

CAMPUS HANDBOOK

KATALIN BALOGH HEIDI SALAETS
DOMINIQUE VAN SCHOOR

TraiLLD: Training in Languages of Lesser Diffusion

TRAINING OF LEGAL INTERPRETERS IN LLDs



This publication has been produced with the financial support of the Criminal Justice Programme of the European Union. The contents of this publication are the sole responsibility of the TraiLLD consortium and can in no way be taken to reflect the views of the European Commission.

D/2016/45/44 – ISBN 978 94 014 3327 3 – NUR 630

Cover design: Studio Lannoo and Keppie & Keppie

Interior design: Fulya Toper

© Katalin Balogh, Heidi Salaets, Dominique Van Schoor & Lannoo Publishers nv, Tielt, 2016.

LannooCampus Publishers is a subsidiary of Lannoo Publishers, the book and multimedia division of Lannoo Publishers nv.

All rights reserved.

No part of this publication may be reproduced and/or made public, by means of printing, photocopying, microfilm or any other means, without the prior written permission of the publisher.

LannooCampus Publishers
Erasmestraat 179 box 101
3001 Leuven
Belgium
www.lannoocampus.com

CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION: PROJECT DESCRIPTION	11
<i>Heidi Salaets, Katalin Balogh & Dominique Van Schoor</i>	
1. The objectives of the project	11
2. Partners	13
3. Methodology	14
4. Results	14
CHAPTER 2. LANGUAGES OF LESSER DIFFUSION (LLDs): THE RATIONALE BEHIND THE RESEARCH PROJECT AND DEFINITIONS	17
<i>Heidi Salaets, Katalin Balogh & Dominique Van Schoor</i>	
1. Introduction	17
2. Definitions, concepts and terms	18
2.1 Lesser-Used Languages	19
2.2 Less Translated Languages	19
2.3 Languages of Lesser Diffusion – LLDs	21
3. The rationale behind the TraiLLD project in light of its “predecessors”	24
4. Migration in Europe and changing LLDs	29
CHAPTER 3. COURSE DESCRIPTIONS	35
1. Legal interpreting and translation programme KU Leuven (Antwerp campus)	35
<i>Katalin Balogh, Heidi Salaets & Dominique Van Schoor</i>	
1.1 Course programme	35
1.2 The entrance exam	36
1.3 The training	37
1.4 Final exams	40
2. SIGV: a brief introduction	41
<i>Carola Verhoeff</i>	
2.1 Curriculum overview	42
2.2 Curriculum organization	43
2.3 Adding new languages	45
3. Training interpreters online. An experiential dialogic approach	46
<i>Hanne Skaaden</i>	
3.1 Introduction. The context of training interpreters for the public sector	46
3.2 A blended course with online and on-campus learning activities	48
3.3 Flexible learning for multiple language groups	49
3.4 Discussion	63
3.5 Concluding remarks	64

4. Methodologies and techniques used in training simultaneous interpreters of languages of lesser diffusion at the international criminal court	69
<i>Andrew Constable</i>	
4.1 Introduction	69
4.2 ICC: jurisdiction and language regime	70
4.3 Interpreting in international criminal proceedings	71
4.4 Interpreter training	72
4.5 Time frame	73
4.6 Training methodology: collaborative learning	74
4.7 Conclusion	79
5. The Tandem method for training legal interpreters and translators	80
<i>Christiane Driesen</i>	
5.1 Definitions	80
5.2 A method created in response to urgent needs	81
5.3 Objectives of training legal interpreters and translators in Hamburg and Magdeburg using the tandem method	82
5.4 Curriculum formats having applied the tandem method	82
5.5 Selection of languages in accordance with the needs in the region	83
5.6 Profile of trainers	84
5.7 Conditions of admission and constitution of language groups	85
5.8 Curriculum	85
5.9 Final examinations	86
5.10 Conclusion	87

CHAPTER 4. BRIEFING TRAINERS FOR A TANDEM TRAINING PROGRAMME FOR LEGAL INTERPRETERS AND TRANSLATORS 91

Christiane Driesen

1. Information in writing: module catalogue	91
2. Introductory briefing meeting for all three trainer profiles	93
3. Specific briefing of tandem trainers	94
3.1 Description of the introductory sessions	94
3.2 Personal work required from the students	94
3.3 Aims to be targeted by the tandem trainers during the second phase	95
3.4 Typical training settings	95
3.5 Tasks of language experts concerning preparation and evaluation	96
4. Briefing for the final examination	96
4.1 Briefing concerning the written part	96
4.2 Briefing of all trainers for the oral examination	98

CHAPTER 5. LEGAL TRANSLATION AND TERMINOLOGY 101*Christiane Driesen*

1. Specificities of legal translating and interpreting – focusing on the essentials 101
 - 1.1 Translation process applying to general (mostly mono-referential) texts 101
 - 1.2 The translation process for legal texts 102
2. Structure of translation training 102
 - 2.1 Introductory lectures by legal professionals 102
 - 2.2 Introduction to legal language specificities 105
 - 2.3 Introduction to the basics of terminology 105
3. Introductory exercises 105
 - 3.1 Core exercise: elaborating a synoptic table of key terms 106
 - 3.2 Hierarchy of sources 106
4. Exercises using the tandem method with a language expert and a translator trainer 112

CHAPTER 6. RESOURCES AND MATERIALS FOR TRAINING LEGAL INTERPRETERS IN LANGUAGES OF LESSER DIFFUSION 117*Ahmed Zekhnini*

1. Introduction 117
2. Flexibility in programmes with languages of lesser diffusion 118
3. Content for training legal interpreters in LLDs 121

CHAPTER 7. DESCRIPTION OF THE PILOTS AND BEST PRACTICES 145

1. Pilot training Mongolian-Dutch (KU Leuven and SIGV) 145
Katalin Balogh, Heidi Salaets, Dominique Van Schoor & Carola Verhoeff
2. Pilot training Arabic-Slovene (University of Ljubljana and SIGV) 154
Amalija Maček & Ahmed Zekhnini
3. Online learning on remote interpreting: a pilot course (HiOA) 162
Hanne Skaaden
 - 3.1 The pilot course 162
 - 3.2 Distance and remote interpreting 163
 - 3.3 The course 164
 - 3.4 Learning effects and final exam 172
 - 3.5 Evaluations 175
 - 3.6 Concluding remarks 181
4. Reflections on legal interpreter training in a continuous learning course with special focus on LLDs (University of Bologna) 184
Mette Rudvin

4.1	General aim of the course	184
4.2	Situation in Italy	185
4.3	Legal interpreter continuous training course – background information	186
4.4	Legal interpreting for Languages of Lesser Diffusion	187
4.5	Critical points that emerged during the course relating especially to LLDs	188
4.6	Legal interpreting for LLDs	189
4.7	The Romany language in translation – main hurdles	190

CHAPTER 8. PROFESSIONAL RESPONSES TO WORKING WITH AD HOC INTERPRETERS **195**

Erik Hertog

1.	Introduction	195
2.	Professional responses	198
2.1	Longer term strategies	198
2.2	Before the assignment	200
2.3	Prepare for the assignment	201
2.4	During the assignment	204
2.5	After the assignment	207
2.6	Remote interpreting	208
2.7	Conclusion	209

CHAPTER 9. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS **213**

Katalin Balogh, Heidi Salaets & Dominique Van Schoor

NOTES **216**

BIOGRAPHIES OF THE AUTHORS **222**

CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION: PROJECT
DESCRIPTION

1. The objectives of the project
2. Partners
3. Methodology
4. Results

CHAPTER 2
LANGUAGES OF LESSER DIFFUSION
(LLDs): THE RATIONALE BEHIND THE
RESEARCH PROJECT AND DEFINITIONS

CHAPTER 3
COURSE DESCRIPTIONS

CHAPTER 4
BRIEFING TRAINERS FOR A TANDEM
TRAINING PROGRAMME FOR LEGAL
INTERPRETERS AND TRANSLATORS

CHAPTER 5
LEGAL TRANSLATION AND
TERMINOLOGY

CHAPTER 6
RESOURCES AND MATERIALS FOR
TRAINING LEGAL INTERPRETERS IN
LANGUAGES OF LESSER DIFFUSION

CHAPTER 7
DESCRIPTION OF THE PILOTS AND
BEST PRACTICES

CHAPTER 8
PROFESSIONAL RESPONSES TO WORK-
ING WITH AD HOC INTERPRETERS

CHAPTER 9
CONCLUSION AND
RECOMMENDATIONS

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION: PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Heidi Salaets, Katalin Balogh & Dominique Van Schoor

1. THE OBJECTIVES OF THE PROJECT

Europe is fundamentally multilingual and this is reflected in criminal procedures and settings as well. The number of non-Belgians in Belgian prisons has for instance quadrupled between 1980 and 2010. However, in only +/- 35% of the cases, Dutch, French, German or English was required, while in 65% of the cases a plethora of 50 different languages was needed, such as Afaan (Oromo), Afar, Bengali, Fula, Hindi, Malagasi, Mongolian, Pashtu, Punjabi, Singalese, Somali, Urdu and Vietnamese.

It is this particular problem the TraiLLD project tried to address. Every member state has a number of legal interpreters in a number of (for them) main languages. The range of these languages is usually related to educational training opportunities in the country. The urgent problem, however, is the need to provide equally appropriate quality in legal interpreting (LI) in these LLDs [languages of lesser diffusion] which are a reality in every European member state. An LLD [language of lesser diffusion] may be a language that has relatively few speakers in the country, but does that mean that a Tibetan person, involved in a criminal procedure in Italy, is not entitled to a fair treatment because of the absence of appropriately qualified legal interpreters? An LLD may also be the language of a recently arrived, sometimes fairly large community, or the language of a longer established community in the country (e.g. Berber or Roma speaking people) for which there are only few or no qualified interpreters. All EU member states struggle with this problem. The real problem is the number and range of LLDs which require specific training methodologies and programmes. The partners in this consortium know of a number of strategies that are being used to address this challenge. What needs to be done now is to analyse the options and to see which practical recommendations for training programmes and training of

trainers can be made. Even though the partners will obviously build on the results of earlier projects and research, this group brings together new and much-needed expertise from within Europe.

The major objectives of the TraiLLD project were:

- To develop new training methodologies and strategies to enable speakers of LLDs to become interpreters in a short and intensive period of training
- To reduce the widespread use of informal and unqualified ad hoc LLD interpreters
- To explore strategies to train and share trainers of LLDs
- To develop EU-wide access to information, guidelines, models and recommendations on training LLD interpreters and LLD trainers
- To explore the use of simultaneous interpreting techniques in these training strategies
- To ensure better provision in LI in the member states in LLDs
- To ensure there is no blatant discrimination between language provisions in criminal proceedings.

Speakers of LLDs certainly have a much higher risk of being deprived of their procedural rights for practical reasons: either there is nobody available to provide interpretation or the interpretation fails because of the lack of knowledge of the judicial system or the lack of interpreting techniques and ethics of the presumed “interpreter”. Nevertheless, since October 2013, Directive 2010/64/EU requires member states to provide an interpreter of sufficient quality in every phase of the pre-trial and trial proceedings.

By designing models of new training strategies this research project will help all EU member states to tackle the problem of interpreting in LLD. These training models will be duly disseminated. Two fundamental steps were taken during the course of the project to prove the effectiveness of such training models: first, we explored best practices in the partner countries and secondly we tested those models that have shown to be the most efficient in a test case; thus almost every partner country (Belgium, the Netherlands, Slovenia, Italy) has been able to give feedback on their actual effectiveness and collaboration with each other.

The innovative aspect of this project lies precisely in adapting knowledge, achievements and results of previous projects by proposing specific and new methodologies for training legal interpreting candidates with an LLD as their mother tongue. These training methodologies must above all be pragmatic,

cost-effective and innovative: e-learning, peer-to-peer learning, blended learning and other methods have been evaluated and integrated.

The unique aspect consisted in adapting these training programmes to the needs of a specific group (i.e. future interpreters of LLDs). Another innovative aspect was to reduce the cost of training by organizing more online training, by working with peers (instead of with experts only) and by developing training programmes that profit from new technologies. Because of technological developments (see article 2[6] of Directive 2010/64/EU: "Where appropriate, communication technology such as videoconferencing, telephone or the Internet may be used") and time and cost efficiency factors, all EU member states are confronted with an increasing demand for legal interpreting. For that reason, we would also like to explore the possibility of finding creative solutions (e.g. thanks to new technologies) to improve the training for legal interpreters of LLDs.

2. PARTNERS

KU Leuven (Antwerp Campus) is the coordinator of the TraiLLD project. The first project partner, Hochschule Magdeburg-Stendal, has extensive expertise in the field of interpreter training, particularly with its "tandem" method to train German court interpreters of minority languages. This is also the case for external expert Christiane Driesen.

The same is true for SIGV [Dutch Association for Legal Interpreters and Translators], which offers a legal interpreting course specifically aimed at LLD students since 2003.

The University of Bologna and the University of Ljubljana both represent countries that are facing considerable challenges in this area. Our other key experts are Andrew Constable, interpreter and interpreter-trainer working at the ICC, which regularly organizes internal intensive courses in simultaneous interpreting for LLDs. Em. Prof. dr Erik Hertog is actively involved as researcher in many European projects on legal interpreting, either as coordinator or participant. Hanne Skaaden is also an interpreting expert and researcher. She developed the e-learning platform for interpreter training in Norway.

3. METHODOLOGY

During the first preliminary stage of the project we focused on information gathering and observation. The information gathering has enabled us to design a roadmap of training methodologies for LLD in the different partner countries. In addition, experts who had already put into practice certain methodologies and strategies for training people with an LLD as a mother tongue to become an interpreter, explained their best practices. Study visits were organized in the partner countries to witness concrete examples of the training methods.

The next methodological step was a **qualitative analysis** of the different training methodologies and strategies for LLDs observed and presented so far: this then led to a **combination or adaptation** of best practices in training methodologies.

Following this qualitative analysis, we adopted an **empirical method**: test cases were run in the partner countries to examine the effectiveness of the proposed training methodologies and strategies. This gave us the chance to collect **immediate feedback** (from both participants and trainers) on the feasibility and effectiveness of the applied training methodologies.

Based on this feedback and the description of the pilot collaboration, we formulated **recommendations** on training methodologies and strategies for LLDs for all EU member states.

These different methodologies offer a mixture of theoretical analysis and expertise by experts and practitioners, combined with pragmatic empirical methods to prove the effectiveness and feasibility of each strategy.

4. RESULTS

One of the most important outputs of this project is without any doubt this manual. Through the different chapters we want to give an overview of best practices in training interpreters for LLDs in the partner countries (BE, NL, DE, IT, SI). At the same time, we have tried to draw a roadmap of training methodologies and strategies for LLD. The project partners applied this roadmap in their countries through test cases and through the applications of theory in practice. Based on the feedback of the test cases and the pilot trainings we formulated recommendations to other EU member states.

In order to provide broader awareness and better dissemination we designed a leaflet with practical information, including several key recommendations for both interpreter trainers and users. This leaflet is available electronically as well as in print format. The training manual is available on the project website as well as on the EULITA-website.¹

In this way, the project hopes to contribute to a better training of legal interpreters for LLDs, which raises the quality of interpretation in these languages. This research project in turn enhances the rights of suspected and accused persons in a criminal proceeding, and helps to fully guarantee the procedural rights of victims, vulnerable persons and witnesses as well.

**CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION: PROJECT
DESCRIPTION**

**CHAPTER 2
LANGUAGES OF LESSER DIFFUSION
(LLDs): THE RATIONALE BEHIND THE
RESEARCH PROJECT AND DEFINITIONS**

1. Introduction
2. Definitions, concepts and terms
3. The rationale behind the TraiLLD project in light of its “predecessors”
4. Migration in Europe and changing LLDs

**CHAPTER 3
COURSE DESCRIPTIONS**

**CHAPTER 4
BRIEFING TRAINERS FOR A TANDEM
TRAINING PROGRAMME FOR LEGAL
INTERPRETERS AND TRANSLATORS**

**CHAPTER 5
LEGAL TRANSLATION AND
TERMINOLOGY**

**CHAPTER 6
RESOURCES AND MATERIALS FOR
TRAINING LEGAL INTERPRETERS IN
LANGUAGES OF LESSER DIFFUSION**

**CHAPTER 7
DESCRIPTION OF THE PILOTS AND
BEST PRACTICES**

**CHAPTER 8
PROFESSIONAL RESPONSES TO WORK-
ING WITH AD HOC INTERPRETERS**

**CHAPTER 9
CONCLUSION AND
RECOMMENDATIONS**

CHAPTER 2

LANGUAGES OF LESSER DIFFUSION (LLDs): THE RATIONALE BEHIND THE RESEARCH PROJECT AND DEFINITIONS

Heidi Salaets, Katalin Balogh & Dominique Van Schoor

Every individual has equal status under the law and thereby the right to services equal in nature and quality to those provided to any other individual. The question, then, is how to tackle the difficulties inherent in providing competent interpreting services in all languages, at all times, and in all places. Speaking realistically, this goal presents an extreme challenge to judicial authorities and to the agencies or individuals charged with procuring interpreting services, and there is no easy answer. There are, however, some useful strategies that can be employed.

CYNTHIA GIAMBRUNO (Giambruno 2014: 94).

1. INTRODUCTION

What is cited in the quote, is exactly the aim of the TraiLLD project (JUST/2013/JPEN/AG/4594): to present strategies that can be employed to provide equal access to justice, also for people who speak a different language. In the case of TraiLLD, this means that interpreting services are provided even in Languages of Lesser Diffusion (LLDs). Since the right to be heard (see article 41 of The Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union) cannot be conditioned “in any way by the language community to which an individual in need of assistance belongs, by the educational level the individual has achieved, by the cultural beliefs and practices to which the individual subscribes, or by the difficulties involved in finding a qualified professional to provide the required interpreting

services” (Giambruno 2014:94), solutions must be found to treat every individual in the same way before Iustitia or Lady Justice. The right to interpretation and translation as stipulated in the 2010/64/EU Directive is a measure in place to ensure the right to a fair trial for those who do not speak or understand the language of the jurisdiction.

This manual wants to contribute to the above-mentioned complex task of judicial authorities and interpreting service providers in having to provide interpreting services that can ensure equal access to justice, specifically in those cases where a “rare language” is involved.

Before entering the core of the matter, we first need to define the concept of LLD. *Languages of Lesser Diffusion* (LLDs) is a term that has some competing equivalents like *Languages of Limited Diffusion*, that carries the same acronym. The term “exotic” or “rare” languages is a widespread lay term for this type of languages.

These terms are sometimes confused with terminology that seems to be close to the LLD-concept, namely *Lesser-Used Languages* or *minority languages*, which refer to a certain area of language policy rather than the issue of the diffusion or *frequency* of a given language in a particular geographical area. Language policy is not, however, the specific aim of this publication.

In what follows we will first discuss these terminological differences and propose some definitions to more clearly distinguish the above-mentioned conceptual threads. We will do this in the light of the aim of the present publication, which is the result and final deliverable of the TraiLLD project. The next part of this introduction will then present the project itself and the rationale behind it, by referring to previous or ongoing European projects and available materials. We will also explain why training in LLDs, and consequently this manual with concrete training models, is still needed. Finally, we will illustrate our case with concrete facts and figures about migration in Europe.

2. DEFINITIONS, CONCEPTS AND TERMS

Before providing an overview of the rather complex concept of LLD as found in the literature, and a definition proposed by the TraiLLD consortium, we will first rule out what is **not included** in the project’s definition of LLD.

2.1 Lesser-Used Languages

Until 2010 the concept ‘Lesser-Used Languages’ was an official term used in the EU as it was linked to the EBLUL (European Bureau for Lesser-Used Languages). EBLUL was founded in 1985 to protect the interests of lesser-used languages in the EU and dissolved in 2010 (see EBLUL Closing Statement at www.eblul.eurolang.net).

If we look at some of the languages that were involved in the EBLUL (Frysk or Frisian, Brezhoneg or Breton, Gaeilge or Irish Gaelic, Cymraeg or Welsh, Euskera or Basque, Arbërishtja or Arbrësh, Sardu or Sardinian etc.) it is clear that it exclusively covers a European concern linked to language policy.

EBLUL was conceived as an NGO promoting languages and linguistic diversity and therefore has other goals than the TraiLLD project elaborated by academics, interpreter trainers and interpreters. Their statements as defenders of minority or “minoritized” languages illustrate this clearly:

In today’s EU there are some 46 million speakers of European lesser-used, regional and minoritized languages. EBLUL, with a mandate from its democratically elected Member State Committees, represents the interests of these language communities at regional, state and European level. It plays a pre-eminent role in information generation, sharing and networking in the field of language promotion at European and international levels. EBLUL also disseminates information on EU action in the field of languages and to represent and inform lesser-used language communities on EU policies and funding programmes which are appropriate to their languages. (www.eblul.eurolang.net/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=14&Itemid=33)

The protection of lesser-used languages to avoid extinction, or the promotion of these rare languages, in order to put minority communities, cultures or customs in the spotlight is not the aim of this publication. The TraiLLD project, by contrast, has a broader goal: to assure that any person, speaking any language from any culture can exercise their right to be heard in legal proceedings.

2.2 Less Translated Languages

In some sources and publications, *lesser-used languages* are mentioned in the capacity of *minority languages* related to *less or lesser translated languages*, as in the publication edited by Branchadell & West: *Less Translated Languages*.

According to the editors, the term is “inspired by the concept of ‘lesser-used languages’, [...] (it) applies to all those languages that are less often the source of translation in the international exchange of linguistic goods, regardless of the number of people using these languages [...] (it) would be the *contrary* of source-language intensive languages (not necessarily target-language intensive)” (Branchadell & West, 2005:1).

The same term also appears in a recent publication, i.e. the JoSTrans online journal which dedicates the 2015 issue to “Translation and minority, lesser-used and lesser-translated languages and cultures”. Amongst others, Debbie Folaron (2015) states the following in her article “Translation and minority, lesser-used and lesser-translated languages and cultures”:

Indigenous, aboriginal, minority, minor, lesser-used: they constitute about 90% of the world’s 7000 languages. A growing number of articles and essays have also been devoted to discussing lesser-translated languages. [...] Meanwhile, the globalising digital world and technologies are recontextualising many individual and collective social practices in relation to minority, minor, lesser-used, and endangered language communities. It is clear that translation activities – including audiovisual and multimedia translation, localisation, terminology creation and management, interpreting, etc. – play a significant role in these changing practices. (Folaron 2015: 16)

In this regard, in his contribution “Computerized writing for smaller languages” (Hall 2015: 163-186) Pat Hall precisely describes the difficulty of digitally encoding written languages in order to enable members of a linguistic community to share knowledge on the Internet, taking Nepal as example. Nepali as a language for him is not the problem, but the fact that there are more than 120 languages in Nepal, and especially the languages with no written form, constitutes a real challenge.

Again, these are not the primary concerns of the TraiLLD project as described here. Nevertheless, the issues that are mentioned here are linked to it, but are much broader. It is here that the LLDs as intended by the project consortium come into play.

2.3 Languages of Lesser Diffusion – LLDs

What if our Nepalese citizen travels to an EU member state, for example to Germany, (either for holidays, family reunion, a more permanent stay or any other reason) and encounters a problem that brings him to the police station. Given that he does not speak German and only a little bit of English, the police officer tries to speak with him in that language. The question is, however: do the Nepalese citizen and the German police officer have enough knowledge of English to communicate successfully? This might be sufficient for a first superficial encounter, but not for in-depth discussions about details, or in court. In that case, the presence of a professional interpreter Nepali-German is required. Only in this way can the rules laid down in the EU Directive 2010/64/EU be complied with.

Other problems are also involved here: what if the Nepalese citizen speaks a local dialect? What if his/her mother tongue has no written form and/or official status? What about the specificities of the Nepalese legal system and terminology that is different from the legal system of that specific EU member state? Despite the existence of a European E-justice portal in 23 languages, there is no such thing as a “European legal system”.

Finally, how are we going to look for an interpreter in the given Nepalese language? If ever such a person can be found, the last but fundamental question is the hardest one: is this person trained, in other words, is he or she a professional, trained legal interpreter? Does he/she possess the skills, knowledge and professional attitude that characterize a professional interpreter? And last but not least: if a person is found that must be trained, do we have training resources to do so? And how much time do we need to “transform” the bilingual speaker into a professional legal interpreter?

This brings us to the next problem, which is how to define an LLD, which is not an easy task. A first definition was given by Roat during a webinar on March 28 2008 of the *Refugee Health Technical Assistance Center* in Massachusetts USA. She states the following:

A language of lesser diffusion is what we call a language that has relatively few speakers in a defined geographic area. So when I say Somali is a language of lesser diffusion it doesn't mean that few people speak Somalia, Somali, if you go to Somalia lots of people speak Somali. If you go to Minneapolis a lot of people speak Somali, but if you go to Arizona, not so much and it becomes difficult to find interpreters. German, you'd hardly consider German a small language in terms of how many people speak it, but it is, and if you went to Chicago you would find a fair number of LEP patients that need interpretation in German, but if you go to Seattle it's very rare. And then again we have some refugee languages like Nuer that is just a language of lesser diffusion everywhere in the United States. Wherever you go this is going to be a hard language to find interpreters in. (www.refugeehealthta.org/files/2012/03/Transcript_Ad-dressingLanguageAccess_RHTACWebinar3.28.12.pdf)

Skaaden and Wadensjö implement this definition to a pedagogical context as part of the *Qualitas* publication:²

In fact, the concept 'languages of lesser diffusion' refers to a plethora of challenges involved in the testing of bilingual speakers and of potential interpreters in particular. As indicated by Roat's delineation, languages of lesser diffusion are those languages that have recently arrived in an area (e.g. Karen in Europe, Dutch in Norway etc.). Hence, the particular problem that these languages represent to any testing system is related to the challenge of finding individuals who are qualified to assist in the design and administration of certification, processes, and who can serve as assessors in the testing process. (Skaaden & Wadensjö 2014: 24).

Of course, it is only at the end of the quality control chain that we encounter these problems. Before even being able to test candidate interpreters, they must first be trained. This generates the same kind of problems when having to find a qualified native language speaker who is able to work as an (interpreter) trainer. If this 'rara avis' is found, the next question is whether he or she can work as a language teacher or as an interpreter trainer, which do not necessarily require the same competences. Although there can be an overlap, they are not interchangeable.