

Case-based learning for public service interpreting: Designs and procedures

1. Introduction

Public service interpreting (or alternatively “community interpreting” and “liaison interpreting”¹) refers to “oral and signed communication that enables access to services for people who have limited proficiency in the language of such services” (ISO13611, 2014). Public service interpreting (PSI) usually takes place in schools, hospitals, courts, police stations, community service centers, and churches (Tipton & Furmanek, 2016). While there is an increasing demand of PSI prompted by greater worldwide mobility, PSI training has been deemed insufficient (De Pedro Ricoy, 2010), with a much smaller number of stand-alone programs or courses, compared to those in conference interpreting. This is one of the reasons why public service interpreters have not achieved a professional status comparable to conference interpreters (Vargas-Urpi, 2016; Wu, 2016). As such, D’Hayer (2013) aptly pointed out that “[t]he curriculum design strategies, the teaching and learning approaches are the initial key to the professionalization” of PSI (p. 327).

A survey of existing literature on PSI education shows that scholarly interests revolve around three themes, corresponding to the tripartite distinction of *approaches*, *designs*, and *procedures* in a pedagogy (Kiraly, 2000). An *approach* reflects the fundamental conceptualization of a subject domain (e.g. what is a language) and the learning of the subject domain (e.g. what is language learning). For instance, in the context of PSI education, a “discourse-analytical approach to interpreting” (Niemants & Cirillo, 2017, p. 6) sees meaning as being co-constructed by participants within the interpreter-mediated communication. Thus, the pedagogies undergirded by this approach do not give primacy to the cognitive skills (e.g. short-term memory), but rather to the analytical skills that help capture and negotiate the interactional dynamics in PSI (Valero-Garcés, 2008). Guided by the fundamental conceptualizations of a subject domain, a pedagogical *design* more concretely deal with learning goals, curricular, syllabi, teaching

¹ In this chapter, the three terms are used interchangeably as they are widely used in the literature (Niemants & Cirillo, 2017).

methods, teacher and learner roles, and teaching materials. For instance, De Pedro Ricoy (2010) described the PSI curriculum designs in the UK, explaining the component skills and topics in the training programs. In PSI classrooms, teachers are advised to assume the role of a facilitator (D’Hayer, 2013), “guiding the students in their interactions and shared knowledge building” (Skaaden, 2017, p. 330). Informed by the approaches and designs, teaching *procedures* (such as teaching practices, techniques, and activities) are orchestrated and enacted in PSI classrooms. Some commonly used teaching activities include role playing (e.g. Angelelli, 2017), teacher-facilitated discussion (e.g. Davitti & Pasquandrea, 2014), and analysis of discourse markers (Major, Napier, & Stubbe, 2012).

In light of existing literature, this chapter focuses on the *design* and *procedure* of a PSI course at a university in Hong Kong. While previous studies have stressed the importance of using authentic materials (e.g. transcript of interpreter-mediated communication) in PSI education (D’Hayer, 2013; Major et al., 2012), more information is needed to guide teachers to present these materials in a principled way in order to develop the target skills (e.g. analytical and critical thinking) necessary for professional development. To this end, this chapter introduces a case-based learning design so that real-life PSI cases are presented to students in a four-stage sequence (see Section 2 for details). Additionally, this chapter explains three types of metacognitive scaffolds that can potentially help students become “discourse analysts” (Roy, 2000, p. 22). These scaffolds are integrated into teacher-facilitated classroom discussion (see Section 4 for details) as concrete instantiations of the case-based learning design. In the following sections, I will first explain the notion of “case-based learning” and then delineate the four stages of implementing this design in PSI education. In Section 3, I will describe the contextual particularities of the focal PSI course and explain how the case-based learning design is materialized in the course. Building on this, in Section 4, I will demonstrate how three metacognitive scaffolds are deployed to engage students in critical discussions of “rich points” (Ribas & Vargas-Urpi, 2017), i.e. potential issues that challenge students to propose and deliberate different solutions in PSI settings.

2. Case-based learning

Case-based learning (CBL) is a pedagogical approach that uses authentic, real-life cases to develop students' professional skills and knowledge (Thistlethwaite et al., 2012). CBL engages students in an active inquiry process of making sense of a case that promises pedagogical values, theoretical possibilities, and real-life implications. Typically, in CBL, instructors assume the role of a facilitator and guide students to conceptualize and analyze issues inherent in cases. The purpose of CBL is not to find out correct answers to case issues, but to develop students' abilities to discern and disengage the complex intricacies inherent in real-life cases so that they are prepared for similar and/or dissimilar situations in their professional life. Previous studies have shown that CBL contributes to student engagement, critical thinking skills, learning motivation, and learning outcomes (McMellon, 2013; Raza, Qazi, & Umer, 2019). Because of these benefits, CBL is widely used in medical education (Thistlethwaite et al., 2012) and business education (McMellon, 2013). In fact, CBL has great potentials to be applied to PSI education because PSI skills and knowledge are simultaneously contextualized and abstract. That is, CBL can engage students in both inductive and deductive reasoning processes (e.g. from contextual particularities to generalized solutions and from professional norms to specific practices). In this way, students are guided to think about PSI issues from multiple perspectives and develop a sophisticated, systematic understanding of PSI across service settings.

Hansen and Dohn (2019) proposed a four-stage design for case-based learning: (a) gain access to a case; (b) define an issue of inquiry; (c) engage in inquiry; and (d) develop understanding. In the first stage, the teacher directly provides students with a case or offers instructions for students to locate a case. In the context of PSI education, a case can come from transcripts in academic publications (as will be exemplified in this chapter), audio or video-recorded PSI events (e.g. Davitti & Pasquandrea, 2014), and publicly accessible contents (e.g. Pope Francis' homily in the Philippines as a featured case study in Tipton & Furmanek, 2016). These real-life cases guarantee the authenticity of training materials and tasks (D'Hayer, 2013; Major et al., 2012) and offer students rich opportunities to observe and reflect on "naturally-occurring instances of interpreter-

mediated interaction [that] may allow [them] to compare actions which favour participant communication with ones that may impede it” (Gavioli, 2017, p. xii).

In addition to providing access to a case, as a second stage, the teacher needs to define an issue or issues of inquiry relevant to training goals. These issues should challenge students to think deeply about the focal case and connect experiential knowledge with conceptual knowledge. In PSI education, there are multiple issues that are worthy of inquiry and students should be made aware of them. For instance, Ribas and Vargas-Urpi (2017) identify different types of problems or what they called “rich points” including, *inter alia*, lexical issues (e.g. terminology), pragmatic issues (e.g. register), cultural issues (e.g. culture-specific reference), management of the conversation (e.g. long segments), and ethical issues (e.g. interpreters being requested to act outside the conventional role boundaries). The inclusion of “rich points” is motivated by the teaching goals and course contents of the PSI training. In this way, rich points can be the experiential-conceptual linkage between case particulars and professional norms.

In the third stage, students are engaged in teacher-facilitated inquiry. Teachers should guide students to approach the issues of inquiry from multiple, at times conflicting perspectives so that they are sensitized to the complexities of professional practices. In PSI education, a dialogic pedagogy has been proposed to treat teacher-student classroom dialogues as sites of inquiry, where “teachers and learners jointly engage in observing and responding to interactional and professional dilemmas” (Niemants & Stokoe, 2017, p. 296) and where a set of problems, solutions, and choices are considered and contested. In a simple but effective form, teacher-student dialogues can be conducted in a Socratic fashion, in which “assumptions and beliefs” are examined “in a systematic and logical way, primarily by asking searching questions” (Atkinson, 2014, p. 16). In more elaborate forms, teacher-student dialogues can be facilitated by alternative metacognitive scaffolds, defined as “tools, strategies, and guides that engage students in a higher level of regulating their thinking” (Kim & Pedersen, 2011, p. 1781). In Section 4 of this chapter, three metacognitive scaffolds (i.e. question prompts, decision matrixes and the Toulmin’s model of argumentation) will be explained and illustrated with PSI cases.

In the fourth stage, at the end of the inquiry, students develop a sophisticated understanding by (re)organizing and conceptualizing their case experiences. In PSI

education, after teacher-student dialogues in the classroom, a debriefing session can be conducted so that students have opportunities to summarize the perspectives and solutions explored in the case study and verbalize the implications for their future learning and practices. This step can help students take stock of their learning and encourage them to translate what they have learned into practices in their (future) professional careers. In the next section, I will elucidate how the case-based learning design is applied to a PSI course.

3. Context of the course

This chapter features a course called *Advanced Liaison Interpreting* at a university in Hong Kong. It is a postgraduate, elective course, subsequent to two prerequisite courses that focus on basic interpreting skills (e.g. use of short-term memory, note-taking). As such, the focal course does not prioritize language skills or cognitive skills (because they have been dealt with in the prerequisite courses). Instead, the course exposes students to real-life PSI cases and guide them to reflectively and critically analyze these cases. The class meets in a three-hour weekly session for a total of 13 weeks. The course contents are “segmented according to the different public service areas” (De Pedro Ricoy, 2010, p. 105), covering PSI in educational, medical, and legal settings. A discourse-analytical approach is adopted to go beyond mere linguistic features (e.g. accurate and idiomatic rendition) and look deeper into the contextual particularities and participants’ roles in PSI. More specifically, the discourse-analytical approach is reflected in the four-stage case-based learning design. As explained in Section 2, the first two stages involve gaining access to cases and defining issues of inquiry. Table 1 summarizes the issues of inquiry covered in the course as part of the course content. These issues are of great interest to PSI practice, research, and training (as illustrated by the supporting literature in Table 1).

<Insert Table 1 here>

To contextualize these issues, cases (in the form of PSI transcripts) are provided to students before each teaching session. Additionally, to make the issues of inquiry more accessible, a set of question prompts are also provided to draw students' attention to specific instances/issues in the transcripts. Cases are selected from publications featuring varying language combinations (e.g. English-Italian) not limited to the students' A or B languages (Chinese-English). This is done to expose students to the diversity and possible universality across cases and milieus. The design of question prompts purports to draw out the "rich points" (Ribas & Vargas-Urpi, 2017) in the focal cases (see Section 4 for details).

During teaching sessions, students are engaged in active inquiry revolving around the rich points inherent in and/or emergent from the question prompts. The inquiry is conducted in the form of teacher-facilitated discussions (Skaaden, 2017). Importantly, the goal of teacher-student dialogues is not to find out the right answers to the questions. In fact, the questions do not have simple, clear-cut answers and thus need to be approached "as a set of dilemmas to consider, concepts to think about, commitments to pursue and balance, and practices to add to students' current repertoires" (Angelelli, 2017, p. 36). To facilitate students' inquiry, metacognitive scaffoldings are used so that students can grapple with the complexities of PSI cases and develop a sophisticated understanding of the issues of inquiry. These are the final two stages of the case-based learning design. In the following sections, three metacognitive scaffolds are exemplified.

4. Metacognitive scaffolds in the case-based learning design

As explained in Section 2, metacognitive scaffolds are pedagogical "tools, strategies, and guides" to facilitate students in the process of higher level of thinking (Kim & Pedersen, 2011, p. 1781). Carefully designed metacognitive scaffolds can draw students' attention to specific issues and guide them to think deeper about these issues. In PSI education, students may be overwhelmed by the contextual particularities and lose sight of a bigger issue at hand. Thus, in the following subsections, three metacognitive scaffolds are exemplified to facilitate students' analytical and critical thinking of PSI issues.

4.1 Question prompts

To assume the role of a facilitator in the PSI classroom, a teacher should ask, not answer questions (Skaaden, 2013). Open-ended questions create problem spaces for students' reflection. The design of question prompts for the case analysis is based on three types of reflection: *descriptive*, *comparative*, and *critical* (Jay & Johnson, 2002). Questions that focus on *descriptive* reflection draw students' attention to a particular instance or instances and ask them to think about the rhetorical function and/or significance in the triadic communication. Questions that prompt *comparative* reflection require students to compare different instances, renditions, and scenarios so that they are aware of the complex, dynamic nature of PSI. Questions that promote *critical* reflection challenge students to evaluate the solution presented in the case and propose their own solutions to further the communicative goals in the featured PSI setting.

To illustrate, Extract 1 (teacher-parent meeting) is included here. Students are given the transcript, adapted from Davitti (2013). Additionally, they are provided with three sets of questions to reflect on the case from multiple perspectives:

1. In Turn 3, what pronoun does the mother use? In Turn 4, what pronoun does the interpreter use? Do these pronouns have any impact on the communication?
2. The interpreter does not interpret the mother's utterance for the teacher, but instead takes initiative to respond to it (Turn 4). How do you think of this (non-)rendition?
3. At the end of Turn 4, the interpreter adds something not found in the teacher's original utterances. Is this acceptable to you? Why?

The three sets of question prompts feature varied combinations of descriptive, comparative, and critical reflections on the issues of inquiry (i.e. the first group of questions on communicative goals, the second group on the principle of transparency, and the third on the principle of impartiality). To elaborate further, within the first group of questions, students are asked to describe and compare the rhetorical effects of the pronoun shift (from "one" to "he"). Based on this, they are invited to come up with critical solutions to this potential communication issue.

Extract 1. Teacher-parent meeting in Italian and English (adapted from Davitti, 2013, p. 182)

- 1 Teacher there's no penalty for having done the exams and then doing them again next year so
- 2 Interpreter *sicuramente non c'è una una penale una una punizione per aver fallito all'esame e aver e ridarli'anno prossimo*
surely there is not a penalty a a punishment for failing the exam and having and trying them again next year
- 3 Mother *si può ripetere*
one can repeat it
- 4 Interpreter *può ripeterli tranquillamente poi li passa*
he can repeat it **easily then he passes them**

In addition to designing questions prompts for one single case (transcript), descriptive, comparative, and critical questions can be raised across multiple cases. For instance, Extracts 2, 3 and 4 (healthcare interpreting in the contexts of Italy and Hong Kong) are provided to students, along with the following question prompts:

1. In Extract 2 and Extract 3, the interpreters interpret the doctor's questions and then ask some more questions. What purposes do these extra questions serve? Do you find these extra questions acceptable? Why?
2. In Extract 2, Turn 2, the interpreter renders the doctor's utterance more explicitly ("tell me now" vs. "what's your problem now"). In Extract 3, Turn 2, the interpreter uses a more general term ("doctor") versus a specific term ("pediatrician" in Turn 1). In Extract 4, Turn 4, the interpreter uses "sugar" rather than the original technical term in the doctor's utterance ("glucose" in Turn 1). To what extent are these instances of register shift justified?
3. What are the interpreters' roles in these three cases? To what extent are they similar with (or different from) each other? Do you think the interpreters in these cases are professional? Why?

The design of these three sets of questions is closely related to the issues of inquiry. Specifically, the first set of questions is about communicative goals and role boundaries. The second set focuses on terminologies, and the third set prompts students to reflect on professional norms versus practices.

Extract 2. Healthcare interpreting in Italian and English (adapted from Baraldi & Gavioli, 2014, pp. 341-342)

- 1 Doctor *allora dimmi adesso*
so tell me now
- 2 Interpreter so what's your problem now?
- 3 Patient my heart is worrying me, my heart
- 4 Interpreter how is it worrying you?
- 5 Patient ehm, my heart is
- 6 Interpreter beating faster?
- 7 Patient yes, yes, beat fast, fast, fast.
- 8 Interpreter or you feel pain?
- 9 Patient ye-yes, I feel pain.
- 10 Interpreter it beats faster?
- 11 Patient Yes.
- 12 Interpreter *eh, ha il cuore che batte forte. Ha anche dolore dice.*
erm, he's got his heart beating fast. He also feels pain he says.
- 13 Doctor *da quanto?*
since when?

Extract 3. Healthcare interpreting in Italian and English (adapted from Baraldi & Gavioli, 2014, p. 346)

- 1 Doctor *il pediatra ce l'hanno già?*
have they already got their **pediatrician**?
- 2 Interpreter have you chosen any **doctor** already?

- 3 Patient yeah
- 4 Interpreter OK. What's the name?
- 5 Patient I don't know
- 6 Interpreter but you have the card with you?
- 7 Patient no it is at home
- 8 Interpreter at home. OK.
- L'hanno già scelto*
- they have chosen that already.
- 9 Doctor *comunque l'hanno già scelto*
- anyway they have chosen that
- 10 Interpreter *sì sì*
- yes yes
- 11 Doctor OK

Extract 4. Healthcare interpreting in Punjabi and English (adapted from Leung, 2020, p. 276)

- 1 Doctor He had his blood checked on 9th May. We checked **glucose**, lipids and also his adrenal function. The adrenal function test was normal.
- 2 Interpreter *Twahdda inhan ne may noo laiya ni test nau may noo wo thik hai 'twahdda*
- They took a blood test on 9th May; it is alright.
- 3 Patient *Sugar thik hai sara?*
- Sugar is alright all?
- 4 Interpreter *Thik hai sugar thik hai.*
- It's alright; **sugar** is OK

In the later stage of the *Advanced Liaison Interpreting* course, question prompts can guide students to think about PSI cases across settings. For instance, when Extract 5

(court interpreting) is provided to students, the following questions are designed to critically compare PSI contexts:

1. In Extract 1, Extract 2, and Extract 5, what pronouns are used by the interpreters to represent the speakers?
2. In these three extracts, pronoun shifts are noticeable. How do they differ from each other? Think about the possible motivations and consequences of the pronoun shifts.
3. It is a widely held professional norm to interpret in the first-person. To what extent do you think this norm can be more flexible in the three cases?
4. Building on the analysis of pronouns, how do you think the power structures and communicative goals differ across the educational, medical, and legal settings? What implications can be drawn for interpreters navigating these PSI settings?

These four sets of questions are in common with the previous ones outlined above in that they are descriptive (question 1), comparative (question 2) and reflective (questions 3 and 4). However, they are less specific because students are not told where and how pronouns are shifted. Thus, they need to locate specific instances on their own and describe the patterns across the educational, medical, and legal settings. This design at the later stage of the course is to provide opportunities for students to apply what they have learned in new PSI cases.

Extract 5. Court interpreting in English and Cantonese (adapted from Ng, 2018, p. 155)

- | | | |
|---|-------------|---|
| 1 | Judge | Er well, you are eligible for the Duty Lawyer Scheme. And I would as you are pleading not guilty, er I would uh advise you uh to retain the services for the trial. |
| 2 | Interpreter | 其實你呢係有資格可以用當值律師嘅服務㗎，既然你宜家不認罪吓，法官就話你最好都係呢，係審訊嘅時候，聘請當值律師代表你。 |

In fact, you are eligible for the duty lawyer service. Since you have pleaded not guilty, the judge said it's better for you to hire a duty lawyer to represent you at the trial.

- 3 Defendant *Er* 我自己搵律師。
Uh I'll find a lawyer myself.
- 4 Interpreter I'll get a lawyer myself.

4.2 Decision matrix

A decision matrix is a tool to evaluate different aspects (decision points) of several options. A decision matrix has two typical forms: unweighted and weighted. In the unweighted form, equal weighting is assumed for all decision points. For instance, in Tables 2, four PSI contexts and their exemplar events are compared to determine the level of difficulty of these PSI contexts. Three aspects are considered: public (the extent to which the event is publically accessible), technical (the extent to which terminologies are opaque), and interactive (the extent to which interaction is back-and-forth). It is important to note that the values in the cells are subjective and relative. A student may think legal terms are more technical than medical terms, so she assigns value "2" to the legal context and "3" to the medical context. Others may disagree and have different perceived levels of technicality for legal and medical terms. Regardless of the particular values, Table 2 offers a way to describe and compare different PSI contexts from three aspects, the sum of which indicate the difficulty of possible job assignments.

<Insert Table 2 here>

In a weighted form, a decision matrix specifies the weighting of each decision point (see Table 3). Again, weightings are subjective and relative. Comparing Table 2 and Table 3, we find that the results are somewhat different. In Table 2, legal and religious contexts are considered most difficult. In Table 3, after weightings are factored, legal contexts are considered most difficult. It is important to reiterate that these numeric values are for illustrative purposes only. In this way, students can articulate their feelings

and opinions about PSI contexts and see how contexts can influence interpreters' decision-making.

<Insert Table 3 here>

In addition to the two typical forms presented previously, a decision matrix can do without numeric values. For instance, Salisbury, Goff and Blitz (2019) proposed a decision matrix with three components (i.e. decision points, underlying concepts and guiding questions) to compare two assessment tools for school leadership. In PSI education, this alternative form has two advantages. First, it is integrated with the metacognitive scaffold (i.e. question prompts) demonstrated in Section 4.1, thus providing additional metacognitive supports for students. Second, it maps questions to decision points and to underlying issues of inquiry, which enables students to develop systematic ways of reflecting on PSI cases. For instance, in relation to Extracts 1, 2 and 5 (corresponding to the educational, healthcare and legal settings), students are asked to think about the professional norm of interpreting in the first person. During the classroom discussion, the teacher can further guide students' analysis with the help of a decision matrix (see Table 4) that approaches the issue from three aspects (i.e. decision points). In the matrix, relevant underlying issues of inquiry and more detailed guiding questions are presented to help students evaluate pronoun shifts in light of professional norms and contextual practices. The decision matrix engages students in active inquiry of the relationship between practices as they are and as they should be, thus allowing students to deliberate how "rules or standards" might not be independent "from one situated practice to another...or from one setting to another" (Angelelli, 2020, p. 117).

<Insert Table 4 here>

Whether in typical or alternative forms, the primary purpose of a decision matrix is to engage students in a systematic, structured decision-making process. Instead of solely relying on either their intuition or inflexible standards of practice, students can use a decision matrix as a metacognitive scaffold to explore and reflect on the "fluidity and

dynamism” in a variety of PSI contexts (Tipton & Furmanek, 2016, p. 10). In this way, students will be able to understand that professional PSI practices shall not be subjected to intuitive responses or dictated by rigid norms, but shall be the results of a series of informed and balanced decision making.

4.3 Toulmin’s Model of Argumentation

The Toulmin’s model of argumentation contains three primary elements: data, warrant, and claim (Toulmin, 2003). Data are facts, grounds, and evidence to support a claim (which can be an assertion, an argument, or a thesis). Warrant is the justification that links data to the claim. To use a daily-life example, the evidence (“Jack was born into the Smith family”) can be used to support the claim that “Jack is red-haired” because of the warrant (“Red hair is the trademark of the Smiths”). The Toulmin’s model has three other elements: backing, rebuttal, and qualifier (Toulmin, 2003). Backing offers additional support to establish the relevance and validity of the warrant. Rebuttal explores exceptions that might undermine the claim. Qualifier modifies the claim to avoid absolute statements. To continue with the previous example, the backing to further support the warrant can be “All Jack’s brothers are red-haired.” However, a rebuttal may be “Jack has dyed his hair or has gone white,” which leads to the qualifier (“so, almost certainly”) (see Table 5, cf. Toulmin, 2003).

<Insert Table 5 here>

After students are familiar with the Toulmin’s model of argumentation, the teacher can exploit its heuristic values in discussing PSI cases. For instance, in relation to Extract 1 (parent-teacher meeting), students are asked to deliberate the extra comments made by the interpreter. Students may offer various opinions and statements. The teacher can ask them to organize their observation, reasoning, and propositions around the six components. Table 6 offers a possible line of argument to critically evaluate the acceptability (i.e. the claim) of the interpreter’s additional comments (i.e. the data) in light of the principle of impartiality (i.e. the warrant) and consequence of non-compliance of the principle (i.e. the backing). Importantly, the model also prompts students to

consider possible scenarios in which the interpreter's behaviors are justified (i.e. the rebuttal) so that the claim is made in relative, not absolute terms (i.e. the qualifier).

<Insert Table 6 here>

As a second example, we refer to Extract 2 and Extract 3 (healthcare interpreting) and the related issues about the interpreter asking additional questions. Students can be asked to organize and synthesize their thoughts around the six components of the model. Table 7 presents one way to structure the critical reflection on the interpreter's taking initiative to ask extra questions (i.e. the data) in light of the increased "doctorability"² of the patient's answers (i.e. the warrant), which is made possible by saving unnecessary back-and-forth turns (i.e. the backing). Hence, the increased "doctorability" can justify the interpreter's behaviors as facilitative in furthering the communicative goals (i.e. the claim). However, students are also urged to think about the situations, in which asking additional information may overstep the interpreter's role boundaries (i.e. the rebuttal).

<Insert Table 7 here>

These two examples show that the Toulmin's model of argumentation offers a useful set of heuristics for students to connect their case experience with issues of inquiry inherent in the cases (e.g. the principle of impartiality and the communicative goals). The model, as a metacognitive scaffold, can enable students to approach PSI issues from multiple perspectives and formulate sound, balanced arguments about interpreters' strategies in dealing with PSI issues. An expected outcome of using this model in the PSI classroom is the development of students' analytical and critical thinking skills. Such skills are important for them to consider contextual particularities relative to professional norms and to avoid "the uncritical transfer of codes of conduct and standards of practice across interpreting settings" (Niemants & Cirillo, 2017, p. 2).

² Heritage and Robinson (2006) pointed out that "a doctorable problem is one that is worthy of medical attention, worthy of evaluation as a potentially significant medical condition, worthy of counseling and, where necessary, medical treatment" (p. 58). An interpreter can increase the doctorability of a patient's utterances by soliciting more information that is medically relevant (Baraldi & Gavioli, 2014).

5. Conclusion

As Turner (2005) aptly pointed out, “the ability to reflect critically when we encounter complexity and unfamiliarity is a vital component of professional practice” (p. 48). To train students’ reflective and critical thinking skills to grapple with the complexity in PSI, this chapter proposes a case-based learning design in PSI education. The design features four stages: selecting real-life PSI cases, defining issues of inquiry, engaging students in active inquiry, and developing a sophisticated understanding of PSI. Additionally, three metacognitive scaffolds (i.e. question prompts, decision matrixes, and the Toulmin’s model of argumentation) are integrated into the case-based learning design so that students are sensitized to contextual particularities and guided to reflect on various issues emergent from PSI cases. Hopefully, the pedagogical designs and procedures described in this chapter will function as a set of heuristics for PSI educators to orchestrate their course contents and teaching practices that enable students to become “discourse analysts.” As a positive and promising outcome, they will be keenly aware and critical of the “room for manoeuvre and [the] amount of freedom to make professional decisions” (Hammer & van den Bogaerde, 2017, p. 69).

References

- Angelelli, C. V. (2017). Anchoring dialogue interpreting in principles of teaching and learning. In L. Cirillo & N. Niemants (Eds.). *Teaching Dialogue Interpreting* (pp. 30-44). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Angelelli, C. V. (2020). Community/Public-service interpreting as a communicative event: A call for shifting teaching and learning foci. *Translation and Translanguaging in Multilingual Contexts*, 6(2), 114-130.
- Atkinson, D. P. (2014). Developing psychological skill for the global language industry: An exploration of approaches to translator and interpreter training. *Translation Spaces*, 3(1), 1-24.

- Baixauli-Olmos, L. (2017). Ethics codes as tools for change in public service interpreting: symbolic, social and cultural dimensions. *The Journal of Specialised Translation*, 28, 250-272.
- Baraldi, C., & Gavioli, L. (2014). Are close renditions the golden standard? Some thoughts on translating accurately in healthcare interpreter-mediated interaction. *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer*, 8(3), 336-353.
- Chesterman, A. (2001). Proposal for a hieronymic oath. *The Translator*, 7(2), 139-154.
- D'Hayer, D. (2013). Public service interpreter education: A multidimensional approach aiming at building. In C. Schäffner, K. Kredens, & Y. Fowler (Eds.). *Interpreting in a Changing Landscape: Selected Papers from Critical Link 6* (pp. 321-337). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Davitti, E. (2013). Dialogue interpreting as intercultural mediation: Interpreters' use of upgrading moves in parent–teacher meetings. *Interpreting*, 15(2), 168-199.
- Davitti, E., & Pasquandrea, S. (2014). Enhancing research-led interpreter education: an exploratory study in Applied Conversation Analysis. *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer*, 8(3), 374-398.
- De Pedro Ricoy, R. (2010). Training public service interpreters in the UK: A fine balancing act. *Journal of Specialised Translation*, 14, 100-120.
- Dean, R. K., & Pollard Jr, R. Q. (2011). Context-based ethical reasoning in interpreting: A demand control schema perspective. *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer*, 5(1), 155-182.
- Diriker, E. (2004). *De-/re-contextualizing Conference Interpreting: Interpreters in the Ivory Tower?*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Downie, J. (2017). Finding and critiquing the invisible interpreter—a response to Uldis Ozolins. *Interpreting*, 19(2), 260-270.
- García-Beyaert, S., Bancroft, M. A., Allen, K., Carriero-Contreras, G., & Socarrás-Estrada, D. (2015). *Ethics and Standards for the Community Interpreter. An International Training Tool*. Accessed December 22, 2020.
[https://ddd.uab.cat/pub/reccdoc/2015/218104/Garcia-Beyaert et al 2015 TCii Ethics and Standards.pdf](https://ddd.uab.cat/pub/reccdoc/2015/218104/Garcia-Beyaert_et_al_2015_TCii_Ethics_and_Standards.pdf)

- Gavioli, L. (2017). Foreword. In L. Cirillo & N. Niemants (Eds.). *Teaching Dialogue Interpreting* (pp. xi-xii). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Hale, S. (2008). Controversies over the role of the court interpreter. In C. Valero-Garcés & A. Martin (Eds.). *Crossing Borders in Community Interpreting: Definitions and Dilemmas* (pp. 99-121). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Hammer, A., & van den Bogaerdei, B. (2017). Sign language interpreting education: Reflections on interpersonal skills. In L. Cirillo & N. Niemants (Eds.). *Teaching Dialogue Interpreting* (pp. 63-81). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Hansen, J. J., & Dohn, N. B. (2019). Design principles for professional networked learning in “Learning Through Practice” designs. In A. Littlejohn, J. Jaldemark, E. Vrieling-Teunter & F. Nijland (Eds.). *Networked Professional Learning: Emerging and Equitable Discourses for Professional Development* (pp. 129-146). Cham: Springer.
- Heritage, J., & Robinson, J. (2006). Accounting for the visit: Giving reasons for seeking medical care. In J. Heritage & D. Maynard (Eds.). *Communication in Medical Care: Interactions between Primary Care Physicians and Patients* (pp. 48-87). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- ISO 13611. (2014). *Interpreting – Guidelines for Community Interpreting*. Geneva: ISO.
- Jay, J. K., & Johnson, K. L. (2002). Capturing complexity: A typology of reflective practice for teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 18(1), 73-85.
- Kim, H. J., & Pedersen, S. (2011). Advancing young adolescents’ hypothesis-development performance in a computer-supported and problem-based learning environment. *Computers & Education*, 57(2), 1780-1789.
- Kiraly, D. (2000). *A Social Constructivist Approach to Translator Education: Empowerment from Theory to Practice*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Leung, E. S. (2020). Medical interpreting as an emerging profession in Hong Kong. In E. Ng and I. Crezee (Eds.). *Interpreting in Legal and Healthcare Settings: Perspectives on Research and Training* (pp. 263-286). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Major, G., Napier, J., & Stubbe, M. (2012). “What happens truly, not textbook!.” Using authentic interaction in discourse training for healthcare interpreters. In L. Swabey &

- K. Malcolm (Eds.). *In our Hands: Educating Healthcare Interpreters* (pp. 27-53). Washington: Gallaudet University Press.
- McMellon, C. (2013), New advantages and insights into the living case teaching method: an exploratory study. *Journal of Academy of Business and Economics*, 13(1), 17-24.
- Ng, E. N. (2018). *Common Law in an Uncommon Courtroom: Judicial Interpreting in Hong Kong*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Niemants, N., & Cirillo, L. (2017). Dialogue interpreting: Research, education and professional practice. In L. Cirillo & N. Niemants (Eds.). *Teaching Dialogue Interpreting* (pp. 1-28). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Niemants, N., & Stokoe, E. (2017). Using the conversation analytic role-play method in healthcare interpreter education. In L. Cirillo & N. Niemants (Eds.). *Teaching Dialogue Interpreting* (pp. 293-322). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Raza, S. A., Qazi, W., & Umer, B. (2019). Examining the impact of case-based learning on student engagement, learning motivation and learning performance among university students. *Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education*, 12(3): 517-533.
- Ribas, M. A., & Vargas-Urpi, M. (2017). Strategies in public service interpreting: A roleplay study of Chinese–Spanish/Catalan interactions. *Interpreting*, 19(1), 118-141.
- Roy, C. (2000). *Interpreting as a Discourse Process*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Salisbury, J., Goff, P., & Blitz, M. (2019). Comparing CALL and VAL-ED: An illustrative application of a decision matrix for leadership feedback instruments. *Journal of School Leadership*, 29(1), 84-112.
- Skaaden, H. (2013). No set answers? Facilitating interpreter students' learning in an experiential approach. In C. Wadensjö (Ed). *Training the Trainers: Nordic Seminar on Interpreter Education* (pp. 12-24). Tolk-och översättarinstitutet, Stockholms universitet.
- Skaaden, H. (2017). "That we all behave like professionals" – An experiential–dialogic approach to interpreter education and online learning. In L. Cirillo & N. Niemants (Eds.). *Teaching Dialogue Interpreting* (pp. 323-340). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

- Skaaden, H. (2019). Invisible or invincible? Professional integrity, ethics, and voice in public service interpreting. *Perspectives*, 27(5): 704-717.
- Thistlethwaite, J. E., Davies, D., Ekeocha, S., Kidd, J. M., MacDougall, C., Matthews, P., ... & Clay, D. (2012). The effectiveness of case-based learning in health professional education. A BEME systematic review: BEME Guide No. 23. *Medical Teacher*, 34(6), 421-444.
- Tipton, R., & Furmanek, O. (2016). *Dialogue Interpreting: A Guide to Interpreting in Public Services and the Community*. London: Routledge.
- Toury, G. (1999). A Handful of Paragraphs on 'Translation' and 'Norms'. In C. Schäffner (Ed.). *Translation and Norms* (pp. 9–31). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Turner, G. (2005). Toward real interpreting. In M. Marschark, R. Peterson, & E. A. Winston (Eds.). *Sign Language Interpreting and Interpreter Education: Directions for Research and Practice* (pp. 29-56). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Toulmin, S. E. (2003). *The Uses of Argument*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Valero-Garcés, C. (2008). Hospital interpreting practice in the classroom and the workplace. In C. Valero-Garcés & A. Martin (Eds.). *Crossing borders in community interpreting: Definitions and dilemmas* (pp. 165-185). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Vargas-Urpi, M. (2016). Problems and strategies in public service interpreting as perceived by a sample of Chinese-Catalan/Spanish interpreters. *Perspectives*, 24(4): 666-678.
- Wu, Z. (2016). Towards professionalizing public service translators in China: Education and certification. *New Voices in Translation Studies*, 14, 164-189.

Table 1. Issues of inquiry in the case-based learning design

Issues of inquiry	Explanation	Related literature
Pronoun shifts	Interpreter's (non-)renditions of pronouns that are deviated from the ones in the source utterance	Diriker (2004); Ng (2018)
Terminologies	Domain-specific vocabularies	Leung (2020); Vargas-Urpi (2016)
Norms	Professional norms are "performance instructions appropriate for and applicable to particular situations" (Toury, 1999, p. 14). They represent expectations about "what is conventionally right and wrong, adequate and inadequate" (Toury, 1999, p. 14) for practitioners to "serve prevailing values" (Chesterman, 2001, p. 141)	Downie (2017); Skaaden (2019)
Role boundaries	What a public service interpreter is expected to do in professional norms as compared to what he/she actually does in practice.	Baixauli-Olmos (2017); Vargas-Urpi (2016)
Communicative goals	A teleological (or outcome-based) perspective that facilitates decision-making to deliver the intended outcome(s) of the interpreter-mediated communication	Dean and Pollard (2011); Downie (2017)
The principle of impartiality	The interpreter's stance is expected or perceived not to align with any participant in the event.	Baixauli-Olmos (2017); Hale (2008)
The principle of transparency	"The interpreter should...interpret his or her own utterances whenever he or she has to intervene and speak as the interpreter" (García-Beyaert et al., 2015, p. 9); "the interpreted encounter must be transparent so that everyone knows what is happening at	Chesterman (2001); Ribas and Vargas-Urpi (2017)

any time” (García-Beyaert et al., 2015, p. 18)

Table 2. A decision matrix (equal weightings assumed) about the difficulty of job assignments across PSI settings

Context (PSI event)	Public	Technical	Interactive	Difficulty
Educational (Teacher-parent meeting)	1	1	2	4
Legal (recorded session of police interview)	2	2	3	7
Medical (pre-operation information session)	1	3	2	6
Religious (mass)	3	3	1	7

Table 3. A decision matrix (with different weightings) about the difficulty of job assignments across PSI settings

Context (PSI event)	Public	Technical	Interactive	Difficulty
Weighting	2	1	3	Total
Educational (Teacher-parent meeting)	$1 \times 2 = 2$	$1 \times 1 = 1$	$2 \times 3 = 6$	9
Legal (police investigation recording session)	$2 \times 2 = 4$	$2 \times 1 = 2$	$3 \times 3 = 9$	15
Medical (pre-operation information session)	$1 \times 2 = 2$	$3 \times 1 = 3$	$2 \times 3 = 6$	11
Religious (mass)	$3 \times 2 = 6$	$3 \times 1 = 3$	$1 \times 3 = 3$	12

Table 4. A decision matrix evaluating pronoun shifts in PSI

Decision points	Underlying issues of inquiry	Guiding questions
Referential clarity	Norms	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Does the pronoun shift cause referential confusion?2. Does the deictic shift lead to better referential clarity than sticking to the first-person professional norm?
Visibility of the interpreter	Role boundaries	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Does the pronoun shift unnecessarily project the voice of the interpreter?2. Would the projection of the interpreter's voice overstep his or her expected role boundaries?
Perceived alignment	The principle of impartiality	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Does the pronoun shift lead to an impression that the interpreter is aligning with one party in the communication?2. Does the pronoun shift make both parties' voices better recognized and thus fully and equally represented?

Table 5. An example of the Toulmin's model of argumentation (adapted from Toulmin, 2003, p. 117)

Element	Item
Data	Jack was born into the Smith family.
Warrant (<i>because</i>)	Red hair is the trademark of the Smiths.
Backing (<i>since</i>)	All Jack's brothers are red-haired.
Rebuttal (<i>unless</i>)	Jack has dyed his hair or has gone white.
Qualifier	<i>so, almost certainly</i>
Claim	Jack is red-haired.

Table 6. Acceptability of public service interpreters adding extra comments

Element	Item
Data	The interpreter adds some comments about the boy, trying to comfort the mother.
Warrant (<i>because</i>)	Interpreters are bound by the principle of impartiality.
Backing (<i>since</i>)	Aligning with one participant may affect the trust of the other.
Rebuttal (<i>unless</i>)	In the previous part of the conversation, the teacher has made comments about the boy's ability to easily pass exams.
Qualifier	<i>so, probably</i>
Claim	The additional comments are unacceptable.

Table 7. Acceptability of public service interpreters asking extra questions

Element	Item
Data	The interpreter asks additional questions to solicit information from the patient.
Warrant (<i>because</i>)	These questions increase the “doctorability” of the patient's answers.
Backing (<i>since</i>)	The interpreter controls the flow of turn-taking and saves time.
Rebuttal (<i>unless</i>)	The questions are not routine ones.
Qualifier	<i>so, chances are that</i>
Claim	The interpreter's intervention contributes to the communicative goals.