



Universiteit  
Leiden  
The Netherlands

## Effect of prosody awareness training on the quality of consecutive interpreting between English and Farsi

Yenkimaleki, M.

### Citation

Yenkimaleki, M. (2017, June 7). *Effect of prosody awareness training on the quality of consecutive interpreting between English and Farsi*. LOT dissertation series. LOT, Utrecht. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/49507>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/49507>

**Note:** To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



The handle <http://hdl.handle.net/1887/49507> holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation

**Author:** Yenkimaleki, Mahmood

**Title:** Effect of prosody awareness training on the quality of consecutive interpreting between English and Farsi

**Issue Date:** 2017-06-07

**EFFECT OF PROSODY AWARENESS  
TRAINING ON THE QUALITY OF  
CONSECUTIVE INTERPRETING  
BETWEEN ENGLISH AND FARSI**

Published by  
LOT  
Trans 10  
3512 JK Utrecht  
The Netherlands

phone: +31 30 253 6111

e-mail: [lot@uu.nl](mailto:lot@uu.nl)  
<http://www.lotschool.nl>

Cover illustration: Schematic representation of consecutive interpreting

ISBN: 978-94-6093-241-0

NUR 616

Copyright © 2017: Mahmood Yenkimaleki. All rights reserved.

**EFFECT OF PROSODY AWARENESS  
TRAINING ON THE QUALITY OF  
CONSECUTIVE INTERPRETING  
BETWEEN ENGLISH AND FARSI**

PROEFSCHRIFT

ter verkrijging van  
de graad van Doctor aan de Universiteit Leiden,  
op gezag van Rector Magnificus prof. mr. C.J.J.M. Stolker,  
volgens besluit van het College voor Promoties  
te verdedigen op woensdag 7 juni 2017  
klokke 13.45 uur

door

MAHMOOD YENKIMALEKI

geboren te Tafresh, Iran  
in 1975



Promotores: Prof. dr. Vincent J. van Heuven  
Prof. dr. Niels O. Schiller

Promotiecommissie: Prof. dr. Kees de Bot (University of Pannonia)  
Prof. dr. Bernhard Hommel (Fac. Sociale Wetenschappen)  
Prof. dr. Maarten Mous  
Prof. dr. Frieda Steurs (INT, Leiden)





# Contents

<b>Contents</b>	vii
<b>Acknowledgments</b>	xi
<b>Chapter one: General Introduction</b>	1
1.1 About the dissertation	1
1.2 Training future interpreters	3
1.3 Prosody awareness and interpreting	4
1.4 Teaching prosody to interpret	5
1.5 The issue of directionality	6
References	7
<b>Chapter two: Interpreting and its pedagogy: Some prominent issues</b>	9
Abstract	9
2.1 Introduction	10
2.2 A typology of interpreting	12
2.3 Modes of interpreting: consecutive and simultaneous interpreting	12
2.4 Pedagogy of interpreting	13
2.5 The interpreting process	15
2.6 Omission in interpreting	16
2.7 Input and output in interpreting	17
2.8 Prosody	18
2.9 Prosody awareness training and the quality of interpreting	19
References	21
<b>Chapter three: Effects of teaching prosody awareness on consecutive interpreting from English into Farsi</b>	25
Abstract	25
3.1 Introduction	26
3.2 Phonetics and interpreting	27
3.3 Prosodic consciousness in message perception	27
3.4 Stress	28
3.5 Method	30
3.5.1 Participants	30
3.5.2 Procedures	30
3.6 Results	34
3.6.1 Effect of training program	34
3.6.2 Specific effects of awareness training on prosodic components of test	39
3.6.3 Predicting consecutive interpreting performance by multiple regression	40
3.7 Conclusion	41
References	44

<b>Appendices to Chapter three</b>	49
A 3.1 Side-by-side comparison of training program for experimental and control groups.	50
A 3.2 Information about the TOEFL test which has been applied.	86
A 3.3 Sample questions of summative test for control group and experimental group.	87
A 3.4 Three audio extracts which were evaluated by raters.	88
A 3.5 An ideal model for interpretation for three extracts which have been evaluated.	89
<b>Chapter four: Effects of prosody teaching on developing word recognition skills for interpreter trainees</b>	91
Abstract	91
4.1 Introduction	92
4.2 Stress	93
4.3 Research question	94
4.4 Method	94
4.4.1 Participants	94
4.4.2 Procedure	95
4.4.3 Data analysis	96
4.5 Results	96
4.6 Conclusion	100
References	100
A 4.1 Stimuli for word recognition test	103
<b>Chapter five: Effects of explicit teaching of prosodic features on the development of listening comprehension by Farsi-English interpreter trainees</b>	105
Abstract	105
5.1 Introduction	106
5.2 Research question	108
5.3 Method	108
5.3.1 Participants	108
5.3.2 Procedure	108
5.3.3 Data analysis	109
5.4 Results	109
5.5 Conclusion	113
References	113
<b>Chapter six: Effects of explicit teaching of segments versus prosody on listening comprehension in English by Iranian learners</b>	117
Abstract	117
6.1 Introduction	118
6.2 Methodology	120
6.2.1 Participants	120
6.2.2 Procedure	120
6.3 Results	122
6.4 Conclusion	123

References	125
<b>Chapter seven: Objective correlates of the quality of interpreting</b>	127
Abstract	127
7.1 Introduction	128
7.2 Objective measures used	129
7.2.1 Count measures	129
7.2.2 Acoustic measures of pace	130
7.3 Results	132
7.3.1 Count measures	132
7.3.2 Acoustic measures	134
7.3.3 Disfluencies	138
7.3.4 Predicting pace from multiple correlates of fluency	141
7.4 Conclusions and discussion	144
References	147
<b>Chapter eight: Effects of prosodic feature awareness training on consecutive interpretation from Farsi into English</b>	149
Abstract	149
8.1 Introduction	150
8.2 Research question	152
8.3 Method	152
8.3.1 Participants	152
8.3.2 Procedures	153
8.3.3 Data analysis	155
8.4 Results	155
8.5 Conclusion	163
References	165
<b>Chapter nine: Effects of directionality on consecutive interpreting between English and Farsi</b>	169
Abstract	169
9.1 Introduction	170
9.2 Methodological considerations	171
9.3 Summary of methods	173
9.3.1 Participants	173
9.3.2 Materials	173
9.3.3 Procedures	173
9.4 The effect of directionality in consecutive interpreting	175
9.6 Conclusion and discussion	181
References	183
<b>Chapter ten: Prosody training for interpreters: Does methodology matter?</b>	187
Abstract	187
10.1 Introduction	188
10.2 Method	190
10.2.1 Participants	190
10.2.2 Procedure	190

10.3	Results	191
10.4	Conclusion	198
	References	199
<b>Chapter eleven: Conclusion</b>		203
11.1	Introduction	203
11.2	Summary of main findings	203
11.3	General discussion and implications	206
11.4	Prosodic feature awareness training	211
11.5	Shortcomings and suggestions for further research	212
	References	213
<b>Summary</b>		217
<b>Samenvatting</b>		221
<b>خلاصه</b>		227
<b>Curriculum Vitae</b>		231

# Acknowledgments

I would like to express my gratitude and thanks to my first promotor, Prof. dr. Vincent van Heuven, for his support, insightful comments, constant encouragement and inspiration. He really taught me to develop a critical view towards my field of science.

I am also most grateful to my second promotor, Prof. dr. Niels Schiller, for the support and guidance he gave to my studies at LUCL. Your inspirational ideas were perfect for this dissertation and (generally) in LACG meetings for all the students at LUCL.

I would also like to thank members of my dissertation committee, professors Kees de Bot, Bernard Hommel, Maarten Mous and Frieda Steurs, for their comments and suggestions for improvement of this study.

I would also like to thank all LUCL members for their help whenever I needed it and for providing a friendly atmosphere to work at the Leiden University Centre for Linguistics.

I am most grateful to the management board of Leiden University, LUCL, and UAF (University Assistance Fund) for financial support. You helped me to survive in the Netherlands.

Leiden, April 2017

