

The problems of the interpretations that were performed by  
untrained Japanese returnee students

高橋絹子

上智大学大学院博士後期課程言語学専攻

Abstract

This paper examines the English-to-Japanese consecutive interpretations performed by untrained Japanese returnee students and identified the errors and issues. In the previous study conducted by Takahashi (2012 to be published) it was found that although the gist of the source speech was conveyed, there were omissions and minor deviations from the source speech. The focal point of the present study was the problem that existed in the output style. The results revealed that there were frequently filled pauses such as ‘e’, ‘etto’ or ‘ma’ and repeated self-corrections, or repetitions of the same words or phrases in the interpretations.

1. Introduction and literature review

The present research explores the problem that existed in the interpretations performed by untrained Japanese returnee students who spent their childhood outside Japan, and were educated in English while abroad. Interpreting requires different sub skills, among which the importance of the ‘linguistic knowledge’ was stressed (Viaggio, 1992), and the mastery of his or her working languages was emphasized (Presas, 2000; Riccardi, 2002). Selescovitch (1978) also referred to the mastery of the two languages as an absolute must for anyone who wants to know how to interpret. However, Presas (2000) claimed that bilingual competence was not in itself sufficient to guarantee translation competence.

On the other hand, according to the results of the study conducted by Harris and Sherwood (1978), bilingual children who grew up in a bilingual family were able to interpret without learning how to do so. Harris and Sherwood (1978) observed the conversations that were made by the bilingual children between their parents and other family members, and concluded that the bilingual children were able to interpret, even though they were not taught how to. The scope of the study was restricted to European languages, and therefore bilingual Japanese children were not part of the study.

Following on from Harris and Sherwood (1978), a study was conducted by

Takahashi (2012 to be published), in which seven Japanese university and post graduate students who grew up outside Japan (i.e., returnee students) were asked to consecutively interpret an English interview into Japanese. The interpretations were transcribed and compared with the source speech, in terms of omission, substitution and addition, which was the same method as applied by Barik (1971). The same interpretations performed by two professional interpreters were used as a frame of reference to examine the participants' interpretations. It was found that although the gist of the source speech was interpreted, there were omissions and minor deviations from the source speech in terms of the meaning. Therefore, it was concluded that the results were different from those indicated by Harris and Sherwood (1978).

Other research on interpretations performed by bilingual students include Dillinger (1994) where he examined the interpretations performed by professional interpreters and Canadian French bilingual students. In the results of the study, Dillinger (1994) concluded that the input process of the interpreting was almost the same between the professional interpreters and the bilingual students. However, a difference existed in the delivery of the output with the bilingual students finding it more problematic.

The results of the study suggest that the returnee students might have the same problem in terms of output delivery. Therefore, in the present study, the output performance of the participants was further examined but not in terms of accuracy, as the examination has already been completed, but in terms of intelligibility, which is one of the two dimensions of evaluating translation (Carroll, 1966).

## 2. Research questions

In the previous study conducted by Takahashi (2012 to be published), it was found that the interpretations performed by the returnee students included omissions and minor substitutions, though the gist of the source speech was conveyed. Therefore, the results were different from the results of the study conducted by Harris and Sherwood (1978), particularly, in terms of accuracy. On the other hand, according to the results of the study conducted by Dillinger (1994), the input process was the same for the professional interpreters and the bilingual students, but the output process was different, indicating a problem in the output delivery process.

The question to be asked in the present study is besides omissions and minor substitutions (i.e., deviation from the source speech) in the interpretations,

what the problems of the interpretations performed by returnee students are, if any exist, particularly, in terms of output performance.

### 3. The study

#### 3.1. Participants, Material and Procedures

The participants in the present research were the same as those participated in the previous study (Takahashi 2012 to be published). That is seven returnee students (between 22 and 24 years old) who grew up outside Japan and were educated in English while abroad. The prospect participants were not told what to do in the study beforehand. Otherwise, only the participants who had a confidence in interpreting would have joined the study.

The participants were asked to consecutively interpret an English interview into Japanese, consisting of 276 words in 14 sentences. In the interview, an American teacher who taught at an international school in Japan was asked about “the good things in Japan”, which was a common topic that did not require any specific knowledge. The interpretations were recorded and transcribed for analysis.

#### 3.2. Data analysis method

##### 3.2.1. Measuring the numbers of filled pauses and self-corrections

The interpretations suggested that participants inserted frequent fillers, or filled pauses, such as ‘e’ ‘etto’ or ‘ma’, in the interpretations and made self-corrections, or repetitions of the same words during interpretations, which made the interpretations less intelligible. In an error analysis, there are cases where numerous features affecting presentation, including voiced hesitations or false start are analyzed (Bartłomiejczyk, 2010). Therefore, in order to examine the degree of the issues in a scientific manner, such features affecting presentation, including filled pauses and self-corrections were quantified in terms of frequencies of an incidence.

According to Dictionary of Language Teaching & Applied Linguistics (Richards, 2002), the definition of filled pauses are “gaps which are filled by such expressions as *um. er, mm*”. In the present study, a filled pause was defined as such “production of utterance” as ‘etto’, ‘e’, ‘ee’ ‘n’ ‘ma’ ‘ano’ and ‘de’. As for self-correction, there were areas in the interpretations where the participants made repetitions of either the same word or phrase or sometimes a similar word in a sentence. The repetitions of the word or phrase or a similar word ranged from one

to five times. There were cases where such repetitions were made in two areas in a sentence. Self-correction defined such phenomena.

As the interpretations performed by the participants were recorded and transcribed verbatim, it was possible to measure the numbers. The computations were double-checked by my colleague in order to ensure accuracy.

The following is an example of how filled pauses were counted. The letter or letters in bold indicate a filled pause and the figure above shows the frequency. Sentences in Roman alphabets phonetically indicate the interpretation in Japanese.

#### Example of Participant A (Int-1)

えっと<sup>1</sup> まずー、第一に一番重要なのは、景色で、え<sup>2</sup>、ま<sup>3</sup>、富士山が見えるところが ま<sup>4</sup>、一番すばらしいです。

(**Etto**<sup>1</sup>, mazu daiichinii ichiban ni jyuyounano ha, keshiki de, **e**<sup>2</sup> **ma**<sup>3</sup> Fujisan ga mieru tokoro ga, **ma**<sup>4</sup> ichiban subarashii desu.)

In the first section of the source speech (i.e., Int-1), there were four filled pauses included in the interpretations performed by Participant A.

The following is an example of how self-corrections were counted. The underlined words or phrases were repeated. Sentences in the Roman alphabets phonetically indicate the interpretation in Japanese.

#### Example of Participant G (Int-1)

まず最初にえー<sup>1</sup> 日本、えー<sup>2</sup> 日本<sup>1</sup>の風景を見られるのは、え<sup>3</sup>、とてもすばらしいことですね。毎日、え<sup>4</sup>、富士山、ん<sup>5</sup>、富士山<sup>2</sup>を見られるのはとても素晴らしいことだと思います。

(mazusaisho ni, **ee**<sup>1</sup>, nihon **ee**<sup>2</sup>, nihon no fuukei wo mirareruno ha, **e**<sup>3</sup> totemosubarashii koto desu ne. Mainichi, **e**<sup>4</sup> Fujisan, **n**<sup>5</sup>, Fujisan wo mirareruno ha totemo subarashii kotoda to omoi masu).

In the first section of the source speech (i.e., Int-1), the two underlined words were repeated (i.e., 'nihon' and 'Fujisan') in the interpretations performed by Participant G. Therefore, there were two self-corrections. Incidentally, there were five filled pauses included.

### 3.2.2. Interpretations after eliminating filled pauses and self-corrections

In the next step, all filled pauses and self-corrections were eliminated from the interpretations, and the interpretations were examined in terms of a) the naturalness of Japanese, and b) the intelligibility of the interpretation. As the accuracy of the interpretations was already examined in detail in terms of omission and substitution by applying the method used by Barik (1971) in the previous study (Takahashi 2012 to be published), omissions and minor substitutions were not examined in the present study.

## 4. Results

### 4.1. Numbers of filled pauses and self-corrections

As shown in Table 1, the mean was 34.3, implying that on average each participant inserted 34.3 filled pauses (i.e., ‘etto’, ‘e’ etc.) during interpreting, and 2.5 filled pauses appeared in each sentence.

Table 1

*Numbers of filled pauses inserted by the participants*

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	Total	Mean	SD
55	21	26	14	36	44	44	240	34.3	13.5

Table 2 shows the numbers of self-corrections that were made by the participants during interpreting. The mean was 7.0.

Table 2

*Numbers of self-corrections made by the participants*

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	Total	Mean	SD
6	4	9	6	8	3	13	49	7.0	3.1

As was shown in Table 1 and 2, there were individual differences. However, filled pauses and self-corrections were observed among all participants. The interpretations that included high count of filled pauses and self-corrections are detailed below. The superscripts indicate the frequencies, and the underlined parts are repetitions.

### Example 1

#### Example of frequent filled pauses inserted by Participant F (Int-3)

え<sup>1</sup>、私の日本語はあまり、えー<sup>2</sup>、よくはありません。しかし、えー<sup>3</sup>、日本人の人々は、えー<sup>4</sup>、どこに行っても私のことをえ<sup>5</sup>、助けてくれます。たとえば、道に迷った時には、えー<sup>6</sup>、しっか、ちゃんと、えー<sup>7</sup> 行きたいところに行きつくようにえ<sup>8</sup>、手伝ってくれます。

### Example 2

#### Example of frequent filled pauses inserted by Participant A (Int-4)

ま<sup>1</sup>、先ほどあげた のがま<sup>2</sup>、もっともすばらしいところで、他にも、ま<sup>3</sup> 文化や、とまあ<sup>4</sup> 食べものも、えー<sup>5</sup>、ま<sup>6</sup>、とても、ま<sup>7</sup>、気に入っています。特にまあ<sup>8</sup> 寿司はえ<sup>9</sup>、他の、えま<sup>10</sup>、世界中の他の国で食べるよりもやはり、日本で食べるのが一番いいと。

### Example 3

#### Example of frequent filled pauses inserted by Participant B (Int-6)

えっと<sup>1</sup>、その名古屋でえーと<sup>2</sup>、お好み焼きを食べた。で<sup>3</sup>、私がか、結構好きでした。で<sup>4</sup>、えっと<sup>5</sup>、名古屋じゃなくて、富士見町でもえっと<sup>6</sup>、お好み焼きを楽しめるレストランがあります。で<sup>7</sup>、そこに行って、私はお好み焼きをえーと<sup>8</sup>、食べておいしかったです。

### Example 4

#### Example of repeated self-corrections made by Participant C (Int-3)

えー<sup>1</sup> 私の日本語はあまりよくない<sup>1</sup>、上手じゃないんですけれども<sup>1</sup>、えー<sup>2</sup>、日本人の人々はいつも私を、たす<sup>2</sup> 困った時には、助けてくれます。<sup>2</sup>

In the interpretations, Participant C repeated the underlined phrase (with a superscript 1) by using different Japanese words, though the meaning was the same. In the second repetition, Participant C repeated the verb, as the first verb was terminated and moved onto the next word before ending.

### Example 5

Example of repeated self-corrections made by Participant E (Int-3)

えー<sup>1</sup>、私の日本語はあまり<sup>1</sup>、えー<sup>2</sup>、私は日本語はあまり<sup>1</sup>よくできませんが、えー<sup>3</sup>、どこに行っても、えー<sup>4</sup>、私のことを助けてくれることができる人がいます。えー<sup>5</sup>、私がたとえば、迷子になった時は、え<sup>6</sup>、その、道を、えー<sup>7</sup>探してくれることが<sup>2</sup>、え<sup>8</sup>、探してくれます<sup>2</sup>。

In the case of the task of interpretation (i.e., Int- 3) performed by Participant E, there were not only self-corrections but also frequent filled pauses of ‘e’ in the interpretations. Participant E repeated the first underlined phrase with a superscript 1. In between, there was a filled pause ‘e’. Almost the same phenomenon was examined in the second repetition. However, in the second repetition, Participant E tried to make a subject of a sentence with ‘ga’, but gave up by uttering a filled pause ‘e’ and repeated the verb alone and terminated the interpretation.

### Example 6

Example of repeated self-corrections made by Participant D (Int-5)

そうですね。とても興味深いですね。とてもおもしろいですが。えっと<sup>1</sup>、お好み焼きを、い、外国人は一般的にあまり食べないと言いますよね。私は名古屋に行ったことがあるんですけど、名古屋はおこの<sup>1</sup>、まさに日本のお好み焼き<sup>1</sup>、お好み焼き<sup>1</sup>でとても有名なところですよ。

In the interpretation, Participant D repeated the same word ‘okonomiyaki’ three times, among which, the first ‘okonomiyaki’ did not reach the ending of the word, and inserted another word. After that, the interpretation returned to the word ‘okonomiyaki’, which was repeated.

### Example 7

Example of repeated self-corrections made by Participant A (Int-6)

んーとま<sup>1</sup>、名古屋で、えー<sup>2</sup>いろいろなお店を回って、ま<sup>3</sup>、お好み焼きが<sup>1</sup>、は<sup>1</sup>まあ<sup>4</sup>、ま<sup>5</sup>、まあまあ気に入りましたと。で<sup>6</sup>、まあ<sup>7</sup>、富士<sup>2</sup>、えー<sup>8</sup>ここ富士見にも<sup>2</sup> えー<sup>9</sup>、おいしいお好み焼きやさんがあって、まー<sup>10</sup>、大変気に入っています。

In the case of the interpretation task (i.e., Int- 3) performed by Participant A, there were not only self-corrections but also frequent filled pauses in the interpretations.

In the interpretation, although the phenomenon was recognized as a repetition, Participant A switched the particle from ‘ga’ to ‘ha’, which was a self-correction. In the next self-correction, Participant A started with ‘Fuji’ but gave up uttering before the ending. Instead, Participant A inserted a filled pause ‘ee’ and added the word ‘here’, returning to “Fujimicho”.

#### Example 8

Example of repeated self-corrections made by Participant G (Int-7)

ええ<sup>1</sup>、で<sup>2</sup>、あのう<sup>3</sup>、同じ先生<sup>1</sup>生の友達<sup>1</sup>、教えている<sup>1</sup>、教え<sup>1</sup>、ん<sup>4</sup>、  
教員仲間たちと<sup>1</sup>ビールを飲みながら、え<sup>5</sup>、お好み焼きを食べに行って、  
あの<sup>6</sup>、いろいろその日教えたこととかを話し<sup>2</sup>、話し合ったりする<sup>2</sup>、  
して<sup>2</sup>、あの<sup>7</sup>、楽しむのが<sup>2</sup>、すごい、楽しんだりしています<sup>2</sup>

In the interpretations of a task Int-7 that was performed by Participant G, there were also not only self-corrections but also frequent filled pauses in the interpretations. In the interpretation, Participant G corrected her utterance over and over again before reaching the target word.

#### 4.2. Interpretations after eliminating filled pauses and self-corrections

The followings are the interpretations after eliminating filled pauses and self-corrections. The examples are the same as those used from Example 1 to Example 8 and indicated accordingly (i.e., from Example 1b to Example 8b). The source text correspond to each example are also indicated below the examples.

#### Example 1b

Example of frequent filled pauses inserted by Participant F (Int-3)

え<sup>1</sup>、私の日本語はあまり、えー<sup>2</sup>、よくはありません。しかし、えー<sup>3</sup>、日本人の人々は、えー<sup>4</sup>、どこに行っても私のことをえ、助けてくれます。たとえば、道に迷った時には、えー<sup>5</sup>、しっか、ちゃんと、えー<sup>6</sup> 行きたいところに行きつくようにえ<sup>7</sup>、手伝ってくれます。

After all filled pauses were eliminated, the interpretations was reduced to;

私の日本語はあまり、よくはありません。しかし、日本人の人々は、どこに行っても私のことを、助けてくれます。たとえば、道に迷った時には、ちゃんと、行きたいところに行きつくように、手伝ってくれます。

Source text (Int-3):

My Japanese is not very good, but the Japanese always seem to be able to help me, wherever I go. And when I get, shall we say, lost, they managed to find my way for me.

The Japanese included in the interpretations were intelligible.

Example 2b

Example of frequent filled pauses inserted by Participant A (Int-4)

ま<sup>1</sup>、先ほどあげたのがま<sup>2</sup>、もっともすばらしいところで、他にも、ま<sup>3</sup>文化や、とまあ<sup>4</sup>食べものも、えー<sup>5</sup>、ま<sup>6</sup>、とても、ま<sup>7</sup>、気に入っています。特にまあ<sup>8</sup>寿司はえ<sup>9</sup>、他の、えま<sup>10</sup>、世界中の他の国で食べるよりもやはり、日本で食べるのが一番いいと。

After all filled pauses were eliminated, the interpretation was reduced to;

先ほどあげたのが、もっともすばらしいところで、他にも、文化や、食べものも、とても、気に入っています。特に寿司は世界中の他の国で食べるよりもやはり、日本で食べるのが一番いいと。

Source text (Int-4):

So that's the best part of Japan. Needless to say, the culture and the food are quite enjoyable. And it's much better eating sushi here in Japan, than virtually anywhere else in the world.

After eliminating the filled pauses, it was found that the Japanese included in the interpretations was intelligible.

### Example 3b

Example of frequent filled pauses inserted by Participant B (Int-6)

えっと<sup>1</sup>、その名古屋でえーと<sup>2</sup>、お好み焼きを食べた。で<sup>3</sup>、私は、結構好きでした。で<sup>4</sup>、えっと<sup>5</sup>、名古屋じゃなくて、富士見町でもえっと<sup>6</sup>、お好み焼きを楽しめるレストランがあります。で<sup>7</sup>、そこに行って、私はお好み焼きをえーと<sup>8</sup>、食べておいしかったです。

After all filled pauses were eliminated, the interpretation was reduced to;

その名古屋でお好み焼きを食べた。私は、結構好きでした。名古屋じゃなくて、富士見町でもお好み焼きを楽しめるレストランがあります。そこに行って、私はお好み焼きを食べておいしかったです。

Source text (Int-6):

And I took that advantage to eat at several of the better restaurants, and discovered how good it can be. But quite frankly, here in Fujimi, there is a particular restaurant that specializes in okonomiyaki, and I enjoy that very much.

The Japanese included in the interpretation was intelligible, though formal and colloquial Japanese were mixed in the interpretations. .

### Example 4b

Example of repeated self-corrections made by Participant C (Int-3)

えー<sup>1</sup>私の日本語はあまりよくない<sup>1</sup>、上手じゃないんですけれども<sup>1</sup>、えー<sup>2</sup>、日本の人々はいつも私を、たす<sup>2</sup>困った時には、助けてくれます。<sup>2</sup>

After all filled pauses and repeated parts were eliminated, the interpretation was reduced to;

私の日本語は上手じゃないんですけれども、日本の人々はいつも私を、困った時には、助けてくれます。

Source text (Int-3):

My Japanese is not very good, but the Japanese always seem to be able to help me, wherever I go. And when I get, shall we say, lost, they managed to find my way

for me.

The Japanese included in the interpretation was intelligible.

#### Example 5b

Example of repeated self-corrections made by Participant E (Int-3)

えー<sup>1</sup>、私の日本語はあまり<sup>1</sup>、えー<sup>2</sup>、私は日本語はあまり<sup>1</sup>よくできませんが、えー<sup>3</sup>、どこに行っても、えー<sup>4</sup>、私のことを助けてくれることができる人がいます。えー<sup>5</sup>、私がたとえば、迷子になった時は、え<sup>6</sup>、その、道を、えー<sup>7</sup>探してくれることが<sup>2</sup>え<sup>8</sup>、探してくれます<sup>2</sup>。

After all filled pauses and repeated parts were eliminated, the interpretation was reduced to;

私は日本語はあまりよくできませんが、どこに行っても、私のことを助けてくれることができる人がいます。私がたとえば、迷子になった時は、道を、探してくれます。

Source text (Int-3):

My Japanese is not very good, but the Japanese always seem to be able to help me, wherever I go. And when I get, shall we say, lost, they managed to find my way for me.

The Japanese included in the interpretation was intelligible after eliminating self-corrections. There were only two small omissions.

#### Example 6b

Example of repeated self-corrections made by Participant D (Int-5)

そうですね。とても興味深いですね。とてもおもしろいですが。えっと<sup>1</sup>、お好み焼きを、い、外国人は一般的にあまり食べないと言いますよね。私は名古屋に行ったことがあるんですけど、名古屋はおこの<sup>1</sup>まさに日本のお好み焼き<sup>1</sup>、お好み焼き<sup>1</sup>でとても有名なところですよ。

After repeated parts were eliminated, the interpretation was reduced to:.

そうですね。とても興味深いですね。とてもおもしろいです。お好み焼きを、い、外国人は一般的にあまり食べないと言いますよね。私は名古屋に行ったことがあるんですけど、名古屋はお好み焼きでとても有名なところですよ。

Source text (Int-5):

Well, it's very interesting because most foreigners do not like okonomiyaki, and I had the opportunity to spend some time in Nagoya, which is, I understand, is virtually the okonomiyaki capital of Japan.

The Japanese in the interpretation was intelligible.

Example 7b

Example of repeated self-corrections made by Participant A (Int-6)

んーとま<sup>1</sup>、名古屋で、えー<sup>2</sup> いろんなお店を回って、ま<sup>3</sup>、お好み焼きが<sup>1</sup>、は<sup>1</sup> まあ<sup>4</sup>、ま<sup>5</sup>、まあまあ気に入りましたと。で<sup>6</sup>、まあ<sup>7</sup>、富士<sup>2</sup> えー<sup>8</sup> ここ富士見にも<sup>2</sup> えー<sup>9</sup>、おいしいお好み焼きやさんがあって、まー<sup>10</sup>、大変気に入っています。

After all filled pauses and repeated parts were eliminated, the interpretation was reduced to;

名古屋で、いろんなお店を回って、お好み焼きはまあまあ気に入りました。ここ富士見にも、おいしいお好み焼きやさんがあって、大変気に入っています。

Source text (Int-6):

And I took that advantage to eat at several of the better restaurants, and discovered how good it can be. But quite frankly, here in Fujimi, there is a particular restaurant that specializes in okonomiyaki, and I enjoy that very much.

The Japanese included in the interpretation was intelligible, though there were minor deviations.

### Example 8b

Example of repeated self-corrections made by Participant G (Int-7)

ええ<sup>1</sup>、で<sup>2</sup>、あのう<sup>3</sup>、同じ先生<sup>1</sup>、先生の友達<sup>1</sup>、教えている<sup>1</sup>、教え<sup>1</sup>、  
ん<sup>4</sup>、教員仲間たちと<sup>1</sup>ビールを飲みながら、え<sup>5</sup>、お好み焼きを食べに行  
って、あの<sup>6</sup>、いろいろその日教えたこととかを話し<sup>2</sup>、話し合ったりする  
2、して<sup>2</sup>あの<sup>7</sup>、楽しむのが<sup>2</sup>、すごい、楽しんだりしています<sup>2</sup>。

After all filled pauses and repeated parts were eliminated, the interpretation was reduced to;

教員仲間たちとビールを飲みながらお好み焼きを食べに行って、いろいろその日教えたこととかを話してすごい楽しんだりしています。

Source text (Int-7):

As I go with some of my teacher friends, a couple of beers, the okonomiyaki and discussing the day's teaching events is a great way of coming down from trials of the day, shall we say.

After eliminating self-corrections, the Japanese included in the interpretation became clear and became intelligible.

## 5. Discussions and conclusion

Besides omissions and minor substitutions, it was found that there were a large number of filled pauses and repeated self-corrections in the interpretations that made the interpretations unintelligible, as shown in the examples. However, after all filled pauses and self-corrections were removed from the interpretations, the Japanese used in the interpretations became to be natural, and the interpretations were intelligible.

According to Dictionary of Language Teaching & Applied Linguistics (Richards, 2002), pausing is defined as hesitation phenomenon. The two commonest types of pausing are: filled pauses and silent pauses. The filled pauses in the interpretations seemed to indicate the participants' hesitation to deliver the output for some reasons. Therefore, it can be said that the participants were hesitant to deliver the output for some reasons. Sadanobu (2010) investigated the function of fillers, which was an equivalent of 'a filled pause' in the present study and insisted that speakers were thinking while uttering filled pauses (translated by

the author). Given the results of his study, it is possible to suggest that the participants were thinking about what to say while uttering filled pauses, and by doing so, the participants seemed to search for a Japanese equivalent. The same can be applied to the self-corrections, and the phenomenon was particularly pronounced when they mixed filled pauses and self-corrections in the interpretations. The filled pauses suggest that the participants seemed to be searching for the appropriate Japanese equivalent, and making a trial of output, sometimes resulting in self-corrections. However, it is unknown in the present study as to what the participants were thinking during filled pauses.

On the other hand, Christoffels and *et. al* (Christoffels, de Groot, & Kroll, 2006) found in their research that the professional interpreters were quicker in lexical search compared with students, and concluded that the quick lexical search is one of the sub skills required for interpreting. De Bot (2000) also suggested the importance of the lexical access during interpreting.

However, even though the filled pauses and self-corrections were found in the interpretations performed by the returnee students, and recognized as a problem, without examining the interpretations delivered by other advanced learners (i.e., untrained non-returnee students), it is not possible to conclude that filled pauses and self-corrections are unique to returnee students.

## 6. Future study

In the future study, as was indicated in Discussion, other advanced Japanese English learners (i.e., untrained non-returnees) would be asked to join the study, interpret the same source speech, and the numbers of filled pauses and self-corrections would be compared. Also, in-depth examination of the positions and length of the filled pauses and self-corrections would reveal further issues that would exist in the output process.

In the following step, the numbers of filled pauses and self-corrections would be compared with those of professional interpreters. The results would eventually be translated and incorporated into interpreter training.

\*I thank the participants of the study for their time. Also, my gratitude goes to the audience of the annual meeting of Sophia Linguistic Society. The advice and comments I received on that occasion allowed my research to move forward. My

thanks should go to Dr. Yoshinori Watanabe, my supervisor, who is always leading me in the right direction with his interest in my research. Also, I am grateful to my friend, Mr. David Klein, for taking time out of his schedule and proofreading my paper. Finally, I am thankful to all people in Sophia Linguistic Society who made my presentation and article possible.

## Reference

- Barik, H. C. (1971). A Description of Various Types of Omissions, Additions, and Errors of Translation Encountered in Simultaneous Interpretation. *Meta, Volume 16*, 121-137.
- Bartłomiejczyk, M. (2010). Effects of short intensive practice on interpreter trainees' performance. *Why translation studies matters*, 88.
- Carroll, J. B. (1966). An experiment in evaluating the quality of translations. *Mechanical Translation, 9*, 55-66.
- Christoffels, I. K., de Groot, A., & Kroll, J. (2006). Memory and language skills in simultaneous interpreters: The role of expertise and language proficiency. *Journal of Memory and Language, 54*(3), 324-345.
- De Bot, K. (2000). Simultaneous interpreting as language production. *BENJAMINS TRANSLATION LIBRARY, 40*, 65-88.
- Dillinger, M. (1994). Comprehension during interpreting: What do interpreters know that bilinguals don't? In S. Lambert & B. Morser-Mercer (Eds.), *Bridging the gap: Empirical research in simultaneous interpretation* (pp. 155-189). Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Harris, B., & Sherwood, B. (1978). Translating as an innate skill. *Language interpretation and communication*, 155-170.
- Presas, M. (2000). Bilingual competence and translation competence. *BENJAMINS TRANSLATION LIBRARY, 38*, 19-32.
- Riccardi, A. (2002). Evaluation in interpretation: macrocriteria and microcriteria. *BENJAMINS TRANSLATION LIBRARY, 42*, 115-127.
- Richards, J. C. (Ed.) (2002) *Dictionary of Language Teaching & Applied Linguistics* (Third Edition ed.). Longman.
- Takahashi K. (2012) *Fotum* (to be published)
- Sadanobu, T. (2010). Uttering Fillers in Conversation. *Journal of Phonetic Society*

*of Japan, Vol. 14(No.3), 27-39.*

Seleskovitch, D. (1978). *Interpreting for International Conferences* (S. Dailey & E. N. McMillan, Trans.). Arlington: Pen and Booth.

Viaggio, S. (1992). Translators and interpreters. Professionals or shoemakers? In D. Cay & L. Anne (Eds.), *Teaching Translation and Interpreting* (pp. 307-312). Amsterdam: Benjamins.