Teaching World Englishes in an Interpreter Training Course: an Action Research

Jiun Huh
Ewha Womans University, Seoul, Korea
jiun_h@naver.com

ABSTRACT

The spread of English around the world is affecting the interpreting profession. The challenges of interpreting various World Englishes varieties call for the need to resolve the issue by incorporating World Englishes in interpreter training courses. Building on the pedagogy proposed by Huh (2014), the present study attempts to implement an action research on a B language enhancement course at a graduate school of translation and interpretation in South Korea. A 'modified Presentation-Practice-Performance (PPP)' model is applied to the course, with an additional element of reflective practice. Needs analysis was conducted to create a syllabus based on students' needs. Indian English, Vietnamese English, and French English were covered in the course. Students received form-focused instruction on the features of the three varieties, went through cloze exercises, performed interpreting tasks, and wrote reflective journals. Finally, an end-of-course survey was conducted. The findings of the action research revealed that the 'modified PPP' approach was useful, built higher awareness on the target situation involving World Englishes, and developed capabilities for problem analysis and strategy building.

KEYWORDS

World Englishes, interpreter training, reflective practice, interpreting process, non-native accent

1. Introduction

English is now one of the most widely spoken languages around the world, with the world's English speaking population reaching around one third of the global population (Qiong 2004:6). Native speakers of English no longer take up the dominant share of the English speaking population. In fact, non-native English speakers outnumber native speakers (Crystal 2008: 3-6). Naturally, English, whether it be native or non-native, exists in multiple varieties. Influenced by migration, nativization, and institutionalization, English has developed into various varieties. English has spread to populations already equipped with their own first languages, and has developed into different varieties loaded with unique features influenced by their first languages, culture, and historical background. These different varieties can be classified into three concentric circles, as proposed by Kachru (1985): the Inner Circle refers to the native English speaking regions; the Outer Circle includes regions where English is nativized, influenced by historical reasons such as colonization; the Expanding Circle refers to regions using English for international communication purposes.

The worldwide spread of English is also affecting the interpreting profession. Increasingly, English is used as one of the official languages in international conferences, and it is often adopted as the only official language requiring both native and non-native speakers to speak in English only (Albl-Mikasa 2010). This creates a challenging work environment for interpreters as they suffer from deviated or unique features of discrete varieties manifested across phonological, syntactic, lexical and pragmatic levels (see Albl-Mikasa 2010; Huh 2013a; Huh 2013b).

With the acceleration of the global spread of English, the

challenges for interpreters will only grow. These challenges should be tackled by employing multiple approaches and agents. Non-native English speakers can improve their communicative competency by slowing down their speech, putting extra effort to make their speech clearer and more succinct than usual, and providing speech related materials in advance to interpreters. These are of course measures also required in every interpreting situation, but when non-native English speech is expected, extra effort can serve to improve the outcome. Interpreters could also do their parts by growing familiarity with different varieties of English, and the endeavor could start from interpreter training courses. This study, thus, aims to explore the appropriate methods to incorporate World Englishes in interpreter training courses. Based on the proposal for teaching World Englishes by Huh (2014), the present study introduces an action research carried out in a B language enhancement course at a graduate level to test out whether the proposed approach benefits students' understandings of different varieties of English and their interpreting process as well.

2. World Englishes and interpreting

The increasing use of English for international communication is affecting the interpreting profession as well. In Albl-Mikasa (2010)'s survey conducted on professional interpreters in Europe, interpreters responded that non-native English speakers, who prefer to or are asked to deliver their speech in English rather than in their mother tongue, are increasing in international conferences, thereby decreasing the need for non-English booths. English, however, doesn't consist of a single variety but many, as has been mentioned above,

and it is this sheer variety and unfamiliarity that are causing a diverse range of difficulties to interpreters. Studies on World Englishes illuminate unique features of each and every variety, which is heavily influenced by the first language of the speaker, history, culture, and social situations (see Kachru 1985; Kirckpatrick 2007; Deterding 2006). Table 1 illustrates examples of phonological features of World Englishes varieties.

Table 1 Phonological features of Indian English, Vietnamese English and French English

	Indian English (Shackle 1987)	Vietnamese English (Honey 1987)	French English (Walter 1987)
Vowel	Diphthong pronounced as monophthong Vowels produced further forward	English vowels are frequently pronounced in pure vowels as Vietnamese has a more complex vowel system than English Ex: /lo/ for 'low'	Confusion between /ɪ/ and /i:/ Confusion between /ʊ/ and /ʊ:/ /eɪ/ becomes /e/
Consonant	Voiceless consonants such as /p/, /t/, /tʃ/, /k/ are voiced Alveolar consonants such as /t/ and /d/ are pronounced as retroflex consonants /ʈ/ and /ɖ/ /ɵ/ and / / are replaced by /t^h/ and /d/ /ʒ/ is pronounced as /z/, /ʃ/, or /dʒ/ as the sound does not exist in Indian language	Final stops /p/, /t/, /k/ are unexploded in all contexts Bilabials /m/ and /b/ are pre-voiced in initial position Initial /t/ is unaspirated /f/ is pronounced a bilabial Pronunciation problems with /ɵ/, / /, /z/, /ʃ/, /ʒ/, /tʃ/, /dʒ/	/ɵ/ and / / are pronounced as /s/, /z/, /f/, /v/, /t/, or /d/ /tʃ/ is realized as /ʃ/ /h/ is dropped /r/ is pronounced as /ʀ/ Dark 'l' is replaced by clear /l/
Intonation & Rhythm	Pitch is raised and monotonous Full vowels are retained even in unstressed syllables and weak forms	Unable to express stress by tone as Vietnamese is monosyllabic and tonal	Word stress is usually placed on the last syllable

Unique features of varieties reflect the diversity of the world's

languages and cultures, but the very diversity itself may cause interpreting problems as no one interpreter can be versed in every variety of World Englishes. Of course, interpreters may find some varieties easier to understand than others. As Taylor (1989, as cited in Reithofer 2011)'s experiment reveals, interpreters may experience less interpreting problems when they share the L1 with the non-native English speaker than otherwise.

In most cases, interpreters find non-native English speeches difficult to understand, which may lead to interpreting failures. Cooper et al. (1982)'s survey result reveals that interpreters find 'difficult accent' as the major cause for stress. Difficult accent, in their survey, was ranked as the fourth stress factor, following fast rate of speech, reading off from scripts, and uncomfortable equipment. Furthermore, Albl-Mikasa (2010)'s survey reveals that non-native English speeches are more challenging to professional interpreters as they create comprehension problems and require more processing capacity. Interpreting problems can be triggered by all linguistic levels of a variety, such as phonological, syntactic, lexical, and pragmatic levels. But phonological level may serve as the biggest problem trigger as it constitutes the first stage of the interpreting process (see Setton 1987; Kitano 1991). Moser (1978: 353-354) describes a listening process in interpreting: speaker's message is first received in listener's receptor system and stored in auditory storage; its acoustic features are then recognized based on the phonological rules stored in long term memory; the acoustic features are then synthesized into syllables and words. Field (2008: 113-118), taking an information process approach, distinguishes the listening process into a decoding process and a meaning building process. He also describes the decoding process as a progression from acoustic input to phonemes, syllables, words, and then to sentences, finally forming a proposition

or an abstract idea ready for the ensuing meaning building process. The listener will use 'co-text', short-term information acquired by immediate conversation, or, 'context', long-term information coming from listener's schema (ibid: 130). Although Field makes a distinction between 'decoding' and 'meaning building' and introduces a sequential process in decoding, he understands listening as an online activity and states, "it seems likely that the listener forms an idea about what the speaker is saying quite early on in the utterance, but constantly revises it as she hears more and more. So decoding is not the simple sequential operation" (ibid: 129). In the process of constant revision, listeners use co-text or context to enrich or complement their decoding process, with less skilled listeners using them to complement the acoustic input that they failed to decode and skilled listeners, by contrast, leveraging them to further enrich what they decoded (ibid: 131). In this line of reasoning, Field illustrates how important it is to enhance one's decoding skills, as with more expert decoding skills, listeners will have their attention freed up for enriching their understanding with co-text and context instead of constantly compensating for deficient understanding with context (ibid: 137).

Consistent with the aforementioned views, problems in interpreting can also start from the listening phase, when acoustic input loaded with non-native English features fails to find a match in interpreter's long-term memory. With deficient information coming in, interpreters may find it hard to decode the message, as, for example, parts of speech may be missing, making it hard for them to figure out the syntactic structure of the speech, or key terminologies or message may be missing, forcing interpreters to resort to what little co-text they decoded so far. Huh (2013a; 2013b) conducted interpreting experiments on professional interpreters using Indian English and

Chinese English as source text speeches, mainly focusing on the impact of phonological deviations of the World Englishes varieties on target text. The study illustrates how phonological intelligibility affects interpreting process and results in omission or meaning deviations.

The studies above point to the need to alleviate interpreting problems caused by World Englishes varieties. The general prescription is to expand exposure to diverse varieties by, for example, listening to non-native English speeches or carrying out interpreting practices using non-native English speech as source texts. This, however, requires a lengthy period, and considering the ever-increasing speakers of World Englishes and the diversity of the varieties used in international conferences, we need to come up with a systematic solution to resolve this problem efficiently. These efforts could start from the interpreter training courses, by sensitizing students to the reality of the professional environment and equipping them with knowledge and skills to successfully interpret various World Englishes varieties.

Although Seleskovitch & Lederer (1995: 51) suggests the use of accented speeches as source texts in interpreting classes and Gile (2009: 173) also discusses non-native accent in his effort model, resources and models on the pedagogy of World Englishes in interpreter training courses are scarce. But before jumping into concrete pedagogies for World Englishes, incorporating World Englishes in interpreter training should start with raising awareness on the diversity of English. Matsuda (2012) states that traditional English classes have focused on the so-called 'standard' varieties, namely, the American and British varieties and that most of the main characters depicted in Japan's English textbooks were from the Inner Circle, which is also echoed through anecdotes from teachers in Expanding-Circle countries. Such Inner Circle dominance in English

teaching is, indeed, evident in South Korea as well, with English teachers for English conversation courses mostly recruited from the Inner Circle countries (Pae 2002). Matsuda (2012) suggests that representation of English language and users should adequately capture the diversity of English and that students should be able to see a comprehensive manifestation of values including not only the linguistic features of the English varieties but also cultural ones. This awareness raising is important not only for second language learners in general but also for interpreters as well, as understanding the reality of English diversity will help interpreters see English as "a heterogeneous language with multiple norms and diverse systems" (Canagarajah 2006: 199) and grow out of their conventional negative views of regarding non-native English, in particular, as mere deficient forms. Learners of interpretation, thus, will be encouraged to understand the uniqueness of different varieties and how they are influenced by speakers' first languages, migration, and globalization.

On top of the efforts to increase the meta-knowledge of English varieties, interpreter training courses should also focus on linguistic features of discrete varieties, as interpreters cannot simply adopt the 'let-it-pass' principle (Firth 1996), where discourse participants adopt a collaborative action to build discourse together without directly pointing to the linguistic errors of interlocutors (House 2012: 189). And even in general discourse, although listeners can often overcome intelligibility problems by guessing the correct meaning from the context in a split second, their comprehension process itself will still slow down as a result (Ur 1984: 12). Furthermore, listeners may even mistake a word spoken by the speaker for a different word because of how it sounds to them however incongruent it is with the overall context (ibid). These problems will be amplified in an interpreting setting, as interpreters need to create a target text faithful to the

source text and one that maintains internal coherence as well.

As part of an effort to build a systematic framework for incorporating World Englishes in interpreter training course, Huh (2014) suggests a curriculum and syllabus design based on second language acquisition and second language learning pedagogies. Huh (2014) suggests the following courses as appropriate for teaching and incorporating World Englishes: B language enhancement, consecutive interpretation, simultaneous interpretation, mock international conference, and special lecture series. Acknowledging the need for both declarative and procedural knowledge, Huh (2014) proposes a mixture of both approaches for the aforementioned courses, with variation in the order of the two approaches depending on the nature of each course: a progression from declarative knowledge acquisition towards building procedural knowledge (henceforth, 'DECPRO'); and a progression from procedural knowledge building towards declarative knowledge acquisition (henceforth, 'PRODEC'). To inform students of features of distinct varieties, Huh (2014) proposes a DECPRO approach for language enhancement course, where form-focused instruction on linguistic features is given first before practicing the presented features; for interpreting courses, a task-based PRODEC approach is suggested, where procedural knowledge is acquired first by carrying out interpreting tasks using World Englishes as source texts, after which feedback and analysis activities follow to help students acquire declarative knowledge. All activities related to World Englishes in the aforementioned courses are geared towards raising listening and comprehension competencies. The task-based approach proposed for the interpreting courses is relatively easy to implement by using more authentic non-native English speeches in class and implementing post-task feedback activities. But the DECPRO approach proposed for the B language enhancement course requires

careful planning and action research to establish it as an effective practice. One of the DECPRO-based classroom activities, the 'PPP (Presentation-Practice-Production)' approach as proposed by Huh (2014), may serve as a useful framework for the present study. Traditional 'PPP' is one of the most widely used teaching approaches in the world (Skehan 1998: 94). The distinct three-phased approach provides a useful framework as it encompasses methods such as form-focused learning, drills, and practicing 'the real thing' (Johnson 2008: 274). The framework can be applied to the B language enhancement course as follows. 'Presentation', the first phase of 'PPP', involves informing students with key linguistic and non-linguistic features of specific varieties, where form-focused instruction could take place. 'Practice' is the step where various exercises can be applied. Studies in second language acquisition present various listening exercises (see Flowerdew & Miller 2005; Ur 1984). Ur (1984) suggests 'listening for perception' and 'listening for comprehension' exercises: listening for perception focuses on intelligibility activities, such as orally repeating what learners listened or taking dictation exercises at both word and sentence levels; and listening for comprehension exercises encourage listeners to analyze perceived words against the speech context, with examples such as cloze, paraphrasing, translation, answering comprehension questions, predictions, filling gaps, and summarizing. Some of the exercises such as, summarizing, paraphrasing, and translation exercises are also common exercises conducted for interpreter training, which makes it easier to incorporate listening exercises for World Englishes into existing teaching methods in interpreter training courses.

The last 'P' that stands for 'production' should be implemented in a rather different way in interpreter training courses than in general second language acquisition, as speaking with different non-native

English accents is not the ultimate goal of nor what is expected from interpreter trainees. Furthermore, if applied to second year students in a two-year interpreting course, interpreting tasks can be introduced in place of the conventional 'production' activity, as they will have acquired adequate level of interpreting skills by then after their first year training. For the purpose of this study, 'production' can be replaced with 'performance', which I define in this study as performing interpretation of World Englishes speeches as part of the 'modified PPP' approach. The 'performance' phase can be exercised not only in the B language enhancement course but also in the consecutive and simultaneous interpreting courses in a connected course design. The effect of the interpreting task can be further reinforced by combining it with reflective practice. Reflective practice enables autonomous learning (see Schön 1987; Sawyer 2004; Francis 1995). In his discussion of reflective practice, Sawyer (2004: 79) says, "reflection on the nature of skill acquisition is beneficial to the student". Reflection can specifically contribute to learner autonomy and empowerment. Freihoff (1993, as cited in Sawyer 2004: 81) regards reflection as a way for learners of interpretation and translation to learn to analyze their performance through self-diagnosis and self-correction. Reflection can be particularly useful in learning World Englishes in interpreter training courses. As new features freshly learnt as declarative knowledge has to be converted to procedural knowledge, it would be useful to continuously analyze one's performance against his/her declarative knowledge and create strategies to help achieve the level of automaticity. For this purpose, writing a reflective journal would be a useful tool for students to establish self-defined goals, engage in critical analysis, set appropriate strategies, and assess effectiveness (Francis 1995).

Building on the aforementioned approaches, a structural syllabus

and a task-based syllabus can be applied to B language enhancement and interpreting courses, respectively (Huh 2014). Syllabus design should be based on a needs analysis that reflects the following elements:

> 1) Lacks: understanding of the concept of World Englishes, familiar varieties, exposure to foreign language and culture
> 2) Necessities: professional information on target situations, appropriate share of World Englishes instructions in the course, priority list of learner's needs for the course
> 3) Wants: reasons for signing up to course, linguistic levels (phonological, syntactic, lexical, pragmatic levels) and varieties students want to learn
>
> (Huh 2014: 344)

In this study, the above-mentioned approaches, needs analysis, and syllabus design serve as the framework for the action research. In the following sections, I will introduce how the principles and approaches were implemented in a B language enhancement course for second year students.

3. Action Research

In this section, I introduce an action research on training of World Englishes in an interpreter training course. Action research follows through a cycle of initial idea, fact-finding, action plan, implementation, monitoring and revision, and amendment of plan (McDonough and McDonough 1997). It is executed to solve problems by identifying problem areas, planning and executing changes to improve or solve problems, and evaluating application of the new

behavior. When applied to educational research, the methodology involves reflective practice to enhance pedagogical strategies through observation, data gathering, and feedback (Lee 2013).

The present research adopts the research methodology by taking the following steps: (i) identifying the current situation and problems related to training of World Englishes in interpreter training courses; (ii) establishing a training method for World Englishes in a B language enhancement course; (iii) applying it to the course; (iv) observing and determining the progress; and (v) proposing necessary adjustments for future applications.

As World Englishes is yet to be applied systematically in interpreter training courses despite its growing impact on interpreting practice (Huh 2014), the present research aims to propose an appropriate pedagogy of World Englishes through action research. The observations from the pedagogy applied to the course will be reflected in the plan for the following semester, in order to refine the teaching method and establish an optimum pedagogic model for teaching World Englishes in B language enhancement course.

The training approach mentioned in the previous section was applied to a B language enhancement course for second year students, taught by the author, at a graduate school of translation and interpretation in Seoul, South Korea, in the spring semester of 2014. A total of nine students enrolled to the B language enhancement course, which runs over 16 weeks. The main purpose of the course is to enhance students' B language skills. The conventional teaching methods have focused on listening, comprehension, and speaking of native Englishes, and students tend to be particularly interested in enhancing their B language speaking and writing skills. So it is important to harmonize World Englishes training with conventional teaching methods and students' priorities for the course.

The overall process encompassing needs analysis, syllabus design, class application, and course evaluation will be introduced in the following subsections.

3.1. Course Planning

3.1.1. Needs Analysis

Needs analysis is a useful way to identify students' needs and priorities for the course. For the purpose of the present study, a needs survey was conducted on the nine students enrolled to the course.

Students' background information revealed that eight out of nine students had lived abroad before, among whom the majority (7 students) had lived in the Inner Circle regions: five in the U.S, two in the U.K, and one in China. All nine students acquired foreign languages other than English over periods ranging between one and four years. While most of the students had lived in Inner Circle countries, the foreign languages they acquired were concentrated on the Northeast Asian languages: Chinese (four students) and Japanese (three students). There were two students who learned French, but each learned Chinese and Japanese as well. The remaining two students learned Spanish and German, respectively.

Table 2 shows students' preferences between native and non-native speeches. The majority of students preferred source text speeches in native English. Two students showed no preference, but none of the students preferred non-native English speech.

Table 2 Preference for ST variety (n=9)

Preference for ST between native vs. non-native speech	N
Native English	7
Non-native English	0
No preference	2

Along with the preference for native English speeches, the majority of the students also claimed that their speeches are close to native English varieties, namely the American English (5 students) and British English (1 student). Two responded that their English speeches do not resemble any specific varieties and one answered that her speech is close to Korean English.

When asked how often they have been exposed to non-native English speeches on a scale of 1 and 5, the mean score was 3.5, indicating that they did not have the chance to listen to or interpret non-native Englishes frequently. And when asked whether it was easy to understand non-native English speeches on a scale of 1 and 5, the mean score returned a mere 2.7, indicating that it was not easy for them to understand non-native English speeches.

Moving on to questions on students' needs of World Englishes for the course, students stayed neutral (mean score: 3.6) on whether they need to learn World Englishes in the course and responded that less than 20% of the time in the course should be allocated for learning World Englishes (see Table 3).

Table 3 Time share allocated for learning World Englishes (n=9)

Time percentage	N
Less than 20%	5
21-40%	3
41-60%	1
61-80%	0
81-100%	0

The next series of questions are on exposure, self-perceived intelligibility, target situation, and learning priorities of distinct varieties of English. The questions are asked to identify the varieties to be included in the syllabus for this course. Table 4 shows students' exposure to and self-perceived intelligibility of different varieties of English. Students were asked to choose up to three varieties they were most exposed to and up to three varieties they found most difficult to understand. The percentage is represented as a case percentage in Table 4.

Table 4 Exposure and self-perceived intelligibility list (n=9)

Variety	Exposure		Intelligibility	
	%	N	%	N
Chinese English	67%	6	33%	3
South Asian English	56%	5	89%	8
French English	33%	3	11%	1
Southeast Asian English 1[1]	22%	2	33%	3
North European English[2]	22%	2	0%	0
South European English[3]	22%	2	11%	1
Netherland English	22%	2	0%	0
Southeast Asian English 2[4]	11%	1	33%	3
Japanese English	11%	1	22%	2
German English	0%	0	0%	0
Russian English	0%	0	11%	1
East European English	0%	0	0%	0
African English	0%	0	33%	3
Middle East Asian English	0%	0	0%	0
Total	266%	24	276%	25

When asked what are the three most frequently encountered varieties of English, students responded that Chinese English is the variety they have been most exposed to, followed by South Asian English and French English. Responses to intelligibility revealed that South Asian English was difficult to understand for eight out of nine participants. Chinese English, the most exposed variety to students, was found to be difficult to understand for just three participants. The findings show that South Asian English, although frequently encountered by over half the participants, is still difficult to understand and therefore may require instruction in the course.

Table 5 illustrates students' perceptions on target situation—varieties they might most frequently interpret in international conferences—and varieties they would like to learn in this course.

Table 5 Target situation perception and preferred varieties (n=9)

Variety	Target Situation Perception		Preferred Variety	
	%	N	%	N
South Asian English	100%	9	78%	7
Chinese English	56%	5	44%	4
African English	33%	3	56%	5
Southeast Asian English 1	33%	3	33%	3
Southeast Asian English 2	22%	2	33%	3
South European English	22%	2	22%	2
North European English	22%	2	11%	1
French English	11%	1	11%	1
South European English	0%	0	22%	2
Middle East Asian English	0%	0	11%	1
German English	0%	0	0%	0
Russian English	0%	0	0%	0
East European English	0%	0	0%	0
Japanese English	0%	0	0%	0
Total	299%	27	321%	29

When asked what are the varieties they are likely to interpret in

international conferences, all nine students chose South Asian English, followed by Chinese English. South Asian English was also chosen by the majority of students (7 students) as the variety students would like to learn through the B language enhancement course. Considering that students also found South Asian English most difficult to understand, the variety should be included in the syllabus. African English, Southeast Asian English 1 & 2 were also of interest by some students and should be considered in the syllabus to reflect the actual target situation.

Finally, students were most interested in learning phonological features of distinct varieties (see Table 6).

Table 6 Learner priority of linguistic features (n=9)

Classification	%	N
Phonology	78%	7
Syntax	11%	1
Lexicon	33%	3
Pragmatics	33%	3

Needs analysis covering lacks, necessities, and wants of the students enrolled to the B language enhancement course indicates that students are moderately interested in learning about varieties of World Englishes, but do not want the portion to exceed 20% of the entire course. The variety that they find most difficult to understand and, thus, would like to learn the most is South Asian English. Students are mainly interested in acquiring knowledge on phonological features of distinct varieties.

3.1.2. Syllabus design

The syllabus design for the B language enhancement course

incorporates the needs analysis result and the elements the instructor finds necessary. The present course aims to enhance linguistic skills encompassing listening, comprehension, and production skills. Listening skills exercises focus on non-native English varieties. Comprehension and production exercises include conventional exercises of B language enhancement course such as text analysis, sentence analysis, and paraphrasing.

The instruction for World Englishes takes up 20% of the course. I divided each class of the 16 week-long course into 4 segments, each taking up 30 minutes, adding up to a 2 hour-long class for a week. World Englishes related instruction takes up a total of 12 segments of the 60 segments for the semester. Instruction follows the 'modified PPP' approach. 'Presentation' refers to a form-focused instruction of features of a specific variety. The instruction concentrates on the phonological features, with an introduction to target situations regarding the specific variety, in order to sensitize students to the real working environment. 'Practice' involves exercises designed to enhance listening and comprehension capability. Cloze exercise is chosen for this activity, as it requires listeners to both listen to the phonological features of the incoming sound and also consider the context to come up with the right matching word. Cloze exercise is widely used for exercising inferencing and predictive skills based on textual cues, and it is also used extensively as a testing device in the listening section of, for example, the TOEFL test (Flowerdew & Miller 2005: 6-7). However when used as a listening exercise in the context of teaching World Englishes, it can serve as a useful 'listening for perception' exercise as well, as listeners have to pay special attention to perceive unfamiliar speech features. Thus, the exercise takes an integrated approach as it incorporates both listening for perception and comprehension, and, in fact, reflects the listening and comprehension

processes, albeit in an elementary form, of interpreting, where decoding, inferencing, anticipation, and context building skills are required. Students are also given listening assignments to prepare for the consecutive interpretation of World Englishes speech that will be conducted in the following class. The syllabus for this B language enhancement course incorporates the 'performance' stage as well, considering that authentic non-native English speeches are not used often in consecutive or simultaneous interpretation courses. By having the opportunity to interpret from the variety students studied in the previous week, they will be able to apply the knowledge to their actual interpreting performance, find out areas of improvement, and develop on-line and off-line strategies. The interpreting task is followed by reflective practice. Students are required to write reflective journals as take-home assignments on the interpreting task they performed for the specific variety at class.

The varieties selected for the present course are Indian English, Vietnamese English, and French English. Indian English, an Outer Circle variety, is a top priority, as the needs analysis clearly shows that students are unfamiliar and eager to learn the South Asian variety. Vietnamese English is selected to cover an unfamiliar variety that belongs to the Expanding Circle. French English is chosen to cover the non-Asian varieties. The syllabus is shown in Table 7.

Table 7 Syllabus[5]

Week	Segment	Activity	Assignment
1	1-4	Class introduction	-
2	1-4	Conventional Activities[6]	-
3	1-2	Conventional Activities	-
	3	Presentation: Phonological features of Indian English	Listening assignment: video clips of Indian English speech
	4	Practice: Cloze exercise	

4	1-2	Performance: Consecutive Interpreting of Indian English speech	Reflective journal
	3-4	Conventional Activities	-
5	1-4	Conventional Activities	-
6	1-4	Conventional Activities	-
7	1-2	Conventional Activities	-
	3	Presentation: Phonological features of Vietnamese English	Listening assignment: video clips of Vietnamese English speech
	4	Practice: Cloze exercise	
8	1-2	Performance: Consecutive Interpreting of Vietnamese English speech	Reflective journal
	3-4	Conventional Activities	-
9	1-4	Conventional Activities	-
10		Public Holiday	
11	1-4	Conventional Activities	-
12	1-2	Conventional Activities	-
	3	Presentation: Phonological features of French English	Listening assignment: video clips of French English speech
	4	Practice: Cloze exercise	
13	1-2	Performance: Consecutive Interpreting of French English speech	Reflective journal
	3-4	Conventional Activities	-
14	1-4	Conventional Activities	-
15	1-4	Conventional Activities	-
16	1-4	Final Assessment	-

3.2. The lecture

3.2.1. Procedure of the 'Modified PPP'

The course was carried out faithfully according to the syllabus designed in 3.1.2. On the third, seventh, and twelfth weeks, I prepared a written document introducing the phonological features of Indian English, Vietnamese English and French English respectively. The features were divided into subsections such as, vowel, consonant,

rhythm, stress, and intonation. Syntactic and lexical features were also provided as necessary. Students were also informed of the real world situation regarding the variety in question, and a short discussion on how to overcome problems arising from difficult accents followed. After the presentation phase, students did a cloze exercise on the variety they learned. Students filled out the blanks while listening to an audio clip of the non-native speech. The presentation and practice activities, provided in such a combined manner, helps students figure out how the declarative knowledge on a specific variety plays out as they actually listen to an authentic clip. After class, students were given a list of video clips of the speeches spoken in the variety they learned and were required to listen to and get familiar to them as part of their assignments. In the following week, students conducted consecutive interpretation tasks. They interpreted from the variety they had learnt in the previous week into Korean. Two 2-minute segments of authentic speeches were presented. Almost all students had the chance to do the interpreting tasks in a given week. After the class, students received the original video clip and they wrote reflective journals on their interpreting performances. Students were required to submit their reflective journals.

3.2.2. Reflective practice

The reflective journals students wrote after their consecutive interpretation tasks presented interesting findings. Given the information of phonological features of each variety, students were able to write their reflective journals in detail containing elements of self-diagnosis and strategy building. The following subsections introduce the quantitative and qualitative findings from students' reflective journals.

3.2.2.1. Quantitative Representation

Students' comments in the reflective journals can be classified based on keywords of their comments. For each keyword, the number of students who mentioned it is calculated, as presented in Table 8. While students' comments were aligned mainly to the linguistic elements — unique segmental and supra-segmental features - introduced during the 'presentation' stage, comments were also made on extra-linguistic factors - background knowledge, rate of speech, and cognitive effort - as well.

Table 8 Quantitative representation of reflective journal comments

Category	Keywords		INE (n=8)	VNE (n=6)	FRE (n=9)
			% (N)	% (N)	% (N)
Linguistic	Segmentals	Consonant	88% (7)	83% (5)	78% (7)
		Vowel	75% (6)	50% (3)	67% (6)
		Literal pronunciation	25% (2)	0% (0)	0% (0)
		Pronounced as L1 words	0% (0)	0% (0)	56% (5)
	Supra-segmentals	Rhythm	13% (1)	33% (2)	11% (1)
		Stress	38% (3)	17% (1)	22% (2)
		Intonation	13% (1)	17% (1)	0% (0)
		Pause	25% (2)	50% (3)	11% (1)
	Syntax[7]		25% (2)	0% (0)	0% (0)
Extra-linguistic	Background knowledge		63% (5)	0% (0)	44% (4)
	Rate of speech		13% (1)	33% (2)	11% (1)
	Processing capacity problems		25% (2)	0% (0)	11% (1)

Most of the comments were made on phonological features in general and segmental features in particular, as most of the interpreting problems students perceived were linked to phonological triggers. There were a lot of comments both on consonant and vowel features of Indian English and French English. French English attracted comments on pronunciation of cognates. Some words, such

as ‘transport’ and ‘experience’, are spelt the same both in English and French. And in the French English speech used in the class, the English pronunciations for these words were replaced entirely with French pronunciations, serving as problem triggers for students. These problems occur as, unlike Indian and Vietnamese, French shares a lot of cognates with English, with the two languages belonging to the same Indo-European language family.

3.2.2.2. Qualitative Representation

In this section, I will introduce excerpts of students’ reflective journals. As seen from Table 8 in section 3.2.2.1, most of the comments were concentrated on phonological elements, describing in detail exactly how specific features affected their performance. The following excerpt illustrates how consonant features of Indian English affected the student’s interpreting process. The student not only describes difficult features but also ones that were not difficult to perceive. This helps the student to tailor the declarative knowledge to her own competency and build strategies accordingly.

> */r/*[8] *is pronounced as a flap ‘r’ or a retroflex consonant in Indian English. In the text, the word ‘years’ appeared a lot, but it was pronounced as /iəɾs/ (with a flap ‘r’), not as /ɪə(r)s/, and I was a bit confused at first. But ‘years’ was relatively intelligible. On the other hand, ‘cheaper’ was pronounced as /tʃ͇ipəɾ/, and it put a load on me. Voiceless consonant /tʃ/ is voiced. The reason why it was difficult to understand ‘cheaper’ was partly because of the flap /ɾ/ sound, but more importantly, because /tʃ/ was pronounced close to /tʃ͇/. The other voiceless consonants (/t/, /k/, /p/) were not difficult to understand even when they were voiced as /t͇/, /p͇/, /k͇/ (Translated by the author).*[9] *(Student 1)*

The following excerpt is on Vietnamese English. The student comments on the bilabial consonants of the variety. She points out that even a small deviation in the first or final consonant causes confusion leading to failure to perceive the word accurately.

> *When 'v', 'p', 'f' are initial sounds or final sounds of a word, they are invariably pronounced as 'f' which makes it difficult for me to understand. The last sound of 'develop' was pronounced as 'f' and 'forty' sounded like 'perty', so I couldn't figure out the number accurately. (Student 2)*

The following excerpt is on French English. The student found the vowel feature of the French English difficult to understand. Also, pronouncing English words according to the French pronunciation system caused confusion to the student. These problems led to total omission of the sentence in question.

> *Vowel /ae/ is pronounced as /a/. Although I did understand properly when 'platform' was pronounced as /platfɔ:rm/ and 'backbone' as /bakboʊn/, I had no idea when 'trams' was pronounced as /trams/. On top of that, the speaker pronounced 'environmental' as /ãviʀɔ̃tal/, which I totally missed, so the sentence 'Trams is the most environmentally friendly transportation' was entirely missed. (Student 3)*

On the other hand, a student who learnt French before found the French pronunciation relatively easy to understand. Because of her knowledge in the French pronunciation system, unlike the student above, she found it easy to infer the matching English word or expression even when the word was pronounced according to conventional French pronunciation. The fact that French shares the Roman alphabet and cognates with English can serve as a double-edged sword, putting those unaware of French pronunciation

system in the dark while giving chance to those who know the language to make further inferences based on the combination of the spelling and the pronunciation system. However, when words are replaced entirely by French words and pronounced in French as well, even those who learned French find it rather difficult to perceive the speech intuitively.

> *French English was easier to understand than the Southeast Asian variety I learned in the previous class. Maybe it's because I learned French a little before. Since French and English words share similar spelling, with only a slight difference in pronunciation, it is easy to guess which English word the speaker is speaking. I learned how French people speak in English in the previous week, and now that I'm used to the knowledge that 'r' is pronounced as /h/ and 'i' as /ɪ/, most of the speech is not difficult to understand. However, when an English word is spelt the same or almost the same as a French word, the speaker tended to pronounce it in a French way, which was quite difficult for me to adjust to at first. But, unlike Southeast Asain English, it was easier to understand French English as French and English are all western languages. (Student 4)*

For Indian English, in particular, there were comments on the supra-segmental features as well.

> *Unique rhythm of Indian English speakers. The fact that Indian English speakers speak fast is in itself challenging. But unique intonation or rhythm of Indian English, which are hard to describe in writing, makes it more challenging to understand. My guess is that the rhythm would be similar to that of Hindi spoken by Indians. (Student 1)*

> *If the vowels had been pronounced more accurately and pauses had been given more often, then [sentence] stress would've sounded clearer. (Student 5)*

Students also mentioned the repercussions of phonological intelligibility problems. When the unintelligible word is the main sentence component, such as a subject or a predicate, it aggravates comprehension and production as well.

> *Overall the most challenging thing in interpreting this speech was the fact that I couldn't perceive important words such as subjects, verbs, or predicates well. The overall sentence meaning was not adequately captured, so I had to resort to a handful of clearly understood words and formulate a sentence as I interpreted into Korean. And that was very challenging. (Student 6)*

The aforementioned problem triggers eventually impacted processing capacity management, which was pointed out in the reflective journal. When students encountered unintelligible words, they had to make a guess, albeit for a split second, what the word was originally in the source speech. This not only hampered the rendition of the sentence in question, but also the listening process for the ensuing sentences. And one student mentioned that it also affected her note-taking style, as her notes became disorganized than usual due to cognitive pressure triggered by intelligibility issues.

> *For example, 'political' sounded like /p̄olit̄ik̄ɾ/, which I took for 'particular' […]. And 'governance' was pronounced as /gəvəɾnəns/ (with a flap 'r'), so I couldn't figure out whether he meant 'government' or 'governance'. And as I was wondering on that, I missed the next utterances of the speaker. (Student 2)*

> *Overall, the pronunciation was difficult to understand. Even after the speaker completed a sentence, I was still lingering on, and thus, missed the next sentence. The combination of lack of background knowledge and intelligibility problems consumed my thoughts.*

Eventually, I didn't have enough time to take notes in an organized way. (Student 7)

The French English speech required a moderate level of knowledge on subject area and terminologies. These requirements, combined with thick French accent, can aggravate students' understanding of the text. This combination was quite challenging for students.

I am not familiar with French accent, which made it more challenging for me. Also, the most challenging part was that I lacked subject area knowledge. There were a lot of concepts and terminologies I was unfamiliar with, so it was impossible to guess words from the context. So I couldn't understand a lot. (Student 6)

The positive outcome of writing reflective journals for this course is that students were able to create their own online and offline strategies for interpreting speeches in non-native varieties. Students did not just stop at describing the challenges. Through reflection, they built up strategies to overcome the issues they mentioned. On phonological intelligibility issues, they found the need to learn more about features of specific varieties and grow familiarity with them. This will eventually help relieve cognitive pressure in their interpreting process as well. They also concluded that they need to build up more background knowledge on the subject area they have to interpret, particularly so, when the speaker is a non-native speaker.

Indian English speakers speak fast, and consonants are usually voiced. […] When I have to interpret an Indian English speaker, I should be well aware of these features, build more subject area knowledge, and guess or infer logically. (Student 5)

I couldn't figure out what word the speaker was trying to say. So it

was difficult to understand the content of the speech and I had to guess words as well. This was extremely burdensome to me. So, I should be well informed of and familiar to the features of Indian English. I also realized that I should also study background information before I interpret so that regardless of speaker's accent, my interpretation is well comprehended by the audience. (Student 2)

I realized through this interpreting exercise that I should be more familiar with features of different varieties, acquire sufficient level of background knowledge, and create symbols for key terminologies. Then I would be more prepared for the task. (Student 4)

The comments in students' reflective journals illustrate students' self-assessed lacks and competencies. They were able to analyze their interpreting problems, find the causes for their interpreting failures, and build strategies to overcome the issues. In the process, students were sensitized to the issues of World Englishes in authentic working environment and felt the need to pay interest to non-native English speeches as well. This process, when iterated over the course, may help accelerate the process of transferring declarative knowledge into procedural knowledge.

3.3. End-of-course survey

At the end of the semester, student survey was conducted to explore students' perceived effectiveness of the proposed World Englishes training method in terms of understanding varieties, building strategies, and raising awareness.

3.3.1. Perceived linguistic challenges

Table 9 illustrates the specific linguistic challenges students experienced through the course. Most of the students experienced

difficulties at the phonological level, but not necessarily at the syntactic level, and this applies to all three varieties covered in the course. As listening process starts from perceiving sounds, it is appropriate to continue to focus on teaching phonological features of World Englishes varieties in future applications.

Table 9 Perceived linguistic challenges

Variety	Classification	Mean (5 point scale)
Indian English	Phonology	4.78
	Syntax	3.22
Vietnamese English	Phonology	4.11
	Syntax	3.11
French English	Phonology	4.78
	Syntax	2.78

3.3.2. Perceived effectiveness

In order to find out whether students found the World Englishes pedagogy applied to the B language enhancement course effective, students were asked to evaluate the following statements on a scale of 1 and 5. The statements were about the effectiveness of the 'modified PPP' approach, reflective practice, and awareness building, as presented in Table 10.

Table 10 Perceived effectiveness

Category		Statements	Mean (5 point scale)
Modified PPP	Presentation	The presentation and materials on features of each variety were helpful in building basic knowledge on the varieties	4.33
	Practice	Cloze activity was useful as a listening exercise before moving on to the main	4.56

		interpreting task	
	Performance	By doing consecutive interpretation from non-native English varieties, I was able to have a hands-on experience on the impact of non-native English features on my interpreting performance	4.78
Reflective Practice	Knowledge Building	Writing a reflective journal after the consecutive interpretation task contributed to a better understanding of the non-native English features	4.33
	Strategy Building	Writing a reflective journal after the consecutive interpretation task contributed to my strategy building	4.11
Awareness Building		The above tasks raised my awareness on non-native English varieties	4.56

The result of all statements scored above 4 points, indicating that participants strongly agreed to all statements. In other words, students found the pedagogy for World Englishes applied to the present course effective. The procedure starting from declarative knowledge to procedural one, activities of each stage, reflective practice as post-task activity, and the overall awareness building efforts were all perceived as useful for them. Students found the 'performance' activity as most effective, which suggests that the activity may be quite useful if applied to consecutive and simultaneous interpretation courses as well.

3.3.3. Needs revisited

Building on the perceived effectiveness of learning World Englishes, the survey, again, asked students' needs to consider for future classroom applications. One question was on whether teaching World Englishes in interpreter training course is necessary. In this end-of-course survey, students strongly agreed to the need for

teaching World Englishes (see Table 11). The mean score, 4.0, was, in fact, a surge from 3.6 recorded from the needs survey conducted at the beginning of the course. While students were uncertain at the beginning, they turned very positive towards learning World Englishes variety by the end of the semester. This suggests that awareness raising effort throughout the course was effective and students were sensitized to the problems triggered by World Englishes through the course.

Table 11 Needs comparison on World Englishes teaching : Beginning vs. End of course

	Beginning-of-course	End-of-course
Mean score (n=9)	3.6	4.0

When asked specifically in which other courses they would like to have World Englishes incorporated, by, for example, using authentic texts or inviting a non-native speaker, students responded that they would like to learn World Englishes in consecutive interpretation BA, simultaneous interpretation BA, and mock international conference courses (see Table 12).

Table 12 Courses appropriate for future applications (n=9)

Course	% (N)
BA Consecutive Interpretation	67% (6)
BA Simultaneous Interpretation	56% (5)
Mock international conference	44% (4)
Simultaneous Interpretation with text	0% (0)
Total	167%(15)

Finally, Table 13 illustrates the varieties students want to learn in future World Englishes incorporated classes. Chinese English tops the

list, with varieties learnt through the present course no longer taking up the top positions. With only Chinese English selected by more than half the respondents, it merits to be the variety of choice for future World Englishes classes.

Table 13 Varieties students want to learn further (n=9)

Variety	Response	
	%	N
Chinese English	67%	6
Southeast Asian English 1	33%	3
Japanese English	33%	3
African English	33%	3
South Asian English	22%	2
French English	22%	2
South European English	22%	2
Russian English	22%	2
Southeast Asian English 2	11%	1
German English	11%	1
North European English	11%	1
Middle East Asian English	11%	1
Netherland English	0%	0
East European English	0%	0
Total	298%	27

4. Conclusion

The present study applied the approach for teaching World Englishes proposed by Huh (2014) in an interpreter-training course. Considering the lack of World Englishes element in conventional interpreter training course, it was deemed appropriate to begin from

the stage where students start acquiring declarative knowledge on World Englishes first. For this purpose, the approach was applied to a B language enhancement course.

The action research involved needs analysis, syllabus design, classroom implementation, and end-of-course survey. Needs analysis conducted on students at the beginning of the course revealed that students lacked knowledge on target situations, where diverse varieties of English speech are spoken. Thus, awareness building was a priority to motivate students to grow interest in learning World Englishes. The 'modifed PPP' approach was applied, in which students are first presented with information on features of selected varieties, and then were given the opportunity to practice listening through a cloze exercise, and finally were required to perform consecutive interpreting tasks, interpreting from the selected variety into Korean. Students were also required to keep reflective journals to reflect on their performance, analyze the problems and build adequate strategies. The approach yielded a positive outcome, with students producing reflective journals that actually work for them. Students did not simply reflect on their performance in an abstract way using vague terms, but tended to specifically link the problems with the features of a variety that triggered the problem. This was possible as they built declarative knowledge on those features at the very first stage of the approach. The cloze activity for the listening exercise facilitated the transition from the first stage, where only information is given, to the third stage (performance stage) where students had to encounter problems and solve the problems as they interpreted the speech. It was a chance for students to map the features with actual sounds and get familiar to the features. The end-of-course survey supported these findings, with students strongly agreeing to the effectiveness of the 'modified PPP' approach, reflective practice, and

awareness building efforts.

In the present study, awareness building was found to be very important to motivate students to learn World Englishes. Students' responses to the question on the need to learn World Englishes in interpreter training courses surged from 'neutral' at the beginning of the course to 'strongly agree' at the end of the course. They were also interested in incorporating World Englishes elements in other interpreting classes as well. This suggests that sensitizing students to the target situation is very important for motivation purposes and that interpreter training courses should be constantly reviewed to reflect the real world target situation.

In addition, interpreting tasks combined with reflective practice was quite useful, as perceived by both the students and the author. Knowledge alone will not guarantee successful interpreting, and knowledge should be combined with actual skills. Performance should be constantly reflected, and in the process declarative knowledge can be converted to procedural knowledge, thereby allowing students to reach the level of automaticity.

For future applications, however, there are rooms for improvement and the following considerations need to be reflected in the course plan. Covering three varieties over the course may not seem enough considering the presence of a large number of varieties of World Englishes. However, since the segment for World Englishes consisted of only 20% of the course, there wasn't enough time for students to gain full familiarity with each variety's features during the presentation and practice phases. As a complementary measure, students were given assignments to watch video clips featuring World Englishes speeches. Still, students were reduced to a passive role during the presentation phase as the instructor presented the features of each variety. Allowing for more autonomy and active

learning might further enhance the efficiency at the presentation phase. In that regard, the presentation phase could be moved up to pre-class phase by adopting a 'flipped learning' approach. A pre-class reading assignment can be given to students. Reading materials on World Englishes can be distributed so that students are pre-equipped with basic knowledge on features of the variety to be covered in class. In class, sound clips and video clips of the variety can be introduced extensively to further the understanding of the variety. In the practice phase, not only cloze exercise but also dictation exercise can be conducted as well so that the focus of practice is not confined to word level.

Furthermore, the evaluation method of the present study needs to be improved. Survey on students' perceptions on the pedagogy alone is not enough and, thus, should be corroborated by empirical data that demonstrates changes in interpreting performance.

Finally, an action research conducted in consecutive and simultaneous interpreting courses would be useful, as part of a 'long journey' towards establishing a pedagogy of World Englishes in interpreter training courses. Since the findings of the present research come from second year students enrolled to the B language enhancement course, the approach may not be directly applicable to first year students and, thus, requires further research for application to students in other stages of learning.

NOTES

1. Varieties spoken in Southeast Asian region, such as Singapore, Malaysia, and the Philippines, which belong to outer circle
2. Varieties spoken in Nordic countries
3. Varieties spoken in Southern Europe, such as Spain, Italy, and Portugal
4. Varieties spoken in Southeast Asian region such as Thailand, Vietnam, and Indonesia,

which belong to the expanding circle
5. Shaded area indicates segments allocated for World Englishes instruction.
6. Conventional activities refer to traditional approaches implemented for B language enhancement at graduate schools of interpretation and translation.
7. Syntax is mentioned by students not just because of the syntactic error itself, but also of the syntax problems resulting from phonological intelligibility of key sentence components.
8. Sometimes students used Korean alphabet to indicate phonetic symbols in their reflective journal. In the translation I converted them to conventional phonetic symbols.
9. All excerpts are translated by the author of this paper.

REFERENCES

Albl-Mikasa, Michaela (2010) 'Global English and English as a Lingua Franca (ELF): Implications for the Interpreting Profession', *Trans-Kom* 3(2): 26-148.

Canagarajah, A. Suresh (2006). 'Negotiating the Local in English as a Lingua Franca', *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 26: 97-218.

Cooper, Cary L., Rachel Davies and Rosalie L. Tung (2010) 'Interpreting Stress: Sources of Job Stress among Conference Interpreters', *Multilingua* 1(2): 7-107.

Crystal, David (2008) 'Two Thousand Million?', *English Today* 24(1): 3-6.

Deterding, David (2006) 'The Pronunciation of English by Speakers from China', *English World-Wide* 27(2):175-198.

Field, John (2008) *Listening in the Language Classroom,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Firth, Alan (1996) 'The Discursive Accomplishment of Normality on "Lingua Franca" English and Conversation Analysis', *Journal of Pragmatics* 26(2): 37-259.

Flowerdew, John and Lindsay Miller (2005) *Second Language Listening: Theory and Practice,* Cambridge; New York: Cambridge UP.

Francis, Dawn (1995) 'The Reflective Journal: A Window to Preservice teachers' Practical Knowledge', *Teaching and Teacher Education* 11(3): 229-241.

Daniel, Gile (2009) *Basic Concepts and Models for Interpreter and Translator Training.* Rev. ed., Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Honey, Patrick James (1987) 'Vietnamese speakers', *In*: Michael Swan and

Bernard Smith (eds.) *Learner English: A teacher's guide to interference and other problems*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 238-251.

House, Juliane (2012) 'Teaching Oral Skills in English as a Lingua Franca', *In*: Alsogoff Lubna, Sandra L. McKay, Guangwei Hu and Willy A. Renandya (eds.) *Principles and Practices for Teaching English as an International Language*. New York: Taylor & Francis, 186-205.

Huh, Jiun (2013a) 'Problems in Simultaneous Interpretation from World Englishes to Korean: Case Study on Indian English', *The Journal of Translation Studies* 14(2): 253-282.

Huh, Jiun (2013b) 'A Study of Simultaneous Interpretation from Chinese English into Korean based on Information Structure Analysis', *Interpreting and Translation Studies* 17(3): 387-418.

Huh, Jiun (2014) 'Methods of Teaching World Englishes in Interpreting Programs', *The Journal of Translation Studies* 15(1): 331-364.

Kachru, Braj B. (1985) 'Standards, Codification and Sociolinguistic Realism: The English Language in the Outer Circle', *In*: Randolph Quirk and H.G. Widdowson (eds.) *English in the World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 11-30.

Kirkpatrick, Andy (2007) *World Englishes: Implications for International Communication and English Language Teaching,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kitano, Hiroaki (1991) 'Phi DM-Dialog: An Experimental Speech-to-Speech Dialog Translation System', *Computer* 24(6): 36-50.

Lee, Jieun (2013) 'Action research on legal interpreter training: A case study of Ewha GSTI legal interpreter certificate program', *The Journal of Translation Studies* 14(5): 195-223.

Matsuda, Aya (2012) 'Teaching Materials in EIL', *In*: Alsogoff Lubna, Sandra L. McKay, Guangwei Hu and Willy A. Renandya (eds.) *Principles and Practices for Teaching English as an International Language*. New York: Taylor & Francis, 168-185.

McDonough, Jo and Steven McDonough (1997) *Research Methods for English Language Teachers,* London: Arnold.

Moser, Barbara (1978) 'Simultaneous Interpretation: A Hypothetical Model and its Practical Application', *In*: David Gerver and H. Wallace Sinaiko (eds.) *Language Interpretation and Communication*. New York; London: Springer US, 353-368.

Pae, Doo-Bon (2002) 'The Conditions of Teaching English through English and the Roles of Teachers in Korea', *The Journal of English Language Teaching* 14(1): 137-161.

Qiong, Hu Xiao (2004) 'Why China English should Stand alongside British, American, and the Other World Englishes', *English Today 78* 20(2): 26-33.

Reithofer, Karin (2011) 'English as a Lingua Franca and Interpreting', *Studia Universitatis Babes-Bolyai-Philologia* 2011(1): 121-131. Visited 28 May 2013, < http://studia.ubbcluj.ro/download/pdf/574.pdf >.

Sawyer, David B. (2004) *Fundamental Aspects of Interpreter Education,* Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Schön, Donald A. (1987) *Educating the Reflective Practitioner,* San Francisco; London: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Seleskovitch, Danica and Marianne Lederer (1995) *A Systematic Approach to Teaching Interpretation.* (Translated by Jacolyn Harmer), The Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf.

Setton, Robin (1999) *Simultaneous Interpretation: A Congnitive–pragmatic Analysis,* Amsterdam; Philadelphia: J. Benjamins.

Shackle, Christopher (1987) 'Speakers of Indian languages', *In*: Michael Swan and Bernard Smith (eds.) *Learner English: A teacher's guide to interference and other problems.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 170-184.

Skehan, Peter (1998) *A Congnitive Approach to Language Learning,* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ur, Penny (1984) *Teaching Listening Comprehension,* Cambridge: Cambridge UP.

Walter, Catherine (1987) 'French speakers', *In*: Michael Swan and Bernard Smith (eds.) *Learner English: A teacher's guide to interference and other problems.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 42-57.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1

Needs Analysis

1. Have you ever acquired or learnt languages other than Korean and English?

① Yes (→ Go to Q2)
② No (→ Go to Q3)

2. Please write down the language acquired/learnt, and years of acquisition/learning.

1) Language: _____ Period: _____
2) Language: _____ Period: _____
3) Language: _____ Period: _____

3. Have you ever lived abroad? (If no → Go to Q4)

1) Country: _____, years of residence: _____
2) Country: _____, years of residence: _____
3) Country: _____, years of residence: _____

4. Which variety do you prefer as source text materials when you study interpreting?

① Native English variety ② Non-native English variety
③ No preference

5. Which variety of English do you speak?

① American English ② British English
③ Australian English ④ Korean English
⑤ No specific variety ⑥ Others ( )

6. Have you ever had exposure to non-native English? (Ex: conference settings, on Internet, or conversations with non-native English speakers, etc.)

① Never (Go to Q10) ② Almost never
③ Sometimes ④ A moderate amount ⑤ A great deal

7. Was it easy to understand non-native English?

① Strongly disagree ② Disagree ③ Neither agree nor disagree
④ Agree ⑤ Strongly agree

8. Select up to three varieties of English that you were most exposed to from below.

① Southeast Asia 1 (Singapore, Malaysia)
② Southeast Asia 2 (Thailand, Vietnam, Indonesia)
③ South Asia (India, Sri Lanka, Pakistan)
④ China (China, Taiwan, Hong Kong)
⑤ Japan
⑥ France (France, Belgium)
⑦ Germany
⑧ Netherland
⑨ Southern Europe (Spain, Italy)
⑩ Northern Europe (Finland, Sweden, Norway, Denmark)
⑪ Russia
⑫ Eastern Europe
⑬ Africa
⑭ Middle East

9. Select up to three varieties of English that you found most difficult to understand.

① Southeast Asia 1 (Singapore, Malaysia)

② Southeast Asia 2 (Thailand, Vietnam, Indonesia)
③ South Asia (India, Sri Lanka, Pakistan)
④ China (China, Taiwan, Hong Kong)
⑤ Japan
⑥ France (France, Belgium)
⑦ Germany
⑧ Netherland
⑨ Southern Europe (Spain, Italy)
⑩ Northern Europe (Finland, Sweden, Norway, Denmark)
⑪ Russia
⑫ Eastern Europe
⑬ Africa
⑭ Middle East

10. Select up to three varieties of English that you expect to interpret the most in real conferences after finishing the interpreting program.

① Southeast Asia 1 (Singapore, Malaysia)
② Southeast Asia 2 (Thailand, Vietnam, Indonesia)
③ South Asia (India, Sri Lanka, Pakistan)
④ China (China, Taiwan, Hong Kong)
⑤ Japan
⑥ France (France, Belgium)
⑦ Germany
⑧ Netherland
⑨ Southern Europe (Spain, Italy)
⑩ Northern Europe (Finland, Sweden, Norway, Denmark)
⑪ Russia
⑫ Eastern Europe
⑬ Africa
⑭ Middle East

11. Do you find the need to learn non-native English varieties and use them as source texts in the current interpreting program?

① Strongly disagree ② Disagree ③ Neither agree nor disagree
④ Agree ⑤ Strongly agree

12. What do you think is the appropriate portion allocated for learning non-native English varieties in this B language enhancement course?

① 10~20% ② 21~40% ③ 41~60%
④ 61~80% ⑤ 81~100%

13. Which varieties do you want to learn in the present course? (Select all that apply)

① Southeast Asia 1 (Singapore, Malaysia)
② Southeast Asia 2 (Thailand, Vietnam, Indonesia)
③ South Asia (India, Sri Lanka, Pakistan)
④ China (China, Taiwan, Hong Kong)
⑤ Japan
⑥ France (France, Belgium)
⑦ Germany
⑧ Netherland
⑨ Southern Europe (Spain, Italy)
⑩ Northern Europe (Finland, Sweden, Norway, Denmark)
⑪ Russia
⑫ Eastern Europe
⑬ Africa
⑭ Middle East

14. Which of the following features of non-native English do you want to learn through the present course? (Select all that apply)

① Phonology ② Syntax ③ Lexis ④ Pragmatics

Appendix 2

End-of-Semester Survey

1. What are the languages you have acquired or learnt? (Select all that apply)

① Indian languages ② Vietnamese ③ French

2. Please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with each of these statements regarding the non-native English varieties that were covered in the present course.

	Statements	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Disagree or Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	I experienced interpreting challenges due to unique phonological features of Indian English					
2	I experienced interpreting challenges due to unique syntactical features of Indian English					
3	I experienced interpreting challenges due to unique phonological features of Vietnamese English					
4	I experienced interpreting challenges due to unique syntactical features of Vietnamese English					
5	I experienced interpreting challenges due to unique phonological features of French English					
6	I experienced interpreting challenges due to unique syntactical features of French English					

3. In the present course, we studied the features of non-native English varieties and used the speeches in the varieties for interpreting tasks. Please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with each of these statements regarding the class activities.

	Statements	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Disagree or Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	The presentation and materials on features of each variety were helpful in building basic knowledge on the varieties					
2	Cloze activity was useful as a listening exercise before moving on to the main interpreting task					
3	By doing consecutive interpretation from non-native English varieties, I was able to have a hands-on experience on the impact of non-native English features on my interpreting performance					
4	Writing a reflective journal after the consecutive interpretation task contributed to a better understanding of the non-native English features					
5	Writing a reflective journal after the consecutive interpretation task contributed to my strategy building					
6	The above tasks raised my awareness on non-native English varieties					

4. Do you find the need to learn non-native English varieties and use them as source texts in the current interpreting program?

① Strongly disagree ② Disagree ③ Neither agree nor disagree
④ Agree ⑤ Strongly agree

5. In which other courses would you want to incorporate non-native English speeches, such as by using authentic non-native English speech video clips or inviting non-native English speakers?

① Consecutive interpretation ② Simultaneous interpretation
③ Mock conference ④ Simultaneous interpretation with text

6. What are the top three non-native English varieties that you would like to learn and practice in the interpreting program?

① Southeast Asia 1 (Singapore, Malaysia)
② Southeast Asia 2 (Thailand, Vietnam, Indonesia)
③ South Asia (India, Sri Lanka, Pakistan)
④ China (China, Taiwan, Hong Kong)
⑤ Japan
⑥ France (France, Belgium)
⑦ Germany
⑧ Netherland
⑨ Southern Europe (Spain, Italy)
⑩ Northern Europe (Finland, Sweden, Norway, Denmark)
⑪ Russia
⑫ Eastern Europe
⑬ Africa
⑭ Middle East

Received: August 29, 2014
Revised: September 22, 2014
Accepted: September 30, 2014