Exploring expectations of Iranian audiences in terms of consecutive interpreting: A reception study

Elnaz Eftekhar
Shahid Bahonar University of Kerman
Kerman, Iran
eftekhar@ens.uk.ac.ir
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9682-181X

Sima Ferdowsi
Shahid Bahonar University of Kerman
Kerman, Iran
sima.ferdowsi@uk.ac.ir
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4556-5112

Somayeh Baniasad Azad
Shahid Bahonar University of Kerman
Kerman, Iran
s.baniasadazad@uk.ac.ir
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3848-7219

Abstract: Media interpreting is becoming increasingly important due to the rise of international relations, with sport media interviews interpreted consecutively gaining more attention. As these interviews are aimed at ordinary audiences, it is crucial to understand the audience's needs and expectations of optimal consecutive interpreting (CI). However, there has been limited research on interpreting recipients in Iran. The present study aimed to investigate the reception of English-Persian sport media interpreting in consecutive mode among ordinary audiences and trainee interpreters as professional viewers. It focused on three main questions: the first and second ones investigated the expectancy norms of optimal consecutive sport interpreting among ordinary audiences and trainee interpreters, and the third question compared these norms between the two groups. To this aim, a mixed-methods approach and triangulated research design that favored a participant-oriented study was employed. A researcher-made questionnaire and three focus group meetings were held in order to gather the required data. Drawing upon both the descriptive statistics of the gathered data and insights from existing literature, six distinct components have been identified. The results in both groups, demonstrated high scores on expectations related to the 'fluency of delivery'; however, the dimensions of 'pleasant voice' and 'sense consistency with the original message' obtained the lowest scores, respectively. Considering the dimension 'required skills', there was a significant difference between the two groups. The findings shed light on the audiences' expectations and needs of CI in the context of Iran.

Keywords: consecutive interpreting; expectancy norms; media interpreting; reception studies.

1. Introduction

With the advent and widespread use of broadcast mass media, media interpreting (MI), a relatively new practice, has gained attention (Pöchhacker, 2018) and is currently the most comprehensive term encompassing all interpreting activities carried out in broadcast mass media (Dal Fovo, 2020). In recent years, interpreting on television (both public and commercial) has developed quickly and is now frequently seen in sports and entertainment programs, particularly in the form of talk show interpreting (Dal Fovo, 2015).

It is true that media interpreting studies in Iran are still in their early stages and more research is needed in this area. The use of sport media interpreting, in particular, has become increasingly common in Iran, especially in live sports broadcasts, but there is a lack of systematic research on this topic. Overall, more research is needed to better understand the role of MI in Iran and to identify ways to improve the quality and effectiveness of interpreting in mass media broadcasts. For example, considering audience as a crucial component of any media, an important research area in MI is the study of how the audience receives and perceives interpreting. Despite the growing interest in different branches of Reception Studies (RS) in Iran, such as literary reception (Bijani *et al.*, 2014) and reception in Audiovisual Translation (AVT) (Ameri & Khoshsaligheh, 2021; Khoshsaligheh *et al.*, 2019), the study of reception in media interpreting studies remains under-researched.

This study aims to explore the main categories of expectancy norms of consecutive interpreting among ordinary audiences and trainee interpreters in Iran. Specifically, the study intends to identify the features of well-received CI in Persian and compare the expectancy norm criteria of these two groups. Due to the lack of research on reception in media interpreting studies in Iran, investigating the attitudes and opinions of Iranian audiences can provide valuable insights into their expectations and needs.

The study yields valuable insights with implications for both applied and pedagogical contexts, particularly for interpreters, scholars, trainers, trainees, and practitioners. Pedagogically, it underscores the need for tailored training programs, material development, and syllabus design to meet real-world demands. Specifically, there's a call for user-centered interpreting curricula to prioritize the needs of actual users, whether lay or professionals.

The current research aims to address three questions; however, as the first and second questions are qualitative in nature, no hypothesis is formulated for them. This is because qualitative research is typically hypothesis-generating rather than hypothesis-testing, as argued by Heigham and Croker (2009). However, the third question due to its quantitative nature is formulated with a hypothesis.

1. What are the main categories of expectancy norms of CI among ordinary Iranian audiences?;
2. What are the main categories of expectancy norms of CI among trainee interpreters?;
3. Is there a significant difference between the expectations of ordinary Iranian audiences and trainee interpreters?

H1: There is no significant difference between the expectancy norms of CI among ordinary audiences and trainee interpreters.

2. Literature review

2.1 Reception Studies

With the sociological turn in the early 21st century, translation research has expanded from the simple analysis of translation products to investigating the human agents involved in the translation process (Wolf & Fukari, 2007). The concept of reception, which originated in literary studies in the 1960s, was one of the significant areas of focus. It shifted the attention from the text and author to the reader. It is important to note that studying the needs and expectations of audiences in media interpreting studies is just as crucial as it is in literary studies.

The present paper adopts Gambier's (2018) concept of reception, focusing on the perceptions, attitudes, and opinions of interpreting users. This framework includes the '3 Rs', with the third 'R' exploring reception from an attitudinal standpoint, particularly regarding audience preferences and expectations. In AVT literature, based on Gambier (2018) there are three dimensions of reception: Response, Reaction, and Repercussion (3 Rs). Response, studied by psychologists, investigates how viewers decode subtitles, including attention allocation and reading behaviors. Reaction examines shared knowledge for effective communication, analyzing inference processes and comprehension levels, especially with condensed subtitle information.

For Gambier (2018) the Repercussion dimension which is the focus of this study considers both attitudinal and sociocultural factors, exploring viewer preferences and habits within the broader socio-cultural context of AVT. This involves evaluating values and ideologies in audiovisual programs and their impact on viewer interpretation. Understanding these dimensions is vital for crafting translations that resonate with diverse audiences and align with their cultural sensitivities and preferences.

In understanding the reception of translated texts, Suojanen *et al.* (2015) delineate four key avenues of investigation: 'thematic studies', 'experiences and attitudes studies', 'studies on perception and the reading process', and 'public reception and reception statistics'. Each category offers unique insights into how readers engage with translated material and contributes to the development of a comprehensive theoretical framework for translation reception studies. The current research applied the second category related to investigating readers' attitudes and approaches to reading translations. 'Thematic studies' examine specific elements like culture, humor, and language in translations, revealing how readers interpret these aspects and informing translation strategies. 'Experiences and attitudes studies' focus on gauging readers' opinions and approaches towards translated texts. Through methodologies like questionnaires, interviews, or focus groups, researchers probe into the overall user experience, unraveling the subjective responses and attitudes that shape readers' engagement with translations. This aspect of research illuminates the broader context in which translations are received and aids in tailoring translations to meet readers'

expectations and preferences. 'Perception and reading process studies' delve into subconscious reactions using methods like eye-tracking, offering insights into how translations are interpreted and assimilated. 'Public reception and reception statistics' offer a macro-level view, analyzing responses from influential figures and statistical data to understand overall reception trends.

Studies on reception in translation studies have been conducted in different fields focusing on Iranian audiences and readership so far, such as the reception of literary texts; including categorization of fiction translation expectancy norms among ordinary readers (Khoshsaligheh *et al.*, 2020) and among undergraduate readership (Bijani *et al.*, 2014). Studies have also been carried out on how Iranian audiences receive AVT products, including the reception of amateur subtitling (Khoshsaligheh *et al.*, 2019); the reception of Persian dubbing regarding the audiences' preferences and perception of quality standards (Ameri *et al.*, 2018; Ameri & Khoshsaligheh, 2018). The reception studies have also been conducted in video game localization setting exploring user's profile, gaming habits and preferences (Khoshsaligheh & Ameri, 2020). Considering all the mentioned studies, to the best of the researchers' knowledge, no research has yet been conducted on the reception of interpreting in Iran. This represents a gap in the literature that could be addressed through research.

2.2 Expectancy norms

According to Chesterman (1997) 'expectancy norms' are "product norms and are based on acceptability and appropriateness rather than grammaticality, and are established by the expectations of readers of a translation (of a given type) concerning what a translation (of this type) should be like" (1997, p. 64). Expectancy norms allow for 'evaluative judgment' when it comes to translation. To put it another way, readers have a sense of what a proper and acceptable translation should look like. The translation is more likely to receive approval from the reader if the translator conforms to these norms (Munday, 2012).

2.3 Reception in Interpreting Studies

In interpreting studies, researches that survey audience expectations and preferences have been referred to as 'quality in interpreting'. Since the turn of the 21st century, research on audience perceptions of interpreting quality has expanded to include new settings, including the media (Pignataro & Velardi, 2013). Quality is regarded as a fundamental concept in interpreting studies (Becerra & Collados Aís, 2020), and it has been evaluated in interpreting from the early intuitive work of practitioners in the 1950s to more recent interdisciplinary and nuanced studies.

In 2021, Pöchhacker *et al.* (2021) investigated quality assessment in conference and community interpreting, revealing diverse criteria and perspectives. By utilizing various methodological approaches and exemplary studies, the article offers a comprehensive overview of interpreting quality, emphasizing the importance of a unified understanding that considers the viewpoints of interpreters, clients, colleagues, and external observers.

Measuring quality in interpreting can involve targeting different agents, and one of these agents is the audience. This involves examining what the audience expects and their expectancy

norms for optimal interpreting. By understanding audience expectations and preferences, interpreters can strive to meet these expectations and provide high-quality interpreting services. Additionally, evaluating interpreting quality from the audiences' perspective can help to identify areas for improvement and inform interpreter training programs.

The examination of user expectations and the establishment of criteria for evaluating quality in interpreting began in the 1980s. A pioneering study in this field was conducted by Bühler (1986), who presented a set of criteria along with a questionnaire for assessing audience expectations. The questionnaire included two criteria: linguistic (semantic) and extra-linguistic (pragmatic). Since then, Buhler's (1986) criteria have been used as the basis for numerous researches on user expectations in conference interpreting (Becerra & Collados Aís, 2020; Collados Aís *et al.*, 2007; Kopczyński, 1994; Kurz, 1993; Moser, 1996; Pöchhacker, 2012).

Since Bühler's (1986) influential study, several researchers including Kurz (1989, 1993), Kopczyński (1994), Kurz and Pöchhacker (1995), and Moser (1996) have investigated whether different types of audiences may have different expectations in relation to interpreting quality. Following Bühler's (1986) pioneering work, two types of research on interpreting quality have emerged. The first one, which was the primary focus of this study, analyzes the relationship between the characteristics of interpreting and different audiences' perceptions. The second one examines the association between the original speech, the interpreted version, and the interpreting's context. Because of technological advancements, research methods in this field have improved; for example, by using online questionnaires, the studies can cover a wider population as their sample size. For the first time, Chiaro and Nocella (2004) used online questionnaires to collect information about interpreters' expectations around the globe; they applied Bühler's (1968) typology determined to utilize a rank order scale because Bühler's (1968) study failed to identify the least important criteria. The results of studies on the relative importance of quality criteria by various audiences point to a general pattern of preferences, with more importance given to content-related criteria such as sense consistency and completeness than to delivery-related features such as voice and intonation (Becerra & Collados Aís, 2020).

Overall, current studies on interpreting quality assessment and audiences' perceptions acknowledge the evolving ways different stakeholders assess an interpreter's performance, with increased interest in the impact of non-verbal elements and situational factors on audiences' perceptions of interpreter performance (Becerra, 2016). As far as the researchers are aware, no studies or theses conducted in Iran have investigated the topic of reception in consecutive interpreting. Therefore, the purpose of this article is to identify the expectancy norms of ordinary Iranian audiences and trainee interpreters of CI and to compare the opinions of these two groups to determine if there is a significant difference in their preferred expectancy norms.

3. Method

3.1 Design

To explore the reception of CI by Iranian audiences and to offer preliminary empirical findings regarding the relatively unexplored facets of this phenomenon, the current study employed a mixed-methods research design, utilizing both qualitative and quantitative data. The qualitative data was collected through focus group interviews with participants, while the quantitative data was gathered using a self-designed questionnaire instrument. The triangulation of these two data sources allowed for a comprehensive understanding of the phenomenon under investigation. Ethical considerations were taken into account during data collection.

3.2 Participants

This research studied two types of participants: professional and lay viewers. For the purpose of this study, the notion of viewing is defined following Guillory (2000), who presented two sorts of readership: professional versus lay. 'Professional' reading is a type of labor that requires a significant amount of time and resources and is typically compensated by a salary. It is considered a disciplinary activity because conventions of interpretation govern it. As a vigilant activity, there is no pleasure in experiencing professional reading.

On the other hand, nonprofessional or 'lay' reading is done for pleasure and leisure and is limited to a shortage of time and resources. It is also concerned with a solitary experience. Guillory's (2000) dichotomy focused on reading, but it would make it reasonable to classify media interpreting audience similarly. The dichotomy can also be quite useful when considering audience design in reception research, as recommended by some scholars (e.g., Chaume, 2012). Therefore, the professional audience was called 'trainee interpreters', and the lay audience was called 'ordinary audience' in the current study.

In pursuit of accurate research outcomes, logistical constraints led researchers to enlist translation students with interpreting training due to the scarcity of professional interpreters in Iran. However, the novice status of these students poses inherent limitations, potentially affecting data validity. To address this, interviews were conducted with seasoned professional interpreters to supplement data collection. Despite challenges, ordinary audiences still play a crucial role in assessing interpreting quality, offering real-world insights despite their potential limitations in English proficiency and interpreting expertise. In sport media contexts, audience members may lack strong English language skills. Therefore, concerns have been raised regarding the reliability of user judgments, particularly concerning fidelity, due to their lack of access to the source language and interpreting expertise. These considerations are relevant when assessing evaluation criteria provided by trainees, whose ratings may be influenced by their educational background and may not fully align with professional norms or end-user expectations, potentially impacting the assessment of sense consistency with the original message category.

Therefore, for the quantitative phase the ordinary Iranian audiences was selected based on snowball and convenience sampling methods (Dörnyei, 2007), and trainee interpreters were selected based on convenience (Dörnyei, 2007) and criterion (Patton, 2001) sampling methods. Trainee interpreters were English translation students at Shahid Bahonar University of Kerman and were all in their 8th semester. They had enrolled in the Interpreting course and had no experience of interpreting before. Their A-language was Persian, and their B-language was English. The demographic information of the participants (i.e., gender and age) is provided in Tables 1 and 2.

Table 1: Gender of the participants by group

| | | Gender | | |
		Male	Female	Total
Group	Trainee Interpreters	40	46	86
	Ordinary Audience	142	158	300
Total		182	204	386

Source: Authors (2024)

Table 2: Age of the Participants by Group

		N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	
Group	Trainee Interpreters	86	20	25	22.11	1.06
	Ordinary Audience	300	18	65	33.36	10.13

Source: Authors (2024)

For the qualitative phase of the study, three focus group interviews were conducted. The participants were from Kerman and Sirjan with 20 men and 25 women aged 20 to 50 (M=35), using criterion sampling (Dörnyei, 2007). Two groups of interpreter trainees were recruited from Shahid Bahonar University of Kerman, and the ordinary audience group was from Sirjan in Kerman.

3.3 Instruments

3.3.1 Questionnaire

For the quantitative phase, a researcher-made questionnaire was used to gather the required data. As there was no related pre-designed questionnaire, developing a new standardized one was essential. To generate the item pool, the researchers drew on two different sources. To provide as many potential items for the questionnaire, the researchers interviewed five male professional Iranian interpreters to find out the expectancy norms of audiences based on the interpreters' experiences confronting audiences to establish the features of optimal interpreting from the interpreters' point of view. All five interpreters were male, due to the limited availability and scarcity of female interpreters in Iran. The gathered data were analyzed using the "[...] three-level coding system, consisting of open coding, axial (or theoretical) coding, and selective coding" based on

grounded theory (Saldanha & O'Brien, 2013, p. 191). This led to identifying some important and common expectancy norms from the interpreting professionals' point of view.

Secondly, the researchers borrowed some items from ready-made questionnaires in the literature that were somewhat related to the present study (Bühler, 1986; Kurz, 1993; Meak, 1990, as cited in Gregoris, 2016; Moser, 1996; Zwischenberger & Pöchhacker, 2010, as cited in Gregoris 2016). The designed closed-ended questionnaire included 40 items in Persian language. The questionnaire contained two parts: demographic information and main items. The responses were measured by a five-point Likert scale ranging from (1) Strongly Disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) No Idea, (4) Agree, and (5) Strongly Agree.

3.3.1.1 Validity of the questionnaire

After finishing the content analysis of the questionnaire, the researchers used Porsline.ir website to create the web-based questionnaire. Following Couper *et al.* (2001), a progress indicator was specified to show participants how much was left to complete. Moreover, to prevent respondents from skipping a response, the questionnaire was programmed not to deliver an item before the previous one has been answered.

This participant-oriented study (Saldanha & O'Brien, 2013) employed Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) to establish the construct validity of the results. EFA is an advanced statistical procedure – a form of factor analysis – currently employed to determine the construct validity of survey data in the social sciences. It tests whether the collected data fit the measurement model initially hypothesized by the researchers (Schumacker & Lomax, 2004). The questionnaire was sent to five Iranian university professors teaching Translation Studies (TS) for more accurate content validity. After collecting the recommended options and comments, the questionnaire was reconstructed. Then, it was sent to 10 M.A. students of TS for face validity. Through this, the ambiguous parts and ungrammatical sentences were identified and corrected. Finally, the questionnaire was pre-tested and piloted among 30 volunteers from Shahid Bahonar University of Kerman.

In order to identify the underlying structures of the variables, an EFA was used as a reduction method. Factor analysis was also used for the development and validation of the questionnaire. The following steps were taken to conduct the EFA: (a) checking the data set, (b) selecting a factor extraction method, (c) determining the number of factors retained, (d) choosing a factor rotation method, and (e) interpreting the factor solution. The preliminary test of normality for the items showed no deviations from normality. The correlation matrix was used to screen the items. Normally, the coefficients below .3 and greater than .9 should be eliminated. The determinant value of the correlation matrix was 2.20E-007 (= 0.000220), which is greater than the necessary value of 0.00001, indicating no multicollinearity in the data. A Principal Component Analysis (PCA) was conducted on the 44 items with orthogonal rotation (varimax). Table 3 shows the Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin measure verified the sampling adequacy for the analysis, KMO = .802 'superb' according to Field (2009), and all KMO values for individual items were > .71, which is well above the acceptable

limit of .5. Bartlett's test of sphericity χ² (946) = 2705.922, p < .001, indicated that correlations between items were sufficiently large for PCA. The communalities are presented in Appendix A.

Table 3: KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.802
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	2705.922
	Df	946
	Sig.	.000

Source: Authors (2024)

An initial analysis was run to obtain eigenvalues for each component in the data. Six components had eigenvalues over Kaiser's criterion of 1 and in combination explained 42.088% of the variance. Appendix B provides an explanation for the Total Variance.

The scree plot was slightly ambiguous and showed inflexions that would justify retaining all six components. Given the adequate sample size, and the convergence of the scree plot and Kaiser's criterion on six components, this is the number of components that were retained in the final analysis. Table 4 below shows the factor loadings after varimax orthogonal rotation. The items that cluster on the same components suggest that component 1 represents Fluency of delivery, component 2 Required skills, component 3 Sense consistency with the original message, component 4 Pleasant voice, component 5 Rhetorical skills, and finally component 6 Required knowledge. The component correlation matrix is provided below.

Table 4: Component Correlation Matrix

Component	1	2	3	4	5	6
1	1.000	.264	.036	.313	-.054	.233
2	.264	1.000	.060	.176	-.004	.201
3	.036	.060	1.000	-.003	-.007	.039
4	.313	.176	-.003	1.000	-.062	.139
5	-.054	-.004	-.007	-.062	1.000	.003
6	.233	.201	.039	.139	.003	1.000

Source: Authors (2024)

Note. Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
Rotation Method: Oblimin with Kaiser Normalization.

Loadings above .3 were retained. The final rotated correlation matrix shows the component for which each item has the highest loading. Four items (Items 12, 21, 34, and 44) did not show loadings above .3 on any of the six factors. The Rotated factor loadings are presented in Appendix C.

3.3.1.2 Reliability of the questionnaire

In order to estimate the internal consistency of the items in the measurement scale, the scores to the items in each group were entered as the variables in a separate data sheet. Cronbach's alpha (α) was utilized to estimate the coefficient alphas.

Based on the results an acceptable level of reliability was found in measurements. Accordingly, the instrument showed a high level of overall consistency of items (Cronbach's α = .868, Number of items: 40). Moreover, the instrument displayed acceptable reliability coefficients in both groups (trainee interpreters: Cronbach's α = .822) and ordinary audience: Cronbach's α =. 879). The reliability coefficients for each subscale of the instrument are provided in table 5:

Table 5: The reliability coefficients of the six components

Component	Cronbach's α (Number of Items: 40)
Fluency of delivery	.678
Required skills	.709
Sense of consistency with the original message	.687
Pleasant voice	.691
Rhetorical skills	.702
Required knowledge	.683

Source: Authors (2024)

3.3.2 An interpreting video clip

In order to investigate the audiences' reception in CI, one video was downloaded from the Aparat.com website. The video takes fifteen minutes and was a CI sports video interview. It was live broadcast by Islamic Republic of Iran Broadcasting (IRIB) TV3.

3.3.3 Focus group interviews

For the qualitative phase of the study, three focus group interviews were conducted using a semi-structured protocol, which consisted of several leading questions informed by the literature. The interviews took approximately 45 to 60 minutes and were audio-recorded and transcribed. To analyze these qualitative data, thematic analysis was used through which the data were analyzed to identify dominant and main themes (Braun & Clarke, 2006).

3.4 Data collection procedure and analysis

For the quantitative phase of the study the questionnaire was distributed among 300 ordinary Iranian audiences from five main cities in Iran: Tehran, Isfahan, Shiraz, Kerman, and Sirjan. Besides the questionnaire, the interpreting video link and the researchers' instructions were sent to the participants, who were supposed to watch the interpreting video and then fill out the questionnaire. The researchers sent the online questionnaire and the interpreting video link to their relatives and

friends through the WhatsApp mobile application. Then they were asked to send the link to their relatives and friends. The participants' questionnaire responses were submitted directly to the researchers' account on the website survey.porsline.ir.

The second group of participants were interpreter trainees who watched the video in their 'Interpreting' class. After that, the online questionnaire was sent to them via WhatsApp. Having collected the data via the developed questionnaire, the quantitative data were analyzed using the SPSS (version 26) software program through mathematical procedures like scale reliability analysis, EFA, and PCA. Additionally, the qualitative data were transcribed and analyzed based on grounded theory (Strauss & Corbin, 1998).

4. Results

4.1 Quantitative results: survey questionnaire

This study examined six main components of expectancy norms among ordinary audience and trainee interpreters, namely Fluency of delivery, Required skills, Sense consistency with the original message, Pleasant voice, Rhetorical skills, and Required knowledge.

Tests of Normality

The assessment of normality of the data was analyzed via Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk estimates which is presented in Appendix D. The results do not show significant deviations from normality, since the p-values in all cases fall above the significance level of .05. Therefore, it is safe to conduct parametric analyses in terms of normality assumption.

Research Question No.1

In order to investigate the first research question regarding the main categories of expectancy norms of CI among ordinary Iranian audiences, the results were analyzed according to the obtained scores on six dimensions of the utilized questionnaire (see Table 6).

According to the results, the main categories of expectancy norms of CI among ordinary Iranian audiences were 1. Fluency of delivery (M = 4.42, SD = .423), 2. Rhetorical skills (M = 4.28, SD = .524), 3. Required skills (M = 4.09, SD = .433), 4. Required knowledge (M = 4.08, SD = .485), 5. Pleasant voice (M = 4.07, SD = .573), and Sense consistency with the original message (M = 3.82, SD = .487).

Table 6: The main Categories of Expectancy Norms of CI among Ordinary Iranian Audiences

	N	Range	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Variance
Fluency of delivery	300	1.67	3.33	5.00	4.4211	.42353	.179
Rhetorical skills	300	3.00	2.00	5.00	4.2867	.52400	.275
Required skills	300	2.30	2.70	5.00	4.0980	.43315	.188
Required knowledge	300	2.33	2.67	5.00	4.0881	.48586	.236
Pleasant voice	300	3.00	2.00	5.00	4.0756	.57334	.329
Sense consistency with the original message	300	2.50	2.50	5.00	3.8242	.48796	.238
Valid N (listwise)	300						

Source: Authors (2024)

Note. a. Group = Ordinary Audiences

Research Question No. 2

Concerning the second research question regarding the main categories of expectancy norms of CI among the trainee interpreters, the results were analyzed according to the obtained scores on six dimensions of the utilized questionnaire (see Table 7).

Table 7: The main Categories of Expectancy Norms of CI among Trainee Interpreters

	N	Range	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Variance
Fluency of delivery	86	1.17	3.83	5.00	4.4651	.34406	.118
Required skills	86	1.20	3.60	4.80	4.2674	.32009	.102
Rhetorical skills	86	2.25	2.75	5.00	4.2616	.46638	.218
Required knowledge	86	1.44	3.33	4.78	4.1525	.36237	.131
Pleasant voice	86	2.67	2.33	5.00	4.0233	.55728	.311
Sense consistency with the original message	86	1.38	3.13	4.50	3.6686	.33198	.110
Valid N (listwise)	86						

Source: Authors (2024)

Note. a. Group = Trainee Interpreters

According to the results, the main categories of expectancy norms of CI among the trainee interpreters were 1. Fluency of delivery (M = 4.46, SD = .344), 2. Required skills (M = 4.267, SD = .320, 3. Rhetorical skills (M = 4.261, SD = .466), 4. Required knowledge (M = 4.15, SD = .362), 5. Pleasant voice (M = 4.02, SD = .557), and 6. Sense consistency with the original message (M = 3.66, SD = .331).

Research Question No. 3

For investigating the third research question regarding the difference between the expectations of ordinary Iranian audience and trainee interpreters, the results on six dimensions of the utilized questionnaire were compared. While the mean scores showed slight differences, the trends in both groups were virtually the same. Both cases, demonstrated high scores on expectations related to the Fluency of delivery. Also in both cases, the dimensions Pleasant voice and Sense consistency with the original message obtained the lowest scores respectively.

Moreover, in order to explore the differences between two groups regarding their obtained scores on each dimension of the instrument, six Independent-Samples t-test analyses were run which are presented in Appendix E. According to the results, there were not any statistically significant differences between the two groups considering the dimensions fluency of delivery, pleasant voice, rhetorical skills, and required knowledge. Considering the dimension required skills, there was a significant difference between the two groups, $t(384) = 3.372$. Specifically, the trainee interpreters (M = 4.267, SD = .320) assigned higher scores to the required skills compared to the ordinary audience (M = 4.098, SD = .433). Conversely, regarding the dimension sense consistency with the original message, the participants in the ordinary audience group (M = 3.824, SD = .487) assigned higher scores to the dimension compared with the trainee interpreters (M = 3.668, SD = .331) and they were significantly different, $t(384) = -2.777$.

4.2 Qualitative results: focus group interviews

After collecting the data from the focus groups, they were thematically analyzed and six main themes emerged. The first phase of the study also quantitatively confirmed the categorization of the six main themes. In the following, main notes from each of the components are presented.

4.2.1 Component I: fluency of delivery

According to the qualitative data, the participants mentioned this category as one of the most important criteria several times. One of the participants talked about 'fidelity', as one of the subcategories of fluency of delivery, as follows:

> *It was a high-quality interpreting. Fidelity to the words and meaning was also very good. However, occasionally the interpreter lagged behind and forgot some sentences. Perhaps he could have interrupted the coach more often to keep up with the fast pace of the interview. Overall, it was a professional interpreting preserving high level of fidelity.*

Another participant mentioned he was annoyed by lack of 'fluency of delivery': "*The interpreter spoke with anxiety; he was nervous, so he did not interpret some parts, and it was annoying that he could not transfer the main idea fluently*".

One of the features of 'fluency of delivery' is speaking with no interruption. Based on the qualitative data, fifteen participants argued that they were annoyed by incomplete sentences and

interrupting the interviewee. A participant explained: "*It was a good interview; the only problem was that the interpreter did not start rendering on time and interrupted the speaker several times*".

4.2.2 Component II: rhetorical skills

According to the qualitative data, various participants pointed to this category and its subcategories several times. One of the participants mentioned 'rhetorical skills' and 'transferring the speaker's tone of voice and his behavior' through interpreting as two important expectancy norms as follows: "*Overall, the interpreting was good. I liked the interpreter's body language and his rhetorical skills. The interpreter tried to transfer the speaker's exact behavior and emotions. It seemed more natural and preferable to me*".

Regarding the importance of 'rhetorical skills', another participant explained: "*The interpreter should not be stressed; should have high rhetorical skill; should deliver the speech fluently. His body language is not very important but should be in a way that does not distract the audience*".

Considering the importance of 'conveying the exact emotion', one of the participants made the following claim: "*The interpreters' behavior and emotions are very important. The interpreter should follow the speaker's emotion and behavior and put the speaker's tone into every sentence and word he interprets*".

4.2.3 Component III: required skills

The average CI audience evaluated this category and its subcategories as the third most significant expectancy norm. Throughout the focus groups, numerous participants repeatedly mentioned different 'required skills'. They believed that an interpreter should practice and endeavor to get better at these skills. Among all the skills mentioned, the 'stress management' was found to be the most important one. Some of the quotes are mentioned in this section.

> *I think the interpreter was unprofessionally stressed and overexcited. Throughout the last several minutes of the interview, the phrases were either too long or too short. His body language revealed his excitement and anxiousness. However, it should be noted that live interpreting has its own set of issues and difficulties.*

> *The interpreter was distracted and used excessive hand motions. He often interrupted the speaker because he was under too much stress. My understanding was disturbed by such actions.*

> *His voice had a certain stress level, which made his translation vague.*

Some interviewees highlighted the significance of an interpreter's ability to concentrate and memory skills.

> *An interpreter should not be stressed. He should listen carefully. He needs to improve his listening and concentration skills. An interpreter's failure to focus when under stress results in a vague and incomplete interpreting.*

> *The interpreter should be calm and have strong memory skills. He should have been able to concentrate and not interrupt the speaker.*

Some of these 'required skills' are consistent with the professional interpreters' interviews. They were asked to describe the important features of an interpreter based on their experience. Almost all of them pointed to these skills and considered them essential features of an interpreter. One of them explained:

> *An interpreter should have a strong memory and practice to improve it. The skill of multitasking is also important because there are times when an interpreter needs to be able to do several tasks at once. The ability to control stress is essential for an interpreter. When unanticipated circumstances emerge, an interpreter should be able to handle them.*

4.2.4 Component IV: required knowledge

The participants and interpreters in qualitative data both mentioned that an interpreter needs to have a variety of knowledge. Some of them are presented here.

One of the subcategories of 'required knowledge' is 'knowing the audience', which in the present study was considered the fourth criterion of importance. Some of the participants commented on this subcategory as follows:

> *The environment and situation are very important for an interpreter; the interpreter should pay attention to these factors and the audience. The interpreter should consider the audience in his mind and transfer the concepts in a way that the audience understands.*

> *Depending on the context and audience, the interpreter should adjust the translation's difficulty level with the audiences' knowledge.*

> *The interpreter must pay close attention to his audience when interpreting technical concepts. If the bulk of the audience has technical knowledge, he can interpret language as technical as that of the speaker. Nonetheless, if the bulk of the audience does not possess this technical expertise, the interpreter must interpret in a manner that is understandable to the public.*

One of the participants made the following points regarding the importance of 'understanding various accents': "*Understanding various accents is essential. The interpreter must be conversant with various English accents in order to comprehend speakers from different countries*".

4.2.5 Component V: pleasant voice

The ordinary audience of CI considered this category the fifth important expectancy norm with its subcategories. According to the qualitative data, the participants repeatedly underlined the importance of this category several times. Some of the quotations were written here: "*The interpreter should have a pleasant voice, his voice should be energetic and not monotones so that the audience will not get tired. His voice should be lively*" and "*The interpreter must remain focused and not be in a rush. His voice should be pleasant, so as not to bore the audience*".

Having a standard accent was mentioned by different participants as an important criterion. Some of the participants explained:

> The interpreter should speak without an accent; he should speak in standard Persian accent. But he should be familiar with all different accents.

> I don't care what the interpreter is wearing; I care a lot about his accent. The interpreter should be familiar with the various English and Persian accents, but when speaking, he should do it in the standard Persian accent.

4.2.6 Component VI: sense consistency with the original message

Based on the qualitative data, the participants only mentioned some of the subcategories during the focus groups. Several participants made the following points to emphasize the importance of 'completeness of interpretation' and 'accuracy of the content' as follows:

> The interpreter should have patience to faithfully interpret all the concepts, including offensive words, good or bad. He might become anxious because they sometimes translate in real time, but he should remain calm and patient.

> The interpreter should accurately interpret each and every sentence. He might want to take some notes so he won't forget anything. It's crucial to interpret accurately and faithfully.

> The interpreter's mode is very important; I like to see the exact emotions of the speaker in interpreting. I would rather hear a whole interpreting; I want to hear every sentence to be interpreted.

> I think the interpreter should interpret every word spoken; if he skips a sentence, it could negatively affect the entire interpreting process.

> The interpreter should interpret each and every statement; without altering them in any way. He should exhibit the same feelings and nonverbal cues as the speaker.

The qualitative examination of the data also supports the assertion that the target audience favored the 'domestication method'. Several of their statements are presented in this section:

> Sometimes, because of cultural differences, the interpreter may delete some sentences and be unable to interpret the exact sentences. Alternately, change the original sentences to better fit the audiences' cultural norms in order to make the interpreting more comprehensible.

> It is preferable for the interpreter to have the same sense of voice as the speaker while keeping the audience in mind. It is also preferable to domesticate the cultural aspects for a better understanding.

Other subcategories, which primarily related to translation strategies, were not mentioned in the qualitative data. Ordinary audience did not pay much attention to the translation of the grammatical structures or precise terminology; this could be a result of their lack of English proficiency, as noted in the focus group interviews.

5. Discussion

This study sought to provide some insight into the reception of CI focused in Iran based on the attitudes of ordinary audience and trainee interpreters. Applying a mixed-methods research design, it was found that the audiences' expectations could be divided into six categories, namely fluency of delivery, rhetorical skills, required skills, required knowledge, pleasant voice, and sense consistency with the original message. According to the results obtained from six Independent-Samples t-test analyses, there were no statistically significant differences between the two groups considering the dimensions fluency of delivery, pleasant voice, rhetorical skills, and required knowledge. Almost all the six categories, along with their subcategories, were rated important, with some differences of attention to two categories named required skills and sense consistency with the original message. Both the quantitative and the focus group results revealed that the category fluency of delivery was ranked the highest criterion among both participants' groups.

Based on the literature concerning the list of delivery aspects, fluency was the parameter that received the greatest attention from participants (Chiaro & Nocella, 2004; Kopczyński, 1994; Meak, 1990, as cited in Gregoris, 2016; Pöchhacker, 2012; Vuorikoski, 1993). However, fluency of delivery was not considered the most important criterion in all studies (Kurz, 1993; Kurz & Pöchhacker, 1995).

The results of this study align with Kurz's (1993) findings, indicating that fluency of delivery is given greater priority in media interpreting contexts. Kurz's (1993, p. 19) study suggested that quality criteria varied according to the user group; "it may be expected that in other situations- e.g., when interpreting for the media- listeners will rank fluency of delivery higher".

According to the results obtained from six Independent-Samples t-test analyses, there was a significant difference between the two groups considering the dimension required skills. The trainee interpreters assigned higher scores to this component than the ordinary audiences. Based on the demographic component of the questionnaire, the ordinary audience was not familiar with interpreting as a profession compared to trainee interpreters who had completed interpreting training courses. Therefore, they recognized the importance of having the required skills for an interpreter more than ordinary audience. Throughout the focus groups, among trainee interpreters, 'strong memory' and among the ordinary audience 'stress management' were found to be the most important subcategories of this component. This difference can be the result of the trainee interpreters' practice sessions at university; by experiencing the importance of 'memory skills' during real practices, they realized how vital this skill could be for an interpreter. Aligning with the important role of 'stress management' as one of the subcategories of required skills, one of the professional interpreters said: *"As an interpreter, no matter how experienced you are, starting to interpret will always make you nervous."*

The fourth ranked criterion among both groups of participants was required knowledge. According to the qualitative findings, the two groups weighted the subcategories of required knowledge differently. For example, the trainee interpreters highlighted the importance of 'knowing the speaker' rather than 'knowing the audience'. While the ordinary audiences considered 'knowing the audience' more important, which is in line with previous studies indicating that different types

of audience could have different expectations (Kopczyński, 1994; Kurz, 1989, 1993; Kurz & Pöchhacker, 1995; Moser, 1996). This indicates that the ordinary Iranian audience has a more audience-centered reception in CI. The trainee interpreters' emphasis on 'knowing the speaker' corresponds with the professional interpreters' view. They have mentioned different reasons for the importance of this knowledge; an interpreter needs to know, among others, if the speaker has a special accent; speaks fast or slowly; uses lots of technical words in her or his speech; uses a PowerPoint while presenting; uses cultural elements in his or her speech. Another subcategory of required knowledge was 'academic education', which, based on quantitative findings, was ranked fourth by the ordinary audiences. This conclusion contrasts with the qualitative findings of experienced interpreters who paid little attention to 'academic education'.

Surprisingly, the notion among Iranian interpreters that academic education and formal training are not important contrasts with the findings of Pompeu and Cavallo's (2019) study, which emphasized clients' strong preference for specialized professionals with formal qualifications in translation and interpretation. This contradiction suggests a disparity in the professional standards and training of interpreters in Iran. 'Having the knowledge of different accents' was also regarded as important by ordinary audiences and interpreters. The literature emphasizes the significance of accent as well. Nolan (2005, p. 6) clearly states that interpreters require training "[...] to grasp difficult accents" since "[...] even an experienced interpreter can be caught off guard by… and an impenetrable accent" (Nolan, 2005, p. 19).

The fifth category of expectancy norms among both groups was pleasant voice. To the ordinary audiences, 'pleasant voice' and 'lively intonation' were two crucial components that persuaded viewers to stick around until the end of the program. This idea may be related to the nature of consecutive media interpreting, which largely consists of entertainment programs. There was no mention of this category in the qualitative data among trainee interpreters. It may be related to their priorities based on their familiarity with the act of interpreting, as they placed greater importance on rendering ideas and concepts rather than having a pleasant voice.

Surprisingly, when compared to other related studies, the present data contradicted other investigations (Amini *et al.*, 2015; Bühler, 1986; Chiaro & Nocella, 2004; Kopczyński, 1994; Kurz, 1993; Kurz & Pöchhacker, 1995; Marrone, 1993; Meak, 1990, as cited in Gregoris, 2016; Zwischenberger & Pöchhacker, 2010, as cited in Gregoris, 2016). In nearly all previous studies, 'native accent' and 'pleasant voice' were deemed less relevant criteria. This can be attributed to the fact that the content of simultaneous conference interpreting, which was the focus of these studies, is more sensitive than that of media CI. The crucial role of voice in reception has been investigated in various fields of RS, such as Iranian dubbing reception (Ameri *et al.*, 2015, 2018).

The sixth and last category between the two groups was sense consistency with the original message; the ordinary audience group assigned higher scores to this dimension than the trainee interpreters and were significantly different. This category and its subcategories mostly deal with linguistic aspects of interpreting; therefore, it is more related to the content of interpreting rather than its form. Based on the qualitative results, trainee interpreters paid more attention to this category's content and linguistic parameters, such as 'use of correct terminology' and 'correct grammatical usage'. However, due to their lack of English knowledge, the ordinary audiences paid

little attention to the linguistic parameters of interpreting. Surprisingly, the results of this category and its subcategories did not concur with other researches. There are several examples that illustrate this contradiction, as written in the subsequent lines. One such example pertains to the findings of 'cultural mediation' or domestication as one of the subcategories, that did not agree with earlier reception studies in other domains, particularly AVT and literary, conducted in Iran. Considering literary reception, the results of two studies (Bijani *et al*., 2014; Khoshsaligheh *et al*., 2020) revealed that Iranian readers of translated fiction preferred foreignized rather than domesticated translation. In the AVT domain, Ameri *et al.* (2018) conducted a study about reception in Persian dubbing; they found a tendency of the viewership toward a 'foreignization approach' in Persian translation. The results of Khoshsaligheh and Ameri's (2020, p. 15) study about video game users' preferences in Iran revealed that "[...] the gamers were interested in playing localized games that retain the foreignness of the original game through keeping the original culture specific references".

Regarding subtitle reception, the quantitative analysis of Khoshsaligheh's *et al.* (2019) research revealed that the audience preferred a 'foreignizing approach' where the otherness of the program is respected. In contrast with earlier studies mentioned, the results of the current study revealed that Iranian audiences of CI prefer the 'domestication strategy' over foreignization. This finding is in line with the professional interpreters' opinions, who emphasized the significance of audience comprehension on multiple occasions. They stated that one of the most significant requirements of an audience is a rapid comprehension of the utterance.

As was already indicated, the results of the current category did not support earlier studies. Here are several other examples. The results of Amini's *et al.* (2015) study which explored the expectations of Malaysian conference interpreting users revealed that sense consistency with the original message came as the first and most important quality criterion among interpreting users. Another example is about one of the subcategories named 'use of correct terminology', that "[...] plays a fundamental role in the concept of quality and it interacts with other parameters, especially the accurate transfer of meaning and cohesion" (Collados Aís & Becerra, 2015, p. 11); in Kurz's study (1993), participants paid particular attention to the 'use of correct terminology' and 'completeness of interpretation' as two subcategories of this component. Unlike the present study, participants in Kopczyński (1994), Mack and Cattaruzza (1995), Moser (1996), and Chiaro and Nocellas' (2004) research also regarded 'use of correct terminology' as one of the most important criteria.

Another subcategory is 'completeness of interpretation', which was ranked sixth among the trainee interpreters. It can be understood that the trainee interpreters have other priorities than 'completeness of interpretation' in the interpreting process. The literature explained why this finding was reasonable. According to Garzone (2000, p. 115):

> In a target-language-oriented perspective, the function of the translated text and the needs of the recipients prevail over the traditionally accepted norm of completeness of rendition, which is seen as subordinate to ease of reception of the translated text by users (Garzone, 2000, p. 115).

As with the previously mentioned studies, in Bühlers' (1986) study, participants paid particular attention to the 'sense consistency' and 'logical cohesion of utterance', as two subcategories of sense consistency with the original message. Moreover, In Chiaro and Nocella (2004), Kurz (1993), Kurz and Pöchhacker (1995), Meak (1990, as cited in Gregoris, 2016), Pöchhacker and Zwischenberger (2010, as cited in Gregoris, 2016), Pöchhacker (2012) and Vuorikoski's (1995) research regarded sense consistency with the original message as the most important criterion. However, in this study, the criterion was ranked the sixth important expectancy norm among the two groups of participants.

6. Conclusion

The overall goal of this article was to explore the main categories of expectancy norms of CI among ordinary audiences and trainee interpreters in the context of Iran, and to compare the expectancy norm criteria of these two groups. Their expectations were evaluated based on six main categories: Fluency of delivery, Required skills, Sense consistency with the original message, Pleasant voice, Rhetorical skills, and Required knowledge. The results suggested that in both groups, high scores were demonstrated on expectations related to the fluency of delivery, while the dimensions of pleasant voice and sense consistency with the original message obtained the lowest scores, respectively.

Given the (de)limitations of the present study, the findings should be generalized with caution due to the small sample size and nonprobability sampling. Furthermore, the research is delimited to investigating the reception of CI in media setting exclusively, but alternative interpreting modes and settings can also be investigated. The findings of this mixed-methods study have practical and pedagogical implications that can benefit various groups of people involved in the interpreting process. This includes freelance interpreters, interpreter trainers, consecutive interpreters. The suggestions and feedback provided by the participants can be taken into account by these groups to improve their interpreting practices. In terms of the pedagogical implications, the results can be particularly valuable to interpreter trainers and trainee interpreters. Moreover, the findings can be used to develop new user-centered interpreting curricula and shift the focus from inferred readers to actual users, whether they are lay or professional. Material developers can use these results to create more effective and relevant training materials that meet the needs and expectations of real-life interpreting users.

References

Ameri, S., Khoshsaligheh, M., & Khazaee Farid, A. (2015). Investigating Expectancy Norms in Dubbing in Iran: An Exploratory Study. *Iranian Journal of Translation Studies*, *13*(3), 21–37.

Ameri, S., Khoshsaligheh, M., & Khazaee Farid, A. (2018). The Reception of Persian Dubbing: A Survey on Preferences and Perception of Quality Standards in Iran. *Perspectives*, 26(3), 1–17. http://doi.org/10.1080/0907676X.2017.1359323

Ameri, S., & Khoshsaligheh, M. (2018). Exploring the Attitudes and Expectations of Iranian Audiences in Terms of Professional Dubbing into Persian. *Hermes: Journal of Language and Communication in Business*, (57), 175–193. https://doi.org/10.7146/hjlcb.v0i57.106206

Ameri, S., & Khoshsaligheh, M. (2021). An Experiment on Amateur and Professional Subtitling Reception in Iran. *Translation and Interpretation*, 14(2). 2–21.

Amini, M., Ibrahim-González, N., Ayob, L., & Amini, D. (2015). Users' Quality Expectations in Conference Interpreting. *International Journal of Multicultural and Multireligious Understanding (IJMMU)*, 2(6), 1–17.

Becerra, O. G. (2016). Do First Impressions Matter? The Effect of First Impressions on the Assessment of the Quality of Simultaneous Interpreting. *Across Languages and Cultures*, 17(1), 77–98.

Becerra, O. G., & Collados Aís, Á. (2020). Quality, Interpreting. In M. Baker & G. Saldanha (Eds.), *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* (pp. 454–458). Routledge.

Bijani, S., Khoshsaligheha, M., & Hashemia, M. (2014). Categorization of the Fiction Translation Expectancy Norms to Iranian Undergraduate Readership. *Asia Pacific Translation and Intercultural Studies*, 1(3), 210–221. https://doi.org/10.1080/23307706.2014.956982

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using Thematic Analysis in Psychology. *Qualitative Research in psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Bühler, H. (1986). Linguistic (Semantic) and Extra-Linguistic (Pragmatic) Criteria for the Evaluation of Conference Interpretation and Interpreters. *Multilingua*, 5(4), 231–235.

Chaume, F. (2012). *Audiovisual translation: Dubbing.* Routledge.

Chesterman, A. (1997). *Memes of Translation: The Spread of Ideas in Translation Theory.* John Benjamins.

Chiaro, D., & Nocella, G. (2004). Interpreters' Perception of Linguistic and Non-Linguistic Factors Affecting Quality: A Survey through the World Wide Web. *Meta*, 49(2), 278–293. https://doi.org/10.7202/009351ar

Collados Ais, A., Pradas Macias, A.M., Stevaux, E., & Becerra, O .G. (Eds.). (2007). *Evaluación de la calidad en interpretacion simultanea: parametros de incidencia.* Comares.

Collados Aís , Á., & Becerra, O. G. (2015). Quality. In H. Mikkelson, & R. Jourdenais (Eds.), *Routledge Handbook of Interpreting.* Routledge.

Couper, M. P., Traugott, M. W., & Lamias, M. J. (2001). Web Survey Design and Administration. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 65(2), 230–253.

Dal Fovo, E. (2015). Media Interpreting. In F. Pöchhacker (Ed.), *Routledge Encyclopedia of Interpreting Studies* (pp. 408-410). Routledge.

Dal Fovo, E. (2020). Media Interpreting. In M. Baker, & G. Saldanha (Eds.), *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* (pp. 315–320). Routledge.

Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics.* Oxford University Press.

Field, A. (2009) *Discovering Statistics Using SPSS.* Sage.

Gambier, Y. (2018). Translation Studies, Audiovisual Translation and Reception. In E. Di Giovanni, & Y. Gambier (Eds.), *Reception Studies and Audiovisual Translation* (pp. 43–66). John Benjamins.

Garzone, G. (2000). Quality and Norms in Interpretation. In G. Garzone, & M. Viezzi (Eds.), *Interpreting in the 21st Century* (pp. 107–119). John Benjamins.

Gregoris, G. D. (2016). *Voice Quality and TV Interpreting: A Proposal for a Gestaltic Evaluation.* [Doctoral thesis]. *Trieste University*.

Guillory, J. (2001). The Ethical Practice of Modernity: The Example of Reading. In M. Garber, J. Matlock, & R. L. Walkowitz (Eds.), *The Turn to Ethics* (pp. 29–46). Routledge.

Heigham, J., & Croker, R. A. (2009). *Qualitative Research in Applied Linguistics.* Palgrave Macmillan.

Khoshsaligheh, M., Ameri, S., Khajepoor, B., & Shokoohmand, F. (2019). Amateur Subtitling in a Dubbing Country: The Reception of Iranian Audience. *Observatorio*, *13*(3), 71–94. https://doi.org/10.15847/obsOBS13320191439

Khoshsaligheh, M., Kafi, M., & Ameri, S. (2020). Fiction Translation Expectancy Norms in Iran: A Quantitative Study of Reception. *Translation & Interpreting*, *12*(1), 74–89.

Khoshsaligheh, M., & Ameri, S. (2020). Video Game Localisation in Iran: A Survey of Users' Profile, Gaming Habits and Preferences. *The Translator*, *26*(2), 190–208. https://doi.org/10.1080/13556509.2020.1724046

Kopczyński, A. (1994). Quality in Conference Interpreting: Some Pragmatic Problems. In S. Lambert, & B. Moser-Mercer (Eds.), *Bridging the Gap: Empirical Research in Simultaneous Interpretation* (pp. 87–99). John Benjamins.

Kurz, I. (1989). Conference Interpreting – User Expectations'. In D. Hammond (Ed.), *Coming of Age: Proceedings of the 30th Annual Conference of the American Translators Association* (pp. 143–148). Learned Information.

Kurz, I. (1993). Conference Interpretation: Expectations of Different User Groups. *The Interpreters' Newsletter*, *5*, 13–21.

Kurz, I., & Pöchhacker, F. (1995). Quality in TV Interpreting. *Traslatio-Nouvelles de la FIT-FIT Newsletter*, *14*(3-4), 350–358.

Mack, G., & Cattaruzza, L. (1995). User Surveys in SI: A Means of Learning about Quality and/or Raising some Reasonable Doubts. In J. Tommola (Ed.), *Topics in Interpreting Research* (pp. 37–49). University of Turku.

Marrone, S. (1993). Quality: A Shared Objective. *The Interpreter's Newsletter*, *5*, 35–41.

Moser, P. (1996). Expectations of Users of Conference Interpretation. *Interpreting*, *1*(2), 145–178. https://doi.org/10.1075/intp.1.2.01mos

Munday, J. (2012). *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications.* Routledge.

Nolan, J. (2005). *Interpretation: Techniques and Exercises.* Multilingual Matters.

Patton, M. Q. (2001). *Qualitative Research & Evaluation methods.* Sage.

Pignataro, C., & Velardi, S. (2013). The Quest for Quality Assessment Criteria in Media Interpreting. In O. García Becerra., E. Pradas Macías, & R. Barranco-Droege (Eds.), *Quality in Interpreting: Widening the Scope* (pp. 143–164). Editorial Comares.

Pöchhacker, F. (2012). Intepreting Quality: Global Professional Standards. In W. Ren (Ed.), *Interpreting in the Age of Globalization: Proceedings of the 8th National Conference and*

International Forum on Interpreting (pp. 305–318). Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.

Pöchhacker, F. (2018). Media Interpreting from User Expectations to Audience Comprehension. In H. D. Giovanni, & Y. Gambier (Eds.), *Reception Studies and Audiovisual Translation* (pp. 253–276). John Benjamins.

Pöchhacker, F., Barbosa, D. M., Manes, P. R. M., & Costa, P. R. . (2021). Avaliação de qualidade em interpretações de conferência e comunitária. *Cadernos de Tradução*, *41*(2), 354–384. https://doi.org/10.5007/2175-7968.2021.e85317

Pompeu, A. C. M., & Cavallo, P. (2019). Bilinguismo, tradução e interpretação: percepção dos clientes quanto aos profissionais contratados. *Cadernos De Tradução*, *39*(3), 90–110. https://doi.org/10.5007/2175-7968.2019v39n3p90

Saldanha, G., & O'Brien, S. (2013). *Research Methodologies in Translation Studies*. Routledge.

Schumacker, R. E., & Lomax, R. G. (2004). *A Beginner's Guide to Structural Equation Modeling*. Routledge.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of Qualitative Research: Techniques and procedures for Developing Grounded Theory*. Sage.

Suojanen, T., Koskinen, K., & Tuominen, T. (2015). *User-centered Translation*. Routledge.

Vuorikoski, A. (1993). Simultaneous Interpretation – User Experience and Expectations. In C. Picken (Ed.), *Translation – the Vital Link, XIII FIT World Congress, Proceedings* (pp. 317–327). Institute of Translation and Interpreting.

Vuorikoski, A. R. (1995). *Audience Response to Simultaneous Interpreting* [Master's thesis]. Tampere University.

Wolf, M., & Fukari, A. (2007). *Constructing a Sociology of Translation*. John Benjamins.

Appendix A
Communalities

	Initial	Extraction
VAR00001	1.000	0.319
VAR00002	1.000	0.425
VAR00003	1.000	0.557
VAR00004	1.000	0.588
VAR00005	1.000	0.477
VAR00006	1.000	0.440
VAR00007	1.000	0.424
VAR00008	1.000	0.444

VAR00009	1.000	0.573
VAR00010	1.000	0.582
VAR00011	1.000	0.417
VAR00012	1.000	0.311
VAR00013	1.000	0.444
VAR00014	1.000	0.485
VAR00015	1.000	0.325
VAR00016	1.000	0.559
VAR00017	1.000	0.301
VAR00018	1.000	0.392
VAR00019	1.000	0.383
VAR00020	1.000	0.536
VAR00021	1.000	0.218
VAR00022	1.000	0.490
VAR00023	1.000	0.537
VAR00024	1.000	0.409
VAR00025	1.000	0.412
VAR00026	1.000	0.443
VAR00027	1.000	0.433
VAR00028	1.000	0.322
VAR00029	1.000	0.324
VAR00030	1.000	0.341
VAR00031	1.000	0.523
VAR00032	1.000	0.398
VAR00033	1.000	0.513
VAR00034	1.000	0.079
VAR00035	1.000	0.323

VAR00036	1.000	0.415
VAR00037	1.000	0.483
VAR00038	1.000	0.449
VAR00039	1.000	0.413
VAR00040	1.000	0.315
VAR00041	1.000	0.481
VAR00042	1.000	0.401
VAR00043	1.000	0.611
VAR00044	1.000	0.204

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Appendix B
Total Variance Explained

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings[a]
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total
1	8.692	19.754	19.754	8.692	19.754	19.754	6.508
2	2.591	5.889	25.643	2.591	5.889	25.643	4.625
3	2.041	4.638	30.281	2.041	4.638	30.281	2.037
4	1.853	4.212	34.493	1.853	4.212	34.493	4.252
5	1.737	3.947	38.441	1.737	3.947	38.441	2.175
6	1.605	3.648	42.088	1.605	3.648	42.088	3.448
7	.974	3.351	45.439				
8	.973	3.167	48.606				
9	.971	2.861	51.467				
10	.968	2.742	54.210				
11	.965	2.613	56.822				
12	.954	2.411	59.233				
13	.952	2.352	61.585				
14	.950	2.282	63.867				

15	.945	2.273	66.140				
16	.940	2.205	68.345				
17	.937	2.129	70.474				
18	.831	1.889	72.363				
19	.822	1.867	74.230				
20	.746	1.695	75.924				
21	.726	1.651	77.575				
22	.706	1.604	79.179				
23	.674	1.533	80.712				
24	.650	1.477	82.189				
25	.628	1.427	83.616				
26	.618	1.404	85.020				
27	.576	1.309	86.329				
28	.559	1.271	87.600				
29	.511	1.161	88.761				
30	.465	1.056	89.817				
31	.454	1.032	90.849				
32	.439	.997	91.846				
33	.390	.887	92.732				
34	.379	.861	93.593				
35	.361	.820	94.414				
36	.354	.805	95.219				
37	.321	.730	95.949				
38	.317	.719	96.668				
39	.289	.657	97.325				
40	.282	.642	97.967				
41	.258	.587	98.554				
42	.238	.542	99.096				
43	.210	.476	99.572				
44	.188	.428	100.000				

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

a. When components are correlated, sums of squared loadings cannot be added to obtain a total variance.

Appendix C

The Rotated factor loadings
Component

	Fluency of delivery	Required skills	Sense consistency with the original message	Pleasant voice	Rhetorical skills	Required knowledge
VAR00001				.323		
VAR00002				-.379		
VAR00003				.401		
VAR00004	.605	-.368				
VAR00005	.455					
VAR00006			.439			
VAR00007			.416			
VAR00008			.538			
VAR00009			-.503			
VAR00010			.648			
VAR00011						.510
VAR00012						
VAR00013		.574				
VAR00014						.548
VAR00015		.524				
VAR00016					.596	
VAR00017	.386					
VAR00018						-.437
VAR00019					.485	
VAR00020			.546			
VAR00021						
VAR00022						.533
VAR00023		.654				
VAR00024						.480
VAR00025			-.441			
VAR00026		.445				
VAR00027		.484				
VAR00028						.563
VAR00029		.386				
VAR00030						.465

	1	2	3	4	5	6
VAR00031						.458
VAR00032						.501
VAR00033	.632					
VAR00034						
VAR00035	.426					
VAR00036			-.491			
VAR00037			.529			
VAR00038		.531				
VAR00039		.365				
VAR00040					.472	
VAR00041		.622				
VAR00042		.470				
VAR00043					.664	
VAR00044						

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

a. 6 components extracted.

Appendix D
Tests of Normality

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov[a]			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	Df	Sig.
Fluency of delivery	.128	386	.068	.943	386	.070
Required skills	.079	386	.095	.977	386	.098
Sense consistency with the original message	.079	386	.077	.990	386	.079
Pleasant voice	.165	386	.069	.935	386	.071
Rhetorical skills	.141	386	.058	.919	386	.059
Required knowledge	.081	386	.063	.981	386	.062

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

Appendix E

Independent Samples t-test Analyses for Six Dimensions in Two Groups

	Group	N	Mean	SD	T	df	Sig.
Fluency of delivery	Trainee Interpreters	86	4.4651	.34406	.883	384	.378
	Ordinary Audience	300	4.4211	.42353			
Required skills	Trainee Interpreters	86	4.2674	.32009	3.372	384	.001
	Ordinary Audience	300	4.0980	.43315			
Sense consistency with the original message	Trainee Interpreters	86	3.6686	.33198	-2.777	384	.006
	Ordinary Audience	300	3.8242	.48796			
Pleasant voice	Trainee Interpreters	86	4.0233	.55728	-.750	384	.453
	Ordinary Audience	300	4.0756	.57334			
Rhetorical skills	Trainee Interpreters	86	4.2616	.46638	-.400	384	.689
	Ordinary Audience	300	4.2867	.52400			
Required knowledge	Trainee Interpreters	86	4.1525	.36237	1.139	384	.255
	Ordinary Audience	300	4.0881	.48586			

Notes

Authorship contribution

Research dataset
Not applicable.

Funding
Not applicable.

Image copyright
Not applicable.

Approval by ethics committee
This research study was conducted in accordance with the APA ethical guidelines. Informed consent was obtained from all human participants included in the study. A pre-requisite formal permission was sought from the participants.

Conflicts of interest
Not applicable.

Data availability statement
The data from this research, which are not included in this work, may be made available by the authors upon request.

License

Publisher

Section editors

Andréia Guerini – Willian Moura

Technical editing

Alice S. Rezende – Ingrid Bignardi – João G. P. Silveira – Kamila Oliveira

Article history

Received: 09-10-2023
Approved: 09-04-2024
Revised: 07-06-2024
Published: 06-2024