International Journal of Interpreter Education

Volume 14 | Issue 1 Article 3

7-2022

Translanguaging in Court Proceedings: How Interpreter Pedagogy Needs to Address Monolingual Ideologies in Court Interpreting That Delegitimize Litigants' Voices

Alan James Runcieman
The University of Vic

Translanguaging in Court Proceedings: How Interpreter Pedagogy Needs to Address Monolingual Ideologies in Court Interpreting That Delegitimize Litigants' Voices

Alan James Runcieman[1]
The University of Vic

Abstract

The majority of court proceedings are based on monolingual ideologies that assume that the court is speaking one, specific, bounded language and the litigant another. Thus, interpreting processes in this context are framed as an L-B to L-A interchange, a bridge between two linguistically and culturally discrete entities. In increasingly superdiverse societies, however, court interpreters are finding that their clients do not always respect these rigid boundaries, often engaging instead in what has become to be known as translanguaging, a form of linguistically fluid, hybrid, and often creative discourse that sources all the client's (para)linguistic repertoires, acquired throughout their personal and working life experiences.

Drawing on preliminary research, this article explores how monolingual biases appear to persist in community or public-service interpreting and suggests that interpreters are little prepared to deal with translanguaging practices. Moreover, findings suggest that such a phenomenon needs to be addressed in interpreter training pedagogy.

Keywords: legitimate language; non-legitimate language; translanguaging; superdiversity; monolingual boundaries; community interpreting

1 Correspondence to: alan.jamesruncieman@uvic.cat

1. Introduction

Court interpreting is one form of what is referred to as *community interpreting or public-service interpreting*,[1] which provides interpreting services for minority language–speaking people in host nations who cannot speak the majority language, potentially restricting their access to essential public services (e.g., medical, educational, and legal). The right to such services is enshrined in Article 2 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights,[2] which states that such rights and freedoms should be an entitlement "without distinction of any kind, such as race, colour, sex, *language*, religion, political or other opinion" (my emphasis). Hence, community or public-service interpreting is positioned as being an essential bridge between linguistically and culturally different groups living in a foreign country and serves to provide justice and equity for all (Bancroft, 2015; Garber, 1998).

However, this concept of interpreters providing a "bridge" between linguistic minority groups and the linguistic majority of a nation-state draws on a monolingual framing of languages (and cultures), whereby individual states claim a "one nation, one language, and one culture" status for all its citizens (Blommaert & Rampton, 2011). Although this stance might have been more relevant in the past, in the postmodern world of today, such myths are being increasingly challenged.

The phenomenon of *translanguaging*, in particular, provides a major challenge to monolingual approaches to interpreting,[3] being a form of multilingualism, but varying from the concept in representing a creative, dynamic, and fluid sourcing of diverse linguistic repertoires, rejecting the "artificial boundaries" between languages (Garcia, 2009; Garcia & Li, 2014). Translanguaging, indeed, represents an individual's, group's, or community's ability to create "new language" from all the principal and partial linguistic resources they have acquired through their personal histories and experiences (Garcia & Li, 2014). Moreover, translanguaging can be seen as a form of "multilingualism from below" or "metrolingualism" (Pennycook & Otsuji, 2015), emerging typically in urban spaces where mixed-language practices are an essential part of *getting things done* in everyday life (Pennycook & Otsuji, 2015). These spaces are where "superdiversity" is most evident in society (a concept described in more depth later), such as in the marketplaces, shops, and areas of production in cities, where getting things done legitimizes drawing on every resource available to build relationships, promote conviviality, and do business.

I argue that where and when translanguaging occurs, it is an essential part of an individual's social identity and voice, particularly for migrants, refugees, and asylum seekers, whose own minority language(s) have adapted in many (semi-)competent ways to the majority language of the host nation. Moreover, I suggest that translanguaging is an integral part of how these people communicate and build communities in their daily lives.

I begin by looking at superdiversity and translanguaging as emerging phenomena before turning to the wider concept of legitimate and non-legitimate language in institutional settings, specifically in relation to power and authority and how these have been influenced and shaped by monolingual ideologies regarding legitimate language usage in professional contexts (e.g., in legal proceedings). I go on to present preliminary research findings to support this argument before concluding with proposals for changes to pedagogic curricula in interpreter studies.

2. Superdiversity and Translanguaging in a Postmodern World

Beginning in Australia and Canada in the 1960s and 1970s, respectively, followed by America, Britain, and European Union (EU) countries in the 1980s and 1990s (Mahood, 2016), multiculturalism and multilingualism have gradually been politically acknowledged as realities in most nation-states, albeit with some still vehemently resisting them (see Monzó-Nebot, 2020). In today's world, however, an even more complex form of globalization and migration has deeply "altered the face of social, cultural and linguistic diversity in societies all over the world" (Blommaert & Rampton, 2011, p. 1). This new diversity has come to be known as *superdiversity* (Vertovec, 2007), a term used to describe

> a (new) level and kind of complexity surpassing anything the country has previously experienced. Such a condition is distinguished by a dynamic interplay of variables among an increased number

> of new, small and scattered, multiple-origin, transnationally connected, socio-economically differentiated and legally stratified immigrants. . . . (p. 1024)

Paralleling the rise of "superdiverse societies" has been a rise in the creative and fluid use of multiple languages in everyday urban speech, a phenomenon that has come to be known as *translanguaging* (Garcia, 2009; Garcia & Li, 2014; Pennycook & Otsuji, 2015). Unlike multilingualism, and its correlation with the concept of "code-switching," passing from one "bounded" language to another (cf. Canagarajah, 2013; Hall & Nilep, 2015), translanguaging represents "a practice that involves [the] dynamic and functionally integrated use of different languages and language varieties, but more importantly *a process of knowledge construction* that goes beyond language(s)" (Li, 2018, p. 15, original italics).

How people construct their knowledge of the world is intricately tied to language, and translanguaging, in its multiple-language use, allows for new voices to permeate new social realities "by bringing together different dimensions of [people's] personal history, experience and environment" (Li, 2011, p. 1223). This relatively new social space in urban settings has brought people together from diverse ethnic, cultural, and linguistic origins with different personal histories and experiences, ranging from relative newcomers to those who have already established deep roots in their local communities, where translanguaging has become a new social necessity and a new reality (Creese et al., 2018; Pennycook & Otsuji, 2015).

3. Legitimate and Non-legitimate Languages in a Monolingual Context

Bourdieu (1977) has argued that

> [l]anguage is not only an instrument of communication or even of knowledge, but also an instrument of power. A person speaks not only to be understood but also to be believed, obeyed, respected, distinguished. Hence the full definition of competence as the right to speech, i.e., to the legitimate language, the authorized language which is also the language of authority. Competence implies the power to impose reception. (p. 648)

The legitimate language in institutional contexts (e.g., education and law) is the language that has been negotiated between the state and its institutions, based on dominant discourses and ideologies that have been historically legitimized over time and that invest the people who speak that language with the power "to be believed, obeyed, respected, [and] distinguished" (p. 648). Indeed, for reasons of political and economic power, *legitimate language speakers* are also those who remain within the matrix of power and continue to propagate specific language hierarchies to maintain that power (Bourdieu, 1977). Thus, non-legitimate language users—those without legitimized repertoires—remain marginalized and powerless (Reagan, 2016), and language practices and conventions are "invested with power relations and ideological processes which people are often unaware of" (Fairclough, 1992, p. 7).

The linguistic inequalities and asymmetries between litigants and legal representatives in courts have received substantive attention over the last 20 years (Conley & O'Barr, 1998; Cotterill, 2004; Matoesian, 1999; Mertz, 1994). However,

> a searching examination of the language-based discrimination of linguistic minority participants in legal contexts has developed only recently. The primary focus of analysis in these studies has been the institutional hegemony of monolingual ideologies that persistently disadvantage speakers of minority languages in procedural contexts. (Maryns, 2012, p. 297)

These monolingual ideologies often frame the interpreter as working between two clearly defined, discrete, and bounded monolingual sets of code, where the litigant is presumed to be equably represented in the mediatory process—that is, Court = L-A, litigant = L-B, interpreter = L-A-L-B (cf. Angermeyer, 2008, 2015; Inghilleri, 2003;

Wadensjö, 2004). However, translanguaging practices are marked by a fluid and creative interchange between multiple repertoires (Auer, 1998; Maryns, 2005, 2012; Maryns & Blommaert, 2001); consequently, a complete monolingual competence in one language can never be completely assumed and, indeed, rarely is the case (Harris, 1997; Leung et al., 1997; Maryns & Blommaert, 2001; Rampton, 1995). Moreover, research has shown that litigants may often be actually incapable of expressing themselves wholly in the language assigned to them through the services of a court interpreter, often leading to the court's, and the interpreter's, questioning of their credibility (Maryns, 2012; Rock, 2017). The complexities of the linguistic variables in play and the everyday nature of translanguaging practices, particularly in some communities, are arguably hardly ever acknowledged by the courts and only in varying degrees by interpreters, as the preliminary research presented here suggests. Moreover, I argue here, as does other research (see Cogo & House, 2017 Firth, 2009), that far from being a wholly arbitrary and idiosyncratic mixing of language codes, a certain consistency in the practice can be identified.

Interpreters themselves might be very aware of the difficulty of maintaining linguistic boundaries in their own personal lives and how often their languages blend, particularly outside their professional roles (Rock, 2017). However,

> many of the social institutions in which they work still view languages as separate and separable units which come into contact in highly regularised ways and can therefore be highly regulated whenever they meet. In other words, many social institutions still operate on the assumption of a monolingual norm even though many social actors within them do not. (p. 218)

This might be the product of a monolingual educational approach to language learning in general, whereby individual languages are taught in isolation and such practices as code-switching are ideologically seen as indicators of deficit (Creese & Blackledge, 2010; Cummins, 2005; Li & Wing, 2018; Rock, 2017). This attitude is also reflected in interpreter curricula, which generally favors a one-to-one monolingual approach to interpreting practices (Runcieman, 2018, 2021) and a consequent expectation of the same in a professional context.

To explore how such monolingual ideologies might affect the professional court interpreter's approach to translanguaging practices in court proceedings, I conducted research involving six practitioners in the field.

4. Research Overview

4.1 Participants

To acquire a cohort for research into court interpreters, I approached the UK's National Register of Public Service Interpreters (NRPSI[4]). The association subsequently agreed to publish a call on its website for volunteers to discuss contemporary issues in court interpreting in addition to the researcher's contact details. In the course of 2 weeks, six members agreed to correspond with the researcher individually, with a guarantee of anonymity when the research was published.

The cohort consisted of five females and one male, with a range of experience in the field of court interpreting from 3 to 28 years. Table 1 provides a brief description of each participant (whose names have been anonymized) based on an initial questionnaire. The questionnaire was also accompanied by an ethics consent form, outlining the nature of the study, guaranteeing that no information would be included in the research without the participants' prior consent, and assuring them that they could withdraw from the research at any time.

Table 1. Research Participants

Name (pseudonym) *M=male* *F=female*	*Languages interpreted*	*Years working as a court interpreter*
Sara (F)	*French-English*	*18*
Jacob (M)	*Polish-English*	*3*
Eva (F)	*Dutch-French-English*	*28*
Henna (F)	*English-Portuguese*	*21*
Tatania (F)	*Russian-English*	*5*
Solada (F)	*Thai-English*	*6*

Registered with the NRPSI, Solada received her diploma in public service interpreting (DPSI)[5] in 2018. She described herself as a full-time interpreter, having worked in the healthcare sector for 11 years but almost exclusively as a legal interpreter for the last 6 years (2015–2021). Apart from court hearings, she also interpreted during police custody interviews, where she sometimes translated depositions and witness statements.

Tatania was also a registered member of the NRPSI and obtained her DPSI in 2014. Apart from legal interpreting, she also interpreted for the social services and in healthcare.

Henna was one of the longest-serving interpreters in the cohort, being awarded her DPSI in 1999. In addition to being a member of the NRPSI for more than 10 years, she was a member of the UK's Association of Community Interpreters (ACIS). Nearly all her professional interpreting career was based in the legal field, including courts, probation hearings, police interviews, and prisons.

Eva, like Henna, had many years of experience in interpreting, working principally as a freelancer. She had worked for the healthcare sector, primarily in the field of psychiatry (mental health assessments), as well as for the European Court of Justice since 1993. Although not a member of the NRPSI, she was a member of the International Association of Conference Interpreters (AIIC) and the European Commission's Directorate General for Interpretation (SCIC). She held a postgraduate diploma in legal interpretation.

Jacob had master's degree in forensic linguistics and a DPSI. He had been an interpreter in the legal field since 2017, working principally on Ministry of Justice assignments, police custody interviews, and witness/victim statements. Previous to this, he had worked for the healthcare sector (2015–2017) in a variety of places, including accident and emergency (emergency room), surgery and minor procedures, hospital discharge, chemotherapy, radiotherapy, pre-op assessments, and pediatrics.

Sara was a member of the NRPSI as well as other organizations, including the Chartered Institute of Linguistics (CIOL),[6] the Institute for Interpretation and Translation (ITI),[7] and the Association of Police and Court Interpreters (APCI).[8] Moreover, she also held a law degree and a solicitor's qualification. She had set up her own company to train legal interpreters and focused principally on legal interpreting in her own professional life, although she also worked in the business and commercial sectors.

4.2 Analysis

The analytic frame in the research involved a discourse analysis of 51 emails specifically related to the cohort's exchanges with the researcher after posing the following initial focus question:

> Have you ever been in an interpreting situation where the client(s) were code-switching, that is, using more than one language interchangeably as they spoke? This might have been anything from

> a few words to a long stretch of discourse. If so, can you describe the situation (with example/s) and say how you dealt with it?

Although translanguaging practices were a central focus of this area of research, using what was considered to be a more familiar and established term—code-*switching*—and framing it as "using more than one language interchangeably," was envisaged as reducing conceptual confusion over specific terminological/conceptual meaning. It was also intended to prevent the participants from taking an anticipatory theoretical or conceptual stance toward the practice of translanguaging itself.

Table 2. Summary of emails and word content analyzed

Name	*Number of emails analyzed*	*Total word content*
Sara	*1*	*253*
Jacob	*20*	*3,456*
Eva	*7*	*1,472*
Henna	*4*	*899*
Tatania	*0*	*0*
Solada	*19*	*2,998*

Two participants (Jacob and Solada) provided much of the data, as they were more engaged with the practice of "language mixing," which they continually observed in their work, and the "problem" they saw it posing to professional legal interpreting.

My focus in these one-on-one exchanges was on how the participants constructed their specific *community of practice* (Lave & Wenger, 1991) as professional court interpreters. The analysis centered on identifying dominant discourses in the data with regard to the central concerns in an analysis of communities of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991)—namely, ethical practices, shared (or unshared) professional values, and best practices, specifically with regard to what I determined as being translanguaging practices in the courtroom.

5. Research Findings

All the participants in the research cohort raised the issue of language transitioning in their clients' speech as hindering legal proceedings and having a negative impact on their professional interpreting abilities. Eva initially responded:

> I would say, depends on whether the speaker is recorded and whether the switch occurs after a prompt. If he is recorded and still speaking in full flow, I would probably first interpret into English and then add "part of this was in another language," knowing that if it matters to know exactly when the switch took place, we can play back the record. This would enable me to render the evidence without imposing my own person on that evidence. If not recorded, I would announce the switch at precisely the point it happened.

Eva described court proceedings as being either "recorded" or not, flagging potential differences in certain court proceedings to the uninitiated reader. If these proceedings were recorded, she described how she would ignore any translanguaging until after the client's turn and then signal it to the court with the phrase "part of this was in another language." The reason she gave was to avoid "imposing my own person on that evidence." This feeds into a discourse that interpreters should act as "passive language conduits" and remain as "invisible" as possible in the interpreting event, a discourse that is increasingly contested in the field of community or public-service interpreting (see Angelelli, 2012; Mikkelson, 2008) but is arguably a far more complex issue in legal interpreting, where the

interpreter can be liable for prosecution if any significant changes or modifications are made from the litigant's speech. If the hearing was not being recorded, however, Eva saw her role as actively interrupting proceedings and allowing the court to decide how best to proceed.

In response to the same research question, Solada said:

> I have a lot of clients from North Eastern of Thailand. They speak Isaan, which is a dialect for the North Eastern of Thailand. Some speak Laotian, as they live near the border of Thailand and Laos. I do not speak Isaan nor Laotian and have many times faced a scenario where my clients mixed Isaan and Laotian words into their Thai sentences. When this occurred, I didn't ask them to clarify or repeat; I instead told the judge/barrister/police officer/or doctor that the client had just used Isaan or Laotian words that I didn't understand. Then, I interpreted what I had just said to the service provider into Thai for the service user too. After that, I asked the service provider to repeat the English question again; by this time, the service user should answer properly in Thai.

Solada appeared to take a more "agentive" and "visible" role when translanguaging occurred in the court, stopping proceedings immediately to flag this with the court officials and then translating what she had said to the court back to the client, seemingly as an implicit request to them to clarify what they had translanguaged in standard Thai. Solada apparently felt obliged to do so due to an inherent discourse that monolingual standards must be observed in the court.

Interestingly, in Solada's case, it appears that she saw her clients' mixing of languages as a problem that could be overcome by making them aware of this in the court and expecting them to subsequently "answer properly in Thai." In a further development of this discourse, however, she made the following observation about the socio-educational demographic of some of these clients: "I'm not being judgemental, but ex bar girls who are married to English men in the UK are not highly educated. They know how to speak Thai, but they sometimes mix different dialects together." By describing these clients as being uneducated Thai girls who "sometimes mix different dialects together," she seemed to presume that their access to formal monolingual Thai might be limited, as it was unlikely that such tight restrictions on how they communicated had been imposed in contexts outside the proceedings of a court of law. What appears to be a relatively easy switch to standard monolingual forms of speech, from the perspective of an *educated* Thai interpreter, might, however, be a much more difficult task for "ex bar girls" whose everyday language might involve a form of translanguaging and for whom crossing monolingual borders might not be so self-evident and clear-cut. Moreover, requiring this monolingual communication from them in the context of a formal court hearing could also cause them to experience heightened levels of anxiety or distress.

Solada's and Eva's approaches to instances of translanguaging appear to include a tendency to interrupt their clients in mid-speech and affect their overall performances in the court case, potentially exasperating and/or negatively influencing the court's perception of the litigants, as it might position them as purposefully hindering communication, particularly if this happened on a regular basis.

In both cases, it is worth noting how the interpreters feel professionally obliged, regardless of whether they understand all of what is said, to raise the issue of translanguaging with the court officials. Court responses in this situation appear to vary quite considerably, however, as Eva observed:

> It really depends on the lawyer or other professional who is present, as responses vary from no interest at all to detailed questions as to which language, whether it is their first or second etc. language, do you the interpreter also speak it, and so on.

The court's responses appear to be rather arbitrary, ranging from "no interest at all" to "detailed questions," the latter being aimed at identifying the exact changes that occurred and whether information might have been missed or misinterpreted by the interpreters. Thus, it would seem that legal proceedings can be affected in diverse ways, from no interruption at all to a potentially sustained interruption with lengthy interrogation by a lawyer or other official.

The court's responses appear to be rather arbitrary, ranging from "no interest at all" to "detailed questions," the latter being aimed at identifying the exact changes that occurred and whether information might have been missed or misinterpreted by the interpreters. Thus, it would seem that legal proceedings can be affected in diverse ways, from no interruption at all to a potentially sustained interruption with lengthy interrogation by a lawyer or other official.

These examples show how court interpreters can frame translanguaging as being a problem that they would rather avoid if possible, particularly as it might cause a halting to proceedings and a potential interrogation of their own abilities to do their job as professionals. These examples refer principally to languages other than English, but what happens when English plays a major role in the translanguaging act itself?

Jacob described some of his clients' language in the following manner:

> I have also had Polish people trying to give full answers in English during their custody interview, but they would swap between giving a full answer in Polish and a full answer in English, so I never knew if they were going to stick to one language or not. When they gave a full answer in English, but the officer didn't understand it because it was broken English and it wasn't grammatically correct, the officer would say then, "Please, if you could use the interpreter," which I would proceed to interpret in Polish. Sometimes after the suspect again tried to answer in English, which would quite likely not get his message across to the officer, I would also just point my finger at myself to indicate the suspect should speak to me directly in Polish. I realize it was kind of breaking the being-unobtrusive rule, but I only did so to aid the flow of communication.

Jacob described his clients as continually attempting to express themselves in English before the court, which caused confusion for him and for the court officials. This situation seemed to be further exacerbated by what Jacob called his clients' use of "broken English." Jacob's attempts to limit this practice by pointing to himself in front of the client, as a way of implicitly insisting that they respond only in monolingual Polish, were described as "breaking the being-unobtrusive rule," referencing the same discourse that Eva did: interpreters should be "invisible" (i.e., neutral) in all interpreting events. Although the concept of neutrality continues to be a strong part of the discourse in interpreter training, as evidenced by Jacob's and Eva's reactions, the possibility of an interpreter's complete neutrality has been substantially critiqued (see Angelelli, 2012; Metzger, 1999; Mikkelson, 2008).

Jacob's frustration with having to intervene appears to come from the fact that despite having access to an interpreter, clients feel the need to use their own voice in the court, albeit one that is not to always effective in communicating.

On closer examination, however, the "broken English" described by Jacob seems to be a form of translanguaging, something that has potentially emerged in the clients' linguistic repertoire as a direct experience of their working lives, as Jacob suggested in his correspondence:

> I have had quite a few situations during custody interviews where Polish speakers were throwing in English phrases or words, albeit in broken English sometimes, whilst giving their version of events. Usually these are the people who had picked up some language and they'd been using their mother tongue and English interchangeably at work. . . .
>
> Most common examples I come across involve using English work-related lingo whilst giving the rest of the evidence in Polish. The words uttered in English would, for example, be . . . *boksy* (a Polish-formed declension in a plural form of the English *boxes*).

What is of particular interest here is the word *boksy*, as it appears to be a morphosyntactic modification of the English word *box* to indicate plurality in Polish, represented here with a -y suffix but representative of an *-ie* termination in Polish, with both orthographic representations being pronounced as a long open-front vowel /i:/.

Such transference of prosodic elements from L-A to L-B has a long history of research in applied linguistics, as exemplified by Flege and Port (1981), Jarvis (2000), Mennen (2006), and Nash (1972), among many others.

When I requested more examples of this type of modification from Jacob, he replied:

- "*Skinowałem chickeny*" (I was skinning chickens)
- "Rozmawiałem z *supervisorem*" (I was talking with the supervisor)
- "Byłem na *kitchenie*" (I was working the kitchens)

In these examples, English verbs and nouns have undergone a form of translanguaging. In the first example, the English verb "to skin" has taken the Polish suffix *-owałem*, indicating the past-imperfect aspect (i.e., "I was skinning"). The object of the verb, "chickens," like "*boksy*" in the previous example, is given the Polish plural suffix *-ie*, represented here by the letter -y again: *chickeny*. The next two examples show the English noun "supervisor" being given the *-em* suffix to signal an instrumental noun in Polish and "kitchen" again taking a Polish plural /i:/ phoneme, represented by an alternative orthographic representation *-ie*.

One might presume that Jacob's Polish client was aware that he was translanguaging, but he incorporated the language he spoke into a repertoire he was apparently incapable of modifying to suit the strict monolingual dictates of the court. The "English work-related lingo" that Jacob described was a language that came from the world of *getting things done*, the everyday world of a man working in the labor market. This "multilingualism from below" (Pennycook & Otsuji, 2015) challenged the legitimate language of the court (in that it was a hybrid form of English and Polish)—not in an overtly, agentive manner but in a subtle way that was perhaps more instinctive than purposefully resistant. The reaction to its use is expressed by Jacob's categorizing it as a non-legitimate form (i.e., "broken"), not whole but arbitrarily fragmented and subjective, a consequence of the individual's lack of knowledge or ignorance about the rules of standard English grammar.

Translanguaging can also be seen in ways that involve not only the morphological adaption of English words to the speaker's "mother tongue" but the phonetic as well, as shown in Jacob's example:

> Sometimes, however, people pick up a particular English word but don't get its pronunciation right, and then I have no idea what they're talking about. One example has stuck with me. A suspect suddenly said, "Pracowałem na *pisorku*." (literally: I was working on *pisorku*.) Because I had no idea what that word meant, I asked during the interview, "May the interpreter ask the suspect to clarify a word he's used?" and after some explanation, I realized that he was trying to say *piecework* but was completely mispronouncing it, and so my interpretation back to the officer was "I was doing piecework."

Jacob's client was speaking Polish when he introduced a word that was initially incomprehensible to the interpreter. After asking the court whether he could clarify the meaning with his client (consequently halting court proceedings), Jacob eventually realized that the word in question was actually English, but, due to a morphological and phonetic adaptation to Polish, it was unfamiliar and confusing for him. On closer examination, we can see how the word *piece* remained relatively intact, orthographically represented by the interpreter as "*pis*" (perhaps Jacob's attempt to render the word as he imagined his Polish client might) but presumably pronounced with a long open-front vowel /i:/, as in standard English. What occurred after this was related specifically to Polish phonetics and morphology: dropping the w (/w/), which is not a phoneme in Polish, and adding a final *u*, which signals a masculine noun in Polish—hence, *pisorku*.

Like the other interpreters' examples, this one shows a certain consistency in the transformative translanguaging process. The "rules" of Polish grammar and phonetics appear to have been applied to English in a relatively consistent manner. Moreover, these examples also show how translanguaging resists the legitimate monolingual language of the court, although it might well be that many speakers may not even be aware of it as representing a form of resistance if they have grown up in a community where translanguaging is the norm, such as the Latino community in New York (U.S.) speaking "Spanglish" (Casielles-Suárez, 2017). Yet despite attempts on both sides

(through appeals from the interpreter and the court official), the litigant is represented as being unwilling, or unable, to conform to the demands made on him to speak a legitimately recognized form of English and/or Polish.

In sum, translanguaging practices, such as these, challenge the theoretical framing of languages as being discreet objects, as exemplified by Saussurean linguistics, by resisting (consciously or unconsciously) idealistic monolingual models and by firmly rooting linguistic resources in the real world—a world that reflects the social activity and the personal history of the speaker.

6. Conclusion

Courts presume, *a priori*, that any litigant who has requested the services of an interpreter has no knowledge of English in any meaningful way (Angermeyer, 2015) and should therefore limit all their interventions in proceedings to the monolingual "foreign" language they are associated with. However, in an increasingly superdiverse society, I suggest that litigants might frequently mix their own language(s) with English, not only by code-switching but also by translanguaging, as this preliminary research demonstrates.

Many of the examples that the professional court interpreters presented in this research are of people transposing the language of the street and the language of their daily lives into the context of a court of law. It is, arguably, part of their "metrolingualism" (Pennycook & Otsuji, 2015), a melded set of linguistic resources that does not conform to hegemonic monolingual dictates of institutional service providers such as courts and the legal field in general.

The Polish workers described in this research have, one might suspect, found forms of employment while living in the UK (where the research was based) that they were not particularly aware of before. "Skinning chickens" is perhaps a new occupation for them in the manual labor market and not something they did back home. Hence, the job has also emerged as a new linguistic reality for them, something that has undergone translanguaging, a development between the unfamiliar occupation in an English-speaking context and their more familiar Polish means of giving it grammatical meaning (e.g., *Skinowałem chickeny*).

Although this preliminary research draws on a very small cohort of court interpreters, further research could draw on a much larger sample, which could also include legal professionals, to examine how any shifts from monolingual usage in a court of law are perceived from different and triangulated perspectives.

6.1 Designing New Curricula

Although successfully challenging monolingual bias in courtrooms is still perhaps a remote possibility, educators could include the phenomenon in interpreter training curricula to better prepare interpreters for the translanguaging challenges they will face (as exemplified by the professional interpreters' narratives in this study). One way to do this might be by introducing a "translanguaging space" into curricula (Runcieman, 2021), addressing the sociocultural processes that have led to its emergence as well as the challenges it poses to professional best practices and its potential impact on professional interpreters' identities (Runcieman, 2018).

Moreover, educators might also begin designing task-based exercises to mirror potentially complex translanguaging scenarios by introducing role-plays that draw from texts with translanguaging examples rather than teaching only a simple one-to-one, source-to-target language approach (LA-LB). These role-plays might be partially modeled on plurilingual task-based exercises in translation studies, drawing on González-Davies's work (2020), for example, which explores how students can successfully complete information-based tasks in their target languages even when working with plurilingual source texts (see Runcieman, 2021, for a specific proposal). González-Davies has shown that by sharing their varied linguistic resources and metacognitive skills, students created a "scaffolding" that allowed them to successfully complete tasks as well as develop their own plurilingual and multicultural competencies. Other approaches might present students with real court transcripts, extracted from courtroom corpora, in which translanguaging has occurred. Here, students might explore and comment on how the interpreter dealt with its occurrence and debate best practices in individual cases with their peers and teachers.

In societies already marked by superdiversity and translanguaging, I argue that interpreting curricula need to begin to reflect this reality to help future interpreters meet the challenges they will inevitably have to face in their professional lives.

References

Angelelli, C. (2012). Language policy and management in service domains: Brokering communication for linguistic minorities in the community. In B. Spolsky (Ed.), *The Cambridge handbook of language policy* (pp. 243–261). Cambridge University Press.

Angermeyer, P. S. (2008). Creating monolingualism in the multilingual courtroom. *Sociolinguistic Studies*, 2(3), 385–403.

Angermeyer, P. S. (2015). *Speak English or what? Codeswitching and interpreter use in New York city courts*. Oxford University Press.

Auer, P. (Ed.). (1998). *Code-switching in conversation: Language, interaction and identity*. Routledge.

Bancroft, M. A. (2015). Community interpreting: A profession rooted in social justice. In H. Mikkelson & R. Jourdenais (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of interpreting* (pp. 217–235). Routledge.

Blommaert, J., & Rampton, B. (2011). Language and superdiversity. *Diversities*, 13(2), 1–21. https://newdiversities.mmg.mpg.de/?page_id=2056

Bourdieu, P. 1977. The economics of linguistic exchange, *Social Science Information*, 16(6), 645–668.

Canagarajah, S. (2013). *Translingual practice: Global Englishes and cosmopolitan relations*. Routledge.

Casielles-Suárez, E. (2017). Spanglish: The hybrid voice of Latinos in the United States. *Atlantis*, 39(2), 147–168.

Cogo, A., & House, J. (2017). The pragmatics of ELF. In J. Jenkins, W. Baker, & M. Dewey (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of English as a lingua franca* (pp. 210–223). Routledge.

Conley, J., & O'Barr, W. (1998). *Just words: Law, language and power*. University of Chicago Press.

Cotterill, J. (2004). Collocation, connotation, and courtroom semantics: Lawyers' control of witness testimony through lexical negotiation. *Applied Linguistics*, 25(4), 513–537.

Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2010). Translanguaging in the bilingual classroom: A pedagogy for learning and teaching? *Modern Language Journal*, 94, 103.

Creese, A., Blackledge, A., & Hu, R. (2018). Translanguaging and translation: The construction of social difference across city spaces. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 21(7), 841–852.

Cummins, J. (2005). A proposal for action: Strategies for recognizing heritage language competence as a learning resource within the mainstream classroom. *Modern Language Journal*, 89, 585–592.

Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Polity Press.

Firth, A. (2009). The lingua franca factor. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 6(2), 147–170.

Flege, J. E., & Port, R. (1981). Cross-language phonetic interference: Arabic to English. *Language and Speech*, 24(2), 125–146.

Garber, N. (1998). Community interpretation: A personal view. In R. P. Roberts, S. E. Carr, D. Abraham, & A. Dufour (Eds.), *The critical link 2: Interpreters in the community. Selected papers from the Second International Conference on Interpreting in Legal, Health and Social Service Settings* (pp. 9–20). Benjamins: Vancouver

Garcia, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century*. Wiley Blackwell.

Garcia, O., & Li, W. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. Palgrave Macmillan.

González-Davies, M. (2020). Developing mediation competence through translation. In S. Laviosa & M. González-Davies (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of translation and education* (pp. 434–450). Routledge.

Hall, K., & Nilep, C. (2015). Code switching, identity, and globalization. In D. Tannen, H. Hamilton, & D. Schiffrin (Eds.), *Handbook of discourse analysis* (2nd ed., pp.597-619. Blackwell.

Harris, R. (1997). Romantic bilingualism: Time for a change? In C. Leung & C. Cable (Eds.), *English as an additional language: Changing perspectives* (pp.14-17. Naldic.

Inghilleri, M. (2003). Habitus, field and discourse: Interpreting as a socially situated activity. *Target*, 15, 243–268.

Jarvis, S. (2000). Methodological rigor in the study of transfer: Identifying L1 influence in the interlanguage lexicon. *Language Learning*, 50(2), 245–309.

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge University Press.

Leung, C., Harris, R., & Rampton, B. (1997). The idealised native speaker, reified ethnicities, and classroom realities. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31(3), 543–560.

Li, W. (2011). Moment analysis and translanguaging space: Discursive construction of identities by multilingual Chinese youth in Britain. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(5), 1222–1235.

Li, W. (2018). Translanguaging as a practical theory of language. *Applied Linguistics*, 39(2), 9–30.

Li, W., & Wing, Y. (2018). Language learning sans frontiers: A translanguaging view. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 38, 33–59.

Mahood, T. (2016). Multiculturalism. In G. Ritzer (Ed.), *The Blackwell encyclopedia of sociology* (pp. 3105–3108).

Maryns, K. (2005). Monolingual language ideologies and code choice in the Belgian asylum procedure. *Language and Communication*, 25, 299–314.

Maryns, K. (2012). Multilingualism in legal settings. In M. Martin-Jones, A. Blackedge, & A. Creese (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of multilingualism* (pp. 297–313). Routledge.

Maryns, K., & Blommaert, J. (2001). Stylistic and thematic shifting as a narrative resource: Assessing asylum seekers' repertoires. *Multilingua*, 20(1), 61–84.

Matoesian, G. (1999). Intertextuality, affect, and ideology in legal discourse. *Text*, 19(1), 73–109.

Mennen, I. (2006). *Phonetic and phonological influences in non-native intonation: An overview for language teachers*. Working Papers, Queen Margaret University, College 9.

Mertz, E. (1994). Legal language: Pragmatics, poetics, and social power. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 23, 435–455.

Metzger, M. (1999). *Sign language interpreting: Deconstructing the myth of neutrality*. Gallaudet Press.

Mikkelson, H. (2008). Evolving views of the court interpreter's role: Between Scylla and Charybdis. In C. Garces (Ed.), *Crossing borders in community interpreting definitions and dilemmas* (pp. 81–94). John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Monzó-Nebot, E. (2020). Translation, power, ethics: Challenging injustice in cross-cultural understanding and cooperation. *Linguapax Review*, 8, 13–31.

Nash, R. (1972). Phonemic and prosodic interference and their effects on intelligibility. *Proceedings of the Seventh International Congress of Phonetic Sciences*, 570–573.

Pennycook, A., & Otsuji, E. (2015). *Metrolingualism: Language in the city*. Routledge.

Rampton, B. (1995). *Crossing: Language and ethnicity among adolescents*. Longman Group Limited.

Reagan, T. (2016). The conceptualization of language legitimacy. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, 13 (1), 1–19.

Rock, F. (2017). Shifting ground: Exploring the backdrop to translating and interpreting. *Translator*, 23(2), 217–236.

Runcieman, A. (2018). *The identity of the professional interpreter: How professional identities are constructed in the classroom*. Springer.

Runcieman, A. (2021). Proposal for a "translanguaging space" in interpreting studies: Meeting the needs of a superdiverse and translanguaging world. *Translation and Translanguaging in Multilingual Contexts*, 7(2), 133–152.

Vertovec, S. (2007). Super-diversity and its implications. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 30(6), 1024–1054.

Wadensjö, C. (2004). Dialogue interpreting: A monologising practice in a dialogically organised world. *Target*, 16, 105–123.

Williams, C. (1994). *Arfarniad o ddulliau dysgu ac ad-dysgu yng nghyd-destun addysg uwchradd Ddwyieithog* [An evaluation of teaching and learning methods in the context of bilingual secondary education] [unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wales].

Endnotes

1 Many other terms exist, with international variations on the actual roles performed and relevant accreditation processes.
2 https://www.ohchr.org/EN/UDHR/Documents/UDHR_Translations/eng.pdf
3 The term interpreting throughout this article refers specifically to public-service or community interpreting, in contrast to other professional forms, such as conference interpreting.
4 https://www.nrpsi.org.uk; all members are certified public-service interpreters, having obtained Level 6 interpreting qualifications.
5 The DPSI program is taught over an 8-month period and can only be accessed after having acquired a certificate in community interpreting (a 3-month course). Interpreters in public-service interpreting therefore have approximately 1 year of studies.
6 https://www.ciol.org.uk
7 https://www.iti.org.uk
8 https://apciinterpreters.org.uk