8. “TO BE ABLE TO INTERPRET ACCURATELY LEGAL ADVICE AND OPTIONS TO A CLIENT”

Identified themes:

1. **“TO BE ABLE TO INTERPRET ACCURATELY LEGAL ADVICE AND OPTIONS TO A CLIENT”** – interpreter’s role is neutral conduit?
2. **“SOMETIMES INTERPRETATION CAN GET LOST IN TRANSLATION AND I HAVE TO THEN CHOOSE MY WORDS CAREFULLY FOR THE INTERPRETER TO INTERPRET TO THE CLIENT.”** – the impact of the presence of the interpreter on the legal proceeding.

3. **"IT IS HELPFUL WHEN THE INTERPRETER HAS EXTENSIVE LEGAL KNOWLEDGE OF THE PROCESSES AND THEREFORE ABLE TO INTERPRET TO THE CLIENT ACCURATELY"** – expectation of the interpreter to have extensive legal knowledge of the process.
4. **"I WOULDN'T SAY AN INTERPRETER IS PART OF THE LEGAL PROCESS"** – interpreter is an outsider of the legal process.
5. **"THEIR STATUS IN THE COURT ROOM IS PIVOTAL IN ACHIEVING A JUST AND EQUITABLE RESULT"** – interpreter's role is very important (pivotal)

The themes in the survey overlap with the following identified themes in the corresponding transcript of the follow-up interview (Themes 1, 2, 4, and 5):

- **"THEIR ROLE IS TO ENSURE THAT THE MESSAGE WE'RE TRYING TO GET ACROSS AND THE ADVICE THAT WE'RE TRYING TO GET ACROSS DOESN'T GET LOST IN TRANSLATION"** – Role perceptions by legal professionals. – **Theme 1.**
- **"THE INTERPRETER SHOULD PERHAPS LET THE LEGAL PROFESSIONAL KNOW"** – **Theme 2**
It particularly overlaps with the subtheme:
- **"I THINK SOME KNOWLEDGE ABOUT THE LEGAL PROCESSES, BUT ALSO WHICH LANGUAGE TO USE"**
- **"THE PACE IS A LOT SLOWER"** – the impact of the presence of the interpreter on the legal proceeding. – **Theme 4.**
- **"THEY ARE AN INTERVENING PARTY"/ "BUT I WOULD THINK THAT THEY HAVE A VERY IMPORTANT ROLE WITHIN THE COURTS"** – **Theme 5.**

An additional theme has been identified in the Survey:

"I WOULDN'T SAY AN INTERPRETER IS PART OF THE LEGAL PROCESS" – interpreter is an outsider of the legal process. – **Theme 4 in the Survey.**

13.3 Identified themes across the interviews and survey with legal professionals

Respondent 1 (criminal barrister from the chamber N5)

1. **"I THINK IT'S HARD WORK BEING AN INTERPRETER"** - Challenges and pressures of interpreters in court as seen and recognised by the legal professionals.
2. **"THEY SHOULD BE AN ENTIRELY NEUTRAL CONDUIT"** - how the role of interpreters is seen by legal professionals.
3. **"THEY SHOULD BE ALERT AND QUICK AND RESPONSIVE AND ENGAGED"** - expectations
4. **"THE INTERPRETER'S ROLE IS VERY IMPORTANT"** – appreciation of interpreters/their role and status in the courtroom.
5. **"IT'S A SLOWER PROCESS; IT'S OBVIOUSLY A SLOW PROCESS"** – the impact of interpreters on the legal proceeding/process.

Respondent 26

1. **"IF THERE'S A COURT HEARING, THEN THE COURT PROVIDES INTERPRETERS"** – provision and sourcing the interpreters.
2. **"THE ONLY THING THAT THEY SHOULD BE DOING IS INTERPRETING EXACTLY WHAT'S ASKED OF THEM."** - how the role of interpreters is seen by legal professionals.
3. **"THEY'RE THERE TO DO A JOB AND THEY HAVE TO BE PROFESSIONAL"** – expectations of the role as seen by the legal professionals.
4. **"WITHOUT AN INTERPRETER IT WOULDN'T BE A FAIR TRIAL"** - appreciation of interpreters/their role and status in the courtroom.

Subtheme:

"I THINK THEY'VE ALWAYS BEEN RESPECTED BY THE LEGAL PROFESSION. I DON'T THINK THEY'VE EVER NOT BEEN"

5. **"THINGS TAKE A LITTLE LONGER"** - the impact of interpreters on the legal proceeding/process.

Identified themes from the Survey:

1. **"AN INTERPRETER IS INTEGRAL TO COURT PROCEEDINGS WHEN THE CASE IS NOT IN THE DEFENDANTS FIRST LANGUAGE"** – interpreters are part of the legal process

2. **"THEY SHOULD INTERPRET EXACTLY WHAT IS SAID"** – the role of the interpreter as seen by legal professionals
3. **"IT WOULD EXTEND THE COURT TIME, BUT I WOULD CONSIDER THIS NECESSARY AND IMPORTANT"** – the impact of the interpreter on the legal process
4. **"THE INTERPRETER IS EXTREMELY IMPORTANT"** – recognition of interpreters
5. **"LISTENING TO THE QUESTION TO BE ASKED OF THE DEFENDANT AND INTERPRETING THE EXACT RESPONSE"** – expectations of the interpreters

The themes in the survey overlap with the following identified themes in the corresponding transcript of the follow-up interview (Themes 2, 3, 4, and 5):

"THE ONLY THING THAT THEY SHOULD BE DOING IS INTERPRETING EXACTLY WHAT'S ASKED OF THEM." - how the role of interpreters is seen by legal professionals. (Theme 2)

"THEY'RE THERE TO DO A JOB AND THEY HAVE TO BE PROFESSIONAL" – expectations of the role as seen by the legal professionals. (Theme 3)

"WITHOUT AN INTERPRETER IT WOULDN'T BE A FAIR TRIAL" - appreciation of interpreters/their role and status in the courtroom. (Theme 4)

"THINGS TAKE A LITTLE LONGER" - the impact of interpreters on the legal proceeding/process. (Theme 5)

Respondent 12

1. "YOU CAN CONTRACT OUT THE FUNCTION, BUT NOT THE RESPONSIBILITY."
2. "INTERPRETERS MUST ALWAYS REMAIN INDEPENDENT OF ALL PARTIES"/ "AS A PROFESSIONAL YOU HAVE OBLIGATIONS TO THE SYSTEM."
3. "THE ROLE OF THE INTERPRETER IS TO COMMUNICATE, TO STRIVE TO COMMUNICATE AS COMPLETELY AS POSSIBLE, TO ENABLE COMMUNICATION."
4. "AS A SURROGATE POLICE OFFICER"
5. "STATUS, HERE, AND ROLE ARE OPPOSITE SIDES OF THE COIN."

Themes from the Survey:

The following themes have been identified:

- 1) Responsibility of the provision of interpreting services and pay; **(IT HAS ALWAYS BEEN THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE COURT TO SECURE SUCH SERVICES.)**

- 2) The role of the interpreter is to **"TO STRIVE FOR OPTIMUM COMMUNICATION AMONGST ALL PARTICIPANTS."**
- 3) Recognition of role and status: **"YES, ALTHOUGH A FULL RECOGNITION OF THAT PROFESSIONAL ROLE AND STATUS IS STILL VERY MUCH WORK IN PROGRESS."**
- 4) Expectations of the role (do's and don't's)
- 5) Suggestions for improvement: **"THINGS HAVE MOVED ON BUT ANY RELIABLE, STILL LESS HOLISTIC, APPROACH TO TRAINING, ACCREDITATION AND CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT REMAINS A CHIMERA."**

Overlap with the following themes from the follow-up interview:

1. Theme 1: **"YOU CAN CONTRACT OUT THE FUNCTION, BUT NOT THE RESPONSIBILITY."**
2. Theme 2: **"INTERPRETERS MUST ALWAYS REMAIN INDEPENDENT OF ALL PARTIES"/ "AS A PROFESSIONAL YOU HAVE OBLIGATIONS TO THE SYSTEM."**
3. Theme 3: **"THE ROLE OF THE INTERPRETER IS TO COMMUNICATE, TO STRIVE TO COMMUNICATE AS COMPLETELY AS POSSIBLE, TO ENABLE COMMUNICATION."**
4. Theme 5: **"STATUS, HERE, AND ROLE ARE OPPOSITE SIDES OF THE COIN."**

A new theme has emerged in the Survey: Suggestions for improvement: **"THINGS HAVE MOVED ON BUT ANY RELIABLE, STILL LESS HOLISTIC, APPROACH TO TRAINING, ACCREDITATION AND CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT REMAINS A CHIMERA."**

Respondent 25

Theme 1: "YOU WANT SOMEONE WHO APPEARS, WHO INTERPRETS, BUT ALSO HAS SOME PERSONAL INPUT IN TERMS OF ABILITY TO FINISH THE JOB"

Subtheme 1): "I'D SAY HE IS A FACILITATOR. HE/SHE IS A FACILITATOR OF COMMUNICATION."

Subtheme 2) "THEY HAVE TO STAY ALMOST INVISIBLE IN A ROOM"

Subtheme 3) "HE WILL STAY IMPARTIAL FROM THE BEGINNING UNTIL AN END"

Subtheme 4) "PROBABLY THE INTERPRETER SHOULD WITHDRAW. HOWEVER, DISADVANTAGEOUS"/ "PROBABLY HONESTY IS A GOOD THING" – ethics of interpreters

Subtheme 5) "BUT I THINK HE IS NOT THERE TO TRANSMIT THE CULTURAL ELEMENT OF IT; IT'S JUST THE LANGUAGE. HE IS A TRANSLATOR. HE IS AN INTERPRETER. THAT IS HIS ROLE. NOT MORE THAN THAT"

Subtheme 6) “AND OBVIOUSLY, TIMING IS IMPORTANT AS WELL. THEY HAVE TO BE ON TIME, TOO.”

Theme 2: “IT MADE THINGS WORSE FOR ME. PLEASE, I DON’T WANT AN INTERPRETER.”

Theme 3: “I DID HAVE A SITUATION WHERE UNPROFESSIONALISM WAS SO HIGH THAT EVEN MY TOLERANCE COULDN’T TAKE IT”

Theme 4: “SO THEY REALLY ARE PEOPLE THAT WE CANNOT BE WITHOUT”

Theme 5: “USUALLY WE WOULD HAVE INTERPRETERS THAT WE KNOW ALREADY”

Theme 6: “I’D SAY THEY’RE MORE LIKE OUTSIDERS, BUT IN A CERTAIN SITUATION THEY CAN BE A NECESSARY, INTEGRAL PART, AND THAT’S WHY THEY’RE THERE”

Additional themes: “I WAS A LAWYER BACK HOME, BUT AS YOU KNOW, IT’S QUITE HARD TO TRANSMIT YOUR KNOWLEDGE IMMEDIATELY.”

Themes from Survey

Identified themes:

- 1. “THE INTERPRETER IS A PART OF LEGAL PROCESS AND HAS PHYSICAL AND VISUAL PRESENCE”** - interpreters are part of the legal process
- 2. “A COURTROOM INTERPRETER WILL ASSIST LEGAL PROCEEDINGS TO RUN SMOOTHLY BY ENSURING THAT THE PARTICIPANT CAN BE UNDERSTOOD”** – interpreter’s role, expectations of the interpreter.
- 3. “WHERE THE NEED FOR AN INTERPRETER ARISES, HIS/HER COMPETENCE IS PIVOTAL TO AN OUTCOME OF THE PROCEEDINGS”** – the importance of interpreters’ competence can not be overemphasised, interpreters are very important in legal proceedings.
- 4. “THE INTERPRETER IS AT THE RECEIVING END OF TRUTH AND LIE AND AS THUS SHOULD WITHDRAW FROM CHANNELLING HIS VIEWS”** – obligations/expectations of the interpreter, impartiality is key.
- 5. “I THINK THE FIELD OF INTERPRETATION RECEIVED A GLOBAL RECOGNITION AS A FAST GROWING INDUSTRY WHICH IS APPLICABLE TO LEGAL SYSTEM IN THE UK.** – about recognition and status of interpreters;

6. **“HOWEVER NECESSARY IT IS TO HAVE AN INTERPRETER, IT DOES SLOW THE PROCESS DOWN AND OFTEN LEADS TO AN EMOTIONAL DETACHMENT OF THE WITNESS”** – impact on the process.

The themes in the survey overlap with the following identified themes in the corresponding transcript of the follow-up interview (Themes 1, subthemes 2&3; themes 4, and 6):

Theme 1. **“YOU WANT SOMEONE WHO APPEARS, WHO INTERPRETS, BUT ALSO HAS SOME PERSONAL INPUT IN TERMS OF ABILITY TO FINISH THE JOB”**

Subtheme 2) **“THEY HAVE TO STAY ALMOST INVISIBLE IN A ROOM”**

Subtheme 3) **“HE WILL STAY IMPARTIAL FROM THE BEGINNING UNTIL AN END”**

Theme 4: **“SO THEY REALLY ARE PEOPLE THAT WE CANNOT BE WITHOUT”**

Theme 6: **“I’D SAY THEY’RE MORE LIKE OUTSIDERS, BUT IN A CERTAIN SITUATION THEY CAN BE A NECESSARY, INTEGRAL PART, AND THAT’S WHY THEY’RE THERE”**

Respondent 27

1. **“THEIR ROLE IS TO ENSURE THAT THE MESSAGE WE’RE TRYING TO GET ACROSS AND THE ADVICE THAT WE’RE TRYING TO GET ACROSS DOESN’T GET LOST IN TRANSLATION”** – Role perceptions by legal professionals.

Subthemes:

- **“THEY’RE THERE TO BRIDGE THE GAP”/ “I GUESS IT’S ALL JUST COMMUNICATION, ISN’T IT, EFFECTIVE COMMUNICATION”** – interpreter as facilitator of communication
- **“THEY HEAVILY ASSIST THE COURTS”** – interpreters as court “helpers”/assistants”
- **“I THINK IT’S REALLY HELPFUL, ESPECIALLY WHEN THE INTERPRETER KNOWS HOW TO EFFECTIVELY EXPLAIN THINGS”** – interpreters are to explain “things”
- **“THE INTERPRETER SHOULD PERHAPS LET THE LEGAL PROFESSIONAL KNOW”** – interpreters are to monitor the level of the clients understanding and inform the legal professionals if in their opinion the client doesn’t understand?

2. **“THE INTERPRETER SHOULD PERHAPS LET THE LEGAL PROFESSIONAL KNOW”**

Subthemes:

- **“I THINK SOME KNOWLEDGE ABOUT THE LEGAL PROCESSES, BUT ALSO WHICH LANGUAGE TO USE”**
- **“THE INTERPRETER SHOULD PERHAPS LET THE LEGAL PROFESSIONAL KNOW”** – the respondent has positively confirmed that in her opinion the interpreters should pick up on signs of misunderstanding of the client and report to the legal professional.
- 3. **“I FIND THAT IF YOU HAVE A GOOD INTERPRETER, THEY CAN ENSURE THAT THEY INTERPRET WHAT YOU’RE TRYING TO GET ACROSS TO YOUR CLIENT IN THE MOST EFFECTIVE WAY”** – what makes an interpreter “good” interpreter, quality matters and what is expected of “good” interpreters.
- 4. **“THE PACE IS A LOT SLOWER”** – the impact of the presence of the interpreter on the legal proceeding.
- 5. **“THEY ARE AN INTERVENING PARTY”/ “BUT I WOULD THINK THAT THEY HAVE A VERY IMPORTANT ROLE WITHIN THE COURTS”** – the importance of interpreters in court proceedings.

Themes from the Survey

Identified themes:

1. **“TO BE ABLE TO INTERPRET ACCURATELY LEGAL ADVICE AND OPTIONS TO A CLIENT”** – interpreter’s role is neutral conduit?
2. **“SOMETIMES INTERPRETATION CAN GET LOST IN TRANSLATION AND I HAVE TO THEN CHOOSE MY WORDS CAREFULLY FOR THE INTERPRETER TO INTERPRET TO THE CLIENT.”** – the impact of the presence of the interpreter on the legal proceeding.
3. **“IT IS HELPFUL WHEN THE INTERPRETER HAS EXTENSIVE LEGAL KNOWLEDGE OF THE PROCESSES AND THEREFORE ABLE TO INTERPRET TO THE CLIENT ACCURATELY”** – expectation of the interpreter to have extensive legal knowledge of the process.
4. **“I WOULDN’T SAY AN INTERPRETER IS PART OF THE LEGAL PROCESS”** – interpreter is an outsider of the legal process.
5. **“THEIR STATUS IN THE COURT ROOM IS PIVOTAL IN ACHIEVING A JUST AND EQUITABLE RESULT”** – interpreter’s role is very important (pivotal)

The themes in the survey overlap with the following identified themes in the corresponding transcript of the follow-up interview (Themes 1, 2, 4, and 5):

- **“THEIR ROLE IS TO ENSURE THAT THE MESSAGE WE’RE TRYING TO GET ACROSS AND THE ADVICE THAT WE’RE TRYING TO GET ACROSS DOESN’T GET LOST IN TRANSLATION”** – Role perceptions by legal professionals. – Theme 1.

- **“THE INTERPRETER SHOULD PERHAPS LET THE LEGAL PROFESSIONAL KNOW”** – Theme 2

It particularly overlaps with the subtheme:

- **“I THINK SOME KNOWLEDGE ABOUT THE LEGAL PROCESSES, BUT ALSO WHICH LANGUAGE TO USE”**
- **“THE PACE IS A LOT SLOWER”** – the impact of the presence of the interpreter on the legal proceeding. – Theme 4.
- **“THEY ARE AN INTERVENING PARTY”/ “BUT I WOULD THINK THAT THEY HAVE A VERY IMPORTANT ROLE WITHIN THE COURTS”** – Theme 5.

An additional theme has been identified in the Survey:

“I WOULDN'T SAY AN INTERPRETER IS PART OF THE LEGAL PROCESS” – interpreter is an outsider of the legal process. – Theme 4 in the Survey.

Overlapping themes (access points)

1. Interpreter as a neutral conduit;
2. Interpreter as a facilitator of communication;
3. Challenges of courtroom interpreters as seen by legal professionals (“hard work to be an interpreter”)
4. Expectations and obligations (what interpreters should and shouldn’t do), ethics;
5. Recognition of interpreters’ role (status/importance of interpreters);
6. Impact on the process (it’s a slower process/intervening party);
7. Provision and sourcing interpreters;
8. Views of legal professionals as to whether interpreters are integral part of the legal process or are rather outsiders;
9. Issues of competence;
10. Criticism of the system.