

ESL Students' Constraints and Strategies in Performing Sight Translation

Maya Rizki Fauzia

Politeknik Negeri Malang, Malang, Indonesia

Corresponding author. Email address: maya_fauzia8@polinema.ac.id

ABSTRACT

Sight translation is a combination of the elements of translation and interpretation in which interpreters read source language text silently and render information to target language out loud. It has been considered as supportive teaching methods for interpreting training. Sight translation takes place during medical consultation, in the court, conference, and meetings. Simultaneous Interpreting is one of the compulsory courses at D4 English for Tourism Industry Politeknik Negeri Malang. Sight translation is discussed and practiced in the class as an attempt to prepare students for simultaneous interpreting. Instructional texts from various fields are used as learning materials in the class. Objective of this study is to identify problems students encountered while performing sight translation and explain some strategies they applied. 38 audio recordings, where students were asked to conduct sight translation of tourism-related text from English to Indonesia, were analyzed in this descriptive-qualitative study. The recordings were transcribed and analyzed to gain information on students' constraints and strategies in sight translation. As an addition, questionnaires were distributed to probe data related students' problems in sight translation. The findings showed that lack of vocabulary which led to inaccurate translation and inaccurate word choice became the major hindrance in performing sight translation. Furthermore, transcribing, deletion, borrowing, addition and use of hypernym are the strategies the majority of the students utilized as an attempt to complete their sight translation. Transcribing or word-per-word translation prevented students from conveying accurate messages into the target language.

Keywords: sight translation, simultaneous interpreting, interpretation, strategies.

INTRODUCTION

Sight Translation has mostly been considered as a supportive interpretation method for simultaneous and consecutive interpretation by far. It denotes a hybrid between translating and interpreting. It is a combination of the elements of translation and interpretation in which interpreters read source language text silently and render information to target language out loud.

The term Sight Translation, hence, refers to the oral translation of a written text. In ST, the source text is a written text as in a written translation, while the target text is an oral text as in an interpretation. ST can be used in a variety of settings. The interpreter sees the translation while listening to the direct speech of the speaker. This is a special form of simultaneous interpreting called "simultaneous interpreting with text" (Pöchhacker, 2004).

Pragmatically, sight translation occurs in many work situations. It takes place during medical consultation, in the court, conference, and meetings. In most cases, they involve meetings (especially bilateral meetings) that are usually held back-to-back. Then, in ST mode, written documentation (annual and financial statements, etc.) is sent, either completely or in selected parts. Sight interpretation is also often used in press conferences, where the interpreter presents statements or press releases in a language that the audience can understand. Other documents suitable for translation include press releases that may be of interest to the meeting, apologies for absence or congratulations. Sight translation saves time in performances, private viewings and various ceremonies: only the first SL work composed and written by the speaker in the native language is transmitted by the speaker and translated sequentially into the target language. The interpreter then interprets the remaining texts as presented by the speaker without hearing the original.

Sight translations can also be used for drafts prepared by a small group in one language and submitted to the plenary for finalization. It can also be used at an international conference, where someone wants to speak in a language other than the working language, for which simultaneous interpretation is not provided. After that, the interpreters working in the booths deliver the ST printout in the working language to the other participants at the same time. Besides, Sight translation is able to be used to guide the client prior to the event when the client does not have sufficient time or opportunity to read and comprehend all the documents in the original language.

It is also common in conference interpreting settings, which require the interpreter to keep up with the source speech rate. In some non conference interpreting settings, however, there is no audio input, and the interpreter deals with written source texts only. ST, then, requires rapid text analysis, rapid conversion of information from one language to another while avoiding word for word translation, and public speaking techniques (Weber, 1990).

Seeing the array usage of ST above-mentioned, thus, Sight Translation has been considered as supportive teaching methods for interpreting training. This is due to the numerous languages skills and the complex techniques applied within the process of translation. It is also considered effective in raising students' awareness of syntactic and stylistic differences between source language and target language. As a result, those aptitudes are generally taught in numerous institutions of interpreter training.

Sight translation Simultaneous Interpreting is one of the compulsory courses at D4 English for Tourism Industry Politeknik Negeri Malang. Sight translation is discussed and practiced in the class as an attempt to prepare students for simultaneous interpreting. Instructional texts from various fields are used as learning materials in the class. Objective of this study is to identify problems students encountered while performing sight translation and explain some strategies they applied.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Sight interpretation skills seem necessary. Nevertheless, the eminence of sight translation seems dubious. It is probably because it seems like such a simple task. But sight interpretation is just as complex as simultaneous interpretation because it involves some of the same mental processes. In sight translation, the input is sight (written text), but the translator still has to process the thought in the source language and generate the target language version of the thought, while processing the next thought in the source language for on and on. For some interpreters, sight translation is even more difficult than other interpretation methods, as focusing on meaning instead of words is a challenge for many.

The literature review shows that for many researchers, sight translation is only a pedagogical exercise to introduce consecutive and simultaneous interpretation techniques. an exercise by which interpreter trainees can learn to respond quickly and improve their oral skills (Weber, 1990). Weber (1990) also states that sight interpreting covers most of the skills needed for a conference interpreter. It is widely believed that sight interpretation is easier than simultaneous and consecutive interpreting, but more difficult than written translation: unlike translators, sight interpreters experience a lack of time. On the other hand, Stansfield considers sight translation as the most difficult task for interpreters (Stansfield, 2008). This is because other types of interpreting (consecutive and simultaneous interpreting) involve only spoken language. An interpreter translates a spoken language into another spoken language (using another language). In sight translation, he may need to translate carefully prepared written language into spoken language, often without the opportunity to prepare carefully.

As formal written language tends to contain longer and more complex sentences than spoken language, interpreting the text can be more difficult. Also, the translator has to move to a different organizational system of cues, moving from punctuation to the use of pauses and intonations, which involves segmenting ideas in ways that are often very different from how ideas are organized in writing.

Since reading and target language production occur simultaneously in ST, the translator must read the source text with the intention of translating it (Weber, 1990). In addition, an interpreter may need reading aloud to identify key words and translation units when planning expressions in the target language to achieve fluent interpretation (Agrifoglio, 2005). The translator may also need to store information in short-term memory until he has read enough information from the source text to reformulate it in the target language. If the sentences are long and complex, it may require further processing by the translator. The greater the syntactic difference between the source and target language, the greater the challenge for the interpreter to coordinate reading and fluent production of the target language. Such ST intermodality, i.e. written source text and spoken target text, may require certain skills and strategies, but so far these have not been thoroughly explored in the existing literature.

Interestingly, Agrifoglio's results for professional interpreters do not seem to support the results of Ivars (2008) and Lee (2012) for student interpreters. Student interpreters who have not yet reached a professional level are likely to have coordination problems in ST. In a survey of 22 translation students, Ivars (2008) found that understanding the source text was the biggest cause of ST translation problems that students encountered, and adaptation in the target language was another major challenge. He sought to identify the causes and strategies for translation problems and found that student translators identified source text comprehension problems as the main cause of inaccuracy in the ST translation process. According to the student respondents, another important cause of difficulties was finding compatibility in the target language (Ivars, 2008). Because comprehension problems in the source text can lead to deviations from the original message, students' ST target texts can contain inaccuracies. The literature has not documented whether the primary challenge for STs is related to comprehension problems, translation skills or delivery, and whether interpreters view students and professional interpreters differently.

The results of Ivars are partially supported by the results of Lee (2012). Lee (2012) compared six student translators and three professional translators on their English-Korean ST performance as assessed by accuracy, target language expression and delivery characteristics. Lee found that most of the student interpreters had reading comprehension problems that led to accuracy errors. In contrast, the three professional translators in Lee's study did not have much trouble understanding the source text. He found that students need to improve their English

reading skills to accurately understand the primary text, as well as distinguish the main idea from secondary ideas. He also found that only the most experienced translator in the study used condensation strategies (ie, lexical and syntactic compression and omission, strategic information reduction, retention of main ideas while omitting extraneous information, and concise expression in the target language). an effective way to improve both the delivery and target language functions. The above review seems to show a difference between research on professional interpreters and student interpreters regarding the main challenges faced during ST. It is important to note that in the studies of Ivars (2008) and Lee (2012), student interpreters performed STs from their B language to A language, suggesting that interpreters' B language skills may play a role in causing comprehension problems.

Gile (2009) also acknowledges that many translation students fail the final exam due to insufficient working language skills rather than sufficient translation skills or cognitive skills. As Gile pointed out, the theoretical consensus is that students should already have a "near perfect" command of their working language when they enter a translation training program. However, it is a fact that sometimes students (or even professional interpreters) lack skills in a language other than their mother tongue (B language) (Gile, 2009). The lack of students and/or practitioners in the working language, especially B, means that they are likely to have difficulties in translation and interpretation training and/or in real life.

Another study about the hindrance experienced by the students conducted by Putranti (2017). She found out that most of the limitations in the interpretation are due to the students' inability to anticipate the vocabulary or expressions that may appear in the given text and be ready with the corresponding expressions in the TL, even if they are able to understand the message. The next problem relates to students' immediate understanding of SL structure. This is reflected in their interpretations, which tend to be literal. Since the target language is usually the students' first or second language, these students do not have a significant problem with message fluency in the TL. However, expression problems in conveying a message in TL can occur due to students' poor knowledge of the source language.

Krapivkina (2018) also wrote an article concluded that there are some aspects of sight translation that should become a training focus, those are (1) clarity and fluency of delivery, (2) the coherence of discourse, (3) factual and linguistic accuracy, (4) compliance with register and genre conventions, (5) appropriate speaking speed rate, (6) information timeliness, (7) appropriate tone, (8) volume, and (9) voice projection. Correspondingly, the study found out that the texts that translators had to translate into another language often contain bureaucratic language characterized by technical jargon, abbreviations, long adjective groups and passive voice.

The translator needs special preparation to translate such texts. He or she should be able to quickly scan and understand the main points of documents, translate documents quickly without omitting anything, avoiding translation errors or sudden stops and long pauses that can distract the listeners. The translator should know the terminology and present the documents so that the translation sounds as if the translator is only reading a document written in the target language. For example, translators may encounter long or special handwritten texts, ungrammatical sentences, poor punctuation, diagrams or tables that are difficult to interpret. Students must be prepared to address these issues in class. Therefore, Krapivkina (2018) suggested that sight translation should be an integral part of any translation/interpreting program. It needs to be taught separately from other interpretation methods because it requires a different combination of skills.

METHOD

This study is a descriptive qualitative study that explains difficulties students faced in performing sight translation and strategies they applied to make sure they could complete the task successfully. The study was conducted in two online simultaneous interpreting classes due to Covid-19 pandemic. There were thirty-eight sixth-semester students in those classes.

The data collection methods were in the form of document analysis (analysis of the students' audio recording transcription while performing sight translation, questionnaire, and classroom observation). In the third week, the classes discussed sight translation. After lecture and a couple of group exercises on the topic, students were asked to perform sight translation from English to Indonesia individually and record it. There were 19 sentences in total. The basis for selecting the text was students' familiarity with the topic of the text (tourism and hospitality). The time allotment was 20 minutes, 5 minutes for scanning and skimming the text, 15 minutes for sight translation, and the last 5 minutes for uploading their recording into cloud storage. This procedure was classified as unrehearsed sight translation where interpreter is given a previously unseen written text and asked to provide an on-the-spot oral translation. The recordings were then transcribed and analyzed to identify types of students' problems in sight translation and strategies to overcome the problems.

The transcription was conducted by the researcher and one translator/interpreter. The following step after transcribing the audio recording was to compare the source language text and the transcription result. Any inaccuracy in transferring information from the source language (English) to target language (Indonesian) was considered as problems in performing sight translation. These problems were then classified into several categories and tallied. On the other hand, interpreting strategy refers to a method that is used deliberately to prevent or solve potential problems in interpreting or enhance interpreting performance (Bartłomiejczyk, 2006; Gile, 1997). To detect the students' use of interpreting strategies, discourse analysis of the transcription of the target text was conducted. The strategies were also divided into several categories and tallied.

As an addition, an online questionnaire was distributed to identify students' difficulty in simultaneous class in general and sight translation in particular. It was distributed immediately after all of the students submitted the recordings of their sight translation. In other words, data from the online questionnaire functioned to verify the data obtained from the data analysis process previously mentioned. The questionnaire comprised seven questions, 5 questions used 4-point Likert scale while the remaining two were open-ended questions. The data from the questionnaire were counted and presented in the form of percentages.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Based on the questionnaire, 43.1% of the students strongly agreed that sight translation helped prepare the students for simultaneous interpreting, while 52.9% of them agreed with the statement. Sight translation enabled students to transfer messages from source to target language in a short time. It allowed students to do so in 'real time,' which mimicked simultaneous interpreting. Furthermore, sight translation trained the students to understand text quickly. Unlike translation where translators have time to read the source text repeatedly to enhance meaning, in sight translation the students learned to understand the source text in a limited amount of time. At last, through sight translation, the students learned to verbalize the result of their translation.

However, the questionnaire revealed that the students faced some obstacles in performing sight translation. In sight translation. The majority of the students (76.5%) stated that lack of vocabulary became the major hindrance (76.5%), followed by difficulty in understanding the source text (51%), and limited time in conducting sight translation (37.3%). The findings are corroborated with Thawabteh (2015) that lexical problems, due to disparity at lexicons between source and target language, is one of the biggest issues student interpreters had to deal with. In addition, they also support Pochhaker (2004) that besides internal factors, such as nervousness and confidence, external factors namely unfamiliar words or terms, vocabulary and choice of words, and grammatical inconsistency are the most common obstacles students encountered in sight translation.

The analysis toward the students' transcript revealed three types of problems students encountered in sight translation. They are as follow:

VOCABULARY

Due to the lack of vocabulary and time constraint, the students were unable to translate frequently used words, glass accurately. Instead of 'barang yang mudah pecah,' 'glass' was translated into 'gelas' or 'kaca,' which was not suitable with the context. Besides that, the noun 'care' was translated into 'perhatian.' Seeing the context, 'care' here should be translated into 'dengan hati-hati.'

Example 1

Source Text (ST): **Glass** of any kind should be handled **with utmost care**.

Target Text (TT): **Gelas** apapun harus di.....**harus dibawa dengan penuh perhatian..**

Example 2

ST: **Glass** of any kind should be handled with utmost care.

TT: **Kaca** apapun harus di.....**kaca** apapun harus...**kaca** apapun harus dibawa dengan berhati-hati.

Based on the examples above, inaccurate word choice, stemming from lacking vocabulary may result in shift in meaning and eventually inaccurate transfer of information to target language.

PARALLEL CONSTRUCTIONS

In grammar, parallelism is a balance within one or more sentences of similar phrases or clauses that have the same grammatical structure. It makes texts easier to process and understand. Another constraint that students encountered was forming parallel structure.

Example 1

ST: **Open sores or band-aids** are not allowed when entering the pool.

TT: **Luka terbuka atau memakai perban** tidak diperbolehkan memasuki kolam renang.

'Open sores' was interpreted into 'luka terbuka,' while 'band-aids' became 'memakai perban.' These interpretations had different parts of speech, noun and verb resulting in unparallel construction. To maintain parallelism, the sentence above can be interpreted into "jika Anda terluka atau memakai perban, Anda dilarang masuk ke dalam kolam."

RUN-ON SENTENCE

The third issue the students encountered in sight translation was difficulty in formulating complete sentences, for example run-on sentences, or subject-verb agreement.

Example 1

ST: Swimming is not allowed if under influence of drugs or alcohol.

TT: Ketika Anda berenang tidak diperbolehkan ee..ketika Anda sedang dalam pengaruh alkohol ataupun minum minuman keras dan ketika Anda mau meminum ee..diwajibkan untuk ee..di bawah pengawasan.

Even though they encountered various difficulties in performing sight translation, the students carried out several attempts to make sure that they were able to complete their tasks.

TABLE 1. ESL Students' Strategies in Performing Sight Translation

Strategies	Percentage
Transcribing (word-per-word translation)	100%
Omission	42%
Borrowing	16%
Reformulation	13%
Addition	7%
Use of hypernym	1%

Table 1 showed that the most frequent strategy the students used was transcribing. The strategy was found in all of the students' transcripts. The second was omission or deletion of language units in the interpretation. 16 out of 38 students implemented the strategy while performing sight translation. The third and fourth strategies the students applied to ensure that all information in the source text was conveyed were borrowing (6 out of 38 students) and reformulation (5 out of 38 students). The last two strategies were addition and use of hypernym. The strategies and their examples were elaborated as follows:

TRANSCRIBING

Transcribing referred to rendering of text from source to target language one word at a time. It is also called literal or direct translation.

Example 1

ST: **Daily operation** is between 7 a.m. to 4 p.m.

TT: **Operasi harian** mulai jam 7 sampai jam 4.

In example 1, 'daily operation' was translated as 'operasi harian' (daily = harian and operation = operasi) which may lead to confusion when used in this context. The sentence can be interpreted as 'kolam renang buka mulai pukul 7 pagi sampai pukul 4 sore' or 'jam operasional harian kolam renang adalah pukul 7 pagi sampai pukul 4 sore.'

Example 2

ST: No **lifeguard** on duty

TT: Tidak ada **penjaga pantai** yang bertugas/ Tidak ada penjaga keselamatan yang berjaga

Most of the students translated 'lifeguard' as 'penjaga pantai.' When we consulted the dictionary, this may be accurate when the beaches became the context. However, the word

‘lifeguard’ here was used for swimming pool regulations and ‘penjaga pantai’ was not the correct interpretation.

Example 3

ST: Running, jumping or **rough play** inside and around the pool area is prohibited

TT: Berlari, melompat atau **bermain yang berbahaya** di dalam atau di sekitar area kolam renang tidak diperbolehkan./ Berlari atau pun **melompat secara ekstrem dan bermain** di sekitar area kolam renang juga tidak diperbolehkan.

The word ‘rough play’ was translated into ‘bermain yang berbahaya’ or ‘ekstrem’ as the word ‘rough’ means ‘kasar’ or ‘buruk.’ The word ‘bermain kasar’ was not natural in Indonesian, the target language. Seeing the context, ‘rough play’ can be interpreted into ‘saling mendorong’ or ‘bergurau berlebihan.’

Example 4

ST: Swimming is not allowed if **under influence** of drugs or alcohol.

TT: Kolam renang tidak diperbolehkan untuk **dibawah kecanduan** atau alkohol.

Some of the students translated ‘under influence’ as ‘di bawah kecanduan’ or ‘di bawah pengaruh’ without explaining the type of intoxicated substance consumed. When transcribing became the strategy implemented for the sentence, some important information may be missing.

OMISSION

Deletion is an interpreting strategy in which the students deleted words or phrases of the source texts.

Example 1

ST: **Daily** operation at 6 a.m – 8 p.m.

TT: Jam buka jam 6 pagi sampai 8 malam/ Buka jam 6 pagi sampai 8 malam

From the example above, it can be seen that the word ‘daily’ which means ‘everyday’ or ‘setiap hari’ was deleted from the interpretation. Consequently, only some of the information was transferred.

Example 2

ST: Swimming is not allowed if under influence of **drug** or alcohol

TT: Berenang.....tidak diperbolehkan bagi siapapun yang.... sedang mengkonsumsi alkohol./ Ketika anda berenang tidak diperbolehkan....ketika anda sedang dalam pengaruh alkohol ataupun minum minuman keras.

Indonesian synonym of the word ‘drug’ was not found in the target text. Looking at the text carefully, this word was an important part of information in the source text. Omitting some information from source text may result in misinterpretation or wrong information.

BORROWING

Borrowing is an interpreting strategy that occurs when the students decided to use words from the source language in the target language.

Example 1

ST: Glass of any kind should **be handled** with utmost care.

TT: Barang-barang seperti kaca harus **dihandle** dengan benar.

Example 2

ST: **Face masks** and goggles must have an unbreakable lens.

TT: **Face masks** dan kacamata renang harus mempunyai...lensa yang tidak mudah pecah.

In example one, it can be seen that the verb “handle” was not interpreted into Indonesian language. There were two possibilities for the use of this strategy; the first was the students may not be sure of its Indonesian equivalence or they thought that listeners were able to understand the information they wanted to convey without transferring ‘handled’ into Indonesian. Furthermore, in example 2, the students applied the borrowing technique for the word ‘facemask’ since it was challenging to find a suitable equivalent to the word to fit the context, swimming pool regulations in a short time. It is not common to wear a mask on one’s face for swimming. Thus, to prevent themselves from getting stuck, ‘facemask’ was not interpreted into the target language.

REFORMULATION

Reformulation occurred when the students expressed an idea in a completely different way. From the data analysis, it was revealed that the students changed some of the sentences in the source text into if-clause and added ‘Anda’ as subject. One of the examples of reformulation strategy in sight translation can be seen below.

Example 1

ST: Swimming is not allowed if under the influence of drugs or alcohol.

TT: **Ketika Anda** berenang tidak diperbolehkan ee...**ketika anda** sedang dalam pengaruh alkohol atau minuman keras.

ADDITION

When extra words are added into the interpretation to gain understanding, the strategy was defined as addition. While carrying out sight translation, some of the students added some words in the result of their interpretation.

Example 1

ST: Children under 12 years of age must be **supervised** by an adult.

TT: Anak yang usianya di bawah 12 tahun harus **didampingi** dan diawasi oleh orang tua... oleh **orang tuanya**.

Based on the example, it can be seen that the word ‘didampingi’ was added to the target language. This emphasized that not only should children be monitored, but they should also be accompanied. In other words, addition functioned to intensify meaning. In addition, the suffix ‘-nya’ was added to ‘orang tua’ to specify which adult children under 12 should be within a swimming pool. It means that additional strategy may also function to provide more explanation in the target text.

USE OF HYPERNYM

This strategy referred to as hypernym is a word with a general meaning that has basically the same meaning of a more specific word. This strategy was implemented in sight translation for words related to clothing items.

Example 1

ST: ...not allowed to use singlet/cotton t-shirt, **boxer/ lingerie, bra/camisoles, denim pants & shorts**) for safety and hygiene reasons.

TT: tidak boleh memakai singlet/kaos...**pakaian dalam....dan bawahan** untuk alasan kebersihan dan keamanan

From the example above, it can be seen that some specific words were interpreted into the more general term, for instance 'boxer/lingerie, bra/camisoles' was interpreted as 'pakaian dalam,' while 'denim pants & shorts' became 'bawahan.' The substitution did not shift the meaning since the only clothing item allowed in the swimming pool was swimming wear.

CONCLUSION

Based on the findings of the study, it can be concluded that lack of vocabulary is the major constraints students faced in sight translation. It causes a shift in meaning or utterances that does not sound natural in the target language. Furthermore, the strategies the students implemented in performing sight translation were transcribing, omission, addition, borrowing and paraphrasing. Taking the importance sight translation in interpreting training into consideration, specific time should be allocated for sight translation practice. Students should be exposed to various types of texts and some coping strategies in sight translation.

REFERENCES

- Agrifoglio, M. (2004). ST and interpreting: A comparative analysis of constraints and failures. *Interpreting*, 6(1): 43-67. <https://doi.org/10.1075/intp.6.1.05agr>
- Edge, M. (1996). Lifetime prediction: Fact or fancy? In M. S. Koch, T. Padfield, J. S. Johnsen, & U. B. Kejser (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Conference on Research Techniques in Photographic Conservation* (pp. 97-100). Copenhagen, Denmark: Royal Danish Academy of Fine Arts.
- Gile, D. (2009). *Basic Concepts and Models for Interpreter and Translator Training*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Ivars, A. J. (2008). ST and written translation: A comparative analysis of causes of problems, strategies and translation errors within the PACTE translation competence model. *Forum*, 6(2): 79-103. <https://doi.org/10.1075/forum.6.2.05iva>
- Krapivkina, O. A. (2018). Sight Translation And Its Status In Training Of Interpreters And Translators. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 7(3): 695-704
- Lee, J. (2012). What Skills Do Student Interpreters Need to Learn in Sight Translation Training? *Meta*, 57(3), 694–714. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1017087ar>
- Pöchhacker, Franz (2004): *Introducing Interpreting Studies*. London: Routledge.
- Putranti, Adventina. (2017). The Constrains In Performing Sight Translation: A Brief Discussion On The Problems Of Translating Written Texts Into Indonesian Oral Texts, *Proceedings of the Fifth International Seminar on English Language and*

- Teaching (ISELT-5) (pp. 162-168). Universitas Negeri Padang, Padang: English Department Faculty of Arts
- Stansfield, C. W. (2008). A Practical Guide to Sight Translation of Assessments. A Report Submitted to the Second Language Testing Incorporation.
- Thawabteh, M. (2015). Difficulties of Sight Translation: Training Translators to Sight Translate. *Current Trends in Translation Teaching and Learning E. 2*. 171-195.
- Weber, Wilhelm K. (1990): The importance of sight translation in an interpreter training program. In: *David Bowen and Margaret Bowen, eds. Interpreting – Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow*. New York: Binghamton, 44-52.