

# Access to court interpreting as social inclusion for migrants in Australia: an analysis of courtroom examination questions and answers<sup>1</sup>

RAN YI

School of Humanities and Languages  
UNSW Sydney, Australia  
[ran.yi@unsw.edu.au](mailto:ran.yi@unsw.edu.au)

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0630-8623>

**Abstract:** With nearly half of its population born overseas, Australia is one of the most prominent societies built and shaped by migrants worldwide. In Australian courts, access to court interpreting is crucial for social inclusion. However, translating the language of law in court is never an easy job. Therefore, court interpreters serve as indispensable gatekeepers for procedural justice and linguistic equity. But how accurately did court interpreters reproduce lawyer questioning and defendant testimony in court? Drawing on triangulated survey and interpreting performance data, our initial findings suggest a mismatch between what the interpreters said they would do and what the interpreters actually did when translating the manner in which lawyers crafted their questions and defendant responded to their questions in court. Our contributions are three-fold: (1) increasing the linguistic ‘manner awareness’, (2) promoting interprofessional understanding, and (3) compassing future pedagogies in court interpreter education.

**Keywords:** court interpreting, social inclusion, courtroom examination.

---

<sup>1</sup> This research was financed by HDR Essential Costs Funding, UNSW.



## **1. Introduction**

### **1.1 International migrants in Australia**

Much has been written and researched about globalisation and mass migration. According to the World Migration Report 2022, published by the United Nations International Migration Organisation, there were 281 million international migrations, and Oceania became the host country for the highest proportion of international immigrants. In Australia, evidence that the urgent need for international migrations in its multilingual and multicultural society has mounted. According to the latest population updates released by the Australian Bureau of Statistics in March 2023, nearly half of Australia's population was born overseas, and Australia is home to more than three hundred languages, including the Indigenous languages, established and emerging, spoken and sign(ed) languages. Considering the mass migration and the diversity of community languages, the high demand for community translators and interpreters seems justifiable. For language communities with limited English proficiency, the role of translators and interpreters is crucial in numerous social justice-critical settings. These include but are not limited to appearing in court, participating in police interviews, accessing social security funds and welfare benefits, and applying for affordable and community housing. Therefore, considering Australia's linguistic and cultural diversity, providing adequate language translation and interpretation services is crucial for international migrants.

### **1.2 Access to court interpreting and social inclusion**

Access to court interpreting is a critical aspect of guaranteeing the migrants' civil rights and social inclusion in their host

society. International and national instruments have provided the legal foundations for such rights. In the context of international law, Article 14(3)(f) of the ICCPR states that:

in the determination of any criminal charge against him, everyone shall be entitled to the following minimum guarantees, in full equality [...] to have the free assistance of an interpreter if he cannot understand or speak the language used in court.

In the context of national law, the s 30 of the Evidence Act 1995 (NSW) stipulates that:

a witness may give evidence about a fact through an interpreter unless the witness can understand and speak the English language sufficiently to enable the witness to understand, and to make an adequate reply to, questions that may be put about the fact.

Apart from the statutory recognition, the importance of competent interpreting in court settings has been recognised by the judicial sector. For instance, Justice Roberts-Smith (2009: 13) has warned that the lack of adequate interpreting in criminal trials constitutes ‘a denial of a fair trial’ and may lead to ‘wrongful conviction or acquittal’. The Hon. Justice Perry and Zornada (2015: 1) have also endorsed the vital role the interpreter plays in ensuring justice, as ‘the principles of fairness and equality before the law are fundamental to a democratic society, and their observance is essential to the maintenance of public confidence in the judiciary’.

Therefore, considering the international migrants’ right to a fair trial and social inclusion in their host society, access to adequate court interpreting is of paramount importance.

### **1.3 Accuracy of court interpreting: content and manner**

The notion of accuracy in court interpreting remains extraordinarily complex. There is a convincing number of

existing studies (see Berk-Seligson 2012; Lee 2011; Yi 2023a, 2023b, 2024a, 2024b) that ascertains the accuracy of court interpreting involving both the content and the manner in which the original speakers speak.

In Australia, the latest version of the Australian Institute of Interpreters and Translators (AUSIT 2012) Code of Conduct reflects the growing acknowledgment of pragmatic accuracy in the expected and accepted professional interpreting practice. To begin with, the prerequisite to becoming a professional court interpreter is a high level of bilingual competence, which basically requires practitioners to develop a native or near-native level of competence in at least two languages in a variety of genres and registers. As the AUSIT Code of Conduct (2012, p. 5) stipulates,

In order to practise, interpreters and translators need to have particular levels of expertise for particular types of work. Those who work with interpreters and translators are entitled to expect that they are working with appropriately qualified practitioners. Practitioners always represent their credentials honestly. Where formal training or accreditation is not available (e.g. in less frequently used language combinations and new and emerging languages), practitioners have an obligation to increase and maintain skills through their own professional development or request employers, agencies or institutions to provide it.

To be more exact, in interpreting in the courtroom, practitioners should be familiar with the varied court-related contexts, the court system and its institutional structures, legal terminology, and genres of the areas in the court assignments they accept (see Clause 3.2 Competence AUSIT Code of Conduct 2012: 9). In addition, if they find the competence required by an assignment is beyond their expertise, they are expected to inform the client(s) immediately and work to resolve the situation by either withdrawing from the assignment or following another acceptable strategy (see Clause 3.4 Competence AUSIT Code of Conduct 2012: 9).

In addition, the Code also expects a high level of accuracy, which requires interpreters to use their best professional judgement in remaining faithful at all times to the meaning of texts and messages. As stated in the Code of Conduct,

(professional interpreters) should provide accurate renditions of the source utterance or text in the target language. In this case, accurate means (1) optimal and complete; (2) without distortion or omission; (3) preserving the content and intent of the source message or text (see Accuracy Principle, AUSIT Code of Conduct, 2012, p.5).

To be more specific, interpreting practitioners should be able to provide an accurate and complete rendition of the source message using the skills and understanding they have acquired through training and education (see Clause 5.1), not adding to, altering, or omitting anything from the content and intent of the source message (see Clause 5.2). In case of any interpreting mistakes, professional interpreters are expected to acknowledge and promptly rectify these mistakes (see Clause 5.3) and ask for clarification, rephrasing, repetition, or explanation if anything is unclear where circumstances permit (see Clause 5.4).

In summary, interpreters should relay accurately and completely everything that is communicated to ensure the same access to all that is said or signed by all parties involved in the trial (see Int2), use the first person (see Int3), maintain the emotions of the speakers and not soften or enhance the force of messages conveyed or language used in courts, including maintaining incoherence, hesitations, and unclear statements (see Int4), and conveying in the exact same manner as presented (see Int5).

Another significant development is the publication of the Recommended National Standards for Working with Interpreters in Courts and Tribunals by the Judicial Council on Cultural Diversity (2017/2022). The Judicial Council on

Cultural Diversity (JCCD) is an advisory body formed to assist Australian courts, judicial officers, and administrators in responding positively to diverse needs. The Standards were drafted by a specialist committee of representatives from the interpreting and legal professionals. The document recommends 26 standards for interpreters, lawyers, judicial officers, and tribunal members that encompass comprehensive educational materials for legal interpreting.

The Standard 20 Duties of interpreters stipulates what must be interpreted and what constitutes accuracy in interpreting. Due to grammatical, pragmatic, and cultural differences across languages, accurate interpreting does not equate to a word-for-word rendition. As such, the accuracy of interpreting involves both the content and manner in hearing room discourse, and interpreters should aim to achieve accuracy in the tone, register, and other aspects of how the information is conveyed. For example, competent and ethical interpreters must not omit linguistic features, whether hesitation or confidence, provided in answers that they deem irrelevant to the original question.

In addition to the manner in which all speakers deliver their speech, the document also identified several factors that influence the accuracy of interpreting, including the understanding of the purpose of the interpretation, the setting where the interpretation takes place, and the mode of interpreting (i.e. consecutive or simultaneous). In summary, two dominant interpreting protocols for professional interpreters in Australia agree on the pragmatic approach to the accuracy of court interpreting and the importance of maintaining the speaker's manner.

## **2. Conceptualising the Manner of Speech**

The concept of Manner of Speech is multifaceted and fluid. It is, therefore, widely contested and critiqued by scholars for its

broad and often inconsistent meaning. Based on a review of cognitive-pragmatic approach to discourse analytical studies, the following working definition is proposed:

The manner of speech refers to the manner in which the propositional content of the utterances is produced and presented by the speaker in the context of a courtroom for a particular purpose and reproduced and represented through an interpreter. It can encompass a variety of heterogeneous features. These features include (1) discourse markers, (2) speech style, and (3) other manner-related contextual or interactional cues.

Manner of Speech serves various functions due to the indexicalities.

Categories	Sub-categories	Relevant literature
Discourse markers	1.1 Acknowledgment markers.	Schiffrin (1987)
	1.2 Politeness markers.	Brown & Levinson (1987)
	1.3 Particle markers.	Miracle (1991)
Speech style	2.1 Hesitations.	Wang (2021)
	2.2 Fillers.	Dayter (2021); Liu & Xiao (2009)
	2.3 Hedges.	Hu (2022); Magnifico & Defrancq (2017)
	2.4 Self-corrections.	Levett (1983)
Other features	3.1 Intonation.	Levis (1999)
	3.2 Tone of voice.	Yip (2002)
	3.3 Register.	Gibbons & Whiteley (2018)

**Table 1.** Analytical Models for Manner of Speech (Mandarin and English).

### **3. The study design**

#### **3.1 Research aim and questions**

The present study is a mixed-method experimental research study that assesses the accuracy of court interpreting in different modes and modalities of remote settings.<sup>3</sup> The aim of this research project is to examine the less-investigated aspect of the interpretation of the Manner of Speech in court-related remote settings. To achieve this objective, the author intended to address two specific research questions in the present study. Table 2 shows an overview of the research questions, data collection and analysis methods.

To address RQ1, the author collected the interpreting performance data that consisted of original English questions and the interpreters' interpretation into Mandarin. These questions included modal, interrogative, and declarative questions in examination-in-chief and cross-examinations. Questions contained the Manner of Speech features, such as discourse markers, false starts, self-repairs, and repetitions, initiated by the prosecutor and the defence lawyer during the criminal court proceedings.

<b>Research questions (RQ)</b>	<b>Instruments</b>	<b>Data sets</b>	<b>Analysis Methods</b>
1. How accurately do professional interpreters render the Manner of Speech in courtroom questions and answers?	Experiment on Zoom	Interpreting performance data: audio data and transcribed texts	1. Quantitative: Descriptive statistics 2. Qualitative: Discourse analysis
2. Do interpreters perform differently in different modes and conditions of remote interpreting?			

**Table 2.** Research design.

To address RQ2, the author collected the interpreting performance data that consisted of original Mandarin answers and the interpreters' interpretation into English. These answers comprised manner-related features, including particle markers, politeness markers, vulgar language, and other features used by the Mandarin-speaking defendant in examination-in-chief and cross-examinations.

### **3.2 Participants**

A total of fifty certified interpreters ( $N = 50$ ) met our screening criteria and were thus invited to participate in the mixed-method experimental research study. Research participants were asked to complete a questionnaire before the interpreting experiment hosted remotely on Zoom. The experiment used the script and recordings of an Australia Research Council (ARC)-funded research project.<sup>7</sup> The experiment materials featured a simulated criminal trial involving a Mandarin Chinese speaking defendant. Table 3 shows the eligibility criteria for our screening process.

1. Age	18 years of age or older;
2. Location	Australia-based;
3. Certification	NAATI-credentialled practitioners certified at Certified Interpreter level; or Certified Provisional Interpreters with considerable relevant experience in court-related settings;
4. Language pair	Certified in Mandarin Chinese and English language combination;
5. Work experience	Experience of working as an interpreter in Australian courts;
6. Technical requirements	Appropriate equipment (computer, headphones, microphone, internet and Zoom application, etc).

**Table 3.** Criteria for screening research participants.

Prior written consent from all research participants were obtained. Data collected from the research participants were fully de-identified.

## **4. The analysis**

### **4.1 Quantitative analysis**

The present study adopted a working definition of accuracy in interpreting, which emphasises that the meaning of the utterance at the discourse level and the pragmatic dimension of language, including the intention behind the utterance and lexical, grammatical and syntactic differences should be taken into account during the interlingual and intercultural transfer.

This approach to the understanding of accuracy of interpreting has guided the assessment of interpreting accuracy in two ways: (1) to examine whether the participants maintained the discourse markers and speech style features of lawyers' questions as they were pragmatically intended and (2) to investigate whether the participants preserved discourse markers and speech style features of a witness's testimony as they were originally articulated, including hesitation, aggressivness, etc., or not.

Therefore, both point-based and criterion-based systems were used in the marking process in the assessment of the accuracy of the interpretation of the Manner of Speech. The criterion-based assessment was first conducted based on Wadensjo's framework. In each criterion, a score of accuracy was given on a scale of 1 to 10. The accuracy score was then proportionately converted to the hundred-mark system. Then, the point-based assessment was conducted. In this system, each incident of inaccuracy resulted in a deduction of one score from the mark received from the participants' total scores obtained in the criterion-based criteria. Since this study does not cover the propositional content, the point-based marking of interpreting inaccuracies was restricted to assessing the participants' interpretations of the Manner of Speech. Descriptive statistics were conducted with the assistance of SPSS 27 software.

## 4.2 Qualitative analysis

Interpreting performance audio data were first transcribed into texts using the speech-to-speech software iFlytek, and then coded in accordance with the analytical framework of the Manner of Speech for discourse analysis.

## 5. Results and discussion

### 5.1 Quantitative analysis

To check the inter-rater reliability, the Intraclass Correlation Coefficient (ICC) was performed using IBM SPSS 27. The Absolute Agreement type was chosen to check the level of agreement between the markers. The average measure was  $ICC = .984$ , 95% confidence interval [.962, .998],  $F(25, 25) = 107.026$ ,  $p < 0.01$ . The average measure  $ICC$  value is .991, which means a high degree of agreement between Marker A and Marker B in the assessment for both interpreting tasks. In summary, the inter-rater reliability test confirmed that coding was reliable.

Preliminary descriptive statistics were conducted to check (1) whether there were any significant outliers in various groups and (2) the distribution of the differences in the dependent variable between groups is approximately normally distributed. When the average scores of Marker A and B were used, no outlier was detected, and the assumption of normality was not violated, as assessed by Shapiro-Wilk's test ( $p > .05$ ). The preliminary analysis provided a good foundation for further and more rigorous statistical testing that takes into account the possible differences in modes and conditions of interpreting.

A two-way between-groups analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to explore the effect of mode and remote condition on the accuracy of the participants' interpretation of the Manner of Speech in courtroom questions and answers. The experiment adopted a 2 x 2 between-subjects design, with participants first randomised into different modes

of interpreting and then further randomised into different conditions. Therefore, the two-way between-groups ANOVA was deemed appropriate.

In regards to the effect of the mode of interpreting on the interpreting accuracy of the Manner of Speech, overall, the participants achieved a higher accuracy score in consecutive mode ( $M = 68.16$ ,  $SD = 17.16$ ) than in simultaneous mode ( $M = 66.11$ ,  $SD = 11.24$ ). However, for the effect of the mode of interpreting,  $F = 2.71$ ,  $p = .106$ ,  $df = 1$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .056$ , indicating that there was no statistically significant difference with a small effect size.

In regards to the effect of the condition of interpreting on the accuracy of the interpretation of the Manner of Speech, overall, the participants achieved a higher accuracy score in audiovisual mode ( $M = 65.73$ ,  $SD = 13.88$ ) than in audio-only mode ( $M = 64.15$ ,  $SD = 15.70$ ). However, for the effect of the condition of interpreting,  $F = .265$ ,  $p = .609$ ,  $df = 1$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .006$ , indicating that there was no statistically significant difference with a small effect size.

The preliminary results from two-way between-groups ANOVA revealed no statistically significant effects for the accuracy of the interpretation of the Manner of Speech in remote settings. The main explanation for this phenomenon is (1) the effect size was small and (2) the marking of accuracy did not differentiate courtroom questions and answers. Given these factors, the effect of mode and condition for the accuracy of interpreting the Manner of Speech seems not statistically significant. However, the preliminary results pointed to a higher accuracy in consecutive and audiovisual mode than in simultaneous and audio-only mode.

## **5.2 Qualitative analysis**

### **5.2.1 Interpreters' addition**

In terms of interpreters' addition of the Manner of Speech features, most of the additions were found in answers involving

the use of politeness markers. Table 4 shows the addition of politeness marker “请(please)” in Mandarin answers.

Original	这是真的！我没说谎！你得相信我啊！ Zhè shì zhēn de! Wǒ méi shuōhuǎng! Nǐ dé xiāngxìn wǒ a!
Interpreters' addition	This is true! I did not lie! Please you got to believe me!
Suggested rendition	It's true! I didn't lie! You got to believe me.

**Table 4.** Interpreters' addition of politeness marker.

The original answer in Mandarin was a statement with a strong force and effect, expressing the defendant's strong emotion against being accused of lying during the proceedings. However, in the interpreter's rendition, a politeness marker was added, which changed the statement from a powerful tone into a pleading or negotiating tone. The suggested version kept the exact original form, force, and effect.

### 5.2.2 Interpreters' omission

In terms of interpreters' omission of the Manner of Speech features, most of the omissions were found in tag questions in declarative. Omissions could be problematic as the pragmatic force and effect were changed beyond the speaker's intention.

The tag questions in declarative were used by counsels to achieve a certain strategic purpose. The term “tag questions” was defined as short phrasal expressions that are attached to the end of a statement in the form of a question (Hale, 2004). Existing literature on the use of tag questions (e.g. Berk-Seligson, 2012; O'Barr 2014) revealed conflicting views on the perception of power and speech style. Scholars (e.g. Hosman & Siltanen, 2011) associated the use of tag questions with negative perceptions of the trustworthiness and credibility of the speaker. Apart from the perceptions of tag questions, there are also

literature suggesting the situations in which tag questions are used, particularly by people in more powerful positions. Harris (1984) examined the use of tag questions in trials and found that legal professionals were more likely to use tag questions than defendants in order to seek confirmation and exert control. The use of tag questions by counsels and judges contradicts the perception of powerlessness when it comes from speakers of a lower status in courts.

In the present article, three types of tag questions were illustrated with examples of interpretations and suggested renditions. These included (1) positive declaratives with positive ratification tag, (2) positive declaratives with negative ratification tag, and (3) negative declaratives with positive tag.

Original	The money you had was from selling drugs (↘), wasn't it? (↗)
Interpreters' omission	你的钱是卖毒品的吗？(↗) nǐ de qián shì mài dù pǐn de ma? Was your money from selling drugs?
Suggested rendition	这钱是你卖毒品赚的，不是吗？ Zhè qián shì nǐ mài dù pǐn zhuàn de, bùshì ma? The money you had was from selling drugs (↘), wasn't it? (↗)

**Table 5.** Positive declarative with positive ratification tag.

Table 5 shows the sample of a positive declarative with positive ratification tag question. The original question was marked by a positive statement with a falling tone, followed by a negative tag with a rising tone. However, in the interpreters' rendition, the tag 'wasn't it' was omitted. The omission of the tag further changed the declarative into a yes-or-no question with a less coercive force and effect. The suggested rendition retained the pragmatic force and effect in the same form of the original question.

Original	You had separated into small bags were drugs that you were selling (↘), weren't they (↗)?
Interpreters' omission	你把你卖的毒品分成小袋了 (↘) Nǐ bǎ nǐ mài de dùpǐn fēnchéng xiǎodàile You had separated into small bags were drugs that you were selling.
Suggested rendition	你分包成小袋的是你在售卖的毒品, 不是吗? What you're packaging into little bags is the drugs you're selling, isn't it? You had separated into small bags were drugs that you were selling (↘), weren't they (↗)?

**Table 6.** Positive declarative with negative ratification tag.

Table 6 shows the sample of a positive declarative with negative ratification tag question. The original question was represented by a positive statement with a falling tone, followed by a positive tag with a rising tone. However, in the interpreters' rendition, the tag 'weren't they' was deleted. The omission of the tag further changed the declarative into a statement. The suggested rendition preserved the pragmatic force and effect in the same form of the original question.

Original	There was no 20 thousand dollars you alleged your mom gave you (↘), was there? (↗)
Interpreters' omission	你声称说, 你妈妈给你的两万美元, 其实是在说谎吧? (↘) nǐ shēng chēng shuō, nǐ mā ma gěi nǐ de liǎng wàn měi yuán, qí shí shì zài shuō huǎng ba? You claimed that your mother gave you \$20,000, but you were actually lying, right?
Suggested rendition	你声称你妈妈给你的两万美元是不存在的, 是吗? Nǐ shēngchēng nǐ māmā gěi nǐ de liǎng wàn měiyuán shì bù cúnzài de, shì ma? 你声称说, 你妈妈给你的两万美元, 其实是在说谎吧? (↗)

**Table 7.** Negative declarative with positive tag.

Table 7 shows the sample of a negative declarative with positive tag question. The original question was represented by a negative statement with a falling tone, followed by a positive tag with a rising tone. However, in the interpreters' rendition, the tag 'was there' was omitted. The omission of the tag further changed the declarative into a statement with an interrogative tone. The suggested rendition maintained the pragmatic force and effect in the same form of the original question.

### **5.2.3 Interpreters' alteration**

In the data, most of the interpreters' alteration was associated with the renditions of the declaratives with rising intonation. Table 8 below shows the occurrences in the interpreted declaratives with rising intonation found in our cross-examination data.

50 Declaratives with rising intonation in the original speech	%
13 × translated accurately	26%
18 × translated as a Wh-interrogative	36%
7 × translated as a simple declarative	14%
5 × translated as a polar interrogative	10%
2 × translated as a forced choice interrogative	4%
2 × omitted	4%
1 × translated as a modal interrogative	2%
1 × translated as a positive declarative with a positive tag	2%
1 × translated as a positive declarative with a positive ratification tag	2%

**Table 8.** Declaratives with rising intonation.

From the table below, it has been revealed that a majority (74%) of this question type had been altered in the cross-examination, whereas only 26% of the question were accurately reproduced in the interpreted versions. Among the 37 altered versions, 18 were translated as a Wh-interrogative, 7 as a simple declarative, 5 as a polar interrogative, 2 as a forced choice

interrogative, 2 omitted completely, and the rest as a modal interrogative, a positive declarative with a positive tag and as a positive declarative with a positive ratification tag. Table 9 presents the typical examples alterations of this question form in the data.

Turn	Speaker	Example
T27Q	Crown	You put the whole thing up your nose at the one time?
Example 1	Modal interrogative	所以(connective)您会一次把 0.7 克全部吸食完吗? [interrogative particle <i>ma</i> ] (So you would take all of the 0.7 g in one go [ <i>ma</i> ]?)
Example 2	Positive declaratives with positive tag	所以你每次都是通过鼻子吸。是吗? (So every time you did it all at once through your nose, did you?)
Example 3	Positive declaratives with positive ratification tag	您是全部从鼻子里面吸进去。是这样子的吗? (You put the whole thing up your nose, is that correct?)
Example 4	Declarative	所以你要拿出所有这些。然后一次性的放到你的鼻子里。 (So you put all of them at once up your nose.)
Example 5	Polar interrogative	所以每次你用鼻子吸都是把它全部用完吗? (So every time did you put the whole thing up your nose?)
Example 6	Wh-interrogative	你每次就是吸到鼻孔里面的时候。每袋 0.7 克里面你每次用多少呢? (How much of the 0.7 g did you use when you put them up your nose?)

**Table 9.** Declaratives with rising intonation in English and interpretations.

In Example 1, the question type was reproduced as a modal interrogative in the interpreted version, as evidenced by

the use of the modal verb “会” in Chinese with a marker of interrogative particle “吗” (ma) in Chinese. In Example 2, the question type was rendered as a positive declaratives with a positive tag with the use of “是吗” (did you) in the interpretation. In Example 3, the same question was represented as a positive declarative with a positive ratification tag “是这样子的吗” (is that correct) in the Chinese version. In Example 4, the question was treated as a simple declarative with a falling intonation. In Example 5, the same question was treated as a polar interrogative using a Chinese interrogative particle “吗” (ma) in the rendition. In Example 6, the same question was mistranslated as a Wh-interrogative, as indicated by the use of “多少”(how much) in the interpreted version.

## **6. Conclusion**

Given the current trend of globalisation and migration, the right to a fair representation and access to adequate court interpreting are important for international migrations' social inclusion in their host society. In court interpreting, the accuracy of both the content and the manner is crucial for a fair outcome. However, the manner in which the speaker expresses the content has been under-explored. This present study conceptualised the Manner of Speech and analysed the interpretation of the Manner of Speech in courtroom examination questions and answers in different modes and conditions of remote interpreting. Preliminary ANOVA results revealed no statistical significance regarding the effect of mode and condition for accuracy of interpreting the Manner of Speech. However, the discourse analysis of interpreters' rendition of particle markers, politeness markers, vulgar language, false start, self-repair, and repetitions showed varying degrees of addition, omission, and mistranslation in courtroom questions and answers. Main explanations included (1) the translability of these manner-related features during the interlingual and intercultural transfers and (2) the knowledge and understanding of pragmalinguistic equivalences of these features. However, the study had several

limitations: (1) it only examined simulated criminal trials, (2) in Mandarin and English, and (3) in common law jurisdiction. Further studies are needed in (1) civil and administrative proceedings, (2) other language pairs, and (3) non-common law jurisdictions.

## Conflict of Interest Statement

The author declares no conflicts of interest to disclose related to this manuscript. If any conflicts arise in the future, the Author will promptly inform the journal.

## AI Use Statement

The author confirms that artificial intelligence (AI) tools were not used in any aspects of this research.

## Bibliography

Australian Bureau of Statistics. 2023. *2021 Census of Population*. Retrieved from <https://www.abs.gov.au/statistics/people/population/national-state-and-territory-population/latest-release> (accessed April 30, 2023).

Australian Institute of Interpreters and Translators. 2012. *AUSIT Code of Ethics and Code of Conduct*. Retrieved from [https://ausit.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/02/Code\\_Of\\_Ethics\\_Full.pdf](https://ausit.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/02/Code_Of_Ethics_Full.pdf) (accessed January 19, 2023).

Berk-Seligson, Susan. 2002. *The Bilingual Courtroom: Court Interpreters in the Judicial Process*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Brown, Penelope, and Stephen C. Levinson. 1987. *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Vol. 4. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dayter, Daria. 2021. "Variation in Non-Fluencies in a Corpus of Simultaneous Interpreting vs. Non-Interpreted English." *Perspectives*, 29(4): 489-506.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/0907676X.2020.1718170>.

Evidence Act NSW.  
<https://legislation.nsw.gov.au/view/html/inforce/current/act-1995-025> (accessed October 24, 2023).

Gibbons, Alison, and Sara Whiteley. 2018. *Contemporary Stylistics: Language, Cognition, Interpretation*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.  
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.3366/j.ctt1tqx9wz>.

Harris, Sandra. 1984. "The Form and Function of Threats in Court." *Language & Communication*.

Hosman, Lawrence A., and Susan A. Siltanen. 2011. "Hedges, Tag Questions, Message Processing, and Persuasion." *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 30(3): 341-349.

Hu, Jiale. 2022. *Hedges in Chinese-English Conference Interpreting*. Cham: Springer.

Judicial Council on Diversity and Inclusion. 2022. *Recommended National Standards for Working with Interpreters in Courts and Tribunals - Second Edition*. Retrieved from <https://jcdi.org.au/wp-content/uploads/2022/05/JCDD-Recommended-National-Standards-for-Working-with-Interpreters-in-Courts-and-Tribunals-second-edition.pdf> (accessed January 19, 2023).

Lee, Jieun. 2011. "Translatability of Speech Style in Court Interpreting." *International Journal of Speech Language and the Law*, 18(1): 1-33. <https://doi.org/10.1558/ijssl.v18i1.1>.

Levelt, Willem J. M. 1983. "Monitoring and Self-Repair in Speech." *Cognition*, 14(1): 41-104. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0277\(83\)90026-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0277(83)90026-4).

Levis, John M. 2012. "Suprasegmentals: Intonation." *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*. Wiley Online Library.  
<https://doi.org/10.1002/9781405198431.wbeal1124> (accessed January 16, 2023).

Liu, Bingham, and Eileen Xiao. 2009. "Chinese Discourse Markers in Oral Speech of Mainland Mandarin Speakers." In *Proceedings of the 21st North American Conference on Chinese Linguistics*

(NACCL-21) (Vol. 2, pp. 358-374). Bryant University, Smithfield, Rhode Island.

Magnifico, Chiara, and Bart Defrancq. 2017. "Hedges in Conference Interpreting: The Role of Gender." *Interpreting*, 19: 21-46. <https://doi.org/10.1075/intp.19.1.02mag>.

Miracle, W. Charles. 1991. *Discourse Markers in Mandarin Chinese*. The Ohio State University: ProQuest Dissertations Publishing. Retrieved from <https://www.proquest.com/openview/f19f718bebf158e5d506a3e5446f6977/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=18750&diss=y> (accessed January 13, 2023).

O'Barr, William M. 2014. *Linguistic Evidence: Language, Power, and Strategy in the Courtroom*. Elsevier.

Schiffrin, Deborah. 1987. *Discourse Markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

United Nations. 1966. *International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR)*. Retrieved from <https://www.equalityhumanrights.com/en/our-human-rights-work/monitoring-and-promoting-un-treaties/international-covenant-civil-and#:~:text=ICCPR%20is%20an%20international%20human,or%20degrading%20treatment%20or%20punishment> (accessed October 6, 2023).

Wadensjö, Cecilia. 2001. "Approaching Interpreting through Discourse Analysis." *Benjamins Translation Library*, 33: 185-198.

Wang, Yibin. 2021. "A Study on the Use of Hesitation Markers in Varied-Level EFL Learners' L2 Speaking Process." *Open Journal of Modern Linguistics*, 11: 823-840. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ojml.2021.115063>.

Yi, Ran. 2023a. "Interpreting the Manner of Speech in Courts: An Overlooked Aspect." *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1209908>.

Yi, Ran. 2023b. "Justice Under Microscope: Analyzing Mandarin Chinese Markers in Virtual Courtroom Discourse." *Discourse Studies*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/14614456231197045>.

Yi, Ran. 2024a. "Manner Matters: Linguistic Equity through a Court Interpreter in Australia." *International Journal for the Semiotics of Law*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11196-023-10090-3>.

Yi, Ran. 2024b. "Doing Justice to the Manner: Interpreting Lawyer Questioning for Multilingual Migrants in Australian Virtual Court Proceedings." *Monti*, 16: 415-442.  
<https://doi.org/10.6035/monti.2024.16.13>.

Yip, Moira. 2002. *Tone*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.