

Sabine Braun and Judith L. Taylor (Eds.)

**Videoconference and
Remote Interpreting
in Criminal Proceedings**

AVIDICUS

EU Criminal Justice Programme Project JLS/2008/JPEN/037, 2008-2011

**With financial support from the Criminal Justice Programme
European Commission - Directorate-General Justice**

THE VIEWS EXPRESSED IN THIS REPORT ARE THE SOLE RESPONSIBILITY
OF THE AUTHORS AND DO NOT NECESSARILY REFLECT THE VIEWS OF
THE EUROPEAN COMMISSION



Sabine Braun and Judith L. Taylor
Editors

Videoconference and Remote Interpreting in Criminal Proceedings

Guildford: University of Surrey.
2011

Contact:

Dr Sabine Braun, s.braun@surrey.ac.uk

AVIDICUS

Assessment of Videoconference Interpreting in Criminal Proceedings

Centre for Translation Studies, University of Surrey, Guildford GU2 7XH, United Kingdom

2011

www.videoconference-interpreting.net

288 pp.

© AVIDICUS 2011

Permission to make digital or hard copies of part or all of the papers in this volume for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies refer to this copyright and cite the original publication in this volume. Abstracting with credit is permitted. Authors may reuse any portion of their work, without fee, in future works of the Author's own, including books, lectures and presentations in all media, or to post author-prepared versions of the work covered by this copyright in a personal collection on their own Home Page and on a publicly accessible server provided the AVIDICUS copyright and publication are cited.

All other rights, including those of translation into foreign languages, are reserved.

Contents

<i>Sabine Braun and Judith L. Taylor</i> Introduction.....	1
Section 1 Framework and context	
<i>Caroline Morgan</i> The new European Directive on the rights to interpretation and translation in criminal proceedings.....	5
<i>Evert-Jan van der Vlis</i> Videoconferencing in criminal proceedings	11
Section 2 Video-mediated interpreting in criminal proceedings: from practice to research	
<i>Sabine Braun and Judith L. Taylor</i> Video-mediated interpreting: an overview of current practice and research	27
<i>Sabine Braun and Judith L. Taylor</i> Video-mediated interpreting in criminal proceedings: two European surveys.....	59
<i>Sabine Braun and Judith L. Taylor</i> AVIDICUS comparative studies – part I: Traditional interpreting and remote interpreting in police interviews.....	85
<i>Katalin Balogh and Erik Hertog</i> AVIDICUS comparative studies – part II: Traditional, videoconference and remote interpreting in police interviews.....	101
<i>Joanna Miler-Cassino and Zofia Rybińska</i> AVIDICUS comparative studies – part III: Traditional interpreting and videoconference interpreting in prosecution interviews.....	117
<i>Dirk Rombouts</i> The police interview using videoconferencing with a legal interpreter: a critical view from the perspective of interview techniques	137
<i>Jemina Napier</i> Here or there? An assessment of video remote signed language interpreter- mediated interaction in court	145

Section 3 Technology

Ronald van den Hoogen and Peter van Rotterdam

True-to-life requirements for using videoconferencing in legal proceedings 187

José Esteban Causo

Conference interpreting with information and communication technologies.

Experiences from the European Commission DG Interpretation 199

Annex 1

Annex 2

Annex 3

Section 4 Training

Sabine Braun, Judith L. Taylor, Joanna Miler-Cassino, Zofia Rybińska, Katalin Balogh, Erik Hertog, Yolanda vanden Bosch and Dirk Rombouts

Training in video-mediated interpreting in criminal proceedings: modules for interpreting students, legal interpreters and legal practitioners 205

Annex 1a – Presentation for student interpreters

Annex 1b – Presentation for practising legal interpreters

Annex 1c – Presentation for legal practitioners and police officers

Annex 2 – Student handout

Section 5 Conclusions and implications

Ann Corsellis

AVIDICUS: Conclusions and implications 255

Sabine Braun

Recommendations for the use of video-mediated interpreting in criminal proceedings 265