

ASYLUM SETTINGS and PRISON SETTINGS for LEGAL INTERPRETING; or sermon interpreting and interpreting of sacred texts for RELIGIOUS SETTINGS. Some authors (e.g. Gentile 1997; Gentile et al. 1996; Mason 1999a; Wadensjö 2009) have also referred to settings as 'situations', 'environments', 'areas (of work)' and 'fields', but the term 'setting' has become widely established in academic as well as professional discourse.

In an attempt to provide a more fluid classification of interpreting events, with less clear-cut boundaries, Pöchhacker (2004a) proposes a model which uses eight dimensions to map the broad spectrum of interpreting phenomena, with setting representing one dimensional continuum extending from international to intra-social settings.

The term 'conference setting' is used mainly in opposition to other, non-conference settings (e.g. MEDIA INTERPRETING). Although 'setting' is generally not used to label subtypes of conference interpreting, there have been attempts to differentiate between various conference prototypes (e.g. Pöchhacker 1992, 1994a).

In summary, settings can be defined as the socio-spatial contexts of interaction in which interpreting events take place. A specific setting is therefore shaped by the interplay of the agents (including their mental, social and cultural dispositions) and the locations involved (including all physical, material structures), both of which are governed by institutional conditions as well as broader social forces. Although the various settings seem to involve customary patterns of action and are associated with specific NORMS and expectations regarding the interpreter's ROLE, they are in fact composed of habitualized and contingent actions and thus subject to historical change.

NADJA GRBIĆ

SHADOWING

Shadowing is a language-processing task, used since the 1960s both in research on SIMULTANEOUS INTERPRETING (SI) and in conference interpreter training. It consists in the repetition of a message presented over headphones, either with minimal lag (phonemic shadowing) or at longer latencies (phrase shadowing). The rationale is that this auditory-verbal task involves the same basic cognitive processes as simultaneous interpreting, that is, information processing and divided attention between listening and speaking. Shadowing is a monolingual task, however, whereas SI requires conveying the source message in a different language.

Shadowing in research

Shadowing was developed as a research tool in the early days of cognitive psychology by Colin Cherry (1953), to investigate selective attention and information processing in dichotic listening studies. Subjects were asked to repeat a target message as it was presented to one ear while a to-be-ignored message was presented to the other ear (see Broadbent 1958). Shadowing without a competing message was also used as a technique to study the production and perception of speech. In a series of experiments, psychologist William Marslen-Wilson (1985) demonstrated that the simultaneous decoding and encoding of messages not only involves auditory, articulatory and phonological processes, but also relies on syntactic and semantic analysis.

In one of the earliest psychological studies on interpreting, Treisman (1965) investigated SI as "a variation on the shadowing task". She found that the (untrained) subjects in her experimental study had a longer TIME LAG when translating than when shadowing, and attributed this to the higher "decision load" in the translation task. Subsequent studies

comparing SI to shadowing as a way of investigating the underlying cognitive processes and components centered on attention sharing, information processing and MEMORY (e.g. Gerver 1974a, 1974b; Lambert 1989b; Darò & Fabbro 1994), as well as hemispheric lateralization of languages in the brain (Green et al. 1990). Most studies involved the shadowing of speeches, more rarely the shadowing of sentences or lists of words (Darò 1989). The findings from such research confirmed that the interpreting task imposes greater cognitive demands and is more easily disrupted than shadowing, which was thus characterized as a "rapidly automatized task with minimal attentional demands" (Green et al. 1990: 111).

Shadowing in testing and training

Seen as a simplified version of SI, shadowing has been used in APTITUDE TESTING OF ENTRANCE exams for predicting candidates' ability to successfully complete a training course in CONFERENCE INTERPRETING (e.g. Moser-Mercer 1985; Lambert 1991). Based on its shared task demands, that is, the ability to speak and listen simultaneously, shadowing also found its way into the PEDAGOGY of interpreting. Many training institutions included shadowing among a set of PRE-INTERPRETING EXERCISES, and the shadowing task is widely used as an introductory exercise for learning to listen and speak at the same time before moving on to SI.

There has been considerable debate among trainers and researchers about the usefulness of shadowing and of other exercises meant to train subskills of SI, such as shadowing and recall, dual-task exercises, paraphrasing and processing NUMBERS, names and acronyms (Lambert 1992). Opponents have regarded shadowing, especially phonemic shadowing, as the exact opposite of what interpreting should be: repeating words verbatim, losing sight of meaningful context, is seen as alien to interpreting and hence as "a pointless and potentially harmful exercise" (Thiery 1989: 4). In their opinion, the focus in any preparatory exercises for SI should therefore be on simultaneous listening and speaking along with COMPREHENSION and context (see Kurz 1992: 247).

Supporters, on the other hand, see shadowing as a useful introductory exercise for SI. They stress the importance of acquiring such a complex cognitive skill gradually, first learning to cope with single subskills that can be trained separately before bringing them together as a global ability (Moser-Mercer 1985; Lambert 1992). Other proposals combine shadowing with other tasks (e.g. delaying response, answering questions at the end of the exercise) or point to its usefulness in improving students' language proficiency, and particularly INTONATION and stress patterns (Schweda Nicholson 1990).

In recent years, shadowing in the A language appears to have lost some of its appeal as a training tool or as an introductory exercise for SI (Déjean le Féal 1997), while it is still used for enhancing and testing B-language proficiency and focusing on PROSODY. In this respect, it is considered an effective tool in foreign language learning much more than in interpreter training (Bovee & Stewart 2009).

There has been little recent research on shadowing in relation to interpreting. Among the few exceptions is a pilot study comparing shadowing proficiency in professionals and interpreting students (Moser-Mercer et al. 2000). The results of the shadowing task in the B language showed that professionals, contrary to what might be expected, performed less efficiently, with more errors and longer latencies than the students. This may suggest that professional interpreters' acquired and largely automatized interpreting STRATEGIES interfered with the task demands of (verbatim) shadowing. Shadowing has also been used in cognitive NEUROSCIENCE APPROACHES to the study of SI (e.g. Tommola et al. 2000), as well as in PSYCHOLINGUISTIC APPROACHES. In some cases (e.g. Christoffels & de Groot 2004), the choice of input for the shadowing task (e.g. sentences) and the use of unbalanced bilinguals without

interpreting experience as subjects reaffirms the role of shadowing as a research tool for testing memory and processing conditions.

Shadowing in healthcare interpreter training

The term 'shadowing' has also been used in interpreter training in a very different sense. In the context of HEALTHCARE INTERPRETING, in particular, the term is used to refer to an opportunity for students to learn 'on the job' ('job shadowing'), usually towards the end of their training programme or upon its completion (e.g. Hasbún Avalos et al. 2013). It consists in observing and following an experienced healthcare interpreter at an actual interpreter-mediated event, to gain familiarity with the interpreting process and the institutional environment.

ALESSANDRA RICCARDI