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INTRODUCTION

BACKGROUND

The first event that prompted me to consider carrying out a study on interpreting in conflict zones and scenarios was my participation as a freelance interpreter at the IAF\(^1\) (International Academy for Leadership) in Gummersbach (Germany), an assignment that I covered for over 15 years. As part of the Academy’s efforts to promote international political dialogue, the IAF offers a variety of training programmes for different target groups: one-week seminars for established leaders, two-week seminars for young leaders, and training workshops on skills and methods both for Friedrich Nauman Foundation (FNF) partners and counterparts working on projects abroad.

During the course of these years, many interesting topics were covered in the different assignments I was given, although the ones I enjoyed most were always the seminars on conflict prevention, conflict mediation and peace. Discovering the different stages that a conflict can be divided into was a watershed for me, in the sense that I discovered that an armed conflict or a war is a dynamic process, with many different scenarios and actors involved. As part of this training, I was also fortunate enough to attend sessions with members of the Berghof Foundation for Conflict Transformation, where these topics covered in seminar sessions were reinforced. During these same sessions, issues such as the challenges in the field, the role of international organisations\(^2\) in peacekeeping, and the tools for peacebuilding and Post-Conflict Regeneration and Reconciliation were also covered.

However, I was always struck by the fact that, although the theoretical framework of conflicts was analysed in depth and all stakeholders and actors in a conflict were scrutinised, interpreters were never mentioned despite the bilingual or multilingual nature of many of these conflicts. Neither their role, the need for their

---

\(^1\) The IAF is a training institution that was established by the Friedrich Nauman Foundation at the beginning of the 1990’s in Cintra (Portugal), and moved to Gummersbach in 1995. The aims of this institution are to promote international political dialogue all over the world, with a particular focus on transition and developing countries. [https://www.freiheit.org/content/welcome-friedrich-naumann-foundation-freedom](https://www.freiheit.org/content/welcome-friedrich-naumann-foundation-freedom)

\(^2\) The Berghof Foundation describes itself as “an independent, non-governmental and non-profit organisation that supports efforts to prevent political and social violence, and to achieve sustainable peace through conflict transformation.” [http://www.berghof-foundation.org/en/](http://www.berghof-foundation.org/en/)
services, nor matters such as training or welfare, were mentioned in these exchanges. This struck a chord with me, and it led to me asking myself a series of preliminary questions such as: why is no attention paid to the interpreter if sharing positions and ideas, as well as understanding each other, are prime elements for communication among the parties in conflict? How can conflict be avoided and peace established in a bilingual or multilingual setting if there are no interpreters presumably present? Am I being presumptuous in the sense that I am assuming the interpreter plays a far more important role than s/he actually does? Are interpreters really invisible in war-related scenarios? Do users of interpreting services in a conflict scenario appreciate the presence of an interpreter? Do they believe interpreters are well trained for working in these particularly sensitive and volatile scenarios? How do interpreters work in an armed conflict? What is the role of interpreters in a war-related context?

To answer these questions, I started to read up on the topic. After reading the seminal works of Roland (1999) and Delisle & Woodsworth (2012), I came to realise that the role of interpreters in general, and more specifically that of interpreters at war, has existed for as long as there has been chronicled evidence of human activity (Gehman, 1914; Garfinkel, 1988; Bowen & Bowen, 1990; Galán, 1995; Guzmán, 2004; Dini, 2009; Andres, 2012). Despite this fact, however, their role is hardly recorded in writing (Roland, 1999; Mairs, 2011; Delisle and Woodsworth, 2012), and hence makes it difficult to find scientific historical literature related to these professionals, despite the key role they seem to have played in communication throughout history.

Similarly, and with very few exceptions (Edwards, 2002; Bos & Soeters, 2006; Van Dijk and Soeters, 2008; C. Baker, 2010a, 2012b; Kelly & Baker, 2013), the existing bibliography on the topic focuses on specific accounts of the role of the interpreter as perceived either by interpreters, or clients or users, but not always by both parties at the same time. Likewise though some of these studies focus on a specific stage of the armed conflict, they seldom take into account these different phases, and their different requirements (Bos & Soeters, 2006; Van Dijk and Soeters, 2008; C. Baker, 2010a), when it could be presumed these different stages will have different needs, because different actions are taken in each stage. In other words, the interpreter and the modes of interpreting in each one of these phases is not clearly distinguished by all authors, with the exception of Baigorri’s classification (2011); nor has a list of possible specific professional requirements been developed by the interpreter’s clients for each of these different phases, which take place at different times and even scenarios in the conflict continuum.
So, in view of the above, my initial intention was to analyse the general topic of the interpreter at war in my dissertation. However, as my work progressed, it started to become obvious that certain limitations would have to apply: firstly, because a single conflict would have to be studied in order to limit clearly the scope of war and not talk about war as an abstract entity; secondly, because covering all the phases of an armed conflict would have been a cumbersome and lengthy exercise, not only because of the complexity of conflict theory but also because it would entail (1) analysing each and every one of those stages, (2) focusing on the breadth of roles that an interpreter can undertake during a conflict, and (3) determining the different tasks, skills and responsibilities of an interpreter that arise in each phase of a conflict.

All of this meant that I would have to focus on only one war and one of the stages. The reason for choosing Bosnia was a personal one because when I started working for the FNF, the Bosnian War was already underway, and in the course of the training seminars I had interpreted at, I had the opportunity to meet many people who had been witnesses and victims of the conflict.

The fact that the war was also taking place on European soil, 50 years after two particularly bloody world wars, made me wonder why and how it could have happened. Being a contemporary war also meant that I could go back in time and research more about Bosnia and the reasons for this contemporary war - it had been waged only 20 years ago -, trying to determine whether there had been similar cases in the past and what the role of the interpreter had been like then and now. Added to this was the fact that in the former Bosnia theatre there was a peacekeeping mission still in place.

The same happened when it came to conflict theory, I felt that if I limited my research to only one of the stages, it would allow me to carry out a more in-depth study of the particular requirements of that phase, establishing links between the role of the interpreter and that particular conflict stage, the reason being that according to different authors, it seems, whether implicitly or explicitly stated, that each of those stages could define and shape the work of an interpreter (Baigorri, 2011; Kelly & Baker, 2103; Vieira, 2014). Not to mention that this approach would help to outline more clearly the different modalities of interpreting that would be required for each stage studied, from both a linguistic and extra-linguistic point of view, the latter including issues such as non-verbal and cultural components required for interpreting in peacekeeping scenarios (Edwards, 2002; Baigorri, 2011; Vieira, 2014). Therefore, I finally settled for the final stage of the conflict: Settlement/Resolution Post-Conflict Peacebuilding and Reconciliation (Brahm, 2003).
At the same time, trying to study the needs and requirements of interpreting in the different stages of an armed conflict, without focusing on a specific situation would have been an abstract and theoretical exercise, which was another reason for focusing on the conflict in Bosnia, as it also has the added feature of being a protracted conflict, where there was the experience of three different peacekeeping missions deployed in different stages of the war. However, all three missions could not be studied and compared due to time and space constraints, so I chose, BiH ALTHEA\(^3\) because it was the last mission deployed in the region; and until today, it is the longest standing peacekeeping operation of EUFOR, as well as a mission deployed on European soil.

These were not the only reasons, however. I also believed that there are many lessons that could be learnt from the experience this operation has acquired in the fields of interpreter recruitment, training and performance, notably the specific language requirements for the BiH mission, language acquisition and language policies, and a clear definition and recognition of the professional status and role of the interpreter (Kelly & Baker, 2013). All these issues were revisited, so that this study could serve as a basis to determine whether the initial problems encountered in this scenario have been overcome with time (Bos & Soeters, 2006; C. Baker, 2010a, 2010b, 2011; Kelly & Baker, 2013). The study could also delve into whether there are still challenges to overcome, and if so, how to deal with them in order to ensure that interpreters perform their duties well, and the user is satisfied with how these duties are fulfilled, while assuring, at the same time, that interpreters are also satisfied with the situation. Similarly, this academic exercise would give me the opportunity to study in greater depth a topic I revelled in, namely conflict theory, and investigate the role of interpreters in peacebuilding and peacekeeping scenarios.

**STUDY SUBJECT**

**Objectives**

The terms “interpreter at war” or “interpreter in armed conflicts” cover a broad range of settings, roles and tasks. This is clear from the existing literature where war interpreters are described as multifaceted, and where it can be presumed that,

\(^3\) BiH ALTHEA is the EU military operation deployed in 2004 by EUFOR in Bosnia and Herzegovina, the successor of the United Nations-led operation UNPROFOR (United Nations Protection Force) and the NATO-led ones SFOR (Stabilisation Force) and IFOR (Implementation Force). The operation is currently still present in BiH soil, supporting its peace and nation-building efforts.
depending on the phases of the conflict the interpreter is operating in — pre, during and post conflict — the tasks carried out and skills required will be different (Roland, 1999; Bos & Soeters, 2006; C. Baker, 2010a, 2010b; Baigorri, 2011; Allen, 2012; C. Baker, 2012b; Kelly and Baker, 2013; Juvinall, 2013; Vieira, 2014). Consequently, I assumed that there would be different interpreting requirements for each scenario. For this reason, in this doctoral dissertation I will revisit the definition of interpreting at war, the role played by the interpreter in the theatre, focusing on the tasks and skills required for an adequate performance. I will also analyse the recruitment systems of interpreters in armed conflicts described in the literature and define the profile and needs of users who work with interpreters in armed conflict scenarios.

I will also briefly cover the concept of conflict, its different stages, as well as users' perception of the role played by interpreters in armed conflict scenarios. After defining these aspects, I will try to understand the specific requirements for interpreting in peacekeeping missions, analysing whether they are fulfilled or not and what the reasons for this are. Once the general framework has been clearly outlined, and the qualitative studies published in the literature of interpreters in different war-related scenarios have been reviewed (Roland, 1999; Bos & Soeters, 2006; C. Baker, 2010a, 2010b; Baigorri, 2011; Allen, 2012; Juvinall, 2013; Vieira, 2014), I will focus on the specific case of interpreters working for BiH Althea and users deployed with the mission during the first 6 months of 2015, to try to obtain quantitative and comparative data from both population groups.

The object of this dissertation is:

- to analyse the status and role played by interpreters throughout history and determine whether there are any lessons that could be learnt from the past;

- to study the professional role played by EUFOR interpreters in peacekeeping missions and detect any particularities related to this role;

- to determine whether the needs and requirements of interpreters working for EUFOR BiH ALTHeA are being fulfilled, and measure their level of satisfaction with the situation;

- to gauge the level of satisfaction of interpreters working for EUFOR BiH ALTHeA with the specific training provided, if any, for working in these missions;
• to determine the level of satisfaction of users working for EUFOR BiH ALTHEA with the specific training provided to interpreters, if any, for working in these missions;
• to estimate the participants’ level of knowledge of the history of interpreting and determine how this knowledge is related to the role interpreters play today;
• and finally, to evaluate the importance of knowing about conflict theory and the stages of war in order to determine where peacekeeping missions are located in the war continuum; and if this knowledge has an impact on the needs, requirements and role of interpreters.

**Structure**

This dissertation has been designed with the purpose of describing the theoretical framework on which the qualitative/quantitative case study is based, while, at the same time, assessing the results of the questionnaires and comparing them with the theoretical background. With this aim in mind, I have divided this dissertation into two parts: Part 1 covers the theoretical foundations on which the study is based; and Part 2 focuses on the quantitative/qualitative case study carried out and its results and conclusions. To achieve these goals, Part 1 begins with an introduction to the topic outlining the background, the subject matter of this study, providing a description of its objectives, the structure, as well as a description of the methodology used.

In Chapter 1, I review the history of interpreting, concentrating more closely on the past of war interpreting. As a result, I describe the main features and background for understanding interpreting in war scenarios. A timeline of the development of the profession is provided from antiquity to the present, starting with Sumer, Egypt, Babylon, Phoenicia, Carthage until Contemporary times, including the New Millennium. In this chapter, I explore interpreting as a profession not only in ancient Greece and Rome, but also in the Middle Ages, the Renaissance and the Modern Era until before WWI, a long historical period in which the role of interpreters remained unchanged with few exceptions. This part is followed by a description of the changes and developments that took place in the profession after WWI, with the appearance of a new modality of interpreting, simultaneous interpreting (SI), during the Nuremberg Trials which led to the appearance of a new breed of interpreters. This historical review draws a roadmap that aims to provide readers with a better understanding of those situations in which war interpreters work and have worked in the past, the challenges
they may have encountered, and both the nature of their work in those settings as well as the types of skills and tasks required for working in war-related scenarios, so that perhaps some lessons may be learnt from this review and applied to the situation of interpreters today.

Chapter 2 takes a theoretical approach to the topic of war. For this purpose, it begins by analysing the concept of war and/or armed conflict, examining how these concepts can be approached from both a systematic and theoretical point of view, considering whether these two terms are synonyms, and establishing a working definition of the term “war” for this paper. Once this matter has been clarified, I move on to analysing the different stages according to the intensity of the confrontation, while trying to correlate those stages with the different interpreting requirements that may arise. The chapter continues with a classification of war interpreters, describing the different scenarios in which their services may be required, as well as the tasks and skills interpreters implement in the course of their work. The next section focuses on the core aspect of this dissertation, namely the interpreter in peacekeeping scenarios, where I start by defining peacekeeping and peace-building missions, before moving on to look at how interpreters work in such missions, covering the role they play, the challenges they encounter in their professional lives and recruitment issues.

In Chapter 3, I focus in more detail on the different contexts related to a war scenario. Hence, I analyse military interpreting and its main features, as well as interpreting in the diplomatic sphere and for international organisations because these are the main scenarios identified within the stages in which interpreters work during an armed conflict. At the same time, I will define peacekeeping, since this is the specific scenario covered in this dissertation. After defining and studying the topic of peacekeeping, I will also take a closer look at interpreters who work on peacekeeping missions in order to gain a better insight into the environment in which interpreters are required to work, and how the multidisciplinary nature of peacekeeping teams may present specific challenges for interpreters due to the level of specialisation, as well as the different topics that have to be covered.

Chapter 4 describes and defines the different interpreting modalities used in war-related scenarios, listed in the previous chapter, in order to gain a better understanding of the different skills required for a good professional performance. The chapter starts by providing a clear definition of interpreting and cites the main modalities used: liaison interpreting, chuchottage or whispering, consecutive interpreting (CI), simultaneous and bidule or boothless simultaneous with portable equipment. All of these modalities are explained clearly so that the reader can
understand how being a war interpreter involves mastering certain abilities and skills, and at the same time, how it also requires being able to seamlessly perform certain tasks that are not the same for all modalities.

Chapter 5 focuses on the history of Bosnia, the background events that led to the situation of the country before it was annexed by Tito to form part of the Former Yugoslavia and the events during WWII. The chapter continues with a description of the situation during this period, the post-war period and the fall of the federated system and the 1990 elections. One section covers the war itself, and a description is given of the prevailing environment before the conflict, as well as a timeline of the war in Bosnia, to make it easier to understand the situation that developed. This is followed by a detailed narration of the events, in order to serve as an introduction to peacekeeping in the region.

Chapter 6 examines interpreting at EUFOR BiH ALTHEA, and begins defining the European External Action Service (EEAS), outlining the main features of this organisation and its structure, as well as the role that EUFOR as a military organisation has within the EEAS. In this chapter I also explain the historical background and reasons that led to the creation of a European-wide foreign affairs and security and defence institution. The chapter concludes with a brief overview of EUFOR and a more in-depth view of the background of BiH ALTHEA in order to better understand the framework in which interpreting professionals have to work.

Chapter 7 introduces Part 2 of this dissertation as well as the empirical study describing the background, aims, research methodology, conceptual framework and the steps followed for the development of the two questionnaires.

Chapter 8 describes the first survey targeted at interpreters, with a thorough analysis of the participants, the research questions and related objectives, reviewing as well the methodology followed to carry out the empirical study, which covers issues such as questionnaire design and structure, analysis of the results and discussion of the results obtained.

Chapter 9 focuses on the survey targeted at users and just like Chapter 8, it concentrates on the study of participants, research questions and objectives, methodological matters such as questionnaire design and structure, including an analysis and discussion of the results obtained. This chapter concludes with a section in which the results of both surveys are compared and discussed.
Finally, Chapter 10 of the dissertation presents the conclusions, Chapter 11 provides a list of the references consulted and cited in the study, and Chapter 12 contains the Annexes referred to in the main body of the text.
PART ONE

LITERATURE REVIEW


CHAPTER 1. HISTORY OF INTERPRETING AND INTERPRETING IN ARMED CONFLICTS

1.1. INTRODUCTION

Interpreting is a professional activity that has been performed since antiquity (Gehman, 1914; Hermann, 1956; Garfinkel, 1988; Bowen & Bowen, 1985; Galán, 1995; Roland, 1999; Pöchhacker, 2004; Guzmán, 2004; Dini, 2009; Delisle & Woodsworth, 2012; Andres, 2012). In this chapter, I will review the evolution of the profession and the status of interpreters, and I will try to analyse more closely the evolution and status of interpreters at war. The purpose of this exercise is to determine whether their status has changed throughout history or whether there are certain features and circumstances from the past that have remained unaltered.

Despite the invisibility and changing status of interpreters in general, and of interpreters in armed conflicts (Campbell, 2001; Mairs, 2011; Delisle & Woodsworth, 2012) in particular, throughout history there appears to be no doubt regarding the need for these professionals and their services, and the importance of the role played by these interpreters, as well as the skills required for providing good quality interpreting (Roland, 1999; Delisle & Woodsworth, 2012; Baigorri, 2014a and 2014b). These affirmations are endorsed by the following facts that prove the need for language intermediaries: firstly, multilingual or polyglot individuals were as rare in the past as they are today (Roland, 1999, Delisle & Woodsworth, 2012); secondly, it seems that certain historical events, such as the signing of treaties, peace accords, military and trade negotiations at both higher and lower levels, would have necessarily required language intermediaries for their implementation (Delisle & Woodsworth, 2012); and finally, the importance of language brokers seems to have been acknowledged already in the past (Gehman, 1914, Hermann, 1956; Roland, 1999; Galán, 2011) because training was provided for these professionals in some instances, although this fact is hardly ever mentioned in the literature, with few exceptions. Indeed, when referring to the role and to the presence of interpreters in different settings, Mairs (2011) stresses that it is more important to note when interpreters were not used, as this was more the exception.

Although I have already mentioned the scarcity of recorded evidence about interpreters and their role in history, I believe that it is also interesting to note one that the reasons for this invisibility (Delisle & Woodsworth, 2012) could be: the primacy of
the written word over the spoken word, which means that translators’ activities would be more likely chronicled than those of interpreters (Roland, 1999; Delisle & Woodsworth, 2012); their social status and gender, as the individuals usually recruited for these activities were women slaves, members of subcastes, prisoners of war, displaced individuals, or victims of different situations (Delisle & Woodsworth, 2012); and the fact that historians cannot be expected to include every single detail they find in their accounts of important events in history (Roland, 1999).

Nonetheless, even if their presence is acknowledged, they are hardly ever alluded to by their names, or specifically noted or described (Roland, 1999; Delisle & Woodsworth, 2012). Indeed, very few interpreters have been cited by their names in history books, despite the existence of some records on the performance of interpreters (Campbell, 2001). Similarly, the information available on these interpreters derives from a variety of sources that do not always focus on interpreting as a professional activity, but more on commercial, political, historical and military events. Nevertheless, it is interesting to note that despite the different events and meetings described, such as diplomatic encounters held among dignitaries, high-ranking officials and members of the military, the accounts of these different meetings and contacts held at international level neither mention nor acknowledge the presence of interpreters, who play a silent and invisible role according to chroniclers and historians (Roland, 1999; Salicrú, 2009; Mairs, 2011; Delisle & Woodsworth, 2012). However, when we get to the 19th and 20th centuries, it can be observed that this trend changes and the role, status and names of interpreters are chronicled by different authors, such as Gaiba (1998), Roland (1999), Delisle & Woodsworth (2012), Andres (2012), and Baigorri (2014a).

In fact, this oversight of the role of interpreters by historians of the past has been very well described by Roland (1999) when she refers to the interpreter as “the missing link” (1999, p. 7); and I believe her description clearly highlights the absence of historical records that register or even mention the existence and the role of the interpreter whether in official documents or accounts. Despite the passing of time and the existence of records of different events, the same lack of information about interpreters can be found within contemporary historical accounts, where presumably interpreters would have been required and whose presence is not mentioned (Delisle & Woodsworth, 2012).

All things considered, references can be found to the need for language mediators already in the Bible; one of the most well-known examples of this need is revealed in the passage on the Tower of Babel, an event which seems to have triggered the awareness that such incredible language diversity could lead to communication
problems requiring a solution (Gehman, 1914; Roland, 1999). Indeed Gehman (1914) and Roland (1999) quote Genesis 42: 23 as the first official mention of the existence of this professional in the diplomatic world: “And they knew not that Joseph understood them, for he spoke unto them by an interpreter” (21st Century King James Version).

This is not the only mention that can be found in the Bible. There are quite a few more quotes where multilingualism is noted or where an interpreter is clearly required for the purpose of communicating with peoples and nations to convey orders and rules coming from the foreign governments they were ruled by. Roland (1999:10) provides us with different quotes in the Old Testament where these mentions appear:

Daniel 3:4
Where Nebuchadnezzar makes an appeal to all peoples and all languages.

Esther 1:22
Where king Ahasuerus sends orders to all provinces and peoples in their own script and language.

Esther 3:12
Where king Ahasuerus summons his scribes to write orders to the king’s satraps, the governors and nobles of the different provinces in the scripts and languages of all lands and peoples.

Esther 8:9
Where Mordecai, a high-ranking official in King Ahasuerus’ court issues orders in the script and language of each people for Jews, satraps, governors and nobles of the 127 provinces stretching India to the Land of Cush. This verse, in fact, makes a special mention to “and to the Jews according to their writing, and according to their language (21st Century King James Version).”

---

4 The author would like to note that for the purposes of this dissertation we are using quotes from the 21st Century King James Version as references.
5 The verses are not quoted, instead a description of the Bible Citation is given.
6 The term Kush has always been problematic to translate. There are different versions: earlier ones advocate for “Ethiopia”, “Aethiopia”, but in the past 40 years the inclination was to use “Gush”, “Nubia” or “Sudan”. However scholars totally agree about the location, in northern Sudan, covering a small part of Southern Egypt (Unseth, 1999).
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Ezra 4:7

Where a letter is written in Aramaic script and language to Artaxerxes to lodge an accusation against the people of Judah and Jerusalem.

Similar accounts can be found in the New Testament. The reason may be, in my opinion, the need to spread Christianity in the region through preaching and conversion, which clearly required the command of other languages. Research into the New Testament has identified the following references:

1 Corinthians 12:10 (21st Century King James Version)
Where mentions are made as to how different individuals are given different skills, quoting among them the gift of interpretation of tongues.

1 Corinthians 14: 5 (21st Century King James Version)
Where interpreting for those speaking foreign tongues is encouraged.

Corinthians 14: 13-16 (21st Century King James Version)
Where the importance of communication for preaching purposes is explained.

Corinthians 14:26-28 (21st Century King James Version)
Where those spreading the word of the Lord are encouraged to interpret into other languages.

As can be observed, these verses mention a variety of contexts where the interpreter’s role would be required, and somehow support the idea that in ancient times the main fields of work for a linguist were for maritime and land-based merchants, militant and migrant labour, the military, as well as the realm of the religious.

1.2. INTERPRETING IN THE ANCIENT CIVILISATIONS: SUMER, EGYPT, BABYLON, PHOENICIA, CARThAGE

As I have previously commented in the introduction to this chapter, the first mention of language chaos is described in the Bible, with the Tower of Babel, where communication was non-existent (Gehman, 1914; Roland, 1999; Piacentini, 2003; Delisle & Woodsworth, 2012). When events like this took place, it could be assumed that interpreters were probably used to breach this language gap, brokering in an
accurate and precise manner to honour Jones’ (2002) statement that “interpreting is an act of communication.” However, before delving deeper into the history of interpreting, I would like to highlight that when the role of interpreters in ancient times has been studied, no clear distinctions have been made between civil and military interpreting (Roland 1999; Mairs, 2010), which makes it difficult to separate clearly one sphere of interpreting from the other. This is the reason why, in many instances, both types of interpreting will necessarily appear interspersed in this review.

Returning to the topic of this section, the first references to the existence of such language specialists appeared around 2600 BCE in Ancient Sumer, where a list of words in cuneiform script from a clay tablet found at Tell Abū Ṣalābikh7, details a registry of different professions recorded in hierarchical order (Biggs & Postgate, 1978, Buccellati, 2003). The literal expression “eme-bal”, “to interpret,” and “to turn” (“bal”) “language” (“eme”), are clearly referred to in this list (Bellos, 2011; Chrobak, 2013). Moreover, the position in which the interpreter was mentioned (eleventh out of eighteen) seems to prove that this figure presumably held quite a high rank in Ancient Sumer. Not to mention the fact that in Ancient Sumer, agreements were signed between different peoples and different languages, a fact that also posits the existence of an interpreter in these exchanges (Chrobak, 2013).

In Ancient Egypt there are also records that confirm the presence of interpreters in this civilisation (Galán, 2011, Andres, 2012; Příhodova, 2012). Indeed, Delisle & Woodsworth (2012) provide us with the evidence of a hieroglyph from 3000 BCE where both terms “interpreter” and “interpreting” are clearly depicted. Interestingly enough, this event coincides in time with the abandoning of nomadism by the Egyptians, which resulted in sedentary lifestyle and the development of a huge administrative infrastructure. This change in lifestyle also meant that Egyptians in those days held peaceful contact with foreign peoples from the beginning of the establishment of their empire (Galán, 1995; Galán, 2011). As a result, interpreters were hired by the court to aid in brokering trading relations and military expeditions, which led to them being considered in Egypt one of the seven classes of the population (Rochette, 1996), a fact that not only acknowledges their existence as professionals but also illustrates their position in society. However, to better understand the status given to interpreters, it must be pointed out that Nomarchs who were not only the supreme chiefs and supervisors of the local administration (nomes), but also high-ranking officials in the

---

7 Inscriptions found on a clay tablet in Southern Iraq, at the site called Tell Abū Ṣalābikh (Biggs & Postgate, 1978).
public administration, and often bilinguals, had a higher status than interpreters. This shows that interpreters were considered of low rank in Egypt, while in contemporary Sumer interpreters were treated as high-ranking professionals; in Ancient Egypt their status was similar to a seaman or merchant and, as a result, they were not much respected socially, despite possessing valuable language skills (Kurz, 1985; Andres, 2013). This is very clearly mentioned by Gehman in his review of the role played by interpreters in antiquity:

For the definite mention of professionally trained linguists, we have to turn to Herodotus’ account of Egypt. According to the historian “the people of that country were divided into seven classes: priests, warriors, cowherds, swineherds, tradesmen, interpreters, and boatmen” (1914, p. 17).

From this statement, it seems clear that interpreters in Ancient Egypt were not held in as high esteem as in ancient Sumer. At the same time, it must be stated that most interpreters were of lower-class birth, slaves or freed men, despite a preference for noble trainees (Roland, 1999).

Among the different records available citing the role played by interpreters in Ancient Egypt, special mention must be made of Harkhuf’s biography, which is considered the first recorded evidence of the exchanges that took place between the Egyptian Empire and other peoples. Harkhuf was the “supervisor of interpreters” (Galán, 2011). In these early times, however, it should be noted that inscriptions dating back to the same period used the term “interpreter” to designate anyone who spoke foreign languages without specifically suggesting the profession as it is understood today (Galán, 2011). In Egyptian times, many scribes were also translators or interpreters though they had received no formal training to carry out their job. Despite the lack of training, they were acknowledged professionally and Tadmor (1991) confirms the fact that bilingual scribes had a special term to identify them, “se-pi-ru”, borrowed from Aramaic, as well as a related term “targummanu” which was used to denominate the interpreter or the person who translated oral communications (Tadmor, 1991; Pöchhacker, 2004; Dini, 2009; Apter, 2010; Hutton & Marzouk, 2012), showing that there were two different terms for two different professional activities but no clear separation of tasks in professional practice nor identification by users.

---

8 Harkuf was a governor of Upper Egypt, serving under the reign of King Pepi II that took place between 2278–2184 BCE (Kozma, 2006).
Furthermore, as time passed and the importance of language brokering increased, the custom of selecting young men and training them to become interpreters arose. Pharaoh Psamtik II⁹, aware of the increasing need for language brokers, decided to create a caste of brand-new interpreters when he took the decision to send a large group of young men to Greece to learn the language of the land (Child 2010; Baigorri, 2015). This practice of training language experts was also followed by other important leaders of the past such as Alexander the Great and Quintus Sertorius¹⁰ (Roland, 1999).

It is also interesting to note that Galán (1995), who studied the importance of diplomacy in Egyptian times, mentions the depiction of the figure of a guide-interpreter leading a group of foreigners before the king in the Amarna tombs¹¹. In fact, in Amarna, on tomb number 8 (Tutu’s¹² tomb), there is an inscription that reads how the chief of the foreign delegation addresses the king through his interpreter. Both Galán (1995) and Andres (2012) describe that there are interpreters represented on the tomb, and that they can be clearly distinguished because each one is portrayed as two people, which is the way interpreters were usually depicted in Egyptian hieroglyphs, probably to show that they had to carry out a job that required them to work into two languages and for two different parties.

Moving forward in history, from the time of Carthage there are two mentions of interpreting events that are described by historians and are related to war interpreting (Gehman, 1914; Taulbee, 1998). One of the most interesting accounts is by Gehman (1914), who refers to the communication problems Carthaginians had with their troops, since their mercenary armies were formed by soldiers of different origins and who spoke different languages such as Libyan, Iberian, Celtic, Italian, Greek and Punic. This meant they had to rely on interpreters to relay the message of the commander, whenever necessary, sometimes having to communicate orders up to five times due to the multilingual nature of their troops. As a result, there were many communication problems because their interpreters were amateur linguists, a situation that is mentioned by Roland (1999), but described more in depth by Gehman (1914), though events like these are already described by Polybius in Book 1 of his Histories. In fact, if we analyse the situation in the Carthaginian army more closely and go back to 220–216 BCE, it can be observed that Polybius, in Book 1 of his “Histories” (Hultsch, 2012),

---

⁹ Egyptian Emperor (595 BCE – 589 BCE).
¹⁰ Roman statesman and military commander (―Sertorius‖, 1989).
¹¹ Site of Royal Tombs, on the east bank of the Nile (―Amarna, 1989‖).
¹² Chamberlain, overseer and treasurer of Pharaoh Akhenaten who died c. 1360 BCE (Bart, n.d.).
already mentioned the multilingual nature of the Carthaginian troops, who were from such diverse nationalities, such as Iberians, Celts, from Liguria, the Balearic Islands and half-bred Greeks. Polybius, and later Gehman (1914) and Roland (1999), also narrated the case of Gesco, a Carthaginian general and government emissary, who was appointed to negotiate and mediate between the troops and the Senate with the help of interpreters to resolve a dispute on payments to the soldiers. His efforts were, however, hindered by Spendius and Mathos, two deserters and agitators who convinced the Libyan mercenaries that Gesco was dealing with them in bad faith. These two individuals were finally captured, tortured and killed (Taulbee, 1998; Hultsch, 2012). The importance of the event seems to be highlighted by the documentation of the whole episode, including the final fate of the interpreter, who was sentenced to death and killed. These detailed documented events already show us that interpreters played an important role in the military.

The second documented event dating from this period showing the presence of language mediation is also narrated by Polybius (Hultsch, 2012), and dates back to the Second Punic War when Hanno the Great waged war in Sicily. Sunianto, who was a very influential citizen of Carthage, was elected mediator for communications held between Hanno the Carthaginian Commander and Hiero II of Syracuse (Hultsch, 2012). But in the letters in Greek sent by Sunianto to Hiero, Sunianto informed Hiero of the approach of Hanno’s armies. Unluckily, this message was intercepted and he was accused of treason by Hanno. As a result, the Carthaginian senate sentenced that only official interpreters would be used for communications with the enemy and that no other citizen of Carthage was allowed to learn Greek (Gehman, 1914; Roland, 1999; Hultsch, 2012). These last two examples reveal the importance of the interpreter’s function, as well as how loyalty to one’s master was considered a key element.

Finally, Gehman (1914) goes on to say that, even though there have been examples of polyglots in history such as Mithridates, who according to Pliny spoke 22 languages, or Cleopatra, who was also a highly cultured individual and who is presumed to have spoken to all ambassadors in their vernacular languages, these individuals were clearly more the exception than the rule. Therefore, as most dignitaries, government officials and public figures were not so linguistically gifted, it would seem that interpreters must have been required for communication purposes (Roland, 1990; Mairs, 2011).
1.3. **INTERPRETING IN ANCIENT GREECE, ROME AND BYZANTIUM**

As suggested in the introduction (§1.1), it could be inferred that if there are parallel written documents that describe meetings, negotiations or conversations that have taken place at a diplomatic, government or administrative level, and which are drafted in more than one language, then there must have been translators present during the drafting process, and hence, also interpreters who brokered during these encounters. Therefore, it is clear that the services of a translator were definitely required, and that it could be presumed that the services of an interpreter would have been needed too. We can also postulate that this would have been the case in Ancient Greece and Rome where, like in any other kingdom or empire, there were language requirements that had to be fulfilled so that adequate communication could be ensured between the other peoples or parties speaking different languages within the empire. And existing scientific literature sustains this last fact (Gibbon & Milman, 1909; Hermann, 1956; Rochette, 1995; Rochette, 2000; Peretz, 2006; Checa & Storch, 2009; Mairs, 2010, 2011; Herrick, 2012).

Language brokering requires good communication and rhetorical skills, which were of utmost importance for the ancient Greeks. Such was the importance attributed to communication that diplomats and their representatives were not only required to possess language competence but also a suitable appearance and a good voice in order to be successful in the undertaking of a diplomatic mission (Roland, 1999). This was mostly because Greeks believed that all males should master the art of rhetoric because “language affords human agents the possibility for persuading others to think as they think, to act as they wish them to act” (Herrick, 2005, p. 31). These skills were clearly defined by Aristotle, and also underscored by Plutarch who added that if rulers were not good speakers, they had to always be accompanied by diplomats who were good orators to ensure the flow of communication. In fact, Demosthenes, who was one of the most accomplished orators of his time, believed that as ambassadors possessed control over words and opportunities, they could be taken to court if they did not abide by their word (Roland, 1999), a clear indication of the importance that was given to communication and its related skills and competences (Herrick, 2005).

The difficulties in defining the role of the interpreter in ancient historical sources is probably due to the ambiguity in the terms used to denominate these professionals in those days (Mairs, 2010). In Greece, the term “ἐρμηνεία” or “hermeneia” (Rochette, 2000) was rarely used just to denominate interpreting or oral
translation activities; it was also applied to middlemen who carried out other tasks that could be of a commercial or general negotiating nature (Mairs, 2011). This apparently suggests that the interpreter was not only a language broker, but also a commercial intermediary, or even played both roles at the same time; all of which is confusing, and makes it difficult, as mentioned at the beginning of the chapter, to clearly define the role played by this professional when revisiting classical texts (Rochette, 2000; Mairs, 2010). This fact is further supported by a document dating back to the Ptolemaic Dynasty, in which Apollonios, “the interpreter of the Trogodytes\textsuperscript{13},” is mentioned (Rochette, 1995). This confusion also exists because the Hermeneus\textsuperscript{14} or interpreter in many cases had been awarded the regulatory function of an Agoranomos (person in charge of controlling the order in the marketplace), whose role was closer to that of a public notary, as well as being the person in charge of controlling the order of the marketplace. It should be noted that at the same time, some of the individuals involved in these transactions spoke Egyptian fluently, which was very useful for different types of transactions, as well as for dealing with their contemporaries (Mairs, 2010). All of this shows that the interpreter’s role, though ambiguously described, was known, acknowledged by some, and recorded in very few occasions (Roland, 1999; Rochette, 1995; Mairs, 2011).

However, the Greeks did not only rely on interpreters for commercial transactions but also to cope with armies formed by recruits of many different nationalities, like the Carthaginians. Proof of this can be found in Xenophon’s Anabasis, which is an account of the march of the “ten thousand” soldier army towards the Battle of Cunaxa and back to Greece (401–399 BCE), and in which it is mentioned on more than one occasion how Cyrus the Younger used interpreters and how the presence of interpreters avoided disaster (Gehman, 1914; Hermann, 1956; Roland, 1999). Not only are interpreters mentioned on several occasions, but also the name of one of these interpreters, Pigres, is given, as well as that of one of Cyrus’s officers, Glus (Hogdman, 1915), who was sent to congratulate Meno the Thesalian by Cyrus (Rochette, 1996). What’s more, army commanders who did not speak languages always had interpreters with them. In Plutarch we also see that Alexander the Great’s expeditions to Central Asia required interpreters of different languages, and that during these expeditions there were requirements for Persian, Hycarnian, Sogdian and Indian

\textsuperscript{13} Inhabitants from the Trogodyte, near the middle Nile (Rochette, 1995).

\textsuperscript{14} The term seems to have derived from “Hermes” the God of commerce who was a mediator for the Olympian Gods (Ringler, 1999).
interpreters (Gehman, 1914; Hermann, 1956). So it would seem clear from these accounts that interpreters were present in the ancient Greek army, as well as in the armies of their adversaries.

Another key point to remember is that some interpreters had already been brought up in a bilingual environment or had parents of different nationalities (Gehman, 1914; Roland, 1999), which paved the way for a future career as interpreters. Furthermore, there was a great demand for linguists at an international level, in the diplomatic, commercial and military domains. This is confirmed by the fact that it was common for the Greeks to travel with interpreters when visiting outside their country, for both commercial and military reasons, a fact that is confirmed in Xenophon’s *Anabasis*, the historical account of the march of the ten thousand recruited by Cyrus the Younger through Persia to dethrone his brother Artaxerxes II (Crespo, 2003). The importance given to the role of interpreters is further confirmed by the fact that there seem to have been individuals who studied languages to become fully-fledged interpreters, whereas other individuals who also studied languages did not do so with this aim in mind but nevertheless ended working in the profession for other reasons. Examples of these individuals would be Themistocles, who studied Persian, and Ovid, the poet, who learnt to speak Getic and to speak and write Sarmatian (Gehman, 1914).

Moving forward in time, we should not forget that Rome was a multilingual empire (Guzmán, 2004). We only have to look at how far the Roman Empire stretched, from the bordering regions of Mesopotamia to India. As a result, educated Romans, from the Republic onwards, were required to master Greek. Latin was a precondition to participate in the world’s government, and Greek to participate in the empire’s cultural life. It is interesting to note that Latin was spoken using many gestures, as it was felt that it was necessary in order to improve communication when the different parties did not speak the same language (Torregaray, 2009). During this historical period, Greek was a status symbol and, as a result, Greeks and Romans always showed little interest in learning foreign languages of the so-called Barbarian tribes and would only do so for practical reasons (Rochette, 1996). It is also known that Cesar had interpreters because this is mentioned in the Commentaries on the Gallic War or *Bellum Gallicum* by Gaius Julius Caesar; likewise, it can also be presumed that other commanders in the Roman army also had these professionals available to help them communicate with the peoples and dignitaries of the lands they conquered (Rochette, 1996). But then again,

---

15 Book 1, Chapter 19, where Caesar dismisses all interpreters except his most trusted interpreter C. Valerius Troucillus.
interpreters were present not only in the military scenario but also in diplomatic assemblies and meetings where their presence was tolerated without any misgivings (Torregaray, 2009).

I have already mentioned the ambiguity of the terms used by Greeks and Romans to describe interpreters (Mairs, 2010). In Rome, the Latin term “interpretes” was used to denominate both translators and interpreters. It was applied in the sense of an intermediary who was the broker in the conclusion of a contract between two parties (Rochette, 2000; Pöchhacker, 2004; Mairs, 2010; Tănase & Muscalu, 2013). Pöchhacker (2004) believes that the reason for this double meaning could be that the term is derived from “partes” or “pretium”, which is what adds the meaning of “middleman”, “intermediary” or “commercial go-between” to the description. Additionally these two Latin terms refer to an individual who explains the meaning or makes sense of what others have difficulty understanding. Interpreters in Roman times were full-time professionals, and were paid for their services by the national treasury (Rochette, 2000). In spite of this, interpreters were not acknowledged as a professional body in the army during Roman times, and they would have to wait until the 5th century for this recognition (Guzmán, 2004). At the same time, as spies would also tend to be bilingual individuals, they would also be referred to by the same term, “interpretes”, making it sometimes difficult to establish the difference between the role played by a spy and that of an interpreter in literature (Cáceres-Würsig, 2012), or even to distinguish in scientific literature when an author refers to a spy or an interpreter (Guzmán, 2004). This was probably because spies were not the only language experts hired by the military (Peretz, 2006). These individuals were also usually appointed to sensitive missions; they were mostly natives from barbarian countries, but were also highly romanised. Belonging originally to the countries where they operated as spies, this fact made it easier for them to get into enemy territory and obtain information that was essential for the Roman army staff (Tănase & Muscalu, 2013).

Nonetheless, Peretz (2006) gives us a clear description of the status of the military interpreter in Roman times. Despite the low status this professional possessed in Rome, interpreting was still considered an important profession. At the same time, it must be noted that although Roman interpreters worked full time, they provided a temporary service to their client because they did not have a life-long occupation, but were rather still considered a faithful client of their patron. They were also even considered new Roman nationals, but there is no evidence as to whether they existed as an organised group or not (Peretz, 2006).
But not all interpreters were of the same level; there was a hierarchy among them. On the basic level, the interpreter was a legionary soldier, and he would have had the right to a double allowance of food in addition to his pay ("stipendium") if his services were considered satisfactory. On a higher level, the position of the Roman interpreter was more advantageous, as he received a "salarium", or an annual sum, which also covered his expenses (Peretz, 2006). The military interpreter was also given freedom of action in his missions and was exempted from heavy duties, in contrast to other active soldiers, which probably shows that he was an "immunis" (Peretz, 2006), that is, an individual who was free from paying taxes or from public obligation (Frank, 1936). The military interpreter could also be relieved from the prohibition of commercial activity, meaning he could profit from his involvement with other populations and obtain an added source of income (Peretz, 2006). It is also important to mention that Roman interpreters had diplomatic immunity in those cases where they were members of an embassy to the enemy (Peretz, 2006).

Finally, the fragmented Western Roman Empire fell in 476 CE with the deposition of Romulus Augustulus (Heather, 1995), though its Eastern counterpart survived another millennium (Roland, 1999). And though Latin was considered the main medium of communication immediately after the Western Roman provinces fell, the use of Latin diminished considerably by the end of the 6th century, when it lost its status as an official language, becoming a dead language already by the 7th century (Blumenthal & Kahane, 1979). From this period onwards, romance languages started to thrive and develop. However, the disappearance of Latin was short-lived. In the 8th century, it was once again reinstated as the prestige language of the "administration, international relations, education, science, theology and the intelligentsia" (Blumenthal & Kahane, 1979, p. 187), a status it would maintain until the 12th century, when vernaculars were used for courtly entertainment.

Meanwhile, in the former Eastern Roman Provinces, the excellent location of Constantinople and the policies implemented by Constantine (Gibbon & Milman, 1909) led to a 12th century Byzantium characterised by its multilingual society, and an empire where the thousands of foreigners residing in it were awarded trading privileges and tax exemptions. By then Constantinople had become a cosmopolitan city and the main language spoken in its streets was Italian. Leo Tuscus\(^{16}\), from Pisa, was the Byzantine Emperor Manuel Komnenos' official interpreter and his existence is mentioned circa

\(^{16}\) Who was already *invicti principis egregius interpres* (interpreter of the invincible and distinguished prince) (in 1166 and still *imperialium epistolarium interpres* (imperial epistolary interpreter) in 1182.
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1149 CE (Haskins, 1918; Haskins, 1920). Interpreters were also required for the Imperial Guard as its troops were mainly Turks and Varangians (Brand, 1968).

This multilingual environment meant that many linguistic needs had to be addressed, and consequently, Barbarian Academies were created by the Byzantines, which became centres where interpreters and guides were sourced (Diener, 1938). However these professionals hardly ever attained membership of the top echelons of civil service, with few exceptions such as the individuals who were able to attain the position of Great Logothete (Roland, 1999), a public official who played a very important role in the Byzantium administration as the comptroller of finances (Guilland, 1971). Finally, when Byzantium was taken over in 1453 by the Ottomans, Arabic became the official language of the empire. A new era had begun in both in Eastern and Western Europe.


After the fall of the Roman Empire, more languages were spoken in Europe than in today’s world. In fact there are many quotes in Late Latin and Arabic medieval literature about interpreting. The reason may be that in the Middle Ages the need for interpreters became evident owing to the consolidation of all these new languages, the ensuing development of societies in different areas, the settlement of population in new regions and the expeditions towards new and unknown territories (Delisle and Woodsworth, 2012).

The Arabs landed in Spain in 711, when Tarik conquered the Iberian Peninsula (Montenegro & del Castillo, 2012; Baigorri, 2015), reaching Poitiers, France in 733, where he and his troops were halted by Charles Martel in their expansion through Europe (Fouracre, 2005). At that point in time, Spain became a centre of Muslim culture and civilization and remained under Arab control until 1492, when the conquest of Granada by the Catholic Monarchs17, Ferdinand and Isabella, took place. During these 800 years, culture flourished within the peninsula’s borders and Spain became a centre for arts and culture worldwide (Montenegro & del Castillo, 2012). Due to the ongoing fighting, the borders between the Christian and Arab kingdoms fluctuated

17 Ferdinand II of Aragon and Isabella I of Castile who were the first monarchs of unified Spain (“Catholic Monarchs”, 1989).
constantly during the 12th and 13th centuries, and many prisoners were captured, leading to the emergence of the “alfaqueques”, language brokers who were in charge of negotiating their return. They were first recognised in the 13th century by Alphonse the Wise (Foz, 1998; Baigorri, 2015).

Meanwhile, these were the years when the Alfonsine Translation School of Toledo was created, though it was not an academic institution in the traditional sense but rather a cultural and academic movement that produced many noteworthy scholarly works and translations (Benito, 2000). In fact, it became known as one of the most important initiatives in history to develop translation principles serving both scientific and religious interests (Pym, 1994; Foz, 1998; González, 2007). This endeavour was successful thanks to the multicultural, multilingual and favourable political environment that existed during this period of history (González, 2007).

In the meantime in the rest of Europe, during this time period and until the onset of Renaissance, the main features of languages, language professions and professionals stabilised and remained very similar until the 19th century in Europe, although it must be noted that no clear distinction was made between the two professions - translation and interpreting - during this entire period (Roland, 1999; Delisle & Woodsworth, 2012). At the same time, both interpreters and translators were nearly always given a high status, and mostly worked for rulers and governments of nations to which they did not belong. It can already be observed how the role of interpreter’s took on an international dimension. In fact, it is believed that the professions of translation and interpreting reached adulthood when Foreign Offices and Intergovernmental Organisations came into being in different countries in the mid-19th century (Roland, 1999), although the Paris Peace Conference of 1919 is considered the landmark designating the birth of modern interpreting (Baigorri, 2014a).

During the Middle Ages, a very interesting chapter in the history of interpreting took place: the Crusades. These were a series of military expeditions organised by Christian States to the Holy Land. The objective of these expeditions was to control Jerusalem, one of the three great centres of pilgrimage jointly with Rome and Santiago de Compostela, and thus prevent it from falling into Saracen hands (“Crusades”, 1989). The multilingual nature of these expeditions can only make one imagine how language problems must have surely arisen as a result of the recruitment of multinational troops at a time when different Western languages were developing, such

18 Name given to Muslims in these times.
as English, Gaelic, German, Slavonic, Italian, Spanish and French (Birschof, 1961). Roland (1999) tells us how nearly 15 different nationalities or peoples were enrolled in these armies. This meant that available interpreters had to be used for any type of communication encounter or purpose that might have arisen, including “intercourse between people who did not speak the same language” (Oldenbourg, 1965, p. 503). Despite the multilingual nature of the armies, the lingua franca was French as the majority of foreign troops originated from France (Roland, 1999).

As with any people or civilisation, although we may imagine that all sorts of exchanges and interactions took place between the different parties, crusaders and Arabs alike, there are, however, very few records about these exchanges, and where they exist, interpreters remain unidentified. Indeed, one of the most renowned missionaries of this period was Ramón Llull, a scientist and prolific writer who spoke Arabic and preached to the Moors in Spain (Hillgarth, 1996; Ausejo; 2004). Although at war, both Christians and Muslims continued their cultural and trade exchanges (Roland, 1999), suggesting the probable need to work with interpreters or to learn languages.

1.5. Europe and the New World

In 1492, Christopher Columbus set off to locate the passage to India. He took with him a Jewish interpreter, Luis de Torres, who spoke Hebrew, Caldean and Arabic fluently as Columbus believed that these languages would be very useful for the different exchanges with the local populations of the lands he set to conquer. When the ships returned to Spain, Columbus sent six Indians back with them so that they would learn Spanish and be useful to him in future expeditions (Roland, 1999; Ríos, 2005).

It seems that the main method of communication between the indigenous population and Columbus, as well as later explorers was sign language, though some members of the local population learnt to communicate with Columbus and his crew very soon (Umaña, 1991). Even preaching to the natives was often done entirely through signs. Missionary priests, however, proved to be true pioneers in linguistics, and became the compilers of the first grammars and dictionaries drafted of Indian tongues (Cuesta, 2004). Their linguistic zeal led them to translate missals, prayer
books, lives of saints, sermons, *The Imitation of Christ* by Kempis, Ecclesiastes, Proverbs (Vega, 2012) and even “autos sacramentales” (allegorical religious plays) into native tongues (Olmedilla, 1957; Vega, 2012).

Interestingly enough, these interpreters were known by their names (Bastín, 2003; Cuesta, 2004): Juan Ortíz, Jerónimo de Aguilar, Felipillo (Vega, 2004), Enrique de Malaca (Baigorri & Alonso, 2004) though the most famous and most researched is “La Malinche” or “Doña Marina”, who was a female slave given to Cortés. She spoke Aztec and Mayan and learnt Castilian Spanish very quickly, which made her indispensable to Cortés (Roland, 1999; Alonso & Baigorri, 2004; Ríos, 2005).

In the North of the American Continent, the need for interpreters was clear and they can be found among the first immigrants to set foot in this part of the world. Therefore, in French Canada these include most notably Mathieu da Acosta (Hamilton, 1991; Roland, 1999; Johnston, 2011; Macleod-Leslie, 2014), the Jesuit Pierre Biard (Leahey, 1995; Roland, 1999), Savignon, Étienne Brûlé and Nicolas Marsolet (Leahey, 1995; Roland, 1999; Delisle & Woodsworth, 2012). In fact, there are records from the New France colonies dating back to the beginning of the 17th century stating that there were a total of 12 interpreters, most registered with their first names, while the few other interpreters registered with their surnames. They were apparently serious professionals who did not perform any other additional activity aside from language mediation (Roland, 1999).

Indeed, Samuel de Champlain, who was the coloniser of New France and the founder of Quebec City, was aware of the language demands that arose in this situation and, as a result, created an institution of resident interpreters (Delisle and Woodsworth, 2012). The first “immersion” apprenticeship schemes were developed by sending French adventurers to live with Indian tribes in order to ensure these adventurers would become familiar with the local language and way of thinking. What is more, in order for this to happen, they did not only live with the west tribes, but dressed like them and hunted, fished and interacted with them on a daily basis (Delisle & Woodsworth, 2012).

However, among the English settlers it seemed more difficult to find good interpreters and the most prominent among them are also recorded with their names. Conrad Weiser, George Croghan, Jacobus Clement (Hagedorn, 1988; Kawashima,

---

*The Imitation of Christ* is a classic Christian devotional book that encourages spiritual living (“Imitation”, 1989).
1989) and Daniel Claus (Hagedorn, 1988) from New York State are mentioned, though the most famous of all is Andrew Montour who was employed by George Washington (Hagedorn, 1988; Kawashima, 1989; Roland, 1999).

It seems clear that interpreting services after the American War of Independence and the conquest of the West were still considered vital. Mediators such as René Jaussame, Toussaint and Sacajawea (Keogh, 1998; Delisle and Woodsworth, 2012; Sanford & Green, 2012); George Drouillard (Roland, 1999; Pike, 2102), as well as an interpreter named Rousseau, all of whom contributed to these expeditions (Roland, 1999), which were not always peaceful and required language brokering to establish links with the native peoples that were encountered in the move towards the West.

The expansion towards the West, as well as the establishment of ties and relations with other nations, meant that the newly constituted US government saw the need to recruit translators for French and at times, though less frequently, for other languages. The first documented case is that of a Spanish translator by the name of Isaac Pinto (Hunt, 1909, Roland, 1999), which is an important landmark in the recognition of interpreters and their role in history.

1.6. INTERPRETING FROM THE PEACE OF WESTPHALIA TO 1919

Meanwhile, in Europe, after the Peace of Westphalia in 1648, nation-states were starting to develop, alongside the formal establishment of vernacular languages in each one of these states (Mattingly, 1937; Nigro, 2006). These ensuing developments were the result of governments realising the importance of having their own representatives at foreign courts (Mattingly, 1937; Roland, 1999; Nigro, 2006; Lee & Hocking, 2011) and the demise of Latin as the lingua franca in diplomatic circles, in favour of French.

As seen in §1.5., a new trend arose during this period, with interpreters playing a much more visible role. At the same time, the position of interpreters in armed conflict also became more evident, as can be observed in the records of Napoleon’s campaign to Egypt and Palestine during 1798–1801, where there are references to translators and interpreters who spoke French and Arabic (Delisle & Woodsworth, 2012). Other references dating from the Napoleonic wars can also found in records of the Russian campaign (Britten, 2000), where it is specifically mentioned that an interpreter was sought “to whom all the details of the affair could be confided and who would repeat what he was told in the proper quarters” (Caulaincourt, 2011, p. 125). During this same period the statute of dragoman emerged, to cover a key position as a language
intermediary in the Ottoman court between the Sultan and his bureaucracy (Roland, 1999; Lewis, 2005). The term comes from “Trucheman” in Turkish and was anglicised to “dragoman”, “dragomen”. Turkish dragomen had to wear a uniform and were paid relatively well and were even allowed to have assistants or student interpreters who earned about one quarter to half of the salary of a dragoman, while students were under their mentorship. Until the beginning of the 17th century dragomen were of Turkish origin. Unfortunately, however, whenever Ottoman officials revealed a Dragoman betrayal of any kind, they would more often than not sentence the individual to death (Roland, 1999; Dolongunsöz, 2014), so it was in this century when foreign powers took the decision to train their own interpreters. However, initial efforts failed due to the flowery language and phraseology used in Turkish official and royal spheres. The situation took a turn when a new capitulatory treaty was signed, whereby the dragomen became legal subjects of the foreign power they were employed by and had rights to all privileges and immunities granted by that power, which were also extended to their families (Roland, 1999).

Consequently, the establishment of permanent foreign legations and representatives in other countries becomes a current practice from this era onwards (Mattingly, 1937; Nigro, 2006; Lee & Hocking, 2011). But another important issue is also highlighted and considered crucial: the training of these professionals; an element pointed out already in 1806 by Prince Adam Czartoryski, who urged the Russian Emperor Alexander I to found a school of international relations and foreign service (Roland, 1999) in order to have suitably trained foreign representatives and intermediaries.

Going back to 1714, the year after the Utrecht Treaty was signed, it must be noted that a new diplomatic practice was implemented, which was the “reservation” of the language to be used in the drafting of the treaties. At the same time, though the importance of French continued until the mid-20th century, English was becoming increasingly present, a fact that was underscored by the fact that from 1800 onwards foreign diplomats were received in English at St. James Court\(^\text{20}\) (Roland, 1999). This action was followed 60 years later by Lord Palmerston’s statement that any government had the right to use their own language in foreign relations (Roland, 1999), which helped sow the seeds for change in the use of languages in the diplomatic world. However, between 1814 and 1914, French was still the language used for drafting

---

\(^{20}\) The Royal Court of the Sovereign of the United Kingdom, where the Marshal of the Diplomatic Corps is housed.
treaties, although already during the second Hague Convention in 1907, the issue of English vs. French resurfaced, resulting in speakers using their own language from thereon at international meetings (Roland, 1999), presumably requiring the assistance of interpreters.

Finally, though there are no previous records about the different interpreting modalities used throughout history, one could imagine that until the beginning of the 19th century, the most prevalent modes were consecutive and whispering. Interestingly enough, the first records describing the use of whispered interpreting date back to the 17th century (Child, 2010, Baxter, 2015).

1.7. INTERPRETING AFTER WORLD WAR I

Conference Interpreting as we know it today was born in 1920 (Gaiba, 1998; Baigorri 2014; Delisle & Woodsworth, 2012; Roland, 1999) during the Peace of Paris, when the supremacy of French as “the language of diplomacy” ended and English was adopted as the other official language in the institutions created in the aftermath of the Peace of Versailles, such as the League of Nations, the Permanent Court of International Justice and the International Labour Office-ILO (Baigorri, 2004). As a result, the need for interpreters arose for the first time as other languages were also accepted as official diplomatic languages (Gaiba, 1998). Until then, the language used in diplomatic circles was French, and the diplomats and high-ranking officials who attended meetings, either in diplomatic circles or at the World Postal Union, mastered this language or were chosen for these positions because they spoke French (Roland, 1999).

The first techniques used at these international meetings were consecutive interpreting (CI) and whispering. It should be noted that at the beginning, during WWI, negotiations were attended by English-speaking delegates who did not speak French. This meant that other diplomats would translate for them, sentence by sentence. This same technique was used for the Armistice Commissions, where French, English and German were spoken. Interpretation in these cases was performed by army interpreters or liaison officers (Gaiba, 1998). After the negotiations, there were around a dozen of interpreters who could interpret between English and French. This led to a gradual development of the CI process, which evolved from a sentence to sentence translation into a fully-fledged CI, as we know it today, where interpreters worked in teams of two, interpreting speeches that could last up to an hour (Baigorri, 2004).
It can be stated that the Paris Peace negotiations were a seminal moment for interpreting as both English and French were adopted as the official languages of the conference. There were twelve interpreters appointed to this assignment among which Paul Mantoux\(^{21}\) and Gustave Henri Camerlynck\(^{22}\) were considered the most prominent. The fact that negotiations were conducted in two official languages led to the use of the consecutive mode. This was the golden age of the pioneers of interpreting, among whom we should mention the following: Antoine Velleman\(^{23}\), the founder of the School of Translation and Interpreting in Geneva (ETI); Jean Herbert\(^{24}\), consecutive interpreter for the League of Nations and Chief Interpreter of United Nations Interpretation Service in New York; and Robert Cofino\(^{25}\), André Kaminker\(^{26}\), Georges Kaminker\(^{27}\) and Madame Rossetti Agresti\(^{28}\) were particularly brilliant forerunners of the profession (Van Hoof, 1996; Delisle and Woodsworth, 2012; Baigorri, 2014a). It is also important to note that there were precedents to the League of Nations such as the International Committee of the Red Cross (1863), the International Telecommunication Union (1865), and the Universal Postal Union (1874). The latter two are today UN specialized agencies (Roland, 1999; Baigorri, 2004).

Meanwhile, the meetings of the League of Nations and the International Labour Office (ILO) highlighted acutely the pressing need for interpreters. To this end, it is important to note that in those days multilingual individuals were scarce (Gaiba, 1998; Baigorri, 2004; Keiser, 2004). Still, the same techniques - CI and whispering - were used. The languages spoken were French and English, but when there were delegations that spoke neither of these two languages, they were provided with interpretation into and from their languages (Gaiba, 1998). It can already be appreciated in these forums that the topics covered went beyond diplomacy and dealt with economic as well as labour issues (Gaiba, 1998). It can also be observed that the records used may have

\(^{21}\) 1877-1956. French-born historian and chief interpreter of the Paris Peace Conference, which was a watershed in the development of interpreting as a profession. Mantoux later went on to become a staff interpreter at the League of Nations (Pöchhacker, 2006; Baigorri, 2014).

\(^{22}\) 1870-1929 French language Professor and interpreter at the Paris Peace Conference. Like Mantoux, he was an interpreter at the League of Nations (Van Hoof, 1996).

\(^{23}\) 1875-1962 Interpreter at the League of Nations (Baigorri, 2014a).

\(^{24}\) 1897-1980 Liaison officer with the British Army, artillery technical advisor with the U.S. Army, interpreter for the Armistice Commission between the Allies and the Germans, as well as interpreter at the Peace Conference.


\(^{26}\) c.1877-c.1961 Interpreter at the League of Nations and Later Head of Interpreting Services at the Council of Europe (Van Hoof, 1996).

\(^{27}\) c.1890-1969 Interpreter at the League of Nations and San Francisco Conference (Baigorri, 2000/2014).

\(^{28}\) 1875-1960 Interpreter at the League of Nations (Baigorri, 2000/2014).
varied, as not only diplomats would intervene in these meetings but also trade unionists, showing us once again that the interpreters’ knowledge of different topics and skills had to be very broad.

But the two interpreting techniques used, CI and whispered, were not considered satisfactory for the dynamics of these meetings. This was because it was considered that CI delayed the sessions unnecessarily and whispering interfered with the proceedings allowing, at the same time, only a few people to hear the interpreter (Gaiba, 1998). These factors led to the inception and development of Simultaneous Interpreting (Diriker, 2013).

1.8. THE NUREMBERG TRIALS

The celebration of the Nuremberg Trials resulted from a decision made in Yalta by Roosevelt, Churchill and Stalin to prosecute Axis leaders (Gaiba, 1998). In fact, these powers had already been warned in 1943 by the Allies that any perpetrators would be made accountable for their crimes before a court of law. This event is considered the landmark of modern interpreting history, which is why I have divided the modern history of interpreting into two periods, before and after 1945, i.e. before and after the Nuremberg Trials.

The first time an official declaration was made to prosecute those responsible for perpetrating violence against European Jews and the civilian population in general was December 1942. Different options were considered to punish the perpetrators, ranging from the execution of 50,000 to 100,000 German Staff Officers to the summary execution of the defendants. In the end, however, the proposal set forth by American leaders of holding a criminal trial and treating the case as a German criminal plot prevailed over the others. This was for different reasons, the most important being that as there would be documentation to endorse the accusations, there would be no claims afterwards that the defendants had been judged and sentenced without evidence, ensuring at the same time their right to a fair trial. As a result, the Nuremberg Trials became a watershed for the creation of a permanent international court, an idea

---

29 Nuremberg is a city located in Bavaria, Germany, and was chosen for the celebration of the trials because the city’s Palace of Justice had survived the war with little damage and it also had a large prison area. It was renovated by the American army (Biddle, 1947). Another reason why Nuremberg was chosen was because it had been the location chosen by Hitler to hold annual Nazi Propaganda rallies (Macdonald, 2010), so that holding the trials there was a way of showing the defeat of the Third Reich to the whole world (“Nuremberg Trials, n.d.”).
that remained dormant until the end of the Cold War, when the International Criminal Court (ICC) was finally established in 1998 (Gaiba, 1998; ICC, n.d.) with the aim of providing a body that would handle violations of human rights, genocide and crimes against humanity (Taylor, 1955)

The multilingual setting meant that from the beginning there would be important language management issues that would have to be covered. Similarly, the language diversity for the organisation of the first trial meant that interpreting would also be required. However, despite having used both whispering and consecutive interpreting in multilingual forums in the past, these two modes were both ruled out for Nuremberg: consecutive interpreting because it delayed the sessions to unbearable limits; and whispering because it presented the disadvantage that the interpreter's voice interfered with the voice of the speaker. Also, with consecutive interpreting, delegates who had already listened to the interpretation into their language, had to wait and listen to performances in languages they did not understand. Hence, the decision to use simultaneous interpreting was made (Roland, 1999; Gaiba, 1998; Delisle & Woodsworth; 2012).

Specific texts on the Nuremberg Trials (Gaiba, 1998) mention León Dostert as the promoter of simultaneous interpreting at Nuremberg. Dostert had been Eisenhower's interpreter during the war and was aware of the existence of the Filene-Finlay System used at the League of Nations and also of the problems that had been encountered in its use. Nonetheless, he felt that making certain changes to the equipment would adapt it to cater for the needs of the Trial. However his enthusiasm for this type of interpreting was not shared by the jurists that would be involved in the trials because they felt that speed was an insurmountable challenge for interpreters, nor by the interpreters themselves, who would be in charge of relaying the deliberations into the different languages because they were shoved into anonymity and also felt challenged by speed (Baigorri, 2014a). Therefore, Dostert embarked on a mission to convince the different parties to use the new system, determined by the conviction that if it were not used the trial would never end. At last in October 1945, the decision to use simultaneous interpreting was made (Biddle, 1947; Gaiba, 1998). IBM provided the equipment free of charge and the necessary technical staff were trained to operate the equipment during the trials (Bowen & Bowen, 1985; Gaiba, 1998).

Added to the language diversity and its difficulties were legal and procedural complications. One example of these hurdles is that the first setting for SI were the international trials to judge war criminals, where the laws of nations with different legal traditions and practices had to converge. To these complications we should also add the
technical aspects of the operation, which not been fully developed at the time (Gaiba, 1998). Therefore, a series of rules of procedure enshrined in the London Charter of the International Military Tribunal (issued on 8th August 1945) had to be adopted. They included actions such as requesting defendants to submit requests with enough time in advance for presentation of witnesses and documents related to their cases (Biddle, 1947; Roland, 1990), drafting a clear definition and categorisation of crimes by combining Anglo-American and Continental law in order to have a straightforward definition and distinction between crimes against peace, war crimes and crimes against humanity for the purposes of the trials, as well as ensuring that both civilian staff as well as military officers could be accused of war crimes (“Nuremberg Trials”, n.d.).

An additional strain was the recruitment of interpreters. All four Allied countries were supposed to recruit their own translators, interpreters and stenographers. It proved to be a difficult process, among other reasons because there were no existing criteria on how to select the right personnel for this assignment. The decision was taken to apply the same requirements as for consecutive interpreters: an excellent knowledge of the two languages and an extensive cultural and educational background. To these attributes were added composure and the ability to keep calm in stressful situations, if possible a background in law and experience in public speaking, and finally the most important attribute for simultaneous interpreting, namely the ability to speak and listen at the same time (Gaiba, 1998).

The Nuremberg Trials began on 20th November 1945 (Taylor 1955; Gaiba, 1998). In total, a series of 13 trials were held between 1945 and 1949 in Nuremberg, Germany. The first trial was conducted in 4 languages: English, French, German and Russian, the languages of the Allied Powers and Germany (Biddle, 1947; Roland, 1999; Gaiba, 1998); this is what is known as the Nuremberg Trial proper or Main Trial. The other 12 trials, the Subsequent Proceedings as they areidentified, only took place in German and English as the tribunals were formed solely by American judges (Gaiba, 1998).

Finally, and once the Main Trial held in Nuremberg was over, numerous interpreters who had the appropriate language combination left for the United Nations, as they had been aware of the temporal nature of the assignment from the beginning, leaving Germany for New York to find permanent jobs (Gaiba, 1998).
1.9. **INTERPRETING AFTER THE NUREMBERG TRIALS**

As part of this historical review, mention must be made of the creation of two important international bodies after World War II: the United Nations in 1945 which has an international scope and whose inception we have already discussed; and the European Union (EU) in 1993.

### 1.9.1. Interpreting at the United Nations

As explained in previous paragraphs, conference interpreting as a profession began after the Peace of Paris in 1920 (Gaiba, 1998; Roland, 1999; Delisle & Woodsworth, 2009; Baigorri, 2014a). Initially, most of these organisations were created to promote peace and foster development among the member nations. As mentioned in § 1.6., the first of these organisations was the League of Nations\(^3\), which was set up after World War I (1919). It is the predecessor organisation of the United Nations, which in turn was created after World War II (1945) (Roland, 1999).

When the San Francisco Conference was convened from April to June 1945 to draft the Charter of the United Nations, English and French were the only languages used in the plenary sessions and all documents were translated into these two languages as well as the other official tongues (Roland, 1999). The initial decision made when consecutive was the leading and only mode of interpreting used was to resort to consecutive interpreting at the meetings of the United Nations. Meanwhile, delegates were allowed to speak in their own language on condition that they provided their own interpreters (Roland 1999). However, the fact that there were 5 official languages (English, French, Russian, Chinese and Spanish) complicated the process of interpreting to a great extent, as most of the speeches could not be interpreted into all languages because it was a time-consuming exercise.

---

\(^3\) The League of Nations had 3 main bodies: the General Assembly, which met once a year; the Council, which had four permanent members (Britain, France, Italy and Japan) and four others elected every year by the General Assembly; the Secretariat, which drafted the agenda and issued meeting reports; and the International Court of Justice (https://history.state.gov/milestones/1914-1920/league). The official languages of the League of Nations were French and English, and at meetings speeches were summarised into these two languages by an interpreter of the League. Delegates would normally address the meeting in one of the two official languages because they had to bear the cost of the translations and were aware of the time invested in hearing the interpreted version, though there were some exceptions such as that of the German representative who, out of national pride, always addressed the Council in his native tongue (Roland, 1999). Despite there being two official languages, the language services dealt with many more, as many materials sent by different governments were in their mother tongue, which meant that they had to be translated (Roland, 1999).
At the first meeting of the General Assembly of the United Nations held in London in 1946, languages issues were discussed. Manouilksy, a delegate from the Ukraine, suggested that maybe a system like the one used at Nuremberg could be implemented at the United Nations. As a result, a mission was sent to Nuremberg, where the system was seen in operation, and León Dostert was asked to test the same system at the United Nations (Gaiba, 1998, Roland, 1999; Baigorri, 2014a). Upon arrival, he encountered fierce opposition from highly-qualified interpreters who refused to use the system as they considered consecutive interpreting far more accurate, as well as because it had been taken for granted that the former modality was the one to be adopted by the fledgling international organisation (Baigorri, 2004).

Despite the initial opposition expressed, Dostert negotiated a contract for 20 interpreters and 4 members of staff, and trained the interpreters organising mock sessions just like had been done at Nuremberg. A first attempt to show how the system worked to different personalities went completely off-track due to technical problems among others, which meant that at the beginning people did not trust the system and that for approximately a year after that event, a consecutive rendition was always given of a speech after it had been interpreted simultaneously. But the advantages of this new system soon became apparent to delegates who increasingly requested the service. Finally, the United Nations held its first conference without consecutive interpreting in 1947 (Gaiba, 1998).

In any event, Dostert was a key element in the installation of the equipment, also supplied by IBM just like in Nuremberg. It was installed in several meeting and session rooms and 8,000 seats were equipped with headphones allowing reception of all 5 languages. The fact that the system required miles of a complex cabling and wiring system to equip all the sites, and made it compulsory to meet in specific rooms, prompted IBM to develop a wireless system, by which the user carried a battery-operated receiver which allowed him or her to move and work in rooms that were not prewired. This system was used for the first time at the International Radio Conference held in Atlantic City in 1947, and soon after 2,500 of these receivers were commissioned for the United Nations General Assembly (Gaiba 1998).

1.9.2. Interpreting at the European Union

The history of the European Union (EU) is more recent, as it is the culmination of unifying efforts made by previously existing bodies, such as the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) created in 1951 and which was joined by the other two bodies with whom it shared membership and some institutions, namely the European
Economic Community (EEC) and the European Atomic Energy Community (EAEC), in 1958.

In fact, the European Union considers itself as “as one long, on-going, intense political and technical conference” (SCIC, n.d.). To ensure democratic legitimacy, everyone is given the right to express themselves in their mother tongue. Since its inception 50 years ago, European Legislation has been proposed, debated and adopted in around 11,000 meetings a year. The European Union also has the largest conference organiser and interpreting service in the world, called the Directorate General for Interpretation or DG Interpretation, which is also known as SCIC. Its tasks are to:

- provide quality interpretation services;
- deliver effective conference organisation services, which also include technical support and design management of modern conference facilities;
- assist in implementing the Commission’s new multilingualism strategy (SCIC, n.d.).

SCIC provides interpreting and conference services to the Commission, the European Council, the Council of the Union, the Committee of the Regions, the European Economic and Social Committee, the European Investment Bank, and the agencies and offices in the Member States (SCIC, n.d.).

1.9.3. Interpreter training

The appearance of interpreting as a profession led to the need to provide adequate training. Though interpreters were initially self-taught, the need for trained professionals became obvious after the Peace of Paris and the first meetings held at the League of Nations and the ILO. This concern led to the foundation by André Velleman of the former École d'interprètes de Genève (EIG) in 1941 in Geneva to train consecutive interpreters. In fact, Jean Herbert recruited the first team of consecutive interpreters to work at the First UN General Assembly meeting that was held in London in 1946. After this first meeting, Herbert went on to the United Nations in New York, where this same team was posted, and he was the person responsible for founding the first programme to train interpreters and was appointed Head of the Interpretation service (Roland, 1999; Delisle & Woodsworth, 2012).

In 1951, after simultaneous interpreting was adopted by the United Nations and the misgivings about this new modality of interpreting were overcome, this discipline
was included in the training curriculum and taught at the EIG (Diriker, 2013). In 1972, the EIG became the *École de Traduction et d'Interprétation* (School of Translation and Interpreting - ETI), and a Degree Programme in Translation was established. Today it is the Faculty of Translation and Interpreting, a status it acquired in 2011 (University of Geneva, n.d.).

At the same time, other training institutions started to appear in the world such as the Vienna School of Interpreting in 1940, and Georgetown University Division of Interpreting and Translation in 1949. Later on, the need for interpreters led to the creation of training centres in other parts of the world such as Paris, where the *Institut Supérieur d'Interprétation et de Traducteurs* (ISIT) and the *École Supérieure d'Interprètes et de Traducteurs* (ESIT) were founded in 1957. In 1965 Westminster launched a post-graduate programme in the United Kingdom, in 1967 Zurich translation and interpreting studies were established in German-speaking Switzerland, and in 1968 the Monterey Graduate School of Translation and Interpreting was launched (Phelan, 2001). Since then, translation and interpreting schools have proliferated all over the world, where mostly undergraduate programmes are taught, though the trend is towards establishing postgraduate programmes, the clearest example of which is the European Master in Conference Interpreting which was funded by the EU. The member universities of this EU consortium today are: the University of Antwerp, ELTE University of Budapest, Universitatea Babeş-Bolyai of Cluj-Napoca, the Faculty of Translation and Interpreting of Geneva, Boğaziçi University in Istanbul, Ljubljana University, ESIT, Université Sorbonne Nouvelle Paris 3 and ISIT in Paris, Univerzita Karlova v Praze in Prague, Università degli Studi di Trieste and the University of Warsaw (EMCI, n.d.).

## 1.10. CONCLUSIONS

The historical analysis carried out shows us that the figure of the interpreter in general, at war or in an institutional setting has existed since antiquity. At the same time, we have seen that the presence of interpreters in the past and the present remains largely undocumented in written historical texts, which makes it difficult to understand the evolution of the profession. We have also noted that interpreters have been used in different scenarios where negotiations, encounters or conversations of a political and conflictive nature take place. Similarly, although interpreters go unnoticed, it seems clear that they have played an important role in the most important events and episodes in history, and their services have always been required.
It could be said that this historical review is useful because learning about the past allows one to interpret better the present. At the same time, it enables individuals to acknowledge existing needs more critically and effectively and find ways to satisfy them. One of the most interesting facts observed in this review is that despite the position the interpreter plays in different types of exchanges, and particularly in conflict scenarios, apart from the Nuremberg Trials and several more instances recorded in the past, no provisions have been made to train interpreters specifically to work in conflict settings. When covering interpreter education, we should try to define more clearly the role and position of the interpreter in the communication process, and even more so in a conflict scenario; to identify the tasks to be performed by the interpreter, as well as the related skills needed to be successful; to develop the appropriate type of training that would be provided to or would be expected from the interpreter; and finally, to define the interpreting modalities needed.

Finally, knowledge of history can also help us find different ways to tackle a situation and approach it with a more critical insight on how to deal with what is happening at a particular stage in time, and in a specific scenario. At the same time, studying the past allows us to foresee what the future may hold for us and anticipate possible solutions, thanks to the critical judgement acquired from analysing the past, even more so in war situations where we observe that hardly anything has changed since the birth of humankind (Kraus, 2014). The nature of war and its settings may change, but the ability to interpret them and take suitable actions is the result of reflecting upon the past and learning from it.
CHAPTER 2. INTERPRETING AT WAR

After reviewing the evolution of the history of interpreting, where we have seen that interpreters have had a distinct role in the many wars waged since antiquity, I will now proceed to focus on the concepts of war and armed conflict, highlighting the differences and similarities between these two concepts, and will briefly cover the stages of war. These concepts are covered since the topic of this dissertation is the interpreter in peacekeeping missions, which are embedded both in prevention as well as the post war phases.

When focusing on the concepts of war, and its counterpart, peace, Calzada (2007) analyses existing theories on peace and conflict that have been developed by different institutions such as the Association for Conflict Resolution, the Conflict Research Consortium, UNESCO Chair of Philosophy, The Instituto de la Paz y los Conflictos, as well as different handbooks on conflict (Coleman & Deutsch, 2000; Berghof, n.d.), reaching the conclusion that despite there being a wealth of information on conflicts, there is no single, agreed definition of the term.

I was also able to corroborate this finding in my research after observing that in different websites, publications and articles of different international bodies, the term is usually mentioned but not defined. This may be due to the fact that the term defines a tangible concept, or perhaps it is believed that everybody has the same understanding of this event since it is a widespread notion, and war is an entity that is visible in our minds as the opposite of peace. For that reason, I decided to delve deeper into the existing literature on this topic and tried to come up with a working definition for this dissertation.

2.1. DEFINITION OF ARMED CONFLICT

Conflict and war go back to the origins of mankind. The nature of war itself is dynamic and as a result, many different authors have given their own definitions of war (Clausewitz, 1812/1942; Sheehan, 2008; Sharma, 2015). However, Clausewitz’s (1812/1942) definition seems to be the most quoted and extended because it proposes a general description of the process. This author defines war as a sign of political and social behaviour, considering it a tool that has been used by humankind since its very existence, with the purpose of achieving political or social goals by using violence or violent means (Clausewitz, 1812/1942).
However, Sheehan (2008) states that we should not forget that war in itself is an event that is very much organised and also an organizing force in its own right. This is easily understood because by casting a simple glance at an armed conflict, we can see that it is a multidisciplinary event in which different roles and tasks have to be deployed for a war to be waged. At the same time, simply trying to think about and list the different procedures followed when a war is declared probably makes it easier to understand and illustrate more clearly this multifaceted experience. Let us imagine the machinery that unfolds when a war is to be waged:

- Hostilities are declared by one or more parties.
- Government allocates command and authorises army to go to war.
- Commands, ranks and troops are informed.
- Logistics are planned, prepared and implemented.
- Support required is arranged.
- Involvement of army, navy and air force is considered.
- It has to be established if there will there be cooperation among the different countries and/or whether it is a joint operation or not.
- Decisions about the type of personnel to be recruited are made: healthcare, communications, administration.
- Supplies, material and equipment are decided.
- Transportation, accommodation and food requirements are settled.
- Missions are envisaged and organised.

In fact, not only is war an organised event but the whole concept of war and its stages follow a precise structure that one cannot avert, and in this process interpreters will have to be conveniently positioned so that they are given a clear description of the possible tasks they have to accomplish and skills required to perform them, in order to play their role adequately.

At the same time we should not forget that waging war itself has also changed since the past. The 1991 Gulf war was the watershed, as it meant that from there on success at war would be decided by the possession of technological warfare based on highly sophisticated technological developments. This is referred to as the Revolution
in Military Affairs (RMA) and has often led to asymmetric conflicts in which one of the parties at war is inferior to the other in military technology (Sheehan, 2008).

2.2. ARMED CONFLICT VS. WAR

In the previous paragraph I introduced Clausewitz’s (1812/1942) definition of war, which gives us an introduction to the concept. For the purposes of establishing a more systematic approach to the concept of war, I decided to focus on the definition of Armed Conflict (state-based) proposed by the Uppsala Conflict Data Project (UCDP)31 and drafted by Gleditsch, l. (2002), and presented below:

(…) a contested incompatibility that concerns government or territory or both where the use of armed force between two parties results in at least 25 battle-related deaths. Of these two parties at least one is the government of a state (2002, p. 618-619).

Additionally Gleditsch, Wallensteen, Eriksson, Sollenberg, & Strand (2002) believe that providing a 25-death threshold ensures that conflicts like the struggle in the Basque Country are registered and accounted for. This contrasts with the Correlates of War Project32 (COW, n.d.) approach, which advocates a threshold of 1000-battle related deaths as the determining factor to consider an event an armed conflict. This organization considers that a number of deaths of more than 1000 a year would turn the event into a war. However Gleditsch & Ward (1999) have proposed an alternative classification, which provides for subsets of armed conflict taking into account both their perspective and that of the Correlates of War Project (COW, n.d.):

- “Minor Armed Conflict: with at least 25 battle-related deaths per year and fewer than 1,000 battle-related deaths during the course of the conflict.

---

31 The Department of Peace and Conflict Research of Uppsala University established the UCPD in the 1980s under the name Conflict Data Project, with the aim of collecting data continuously on armed conflicts. For this purpose they use definitions that fit scholarly requirements of global comparability. The data collected are available to anybody interested in accessing the information. http://www.pcr.uu.se/research/UCDP/

32 The Correlates of War Project was founded in 1963 by J. David Singer, a political scientist at the University of Michigan. The original and continuing goal of the project has been the systematic accumulation of scientific knowledge about war. http://cow.dss.ucdavis.edu/history
• Intermediate Armed Conflict: at least 25 battle-related deaths per year and an accumulated total of at least 1,000 deaths, but fewer than 1,000 in any given year.
• War: at least 1,000 battle-related deaths per year.” (Gleditsch et al., 2002).

This is a much clearer description and categorisation of the events and allows for a clearer interpretation of armed conflicts.

After having defined the concepts of war and armed conflict, I believe it is important to note that throughout this dissertation, whenever I use the terms “armed conflict”, “conflict” or “war”, I will be using them as synonyms. What is more, I will always be relating them to the meaning of “war” as defined by UCDP. The reason for choosing this definition is because I believe that the descriptions of concepts devised by this institution are short, clear, precise and accurate. Furthermore, I also believe it is worth noting the fact that the UCDP’s approach to the concept is comprehensive, insofar as it includes a global conflict database dating back to WWII, providing us, as a result, with a wealth of information about current world conflicts and wars around the globe. Besides, the UCDP has recently developed a non-state conflict database (Sundberg, Eck, & Kreutz, 2012) which, in my opinion, is a commendable effort to bridge the empirical gap that had existed until its development in the field of conflict studies, which did not include non-state conflicting parties and victims, despite them being subject to the same suffering as the parties involved in state-based conflicts. At the same time, these databases provide updated information, at all times, of the conflicts waged worldwide whether they are intrastate, interstate or internationalised conflicts.

Another reason for choosing the UCDP definition was because the descriptions given of “armed conflict” and “war” are very similar, the only difference being the intensity of the conflict: while in an armed conflict there are at least 25 battle-related deaths in one calendar year, in a war the figure is at least 1000 battle-related deaths in one calendar year. This makes it easier to understand the concepts because, as Shehaan (2008) has stated and I have mentioned at the beginning of this section, war is not an abstract concept that one can theorise about; on the contrary, it is a tangible and visible event that can be studied and analysed.

33 Non-state-based conflicts are any other conflict or confrontation where there is no involvement of a government or territory and are violent encounters such as drug-trafficking, or clashes between groups for religious or other reasons (Sundberg, Eck, & Kreutz, 2012).
As a final point in this section, I believe it would be correct to affirm that from the different war situations I have described in Chapter 2, it can be concluded that interpreters have worked throughout history in all types of war-related scenarios (Gaiba, 1998; Roland, 1999: Dragovic-Drouet, 2007; Baker, 2010; Schweda, 2010; Delisle & Woodsworth, 2012), which leads me to believe that in order to better understand the role played by war interpreters, it may be necessary to focus briefly on each of the stages of war and analyse the types of events taking place in each stage, be it an action, encounter or meeting of some sort, in order to be able to anticipate the professional services that may be required of these interpreters.

2.3. Stages According to Intensity.

Since an armed conflict a dynamic process, different authors have been able to divide the war continuum into stages. However, the stages into which an armed conflict may be divided can be more or less complex, depending on how the stages are defined and on the approach used by different authors to obtain the definition. Therefore a simple classification would be limited to three phases, as described by Väyrynen (2003), who talks about the pre-war, escalation and post-war prevention phases. Dudouet (2006) opts for a more complex definition, similar to the one proposed by Brahm (2003), who takes the previous division slightly further and includes a series of steps in between the previously mentioned categories.

![Figure 1. The Conflict Wave (Brahm, 2003)©.](image)

Brahm’s (2003) bell-shaped division is accepted as a well-structured, clear and reliable outline, as it creates a subdivision between the three main parts of the war,
which can be understood by casting a single glance at the model. This enables researchers to later establish more clearly the scenarios in which interpreters work, allocating the tasks, skills, modes of interpreting required and roles played by interpreters in each one of these settings.

However, another classification that is slightly more sophisticated in its design is the one developed by the Conflict Early Warning Systems (CEWS) project developed by the University of Southern California (USC). This project is based on the premise that conflict histories or backgrounds are ambiguous, because they can be viewed from different perspectives. But then again this classification also reminds the reader that a conflict is not a static and linear event; quite the reverse, this classification also reveals that it is a multi-episodic phenomenon in which different events take place in the war continuum (Alker & Mushakoji, 1999). To this end, the project has developed frameworks, narratives and methods of analysis that allow us to understand and manage more efficiently violent conflicts. These efforts include the development of a colour-coding system which is used in the tables to highlight the nature of the conflict as well as the stage in which it has ended. The research carried out by CEWS allowed the institution to conclude that different stages emerge when conflicts unfold (see Table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHASE 1</th>
<th>Dispute phase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PHASE 2</td>
<td>Crisis Phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHASE 3</td>
<td>Limited Violence Phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHASE 4</td>
<td>Massive Violence Phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHASE 5</td>
<td>Abatement Phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHASE 6</td>
<td>Settlement Phase</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. CEWS classification of war stages (CEWS, n.d.).

As can be observed, CEWS (n.d.) divides an armed conflict into six stages. The first one is the beginning of the conflict, which is when opposing points of view are voiced and there is an expectation of crisis looming in the background, with the declaration of threats or expectations of disablement of the parties. However, there is no violence in this stage. This is followed by the second phase in which opposition is expressed, and although the presence of violence is incidental and sporadic, it can be assumed that a regular and systematic use of force will take place soon. In phase 3, the
unrestrained use of force is released. This means that there may already be casualties associated with the conflict. However, the onset of violence, however limited, already signals the arrival of a massive violent phase. Phase 4 is the most violent one of all, as regular, systematic and unrestrained use of violence is unleashed. While in the previous three stages institutions were ready to sit at the table to negotiate and converse, now they are no longer available for dialogue, and military actions are targeted at both civilians and non-civilians. If violence is unrestrained, it can lead to genocide or politicide; and as the level of force used is high in this stage, the destruction or elimination of the other party is considered one of the goals pursued. In the abatement phase or Phase 5, opposition, the use of violence is temporarily suspended and it becomes evident that the parties are now ready to move on to the next phase as opposition or the use of violence diminish. The final and sixth stage brings us to the resolution of the conflict and the re-establishment of institutional processes, with the peaceful recognition of both parties and their claims (CEWS, n.d.).

The CEWS system is more detailed, includes the concept of sequentiality, and uses a colour-coded system to indicate how each case has ended. The colours used are red, orange and blue for a violent ending, an abatement phase ending and a settlement phase ending, respectively.
Table 2 shows how CEWS has implemented this colour-coding system and applied it to different conflicts that had already ended when the project was nearing its conclusion in 1999. However, it should be noted that this chart does not include, and is by no means an exhaustive description of, all conflicts that have taken place since 1999.

Although these are the most well-known classifications, there are others such as those devised by authors like Rothchild (2003), who goes on to mention five different phases: potential conflict, gestation, trigger and escalation and post-conflict phases of conflict and prevention. Or Wallensteen (2011) who mentions three phases: emergence, dynamics and peace building. Another classification is Byrne’s (1996), who states that a conflict will be divided into the following four stages, an opinion also shared by El Jack (2003):

1. Run-up to conflict (pre-conflict)
2. The conflict itself
3. Peace process (or conflict resolution)
4. Reconstruction and reintegration (or post-conflict)

In general, I believe that by revising these different classifications, it is clear that all authors follow the same linear continuum for war, emphasizing two characteristics when describing the different stages: the timeframe and the intensity of the conflict. Similarly, and depending on the number of phases described, the different stages seem to overlap if all the classifications are compared, going to show that on the whole there is agreement on the description of armed conflict. Furthermore, despite being a core element in Clausewitz’s definition (1812/1942), I believe that the level of violence of a conflict is not as relevant for the aims of this study, because I intend to focus more on the different scenarios arising from these stages in order to locate interpreters within them (Edwards, 2002; Baigorri, 2011). Hence, I will stick by Brahm’s (2003) basic classification due to its clear graphic nature, its simplicity, and the ease with which it can be adapted to the different war scenarios in which interpreters may be involved (Baigorri, 2011). This means I will be comparing conflict theory and the nature and structure of war with Baigorri’s (2011) description of interpreter mediation in war scenarios, in order to identify the requirements of each stage and to correctly illustrate the position of the interpreter in each of these stages. Therefore, I propose relating both of these classifications as follows:
Baigorri (2011) defines the stages of interpreter involvement in a conflict as follows: (a) the preparatory process of war where the interpreter will work for diplomacy and intelligence, and one can presume that the modalities required will be mostly simultaneous and consecutive; (b) warfare or war operations as such, where interpreters will perform their duties for different military personnel who speak diverse languages, and where different modalities of interpretation will probably be required. These two phases are followed by (c) the official end of hostilities and the post-war scenarios. Here is where interpreters will be required to work in peace negotiations or “on site”, where they will be involved in managing mass population movements, the demobilisation process, encounters in which help is required in the rehabilitation process, reintegration of combatants back into civilian life, and even brokering in exchanges with resistance or liberation movements. During the post-war process and once peace has been established, interpreters will also be required for armistice negotiation and signing, as well as for those exchanges taking place where there is an occupation of foreign forces, or peacekeeping missions (C. Baker, 2010a), and reparations. In this last phase I would also include the settlement of responsibilities in military tribunals. Therefore, once again, different interpreting modalities would have to be used. The different settings can be more clearly illustrated in the following chart:

Table 3. Conflict stages by Brahm (2003) and Baigorri (2011).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>CONFLICT STAGES</strong></th>
<th><strong>BRAHM (2003)</strong></th>
<th><strong>BAIGORRI (2011)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Latent conflict</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict Emergence</td>
<td>Preparatory process of war</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict escalation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stalemate (hurting)</td>
<td>Warfare</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deescalating</td>
<td>End of hostilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispute settlement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-conflict</td>
<td>Post-war scenario</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace-building</td>
<td>Post-war scenario</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3.** Conflict stages by Brahm (2003) and Baigorri (2011).
Table 4. Different working scenarios for war interpreters.

All of these working scenarios already show the inherent complexity of the tasks to be carried out by interpreters. One can imagine that in each one of these scenarios different techniques and modalities will be required, and that it will not be enough to master only language skills, suggesting that the possession of “soft skills” or cross-cultural competence - also called the 3C (Ingold, 2014; Vieira, 2014) - could come in very handy to complement the function of these professionals in this field.

2.4. CONCLUSIONS

Defining the concept of war is important in order to better understand the scenario in which interpreters will be working. As highlighted in the introduction of this chapter, “war” and “armed conflict” are considered to be concrete and obvious concepts that everybody seems to know and understand. However, as with the historical review, it is important to go back to the basics of war in order to understand its origins, organisation and workings. The fact that we are talking about an organised event means that the process of war is also organised and, therefore, the elements, encounters, meetings and actions of war should also follow a specific structure. At the same time, understanding the war continuum, as well as the different component stages, has resulted in the classification of the types of encounters held in each of those stages, one aim being to presumably anticipate interpreting needs. Not only that, but the materials and equipment needed would also be foreseen, all of which would lead to a better definition of the tasks required from interpreters in each of these stages, resulting in greater satisfaction on the part of both interpreters and users, as we will see in the following chapters.
CHAPTER 3. INTERPRETING CONTEXTS RELATED TO WAR

3.1. THE INTERPRETER AT WAR

I have already mentioned in § 1.2. that it is difficult to discriminate between civil and military interpreting and how, as a result, the latter was considered an offshoot of political interpreting (Roland, 1999; Mairs, 2010). One can imagine that when the first armies were formed, interpreters would have been required for communication when those armies set off to conquer other lands or fight other foreign armies (Roland, 1999; Mairs, 2011; Delisle & Woodsworth, 2012). The historical review carried out in this dissertation started by stating that interpreters have been necessary since the first relations, peaceful or not, took place between different peoples. Indeed, the first chronicled examples of armies are those of Mesopotamia, and Sargon³⁴, founder of the Akkad Dynasty (Nemet-Nejat, 1998; Zamazalová, 2010) was the first king to have a standing army under his orders.

Roland (1999) describes how interpreters have been hired by the military since Cyrus the Younger, who led the Persian Army. The army was bilingual as 10,000 Greek soldiers were enlisted; hence, announcements had to be made necessarily in both languages, Persian and Greek. By this time, a few interpreters had already been explicitly mentioned by their names: Pigres and Glus (Gehman, 1914; Hodgman, 1915, Roland, 1999), Pategyas and Pahlinus who were Persian and Greek, respectively (Hodgman, 1915). Moving forward in time, we can ascertain that the situation seems to have remained quite stable: there are still few studies on the figure of the war interpreter, until up to WWII, which is considered the watershed and coming of age of modern interpreting, and when records mention the interpreters of dictators, the Nuremberg Trials and the creation of International Organisations that brought to light the role played by these professionals (Gaiba, 1998; Roland, 1999; Delisle & Woodsworth, 2012; Baigorri 2014a). Despite the lack of studies, recently important efforts have been made to analyse more closely the role of interpreters and interpreting or oral translation in war scenarios (Baum, 2005; Dragovic-Drouet, 2007; Ozawa 2008; Baker, 2010; C. Baker, 2010a & 2010b; Collier, 2010; Bandow, 2013; Juvinall, ³⁴ 2334-2279 BCE. Semitic Akkadian emperor.
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2013; InZone, n.d.). These studies, however, appear scattered throughout scientific literature in different fields of study: interpreting, translation and history. In fact, if one were to focus on current conflicts, recent examples could be given such as Iraq, Afghanistan and Syria (Baigorri, 2011; Vieira, 2014), where records give no names, and even the presence of interpreters is not clearly acknowledged. However, more interest has been shown in obtaining a better understanding of the role played by interpreters (Vieira, 2014).

In fact, C. Baker (2010b) tells us how even today there are limited records of the position and responsibilities assumed by these professionals, based on the aforementioned author’s study of the use of local interpreters by the UK during the UNPROFOR deployment stage in BiH, where the First Battalion, the 22 Cheshire regiment, was present. This narrative offers a very insightful and in-depth description of the hiring and selection processes implemented by the British Army, while offering at the same time the specific details about the role, proficiency and attitude of the language intermediaries.

Similarly, when defining and categorising war interpreters, Allen (2012) classifies them into three clearly distinct groups of professionals - military linguists, contract interpreters and humanitarian interpreters -, establishing a series of identifying features and clear differences between the three groups.

Allen (2012) defines the figure of the military linguist as an interpreter who is a member of an established system, and as such, this particular group receives an important amount of financial resources to train staff to speak different languages required in the conflicts waged worldwide. However, when Kelly & Baker (2013) define interpreting in the military, they repeat the same idea that was clear throughout the historical review, namely the fact that the role of translators and interpreters is not clearly distinguished in this setting. These authors give different reasons for this: firstly, in the military no distinctions are made between translators and interpreters; secondly, the term interpreter is used to designate a high level of language proficiency; and thirdly, the denomination “military interpreter” includes all specialist language tasks, and not necessarily only interpreting and/or language mediation ones.

Allen (2012) includes author’s contracts’ or civilian interpreters hired with a specific contract in the second group. These professionals are the ones who provide the bulk of interpretation services in wars and armed conflicts when the level of violence is lowered (Kelly & Baker, 2013). They also have to juggle different skills and work in different settings, which can vary from accompanying on patrol to interpreting during key leader engagements (Allen, 2012). These skills are not only linguistic ones but also...
“soft skills” or cross-cultural competences, which are considered important assets in war and peacekeeping contexts, today (Ingold, 2014; Vieira, 2014) an element that is also highlighted by other authors such as Bos & Soeters (2006), C. Baker, (2010b), Lewis (2012), Baker and Kelly (2013).

The last group defined by Allen (2012) interpreters working on the ground with international aid and news organizations. Although they are less well known, they are very much in demand because their abilities and experience are at the same time essential for, and much sought-after by, the parties hiring them. These interpreters work for different organisations: for example, the Red Cross in Somalia or the Sudan, or for journalists who move to “hot spots” worldwide, like in 2010 and 2011 when many reporters went to Egypt and Northern Africa to cover the Arab Spring and its repercussions. The services of these professionals may also be required by relief agencies in disaster zones where there has been an earthquake or mass casualty incident. Whatever the scenario or whomever the party requiring their services is, they will need proficient and dependable language intermediaries who master local languages and dialects (Allen, 2012; Vieira, 2014).

However, if we go back to the first group of interpreters described by Allen (2012), military interpreters, Baigorri (2011) also highlights a series of features that could be added to Allen’s classification. For example, the author does not talk about military interpreters but rather military tasks, which can be carried out both by interpreters who are members of the military and civilians hired by the institution.

It must also be noted that often, if not most of the time, interpreters have been recruited only for their language skills and their loyalties or affiliations were not questioned (Vieira, 2014). So questions therefore, come to mind about aspects such as professional codes of ethics, moral stature, neutrality, self-confidence, presentation skills and knowledge of the topic covered in conflict scenarios. Indeed this would seem a particularly important issue as trust is considered a focal point in the military (Bos & Soeters, 2006; C. Baker, 2010b; Baigorri, 2011; Tipton, 2011, Askew & Salama-Carr, 2011; Vieira, 2014). In addition to this last notion, we may highlight the fact that, although the language knowledge of the military should be considered as important as any other aspect of their training, equal consideration should be given to ethics in interpreter and translator training. As a matter of fact, this issue is examined very carefully by Baker & Maier (2011), which is the reason why it is considered an important element to be taken into account for professionals working in the army, whatever the system used for their recruitment (C. Baker, 2010b; Tipton, 2011, Kelly & Baker, 2013). This is a consideration that is even extended to interpreters who are
members of the military; even though the majority of these interpreters are forced to accept the job either because the position they occupy in the chain in military command requires them to obey orders from a superior, or because it improves their status, whether it is pay or military rank (Baigorri, 2011).

When referring to the abovementioned military tasks, Baigorri (2011) states that a series of features must be taken into account when studying these scenarios because they could be very useful when analysing the interpreting process:

- Firstly, it is known that the military hierarchical chain of command can interfere in the appropriate performance of interpreting. Therefore, loyalty and trust (Vieira, 2014) are essential and cannot, and should not, be taken for granted, whether the professionals are especially employed for the job or recruited among potential enemies.

- Secondly, there is asymmetry in the relations that are established between the high-ranking officials requiring interpreting and the lower-rank personnel specialised in languages. This situation could lead to a reversion of hierarchy, which, in the military, would be considered unthinkable outside a war scenario.

- Thirdly, interpreters in these environments are required to work in many different setups, ranging from conversations and negotiations taking place behind closed doors to combat areas, special missions and intelligence units, amongst others, putting their lives at risk and even dying. This would provide added stress to the job and should also be taken into account.

Neutrality could be added to the previous list as it is another thorny issue in interpreting in general. Takeda (2012) describes how this concept is imposed on interpreters and how difficult it is to correlate the imposition to guarantee the actual behaviour of interpreters under certain circumstances because of the role they play in helping to resolve the conflict. Indeed, we should ask ourselves if neutrality would exist if the interpreter were a member of the other party (Takeda, 2012), as happens in many occasions in war zones (Kelly & Baker, 2013). This is also a concern in another highly stressful interpreting environment, namely medical interpreting (Vieira, 2014). At the same time, Van Dijk & Soeters tell us how interpreters recruited locally can be very useful:
Because of their knowledge of local vernaculars and cultural affinity, interpreters are able to close gaps, fill in blanks, support where needed, and save situations when necessary. (2008, p.90)

The foregoing clearly shows that interpreting in the military is a complex matter, where many different variables come into play and which should be accounted for before hiring an interpreter.

3.2. INTERPRETING IN THE DIPLOMATIC SPHERE

Although this study focuses on interpreting in the peacekeeping scenario, consideration must also be given to the pre-conflict stages in which high-level meetings are held and where interpreting is required to prevent the escalation of a conflict, so that war can be officially declared and agreements or treaties can be signed. These same encounters take place during the post-conflict stage in order to agree on the terms for the end of hostilities, sign a peace accord or organise peacekeeping activities. For the purposes of this dissertation, interpreting in the diplomatic sphere will not only refer to the interpreting activities that take place in embassies and consulates (Fuentes, 1999), but takes on a broader meaning by including accords (Cremona & Mallia, 2001), and encompassing activities carried out by professionals who worked with Heads of State, official foreign delegations and during the drafting of peace treaties and.

It is believed that European diplomacy as we know it today is of Byzantine origin (Roland, 1999) and it started with the appointment of permanent representatives to other nations. It is worth noting that although the Vatican sent the first of these missions in 452 CE to Byzantium, the first state mission acknowledged as such was that of the Duke of Milan to Cosimo de Medici in 1450 (Nicolson, 2001). Although interpreting activities in the diplomatic sphere started around this period, it still took another century before these emissaries became resident orators\(^\text{35}\), i.e. ambassadors appointed before a foreign court (Cáceres-Würsig, 2012). At first, anyone who had the skill to speak a foreign language was appointed to the position, such as barbers, chemists and merchants. With time, however, the Vatican insisted that these careers be reserved for nobility (Roland, 1999).

\(^{35}\) This denomination reveals the importance attributed to the language proficiency required from these individuals (Roland, 1999).
Ambassadors were initially not subjects of the king who employed them; this situation led to the creation of a large pool of diplomats serving different sovereigns in succession. However, in around the 16th century, concerns arose regarding the potential security risks posed by these individuals; hence, the requirement that they be citizens of the state they represented was institutionalised (Roland, 1999). But it must be noted that the representation of state interests was not new to this era; it was already a concern in 15th century Italy, when it was recognised that in order for the Italian state to survive, it needed representatives who would defend the Italy’s interests before the great powers of their time, namely strong monarchies like France and Spain (Nigro, 2006). In fact, the Italians also developed the figure of the government representative with diplomatic immunity (Nigro, 2006), an initiative that avoided the practice of “killing the messenger” or using the language intermediary as a scapegoat, as was the case in older times.

As we saw in §1.7-§1.9, interpreting in general and diplomatic interpreting in particular are different today compared to the past. Among other events, the changes were due to the following developments (Baigorri, 2014, p. 45-46):

- the gradual disappearance of French as “lingua franca” in favour of English after the 1919 Paris Peace Conference; a fact that was further confirmed by the increasingly present role of the United States in international affairs after WWI.

- The Nuremberg Trials (see§1.8) where interpreting was associated with highest political levels.

- The establishment of the United Nations in 1945 as a multilingual international forum for diplomatic exchanges among states.

- The professionalization of the diplomatic career, where experts held discussions that began to include all types of topics and not only war and peace.

- The changes that have taken place in the geopolitical map that lead to changes in power relations (Wang, Cao & Ge, 2015).

- The growing presence of civil society in international fora through Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) that have given a voice to many groups that never had the opportunity to be heard in the past.
Changes in information and communication technologies that have speeded exchanges and brought in new actors in the diplomatic process such as non-state actors (Gilboa, 2006).

Faster means of transportation.

Baigorri (2014b, p. 45-46) also provides the following reasons to explain these changes:

- the increase in the number of independent states.
- the creation of international and regional organisations.
- the fact that diplomatic meetings are no longer secret encounters but open and visible conversations that are broadcast worldwide in real time.
- the importance given to peace over armed conflict to solve national and international disagreements.
- the fact that English is the main language for communication used in diplomatic circles.
- the need for language intermediaries has increased due to the flourishing of diplomatic relations.

As all these reasons infer, there seems to be no doubt that diplomatic interpreting is here to stay because it cannot be forgotten that diplomacy is “the formal way of communication between states” (Baranyai, 2011, p.2), and there is no replacement for it as yet.

3.3. THE INTERPRETER IN PEACEKEEPING MISSIONS.

When discussing interpreting in the military sphere, a special mention should be given to interpreting during the post-war phase for relief and peacekeeping missions. When I analysed the different classifications of armed conflict, however, I also realised that peacekeeping is not only an ex-post action, but also an ex-ante one, in the sense that peacekeeping measures do not only target maintaining peace after a conflict, but also before it happens. Indeed, we will see in Chapter 6 that peacekeeping missions are deployed not only before a conflict arises, but also even during the most aggressive stages of a conflict to ensure the protection of civilians. Besides, the peacekeeping setting and interpreters working in this scenario are the main topics of
this dissertation, and hence require an overview for a better understanding of the operation and deployment of these missions.

3.3.1. Definition of peacekeeping missions

In this section I will analyse the nature of a peacekeeping mission as part of the armed conflict process where the interpreter will play an important role. These missions were initially actions carried out by the United Nations in order to secure a peaceful transition in countries which had suffered a war (UNDP, n.d.)

According to Goulding (1993, p. 453), “peacekeeping is a technique which has been developed, mainly by the United Nations, to help control and resolve armed conflicts”, though the author goes on to state that there is not a specific definition as such; nor is there agreement as to when the first peacekeeping operation was set up. Moreover, today peacekeeping is not only done by the UN, but also by other international bodies such as NATO and EUFOR. Despite all this, it seems that the first time the United Nations officially recognised the existence of a peacekeeping mission was in the case of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization (UNTSO), which was deployed for the first time in 1943 in Palestine (Goulding, 1993). At the same time, it appears that the origins of peacekeeping could be traced back to the delimitation commissions that were in charge of redrawning European Frontiers established in the early 1920s just after WWI (James, 1990 as quoted by Goulding, 1993).

Notwithstanding the foregoing, there are a series of principles that would allow us to define peacekeeping missions more precisely and accurately (Goulding, 1993):

1. Peacekeeping operations are United Nations operations established by one of the legislative organs of the United Nations under the command and control of the Secretary-General acting in the name of the Security Council. Costs are met collectively by the member states.

2. Peacekeeping operations can only be set up with the consent of the parties to the conflict in question. Success is determined by their continuing consent and cooperation.

3. Peacekeepers must be impartial between the parties, i.e. no one should advance the interests of one party against those of the other.

4. Troops are provided by the member states by means of binding agreements with the Security Council as it is not practicable for the United Nations to maintain a standing army.
5. Force should be used only to the minimum extent necessary and fire should be opened only in self-defence.

As can be observed, these principles provide a good foundation for the development of a definition as minted by Goulding:

Field operations established by the United Nations, with the consent of the parties concerned, to help control and resolve conflicts between them, under United Nations command and control, at the expense collectively of the member states, and with military and other personnel and equipment provided voluntarily by them, acting impartially between the parties and using force to the minimum extent necessary (1993, p. 455).

This definition limits peacekeeping activities to the UN, as this was the first international body to engage in such actions. However with the passing of time, both NATO and the European Union (See EUFOR, chapter 7) became involved in operations aimed at establishing peace in the theatres of the Republics of the Former Yugoslavia. Therefore a more general definition of peacekeeping missions that would also cover the actions implemented by regional operations could be:

“... Operations which are undertaken by multinational coalitions, with or without warring sides’ approval, conducted neutrally, in accordance with international legislation in order to keep on predetermined peace process or ceasefire and prevent, moderate and terminate the hostilities between or within states...” (Başar, Siğri, & Caforio, 2014, p. 48).

This is a more general definition of these missions and more in line with the current situation of peacekeeping because, as already mentioned, these operations are no longer solely carried out by the UN but by regional bodies (de Luna, 2014).

**3.3.2. Main features and scenarios where peacekeeping missions are deployed**

Having finally defined what a peacekeeping mission is, it is worth mentioning that actions within peacekeeping and relief missions can take place in two completely different scenarios. Firstly, on the field, with exchanges taking place between military members, aid organisations and civilians, a context where locals are hired for language interpreting. Secondly, meetings and encounters far from where the action takes place,
and where professional negotiators, support staff and highly-trained professionals meet (Edwards, 2002). This means that peacekeeping missions will also have to implement the decisions of these groups of professionals who carry out tasks of a diverse nature, and which will range from building fundamental and sustainable institutions for governance and the monitoring and protection of human rights to carrying out reforms in the security sector, disarmament, demobilisation and facilitating the reintegration of former combating parties into civil life (UN, n.d.).

Therefore a varied and multifaceted group of professionals will be working in the field within peacekeeping missions, including the following:

- Administrators.
- Economists.
- Police officers.
- Legal experts.
- De-miners.
- Electoral observers.
- Human rights monitors.
- Civil affairs and governance specialists.
- Humanitarian workers.
- Communications and public information experts (UN, n.d.).

We can therefore infer that such a broad range of expertise, which is part and parcel of a peacekeeping mission, already reveals how difficult the interpreter’s role will be since working for all these different professionals requires them to cover specific fields of concepts, knowledge and terminology. But not only that, it also requires learning how to cope with work in stressful conditions akin to those encountered by interpreters who work at court (Hale, 2006, 2007) or medical settings (Hale, 2007; Ingold, 2014; Vieira, 2014).

Bos & Soeters (2006) add that peacekeeping operations typically comprise different national contingents with different and diverse language requirements. Added to this fact we find that they are usually stationed in areas where only the local languages are spoken and speakers of western languages are scarce. These languages are sometimes spoken by minority language groups as in the case of the Central African Republic (CAR), where, though French and Sango are the two official languages, there
are at least another 72 that are recognised as a means of communication among the population. Other cases we can mention are those of Afghanistan and Bosnia (Bos & Soeters, 2006), where both local civilians and local troops were not familiar with Western European languages (Bos & Soeters, 2006), with all the challenges a situation like this entails.

Consequently, it is apparent that in a peacekeeping scenario language requirements change because talking, i.e. communication between the parties, now becomes more important than fighting (Bos & Soeters, 2006). This is the reason why interpreters with the appropriate skills should be chosen.

3.3.3. Interpreting in peacekeeping missions

Edwards (2002) describes the skills required of interpreters working in peace missions, which are similar to those required in any war scenario. Among others, they quote the ability to interpret/translate in both directions, to cover different topics and texts ranging from very simple to highly specialised matters (a treaty, a law, a handwritten letter, a user manual, a medical textbook, for instance) and the capacity to do so on the spot without the use of a dictionary or any other source of help. All of these are quite simple yet very demanding requirements (Edwards, 2002). At the same time, interpreters will also have to be the cultural and even diplomatic and political intermediary between the different groups. This could mean that they run the risk of being considered as belonging to “no man’s land” since they are sometimes shunned by the local population and troops, and are only accepted by the forces for whom they work for in the employment sphere, but not at other levels (Bos & Soeters, 2006).

All these factors coalesce together leading to the fact that interpreters will naturally have to be recruited locally in most cases. Therefore, their origin will be diverse: from academics or people with university degrees to migrants, refugees and victims. All of these individuals, whatever their level of education, are recruited because they are “on the ground”, easily available and cheaper to hire (Bos & Soeters, 2006).

Consequently Edwards (2002) suggests that in a recruitment process when selecting local interpreting staff, recruiters should be looking for bicultural, bilingual experts because they can detect nuances that might otherwise be overlooked by a non-native speaker (Akinsulure-Smith, 2007). Should this not be possible, then the recruitment process should take into account the following issues when hiring an interpreter for this scenario (Edwards, 2002):
• Realise that an oral selection process is absolutely necessary to assess both the general knowledge and language skills of the candidates.

• Assess whether the candidate should be able to work quickly and accurately.

• Understand that it is imperative to find local candidates that are impartial, despite the difficulties one may encounter when trying to do so in these scenarios.

3.4. Conclusions

As mentioned in the introduction to this dissertation, the role of the “interpreter at war” or “the interpreter in armed conflicts” is not a simple and linear one. On the contrary, interpreters employed in these scenarios will have to work for multiple parties and in different settings which include the military or military institutions, the diplomatic sphere and peacekeeping missions. In all of these scenarios, these professionals will have to face different challenges, adapting their skills and knowledge to what is required of them. As far as peacekeeping is concerned, interpreters will have to cope with the challenges that come with an operation that combines both military and civilian expertise, as well as the enormous challenges that are encountered in a state or peace-building process which entail covering broad-ranging issues such as administration matters, healthcare and demining, to mention just a few. Therefore, it can be presumed that interpreting a peacekeeping scenario is not without challenges and institutions deploying missions abroad will clearly have to take these problems into consideration in order to allocate the most appropriate linguistic resources to each mission.
CHAPTER 4. INTERPRETING MODALITIES USED IN WAR-RELATED SCENARIOS

4.1. DEFINITIONS OF INTERPRETING

According to the EU website (SCIC, n.d.), conference interpreting is a mode of interpreting that only deals with verbal communication, in a situation where a message in the source language (SL) is conveyed into the target language (TL), naturally and fluently, adopting the delivery, tone and convictions of the speaker and speaking in the first person. This general definition only refers to the communication process itself and does not take into account the means (if any) used by the interpreter to receive the SL message and convey it in the TL discourse. At the same time, all these features would apply to both Consecutive Interpreting (CI) and Simultaneous Interpreting (SI).

Similarly, Gile (2006) offers us an equivalent definition but adds an additional feature: the context in which interpreters work. He pinpoints the diverse nature of these contexts, not limiting them only to conferences but also including meetings of committees and working groups in international organisations, visits of personalities, meetings of board directors of large corporations, medical and pharmaceutical launches, information technology, economic and other scientific and technical training seminars, TV programmes, arbitration proceedings and even court trials. As a result, we see that the borders between liaison, court and media interpreting become blurred.

Hale (2006), on the other hand, states that the main feature of conference interpreting (both SI and CI) is defined by the level of interaction taking place in the communication process. This means that conference interpreting would be monologic, as the “main objective is to convey the propositional content in the clearest, most accessible way” (Hale, 2007, p. 24). This definition is not all-inclusive as it cannot be applied to liaison interpreting.

Finally Pöchhaker defines interpreting from the point of view of text-processing, considering it an activity that is carried out in real time, which highlights the difficulties that interpreting may present:

Interpreting is a form of translation in which a first and final rendition in another language is produced on the basis of a one-time presentation of an utterance in a source language (Pöchhaker, 2004, p. 11)
This definition describes one of the most important features common to all modalities of interpreting, which is the immediacy of production of the target message.

Notwithstanding the foregoing, when talking about conference interpreting, understood only as SI and CI, it is worth noting that this technique was employed officially for the first time in the Paris Conference after WWI, and the modality used was CI (see § 2). This is the first record there is of the use of CI at an international gathering and in international organisations (Baigorri, 2000; Delisle & Woodsworth, 2012), and therefore one should avoid the mistake of referring to SI only when using the denomination conference interpreting (Gile, 2006). Other modalities of interpreting that are also used less in traditional conference scenarios and more in non-traditional ones are liaison interpreting, sight translation and chuchotage.

4.2. INTERPRETING MODALITIES

4.2.1. Sight translation (STR)

Sight translation is indeed considered an important discipline, as can be inferred from the fact that the different courts around the USA publish handbooks in which they advise candidates on how to prepare to perform correctly in this modality. The importance of this technique is also defined by the fact it is used both as an accreditation test for certain public bodies such as the South African Qualifications Authority (SAQA) in South Africa, Public Service Interpreters in the UK, NAATI (Nation Accreditation Authority for Translators and Interpreters) for its accreditation exams in Australia, or NAJIT (National Association of Judiciary Interpreters and Translators) in the USA, and to be officially certified as a sworn-in translator and interpreter in Brazil, you are also required to pass successfully a STR test (Sampaio, 2007).

Sight translation is a distinct mode of interpreting in which one of the most important elements to take into account is the pressure imposed by the immediacy of time: the interpreter has to provide an accurate and correct rendition in the target language (TL) text practically simultaneously while reading the source language (SL) text (Shreve, Lacruz & Angelone, 2010), which means that is has been used as a preliminary exercise for the acquisition of SI skills (Viezzi, 1989). The fact that they cannot resort to dictionaries and other documentation sources or tools makes this technique ever more challenging for the interpreter. Diplomatic interpreters are also asked occasionally to sight translate texts (Alaska Courts, 2015). In the United States, as it is considered an essential technique for community interpreting purposes, a great
deal of concern has been expressed about the quality of sight translation, which is reflected in the fact they wish to identify appropriate individuals to perform sight translations (Stansfield, 2008).

Although the scope of application of the main skills of a sight translator in this case is limited to the US court system, it nonetheless provides us with insight into the skills required for practicing this type of interpreting; and hence on a broader level, they could be applied to sight translation assignments in general. This means that in order to be a good sight translator, a series of conditions should be met such as:

- A high level of literacy and rapid interpretation skills, for a natural rendering of the text.
- Prior experience in sight translation in general and not only in one area (in this case legal).
- A high level of proficiency in both the SL and TL, and solid knowledge of the culture and geographic region where the SL and TL are spoken.

When it comes to how often this modality is used, Gile (2009) considers STR is used less frequently than SI and CI, though an exception would have to be made for international organisations, and the community interpreting setting (courts, medical consultations, police interviews) or in scenarios where liaison interpreting would be required (field trips, visits to factories and other industrial premises, negotiations, peace accords) where it is more commonly used.

If we wished to categorise STR, it could be classified as a hybrid form of oral written translation (Viaggio, 1995; Sampaio, 2007, Trovato, 2012) as it includes elements from both translation and interpreting. The dual nature of STR means that some authors consider it a variant of translation proper (Biela-Wolonciej, 2007), while others feel that it is as an interpreting modality (Jiménez & Hurtado, 2003); and finally, there are authors who consider it to be both of these things (Agrifoglio, 2004; Dragsted & Hansen, 2009). In this line, Sampaio (2007) has reviewed the different definitions that have been developed for STR by other authors such as Moser-Mercer (1997), who agrees that as both aural and visual information processing skills are involved in the performance process, STR could be considered a modality of either translation or interpretation. Meanwhile Angelelli (1999), who considers STR an oral translation of a written text, adds to this definition the particularity that the rendering in the TL should sound as if the interpreter were merely reading a text in the target language. For their part, Jiménez & Hurtado (2003) define this modality of interpreting
as an oral reformulation of a written text for a listener, and consider STR to be a modality of interpreting in its own right.

4.2.2. Chuchotage or whispered interpreting

Interestingly enough, there is hardly any literature on this modality of interpreting, as corroborated by Pöchhacker (2001), who believes that more comparative studies should be carried out to identify the similarities and differences between the different modes and domains of interpreting, particularly comparing whispered interpreting versus simultaneous (Pöchhacker, 2001). The general opinion is that it is similar to SI, and in fact many authors in the world of community interpreting, when referring to simultaneous, are in fact referring to whispered interpreting (Jacobsen, 2012; Mikelson, 2014). However, the fact that peacekeeping negotiations in the field employ this technique (Edwards, 2002) and that it is used in courtrooms (Jacobsen, 2012), at meetings or other fora where there are only one or two delegates who speak a minority language and are listening to the interpreter, make it worthwhile a mention.

Chuchotage is the French term used by interpreters worldwide to refer to whispered interpreting (Edwards, 2002; Pagura, 2003), though “whispering” is also used. It is categorised as a sub-modality of simultaneous interpreting (Kopczynski, 1984; Alexieva, 1997; Pagura, 2003; Diriker 2013; Hale & Ozolins, 2014) because it is a one way translation where there is no active involvement of the interpreter (Diriker, 2013). In this case, the interpreter is not in a booth isolated from the audience, but usually present in the conference room next to the delegate or delegates who require his/her service (Jones, 2002; Pagura, 2003; Prario, 2008). Hence, the interpreter has to rely on room acoustics, and usually has to interpret without the aid of technical equipment (Pagura, 2003; Hale, 2007, Prario, 2008). If the latter were to be used, we would be taking about booth-less SI or bidule interpreting. In this case a portable system with a microphone for the interpreter and a set of headphones for the listeners would be required. The inherent difficulty of this modality of interpreting means that AIIC -International Association of Conference Interpreters- (2002) recommends it should only be used in exceptional cases (See Annex 3).

4.2.3. Consecutive interpreting

Jones (2002) provides a clear-cut and precise definition of CI, which is described as an act of communication where:
(... the interpreter listens to the totality of a speaker's comments, or at least a significant passage, and then reconstitutes the speech with the help of notes taken while listening; the interpreter is thus speaking consecutively to the original speaker, hence the name. (2002, p. 5-6)

Gile's (1985) description of the CI process is very similar, the only difference being that he adds a time dimension to the length of the incoming speech, stating that the interpreter listens to a segment of a speech in the SL that is usually a few minutes long, very rarely more than 15 minutes, and then renders it in the TL. Gillies (2005) extends this time to 20 minutes. I believe the time dimension is an important specification for it defines the magnitude of the burden imposed on the interpreter's cognitive resources, because usually the longer the time the information has to be stored is, the greater probability there is that the interpreter will forget the information as a result of a STM overload. Consequently, it could be inferred that during the CI process the interpreter must retain information for a relatively long period of time. In CI, and also SI for that matter, information is not retained in linguistic terms, but rather in terms of ideas and concepts. In other words, the focus is not on remembering terms and isolated words, but ideas and concepts. To do this, the interpreter requires good or well-trained retention and recall skills. As we have seen before, interpreters also use notes to support their memory and eventually produce the TL discourse (Jones, 2007). This is particularly important to remember when the incoming SL discourse is long, and note-taking can play an important role as a memory prompter.

Note-taking in CI is the method used to write down the ideas expressed in the SL discourse, in such a way that the meaning can be relayed into the TL. Gillies (2005) goes on to describe the process by stating that the original speech is a group of ideas that are expressed in a specific order with relationships that link them together. These ideas should be relayed correctly in the TL version. In order for this to happen, a special system of annotation called note-taking is used. The notes taken down are an outline of the structure, where the underlying logic and content of the SL speech is clearly visible, i.e., notes are a visual representation of the analysis the interpreter makes of the SL speech, and they are the result of first having heard and understood which is the key message of the SL speech (Gillies, 2005). They are not a verbatim record of the speech but a system that uses symbols, abbreviations, acronyms and sometimes single words to express ideas in writing.

Rozan (1956) was the first to lay down the basic principles of note-taking. He insists on the fact that notes should be a mere outline or sketch of the general discourse, that note-taking should not be a time-consuming process, and that notes
should allow the interpreter to recall, with just casting one glance at them, what the message to be delivered is.

In fact, the notation system, in other words the symbols used, is also considered a time-saving strategy (Gile, 2005) and all the existing systems (Herbert, 1968; Rozan 1956, Matyssek, 1989 quoted in Albl-Mikasa, 2008) insist on the fact that the note-taking system should aid in reducing the time to note down ideas (Gumul, 2007). At the same time, we must remember that in the CI process the interpreter is trying to understand the discourse, analysing and understanding the underlying logic (Albl-Mikasa, 2008), which is in line with Funayama’s (2004) proposal, i.e. going beyond the words and focusing on the main ideas of the message. In fact, Kohn & Kalina (1996) state that to prepare for the production of the TL discourse, the interpreter takes strategic notes that should help to retrieve SL discourse content from memory during the production phase.

Gile (2009) also reminds us that note-taking is critical for processing capacity. This is due to the manual nature of the notation process and the time lag that occurs between notation and the incoming speech, as note-taking requires more time than the latter. The fact that the interpreter may not have a symbol readily available reduces his/her available capacity to deal with the next phases, Listening and Analysis, as well as the time the interpreter invests in recall, reducing the availability of processing capacity for the former. Though it still remains to be seen what impact notes have in triggering working memory operations such as storage, retrieval of previously stored information and recall. It would seem that more studies have to be carried out in order to explain the importance of note-taking and the effect it has on processing capacity.

4.2.4. Simultaneous interpreting

In my opinion, Setton’s (1999) definition is the most appropriate and unambiguous description of Simultaneous Interpreting (SI):

Simultaneous Interpreting (SI), a service which allows participants at international meetings to speak and follow proceedings in their own languages is widely viewed as a particularly impressive form of rapid, instant translation (...). We shall be concerned here exclusively with conference SI as practised in professional conditions, in which interpreters in a soundproof booth with headsets, control consoles and microphones, and a direct view on the meeting room, deliver versions of the discourse in different languages “on line” with a lag of few seconds, alternating every 20-30 minutes or as Speakers take turns on the conference floor (1999, p. 1).
In fact, this process can be outlined more clearly using the chart developed by Chen & Dong (2010):

![Figure 2. SI process (Chen & Dong, 2010).](image)

Jones (2002) also describes the process in a similar fashion, but emphasising the speed and the stress the interpreter suffers as a result of the simultaneity of actions. Gile (2009) adds to these difficulties the lack of reaction time as probably one of the most serious problems the interpreter has to face during the interpreting process. Along the same lines, Ilg (1958) talks about the huge concentration efforts that have to be made by the interpreter to “transpose” the message, and the impact this has on voice quality and breathing.

Two concepts that must be taken into account when talking about SI is ear-voice span (EVS), also called delay or décalage, and split attention. EVS refers to the time lag it takes for the interpreter to hear and process the incoming message, and start uttering the TL discourse. Split attention describes the ability to handle two cognitive tasks at the same time, which in SI refers to the interpreter’s ability to carry out two tasks at the same time: listening and uttering an accurate, faithful rendition of the SL discourse. This skill requires a lot of processing capacity and hence, attentional resources, which seem to suggest the need to train them.

As can be clearly derived from previous analyses, many challenges would arise from the performance of SI, such as: anticipation, rewording, avoidance of calques of structures and false friends, right choice of words, good communications skills, spontaneous TL discourse and monitoring of output, all of which will have an important bearing on the memory resources of the interpreter.

### 4.2.4.1. SI with text

When talking about SI, there is another sub-modality that should also be covered: SI with text (Setton, 2006; Setton & Motta, 2007; Gile 2009). The fact that this modality combines both oral and written input makes it a complex exercise (Setton & Motta, 2007; Gile, 2009). While this modality is considered an interpreting mode halfway between translation and interpreting (Setton, 2006), it should not be confused with STR, as Gile (2009) reminds us that SI with text requires an additional effort to
STR, namely the Listening Effort, which would explain the risks of linguistic interference in the Production phase.

However, SI with text is used increasingly at international meetings, among other reasons because of time restrictions and budgetary limits and also because there are more and more non-native speakers who require the support of a text to deliver their contributions (Setton 2006; Setton & Motta, 2007). This modality would also be extremely important during war or peace negotiations, or the meetings of drafting committees, where the importance of written text is essential as these documents will be proof of the agreements/disagreements between the parties.

Finally, it must be remembered that although text may be used as an aid, when interpreting simultaneously with a text one should always give pre-eminence to the speech/verbal message conveyed by the speaker because there could be deviations from the written text (Gile, 2009).

4.3. General Interpreting Skills for All Modalities

If we focus on the initial skills required for interpreting, it could be stated that the general conference interpreting skills defined by Kalina (2002), as well as other skills enumerated by different authors (Christoffels, 2006; Khon & Kalina, 1996), would be necessary to ensure good performance in any of the modalities mentioned in this chapter:

- First and foremost excellent language skills, as language proficiency is a determining factor for speed and accuracy in the interpreter’s performance (Christoffels, 2006). A good level of language proficiency also requires command of different registers, usages, styles and cultural references (Kalina, 2002). Similarly, it entails possessing a sound knowledge of conference terminology and stock phrases which can be learnt during the training period. Good language skills are important because otherwise interpreters run the risk of not understanding the speaker, or in the worst of cases, end up making serious mistakes (Kremer, 2005) that could jeopardise their professional career.

- A diversified knowledge base (Kohn & Kalina, 1996) which would also include mastering specialised terminology and concepts in the domains of politics, economics and IT; all of which are mainstreaming topics spanning different fields of knowledge. In the case of war scenarios, we should add
sound knowledge of weaponry and military ranks, as well as Rosado’s (2014) suggestion of relevant military and peacekeeping know-how of checkpoints, medical support, training host nation armed forces and cultural awareness; the latter view is also shared by Vieira (2014).

- Memory, which should be used and managed as efficiently as possible. In interpreting in general, it is clear that both the details and the general structure of the discourse are important.

- Text processing strategies such as the recognition of cues in sentences (links), grammatical structures, idioms, false friends, among others. Good inference, comprehension and text analysis skills would seem a useful asset for this purpose.

- Good public speaking skills. Clear, enunciation, control of breathing, learning to speak with conviction, a regular pace when delivering the TL discourse are, among others, valuable skill competences to possess.

From what we have discovered about interpreting, it can be said that it is a complex skill and there is no single term that clearly defines the task that has to be carried out by the interpreter because it is a discipline that encompasses many modalities. It therefore needs to be qualified, i.e. the precise modality of interpreting that is required in each situation must be selected because each stage of a conflict and type of encounter will have its specific requirements (Edwards, 2006).

4.4. CONCLUSIONS

In this chapter a series of different modalities of interpreting have been described: sight translation, chuchotage or whispered interpreting, consecutive interpreting, simultaneous interpreting (SI) and SI with text. Each comes with its own challenges and demands. For Edwards (2002), the two most used modalities in peacekeeping scenarios are consecutive and chuchotage, the latter a modality that is hardly ever mentioned in the scientific literature, maybe because of its consideration as a sub-modality of simultaneous interpreting (Kopczynski, 1984; Alexieva, 1997; Pagura, 2003; Merode, 2011; Diriker, 2013; 2012, Ozolins, 2014). Despite this, and after having reviewed the different interpreting scenarios in Chapter 2, it will be interesting to see, in the second part of this dissertation, which modalities are most used and which modes should be trained for working in a peacekeeping scenario.
Another issue that should be taken into account is that not all interpreters are willing or even able to work in all interpreting modalities. There are professionals who prefer to work from their notes, interacting with the parties doing CI, whereas others feel more comfortable working in a booth, isolated from the speakers in simultaneous mode. Whatever the case, it is important to identify the best mode of interpreting for each setting, and assign the best professionals for the modality and the setting concerned. This would be even more so important for interpreters working in conflict/peacekeeping scenarios, since they are subject to very specific conditions in areas where there may be violence, and their lives and personal security could be at risk, even if they work for a peacekeeping operation and are not in an open war setting.

Finally, all these matters will be taken into account in the following chapters, where the working conditions and expectations that both users and interpreters have with respect to the role of the interpreter will be researched. I felt it would be useful to have both opinions (users and interpreters) in order to suggest possible paths to take in the future for a better description of the tasks to be performed when interpreting and the training of interpreters.
Chapter 5. History of Bosnia

5.1. Introduction

The war in the former Yugoslavia, and more specifically the war in Bosnia, can only be explained by analysing, albeit briefly, the past of the region and the role played by Bosnia within it. Despite the common ancestry of the states involved in the Yugoslav war, Slovenia, Croatia, and Bosnia-Herzegovina were very different in ethnic, religious and cultural matters. While Serbia and Montenegro had been independent nations, Macedonia and Bosnia had been part of the Ottoman Empire; and Slovenia, Croatia and Bosnia had belonged to the Austro-Hungarian Empire. As we will see later on in this section, these states were forced to coexist together since (Passage, 2011) the 7th century CE (Cabrera, 1994; Benson, 2004; Passage, 2011). Having said this, I would like to indicate that this dissertation is not a comprehensive historical study on the former Yugoslavia and the war, nor a complete review of the war of all former Yugoslav republics, but a case study of interpreting at EUFOR BiH ALTHEA, the peacekeeping mission deployed on Bosnian soil. As a result, in this section I will focus exclusively on the historical background of this Bosnia, and at the same time describe how the complex historical and political background is both an explanation and a clear precedent for all the ensuing events that took place after the independence of the states of the former Yugoslavia.

In order to better understand the situation in the region, I have included a timeline that includes the most important events in the region’s history, illustrated chronologically.
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**Figure 3.** Timeline of the Third Bosnian War (Cabrera, 1994; Glenny, 1996; “Bosnia-Herzegovina Profile”, 2015; “Chronology”, 2008).
From the existing accounts (Cabrera, 1994; Glenny, 1996; Benson, 2004) on the origins of the different states in the region, there is agreement about the fact that the Slavic tribes from the area that is today’s Poland, Baltic countries and European Russia migrated towards the south of the Danube between the 5\textsuperscript{th} and 7\textsuperscript{th} centuries CE (Cabrera, 1994; Benson, 2004). This meant that when in the 7\textsuperscript{th} century Bosnia became a Slavic principedom with links to the weakened Eastern Roman Empire, there were 25 different Slavic tribes settled in the region. The arrival of these tribes drove the region’s previous inhabitants such as Albanians and Rumanians, among others, to the mountains and forced them to subsist on farming, while at the same time estranging them from the Roman civilisation. Likewise, Serbs, Croats and Bosnians also split because at the beginning of the Middle Ages, Serbs were under Byzantine jurisdiction (following the orthodox rite), while Croats remained under Rome’s rule (Catholic rite) and Bosnians were Bogomils\textsuperscript{36} persecuted by the Orthodox Church (Cabrera, 1994).

Though the first mention of Bosnia appears in a text by Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos (Constantine “the Purple-Born”\textsuperscript{37}), suggesting that the state belonged to Serbia, there does not seem to be agreement in old historical records about this situation because in the 12\textsuperscript{th} century historians considered that Bosnia belonged to Croatia. In any event, Bosnia was later conquered by Basil the Porphyrogenitus (Basil the Slayer), falling under Serbian rule. In 1377, Tvrtko I crowned himself king of Bosnia and Serbia (Bádenas, 1995). From this date until 1527, Bosnia was an independent state. In the meantime, in 1389 the Ottoman victory increased the divide between the Eastern and Western parts of the region, and in 1527 Bosnia was conquered by the Ottoman Empire and was no longer independent. Despite the conquest, the Bosnian population, which was used to mixing with other ethnicities and religions, adapted to and assimilated the culture they lived with for over four centuries (Cabrera, 1994, Bádenas, 1995).

After the fall of the Kingdom into Ottoman hands in 1527, Bosnia was occupied for many years by the Ottoman Empire, which was responsible for the introduction of Islam in Bosnia. This was aided by the circumstance that large Bosnian landowners and gentry felt that as they had been persecuted by the Orthodox Church in the past because they were Bogomils, it would be safer for them to ally with the conqueror in order to preserve their privileges; this explains why the Islamisation process happened

\textsuperscript{36} Bogomilism, a dualist religio-political sect that believed that all material creations were the work of the devil (Cabrera, 1994).

\textsuperscript{37} Emperor of the Byzantine Empire.
so quickly. From this moment on, Bosnia became the torchbearer of the Ottoman Empire (Cabrera, 1994). But then again nationalistic ideas started brewing between 1739 and 1876 as a result of Serbia’s emancipation. In 1876 there was an uprising in the country and many Bosnians were killed by the irregular Turkish army, prompting Russia to intervene against the Ottoman Empire. As the Austro-Hungarian Empire had been neutral, it was granted the provisional administration of Bosnia-Herzegovina at the Congress of Berlin in 1878, although the territory continued under Turkish sovereignty. The annex to the protocol stated that a full-blown annexation by the Austro-Hungarian Empire would been acknowledged even by Russia if it took place; therefore, the 1908 Young Turk revolution was used as an excuse by the Austro-Hungarian Empire to annexe Bosnia and Herzegovina in 1908, after centuries of Ottoman occupation. However, the hostility that Bosnians felt against the Austrians, coupled with Serbian irredentism, led to the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand of Austria, an event that triggered WWI (Cabrera, 1994; Benson, 2004).

Following the collapse of the Austro-Hungarian Empire in 1918 after WWI, the Kingdom of Yugoslavia was created and Bosnia proclaimed itself part of the kingdom. This new Kingdom was a composite country that also included Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, and in 1929 it formally adopted the name Yugoslavia. Though this new state unified the different nations under one single rule, it continued to be complex and diverse politically, historically and culturally. Despite these differences, Yugoslavia remained one country until WWII when, during the German occupation, Croatia was granted independence between 1941 and 1945; in this process, the territory of Bosnia-Herzegovina was also included in this newly independent state (Glenny, 1996; Bjarnason, 2001). However, it must be noted that during the WWII period, struggles and fighting in the Yugoslav territory were mainly of a civil war nature, i.e. among Serbs, Croats and Bosnians, resulting in the region becoming a theatre where all national parties fought against each other. The consequences of this fighting were the many atrocities all the different parties at war committed against each other (Bjarnason, 2001).

When WWII ended, the situation continued just like before the war, with all three ethnic and national groups consolidated in one large, artificial state, although borders were changed and redesigned (Glenny, 1996; Bjarnason, 2001). This type of solution once again had the effect of misaligning ethnic and state borders in the region, which has always created problems whenever it has been implemented in other parts of the world, Southeast Europe being no exception to (Reményi, 2012). In 1943, Josef Broz “Tito” was named Prime Minister of Yugoslavia (Hinerfeld, 2013), and after the war socialism was introduced (Glenny, 1996; Bjarnason, 2001; Hinerfeld, 203). Under
Tito’s authoritarian rule, expressions of Bosnian, Serbian and Croatian nationalism were repressed (Bjarnason, 2001), and none of the different ethnic groups was considered more important than the other. Such was Tito’s zeal in ensuring this “equality” that if, for instance, a Bosnian Serb was taken to trial for political crimes, a Bosnian Serb and a Bosnian Muslim would be also tried on another occasion, whether or not they had committed those crimes (Glenny, 1996).

After Tito’s death in 1980, the first economic problems started to arise, which would later on lead to the collapse of the Yugoslavian Federation. These problems, which included, among others, the high level of foreign debt, the rampant inflation, the lowering of purchasing power, and the worsening of the standard of living, intensified the differences between the republics (Cabrera, 1994), causing the collapse of the federated system in Yugoslavia and the return to the multiplicity of religions and ethnicities that had forcibly coexisted together under Tito’s regime (Cabrera, 1994; Glenny, 1996).

Until 1989, serious nationalistic confrontations had only taken place in Kosovo, the Serbian province with a Muslim majority, a situation that led to the development of a “dormant” or latent conflict in the region (Cabrera, 1994). In 1990, elections were held in all of the republics: Slovenia in April; Croatia in May; Macedonia in November; and Serbia, in December. Bosnia also held elections in December 1990, and by then the causes of the imminent war could already be envisaged. The result of the elections was the formation of a national coalition government in Bosnia, presided by Alija Izetbegovic. In spite of these election results, there were clear signs of the problems that would arise in the future, due to the complications stemming from the multiplicity of weak political parties representing the many ethnic groups in the country, as well as the impossibility of these parties being able to span all of the communities (Campbell, 1998; Bjarnason, 2001).

5.2. THE BOSNIAN WAR

After the elections, Croatia and Slovenia declared their independence from the Federation of Yugoslavia in 1991. Immediately after, tensions broke out in the region and war was declared between the Slovenian and the Yugoslav Federal Army (JNA), as the latter feared the financial loss that would involve losing Croatian tourism income as well as the industry on the Adriatic Coast. However, the war in Slovenia was short-lived because the Serb minority in this country was not so numerous, which meant there was not as much internal resistance from the Serbs living in Croatia (Bjarnason, 2001). At the same time, there were still signs of tension in the region, with the concurrent
waging of the war between Serbia and Croatia. Despite this, Germany immediately recognised Croatia on 23rd December 1991, an action that was followed by the rest of the EU in January 1992; Slovenia was also recognised as an independent state in 1992. On 29th February and 1st March, Bosnia and Herzegovina held a referendum for independence from Yugoslavia. BiH was recognised as independent by the European Union on 6th April 1992, followed on 22nd May by the recognition of independence of Slovenia; Croatia and Bosnia Herzegovina did not become UN members until 1992 (Kalyvas & Sambanis, 2005).

Although Bosnians had approved independence in this referendum, the Bosnian Serbs resisted this solution, and with the support of the JNA went on to occupy the territory. This action, together with the shots that were fired at a Serbian wedding party in Sarajevo (presumably an unidentified sniper), led to the Serbs setting up barricades in the capital and to the breakout of war on 6th April (Campbell, 1998). Meanwhile, as Serbia was relentless in its aggressive attacks against Bosnia, the UN Security Council imposed economic sanctions on Serbia. Furthermore, as the humanitarian crisis escalated that summer, and there were also repeated violations of human rights, the UN Security Council adopted Resolution 743 (1992), approving the deployment of UN peacekeepers to Bosnia. As a result, UNPROFOR, with 14,000 men and supported by the UNHCR (UN High Commission for Refugees), started its operations in the area (Kalyvas & Sambanis, 2005; Knezović, 2005), the aim being to ensure humanitarian relief reached its destination and to protect Sarajevo, which is why a “no fly zone” was created (Passage, 2011). In 1993, tensions reached their peak and peacekeepers were deployed to the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (FYROM), and the International Tribunal for Former Yugoslavia to prosecute those violating humanitarian law was established by UN Resolution 827(1993) (Passage, 2011). This is the stage of the war when the planned Vance-Owen Peace Plan proved unsuccessful, the bridge in Mostar was destroyed and the Massacre of Amhmici in Central Bosnia took place (Kelly & Baker, 2013).

In 1994, the first diplomatic efforts made were unsuccessful and the battles and fighting continued. The attack on the Markale market square in Sarajevo took place in February; this event led to France formally requesting the intervention of NATO to provide air support (Kelly & Baker, 2013). In March 1994, and thanks to US mediation, the establishment of a federation between Muslims and Croats in Bosnia was agreed between the Bosnian government, Bosnian Croats, and the government of Croatia, leading to the end of hostilities on both sides (Kalyvas & Sambanis, 2005). In the meantime, the United States, Russia, Britain, France, and Germany agreed to establish the Contact Group, which drafted the Peace Plan that would be adopted at the end of
the war in Dayton. In August, the Serbian Artillery positions around Sarajevo were attacked by NATO. At the end of 1994, the warring parties agreed to cease hostilities for four months (Kalyvas & Sambanis, 2005; Kelly & Baker, 2013).

However, after this temporary ceasefire ended, fighting was renewed (Kalyvas & Sambanis, 2005; Kelly & Baker, 2013) because an agreement was not brokered between the warring parties. Bosnian Serbs, supported by the Serbian government and the JNA, attacked the safe areas, taking UN personnel as prisoners and hostages, using them as human shields and massacring 8,000 Bosnian Muslim men and boys between 12 and 60 years of age in Srebrenica, in one of the most heinous attacks against civilians that has taken place since WWII. These events led the US to command an intensive month bombing campaign against Serbian artillery positions all over Bosnia, as a response to the killings in Srebrenica. At the end of the year, the US compelled the three nationalist leaders, Izetbegovic for the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Milosevic for the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and for the Republika Srpska (Serbia Republik) and Franjo Tudman for the Republic of Croatia, and President Zubak for the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina to meet at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio from 1st-20th November, where they brokered the Peace Talks and expressed their will to sign the Peace Accord. The final signature took place in Paris on 14th December 1995 (Kalyvas & Sambanis, 2005; Kelly & Baker, 2013).

5.3. CONCLUSIONS

The historical review carried out in this chapter highlights the complexity of the Bosnian theatre where peacekeeping missions were deployed, as well as the highly diverse and intricate histories of all the countries in region. This review allowed me to garner a better understanding of the society affected by the conflict, namely the civilians who have suffered greatly, as well as the parties involved in the conflict. At the same time, and the reasons proposed by Kraus (2014) for studying history, the re-examination of the conflict allowed me to examine the different facts, assess the sometimes conflicting points of view about the events that took place, and finally consider the different elements of change that have occurred throughout the whole of the history of Bosnia.
CHAPTER 6. INTERPRETING AT EUFOR

Before proceeding to Part 2 of this dissertation, a review must be made of the different organisations that have played an important role in rebuilding BiH, and more specifically of EUFOR BiH ALTHEA, which is the peacekeeping mission that is currently deployed in the area, and is the successor of other international missions installed previously in BiH.

Bosnians experienced the destruction of their country alongside the collapse of Yugoslav socialism almost simultaneously. After the war broke out in 1992, and for more than 20 years, many different international organisations have been deployed in Bosnia-Herzegovina such as political and judicial agencies, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), as well as foreign military institutions, all of which have the aim of helping the country build its political, economic and social fabric (C. Baker, 2012a, 2012b). Among these organisations, as a military institution, is the European Union Force, known by the acronym EUFOR, which is integrated in the European External Action Service (EEAS, n.d.).

6.1. THE EUROPEAN EXTERNAL ACTION SERVICE (EEAS)

The expansion of the European Union since its inception prompted the need to redesign its foreign policymaking. As a result of this situation, the Lisbon Treaty was drafted and endorsed by member countries in order to provide an institutional approach to these matters so that the EU could become a global player in the international scenario (Balfour & Raik, 2013; Crum, 2013). The EEAS (European External Action Service) was established by the Treaty of Lisbon, which was signed in 2007, entering into force in late 2009. The institution was finally launched on 1st January 2011, paving the way for a joint EU approach to foreign policy issues (EEAS, n.d.). The institution is currently chaired by the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy/Vice-President of the European Commission (HR/VP), Federica Mogherini (EEAS, n.d.).

The Treaty of Lisbon was devised with the intention of not only developing a common EU approach as mentioned in the previous paragraph, but also strengthening the role of the Union at an international level in matters of foreign and security policy (Grevi, 2009. The adoption of the Treaty meant the EU drafted, adopted and implemented an overarching foreign and security policy for all members, thus allowing
the organisation to operate, take actions and express its voice as a single entity in the international affairs arena. The agreement also enshrined a series of reforms that included a mutual assistance clause and a solidarity clause for all EU member countries. Today and thanks to this decision, the Union has more influence and n.d. 2014).

At the same time, the EEAS is also the EU’s diplomatic service, a department that is mandated to implement the Union’s Common Foreign and Security Policy. This means that the service has to provide support to the High Representative, as well as operate in conjunction with other EU institutions such as the European Commission and the Foreign Ministries of EU member countries, and all the different efforts in the field of foreign policy and security also have to be coordinated. In order to ensure this happens, the EEAS pursues its aims based on the following guiding principles (EEAS, n.d.):

- to foster worldwide fundamental freedoms,
- to provide respect for human dignity,
- to pursue the principles of equality and solidarity, and

However, it should be noted that all of these aims are to be achieved with the help of the:

(...), diplomatic services of the Member States and comprise officials from relevant departments of the General Secretariat of the Council and of the Commission as well as staff seconded from national diplomatic services of the Member States (EEAS, n.d.).

All of these data evidently confirm that there is a clear link between all the roles that are played by the EEAS (Bátora, 2013).

It is also important to note that in order to ensure that the EU’s presence is global and Europe’s interests are protected worldwide, this Service has deployed 130 Delegations and Offices globally that are responsible for the promotion and protection of Europe’s interests. Not only that, these offices also follow-up on events, developments and policies taking place in the host countries, a task that enables them to compile valuable information for cooperation and negotiations with third countries (EEAS, n.d.).
Another pillar of the EEAS is the Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP) that was also formalised by virtue of the Lisbon Treaty in 2009, and is the successor of the European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP) created in 1999. The forerunner of the ESDP was the WEU (Western European Union), a forum to cover security and defence issues established by the countries who signed the Brussels Treaty back in 1948. Yet the end of the Cold War and the conflicts in the Balkans made the EU realise that a greater effort had to be made in conflict mediation and peacekeeping. This led to the creation of the ESDP, which was a step towards a militarised Union that aimed to fulfil the EU’s aspiration of also having one voice in security and defence issues (EEAS, n.d.), as this contributed to a stronger presence of the Union worldwide. At the same time, having a common and joint approach in these matters on the part of all Member States ensured the Union had a greater influence globally in these affairs (Koivula & Spila, 2011; EEAS, n.d.).

The result of all these efforts was that the EU took upon its shoulders new roles in diplomacy, trade, development aid and work with global organisations and the EEAS was awarded the task of guaranteeing that EU actions abroad were always consistent and successful. The tasks it assumed include the following (EEAS, n.d.):

- Contributing to peace.
- Acting as a responsible neighbour.
- Being a partner in development.
- Defending human rights.
- Cooperating with UN.
- Becoming a force for global security.
- Being able to respond to crisis and provide humanitarian aid.
- Supporting actions on climate change.
- Being a trading bloc.
- Ensuring and expanding the EU (EEAS, n.d.).

All of the above-mentioned tasks are essential for the development of the EU within and outside Europe, as well as a means for ensuring peace within and beyond European borders. To date the most important action regarding peace carried out by the EU on European soil has been the peace-building process in the Western Balkans after the Yugoslav wars in the 1990s (EEAS, n.d.).
All of this proves how complex the structure of EEAS is, even more so because this service also has to necessarily establish relations with other EU institutions, as mentioned previously. In order to obtain a better understanding of how this complicated system works, the first thing to note is that foreign policy is guided by the European Council. Once the guidelines are defined, the Foreign Affairs Council is then awarded the task of outlining these policies in the monthly meetings held by the EU Member States’ Ministers, meetings which are chaired over by the High Representative. Put simply, the role of the European Council is hence to deliberate and define the policy, whereas the role of the Foreign Affairs Council is to implement the policy once it is adopted. Depending on the nature of the topics covered in these meetings, ministers of defence, development, or trade will be convened to cover issues on common security and defence policy, development cooperation, common commercial policy, respectively. This last statement shows that although the Foreign Affairs Council is a an independent body from the Commission both structurally and financially, the ties and cooperation between the EEAS and the European Commission cover many different joint topics, so that a complete and wide-ranging approach is guaranteed to foreign policy and related affairs (Council of Europe, n.d., para 7).

At the same time, the EEAS also cooperates closely with the European Parliament. To ensure that communication is seamless, twice a year the High Representative informs the Parliament on the progress made in matters regarding foreign policy actions, so that the different member countries are informed of the progress made in this field. If there are any questions that a Member of the European Parliament would like to put forward on any of these matters, the HR will deal with them. It is important to note that EEAS supports the High Representative to perform this role and also ensures that cooperation between the EU and its Member States is robust in foreign policy issues (EEAS, n.d.).

The High Representative, who is also the Vice-President of the European Commission, is appointed for a five-year term in office through a qualified majority obtained at the European Council with the agreement of the President of the Commission. At the same time and in line with the Commission President and other members of the Commission, the High Representative is subject to a vote of consent by the European Parliament for the final appointment (EEAS, 2014). Among the different roles played by the High Representative is the responsibility for coordinating and overseeing the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP), as well as the Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP). In this way, all the EU’s existing resources are pulled together in such a way that a comprehensive approach is given to all of its actions, while at the same time guaranteeing the EU speaks with a single voice on
foreign, security and defence issues, as well as crisis management and peacekeeping matters (Bátora, 2013; EEAS, n.d.).

Finally, when it comes to decision-making powers, it is important to note that the ultimate decision-making body in the European Union is the European Council, which meets four times a year. The European Council has 28 members who are the EU Heads of State and Government, and are responsible for determining the principles and general guidelines of policy (EEAS, n.d.).

### 6.2. STRUCTURE AND ORGANISATION OF EEAS

The structure of EEAS is highly complex. In order to better understand its organisation, I have included the main positions in the following (EEAS, n.d.):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positions</th>
<th>Incumbent/s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy</td>
<td>Federica Mogherini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of the EEAS Corporate Board</td>
<td>Executive Secretary General: Pierre Vimont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deputy Secretary General for Political Affairs: Helga Schmid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deputy Secretary General for Inter-institutional Affairs: Maciej Popowski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Directors</td>
<td>Crisis Response: Dr Agostino Miozzo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asia: Viorel Isticioia Budura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Africa: Nicholas Westcott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Europe and Central Asia: Luis Felipe Fernández de la Peña</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle East and Southern Neighbourhood: Hugues Mingarelli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Americas: Christian Leffler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Global and Multilateral Issues: Maria Marinaki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Senior Managers</td>
<td>Director General, EU Military Staff (EUMS): Lt Gen Wolfgang Wosolsobe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Director, Crisis Management and Planning Department (CMPD): Gabor Iklody</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Director, Civilian Planning and Conduct Capability (CPCC): Kenneth Deane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Director, EU Intelligence Analysis Centre (EU INTCEN): Ilkka Salmi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Director, Permanent Chair of the Political and Security Committee (PSC): Walter Stevens</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Positions and incumbents of EEAS (EEAS, n.d.)
The High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy is appointed for a five-year term by the European Council through a qualified majority and the agreement of the President of the European Commission. It is a position of considerable responsibility as the role of the incumbent is to synchronize and implement foreign and security policy matters, namely the “Common Foreign and Security Policy” (CFSP) and the “Common Security and Defence Policy” (CSDP). In order to cover these goals, the High Representative is assisted by both the EEAS Corporate Board and Senior Management. The creation and structure of the Board and Senior Management positions are inspired on principles of private corporation management. There are seven managing directors to guarantee that there is a consistent approach to the matters the EEAS is accountable for (Bátora, 2013; EEAS, n.d.), as well as to ensure comprehensive thematic and geographical coverage.

6.3. EUFOR

Despite the general belief to the contrary, there is no permanent EU army as such. This means that the European Union relies on forces provided by the different Member States and at the disposal of the EU to achieve the following goals:

- Enable joint disarmament operations.
- Carry out humanitarian and rescue tasks.
- Provide military advice and assistance.
- Foster conflict prevention and peacekeeping.
- Facilitate the tasks of combat forces in crisis management, including peace-making and post-conflict stabilisation (EEAS, n.d.).

Twenty-three civilian missions and military operations have been deployed by the EU in the past ten years, and they all encompass tasks of a diverse nature, ranging from post-tsunami peace building in Aceh, to protecting refugees in Chad, or fighting against piracy off Somalia and the Horn of Africa (EEAS, n.d.).

But these are not the only types of operations carried out by the EU; if approval is obtained from the Council of the EU, the EU may also undertake rapid response operations by deploying the EU Battle Group, composed of two concurrent 1,500-strong single-battle groups (Barcikowska, 2013). This is a concept that was devised to provide rapid response and high levels of military readiness for crisis management, and
was structured at the 1999 Helsinki European Council meeting (Barcikowska, 2013; para 2).

6.3.1. Missions and operations

For the purposes of contributing to the actions of the EEAS, the European Union Force has a series of on-going missions deployed in different parts of the world with different aims depending on the security problems detected in the countries where they are present. It can be observed that the nature of the problems encountered is manifold, requiring a great deal of know-how and expertise on the part of the troops and personnel deployed in the area (EEAS, n.d.):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mission</th>
<th>Aim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALTHEA/BiH</td>
<td>Progressing towards European integration in the context of the Stabilisation and Association Process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU NAVFOR Somalia</td>
<td>Combating Somali-based piracy and armed robbery at sea off the Horn of Africa and in the Western Indian Ocean.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU AM Ukraine</td>
<td>Reforming the Civilian Security Sector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUBAM Libya</td>
<td>Civilian mission supporting the Libyan post-conflict reconstruction process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUBAM Moldova and Ukraine</td>
<td>Providing technical advice to the border guard and customs services, and other relevant law enforcement agencies of Moldova and Ukraine who control this border.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUBAM Rafah</td>
<td>Ensuring the agreed principles for passing the Rafah (Gaza) crossing point are complied with.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUCAP Nestor</td>
<td>Enhancing the maritime capacities of five countries in the Horn of Africa and the Western Indian Ocean: Djibouti, Kenya, Somalia, Seychelles and Tanzania.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUCAP Sahel Mali</td>
<td>Civilian mission supporting Mali’s path towards stability, institutional reform and the full restoration of state authority throughout the country.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUCAP Sahel Niger</td>
<td>Civilian mission ensuring stability in the region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUFOR RCA</td>
<td>Providing temporary support in achieving a safe and secure environment for providing humanitarian aid in the Bangui area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EULEX Kosovo</td>
<td>Civilian mission assisting and supporting the Kosovo authorities in the rule of law area, with a specific focus on the judiciary.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MISSION</th>
<th>AIM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EUMM Georgia</td>
<td>Autonomous civilian monitoring mission observing the situation on the ground, reporting on incidents, defusing tense situations and facilitating contacts between security actors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUPOL Afghanistan</td>
<td>Civilian CSDP mission aimed at building a civilian police service that operates within an improved rule of law framework and in respect of human rights.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUPOL COPPS/Palestinian Territories</td>
<td>Police mission with the purpose of building the institutions of a future State of Palestine in the areas of policing and criminal justice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUSEC RD CONGO</td>
<td>Providing practical support for security sector reform in the DRC by giving advice and assistance directly to the competent Congolese authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUTM Somalia</td>
<td>Military training mission strengthening the Transitional Federal Government (TFG) and the institutions of Somalia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUTM-Mali</td>
<td>Restoring security and ensuring lasting peace in Mali.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. EUFOR missions.

From the chart we can see that EUFOR is present in states and regions close to the EU’s borders such BiH, Ukraine, Moldova, Kosovo, Georgia, Africa, and the Middle East. The aims, as mentioned previously, are manifold and range from promoting European integration and fighting against piracy in the Mediterranean to ensuring the implementation of agreements reached regarding the Palestinian territories and Gaza. All of this can be considered a clear example of the complex roles that have to be covered, not only by the institutions that are part of the EEAS, but also of the EEAS at large (Menon, 2012; EEAS, n.d.).

6.3.2. EUFOR BiH ALTHEA

EUFOR ALTHEA\(^{38}\) BiH is the largest and longest-standing of all military operations of the EU that have been deployed to date (Friesendorf & Penska, 2008; EUFOR, n.d.). In fact this operation was envisaged as a confirmation of the firm commitment the EU has towards Bosnia and Herzegovina, as laid down in the 2003 Thessaloniki Declaration. Despite being a military institution, its goals were not clearly

\(^{38}\) ALTHEA” was the Greek Goddess of healing (EUFOR, n.d.).
devised as such, as its tasks focused more on achieving political and social goals, rebuilding the country and its democratic fabric, as well as ensuring that BiH would be put back on track towards EU membership (Knezović, 2005).

6.3.2.1. Background

After the war between Croatia and Serbia in the former Yugoslavia broke out in 1991, the international community recognised quite soon that there was a need to mediate in the conflict by being physically present in the war theatre. As a result, the decision was made to deploy a military mission in the Balkans, with the aim of peacekeeping in mind. This first mission was UNPROFOR, the United Nations Protection Force, whose mandate was very clear: to ensure the demilitarisation of the area and the protection of all persons residing in the three United Nations Protected Areas\(^{39}\) in Croatia from armed attack. Its mandate was later extended and enlarged in 1992 to encompass Bosnia and Herzegovina, Macedonia, Montenegro and Serbia, with liaison presence in Slovenia, in order to cover the different actions included in the operation: the control of the entry of civilians into these areas; the performance of immigration and customs operations at UNPA borders coinciding with international frontiers; and the monitoring of the demilitarization of the Prevlaka Peninsula ensuring the control of the Peruca dam (UNPROFOR, n.d.).

UNPROFOR’s mandate and strength were broadened when in June 1992 the conflict intensified, and extended to Bosnia and Herzegovina because airport security and operation, as well as the provision of humanitarian assistance, had to be guaranteed for the population. However, due to the escalation of the conflict and the increasing complexity of the situation, in September of that same year UNPROFOR’s mandate had to be further extended to support the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees’ efforts and the Red Cross’ requests to protect convoys of released civilian prisoners that were being attacked. The mandate also bestowed the force with the task of monitoring the “no-fly zone”\(^{40}\), banning all military flights in Bosnia-Herzegovina and the UN “safe areas” (UNPROFOR, n.d.).

The implementation of the cease-fire agreement signed by the Croatian Government and local Serb authorities in March 1994 was monitored by UNPROFOR after there was an outbreak of fighting in January and September 1993. At the same

---

\(^{39}\) Safe Areas free from attacks.

\(^{40}\) The term is used to describe a physical area of a nation that is patrolled using airpower of another sovereign state or coalition (Benard, 2004).
time, the cease-fire agreements which entered into force on 1st January 1995, and were signed between the Bosnian Government and Bosnian Croat forces in February 1994, were monitored by the Force (United Nations, 2015). In March 1995, the Security Council replaced UNPROFOR, which was followed by IFOR (Implementation Force) and SFOR (Stabilization Force), the NATO-led successors (UNPROFOR, n.d.; EUFOR, n.d.).

Finally, on 22nd November 2004, the United Nations Security Council adopted Resolution 1575, by which it approved the European Union’s (EU) plan to deploy a military operation in BiH. The resolution authorized EU Member States to establish the legal successor to SFOR, a multinational stabilization force (EUFOR) that would have the primary objective of stabilising peace as provided for in the military provisions of the Dayton/Paris agreement (UNPROFOR, n.d.; Knezović, 2005). Those aspects included (EUFOR, n.d., para 1):

“(1) to provide Capacity Building and Training to the Armed Forces of Bosnia and Herzegovina (AFBiH), supporting them in their progression towards NATO standards; (2) to provide deterrence and continued compliance with the responsibility to fulfil the role specified in Annexes 1A and 2 of the Dayton/Paris Agreement (General Framework Agreement for Peace in BiH); and (3) to contribute to a safe and secure environment in BiH, in line with its mandate, and to achieve core tasks in the OHR’s Mission Implementation Plan and the Stabilization and Association Process (SAP).”

Since then, this military operation has maintained safety and security in BiH. The European Union initially deployed 700 troops in the country to guarantee that the GFAP (General Framework Agreement for Peace) was implemented. This means that the Force carries out monitoring and support activities jointly with the local authorities in fields such as countermine activities, military and civilian movement control of weapons, ammunition and explosive substances, as well as the management of weapons and ammunition storage sites (EUFOR, n.d.). All of this already suggests the complexity of topics and scenarios where interpreting would be required.

6.3.2.2. Mandate and objectives

Since its creation, Operation ALTHEA has undergone certain structural changes in order to adapt to the changing safety and security environment. Despite this, it abides by the peace enforcement mandate given to the operation as enshrined in the
2014 UN Security Council Resolution (2183). Today the main objectives of this military operation are (EUFOR, n.d.):

- To provide capacity-building and training support to the Armed Forces of Bosnia and Herzegovina.
- To support BiH efforts to maintain the safe and secure environment in BiH.
- To provide support to the overall EU comprehensive strategy for BiH.

The presence of Operation ALTHEA in the country is maintained through the so-called Liaison and Observation Teams (LOT), which are the link with the local authorities and the population (Santero, 2008). Similarly, LOTs are in touch with other agencies across the country, monitoring local issues that could endanger the safety and security situation. The deployment of these teams provides a response capability in the event of a security threat (Santero, 2008); similarly, manoeuvre units are deployed at Camp Butmir, Sarajevo, and today comprise troops from Austria, Hungary and Turkey.

Operation ALTHEA is regulated by the Berlin Plus agreements, which were signed at the beginning of 2003 between the EU and NATO. This was the second CSDP military operation deployed under the auspices of these agreements. However, political control and strategic direction is in the hands of EU’s Political and Security Committee, which in turn is under the responsibility of the Council of the EU. The Berlin Plus Agreement allows the EU to make use of the assets and capabilities of NATO whenever EU-led crisis management operations require this support. The current Operation Commander is General Sir Adrian John Bradshaw (UK), who also holds the position of NATO Deputy Supreme Allied Commander Europe (DSACEUR).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>Bosnia and Herzegovina</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HEADQUARTERS</td>
<td>Sarajevo (Camp Butmir)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STARTING DATE</td>
<td>2nd December 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEADS OF MISSION</td>
<td>EU Operation Commander General Sir Adrian John Bradshaw (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISSION STRENGTH</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISSION BUDGET</td>
<td>14 million € (paid through contributions by all Member States, except Denmark)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The multifaceted nature of EUFOR’s role in the area is also believed to be an important element in supporting BiH’s future EU membership (EUFOR, n.d.).

6.3.2.3 Interpreting at EUFOR

The situation and role of interpreters in BiH working for peacekeeping missions has been studied by different authors; (Bos & Soeters 2006; Van Dijk, Soeters & de Ridder, 2010; C. Baker, 2012a, 2012b, 2012c; Kelly & Baker, 2013), with many lessons having been learnt in this process. These studies prove the importance of the role these professionals play, as interpreters do not only possess language skills, they also have cultural understanding and master specific communication skills, which interestingly enough are rarely assessed, even when they are noted during the performance of their job (Vieira, 2014). This is something that was obvious at the beginning of the deployment of foreign forces in the Former Yugoslavian States, and more specifically in the case studied in this dissertation.

When studying the situation in the Former Yugoslavia, it is a fact that there were very few language specialists available when the first forces arrived in 1992 (Dragovic-Drouet, 2007; Kelly & Baker, 2013). Once the few trained conference interpreters had been hired by the international organisations, language teachers were the next group of professionals targeted (Dragovic-Drouet, 2007), and after that the quest led to anyone who had some level of command of English, no matter how low it may have been (Kelly & Baker, 2013). But even resorting to these individuals did not provide enough interpreters to cover the existing demand. Despite this, locally recruited professionals were hired by foreign military and civilian agencies to work as language mediators between these institutions and the local stakeholders. Although most of these professionals were not translation and interpreting postgraduates, they were supposed to carry out, and were entrusted with, a broad range of responsibilities where language knowledge was required. Among these we can highlight functions such as field interpreting and English language office work. Not only this, but these professionals were also entrusted to do media analysis work, forge links with different units and forces, as well as facilitate liaison meetings and link with the local population (Kelly & Baker, 2013). Their all-encompassing role was, and still seems to be, part and parcel of the role that had to be played by the interpreter then and today, as well as the

| CONTRIBUTING STATES | 17 EU Member States | 5 Partner Nations: Albania, Chile, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Switzerland and Turkey |

Table 7. Facts and figures (EUFOR, n.d.)
way these individuals were perceived by both the client and the interpreters themselves (Baker, C., 2012b; Kelly & Baker, 2012).

All of this shows that although language is a key element for a successful interpreting assignment, there are other skills that are desirable and required for success. These are the ones C. Baker (2010a) defines as “a different set of skills”; while Green-Sands (2014) denominates them “soft skills”, and Vieira (2014) and Ingold (2014) called “Cross-Cultural Competence” (3C). These skills would include: the ability to adapt and to work in stressful situations (Başar et al., 2014); the skill to learn fast as the interpreter will be required to work in many different fields of expertise at a very short notice (Vieira, 2014); the facility to build relations with local military personnel (Başar et al., 2014); the ability to build relations with military personnel of EUFOR (Başar et al., 2014); the ability to work into and from their mother tongue (Edwards, 2006); and a sound knowledge of the cultures corresponding to the languages interpreters will have to work with (Edwards, 2006; Vieira, 2014), including sounds and body language. These are skills that are considered valuable by the users’ to survive in this environment, which is why they sometimes prefer the less language-proficient interpreter to the linguist expert (Kelly & Baker, 2013).

In 1992, the first interpreters in BiH were recruited by the UN Protection Force (UNPROFOR), which was deployed in the area and operated there between February 1992 and March 1995; they were headquartered in Zagreb, Croatia (Kelly & Baker, 2013; United Nations Peacekeeping, 2015). These forces were later followed by IFOR (Implementation Force) and SFOR (Stabilization Force), the NATO-led successors, and EUFOR, the European-led troops. But these organisations were not the only hirers of interpreters and translators during this time period; as a result of the tremendous nation-building effort that was being made, humanitarian organisations, NGOs and foreign intervention institutes hired thousands of these professionals as well. All of this led to the emergence of a new workforce that suddenly found itself working in an insecure labour market, without any welfare benefits, and who were being considered as individuals who not only possessed language skills, but also many others that even meant disclosing information about war crimes and other sensitive information (C. Baker, 2012a, 2012b; Kelly & Baker, 2013).

Today, EUFOR is still deployed in the area, is headquartered in Sarajevo and also has a professionalised language service. The number of troops stationed there is much smaller (EUFOR, n.d.). The existence of a professionalised language service allows me to postulate that the interpreters currently working for EUFOR BiH Althea are more experienced, and that users of this institution are more aware of the role
played and the requirements and demands of working with an interpreter. At the same time, both parties expressed satisfaction regarding the linguistic situation because the operation had matured. Nonetheless, I wanted to know if the challenges encountered at the beginning of the deployment of foreign forces had been overcome. I therefore decided to go back and ascertain whether both the interpreters and the users feel that their needs are being satisfied, and to consider if the role of the interpreter is considered appropriate for this setting. At the same time, I also wanted to see how the role of the interpreter is perceived today by interpreters and users, compared to how it was judged in the past.
PART TWO

EMPIRICAL STUDY
CHAPTER 7. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK OF THE EMPirical STUDY

7.1. BACKGROUND

The second part of this dissertation is an empirical study, based on the principle of real world research as promoted by Robson (2011), with the aim of describing and comparing the views of two groups of respondents: EUFOR BiH ALTHEA users and EUFOR BiH ALTHEA interpreters (Fink, 2006). The comparison aims to observe whether there were any differences in the perception of respondents regarding the role played by the interpreter in conflict and peacekeeping scenarios. At the same time, it should be noted that this research is a case study as it focuses on a specific organisation - EUFOR BiH ALTHEA -, and the individuals operating within it or for that organisation - interpreters and users of interpreting services -, with the aim of obtaining further insight into a series of issues regarding interpreting in armed conflict scenarios in general, and in peacekeeping ones in particular. Despite the fact that this topic had already been covered by other authors and qualitative results had been obtained (Bos & Soeters, 2006; Van Dijk & Soeters, 2008; C. Baker, 2010a, 2010b, 2012c; Kelly & Baker, 2013), this study was carried out in order to advance further into the understanding of those issues and offer both quantitative and qualitative results (Buendía, Colás & Hernández, 1998; Robson, 2011). For this purpose, the research method chosen was a survey that followed Robson’s framework for research design (see Figure 1), as well as the principles described by Fink (2006) and Buendía et al. (1998) regarding the design and conduction of surveys.
Robson’s (2011) framework clearly establishes the different stages that are included in the design of a research project: purposes or objectives (1) and conceptual framework (2), which lead to the research questions (3). Once the research questions are established, the methods (4) and sampling strategy (5) are devised in order to reply to these questions, although always taking into consideration both the purposes and the conceptual framework established. This dissertation follows this same structure. To begin with, the purpose of the study was to establish if interpreters and users at BiH ALTHEA had the same opinions about the role played by the interpreter in peacekeeping scenarios. This meant carrying out, in the first place, a careful review of the references, the variables of the two study populations and the data I wanted to collect. Once these phases were completed, the data were defined and classified as recommended by Buendía et al (1998).

Secondly, it was also important to clearly define the conceptual framework scaffolding the empirical study, i.e. the theoretical background, concepts, assumptions and beliefs supporting the research (Robson, 2011; Maxwell, 2012; Rowley, 2014). The data were gathered in order to obtain a better understanding of both groups of respondents - EUFOR interpreters and users - and their views on a series of issues regarding the role of interpreters in armed conflict, and more precisely in peacekeeping scenarios. To this end, it was necessary to research the following:

**Figure 4.** Framework for research design (Robson, 2011:71).
• the specific role played by interpreters in peacekeeping scenarios;
• the relevance of knowing about the history of interpreting for defining the role of interpreters;
• the importance of understanding war theory and war phases for a clearer allocation of the interpreter in the war and peace communication process;
• and finally, the interpreting modalities and skills required for each phase, in order to make recommendations as far as training requirements were concerned.

Once these matters were settled, I proceeded to draft the research questions and to select the method I would use. It is clear that the nature of the information sought through the research questions would have an impact on the type of method or research strategy chosen (Robson, 2011); hence, after ruling out other methods, I finally settled on the survey method, which is a non-experimental fixed design research method, mostly used for descriptive purposes (Robson, 2011). This choice was followed by the analysis of the different surveys available, which led me to select the sample survey, since Robson (2011) states that it is the most common type of survey used when participants are chosen as a group of individuals that represent a larger population due to the attributes they possess.

Thirdly, after having chosen the survey method for the purposes of the study, I had to select an approach. As I wished to gather quantitative data, however limited it might be, I finally settled on a questionnaire. At the same time, I also wanted to collect qualitative information about the two sample groups because although the majority of studies carried out in the field on interpreting in conflict and peacekeeping scenarios are more of a qualitative nature (Fink, 2006; Robson, 2011), I wanted to see the complete picture of the situation, and only this dual focus would allow me to do so. At the same time, it should not be forgotten that surveys are also a common method used since the 17th century to compile data (Robson, 2011). Therefore, I finally decided to draft and submit to respondents a link to an online self-completion questionnaire, which is a “method widely used in social studies to collect data from and about people” (Robson, 2011, p. 236), an opinion also shared by Fink (2006) as she believes that surveys are an excellent way to find out about characteristics that describe populations such as perceptions, values or demographic features, among others.
At the same time, during the design process the different steps described by Robson to develop a small scale questionnaire were carried out (adapted from Robson, 2011):

Figure 5. Steps followed to develop a questionnaire (Robson, 2011, p. 237).
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All these steps shown in Figure 2 were followed. Despite the disadvantages that a self-administered questionnaire may present as described by Robson (2011), in this case I felt the advantages outweighed the disadvantages (See Table 8) for different reasons, namely: this approach provided a simple way of studying the opinions of the respondents; it was easy to adapt to the two different groups of respondents, users and interpreters; the data was easy to interpret; it allowed me to obtain historical data of the respondents on the topics they were asked about; it proved an effective way of obtaining data in a short period of time at no cost; and it guaranteed anonymity, an important issue for the organization studied.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADVANTAGES</th>
<th>DISADVANTAGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A straightforward and simple approach to study attitudes, beliefs and motives.</td>
<td>Data are affected by the characteristics of the respondents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May be adapted to collect generalizable information from almost any human population.</td>
<td>Respondents do not necessarily express their views.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High amounts of data standardization.</td>
<td>Low response rate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only and easiest way, in some cases, of retrieving information about the past history of a large set of people.</td>
<td>Ambiguities and misunderstandings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely efficient way to provide large amounts of data at a low cost and in a short time.</td>
<td>Not sure if the sample population is representative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymity is ensured.</td>
<td>Ambiguities and misunderstandings may not be detected.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8. Advantages and disadvantages of questionnaires (Robson, 2011, p. 240-241).

Lastly, the final questionnaires submitted included 67 questions for the interpreters and 51 for the users. Both questionnaires were divided into seven sections in order to cover all the issues studied in the first part of the dissertation and meet the objectives.
CHAPTER 8. SURVEY TARGETED AT EUFOR BiH ALTHEA INTERPRETERS

As I have explained in previous chapters, the intention of this study was to determine the views of the interpreters and the users about the role played by interpreters in armed conflict scenarios. For this purpose two questionnaires were drafted that would take better account of the specificities of working in these settings and the challenges arising when working with an institution like EUFOR. In this chapter the first survey is reviewed.

8.1. RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND OBJECTIVES

I posed the following research questions for this first survey:

- RQ 1. What is the profile of interpreters who work in peacekeeping scenarios?
- RQ 2. What requirements do interpreters face in peacekeeping scenarios?
- RQ 3. Do interpreters know about the evolution and development of the role of the interpreter in armed conflict-related scenarios?
- RQ 4. Do interpreters believe there is a definition of armed conflict?
- RQ 5. What are the different stages in an armed conflict?
- RQ 6. Are there specific interpreting requirements in each stage of the armed conflict?
- RQ 7. What requirements are demanded from an interpreter who has to work in peacekeeping missions?
- RQ 8. Are these requirements fulfilled in EUFOR BiH ALTHEA?
- RQ 9. What modalities of interpreting are mostly used in peacekeeping operations?
- RQ 10. What are the working conditions of EUFOR interpreters?
- RQ 11. What are the challenges identified by EUFOR interpreters in their work?
RQ 12. What do EUFOR interpreters think about interpreter training for armed conflict and peacekeeping scenarios?

Based on these research questions, I designed a questionnaire that would allow me to achieve the following objectives:

- **Objective 1.** To analyse the profile of interpreters who work in peacekeeping scenarios.
- **Objective 2.** To determine the needs interpreters perceive they have in peacekeeping scenarios.
- **Objective 3.** To examine if the interpreters have previous knowledge of the evolution and development of the role of the interpreter in armed conflict scenarios.
- **Objective 4.** To analyse the concept of armed conflict according to interpreters.
- **Objective 5.** To analyse the different stages of an armed conflict as perceived by interpreters.
- **Objective 6.** To find out whether there are specific interpreting needs in each of these stages.
- **Objective 7.** To determine the requirements an interpreter has to fulfil in order to work for peacekeeping missions.
- **Objective 8.** To examine if the requirements for interpreting in peacekeeping missions are fulfilled or not and why.
- **Objective 9.** To determine the interpreting modalities used in peacekeeping missions.
- **Objective 10.** To describe the working conditions of interpreters at EUFOR.
- **Objective 11.** To determine the different challenges identified by EUFOR interpreters.
- **Objective 12.** To explore training possibilities in the field of interpreting in armed conflicts and more specifically in peacekeeping missions.
8.2. PARTICIPANTS

The participants in this study were interpreters working for BiH Althea. The conflict was selected for the reasons already indicated in the introduction of this dissertation: firstly, for personal reasons because when I started working for the FNF back in 1995, the Bosnian War was already underway; secondly, the war was also taking place on European soil, 50 years after two particularly bloody world wars; thirdly, it was a contemporary conflict, which also meant that I could go back in time and look into the reasons for the outbreak of the war and observe if there had been similar cases in the past; and finally, there was still a peacekeeping mission in place in Bosnia: EUFOR BiH ALTHEA. All of these reasons were considered with the intention of contrasting the results of this first questionnaire with the second one submitted to users of interpreting services (see Chapter 8). The final purpose of both questionnaires was to find out what the two groups felt about the same issues, compare their views and determine whether there were any commonalities or differences between the two groups.

As far as this study is concerned, the subjects were selected by a high-ranking official of EUFOR who was appointed as the contact person and who for reasons of confidentiality and security had to oversee all the stages of the survey process: from the initial approval and supervising of the questionnaire design to avoid security and intelligence problems, to the contact with respondents. This meant that as far as the research population was concerned, as a researcher I was blinded to the characteristics of the subjects and their anonymity was confirmed by this selection process. The contact person in charge of the selection process selected the subjects taking into account their exposure to interpreting, as well as their experience working for BiH ALTEHA.

A total number of 30 interpreters were contacted as respondents for this first survey. It is important to point out that as the study focused on a specific institution, EUFOR BiH ALTHEA, the population only consisted of interpreters working for this institution.

8.3. Methodology

8.3.1. Questionnaire design

Once the institution, EUFOR BiH ALTHEA, was aware of the objectives and the framework of my study, and had expressed its willingness to collaborate in the study, I
proceeded to prepare the questionnaire which included both multiple-choice and open-ended questions (Fink, 2006) because the research questions required both qualitative and quantitative responses in order to obtain a clearer description of the situation.

8.3.1.1. Structure of the questionnaire

At the same time and following Moser-Mercer’s advice (2008), in the presentation of the questionnaire, I explained the purpose of the survey, provided details of the data collector, describing the purpose of the survey and why the respondents had been selected. At the same time, as security was paramount for the institution, participants were reassured about the confidentiality and the anonymity of their responses. Further information about how to complete the questionnaire, how long it would normally take to complete it and how the data would be used was also provided to the respondents.

Different question types were also used; multiple choice questions and open-ended items, in order to compile as much qualitative and quantitative information possible from the respondents of both population groups (Fink, 2006).

The questionnaire was divided into seven sections in order to match the different research questions mentioned at the beginning of this chapter:

Section 1: Professional information.
Section 2: The role of the interpreter throughout history.
Section 3: Conflict definition and conflict stages.
Section 4: Specificities of interpreting for Peacekeeping Missions
Section 5: Interpreters’ perceptions of their own work.
Section 6: Working conditions of interpreters.
Section 7: Training interpreters for peacekeeping missions.

Following Buendía et al. (1998), in the presentation letter of the questionnaire that was submitted to the respondents by the contact person appointed by EUFOR, I indicated the objective of the research, the reason the respondents had been chosen, and I also included the collector’s particulars, both personal and institutional, as well the contact details. These details also appeared in the introduction to the survey, together with assurances of confidentiality and anonymity of data (Moser-Mercer, 2008).
8.3.1.1.1. Section 1. Personal information

The aim of this section was to compile information about the demographic, academic and training characteristics of the respondents who were asked to reply to questions in the following areas:

1. Nationality.
2. Age.
3. Status: member of the military or civilian.
4. Mother tongue.
5. Highest scholastic/academic qualification.
6. Languages spoken using AIIC’s (International Association of Conference Interpreters) language classification system (ABC).
7. Other languages spoken.
8. Possession of a qualification or degree in interpreting?
9. Name of the qualification or degree?
10. Length of training?
11. Institution where the qualification or degree was obtained.
12. Whether or not guidance was given on how to fulfil their role as interpreters.
13. Areas where the guidance was given.

8.3.1.1.2. Section 2. The role of the interpreter throughout history

The aim of this section was to find out if the interpreters knew about the history of interpreting, i.e. if the respondents believed that it was necessary to know about this subject in order to better understand the role the interpreter plays today in general, and in peacekeeping missions and armed conflict scenarios in particular. Hence, the questions asked were:

14. Do you know anything about the history of interpreting?
15. Do you think knowing about the past history of interpreting in armed conflicts is important in order to understand the interpreter’s role today?
16. Since when do you think that interpreters have existed in the context of war?

17. In your opinion, what is the importance of knowing about the history of interpreting in order to understand your professional role today?

18. Of the issues listed below, which do you think influences how EUFOR users perceive the role the interpreter plays?

19. Are there any other topics or issues not mentioned above that you would like to add?

8.3.1.1.3. Section 3. Conflict definition and conflict stages

In this section, the intention was to find out if interpreters knew about conflict theory, the definition of conflict and the different stages within a conflict, in order to see if they were aware of where they stood professionally in the war continuum. I also wanted to know if they contemplated that there could be different stages in an armed conflict; and if so, whether they thought there would be different interpreting requirements for each of these stages. Therefore the following questions were posed:

20. Do you think there is an established definition of the concept of armed conflict?

21. Do you think a conflict can be divided into different stages?

22. Which stages would you divide an armed conflict into?

23. In which of the following stage/s of an armed conflict according to Brahm (2003) would you frame peacekeeping?

24. If an armed conflict is divided into different stages, do you think there are different interpreting requirements in the different stages of conflict?

25. Why?

8.3.1.1.4. Section 4. Specificities of interpreting for peacekeeping missions

In this section I not only wanted to find out if Peacekeeping Missions presented special needs to be considered when working with interpreters, but also whether the interpreters’ performance had ever been monitored. To this end the following questions were asked:
26. Do you believe that there are particular requirements when interpreting for peacekeeping missions?

27. Would these requirements also be applicable outside the peacekeeping scenario?

28. Where?

29. What would you say are the specific requirements for interpreting for peacekeeping missions?

30. Have you ever been given materials to carry out your job more easily while working for Peacekeeping Mission?

31. What type of materials were you given?

32. Were the materials provided useful for your assignment?

33. Do you think there are particular topics that could be taught in advance to interpreters in order to prepare them to work in peacekeeping scenarios?

34. Has your performance as an interpreter even been monitored for quality issues?

35. Who did the monitoring?

8.3.1.1.5. Section 5. Interpreters’ perception of their own work

In this section I wanted to enquire into how interpreters assessed their work and if they considered interpreting on peacekeeping missions such as BiH ALTHEA was a fully-fledged profession, as well as a vocational career choice.

36. Do you believe that working as an interpreter in a peacekeeping scenario could be considered as a vocational career choice?

37. Do you consider that your job as an interpreter for EUFOR BiH ALTHEA is a vocational career choice for you?

38. Are you satisfied with the way you have been treated by users of interpreting services?

39. How would you rate the role you play in the communication process?
8.3.1.1.6. Section 6. Working conditions for interpreters at EUFOR

In this section I wanted to understand how interpreters felt about their working conditions to obtain specific data about them, as well as about the modalities and the languages used.

40. For how long have you been working as an interpreter?
41. For how long have you been working as an interpreter for EUFOR BiH ALTHEA?
42. Which modalities of interpreting do you use in your job?
43. How often do you use each one of these modalities of interpreting in your job?
44. What language combination/pairs do you use?
45. Do you work mainly into your mother tongue?
46. Do you work mainly into a second language that is not your mother tongue?
47. Do you work to and from your mother tongue?
48. Did you have previous experience working as an interpreter in any field other than peacekeeping before working for EUFOR BiH ALTHEA?
49. Did you have previous experience working as an interpreter in peacekeeping missions before working for BiH ALTHEA?
50. How long did you work as an interpreter on peacekeeping missions before working for EUFOR BiH ALTHEA?
51. How many hours do you work per day?
52. How often have you been asked to work more than 7 hours?
53. Have you been paid overtime?
54. If not, have you been given any type of non-monetary compensation? (Please specify):

8.3.1.1.7. Section 7. Training interpreters for EUFOR peacekeeping missions

Finally, in this section my aim was to collect information on interpreter training for peacekeeping missions.
55. Do you think that there should be specific training for interpreters who are working or are going to work in peacekeeping scenarios?

56. Do you think there should be specific training for interpreters working for EUFOR Peacekeeping Missions?

57. Why?

58. Who do you think should provide that training?

59. Do you think that the training you received prepared you to work for EUFOR BiH ALTHEA?

60. Why yes or why not?

61. Do you think there are particular topics that could be taught in advance in order to prepare interpreters to work in armed conflict and peacekeeping scenarios?

62. Which topics?

63. Do you think there are particular topics that could be taught in advance in order to prepare interpreters to work for EUFOR?

64. Why?

65. Please state the importance of teaching the following interpreting modalities for working in peacekeeping and armed conflict scenarios.

66. In your opinion, if a short training module were to be organised for the training of interpreters working for peacekeeping missions, how long should that course be in order to equip the interpreters with the appropriate skills?

67. In which area did you encounter the most challenges in the performance of your interpreting duties?

8.3.1.2. Pilot study

It is always recommended to carry out a pilot study before proceeding to the final administration of a questionnaire as it will help to pinpoint any problems that may arise when completing the survey (Fink, 2006; Moser-Mercer, 2008; Robson, 2011). At the same time, pilot testing allows the researcher to determine whether the survey provides the necessary information, if the questions are the most appropriate for the sample population and topic covered, and whether the information collected in the survey is consistent with the objectives, conceptual framework and research questions.
proposed (Fink, 2006). In Robson’s words it is a “small-scale version of the real thing, a try-out you propose so that its feasibility can be checked” (2011, p. 141). The pilot questionnaire was reviewed by 4 interpreters; 2, who were interpreter trainers and had experience with questionnaire drafting⁴¹, one of whom works in conflict zones on a regular basis; and another two interpreters who had worked for EUFOR and Peacekeeping Missions⁴².

All of these interpreters were contacted via email, and sent the same message where they were kindly requested to provide their feedback about the drafting of questions, clarity of expression, objectivity of the questions, presence of redundancy and appropriateness of the questions concerning the respondents.

8.3.1.2 1. Comments received during the pilot phase

The comments delivered about the questionnaire were:

- In question 19, the format of the question was different to the others, with more boxes to fill in which made it difficult to know what and how to reply.
- Question 44 only included the denomination “bidule” interpreting and did not add the description “portable equipment”.
- It was suggested that the option “0-1 year” should be replaced by “Less than one year” in question 51, as it sounded awkward and unclear.
- Question 60 “Do you think that the training you received prepared you to work for EUFOR BiH ALTHEA?” initially included the option: “check all that apply”, which was incorrect, as it should have only offered the options: “yes”, “no” and “N/A”.
- It was suggested that the order of questions 66, 67 and 68 should be changed because they did not follow a logical sequence.
- It was advised to skip some questions in the survey or to include the option “N/A”.

---

⁴¹ It is important to note that the interpreter who was a trainer and experienced in questionnaire drafting had not worked in a peacekeeping setting deployed in the host country but had experience working at diplomatic and conflict mediation settings, such as those organized by the FNF.

⁴² These two interpreters were selected by the contact person at EUFOR.
- In some questions it was suggested that the option “other” or “N/A” be added.

As all the changes were considered appropriate they were accepted, question 68 was finally deleted and all the changes suggested were introduced before the final questionnaire was sent out.

8.3.1.3. Distribution of the questionnaire

Due to limited time and resources, difficulties in contacting the target group and problems with confidentiality issues and the military structure of the institution the respondents work for, it was not feasible to conduct an outright statistical study, i.e. it was simply impossible to select a representative sample of interpreters and users for this study and draw conclusions that could be extrapolated to all interpreters.

Nor was it possible to contact the interpreters directly. Therefore, I got in touch with the contact person listed on the EUFOR website. This person forwarded my request to another department, which in turn put me in touch with the contact person who was appointed to address my query. This last person contacted a group of 30 interpreters stationed in the aforementioned conflict zone. New technologies were used to collect data. The survey was conducted online using LimeSurvey®, an open source statistical tool for online surveys. This tool is used to design anonymous public surveys, with or without restrictions on access using a one-time password. Finally, once all the data were gathered, the information was analysed with R, a GNU project free statistical tool and its corresponding GUI, which is R-Commander. However, the quality of this tool proved to be unsuitable for this type of academic study, which is why the final the data used in this dissertation were interpreted and charted with Microsoft Excel

8.4. RESULTS

In this section, I will present the results of the survey. The survey was sent to 30 interpreters and the breakdown of answers received was as follows:

- Out of the 30 interpreters who accessed the survey, 10 responded. One of the respondents only answered the first part of the survey (personal information) and was therefore not included in the data analysis. Of the remaining 9 respondents, one answered only until Section 2 and another answered only until Section 5. These two respondents were included in the analysis, as it was worthwhile combining all opinions from the different sections. However, this should be considered when interpreting the
results of this analysis, given that the total number of data items will vary between 7 and 9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF INTERPRETERS WHO RECEIVED THE SURVEY</th>
<th>30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL RESPONSES RECEIVED</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FULL RESPONSES</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCOMPLETE RESPONSES</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9. Breakdown of responses received

The total number of responses shows that 10 interpreters answered the surveys (33%). The incomplete responses were probably due to the fact that respondents forgot to click on the “submit” button and/or save some answers and did not finish the questionnaire. Others probably started to complete the questionnaire and then started a new questionnaire without finishing the first one and the software consequently recorded these answers as incomplete.

As stated by Robson, unfortunately there is little agreement on what constitutes an adequate response rate (2011). I do believe that in this particular case, given the three reasons stated below, the response rate can be considered as satisfactory and the sample population representative:

- It was the first time that EUFOR interpreters had been asked as a group to respond to a questionnaire;
- This study population comprised professionals whose experience and knowledge could be considered as highly valuable.

For structuring purposes, the results are presented section by section (they will be analysed very briefly here since they will be interpreted in the discussion section). Graphs are also included in most cases to illustrate the results more clearly. I have also used values in the graphs and percentages when commenting on the numbers.
8.4.1. Section 1. Personal information

This section was completed by 9 respondents.

❖ Nationality

A majority of respondents (44.44%) were Bosnian (4 participants), and the rest were of other nationalities, namely Austrian (3) and German (1). One of the interpreters of the interpreters who responded specified their nationality as Bosniak (Bosnian Muslim), and was accounted for as Bosnian in Table 10. Therefore, it could be concluded that the interpreters working in a conflict zone are local people. Although, a priori, one might think that interpreters of other nationalities would be preferred for reasons of objectivity, reality proves the opposite, as also reported in the relevant literature on the subject (C. Baker, 2010a).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NATIONALITY OF INTERPRETERS</th>
<th>NUMBER OF INTERPRETERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bosni an</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austrian</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10. Nationality of interpreters.

❖ Age

Five (5) respondents were in the 51 to 60 year age group, accounting for 55.56% of the total. There was one respondent in each of the 21-30 and 31-40 groups, and two in the 41-50 age group. 77.78% were over 40, therefore it could be concluded that interpreters working in this setting are mostly mature adults, and that it is uncommon to find young people in this setting. Given the protracted nature of the conflict, this could have been due to the fact that these individuals had been working for the mission since 1992, when the first peacekeeping mission was first established in the region, an issue that will be confirmed in the section analysing the interpreters’ experience.
Gender

The answer to this question is more balanced than what might be expected: 55.56% were men vs. 44.44% women. It is interesting to note here that interpreters are eminently female (Gile, 2006) and that in this setting there is balanced gender mix, contrary to what could be expected. This is probably due to the fact that women have a small presence in the Bosnian labour market (Somun-Krupalija, 2011).

Status

The answers show that most of the interpreters (6) were civilians, while the rest (3) belonged to the military, equivalent to 66.67% and 33.33%, respectively. This
confirms that a larger proportion of interpreters hired in the conflict/peacekeeping scenario were civilians (Bos & Soeters, 2006; C. Baker, 2010b).

**Graph 3.** Status of the interpreters

- **Highest scholastic/academic qualification**

  The options “High school graduate, diploma or equivalent” and “Bachelor’s degree” corresponded to 3 interpreters each, followed by “Doctorate degree” and “Master’s degree”, with 2 and 1 interpreter, respectively. It can therefore be concluded that most of the interpreters had academic qualifications of some sort, although not all had received university education.

**Graph 4.** Academic qualification of the interpreters
Language combination

In terms of the languages spoken by the interpreters, the results are shown in the following chart:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LANGUAGE</th>
<th>SPEAKERS</th>
<th>LEVEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bosnian</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatian</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbian</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11. Languages spoken by interpreters. AIIC Classification: ABC.

From what can be observed, Bosnian was spoken by 4 people as an A language, i.e. it was their mother tongue, and the same applies to Croatian and German with also 4 native speakers each. It is interesting to note that although more interpreters spoke English (5), there was a greater variety in terms of levels of expertise: 1 subject had English as an A language, 3 had it as a B, and 1 as a C, whereas only 1 interpreter spoke French as a B language, and 2 individuals spoke Italian, one as a B language, and the other as a C language. Two interpreters also indicated that they spoke Russian and Latin; the former as a B language and the latter as a C. Five (5) individuals spoke Serbian as an A language.

It can therefore be concluded that most interpreters were Serbian mother-tongue speakers (A language), followed by English, though the majority use it as a B language. Bosnian, Croatian and German were spoken by 4 individuals as an A language. The few individuals who spoke Italian and French used it as a B or C language. As for the other languages included in the list, none of the respondents chose Albanian or Spanish. It can be concluded from these two questions that the majority of
the interpreters spoke 3 mother tongues, as 5 interpreters had more than one A language. Four (4) had 3 A languages, Bosnian, Croatian and Serbian and one had German and English as mother tongues.

❖ Degree in interpreting

Two of the participants did not reply to this question, while 4 answered “No” and 3 said “Yes”. This means that most interpreters did not hold a degree in interpretation, which confirms related findings reporting that interpreters in peacekeeping and conflict–related scenarios do not usually possess specific interpreter training.

In the follow-up question about the name of the qualification or degree, 3 interpreters that had replied to the previous questions indicated the following degrees: “Military interpreter”, “Professor engleskog jezika I knjizevnosti” [Professor of English Language and Literature] and “Diplom-Dolmetscher” [Diploma in Interpreting]. It can be observed that only one interpreter had a formal qualification in interpreting.

❖ Duration of the training

The answers to this question were extremely varied. Though the majority responded an average of one year and a half, the following time frames were marked: less than 3 months; 6 months to one year; one and a half years; and other. Likewise, a couple of individuals mentioned that their time frame was not included in the
questionnaire, suggesting that their training exceeded 2 years. One individual did not indicate the time frame, and another stated four years. It can therefore be concluded that all interpreters received training to a greater or lesser extent, though not specifically for interpreting.

Graph 6. Duration of the training

Training institution

Only 4 people responded to this open-ended question, indicating the following institutions: “Austrian Armed Forces”; “Filozofski fakultet” [Faculty of Philosophy] where the exact location was not given; “Sarajevo”, where a degree in this subject is offered at Sarajevo University, although a language studies programme is not offered. Another subject replied “Heidelberg University”, where a Master’s programme is offered in translation and interpreting. Another individual mentioned “High School”, but did not give the name of the institution.

Guidance as to how to fulfil your role as an interpreter

When the interpreters were asked whether they had received some type of guidance on how to perform their professional duties, the answer was clear as the majority, seven respondents, answered “Yes” to this question, equivalent to 77.78% in relative terms.
It can be observed that 8 participants stated that they received guidance on allegiances and etiquette, and 1 of them said that no guidance was provided in this respect. As regards non-verbal communication, 7 said they had not received any guidance and 2 answered affirmatively to this question. The majority of them (6) also referred to having been provided with guidance on protocols, versus 3 interpreters who had not received this kind of orientation. It can therefore be concluded that, overall, interpreters are given guidance on how to perform their job in most aspects. It is interesting to note that whereas only 2 subjects received guidance on non-verbal communication, 77.78% - the majority - stated that they were given guidance in Verbal Communication.

8.4.2. Section 2. The role of the interpreter throughout history

Interpreters’ knowledge of the history of interpreting

In terms of the participants’ knowledge of the history of interpreting, the question scored between 1 and 5, ranging from not at all (1) to very much (5). Indeed, 55.56% of respondents scored this with a 2 (slightly), 33.33% with a 3 (somewhat) and only 11.11% gave 5 (very much). The average score was 2.67, between slightly and somewhat, which is low. This appears to indicate that interpreters have a low awareness of the history of interpretation. While none gave the lowest score, the majority of interpreters gave a value of 2 (slightly) or, at most, 3 (somewhat). Indeed, none of the interpreters gave a 4 (moderately), and only one gave 5 (very much), the highest score.
Graph 8. Interpreters’ knowledge of the history of interpreting

Although the variables of age, gender and level of academic training were not analysed for all variables since the group of respondents was small, they were studied in cases where the issue analysed was related to the training or theoretical background of the respondents, as the issue in question could be considered in interpreter training. Therefore in this case I decided to determine whether the older individuals in the group may have had more in-depth knowledge of the history of interpreting. This variable was analysed by age groups, and the results were surprising.

21-30: average 3.0
31-40: average 3.5
41-50: average 2
51-60: average 2.4

Contrary to what was anticipated, the younger individuals appeared to have a more in-depth knowledge of the history of interpretation, although the difference was minor. Only the 31–40 age group exceeded the average of 3.

The findings were also surprising when the data were analysed separately by gender.
Female: average 3.25  
Male: average 2.20  

As far as this variable is concerned, women claim to have a better understanding of history than men with a difference of 1 point on the scale used. This suggests that this knowledge may be due to the educational level of the respondents. Hence, the variable was analysed based on academic qualifications:

High school graduate, diploma or equivalent: average 2.67  
Bachelor’s degree: average 3.33  
Doctorate degree: average 2  
Master’s degree: average 2  

In this case the results were surprising as the interpreters who had a Bachelor’s degree were the ones with a more in-depth knowledge of the history of interpreting with a score exceeding 3, whereas Master’s degree and Doctorate degree students had a lower level of knowledge, even lower than that of the high school graduates.

❖ Relevance of understanding the past history of interpreting in armed conflicts to understand the interpreter’s role today  

71.43% of respondents answered “Yes” to the question “In your opinion, what is the importance of knowing about the history of interpreting in order to understand your professional role today” while the rest said “No”. This reveals that most interpreters believe that knowledge of past armed conflicts is important to understand the role of an interpreter today.  

Related to this question, I included another one that asked them since when they thought that interpreters have existed in the context of war. This open-ended question gave rise to a diversity of opinions, including the following:

- “Since Roman times”.  
- “Probably ever since there have been wars between different nations/tribes...”  
- “Tough/tricky question, have no answer!!”  
- “1700.”
• “Spanish Civil War and WWII.”

• “Since the beginning.”

• “I assume they have always been used, in one form or another, in times of conflicts/wars. At least when negotiating a peace.”

• “Every negotiation of an armistice/peace, and prior to that, every ultimatum or declaration of war.”

• “Since antiquity.”

Factors that interpreters believe influence the way their role is perceived by EUFOR users

There were two questions related to this aspect: one was a closed question that offered a series of factors such as position/rank, training of the user, experience working with interpreters and others, as well as a scale of 1 (not at all) to 5 (very much) in the answer option; the second one was an open question that allowed interpreters to include any other factor not listed in the previous question. For the sake of clarity, these two questions were analysed together, despite the fact that the scoring scale was from 1 to 5, which made it difficult. The following results were obtained based on the options available:

• Position/rank: 50% of the interpreters scored this question with a 3, followed by 37.5% with a 4, and 12.5% with a 2. None of the respondents gave the lowest or highest score. The average and median values obtained were, respectively, 3.25 and 3. It can therefore be concluded that according to the interpreters, this issue is not relevant to the user’s perception of the role of the interpreter.

• Training: in this case, scores 4 and 5 respectively accounted for 37.5% of the answers, whilst 2 and 3 accounted for 12.5% each. None of the respondents gave the lowest score in this case. The highest scores accounted for 75% of the answers. The average and median value stood at 4. It can therefore be concluded that the interpreters considered that the user’s level of training is an important factor in users’ perception of the interpreter’s role.

• User’s experience working with interpreters: of the respondents, 44.44% scored this with a 5, the maximum score for this item, followed by 33.33%, who gave it 4. Furthermore, scores 2 and 3 accounted for 11.11% each. This
means that the two highest scores accounted for 77.77% of the votes. On the other hand, the average value was 4.1 and the median value 4. It can therefore be concluded that the interpreters considered that the user’s experience working with interpreters is an important factor in the latter’s perception of the interpreter’s role.

- Others: 4 respondents considered that there are other influencing issues. However, although 3 respondents scored the importance of these factors with a 5, only one of them specifically mentioned the factor in question (“the overall training and command of participants in the working language English”).

The graphical representations shown below make comparison even easier:

**Graphs 9.** Results for position/rank

**Graph 10.** Results for training
8.4.3. Section 3. Conflict definition and conflict stages

There were 8 respondents in this section.

✧ Opinion on if there is an established definition of the concept of armed conflict

Virtually all the respondents agreed on this issue, with 7 answering “Yes” and only 1 saying “No”. The reason for this may be, as mentioned in the introduction to Chapter 2, that everybody seems to have a different notion of what war is and what it entails. This is clearly revealed in the graph:
Opinion on whether a conflict can be divided into different stages

The responses to this question produced the same results as the previous one, i.e. 7 respondents answered “Yes” and only 1 “No”, corroborating the fact that almost everybody has a concept of war to relate to and that the stages are clearly visible:

Graph 13. Opinion on whether a conflict can be divided into different stages

Stages of an armed conflict

According to the results, the interpreters divided a conflict as follows:

- Pre-conflict, conflict, peace process: none of the respondents selected this stage.
- Dispute phase, crisis phase, violence phase, settlement phase: none of the respondents selected this stage either.
- Pre-war, escalation and post-war: 6 respondents did not select this stage and 2 chose “Yes”.
- No conflict, Latent conflict, Emergence, Escalation, Stalemate, De-Escalation, Settlement/Resolution, Post-Conflict Peacebuilding and Reconciliation: 1 respondent did not select this stage and 7 chose “Yes”.

It can therefore be concluded that the majority of the interpreters divide armed conflicts into “No conflict, latent conflict, Emergence, Escalation, Stalemate, De-Escalation, Settlement / Resolution, Post-Conflict Peace-building and Reconciliation”
and disregard the other stages, which are, interestingly enough, the stages described by Brahm (2003), about which the respondents were asked in the following question.

❖ **Stage/s of an armed conflict (Brahm, 2003) in which participants frame peacekeeping**

These were the results obtained by stages:

- No conflict: none of the respondents selected this stage.
- Latent conflict: 2 respondents answered “Yes” and 6 “No”.
- Escalation: only 1 answered “Yes” and the others “No”.
- Stalemate: 2 answered “Yes” and the others “No”.
- De-escalation: 4 responded “Yes” and the others “No”.
- Settlement/Resolution: 5 answered “Yes” and the others “No”.
- Post-Conflict Peacebuilding and Reconciliation: 7 answered “Yes” and 1 “No”.

It can therefore be concluded that, in line with Brahm, the interpreters considered that peacekeeping missions clearly take place in the context of “Post-Conflict Peacebuilding and Reconciliation”. A majority of respondents also mentioned “Settlement/Resolution” and “De-escalation”. However, it must be noted that peacekeeping was not only limited to certain stages, which denotes the multifaceted nature of these operations (refer to §3.3.1. and to §3.3.2.), and how peacekeeping and peacebuilding are activities both ex post and ex ante (§3.3).

❖ **Existence of specific interpreting requirements in the different stages of a conflict**

Only one of the respondents answered “Yes” to this question, 1 did not reply and the rest (6) answered “No”. In relative terms, only 12.5% of the interpreters answered “Yes”. This shows that the interpreters considered that they do not have to meet special requirements depending on the stage of the armed conflict. It can therefore be argued that, for example, hirers do not have to recruit interpreters depending on the stage of an armed conflict, because the interpreters would be the same in all cases. A pool of interpreters that would work in armed conflict and peacekeeping scenarios would supposedly be created, thus also allowing an interpreter to move from one conflict to
another, languages permitting, regardless of the stage in which the armed conflict was, as there would be no special requirements to be met.

When asked to elaborate on the previous question, few, i.e. only 3 individuals responded. The answers are shown below:

- “Choice of the interpreter can influence his/her acceptance.” In this case the respondent presumably meant that the acceptance of an assignment by an interpreter will depend on the modality of interpreting used.

- “Any situation that requires interpreting requires nothing but truthful, complete and honest interpreting. There are no and should not be different variations of that according to stages.”

- “The knowledge of an earlier stage can be helpful for the later one.”

8.4.4. Section 4. Specificities of interpreting for peacekeeping missions

❄ Existence of particular requirements when interpreting for peacekeeping missions

All respondents unanimously answered “Yes”. These data seem to contradict the answer given to the question whether different stages of a conflict would have different interpreting requirements. However, in this case, as the interpreters are already working in the peacekeeping scenario, they are more aware of those needs. This is also why, when asked if these requirements would apply outside peacekeeping missions, again there was unanimity among the respondents, as shown in the graph below.

![Graph 14. Existence of specific requirements in peacekeeping](image-url)
As a follow up to whether particular interpreting requirements would be required outside a peacekeeping setting, respondents were asked to name those areas. The answers were as follows:

- War scenarios: 3 answered “Yes” and 5 “No”.
- Permanent-peacekeeping-missions: 8 replied “Yes”.
- Negotiations: 7 responded “Yes” and 1 “No”.
- Other: only 2 respondents chose this option and wrote “international organizations” and “media reporting”.

It is interesting to note that these requirements do not only apply to peacekeeping missions but also to settings that can be found in other stages of an armed conflict (see § 2.3.). From the results obtained, it can therefore be concluded that the respondents clearly believed that these requirements apply to permanent peacekeeping missions and other conflict scenarios, as well as to negotiations involving international organizations that can happen in all stages of war. However, it is interesting to note that media reporting was also cited, which probably merits a more in-depth analysis.

**Specific requirements for interpreting for peacekeeping missions**

Despite the difficulties of an open-ended question, all respondents answered this question. It can therefore be argued that the respondents were keen to highlight these requirements. The answers were as follows:

- “Knowledge of hierarchies, technical terms, confidentiality.”
- “Highly different requirements depending on specific location in a PK force. Job of an interpreter in a linguistic pool in a large HQ has virtually nothing in common with the job of interpreter in a weapons inspection team, for example.”
- “Military terms, phrases, knowledge of equipment terms, etc.”
- “Truthful, complete, un-biased.”
- “Many of them.”
- “Composure, tactfulness, honesty.”
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- “Vocabulary of military/conflict/war techniques/post war situations; patience, tolerance, good nerves.”

- “Good knowledge of the history of the region and cultural specifics. High degree of diplomacy to handle difficult situations. Being able to work under stress.”

✗ Existence of materials to carry out the job when working for peacekeeping missions

This question is rated from 1 to 5. Three (3) respondents gave the minimum score (1), 3 gave 3 and 2 gave 4, equivalent to 38% for 1 to 3 and 25% for 4 in relative terms. The average value was 2.5 and the median was 3.

Graph 15. Existence of materials to work in peacekeeping missions

The values ranging from 1 to 3 accounted for 75% of the answers. Combined with the foregoing, it can be concluded that interpreters rarely carry with them materials that facilitate their work on peacekeeping missions.

✗ Type of materials provided

This open-ended question included only the 5 respondents who gave a score equal to or greater than 2 in the previous question. The answers were as follows:

- “Military dictionaries.”

- “Background info, speaking notes.”
• “Military dictionary(ies), other field-related dictionaries.”
• “Conference materials, notes, agendas, etc.”
• “Language skills, vocabulary, historical lessons.”

❖ Usefulness of materials for the assignment

Again, only the answers given by respondents who scored the question “Were the materials provided useful for your assignment?” with a rating equal to or greater than 2 were considered. One respondent did not answer (20%), another respondent gave a score of 3, 2 respondents gave 4 and 1 gave 5, equivalent to 3 (20%), 4 (40%) and 5 (20%) in relative terms. The average and median value was 4.

![Graph 16. Usefulness of materials](image)

From these findings it can therefore be concluded that the interpreters considered the provision of materials they were provided with to perform their job to be quite useful. In light of these findings, it is important to reflect on the need to make working materials available to these workers.

❖ Topics that could be taught in advance to interpreters in order to prepare them for working in peacekeeping scenarios

The answers to this open-ended question are shown below:

• “Cultural awareness, etiquette.”
“Military and politics (scenario specific) would be beneficial to everyone at the beginning. Later, a degree of specialization is necessary as PK missions may comprise a wide variety of activities, from war fighting to all aspects of nation-building.”

“Sensitivity of material, the importance of clear, concise and precise interpretation.”

“Some communication skills, both verbal and non-verbal. And some introduction into military environment, not necessarily military terminology because that is something that one learns during their careers.”

“History.”

“Background information on the conflict which is not in the public domain. Names and biographies of main players. If possible and applicable, documents like MoU, draft agreements etc.”

One individual answered “I don't know” and another replied “Yes”, without further comment.

These topics could be classified into the following categories:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTERPRETERS’ TOPICS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HARD SKILLS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialised terminology, political and military issues, background information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical terms, structure of the force, cultural awareness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic military and political matters, including technical glossaries, specific linguistic specialization to determine the future course of training (it may be as different as legal, medical, army, air force, political, etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background information on the conflict, stakeholders, rules of employment, risk involved, do's and don’ts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All topics discussed by parties using interpreters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOFT SKILLS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural awareness, behaviour (etiquette, diplomacy and tact).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural awareness (especially for expat interpreters who may only know the language but not the culture as well), etiquette, diplomacy, tact, empathy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication skills, situational awareness and cultural issues.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 12.* Topics to be trained as considered by interpreters.
As can be observed, these findings are consistent with the existing scientific literature which highlights the importance of an interpreter possessing both sets of skills for a better professional performance (Başar et al., 2014; Ingold, 2014; Vieira, 2014).

Monitoring of the interpreter’s performance for quality issues

This question was to be scored between 1 and 5, 1 being never and 5 being always. The ranking in relative terms of the answers to this question, scored from 1 to 5, are shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The graph shows:

[Graph 17. Monitoring of performance]

Thus, the average value for the monitoring of interpreters by the user was 2.875 and the median 3. The findings do not provide enough information about this variable. However, they are rather low values, suggesting that monitoring has seldom occurred.

Another open-ended question was made related to this first question about who was in charge of this monitoring. This question was answered only by respondents who rated the previous question with a score equal to or greater than 2. It should be noted that one eligible respondent did not reply; therefore, there were only 5 answers, including one “I don’t know”. The other 4 answers were:

- “Another military interpreter.”
• “SFOR/EUFOR HQ Linguistic Branch chief/supervisors.”

• “Linguistic Service chief(s).”

• “My superiors, both military and civilian.”

8.4.5. Section 5. Interpreters’ perception of their own work

❖ Interpreting in a peacekeeping scenario as a vocational career choice

The respondents were asked if working as an interpreter in a peacekeeping scenario is a vocational career, and they were requested to score this question from 1 to 5. 50% of the respondents gave it a score of 3, 12.5% gave 1 and 37.5% gave 4. The average value was 3.125 and the median 3.

Graph 18. Interpreting in peacekeeping operations as a vocational career

It can therefore be concluded that the respondents considered working as an interpreter in peacekeeping missions a vocational career choice. As this is a new concept, making interpreting for peacekeeping a professional career choice, I thought that it would be interesting to explore further the answers to this question based on certain variables just like I mentioned in Section 7.4.2. For this purpose, I selected age, gender and academic qualification among the different variables that could be analysed.

In terms of age, in the findings the group of older individuals was more numerous and was supposedly the group with more experience in interpreting in a protracted conflict scenario. Though the findings are not conclusive, it can be argued
that the older the individual, the more vocational he/she is. The data are provided below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE GROUP</th>
<th>AVERAGE</th>
<th>MEDIAN</th>
<th>TOTAL DATA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 13.** Interpreting in peacekeeping operations as a vocational career. Results per age.

If we break the results down by gender we obtain the following results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENDER</th>
<th>AVERAGE</th>
<th>MEDIAN</th>
<th>TOTAL DATA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 14.** Interpreting in peacekeeping operations as a vocational career. Results per gender.

There were equal numbers of men and women. The men viewed interpreting as a vocational career choice that is more viable for them than for women.

The breakdown of the results by academic qualification gave the following data:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUALIFICATION</th>
<th>AVERAGE</th>
<th>MEDIAN</th>
<th>TOTAL DATA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate degree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate, diploma or the equivalent</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s degree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 15.** Interpreting in peacekeeping operations as a vocational career. Results per qualification.

Though a cautious interpretation of the data is warranted, given that the little data available for each option was collected from several respondents, it appears that the respondents with higher levels of education gave a higher score and viewed vocational career choice as an option.
∀ Interpreting for EUFOR BiH ALTHEA as a vocational career choice

In this case, 50% of respondents gave a score of 3, whereas the remaining 50% split equally between 1 and 4 on a scale of 1 to 5. The average was 2.75 and the median 3.

Graph 19. Interpreting for EUFOR BiH ALTHEA as a vocational career choice

It can be argued that the majority of respondents, who accounted for 75% of 3 and 4 points, viewed their work at EUFOR as a vocational career choice. It is interesting to compare the findings obtained for this question and the previous one. The results were better when the respondents were questioned about their more general perception than the EUFOR-specific case. However, the difference was also minimal. Indeed, given the limited data set, the findings are inconclusive. In both cases, this is shown in the graph and by the average value.

∀ Satisfaction with treatment by users of interpreting services

This question was also scored from 1 (not at all) to 5 (very much). The relative frequencies in percentages for the replies were for 1, 2 and 4 12.5%; for a score of 3, 37.5% and for 5, 25%. The average value for this question was 3.25 and the median 3:
It can be observed that most respondents were quite satisfied with the way they had been treated by the users, with the top three scores accounting for 75%. However, one must also be critical in this regard and acknowledge that this can be improved. If we look at the average and median values, the results are not very good.

**Relevance of the role played in the communication process**

The respondents only scored between 3 and 5, with 3 accounting for 12.5%, 4 for 50% and 5 for 37.5%. The average value was 4.25 and the median 4.
This clearly shows that the respondents considered their role in the evaluation process to be very important. Indeed, this variable obtained by far the highest quantitative score of all the variables rated from 1 to 5.

8.4.6. Section 6. Working conditions for interpreters at EUFOR

❖ Years of professional experience as an interpreter

Answers were varied despite the given age brackets: less than one year, 1-3 years, 4-7 years, 8-10 years, other.

The frequencies were as follows: 4-7 years (1) and 8-10 years (2). The remaining respondents (up to 7) marked the “Other” option and indicated the number of years. It must be underlined that one of the respondents was no longer answering the questions, leaving the number of respondents at 7 in this Section. This meant that the data set used had changed: 17, about 20, 23 and 29 years.

This implies two things: (1) we did not correctly anticipate the years of experience that our respondents could have; and (2) the respondents had been working for longer than we anticipated. The table shows the results after the data had been consolidated:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEARS OF EXPERIENCE</th>
<th>0-3</th>
<th>4-7</th>
<th>8-10</th>
<th>11-20</th>
<th>21-30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16. Number of years’ experience as interpreters

Nevertheless, the fact is that most of the respondents had more than 20 years of experience working as interpreters.

❖ Years of professional experience as an interpreter for EUFOR BiH ALTHEA

The frequency distribution of the years worked for EUFOR is shown below:
### Interpreting modalities used

The findings for the various modalities are analysed here:

- **Simultaneous**: 2 answered “Yes” and 5 “No”.
- **Consecutive**: 7 replied “Yes”.
- **Chuchotage**: 5 responded “Yes” and 2 “No”.
- **Sight translation**: 2 answered “Yes” and 5 “No”.
- **Bidule/portable equipment**: All 7 replied “No”.

It can therefore be concluded that the “Consecutive” modality, which all claimed to use, was the most widespread, followed by “Chuchotage” and “Simultaneous”. “Sight translation” was also used but only by a few interpreters. None of the respondents used...
“Bidule/portable equipment”. It can also be concluded that while the respondents used all modalities of interpreting, to a greater or lesser extent, with the exception of “Bidule/portable equipment”, “Consecutive” was the most popular. It can be argued that an interpreter in a peacekeeping setting must be flexible and adapt to different modalities of interpreting, depending on each scenario or situation.

**Frequency of use of these modalities**

The distribution of absolute frequencies for the different modalities is shown below.

- **Simultaneous**:
  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

  The average was 2.14 and the median 1.

- **Consecutive**:
  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

  The average was 4.14 and the median 4.

- **Chuchotage**:
  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

  The average was 2.71 and the median 3.

- **Sight translation**:
  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

  The average was 2.29 and the median 2.

- **Bidule/portable equipment**:
  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

  The average was 1.29 and the median 1.

The results are presented graphically below for comparison.
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Graph 23. Frequency of simultaneous

Graph 24. Frequency of consecutive

Graph 25. Frequency of chuchotage
The graphs show that “Consecutive” was the most extensively used modality, with an average and median value of around 4. In line with the response to the previous question, it should be noted that all respondents used this modality on a regular basis.

Language combination/pairs used

The answers to this open-ended question were:

- German - Italian (in 2005 cooperation between Austrian military police and Italian Carabinieri).
- Serbian/English
- Bosnian to English, and vice versa
• Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian - English and vice versa
• English - B/C/S and vice-versa
• Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian - English and vice versa
• English- German, German-English, Italian-German

The number of combinations appears more clearly in the chart below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LANGUAGE COMBINATIONS</th>
<th>NUMBER OF SPEAKERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>German- Italian</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbian- English</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnian- English</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian-English- and vice versa</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English- German, German-English, Italian-German</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 18-** Language combinations used by interpreters

**Directionality**

Six participants answered that they mainly interpret into their A language, while 1 participant answered “No”. These results show that most of the interpreters work into their mother tongue. At the same time, when asked if they worked both ways, into and from their mother tongue, all participants declared that they work from and into their mother tongue.
When the interpreters were asked if they worked both ways, i.e. into and from their mother tongue, they all responded yes, showing that interpreting in armed conflict scenarios requires a sound knowledge of both the source and target languages (SL & TL).

**Previous experience working as an interpreter in any field other than peacekeeping**

Five (5) respondents replied “Yes” vs. 3 “No”. the replies suggest that most interpreters had a long-standing experience working as interpreters in scenarios that were not related to peacekeeping, providing them with exposure to different topics and situations other than the ones encountered only in armed conflict ones.

**Graph 29.** Previous experience as an interpreter in any other field.

**Previous experience working as an interpreter in peacekeeping missions before working for BiH ALTHEA**

In this case, unlike the previous question, only 3 of the 7 respondents answered Yes. It can therefore be argued that though many of the respondents (over 70%) had prior experience in other fields before working for BiH ALTHEA, the majority started working as interpreters in peacekeeping missions once they joined EUFOR BiH ALTHEA.
Previous experience as an interpreter in peacekeeping before BiH ALTHEA

Graph 30. Previous experience as an interpreter in peacekeeping before BiH ALTHEA.

❖ **Length of time working as an interpreter on peacekeeping missions before working for EUFOR BiH ALTHEA**

It is interesting to observe that only one interpreter had worked less than a year on peacekeeping missions before working for EUFOR: all the other respondents - 85.71% - had worked for some time on peacekeeping missions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME WORKED</th>
<th>ANSWERS</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than a year</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-7 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 7 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19. Years working for BiH ALTHEA

❖ **Hours worked per day**

This question was also a multiple choice one that came with a list of options. 42.86% of the respondents worked between 4 and 7 hours per day and the remaining 57.14% worked over 7 hours. Despite the multiple options, these were the only two answers chosen by the respondents.

The difference in working hours among respondents is intriguing; and there are two conclusions one could reach: on the one hand, it could be that some interpreters worked part time, whilst others worked full-time; and on the other, the interpreters...
were probably subscribing to the working days and hours recommended for interpreters by AIIC:

Given the constraints related to quality and health, the normal duration of an interpreter’s working day shall not exceed two sessions of between two-and-a-half and three hours each (AIIC, n.d.).

![Graph 31. Hours worked per day.]

**Frequency interpreters have been asked to work more than 7 hours**

The frequency was scored on a scale of 1 to 5 with the following results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average was 2.86 and the median 3.

The interpreters were required to work more than 7 hours on a relatively regular basis. Though the reasons are unknown, it is conceivable that the respondents were requested to work overtime when certain circumstances arise.

Nonetheless, it was interesting to determine whether the interpreters who were asked on a regular basis to work overtime were those that usually worked fewer hours or those who worked more than 7 hours. This data was analysed based on the previous question about hours worked per day. The results were as follows:
Table 20. Number of hours worked per day

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOURS WORKED PER DAY</th>
<th>AVERAGE</th>
<th>MEDIAN</th>
<th>TOTAL DATA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4–7 hours per day</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 7</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Though the findings are rather inconclusive, it can be argued that the average and median values show that the respondents who worked fewer hours were more frequently asked to work overtime than those who worked more than 7 hours per day.

Payment of overtime

The question focuses on whether or not the respondents were paid for working outside their normal working hours. Only 2 answered “Yes” and the others “No”. Three things can be concluded: (1) the respondents did or did not work overtime when asked to do so (therefore, they replied “No”), (2) they were paid in some other way (refer to next question), and (3) the employment rights of the interpreters were undermined to some extent.

Graph 32 Payment of overtime.

Compensation of overtime

Only 5 of the individuals who answered “No” to the previous question; their responses were as follows:
• “As a soldier on a military mission there is no overtime”.

• “Compensatory time off, ONLY for working over weekends or other designated days off.”

• “Yes, hours/days off.”

• “No.”

• “CTO or compensatory time off”, without qualifying the reply.

8.4.7. Section 7. Training interpreters for EUFOR Peacekeeping Missions

❖ Specific training for interpreters working for peacekeeping scenarios

Six (6) respondents answered “Yes” and only 1 replied “No” to the question: should there be specific training for interpreters who are working or are going to work in peacekeeping scenarios? The respondents appeared to consider it important that specific training to work in peacekeeping scenarios be made available to current and future interpreters (training a priori would be considered).

![Graph 33. Specific training for interpreting in peacekeeping settings.](image)

❖ Specific training for interpreters working for EUFOR peacekeeping missions

The same question was asked regarding EUFOR. Four (4) individuals answered “Yes”, 2 “No”, and 1 “No Answer”.

It can therefore be argued that, based on the previous question, although most respondents believed that this training was important, they considered that it was more
useful when provided before or during a peacekeeping mission, as is the case of EUFOR.

![Specific training for EUFOR](image)

**Graph 34.** Specific training for interpreting on EUFOR MISSIONS.

**Reasons for specific training**

This question focused on the possible reasons for answering “Yes” to the previous question:

- “Culturally sensitive environment.”
- “Complicated multicultural environment with military supervisors and customers mostly unable or uninterested in assisting a beginner and most of interpreters come from academic backgrounds and lack basic knowledge of military organisation and political considerations relevant to the job.”
- “Just as there is training provided for Peacekeepers before they head into a warzone, training should be provided to the interpreters who will be working with them. All participants in the process should be well equipped with information.”
- “It is necessary.”

**Responsibility of the training**

This question only targeted the individuals who answered “Yes” to question number 57. Of the multiple choices available, the respondents chose only 2 with the following frequencies:
• EUFOR in-house training services: 4 individuals chose this option.

• Third parties specialised in the training of peacekeeping mission staff: 1 person chose this option.

It is clear that, in their opinion, this training should be provided by EUFOR services.

❖ Level of satisfaction/appropriateness of the training received

When interpreters were asked if they were satisfied with the training received, only 3 respondents answered “Yes” to this question vs. 1 “No” and 3 who did not answer. Despite the strong interest in the answer to this question, the findings are inconclusive owing to the fact that a larger proportion of respondents did not answer. It can only be said that many appeared to think that the training did prepare them.

Graph 35. Satisfaction with training received.

❖ Reasons for satisfaction

Only 4 individuals answered this question on the reasons why they replied “Yes” or “No” to the previous question. The reasons were:

• “Long-standing experience in the military.”

• “There was virtually no training and self-education, experience and trial and error is what qualified me, which is a wrong way.”

• “It sharpened my skills.”
• “In addition to the knowledge I received during my university study, I learnt this job while working as an interpreter (‘on-the-job training’) and it has been over 2 decades now that I became one. Also, while working for NATO I attended two sessions of interpreter/translator training, which was of great value for me.”

❖ Specific topics that should be taught to work in armed conflict and peacekeeping scenarios

The answer to the question: Do you think there are particular topics that could be taught in advance in order to prepare interpreters to work in armed conflict and peacekeeping scenarios? is unequivocally “Yes”, with the exception of one individual who did not reply.

It can therefore be concluded that the interpreters considered proper advanced training in certain topics when working in an armed conflict or a peacekeeping mission to be important. Indeed, the relevant person in this case should take due notice of these findings.

Graph 36. Specific topics to be trained for interpreting in peacekeeping missions and war.

❖ Topics to be trained

This question focused on which are the relevant topics.

• “Technical terms, structure of the force, cultural awareness.”

• “As stated earlier, basic military and political matters - all this including technical glossaries and later, specific linguistic specialization will
determine the course of training (it may be as different as legal, medical, army, air force, political ...)."

- “Cultural awareness (especially for expat interpreters who may only know the language but not the culture as well), etiquette, diplomacy, tact, empathy.”

- “All topics discussed by parties using interpreters.”

- “Communication skills, situational awareness and cultural issues.”

- “Background information on the conflict, stakeholders, rules of employment, risk involved, do’s and don’ts.”

**Specific topics that should be trained for interpreters working for EUFOR**

The same questions were asked in relation to working for EUFOR. Three (3) individuals answered “Yes”, 1 “No” and the others did not answer.

As was the case in some previous questions, the findings were inconclusive owing to the large number of people who did not answer. However, the number of individuals who answered “Yes” was higher.

![Graph 37. Specific topics to be trained for interpreting for EUFOR.](image)
Reasons for training these topics

This question targeted respondents who answered “Yes” to the previous question only. The answers to this open-ended question are shown below:

- “Cultural awareness.”
- “To prepare interpreters to interpret at meetings as which those topics are discussed.”
- “Background information on the conflict, stakeholders, rules of employment, risk involved, do’s and don’ts.”

Importance of teaching interpreting modalities

This question focused on the frequency of different interpreting modalities, which were rated on a scale of 1 to 5 and plotted in a graph so they are easier to understand:

- Consecutive:

![Consecutive Modalities Graph](image)

The average was 4.71 and the median 5.

Graph 38. Importance of teaching consecutive.
• Simultaneous:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average was 3.86 and the median 3.

**Graph 39.** Importance of teaching simultaneous.

• Chuchotage:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average was 3.71 and the median 4.

**Graph 40.** Importance of teaching chuchotage.
• Sight-translation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average was 2.86 and the median 3.

Graph 41. Importance of teaching sight translation.

• Bidule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average was 2.14 and the median 3.

Graph 42. Importance of teaching bidule.

It can only be concluded that the “Consecutive” modality was clearly important for the respondents, as it scored the highest average and median throughout the
questionnaire. All other modalities are listed in declining order of relevance, with “Bidule” being the modality that the interpreters considered least important to learn to use.

✧ Length of training required for interpreting in peacekeeping missions

The answers to this multiple choice question on the duration of training are shown below. One respondent replied “I don’t know”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of Training</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 month intensive</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 months intensive</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 months intensive</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 21. Length of training for interpreting in peacekeeping missions

The majority of respondents felt that a one-month intensive training course would suffice to prepare an interpreter working for peacekeeping missions. The relevant person in this case should bear in mind this finding and support the organisation of courses of reasonable length.

✧ Challenges of interpreting

The respondents were asked to score the following areas on a scale of 1 to 5. The tables below show the absolute frequencies of their answers.
• Linguistic-skills:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average was 2.43 and the median 3.

• Linguistic-accuracy:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average was 2.71 and the median 3.

• Cultural-awareness:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average was 2.29 and the median 2.

• Non-verbal communication:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both the average and median values were 2.

• Etiquette:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average was 2.29 and the median 2.

• Empathy:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average was 1.71 and the median 2.

• Flexibility:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average was 1.86 and the median 2.
• Diplomacy:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average was 2.14 and the median 3.

• Psychological-stamina:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average was 2.86 and the median 4.

• Physical-endurance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average was 2.71 and the median 4.

The results are shown in graphs for the sake of clarity:

**Graph 44.** Linguistic skills.
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**Graph 45.** Linguistic accuracy.

**Graph 46.** Cultural awareness.

**Graph 47.** Non-verbal communication.
Graph 48. Etiquette

Graph 49. Empathy

Graph 50. Flexibility
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Graph 51. Diplomacy.

Graph 52. Psychological stamina.

Graph 53. Physical endurance.
The results show that the interpreters faced the greatest challenges in the performance of their duties in “Psychological stamina” and “Physical endurance”. Conversely, the least challenging areas were “Empathy” and “Flexibility”.

It can therefore be concluded that working as an interpreter is physically and psychologically stressful and requires the building of resilience. On the other hand, though not strictly required, there are certain attributes that interpreters must have, such as Empathy and Flexibility, which come to them naturally, without any extra effort being required.

8.5. DISCUSSION

8.5.1. Section 1. Personal Information

From the information presented in this section, the first thing we can observe is that the majority of respondents were Bosnian, which is in line with the results reported in the literature stating that interpreters in conflict areas are usually recruited locally, or are heritage speakers, and in some cases are natives of the deploying army who happen to have mastered the language (Bos & Soeters 2006, C. Baker, 2010a, 2010b; Kelly & Baker, 2013, Vieira, 2014). Also, most respondents were in an older age group (51-60), suggesting that as we are talking about a protracted conflict, this circumstance could be due to the fact that some of these individuals have been working for the peacekeeping missions for a long time, between 7-10 years, as well as to the fact that some had professional experience of “17”, “about 20”, “23” and “29” years.

One very interesting finding was that there were as many men as women working in this scenario, in a profession that is mainly considered a female one (Gile, 2006). This could be due to the fact that the presence of women in the Bosnian labour market is low (Somun-Krupalija, 2011). However though the majority of the interpreters were Bosnian, this is not a conclusive finding because there were also interpreters from other nationalities. It may also be due to the nature of the job itself. In any case, it is an issue that deserves further quantitative research.

At the same time, a majority of civilian interpreters already suggests that the military did not have enough vernacular speaking linguists prepared to operate in the region, which is consistent with the accounts of Dragovic-Drouet (2007), C. Baker (2012c), Kelly & Baker (2013) and Vieira (2014).

Most interpreters also had higher education qualifications, i.e. a Bachelor’s, Master’s or Doctorate degree, which is maybe due to the fact that as time passed and
less interpreters were required, the most skilled and experienced were retained by EUFOR. Indeed, Fitchett (2012) and C. Baker (2012a), remind us that, contrary to what is commonly thought, interpreters recruited in war scenarios are usually individuals with a high education level and well versed in the languages they have to interpret because they take up these well-paid jobs in a torn economy, forsaking the possibility of following another professional career in their field of expertise because of the situation their country is in at that moment in time.

The results regarding the languages used and interpreted from and into also confirm what other researchers have found in this field when interpreted encounters are described, where it is noted that interpreters have to work into and out of their mother tongues. It is also interesting to remark that respondents had in the majority of cases more than one A language, which is probably the result of EUFOR BiH ALTHEA being a multinational body, where more than one language is spoken. At the same time, in the results it can be observed that the 4 interpreters who spoke Bosnian also claimed that their other A languages were Serbian and Croatian, a feature that is probably due to the fact that before the country split-up, all the former states were under a single government umbrella, forcing them to communicate and interact with each other and speak one single tongue, Serbo-Croat, while after the war, all three groups declared their languages were different (C. Baker, 2010b).

When it comes to the academic training of the subjects, most interpreters replied that they did not read interpreting or translation at University, despite having followed higher education studies. Nonetheless, they were capable of carrying out their interpreting assignments, which probably suggests that although it is believed that interpreting requires training to possess advanced language, cognitive and memory/attention skills, in this scenario we observe that this is not the case for most interpreters. However, this statement must be taken with caution because when talking about interpreting in this setting, we are including all the modalities (simultaneous, consecutively liaison, chuchotage, sight translation) under one single denomination – interpreting-, and this may have had an impact on the results because for simultaneous interpreting, and probably for consecutive –if it is a long consecutive-, one would probably require more specific training. This result also endorses findings reported in the literature where it has been observed that most interpreters recruited in peacekeeping scenarios do not have specific training in translation and interpreting (Bos & Soeters, 2006; Kelly & Baker, 2013; Vieira, 2014). This is a fact that is also highlighted in the comments made by respondents, where there was one interpreter who defined the training received as “military interpreter”, suggesting that there is specialisation in this field in the military and that despite civilian interpreters being a
majority, there are also military interpreters. At the same time, although the
interpreters had not studied interpreting, they had had all received some kind of
training in the field for interpreting, which shows the maturity acquired in this field by
EUFOR after many years of working with interpreters in BiH.

In terms of whether the interpreters had been offered guidance on the role they
were supposed to play in their job, the majority agreed that they had, with a high
response rate, suggesting that the guidance provided by EUFOR shows that the
institution is aware of the issues that can arise when working with interpreters and also
of the importance that both verbal and non-verbal skills have. This coincides with the
proposals of Bos & Soeters (2006), C. Baker (2010a), Kelly & Baker (2013), and Vieira
(2014), all of whom suggest the importance not only of language proficiency but also of
matters regarding allegiances, and “soft skills” or protocols which are important
components of cross-cultural competence (3C), a topic that has to be taken into account
when working with interpreters and in multilingual or bilingual scenarios. Overall, this
guidance received reveals the importance attributed to these skills.

8.5.2. Section 2. The role of the interpreter throughout history

The results in this section are quite interesting. At the beginning of this
dissertation, I mentioned that learning about the past gives us a better understanding
of the present and that knowledge of conflict theory is useful for understanding the role
played by interpreters because it provides a framework that defines the different roles
these professionals have to play, as well as the tasks, skills and modes of interpreting
required in each scenario.

The scores obtained in relation to the interpreters’ knowledge of the history of
interpreting were rather low, probably because training usually focuses more on the
specific techniques and topics that have to be mastered for interpreting. Also, though
there are many studies on the history and status of interpreters in the past, the
information is scattered and there is really only one seminal work that provides an in-
depth analysis of the entire history of the profession, which is Roland’s (1999), with a
special focus on North America and Asia. Delisle and Woodsworth (2012) also provide
an interesting insight into the history of translation, however there is only one chapter
in their book that actually covers the past of interpreting. Although Baigorri (2014a)
and Gaiba (1998) do carry out an analysis of contemporary interpreting. While Baigorri
(2014a) goes back to the Peace of Paris, considering it the beginning of modern
interpreting history, all the way up to the establishment and settlement of the United
Nations, Gaiba (1998) focuses on the Nuremberg Trials, providing us a detailed view
and description of all that happened during the trials. So, despite the increasing number of historical sources that are becoming available, it seems that the history of interpreting is not yet considered a subject in its own right in training curricula.

This situation was further evidenced by the fact that respondents gave different answers when talking about the existence of interpreters. Interestingly enough the results were very varied, showing that there is no consensus as to when the need for language intermediaries arose, and even less so regarding the status of interpreters. Replies varied from a “Tough/tricky question, have no answer” to a specific date like “1700”. One respondent said since Roman times, probably because the Roman Army conquered many foreign lands and one could presume the need for some type of intermediary in this scenario as described in Chapter 1. To this same question other respondents answered that interpreters have been used in times of war and conflict between nations and tribes, showing that in war interpreters are necessary. In this regard, another respondent stated that in any negotiation of an armistice and or peace there must have been an interpreter, and more so if it were a peace process. Whereas other respondents highlighted the Spanish Civil War and WWII as the events that signalled the appearance of interpreters, which makes me wonder how armies or governments would have been able to communicate in the past, if multilingual individuals were more the exception than the rule. Only one respondent actually replied that interpreters must have been required “since antiquity”, and another “since the beginning”. This shows that the knowledge of this topic is sparse and fragmented, and somehow linked to specific historical periods.

8.5.3 Section 3. Conflict definition and conflict stages

In this section, the aim was to see if all respondents were aware of the existence of conflict theory or conflict studies and, if that were the case, whether all respondents related the term “armed conflict” or “war” to the same concept.

When it came to stating whether there was a specific definition for war, all subjects, except one, agreed there was one and also that there were different stages in a conflict. However, when it came to the different stages of the conflict the respondents’ opinions varied. There was a minority that opted for the simplest description of the stages of a war: Pre-war, escalation and post-war. A majority was more in favour of a more complex division: No conflict, Latent conflict, Emergence, Escalation, Stalemate, De-Escalation, Settlement/Resolution, Post-Conflict Peace building and Reconciliation. These replies show that respondents were very aware of the different stages, and probably of the different challenges arising in each one of them, making me believe that
they had not acquired formal knowledge of these facts. When asked in which of the stages they would frame peacekeeping in the conflict curve devised by Brahm (2003), the replies were quite revealing because they associated peacekeeping with a variety of scenarios: latent conflict, stalemate, de-escalation, settlement/resolution and Post-Conflict Peace building and Reconciliation. The majority of them, however, selected post-conflict peace building and reconciliation” as well as “Settlement/Resolution” and “De-escalation”; and only one respondent included peacekeeping in the escalation phase, and none in the non-conflict stage. This was very interesting because even though it was not a view shared by the majority, when respondents included peacekeeping and peace-building activities, which are included in a variety of settings, it revealed that they believed that the role of the interpreter was not limited to a single stage of war but was necessary in many others. Similarly, it would be interesting to see if required interpreting modalities would be the same depending on the stage in which the peacekeeping action is being developed to ensure that the right professionals are hired and the users’ expectations are fulfilled.

This question also led to me to enquire about the possible specific interpreting requirements for each stage of the conflict (Baigorri, 2011). Interestingly enough and contrary to what I expected, the interpreters believed that there are no specific requirements for each stage of an armed conflict. Consequently, this would mean that, according to the respondents, an institution or individual could work with the same interpreter in all stages of the conflict. However, I believe that once again the issue of interpreting modalities was not taken into account. If we refer to Chapters 3 and 4, it can be observed that different modalities are used in peacekeeping scenarios. Likewise, when in Table 3 in Chapter 3 I compare Brahm’s (2003) conflict stages with Baigorri’s (2011), I provide a detailed description of the types of meetings that arise in each stage, where supposedly different interpreting modalities will be used, while in Chapter 4 the different interpreting modalities are described and it is clear that to interpret simultaneously, do a long consecutive, whisper or sight translate, certain skills and abilities have to be trained and certain requirements must be put into place. The responses given may have been due to the fact that although most of the interpreters in my study were university graduates, few either had university qualifications in interpreting or had received some type of training to carry out their job, and as a result did not distinguish between the modalities, the different stages of the conflict, or both. I suggest that if we analyse the different stages carefully (see Chapter 2), one should consider that there would be different needs and specific modes of interpreting that would be more appropriate for each individual stage, which would make it sometimes, if not always, difficult to work with the same interpreters in all of those phases. This is a
matter to which the interpreters did not attribute importance, or did not understand well, because when they were asked to elaborate on the topic, very few of them replied, and those who did felt that they would or would not accept an assignment depending on what they were offered; a couple reasoned that all situations require honest interpreting and therefore there should be no variations expected or implemented for a particular stage of the conflict. All of these reasons were not specifically related to the question asked, which was probably due to a misinterpretation of the original meaning that referred to the most technical aspects of the working scenario. In fact, only one respondent, replying to this same question, even argued that knowing more about an earlier stage of a conflict could be useful for working in later stages. This could be true because becoming involved at an early stage provides an in-depth and first-hand knowledge of the conflict; this expertise would mean that interpreters would have no doubts about how to prepare and study the topic, and cultural issues would have been eliminated. Nonetheless, and in view of the majority of replies given to these questions, the answers seem totally unrelated with the questions asked, and this may have been due to the fact that the questions were unexpected, not clearly drafted, or not fully understood by the respondents.

8.5.4. Section 4. Specificities of interpreting for Peacekeeping Missions

This section focused on the specificities, if any, of interpreting peacekeeping missions. When referring to the different characteristics, respondents agreed that there were indeed specificities when working in peacekeeping operations, and also felt that those specificities were not only limited to the peacekeeping scenarios but also ought to be applied outside a peacekeeping mission. The interpreters felt that knowledge of specialised terminology, political and military issues, background information, cultural awareness, behaviour (etiquette, diplomacy and tact) were important. These results seem to reveal that not only language skills are valued for interpreting but also “soft skills” are considered an asset, and that these skills, both verbal and non-verbal, can also be extrapolated to other interpreting scenarios.

With respect to the specific requirements mentioned, they all seem relevant to this environment. Firstly, etiquette, knowing how to address the parties is important, and even more so in a military environment, where the chain of command is a key element for the allocation of duties, and where it would be correct to address the parties by order of importance. It was also very clear that specific terminology and knowledge was a must, as respondents felt that knowledge of military terms and stock phrases, equipment terms and techniques were important. Soft skills were also mentioned: composure, tactfulness and honesty, diplomacy when handling difficult situations and
working under stress and duress (Bos & Soeters, 2006; C. Baker, 2010b). I believe it is extremely important, as flexibility is the name of the game in these environments where so many difficult and stressful encounters take place. Ethics was also mentioned when it was stated that the interpreter has to be truthful, unbiased and convey the complete message, and also be able to handle confidential information/confidentiality. And it was also highlighted that the job of an interpreter would change depending on whom they would be working for on the mission, as it would not be the same to work for a weapons inspection team or in a large headquarters because the professional jargon, the environment and the topics covered would all be different.

For preparation purposes it is always important to have access to specific documents and relevant materials, as prior knowledge of the topic covered is very important, allowing the interpreter to anticipate the speaker and thus use less memory and cognitive resources. Despite the proven importance of preparation, the respondents to this survey stated that they were rarely given materials. This coincides with the findings reported by Kelly & Baker (2013), who stated that this is due to reasons of confidentiality and trust. Meanwhile, the interpreters added that when they were provided with materials, these materials included a haphazard collection of materials, ranging from military dictionaries, speaking notes, agendas and conference materials to vocabulary and history lessons. This shows that maybe it is important to insist to users in this scenario how important it is to provide interpreters with appropriate materials, and how they can definitely have an impact on their performance. In any case, the usefulness of the materials was acknowledged by the respondents.

As the military in general and the peacekeeping environment in particular value trust (Dragovic-Drouet, 2007; Palmer, 2007; C. Baker 2012a; Kelly & Baker; 2013; Vieira, 2014;), I considered that monitoring for quality issues was an important topic to cover. To this end, I felt it was important to determine whether the interpreters had been monitored. It seemed that this was seldom the case and when they were monitored, this was done by a peer or a linguistic supervisor, either civilian or military (Van Dijk et al., 2010; C. Baker, 2012a; Kelly & Baker, 2013). This was probably because the users completely trusted the interpreters.

8.5.5. Section 5. Interpreter’s perception of their own work

First of all, although at the beginning of the conflict in Bosnia interpreters were hired as required, today in a similar setting where there is a huge state building effort taking place in the midst of a protracted conflict, I thought that perhaps the possibility
of considering interpreting in a peacekeeping scenario should be considered a professional career option, despite not having found references on this matter. This is because we have observed similar scenarios unfolding in Afghanistan, Iraq and possibly Syria. In fact, when asked about this possibility, interpreters considered interpreting in a peacekeeping scenario a vocational choice. A factor that enhanced their views on the topic seems to be that they were mostly satisfied with the way users treated them. In those cases where dissatisfaction was expressed, probably the rotation of troops (Bos & Soeters, 2006; C. Baker, 2010a), as reported in the literature, may have influenced these views.

Interpreters also perceived their role as very important in the communication process. This is consistent with accounts that appear in the literature where the role of the interpreter is clearly acknowledged and required.

8.5.6. Section 6. Working conditions for interpreters at EUFOR

In this section, I wanted to focus on the working conditions of interpreters at EUFOR, as I felt it was important to obtain a better understanding of their situation within this organisation.

Working conditions are important for a successful performance in interpreting, a fact that professional associations always insist on, and therefore AIIC could not be an exception to this rule, with a clear ethics code as well as professional standards and the regulation of working conditions. The Association also promotes interpreters’ rights, subscribing working agreements and other memorandums with international organisations such as the Economic Community of West African States, United Nations, European Union, Global Union Federations Sector, World Customs Organisation, European Space Agency, NATO and the Council of Europe, to ensure interpreters’ interests and working conditions are complied with. Conflicts are no exception, and for this purpose AIIC, Red T and FIT (International Federation of Translators) drafted the first conflict zone field guide to ensure the basic rights, responsibilities and practices recommended by these organizations are clearly defined, not only for “field linguists for the armed forces”, but also interpreters/translators working for “armed forces, journalists, NGOs, and other organizations in conflict zones and other high-risk settings” (AIIC, n.d.).

Quality in interpreting is important, as the different skills required depend on attention and memory, which diminish after some time. Therefore, a series of questions were included in the interpreters’ questionnaire on working conditions.
Working hours are part and parcel of the professional standards of interpreters, which is why I wanted to know how many hours a day an interpreter worked. I was struck by the replies, as they indicated that although 48.56% of the interpreters worked between 4 and 7 hours a day, which could be considered a normal working day, 57.14% worked over 7 hours, a working day that is much longer than recommended by AIIC in its professional standards:

Given the constraints related to quality and health, the normal duration of an interpreter’s working day shall not exceed two sessions of between two-and-a-half and three hours each (AIIC, n.d.).

This is something that may have to do with the pool of interpreters available, as well as the impossibility in many cases of being able to foresee how situations may unfold. If an interpreter is working in the field, away from the base, it would not be very practical to try to switch interpreters unless a back-up is provided. But this can also be the case when a difficult issue has to be covered during a negotiation encounter. The length of time can already be anticipated as long. Furthermore, as it seems interpreters are required to work more than 7 hours on a regular basis, and it seems to happen often, this should be anticipated by the hiring institution, in this case EUFOR, so that the interpreters can have some rest, as this will have an impact on the quality of their work. In the specific case studied here, the interpreters received some type of compensation for these additional hours. Some were paid an extra sum of money and others were given compensatory time off, hours or time off. Only one individual, a military interpreter, stated that as a soldier there is no such concept as overtime, which is in close relation to what was mentioned about military interpreting in Chapter 3.1, where Baigorri (2011) stated how the military hierarchical chain of command has a say in the interpreting event, implying that it may be interesting in the future to follow another line of research where the status of military and civilian interpreters is compared.

Indeed, quality is important in any professional field (Kopczynski, 19984; Kurz, 2001; Pöchhacker, 2001; Ruiz Rosendo, 2009), and expertise plays an important role in this. That is why I wanted to determine how long the interpreters had worked for. At the beginning of the conflict the interpreters were very young when they were hired. The conflict continued and became protracted. As a result, when the interpreters were asked about how long they had worked for EUFOR BiH ALTHEA, the times mentioned varied from 1 to 10 years, showing that this was quite a “veteran” pool of interpreters.
The interpreting modalities used most are consecutive, chuchotage and, to a lesser extent, sight translation and simultaneous. These findings coincide with the results reported by Edwards (2002). As a result, consecutive is mostly used in the field, (Edwards, 2002) as well as during negotiations, both long and short consecutive (Edwards, 2002, C. Baker, 2012a). None of the interpreters used the bidule/portable equipment as it is probably not available in the institution.

The language combinations employed were the expected ones: mostly English and one of the local vernaculars Bosnian, Croatian or Serbian. German was also used, not surprisingly as troops from Austria, Turkey and Hungary were deployed in the area at the time this study was carried out. The interpreters also stated that they worked mostly into their A language, although they also had to work into the other foreign language, which is to be expected in this scenario. As the interpreters in this study stated that they worked mostly in the consecutive mode, working in consecutive into a B language is accepted by AIIC, though it is mostly done either in only one modality, consecutive or simultaneous. Consecutive is usually preferred because it is slower (AIIC, n.d.) and it offers the interpreters the possibility of interacting with the parties, should there be need for an explanation or to pose a question.

The majority of the interpreters stated that they had professional experience working in fields other than peacekeeping but did not mention what these fields were, as a follow-up question was not included in this regard because I only wanted to check whether they had previous experience working as interpreters or not. This is important because it goes to show that the sample population of interpreters studied, regardless of whether they had received specialised training in interpreting, had prior experience in the profession. In contrast, when the interpreters were asked if they had experience working with peacekeeping missions, the opposite was the case because most of the interpreters first started working in this setting when they joined EUFOR BiH ALTHEA. Despite this, by the time the completed questionnaires were received only one interpreter had worked for less than one year for EUFOR and all the others had worked between 3 and more than 7 years.

8.5.7. Section 7. Training interpreters for EUFOR Peacekeeping Missions

Training is important for professional interpreting (C. Baker, 2012a) and this was also highlighted in the responses to this questionnaire. The majority of the respondents said that specific training should be provided to interpreters working in peacekeeping scenarios. However, when the same question was asked as to whether specific training should be provided to interpreters working for EUFOR Peacekeeping
Missions, slightly more that 50% of the individuals agreed. This result may be due to the fact that most of the interpreters were experienced. The reasons for training were manifold, and have been described in the relevant scientific literature on the topic (Bos & Soeters, 2006; C. Baker, 2012a; Kelly & Baker, 2013). The answers to this last question included the need to be culturally aware, to prepare interpreters for meetings in which specific topics are covered, to provide interpreters with information on the conflict, stakeholders, rules of employment, risk involved, and do’s and don’ts.

Training was therefore considered important because even though most interpreters had an academic background, they did not have basic knowledge of military organisations or political considerations relevant to the job. In fact, an important comment was made, namely that if peacekeepers are given specific training before entering a warzone, why is this same training not provided to interpreters as it would beneficial for the mission and its process to always count upon trained linguists. Just as training is provided for peacekeepers before they head into a warzone, training should be provided for the interpreters who will be working with them. All participants in the mission and its process should be well equipped with information, as this practice guarantees a good communication in any encounter and a successful outcome.

Interpreters also believe that this training should be provided by EUFOR’s in-house training services or third parties specialised in the training of peacekeeping mission staff, highlighting the importance of specialisation in this field.

I was very interested in hearing about whether the training received had prepared interpreters to work for BiH ALTHEA. In this regard, only 3 interpreters said “Yes”, one replied “No”, and 3 did not reply. The respondents who replied also felt that they learned on their own or relied on their military experience, and when they did receive training, it helped them to improve their skills. The reply to this question is inconclusive and should be analysed in future studies.

In terms of specific topics that could be taught to prepare interpreters for work in war and peacekeeping scenarios, all the interpreters agreed that there were topics that they could have been taught in advance such as technical terms, army organisation issues, basic military and political matters, which would prepare the interpreter with specific linguistic training. In line with the relevant scientific literature (Van Dijk et al., 2010; C. Baker 2012a; Kelly & Baker, 2013), other topics mentioned were cultural issues and awareness, communication skills, etiquette, diplomacy, tact, awareness of the situation, as well as information on the conflict, parties and other issues; in short, as one respondent stated, the “do’s and don’ts”.

When focusing on training, I also wanted to determine which modalities of interpreting they believed should be taught to work in peacekeeping scenarios. The result was clear: consecutive was the modality that respondents felt was most important to learn, which is understandable as it is the one they used most. This also led me to believe that consecutive interpreting should continue to be trained at interpreting schools, in view of the importance it has not only in war scenarios but also in community interpreting settings (Hale & Ozolins, 2014; Vieira, 2014).

As interpreters usually felt that training was important and other authors also mention this fact (Van Dijk et al, 2010; C. Baker, 2012a; Kelly & Baker, 2013), I felt the need to enquire about their views if a short training module on interpreting were to be organised. It is interesting to note that many interpreters (4 out of 6) felt that a one-month intensive course would be enough, which is somehow appropriate as the need to have trained interpreters in these settings is pressing, and cannot be postponed or prolonged too much in time because deadlines have to be met.

The final question asked to interpreters addressed the most important challenges they had encountered while working for EUFOR. It is of interest to note that the interpreters participating in the survey faced the greatest challenges in “Psychological stamina” and “Physical endurance”, two features that C. Baker, (2012), jointly with language skills and tolerance for risk, has stated are the characteristics that were implicitly understood as key by interpreters and users in the Bosnia theatre. Conversely, the least challenging areas were “Empathy” and “Flexibility”, which are features that are mentioned by other authors (Greene-Sands, 2014; Ingold, 2014; Vieira, 2014).
CHAPTER 9. SURVEY TARGETED AT EUFOR USERS

9.1. INTRODUCTION

As mentioned previously in the introduction to this dissertation, EUFOR BiH ALTHEA is the longest-standing EU military mission deployed to date. Despite its military nature, this operation does not only use military mechanisms for crisis management but also civilian ones covering a broad range of areas in the state-building process the mission is developing in Bosnia. The different fields of expertise required for the actions of this mission include the following: peacekeeping, economic reconstruction, counter-narcotics, organised crime and institution-building (Sweeny, 2012). At the same time, EUFOR BiH ALTHEA is a multinational body, which means that there will be interpreters working for an institution where there are many different levels of expertise in many different sub-settings, each with its own particular requirements.

In this second survey, the same process was followed as with the first one, i.e. an in-depth analysis of the purposes, methods and sampling strategy to be used, as recommended by Robson (2011), and also the implementation of the principles proposed for the design and construction of surveys established by Buendía et al. (1998) and Fink (2006). Likewise (see Chapter 7), the theoretical background, concepts, assumptions and beliefs underlying the research were also defined (Robson, 2010; Maxwell, 2012). Similarly, the data I wanted to collect were to be compared to those obtained from the interpreters’ survey study and, as a result, were targeted at finding out what users felt about the role of the interpreter in armed conflicts, and more specifically in peacekeeping scenarios; hence the focus on the specific role played by the interpreter in peacekeeping missions; the relevance of possessing knowledge about the history of interpreting in order to define more clearly the role to be played by these professionals; the significance of knowing about war theory so that this knowledge can be related to the conflict stage in which the interpreter is working in the war continuum communication process; and to consider the interpreting modalities and skills required for each phase so that recommendations can be made for interpreter training in the field of armed conflicts and peacekeeping scenarios.

As with the interpreters’ survey, the design process continued with the drafting of the research questions, followed by the selection of the survey method used. The same approach was chosen: a questionnaire, which, as mentioned in Section 7.1, is a
non-experimental fixed design research method used for descriptive purposes (Robson, 2011). Finally, the method was reduced again to the sample survey recommended by Robson (2011) for groups of individuals possessing attributes that represent a larger population.

Having selected the method, the approach chosen was again a questionnaire as it allowed me to gather both qualitative and quantitative information (Fink, 2006; Robson, 2011). The intention, just like with the interpreters’ questionnaire, was to obtain measurable results, as most of the information published on interpreters in armed conflict scenarios is qualitative in nature. The same design process steps (see Figure 2) recommended by Robson for small-scale questionnaires were followed, resulting in a questionnaire which had seven sections just like the first one, but shorter –51 questions –because users were asked less questions about the working conditions of interpreters as the respondents were not the direct hirers of the interpreters.

9.2. RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND OBJECTIVES

Just like with the previous questionnaire, and once the purposes and theoretical framework were clear, I posed the following research questions before proceeding to draft the second questionnaire:

RQ1. What is the profile of users who work with interpreters in armed conflict scenarios?

RQ2. What are the needs of users who work with interpreters in armed conflict scenarios?

RQ3. Are users aware of the existence of the profession of interpreter in armed conflict scenarios, its evolution and development?

RQ4. Do users believe that the conflict stage will have an impact on the work of the interpreter, in terms of modalities and scenarios?

RQ5. How do users perceive the role of interpreters who work in armed conflict scenarios in terms of usefulness?

RQ6. Which are the specific requirements for interpreting in peacekeeping missions according to users?

RQ7. Are these requirements fulfilled or not? Why?

RQ8. Did the interpreters have enough language skills to perform their duties according to users?
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RQ9. Which were the main problems encountered when working with interpreters?

RQ10. Which are the interpreting modalities used in peacekeeping missions?

RQ11. Do users think that specific training is required for working in peacekeeping missions?

RQ 12. How could this training be organised in terms of time, topics, modalities, etc.?

The objectives of the study are the following ones:

Objective 1. To analyse the profile of users\(^{43}\) who work with interpreters in armed conflict scenarios, including peacekeeping.

Objective 2. To list the needs that users who work with interpreters in peacekeeping scenarios have.

Objective 3. To determine if users are aware of the history of interpreting in armed conflict and peacekeeping scenarios and its importance.

Objective 4. To establish if users believe that the stage of the conflict has an impact on the work carried out by the interpreter, the modalities used and the scenarios.

Objective 5. To determine how useful users think interpreters are in armed conflict scenarios.

Objective 6. To examine armed conflict and its different stages to determine whether users believe there are specific interpreting needs to satisfy in each of those stages.

Objective 7. To review users’ perception of how interpreters satisfy the requirements that arise in the different stages of an armed conflict.

Objective 8. To find out if users believe interpreters possess enough language skills to perform their duties.

Objective 9. To enumerate the main problems users have encountered when working with interpreters.

---

\(^{43}\) Please note that when the term user is quoted in this study it refers to BiH ALTHEA users.
Objective 10. To verify the interpreting modalities used in peacekeeping scenarios.

Objective 11. To ascertain if users believe that specific training is required for working in peacekeeping missions.

Objective 12. To establish how to organise specific training for interpreting in peacekeeping in terms of time, topics and modalities, among other matters.

9.3. PARTICIPANTS

All the participants in this study were users of interpreting services who were deployed within Bosnia with EUFOR BiH ALTHEA. These respondents were supposed to express their views on the performance of interpreters working for BiH ALTHEA. Just like with the previous questionnaire, the selection of subjects was carried out by a high-ranking official, who was the contact person appointed by BiH ALTHEA for this purpose. Likewise, for reasons of confidentiality and security this person was also in charge of overseeing all the stages of the survey process, which in the case of the second questionnaire meant supervising tasks such as ensuring the initial approval to carry out the questionnaire was given, studying the questionnaire design to avoid any possible security and intelligence problems and contacting the study subjects. Again, and as I mentioned in §8.3 when referring to the interpreter's questionnaire, I believe it can be said that the researcher was blinded to the subjects' features and that the anonymity of respondents was therefore clearly established by this selection process. All subjects were selected bearing in mind that they belonged to EUFOR BiH ALTHEA and that they were exposed to interpreting services.

The total number of participants contacted for this study was 21 users, all of which were stationed or had been stationed with EUFOR BiH ALTHEA. Being blinded as to the population, as I mentioned previously, made the first section of the questionnaire particularly important as it helped me describe the population targeted for the purposes of this study.

9.4. METHODOLOGY

9.4.1. Questionnaire design

Once again, just like the first questionnaire, the second questionnaire also focused on describing the role played by interpreters in EUFOR BiH ALTHEA, but from the point of view of the user. The design followed the same steps as the interpreters’
questionnaire insofar as it was aligned with the objectives and research questions. Many of the research questions and related objectives were similar to the interpreters’ as I wanted to establish comparisons between the views of both groups. Equally, both open-ended and multiple choice questions were included (Fink, 2006) in order to gather both qualitative and quantitative data. The intention of this questionnaire was to ensure that the information obtained would shed more light on the opinions of users about the interpreter’s role, the level of satisfaction of users with the interpreter’s role, and to find out if users believed they could provide some feedback as to the training of interpreters who would be working with them, the purpose being to make the interpreter’s task easier and improve the quality of the communication process.

As history is important for the development of basic critical skills (Kraus, 2014; Q.A.A., 2014) and also to learn from the past, I also felt that users would probably possess knowledge about the history of interpreting at war for the mere fact that they are members of a military organisation, whether in a military or civilian position. As a result of their belonging to a military institution, it could be presumed that they would have received training in history of war, even if only to study strategies and tactics. Similarly, users would also possess knowledge about conflict theory and the stages of war, although they were probably not aware of the different requirements that might arise in each stage of the armed conflict and hence, would not allocate specific tasks to specific phases of the armed conflict. At the same time, I was intent on discovering how users perceived the interpreting profession and if they believed that interpreting for peacekeeping missions entailed catering for specific needs.

9.4.1.1. Structure of the user’s questionnaire

In agreement with the principles set down for survey submission by Robson (2011), a request was submitted for the approval and piloting of the questionnaire to ensure it complied with security matters in EUFOR.

The questionnaire began with an introduction where a brief note was given of the professional, as well as contact details of the data collector, the purpose of the survey, and the time it would take to complete. At the same time, assurance was given regarding the voluntary nature to respond to the survey and of the confidentially and anonymity of responses. The questionnaire was divided into seven sections (see Annex 2) to cover the research questions set forth in the first chapter of this dissertation.
9.4.1.1.1. Section 1. Personal information

The first section was comprised of 9 questions with the aim of identifying more clearly the study population as far as the following variables were concerned:

1. Nationality.
2. Age.
3. Gender.
4. Status: military or civilian.
5. Level of academic training/education.
6. Experience working with interpreters.
7. Mother tongue.
8. Languages of the Balkans or the Former Yugoslavia spoken by the user.

9.4.1.1.2. Section 2. The role of the interpreter throughout history

The aim of this section was to determine whether the users knew anything about the history of interpreting and enquire if they believed it was necessary to know about the past history of interpreting in order to better understand the role these professionals play today.

The questions asked were:

9. Do you know anything about the history of interpreting?
10. How long ago do you think that interpreters have existed in the context of war?
11. How relevant do you think knowing about the history of interpreting is to understand the role interpreters play today?
12. Do you think knowing about the past history of interpreting in armed conflicts is important to understand the interpreter’s role today?

9.4.1.1.3. Section 3. Conflict definition and conflict stages

This section was designed to determine whether users possessed knowledge of conflict theory and the different stages of a conflict. The aim was to see where users embedded peacekeeping actions within this framework, and whether there were different
requirements depending on the different stages of the conflict. As a result, the users were asked the following questions:

13. Do you think there is an established definition of the concept of armed conflict?
14. Do you think a conflict can be divided into different stages?
15. Which stages would you divide a conflict into?
16. In which of the following stage/s of an armed conflict according to Brahm (2003) would you frame peacekeeping?
17. If an armed conflict is divided into different stages, do you think there are different interpreting requirements in the different stages of conflict?
18. Why?

9.4.1.1.4. Section 4. Specificities of interpreting for peacekeeping missions

This section aimed to determine whether peacekeeping missions had special needs that ought to be considered when working with interpreters. To this end, the following questions were asked:

19. Do you believe that there are particular requirements when working with interpreters on peacekeeping missions?
20. In your opinion, what are those requirements?
21. Have you provided interpreters, at any stage of the peacekeeping mission, with materials to carry out their job more easily?
22. What type of materials did you provide interpreters with?
23. What issues do you think should be targeted in order to improve communication when interpreting is required?
24. Have you ever monitored an interpreter’s performance for quality issues?
25. Why?
26. In general, how do you rate the performance of the interpreters you have worked with?
9.4.1.1.5. Section 5. Users’ perception of interpreters’ work

I designed this section with the intention of finding out what the users thought of the interpreters’ performance and the role they play in practice. In order to ensure this, users were asked the following questions:

27. During other missions abroad, had you already worked with interpreters?
28. How would you rate the role interpreters’ play in the communication process?
29. What happens if a mistake is made during an interpreting session?
30. Do you believe that your interpreting and language needs are being covered today?

9.4.1.1.6. Section 6. Working conditions for interpreters

The purpose of this section was to obtain an insight into the working conditions of interpreters as perceived by the user. To elucidate this information, the following questions were asked:

31. How often have you worked with interpreters?
32. What language combination/pairs do you use when working with interpreters?
33. Have you worked with more than two languages at the same time?
34. Have you worked with an interpreter despite knowing the language of the other party?
35. Why did you work with an interpreter despite knowing the language of the other party?
36. How would you rate that/those previous experience/s of working with interpreters in other peacekeeping missions?
37. Which modalities of interpreting have you worked with?
38. How often have you used the following modes of interpreting?
39. Have you encountered problems working with interpreters while on a EUFOR BiH mission?
40. What problems have you encountered when working with interpreters on a EUFOR BiH mission?
41. How would you rate your experience of working with interpreters?

9.4.1.1.7. Section 7. Training interpreters for peacekeeping missions

This final section was conceived to obtain information to train interpreters working for peacekeeping missions.

42. Do you think that there should be specific training for interpreters who are working or are going to work in armed conflict scenarios?

43. Do you think there should be specific training for interpreters working in peacekeeping scenarios?

44. Do you think there are particular topics that could be taught to interpreters in advance, in order to prepare them to work in peacekeeping scenarios?

45. Which topics?

46. Do you think that there are particular topics or issues that should be taught to interpreters working for EUFOR?

47. Which topics?

48. Why?

49. In which of the following interpreting modalities do you think interpreters should be given specific training before working in peace-keeping scenarios?

50. Which of the following do you find more important when you work with interpreters?

51. Are there any other requirements not mentioned in the previous question that you would like to add?

9.4.1.2. Pilot study

A pilot study was also carried out with a smaller group of respondents, to ensure a smooth data collection process once the survey had been compiled (Fink, 2006; Moser-Mercer, 2008; Robson, 2011).

As previously mentioned, for security and confidentiality reasons a contact person was appointed to recruit the respondents. On October 29, 2014, the person in charge of piloting the questionnaire, as required by EUFOR, was contacted. This person was to be responsible for contacting the subjects for the final study so that anonymity
and confidentiality were guaranteed and problems related to security were avoided. This person had been involved previously in research and was the holder of a Ph.D.; hence, this person was also appointed as the person responsible for piloting the questionnaire.

9.4.1.3. Comments received during the pilot phase

Only two minor details regarding the logistics of completing the questionnaire were detected at this stage and subsequently corrected. It was also pointed out that the question about the Balkan languages the respondents spoke had been awkwardly designed and was subsequently corrected. The issue with this question was that unless respondents forcibly clicked it, they could not move to the next section, even if they did answer or did not speak any of the languages. As a result, the design of this question was changed to make it easier to complete.

Once the suggested changes were accepted and implemented, and as the questionnaire content, sections and questions were considered appropriate, I was given the green light to proceed to its final drafting, layout and uploading onto the LimeSurvey® website, so that it could be launched to all target users.

9.4.1.4. Distribution of the questionnaire

Just like with the interpreters, due to limited time and resources, difficulties in contacting the target group and problems with confidentiality issues and the military structure of the institution the respondents work for, it was once again, not feasible to conduct an outright statistical study, as it was impossible to select a representative sample of users for this study and try to draw conclusions that could be extrapolated to all users.

The same problem that I had with the interpreters also arose when trying to contact users directly, it wasn’t possible either. Therefore, the same person appointed to contact the interpreters got in touch with the users stationed in the aforementioned conflict zone. In this case, new technologies were also used to collect data. This survey was also conducted online using LimeSurvey®. Finally, and just like with the interpreters’ survey, once all the data were gathered, the information was analysed with R, a GNU project free statistical tool and its corresponding GUI, which is R-Commander. However, the quality of graphs of this tool as was mentioned in §8.4.1.3 proved to be unsuitable for this type of academic study, which is why the final data used in this dissertation were interpreted and charted with Microsoft Excel®.
9.5. RESULTS

This section presents the results of the survey. The survey was sent to 21 users and the breakdown of answers received was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Users Who Received the Survey</th>
<th>21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses Received</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Responses</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incomplete Responses</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 22. Breakdown of responses received

Of the 21 users who accessed the survey, 12 responded. One of the respondents only answered the first section of the survey (personal information); therefore, this person was not included in the data analysis. Of the remaining 11 respondents, one answered only until Sections 1 and 2, two answered Sections 1, 2 and 3 and one answered only until Section 4. These 6 respondents were included in the analysis, since it was worthwhile combining all the opinions from the different sections. However, this should be considered when interpreting the results of this analysis, given that the total number of data items varied between 11 and 7.

9.5.1. Section 1. Personal information

✧ Nationality

As already stated above, the analysis initially focused on 11 individuals with the following nationalities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationalities of Users</th>
<th>Number of Users</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austrian</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbian</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danish</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwegian</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 23. Nationality of users
Out of the 11 individuals, six (two each) hailed from Sweden, Austria and Germany, equivalent in relative terms to 18.18% each. The other five nationalities accounted each for a relative frequency of 9%.

❖ Age

The 41-50 years and 51-60 years age groups accounted for a relative frequency of 36.36% each with four respondents in each group. Another individual indicated 61 years of age. Only 9.9% of respondents belonged to each of the younger age groups, with the exception of the 18-20 group, from which there are no respondents.

Indeed, users aged over 41 years accounted for 81.81% of the respondents, and those over 51 represented 45.36%. It can therefore be concluded that the users were mostly mature adults over 40 years of age, with few young users.

❖ Gender

This question drew a categorical response: 91% of respondents were male compared to 9% female respondents, i.e. in absolute terms, 10 respondents were men and 1 a woman. This result may have been affected by the fact that users worked for the military where there is a majority of men (DeGroot, 2001).
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**Graph 55.** Gender of the users.

- 90.91% Male
- 9.09% Female
- N/A

**Status**

54.54% of respondents said they were members of the military and 45.45% were civilians, which in absolute terms was 6 and 5, respectively.

**Graph 56.** Status of the user.

- 54.54% Military
- 45.45% Non-Military

**Highest scholastic/academic qualification**

Six (6) of the respondents had a “Master's degree”, followed by 2 with a “Bachelor's degree”, and 1 each with a “Professional degree”, “Some college credit, no degree” and “Staff College”, accounting, in relative terms, for 54.54% (“Master's degree”), 18.18% (“Bachelor's degree”), and 9% (“Professional degree”, “Some college
credit, no degree” and “Staff College”), respectively. In all cases, the users were highly educated.

![Level of Academic Qualification]

Graph 57. Academic qualification of the users.

†Previous experience working with interpreters

Eight (8) respondents answered “Yes” vs. 2 who said “No”, equivalent, in relative terms, to 80% and 20%, respectively. Therefore, it can be argued that most users had experience working with interpreters.

![Previous experience working with interpreters]

Graph 58. Previous experience working with interpreters.
Languages spoken by users

The results in terms of the languages spoken by users are better described by plotting them in a chart. Firstly, the respondents were asked which their mother tongue was. This was a multiple choice question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LANGUAGE</th>
<th>SPEAKERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbian</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danish</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwegian</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 24. Users’ mother tongues.

Out of the choices given, 4 respondents indicated German as their mother tongue and 1 chose Spanish. The other 6 chose the following options: Swedish (2), Serbian (1), Danish (1), Dutch (1) and Norwegian (1). Hence, German was the most common language (36.36%), followed a long way behind by Swedish (18.18%) and other languages (9%).

Graph 59. Users’ mother tongues.
Respondents were also asked whether they spoke other languages from the Balkans or the Former Yugoslavia. This was a multiple choice question. The results were as follows:

- Bosnian: 2 respondents chose this option.
- Bulgarian: only 1 chose this option.
- Croatian: 2 respondents chose this option.
- Macedonian: 2 respondents chose this option.
- Serbian: 2 respondents chose this option.
- No, I don’t understand, speak or read languages from the Balkans or spoken in the Former Yugoslavia: 9 respondents chose this option.
- None of the respondents chose the other options available.

Following a detailed analysis of the results, the same 2 respondents stated that they understood, spoke and read these languages, whilst the rest did not understand, speak or read them.

It can therefore be concluded that most respondents (81.81%) did not understand, speak or read the Balkan or former Yugoslavian languages, a finding that clearly suggests the need to recruit interpreters for communication.

9.5.2. Section 2. The role of the interpreter throughout history

In this section we reviewed whether users were aware of the role of interpreters and interpreting since Antiquity.

❖ Participants’ knowledge

This question gave rise to a diversity of opinions. Respondents were asked to score their knowledge on a scale of 1 to 5. In absolute terms, the results were as follows:

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In relative terms, 4 was chosen more frequently (36.36%), followed by 1 (27.27%), 3 (18.18%), then 2 and 5 with 9.09% each. The average score was 2.91 and the median 3, which, as already mentioned previously, added little information. The only
thing worth noting is the diversity of views on this question. Some respondents considered that they had little knowledge of the history of interpreting, whilst others stated that they were fairly knowledgeable. However, overall, the scores were quite acceptable.

Graph 60. Knowledge about the history of interpreting.

Related to the previous question was the next question on how long ago users think that interpreters had existed in the context of war did. The answers to this open-ended question were as follows:

- “50 years.”
- “2000 years.”
- “Interpreters were used for negotiations. Negotiations have always existed, it means that the role of interpreters existed in every war, but in a different coverage (they have not been called interpreters, but it is just a terminology).”
- “As long as talks between warring parties have existed, i.e. 1000+ years.”
- “Forever…”
- “They have existed in the context of war since people with different cultures and languages fighting each other.”
- “Thousands of years.”
- “5000 years.”
“I think it started with the first war ever...Hamoukar, 5500 years ago.”
“Always.”
“Since the beginning of mankind.”

From the different replies given, it can be concluded that users date the existence of interpreters to a time very much in the past, with a majority replying that there have been interpreters since our most ancient past, as can be viewed more easily in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>% VALUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1000 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 25. Existence of interpreters.

Relevance of understanding the history of interpreting in armed conflicts in order to understand the interpreter’s role today

This question, which was rated on a scale of 1 to 5, produced the following table of absolute frequencies:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In relative terms, scores 3 and 5 accounted for 27.27% each, followed by 2 to 4 with 18.18% each, and finally 1 with 9%. The average value was 3.36 and the median 3.

This meant that the number of users who considered that knowing about the history of interpretation is important to understand the role of interpreters today was greater than those who believed it is not, although the difference is minimal.

The data are represented in graph form below:
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Graph 61. Importance of knowledge of the history of interpreting.

As a follow-up to the previous question, users were also asked a similar question on armed conflict, i.e. the importance of knowing about the history of armed conflicts in particular. Unlike the previous question, respondents only had to answer “Yes” or “No”. In this case, 9 individuals responded “Yes” and 2 “No”, equivalent in relative terms to 81.81% and 18.18%, respectively.

It can be argued that most of the respondents believed it is important to have this knowledge, although it is not possible to determine how important this factor is.

Graph 62. Importance of knowing about the history of interpreting in armed conflicts.
9.5.3. Section 3. Conflict definition and conflict stages

 opinon on whether there is an established definition of the concept of armed conflict

It should be noted that only 10 individuals continued to participate in the survey at this point.

The vast majority of respondents (9) answered “Yes” and only 1 replied “No”, i.e. 90% believed that there is a clear definition of armed conflict and only 10% thought otherwise.

The results are shown in the graph below:

Graph 63. Opinion on whether there is a definition of armed conflict.

Opinion on whether a conflict can be divided into different stages

This question was one of a handful for which the conclusions were unequivocal: 100% of respondents answered “Yes”.

Stages of an armed conflict

When asked to indicate the stages of an armed conflict, the respondents gave the following answers. Though this question was intended as a multiple choice question, the respondents chose only one of the options available, making it possible to compare the percentages:
• Pre-conflict, conflict, peace process: none of the respondents selected this stage.

• Dispute phase, crisis phase, violence phase, settlement phase: this stage was chosen by 2 of the 10 respondents, which, in relative terms, represented 20%.

• Pre-war, escalation and post-war: 2 of the 10 respondents also chose this option, which, in relative terms represented 20%.

• No conflict, Latent conflict, Emergence, Escalation, Stalemate, De-Escalation, Settlement/Resolution, Post-Conflict Peacebuilding and Reconciliation: the remaining 6 (60%) chose this option.

![Stages of an armed conflict](Image)

**Graph 64. Stages of an armed conflict.**

It can therefore be concluded that most users believed that an armed conflict can be divided into “No conflict, Latent conflict, Emergence, Escalation, Stalemate, De-Escalation, Settlement/Resolution, Post-Conflict Peacebuilding and Reconciliation”.

❖**Stage/s of an armed conflict (Brahm, 2003) in which participants frame peacekeeping**

This was also a multiple choice question; therefore, it was not possible to compare the percentages as in other cases.

The results for the different options were:
• No conflict: none of the respondents selected this stage.
• Latent conflict: 4 of the 10 respondents answered “Yes” and 6 chose “No”.
• Escalation: this produced the same results as the previous question: 4 of the 10 respondents answered “Yes” and 6 chose “No”.
• Stalemate: 5 answered “Yes” and 5 “No”.
• De-escalation: 4 responded “Yes” and 6 “No”.
• Settlement/Resolution: 5 answered “Yes” and 5 “No”.
• Post-Conflict Peacebuilding and Reconciliation: 6 answered “Yes” and 4 “No”.
• Other: 1 respondent chose this option.

Therefore, it can be concluded that, as Brahm (2003) proposes, most users thought that peacekeeping missions were part of "Post-Conflict Peacebuilding and Reconciliation", though several respondents chose other options. Perhaps most importantly, none of the respondents chose “No conflict”, and all individuals, to a greater or lesser extent, included the missions in one of the options.

❖ Existence of specific interpreting requirements in the different stages of conflict

Five (5) out of 10 respondents replied “Yes” to this dichotomous response, followed by 4 who chose “No” and 1 who preferred not to answer. In relative terms, this was equivalent to 50%, 40% and 10%, respectively.

It can be concluded that 50% of users thought that interpretation involves special requirements depending on the stage of the conflict.
Graph 65. Different requirements per conflict stage.

When asked to elaborate on the previous question, only the respondents (9) who answered “Yes” or “No” to the previous question were asked to reply to this question. However, one chose not to reply, so there were only 8 answers. The results of this open-ended question are shown below:

- “It’s a question of translating.”
- “Only in Bosnia. Because before the war there was one language. Now there are three equal languages. The LA usually translates and after a meeting gives his personal impression to his or her superior. That does not change within the phases.”
- “Interpreting skills are crucial in this domain. Interpreter has to be a very good psychologist also. In the different stages of a conflict every word is crucial and wrongly chosen word could affect upcoming events.”
- “Different user groups (politicians, civilians, soldiers) in each stage with "own" professional language.”
- “Always important.”
- “Safety.”
- “Because there are different needs in each phase of the conflict.”
- “Interpreting is interpreting.”
9.5.4. Section 4. Specificities of interpreting for peacekeeping missions

❖ Existence of particular requirements when interpreting for peacekeeping missions

It should be noted that from this point onward there were only 8 respondents. All respondents unanimously replied “Yes” to the question about specific requirements for peacekeeping missions.

❖ Requirements needed when interpreting for peacekeeping missions

This question was only applied to those who answered “Yes” to the previous question, which, in this case, were all the respondents. Therefore, all the responses would be analysed, although one of them chose not to respond.

This open-ended question gave rise to the different views shown below:

- “Danger is always involved.”
- “Empathy, strict leadership, a certain kind of mutual distance and trust as well.”
- “Trusting the interpreter without condition is required. The interpreter needs to be neutral and professional.”
- “Culture knowledge and awareness and more.”
- “Objectivity, agenda, safety.”
- “Diplomacy, empathy, neutrality.”
- “Negotiations will take longer due to translation. One has to interrupt sentences to give the interpreter the chance to translate.”

If we try to group them into different sub-groups, we could say that the users were concerned about knowledge of safety issues, trust, neutrality, empathy, diplomatic skills, a professional attitude towards the client/user, cultural knowledge/awareness, as well as awareness of the presence of the interpreter by the user/client.
Provision of materials to interpreters when working for Peacekeeping Missions

Six (6) respondents answered “Yes” to this question and 2 replied “No”, equivalent in relative terms to 75% and 25%, respectively.

It can therefore be concluded that the vast majority of users provided materials at some stage in the peacekeeping mission to support the work of the interpreters.

This is clearly shown in the graph:

![Provision of Materials Graph](image)

**Graph 66.** Provision of materials to interpreters.

Type of materials given

Only the respondents who replied “Yes” to the previous question where asked to indicate the type of material provided. This open-ended question gave rise to the following 6 results:

- “Id card, flat jacket, helmet.”
- “Gear. Rain protection, safety equipment. Literature.”
- “Background information about speech partner and details about desired/optimal result of discussion.”
- “Stationary.”
- “Manuals and books.”
- “Texts and documents, also charts and maps.”
After grouping the results into different categories, I was able to affirm that the users had provided materials such as safety equipment, background information for the meeting including different types of written materials and maps, and even stationery.

Topics that improve communication when working with interpreters

Only 7 of the 8 respondents answered this open-ended question with the following results:

- “Language, military abbreviations and terms, behaviour rules.”
- “Knowing history, having the certain background and sensitive topics, negotiations skills.”
- As much details as possible to improve interpreters understanding of the goals.
- “What are we aiming at what is the task?”
- “Trust, language, technical equipment.”
- “The situation and the stakeholders, as well as the aim of the mission should be made clear to the interpreter.”

Users felt that there were a series of topics that contributed to the quality of interpreting. When classified into different categories, it can be observed that they cover specific terminology and knowledge about the military, background on history, an understanding of the negotiation process, its aims and sensitive issues, as well as trust.

Monitoring of an interpreter’s performance for quality issues

The respondents were asked to rate the question on a scale of 1 to 5. The results are shown in the following table of absolute frequencies:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respectively, this was equivalent in relative terms to 37.5% for 1 and 3, and 12.5% for 4 and 5. The average value was 2.63 and the median 3.
It can be argued that few users monitored the quality of the interpreter's performance, as the highest values (4 and 5) only accounted for 25%.

![Monitoring of interpreters](image)

**Graph 67.** Monitoring of interpreters’ performance.

As to the reasons for monitoring, 7 of the 8 respondents answered this open-ended question, with the following results:

- “To settle salary.”
- “Because if the performance is poor, the service has to be ended.”
- “I am the interpreter and I am one being monitored.”
- “Because several conversations have been unsuccessful (w/o satisfying result).”
- “To get the best result.”
- “Because it's not my responsibility.”
- “My interpreter always enjoyed my full confidence.”
- “No answer.”

These results show that though few users monitored interpreters, and when they did so it was for reasons of quality or to establish the working conditions for interpreters.
Rating of the performance of the interpreters users had worked with

This question, which was rated on a scale of 1 to 5, produced the following table of absolute frequencies:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In relative terms, this meant that 3, 4 and 5 accounted for 14%, 57% and 29%, respectively. The average value was 4.14 and the median 4.

It can therefore be unequivocally concluded that users valued highly the performance of the interpreters with whom they had worked, as shown by the relative frequencies of the two highest values (85.81%) and the statistical measures. Indeed, this question accounted for the highest value of all the survey questions.

This is clearly shown in the graph below:

Graph 68. Rating of interpreters’ performance.

9.5.5. Section 5. Users’ perception of interpreters’ work

Previous experience working with interpreters in other missions.

It should be noted that only 7 respondents continued with the survey as from this point.
Six (6) of the 7 users replied “Yes” to this question and 1 chose “No”, which, in relative terms corresponded to 85.71% and 14.29%, respectively. Therefore, it can be clearly argued that most respondents had worked with interpreters in other missions.

**Graph 69.** Previous experience working with interpreters.

**Perception of the interpreter's role by the user**

The respondents were asked to rate the role played by interpreters on a scale of 1 to 5.

The respondents only scored between 3 and 5, with 3 accounting for 14.28%, 4 for 28.57% and 5 for 57.14%. The average value was 4.43 and the median 5.

The results are shown in the graph below:

**Graph 70.** Perception of the interpreter's role by the user.
It can be categorically stated that the users considered the interpreters essential in the communication process. Indeed, this question produced one of the highest scores of the survey.

**Monitoring interpreters when mistakes are made**

The results of this open-ended question, which focused on what users do when an interpreter makes a mistake, are shown below:

- “It has to be corrected.”
- “The meaning of the meeting could be remembered in a completely wrong way. Usually, the interpreter is a tool, but not just. Most of the time, the conversation partner understands, that he or she is a human being and the interpretation needs time and sometimes some more questions have to be asked. This even may ease the situation.”
- “In best case the misunderstanding can be resolved/a new conversation could be arranged.”
- “Pending on type of mistake.”
- “Could lead to misunderstanding.”
- “Depend of the issue to translate, from nothing to terrible.”
- “I have never experienced such a case.”

These results show that when a mistake is made, depending on the type of mistake, there are essentially two reactions: if it is a serious mistake, it should be corrected; however, if it is a minor misunderstanding, it can be overlooked in the interest of the meeting.

**Perception of coverage of language and interpreting needs.**

The users rated the question on a scale of 1 to 5, and one did not respond. The respondents only scored between 3 and 5, with 3 accounting for 16.67%, 4 for 66.66% and 5 for 16.67%. The average and median values were both 4.
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Graph 71. Perception of coverage of language and interpreting needs.

The users argued that their needs were covered, although there was room for improvement. When comparing these results with those to Question No. 29, it can be argued that although the users had their needs covered, they considered the role of interpreters essential in the communication process. It is therefore necessary not only to have interpreters available, but also to encourage greater participation.

9.5.6. Section 6. Working conditions for interpreters at EUFOR

✧ Frequency with which users had worked with interpreters

Respondents were asked to indicate the frequency on a scale of 1–5. The respondents only chose 3 and 4 (6 and 1 respondents, respectively), equivalent in terms of relative frequency to 85.71% and 14.29%, respectively. The average was 3.14 and the median 3.

In light of these results, it can be concluded that users had worked with interpreters occasionally, neither too frequently nor too rarely.

This is clearly shown in the graph:
**Language combinations/pairs used when working with interpreters**

As far as this question is concerned, the following results were obtained:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LANGUAGE COMBINATIONS OF USERS</th>
<th>TIMES MENTIONED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German-Serbo-Croatian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English-Serbo-Croatian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They translate to English sometimes to German</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English/ local language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnian/English Serb Croatian/English Arabic/English Hebrew/English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English / Spanish; Bosnian / Spanish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German-English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German-Albanian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German-Italian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 26.** Language combinations users have worked with.

These answers can be better viewed and interpreted when plotted in a chart format, as the chart reflects more clearly the times the combinations were mentioned, as well as the different combinations.
It is interesting to note that two combinations that are not working languages in the region were mentioned: Arabic-English and Hebrew-English. This is probably due to the fact that the respondent must have felt that they were supposed to include all the language combinations they had worked with since their first posting in a peacekeeping mission.

**Numbers of languages the users have worked with at one same time**

Four (4) of the 7 respondents answered “Yes” to this question, 2 replied “No” and one did not answer equivalent in terms of relative frequency to 57.14% and 42.86 %, respectively. Indeed, most users claimed to have worked simultaneously with more than two languages.

The results are shown in the graph below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Languages/Language combinations</th>
<th>Times mentioned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bosnian/Spanish</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English/German</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English/local language</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English/Spanish</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English-Serbo-Croatian</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German Albanian</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German Italian</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German-Serbo-Croatian</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew/English</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 27. Language combinations used.
Working with more than two languages at the same time

Graph 73. Numbers of languages the users have worked with at the same time.

Working with an interpreter despite knowing the language of the other party

Four (4) of the 7 respondents answered “Yes” to this question, and 2 replied “No”, equivalent in relative terms to 57.14% and 42.86%, respectively.

The majority of users appeared to rely on the support or advice of an interpreter, even when they knew the language of the other party. It could be argued that this gives weight to the important role interpreters play because, although the users knew the language, they preferred to avail themselves of the services of a professional interpreter. The next question addressed why this is the case.

The results are shown in the graph below:

Graph 74. Working with an interpreter despite knowing the language of the other party.
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The table shows the reasons given by users who had worked with an interpreter despite knowing the language of the other party:

- “Just for checking. Training.”
- “In order to avoid any unclear situation / misunderstandings.”
- I had an assistant who knew the foreign language and I was informed by him that my interpreter did not translate “everything”.
- “While the translation was going on, I had time to reflect on my next move. Also I could hear the conversations going on in the other party's delegation. That gave me some advantage in the negotiations.”

The table shows that this situation was the result of the users’ concern about avoiding misunderstandings and having spare time for thinking.

❖ Degree of satisfaction with interpreters in previous peacekeeping missions

One individual did not respond to this question. On a scale of 1 to 5, the remaining respondents rated their experience with a 4, equivalent in relative terms to 100%. The average and median value was therefore 4.

It can be concluded that the users clearly highly valued their experiences working with interpreters in other peacekeeping missions.

This removed any possible bias or influence that the users may have had in rating certain questions, such as No. 27 on the performance of the interpreters with whom they had worked. It may be categorically stated that the users highly appreciated the work of the interpreters.

❖ Interpreting modalities used

This is a multiple choice question with the following options:

- Simultaneous: 6 of the 7 respondents answered “Yes” and 1 “No”.
- Consecutive: 5 responded “Yes” and 2 “No”.
- Chuchotage: 2 answered “Yes” and 5 “No”.
- Sight translation: 2 answered “Yes” and 5 “No”.
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• *Bidule/portable equipment*: 1 answered “Yes” and 6 “No”.

It can therefore be concluded that the “Simultaneous” mode of interpreting is the most widely used, followed by “Consecutive”, and the remaining modalities are seldom used. Indeed, “*Bidule/portable equipment*” is the least used, chosen only by 1 respondent.

⚠️ **Frequency of use of these modalities**

It should be noted that some respondents did not rate all the modalities shown here. The distribution of absolute frequencies for the different modalities is shown below.

• Simultaneous:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average was 2.86 and the median 2.

The results are shown in graph form below:

![Simultaneous Graph](image)

*Graph 75. Simultaneous.*

• Consecutive:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average was 3.17 and the median 3.5.

The results are shown in graph form below:
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Graph 76. Consecutive.

- Chuchotage:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average was 1.8 and the median 1.

Graph 77. Chuchotage.

- Sight translation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average and the median were 2.
Graph 78. Sight translation.

- **Bidule/portable equipment:**

  \[
  \begin{array}{c|c|c|c|c|c|}
    \text{Bidule/Portable equipment} & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 \\
    \hline
    4 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0
  \end{array}
  \]

  The average was 1.2 and the median 1.

Graph 79. Bidule/Portable equipment.

The graphs show that “Consecutive” is most extensively used, with an average and median value of around 3. It can be argued from the two previous questions that, although “Simultaneous” is the modality most extensively used by the users, “Consecutive” is the most frequent.
Problems encountered working with interpreters while on a EUFOR BiH mission

Only 2 (28.57%) of the 7 respondents answered “Yes” to this question versus 5 (71.43%) who replied “No”. The following question must be analysed to identify the types of problems encountered.

Graph 80. Problems encountered when working with interpreters on a EUFOR BiH mission.

The users who encountered problems with interpreters gave the following reasons:

- “Behaviour. Work ethic”.
- “Sometimes I got the feeling that the conversation between interpreter and speech opponent gets emotional and loud without knowing what's going on.”

As only two respondents replied to this question, it cannot be said that the results were conclusive.

Overall level of satisfaction with interpreters

On a scale of 1-5, the respondents did not choose the two lowest scores. One (1) respondent chose 3, 3 chose 4 and another 3 chose 5. In relative terms, these scores were equivalent to 14.28%, 42.86% and 42.86%, respectively. The average value was 4.29 and the median 4.
It should be noted that similar questions on interpreters’ performance produced fairly high scores. This supports the findings of this survey that the work of interpreters is highly valued by the users.

This is clearly shown in the graph:

**Graph 81.** Overall level of satisfaction with interpreters.

### 9.5.7. Section 7. Training interpreters for EUFOR Peacekeeping Missions

- **Do you think that there should be specific training for interpreters who are working or are going to work in armed conflict scenarios?**

  All users answered “Yes”. It can therefore be argued that users clearly feel that interpreters should be specifically trained to work in armed conflict.

- **Availability of specific training for interpreters working in peacekeeping scenarios**

  There was virtual unanimity on this question with 6 of the 7 users indicating “Yes” versus 1 who said “No”. In relative terms, this was equivalent to 85.71% and 14.29%, respectively.

  It can therefore be concluded that the vast majority of users considered that interpreters should have special training to perform their work in peacekeeping scenarios. The results are presented in graph form below:
Graph 82. Availability of specific training for interpreters working in peacekeeping scenarios.

Particular topics that could be taught to interpreters in advance, in order to prepare them to work in peacekeeping scenarios

All users, except one, answered “Yes” to this question. This clearly shows that all users considered that certain topics should be taught to interpreters in order to prepare them for working in peacekeeping scenarios.

The follow-up question where users were asked to indicate exactly which topics should be taught yielded the following answers:

- “Organisation”
- “Role of interpreter”
- “Military diplomacy”
- “Treatment of prisoners”
- “What type of armed conflict is going on”
- “History (The real and common one)”
- “Cultural knowledge”
- “Help to victims”
- “Risks involved (i.e. toxic gas)”
- “Armed forces”
- “Behaviour in combat”
• “Geography an topography”
• “How to handle classified material”
• “Communications”
• “Ranks and how to identify them”
• “Weapons”
• “Know the conflict”

These topics can be organised in the following categories:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USERS’ TOPICS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HARD SKILLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialised terminology, political and military issues, background information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information about the conflict, history, geography and topography.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOFT SKILLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural awareness, behaviour (etiquette, diplomacy and tact).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of the interpreters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Table 28. Topics to be trained as considered by users. |

❖ Particular topics or issues that should be taught to interpreters working for EUFOR

When these same questions were asked regarding the interpreting services for EUFOR, only 3 replied “Yes”, 2 answered “No”, and 2 did not answer. This was equivalent, in relative terms, to 42.86%, 28.57% and 28.57%, respectively.

Despite the great importance attached to specific training for interpreters for working in peacekeeping scenarios, users did not feel that interpreters needed specific training to work for EUFOR. However, these conclusions should be taken with caution owing to the limited number of respondents.

The results are presented in graph form below:
Graph 83. Particular topics or issues that should be taught to interpreters working for EUFOR.

However, when it came to listing the topics that should be answered, only 2 respondents answered this question:

- “See above.”
- “lol, the undisclosed stresses between the military partner nations.”

Few conclusions can be drawn from only two replies, and I can only suggest taking these replies as indicative of possible trends that could be studied in greater depth. In terms of why those topics should be taught, once again only 2 users replied to this question.

- “Because it is important.”
- Sometimes the desired targets have different meanings for the involved military partners.

Training in interpreting modalities for working in peace-keeping scenarios

This question focused on the absolute frequency of different interpreting modalities, which were rated on a scale of 1 to 5:

- Consecutive:
The average was 3.43 and the median 3.

**Graph 84.** Consecutive.

- Simultaneous:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average and the median were both 3.

**Graph 85.** Simultaneous.
• Chuchotage:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average and the median were both 3.

Graph 86. Chuchotage.

• Sight-translation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average was 3.14 and the median 3.

Graph 87. Sight Translation.
\textbf{Bidule:}

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
& 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\
\hline
1 & 1 & 1 & 2 & 3 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

The average and the median were both 3.

\begin{center}
\textbf{Bidule}
\end{center}

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{bidule_graph.png}
\caption{\textit{Bidule.}}
\end{figure}

It can therefore be concluded that users considered “Consecutive” interpreting as the modality in which interpreters should be given specific training, though most of the modalities were virtually tied (average of 3). This result failed to clarify whether it is considered somewhat or very important.

\textbf{Which of the following do you find more important when you work with interpreters?}

The users were asked to score the following areas on a scale of 1 to 5. The tables below show the absolute frequencies of their answers.

\textbf{Linguistic-skills:}

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
& 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\
\hline
0 & 0 & 1 & 4 & 2 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

The average was 4.14 and the median 4.

The scores are presented in graph form below:
Graph 89. Linguistic skills.

- Linguistic-accuracy:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average was 4.43 and the median 4.

Graph 90. Linguistic accuracy.
• Cultural-awareness:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average was 4 and the median 4.

**Graph 91.** Cultural awareness.

• Non-verbal communication:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average was 3.29 and the median 3.

**Graph 92.** Non-verbal communication.
• Etiquette:

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average was 3.86 and the median 4.

Graph 93. Etiquette.

• Empathy:

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average was 3.43 and the median 3.

Graph 94. Empathy.
• Flexibility:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average was 4.57 and the median 5.

Graph 95. Flexibility.

• Diplomacy:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average was 4.14 and the median 4.

Graph 96. Diplomacy.
• Psychological-stamina:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average was 3.83 and the median 3.5.

**Graph 97.** Psychological stamina.

• Physical-endurance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average was 3.71 and the median 4.

**Graph 98.** Physical endurance.
It can be concluded that, given the high scores obtained, users considered all these areas important. “Flexibility” was viewed by the users as the most important area when working with interpreters and “Non-verbal communication” the least important. However, the differences in ratings between the different areas were minimal, except for the highest rated area, which stood out from the rest.

9.6. DISCUSSION

9.6.1. Section 1. Personal information

This was a particularly interesting section as it provided me with information on the respondents and gave me a better understanding of the main features of the population. The results for the nationalities of users were varied and expected, as EUFOR is a multinational EU military force. Therefore, it is not surprising to see that out of the 11 individuals who replied to this first section, there were two each from Sweden, Austria and Germany. The others were Serbian, Danish, Dutch, Norwegian and Spanish.

I was interested to note that the 41-50 and 51-60 year age groups were the most frequent. This could have been probably due to the fact that the respondents were high in rank.

The results in terms of gender were not surprising either as the majority of respondents were men. This is consistent with the fact that women in EUFOR “constitute only a small minority in the Member States’ national forces” (Valenius, 2007, p. 39).

Interestingly enough, I observed that when focusing on status, only a slight majority of members were from the military 54.54% vs. 45.45% civilians. This clearly reveals, firstly, the dual nature of peacekeeping —both military and civilian—, and secondly, that according to Friesendorf & Penksa (2008:679), EUFOR “as a ‘postmodern military’ has changed its focus from traditional war fighting to multipurpose missions such as peace operations”.

From the answers relating to academic training and education, we observe that all users were highly educated as only one respondent stated that they had "Some college credit, no degree"; most users had a master’s degree (6), while the rest had a Bachelor’s degree (2), Professional degree (1) and Staff College (1). This could probably mean that they were more sensitive to interpreters’ needs and requirements. This fact is supported by the fact that most users - 63.63% - had already worked with interpreters.
Chapter 9. Survey targeted at EUFOR users

The multinational nature of EUFOR obviously has an impact on the mother tongues of the users, revealing the variety of languages spoken by them, namely German, Spanish, Swedish, Serbian, Danish, Dutch and Norwegian. At the same time, and as users were deployed in BiH, they were asked if they spoke other languages from the Balkans or the Former Yugoslavia. As is usually the case in these scenarios, most respondents did not understand, speak or read the Balkan or former Yugoslavian languages (C. Baker, 2010b; Kelly & Baker, 2013), showing that there was a pressing need to hire interpreters for communication. However, it should be remembered that catering for language problems is sometimes a complex matter, since it is difficult to anticipate when and where a war will be waged. To this end, Başar, Siğri & Caforio (2014) believe that languages should be taught to peacekeepers before they are deployed to a mission, to the extent that these authors recommend that teaching programmes be planned in advance to include information about the operation to which the peacekeepers will be deployed, as well as information on the local culture, thus revealing the importance of 3C in this setting. This training should also be considered for interpreters.

9.6.2. Section 2. The role of the interpreter throughout history

History is important to understand our past, learn to view events and actions critically and analytically, and thus be able to identify trends. In the case of war, studying the strategies and logistics of war and peace allows us to review events and situations with the distance of time, allowing for a more objective view of matters (Sun Tzu & Lawson, 2004; and Clausewitz, 1812/1942).

As regards the level of knowledge users possess of the history of interpreting, the replies were diverse and the results obtained did not provide me with much more information. It is only worth mentioning that the answers were extremely diverse and therefore prevented me from making any generalisations about the users’ level of knowledge of the history of interpreting. However, this view contrasts with when respondents gave a specific answer as to since when interpreters have existed, and the majority stated that interpreting has been required since the beginning of humankind and since when the first wars were waged. This finding is supported by the fact that a slight majority of users believe that it is important to know about the history of interpreting in order to understand the role that interpreters play today. In contrast, when respondents were asked the same question about armed conflict and the importance of learning the history of wars, the majority agreed it was important. This is probably due to the fact that the users believed that analysing strategies and tactics of war is important for understanding and reacting in a war setting today.
9.6.3. Section 3. Conflict definition and conflict stages

As I have mentioned previously in this dissertation (see Chapter 2), I believe that knowing about war theory is very important to understand the role and tasks carried out by interpreters in this scenario. This would start with a definition of what armed conflict is (see § 2.2). Consequently, when respondents were asked the question as to whether there is a clear definition of armed conflict, an overwhelming majority of respondents (90%) believed there was. The same happened when enquired as to the stages of the conflict: all respondents believed there were different stages, whichever the classification they chose. It is interesting to note that the majority chose Brahms’s (2003) conflict curve as the classification that best defines the different phases of a war. This probably suggests that the respondents had knowledge and a sound theoretical background on conflict theory.

As peacekeeping missions take place in a war setting, I felt it was important to try to identify the stage in which users would include peacekeeping in order to highlight the role of the interpreter more clearly. I observed that although the majority chose “Post-Conflict Peacebuilding and Reconciliation”, other respondents, chose “Latent conflict, Escalation, Stalemate De-escalation, Settlement/Resolution”, showing how peacekeeping is not only limited to one single stage, and that these tasks can be included at different stages of the conflict. Therefore, this has to be taken into account when planning the deployment of an operation requiring interpreters.

After considering the different stages of war, half of the respondents stated that there would be different requirements depending on the stage of the conflict. In the follow-up question, multiple reasons were given for this. It can be inferred from these answers that requirements depend on the interpreting scenario. This is an interesting finding because it is not only necessary for the interpreter to have excellent language skills because they will have to juggle with different professional jargons, but also non-verbal aptitudes, which we could state are the so-called “soft skills” or cross-cultural competence (3C) mentioned in the literature (Greene-Sands, 2014; Ingold, 2014; Vieira, 2014); and because there will generally be different needs to satisfy in each phase of the conflict.

9.6.4. Section 4. Specificities of interpreting for peacekeeping missions

After having focused on the different stages of an armed conflict, it is necessary, in my opinion, to see whether there are special requirements for interpreting for a peacekeeping mission. All the respondents concurred in that this was the case. They gave different reasons for this, but trust seems to be the underlying topic (Bos &
Soeters, 2006; Vieira, 2014), jointly with 3C or “soft skills” (Ingold, 2014; Vieira, 2014) such as objectivity, diplomacy, neutrality and the awareness on the part of the user that the interpreter requires certain pauses to interpret. This last comment seems to confirm the use of consecutive interpreting. Safety seems to mainstream these responses, presumably because knowing the stage of the conflict one is involved in has an impact on how one decides to react and perform the assignment.

Providing interpreters with materials is important for a good performance. Three quarters of the respondents stated they had given interpreters materials to support their work. However, the term “materials” was interpreted very broadly and included not only books, manuals, charts and maps but also ID cards, gear and safety equipment. This may have been because the term was not clearly explained to the respondents and maybe they should have been informed that “materials” referred only to documentation and information matters, and hence was ambiguous. In spite of this, it was interesting to note the importance given to interpreter safety in a mission, although it did somehow leave me wondering as to whether interpreters were actually given background materials to prepare for their task.

Nonetheless, when users were asked about the topics that should be trained in order for interpreters to perform better in a peacekeeping scenario, the replies were quite enlightening. Firstly, importance was given to specific terminology, knowing about history and background; secondly, behaviour, trust and negotiation skills were mentioned; and thirdly, information about the mission and its goals, the situation and the parties involved. This shows that users are aware of interpreters’ requirements.

Quality is important for interpreting (Kopczynski, 1994; Kurz, 2001; Pöchhacker, 2001; Ruiz Rosendo, 2009), and it is usually in the “eye of the user” although it can be monitored. When respondents rated this issue, few users said they monitored the quality of an interpreter’s performance; and when they did, it was because the results of the interpreting session were not successful or the interpretation was poor, because it was important to obtain the best results possible. One respondent stated that they had also worked as an interpreter and they had been monitored when working in that position, while another respondent felt that the interpreters they had worked with were always reliable and trustworthy. Finally, one respondent stated that they monitored the interpreter to settle the salary, probably because the language competence/skill of the interpreter would influence the level of the salary paid. One respondent did not monitor because it was not their responsibility.

In the event mistakes were made, it was clear that there were different types of mistakes, from more serious to minor ones. Respondents were also clear about what to
do: ensure the mistake was corrected but at the same time be understanding about it. The nature of the mistake was also quoted as an element to take into account, as misunderstandings can be resolved and new conversations arranged, although it seems clear that a misunderstanding could also be a serious affair requiring intervention on behalf of the user. Despite these comments about mistakes made, the users were undoubtedly pleased with the interpreters’ performance.

9.6.5. Section 5. Users’ perception of interpreters’ work

Firstly, I wanted to determine if users had previous experience working with interpreters, as I felt that this would have an impact on how they perceived interpreters’ performance. Most users did in fact have experience working with interpreters and perceived their role as indispensable for communication.

As far as the needs of users were concerned, they felt that these needs could be satisfied much better. Maybe they required more interpreters or more participation from the interpreters. It could be that they needed other language combinations or more expertise in different modalities of interpreting. The issue of “soft skills” could even have been the reason for this. However, as there was no follow-up question, it showed that the matter requires further research as it would be very important to know why the needs of users were not completely satisfied despite the high level of satisfaction with interpreters.

9.6.6. Section 6. Working conditions for interpreters at EUFOR

◆ Frequency with which users had worked with interpreters

The users stated that they had worked only occasionally with interpreters. This could be due to the fact that EUFOR BiH ALTHEA is currently a much smaller operation and that state-building actions have been going on for some time, and as a result less encounters and meetings are being held.

When enquired about the language combinations used, users provided the expected ones for the region and conflict in question. However, Arabic and Hebrew were mentioned, which seems out of place and could be probably due to the fact the respondents mistakenly understood that one was supposed to include all the languages they had worked with in peacekeeping missions, as these languages are not the vernaculars of the region.

When requesting information about languages, I wanted to know if users had worked simultaneously with more than two languages, i.e. determine whether the
meetings were multilingual and not only bilingual. I asked this question due to the multilingual setting in which the war took place and out of personal interest. I was also curious as to whether the users had worked with an interpreter despite knowing the language of the other party, for I wanted to find out if they did so for monitoring purposes. In fact a majority of users had worked with interpreters in this situation. Some of the reasons given for doing so were: to check the situation, for training, to avoid misunderstandings and avoid lack of clarity. In one case, the user mentioned that they had an assistant available pointing out that the interpreter had not translated everything, while another respondent did so to gain time and hear the conversations between members of the other party, thus obtaining an advantage over the situation. This shows that the interpreter is not only considered a language expert but also a person in whom a lot of trust is placed (C. Baker, 2010a, 2010b, 2012a; Kelly & Baker, 2013), highlighting once again the importance that this matter has in a war or peacekeeping scenario.

In general, users were pleased with and valued highly their encounters with interpreters before being deployed to BiH ALTHEA.

In terms of the modalities of interpreting used, it is interesting to note that the first modality used was simultaneous, followed closely by consecutive; chuchotage and sight translation were used less. The least-used modality was bidule/portable equipment. The situation differs slightly from what is reported and/or inferred in the literature, where we see that the most used modalities are consecutive, chuchotage and sight translation (Edwards, 2002). These results are probably due to the fact that most respondents worked in a longstanding mission such as EUFOR and probably do so at their headquarters.

On the subject of problems encountered when working with interpreters, a majority did not encounter any problems. The two respondents who did have problems mentioned behaviour, work ethics and sense of isolation from the conversation at a moment they knew it was becoming emotional and loud. These results are not conclusive, but they do reflect concerns that have been voiced on other occasions by other authors (C. Baker, 2012). Notwithstanding the foregoing, I observed again that the users felt that the interpreters’ performance was good and once again highly respected.

9.6.7 Section 7. Training interpreters for EUFOR peacekeeping missions

Training was clearly a very important matter for users. All of the respondents believed there should be specific training for working in both an armed conflict and a
peacekeeping scenario. This finding is clearly in line with the findings reported by other authors in this field (Kelly & Baker, 2013; Moser et al., 2014). Practically all users also felt that there were particular topics that had to be taught to interpreters who work in peacekeeping scenarios. The topics suggested cover a broad range of issues, including the following: more general topics regarding the role of the interpreter, knowledge of the culture, history, geography and topography; matters relating to the military such as organisation, how to identify the different ranks, information about the armed forces, the type of armed conflict being waged, as well as knowledge about the armed conflict itself and military diplomacy; situational and social matters such as behaviour in combat, how to handle classified material; and more specific professional topics such as treatment of prisoners, help to victims, risks involved (toxic gas was mentioned) and learning about weapons. I believe that these matters highlight the importance of training for war and peacekeeping interpreters, as well as the broad range of topics these professionals encounter in their jobs (Moser-Mercer et al., 2014).

The same question was asked about aspects to be taught to interpreters working for EUFOR, and only 3 users replied to this question. In my opinion, it was a redundant question, which was clear from one of the answers as it referred the reader to the response to the previous question. Therefore, it would have been enough to just ask one of the two questions. The additional answers given by the users focus on issues such as explaining to the interpreter the “underlying stress that exists between partner nations and the foreign military deployed”, which is an information that is not often given for reasons of confidentiality. The reasons given for the additional answers were also very simple: “because they are important” subjects to cover as “the military partners do not share the same goals.” However this is a minority view.

For users, training should mainly be provided for consecutive interpreting. However, based on these results, I do not believe users are very aware of the differences between the different modalities as none were mentioned as being of more interest for training purposes. This could be probably due to the fact that only certain modalities are used in armed conflict and peacekeeping scenarios as was seen in the first part of the study, leading to the conclusion that the users considered “Consecutive” interpreting to be the modality in which interpreters should be given specific training, although most of the modalities were virtually tied (average of 3). This result failed to clarify whether it was considered somewhat or very important.

When asked about the areas they considered most important when working with interpreters (linguistic-skills, linguistic-accuracy, cultural-awareness, non-verbal communication, etiquette, empathy, flexibility, diplomacy, psychological stamina,
physical endurance), all of the areas were considered important, although flexibility was considered the most important and non-verbal communication the least important. I presume this is due to the nature of the job of the war interpreter: working for different parties, switching topics constantly and changing scenarios, which requires stamina as well as the ability to “change one’s hat” easily. Users felt that the requirements mentioned were the appropriate ones, because only one respondent replied to the follow-up question about adding any other areas. The answer to this additional question addressed the issue of interpreters who had had problems working with individuals who had been their opponents/enemy during the war, an aspect that has been highlighted in the literature (Kelly & Baker, 2013).

9.7. **Comparative analysis of the interpreters’ and users’ questionnaires**

9.7.1. **Section 1. Personal information**

The answers to this section by the interpreters revealed that 44.44% were Bosnian and the others from different nationalities, whereas there were no Bosnians among the users. The largest number of users were Swedish, Austrian and German, with a relative frequency of 18.18% each. The users from other nationalities (5) had a frequency of 9% each. As mentioned previously (see§ 3.3), it can be concluded that the interpreters working in conflict zones were local people. This finding coincides with the results of research carried out by different authors (Kelly & Baker, 2013; Vieira, 2014) although, a priori, one might think that interpreters not resident in the country or who have been not been involved in or are not victims of the conflict, would be preferred for reasons of objectivity towards the conflict. However, reality proves the opposite as can be seen from the results of the questionnaire. As far as the users of these services are concerned, they come from a mix of nationalities, primarily Swedish, Austrian and German, which is due to the multinational composition of EUFOR.

With regard to age, 5 interpreters (55.56%) belonged to the 51-60 age group. In the case of the users, 81.72% were over 41 and 45.36% were 51 or older.

This finding is clearly shown in the following chart:
It can therefore be concluded that both users and interpreters were mostly mature adults over 40 years, with few young users. Indeed, the interpreters were older than the users. This was probably due to the turnover of troops that were only stationed for 6 months in the area, whereas the interpreters were mostly locals.

In terms of gender, 55.56% of the interpreters were male and 44.44% female, although the difference was minimal. However, in the case of users, 91% of respondents were male vs. 9% women.

It can be argued that in the case of the interpreters, the ratio was balanced as the individuals hailed from or had studied in other countries and therefore had a different culture. It is worth noting, nonetheless, that according to different authors (Gile, 2006) the majority of interpreters are women. The fact that there were more men than usual represented in this study could be due to the fact that the presence of women in the Bosnian labour market is low (Somun-Krupalija, 2011). Also, according to C. Baker (2012a), women were reluctant to work for foreign forces at the beginning of the recruitment period and prior to the non-EUFOR missions in 1995.

However, in the case of users, the situation was explained by the fact that they are members of a military institution, EUFOR, where the presence of women is still infrequent (Valenius, 2007).
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Graph 100. Gender.

❖ Status

While 66.67% of the interpreters were non-military and 33.33% military, 54.54% of the users were military and 45.45% were not. Therefore, more users than interpreters were military personnel, clearly showing that interpreters are outsourced and not members of EUFOR, and also reflecting the dual nature (military and civilian) of EUFOR peacekeeping tasks despite the institution being military in nature. These differences are shown in the chart below:

Graph 101. Status.

As can be observed, the majority of interpreters were civilians (66.67% vs. 33.33%), whereas in the case of the users, the split in relative terms was 54.54% and
45.45%, respectively. I therefore believe that it may be concluded that although there were more civilians in both cases, in this regard civilian interpreters appeared to outnumber civilian users.

**Highest scholastic/academic qualification of users**

When studying the academic background of all the respondents, it can be observed that in the case of the interpreters, “High school graduate, diploma or the equivalent” and “Bachelor's degree” respectively accounted for 33.33%, followed by “Doctorate degree” (22.22%) and “Master's degree” (11.11%).

In contrast, the breakdown for users was “Master's degree” (54.54%), “Bachelor's degree” (18.18%) and “Professional degree”, “Some college credit, no degree” and “Staff College” (9% each). This provides one of the most interesting conclusions of the study: most of the users had higher academic qualifications than the interpreters, who did not necessarily have the highest academic qualification.

The results are plotted below for comparison purposes:

![Graph 102. Qualifications.](image)

The findings on interpreter training were consistent with the literature in that local interpreters were recruited in droves in Bosnia at the beginning of the Yugoslav war (C. Baker, 2012a; Kelly & Baker, 2013). As a result, once the most qualified interpreters had been hired, anybody who had a knowledge of English was hired, which resulted in this situation. With the coming and going of forces every six months, today interpreters are the most stable and knowledgeable source of information available.
9.7.2. Section 2. The role of the interpreter throughout history

When it comes to the knowledge both population groups had of the history of interpreting, 55.56% of the interpreters gave a score of 2, while 33.33% gave 3 and only 11.11% gave a score of 5. The average score was 2.67, which is low. It can be argued that the interpreters have a limited knowledge of the history of interpretation. Whereas in the case of the users, 4 was chosen more frequently (36.36%), followed by 1 (27.27%), 3 (18.18%), then 2 and 5 (9% each). The average value was 2.91 and the median 3. Interestingly enough, it appears that more users than interpreters had some knowledge of the history of interpretation, although the difference in the average value was low. This is clearly shown on the comparative graphs:

![Knowledge of history graph](image)

Graph 103. Knowledge of history.

Although a detailed analysis of how interpreters considered knowing the history of interpreting could have an impact on their working conditions was carried out using other variables, this analysis was not conducted on users as the outcome would have been irrelevant and because I was interested in relating this outcome to training. Therefore, in this case, the results of the two surveys cannot be compared due to the different variables used.

When focusing on the existence of interpreting and interpreters in history, users had greater knowledge than the interpreters, probably because being members of a military institution made them more aware of the existence of war since Antiquity, which, as a result, also made them more aware of the need for communication in war settings. In terms of the relevance of this knowledge, the average and median value
obtained for interpreters was 3. It can therefore be concluded that the results and conclusions were irrelevant as they revolved around the focal point.

In the case of the users, the average value was 3.36 and the median 3. Indeed, the number of respondents who considered that knowing about the history of interpreting is important to understand the role of interpreters today was greater than those who do not think so, although this difference was small. It can therefore be argued that the results for this question, for both interpreters and users, were inconclusive, although the values were minimally higher for users.

However, when talking about the importance of knowing about the history of interpreting and its relevance for today’s interpreters, 71.43% of interpreters answered “Yes” and the rest “No”. In the case of the users, 81.81% replied “Yes” and 18.18% “No”. Hence, in both cases, the majority considered that knowledge about the history of armed conflicts is important for understanding the role of the interpreter today. In fact, users gave greater importance to this than the interpreters did. This was probably due to the fact that users, due to their training in the military, have to study cases of wars in order to analyse strategies, tactics and other lessons learnt, and also possess a good knowledge of military history.

![Graph 104. Importance of history.](image)

### 9.7.3. Section 3. Conflict definition and conflict stages

I consider that knowing war theory is important for understanding the role of the interpreter in each of the stages into which an armed conflict can be divided. So asking the respondents if they believe there is an established definition of the concept of armed conflict seemed like a natural choice, if the respondents were operating in war
settings. Seven (7) of the 8 Interpreters answered “Yes”, and 1 replied “No”, equivalent to 87.5% and 12.5%, respectively, in relative terms. 90% of the users believed there is an accepted definition for armed conflict and only 10% did not. Therefore, it is clear that both the interpreters and users thought there is an accepted definition. This is clearly shown in the charts below:

![Definition of armed conflict](image)

**Graph 105.** Definition of armed conflict.

When dividing the conflict into different stages, virtually all the interpreters (7 out of 8) replied “Yes” (87.5%) and only 1 answered “No” (12.5%). However, the response given by the users speaks for itself: 100% of the respondents answered “Yes”. It can therefore be argued that both the interpreters and users considered that a conflict can be divided into different stages. The options provided were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPTIONS PROVIDED</th>
<th>INTERPRETER’S CHOICE</th>
<th>USER’S CHOICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-conflict, conflict, peace process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispute phase, crisis phase, violence phase, settlement phase</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-war, escalation and post-war</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No conflict, Latent conflict, Emergence, Escalation, Stalemate, De-Escalation, Settlement/Resolution, Post-Conflict Peacebuilding and Reconciliation</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 29.** Stages of armed conflict.
The table shows the choices of both interpreters and users, and we can see that interpreters opted for only 2 of them, whereas users chose three. More specifically, the interpreters ticked the following options:

- Pre-war, escalation and post-war: 6 respondents did not select this stage and 2 chose “Yes”.

- No conflict, Latent conflict, Emergence, Escalation, Stalemate, De-Escalation, Settlement/Resolution, Post-Conflict Peacebuilding and Reconciliation: 1 respondent did not select this stage and 7 chose “Yes”.

While, given the same options, the users chose:

- Dispute phase, crisis phase, violence phase, settlement phase: this stage was chosen by 2 of the 10 respondents (20%).

- Pre-war, escalation and post-war: again 2 of the 10 respondents chose this stage (20%).

- No conflict, Latent conflict, Emergence, Escalation, Stalemate, De-Escalation, Settlement/Resolution, Post-Conflict Peacebuilding and Reconciliation: the remaining 6 (60%) chose this option.

When comparing the results, it can be concluded that, in both cases, the vast majority of respondents considered that the different stages of a conflict are “No conflict, Latent conflict, Emergence, Escalation, Stalemate, De-Escalation, Settlement/Resolution, Post-Conflict Peacebuilding and Reconciliation”.

Also, when asked where peacekeeping would be embedded in Brahm’s (2003) conflict curve, the percentage value cannot be calculated as this was a multiple choice question. The results obtained were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stages</th>
<th>Interpreters</th>
<th>Users</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No conflict</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latent conflict</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escalation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stalemate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De-escalation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement/Resolution</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These were very mixed results, which probably shows that though there was no explicit theoretical awareness of theoretical concepts and the theory of conflict studies among users and interpreters, it was clear that both groups of respondents felt that there were specificities to each stage of the conflict. It can therefore be concluded that, in both cases, the majority considered that peacekeeping takes place in the context of “Post-Conflict Peacebuilding and Reconciliation”, although they also chose other options, albeit to a greater or lesser extent. Both groups agreed that it did not take place in “No conflict”. This could be due to the fact that the respondents understood literally no-conflict.

After having focused on the stages of a conflict, a natural question to ask was whether there are different stages in a conflict. To this question, only 1 interpreter answered “Yes”, 1 did not answer and the remaining 6 replied “No”. In relative terms, only 12.5% of the interpreters answered “Yes”. In contrast, 5 out of 10 users replied “Yes”, 4 answered “No” and 1 chose not to answer. In relative terms, this equated to 50%, 40% and 10%, respectively. This question is one of few in which the interpreters and users disagreed. Whilst few interpreters considered that different stages of conflict require special interpreting requirements, 50% of the users felt that they are necessary. The reasons expressed by both groups are shown in the following chart:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>User’s reasons</th>
<th>Interpreter’s reasons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“It's a question of translating.”</td>
<td>“Choice of the interpreter can influence his/her acceptance.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Only in Bosnia. Because before the war there was one language. Now there are three equal languages. The LA usually translates and after a meeting gives his personal impression to his or her superior. That does not change within the phases.”</td>
<td>“Any situation that requires interpreting requires nothing but truthful, complete and honest interpreting. There are no and should not be different variations of that according to stages.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Interpreting skills are crucial in this domain. Interpreter has to be a very good psychologist also. In the different stages of a conflict every word is crucial and wrongly chosen word could affect upcoming events.”</td>
<td>“The knowledge of an earlier stage can be helpful for the later one.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Different user groups (politicians, civilians, soldiers) in each stage with &quot;own&quot; professional language.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 31. Specific interpreting requirements for different stages of armed conflict.
As the responses were very different, an attempt has to be made to correlate the statements in order to interpret them. From this correlation we could say that both groups believed it was important to train interpreters to work for peacekeeping scenarios; that it is important to possess and/or train specific peacekeeping skills for working in these settings and, similarly, precision and accuracy in the performance of an interpreting assignment are also considered essential components of interpreting.

9.7.4. Section 4. Specificities of interpreting for peacekeeping missions

All respondents agreed to the fact that particular requirements exist when working with interpreters in peacekeeping missions. In fact, this question was one of the few in which the interpreters and users agreed. All the respondents (100%) answered “Yes”. It can therefore be concluded, without a doubt, that special requirements are needed when working with interpreters in peacekeeping missions.

As regards the materials given to interpreters, when the interpreters were asked if they were given materials for their job, they rated this question on a scale of 1-5. In relative terms, the values obtained were 1 and 3 (respectively 37.5%) and 4 (25%), equivalent to an average of 2.5 and a median of 3. In terms of the users, 75% replied Yes and 25% “No”. The graphs below show the results based on this interpretation. This produced contrasting results: whilst few interpreters considered that they were provided with materials, most users thought that they did.

![Provision of materials](image)

**Graph 106.** Provision of materials.

The type of materials provided were as follows:
### Table 32. Materials provided to interpreters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USERS</th>
<th>INTERPRETERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Id card, flat jacket, helmet.</td>
<td>Military dictionaries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gear. Rain protection, safety equipment.</td>
<td>Background info, speaking notes...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature.</td>
<td>Military dictionary(ies), other field-related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dictionaires.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background information about speech partner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and details about desired/optimal result</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of discussion.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stationary.</td>
<td>Conference materials, notes, agendas...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuals and books.</td>
<td>Language skills, vocabulary, historical lessons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texts and documents, also charts and maps.</td>
<td>In general, they mostly carry dictionary-like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>materials.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is interesting to note that for the users materials included safety gear and equipment, which the interpreters did not mention at all. This shows that preparation for the users is not only limited to linguistic matters but encompasses a broader range of elements that should perhaps be included in the interpreters’ armamentarium for interpreting in conflict situations. However, both groups acknowledged the importance of providing the interpreter with background information on the situation and the conflict, although it was also observed that interpreters attributed more importance to linguistic matters because they considered terminology an important element for successfully performing their job.

Monitoring for quality provided the following results: in the case of the interpreters, 1, 3 and 4 respectively accounted for 25% of the answers, and 2 and 5 accounted for 12.5% each. The average value was 2.875 and the median 3. In relative terms, this equated, respectively, to 37.5% for 1 and 3, and 12.5% for 4 and 5 in the case of the users. The average value was 2.63 and the median 3. It should be noted that the interpreters felt that they had been monitored more intensely than claimed by the users, although the difference was small. This difference may have been due to two factors: (1) the interpreters’ performance had been monitored by the users, but not always; or (2) the interpreters’ had a heightened impression that their performance was being monitored for quality issues because they were being observed. These results are presented in the graph below:
9.7.5. Section 5. Perception of interpreters’ work

In the case of the interpreters, the two highest scores accounted for 37.5% of the responses, and the three top scores 75%. This gave an average of 3.25 and a median of 3. As for the users, the two highest scores accounted for 85.81% of the responses, with an average of 4.14 and a median of 4. It can be concluded that the score was high in both cases, although the users’ rating of the interpreters’ performance was significantly higher than the scores given by the interpreters regarding how they were treated by the users.

The results are compared in the graph below:
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The role played by the interpreter was viewed similarly by both groups of respondents. The interpreters only scored between 3 and 5, with 3 accounting for 12.5%, 4 for 50% and 5 for 37.5%. The average value was 4.25 and the median 4. The users also only chose the three highest scores with a relative frequency of 14.28%, 28.57% and 57.14%, respectively. The average value was 4.43 and the median was 5. This question was one of the few in the survey where the results for the interpreters and users virtually coincided and were highly positive. It could even be argued that the users gave higher ratings to the role of the interpreters in the communication process than those given by the interpreters themselves. This becomes apparent on closer inspection of the average and, in particular, the median value, as no other question in this survey was given such a high rating. This shows that the work of the interpreters is very helpful and cannot be dispensed with.

The graph below plots these results more clearly:

Graph 109. Importance of the role of interpreters.

9.7.6. Section 6. Working conditions for interpreters

As far as language combinations and pairs are concerned, I have plotted the answers on the following chart to make it easier to visualise the results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Users</strong></th>
<th><strong>Interpreters</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>German - Italian (in 2005 cooperation between Austrian military police and Italian Carabinieri)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German-Serbo-Croatian</td>
<td>Serbian/English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English-Serbo-Croatian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They translate to English</td>
<td>Bosnian to English, and vice-versa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 33. Language combinations used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USERS</th>
<th>INTERPRETERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sometimes to German</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English/local language</td>
<td>Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian - English and vice-versa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnian/English Serbo-Croatian/English Arabic/English Hebrew/English</td>
<td>English - B/C/S and vice-versa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English/Spanish; Bosnian/Spanish</td>
<td>Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian - English and vice-versa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German-English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German-Albanian</td>
<td>English - German, German-English, Italian-German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German-Italian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As was to be expected, the language combinations coincide as we are talking about a specific scenario, BiH, as well as a single institution. The two unexpected languages - Arabic and Hebrew – may have been mentioned because the question was insufficiently clear, prompting the respondents to believe that all language combinations used in all missions were to be included.

With respect to the interpreting modalities used, “Consecutive” was the modality used most extensively by the interpreters. Indeed, all the respondents claimed to use it. At the opposite end of the spectrum was the “Bidule/portable equipment”, which none used. The other modalities were used to a greater or lesser extent.

According to the users, the “Simultaneous” mode of interpreting was most widely used, followed by “Consecutive”, and the other modalities that were seldom used. Indeed, “Bidule/portable equipment” was the least used, chosen only by 1 respondent. Both groups agreed that “Consecutive” was the modality most used, and “Bidule/portable equipment” the least. Although the interpreters used the other modalities to a greater or lesser extent, the users rarely did so. It should be noted that “Simultaneous” was the modality used most used by the users, but not by the interpreters.

This could be a first step to reconsider the established perception of interpreters. Although the interpreters claimed that they used different modalities of interpreting, the users stated that they primarily used simultaneous interpreting. However, one has to consider whether the users were able to distinguish between chuchotage and SI, as maybe the difference between both modalities is not clear. This should be taken into account when raising awareness of interpreters’ work, which contrasts with what has been described in the literature (Edwards, 2002). The difference may be due to the fact that as the EUFOR mission has been deployed for a
long time in Bosnia, less meetings are being held in the field and more at HQ, although this affirmation would have to be confirmed. At the same time, the issue of interpreting modalities comes to the fore, and one could speculate that maybe the users are not completely aware of the differences that exist between the different modes of interpreting, so that *chuchotage* and simultaneous could be considered similar or even the same modality, which would explain these differences.

The results for both groups for the different modalities are shown below:

- **Simultaneous**: although both groups presented similar average values - interpreters 2.14 and users 2.86 -, on close examination of the median value of the frequencies (1 for the first group and 2 for the second), it can be concluded that this modality was used more often according to the users than the interpreters.

The following graph shows a comparison of the results:

Graph 110. Comparative Graph - Simultaneous.

- **Consecutive**: this modality was widely used by both groups, as can be inferred from the different frequencies. In comparing averages, the interpreters scored 4.14 and a median of 4, and the users 3.17 and 3.5, respectively. It can therefore be concluded that according to the interpreters they use this modality more frequently than the users state it is used.
A graphic comparison is shown below:

**Graph 111.** Frequency of use of consecutive.

- Chuchotage: when comparing the different frequencies and statistics (average 2.71 and median 3 for interpreters and 1.8 and 1 respectively for users), this modality was again considered to be used more frequently by the interpreters than by the users.

This is clearly shown in the graphs:

**Graph 112.** Frequency of use of chuchotage.

- Sight translation: the results were similar for interpreters and users in this case, although the interpreters appeared to use it slightly more. The
average and median values were 2.29 and 2 for the former, and 2 (average and median) for the latter.

The results are presented in graph form below:

**Graph 11.3.** Frequency of use of sight translation.

- **Bidule/portable equipment:** frequency of use and statistics were similar and equally low for both groups (average value of 1.29 and 1.2, respectively, and a median of 1 in both cases).

**Graph 11.4.** Frequency of use of bidule.
It can be concluded from these results that both groups stated that “Consecutive” was the modality most frequently used and “Bidule/portable equipment” the least used.

9.7.7. Section 7. Training interpreters for EUFOR Peacekeeping Missions

❖ Specific training for interpreters working in peacekeeping scenarios

The interpreters and users coincided in their answers to this question: 6 of the 7 respondents answered “Yes” versus 1 “No”. In relative terms, this was equivalent to 85.71% and 14.29% respectively.

It can be concluded that all respondents believed that specific training for interpreters working in peacekeeping scenarios was essential. This conclusion should be taken into account by organisations that recruit interpreters, including EUFOR.

The response is clearly shown in the graph:

![Graph 115. Specific Training required for EUFOR.](image)

❖ Particular topics that could be taught to prepare interpreters for working in peacekeeping scenarios

All the interpreters and users unanimously agreed on this question, i.e. that it is important to train interpreters in specific topics related to peacekeeping. It can therefore be categorically concluded that it was considered essential for interpreters working in peacekeeping scenarios. This outcome should be taken into account by organisations that recruit interpreters for peacekeeping missions.
When focusing more specifically on the particular topics that should be taught to interpreters working for peacekeeping missions, the replies given by users and interpreters are compared in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTERPRETERS’ TOPICS</th>
<th>USERS’ TOPICS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technical terms, structure of the force, cultural awareness.</td>
<td>Organisation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As stated earlier, basic military and political matters - all this including technical glossaries and later, specific linguistic specialization will determine the course of training (it may be as different as legal, medical, army, air force, political...).</td>
<td>Role of interpreter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background information on the conflict, stakeholders, rules of employment, risk involved, do's and don'ts.</td>
<td>Military diplomacy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural awareness (especially for expat interpreters who may only know the language but not the culture as well), etiquette, diplomacy, tact, empathy.</td>
<td>Treatment of prisoners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All topics discussed by parties using interpreters.</td>
<td>What type of armed conflict is going on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication skills, situational awareness and cultural issues.</td>
<td>History (the real and common one).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural knowledge.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help to victims.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risks involved (i.e. toxic gas).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armed forces.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviour in combat.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography and topography.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to handle classified material.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranks and how to identify them.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weapons.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Know the conflict.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 34.** Specific topics to be trained.

For the interpreters we can see that the knowledge of specialised terminology, political and military issues, background information, cultural awareness, behaviour (etiquette, diplomacy and tact) were important. Users went into much more detail when replying to this question and mentioned the following: the role of the interpreter, knowledge of the culture, history, geography and topography; matters regarding the
Military such as organisation, how to identify the different ranks, information about the armed forces, the type of armed conflict being waged, as well as knowledge about the armed conflict itself and military diplomacy; situational and social matters such as behaviour in combat, how to handle classified material; and more specific professional topics such as treatment of prisoners, help to victims, risks involved (toxic gas was mentioned) and learning about weapons. This was probably due to the fact that the users had encountered problems in these areas and wished to see them resolved in the future. It is also interesting to note that the interpreters, despite their experience in this field of interpreting, did not go into so much detail, but the general categories they mentioned covered a broad range of topics mentioned by the users.

Additionally, when comparing the responses of the interpreters and users to this question, it can be argued that the results for both groups were inconclusive due to lack of data (some respondents did not reply). Nonetheless, it can also be argued that there were some commonalities in the views of the interpreters and users, as most respondents chose Yes.

The graphs below illustrate the commonalities:

![Graph 116. Specific topics for peacekeeping.](image)

Though few respondents replied as to why these topics should be taught, and therefore the results are inconclusive, I still think it is worthwhile mentioning them. The reasons given by the 2 users who replied on why these topics should be taught were the importance of doing so and the “different meanings the desired targets have for the involved military partners”. To this question the two interpreters who answered stated cultural awareness, preparation of the interpreters to work at meeting where the topics
are discussed and the need for background information on the conflict, the stakeholders, rules of employment, risks involved, do's and don'ts.

When questioned about the different interpreting modalities that should be trained, the results were very interesting.

- **Consecutive**: interpreters and users held different views. The former had an average score of 4.71 and a median of 5, whilst the latter had an average and median of 3.43 and 3, respectively. This clearly shows that the interpreters considered training in this modality before working in peacekeeping scenarios essential, whilst the users did give this much importance.

A comparative graph clearly shows this:

![Importance of training consecutive](graph.png)

**Graph 117.** Training consecutive.

- **Simultaneous**: this modality produced similar results among both the interpreters (average 3.86 and median 3) and the users (average and median 3).

The results are presented in graph form below:
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Graph 118. Training simultaneous.

- Chuchotage: in this case, the score given by interpreters was higher, with an average of 3.71 and a median of 4. The average and median for users was 3.

Graph 119. Training chuchotage.

- Sight-translation: the outcome, in this case, was the opposite to the previous modality: users rated this modality higher, though not by much. Interpreters had an average of 2.86 and median of 3, whilst the users produced an average of 3.14 and median of 3.
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**Graph 120.** Training sight translation.

- **Bidule:** again the users rated this modality higher than the interpreters did, though not by much. The interpreters had an average score of 2.14 and a median of 3, whereas the average and median for the users was 3.

**Graph 121.** Training bidule/ portable equipment.

It can therefore be concluded that both the interpreters and the users agreed that “Consecutive” is the interpreting modality in which interpreters should be trained before working in peacekeeping scenarios. Both groups agreed that “Bidule” was the modality in which training was least needed.
Most challenging/important skills when working with interpreters?

When the interpreters and users were enquired about their views as to the challenges encountered in the different areas, the following results were obtained:

- Linguistic-skills: contrasting results were obtained in this area. On one hand, the interpreters gave a low score, as can be observed in the table where the frequencies are given, with an average of 2.43 and a median of 3 as statistical values. On the other hand, the users gave relatively high scores, starting at a value of 3, with an average score of 4.1 and a median of 4. The values are more clearly expressed in the following chart:

![Graph 122. Importance of linguistic skills.](image)

- Linguistic-accuracy: once again the scores obtained were low among the interpreters and high for the users, with average values of 2.71 and 4.43, respectively, and median values of 3 and 4, respectively.
Cultural-awareness: we once again observe the same trend, i.e. low scores for interpreters and high ones for users. Average values 2.29 and 4, median values of 2 and 4, respectively.

Non-verbal communication: again the scores were lower for interpreters compared to users. It can also be observed that the values in both groups were even lower than in other factors as plotted in the frequency tables and the statistical values: average values of 2 and 3.29 and median values of 2 and 3, respectively.
Graph 125. Importance of non-verbal communication.

- Etiquette: once again, low scores for interpreters and high scores for users. Averages 2.29 and 3.86 and median values of 2 and 4, respectively.

Graph 126. Importance of etiquette.

- Empathy: the same trend was observed. Lower scores were given by the interpreters. It is important to note that this was the factor that the interpreters scored the lowest, which was not the case with the users. The averages obtained were 1.71 and 3.43, respectively, and median values of 2 and 3, respectively.
Graph 127. Importance of empathy

- Flexibility: the same pattern was observed, but this time there was an important divide between the answers given by interpreters and users. The second least valued factor for interpreters was this one, with an average value of 1.86 and a median value of 2. In contrast, the users gave this the highest score, with an average of 4.57 and a median of 5, the maximum score.

Graph 128. Importance of flexibility.

- Diplomacy: once again, low scores for interpreters and high scores for users. Average values 2.14 and 4.14 and medians of 3 and 4, respectively.
Psychological-stamina: this was probably the area in which the interpreters and users displayed a higher level of consensus; despite average median values of 2.86 and 3.83, respectively, a slight difference was observed but was not as marked as for other factors.

Physical-endurance: finally, although the scores were also to some extent lower among interpreters than users, the results here were more similar to the ones in other disciplines, with averages of 2.71 and 3.71, respectively, and a median of 4 for both groups of respondents.
We may conclude that the scores given by the interpreters to all the factors considered were always lower than those given by users, highlighting the importance of these factors for the users when working with interpreters, all the more so as they included 3C skills. The greatest divergence in results can be seen in relation to “Flexibility”, whereas the smallest difference corresponded to “Physical-endurance”, followed closely by “Psychological-stamina.”
CHAPTER 10. CONCLUSIONS

As I mentioned in the introduction, this dissertation is the result of my professional, academic and personal interests, as I had always wondered what role interpreters play in challenging scenarios such as war. I had also always asked myself how the role of the interpreter had arisen and developed, whether there had been many changes and if so, why these had taken place.

To cover the topic of this dissertation, I divided it into two parts. The first part, the theoretical framework, started by delving into the past and reviewing the role played by interpreters in general and in war scenarios in particular. This meant going back to the Bible, considering the role played by interpreters from antiquity until today, in order to carry out a better and more in-depth appraisal of the role and visibility of interpreters in war. In this process, I found it interesting to note that, although these professionals were mentioned on more than one occasion, this did not happen very often and the treatment and status of interpreters varied enormously depending on the eras and civilizations studied.

After resolving this matter and completing the historical review, I decided it was important to focus more on the situation of interpreting in war scenarios, describing the different contexts and spheres in which interpreters work in order to have a clearer idea of the foundations on which my research was going to focus. However, it soon became very clear to me that studying the “interpreter at war”, or the “interpreter in armed conflicts”, was too broad a subject as it could cover from the interpreter working in the frontline, at diplomatic meetings and negotiations to the professional required at war/peace accords, war tribunals or peacekeeping missions. As a result, I felt it was necessary to limit my research to one particular scenario. That is the reason why I chose peacekeeping, since it is a multilingual and multidisciplinary scenario in which many challenges arise, not just for the reasons mentioned above but also because of the multiplicity of stakeholders involved and the many different tasks that have to be carried out.

Of course, peacekeeping in itself was also a very daunting topic to study due to its scope; one just has to think about what the word “peacekeeping” means and everybody envisages UN and other military missions deployed worldwide in a multiplicity of countries where different languages are spoken and different cultures exist. The specific nature of each peacekeeping mission deployed worldwide would have made it practically impossible for me to establish a basic working framework to
encompass them all. These circumstances, coupled with the fact that a discussion of peacekeeping could become very abstract if it were not limited to a specific armed conflict scenario, were the main reasons why I decided to study just one conflict. But why did I choose the war in Bosnia? This question takes the reader back to the introduction of this dissertation, where the main reasons were given. Firstly because it was a conflict that took place in Europe; and secondly, and as mentioned in the introduction to this dissertation, because when interpreting for the FNF, I had the opportunity of meeting people who had suffered the war in Bosnia and also interpreted at many seminars on the topic of conflict prevention, conflict mediation and peace, where the Bosnian conflict played a preeminent role.

This choice meant looking carefully at the historical background of Bosnia, analysing the events that took place before the Yugoslav conflict, examining the timeline of the war as well as its most important events in order to obtain a better understanding of the role of peacekeeping missions in the region. This overview served as an introduction to EUFOR, its mandate and the role it plays in the region, and allowed me to zoom in on the specific case of BiH ALTHEA. The overview of EUFOR was an important exercise because it allowed to me understand the complexity of peacekeeping missions and the particularities of the case study covered in this dissertation.

Part 2 of the dissertation presented two quantitative studies on interpreting at EUFOR BiH ALTHEA. This part was divided into 3 chapters, the first one introducing the empirical study, the methodology followed and the next two covering the questionnaires submitted to the two groups of subjects from EUFOR BiH ALTHEA, i.e. one group of interpreters and another group of users of interpreting services. Both questionnaires sought (a) to analyse the status of and role played by interpreters throughout history and identify possible lessons that could be learnt from the past; (b) to understand the role played by EUFOR interpreters in peacekeeping missions, and any particularities of interpreting in this setting; (c) to enquire if and how the needs and requirements of interpreters were being fulfilled; (d) to gauge the level of satisfaction with the performance of interpreters; (e) and find out the level of satisfaction of both groups of respondents with the specific training provided to interpreters for working in peacekeeping missions.

It is important to note here that one of the most striking facts I encountered in the research process was the difficulty of contacting the subjects and their reluctance to talk or provide any type of information about their experiences. It was as if an invisible curtain had been drawn between them and their working lives, pulling down the
shutter on the window into the details of the conflict. This is understandable in the sense that any war is undoubtedly a traumatic experience for all parties involved: troops, locals —whether military or civilians—, and in the case covered in this dissertation, interpreters. This is even more so true when a civil war is waged, and the conflict in Bosnia is no exception. Indeed, after reading the seminal work by Glenny (1996) on the Yugoslav war, I feel that I now understand far better the respondents’ reluctance to become involved in any type of action, be it research or any other that would remind them of the conflict. In fact, when I contacted the Facebook IFOR/SFOR/NATO/EUFOR veteran group, they accepted me immediately, but when I told them about my research intentions, the group administrator made it very clear to me that they were a private group and that they only wanted to share personal experiences among their members. Despite this, I was graciously accepted in their midst. And although there were no responses to the questionnaire, many members showed interest in my research and sent me words of encouragement or “likes” to my posts. In the end, the subjects who responded to the questionnaires were users and interpreters contacted via the person appointed by EUFOR for this purpose.

These same reasons also explain why research that has been carried out to date is primarily of a qualitative nature or the result of interviews (Bos & Soeters, 2006; Van Dijk and Soeters, 2008; C. Baker, 2010a, 2010b, 2010c; Kelly & Baker, 2013). Not only that, but when I contacted different institutions involved in these settings, reasons of confidentiality, security and anonymity made researching in this field a painstaking process that required a huge investment of time, persuasion and patience. At the same time, and as Hale (2006) states, the low response rates could also have been due to the lack of interest shown by interpreters in the topic, as well as to the fact the questionnaire I drafted was long, detailed and in some cases repetitive. However the questionnaire was designed in this way because the sample population was small, I needed to confirm the reliability of the data gathered and I wanted to retrieve as much information as possible from these subjects.

It has to be borne in mind that when it comes to the specific case of Bosnia, we are talking about a protracted conflict and the ensuing process of state-building, a situation in which a wealth of stakeholders became involved, including peace-keeping operations. As I have described in this dissertation, peace-keeping missions were deployed for the first time when the war broke out (UNPROFOR); and since the Dayton accords were signed in 1995, they have remained present there (see §5.2). EUFOR BiH ALTHEA was deployed in 2004, and this means that many interpreters who are working today with these missions have been doing so since the beginning of the conflict when they were hired by the previous missions deployed there, and which
shows that there is a wealth of knowledge waiting to be untapped and which would also shed light on many aspects given the lessons learnt in the different areas concerned, providing many opportunities for researchers, as already evident from existing scientific literature (Bos & Soeters, 2006; C. Baker, 2010a, 2010b, 2010c, 2012a, 2012b; Kelly & Baker, 2013).

The questionnaire revealed that interpreters were recruited locally and were mostly civilians, a fact also confirmed in the literature (Askew & Salma-Carr, 2011), indicating that a clear and structured approach to training is probably necessary in order to cover the needs both of interpreters and users in the most efficient way possible. However, training is a tricky subject, as one has to think about both the short and long terms goals in interpreting. The long term is easier to organise providing the future interpreters are proficient in the working languages required; in this case maybe an intensive two to three month training course could be structured and organised. However, when it comes to the short-term, it is all about immediately employing someone to be a language broker; and the hirer/user only has a few days or a couple of weeks at most to train their interpreters. That is why a “quick-response mechanism” and skills-focused programme could also be developed for these cases, in order to provide interpreters with the minimum skills to do a decent job. It should also be a course focusing on the specific requirements and structure of the organisation concerned; these aspects have to be verified beforehand. Please note that when I refer to a short course, I am not thinking of a shortcut to interpreter training, on the contrary; as I have called this solution a “quick-response mechanism” and not a quick training method in interpreting, I have made it clear that I am referring to an easy-to-implement solution to a pressing problem. This view is supported by the fact that most of the interpreters believed that a one-month intensive programme would be enough to train an interpreter for working in a conflict or peacekeeping scenario. However, caution is the word; these interpreters have a long-standing professional experience and have also worked for EUFOR for a long time.

Nonetheless, training should not only be limited to the interactions that take place in the interpreting setting as such. I asked both groups what they felt about knowledge of the history of armed conflicts and the two groups of respondents stated that knowing about the history of interpreting is important in order to understand the role of the interpreter today. If the knowledge of history for translation practice has already been identified as a means of understanding better the discipline (Gürçaglar, 2013), it may also be useful to apply this practice also to interpreting.
I also felt that knowing about conflict theory was important in order to understand which role the interpreter was supposed to play, as well as the skills and techniques required for a good performance. This entails knowing theory about war, its definition, the stages into which an armed conflict is divided into, and where peacekeeping missions would be present. Both groups assigned peacekeeping to different stages and agreed it would not be present in “no conflict”. But when it came to the different stages and the specific training requirements, there was no agreement between the two groups: a limited number of interpreters considered there were special requirements, whereas half of the users felt that special requirements existed. This is an interesting line of results that merits future research.

Having said this, I believe that the limited scope of my research allowed me to consider that both users and interpreters are aware of the importance of (a) learning about the history of interpreting and (b) acquiring more knowledge about conflict studies. There are reasons that support the learning of history in any specific field (Delisle, 2003). Firstly, studying history provides structure to knowledge, raises awareness about ethical issues and responsibilities, and also develops cognitive skills such as analytical abilities, critical thinking while at the same time teaching to appreciate the complexity of situations (QAA, n.d.). Secondly, learning about war and peace and the concepts underlying conflict and its stages, and relating them to specific roles, tasks and skills, allow users and interpreters to know what to expect when they interpret in these scenarios. Therefore, these are also topics that could be included in mainstream interpreter training to precisely train the skills mentioned (Kraus, 2014).

Following the same line of thought, it is interesting to note that among the interpreters there were some professionals who did not have higher education studies (Askew & Salama-Carr, 2011), which contrasted very much with the users, all of whom had some type of university qualification. If interpreters performed well despite the fact they did not have specific training or a degree in interpreting, the proposal to organise a “quick response mechanism” for training seems to gain ground, as it is apparent that individuals who do not have the necessary skills will not survive as interpreters in any scenario, and this is even more true in an armed conflict scenario. For this reason, specific training to work in these settings should be provided, as both the users and interpreters expressed in their replies.

The training issues lead me to affirm that institutions like EUFOR should provide materials to interpreters for preparation. If the issue of trust is a concern, as became clear from the users’ responses in the survey, then the appropriate mechanisms
for security clearance and confidentiality should be put into place, so that interpreters may access the materials they require in order to guarantee a good performance.

A good performance includes covering issues related to quality and how it is controlled or monitored. In this study, few users admitted to monitoring the quality of interpreters’ performance, and as long as the outcome of the session, meeting or encounter was successful, and no major mistakes were made, they would not intervene. It is evident that mistakes were considered either significant or not, but intervention is clearly required when the mission’s goals may be jeopardised.

As for the most important challenges faced by the interpreters in the performance of their duties, psychological stamina and physical endurance were the main difficulties they encountered. While the users considered all the areas important, they believed that flexibility was of primary importance and non-verbal communication the least important aspect. These results show that interpreting in conflict scenarios is considered a demanding assignment by interpreters; therefore, this should be noted by the user or employer institution in the hiring conditions. The best approach would be to abide by the working conditions agreed by AIIC. However, as this is difficult to foresee in the field because of the shortage of interpreters or remoteness of the location, other mechanisms will have to be envisaged in order to resolve this problem.

At the same time, the questions I asked myself in the introduction of this dissertation were only partially answered, as the results cannot be considered conclusive because of the sample size, meaning that further research is required. Why no attention is paid to the interpreter if sharing positions and ideas, as well as understanding each other, are prime elements for communication among the parties in conflict? This is due to the invisibility of the role played by this professional, since interpreters have often only been considered “language hubs” and outsiders by their clients/users, and as a result they have been treated as outsiders (C. Baker, 2012a, 2012b). Indeed, the lack of “belonging to” an institution may have had something to do with the perception of interpreting on the part of the users they worked for, which is also endorsed by the historical accounts of interpreting in the past.

How can conflict be avoided and peace established in a bilingual or multilingual setting if there are no interpreters presumably present? I think that this question is clearly answered when we observe that interpreters are hired, but somehow do not belong anywhere: neither to the institution, nor to the other stakeholders who view them from a distance (Kelly & Baker, 2013). Nevertheless, if interpreters do not wish to have their names published or disclosed, this right should be respected; their
intervention, role and the level of satisfaction of the parties they broker for, together with their performance, should be registered.

Am I being presumptuous in the sense I am assuming that the interpreter plays a far more important role than s/he actually does? Do users of interpreting services in a conflict scenario appreciate the presence of an interpreter? I do not think I was being presumptuous in considering that interpreters play a far more important role than stated, and it is clear from the results of the questionnaires that respondents believe that interpreters are essential in these scenarios, and appreciate the role these professionals play. And this idea is consistent with the literature on the topic. Also, the results obtained about the languages spoken, thus highlighting the multinational nature of the users, confirm the need to count upon the assistance of interpreters.

Do users believe interpreters are well trained for working in these particularly sensitive and volatile scenarios? They do, a clear and overwhelming response was given in this respect.

Are interpreters happy with the way they are treated by users/clients in war-related contexts? They are, but they also believe that this could be improved, as stems clearly from the data of the questionnaires.

As happens with any initial research study, there are always strengths and limitations that open up avenues for future research. The intention of obtaining qualitative results prompted me to use the survey method, which, as was mentioned, has its limitations (Robson, 2011). However, in this particular case this method provided quantitative results that confirmed the findings of other qualitative studies carried out in this field (Bos & Soeters, 2006; C. Baker, 2010a, 2010b, 2011, 2012c). I believe it is a first step towards designing future quantitative studies that will shed more light on the complexities of interpreting in armed conflict and peacekeeping scenarios. At the same time, although the questionnaire was necessarily long because my intention was to obtain as much information as possible from the sample population, I believe it was overly ambitions in its aims, and that precisely the length of the questionnaire was a reason for the loss of respondents. This is an issue that I will take into account in future research studies. Despite these shortcomings, the empirical study has provided me with insights as to future lines of research that could be undertaken in different fields, for example: studying the importance of history for interpreting studies; applying war theory to interpreting in armed conflict scenarios; defining the role the interpreter plays in each stage of the armed conflict; understanding the importance of each of the different interpreting modalities used in
these settings; and designing specific training for interpreting in armed conflict and peacekeeping settings.

Finally, it seems clear that interpreting in armed conflict and peacekeeping scenarios is a complex matter, as well as a field where further research could be carried out on the history of armed conflicts in different periods of history, the stages of war and related interpreting needs, the need to design a “quick response mechanism” training solution for war settings and the possibility of considering interpreting in these scenarios a vocational career choice. It must be noted, however, that despite the difficulties in recruiting subjects, this research would necessarily have to be more quantitative in nature, so that objective data could help to reach clear-cut decisions that would allow interpreting needs identified in armed conflict scenarios to be met. Institutional awareness, although it exists, would be required for this to be achieved and could perhaps be enhanced by working more closely with professional associations of interpreters. At the same time, the proposed studies would provide further insight into the trials and tribulations faced both by interpreters and users of interpreting services, making it easier for both parties to know what can and cannot be expected from each other.
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CHAPTER 12. ANNEXES

ANNEX 1. SURVEY FOR EUFOR INTERPRETERS

EUFOR BiH ALTHEA

Dear participant:

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey. During the past two years I have been researching the topic of interpreters working in war and peacekeeping scenarios for my Ph.D. Dissertation. You have been contacted so that I can count upon the experience and knowledge of someone who has first-hand experience working in these scenarios. I would appreciate your taking the time to complete the following survey. It should take about ten minutes of your time. Your responses are voluntary and will be confidential. Responses will not be identified by individual. All responses will be compiled together and analysed as a group. If you have any questions or concerns, please contact María Clementina Persaud, Assistant Lecturer at Universidad Pablo de Olavide cper@upo.es.

There are 68 questions in this survey

SECTION 1. PERSONAL INFORMATION

1. What is your nationality?
   Please write your answer here:

2. What is your age?
   Please choose only one of the following:
   - 18-20
   - 21-30
   - 31-40
   - 41-50
   - 51-60
   - +61
   - Prefer not to answer
3. What is your gender?
   Please choose only one of the following:
   ○ Male
   ○ Female
   ○ Prefer not to answer

4. Are you a member of the military?
   Please choose only one of the following:
   ○ Yes
   ○ No
   ○ Prefer not to answer

5. Please provide your highest scholastic/academic qualification
   Please choose only one of the following:
   ○ High school graduate, diploma or the equivalent
   ○ Some college credit, no degree
   ○ Trade/technical/vocational training
   ○ Associate degree
   ○ Bachelor's degree
   ○ Master’s degree
   ○ Professional degree
   ○ Doctorate degree
   ○ Other

6. Which is/are your mother tongue/s using AIIC’s (International Association of Conference Interpreters) language classification (ABC)?
   Please choose the appropriate response for each item:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albanian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 7. Other languages not listed above

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbian</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 8. Do you have a qualification or degree in interpreting?

Please choose **only one** of the following:

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ N/A or don’t know

### 9. If so, what is the name of the qualification or degree?

Please write your answer here:

### 10. How long was your training?

Please choose **all** that apply:

- ☐ Less than 3 months
- ☐ 3 months
11. At which institution did you obtain your qualification or degree?  
Please write your answer here:

12. Did you receive any guidance as to how to fulfil your role as an interpreter?  
Please choose only one of the following:

- Yes
- No
- N/A or don’t know

13. Did you receive guidance on any of the following?  
Please choose all that apply:

- Verbal Communication
- Non-Verbal Communication
- Etiquette
- Protocols
- Allegiances
- Other:

SECTION 2. THE ROLE OF THE INTERPRETER THROUGHOUT HISTORY

14. Do you know anything about the history of interpreting?  
(1 being Nothing at All and 5 being Very Much)  
Please choose only one of the following:

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
15. Do you think knowing about the past history of interpreting in armed conflicts is important to understand the interpreter's role today?
   Please choose only one of the following:
   ○ Yes
   ○ No

16. Since when do you think that interpreters have existed in the context of war?
   Please write your answer here:

17. In your opinion, what is the importance of knowing about the history of interpreting in order to understand your professional role today?
   (1 being of little importance and 5 Very important)
   Please choose only one of the following:
   ○ 1
   ○ 2
   ○ 3
   ○ 4
   ○ 5

18. Of the issues listed below, which do you think influences how EUFOR users perceive the role the interpreter plays?
   (1 being Not at All, 5 being Very Much)
   Please choose the appropriate response for each item:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position/Rank</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience working with interpreters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
19. **Are there other topics or issues not mentioned above, you would like to add?**

(Please state level of importance 1 being Not at All, 5 being Very Much)

Please choose **only one** of the following:

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

**SECTION 3. CONFLICT DEFINITION AND CONFLICT STAGES**

20. **Do you think there is an established definition of the concept of armed conflict?**

Please choose **only one** of the following:

- Yes
- No
- N/A or don’t know

21. **Do you think a conflict can be divided into different stages?**

Please choose **all** that apply:

- Yes
- No
- N/A

22. **Which stages would you divide an armed conflict into?**

Please choose **all** that apply:

- Pre-conflict, conflict, peace process
- Dispute phase, crisis phase, violence phase, settlement phase
- Pre-war, escalation and post-war
- No conflict, Latent conflict, Emergence, Escalation, Stalemate, De-Escalation, Settlement/Resolution, Post-Conflict Peacebuilding and Reconciliation
- Other:
23. In which of the following stage/s of an armed conflict according to Brahmi (2003) would you frame peacekeeping?

Please choose all that apply:

- No conflict
- Latent conflict
- Escalation
- Stalemate
- De-escalation
- Settlement/Resolution
- Post-Conflict Peacebuilding and Reconciliation
- Other:

24. If an armed conflict is divided into different stages, do you think there are different interpreting requirements in the different stages of conflict?

Please choose only one of the following:

- Yes
- No
- N/A or don’t know

25. Why?

Please write your answer here:

SECTION 4. SPECIFICITIES OF INTERPRETING FOR PEACEKEEPING MISSIONS

26. Do you believe that there are particular requirements when interpreting for peacekeeping missions?

Please choose all that apply:

- Yes
- No
- N/A or Don’t know

27. Would these requirements also be applicable outside the peacekeeping scenario?

Please choose all that apply:

- Yes
28. Where?
Please choose all that apply:

- [ ] War scenarios
- [ ] Permanent peacekeeping missions
- [ ] Negotiations
- [ ] Other:

29. What would you say are the specific requirements for interpreting for peacekeeping missions?
Please write your answer here:

30. Have you ever been given materials to carry out your job more easily while working for Peacekeeping Mission?
(1 being Never and 5 being Always)
Please choose only one of the following:

- [ ] 1
- [ ] 2
- [ ] 3
- [ ] 4
- [ ] 5

31. What type of materials were you given?
Please write your answer here:

32. Were the materials provided useful for your assignment?
(1 being Not at all and 5 being Very much)
Please choose only one of the following:

- [ ] 1
- [ ] 2
- [ ] 3
- [ ] 4
- [ ] 5
33. Do you think there are particular topics that could be taught in advance to interpreters in order to prepare interpreters to work in peacekeeping scenarios?
   Please write your answer here:

34. Has your performance as an interpreter even been monitored for quality issues?
   (One being Never and 5 being Always)
   Please choose only one of the following:
   ○ 1
   ○ 2
   ○ 3
   ○ 4
   ○ 5

35. Who did the monitoring?
   Please write your answer here:

SECTION 5. INTERPRETER'S PERCEPTION OF THEIR OWN WORK

36. Do you believe that working as an interpreter in a peacekeeping scenario could be considered as a vocational career choice?
   (1 being Not at all and 5 being Very much.)
   Please choose only one of the following:
   ○ 1
   ○ 2
   ○ 3
   ○ 4
   ○ 5

37. Do you consider that your job as an interpreter for EUFOR BiH ALTHEA is a vocational career choice for you?
   (1 Being not at all and 5 being Very much so)
   Please choose only one of the following:
   ○ 1
   ○ 2
   ○ 3
38. Are you satisfied with the way you have been treated by users of interpreting services?
   (1 Being not at all and 5 being Very much so)
Please choose only one of the following:
   ○ 1
   ○ 2
   ○ 3
   ○ 4
   ○ 5

39. How would you rate the role you play in the communication process?
   (1 being Unimportant and 5 being Essential)
Please choose only one of the following:
   ○ 1
   ○ 2
   ○ 3
   ○ 4
   ○ 5

SECTION 6. WORKING CONDITIONS FOR INTERPRETERS AT EUFOR

40. For how long have you been working as an interpreter?
   Please choose only one of the following:
   ○ Less than a year
   ○ 1-3 years
   ○ 4-7 years
   ○ 8-10 years
   ○ Other

41. For how long have you been working as an interpreter for EUFOR BiH ALTHEA?
   Please choose only one of the following:
   ○ Less than 3 months
   ○ 3-6 months
   ○ 6 months-1 year
42. Which modalities of interpreting do you use in your job?
   Please choose all that apply:
   □ Simultaneous
   □ Consecutive
   □ Chuchotage
   □ Sight translation
   □ Bidule/portable equipment

43. How often do you use each one of these modalities of interpreting in your job?
   Please choose the appropriate response for each item:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simultaneous</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consecutive</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuchotage</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sight translation</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bidule/portable equipment</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

44. What language combination/pairs do you use?
   Please write your answer here:

45. Do you work mainly into your mother tongue?
   Please choose all that apply:
   □ Yes
   □ No
   □ N/A or don’t know

46. Do you work mainly into a second language that is not your mother tongue?
   Please choose only one of the following:
47. Do you work to and from your mother tongue?  
Please choose **only one** of the following:  
☐ Yes  
☐ No  
☐ N/A or don’t know

48. Did you have previous experience working as an interpreter in any field other than peacekeeping before working for EUFOR BiH ALTHEA?  
Please choose **only one** of the following:  
☐ Yes  
☐ No  
☐ N/A or don’t know

49. Did you have previous experience working as an interpreter in peacekeeping missions before working for BiH ALTHEA?  
Please choose **only one** of the following:  
☐ Yes  
☐ No  
☐ N/A or don’t know

50. How long did you work as an interpreter on peacekeeping missions before working for EUFOR BiH ALTHEA?  
Please choose **all** that apply:  
☐ Less than one year  
☐ 1-3 years  
☐ 3-7 years  
☐ More than 7 years  
☐ Other:

51. How many hours do you work per day?  
Please choose **all** that apply:  
☐ Less than 4  
☐ 4-7  
☐ More than 7
52. How often have you been asked to work more than 7 hours?
   (1 being Never and 5 being Very Often)
   Please choose **only one** of the following:
   - [ ] 1
   - [ ] 2
   - [ ] 3
   - [ ] 4
   - [ ] 5

53. Have you been paid overtime?
   Please choose **all** that apply:
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No
   - [ ] N/A or Don't know

54. If not, have you been given any type of non-monetary compensation?
   *(Please specify):*
   Please write your answer here:

**SECTION 7. TRAINING INTERPRETERS FOR EUFOR PEACEKEEPING MISSIONS**

55. Do you think that there should be specific training for interpreters who
   **are working or are going to work** in peacekeeping scenarios?
   Please choose **only one** of the following:
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No

56. Do you think there should be specific training for interpreters working
   for EUFOR Peacekeeping Missions?
   Please choose **only one** of the following:
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No
   - [ ] N/A or don't know

57. **Why?**
   Please write your answer here:
58. Who do you think should provide that training?
   Please choose all that apply:
   □ Current Post-graduate interpreting programmes
   □ EUFOR in-house training services
   □ Third parties specialised in the training of peacekeeping mission staff
   □ Other:

59. Do you think that the training you received prepared you to work for EUFOR BiH ALTHEA?
   Please choose only one of the following:
   ○ Yes
   ○ No
   ○ N/A or don’t know

60. Why yes or why no?
   Please write your answer here:

61. Do you think there are particular topics that could be taught in advance in order to prepare interpreters to work in armed conflict and peacekeeping scenarios?
   Please choose only one of the following:
   ○ Yes
   ○ No
   ○ N/A or don’t know

62. Which topics?
   Please write your answer here:

63. Do you think there are particular topics that could be taught in advance in order to prepare interpreters to work for EUFOR?
   Please choose only one of the following:
   ○ Yes
   ○ No
   ○ N/A or don’t know

64. Why?
   Please write your answer here:
65. Please state the importance of teaching the following interpreting modalities for working in peacekeeping and armed conflict scenarios. (1 being the Least and 5 being the Most)

Please choose the appropriate response for each item:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consecutive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simultaneous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuchotage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sight translation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Bidule</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

66. In your opinion, if a short training module were to be organised for the training of interpreters working for peacekeeping missions, how long should that course be in order to equip the interpreters with the appropriate skills?

Please choose only one of the following:

- ○ 1 month intensive
- ○ 2 months intensive
- ○ 3 months intensive
- ○ Other

67. In which area did you encounter the most challenges in the performance of your interpreting duties? (1 being the Least and 5 being the Most)

Please choose the appropriate response for each item:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic accuracy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-verbal communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etiquette</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Empathy
Flexibility
Diplomacy
Psychological stamina
Physical endurance

Thank you very much for collaborating in this study!
Submit your survey.
Thank you for completing this survey.
ANNEX 2. SURVEY FOR EUFOR USERS OF INTERPRETATION SERVICES

Dear participant,

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey. During the past two years I have been researching the topic of interpreters working in war and peacekeeping scenarios for my Ph.D. Dissertation. You have been contacted so that I can count upon the experience and knowledge of someone who has first-hand experience working in these scenarios. I would appreciate your taking the time to complete the following survey. It should take about ten minutes of your time. Your responses are voluntary and will be confidential. Responses will not be identified by individual. All responses will be compiled together and analysed as a group. If you have any questions or concerns, please contact María Clementina Persaud, Assistant Lecturer at Universidad Pablo de Olavide cper@upo.es.

There are 52 questions in this survey

SECTION 1. PERSONAL INFORMATION

1. What is your nationality?
   Please write your answer here:

2. What is your age?
   Please choose only one of the following:
   - 18-20
   - 21-30
   - 31-40
   - 41-50
   - 51-60
   - +61

3. What is your gender?
   Please choose only one of the following:
   - Male
   - Female
   - Other
4. Are you a member of the military?
   Please choose only one of the following:
   - Yes
   - No
   - Prefer not to answer

5. Please provide your highest scholastic/academic qualification
   Please choose all that apply:
   - High school graduate, diploma or the equivalent
   - Some college credit, no degree
   - Trade/technical/vocational training
   - Associate degree
   - Bachelor's degree
   - Master's degree
   - Professional degree
   - Doctorate degree
   - Other:

6. During other missions abroad, had you worked with interpreters before?
   Please choose all that apply:
   - Yes
   - No
   - Prefer not to answer

7. Which is/are your mother tongue/s?
   Please choose all that apply:
   - English
   - French
   - German
   - Italian
   - Spanish
   - Other:
8. Do you understand, speak, read languages from the Balkans or languages spoken in the Former Yugoslavia?

Please choose all that apply:

- [ ] Albanian
- [ ] Bosnian
- [ ] Bulgarian
- [ ] Croatian
- [ ] Macedonian
- [ ] Serbian
- [ ] Slovenian
- [ ] No, I do not understand speak or read languages from the Balkans or spoken in the Former Yugoslavia
- [ ] Other:

SECTION 2. THE ROLE OF THE INTERPRETER THROUGHOUT HISTORY

9. Do you know anything about the history of interpreting?

(1 being Nothing at All and 5 being Very Much)

Please choose only one of the following:

- [ ] 1
- [ ] 2
- [ ] 3
- [ ] 4
- [ ] 5

10. How long ago long do you think that interpreters have existed in the context of war?

Please write your answer here:

11. How relevant do you think is knowing about the history of interpreting to understand the role interpreters play today?

(1 being Not at all and 5 being Very Important)

Please choose only one of the following:

- [ ] 1
- [ ] 2
- [ ] 3
- [ ] 4
12. Do you think knowing about the past history of interpreting in armed conflicts is important to understand the interpreter’s role today?
   Please choose all that apply:
   - Yes
   - No
   - N/A

**SECTION 3. CONFLICT DEFINITION AND CONFLICT STAGES**

13. Do you think there is an established definition of the concept of armed conflict?
   Please choose only one of the following:
   - Yes
   - No
   - Prefer not to answer

14. Do you think a conflict can be divided into different stages?
   Please choose only one of the following:
   - Yes
   - No

15. Which stages would you divide a conflict into?
   Please choose all that apply:
   - Pre-conflict, conflict, peace process
   - Dispute phase, crisis phase, violence phase, settlement phase
   - Pre-war, escalation and post-war
   - No conflict, Latent conflict, Emergence, Escalation, Stalemate, De-Escalation, Settlement/Resolution, Post-Conflict Peacebuilding and Reconciliation
   - Other:

16. In which of the following stage/s of an armed conflict according to Brahm (2003) would you frame peacekeeping?
   Please choose all that apply:
   - No conflict
17. If an armed conflict is divided into different stages, do you think there are different interpreting requirements in the different stages of conflict?
Please choose only one of the following:

- Yes
- No
- Prefer not to answer

18. Why?
Please write your answer here:

**SECTION 4. SPECIFICITIES FOR INTERPRETING FOR PEACEKEEPING MISSIONS**

19. Do you believe that there are particular requirements when working with interpreters on peacekeeping missions?
Please choose only one of the following:

- Yes
- No
- N/A or don't know

20. In your opinion, what are those requirements?
Please write your answer here:

21. Have you provided interpreters, at any stage of the peacekeeping mission, with materials to carry out their job more easily?
Please choose only one of the following:

- Yes
- No
22. What type of materials did you provide interpreters with?
Please write your answer here:

23. What issues do you think should be targeted in order to improve communication when interpreting is required?
Please write your answer here:

24. Have you ever monitored an interpreters’ performance for quality issues?
(1 being never, 5 being always)
Please choose only one of the following:

   ○ 1
   ○ 2
   ○ 3
   ○ 4
   ○ 5

25. Why?
Please write your answer here:

26. In general, how do you rate the performance of the interpreters you have worked with?
(1 being poor, 5 being excellent).
Please choose only one of the following:

   ○ 1
   ○ 2
   ○ 3
   ○ 4
   ○ 5

SECTION 5. USER’S PERCEPTION OF INTERPRETER’S WORK

27. During other missions abroad, had you already worked together with interpreters?
Please choose only one of the following:

   ○ Yes
28. How would you rate the role interpreters play in the communication process? 
(1 being unimportant and 5 being essential)
Please choose only one of the following:
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

29. What happens if a mistake is made during an interpreting session?
Please write your answer here:

30. Do you believe that your interpreting and language needs are being covered today? 
(1 being Not at All and 5 being Always)
Please choose only one of the following:
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

SECTION 6. WORKING CONDITIONS FOR INTERPRETERS

31. How often have you worked with interpreters? 
(1 being Never, 5 being Always)
Please choose only one of the following:
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
32. **What language combination/pairs do you use when working with interpreters?**
   Please write your answer here:

33. **Have you worked with more than two languages at the same time?**
   Please choose all that apply:
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No
   - [ ] N/A or don’t know

34. **Have you worked with an interpreter despite knowing the language of the other party?**
   Please choose all that apply:
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No
   - [ ] N/A or don’t know

35. **Why did you work with an interpreter despite knowing the language of the other party?**
   Please write your answer here:

36. **How would you rate that/those previous experiences of working with interpreters in other peacekeeping missions?**
   (1 being Poor and 5 being Excellent)
   Please choose only one of the following:
   - [ ] 1
   - [ ] 2
   - [ ] 3
   - [ ] 4
   - [ ] 5

37. **Which modalities of interpreting have you worked with?**
   Please choose all that apply:
   - [ ] Simultaneous
   - [ ] Consecutive
   - [ ] Chuchotage
   - [ ] Sight translation
   - [ ] Bidule/Portable equipment
38. How often have you used the following modes of interpreting? 
(1 being Never and 5 being Always) 

Please choose the appropriate response for each item:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode of Interpreting</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simultaneous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sight Translation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consecutive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuchotage or whispering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bidule/portable equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

39. Have you encountered problems working with interpreters while on a EUFOR BiH mission? 
Please choose all that apply:
- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] N/A or don't know

40. What problems have you encountered when working with interpreters on a EUFOR BiH mission? 
Please write your answer here:

41. How would you rate your experience of working with interpreters? 
(1 being Poor and 5 being Excellent) 
Please choose only one of the following:
- [ ] 1
- [ ] 2
- [ ] 3
- [ ] 4
- [ ] 5
SECTION 7. TRAINING INTERPRETERS FOR PEACEKEEPING MISSIONS.

42. Do you think that there should be specific training for interpreters who are working or are going to work in armed conflict scenarios? Please choose only one of the following:

- Yes
- No
- N/A or don’t know

43. Do you think there should be specific training for interpreters working in peacekeeping scenarios? Please choose all that apply:

- Yes
- No
- N/A or don’t know

44. Do you think there are particular topics that could be taught to interpreters in advance, in order to prepare them to work in peacekeeping scenarios? Please choose all that apply:

- Yes
- No
- N/A or don’t know

45. Which topics?

- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]

46. Do you think that there are particular topics or issues that should be taught to interpreters working for EUFOR? Please choose all that apply:

- Yes
- No
47. Which topics?
   Please write your answer here:

48. Why?
   Please write your answer here:

49. In which of the following interpreting modalities do you think interpreters should be given specific training before working in peace-keeping scenarios?
   (1 being None at All and 5 being Very Much)
   Please choose the appropriate response for each item:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consecutive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simultaneous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuchotage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sight translation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Bidule</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

50. Which of the following do you find more important when you work with interpreters?
   (1 being Not important and 5 Very important)
   Please choose the appropriate response for each item:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic accuracy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-verbal communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etiquette</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Diplomacy  ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
Psychological stamina ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
Physical endurance ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

51. Are there any other requirements not mentioned in the previous question that you would like to add?

Please write your answer here:

Thank you very much for collaborating in this study!

Submit your survey.

Thank you for completing this survey.
ANNEX 3. TEXT ON BIDULE

“Simultaneous interpretation without a booth (bidule) is a practice to be avoided because of the inherent difficulty - even at best - in producing the requisite high quality of interpretation. In exceptional cases, where such practice is unavoidable, ALL the criteria laid down must be met, namely:

- exceptional circumstances: visits to factories, hospitals and similar establishments or remote field visits
- short meetings (e.g. 2 hours)
- limited number of participants (e.g. a dozen)
- two-way equipment (i.e. 2 transmission channels and one from interpreters to participants, the other from speakers' microphones (essential) to interpreters' earphones
- compliance of such equipment with IEC914 standard.

In any case, the equipment should be under qualified technical supervision.

Members are reminded that this is not consecutive but a form of simultaneous interpretation and, as such, requires the same manning strengths” (AIIC, n.d.).
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