1991

Role and behavior of interpreters : an exploratory study in American-Chinese business negotiations

Zhijian Kevin Yang
Portland State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/open_access_etds

Part of the [Communication Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

Yang, Zhijian Kevin, "Role and behavior of interpreters : an exploratory study in American-Chinese business negotiations" (1991). *Dissertations and Theses*. Paper 4277.
<https://doi.org/10.15760/etd.6161>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations and Theses by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible: pdxscholar@pdx.edu.

AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF Zhijian Kevin Yang for the Master of Arts in Speech Communication presented February 7, 1991.

Title: Role and Behavior of Interpreters: An Exploratory Study in American-Chinese Business Negotiations.

APPROVED BY THE MEMBERS OF THE THESIS COMMITTEE:

Stephen A. Koskoff, Chairman

Devorah Lieberman

Larry Steward

Douglas Tseng

The purpose of this study is to identify the roles and behaviors of interpreters. The context of this research is American-Chinese business negotiations. The focus of this study is on the roles and behaviors of interpreters by means of revealing the perspectives of interpreters and American negotiators.

The population for this study was (a) the interpreters who have been hired by American firms; and (b) the American negotiators who are the employers or represent the American

employers. Twenty subjects in Portland, OR, U.S.A., were interviewed, including ten interpreters and ten American negotiators.

Review of the literature revealed very little that directly related to this research. However, a number of statements about the interpreter's roles supports the discussions and lays the foundation for this research. Anderson (1976) believed that (a) the interpreter's role is inadequately defined and prescribed; (b) interpreters are overloaded with expectations; and (c) the interpreter's role conflicts with expectations. This research emphasized defining and confirming the roles and behaviors of interpreters.

This research offers four role descriptions for respondents to identify: (a) A negotiation assistant; (b) A negotiator; (c) A middle person hired by one negotiating party; and (d) A third party person. All those role descriptions are based on the related literature.

This qualitative research employs personal interview as a means of data collection. An identical questionnaire was employed for each interview. Closed-ended data are analyzed by frequency count of respondents' answers. Open-ended questions are clustered by theme. Major themes, as identified by the researcher, are reported.

In data analyses and discussions, this researcher discussed (a) the interpreters' perspectives about the

interpreter's role; (b) the American negotiators' perspectives about the interpreter's role; and (c) the similarities and differences of the perspectives of these two groups.

The major conclusion drawn from this research is that neither the interpreters nor the American negotiators have clear definitions of the role that an interpreter plays. One of the possible explanations is that because there are not written guidelines prepared to define and confirm the role of interpreters, and also because a large number of the interpreters and the American negotiators tend not to discuss the interpreter's role between themselves or with their colleagues, contradictions and conflicts are found frequently between and/or within each of these two groups in terms of their perspectives and understandings of the interpreter's role(s) and responsibilities. There is little compatibility of perspectives between interpreters and American negotiators.

A potential application of this study is to design a training program, based on the results of this thesis, for business firms as part of their preparations for negotiations. The purpose of this training program would be (a) to define roles of interpreters; (b) to help American negotiators understand the important roles that an interpreter plays; (c) to raise awareness of the pivotal position and different perspectives of an interpreter in a business

negotiation; (d) to teach American negotiators how to work with or use interpreters in business negotiations.

ROLE AND BEHAVIOR OF INTERPRETERS:
AN EXPLORATORY STUDY
IN AMERICAN-CHINESE BUSINESS NEGOTIATIONS

by

ZHIJIAN KEVIN YANG

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS
in
SPEECH COMMUNICATION

PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

1991

TO THE OFFICE OF GRADUATE STUDIES:

The members of the Committee approve the thesis of
Zhijian Kevin Yang presented February 7, 1991.

Stephen A. Kosokoff, Chairman

Devorah Lieberman

Larry Steward

Douglas Tseng

APPROVED:

Theodore Grove, Chair, Department of Speech Communication

C. William Savery, Interim Vice Provost for
Graduate Studies and Research

DEDICATED TO

My beloved Mongolian father Saifu.

May God of the Future World bless
and protect him forever.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Chinese proverb says, "As distance tests a horse's strength, so time reveals a person's heart." In the past five years during my study at Portland State University, Oregon, U.S.A., I truly recognized the meaning of this Chinese proverb, and personally experienced the love and beauty of my family and my friends.

I am indebted to many people who have contributed to this thesis: my parents, my brothers and my friends. I wish my beloved father were still alive. I know how much my achievement of this degree would mean to him.

At this special moment, I would like to thank all those friends who persistently helped me come to America to study. I extend my heartfelt gratitude especially to Margaret Willson, Jeff MacDonald, Gary MacDonald, Gloria MacDonald, Dr. Kosokoff, Betsy Willson and Roger Clark, Stanley and Virginia Wilson, and Sally Lounsbury.

My opportunity to study in America was given by the kindhearted American people. It was your financial aid, loving care and moral support that gave me the strength and courage to finish this study. I would like give my special thanks to Gary MacDonald, Donna and Steve McElroy, Mary E. Cates, Mr. and Mrs. Ensminger, Gloria MacDonald, Charles and

Luisa Wilson, David and Maria Biehler, and many other friends of mine.

For the completion of my study at PSU, I would like to give special thanks to Dr. Kosokoff, who has been my professor and friend since we met each other ten years ago in Inner Mongolia, China. His knowledge and viewpoint upgraded my outlook on the world. I am also very grateful to Ms. Irene Curtis for her advice and assistance through International Student Services at PSU.

For the completion of this thesis, I extend my grateful appreciation to all the members of my Committee for their help in providing valuable recommendations for this research. Dr. Kosokoff's guidance and criticism have always been very helpful to my research. Dr. Lieberman deserves much gratitude. Her profound knowledge, patience, spirit dedicated to education and beauty won all my respect and admiration. Without her encouragement and suggestions, I dare not think when I would be able to finish the thesis. I thank her from the bottom of my heart. I very much appreciate the willingness and kindness of Dr. Steward and Dr. Tseng to help me through this process. Owing to the confidentiality required by the Human Subjects Research and Review Committee, I cannot mention any name of the twenty survey respondents. But their information is a fundamental and significant contribution to this thesis.

Others made it possible for me to improve the quality of my English writing skill. I am grateful to Jeff

MacDonald, Donna McElroy, Rita Meiser, Guy Boileau and Eric Foster for their careful proof-reading and comments.

In the past five years, many American and Chinese friends helped me in various ways during my living and studying in America. I would not mention any names for fear that I might fail to mention one, but you all are in my heart.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iii
LIST OF TABLES	viii
CHAPTER	
I INTRODUCTION	1
Problem Statement	1
Significance and Justification	3
Definitions in the Research.....	7
II LITERATURE REVIEW	12
III METHODOLOGY	18
Scope of the Research.....	18
Purpose	19
Research Subject.....	20
General Approach.....	22
IV RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS.....	26
Question 1	27
Question 2	36
Question 3	42
Question 4	56
Question 5	60
Question 6	67

Question 7	73
Question 8	76
Question 9	80
Question 10	83
V CONCLUSIONS, LIMITATIONS, SUGGESTIONS.....	88
Conclusions.....	88
Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research	93
REFERENCES	96
APPENDIX	
A RESEARCH SUBJECTS.....	101
B INFORMED CONSENT FORM	103
C QUESTIONNAIRE	105

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
I	What Role(s) Do Interpreters Play in American-Chinese Business Negotiations?....	37
II	What Role(s) Should Interpreters Play in American-Chinese Business Negotiations?....	43
III	What Behaviors Do You Expect of an Interpreter?	57
IV	Do You Ever Discuss the Interpreter's Role with Your Interpreter/Negotiator?.....	61
V	To What Extent Are You Aware That Any of the Following Factors Have Influenced a Negotiation?.....	68
VI	When You Make a Judgment about an Interpreter's Performance, What Do You Usually Consider?	75
VII	Have There Ever Been Misunderstandings between You and Your Interpreter/Negotiator about the Interpreter's Role?.....	78
VIII	Does Your Company Have Written Guidelines for the Role of an Interpreter?.....	82
IX	Are There Any Conflicts between the Various Behaviors That You Expect of an Interpreter?.....	85
X	Have There Been Any Conflicts between You and Your Interpreter/Negotiator?.....	87

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

PROBLEM STATEMENT

It is a very common situation in American-Chinese business negotiations that American negotiators do not speak Chinese, and Chinese negotiators do not speak English. In some situations, negotiators can speak a little of their counterpart's native language but have an insufficient command of it for negotiating details. Therefore, an interpreter (sometimes one from each side) is usually employed in the negotiation to facilitate the communication between the two parties.

This situation elevates an interpreter's position and function in the negotiation process. These circumstances draw attention to the key importance of knowledge and information as sources of power. An interpreter is a person who works with information. When both negotiating parties have to depend on an interpreter to collect their information for making decisions, the interpreter may become powerful and influential. Generally, the importance of interpreters is not properly recognized (Smith, 1987), and the study of interpreters has lagged behind the study of negotiation styles. When many American authors and speakers

discuss American-Chinese business negotiations (Pye, 1982; Wik, 1984), they either avoid discussing the role and behavior of interpreters or only mention interpreters very briefly.

It is important to focus on Chinese or American negotiating styles, but it seems inappropriate to ignore or neglect discussing the role and behavior of interpreters. In a negotiation, an interpreter is the last person who interprets Party A's message before it is conveyed to Party B. An interpreter is also the first person who receives the message of Party B and then interprets it before passing it to Party A. What roles do interpreters really play? If an American negotiator does not have a clear understanding of what and how an interpreter can perform, how can he guarantee his message has been converted with greatest fidelity into another language and conveyed clearly to Chinese negotiators, and in return, that the message Chinese negotiators transmitted has been accurately interpreted and reported?

As for the published literature on interpreters, it generally falls into two groups, one concerning interpreters and the other about their clients. None of the authors in either group, whether in psychology, anthropology, sociology or business, documents his first-hand sources of information clearly; therefore, none of the authors can specify the points of view of their sources. What do the interpreters

and American negotiators really think about the interpreter's role? Do they expect the same roles and behaviors of an interpreter? There are many questions left unanswered in the previous research.

Anderson's statement inspires this researcher to pursue the study of the interpreter's role further. Anderson (1976) wrote,

In general, the interpreter's role is characterized by some degree of inadequacy of role prescription, role overload, and role conflict resulting from his pivotal position in the interaction network (p. 218).

According to Anderson, the role ambiguity due to inadequate role description is causing problems in the performance of interpreters. In this study, this researcher attempts to reveal the perspectives of both interpreters and American negotiators so as to determine the accepted and expected roles and behaviors of interpreters and reduce the role ambiguity.

SIGNIFICANCE AND JUSTIFICATION

In 1963, many translator trainers from several countries held a conference in Bonn, Germany, to discuss the issues of interpreters. This conference is referred to as the Bad Godesberg Congress (Frerk, 1963). In this conference, the representatives spotlighted the importance of training translators and the need for close attention to

the professionals connected with translation (Frerk, 1963). They also called for immediate attention to the devastating situation in which precise information from the ultimate employers was lacking (Frerk, 1963). Twenty-eight years have passed with few studies on employers and translators (or interpreters). A search of the literature revealed that there are only three essays (Anderson, 1976; Brislin, 1976; D'Haucourt, 1958) discussing the roles of interpreters.

Interpreters and translators are making a valuable contribution to understanding among nations and to the advancement of science and technology and, of course, to the development of commerce. Marjorie Smith, shocked by the "chronic shortage" of American interpreters, wrote in NEWSWEEK (1987), "This is often the American predicament. The more difficult the language, the more likely our interpreters will be foreigners" (p.9). This is the consequence of misunderstanding, or perhaps simply abstaining from understanding or even refusing to learn about, interpreters and foreign languages. Therefore, research on the interpreter's role is needed.

Along with the rapid increase of intercultural interactions, such as American-Chinese business negotiations, interpreters play very important roles in intercultural, organizational and interpersonal communication. Traditionally, people resist dealing with issues such as foreign languages and interpreters. Smith

(1987) said the problem is, "When we can't provide our own interpreters, everything that is translated is filtered through the cultural, or political, perspective of foreigners." She also asked, "Why are we so willing to depend upon the other fellow's (counterpart's) English? Or on his translation?" (p. 9). To understand the interpreter and his roles is no longer something that can be left for other people to worry about.

When people study Chinese or American ways of doing business or making decisions, they like to begin with studying Chinese or American business people (Chu, 1988), their negotiation styles (Pye, 1987), or their organizational systems (Wik, 1984). They often forget or neglect to consider a very important issue: When both parties cannot communicate in a language that both understand, an interpreter is usually hired. Thus, the information needed by both parties for their decision-making is collected and exchanged through an interpreter, whose translation is actually his own interpretation. The interpreter's interpretation is a process such that the interpreter interprets the information based on his own comprehension and judgment, and then expresses the translated version of the source information to the listener. It is suggested that an interpreter may actually control or shape his own output of the source message due to his/her personal bias. Therefore, the assigned function of an interpreter is not

just pure linguistic translation. An interpreter may play a more complex role than people generally realized. This author believes that to study the roles of interpreters should be considered an important area of inquiry in understanding negotiation styles and strategies for doing business.

Anderson (1976) pointed out that an interpreter's role is inadequately defined, and he/she is overloaded with expectations, which often are in conflict with the interpreter role. Anderson brought up the issue of role ambiguity of interpreters. For instance, an interpreter, the person in the middle, is serving two clients at the same time. He is under an obligation to both clients. These obligations are not always entirely compatible (Phillips, 1960). Therefore, the interpreter can be said to be playing two roles simultaneously (Seleskovitch, 1976). Role ambiguity is an essential problem of inconsistency within a single role (Phillips, 1960). This author believes that unclear expectations generate the role ambiguity of interpreters. Therefore, before we study the role of an interpreter, we should first identify what interpreters are expected to perform in American-Chinese business negotiations.

If we do not know sufficiently and thoroughly about the interpreters' roles and responsibilities, how can we use him/her properly? Berris (1983) and Nadler (1987) pointed

out that many negotiators do not know how to use an interpreter. If this is the true situation of American employers and negotiators, shouldn't we question American negotiators to discover whether there is a common understanding of what an interpreter can offer and what role an interpreter should play? Conversely, this inquiry also applies to interpreters.

DEFINITIONS IN THE RESEARCH

American-Chinese Business Negotiation is a process of decision-making through which both American and Chinese parties coordinate their positions to maximize their goals for the purpose of reaching an agreement between them.

Behavior: Behavior is one or a series of actions in a person's response to the stimuli in a given environment, such as in a American-Chinese business negotiation.

China: This study is limited to interactions with the People's Republic of China and excludes Taiwan, Hong Kong, etc.

Consecutive Interpreting: A style of oral translation, during which the interpreter does oral translation only when the speaker has finished his whole sentence or statement (Gerver, 1976). This style of translation is used in small group or one-on-one discussion, but the language exchange takes twice as long as in simultaneous interpretation (Nadler, 1987).

Interpretability: It is a range of legitimate interpretations of the same document or text. This range is a scale between two extremes or limits, between which there can be more than one acceptable interpretation. The most suitable interpretation has to be selected by the interpreter. A text generally allows for a certain range of interpretability (Kandler, 1963).

Interpretation: A type of translation. It refers to oral translation in communication situations in which one person speaks in the source language, and the interpreter processes this input based on his/her own judgment and produces output in a second language, which becomes a version of the source language for a third person to understand (Brislin, 1976).

Interpreter: A bilingual person who speaks English and Chinese, and is hired mainly to do oral translation in live and action-oriented situations, such as American-Chinese business negotiations. Most English and Chinese bilingual interpreters can be categorized into the following two groups:

- 1) The English/Chinese bilingual whose first language (native tongue) is Chinese, and who learned English as a foreign language.
- 2) The English/Chinese bilingual whose first language (native tongue) is English, and who learned Chinese as a foreign language.

Literary Interpreting: It is a style which allows the interpreter to choose from a wide range of alternatives in selecting vocabulary, sentence structures and even grammar. But at the same time, it is much more demanding from the points of view of knowledge and creativity of interpretation (Zilahy, 1963).

Norm: A principle of a "correct" way of doing things. It binds both interpreters and American negotiators, serves as a guide and controls or regulates their behaviors.

Perspective: A subjective point of view of an American negotiator or an interpreter in understanding or judging the interpreter's role in the true relationship.

Role: "Role, a term borrowed directly from the theater, is a metaphor intended to denote that conduct adheres to certain 'parts' (or positions) rather than to the player who reads or recites them" (Sarbin and Allen, 1968, p.489). For example, certain behaviors are expected from the role of interpreter, no matter who occupies the position. The behaviors that related to the performance of roles involve such issues as follows:

- 1) Is one's behavior appropriate to his social position assigned by other people?
- 2) Does his overt behavior meet the normative standards which serve as evaluating criteria for observers?
- 3) Does his enactment lead the observer to declare

positively that the jobholder is legitimately occupying the position (Sarbin and Allen, 1968, p. 490)?

Role Conflict: A state of disagreement and disharmony in the understanding of the interpreter's role(s), responsibilities and behaviors among American negotiators and interpreters.

Role Expectation: An anticipation of the desired or assumed role(s) that an interpreter should play. Such anticipation consists of subjective perceptions, which exist internally and await to match reality and one's own experience, feeling, knowledge, etc. Bruteau (1983) said, "We have not specified our expectation precisely, but we have----perhaps unconsciously----set limitations on how far the experience can vary from our accepted norm" (p. 149).

Role Prescription: An adequately defined description of the role that an interpreter is expected to perform. Such written role prescription should be established, understood and accepted by both negotiators and their interpreters before a translating or interpreting activity commences.

Role Overload: Excessive responsibilities that are assigned to an interpreter's position. An interpreter is frequently expected to perform more than he is objectively and/or physically possible to manage.

Source Language: It is the first language that an interpreter hears and then translates into a second language

in an interpreting process.

Simultaneous Interpreting: A style of oral translation, during which, theoretically speaking, the interpreter does oral translation "at the same time" the speaker is speaking. In fact, the interpreter's interpreting is always 2-3 seconds behind the speaker (Gerver, 1976).

Technical Interpreting: It is clearly circumscribed within the given limits of the subject matter and its specialized language, and requires from the interpreter a thorough knowledge of the technical material, as apart from the language itself (Zilahy, 1963).

Translator is a bilingual person who works with the written word, sometimes in isolation, seeing neither the writer nor the reader (Nadler, 1987). Nadler (1987) said, "It is possible for an interpreter to translate but unusual for a translator to interpret" (p. 108). Berris (1983) pointed out, "A good interpreter is more than a translator of words, since language skills are only a part of the process of communication" (p. 42).

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

In reviewing the literature in the U.S. about interpreters, few articles are found on the interpreter's role (D'Haucourt, 1958; Anderson, 1976; Brislin, 1976). Most published research concerns the style and quality of translation (Zilahy, 1963; Kandler, 1963; Berris, 1983), the techniques and theory of interpretation (Glenn, 1958; D'Haucourt, 1958; Seleskovitch, 1976; Shepard, 1987; Smith, 1987), or the relationship between interpretation and intercultural communication (Glenn, 1958; Sechrest et al., 1972; Wilss, 1982). Often related studies concern legal interpretation of plurilingual treaties (Stevens, 1967; Germer, 1970), interpretation of the politics of international crisis (Young, 1967, 1968), attitudes of various ethnic groups toward each other in multilingual societies (Gumperz, 1962; Ferguson, 1962; Lambert, 1967), or the problems of integration of ethnic and linguistic minorities (Ervin-Tripp, 1967; Gaarder, 1967; Macnamara, 1967).

Review of the literature revealed only a few books and articles, mainly published in the 1960's, on translation techniques and theory. Some new publications on American-

Chinese trading and negotiations are found, but they omit discussing interpreters. Only a few authors mention interpreters briefly (Pye, 1982; Wik, 1984). Review of the literature revealed that the majority of authors did not specifically discuss the role of interpreters in their publications; but, they noted that the role and behavior of interpreters is likely to prove relevant (Anderson, 1976). This author found that there was very little that related to this area of research. Reviewing the literature on interpreters, however, there are a number of statements that can lay a foundation for this research.

There is a transformation occurring in researchers' understanding of interpreters. The largest body of research findings on language has applied to translation in studies on learning, memory, and reproduction of material learned (Zimbardo and Ruch, 1975). Cofer (1973) observed that, historically, emphasis was on developing stimulus conditions so as to get a desired response or output from the receiver, and people were considered as reactive organisms. Currently, emphasis is on studying the person who acts and reacts. People are considered to be active thinkers. Recent research has given increasing attention to the way an organism processes information and how it actively intercedes between stimuli received and responses emitted. In this thesis, an interpreter is an organism. In the late 1950's, an interpreter was often described as a "robot" and

"empty organism" (D'Haucourt, 1958) whereas new research tends to see an interpreter as an active and introspective thinker (Brislin, 1976), and an active processor of information (Gerver, 1976). Anderson (1976) says that an interpreter does not merely echo the source language, because he/she has his/her own complicated thinking system. Human sensory organs do not function like photographic film or magnetic tape (Seleskovitch, 1976). This means an interpreter is not a translation machine. An interpreter makes decisions on how to behave and what to do without requesting other people's instructions. In other words, he/she is acting on his/her own comprehension and judgement, just like an independent individual system.

To translate from one language to another is a matter of interpretation (Smith, 1987). For example, in intercultural communication, there is much information not available in the speakers' words. An interpreter often facilitates understanding through interpretation. D'Haucourt (1976) pointed out, "Interpretation is a bridging of a gap in communication." It has been well accepted by many people that an interpreter should have this legitimate power of interpretation. Kandler (1963) brought out an interesting issue, which is called "range of interpretability." He believes each text in its source language allows a certain "range of interpretability." This means that an interpreter has control over the interpretation. An

interpreter has the power to use different interpretation as part of his role. His interpretation is subject to his own judgement and personal bias.

As for the role of an interpreter, a number of authors believe that an interpreter is not merely doing pure linguistic translation. Gerver (1976) thinks that an interpreter acts like an active processor of information. Seleskovitch (1976) said an interpreter is playing two roles simultaneously in the field of language and communication: one is dealing with speech, the other with understanding.

An interpreter is a cultural as well as linguistic interpreter or mediator (Lippitt and Watson, 1955). An interpreter is a specialist in communication art, because, "A good interpreter is more than a translator of words, since language skills are only a part of the process of communication" (Berris, 1983). An interpreter is the person in the middle with some obligations to both clients, and these obligations may not be entirely compatible (Anderson, 1976). For instance, the host-provided interpreter will feel a strong sense of loyalty to that host. Therefore, he might influence the nature and content of the communication process (Nadler, 1987). An interpreter is occupationally vulnerable to the pressures from both negotiating parties (Anderson, 1976). An interpreter controls information (Anderson, 1976). Therefore, he has a great impact on the structure of the entire situation of negotiations. An

interpreter is a promoter of knowledge and an inventor of terms (Kandler, 1963). The World Press (1986) referred to the translators as messengers. Lehman (1986) wrote that a translator is a legislator of words.

The pivotal position and function of an interpreter legitimize his power and influence in the intercultural interaction context. Owing to the demands of their needs, both parties/clients increase their expectations of interpreters. It is important, therefore, that the "precise nature" of an interpreter's role become clearly identified.

In the published literature, the discussions of interpreters and the roles they play are theoretical rather than experimental and lack systematic and complete discussion. In reality, the profile of an interpreter's roles needs more detailed description. Anderson (1976) points out,

...the interpreter's role is always partially undefined--that is, the role prescriptions are objectively inadequate. The interpreter's position is also characterized by role overload. Not only is it seldom entirely clear what he is to do, he is also frequently expected to do more than is objectively possible (pp. 216-217).

In general, the interpreter's role is characterized by some degree of inadequacy of role prescription, role overload, and role conflict resulting from his pivotal position in the interaction network (p. 218).

Anderson basically mentioned three problems in his assertions regarding the interpreter's role: (a) Inadequate

role description; (b) overloaded responsibilities; and (c) conflicts in expected roles and behaviors. According to Anderson, the ambiguity of interpreter's role is a major problem.

All the above-mentioned theories and statements lay the foundation for this current study. A clear definition of role is an important approach to defining responsibilities. The clear understanding of responsibility can help establish rules, reduce ambiguity and maximize an interpreter's effectiveness.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

SCOPE OF THE RESEARCH

In order to narrow down the research subject and control the scope of the research, this study will focus only on discussing the roles and behaviors of interpreters in business negotiations between American companies and companies from the People's Republic of China. Other contexts are excluded. However, the research findings of this study could be generalized to many other contexts in which an interpreter is employed.

This research is conducted based on the information of single-interpreter negotiations and the situations of American-employed interpreters. Ten interpreters and ten American negotiators from Portland, Oregon, served as informants in the data collection. All the American negotiators in this study have experience working with only one interpreter in a consecutive translating style. All the interpreters in this study have experience interpreting only between two negotiating parties. Therefore, the situations, such as multi-interpreters, multi-negotiating parties, simultaneous translation, and interpreters provided by a Chinese counterpart, are excluded.

PURPOSE

This study is designed to identify the roles and behaviors of an interpreter from two distinctive points of view: Those of the interpreters and those of the American negotiators. In short, the research is designed to study one subject from the perspectives of two groups.

Anderson's statements (see Chapter I, p. 3; Chapter II, p. 12) accurately describes the current working situation of interpreters. This study closely examines Anderson's categories of interpreter issues, such as (a) role prescription, (b) role overload, and (c) role conflicts. The main issue here is role ambiguity due to the inadequacy of role prescription, which may contribute to role overload and role conflict.

In order to describe the expected role of an interpreter, this research will (a) examine the perspectives of interpreters and American negotiators on the subject of the role prescription of interpreters; (b) discuss the differences and similarities of their perspectives; and (c) describe the expected roles and behaviors of interpreters drawn from the results of the data.

Based upon the review of literature, the following research questions have been developed:

- 1) What roles and behaviors are expected of an interpreter or prescribed by the American negotiators?

- 2) What roles and behaviors do the interpreters expect to perform?
- 3) How compatible are the perspectives of these two groups regarding the behaviors of interpreters?

With these research questions, this researcher explores plausible dimensions and aspects for answers. In accordance with Anderson (1976), this researcher understands that the more important issue is not what roles an interpreter can play, but how much is expected of an interpreter. This study will lend itself to a clearer understanding of the roles and behaviors that the interpreters play.

RESEARCH SUBJECT

In this research, the subjects are ten (10) interpreters and ten (10) American negotiators in Portland, Oregon, USA. In order to specify precisely the research subjects, definitions are as follows:

Interpreters: Interpreters are those who have been hired by one or more American companies for doing on-the-spot oral translation in American-Chinese business negotiations.

American Negotiators: American negotiators are those who represent American companies and are engaged in business negotiations with any company from the People's Republic of China, and have the experience of communicating

with the Chinese negotiators through an interpreter.

Among the ten (10) interpreters, six (6) were male and four (4) were female. Their average age was thirty-eight (38) years old. Their average interpreting experience in American-Chinese business negotiations was thirteen point seven (13.7) times. Among the ten (10) American negotiators, seven (7) were male and three (3) were female. Their average age was forty-three point five (43.5) years old. Their average negotiating experience in American-Chinese business negotiations was ten point one (10.1) times. For details about the qualifications of the research subjects refer to Appendix A (p. 101).

As for the respondent qualification, this researcher selected available American negotiators and interpreters to answer the questionnaire. The researcher understands that the qualification of interpreters varies greatly due to their capabilities. There are many variables involved in determining the qualifications, i.e. language, communication skill, experience, competence, and his/her interest and reliability to both negotiating parties. Having considered all those necessary qualifications, this researcher conducted this study on the interpreter's role.

Among the interpreters used in this study are Americans, American Chinese, and Chinese from the People's Republic of China or Taiwan now working or studying in Portland, Oregon. This researcher has access to each of the

interpreters and American negotiators because of previous non-professional interaction with them. All subjects volunteered to participate in this proposed study.

GENERAL APPROACH

This qualitative exploratory research employs personal interview method as a means of data collection. This research constitutes an exploratory survey approach that combines questionnaire and personal interview together.

According to Tucker, Weaver and Berryman-Fink (1981), survey is to collect information directly from individuals in writing through questionnaires and other forms of techniques. Interview is a survey technique, which is employed to gather information directly from individuals through oral contact with respondents. As for observation, it is to gather information through systematic watching, studying, or interpreting the source of the data, which can be a person, a group or a document (p. 109).

Bailey (1982) wrote in his Methods of Social Research, "A survey consists of asking questions of a (supposedly) representative cross-section of the population at a single point in time" (p. 110). He said, "The questions are often mailed to respondents, asked by an interviewer in the person's home or elsewhere, asked over the telephone by an interviewer or handed out (as in a classroom setting) for the respondent to answer and return" (p. 110). According to

Bailey, "The interview is a special case of social interaction between two persons and as such is subject to some of the same rules and restrictions as other instances of social interaction" (p. 184). Bailey said, "Among the advantages of interviews over mailed questionnaires are generally higher response rate, flexibility, ability to observe nonverbal behavior, control over environment, control over question order, and several other factors" (pp. 216-217).

Following the principles of survey and interview methods, this researcher was also an interviewer. The interviewer interviewed separately each one of the twenty respondents. A copy of an Informed Consent (p. 103) was given to each interviewee to be signed before an interview commenced. Identical questionnaires (p. 105) were given to each interviewee and collected at the end of each interview by the interviewer.

The responsibility of the interviewer in each interview was not to ask further questions but to explain the ten questions in the questionnaire and probe for answers. The presence of the researcher during the completion of the questionnaire can decrease the number of "don't knows" or "no answers" and enables the researcher to observe the differences between the standardized questionnaire and variations in individual respondents (M. J. Smith, 1988). An interview also gives the researcher considerable

flexibility in the analyses and lets operational definitions develop from actual observation.

One questionnaire was designed for two groups of people, interpreters and American negotiators, who have been engaged in American-Chinese business negotiations. Ten American negotiators and ten interpreters served as respondents for this study. The questionnaire employed in this research was designed in a form which combined forced-choice questions and open-ended questions (Appendix C, p. 105). According to H. Smith (1975), a forced-choice question can collect theme-related information from informants in a straight-forward manner, whereas an open-ended question can leave the informants free to respond in a relatively unrestricted manner. In the questionnaire, there were ten questions in total. Question 1 and Question 2 dealt with the role of an interpreter. Question 3 was about expected behaviors of an interpreter. Question 4 asked if there had been any communication between interpreters and American negotiators on the role of interpreter. Question 5 and Question 6 were designed to discover what drew more attention in judging a translation and evaluating an interpreter. Question 7 explored the awareness of misunderstanding about the role of an interpreter between interpreters and American negotiators. Question 8 surveyed existence of any written guidelines for the role of an interpreter in American companies. Question 9 searched for

the awareness of conflicts among the various behaviors that interpreters and American negotiators expected of an interpreter. Question 10 investigated the awareness of conflict between interpreters and American negotiators. All the questions and listed choices in the questionnaire were chosen based on this researcher's study of literature on interpreters.

The survey was completed within two weeks. The average length of interviews was forty minutes. All the interviews were conducted off the working sites or outside offices. The language employed in all the interviews was English. Tape recorder was not used in any one of the twenty interviews. Interviewees wrote their own answers independently on their given questionnaires.

The data were analyzed for patterns and themes which emerged from the forced choices and open-ended responses.

The sample size was too small to ascertain percentages or strong conclusions. However, clustering of responses will suggest further studies with larger samples.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

This chapter summarizes and discusses the results of the questionnaire given to ten American negotiators and their ten interpreters.

Ten questions in this Chapter follow the same sequence as they were in the questionnaire. Since some questions in the questionnaire are considerably long and have many subdivided sections, the researcher decided to offer a discussion section immediately after every segment of summary of the results. Where a question offers multiple choices, a discussion follows each choice. For all questions the table following the discussion section cites the number of respondents of each group in the columns.

Following each question is discussion based on the data. The discussion focuses on similarities and differences between the two groups' responses and determine whether or not this data suggests that interpreters and American negotiators have compatible perspectives and understandings on this subject matter.

QUESTION 1

QUESTION 1: WHAT ROLE(S) DO INTERPRETERS PLAY IN AMERICAN-CHINESE BUSINESS NEGOTIATIONS? (YOU CAN CIRCLE MORE THAN ONE OF THE FOLLOWING ROLE DESCRIPTIONS.) (See Appendix C, p. 107.)

Choice 1

As a negotiation assistant who does only language interpretation and facilitates communication between American and Chinese parties. This language-oriented position in American-Chinese business negotiation requires an interpreter to be objective and to be interested in nothing other than language translation. (See Appendix C, p. 107.)

Result of Choice 1. Four American negotiators think this choice describes the role interpreters actually perform in American-Chinese business negotiations. Five interpreters also think so.

Discussion. This description emphasizes language translation exclusively, as if the interpreter should be only a robot, a translation machine. It is a subordinate role, where providing only a faithful and objective translation is seen as sufficient and appropriate for facilitating communication.

Half of the interpreters agree with this description of their role. This result suggests interpreters who made this choice perceive their roles as being simply hired to do impartial language translation, assuming no further involvement or responsibility in the communication.

Four American negotiators agreed on this role description. This suggests that American negotiators do not expect

the interpreter to contribute personally; they are only interested in their negotiating counterpart. The interpreter should be no more than a window through which they can communicate with the other party. These are, however, still in the minority; the majority expect somewhat more from the interpreters they hire.

According to the responses of Question 1, seven of the American negotiators circled two choices, two circled one choice and one circled three choices. As for interpreters, eight of them circled two choices and two circled one choice. Every respondent circled at least one choice in Question 1.

Although Choice 1's wording implies that this is the only choice, respondents often made a second or third choice. One possible explanation is that the interviewer encouraged interviewee to make more than one choice. In the questionnaire, it is said after Question 1 that "You can circle more than one of the following role descriptions" (p. 108). It is perhaps also because the word "only" was not very obvious in the role description of Choice 1. Therefore, some respondents did not pay too much attention to this word and circled other choice(s). This situation suggests that (a) the respondents who chose Choice 1 as well as other choice(s) in Question 1 might not have a clear and definite definition of their own about the interpreter's role; (b) they might simply believe that an interpreter

plays more than one role; (c) they might believe that all the role descriptions presented under Question 1 were rhetorical games about the same person; (d) they might believe that all the listed role descriptions showed different angles of looking at the same person; and (e) they might believe that none of the presented role descriptions in Question 1 was complete whereas each one of them only covered part of the interpreter's role. Therefore, they tended to choose other choice(s) as long as they found their second and even third choice making sense or relating to their past experience.

Choice 2

As a negotiator who is employed by one party to do language interpretation and to represent the attitude, viewpoint and concern of the employer. Therefore, the interpreter's personal feeling and viewpoint are irrelevant. An interpreter plays the role of a negotiator. (See Appendix C, p. 107.)

Result of Choice 2. Nine of the American negotiators made this choice. Two of the interpreters agreed.

Discussion. Choice 2 is similar to choice one, but with a twist: The interpreter actually participates in the negotiation. A majority of the American negotiators made this choice; they feel that an interpreter plays the role of a negotiator. He/She shoulders significant responsibility in a negotiation as other negotiators do. He/She is not a tool of negotiators or an outsider; he/she works actively with the rest to achieve the goal. If he/she has any

personal interest or opinion about the negotiation, though, he must subordinate that to his employer's interest and viewpoint. He/She is still not at all autonomous.

Most of the interpreters did not choose this role prescription, suggesting that it describes the interpreter as having the same position or title as other negotiators, but there is no authority attached to it. According to the responses, most interpreters think they do not play the role of a negotiator. Because of that, an interpreter deals with translating information whereas a negotiator deals with making decision based on the information interpreted by the interpreter. This suggests that interpreters are much more interested in providing interpreting service than taking the responsibility of making decision for his/her company. As an interpreter, he/she has freedom to choose words or translating methods from a wide range of alternatives. As a negotiator, he/she has the responsibility to make appropriate decisions. The result suggests that besides the interpreting responsibility, interpreters are not willing to be in a position where they have to take the responsibility and stress of decision making for their employing companies.

Choice 3

As a "middle man" who is employed by one party, but obligated to both American and Chinese parties. An interpreter works for both parties independently. His/her personal viewpoint carried in his/her interpretation can influence and be influenced by the decision-making of both parties. (See Appendix C, p. 107.)

Result of Choice 3. Four of the interpreters viewed this description as their reality. Only one of the American negotiators accepted this description.

Discussion. This choice describes an interpreter's role from another perspective, the specific contractual relationship between the interpreters and negotiators. The controversial issue here is to whom the interpreter belongs and for whom he works. The large difference between negotiators and interpreters in their responses shows this controversy.

In this research, interpreters are employed by the American party. Interpreters provided by an independent third party agency are far less common, and are not considered in this study.

By their response to this choice, the interpreters suggest their affinity to the idea of being paid by one party but working for both parties. Only being in such a position can the interpreter see the complete picture and give the most objective and accurate interpretation. These interpreters enjoy working independently. They believe that the less they are attached to and controlled by either party, the more accurate their interpretation would be.

It does not appeal to American negotiators that they have employed the interpreter but he/she still acts like a middle person. It is easy for an interpreter to give an interpretation, in which the American negotiators would not

know how much the message is from the counterpart and how much it is the interpreter's personal input. It would be much more comfortable for the American negotiator to have a clear understanding that the interpreter he/she hired is obligated to nobody except himself/herself, and the interpretation is simply a reference for him/her to make decisions. In this view, the interpreter should not have the authority to influence the decisions of the American negotiator.

Choice 4

As a third party, who in addition to providing translation of source languages, gives time for the negotiators of both parties, thus enabling them to prepare their next statement and plan their strategies for the next step. (See Appendix C, p. 107.)

Result of Choice 4. Six of the interpreters responded that this description defines their role. Three of the American negotiators supported this description. Twice as many interpreters agree with this descriptions than did the negotiators.

Discussion. Choice 4 suggests a very simplistic description of an interpreter's function in American-Chinese business negotiation. The interpreters and American negotiators who made this choice suggest the role of interpreters as not very complex. Their role is simply to provide translation of the source language. In addition to this, the choice describes one significant aspect of the

interpreter's behavior that is often overlooked--it always takes time to produce an interpretation. This legitimate time an interpreter takes in his interpretation gives a valuable opportunity to negotiators to prepare their next statement or response. This can be a benefit or feature of an interpreter's role if the interpreter is unconscious of this effect. But in many situations, it also can be understood as a role when an interpreter deliberately stretch the time of interpretation so as to allow more time for a negotiator to plan his/her negotiation strategy, speech, etc.

Since an interpreter only interprets the given information of the source language and cannot make decisions for either negotiating party, it is also made clear in Choice 4 that the interpreter is only a third party, especially when both American and Chinese parties make their decisions. But, linguistically and culturally speaking, an interpreter must be equally responsible to the two negotiating parties. That six interpreters favor this description suggests that interpreters would prefer not to take on any more pressure and responsibility in decision making than they have to in the course of performing language and cultural interpretation.

Choice 5

If you do not agree with any descriptions above, please write your own. (See Appendix C, p. 107.)

Result of Choice 5. Choice 5 is an open-ended choice, leaving room for both interpreters and American negotiators to fill in information not covered in any of the regular choices or simply to write a new role description of their own. Three of the American negotiators and four of the interpreters made this choice and wrote their own descriptions.

From American negotiators, the comments are:

- 1) An interpreter is employed to translate and represent the interests of the employing party.
- 2) An interpreter is a specialist of intercultural communication.
- 3) An interpreter is an advisor whose insight and input is welcomed by American negotiators. An American negotiator can accept or reject the interpreter's suggestions based upon his feelings or viewpoints. American negotiators would rather have the choice than nothing at all.
- 4) Finally, as an advocate for the employer, American negotiators would not expect the interpreter to be offering the same advice to the counterpart that the American party asks for. Since negotiations are partly adversarial, American negotiators expect that the interpreter who was hired by the American party will also represent his employer's interest over those of the other party in the

pursuit of advantage.

From the interpreters, the comments are as follows:

- 1) An interpreter is an objective intermediary, who serves as a linguistic bridge between the two negotiating parties, no matter which party is hiring him.
- 2) An interpreter's role is to assist in achieving effective communication. Besides giving faithful translation, he should explain to the negotiators about any nuances or culturally specific subtleties that might cause miscommunication.
- 3) An interpreter also plays the role of a consultant and occasionally the role of a negotiator on behalf of his employer.

Discussion. In Choice 5, both groups agree that an interpreter is employed to do linguistic and cultural translation. But interpreters believe it irrelevant which party is the employer, because language translation has to be objective in any situation. On the other hand, American negotiators believe that it does matter, because the interpreter should provide his employer more service, including advice, than he provides the counterpart.

Interpreters think the word "consultant" more accurately describes the role of an interpreter in negotiations, because an interpreter participates in contributing his/her opinion only when being asked by other

negotiators. His/Her opinion is always considered as advice which is for reference only. Thus, American negotiators consider an interpreter as simply an "advisor."

The concepts of consultant and advisor are very close. A consultant is "an expert who is called on for professional or technical advice or opinions" (Guralnik, 1986). An advisor is "a person who offers advice, especially in an official or professional capacity" (Berube, 1982).

Webster's New World Dictionary explains that the word "advice" implies the making of recommendations as to a course of action by someone with actual or supposed knowledge, experience, etc. They both are people who give expert or professional advice to other people when they are asked to do so. Both of them do not make decisions for other people. They give only necessary information.

The responses to Question 1 are summarized in Table I (p. 37).

QUESTION 2

QUESTION-2: WHAT ROLE(S) SHOULD INTERPRETERS PLAY IN AMERICAN-CHINESE BUSINESS NEGOTIATIONS?
(See Appendix C, p. 108.)

Results

This open-ended question was clustered by themes. Nine of the interpreters and nine of the American negotiators answered. The comments of interpreters and American negotiators were clustered and categorized as follows:

TABLE I

WHAT ROLE(S) DO INTERPRETERS PLAY IN AMERICAN-
CHINESE BUSINESS NEGOTIATIONS?

	NEGOTIATORS (10 PERSONS) NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	INTERPRETERS (10 PERSONS) NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS
(1)	4	5
(2)	9	2
(3)	1	4
(4)	3	6
(5)	3	4

Note: See APPENDIX C for choices.

* Seven of the American negotiators circled two choices.
Two circled one choice.
One circled 3 choices.

* Eight of the interpreters circled two choices.
Two circled one choice.

N= 20
10 American negotiators
10 Interpreters

Interpreters:

- 1) An interpreter is a linguist with profound knowledge in both languages and cultures.
- 2) An interpreter should be an objective intermediary.
- 3) An interpreter should be a negotiation assistant.
- 4) An interpreter should be a consultant.

American Negotiator:

- 1) An interpreter should be an language interpreter.
- 2) An interpreter should be a specialist of intercultural communication.
- 3) An interpreter should be a negotiator.
- 4) An interpreter should maintain neutrality, never take sides.

Discussion

This is an open-ended question inviting the respondents to say how they think interpreters should ideally function. Their answers suggest that neither interpreters nor American negotiators have a complete concept of the ideal interpreter they would like to employ and to work with. No one in either group gave a complete description of the interpreter's role. Some of their answers repeated the role descriptions under Question 1 (Appendix C, p. 107). Some of them added some information to the choices they made under Question-1. From reviewing the answers to Question-1 and Question-2 (Appendix C, p. 108), however, it is very

difficult to draw a clear distinction between the interpreters they have in practice and the interpreters they wish to have in theory.

Both interpreters and American negotiators believed that an interpreter should be a language interpreter, who is a linguist with profound knowledge in languages as well as in technical concepts and terminologies involved in negotiations. It suggests what interpreters and American negotiators wish to have is a language interpreter who can give objectively and technically correct translation.

Both groups were aware of the importance of cultural differences in American-Chinese negotiations. They wanted their interpreters to be specialists of intercultural communication. It suggests that an interpreter should be constantly vigilant of cultural pitfalls and direct the American negotiators away from unintentionally offending their counterparts. In order to be qualified for this role, an interpreter should be familiar with cultures and idiomatic usages. He/She should be able to interpret correct nuances and convey fully the intention and feelings in each party's language.

Theoretically speaking, it is the responsibility of an interpreter to be a language interpreter while being a specialist in cultures. Seleskovitch (1976) believes that in the field of language and communication an interpreter plays two roles simultaneously. One role deals with speech,

which is the expression of ideas, such as technical terminology, grammar, idiomatic usages, etc.; The other deals with understanding, which occurs when we listen to the speech and comprehend the ideas of the other speaker.

In American-Chinese business negotiations, the comprehension of cultural differences is considered by many interpreters and American negotiators as a very important part of communication. The unique feature of an interpreter is that two roles (language interpreter and cultural specialist) are naturally and inseparably combined. These two roles are performed by the same person.

On each and every occasion an interpreter's performance is based on two processes: recognizing the linguistic items perceived and construing the meaning of the message (Seleskovitch, 1976). To recognize the linguistic items requires profound knowledge in the languages employed. To construe the meaning of the message requires an interpreter to understand the context. During intercultural interactions, cultural context plays an important role. In American-Chinese business negotiation, it is an interpreter's responsibility to explicate the cultural context of the source language and the second-language versions. An interpreter must fully understand expressions and be sensitive to the use of words. He/She must know how to fit words into cultural context and how to direct an American negotiator from cultural pitfalls. Sometimes this

role requires the interpreter to note instances where he believes the literal interpretation does not express the intended meaning. In these instances, the interpreter should offer his considered opinion of what is intended.

Those American negotiators who think an interpreter should be a negotiator believe that an interpreter should always represent his employer. But they also believe that interpreters must be always objective and never take sides. This suggests the difficulty of interpreting work. The difficulty for an interpreter to work is how to represent his/her employer while maintaining his own viewpoint, especially when the employer and interpreter do not agree with each other. This is role conflict. This also suggests a contradiction in the expectation of American negotiators.

Differing from American negotiators, interpreters think they should be negotiation assistants and intermediaries. The reason is that they participate in negotiations but have different responsibilities from those of negotiators. An interpreter only translates the source language based on knowledge of the language, culture, subject, etc., and provide professional advice only at the time when it is requested.

The results suggest that American negotiators want interpreters to act as negotiators but do not want interpreters to have the same power as other American negotiators have in decision-making in a business. American

negotiators want to retain full control in every detailed procedure, including interpretation and translation. They are not comfortable allowing an interpreter to be in a position that is difficult for American negotiators to access, control and understand.

Reviewing all the answers from interpreters and American negotiators, it is still very difficult to describe adequately what roles interpreters should play in American-Chinese business negotiations. Surprisingly enough, within each group it is also difficult to find a common ground. It seems that every individual has an opinion about this subject, yet no one has a complete one. Some actually simply referred to the role descriptions of interpreters listed in Question 1, which is about the roles that interpreters play in reality.

The responses to Question 2 are summarized in Table II (p. 43).

QUESTION 3

QUESTION-3: WHAT BEHAVIORS DO YOU EXPECT OF AN INTERPRETERS?
(See Appendix C, p. 108.)

Result

(1) Pure Linguistic Translation. Five of the American negotiators expected pure linguistic translation and five of them sometimes expected it. Three of the interpreters believed they expected pure linguistic translation, six of

TABLE II

WHAT ROLE(S) SHOULD INTERPRETERS PLAY IN AMERICAN-
CHINESE BUSINESS NEGOTIATIONS?

NEGOTIATORS	INTERPRETERS
1. Interpreter is employed to translate and represent the interests of the employing party.	1. Proficiency in Chinese and English is basic skill.
2. Note instances where the literal interpretation does not express the intended meaning.	2. Promote communication.
3. Constantly vigilant of cultural pitfalls and direct the employer away from unintentionally offending the counterpart.	3. Cultural interpretation is necessary.
4. Offer some insights into the relationship.	4. Familiar with cultures.
5. Do not offer the same degree of advice to the counterpart as the employer asks for.	5. Be knowledgeable about the nature of negotiation.
6. Translate the desired meaning and make it clear to the counterpart.	6. Be creative and pleasant to relax the atmosphere.
7. Stay out of taking sides.	7. Be an objective intermediary.
8. Direct/literal translation is necessary for basic cultural protocol.	8. Consultant.
9. Bridge the communication gap.	9. Negotiator of employer.
10. Refer to 1) in Q-1.	10. Refer to 4) in Q-1.
11. Refer to 2) in Q-1.	11. Help to achieve effective communication.
12. Refer to 4) in Q-1.	12. Refer to 1) and 2) in Q-1.
13. Be a cultural guide as well as translator.	13. Bridging cultural gaps.
14. Be culturally sensitive.	14. Refer to 2) in Q-1.
15. Remember the connotative interpretation and cultural differences.	15. Help both sides to understand issues.
	16. Convey fully the intention and feelings of the employer.
	17. Be absolutely familiar with the subject and technical terminology.
	18. Be familiar with idiomatic usages and give correct nuances in counterpart's language.

Note: See APPENDIX C for referred question choices.
N=20 (10 American Negotiators; 10 Interpreters.)

them sometimes expected it and one did not expect it.

(2) Cultural Interpretation. Eight respondents in each group expected an interpreter to do "cultural interpretation" and two in each group circled "sometimes" expecting such behavior.

(3) Bridging Gaps in Communication. All the interpreters believed that bridging gap is their expected behavior. Six of the American negotiators agreed, but four of them believed that sometimes this behavior is expected.

(4) Mediating. Four of the American negotiators expected interpreters to mediate. Seven of the interpreters circled "No."

(5) Consulting. Three of the American negotiators did not expect interpreters to be their consultants. Seven of the interpreters thought that sometimes the consulting service is their expected behavior.

(6) Business Information Gatherer. Five of the American negotiators expected interpreters to gather business information and three of them sometimes did and two of them never did. One of the interpreter believed that interpreters should gather business information for their employers. Five of them believed it was necessary sometimes and four of them believed they should not do it.

(7) Personal Information Gatherer. Five of the American negotiators expected interpreters to gather personal information about their counterpart. Four of them

sometimes expected it. One of them did not expect it at all. One of the interpreters believed they should gather such information for their employers. Four of them believed sometimes they should do it. Five of them thought they should not do that.

(8) Being a Liaison for both Parties. Four of the American negotiators expected an interpreter to be a liaison for both parties. Five of them sometimes expected it. One of them did not expect it. Three of the interpreters believed they should be a liaison for both parties. Four of them thought sometimes it was necessary. Three of them thought they should not do it.

(9) Advertising Product, Business, Company or Person. Six of the respondents in each group did not expect an interpreter to "advertise product, business, company or person." Four in each group circled "sometimes" expecting such behavior.

(10) Being Passive and Mechanical. Seven of the American negotiators did not expect interpreters to be passive and mechanical and three of them thought sometimes they did. Five of the interpreters thought interpreters should not be passive and mechanical and five of them thought sometimes they should.

(11) Being Active and Creative. Three of the American negotiators expected interpreters to be active and creative, five of them sometimes did and two did not have such

expectations. Four of the interpreters believed that interpreters should be active and creative. Five of them thought sometimes they should behave in this way and one thought they should not be.

(12) Giving Word-to-Word Translation. Four of the American negotiators expected interpreters to give word-to-word translation; five of them sometimes expected it, and one did not expect it. One of the interpreters believed they should give such translation, three of them thought sometimes it was necessary and six thought they should not do it.

(13) Giving Meaning Interpretation. Seven of the American negotiators expected an interpreter to give meaning interpretation and three of them sometimes expected it. Eight of the interpreters believed they should give meaning interpretation and two thought sometimes it was necessary.

(14) Being Introverted. Six of the American negotiators sometimes expected interpreters to be introverted and four of them did not expect it. Four of the interpreters believed that sometimes interpreters should be introverted and six thought they should not be.

(15) Being extroverted. Three of the American negotiators expected interpreters to be extroverted, five of them sometimes expected it and two did not expect it. Three of the interpreters thought they should be extroverted, six of them thought sometimes they should behave like that and

one thought they should not be.

(16) Controlling Information. Nine of the interpreters believed that "controlling information" was not their expected behavior and one thought it was needed sometimes. Among the American negotiators, seven did not expect interpreters to control information and three thought it was acceptable sometimes.

(17) Influencing over Decision-Making of the Employer. Eight in each group did not expect an interpreter to "influence decision-making of the employer." Two of them in each group said they expected such behavior sometimes.

(18) Exerting Influence over Decision-Making of the Counterpart. All the interpreters believed that exerting influence over decision-making of the counterpart was not their expected behavior and eight of the American negotiators agreed. One of the American negotiators did expect interpreters to influence over decision-making of their counterparts. One of the American negotiators sometimes expected such behavior.

(19) Having Strong People Skills. Nine of the American negotiators expected interpreters to "have strong people skills" and one of them thought it was only needed sometimes. Among the interpreters, five thought it was their expected behavior and five thought it was only needed sometimes.

(20) Being Diplomatic. All of the American negotiators

believed that "being diplomatic" was an expected behavior of interpreters whereas five of interpreters agreed with it and five of them believed that it was only needed sometimes.

(21) Providing off-the-Record Remarks made by the Counterpart. Five of the American negotiators expected interpreters to provide off-the-record remarks made by the counterpart and five of them believed sometimes they do. Two of the interpreters thought they should provide such information, seven of them thought sometimes they should provide it and one thought they should not provide it.

(22) Participating in Decision-Making of the Employer's Party. Two of the American negotiators expected interpreters to participate in decision making. Five of the American negotiators sometimes expected such behavior and three of them did not expect it. Eight of the interpreters thought sometimes they should participate in such activity and two of them thought they should not do it.

(23) Being Friendly and Energetic. Nine of the interpreters believed that "being friendly and energetic" was their expected behavior and one of them thought it was only needed sometimes. Among the American negotiators, seven believed interpreters should be friendly and energetic and three of them thought it was only needed sometimes.

(24) Being a Sounding Board for both Parties to Test and Prepare Their Strategies. Five of the American negotiators sometimes expected an interpreter to be a

sounding board for both parties to test and prepare their strategies and five of them did not have such an expectation. One of the interpreters thought they should be a sounding board for both parties, six of them thought sometimes they should act like that and three of them thought they should not act like that.

Choice 25 is an open-ended question to which only some American negotiators responded. In this choice, American negotiators also expected the interpreter to be an excellent listener, very patient, and have a sense of humor as well as being a useful testing device for both parties.

Discussion

On some behaviors listed in the question, both interpreters and American negotiators have very similar opinions whereas on some behaviors their choices vary greatly. In general, rarely do these two groups of people have complete overlap in their expectation of interpreters' behavior. Within each group, it is also rare that their choices were the same.

Behavior is one or a series of actions in a person's response to the stimuli in a given environment, such as in American-Chinese business negotiation. The relationship between role and behavior is that role is an abstract form which becomes tangible, recognizable and definable only when certain behaviors are performed. Recognizing and identifying behaviors can also help to define the role one plays.

In many situations, the interpreter's role is an abstract form, under which certain behaviors of interpreters are assigned or expected by other people.

It is straightforward for an interpreter to understand what to do when an action is verbally described and assigned. Problems arise when there are unspoken but expected behaviors. The interacting people assume they understand each other, leading them to consider verbal description unnecessary. Clarifying all these expected behaviors of interpreters should help determine the role of interpreters in American-Chinese business negotiations.

In order to determine the behaviors of an interpreter from Question-3, two lists of expected behaviors were established. One list was from the answers of interpreters, the other from American negotiators. The most frequent responses of every behavior determined its entry and sequence in each list. The higher the rate is, the earlier the choice will be listed in each list. Therefore, the sequence of choices in each list suggests the order of preference in expected behaviors of interpreters. These two lists indicated the variation of emphases that each group made. All the listed behaviors were considered appropriate to the interpreter role by both groups. These two new versions of expected behaviors could serve as a reference or an evaluation criteria for the American negotiators. The two new versions of expected behaviors of interpreters are

listed separately as follows:

American negotiators expect the following behaviors of an interpreter:

- 1) Be diplomatic.
- 2) Have strong people skills.
- 3) Give cultural interpretation.
- 4) Do not influence decision-making of the counterpart.
- 5) Do not influence decision-making of the employer.
- 6) Be not passive and mechanical.
- 7) Give meaning interpretation.
- 8) Do not control information.
- 9) Be friendly and energetic.
- 10) Bridge gaps in communication.
- 11) Do not advertise product, business, company or person.
- 12) Be introverted.
- 13) Give pure linguistic translation.
- 14) Sometimes mediate between American and Chinese parties.
- 15) Gather business information.
- 16) Gather personal information.
- 17) Sometimes be a liaison for both parties.
- 18) Sometimes be active and creative.
- 19) Sometimes give word-to-word translation.
- 20) Be extroverted.

- 21) Provide off-the-record remarks made by the counterpart.
- 22) Sometimes participate in decision-making of the employer's party.
- 23) Sometimes be a sounding board for both parties to test and prepare their strategies.
- 24) Provide consulting service.
- 25) Be an excellent listener.
- 26) Be very patient.
- 27) Have a good sense of humor.
- 28) Be a useful testing device for both parties.

Interpreters expect the following behaviors:

- 1) Bridge gaps in communication.
- 2) Do not influence decision-making of the counterpart.
- 3) Do not control information.
- 4) Be friendly and energetic.
- 5) Give cultural interpretation.
- 6) Give meaning interpretation.
- 7) Do not influence decision-making of the employer.
- 8) Sometimes participate in decision-making of the employer's party.
- 9) Do not mediate between American and Chinese parties.
- 10) Sometimes provide consulting service.
- 11) Sometimes provide off-the-record remarks made by

the counterpart.

- 12) Sometimes give pure linguistic translation.
- 13) Do not advertise product, business, company or person.
- 14) Do not give word-to-word translation.
- 15) Do not be introverted.
- 16) Sometimes be extroverted.
- 17) Sometimes be a sounding board for both parties to test and prepare their strategies.
- 18) Gather business information.
- 19) Gather personal information.
- 20) Be not passive and mechanical.
- 21) Sometimes be active and creative.
- 22) Have strong people skills.
- 23) Be diplomatic.
- 24) Sometimes be a liaison for both parties.

The American negotiators' list has four items more than the interpreters' list. It is because in Question-3 the 25th choice is an open-ended choice. The American negotiators listed four items extra whereas the interpreters did not. By reading these two lists, one can observe very clearly the preferences of these two groups.

For some unknown reasons many respondents had difficulty understanding that language translation consists of two levels of translation. One level is linguistic translation, the other is cultural translation

(Seleskovitch, 1976). They are both equally important. However, the choices both groups made in this question suggests that they were aware of the importance of cultural translation but not linguistic translation (Choice 1).

Seven of the interpreters believed that they should not give mediating service (Q-3, 4). However, five of the American negotiators think that sometimes interpreters should give consulting service (Q-3, 5). This indicates the contradiction in the answers of interpreters in Question-2. Question-2 asks about the role of an interpreter in theory. This suggests that interpreters, theoretically speaking, believe they should act as objective intermediaries, who actively introduce ideas to the disputing parties for an agreement. But, in the reality of American-Chinese business negotiation, the majority of interpreters prefer to offer their advice only when they are being consulted by the disputing parties.

Choice 16, 17 and 18 were about the power of the interpreter. Brislin (1976) thinks that another way to learn the insight of an interpreter's role is to analyze "power relations." According to French (1956), there are five types of interpersonal power: Attraction power, expert power, reward power, coercive power and legitimate power. As an interpreter, his/her expert power is his possession of knowledge and his control of information. Interpreters have the ability to control information. Is it an expected and

acceptable behavior? In Choice 16, the answers indicated that nine of the interpreters did not expect to control information. Seven of the American negotiators did not expect of interpreters to do it either. But, there were a few of the respondents in both groups who believed it is sometimes necessary for an interpreter to control certain information. These answers suggest that an interpreter does have the ability to be selective in translation. It is completely decided by the interpreter when and how much he/she should exercise this "expert power."

In choices 17 and 18, the majority of interpreters and American negotiators stated that they did not expect an interpreter to influence the decision-making in either the American or the Chinese party. This suggests that an interpreter is not expected by either group to participate in decision-making or have influence over the decision-making of either negotiating party. But the fact is that all the first-hand information, on the basis of which both monolingual parties make their decisions, is from the bilingual interpreter. This situation suggests that interpreters are still being treated as sophisticated translating machines, that are employed for obtaining the information required for decision-making.

Reviewing all the answers to Question 3, the data suggests that all the behaviors listed were appropriate and related to the interpreter's role assigned or expected by

both interpreters and American negotiators. The difference is that some choices were chosen more than others. Very infrequently did both groups have identical answers. It can be assumed that the more categories chosen, the stronger the behavior is preferred by the respondent. Since the answers of these two groups do not match, it is very difficult to bring out one list of expected behaviors that both groups would support.

To study and determine the expected behaviors of an interpreter, the answers in this question suggested that the important issue was not what behaviors were appropriate, but who was the person evaluating them and when he/she evaluated them. The answers suggest that the beliefs and normative standards that served as evaluation criteria for American negotiators varied from person to person. Their answers also suggest that it may be difficult for an interpreter to perform his/her role in an effective manner because of the discrepancy between expected behaviors by the interpreter and the negotiator.

The responses to Question 3 are summarized in Table III (p. 57).

QUESTION 4

QUESTION-4: DO YOU EVER DISCUSS THE INTERPRETER'S ROLE WITH YOUR INTERPRETER/AMERICAN NEGOTIATOR? (See Appendix C, p. 110.)

TABLE III
WHAT BEHAVIORS DO YOU EXPECT OF AN INTERPRETER?

	YES		NO		SOMETIMES	
	*A.N.	**I.	A.N.	I.	A.N.	I.
(1)	5	3	0	1	5	6
(2)	8	8	0	0	2	2
(3)	6	10	0	0	4	0
(4)	4	0	1	7	5	3
(5)	4	1	3	2	3	7
(6)	5	1	2	4	3	5
(7)	5	1	1	5	4	4
(8)	4	3	1	3	5	4
(9)	0	0	6	6	4	4
(10)	0	0	7	5	3	5
(11)	3	4	2	1	5	5
(12)	4	1	1	6	5	3
(13)	7	8	0	0	3	2
(14)	0	0	4	6	6	4
(15)	3	3	2	1	5	6
(16)	0	0	7	9	3	1
(17)	0	0	8	8	2	2
(18)	1	0	8	10	1	0
(19)	9	5	0	0	1	5
(20)	10	5	0	0	0	5
(21)	5	2	0	1	5	7
(22)	2	0	3	2	5	8
(23)	7	9	0	0	3	1
(25) ***	An excellent listener. Very patient. Good sense of humor. A useful testing device for both parties.					

Note: * A.N. is American Negotiator.
 ** I is Interpreter.
 *** The open-ended responses of American negotiators.

See APPENDIX C for choices.

N=20
 10 American Negotiators
 10 Interpreters

Result

Two of the American negotiators and one of the interpreters indicated they "often" discussed the roles of interpreters. Six of the American negotiators and three of the interpreters indicated "occasionally" talked about it. One of the American negotiators and four of the interpreters said they "rarely" talked about it. One of the American negotiators and two of the interpreters answered that they do "not at all" discuss it.

Discussion

Generally speaking, there were only two of the American negotiators and one of interpreters "often" discussing this subject with their partners. Seven respondents in each group did not often talk about it. One of the American negotiators and two of the interpreters discussed it not at all. This suggests that this subject is not a popular topic among these two groups.

Why do such a large number of interpreters and American negotiators rarely discuss the roles of interpreters? This might have to do with their presumptions about this subject. The answers suggest that interpreters and American negotiators do not have a desire to discuss the roles of interpreters. It suggests that they are confident in their knowledge and understanding of this subject. They understand that the principle role of an interpreter is to

interpret the source language into a version of another language. But it is indicated that they are not aware that there are various expectations of interpreters besides language translation.

Can American negotiators and interpreters understand each other precisely without going through verbal communication? By reviewing the answers in Question-1, Question-7 and Question-9 of the questionnaire, it is suggested that each individual respondent has his/her own understanding on the roles of interpreters and no one assumes there would be differences on this subject. But looking at this issue more closely, this researcher finds that contradictions exist in the reported perspectives of interpreters and American negotiators. For instance, choice 7 in Question 3 reports that five of the American negotiators wanted interpreters to gather personal information on their counterparts whereas five of the interpreters did not think they should do so. In choice 22, two negotiators wanted their interpreter to participate in their decision-making but three of them opposed. Eight of the interpreters thought sometimes an interpreter should participate in his/her employer's decision-making. In choice 24, five of the American negotiators did not expect the interpreter to be a sounding board whereas five of them said that they sometimes expected it.

How can interpreters and American negotiators

understand these differences about each other correctly by simply depending on observation and nonverbal communication? Misunderstandings become inevitable. This situation suggests that "role ambiguities and conflicts of the interpreter role" (Anderson, 1976, p. 127) might have to do with the lack of verbal communication between interpreters and American negotiators.

The responses to Question 4 are summarized in Table IV (p. 61).

QUESTION 5

QUESTION-5: TO WHAT EXTENT ARE YOU AWARE THAT ANY OF THE FOLLOWING FACTORS INFLUENCED A NEGOTIATION?
(See Appendix C, p. 110.)

Result

All ten interpreters and seven of the American negotiators believed that "accuracy of translation" was always a factor that influenced their negotiation.

Seven of the interpreters thought that sometimes the "amount of explanation" would change the intended meaning of the original message and affect the negotiation. Four of the American negotiators thought the amount of explanation given by an interpreter could always have an influence over a negotiation.

Six of the interpreters and four of the American negotiators believed the "interpreter's bias" sometimes could influence a negotiation. But two from each group

TABLE IV

DO YOU EVER DISCUSS THE INTERPRETER'S ROLE WITH
YOUR INTERPRETER/AMERICAN NEGOTIATOR?

1. OFTEN		2. OCCASIONALLY		3. RARELY		4. NOT AT ALL	
*A.N.							I.
2	1	6	3	1	4	1	2

Note: * A.N. is American negotiator.

** I is Interpreter.

See APPENDIX C for choices.

N=20

10 American Negotiators

10 Interpreters

believed it never influenced their negotiations.

Six of the interpreters and four of the American negotiators believed that "interpreter's influence" sometimes affected their negotiations. Two of the interpreters and three of the American negotiators thought it never influenced a negotiation.

Five of the American negotiators and four of the interpreters thought that sometimes "interpreter's knowledge and experience" could influence a negotiation. Five of the American negotiators and six of the interpreters believed that interpreter's knowledge and experience could always influence a negotiation.

Six of the American negotiators and three of the interpreters thought that sometimes an interpreter's "ability to control direction of negotiation" influenced their negotiations. One of the American negotiators and four of the interpreters thought this factor never influenced their negotiations.

Seven of the interpreters believed that sometimes "interpreter's obligation to American employer" influenced a negotiation and five of the American interpreters believed this factor could always influence a negotiation.

Eight of the interpreters and five of the American negotiators thought that "interpreter's responsibility" could influence a negotiation.

Three of the American negotiators and five of the

interpreters thought that sometimes "interpreter's loyalty to an American employer" could influence a negotiation. Five of the American negotiators and four of the interpreters thought this factor could always influence a negotiation. Two of the American negotiators thought this factor never influenced a negotiation.

Discussion

This is a question based on people's past experience in American-Chinese business negotiations. In this question the researcher attempted to discover the awareness of intangible factors which directly relate to interpreters and affect negotiations.

The results suggest that everyone is aware of an interpreter in an American-Chinese negotiation and knows that the interpreter's role is to translate languages between American and Chinese parties. We can name this role as an assigned role of interpreters. But, what else are they aware of? To what extent are they aware of those less tangible factors which may influence the negotiations? Ten items were listed and three choices (Never, Sometimes and Always) were given.

The majority of interpreters and American negotiators highly value accuracy of translation. This suggests their belief that good quality translation requires accuracy. An interpreter cannot just translate language, but also has to translate it accurately. If an interpreter cannot guarantee

the accuracy, his/her translation can affect a negotiation. Another well-considered factor is responsibility. Eight of the interpreters considered the responsibility of interpreters as an influential factor. Interpreters believe both accuracy of translation and responsibility of interpreters can always affect an interpreter's performance and influence the quality of negotiation.

Before we can prescribe the role of an interpreter, interpreters and American negotiators should identify what they expect of an interpreter. Unclear expectation can cause unclear and inadequate role description of interpreters. Incompatible perspectives on the role of interpreters can affect the coordination and efficiency of both interpreters and American negotiators.

Besides accuracy of translation, American negotiators were aware of additional factors. Five of them attached equal importance to factors such as interpreter's knowledge, experience, obligation to employer, responsibility and loyalty. This phenomenon suggests that American negotiators need an interpreter who gives not only quality translation but also profound knowledge, rich working experience, responsibility to work, and loyalty to the employer. All of these accessories attached to the role of interpreter were considered to different extents by both interpreters and American negotiators.

Seven of the interpreters and four of the American

negotiators believed that sometimes they were aware of interpreters' explanations. As for interpretation, the more explanation an interpreter adds to a translation, the easier the listener will understand. But the interpreter's version might change the intended meaning of the original message. Kandler (1963) introduced "interpretability" theory, which legitimized this practice of interpreters who can choose more than one way to translate a given text. Since interpreters are the only bilinguals who do the translation in American-Chinese negotiations, they are more aware of the amount of explanation or interpretation than the American negotiators.

Six of the American negotiators and three of the interpreters said that sometimes they were aware of the interpreter's ability to control the direction of negotiation. More American negotiators recognized an interpreter's ability to control negotiation than interpreters. This situation is odd. How could American negotiators recognize the interpreters' intention or ability to control the direction of negotiation better than the interpreters know themselves? Perhaps it is more suspicion than awareness on the part of American negotiators.

Four of the interpreters and one of American negotiators said that they were never aware of an interpreter's ability to control the direction of negotiation. Three of the American negotiators and two of

the interpreters always noticed this influence from interpreters. Six of the American negotiators and three of the interpreters were sometimes aware of it. Brislin (1976) also noticed this ability in an interpreter in a court case. He wrote,

...the interpreters are not behaving as a 'faithful echo' of the defendant but rather are presenting the communication as they (the interpreters) feel will be most acceptable to the judge. Since no one else in the courtroom can understand both the language of the defendant and English, there is no one to check on the interpreter. (1976, pp. 30-31.)

Similarly, depending on the setting of American-Chinese business negotiations, these responses suggest that interpreters have and exercise their abilities in taking control of the direction of a negotiation. Such ability or behavior of an interpreter would fulfill the quality under French's description of "legitimate power" (1956). Anderson's study (1976) also supports this finding. Anderson (1976) wrote,

The interpreter's control over the interaction pattern that develops, and thereby over the structure of the triadic relationship, is found in his ability to translate selectively. He may translate all that is said by both clients with as great fidelity as he can muster--or he may choose not to. His monolingual clients will be unable to ascertain the difference unless he oversteps rather wide bounds (p. 218).

To be aware of this ability of interpreters should bring American negotiators certain control over the positive

output of a negotiation. However it is not easy for any monolingual negotiator to monitor it. Therefore, a strong negotiator-interpreter relationship, which is solidly built upon trust, loyalty, respect, friendship, communication, etc., is required in this team work in order to achieve a successful negotiation.

Reviewing the data in Table V, it suggests that interpreters and American negotiators are aware of different factors regarding negotiation to different extents. Within each group, the extent of awareness is also different from person to person. Interpreters' opinions are more concentrated and coherent whereas American negotiators' opinions are more scattered and diversified. All those factors listed under Question-5 directly relate to the interpreter's role in American-Chinese business negotiation. The choices made by the interpreters and American negotiators indicate the extent of awareness of related issues that every interpreter has been dealing with on his/her job.

The responses to Question 5 are summarized in Table V (p. 68).

QUESTION 6

QUESTION-6: WHEN YOU MAKE A JUDGMENT ABOUT AN INTERPRETER'S PERFORMANCE, WHAT DO YOU USUALLY CONSIDER? (See APPENDIX C, P. 110.)

TABLE V

TO WHAT EXTENT ARE YOU AWARE THAT ANY OF THE FOLLOW-
ING FACTORS INFLUENCED A NEGOTIATION?

***	NEVER		SOMETIMES		ALWAYS	
	*A.N.	**I.	A.N.	I.	A.N.	I.
(1)	1	0	2	0	7	10
(2)	1	0	4	7	4	2
(3)	2	2	4	6	3	2
(4)	3	2	4	6	3	2
(5)	1	0	4	3	4	6
(6)	0	0	5	4	5	6
(7)	1	4	6	3	2	3
(8)	2	1	3	7	5	2
(9)	2	0	2	2	5	8
(10)	2	0	3			

Note: * A.N. is American negotiator.

** I is Interpreter.

*** See APPENDIX C for choices.

N=20

10 American Negotiators

10 Interpreters

Result

English proficiency and skill of communication ranked highest among interpreters and American negotiators. Both groups responded similarly on these two issues.

All ten of the interpreters consider personality as an important factor and nine of the American negotiators agree with them.

All ten of the American negotiators believed that their past experience of working with the interpreter attributed to their judgment. Seven of the interpreters believed it was also a significant part of their consideration.

All ten of the interpreters and eight of the American negotiators considered an interpreter's Chinese proficiency when judging an interpreter's performance.

All ten of the American negotiators and seven of the interpreters considered the intercultural experience of an interpreter.

All ten of the interpreters and seven of the American negotiators considered an interpreter's knowledge of translation.

Eight of the interpreters and seven of the American negotiators listed maturity as a consideration.

Eight of the interpreters and six of the American negotiators also counted on the interpreter's previous experience in successful negotiations.

Sevent of the American negotiators and five of the

interpreters thought it was important to consider the interpreter's respect shown to others.

Six of the interpreters and four of the American negotiators considered the interpreter's educational background.

Six of the interpreters and two of the American negotiators believed that an interpreter's physical appearance related to his/her performance.

Three of the American negotiators considered an interpreter's national identity. All ten interpreters thought it was irrelevant.

Four in each group of respondents considered the length of interpreting experience of an interpreter an important issue.

Four of the interpreters and one of the American negotiators also listened to the comments of negotiating counterpart.

Two in each group considered their employers' comments on an interpreter.

Two of the American negotiators and one of the interpreters considered the political viewpoint of an interpreter in their judgment.

No one in either group reported age of an interpreter an issue.

One respondent in each group reported gender as an influencing factor.

Some American negotiators also listed consideration of the cost of an interpreter, time available, willingness to take chores like entertainment and other social/weekend events, professionalism, as well as sense of humor.

Discussion

This question is designed to study the interpreter's role by means of examining the criteria that are usually used in making judgments about an interpreter's performance. This researcher believes that the clearly defined needs of employing an interpreter can determine the role(s) of an interpreter. The role(s) of an interpreter can orient his/her responsibility, which decides his/her related behaviors.

This question brings up the issue of role criteria. Criteria are man-made forms, such as standards, rules or test on which a judgment or decision can be made (Berube, 1982). Criteria should be generated and conceptualized on the basis of clearly defined roles, specified responsibility and related behavior. In other words, the understanding of the role(s) of an interpreter should be clarified prior to the establishment of criteria. This researcher believes that to study criteria is to study the roles of an interpreter at a higher level.

In one aspect, Question 5 discussed the detailed criteria which was involved in making a judgment about an interpreter. But, from another perspective, it actually

studies the roles of interpreters. The results suggested that the criteria that interpreters and American negotiators used were established on the basis of their individual understanding about the roles of an interpreter. Owing to their different experiences of working with interpreters and differing understandings of the interpreter role, interpreters and American negotiators contributed different standards to measure the performance of an interpreter and put emphasis on different aspects. The results suggested that there were no clear rules or limits to control the criteria. The results suggested that criteria were subject to each individual's understanding of the roles of interpreters.

Summarizing the research results of this question, American negotiators and interpreters have different criteria. Each of these two groups has priorities and emphases. Within each group, their opinions were not always completely overlapping. The items which were reported by all respondents in each group are listed as follows:

INTERPRETERS:

- 1) English proficiency
- 2) Chinese proficiency
- 3) skill of communication
- 4) pleasant personality
- 5) knowledge of translation

AMERICAN NEGOTIATORS:

- 1) English proficiency
- 2) past experience of working with interpreter
- 3) skill of communication
- 4) intercultural experience
- 5) pleasant personality

Both groups responded in common on three issues:

English proficiency and skill of communication and pleasant personality. However, the order is different on each list. Interpreters emphasized Chinese proficiency whereas American negotiators put attention in their past experience in working with their interpreters. Interpreters believed that knowledge of translation was an important criterion whereas American negotiators believed that intercultural experience was one of their most important criteria. This researcher believes that all those entries in each group's list are crucial. The important difference indicated in these entries is that interpreters are more interested in language and knowledge of translation whereas American negotiators are more interested in evaluating their past experience of working with their interpreters and learning if their interpreters have rich intercultural experience.

Interpreter's age (4) is irrelevant to his/her quality of performance. Not one interpreter believed that the interpreter's national identity has to be considered whereas three of the American negotiators think it should be. Six of the interpreters thought an interpreter's physical

appearance had to be considered whereas only two of the American negotiators agreed with this.

The responses to Question 6 are summarized in Table VI (p. 75).

QUESTION 7

QUESTION-7: HAVE THERE EVER BEEN MISUNDERSTANDINGS BETWEEN YOU AND YOUR INTERPRETER/AMERICAN NEGOTIATOR ABOUT THE INTERPRETER'S ROLE? (See APPENDIX C, P. 111.)

Result

In this question, six of the American negotiators circled "No." Four of the interpreters also chose the same answer. There were only two of the American negotiators and one of interpreters acknowledging that such misunderstandings occurred. One of the American negotiators admitted such misunderstandings sometimes happened in their negotiations. Five of the interpreters and one of the American negotiators circled "I don't remember."

Discussion

This question attempts to explore the awareness of linguistic and/or cultural misunderstandings between interpreters and American negotiators. But, the answers suggest that such misunderstandings have not yet been experienced by six of the American negotiators and four of the interpreters. Five of the interpreters and one of the American negotiators indicated that they did not remember if

TABLE VI

WHEN YOU MAKE A JUDGMENT ABOUT AN INTERPRETER'S PERFORMANCE,
WHAT DO YOU USUALLY CONSIDER?

	TEN NEGOTIATORS	TEN INTERPRETERS
(1)	10	10
(2)	8	10
(3)	3	0
(4)	0	0
(5)	2	6
(6)	1	1
(7)	2	1
(8)	1	4
(9)	2	3
(10)	10	7
(11)	4	6
(12)	10	10
(13)	10	10
(14)	10	7
(15)	7	8
(16)	7	10
(17)	2	2
(18)	4	4
(19)	6	8
(20)	7	5
* * * * *	Willingness to take chores like entertainment, other social events and weekend events. Cost. Time available. Professionalism. Sense of humor.	

Note: * Open-ended responses of American negotiators.
 ** See APPENDIX C for Choices.

N=20
 10 American Negotiators
 10 Interpreters

there had been any misunderstandings between them. There was only a very small number of people in each group who experienced such misunderstandings. The answers suggest that misunderstandings between interpreters and American negotiators is not an issue which is often acknowledged in American-Chinese business negotiations.

The result of this question suggests that misunderstanding has not yet become a serious problem which can draw enough attention from both interpreters and American negotiator to study it. The result also raised new questions: If it is true that the interpreter's role is inadequately prescribed (Anderson, 1976), why does it not cause much confusion and misunderstanding among the interpreters and American negotiators? Do they always understand each other and do what is expected?

This researcher believes that misunderstandings can be at different levels and in various forms. Sometimes they are noticeable, sometimes they are not. For instance, when the person using the interpreter does not know something has gone wrong, communication and relationships often break down (Nadler, 1987). Misunderstanding can lead to misinterpretations, which are less noticeable but much costlier than mistranslation (Orlov, 1989). Misinterpretation may be caused by incorrect understanding; it is not visible or obvious until oral explanation conducted. Such explanation could lead listeners to a very wrong direction. Mistrans-

lation is also caused by incorrect understanding, but it always has a written text to follow with.

This researcher believes that one explanation for high frequency count of the "I Don't Remember" could be because this is a sensitive question, which might challenge certain professional qualifications of the respondents.

The responses to Question 7 are summarized in Table VII (p. 78).

QUESTION 8

QUESTION-8: DOES YOUR COMPANY HAVE WRITTEN GUIDELINES FOR THE ROLE OF AN INTERPRETER? (See APPENDIX C, P.112.)

Result

No respondent reported "Yes" to this question. Nine of the interpreters and eight of the American negotiators answered "NO." One of the interpreters and two of the American negotiators circled "It does not make any difference."

Discussion

Written guidelines are a form of orientation which can assist both interpreter and American negotiator to identify their desired roles of interpreters in a solid and tangible manner. Brislin (1982) believed that if interpreters were invited to prepare such orientations, communication problems might be lessened. Brislin also believed that users of interpreters should have instructions of the desirable

TABLE VII

HAVE THERE EVER BEEN MISUNDERSTANDINGS BETWEEN YOU
AND YOUR INTERPRETER/AMERICAN NEGOTIATOR
ABOUT THE INTERPRETER'S ROLE?

TEN NEGOTIATORS				TEN INTERPRETERS			
YES	NO	SOME- TIMES	NOT REMEMBER	YES	NO	SOME- TIMES	NOT REMEMBER
2	6	1	1	1	4	0	5

Note: See Appendix C.

N=20

10 American Negotiators

10 Interpreters

behaviors, which are likely to increase the accuracy of the translation and intercultural communication in general.

The results of Question-8 indicated that all the companies which the respondents of this survey worked for did not have any written guidelines for the role of an interpreter. The understanding of interpreters and American negotiators about the roles of interpreters still remained at an oral or nonverbal communication level. Is it necessary to have some written guidelines for both interpreters and American negotiators to follow?

To look at this issue with the viewpoint of interpersonal communication, this researcher found that this situation needs to be improved. Haley (1963) said whenever a person communicates with another the relationship is being defined. When an interpreter and an American negotiator work together as a negotiating team, a relationship has formed. Ruddock (1969) said in a relationship participants are always in roles by definition. Wilmot (1980) also said that role is one inescapable element in the mutual definition of any relationship. Thus, we can say that to write guidelines is to define the relationship between an interpreter and an American negotiator, and to define the interpersonal relationship is to define the role of each other. Therefore, the written guidelines have the function of defining the role definitions of an interpreter in a literature form.

Such relationship/role defining process is a complicated transaction. Two individuals have to adjust to each other back and forth and confirm each other in order to fit into each other's assumed role identity (Wilmot, 1980). This process requires time and clear communication between the interpreter and the American negotiator. Wilmot (1980, p. 90) wrote,

Relationships demand that each participant (1) have his own definition of the situation (direct perspective), and (2) be aware of, and adjust to, how he thinks the other person defines the relationship (metaperspective).

During such "perspective adjusting stage," it would be very difficult for both interpreter and American negotiator to understand each other precisely through only oral and nonverbal communication. In Question 8, there was one of the interpreters and two of the American negotiators who believed it did not make any difference whether or not there were written guidelines. The danger is that the respondents who held such beliefs would rely on their assumptions that they had understood each other's expectation. This researcher believes that written guidelines can address the desired roles and behaviors of an interpreter, and make error more obvious if there is any.

Ideally, such time-consuming process should be finished and the interpreter's role should be clearly defined before a business negotiation starts. Since many American business firms are not well prepared for dealing with such issue and

do not have written guidelines for both interpreters and American negotiators to follow, most interpreters have to identify their roles and make necessary adjustments during the negotiations. This situation made the interpreter's work become more complex and stressful. Although to use written guidelines is not the most perfect method to confirm the role definition of an interpreter, this researcher believe we can say that it is surely an approach to reinforce the messages expressed through oral and/or non-verbal communication.

The responses to Question 8 are summarized in Table VIII (p. 82).

QUESTION 9

QUESTION-9: ARE THERE ANY CONFLICTS BETWEEN THE VARIOUS BEHAVIORS (SEE Q-3) THAT YOU EXPECT OF AN INTERPRETER? (See APPENDIX C, P. 113.)

Result

Nine of the American negotiators and six of the interpreters believed that there were no conflicts between the behaviors they expected of an interpreter. Four of the interpreters indicated "sometimes" there were conflicts. One of the American negotiators reported conflict among their expected behaviors of an interpreter.

Discussion

This question was a self-examination. It was to test

TABLE VIII

DOES YOUR COMPANY HAVE ANY WRITTEN GUIDELINES
FOR THE ROLE OF AN INTERPRETER?

(1) YES		(2) NO		(3) MAKE NO DIFFERENCE	
*A.N.	**I.	A.N.	I.	A.N.	I.
0	0	8	9	1	5

Note: * A.N. is American negotiator.
 ** I. is interpreter.
 *** See APPENDIX C for choices.

N=20

10 American Negotiators
 10 Interpreters

the conflict on a conceptual level within the system of each individual person. It was designed to discover whether or not an interpreter or an American negotiator is aware of any conflicts between the various behaviors that he/she expects of an interpreter. A review of Question 3 in the questionnaire was suggested. In Question 3, 24 behaviors were listed and an open-ended question was also placed at the very end for additional information from the respondents.

The result suggested that most American negotiators believed everything they expected of an interpreter was coherent, appropriate and logical. Over half of the interpreters shared the same feeling.

The difference was that there were many more interpreters who were aware of the conflicts among their expectations than American negotiators were aware of. It is suggested that when American negotiators took charge of a negotiation, their interpreters had to follow the rules or criteria of American negotiators. Interpreters had to abandon their own criteria and overcome difficulties to fit themselves into those criteria set by their American parties. The fewer the mistakes an interpreter made, the better chance he/she would be appreciated and hired again by the American employers.

Because interpreters and American negotiators did not often discuss the differences about their expected behaviors, both interpreters and American negotiators could

not compare the similarities and differences in their perspectives. A large percentage of them simply assumed there were no conflicts between their various expected behaviors. It is possible, but it is very unlikely that there were no conflicts among the behaviors that each individual expected of an interpreter.

The responses to Question 9 are summarized in Table IX (p. 85).

QUESTION 10

QUESTION-10: HAVE THERE BEEN ANY CONFLICTS BETWEEN YOU AND YOUR INTERPRETER/AMERICAN NEGOTIATOR?
(See APPENDIX C, p. 113.)

Result

Nine of the interpreters and six of the American negotiators said there were no conflicts between them. One of the interpreters and four of the American negotiators remembered there were conflicts between them.

Discussion

This question is designed to study the interpreter's role through inquiring about interpersonal interaction between interpreters and American negotiators. The motivation is to discover whether or not inadequate role prescription of interpreters and ambiguity of expected behaviors would arouse conflicts between interpreters and American negotiators.

TABLE IX

ARE THERE ANY CONFLICTS BETWEEN THE VARIOUS BEHAVIORS
THAT YOU EXPECT OF AN INTERPRETER?

(1) YES		(2) NO		(3) SOMETIMES	
*A.N.	**INT.	A.N.	INT.	A.N.	INT.
1	0	9	6	0	4

Note: * A.N. is American Negotiator.

** INT. is Interpreter.

*** See APPENDIX C for choices.

N=20

10 American Negotiators

10 Interpreters

The result suggested that most interpreters (nine) were satisfied with their working relationship with American negotiators. They reported their relationship as harmonious and conflict-free. Six of the American negotiators shared the same opinion.

The result indicates that there were more American negotiators (four) who remembered their conflicts with their interpreters than the interpreters (one) did. Why was this the situation? Does not a conflict involve two parties?

The word "conflict" used in this question means "A state of disagreement and disharmony" (Berube, 1982). It is not intended to mean any kind of physical struggle, although this word can be used for both situations. Interpreters may have understood the word "conflict" as a physical struggle rather than a mental disagreement. Therefore, more interpreters may have circled "No" to mean they have never argued or fought with their American negotiators.

In the context of this question, American negotiators may have understood the word "conflict" as mental disagreement. Thus, their responses (four) confirmed the existence of such disagreement between interpreters and American negotiators.

The responses to Question 10 are summarized in Table X (p. 87).

TABLE X

HAVE THERE BEEN ANY CONFLICTS BETWEEN YOU AND YOUR
INTERPRETER/AMERICAN NEGOTIATOR?

(1) Yes		(2) No	
* A.N.	** Int	A.N.	Int
4	1	6	9

Note: * A.N. is American Negotiator.

** Int. is Interpreter.

*** See APPENDIX C.

N=20

10 American Negotiators

10 Interpreters

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS, LIMITATIONS, SUGGESTIONS

CONCLUSIONS

This study has been an examination of roles and behaviors of interpreters in American-Chinese business negotiations. The focus of this study is on the interpreters who have been hired by American firms and the American negotiators who are the employers or represent the American employers. The given context of this research is single-interpreter negotiation between American and Chinese companies.

Furthermore, this project is designed to describe the expected roles and behaviors of an interpreter by means of revealing the perspectives of American negotiators and interpreters. This research should be considered a study in understanding interpreters' roles and behaviors in American-Chinese business negotiations.

Anderson's (1976) theoretical statements are the basic foundation of this research:

In general, the interpreter's role is characterized by some degree of inadequacy of role prescription, role overload, and role conflict resulting from his pivotal position in the interaction network (p. 218).

...the interpreter's role is always partially undefined--that is, the role prescriptions are objectively inadequate. The interpreter's position is also characterized by role overload. Not only is it seldom entirely clear what he is to do, he is also frequently expected to do more than is objectively possible (pp. 216-217).

Three research questions were asked based on the review of literature. The research questions were:

- 1) What roles and behaviors are expected of an interpreter by the American negotiators?
- 2) What roles and behaviors do the interpreters expect to perform?
- 3) How compatible are the perspectives of these two groups of people regarding the behaviors of interpreters?

In order to answer the research questions, two groups of respondents, ten (10) American negotiators and ten (10) interpreters, answered an identical questionnaire. This research was conducted in an interview survey style and data analysis employed qualitative methodology.

The results indicated that no form of written guidelines for the role of an interpreter is available for either interpreters or American negotiators (Q-8). Both American negotiators and interpreters work in a situation in which they have to rely on their individual norms to understand the roles and behaviors of an interpreter. Most American negotiators and interpreters do not feel

comfortable in discussing this subject with each other (Q-4).

This situation forced both American negotiators and interpreters to create their own sets of standards and criteria based on their personal experience and knowledge. Because of the variation of personal situations among the respondents, the results indicated great differences and inconsistency between and/or within these two groups. Four of the American negotiators believe that the interpreter is paid by the American company and therefore he must advocate his employer's position and favor his employer's interest. Nine of the American negotiators expect an interpreter to be a negotiator who represents the interest of the employing party. However, three of them excluded the interpreter as a third party who has nothing to do with the negotiation business except that he is paid to translate the languages.

Because of the different understanding of professionalism and responsibility, the results indicated that interpreters are more interested in not taking sides on this role issue. Six of them responded that the interpreter's role is no more than a third party person who has no involvement in either party's business besides language translation. His responsibility is simply to give objective and technically correct translation of the source language.

The results suggest that the interpreter's role can be described from many perspectives. The majority of the

respondents found every listed description (Q-1), in a certain context, related to their own experience and in a certain context unrelated. Anderson (1976) pointed out that "...the interpreter's role is always partially undefined-- that is, the role prescriptions are objectively inadequate." The rhetorical terminology for the interpreter's role becomes controversial. For example, in Question 1, two in each group chose one role. Eight of the interpreters and seven of the American negotiators circled two role descriptions, one American negotiator chose three roles.

Since many respondents felt the given choices of the role description of interpreters (Q-1) are partially defined and inadequate, and they, themselves, were also unable and indecisive to define it in their own way (Choice 5 in Q-1; Q-2), they became confused and uncertain.

In most situations, the relationship between role, responsibility, and behavior is that role is defined by responsibility, which is implemented by related behaviors. Both American negotiators and interpreters understand that an interpreter stands by himself/herself as a role. His/Her assigned responsibility is to translate language between two negotiating parties in a negotiation. To execute his/her responsibility, an interpreter has to do related work, which includes expected behaviors (see pp. 51-53). For instance, the person must give language and cultural translation, bridge gaps in communication, and resist controlling

information.

Since the role description of interpreter is not adequate and complete, it becomes very difficult for both American negotiators and interpreters to draw clear parameters on responsibility of an interpreter and to choose appropriate behaviors for him/her. The results suggest that all the respondents circled as many responsibilities (Q-2, Q-5) and behaviors (Q-3, Q-6) as they could in the questionnaire. The results suggest that it is easier for both groups to select the interpreter's responsibilities and behaviors than to define his roles. Therefore, the interpreter's responsibility is often expected to expand depending on who the interpreter works with and where he works. This situation made an interpreter "seldom entirely clear what he is to do, [and] he is also frequently expected to do more than is objectively possible" (Anderson, 1976, p. 217).

The major conclusion reached is that because there are not written guidelines for interpreters, both interpreters and American negotiators do not have clear definitions of the role that an interpreter plays. In addition, the respondents also were dissatisfied with the given role descriptions listed in Question 1. Therefore, contradictions and conflicts are found frequently between and/or within each of these two groups in terms of their perspectives and understandings of the interpreter's role,

responsibility and behaviors. The compatibility of perspectives between American negotiators and interpreters is very low.

The research findings support Anderson's assertions. The problems Anderson (1976) stated, such as inadequate role prescription, role conflict and role overload of responsibilities, are also the problems of American negotiators and interpreters in American-Chinese business negotiations. These negative factors make no positive contributions but cause frustration and inefficiency in the performances of both interpreters and American negotiators.

A potential application of this study is to design a training program, based on the results of this thesis, for business firms as part of their preparations for negotiations. The purposes of this training program would be (a) to define the roles of interpreters; (b) help American negotiators understand the important roles that an interpreter plays; (c) to raise awareness of the pivotal position and different perspectives of an interpreter in a business negotiation; and (d) to teach American negotiators how to work with or use interpreters in business negotiations.

LIMITATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

This research was conducted based on the reported perspectives and experiences of American negotiators and

interpreters. The viewpoint and perspectives of Chinese negotiators and interpreters were not available; therefore, they were excluded.

The major limitation of this study is the small number of subjects. A larger sample would have provided greater opportunity for generalization.

The role descriptions in Question 1 are not in large variety and choices offered are not very flexible. The results of the questionnaire suggest that the forced-choice questions are more often answered than the open-ended questions. Respondents may have felt inhibited to write their own responses in open-ended questions.

The respondents' working experiences in American-Chinese negotiations are uneven. Some respondents participated in more than twenty American-Chinese business negotiations, whereas some respondents attended less than five such negotiations. The majority of the interpreters who participated in the interview had only the experience of consecutive interpretation, which means that the interpreter begins his/her translation after the speaker finished his sentence(s). None of the interpreters have simultaneous translation experience.

In this research, the information was collected only from interpreters and American negotiators in Portland, Oregon, USA. Although many interpreters who participated in this research have the experience of working for both

American and Chinese companies, the American negotiators in this research have no idea about the perspectives of their counterpart, the Chinese negotiators, on the subject of the interpreter role and behavior. Further research should focus on the perspectives of the Chinese negotiators and interpreters in terms of the interpreter's role.

It would be more valuable if the questionnaire of this research could be translated into Chinese. As a second half of this research, twenty Chinese negotiators and interpreters could be invited to participate in the interview in China. Through the identical research methodology as used in this study, a collection of very interesting perspectives might be gathered. Then, the results from the interview done in America and the results from the interview done in China could be compared. We might discover some significant findings about American and Chinese negotiating teams.

Since this research is based on the experience and information of American-hired single-interpreter negotiations, it would be interesting to study the roles of interpreters in double-interpreter negotiations, especially in a context in which both American and Chinese parties brought their own interpreters.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, R. Bruce W. (1976). Perspectives on the Role of Interpreter. In Richard W. Brislin (Ed.), Translation: Application and Research. New York: Gardner Press, Inc.
- Babbie, Earl. (1986). The Practice of Social Research (4th Ed.). Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Co.
- Bailey, Kenneth D. (1982). Methods of Social Research. New York: The Free Press, a Division of Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc.
- Berris, Jan Carol. (1983). The Art of Interpreting. In Robert A. Kapp (Ed.), Communication with China. Chicago: Intercultural Press.
- Berube, Margery S. (1982). The American Heritage Dictionary. Second College Edition. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Brislin, Richard W. (1976). Introduction. Translation: Application and Application. New York: Gardner Press, Inc.
- Brislin, Richard W. (1982). Cross-Cultural Encounters: Face-to-Face Interaction. New York: Pergamon Press.
- Bruteau, Beatrice. (1983). The Psychic Grid. Wheaton, Illinois: The Teosophical Publishing House.
- Chu, Chin-Ning. (1988). The Chinese Mind Games. Beaverton, OR: AMC Publishing.
- Cofer, C. (1973). Constructive Processes in Memory. American Scientist, 61, 537-543.
- Ekvall, R. (1960). Faithful Echo. New York: Twayne.
- Ervin-Tripp, S. (1967). An Issei Learns English. The Journal of Social Issues, 23, 70-90.
- D'Haucourt, Genevieve. (Winter, 1957-58). Interpretation and Interpreter. ETC.: A Review of General Semantics, XV (2), 96-102.

- Ferguson, C. (1962). The Language Factor in National Development. In L. Thayer (Ed.), Study of the Roles of Second Languages in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Freed, Anne O. (July-August, 1988). Interviewing through an Interpreter. Social Work, 33 (4), 315-319.
- French, J. (1956). A Formal Theory of Social Power. Psychological Review, 63, 181-194.
- Frerk, Charles W. (1963). Training Translators. In E. Cary and R. W. Jumpelt (Ed.), Quality In Translation. New York: The Macmillan Company.
- Gaarner, A. (1970). Organization of the Bilingual School. The Journal of Social Issues, 23, 110-120.
- Germer, P. (1970). Interpretation of Plurilingual Treaties: A Study of Article 33 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties. Harvard International Law Journal, 11, 400-427.
- Gerver, David. (1976). Empirical Studies of Simultaneous Interpretation: A Review and Model. In Richard W. Brislin (Ed.), Translation: Applications and Research. New York: Gardner Press, Inc.
- Glenn, Edmund S. (Winter 1957-58), Introduction to the Special Issue: Interpretation and Intercultural Communication. ETC.: A Review of General Semantics, XV (2), 87-95.
- Gumperz, J. (1962). Language Problems in the Rural Development of North India. In F. Rice (Ed.), Study of the Roles of Second Languages in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. Washington, D.C.: Center For Applied Linguistics.
- Guralnik, David B. (1986). Webster' New World Dictionary. New York: Prentice Hall Press.
- Haley, Jay, (1963) Strategies of Psychotherapy. New York: Grune and Stratton.
- Kandler, Gunther. (1963). On the Problem of Quality in Translation: Basic Considerations. In E. Cary & R.W. Jumpelt (Eds.), Quality In Translation. New York: The Macmillan Company.

- Isard, Stephen. (1975). Changing the Context. In Edward L. Keenan (Ed.), Formal Semantics of Natural Language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lambert, W. (1967). A Social Psychology of Bilingualism. Journal of Social Issues, 23, 91-109.
- Larson, Mildred L. (1984). The Communication Situation. Meaning-Based Translation. New York: University Press of America.
- Lehman, David. (1986). Across Literary Frontiers. Newsweek, 12, 89.
- Lippitt, R., & Watson, J. (1955). Learning Across Cultures. New York: Ann Arbor Press.
- Macnamara, J. (1970). Bilingualism and Thought. In J. Alatis (Ed.), Report of the Twenty-first Round Table Meeting on Linguistics and Language Studies. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Mish, Frederick C. (1987). Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary. Springfield, Massachusetts: Merriam-Webster, Inc.
- Nadler, L., & Nadler, Z. (June, 1987). Overcoming the Language Barrier. Training & Development Journal, 108-111.
- Orlov, Victor. (March, 1989). When Spies Fool Themselves. World Monitor: The Christian Science Monitor Monthly, 2 (3), 42-46.
- Phillips, H. (1960). Problems of Translation and Meaning in Field Work. Human Organization, 18 (4), 184-192.
- Pye, Lucian. (1982). Chinese Commercial Negotiating Style. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Oelgeschlager, Gunn & Hain, Publishers, Inc.
- Ruddock, Ralph, (1969). Roles and Relationships. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Sarbin, T., & Allen, V. (1968). Role Theory. In G. Lindzey and E. Aronson (Eds.), Handbook of Social Psychology (2nd ed.), 1. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley.
- Scheff, Thomas J. (1987). Is Accurate Cross-cultural Translation Possible? Current Anthropology, 6, 364.

- Sechrest, L., Fay, T. L., & Zaidi, S. M. (1972). Problems of Translation in Cross-Cultural Communication. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 3 (1), 41-56.
- Seleskovitch, D. (1976). Interpretation, A Psychological Approach to Translating. In Richard W. Brislin (Ed.), Translation: Application and Research. New York: Gardner Press, Inc.
- Shepard, Clinton. (1987). Interpretation: Techniques or Theory? Parks & Recreation, 7, 44-47.
- Smith, H. W. (1975). Strategies of Social Research. Eaglewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice--Hall, Inc.
- Smith, Marjorie. (1987). A Matter of Interpretation. Newsweek, 12, 9.
- Smith, Mary John. (1988). Contemporary Communication Research Methods. Belmont, California: Washington Publishing Company.
- Stevens, L. (1967). The Principle of Linguistic Equality in Judicial Proceedings and in the Interpretation of Plurilingual Instruments: The Regime Linguistics in the Court of Justice of the European Communities. Northwestern Law Review, 62, 701-734.
- Taylor, S. J., & Bodgan, R. (1984). Introduction to Qualitative Research Methods (2nd ed.). New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Triandis, Harry C. (1976). Approaches Toward Minimizing Translation. In Richard W. Brislin (Ed.), Translation: Applications and Research. New York: Gardner Press, Inc.
- Tucker, R. K., Weaver, R. L., & Berryman-Fink, C. (1981). Research in Speech Communication. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Werner, O., & Campell, D.T. (1970). Translating, Working through Interpreters, and the Problem of Decentering. In R. Naroll & R. Cohen (Eds.), A Handbook of Method in Cultural Anthropology. New York: The Natural History Press.
- Wik, Philip. (1984), How to Do Business with the People's Republic of China. Reston, Virginia: Reston Publishing Company, Inc.

- Wilmot, William W. (1980). Dyadic Communication. New York: Random House.
- Wilss, Wolfram. (1982). Translation as a Modern Means of Communication. The Science of Translation: Problem and Methods. German: Gunter Narr Verlag Tubigen.
- Whorf, B. L. (1956). Language, Thought and Reality. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Young, O. (1967). The Intermediaries: Third Parties in International Crises. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Young, O. (1968). The Politics of Force: Bargaining during International Crises. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Zilahy, Simon Pietro. (1963). Quality in Translation. In E. Cary & R.W. Jumpselt (Eds.), Quality in Translation. New York: The Macmillan Company.
- Zimbardo, P., & Ruch, F. (1975). Psychology and Life (9th Ed.). Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman, and Co.

APPENDIX A

RESEARCH SUBJECTS

TEN INTERPRETERS

INTERP.	AGE	SEX	TITLE	BUSINESS	NEGO. TIMES
Subject 1	30	F	Interpreter	Cable Testing Equip.	4
Subject 2	45	M	Interpreter	City Hall Projects	8
Subject 3	50	M	College Prof.	Language, literature	15
Subject 4	45	F	Realter, Interp.	Real Estate	10
Subject 5	50	M	College Prof.	Language, literature	5
Subject 6	28	M	Lawyer	International law	20
Subject 7	35	F	Assi. to Presi.	Footware manufacture	30
Subject 8	37	M	Atterney	International trade	20
Subject 9	30	M	Student, interp.	Urban Studies (Doctoral Degree)	10
Subject10	30	F	Student, interp.	System Science (Doctoral Degree)	15

TEN AMERICAN NEGOTIATORS

A.N.	AGE	SEX	TITLE	BUSINESS	NEGO. TIMES
Subject 1	41	M	Operations MGR	Lab Equipment Exp.	7
Subject 2	35	M	Trader	Construction Supply	10
Subject 3	50	M	President	Cable Testing Equip.	4
Subject 4	30	M	Engineer	Cable Testing Equip.	2
Subject 5	40	F	President	U.S.-China Trading	6
Subject 6	36	F	Assistant V.P.	Bank and Loan	20
Subject 7	55	M	President	Banker	10
Subject 8	50	F	President	U.S.-China Trading	10
Subject 9	53	M	President	Consulting	30
Subject10	45	M	V.P. Marketing	Computer Manufacture	2

APPENDIX B

INFORMED CONSENT FORM

I, _____, hereby agree to serve as a respondent in the research project entitled, "Role and Behavior of Interpreters: An Exploratory Study in American-Chinese Business Negotiations" conducted by Zhijian Kevin Yang under the supervision of Steven Kosokoff, Ph.D.

I understand that the study involves verbally responding to questions asked by Zhijian Kevin Yang.

It has been explained to me that the purpose of this study is to learn what role(s) and behavior(s) are expected of interpreters in American-Chinese business negotiation.

I will not receive any direct benefit from participation in this study, but my participation may help to increase knowledge which may benefit others in the future.

Zhijian Kevin Yang has offered to answer any questions I may have about this study and what is expected of me in the study. I have been assured that all information I give will be kept confidential and that my identity will be protected in any discussion of results or in any written research summary.

I understand that I am free to withdraw from participation in this study at any time without jeopardizing my relationship with Zhijian Kevin Yang, persons who may have referred me to this study, Portland State University, or the organizations I work for.

I have read and understand the foregoing information.

Signature of respondent

Date

NOTE WELL: If you experience problems that are the results of your participation in this study, please contact the secretary of the Human Subjects Research and Review Committee, Office of Grants and Contracts, 303 Cramer Hall, Portland State University. Telephone number: (503)725-3417

APPENDIX C

QUESTIONNAIRE

Please provide the following information. The names of respondents will never be revealed. However, the following information is needed from the standpoints (1) of analyzing the survey, and (2) of following up should I need to contact you.

Your Name: _____ Your Title: _____

Business: _____

You Were/Are: 1. A Negotiator 2. An Interpreter

How Many American-Chinese Business

Negotiations Have You Attended? _____

Name of Your
Company: _____

Your Mailing
Address: _____

Your Phone
Number: _____

Q-1: WHAT ROLE(S) DO INTERPRETERS PLAY IN AMERICAN-CHINESE BUSINESS NEGOTIATIONS? (YOU CAN CIRCLE MORE THAN ONE OF THE FOLLOWING ROLE DESCRIPTIONS.)

- (1) As a negotiation assistant who does only language interpretation and facilitates communication between American and Chinese parties. This language-oriented position in American-Chinese business negotiation requires an interpreter to be objective and to be interested in nothing other than language translation.
- (2) As a negotiator who is employed by one party to do language interpretation and to represent the attitude, viewpoint and concern of the employer. Therefore, the interpreter's personal feeling and viewpoint are irrelevant. An interpreter plays the role of a negotiator.
- (3) As a "middle man" who is employed by one party, but he is obligated to both American and Chinese parties. An interpreter works for both parties independently. His/her personal viewpoint carried in his/her interpretation can influence and be influenced over the decision-making of both parties.
- (4) As a third party, who in addition to providing translation of source languages, gives time for the negotiators of both parties, thus enabling them to prepare their next statement and plan their strategies for the next step.
- (5) If you do not agree with any descriptions above, please write your own.

Q-2: WHAT ROLE(S) SHOULD INTERPRETERS PLAY IN AMERICAN-CHINESE BUSINESS NEGOTIATION? (PLEASE FEEL FREE TO LIST THE ROLES YOU THINK THEY SHOULD PLAY. IF THE SPACE IS NOT ENOUGH, PLEASE WRITE ON THE BACK OF THIS PAGE.)

Q-3: WHAT BEHAVIORS DO YOU EXPECT OF AN INTERPRETER? (PLEASE CIRCLE YOUR ANSWERS.)

1) Pure linguistic translation.	YES. NO. SOMETIMES.
2) Cultural interpretation.	YES. NO. SOMETIMES.
3) Bridging gaps in communication.	YES. NO. SOMETIMES.
4) Mediating.	YES. NO. SOMETIMES.
5) Consulting.	YES. NO. SOMETIMES.
6) Business information gatherer.	YES. NO. SOMETIMES.
7) Personal information gatherer.	YES. NO. SOMETIMES.
8) Being a liaison for both parties.	YES. NO. SOMETIMES.
9) Advertising products, business, company or person.	YES. NO. SOMETIMES.
10) Being passive and mechanical.	YES. NO. SOMETIMES.
11) Being active and creative.	YES. NO. SOMETIMES.

- 12) Giving word-to-word translation. YES. NO. SOMETIMES.
- 13) Giving meaning interpretation. YES. NO. SOMETIMES.
- 14) Being introverted. YES. NO. SOMETIMES.
- 15) Being extroverted. YES. NO. SOMETIMES.
- 16) Controlling information. YES. NO. SOMETIMES.
- 17) Influencing over decision-making
of the employer. YES. NO. SOMETIMES.
- 18) Influencing over decision-making
of the counterpart. YES. NO. SOMETIMES.
- 19) Having strong people skills. YES. NO. SOMETIMES.
- 20) Being diplomatic. YES. NO. SOMETIMES.
- 21) Providing off-the-record
remarks made by the counterpart. YES. NO. SOMETIMES.
- 22) Participating in decision-making
of the employer's party. YES. NO. SOMETIMES.
- 23) Being friendly and energetic. YES. NO. SOMETIMES.
- 24) Being a sounding board for both
parties to test and prepare their
strategies. YES. NO. SOMETIMES.
- 25) Please list additional descriptions if you have any.

Q-4: DO YOU EVER DISCUSS THE INTERPRETER'S ROLE WITH YOUR INTERPRETER/AMERICAN NEGOTIATOR?

1) OFTEN. 2) OCCASIONALLY. 3) RARELY. 4) NOT AT ALL.

Q-5: TO WHAT EXTENT ARE YOU AWARE THAT ANY OF THE FOLLOWING FACTORS HAVE INFLUENCED A NEGOTIATION?
(PLEASE PLACE AN "X" IN APPROPRIATE COLUMN.)

	NEVER EXPECT	SOMETIMES EXPECT	ALWAYS EXPECT
1) Accuracy of translation.	_____	_____	_____
2) Amount of explanation.	_____	_____	_____
3) Interpreter's bias.	_____	_____	_____
4) Interpreter's influence.	_____	_____	_____
5) Quality of interpretation.	_____	_____	_____
6) Interpreter's knowledge and experience.	_____	_____	_____
7) Ability to control direction of negotiation.	_____	_____	_____
8) Interpreter's obligation to American employer.	_____	_____	_____
9) Interpreter's responsibility.	_____	_____	_____
10) Interpreter's loyalty to American employer.	_____	_____	_____

Q-6: WHEN YOU MAKE A JUDGEMENT ABOUT AN INTERPRETER'S PERFORMANCE, WHAT DO YOU USUALLY CONSIDER?
(PLEASE MARK ALL THAT APPLY.)

1) English proficiency.	_____
2) Chinese proficiency.	_____
3) Nationality identity.	_____
4) Age.	_____
5) Physical appearance.	_____
6) Gender.	_____
7) Political viewpoint.	_____
8) Comment of counterpart.	_____
9) Comment of employers.	_____
10) Past experience of working with the interpreter.	_____
11) Education background.	_____
12) Skill of communication.	_____
13) Personality.	_____
14) Intercultural experience.	_____
15) Maturity.	_____
16) Knowledge of translation.	_____
17) Naivety.	_____

- 18) Length of interpreting experience. _____
19) Previous experience in _____
successful negotiations. _____
20) Respect shown to others. _____
22) Please list if you have more. _____

Q-7: HAVE THERE EVER BEEN MISUNDERSTANDINGS BETWEEN YOU AND YOUR INTERPRETER/AMERICAN NEGOTIATOR ABOUT THE INTERPRETER'S ROLE? (PLEASE CIRCLE YOUR ANSWER.)

- 1) Yes. 3) Sometimes.
2) No. 4) I don't remember.

IF YOU ANSWERED "YES" OR "SOMETIMES", PLEASE LIST WHAT HAS CONFUSED YOU.

Q-8: DOES YOUR COMPANY HAVE WRITTEN GUIDELINES FOR THE ROLE OF AN INTERPRETER? (PLEASE CIRCLE YOUR ANSWER.)

- 1) Yes. 2) No. 3) It does not make any difference.

IF SUCH GUIDELINES EXIST, WHAT ARE THEY? WHERE ARE THEY FOUND?

(PLEASE WRITE ON THE BACK OF THIS PAGE IF MORE SPACE IS NEEDED.)

IF WRITTEN GUIDELINES DO NOT EXIST, WHAT CRITERIA DO YOU ENLIST WHEN YOU HIRE AN INTERPRETER OR ACT AS AN INTERPRETER?

Q-9: ARE THERE ANY CONFLICTS BETWEEN THE VARIOUS BEHAVIORS
(SEE Q-3) THAT YOU EXPECT OF AN INTERPRETER?

1) YES. 2) NO. 3) SOMETIMES.

IF YOU ANSWERED "YES" OR "SOMETIMES", WHAT ARE SOME OF
THESE CONFLICTS? (IF THE SPACE IS NOT ENOUGH, PLEASE
WRITE ON THE BACK OF THIS PAGE.)

Q-10: HAVE THERE BEEN ANY CONFLICTS BETWEEN YOU AND YOUR
INTERPRETER/ AMERICAN NEGOTIATOR?

1) Yes. 2) No.

IF YES, WHAT ARE SOME OF THESE CONFLICTS? (IF YOU NEED
MORE SPACE, PLEASE WRITE ON THE BACK OF THIS PAGE.)