Translation and Interpreting Research
Vol. 2, No. 5, March 2025, 31-43
tir.atu.ac.ir
DOI: 10.22054/tir.2025.86461.1043

Repair Strategies in English-Persian Interpreting: A Comparative Study of Simultaneous and Consecutive Modes

Sima Ferdowsi* Department of Foreign Languages, Shahid Bahonar University of Kerman, Kerman, Iran

Leila Iranmanesh Department of Foreign Languages, Shahid Bahonar University of Kerman, Kerman, Iran

Abstract

This empirical investigation examines the repair strategies used by trainee interpreters in English-Persian simultaneous (SI) and consecutive interpreting (CI) modes. The research seeks to investigate two main questions: whether there are differences in the frequency of repairs between SI and CI, and whether there are variations in the sorts of repair strategies employed in both modes. The study involved nine trainees from Shahid Bahonar University of Kerman who were learning interpreting. The study employed a 4-minute speech from Voice of America English News, which discussed the influence of vitamins on preventing the advancement of AIDS in women. Occurrences of self-repairs were detected using Tang's (2020c) framework. The findings revealed a notable disparity in the frequency of repair strategies between CI and SI modes, with CI trainees utilizing a greater number of repairs. In addition, the trainees in the CI mode achieved superior scores in explicitation and synonym techniques. The results emphasize the unique patterns of repair strategies in both consecutive and simultaneous interpretation, reflecting the importance of focused training to improve interpreters' abilities in both modes. Interpreter training programs may consider including explicit instruction on repair procedures and placing emphasis on evaluating their use in performance assessments.

Keywords: Repair strategies, consecutive interpreting, simultaneous interpreting, trainee interpreters

Original Article
Accepted: 16.03.2025
Received: 25.01.2025

*Corresponding author: sima.ferdowsi@uk.ac.ir

Cite this article: Ferdowsi, S., & Iranmanesh, L. (2025). Repair strategies in English-Persian interpreting: A comparative study of simultaneous and consecutive modes. *Translation and Interpreting Research*, *2*(5), 31-43. DOI: 10.22054/tir.2025.86461.1043

Publisher: ATU Press

Translation and Interpreting Research is the journal of Research Institute for Translation Studies (RITS), affiliated with Allameh Tabataba'i University, Tehran, Iran.

1. Introduction

Disfluencies refer to inconsistencies that disrupt the smoothness of a speaker's speech, without contributing any meaningful information to what the speaker is saying (Fox Tree, 1995; Gósy, 2007). The majority of research often classify disfluencies into two main categories. Repair disfluencies refer to instances where the smoothness of speech is interrupted, and the speaker then makes an effort to repair or replace what was previously spoken. Conversely, non-repair disfluencies are not corrected and consist of filled pauses (such as "uh" and "uhm"), silent pauses (sometimes referred to as "silent hesitations"), and elongations of vowels and consonants (Paice, 2022).

The notion of repair was first introduced by Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks (1997) in their examination of first language everyday communication. In their study, Bortfeld et al. (2001) discovered that, on average, 6% of words in spoken language exhibit disfluencies. Furthermore, Blacfkmer and Mitton (1991) found that radio talk show callers have a disfluency around every 4.6 seconds. These findings highlight the prevalence of disfluencies in spoken language.

According to Petite (2005), interpreters, similar to speakers, engage in the process of editing their product and making self-modifications, which are referred to as repairs. The occurrence of self-repairs in interpreting reveals that interpreters actively engage in monitoring their own output and make efforts to ensure accuracy and clarity in their interpretations. It demonstrates their recognition of possible mistakes or inaccurate understandings and their dedication to correcting them when they occur. To put it in Magnifico and Defrancq's (2019) terms, self-repairs serve as evidence of interpreters' conformity to norms. They emphasize that it is the interpreter, rather than the observer, who determines that the output does not meet a specific norm.

Wang (2007) investigates this active self-monitoring through a study on self-repairs in English to Chinese simultaneous interpreting, utilizing Levelt's (1983) classification of repairs as a framework. He asserted that the compensate technique of interpreting is not solely focused on correcting errors, but rather relies on the monitoring mechanism launched by interpreters. Similarly, Li (2011) examined the use of self-repairs by trainee interpreters during consecutive interpreting. Through the analysis of a set of thirty-one trainees, it was discovered that self-repair is strongly correlated with the self-monitoring mechanism. In addition, he categorized the different forms of self-correction using Kormos' (1999) classification of repairs in second language acquisition.

Repair in interpreting is defined by Tissi (2000, p. 114) as "an utterance rectifying what the interpreter has just said or certain errors because of slip of tongue". However, interpreters are usually advised to minimize repairs in order to improve the fluency of their delivery (Tang, 2020; Tissi, 2000). There has been an increasing scholarly focus on fluency as a measurable indicator of interpreting quality within the field of interpreting studies (Bartłomiejczyk & Gumul, 2024; Lin et al., 2018; Macías, 2006; Plevoets & Defrancq, 2016; Tissi, 2000). This focus on fluency as a key indicator of interpreting quality aligns with broader efforts to assess interpreting quality from multiple perspectives and dimensions, utilizing diverse standards and criteria (Pöchhacker, 2001). Interpreting quality assessment can be analyzed from several viewpoints and aspects, utilizing a variety of benchmarks and criteria (Pöchhacker, 2001). Interpreters, consumers (listeners, speakers), and commissioners of interpreting services can offer subjective evaluations (Gile, 1991). On the other hand, researchers may use objective measurements to assess the quality of the interpretive output as external observers (Viezzi, 1996, as cited in Pöchhacker, 2001).

The fact that self-repair can serve as both an apparent indicator of interpreting disfluency and an interpreting strategy (Bakti & Bóna, 2016; Zeng & Hong, 2012; Dailidėnaitė, 2009; Kohn & Kalina, 1996; Petite, 2005) underscores the need for further investigation into this topic. However, the topic of self-repairs has received less attention in interpreting compared to monolingual speech (Magnifico

& Defrancq, 2019). Additionally, as correctly stated by Mirek (2022), self-repairs have received limited attention with regard to trainee interpreters. Furthermore, it remains unclear whether such strategies would exhibit distinct characteristics depending on the mode of interpretation. Moreover, there is a scarcity of research on repairs in the English and Persian language combination. The present experimental study intended to fill this gap by comparing the repairs used by trainee interpreters in English-Persian simultaneous and consecutive interpreting modes. To this end, the following research questions were posed:

1. Does the frequency of repair strategies used by trainee interpreters in English-Persian simultaneous interpreting differ significantly from those used in consecutive interpreting?

2. Do the types of repair strategies used by trainee interpreters in English-Persian simultaneous interpreting differ significantly from those used in consecutive interpreting?

2. Literature Review

Self-repair in Spontaneous Speech

In the domain of language production, whether in a first or second language, self-repair is a widespread occurrence. The process entails recognizing an issue in our speech plan or spoken output, pausing the speech flow, and making the necessary repairs (Gilabert, 2013). Linguistically, repairs are defined as efforts to resolve problems in speaking, hearing, or understanding (Mead, 2015). In conversational contexts, repairs can be initiated by the speaker or other participants, resulting in either 'self-repairs' or 'other-repairs' (Schegloff et al., 1977).

Second language acquisition scholars have shown interest in both self-initiated and other-initiated repairs since they demonstrate students' awareness of form and can be interpreted as efforts to improve accuracy (Kormos, 1999). According to Lyter and Ranta (1997), when learners receive corrective feedback and undertake repairs themselves, it helps them to automate the retrieval of their knowledge of the target language and change their assumptions about the language. Self-initiated repairs have comparable objectives but are generated spontaneously by learners without any external input (Gilabert, 2013).

Self-repairs, as Schegloff et al. (1977) highlighted, goes beyond simple error correction. They contend that occurrences of repair can take place even in the absence of any evident error, mistake, or problem. Petite (2005, p. 30) echoes the same idea and considers repairs as "matching the output against fitness for purpose rather than simply as the correction of errors". Blacfkmer and Mitton (1991) propose that self-repair may encompass modifications to prior content, repetition of prior content (with the exception of repetition for emphasis), or the application of an editing term. In other words, self-repair encompasses more than just error correction; it also pertains to the suitability or propriety of an expression.

According to Levelt (1983), repairs in speech are linked to the language monitoring mechanism used by speakers to identify possible difficulties in their utterances. To commence a repair, two crucial processes must occur. Initially, the speaker must become aware of any difficulty or disturbance in their speech, prompting them to abruptly halt their ongoing flow of speech. Furthermore, the speaker must produce a new utterance that addresses the detected problem and takes into account its possible influence on the listener.

Self-repair in Interpreting

According to Mead (2015), in monologues, repairs are self-initiated. Petite (2005) suggests that repairs in interpreting are similar to those found in monolingual speech. Kohn and Kalina (1996) were the first to identify self-repair as an interpreting strategy. They defined self-repair as an emergency strategy to be employed in situations where comprehension and production strategies have proven

ineffective. Repair strategies are categorized as replacement, completion, approximation, and relativation by Kalina (1998). The first two are referred to as 'overt repair'. Completion is used to restore an incomplete sentence by restarting a new sentence. On the contrary, approximation and relativation are 'covert repair' that assist interpreters in bringing their output closer to the input without producing visibly disfluent speech.

Dailidėnaitė (2009, p. 17) expands the classification of self-repairs by incorporating the categories of 'no repair' and 'delayed repair'. A 'no repair' circumstance arises when the interpreter chooses not to correct an error if the potential harm caused by the correction is greater than the advantage gained. However, the interpreter may still employ filled pauses like "uh" or "ah" and repeat certain words. The idea of 'no repair' is consistent with Levelt's (1983) concept of covert repairs seen in spontaneous speech, when there are no changes, additions, or removals of morphemes. However, the occurrence of filled pauses and repetitions in 'no repair' situations might have a negative impact on the fluency and coherence of speech delivery. In the field of interpreting, 'delayed repairs' refer to instances where interpreters offer a repair or correction at a certain distance from the original input. Technically speaking, delayed repairs have minimal impact on the smoothness of interpretation and might be seen as subtle, voluntary repairs.

In Petite's (2005) study, the process of interpretation was considered, and some modifications were made to Levelt's (1983) terminology of repairs. The objective was to uncover the reasons behind the use of self-repair procedures. Based on an examination of genuine data obtained from a collection of eight skilled interpreters who were recorded at four distinct international conferences, the author proposes that interpreters engage in repairs in order to enhance the suitability of their statements, rather than solely to rectify mistakes. In addition, Petite (2005, p. 44) categorizes repairs as either 'input-generated repairs', where the interpreter seeks to closely resemble the original input, or 'output-generated repairs', where the interpreter aims to maximize the impact of their output while minimizing the effort involved in producing and receiving it. She categorizes repairs into four main types: post-articulatory appropriateness repairs, post-articulatory error repairs, post-articulatory D repairs, and mid-articulatory repairs. Appropriateness repairs are further divided into AA (repairs to remove ambiguity), AL (repairs for more precise terms), and AC (repairs for more coherence with previous text or terminology). Error repairs are subdivided into EL (repairs of lexical errors), ES (repairs of syntactic errors), EF (repairs of phonological errors), and EG (repairs of grammatical errors).

Tang (2020) conducted multiple studies on self-repair in consecutive interpreting. The initial research (Tang, 2020a) investigates how trainees' interpreting from Chinese to English (and vice versa) impacts the frequency and types of repairs. The findings revealed that trainees exhibited different repair patterns depending on the direction of interpretation. Interpreting from Chinese to English generally resulted in more frequent repairs compared to the reverse. Moreover, the study identified various types of repairs, such as self-corrections and reformulations, and noted that these were more prevalent when interpreting into the non-native language. The findings suggest that training programs should emphasize direction-specific strategies to improve repair fluency and overall interpreting performance. In another study, Tang (2020b) constructed a parallel corpus comprising source speeches and interpreting outputs from invited interpreting trainees. She classified all identified repair cases based on four criteria: (a) linguistic information in the output, (b) paralinguistic features of the output, (c) trainees' notes, and (d) trainees' reports from retrospective interviews conducted post-interpreting session. The resulting taxonomy model categorizes interpreters' repair strategies into five major categories and nine subcategories. Moreover, Tang (2020c) examines the methods used to repair errors in Chinese-English consecutive interpreting, by comparing the approaches of experienced interpreters and trainee interpreters. The study reveals that competent interpreters make significantly fewer repairs, employing a greater number of adept synonym repairs as a means of mitigating errors. Conversely, trainees often rely on repetitions, restart repairs, and

correcting grammatical and lexical errors as a result of their limited ability in the English language. The disparities underscore the influence of expertise on fluency and the capacity to handle repairs efficiently, indicating that the advanced skills of professional interpreters result in more fluid and cohesive interpretations.

Magnifico and Defrancq (2019, p. 19) categorize the motivations for self-repairs into two main groups: (a) the desire to adhere to norms and (b) motivations unrelated to norm compliance. When the output is defective, repairs are clearly employed by interpreters to fix instances of errors, which are norm-breaching situations. In the latter case, numerous hypothetical events can occur. In a flawless result, where self-repairs are unnecessary in terms of meaning (such as paraphrasing), interpreters may provide corrections to "buy time" in order to digest the lengthy sentence in the input. Moreover, characteristics of the original speeches can impact the cognitive capabilities of the interpreter. For instance, "problem triggers" such as faster speech rates, greater lexical density, or less organized texts can increase cognitive load and result in more errors. These findings are supported by Gile (2015, 2009, 1999).

Classification of Self-repair

For the sake of the present research, instances of self-repairs were identified in every mode of interpreting based on Tang (2020c, p. 40):

1. Error Repairs (ER): The goal of error repairs is to ensure that the interpretation remains accurate, clear, and faithful to the original message and are further divided into:
    - Phonetic Error Repairs (ERPs): These involve correcting mistakes in pronunciation or phonetic articulation. For example, if an interpreter mispronounces a word, they would correct it immediately.
    - Grammatical Error Repairs (ERGs): These repairs address errors in grammar, such as incorrect verb tense, subject-verb agreement, or preposition use. For instance, changing "he go" to "he goes".
    - Lexical Error Repairs (ERLs): These involve correcting mistakes in word choice or vocabulary. For example, if an interpreter uses the wrong word, they would replace it with the correct one.
    - Semantic Error Repairs (ERSs): These repairs correct errors in meaning. If an interpreter realizes they have misunderstood or misrepresented the original message, they would correct the meaning to align with the source.
2. Explicitation Repairs (XR): These involve making implicit information explicit.
3. Precision Repairs (PR): These aim to enhance the accuracy or completeness of the interpretation.
4. Synonym Repairs (SR): These involve substituting a word with a synonym to maintain fluency.
5. Restart Repairs (RR): These occur when the interpreter begins a sentence with one word but then continues it using a different word, after initially selecting another word.
6. Repetition (RP): This involves repeating words, phrases, or phonemes to gain time or ensure clarity.

3. Methodology

This experimental study employed a quantitative approach to identify and compare occurrences of self-repair in the output of trainee interpreters during consecutive and simultaneous interpreting

tasks. Self-repair, in this particular context, pertains to the interpreters' instinctive rectification of their own output without any external influence or prompting.

Participants

The study included nine interpreting trainees (7 females and 2 males), all of whom were native Persian speakers with English as their foreign language. The participants had an average age of 21.8 years (SD=1.53), ranging from 21 to 23. All the trainees were pursuing a Bachelor's degree in English Translation at Shahid Bahonar University of Kerman. The students received instruction in both consecutive and simultaneous interpretation throughout two successive semesters. This systematical training was conveyed through two distinct university courses, with each course specifically emphasizing the cultivation of CI and SI skills, respectively. The participants were chosen using convenience sampling and could withdraw from the study if they desired.

Source Material

The source material used for the CI and SI tasks consisted of a 4-minute speech including 376 words, obtained from Voice of America English News (VOA). The speech was about the effect of vitamins in decreasing the progress of AIDS in infected women. The selected audio clip did not present any notable language or vocabulary difficulties for the students. The duration, type, and difficulty level of the audio clip closely corresponded to those experienced by the students throughout their CI and SI training in the multimedia lab.

Procedure

The participants were required to perform two interpreting tasks: consecutive interpreting and simultaneous interpreting. Before assessing their consecutive interpreting proficiency, the participants initially engaged in a sequence of 16 sessions, with each class lasting 90 minutes. These classes were centered around instructing students in the techniques and skills of consecutive interpreting, as outlined in Gillies (2013). These skills included delivery, active listening and analysis, memory and recall, note-taking, reformulation, self-monitoring, and split attention. Upon completion of the course, the participants went through a CI evaluation. They listened to a speech that was presented with a typical American accent. The speech was divided into chunks to facilitate consecutive interpretation. The participants' regular interpreting classes were held in the same multimedia lab where the exam was administered. One researcher served as the course instructor, while the other aided her in conducting the examination. The trainees were seated in front of a computer, wearing headphones. The instructor delivered oral instructions for the interpreting examination. The participants were needed to take notes as they listened to the speech segment by segment during the examination. After each segment, the participants were alerted with a "ding" sound to start interpreting. The interpretation of each participant was independently recorded for subsequent analysis. Finally, the data on the participants' CI and SI performance was transcribed to detect occurrences of self-repairs made in each interpretation mode.

Data Analysis

While there is agreement on the notion of a repair, the classification of repairs in the realm of interpretation has been extremely varied. In order to effectively analyze the repair tactics employed by trainee interpreters in simultaneous and consecutive interpreting, it is crucial to use a taxonomy specifically designed for studying interpreted speech.

Four systematic classifications of self-repair in interpreting were pertinent to this inquiry. In 2005, Petite conducted the initial categorization of repair strategies in SI by a corpus-based approach. The proposed model was mostly influenced by Levelt's (1983, 1989) taxonomy which was designed for spontaneous speech. Therefore, some amendments were made to Levelt's model. Nevertheless, it has constraints in differentiating certain sorts of repairs and is deficient in certain repairs that are

specific to interpretation. For instance, the model does not encompass repairs made to rectify semantic errors that occur when the interpreter misinterprets the original meaning. These kinds of repair are common in interpreting and should not be ignored.

Furthermore, Shen and Liang (2020) developed a taxonomy based on consecutive interpreting. This taxonomy identifies five distinct repair forms that are well characterized and do not overlap. However, due to the limited number of sample and the specific choice of source speeches the model does not cover certain typical repairs in interpreting such as repairs for correcting semantic errors. As a result, their taxonomy may not be universally applicable.

Tang (2020b) proposed the third repair taxonomy, which was derived from a parallel corpus of source speech and interpreting output produced by interpreting trainees. Afterwards, she categorized all the identified repair cases from that corpus into (a) error repairs further subdivided into (phonetic error repairs, grammatical error repairs, lexical error repairs, and semantic error repairs) (b) explicitation repairs, (c) precision repairs including (accuracy-targeted precision repairs, and completeness-targeted precision repairs), (d) synonym repairs, and (e) restart repairs.

In another study, Tang (2020c) introduced two modifications to his prior classification, namely Tang (2020b). Initially, precision repairs were no longer categorized into accuracy-focused precision repairs and completeness-focused precision repairs. Additionally, the category of repetition was included as a category due to its similarity to repairs. Furthermore, it was argued that this taxonomy encompasses a more extensive array of repair techniques usually employed by interpreters and offers a broader perspective on the characteristics of repair strategies in interpreting (Tang, 2020c).

4. Results

The first question was in search of whether the frequency of repair strategies used by trainee interpreters in English-Persian simultaneous interpreting (SI) differs from those used in consecutive interpreting (CI).

An independent samples *t*-test was run to compare the frequency of repair strategies of trainee interpreters in English-Persian simultaneous interpreting and consecutive interpreting.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics of Frequency of Repair Strategies of Both Groups

Group	N	Mean	SD	Std. Error Mean
CI	9	27.66	10.09	3.36
SI	9	10.33	4.52	1.5

As shown in Table 1, the consecutive interpreting trainee interpreters (M= 27.66, SD=10.09) used repair strategies more than their simultaneous interpreting counterparts. The following table reveals if the difference between the two groups was statistically significant.

Table 2. Independent Samples Test Comparing Frequency of Repair Strategies of Both Groups

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		*t*-test for Equality of Means						
	F	Sig.	*t*	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper
Equal variances assumed	4.18	.05	4.69	16	.00	17.33	3.68	9.51	25.15
Equal variances not assumed			4.69	11.09	.00	17.33	3.68	9.22	25.44

There was a significant difference in the frequency of repair strategies of consecutive interpreting trainee interpreters (M = 27.66, SD = 10.09) and the simultaneous interpreting trainee interpreters (M = 10.33, SD = 4.52; *t* (16) = 4.69, p = .00, two-tailed). The magnitude of the differences in the means (mean difference = 17.33, 95% CI [9.51, 25.15]) was large (eta squared = .57). In general, consecutive interpreting trainee interpreters used more repair strategies than simultaneous interpreting trainee interpreters.

The second question examined whether the types of repair strategies used by trainee interpreters in English-Persian simultaneous interpreting differ from those used in consecutive interpreting. A multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was run to compare the two groups in terms of the types of repair strategies (i.e., semantic, lexical, phonetic, explicitation, synonym, restart, and repetition).

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics of Repair Strategy Types of Both Groups

Type	Group	Mean	SD	N
Semantic	CI	1.22	1.09	9
	SI	.55	.72	9
Lexical	CI	1.66	1.22	9
	SI	1.77	1.39	9
Phonetic	CI	.22	.44	9
	SI	.44	.52	9
Explicitation	CI	14.55	5.89	9
	SI	4.44	4.3	9
Precision	CI	.66	1.11	9
	SI	.11	.33	9
Synonym	CI	1.33	1.73	9
	SI	.00	.00	9
Restart	CI	4.44	4.77	9
	SI	1.22	1.2	9

Repetition	CI	3.44	2.4	9
	SI	1.88	1.61	9

Table 3 reveals that the consecutive interpreting trainee interpreters obtained higher scores in all types of repair strategies. Table 4 shows if the difference in the performance of the two groups was statistically significant.

Table 4. Multivariate Test of Repair Strategy Types of Both Groups

Effect	Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.
Pillai's Trace	.85	6.72	8	9	.00
Wilks' Lambda	.14	6.72	8	9	.00
Hotelling's Trace	5.97	6.72	8	9	.00
Roy's Largest Root	5.97	6.72	8	9	.00

The result of Wilk's Lambda F (8,9) = 6.72, P = .00 indicates a statistically significant difference among the scores of types of repair strategies (Table 4). The pairwise comparison results (Table 5) show the components whose difference was significant.

Table 5. Pairwise Comparisons of Repair Strategy Types of Both Groups

Dependent Variable	(I) Group	(J) Group	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
explicitation	CI	SI	10.11*	2.43	.00
synonym	CI	SI	1.33*	.57	.03

*. The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

The pairwise comparisons table reveals that the difference between the mean scores of types of repair strategies was significant for both groups ($p < .05$). In other words, the consecutive interpreting trainee interpreters obtained higher scores in explicitation and synonym strategies.

5. Discussion and Conclusion

The investigation into the frequency of repair techniques used by trainee interpreters in English-Persian simultaneous interpreting (SI) and consecutive interpreting (CI) demonstrates that trainee interpreters employed a greater number of repair strategies in CI than in SI mode. These findings are consistent with previous research that indicates that CI, which frequently entails more intricate linguistic and contextual difficulties, requires a greater number of repairs (Liang et al., 2017; Liang et al., 2019; Lv & Liang, 2019). This disparity can be attributed to the fundamental differences in cognitive processing between the two modes. In CI, interpreters work in phases—first listening and taking notes, then reconstructing the message—which introduces a temporal delay that allows for heightened self-monitoring and error detection. Han et al. (2023) frame this as *momentary engagement* within Complex Dynamic Systems Theory (CDST), arguing that CI's segmented structure creates opportunities for interpreters to dynamically adjust their output, leading to more frequent but deliberate repairs. In contrast, SI's real-time demands force interpreters to prioritize fluency over accuracy, suppressing repairs to avoid disrupting the flow of speech (Tang, 2020c). Trainee interpreters in CI mode may face several opportunities for errors that necessitate repairs, which is

indicative of their continuous learning process and the inherent difficulties in mastering consecutive interpreting techniques (Tang, 2020c). The extended processing time in CI not only increases the likelihood of noticing errors but also encourages trainees to experiment with corrections, reinforcing learning through iterative refinement. Han et al. (2023) further suggest that this iterative process aligns with CDST's emphasis on adaptability, where interpreters engage in online problem-solving to navigate linguistic and cognitive challenges. On the other hand, the reason for fewer repairs in SI mode could be related to the immediate nature of the interpreting process. Interpreters need to maintain fluency and coherence, which may restrict their ability to use repair procedures (Tang, 2020c). Here, Han et al.'s (2023) concept of *momentary engagement* is limited by SI's rigid time constraints, leaving little room for corrective adjustments without compromising delivery speed. Furthermore, the significant disparities in the utilization of repair strategies in the two modes indicate that training programs should be customized to tackle the distinct problems and cognitive requirements linked to each interpreting mode. For CI, pedagogy could leverage Han et al.'s (2023) findings by explicitly teaching trainees to exploit the *engagement windows* in their note-taking and reconstruction phases for strategic repairs. Conversely, SI training might focus on preemptive strategies (e.g., anticipation and simplification) to minimize errors before they occur, reducing the need for repairs altogether. By prioritizing the improvement and fine-tuning of repair strategies, interpreting pedagogy can optimize the overall efficiency and fluency of trainee interpreters (Gile, 1997).

The results of the second research question indicate significant disparities in the types of repairs employed by trainee interpreters in the two modes. The study revealed that explicitation repair and synonym repair were more frequently employed in consecutive mode as opposed to simultaneous mode. The growing use of explicitation in CI can be attributed to the intrinsic features of this mode, which allows for more time to clarify and elaborate on concepts. This aligns with Gile's (1997) effort models of interpreting, which posit that consecutive interpreting provides a temporal buffer between comprehension and production, enabling interpreters to strategically incorporate explicitations for clarity, coherence, or audience adaptation. In CI, the segmented workflow—where interpreters first process a speech segment before reformulating it—reduces cognitive pressure, freeing up attentional resources for deliberate repairs such as elaborative expansions or disambiguations. Conversely, in simultaneous interpreting (SI), the real-time demands of parallel listening and speaking constrain interpreters' capacity for structural or semantic elaboration (Seeber, 2015). Furthermore, the use of synonym repairs indicates a wider range of vocabulary and the ability to discover alternative terms in order to achieve coherence and logical progression. The decreased use of explicitation and synonym repair in simultaneous interpretation may also arise from the need to maintain a steady rhythm and avoid any disruption to the flow of the interpreted information. In other words, the immediacy of SI prioritizes fluency over precision, often leading to simpler, faster repairs (e.g., substitutions or omissions) rather than the more time-intensive explicitation strategies favored in CI. Thus, the modal-specific disparity in repair types reflects fundamental differences in cognitive load and processing time, as theorized by Gile (1997, 2009).

The current study's findings contrast those of Tang (2020c), which identified repetition repairs and restart repairs as the most often employed repair procedures among interpreting trainees. While the current study utilized the repair taxonomy presented by Tang (2020c), the variations in the results may be attributed to many reasons. Participant heterogeneity, such as variations in skill level and educational backgrounds, can impact the choice of repair strategies employed. Additionally, the complexity of the interpreting tasks could lead to different errors and repair strategies. Various contextual considerations, including the topic, setting, and accents of the speakers, can influence the type of repair. Ultimately, the divergence in languages and cultures among the participants in the two studies may contribute to the situation, as diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds entail distinct communication norms and expectations, including those related to self-repair. Logically, conducting various research on the English-Persian language pair could assist in determining

interpreters' preference for employing particular types of repairs during English-Persian interpreting. Additionally, the directionality of interpreting may also affect the types and frequency of repairs used by trainees.

While the sample size and the sampling technique used in the present study may limit the generalizability of the findings, the results nonetheless offer useful insights into the repair strategies used by interpreters. Notwithstanding these constraints, the discoveries are crucial and carry significant pedagogical implications. In order to apply these insights to practical training, it is crucial to concentrate on providing organized feedback and clear guidance on repair procedures. Offering structured feedback on the implementation of repair methods during practice sessions can help trainees understand the effectiveness and appropriateness of repairs in different scenarios. This involves incorporating explicit training on repair strategies into the curriculum, including discussions on their many forms, appropriate contexts, and impact on the quality of interpretation. Moreover, it is crucial to provide trainees with guidance on developing self-monitoring skills that enable them to recognize when repairs are needed and do them effectively. Finally, the assessment methods employed in interpreter training programs should prioritize the significance of repair strategies. Instructors can enhance the assessment process by incorporating performance exams that specifically evaluate the application of repair strategies in interpretation tasks. This approach provides a more thorough understanding of the trainees' capabilities. Furthermore, offering detailed feedback on trainees' competency in utilizing these strategies during evaluations assists in directing their future learning and progression, ensuring the development of the necessary abilities for successful interpreting.

References

Bakti, M., & Bóna, J. (2016). Self-monitoring processes in simultaneous interpreting. *Forum*, 2, 194–210. https://doi.org/10.1075/forum.14.2.02bak

Bartłomiejczyk, M., & Gumul, E. (2024). Disfluencies and directionality in simultaneous interpreting: A corpus study comparing into-B and into-A interpretations from the European Parliament. *Translation & Interpreting: The International Journal of Translation and Interpreting Research*, *16*(1), 38-54. https://doi.org/10.12807/ti.116201.2024.a03

Blacfkmer, E. R., & Mitton, J. L. (1991). Theories of monitoring and the timing of repairs in spontaneous speech. *Cognition, 39*, 173-194. https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0277(91)90052-6

Bortfeld, H., Leon, S. D., Bloom, J. E., Schober, M. F., & Brennan, S. E. (2001). Disfluency rates in conversation: Effects of age, relationship, topic, role and gender. *Language and Speech, 44*(2), 123–147. https://doi.org/10.1177/00238309010440020101

Dailidėnaitė, A. (2009). Directionality: Types and frequency of repairs in simultaneous interpretation. *Vertimo Studijos*, *2*, 9–25. https://doi.org/10.15388/VertStud.2009.2.10600

Fox Tree, J. E. (1995). The effects of false starts and repetitions on the processing of subsequent words in spontaneous speech. *Journal of Memory and Language, 34*, 709–738. https://doi.org/10.1006/jmla.1995.1032

Gilabert, R. (2013). Self-repair. In P. J. Robinson (Ed.), *The Routledge encyclopedia of second language acquisition* (pp. 575–577). Routledge.

Gile, D. (1991). A communication-oriented analysis of quality in nonliterary translation and interpretation. In L. Mildred (Ed.), *Translation: Theory and practice. Tension and interdependence* (pp. 188-200). ATA Scholarly Monograph Series 5.

Gile, D. (1997). Conference interpreting as a cognitive management problem. *Applied Psychology, Sage*, *3*, 196-214.

Gile, D. (1999). Testing the effort models' tightrope hypothesis in simultaneous interpreting: A contribution. *HERMES-Journal of Language and Communication in Business*, (23), 153-172.

Gile, D. (2009). *Basic concepts and models for interpreter and translator training*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Gile, D. (2015). Analyzing translation studies with scientometric data: From CIRIN to citation analysis. *Perspectives*, *23*(2), 240-248.

Gillies, A. (2013). *Conference interpreting: A student's practice book*. Routledge.

Gósy, M. (2007). Disfluencies and self-monitoring. *Govor*, *26*, 91-110. https://hrcak.srce.hr/173610

Han, L., Lu, J., Wen, Z., & Tian, Y. (2023). Momentary engagement in simultaneous versus consecutive interpreting: Through the lens of translanguaging and CDST. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14, 1-11. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1180379

Kalina, S. (1998). *Strategische prozesse beim Dolmetschen: Theoretische Grundlagen, empirische Fallstudien, didaktische Konsequenzen*. Gunter Narr.

Kohn, K., & Kalina, S. (1996). The strategic dimension of interpreting. *Meta*, *1*, 118–138. https://doi.org/10.7202/003333ar

Kormos, J. (1999). Monitoring and self-repair in L2. *Language Learning*, *49*(2), 303-342. https://doi.org/10.1111/0023-8333.00090

Levelt, W. J. M. (1983). Monitoring and self-repair in speech. *Cognition*, *14*, 41–104. https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0277(83)90026-4

Levelt, W. J. M. (1989). *Speaking: From intention to articulation.* MIT Press.

Li, C.Y. (2011). An analysis of the on-going mechanism of the use of the repair strategy in consecutive interpreting. *Foreign Languages and Their Teaching*, (5), 78-82. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/324965122

Liang, J., Fang, Y., Lv, Q., & Liu, H. (2017). Dependency distance differences across interpreting types: Implications for cognitive demand. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *8*, 1–10. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.02132

Liang, J., Lv, Q., & Liu, Y. (2019). Quantifying interpreting types: Language sequence mirrors cognitive load minimization in interpreting tasks. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *10*, 1–12. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.00285

Lin, Y., Lv, Q., & Liang, Y. (2018). Predicting fluency with language proficiency, working memory, and directionality in simultaneous interpreting. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *9*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01543

Lv, Q., & Liang, J. (2019). Is consecutive interpreting easier than simultaneous interpreting? A corpus-based study of lexical simplification in interpretation. *Perspectives*, *27*, 91–106. https://doi.org/10.1080/0907676X.2018.1498531

Lyster, R. & L. Ranta (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 19*, 37–66. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263197001034

Macías, M. P. (2006). Probing quality criteria in simultaneous interpreting: The role of silent pauses in fluency. *Interpreting, 8*, 25–43. https://doi.org/10.1075/intp.8.1.03pra

Magnifico, C., & Defrancq, B. (2019). Self-repair as a norm-related strategy in simultaneous interpreting and its implications for gendered approaches to interpreting. *Target*, *31*(3), 352-377. https://www.jbe-platform.com/content/journals/10.1075/target.18076.mag

Mead, P. (2015). Repairs. In F. Pöchhacker (Ed.), *Routledge encyclopedia of interpreting studies* (pp. 348–349). Routledge.

Mirek, J. (2022). Translational self-repairs in trainee conference interpreters: Preliminary findings from a pilot study. *Current Trends in Translation Teaching and Learning E*, *9*, 1–31. https://doi.org/10.51287/cttl20221

Paice, E. (2022). *The influence of sex on self-repair disfluencies in simultaneous interpreting* (Doctoral dissertation, Ghent University). https://libstore.ugent.be/fulltxt/RUG01/003/116/260/RUG01003116260_2023_0001_AC.pdf

Petite, C. (2005). Evidence of repair mechanisms in simultaneous interpreting: A corpus-based analysis. *Interpreting*, *7*, 27–49. https://doi.org/10.1075/intp.7.1.03pet

Plevoets, K., & Defrancq, B. (2016). The effect of informational load on disfluencies in interpreting. *Translation and Interpreting Studies*, *11*, 202–224. https://doi:10.1075/tis.11.2.04ple

Pöchhacker, F. (2001). Quality assessment in conference and community interpreting. *Meta*, *46*(2), 410-425. https://doi.org/10.7202/003847ar

Seeber, K. G. (2015). Cognitive load in simultaneous interpreting: Measures and methods. In M. Ehrensberger-Dow, S. Göpferich & Sh. O'Brien (Eds.), *Interdisciplinarity in translation and interpreting process research* (pp. 19-33). John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Schegloff, E., Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H. (1977). The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language*, *53*(2), 361–382. https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.1977.0041

Shen, M., & Liang, J. (2020). Self-repair in consecutive interpreting: Similarities and differences between professional interpreters and student interpreters. *Perspectives*, *29*(5), 761-777. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/0907676X.2019.1701052

Tang, F. (2020a). Directionality in Chinese/English consecutive interpreting: Impacts on trainees' repair fluency. *American Journal of Translation Studies*, *12*(3), 104-125. https://tigerprints.clemson.edu/ijie/vol12/iss2/5

Tang, F. (2020b). Features of interpreting learners' self-repairs in English-Chinese consecutive interpreting. *Chinese Translators Journal*, *41*(3), 67-77.

Tang, F. (2020c). Repair strategies in consecutive interpreting: Comparing professional interpreters and interpreting trainees. *International Journal of Interpreter Education*, *12*(2), 36-46. https://tigerprints.clemson.edu/ijie/vol12/iss2/5/

Tissi, B. (2000). Silent pauses and disfluencies in simultaneous interpreting: A descriptive analysis. *The Interpreters Newsletter*, *10*, 103–112. http://etabeta.univ.trieste.it/dspace/bitstream/10077/2455/1/06.pdf

Wang. S. X. (2007). A glimpse of the compensation mechanism of simultaneous interpretation. *Journal of Nanhua University (Social Science Edition)*, *8*(5), 94-97.

Zeng, J., & Hong, M. (2012). Self-repair of student interpreters in C-E consecutive interpreting. *Chinese Translators Journal, 3*, 68–71.