BRIDGE
Trends & Traditions in Translation & Interpreting Studies

Experience level and adoption of interpreting strategies by Iranian interpreters

Niloofar Fathizaviyehkord
Complutense University of Madrid
nfathi@ucm.es

Fathizaviyehkord, Niloofar. 2025. Experience level and adoption of interpreting strategies by Iranian interpreters. In: *Bridge: Trends and Traditions in Translation and Interpreting Studies*. Vol. 6, No. 2: pp. 41-59.

Abstract

Just as two hands cannot make a good boxer, knowing two or more languages does not make a skilful interpreter. Interpreting is a cognitively demanding task, requiring not only linguistic and discursive knowledge but also strategic competence. Experience level of interpreters in particular can play a significant role in the strategies they employ. This study investigated what strategies were mainly employed by interpreters, what strategies were employed more frequently, and whether experience level affects interpreters' choice of strategies. To collect the data, his study was divided into two stages. In the first stage, retrospective interviews were first held with 10 interpreters working in simultaneous and consecutive modes to identify strategies beyond those classified in the literature. Next, several classifications of strategies in the literature were merged with those emerging from the retrospective interviews to come up with a comprehensive questionnaire on interpreting strategies. The questionnaire was developed and its wording and content were validated by five experts. In the second stage, it was administered to 60 interpreters. ANOVA of questionnaire data and experience level showed that experience level could affect the choice of strategies. The findings demonstrate that experience level shapes interpreters' use of strategies, with implications for theorizing interpreting as a strategic process and for developing more targeted strategy training in interpreter education.

1. Introduction

According to Wang (2009), "Interpreters not only assume the role of linguistic mediator, but also act as communicative mediator and cross-cultural mediator". As far as language is concerned, interpreters are expected to have native-like knowledge of the language(s) involved. Language proficiency and fluency have to be accompanied by a wide vocabulary in numerous subjects (Romero 2008). Linguistic ability is not the only competence a professional interpreter should master; a certain level of cultural knowledge and educational background is also required. The competence profile of interpreters is therefore far more complex and has been modelled as a multi-component construct comprising linguistic, cognitive, communicative, and strategic competences (e.g., Pöchhacker 2016; Albl-Mikasa 2013). Obviously, the best results are achieved when interpreters have spent several years in countries of both languages (Kalina 2002).

Another factor that indicates qualified candidates for interpreting is a professional background in public speaking. Considering the stressful conditions of the job, interpreters need to have self-confidence under pressure and the ability to concentrate in difficult situations (Moore 2020). The job requires the mental readiness to hear and speak at the same time, and to modify wording instantaneously in response to the stimulus of the source language. Interpreters have to be able to make quick and accurate decisions. The job also requires considerable mental and physical stamina, as interpreters must sustain intense concentration, process information rapidly, and produce accurate output under time pressure for extended periods of time (Raval 2003). Furthermore, it should be noted that interpreters are required to have a good voice and clear enunciation, making it possible to listen to them for hours (Kalina 2014).

Most of the above issues in interpreting could be solved if interpreters are equipped with different strategies (Li 2015). Common discourse strategies are not enough to cope with the numerous difficulties inherent in interpreting. Consecutive interpreting can be facilitated if well-known discourse strategies are adapted and developed to match its specific requirements, which is itself a challenge (Arumí Ribas 2012). Both simultaneous and consecutive interpreting rely on strategic discourse processing, as they involve a number of complex processes that can only result in reasonably comprehensible target discourse if they are strategically controlled (Bartłomiejczyk 2006).

Strategies are essential to any comprehensive interpreting model; without them, little can be accomplished under the intense pressure typically associated with interpreting (Baxter 2019). A number of authors have focused on specific interpreting strategies or examined how such strategies apply to particular interpreting scenarios and language pairs (e.g. Dayter 2020; Gumul 2006; Riccardi 2005).

The literature on simultaneous interpreting suggests that different variables can influence the quality of interpreting and the level of strategy use in it (Christoffels & De Groot 2009, Díaz-Galaz et al. 2015, Nurakhmetova 2023). One factor that can play a role in any skill acquisition is the amount of experience in that skill, which has a significant relationship with the amount of input a person receives in order to learn that skill. Since interpreting is a challenging skill to teach and to learn, it is a functional idea to delve into the strategies and techniques interpreters employ in learning and in current interpreting practice. Experienced interpreters tend to deploy a wider range of strategies, whereas novice interpreters are more likely to encounter difficulties in managing interpreting tasks, as shown in studies comparing interpreters with different levels of professional experience (e.g., Melicherčíková & Hodáková 2023).

To address the following questions, we conducted retrospective interviews and administered a comprehensive questionnaire to professional interpreters, followed by statistical analysis.

1. Which interpreting strategies are used most often by Iranian interpreters?
2. Is there any significant difference among interpreters with different experience levels (low, mid, high) in terms of their overall interpreting strategy use frequency?
3. Is there any significant difference among interpreters with different levels of experience in terms of the frequency of use of each interpreting strategy?

2. Review of related literature

Strategies are considered constituents of interpreter training since they help interpreters deal with problems arising from cognitive and language-specific limitations (Arumí Ribas 2012, Li 2015). This study focuses on a specific area, examining interpreting strategy use in relation to training and professional experience. Due to the significant role that strategies play in interpreting, as stated by Wang (2009), the cognitive process in interpreting should be further investigated. These strategies have been addressed in studies devoted specifically to interpreting strategies (e.g., Riccardi 2005, Gumul 2006, Bartłomiejczyk 2006, Dayter 2020).

Different strategies are used by simultaneous interpreters to cope with the challenging process of interpreting (Dayter 2020, Gumul 2006, Riccardi 2005). The content presents important strategies for simultaneous interpreting according to these experts.

Strategies used by interpreters can be categorised into two groups: general strategies, which do not appear to be affected by the language combination involved in the interpreting, and specific strategies that are

likely to be connected to the uniqueness of the languages involved (Li 2015). Chunking and syntactic modification are areas that might be used to varying degrees by interpreters depending on the type of language pairs they are dealing with. However, stalling can be considered a general strategy at the disposal of interpreters regardless of the language pair at work due to the similarity of the challenge in dealing with syntactic, semantic and other types of problems faced.

The other strategy which can be a specific one and can depend on the types of languages involved is anticipation, which involves conjecturing the speaker's phrases before they are actually spoken. Interpreters may resort to this strategy to varying degrees, depending on the syntactic structures of the source and target languages (Kader & Seubert 2014). However, as with most variables, there is no unanimity on the nature of this strategy among experts (Bartłomiejczyk 2008).

Due to the prevalence and importance of anticipation, to guarantee reliability, empirical research into strategy use and language pairs with similar surface structures is necessary. It can also be concluded that when anticipating, top-down strategies induce bottom-up strategies. Although it stands out as a general strategy, some interpreters opt for structural anticipation by producing syntactic structures that make it possible to postpone the production of the target verb. Interpreters' conjecturing of the speaker's phrases is influenced by extra-linguistic information such as general and situational knowledge, and the data gathered in the process of translation. On the other hand, linguistic knowledge on its own plays only a small part (Bayraktar Özer 2017).

3. Method

This study adopted an exploratory sequential research design. In stage 1, the qualitative phase, retrospective interviews were conducted with a small group of professional interpreters in order to identify interpreting strategies used in practice and to supplement existing strategy classifications reported in the literature. The findings from this phase were used to construct a comprehensive questionnaire. In stage 2, the quantitative phase, the questionnaire was administered to a number of interpreters to examine the frequency of strategy use and to analyse the effect of experience level on the deployment of interpreting strategies.

3.1. Participants

Accordingly, two groups of interpreters participated in the study. The first group consisted of 10 interpreters who took part in retrospective interviews. The purpose of this group was not comparative analysis but the elicitation of interpreting strategies used in professional practice. The strategies identified in these interviews were added to those reported in

the literature to construct the strategy questionnaire used in the second stage. The wording and content of this questionnaire were validated by five experts.

In the second stage 60 interpreters completed the questionnaire. Data from this group were used for statistical analysis to examine patterns of strategy use and the effect of experience level. These participants (39 males and 21 females), aged between 27 and 41, shared Persian as their mother tongue, had studied English in a foreign-language context, and had no experience of living in English-speaking countries. They had between 1 and 6 years of interpreting experience, with approximately equal numbers across experience ranges.

3.2. Instrumentation

The main instrument was the questionnaire on interpreting strategies. In order to develop a questionnaire on interpreting strategy use, the related literature was reviewed and strategies based on Al- Khanji, et al. (2000), Donato (2003), Han and Chen (2016), Kirchhoff (2002), and Tohyama and Matsubara (2006), were listed and defined. It should be noted that most of the strategies were based on Kalina (1998) and most of the others had only different names for the same strategies introduced by Kalina. These strategies were defined and fully explained in a separate file. Next the strategies extracted from the retrospective interviews were added.

Finally, for each strategy, the respondents were asked:

- In which type of interpreting do you more often employ this strategy?
- In which direction of interpreting do you more often employ this strategy?
- How often do you employ this strategy?
- Please explain your reason(s) for your choices in this part.

To the above list, the five other strategies extracted from the interviews with the 10 participants in the pilot study were added to make it as comprehensive as possible. These included: silence, subjective addition/deletion, quitting, protest, and warning.

Each strategy was defined and explained so that respondents could consult the definitions for clarification and provide more accurate responses. Before distribution, the final version of the questionnaire was reviewed by five experienced interpreters for validation and then revised based on their comments.

3.3. Procedure

In the first stage, to collect the necessary data, 10 experienced interpreters whose demographic features were similar to the main participants' in terms of experience and proficiency level were briefed on the nature and the purpose of this study. The relevant types of strategies were explained to them in detail. Next, they were asked an open-ended question as to what strategies they usually employed in consecutive and simultaneous interpreting, and what strategy they would recommend to new trainees if they were supposed to teach them based on their own experience.

Prior to reporting the results, the interpreting strategies investigated in this study are listed to provide a clear reference framework for the subsequent analyses. The final questionnaire comprised 30 strategies, identified through a synthesis of existing classifications in the literature and strategies elicited from retrospective interviews with professional interpreters. For ease of reference, each strategy was assigned a code (S1–S30) and is listed below:

S1. Skipping
S2. Approximation
S3. Summarisation
S4. Omission
S5. Substitution
S6. Speaker Word Order
S7. Delay
S8. Chunking
S9. Pure Anticipation
S10. Structural Anticipation
S11. Syntactic Transformation
S12. Reordering
S13. Generalisation
S14. Explanatory Additions
S15. Repetition
S16. Transcoding
S17. Request
S18. Speeding
S19. Passivisation
S20. Preparation
S21. Inference
S22. Expansion
S23. Presentation Strategies
S24. Self-Correction
S25. No Correction
S26. Silence
S27. Subjective Addition/Omission
S28. Quitting
S29. Protest
S30. Warning

Each strategy was defined to participants to ensure consistency in interpreting and response accuracy.

3.4. Data Analysis

The results showed that the interpreters named most of the strategies already existing in the literature; however, five additional strategies were mentioned which were added to the interpreting strategies employed in this study, namely silence, subjective addition/deletion, quitting, protest, and warning.

Next, the related literature on interpreting strategy use was reviewed and a comprehensive list of strategies was formed, to which the strategies found in the interviews with 10 interpreters were added. The strategies were defined and the questionnaire was developed after expert validation. It was then administered to 60 interpreters, and the resulting data were analysed to answer the research questions.[1]

To answer question 1, the mean scores for responses to each strategy on the strategies questionnaire were computed and arranged in descending order (Table 1). Evidently, **skipping** and **preparation** were the most frequently used strategies with average rating above 3 (i.e. most often to always used). Moreover, **quitting** and **protest** were the least frequently used strategies with average rating below 1 (i.e. never to not often used).

Brief description	**Strategies (codes)**	**Frequency category**
Strategies regularly used from "most often" to "always."	S1 (Skipping), S20 (Preparation)	Most often–always used (mean > 3)
Strategies typically employed "sometimes" to "most often."	S16 (Transcoding), S18 (Speeding), S14 (Explanatory Additions), S6 (Speaker Word Order), S7 (Delay), S25 (No Correction), S23 (Presentation Strategies), S8 (Chunking), S21 (Inference), S24 (Self-Correction), S17 (Request), S26 (Silence), S15 (Repetition), S22 (Expansion), S13 (Generalisation), S4 (Omission), S10 (Structural Anticipation), S2 (Approximation), S19 (Passivisation)	Sometimes–Most Often used (2 < mean < 3)
Strategies used infrequently but not rarely.	S27 (Subjective Addition/Omission), S3 (Summarisation), S5 (Substitution), S11 (Syntactic Transformation), S30 (Warning), S12 (Reordering), S9 (Pure Anticipation)	Not often–sometimes used (1 < mean < 2)
Strategies rarely or never used.	S28 (Quitting), S29 (Protest)	Never– not often used **(mean < 1)**

Table 1. Descriptive statistics on the frequencies of strategies used by interpreters

Note. Mean values represent average strategy-use frequency on a 0–4 scale (0 = never, 4 = always). Categories reflect groupings based on repeated-measures ANOVA results.

[1] Since the research questions required mean comparison statistics, in particular ANOVA, for the analysis, assumptions such as normality and homogeneity of variances were initially checked. Normality was assessed using skewness and kurtosis ratios (±1.96). Homogeneity of variances was tested with Levene's test, with a stricter alpha (.025) applied where violated. Games–Howell or Bonferroni-adjusted post hoc tests were used depending on variance equality.

To check whether the mean frequencies of these strategies were significantly different from each other, repeated measures ANOVA (RM ANOVA) was run to compare the means; the results of which indicated that there were significant differences among the mean frequencies of the strategies ($p < .05$). Since there were too many comparisons involved, no multiple post hoc tests of any kind were run to avoid Type I and Type II errors. It was decided to only consider the mean frequencies in Table 1.

Answering question 2 required comparing the three experience groups of interpreters in terms of their total strategy mean scores on the strategies questionnaire. As explained in the Method section, the participants of this study had a minimum of one to over six years of experience in interpreting. In order to define experience levels, the raw experience years were divided into three groups (i.e., low, mid, and high) based on the 33.33rd and 66.66th percentiles of the raw years of experience, whose descriptive statistics are presented in Table 2.

As this table demonstrates, the higher the experience level, the higher the mean total frequency of interpreting strategies. To see whether there is any significant difference among these three groups in terms of their total mean strategy use, ANOVA was run.

Significant difference*	SD	Mean total frequency	N	Experience level
a	4.81	55.40	20	Low (1–2 yrs)
b	7.78	65.80	20	Mid (3–4 yrs)
c	4.44	77.20	20	High (5–6 yrs)

Table 2. Mean Total Frequency of Strategy Use by Experience Level

Note. Different letters (a, b, c) indicate significant differences at $p < .05$ (Bonferroni-adjusted).

The ANOVA results indicated significant differences among the groups ($p < .05$). To see where among the groups of experience the difference exists; post hoc comparisons were run employing Bonferroni adjustment, the results of which in Table 2 indicated that the high experience group of interpreters employed strategies more frequently than the mid and low experience groups ($p < .05$). The mid group of interpreters also employed strategies more frequently than the low experience group ($p < .05$). In general, the null hypothesis to this research question was rejected. That is to say, there was a significant difference among interpreters with different experience levels (low, mid, high) in terms of their total interpreting

strategy use frequency. In sum, the higher the experience level, the more use of interpreting strategies could be observed.

To answer question 3, the mean frequency for each strategy was computed for each experience level (Table 3) and then compared. As demonstrated, the means of strategies are divided into 3 groups of high to low frequency strategies based on their mean values in each experience group. When these groups were compared, conspicuous contrasts could be observed especially in the case of low and high experience groups. Specifically, **Presentation Strategies, Request, Expansion, Chunking, Approximation, Generalisation, Structural Anticipation, Substitution, Syntactic Transformation, and Reordering**, which were the least frequently used strategies in the low experience group with mean frequencies denoting never to not often use were the ones that were rated as highly frequently used by the high experience group. Though quite informative, it should be noted that these contrasts were based on descriptive statistics. Therefore, in order to have comparisons based on statistical significance, ANOVA was run for each strategy mean frequency across the groups.

High (mean range)	Mid (mean range)	Low (mean range)	Key strategies (codes)	Category (mean range)
3.1–3.9	2.9–3.7	2.3–3.5	Skipping (S1), Chunking (S8), Transcoding (S16), Generalisation (S13), Presentation Strategies (S23), Approximation (S2), Summarisation (S3), Reordering (S12), Syntactic Transformation (S11)	**High use (≥3.0)**
1.9–2.8	1.8–2.8	1.5–2.8	Request (S17), Expansion (S22), Passivisation (S19), Pure Anticipation (S9), Structural Anticipation (S10), Substitution (S5), Preparation (S20), Delay (S7), Inference (S21), Repetition (S15), Omission (S4), Explanatory Additions (S14)	**Moderate use (1.5–2.9)**
0.4–1.4	0.4–1.4	0.3–1.4	Self-Correction (S24), Speeding (S18), No Correction (S25), Silence (S26), Subjective Addition/Omission (S27), Speaker Word Order (S6), Protest (S29), Quitting (S28), Warning (S30)	**Low use (<1.5)**

Table 3. Strategy categories and typical mean ranges by experience level (0–4 scale)

This table presents the descriptive statistics of experience groups in terms of mean frequency for each strategy. One interesting point found is that in most of the strategies, the high experience group had a higher mean frequency for each strategy except for **explanatory additions, speeding, preparation, inference, self-correction, no-correction, silence,** and **subjective addition/omission**. That is to say, these strategies were used more often by low experience groups.

Table 4 presents the main ANOVA results on comparison of experience groups in terms of each strategy frequency mean score. As the

p values indicate, the experience groups do not differ significantly in terms of mean frequencies for strategies **omission, delay, repetition, preparation, inferencing,** and **quitting** (P >05). In other words, interpreters with different experience levels do not use these strategies more often or less often than each other.

p range	Typical F range	Example strategies	Pattern of experience effect
< .001	20–78	Skipping, Approximation, Chunking, Pure Anticipation, Structural Anticipation, Syntactic Transformation, Reordering, Generalisation, Substitution	**High > Mid & Low**
< .001	10–47	Explanatory Additions, Speeding, No Correction, Self-Correction, Silence, Subjective Addition/Omission, Speaker Word Order	**Mid & Low > High**
.007–< .001	5–66	Request, Expansion, Passivisation, Presentation Strategies, Protest	**High > Low only (Mid not different)**
n.s.	—	Omission, Delay, Repetition, Preparation, Inference, Quitting	**No significant difference**

Table 4. Summary of significant ANOVA results for individual interpreting strategies

Note. Patterns are based on one-way ANOVAs comparing low-, mid-, and high-experience groups. F and p values vary within each category (ranges shown). Full individual F and p values for all 30 strategies are available in the supplementary material.

However, as can be seen in Table 5, the groups significantly differ in terms of mean frequencies of other strategies. To see which groups specifically differ, post hoc tests (Games-Howell for unequal variances and Bonferroni for equal variances) were run.

p range	Typical mean difference range	Example strategies	Pattern of difference
.009 – < .001	0.6 – 1.9	Skipping, Approximation, Chunking, Pure Anticipation, Structural Anticipation, Syntactic Transformation, Reordering, Generalisation, Substitution, Warning	High > Mid & Low
.032 – < .001	0.4 – 1.6	Speaker Word Order, Explanatory Additions, Speeding, No Correction, Self-Correction, Silence, Subjective Addition/Omission	Low & Mid > High
.006 – < .001	0.7 – 1.4	Request, Expansion, Passivisation, Presentation Strategies, Protest	High > Low only (Mid not different)
n.s.	—	Omission, Delay, Repetition, Preparation, Inference, Quitting	No significant pairwise difference

Table 5. Summary of significant pairwise group differences (Games–Howell post hoc tests)

Note. Patterns are based on Games–Howell post hoc comparisons following one-way ANOVAs of low-, mid-, and high-experience interpreter groups. Finer-grained results (mean difference and p for each strategy and each pair of groups) are available in the supplementary material.

The post hoc test results based on Games-Howell Multiple Comparisons and Bonferroni adjustment indicate that:

In strategies of **skipping, approximation, summarisation, substitution, chunking, pure anticipation, structural anticipation, syntactic transformation, reordering, generalisation** and **warning**, the higher the experience level, the significantly higher the frequencies of the strategy were.

In strategies of **speaker word order, self-correction, silence, subjective addition/omission, explanatory additions, speeding,** and **no correction**, the mid and low experience groups did not differ, but the low and mid groups made significantly higher use of these strategies in comparison to the high experience group.

In strategies of **transcoding, request, passivisation, expansion, presentation strategies** and **protest**, the mid and low experience groups did not differ, but the low and mid group made significantly lower use of these strategies in comparison to the high experience group.

4. Discussion

In this section, each of the findings of the quantitative analysis is discussed in light of the related literature, and, where relevant, respondents' comments on the questionnaire are used to help interpret the findings. Some respondents provided descriptive comments in their questionnaires, their informative remarks can be taken into account for a better understanding of the issues of interest. Moreover, a few of the respondents were available for follow-up interviews, whose comments are also considered here.

The results showed that **skipping** and **preparation** are the most frequently used strategies by the interpreters. As for **preparation**, 15 of the respondents generally believed that the stakes are usually high in consecutive and simultaneous interpreting, and commissioners usually demand high-quality work from interpreters, especially given that in most cases these two types of interpreting are required when eminent political and scientific figures' speeches are supposed to be interpreted. At times the content of the speeches is given to interpreters, which allows further preparation on their side. As for **skipping**, nine interpreters believed that time is always an issue in consecutive and simultaneous interpreting. Therefore, it is one of those strategies employed most often by interpreters. This finding seems to be in line with the above findings; Al-Khanji, et al.

(2000) also state that **skipping** is one of the effective strategies when interpreters fall behind in the process of simultaneous interpreting.

The findings indicated that **quitting** and **protest** are the least frequently used strategies. These two strategies were absent from Kalina's (1998) classification and were added based on retrospective interviews with the initial participants. First, these participants were not too many in number (only two), and one of them firmly stated that he used these two strategies since he had some authority in the organisation with which he worked. That is why, if he found it necessary, he protested or quit when the speakers did not cooperate with him by slowing down their speed.

This study also found that, in general, more experienced interpreters make use of more strategies in consecutive and simultaneous interpreting. This finding was anticipated in advance of this study since, in general, these two types of interpreting are essentially psycholinguistic tasks in nature that require not only linguistic and cognitive abilities but also strategic competence to buy time and facilitate the interpreting process, a point emphasized by Diriker (2015). As interpreters gain experience, they increasingly address interpreting challenges through strategic rather than purely linguistic or cognitive means. After all, the more an interpreter is experienced in consecutive and simultaneous interpreting, the more he or she is likely to receive input and training regarding these modes, which in turn facilitates language acquisition (Bentley Sassaman 2009; Rido 2011) and the learning of interpreting (Khanji et al. 2000) with strategic competence as one of its most important components.

Another finding of this study was that in most of the strategies, the high-experience group had a higher mean frequency for each strategy except for **explanatory additions, speeding, preparation, inference, self-correction, no correction, silence,** and **subjective addition/omission**. That is to say, these latter strategies were used more often by low experience groups. This can be inferred from the nature of these strategies, especially **explanatory additions, speeding, preparation, self-correction, no correction, silence,** and **subjective addition/omission**, which are supposed to be used when the interpreter faces a linguistic or cognitive problem such as not knowing a word or forgetting in Kalina's (1998) model. Since less experienced interpreters are expected to face more of these issues, it seems that they also need to employ these strategies more often.

The next important point found in this study was that in strategies of **skipping, approximation, summarisation, substitution, chunking, pure anticipation, structural anticipation, syntactic transformation, reordering, generalisation,** and **warning**, the higher the experience level, the significantly higher the frequencies of the strategies were. As the nature of most of these strategies shows, strategies such as **skipping, approximation, summarisation, substitution, chunking, pure anticipation, structural anticipation, syntactic transformation,**

reordering, and **generalisation** are of a linguistic (syntactic and semantic) nature. Since it is expected that more experienced interpreters have a stronger grasp of the languages involved in interpreting, they can easily employ the above strategies because they are more linguistic in nature rather than compensatory or cognitive. Regarding warning, which was also used frequently by high experience groups, it was one of those strategies that more experienced interpreters believed they could employ due to the status and authority they had in their respective organisations.

Another finding was that **passivisation, protest, and warning** were specifically more often employed in the Persian–English direction of interpreting. According to a comment made by one of the respondents, the most common word order in Persian (i.e., SOV) is more easily converted into passive in English because, as soon as the object appears in Persian, it can be used as the subject of the translated English sentence, which has the common word order OVS in the passive. Then, the verb of the Persian sentence can be easily used in the passive in English (Amouzadeh & House 2010). This finding is also supported by Kalina (1998) in that **passivisation** can be applied when the subject is obvious from the context. Evidently, **omitting** a word from the interpreting can buy some more time for the interpreter.

As for **protest** and **warning** being used more in Persian-English interpreting, the comments by interpreters implied that shared intercultural knowledge and pragmatic information with the speaker whose speech is to be interpreted can affect the frequency of use of strategies such as warning and protest. This issue could be considered novel in the literature on directionality, since most studies have focused on cognitive and linguistic issues such as memory and language structure, but probably the consideration of shared pragmatic and intercultural knowledge as well as rapport with the speaker whose speech is to be interpreted can open some new lines of research.

This study is subject to certain limitations. The findings are based on self-reported data from a relatively small sample of Iranian interpreters working with a single language pair, which may limit their generalizability. In addition, language proficiency was not independently assessed and may have interacted with experience level. Future studies could address these limitations by using performance-based measures and more diverse participant samples.

5. Conclusion

Apart from the role of theory in translation studies and interpreter training, the practice of translation and interpreting is a major concern in real life. From this perspective, the findings of the current study shed light on the significance of experience, which is inextricably bound up with the quality of interpreting and interpreters' professionalism. The findings also

highlight the significance of strategy training rather than training only in linguistic skills in interpreter training, which could benefit trainees in advancing their qualifications. Moreover, trainers and course developers can better recognize the role of strategies and how they may interact with other variables, and include more strategy training in their courses.

Overall, the findings underscore the role of professional experience in shaping interpreters' strategic behaviour and suggest that interpreting competence develops not only through linguistic proficiency but also through accumulated strategic expertise. This perspective can inform both future empirical research and the design of more experience-sensitive approaches to interpreter training.

References:

Al-Khanji, Raja; El-Shiyab, Said Hussein and Hussein, Riyadh. 2000. On the use of compensatory strategies in simultaneous interpretation. In: *Meta*. 45(3): pp. 548-557.

Albl-Mikasa, Michaela. 2013. Developing and cultivating expert interpreter competence. In: *The Interpreters' Newsletter.* 18: pp. 17–34.

Amouzadeh, Mohammad and House, Juliane. 2010. Translation as a language contact phenomenon: The case of English and Persian passives. In: *Languages in Contrast*. 10(1): pp. 54-75.

Arumí Ribas, Marta. 2012. Problems and strategies in consecutive interpreting: A pilot study at two different stages of interpreter training. In: *Meta*. 57(3): pp. 812-835.

Baigorri-Jalón, Jesús. 2004. *Interpreters at the United Nations: A History*. Salamanca: Universidad de Salamanca.

Baigorri-Jalón, Jesús and Travieso-Rodríguez, Críspulo. 2017. Interpreting at the United Nations: The impact of external variables – the interpreters' view. In: *CLINA: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Translation, Interpreting and Intercultural Communication*. 3(2): pp. 53-72.

Bartłomiejczyk, Magdalena. 2006. Strategies of simultaneous interpreting and directionality. In: *Interpreting*. 8(2): pp. 149-174.

Bartłomiejczyk, Magdalena. 2008. Anticipation: A controversial interpreting strategy. In: *Translation and Meaning*. 8: pp. 117-126.

Baxter, Robert N. 2019. Style versus strategy in simultaneous interpreting: Different approaches and their effects. In: *Quaderns: Revista de Traducció*. 26: pp. 287-305.

Bayraktar Özer, Özge. 2017. Complementarity between linguistic and extralinguistic knowledge in simultaneous interpreting. In: *Journal of Translation Studies and Applications*. 4(2): pp. 52.

Bentley Sassaman, Jessica. 2009. The Experiential Learning Theory and Interpreter Education. In: *International Journal of Interpreter Education*. 1(1): pp. 4-14.

Sodiqova, Malohat Olimjon qizi and Botiraliyevna, Bakirova Hilola. 2023. Anticipation strategy in simultaneous interpretation of political discourse and its features. In: *Образование Наука и Инновационные Идеи в Мире*. 22(7): pp. 149-152.

Christoffels, Ingrid and De Groot, Annette. 2009. Simultaneous interpreting. In: De Groot, Annette and Kroll, Judith F. (eds.). 2009. *Handbook of Bilingualism: Psycholinguistic Approaches*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. pp. 454-479.

Dayter, Daria. 2020. Strategies in a corpus of simultaneous interpreting: Effects of directionality, phraseological richness, and position in speech event. In: *Meta*. 65(3): pp. 594-617.

Díaz-Galaz, Stephanie; Padilla, Presentación and Bajo, Maria Teresa. 2015. The role of advance preparation in simultaneous interpreting: A comparison of professional interpreters and interpreting students. In: *Interpreting*. 17(1): pp. 1-25.

Diriker, Ebru. 2015. Simultaneous interpretation. In: Pöchhacker, Franz (ed.). *Routledge Encyclopedia of Interpreting Studies*. New York: Routledge. pp. 381-383.

Donato, Valeria. 2003. Strategies adopted by student interpreters in SI: A comparison between the English–Italian and the German–Italian language pairs. In: *The Interpreters' Newsletter*. 12: pp. 101-134.

Gumul, Ewa. 2006. Explicitation in simultaneous interpreting: A strategy or a by-product of language mediation? In: *Across Languages and Cultures*. 7(2): pp. 171-190.

Han, Chao and Chen, Sijia. 2016. Strategy use in English-to-Chinese simultaneous interpreting: A descriptive–exploratory study. In: *Forum:*

International Journal of Interpretation and Translation. 14(2): pp. 173-193.

Kader, Stephanie and Seubert, Sabine. 2014. Anticipation, segmentation… stalling? How to teach interpreting strategies. In: Dörte, Andres and Behr, Martina (eds.). 2014. *To Know How to Suggest…: Approaches to Teaching Conference Interpreting.* Berlin: Frank & Timme. pp. 125-144.

Kalina, Sylvia. 1998. *Strategische Prozesse beim Dolmetschen: Theoretische Grundlagen, empirische Fallstudien, didaktische Konsequenzen*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.

Kalina, Sylvia. 2002. Interpreters as professionals. In: *Across Languages and Cultures*. 3(2): pp. 169-187.

Kalina, Sylvia. 2014. Interpreter Training and Interpreting Studies – Which is the Chicken and Which is the Egg. In: Dörte, Andres and Behr, Martina (eds.). 2014. *To Know How to Suggest…: Approaches to Teaching Conference Interpreting*. Berlin: Frank & Timme. pp. 17-43.

Kirchhoff, Hella. 2002 [1976]. SI: Interdependence of variables in the interpreting process, interpreting models and interpreting strategies. In: Pöchhacker, Franz and Shlesinger, Miriam. (eds.). 2002. *The Interpreting Studies Reader*. London/New York: Routledge. pp. 112-130.

Kurz, Ingrid and Färber, Birgit. 2003. Anticipation in German–English simultaneous interpreting. In: *Forum: International Journal of Interpretation and Translation*. 1(2): pp. 123-150.

Li, Xiangdong. 2015. Putting interpreting strategies in their place: Justifications for teaching strategies in interpreter training. In: *Babel*. 61(2): pp. 170-192.

Melicherčíková, Miroslava; Hodáková, Soňa. 2023. Interpreters' ability to cope with interference compared with the length of their professional experience. In: *trans-kom.* 16(2): pp. 425–442.

Moore, Kiarah E. 2020. *Cultivating Confidence: Embodying Self-Esteem and Self-Efficacy in Novice Signed Language Interpreters*. Unpublished PhD dissertation. Monmouth, OR: Western Oregon University.

Nurakhmetova, Aigerim. 2023. *The Issue of Quality in Simultaneous Interpretation*. Unpublished MA thesis. Nur-Sultan: M. Narikbayev KAZGUU University.

Pöchhacker, Franz. 2016. *Introducing Interpreting Studies.* 2nd ed. London/New York: Routledge.

Raval, Hitesh. 2003. An overview of the issues in the work with interpreters. In: Tribe, Rachel and Raval, Hitesh. (eds.). 2003. *Working with Interpreters in Mental Health*. London: Palgrave Macmillan. pp. 8-29.

Riccardi, Alessandra. 2005. On the Evolution of Interpreting Strategies in Simultaneous Interpreting. In: *Meta*. 50(2): pp. 753-767.

Rido, Akhyar. 2011. Language learning through interpreting and translation: Highlighting students' experiences. In: *Proceedings of the 58th TEFLIN International Conference: Responding to Global Challenges through Quality English Language Teaching, Malang, Indonesia, 1–3 December 2011*. Malang: TEFLIN. pp. 54-59.

Romero, Bruno G. 2008. Here Are Your Right Hands: Exploring Interpreter Qualifications. In: *University of Dayton Law Review*. 34(1): pp. 15-34.

Ruiz Rosendo, Lucía; Barghout, Alma and Martin, Conor H. 2021. Interpreting on UN field missions: A training programme. In: *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer*. 15(4): pp. 450-467.

Taylor, Paul; Smith, Karen. 2019. The United Nations (UN). In: Taylor, Paul and Smith, Karen (eds.). 2019. *Peacekeeping and the Role of Russia in Eurasia*. London/New York: Routledge. pp. 189-212.

Tohyama, Hitomi and Matsubara, Shigeki. 2006. Development of Web-Based Teaching Material for Simultaneous Interpreting Learners Using Bilingual Speech Corpus. In: Pearson, Elaine and Bohman, Paul (eds.). 2006. *Proceedings of Ed-Media: World Conference on Educational Multimedia and Hypermedia, Orlando, Florida, June 26–30*. Chesapeake, VA: AACE. pp. 2906-2911.

Wang, Binhua. 2009. *Description of standards in interpreting and its application – a study based on the corpus of consecutive interpreting in Chinese Premier press conferences.* Unpublished PhD dissertation. Guangzhou: Guangdong University of Foreign Studies.

Annex 1.

Interpreting Strategies Questionnaire

This questionnaire was developed based on a review of the interpreting strategies literature. Strategies were identified and defined drawing on Al-Khanji et al. (2000), Donato (2003), Han and Chen (2016), Kirchhoff (2002), and Tohyama and Matsubara (2006). Most strategies are rooted in the classification proposed by Kalina (1998), with several others representing alternative labels for strategies originally introduced by Kalina. In addition, strategies emerging from retrospective interviews with professional interpreters were incorporated to ensure comprehensive coverage of strategy use in practice.

Instructions to Respondents
Please read each strategy definition carefully and answer the questions based on your own professional practice in simultaneous and/or consecutive interpreting. There are no right or wrong answers. Your responses will be used for research purposes only.

Questions
For each strategy listed below, please answer the following questions:

1. In which type of interpretation do you more often employ this strategy?
☐ Simultaneous ☐ Consecutive ☐ Both equally

2. In which direction of interpretation do you more often employ this strategy?
☐ Persian → English ☐ English → Persian ☐ Both equally

3. How often do you employ this strategy?
0 = Never | 1 = Not often | 2 = Sometimes | 3 = Most often | 4 = Always

4. Please explain your reason(s) for your choices in this part.

Interpreting Strategies
S1. Skipping
S2. Approximation
S3. Summarisation
S4. Omission
S5. Substitution
S6. Speaker Word Order
S7. Delay
S8. Chunking
S9. Pure Anticipation

S10. Structural Anticipation
S11. Syntactic Transformation
S12. Reordering
S13. Generalisation
S14. Explanatory Additions
S15. Repetition
S16. Transcoding
S17. Request
S18. Speeding
S19. Passivisation
S20. Preparation
S21. Inference
S22. Expansion
S23. Presentation Strategies
S24. Self-Correction
S25. No Correction
S26. Silence
S27. Subjective Addition/Omission
S28. Quitting
S29. Protest
S30. Warning

Sources Used for Questionnaire Development

Al-Khanji, R., El-Shiyab, S. H., & Hussein, R. (2000).
Donato, V. (2003).
Han, C., & Chen, S. (2016).
Kirchhoff, H. (2002).
Tohyama, H., & Matsubara, S. (2006).
Kalina, S. (1998).