

# Interpreter as the Discourse Analyst: A Case Study of Court Interpreting

Taufiq Jati Murtaya<sup>1</sup>, Pratomo Widodo<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Applied Linguistics Department, Post-Graduate Program, Yogyakarta State University, Yogyakarta, Indonesia*

**Keywords:** Interpreting, court interpreting, discourse analysis.

**Abstract:** To have a complete and indeed scientific enquiry of interpreting study is to invoke another expansive and shrill systematic point of view, namely the discourse study. This is because interpreting is the composite acts of transmitting the conveyed messages linguistically, understanding the whole interaction among all participants, and rendering the intended meaning prevalently. Thus, such thorough discourse analysis is worthy to make in drawing comprehensive elaboration of those phenomena. Technically, in doing interpreting, various strategies will be implemented when dealing with the complicated messages transfer or in coping the dense intended meaning of the utterances. Thus, this paper will dive deeper scrutinizing of what lies beneath when an interpreter put such strategies in the realm of legal activity by using discourse analysis. Specifically, this paper will investigate one of Indonesia phenomenal judicial event which involved court interpreting activity, namely the case of Jessica Kumala Wongso. Finally, to make a substantial inference then the study of conversational analysis and communication theory is crucially applied.

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Interpreting is a forceful and burdensome self-consistency of being responsible and aware in handing on the most noteworthy intention running along within the communicative situation in a very restricted time. It is like a brief rush hour in which each of the various processes leads its own way, supposedly in integrated and accordance works, to the canal of proportional pragmatic utterance; so that the communication flawlessly and naturally constructed. Once, Viezi (1996) ever stated as quoted by (Pöchhacker, 2001) that the top priority of an interpreter was to enable communication by his or her expressions production activities. Thus from those point of views, it can be said that one of the crucial matters during the interpreting process is to revive and provoke self-awareness of the linguistics competencies, interpreting techniques, and fluctuated situations. The linguistics competence and the interpreting techniques are inevitably elements which have to be there in the interpreter as the basic cornerstones. Those can be learnt and trained through a particular program. Meanwhile, the awareness of the dynamic situation closely dealing

with the real time condition in which the interpreter engaged to. Therefore it, definitely, can be out of the expectation from what have been done in the training through designed simulation; yet it can be occupied by a learning-by-doing real time practices. What can be said from the above illustration is that the need to investigate the unpredictable of a given situation during the interpreting event valuable to be done.

Looking at the self-awareness of the dynamic situations, generally speaking, referring to what was stated by (Pöchhacker, 2001) who defined two types of interpreting based on its working mode namely consecutive (the rendition take place after the source expression production) which later be specified by community interpreting; and simultaneous (the rendition take place almost at the same time of the source expression production) that then closely related to conference interpreting; then the changing situation will be much more occur in the field of community interpreting. Community interpreting as defined by (Hale, 2006) meant that the interpreter brought upon certain setting in which the common discussed matter were intimate and significant issues in daily life. Basically, the daily issues are spreading

from the informal to the formal occasion. And as the concern of this study then it will be specified the community interpreting that undergoes in a formal purview, namely in the legal occasion. Then, this study certainly will put its stand point on the realm of court interpreting in which such dynamic situations frequently occur. Those dynamic situations heavily related to the current issues of interpreting as proposed by (Hale, 2004) in the notion of how professional interpreters should behave; namely the state of being aware of their responsibilities as professional, so that they can escalate client's trustworthiness of their performances. Furthermore it will be reinforced also by the adequate rendition in realizing the expressions; therefore they should overcome the important of the language in the courtroom, use various strategies in interpreting, and also understanding the other legal procedures which are essential of the court session overflow. The second is the awareness of the tough process in interpreting which require integrated phase of comprehension, conversion, and delivery (three proficiencies) as ever suggested by Ginori and Scimone (1995) (Hale, 2004). Thirdly is the pragmatic equivalence. This term has the core meaning as adopted from (House, 2009) of the conscious intercultural differences, language appropriateness (Crystal, 1987), the sentence usage and real world relevance (Stalnaker, 1973, p. 380) in (Zambrano-paff, 2011), the relationship of the users and its linguistics form (Yule, 1996), and the top down approach of discourse understanding to its re-expression in the word level (Hale, 2004). Rather this study will consider the pragmatic equivalence more on the relation to the notion in discourse purview. And the last is the role of interpreter. The interpreter's role is explicitly and closely related with its code ethic as asserted by Mikkelson (2000, p. 48) in (Hale, 2004), that the interpreter's most prominent role is to sustain the equality before the law and human rights reinforcement; this is as mentioned in the Austrian Association of Court Interpreter's Ethic Code. Naturally the role of interpreter is providing a social justice and making clearance of certain deviations from the source expression to the target expression to make sure the understanding (Conomos (1993) in (Hale, 2004) in purpose of helping the deprived client of non-source expression producer (Hale, 2004) or enhance the answers to help get sufficient and proportional result (Barsky, 1996).

However, since this study is conducted in Indonesia, the present of interpreter in a prosecution can be viewed in a more political as

well as moral issue and having marketing selling point. In this case, when a lawyer brings a foreign expert witnesses that demand the help of an interpreter; actually the implied meaning will be that the open prosecution is pumping the people's curiosity in search of law enforcement thus the interpreter having a chance to provide the justification of the gap in the different language or to buffer the self-arrogance exposition of the lawyer as he or she is showing off the credible judicial evidence on board. In short, in this study the present of the interpreter, in a more extensive range, can be the discourse signifier.

Diving to the deeper exploration, then this study embraces the last two issues that are the pragmatic factor and the interpreter's role. The interpreter here shall be consciously aware of the discourse in the court interpreting as the dynamic condition that has to be taken into account as the considerable element in coping the understanding, alteration, and transmission. Based on this principal, it will clearly against the statement of the former Supreme Court judge of South Australia, W Wells (1991) that ever cited in Hale's work (Hale, 2004), who once proclaimed that the interpreter wisely look upon his or her role as a robotic transformer, who just literary throwing up of what has been injected in. No consideration and sense of sensitivity of what are mentioned above. In brief, the focus of this study is on how the court interpreter operates as the discourse analyst.

For this recent decade, apparently the study of court interpreting has been expanding through time. For the most previous one was the study conducted by Dimitrova (Dimitrova, 1993) which elaborate the need to be strict in interrupting the spacious and discursive utterances during the turn-taking in judicial event. The longer and bigger chunk of utterance were produced the more important information would lose because of the comprehension narrow capacity. On the other hand, rather, this recent study sets its justification on how the interpreter manages the turn-taking, so that the communicative question and answer session pops up. Later, the next study presented by (Moeketsi, 2001) who tried to implemented Hymes SPEAKING mnemonic in all aspect of court interpreting. Slightly different from Moketsi's work, deriving from the core that court interpreting is part of the community interpreting, thus there hardly predicted that the speech community strike its existence within. From this point of view, Hyme's theory on component of communicative event is surely preferable. The work of Jieun Lee, a PhD of Ewha Womans University

Graduate School of Translation and Interpretation, in 2009 asserted that the disclosure of linguistics and cultural aspect would impact the accuracy in court interpreting. Here, the study does agree as referring to that previous conclusion. However, the concern of this study is not merely the accuracy but more on the ability and awareness of the interpreter of the three proficiencies which can be investigate through the techniques applied. The next previous study was performed by (Zambrano-paff, 2011) who rigorously explained the court interpreter's failure and bad condition of failing linguistic mechanism choices. Rather than exposing the failure factors, then this study tend to elaborate the integrated efforts of the interpreter lies within the strategies grounded during the court interpreting. An empirical explanation of fully independent behavior to gain in the court interpreting was what (Jacobsen, 2012) had come up with. In her previous research it was told that the interpreter intentionally ignoring the recommendation and also choosing the strategies that could hinder the stream of communication in question-answer dialogues in court interpreting. Perversely, the court seemed to accept of this situation. Unlike the Jacobsen's work, this study instead scrutinizes how the interpreter is completely aware and responsible of what means the most in the court interpreting for the sake of the flawless communicative occasion. Finally, this study has similarity with the research of Dordevic which argued the important to have the ability in discourse analysis when conducting consecutive interpreting (Dordevic, 2012). However, still, there is a gap to catch, since the concern in this study is an empirical and practical while Dordevic's range is an educational one.

In this present study, the focus will be the interpreter as the discourse analyst which can be reflected through the strategies applied within the rendering processes. Since it is a case study, then the court session of Jessica Kumala Wongso which involves an interpreting act of the English speaking expert witness will be precious to take. For its feasibility, this case is considered as the most phenomenal of Indonesian planned assassination case through a poisonous coffee. In order to draw a structuralized framework, thus the questions of this study will be; what are the techniques applied during the court interpreting? And how do the techniques reflect the interpreter's discourse analysis?

## 2 THEORITICAL BACKGROUND

### 2.1 Court Language and Court Interpreting

What is meant by the court interpreting here in this study is refer to the courtroom interpreting. Why it is so; because for the recent study, many of those researches was conducted in the courtroom setting. This is an unsurprising thing, as the practical intention, first will be, the availability of the recorded data that is accessible from the internet channel because the judicial form is an open prosecution. The second may be because the whole conditions attached in the court such as the firm rules, ritualistic procedures and protocols, and permanent participant roles (including the interpreter) are challenging and scientifically explorative to be analyzed (Hale, 2007). Those conditions are clearly operated in the question and answer sessions. Related to the purpose of the question and answer session, there are two major terms which commonly employed in an adversarial courtroom in examining witnesses. The first is called examination-in-chief. The purpose of examination-in-chief is to assure the decision maker (Hale, 2007) and presenting evidence (Monsefi, 2012) through the version of the interrogating side facts that permits the witnesses independently speaking and has non-confrontational sense (Hale, 2004). Meanwhile the other examination is called cross-examination. This examination aims to contradict, challenge or event discredit the evidence of the witnesses that is under cross-examined so that the decision maker will certainly accept the facts that is presented by the cross-examiner (Hale, 2004). Stemming from those conceptual models of courtroom language above, it can be inferred that the study of its linguistics patterns in line with the discourse senses is preferable to conduct; since the only accessible and empirical data is the melodious wording expression. It has the same nuance as the statement from Du Cann (1986, p. 112) in Hale (Hale, 2004) that the only weapon belongs to an advocate is his own words.

Focusing on the court interpreting as the courtroom interpreting, this study put the concern more on the role of the interpreter in a judicial event. The interpreter should gain two functions within a prosecution; namely as a barrier remover and as a conscious mediator. What is meant by barrier remover here is in tune with the basic principal asserted by Hale (Hale, 2004) that an interpreter should have the ability to move out the

gap of the two different languages from the interaction and could be as a “helper”. Nevertheless, related to this study, it is suggested to have two kind of barrier remover function that are linguistic barrier remover (LBR) which related to has been said by Hale; and contextual barrier remover (CBR). The second barrier remover aims to connect or bridge as close as possible even the most slightly different contexts that are having cross-perception and cross- interpretation. This concept is derived from the core that the interpreter may face various different context even the slightest. Interpreter as a conscious mediator means that the interpreter should be sensible when transferring the intended meaning pragmatically and not be machine-like converter. Thus, this study proposes two kinds of conscious mediator namely situational conscious mediator (SCM) and neutral conscious mediator (NCM). SCM occurs whenever the interpreter having fully aware of the given condition and the context of the setting in which the interpreting takes place, thus the renditions should cope the pragmatic sensibility (Hale, 2004). On the other hand, NCM requires the interpreter to liberate his or her tendencies to one of the other participants; that is only caused by the inequality matter that may occur in the courtroom. The interpreter has to be neutral from particular alignment, even it refers to his or her own personal intuition. This situation supported by the notion that the interpreter should not be swayed by sympathy (Edwards, 1995) and might not mix the alternation with his or her own expression and idea (Harris, 1990).

## 2.2 A Brief Review of Interpreting Techniques

As mentioned previously in the introduction that the starting point of this study is to scrutinize the techniques employed within the court interpreting, thus some elaboration of particular techniques will be much beneficial. This study adopts the techniques that are proposed by some experts as interpreting strategies. The variety of those techniques can be viewed as follows:

### 2.2.1 Addition

Addition is viewed when the interpreter willingly to add (some explanation) of what is not mentioned by the source expression producer. This is because the interpreter thinks the interpretation does not clear

enough and has bias on it; usually due to the inconsistency of the source-and-target expression culture and the occurrence of specific terminology (Kalina (1998) in (Bartłomiejczyk, 2006).

### 2.2.2 Reformation

Reformulation is taken whenever the interpreter faces a situation in which the utterance is long and complicated. He or she has to reformulate the wording of the source expression; it can be broken down a series that easier and shorter. For example the relative and subordinate clauses can be shifted around in the sentence; changing the active form into the passive one and vice versa; etc (Jones, 1998).

### 2.2.3 Omission

Omission here proposes some parts are left out without language conversion; and specifically this step refers to the situation in which the source expression is claimed to be something that has been understood in the context and redundantly mentioned; or regarded as something which was less/unimportant and not-transmittable considering the different culture and stylistic realm (Napier, 2004).

### 2.2.4 Anticipation

Anticipation is believed to be occurred when the interpreter predicts what will come next of the source expression (Gile, 2009) and (Chernov, 2004); although in some simultaneous cases the interpreter does not know where the source expression will lead to (Jones, 1998). The prediction may base on the information, content, and context that the interpreter has acquired before (Bartłomiejczyk, 2006).

### 2.2.5 Paraphrasing

The paraphrasing occurs when the interpreter takes a longer phrase to explain a single word that cannot be converted in the target expression at the moment (Gile, 2009).

### 2.2.6 Repair

What is meant by repair here is nearly the same as in (Jones, 1998) of the condition if the interpreter makes a mistake; in which the interpreter should cope up the mistake by revision as fast and distinct as possible. In addition, as proposed by Kalina (1998) as cited by (Bartłomiejczyk, 2006), the repair



is taken by the interpreter whenever he or she has delivered a misinterpretation of the intended meaning; and much of the time it is done when the interpreter has the better idea to express of what have been uttered before.

Except the techniques presented above, since the interpreting setting is in a courtroom in which all of the participants are connected through the question and answer session mediated by the interpreter, then the interpreter has two chances to make clear of what are being said during the prosecution. The chances are questions asking for clarification and questions asking for a repetition (Hale, 2004).

### 2.3 The Discourse Nuance and Device in Court Interpreting

Discourse is the highest linguistics system which can be function as a representation of particular social purview. As its fundamental notion, discourse can always have the motion in language as well as its interaction toward the other aspects surrounding. Language and discourse cannot be separated, whether it is written or spoken. Reviewing to the functional approach, discourse is viewed as a language in its use and as an open system, which means that a language can be various. Different context will provide different language usage. In short, a language is a means of communication; as this ever claimed by (Schiffrin, 2007) that discourse can be understood as a communication event, an implementation of an individual who are having a communication. Then, functional discourse analysis will focus on the investigation of a language as the communication device.

Specifically, since the study is in the field of court interpreting in which many of participants are getting involved in adversarial moment; the most appropriate principle to take one ever asserted by (Bourdieu, 1991) that in imposing power over other, the most effecting one is by using linguistics control. It is also strengthen by (Fairclough, 1989) that the contributions of the non-powerful participant is controlled and constrained by the powerful one. To be precise, the connection between language, power, control, and social structures can be summarized as depicted in Fowler's et al statement. The dominant participant's control over the subordinate one is under the surveillance of the sociolinguistics mechanism function in which the control is affected by a regulation and constitution; meanwhile the underlying semantic for the systems of ideas

encoded in language structure is provided by power disparity as cited in (Hale, 2004).

Then how the interpreter role dealing with that situation in a courtroom session can be analysed through the techniques that are applied is by relating it to the concepts as follows.

#### 2.3.1 Discourse Marker

What is considered as the discourse marker in this study refers to the concept proposed by Schiffrin (1987, p. 328) in (Hale, 2004). She claimed that discourse marker usually can be separated from the sentence with no alteration of the proportional content, because it is syntactically unbound to the sentence. Its position tends to be in the first place of an utterance and has a pause which comes after a tonic stress. Furthermore, this marker can be identified in such ways namely when the utterance's real condition is not affected by its present or absent; it has situational relation to the utterance; and its function is emotive and conative rather than denotative or referential (Hölker, 1991). The example of discourse marker such as "well", "you know", "as we can see", "you see", "now", etc.

#### 2.3.2 Text, Co-Text, and Context

To have detail analysis, this study also adopts the concept of text, co-text, and context; because the data of the study an oral text in the courtroom situational which highly predicted will share particular context within. In brief, the notion of text is taken from the definition given by (Fairclough, 1995) that asserted text as the linguistics unit of spoken or written language that had a content and form as a means of message transmitter. Meanwhile co-text is sentence or any substance that proceeds or follows the other text in the discourse. In other word, it is another text that accompanies the other one in relational matter (Kridalaksana, 2011). The last one is context. According to (Yule, 1983) context was defined as the environment or situation in which the language was used. It implies that all information, intention, meaning that related to particular utterance depend on the context. Further, (Schiffrin, 2007) asserted that context in the perspective of speech act which stand its point on the share of knowledge would justify how the knowledge lead the language usage and understand its interpretation. When the speaker and the hearer share the same knowledge, it will minimize or even eradicate the misunderstanding and misinterpreting. In short, to have a rounded discourse, thus three elements should work in harmony and integrated supportively.

The realization of meaning can in the text is based on the interaction between the language user and a context. To know a text is to know the context first. In the more specific matter of communication context can be who the communicator is, to whom the utterance is being communicated, what is the intention of the communication, in which situation the communication is set up, in what media and relation the communication is held, etc.

### 2.3.3 Turn-Taking and Question-and-Answer

Turn-taking and question and answer (QA) cannot be neglected in a conversation, since those are the main cornerstone of a communication. Turn-taking is a mechanism managed by the participants about how each of the members takes in turn to speak up and who is talking to whom (Bussman, 1996). However in the court interpreting, it will be an interesting topic to discuss, since in fact the turn-taking goes through a mediated communication by the interpreter. It has a unique and complex activity if it goes within a court interpreting process; because of the unavoidable processes of organizing, managing, constraining and directing the movement of talk. The management of turn is handled by the interpreter's decision in managing and orchestrating the turns that based on and due to the surface of linguistics and social meaning which innate in the given situation and its expectations. In short, the role of interpreter of making decisions must produce a natural and communicative conversation (Roy, 2000). Meanwhile, QA placed its significance in the court interpreting as a discourse device which functions as an adjacency pairs. Has the similar value with the turn-taking, QA also can be the thing that has to be embraced by the interpreter in term of flawless communication in a court session regarding the two witness examination situations mentioned before namely the examination-in-chief and cross-examination.

### 2.4 Conversation Analysis and Component of Communicative Event

Since the discussion later in the study is framing its own basic in term of how the interpreter cope with the pragmatic and situational prosecution communication, then a conversational analysis in line with the theory of communicative event component will be beneficial to earn such inference. Conversation analysis (CA) has an examination of

language as social action in which interactional talk is taken to be systematically organized (Wooffitt, 2005) and ordered (Wooffitt, 2005) and (Have, 1999) produced in everyday occasion (Hutchby, I., Wooffitt, 1998). In relation to discourse analysis, then this study adopts the principles of CA suggested by (Schiffrin, 2007) as follows:

- The analysis should be empirical.
  - ✓ The data is a real time language usage by the people.
  - ✓ The analysis tries to elaborate sequentially (why does A follow B?) as well as distributionally (why does A occur with B and not with C?).
- The coherent should be more than just linguistic form and meaning.
- The linguistics form and meanings mutually contextualized each other; and set up together, to create a discourse, with social meanings and interpretive schemes.
- There is an interactive negotiation and achievement between the structures, meanings, and action in everyday spoken discourse.
- The utterance, aim, and action are sequentially situated. Meaning to say that the utterance is interpreted and produced stem from the local context of other one.
- The utterance, aim, and action in which the speaker's decision to select of various linguistics devices as a mean of way of uttering are constrained by six principals:
  - ✓ The intention of the speaker;
  - ✓ The strategies that have been conventionalized in making recognizable intention;
  - ✓ The function and meaning of the linguistics form within the emerging context;
  - ✓ The other utterance's sequential context;
  - ✓ The discourse mode properties, such as narration, description, exposition, etc;
  - ✓ The social context namely the setting, identity and relationship of the participant, and situation structure.

To have detail elaboration, later in the discussion, the study probably only concern on several principles presented above and also takes the principles of communicative event component. To have Hyme's communicative event component as the tool of the inference session is an appropriate option. Actually, this is based on the proportional argument that the court interpreting is part of

community interpreting where particular speech community plays its parts. Therefore, as proposed by (Angelelli, 2000) then the most comprehensive component to use in the analysis namely the setting as the context provider for the utterance; the participant which have different social and linguistics aspect, so the interpreter is permitted to negotiate meaning; the purpose-outcomes and the purpose-goals in which the interpreter has the chance of negotiation if he or she does not engaged with the participant outcomes and has the opportunity to clarify if he or she think fail to cope the participants' intended meaning or goal; those opportunities are also happened in the form of speech if the interpreter does not get into the different register, variety, etc.

### 3 METHOD

#### 3.1 Setting

This study took the 24th prosecution of Jessica Kumala Wongso as the main provider data source, since there was a court interpreting activity. The data was downloaded from youtube.com in a video recorded data. To be precise, there were four question and answer court sessions. However, this study employed a purposive sampling. Therefore the main data was only the first court session that was the question and answer session between the English speaking expert witness and the lawyer. The duration of the session was about 1 hour and 20 minutes. As the question and answer court session was conducted in a conversation, thus the unit analysis of the data was an utterance. From the more than a hundred utterances, only 40 utterances were taken into the next analysis regarding to the validity that has been done since the observation, transcription, identification, and classification phases.

#### 3.2 Instrument and Procedure

Regarding to its unit analysis, this study applied content analysis method. The sequential steps to take could be mentioned such as observation, transcription, identification, classification, description, interpretation, elaboration, and inference. For the proportional method, this study adopted *padan translational* and *padan pragmatis*, and for its technique in providing the data *simak* method was appropriate to take. In gaining the valid data from a recorded file then it was used *simak*

*bebas libat cakap* technique. And for the subsequent techniques, *rekam* technique was taken as well as *catat* technique in order to ease the transcription processes (Sudaryanto, 2017). As the most appropriate and common transcription system that scientifically often applied within any of interpreting transcription steps, the Jeffersonian transcription system (Hutchby, I., Wooffitt, 1998) was taken. And to have precise analysis the study also employed *intrarater* and *interrater*.

#### 3.3 Data Analysis

As this study was a descriptive qualitative study, therefore the first phase to have was by investigating the techniques which were used in the court interpreting. Based on these findings later the next analysis was by justifying how certain discourse marker is transmitted into the target expression. To go sharper in the exposition of the discourse devices, the analysis in the turn-taking and the question-answer aspects were elaborated more in the realm of discourse analysis. Finally to earn the inference, the conversational analysis and the theory in component of the communicative event were adopted.

### 4 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

To embrace the cornerstone of the deeper analysis, first, this study stated that the context of the discourse was the prosecution of Jessica Kumala Wongso. In detail, it took the judicial event in which the Australian pathologist was invited as the expert witness. In this hearing, the study only concentrate on the examination-in-chief session, thus the dialogue or the question-answer session would be between the attorney and the expert witness that indeed mediated by the interpreter. In short, specifically, the context was the question-answer between the lawyer and the expert witness in the scope of examination-in-chief where the main purpose was to earn some supportive tribunal facts of the lawyer's version. Unsurprisingly, that notion is also supported by Hale's claim about the nature of the lawyer; as it was mentioned that it was a noticeable act that the lawyers strategically maintained the language usage to reach their purposes that implemented through various of linguistics means (Hale, 2006). In addition, since it was a question-answer session, then there was turn-taking that had to be maintained, not only by the lawyer and the expert witness, but dependently by

the court interpreter. Therefore, later the interpreter maintained the turn-taking by signaling through his techniques in transferring the discourse marker that would be elaborated in the next part of this study. After all, to have the analysis of the techniques was preliminary one; as it was the basic part for the next analysis.

From the analysis of the techniques implemented in the court interpreting of Jessica Kumala Wongso prosecution, then the results was presented table 1 as follow:

Table 1: The interpreting techniques in the examination-in-chief session.

Technique	Number	Percentage
Omission	15	37.5%
Reformulation	10	25%
Addition	7	17.5%
Paraphrasing	6	15%
Repair	2	5%
Anticipation	0	0%
TOTAL	40	100%

It was clearly stated that the most common technique employed is omission with 37,5%, while the rarely used technique was repair which has 5% in the usage intensity. Concerning on the top four above, it could be breakdown into two categories of transmission namely Indonesian-English (I-E) and English-Indonesia (E-I) in each technique. In the omission, the I-E conversion higher than the E-I one, namely 86,6% for I-E interpreting and 13,3% for E-I interpreting. In the reformulation, the I-E rendition is 80% and the E-I rendition is 20%. Meanwhile in paraphrasing technique the I-E was equal to the E-I rendition. The most distinct fact was found in the addition technique, since the I-E rendition got lower position than the E-I rendition, that was only 14,3% for I-E rendition and 85,7% for E-I rendition.

Excluding from the 40 utterances of that named to be the data in which some techniques were proportionally applied, there were also 6 utterances that convey the act of clarification and repetition, and 100% the data shown that the rendition was from E-I, or from the foreign expert witness to be translated into Indonesian. In addition there were 5 the utterances that contain discourse marker; and the discourse markers that were found such as “baik”, “ya”, “jadi”, and “saya ulangi ya”, and the English discourse marker namely “well”, “now”, and “so”. In the discourse marker utterances, 3 out of 5 was I-E rendition, the rest was E-I rendition.

Going into deeper discussion, this study will begin with the relation of the omission,

reformulation, and addition that are found in the result. The omissions that were found believed to be the strategy that used to overcome redundancy and unimportant utterance produce by the lawyer; or even more, since the context occur in the setting of judicial moment then the tone has to be succinct and straight. No long-winded and incoherent saying is prevalent. For example as follows:

Example 1

Lawyer : [Baik, saya mau tanya. Apakah formalin, ketika proses embalming (.) itu bisa menghancurkan atau merusak atau meniadakan sianida yang ada di dalam tubuh.]  
 Interpreter : [Can a formalin destroy cyanide?]  
 Witness : [yes it can.]  
 Interpreter : [ya, dapat]

The next is reformulation. Reformulation was done as to simplified long utterances for the sake of flawless turn-taking, and also to overcome the difficulties of memorizing things. In this study, the reformulation is almost similar to omission. The reason is the present of not only long utterance but also the superfluous and not to the point sentence, which may represent the unwell-structured sentence. It can be seen as follows:

Example 2

Lawyer : [Apakah saudara setuju bahwa biomer = bio marker atau ciri-ciri atau tanda-tanda dari kematian daripada e::: seorang karena sianida itu adalah terdapatnya sianida atau tiosianat yang ada di dalam tubuh korban antara lain di dalam urine ,di dalam darah, atau di dalam liver?]  
 Interpreter : [Do you agree that one of the bio markers for cyanide poisoning is the findings of cyanide or thiocyanate in::: e::: in::: parts of the body such as in urine, blood, and liver ?]

Meanwhile addition which has different portion of I-E rendition compare to the other two, may occur



because the need to explain things tend to be done in the E-I rendition in order to share the knowledge not only to the participants of the prosecution but also to the out there since this hearings is well-known incident. The example can be viewed as follows:

Example 3

Expert Witness : [Depending on the circumstances of the death, particularly if it were suspicious the only proper autopsy to be performed is a complete post mortem examination]  
 Interpreter : [tergantung pada keadaan-keadaan yang terjadi di seputar kematian. Akan tetapi apabila kematian itu dicurigai atau patut dicurigai, maka otopsi yang seharusnya dilakukan adalah otopsi penuh atau otopsi yang lengkap dan menyeluruh]

From the condition presented above, it could be inferred that the interpreter was well-realized that the prosecution he had was as a discourse, a phenomenal one in Indonesia. Therefore, he could definitely awaken his awareness as this session was the examination-in-chief session where the expert witness was invited to be elicited the judicial facts that support the lawyer's version of facts in court. Specifically, the interpreter had gained two functions in the court interpreting processes. As a CBR and SCM, the interpreter often came up with the act that remained him to situation and role he had that reflected through the techniques he took. This condition also represents that all of the interpretation acts are also clearly match with the principle of the conversational analysis; that the interpreter engaged to a conversation and he can cope the setting, identity and relationship of the participant, and social structure as part of the social context. Later, it will be discussed in the next session of this study in relation to the need to held clarification.

The things to put into the next consideration are the interpretation of the discourse marker. There are some discourse markers that pragmatically equivalent transmitted into the source expression regarding, again, the context, that is the court session of examination-in-chief of the expert witness. There are "baik" into "now", jadi" into "so", and "well"

into "ya". However, the interpreter also saving time and be efficient in converting the discourse marker using reformulation strategy of the source expression "saya ulangi ya" into the target expression of "OK", this is because he has LBR awareness. For example as follows:

Example 4

Lawyer : [Saya ulangi ya. Ada bukti BB4. Bukti BB4 ini diambil 70 menit sebelum..eh..setelah dia meninggal. Bukti ini diperiksa 15 hari kemudian. Itu dulu.]  
 Interpreter : [OK. BB4 e::: was (.) e::: taken seventy e::: from = was taken e::: based on = was taken from the gastric liquid seventy minutes after death. And then BB4 was examined fifteen days hereafter]

In addition, the source expression does not contain any discourse marker, but by using addition strategy the interpreter put the word "baik" in the target expression. It functions as the turn-taking emphaziser, as an indication that the turn-taking from the witness to the lawyer can smoothly flow. For example as follows:

Example 5

Lawyer : [If this = if the result is real, there is no cyanide found in the victim apart from the small amount in the gastric sample taken out of autopsy, then the corrosiveness e::: is more likely to be due to the normally present hydrochloric acid and she was suffering from\_erosive gastritis]  
 Interpreter : [ (#2 seconds) baik, kalau sample (.) ee::: kalau sample = sample tersebut ee::: diambil dan tidak ditemukan adanya ee::: sianida ee::: maka adanya korosif yang ditemukan pada tubuh korban tersebut diakibatkan oleh a = asam =

hip = hipoklorida (#1 second) dan ini menunjukkan bahwa yang bersangkutan menderita gastritis erosive]

What makes the findings more interesting is that there was a direct translation or word for word translation that was employed by the interpreter in rendering the discourse maker, that was “well” into “ya”. However when considering the whole utterance, he also used omission of “as I understand”. The utterance is as follows:

Example 6

Expert Witness : [well in this particular case it will a pain put in the vein = in the femur vein in the embalming process, as I understand]  
 Interpreter : [ya, sebag = dalam proses ee::: pemberian formalin biasanya dimasukan melalui pembuluh femur]

It could be inferred that the discourse marker “well” strengthen by the final clause “as I understand” in the source expression could be aimed to show convincing opinion based on the witness’ scientific understanding. This notion opposed Hale’s statement that the occurrence of the discourse marker “well” indicating the witness’ maintaining of frustration (Hale, 2006). In the other hand, here the interpreter still kept the discourse marker in the rendition into “ya” but omitted the clause of “as I understand”. This condition supported the findings of Hale (Hale, 2004) where the hedges and fillers were omitted for the sake of hesitation deletion. In short, this step was taken by the interpreter to raise the certainty of the witness’ opinion. Nevertheless, to have a holistic and detail scrutiny it needed another discipline such as socio-pragmatic or forensic linguistics.

Regarding to the 6 utterances that found in the study, which held in E-I rendition; it can be inferred based on Hyme’s communicative event component in term of form of speech, purpose-outcomes and the purpose goals that the interpreter had the chance to clarify (asking question in order to get the intended meaning) or the ask a repetition for the unclear saying; that those event might be derived from linguistics factor and contextual factor. From the

linguistics factor, the clarification aimed to get clear definition of specific term such as in

Example 7

Expert Witness : [both on its external surface and on its cuts surface]  
 Interpreter : (asking for clarification of the “cuts surface” term) – [what is the difference of cuts surface and the external surface?]

or asking for repetition in purpose to have clear utterance such as in

Example 8

Expert Witness : [and acute asthmatic attack]  
 Interpreter : (move his ear closer to make the utterance clearer and asking for clarification)  
 Expert Witness : (repeat the utterance in broken way) [and acute asthmatic attack]  
 Interpreter : [serangan asma yang akut]

Further analysis could also be held relating to the notion of discourse. Since the context was an examination-in-chief session where the witness was invited in purpose to help strengthen the lawyer judicial facts version, therefore the clarification or negotiation was always addressed to the witness as the subordinate participant. Meanwhile, in fact, the lawyer utterances itself were mostly long and sometimes pointless. Nevertheless, the interpreter never interrupted or asked for clarification. This was strongly believed that because the interpreter had full awareness of the dominant position of the lawyer in the court session, and he had the power to over control the turn-taking as well as lead the way of the question-and-answer flow. The interpreter, thus, should reinforce the purpose of the lawyer by having SCM.

From the discussion elaborated above, then the notion of this study has the same nuance of what has been stated by Hale (Hale, 2004) that the interpreter must have realized that a prosecution shares its own discourse that the interpreter has to come up with. In line with the statement proposed by (Dordevic, 2012), this study do agree that to earn a pragmatic communicative event, then an interpreter must learn the basic analysis of discourse in helping his or her

performance in comprehension, conversion, and rendition. In addition, this study also provides the answer of what have been asserted by Eades (2010) in (Correa, 2013) that the interpreter does provide a 'buffer' between the lawyer and the witness. This study probably has a limitation on the obtained limited data that may be will set asides particular question of the implication of other interpreting techniques. Even so, since the study has rigor and deep analysis related to the role of court interpreting, then it will be a promising an convincing writing to be taken into a cornerstones for the next research. Specifically, this study has clear implication to the next research of court interpreting as the way how the interpreter should take his or her role appropriately. The future study should address this issue since there are still many gap left behind in the realm of empirical study as well as educational range.

## 5 CONCLUSIONS

Orchestrating the awakening of the interpreter's barrier remover and conscious mediator is one of an alluring work to do. It will be inadequate to only mastering the techniques in interpreting as the discourse of the interpreting vary from its settings. To have the practical interpreting in a tribunal session demands particular competence; and has to be aware of the given contextual situation. Therefore, adjusting a lesson plan or curriculum which only concern in the institutional jurisdiction and purposes will not be sufficient in interpreting competence acquisition. The interpreting academic praxis should arrange the lesson plan in accordance to the future real time condition. In short the next professional interpreter must receive the exposure as much as possible. At last, in practical and educational implication, there is a chance to make such study in specific field of interpreting namely Interpreting for Specific Community (ISC).

## REFERENCES

- Angelelli, C. 2000. Interpretation as a communicative event: a look through hymes 'lenses', *Meta J. Trad.*, vol. 45, pp. 580. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.7202/001891ar>
- Barsky, RF 1996, 'The Interpreter as Intercultural Agent in Convention Refugee Hearings. The Translator 2, 45–63. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13556509.1996.10798963>
- Bartłomiejczyk, M 2006, 'Strategies of simultaneous interpreting and directionality', *Interpret. Int. J. Res. Pract. Interpret.*, vol. 8, pp. 149–174. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1075/intp.8.2.03bar>
- Bourdieu, P 1991, *Language and symbolic power*, Polity Press, Cambridge.
- Bussman, H 1996, *Routledge dictionary of language and linguistics*.
- Chernov, GV 2004, *Inference and anticipation in simultaneous interpreting, a probability- prediction model*, John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam / Philadelphia.
- Correa, M 2013, 'Forensic linguistics: an overview of the intersection and interaction of language and law', *Stud. Lang.*, pp. 5–13. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.5755/j01.sal.0.23.5020>
- Crystal, D 1987, 'The cambridge encyclopedia of language - david crystal.pdf. psycritiques', Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1037/027621>
- Dimitrova, BE 1993, 'Turntaking in interpreted discourse: interplay of implicit and explicit rules; Problemi na sociolingvistikata. Ezikovata situacija v mikro-I makrosocialnite obštosti. Veliko Tărnovo Univ', *Izd. Sv Sv Kiril Metodij*, pp. 15–21.
- Dordevic, JP 2012, 'Discourse analysis in consecutive interpreting – necessity rather than aid', vol. 6, pp. 197–213.
- Edwards, A.B 1995, *The practice of court interpreting*.
- Fairclough, N 1995, *Critical discourse analysis*, Longman Group Limited, New York.
- Fairclough, N 1989, *Language and power*, Longman, London and New York.
- Gile, D 2009, *Basic concept and models for interpreter and translator training*, John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam / Philadelphia.
- Hale, S 2006, 'Theme and methodological issues in court interpreting reasearch', vol. 5, pp. 205–228.
- Hale, S.B 2007, *Comunity interpreting*, Palgrave Macmillan, New York.
- Hale, SB 2004, *The discourse of court interpreting discourse practices of the law, the witness, and the interpreter*, John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam / Philadelphia.
- Harris, B 1990, *Norms in interpretation*, Target 2, pp. 115–119. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1075/target.2.1.08har>
- Have, PT 1999, *Doing conversation analysis second edition*, Sage Publications, Los Angeles/London/New Delhi/ Singapore.
- Hölker, K 1991, 'Französisch: partikelforschung', *Lex. Rom. Linguist. Neimeyer*, vol. 1, pp. 77–88.
- House, J 2009, *Translation quality assessment, mutatis mutandis*. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1353/utq.2006.0043>
- Hutchby, I, Wooffitt, R 1998, *Conversation analysis principles, practice and aplications*, Polity Press, USA.
- Jacobsen, B 2012, John Benjamins Publishing Company. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1075/intp.14.2.05jac>

- Jones, R, 1998, *Conference interpreting explained*, St Jerome Publishing, Manchester.
- Kridalaksana, H 2011, Kamus linguistik edisi keempat, Gramedia Pustaka Utama, Jakarta.
- Moeketsi, R 2001, 'In court with dell hymes: implications for courtroom discourse and court interpreting', *South Afr. J. Afr. Lang.* vol. 2, pp. 133–147. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1080/02572117.2001.10586522>
- Monsefi, R 2012, 'Language in criminal justice: forensic linguistics in shipman trial', *Int. J. Law Lang. Discourse*, vol. 2, pp. 117-142
- Napier, J 2004, *Interpreting omissions a new perspective 2*.
- Pöschhacker, F 2001, 'Quality assessment in conference and community interpreting. *Meta J. Trad.* vol. 46, pp. 410. Available: <https://doi.org/10.7202/003847ar>
- Roy, CB 2000, *Interpreting as a discourse process*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Schiffirin, D 2007, *Ancangan kajian wacana. (Terjemahan Unang, dkk)*, Pustaka Belajar, Yogyakarta.
- Sudaryanto, 2017, *Menguak tiga faset kehidupan bahasa fungsi hakikinya, pengelola ilmunya, kesalingterkaitannya dengan budaya*, Sanata Dharma University Press, Yogyakarta.
- Wooffitt, R 2005, *Conversation analysis & discourse analysis*, Sage Publications, London/Thousand Oaks/New Delhi.
- Yule, G, 1996, *Pragmatics*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Yule, GB & G 1983, *Discourse analysis*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Zambrano-paff, M 2011, 'The impact of interpreters' linguistic choices in bilingual hearings', pp.190–202.