



Theses and Dissertations

2018-04-01

Evaluating the Effectiveness of a Korean Heritage-Speaking Interpreter

Yoonjoo Lee
Brigham Young University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/etd>



Part of the [Arts and Humanities Commons](#), and the [Linguistics Commons](#)

BYU ScholarsArchive Citation

Lee, Yoonjoo, "Evaluating the Effectiveness of a Korean Heritage-Speaking Interpreter" (2018). *Theses and Dissertations*. 7333.

<https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/etd/7333>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by BYU ScholarsArchive. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of BYU ScholarsArchive. For more information, please contact ellen_amatangelo@byu.edu.

Evaluating the Effectiveness of a Korean Heritage-Speaking Interpreter

Yoonjoo Lee

A thesis submitted to the faculty of
Brigham Young University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts

William Eggington, Chair
Janis Nuckolls
Julie Damron

Department of Linguistics and English Language
Brigham Young University

Copyright © 2018 Yoonjoo Lee

All Rights Reserved

ABSTRACT

Evaluating the Effectiveness of a Korean Heritage-Speaking Interpreter

Yoonjoo Lee

Department of Linguistics and English Language, BYU

Master of Arts

The U.S. is a country of immigrants who are non-native speakers of English (NNS), yet its legal system is not always in the favor of them. One of the issues for the NNSs is not being provided with proficient interpreters in legal settings such as police interrogations or courtrooms. There are times when some NNSs are offered qualified interpreters or translators, but others are provided with heritages speakers of needed languages in the local area. The heritages speakers are often thought to have good proficiency in languages, but unfortunately that's not always the case. To investigate the need for qualified interpreters, I conducted a discourse analysis on the interpreting provided in police interrogations in a legal case involving a Korean immigrant suspect, a heritage speaker of Korean who acted as an interpreter, and English speaking police officers. The result of this research is to help American jurisprudence be more aware of the implications of unverified interpretations to protect both jurisprudence and potential defendants and suspects of NNSs.

Keywords: police interrogation, police interpretation, Korean immigrants, Korean heritage speakers

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First, I would like to thank my thesis chair, Dr. Eggington. Thank you for giving me unfailing support and advice and being a Korean friend to me whenever I missed home. Without your advice throughout the program, I would not have had enough courage to start writing a thesis, let alone finishing one. I also would like to thank Dr. Nuckolls and Dr. Damron for giving me thesis ideas and helping me navigate the process of finding the right thesis topic for me.

I would like to thank my family and friends living in different parts of the world. Thank you for all the endless support and love you have shown me throughout this journey regardless of our physical distance. I would not have made it this far without your texts, phone calls, letters, and visits.

Lastly, I must thank my loving husband, Brian, for pushing me harder when my motivation was low, putting up with my stressful moments, and for believing that I am capable of doing hard work. My dream of getting a higher education in the U.S. was possible thanks to you.

Thank you.

Table of Contents

Evaluating the Effectiveness of a Korean Heritage-Speaking Interpreter	i
ABSTRACT	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
Table of Contents	iv
List of Tables	vi
Chapter 1 Introduction	1
Chapter 2 Literature Review	3
2.1 Introduction.....	3
2.2 Miranda Rights.....	3
2.3 Heritage speakers as interpreters (Heritage speakers’ linguistic limitations).....	8
Chapter 3 Research Design.....	10
3.1 Introduction.....	10
3.2 Methodology	10
3.2.1 Step 1: Video Transcription	11
3.2.2 Step 2: Ideal Translation	11
3.2.3 Step 3: Coding Interpretation.....	15
3.2.4 Step 4: Inter-rater Reliability Test	16
Chapter 4 Results	17
4.1 Results for Research Question 1: Quality of Interpretation in terms of Miranda Rights	

4.2	Results for Research Question 2: Quality of Interpretation in General	24
4.2.1	Interpretation from the Police officer (English) to Kim (Korean).....	25
4.2.2	Interpretation from Kim (Korean) to the Police officer (English).....	48
4.3	Inter-rater Reliability Test Results.....	51
	Chapter 5 Discussion	53
5.1	Introduction.....	53
5.2	Discussion: Answers to Research Questions	53
5.3	Limitation.....	54
5.4	Future Research	54
5.5	Summary	55
	References.....	56

List of Tables

TABLE 3.1 EXAMPLES OF VIDEO TRANSCRIPTIONS 11

TABLE 3.2 EXAMPLE OF TRANSLATION FROM ENGLISH TO KOREAN 12

TABLE 3.3 EXAMPLE OF TRANSLATION FROM KOREAN TO ENGLISH 13

TABLE 3.4 INTERPRETATION FEATURE CODE..... 15

TABLE 4.1 EXAMPLES OF INACCURATE VOCABULARY OR PHRASE 18

TABLE 4.2 EXAMPLES OF INACCURATE GRAMMAR..... 20

TABLE 4.3 EXAMPLES OF INADEQUATE VOCABULARY OR PHRASE..... 21

TABLE 4.4 EXAMPLE OF INADEQUATE ENDINGS 22

TABLE 4.5 EXAMPLES OF MISSING VOCABULARY OR PHRASE 23

TABLE 4.6 EXAMPLE OF MISSING ENDINGS..... 24

TABLE 4.7 EXAMPLES OF INACCURATE VOCABULARY OR PHRASE 29

TABLE 4.8 EXAMPLES OF INACCURATE GRAMMAR..... 32

TABLE 4.9 EXAMPLES OF INADEQUATE VOCABULARY OR PHRASE..... 34

TABLE 4.10 EXAMPLES OF INADEQUATE ENDINGS 38

TABLE 4.11 DIFFERENT TYPES OF FORMAL AND INFORMAL ENDING DEPENDING
ON THE LISTENER(S) 39

TABLE 4.12 EXAMPLES OF MISSING VOCABULARY OR PHRASE 44

TABLE 4.13 EXAMPLES OF MISSING ENDINGS 48

TABLE 4.14 EXAMPLE OF INACCURATE VOCABULARY OR PHRASE 50

TABLE 4.15 EXAMPLE OF MISSING VOCABULARY OR PHRASE..... 51

TABLE 4.16 EXAMPLE OF THE SECOND RATER’S RESULT 51

TABLE 4.17 EXAMPLE OF DISAGREEMENT BETWEEN THE FIRST AND THE SECOND
RATERS 52

Chapter 1 Introduction

With a slow, yet steadily growing rate of immigrants entering the United States (Flores, 2017), it is hard to say that the U.S. is completely ready to accommodate the immigrants in many areas including the legal domain. For example, not everyone comes to the US with fluent English speaking ability and these limited English proficient speakers are more likely to have obstacles in life than the English-proficient population. These obstacles include getting less education and facing a greater likelihood of living in poverty (2017, March 02). Unfortunately, for some people, hardships don't end with the challenges of daily living. They sometimes face civil and criminal legal challenges and end up being in great need of help due to their limited English ability. Sometimes, in these cases, the US government provides interpreters to defendants who are not native speakers of English and have difficulty understanding English. However, not every jurisdiction has interpreters readily available. Sometimes, depending on the urgency of the case, the police department needs to find an interpreter who resides in the local area. Often, the interpreters turn out to be heritage speakers of the needed language. The US government recognizes that there is a great demand for heritage speakers for their bilingual ability in many aspects of the society and tries to utilize them as interpreters and translators for legal work and other fields of the society (Peyton, 2001). However, being a heritage speaker does not automatically make one a competent bilingual or a qualified interpreter. This assessment forms the foundation for the following research project.

To investigate the need for qualified interpreters, I conducted a discourse analysis on the interpretation provided in police interrogations in a legal case involving a Korean immigrant suspect, a heritage speaker of Korean who acted as an interpreter, and English speaking police officers. This legal case occurred in one of the metropolitan cities in the US. Names and

locations have been changed because this is an on-going case. The Korean immigrant father (Kim) was accused of murdering his son (John) who was found dead at Kim's house laying face-down in Kim's living room. The very next morning, after Kim was arrested, Kim was interrogated by police officers accompanied by a heritage speaker of Korean who acted as the interpreter. I analyzed video recordings of these interviews.

The two specific research questions in this study are:

1. How accurate is the interpretation in three police interrogations involving a Korean non-native English-speaking suspect accompanied by a heritage speaker of Korean acting as an interpreter with respect to the provision of the suspect's Miranda Rights?
2. How accurate is the interpretation in three police interrogations involving a non-native English-speaking suspect accompanied by a heritage speaker of Korean acting as an interpreter with respect to the non-Miranda Warning segments of the interrogations?

The results of this research provide understandings concerning the quality of some heritage speakers acting as interpreters.

In Chapter 2, I will review prior literature regarding the difficulty of understanding Miranda rights and heritage speakers' limitations as interpreters. Then, I will explain the research methodology that I used to carry out the analysis in Chapter 3. Next, I will present results from the research and analyze results in Chapter 4. Finally, in Chapter 5, I will discuss limitations of the research, suggestions for future research and implication of the research.

Chapter 2 Literature Review

2.1 Introduction

This thesis performs research on the quality of interpretation with a suspect who is a non-native speaker of English with a speaker who is a heritage speaker of Korean acting as an interpreter. The ultimate goal of the research is to investigate the rationale for having qualified interpreters (and/or translators) in legal fields. To begin, I will discuss the difficulty of understanding Miranda Warnings as non-native speakers of English to show why it is important to have interpreters who are good at both English and non-native speakers' language(s). Then, I will review the effectiveness of heritage speakers of a language acting as interpreters with respect to their proficiency in their heritage languages.

2.2 Miranda Rights

Origins

In the 1960s, Ernest Miranda was accused and arrested under suspicion of kidnapping and rape. Police subsequently intensely interrogated him until he confessed. As a Mexican immigrant, Miranda was unaware of his rights in a US court of law, as well as the legal ramifications of his words during interrogation, and his right to have an attorney present, nor did the officers inform him of his rights. Miranda was subsequently prosecuted and sentenced to 30 years based on his confession. When he appealed to the State of Arizona, the court upheld his conviction. Miranda's attorney appealed to the United States Supreme Court which agreed to hear the case along with four similar cases.

Purpose

The Supreme Court ruled in favor of Miranda and, in so doing, outlined the "rights" information that should be provided to all suspects before an interrogation can proceed. These rights are now known as the Miranda Warning. This was done to ensure that police officers

uphold their role in protecting the rights of the accused. The decision was based on the following assumptions based on the interrogation process: The Fifth Amendment; rights against self-incrimination, the Sixth Amendment; rights of the accused to request an attorney.

Definition

Basically, the Miranda Warnings are an attempt to address common problems faced by individuals who are unaware of the laws and their rights. Although the Miranda Warning provides ample information for one to recognize the ramifications of their statements, the effectiveness of the Supreme Court's decision is still based on an assumption that the individual being prosecuted has the vocabulary, mental cognition, and mental capability to interpret the warning. The problem increases when many foreign, newly immigrated, or non-native speakers of English are interrogated by police officers. The purpose of the court's decision was to inform, not just state, and informing requires a recognition of cognitive understanding, which may require further assistance from professionals in translation and "counseling" or negotiating the meanings of the Miranda Warnings.

Many studies have been done on how difficult it is for native speakers of English to understand their Miranda Rights (Rogers, Harrison, Shuman, Sewell, & Hazelwood, 2007; Rogers, Hazelwood, Sewell, Harrison, & Shuman, 2008; Rogers, Rogstad, Steadham, & Drogin, 2011; Viljoen, Zapf, & Roesch, 2007). Although there are many different reasons behind the difficulty in comprehending Miranda rights, there are three commonly discussed, linguistically-related reasons that can be applied to cases involving non-native English speakers. These are: 1) low frequency abstract vocabulary items, 2), complex syntax, and 3) variation in the way the Miranda Rights are presented to suspects.

Vocabulary found in Miranda Warnings can be confusing for the two following reasons:

the low frequency of advanced vocabularies and polysemous words. The first reason is primarily rooted in the general outlining of Miranda warnings, since they are not written with the most common terminologies. In a study done by Stahl (2003), it is agreed that reading comprehension can be affected by words with low frequency, which adds vocabulary difficulty. For example, Grisso (1998) stated that a word such as 'interrogation' found in a relatively simple warning can make comprehending Miranda rights challenging to offenders because of its infrequency. Also, Breland said that 41 terms in one Miranda warnings would not be familiar with most individuals and this can have negative effect on people's comprehension of their Miranda Rights (Breland, 1996; Rogers et al., 2008).

Secondly, even the commonly understood lexical items used throughout the Miranda Warnings tend to have more than one meaning and/or specialized legal definitions. Additionally, these polysemous words may also carry an unfamiliar weight in the severity of the intended meaning and may not be understood appropriately. For example, according to Rogers, Harrison, Shuman, Sewell, and Hazelwood, unofficial surveys showed that "college students do not understand the term 'right' as a protection" (2007). Instead, the large majority of students construed 'right' as simply an option, but an option for which they could be severely penalized (i.e., their non-cooperation will be used in court as incriminating evidence)" (Rogers et al., 2007). The problem with these polysemous words is further studied by Grisso (1998) in his study where he examined the familiarity of the most commonly misunderstood words in a single warning. Six words were identified, evaluated and tested with participants by a panel of attorneys and psychologists and determined as difficult to comprehend (Rogers et al., 2008; Grisso, 1998). 'Right(s)', one of the six complex words from Grisso's (1998) study and 'exercise' are good examples of having more than one meaning and/or legally loaded meanings. As Rogers et al.

(2008) pointed, ‘right(s)’ can be used as a directional term, but it also can mean ‘legal claim or privilege’ in legal settings. Likewise, ‘exercise’ can be simple to understand as a physical activity, but confusing to many in its “using something” meaning.

Complex syntax is another factor that contributes to making understanding the Miranda Warnings challenging. Often, legal language affects the comprehension and understanding of one’s rights, as well as the recalling, processing and decision making process of the accused (Breland, 1996; Rogers et al., 2008). It is argued that under high stress situations – especially when under interrogation – inferential thinking and other cognitive processes are likely to be compromised (Rogers et al., 2008). Rogers et al.’s study used a sentence complexity scale via Grammatik, a WordPerfect tool, and found that Miranda Warnings average a Grammatik score of 48.96. This even exceeds the score of the Internal Revenue Service’s 1040-EZ instructions of 42 and their final recommendation was that the warning should never exceed a Grammatik score of 40. The difficulties of complex sentence structure are compounded if the individual does not fully comprehend the basic notion of “rights.” If mental processing is interrupted by the complexity of the sentence structure, as well as the stress of the situation, then the individual’s mental processing of the Miranda Warning may be jeopardized resulting in an attempt to understand unfamiliar words while simultaneously trying to keep up with the verbal warning coming from the police officer.

The final problematic source of misunderstanding the Miranda Warning is variations in how it is presented. The first extensive study done on Miranda Warning variations included 560 different types (Rogers et al., 2007). In another research study done by Rogers et al. (2008), it was shown that there are at least 385 to 700 variations of the Warning. Also, rote regurgitation of one’s rights is not required by law, currently. Police officers are only required to state the rights

of the accused in their own wording, which can be influenced by the local-police culture and individual bias. This results in an inconsistent method of conveying the Warning throughout the nation.

Additionally, the variation of Miranda Warnings extends into how the information is conveyed. Oral Warnings versus written Warnings introduce new complications in comprehension. As Flesch (1951) reported in his study, “what is hard to read is even harder to understand by listening.” It was also found that reading was a more efficient means of language processing than listening, even though reading required more mental effort due to decoding orthogonal symbols over phonetic decoding (Rubin, Hafer, & Arata, 2000). With an unpredictable method of receiving a Miranda Warning, the public may no longer receive the Warning in a way that is expected, thus recollection of the description of their rights can be impaired (Breland, 1996; Rogers et al., 2008).

Much of the related current research is primarily focused on individuals whose first language is English (Rogers et al., 2007; Rogers et al., 2008; Rogers, Rogstad, Steadham, & Drogin, 2011; Viljoen, Zapf, & Roesch, 2007) and little has been done on examining the comprehension of Miranda warnings for non-native speakers. Brière claimed that this is something that needs to be addressed since the level of difficulty of the language of the Rights can affect thousands of people with limited-English speaking ability (1978). Additionally, Brière stated that just as native English speakers struggle with vocabulary and phrases, so do non-native speakers. For example, as it is stated in Brière’s study:

not every English speaker knows that ‘lawyer’ and ‘attorney’ share the same meaning because of the nature of infrequency of the word. Accordingly, it is apparent that people with limited English speaking ability will be very likely to be confused with these two

terms. Also, it is not guaranteed that someone who knows the meaning of ‘give’ and ‘up’, respectively, would know what ‘give up’ means (1978).

Other studies have briefly explored the problems with the Miranda Warnings and non-native speakers.

2.3 Heritage speakers as interpreters (Heritage speakers’ linguistic limitations)

Definition

Often, non-native speakers face issues with understanding legal terminology. In such cases, it is not uncommon to use heritage speakers as interpreters on behalf of the accused non-native speaker. Heritage speakers are defined as receptive bilinguals, speakers of an ethnic or immigrant minority language, whose first language does not reach native-like attainment in adulthood (Benmamoun, Montrul, & Polinsky, 2013). For heritage speakers in America, these tend to be “individuals raised in homes where a language other than English is spoken and who are to some degree bilingual in English and the heritage language” said Valdés (2000).

Discussion

Many times, it is assumed that heritage speakers are inherently qualified for legal interpretations and/or translations. This may be primarily because the heritage speakers seem to be able to carry out daily conversations without anyone properly vetting their actual capabilities. However, those heritage speakers’ heritage language competence is not as strong as they are thought to be according to Benmamoun et al. (2013). Benmamoun et al. said “heritage language development is a common outcome of bilingualism, where one of the languages become much weaker than the other.” (2013). They also stated that “by early adulthood a heritage speaker can be strongly dominant in the majority language.” and the heritage language isn’t completely

acquired or it faces attrition during the transition from learning heritage language to dominant language or pressure from the dominant language (Benmamoun et al., 2013).

The common linguistic limitation of heritage speakers is incomplete acquisition. Even though heritage speakers learn their heritage language first, they use the dominant language to socialize once they start education. Thus, it is hard for them to fully develop heritage language ability (Benmamoun et al., 2013). Lack of sufficient input of the heritage language makes it a weaker language and therefore, heritage speaker may not reach native-like development (Benmamoun et al., 2013). It is also said that immigrants who come to the United States before puberty are more likely to lose their heritage language more quickly and to a greater extent than the people who moved as adults (Ammerlaan, 1996; Hulsen, 2000). This suggests that they may not have native-like competence even if they did get a certain level of education back in their home countries before they moved to the U.S.

Examples for incomplete acquisitions are vocabulary and grammar. Montrul pointed out that “heritage language speakers know many words in their heritage language, but most often these are words related to common objects used in the home and childhood vocabulary. In fact, heritage language speakers also have significant gaps in their vocabulary and find it difficult to retrieve words they do not use very frequently” (2010). She also reported that they showed a marked tendency such as simplification and restricted word order in their grammatical system and stated that transfer from English might have triggered those effects (Montrul, 2010).

Chapter 3 Research Design

3.1 Introduction

This chapter provides a detailed overview of the research design for this thesis. The main purpose of this thesis is to examine the quality of interpretation found in three police interrogation videos involving a non-native English-speaking suspect accompanied by a heritage speaker of Korean acting as an interpreter in terms of Miranda Rights and general legal interpreting.

The research done for this consists of the following four steps: Step 1, transcribing the police interrogation videos with regard to the features that needed to be focused to answer the research questions. Step 2, plotting segments where what the police officer said in English was interpreted into Korean and what Kim said in Korean was interpreted into English and translating both into an ideal translation of Korean and English, respectively. Step 3, coding each interpretation segment where each plotted segment from Step 2 was assigned a number according to its interpretation feature that each segment lacked. Step 4, running an inter-rater reliability test where another rater was asked to read through the list of the original interpretation, and code them with an interpretation feature.

3.2 Methodology

In order to answer the research questions, an interpretation analysis needed to be conducted to examine the quality of interpretation. The purpose of this analysis was to evaluate how correctly what the police officers said in English was interpreted into Korean and what the Korean suspect said in Korean was interpreted into English by a heritage speaker of Korean. The following procedures designed by the researcher are explained in order.

3.2.1 Step 1: Video Transcription

Three police interrogation videos were carefully transcribed by the researcher. Every segment that involved the interpreter in the videos was written out correctly and any inaudible or unrecognizable sound was marked with ‘---’. Each video was numbered in order and coded as ‘V’ and the number of the video; V1, V2 and V3. An example is given below. P stands for the police officer, I for the interpreter and K for the Korean suspect.

Item	Time	English: source language	Korean: target language	Ideal Interpretation
3	V1 01:00	P: You have the right to remain silent.	I: 말 안해도 되는 --- 인권 있습니까 [I: (You) don't have to talk---. (Do you) have human rights?]	진술거부권을 행사할 수 있습니다 [You have the right to remain silent.]

Table 3.1 Examples of Video Transcriptions

3.2.2 Step 2: Ideal Translation

After each interpretation was transcribed in Step 1, they were sorted into two different lists: interpretation of the police officer’s English into Korean and interpretation of Kim’s Korean into English. Once two lists were completely organized, each interpretation was evaluated and analyzed to examine the quality of interpretation and then, it was modified to an ideal translation by the researcher if it did not deliver the intended meaning of an original message precisely. In order to compare what was actually said and how it was interpreted, two Tables given below were created.

Item	Time	English: source language	Korean: target language	Ideal Interpretation
------	------	--------------------------	-------------------------	----------------------

1	V1 34:56	<p>P: But you got into an altercation with him then?</p> <p>(K: Oh, yeah. I: 손으로 때리고? K: Ah, no.)</p> <p>([K: Oh, yeah. I: Hit with hand(s)? K: Ah, no.]</p>	<p>I: 그때 싸웠습니까? [I: Did (you) fight at that time, then?]</p>	<p>그 때 몸으로(치고 박고) 싸웠습니까? [Did you have a physical fight at that time?]</p>
---	----------	--	--	--

Table 3.2 Example of Translation from English to Korean

Item	Time	Korean: source language	English: target language	Ideal Interpretation
1	V2 15:40	<p>(P: So when you were in the, when you were in college, you were military training? You training military? ... What did they teach you?)</p> <p>K: 어떻게 했으면 우리 우리 다닐 때(interruption) (I: 군대를 안 다녀오셨어요?) K: 어 군대는 안가고(interruption) (I: 한국에서 어떻게 군대를 안 들어갔어요?) K: 학교에서는 학교 선생들은 그(interruption) (I: 학교 선생님이었어요?) K: 응 응 학교 선생을 할 경우에는 그걸 일종의 면제 해주는 제도가 있어요 그런데 거기서 그 대신에 트레이닝은 받지 줄스고 줄스고 따르거 줄스고 총 어떻게 행동하고 이런 정도</p>	<p>I: They were like military techniques like um, formation and stuff like that, but no actual training. No nothing with weapon. Because he was a school teacher and he's exempt from military because there's a lot of Korean that all male over 18 were required to serve in the military, but because he was a school teacher he's exempt from that and because he was a school teacher they didn't require him ---.</p>	<p>I: There was an exemption (system) for school teachers back then. There I got a training such as formation and handling guns.</p>

		[K: How we did it when we were there(interruption) I: You didn't do military service? K: No, I didn't do military service(interruption) I: In Korea... How did you not go do military service? K: In schools, school teachers were(interruption) I: Were you a school teacher? K: Yeah, yeah. There was a system where (they) exempt you from doing the military service if you were a school teacher. However, you get some training instead. (Such as) lining up, lining up and following (the rules) lining up and learning how to handle guns, this much.]		
--	--	--	--	--

Table 3.3 Example of Translation from Korean to English

Indicators of Deficient Interpreting

Markers of unsatisfactory quality of interpretation found in interpretations from English to Korean were inaccurate vocabulary usage, incorrect grammar usage, inadequate vocabulary or phrase, inadequate ending, lack of correct vocabulary or phrase, and/or lack of correct verb ending. These are further explained below.

- **Inaccurate vocabulary or phrase usages** show a place where a word or a phrase was used in a translation, and essential meaning of the initial message was altered. For example, Miranda rights was misinterpreted to basic human rights in the interviews.
- **Inaccurate grammar usages** indicate any incorrect Korean grammar that changes the meaning of the original message in the source language. For instance, ‘We’re going to

read you your Miranda rights (source language)' was interpreted to '(We're going to read (you) *with* human rights (target language).'

- **Inadequate vocabulary or phrase usages** are interpretations that are grammatically correct, yet it has more than one meaning and creates confusion in understanding as a result. For instance, 'the right to remain silent' was replaced with 'a right that you don't have to talk'. Any sentence that is grammatically correct, but lacks formality and/or honorifics regarding vocabulary and phrases can fall under this category.
- **Inadequate endings** apply to interpretations with any informal sentence endings that are not formal enough to be used in a legal setting such as '~어요'. '~어요' is used to talk in a honorific way, yet it is not a formal form of honorifics. Therefore, '~어요' is not proper to use in the legal setting, and any use of such informal honorifics were put under this category.
- **Lack of correct vocabulary or phrase usages, or entire sentences** indicate interpretations that do not have equivalent Korean words to English compared to original English texts. For instance, 'against you' was omitted in delivering one of the Miranda Rights in Korean (Anything you say can be used against you in a court of law) during the interviews. When a sentence or sentences were entirely omitted in the translation, it fell into this category as well. Lastly, when any subject and/or objects were presented in police officers' messages, yet they were not clearly interpreted in Korean or omitted during the interpretation, then it fell into this category.
- **Lack of correct endings** are the ones without any proper sentence endings such as 'Just not hanging out with them.' rather 'You don't want him to hang out with these people.'

Markers for insufficient quality of interpretation found in translation from Korean to English are the same as the markers mentioned above and share the same definitions except the source language is Korean and the target language is English.

3.2.3 Step 3: Coding Interpretation

Once all the interpretations were plotted and modified to an optimal interpretation in Step 2, they were given a certain number depending on their interpretation quality feature. As noted previously, the most salient features in conducting the analysis were (1) inaccurate vocabulary or phrase, (2) inaccurate grammar, (3) inadequate vocabulary or phrase, (4) inadequate ending, (5) lack of proper vocabulary or phrase, and (6) lack of proper ending. These features formed the coding procedure I used in analyzing the interpretations from the videos. The purpose of the coding interpretation features was to assort them and efficiently quantify them for the rater reliability test.

Interpretation Feature Code	
Description	Code/Number
Inaccurate vocabulary or phrase	(1)
Inaccurate grammar	(2)
Inadequate vocabulary or phrase	(3)
Inadequate ending	(4)
Lack of correct vocabulary or phrase,	(5)
Lack of correct ending	(6)

Table 3.4 Interpretation Feature Code

3.2.4 Step 4: Inter-rater Reliability Test

To ensure the credibility of this research, an inter-rater reliability test was carried out. A person with some degree of awareness and familiarity in linguistics was asked to conduct the interpretation analysis on the same problems in the transcripts of the videos. Then, she was asked to decide which interpretation features she thought they fitted in from the interpretation feature list and to write down an interpretation feature code on a given sheet of paper. After the interpretation analysis was completed by the other rater, it was compared with the first analysis that was previously done by the researcher. Once the comparison was finished, a follow up was done to discuss different results and opinions.

Chapter 4 Results

This chapter presents the results of the findings of the research analysis outlined in Chapter 3. The four steps of the research analysis were to examine the interpretation of linguistic features that could be observed in the police interrogation videos. The first part of the research analysis included the analysis of Miranda Rights by interpretation features and the second part of the research analysis included the rest of interpreted portion in the videos.

4.1 Results for Research Question 1: Quality of Interpretation in terms of Miranda Rights

I first present the results of the first research question:

How accurate is the interpretation in three police interrogations involving a Korean non-native English-speaking suspect accompanied by a heritage speaker of Korean acting as an interpreter with respect to the provision of the suspect’s Miranda Rights?

Results for this research question are presented in terms of (1) inaccurate vocabulary or phrase, (2) inaccurate grammar, (3) inadequate vocabulary or phrase, (4) inadequate ending, (5) missing vocabulary or phrase, and (6) missing ending. One item may fall in one category only, or one item may fall in more than one category. Words highlighted in red in the Tables are the parts that are discussed in explanation below.

- **Inaccurate vocabulary or phrase:** Interpretations with an inexact vocabulary or phrase and changing the fundamental meaning of an original message.

Item	Time	English: source language	Korean: target language	Ideal Interpretation
1	V1 00:32	P: We’re going to read you your Miranda rights.	I: 인권으로 읽어주겠습니다 [K: 응] 인권이요 [K: 인권] 예	미란다 원칙을 읽어드리겠습니다

			[I: (We're going to) read (you) with human rights. K: Huh? I: Human rights. K: Human rights? I: Yeah.]	[I'm going to read (you) Miranda rights.]
2	V1 00:46	P: Do you know what your rights are?	I: 인권 무슨 인권인지 아세요? [I: Human rights.. Do you know what human rights are?]	어떤 권리를 갖고 계신지 아십니까? [Do you know which rights you have?]
3	V1 01:00	P: You have the right to remain silent.	I: 말 안해도 되는 --- 인권 있습니까? [I: (You) don't have to talk---. (Do you) have human right?]	진술거부권을 행사할 수 있습니다 [You have the right to remain silent.]
4	V1 01:40	(I: Translating Miranda rights from the documentation.)	I: 인권으로 말씀 안 해도 되는 인권(입니다) [I: With human rights... It's human right that you don't have to talk.]	진술거부권을 행사할 수 있습니다 [You have the right to remain silent.]

Table 4.1 Examples of Inaccurate Vocabulary or Phrase

Table 4.1 shows all the examples of inaccurate vocabulary or phrases found in interpreted segments of Miranda rights explained by the police officer in English and interpreted by the interpreter into Korean. As Table 4.1 reveals, throughout the explanation of Miranda Rights in the beginning of the interview, ‘Miranda rights’ was interpreted into ‘human rights’ which means basic human rights in Korean. It should have been interpreted into **미란다 원칙** ‘Miranda rights’

when it was brought up first as shown in Item 1 and 권리 ‘right’ should have been used to mention, specify and explain each right from Item 2 to Item 4.

As Item 2 indicates, the interpreter said ‘무슨 인민 ‘What right’ 인지 아세요?’ to interpret ‘Do you know what your rights are?’. This causes confusion since the Korean sentence can also be used to ask/check if Kim knows what right is or not. However, this can be resolved if 어떤 ‘which’ is used alternatively; although 어떤 and ‘which’ don’t share absolutely the same characteristics. In English, the difference between ‘what’ and ‘which’ is if a perimeter of a topic is decided or not. For example, if there is not a selection to choose from, then ‘what’ is used. If there is a selection of things to choose from, then ‘which’ is used. Similar to English usages of ‘what’ and ‘which’, 무슨 ‘what’ and 어떤 ‘which’ have a similar relationship. 무슨 ‘what’, just like English, is used to ask about events, objects, things, people, etc. that a person doesn’t know of/about. 어떤 ‘which’ is used to ask characteristics, contents and condition/status of events or things, or characteristics and personality of a person. Therefore, 어떤 ‘which’ should be used to find out if Kim knows the contents of the Miranda rights.

- **Inaccurate grammar:** Interpretations with imprecise grammar.

Item	Time	English: source language	Korean: target language	Ideal Interpretation
------	------	--------------------------	-------------------------	----------------------

1	V1 00:32	P: We're going to read you your Miranda rights.	I: 인권으로 읽어주겠습니다 [K: 응씨 인권이요 [K: 인권씨 예 [I: (We're going to) read (you) with human rights. K: Huh? I: Human rights. K: Human rights? I: Yeah.]	미란다 원칙을 읽어드리겠습니다 [I'm going to read (you) Miranda rights.]
4	V1 01:40	(I: Translating Miranda rights from the documentation.)	I: 인권으로 말씀 안 해도 되는 안문(입니다) [I: With human rights... It's human right that you don't have to talk.]	잔술거부권을 행사할 수 있습니다 [You have the right to remain silent.]

Table 4.2 Examples of Inaccurate Grammar

Table 4.2 exhibits all the examples of inaccurate grammar. As both Item 1 and 2 indicate, the interpreter used 으로 'with', a postposition used to show a direction of movement or a path of movement, for an object instead of a direct object marker '을/를'; in this case 을 is grammatically correct. Consequently, what the interpreter interpreted does not deliver the original meaning of the English message, and it is grammatically wrong.

- **Inadequate vocabulary or phrase:** Interpretations that are grammatically correct, yet not formal enough to be used in a legal setting, or a vocabulary or a phrase has more than one meaning, thus causes confusion.

Item	Time	English: source language	Korean: target language	Ideal Interpretation
------	------	--------------------------	-------------------------	----------------------

3	V1 01:00	P: You have the right to remain silent.	I: 말 안 해도 되는 --- 인권 있습니까? [I: (You) don't have to talk---. (Do you) have human rights?]	진술거부권을 행사할 수 있습니다 [You have the right to remain silent.]
4	V1 01:40	(I: Translating Miranda rights from the documentation.)	I: 인권으로 말씀 안 해도 되는 인권(입니다) [I: With human rights... It's human right that you don't have to talk.]	진술거부권을 행사할 수 있습니다 [You have the right to remain silent.]

Table 4.3 Examples of Inadequate Vocabulary or Phrase

Presented above in Table 4.3 are examples of inadequate vocabulary or phrases. As item 3 and 4 reveal, the interpreter used sentences that are inappropriate in legal environment while he was explaining Miranda rights to Kim. For instance, as shown in Table 4.3, 진술거부권 ‘the right to remain silent’, a term actually used in Korean legal field was replaced with 말씀 안 해도 되는 인권 ‘the right that you don’t have to talk’. It doesn’t necessarily affect the communication between the police officer and Kim. However, it could lower the gravity of the interrogation to a certain level. Confusion caused by a word having more than one meaning was not found in the results of research question 1, the analysis of interpretation of Miranda rights explained in English spoken by the police officer and interpreted by the interpreter into Korean.

- **Inadequate ending:** Interpretations that are grammatically correct, yet not formal enough to be used in a legal setting because of endings.

Item	Time	English: source language	Korean: target language	Ideal Interpretation
5	V1 01:47	(I: Explaining Miranda rights from the documentation.)	[I: 지금 여기 우리랑 말씀하시는 거요 아무거나 무슨 말 하는 거요 법정에서 쓰일 수 있고요 (K: I think it's pastor.) [I: Things that you talk about with us. Anything you say. It can be used in the court. (K: I think it's pastor.)]	피의자의 모든 발언이 법정에서 불리하게 적용될 수 있습니다 [Suspect's any comment/statement can be used against the suspect in the court.]

Table 4.4 Example of Inadequate Endings

Table 4.4 shows an example of inadequate endings. As item 5 reveals, the interpreter is, again along with the previous feature, using an informal style ending. 요 is one type of endings in Korean, yet the reason why it shouldn't be used in a situation like this is because as one of the informal style endings, 요 delivers deference to a listener, yet it doesn't carry formality. Thus, 요 is inappropriate to be used in a legal setting.

- Missing vocabulary or phrase:** Interpretation without equivalent Korean words to English words compared to original English texts.

Item	Time	English: source language	Korean: target language	Ideal Interpretation
5	V1 01:47	(I: Explaining Miranda rights from the documentation.)	[I: 지금 여기 우리랑 말씀하시는 거요 아무거나 무슨 말 하는 거요 법정에서 쓰일 수 있고요 (K: I think it's pastor.)	피의자의 모든 발언이 법정에서 불리하게 적용될 수 있습니다

			[I: Things that you talk about with us. Anything you say. It can be used in the court. (K: I think it's pastor.)]	[Suspect's any comment/statement can be used against the suspect in the court.]
6	V1 01:47	(Continued)	I: 아니 여기 변호사만. 목사님은 안되고 변호사를 돈으로. 날짜하고 시간만 --- 하세요 [I: No, here a lawyer only... A pastor can't. A lawyer with money... Date and the time only ---.]	(피의자는 묵비권을 행사할 수 있으며 변호사를 선임할 수 있습니다 만약 경제적인 문제로 변호사를 고용할 수 없다면 국선 변호사를 요청할 수 있습니다 [(You have the right to remain silent) and to hire a lawyer. If you can't hire a lawyer for financial issues, you can ask for a public defender.]

Table 4.5 Examples of Missing Vocabulary or Phrase

Presented above in Table 4.5 are examples of missing vocabulary or phrases. As both examples indicate, Korean interpretations done by the interpreter used only a few words compared to the ideal translation. Item 5 is very critical as one omitted word drastically changed the original meaning of what the police officer said. In interpreting Miranda rights to Kim, the word 불리하게 ‘against (the suspect)’ was dropped, and it was never mentioned or explained again afterwards. This type of incident can be very fatal to both a suspect and a police department in any legal case. The police department can be sued by the suspect for not providing accurate information regarding his/her rights if the suspect’s legal representative finds out about it. Furthermore, even if the suspect is proven guilty, the verdict can be overridden when it is found out that the suspect was not provided with exact Miranda rights.

A word dropped in item 6 didn't cause as big of a change as the word in item 5 did. Still, the interpreter failed to deliver full information that Kim needed to know by omitting a word, 선임 'appoint'.

- **Missing endings:** Interpretations without a required ending.

Item	Time	English: source language	Korean: target language	Ideal Interpretation
6	V1 01:47	(Continued)	<p>I: 아니 여기 변호사만... 목사님은 안되고 변호사를 돈으로. 날짜하고 시간만--- 하세요</p> <p>[I: No, here a lawyer only... A pastor can't. A lawyer with money... Date and the time only ---.]</p>	<p>피의자는 묵비권을 행사할 수 있으며 변호사를 선임할 수 있습니다 만약 경제적인 문제로 변호사를 고용할 수 없다면 국선 변호사를 요청할 수 있습니다</p> <p>[You have the right to remain silent and to hire a lawyer. If you can't hire a lawyer for financial issues, you can ask for a public defender.]</p>

Table 4.6 Example of Missing Endings

Table 4.6 shows an example of missing endings. Several endings were dropped by the interpreter. This didn't change the entire meaning of what the police officer originally said. Yet, the interpreter spoke almost only word by word rather in a full sentence and this is definitely discouraged in any professional setting, let alone a legal setting.

4.2 Results for Research Question 2: Quality of Interpretation in General

Presented here are the results pertaining to the second research question:

How accurate is the interpretation in three police interrogations involving a non-native English-speaking suspect accompanied by a heritage speaker of Korean acting as an interpreter with respect to the non-Miranda Warning segments of the interrogations?

Results for this research question will be presented in terms of (1) inaccurate vocabulary or phrase, (2) inaccurate grammar, (3) inadequate vocabulary or phrase, (4) inadequate ending, (5) missing vocabulary or phrase, and (6) missing ending, the same order of the previous research results.

4.2.1 Interpretation from the Police officer (English) to Kim (Korean)

- Inaccurate vocabulary or phrase

Item	Time	English: source language	Korean: target language	Ideal Interpretation
3	V1 35:14	<p>P: But you got into an altercation with him then?</p> <p>(K: Oh, yeah. I: 손으로 때리고? K: Ah, no.)</p> <p>([K: Oh, yeah. I: Hit with hand(s)? K: Ah, no.] (continuing)</p>	<p>(K: 폭력? 그걸 폭력이라고 해야하냐?) I: 아 아아니죠 근데 때렸어요? 이들 이들이 혹시나 아저씨한테 손 그렇게 건네 줬습니까 뭐</p> <p>[K: Violence? Should (I) call it violence? I: Ah, ah no. But did (you/he) hit (him/you)? Maybe did he hand you like that? Something?]</p>	<p>I: 아들이 아저씨에게 손찌검을 했습니까? 혹은 아저씨를 때렸습니까</p> <p>[I: Did (your) son smack/strike you? Or hit you?]</p>
4	V2 26:22	<p>P: ... So he never moved out. He didn't stay away from home a couple days?</p>	<p>I: 며칠 동안 안 나갔었어요?</p> <p>[I: (He) didn't go out for a few days?]</p>	<p>I: 결국 (존이) 가출을 안했습니까? 며칠 동안 가출을 한 적이 아예 없네요?</p>

				[I: So (he) didn't run away from home for a few days? Running away from home for a few days never happened?]
7	V2 47:03	P: How many people of his friends do you not like? Or you think that are bad for him?	I: 아버지 안 좋은 사람을 몇명 얘기하는 거예요? [I: How many bad people are you (Mr.) talking about?]	I: 아버지가 안 좋아하시는 나쁜 친구들이 몇 명 있습니까? [I: How many bad friends are there that you (Mr.) don't like?]
8	V2 47:39	P: You don't want him to hang out with these people.	I: 그냥 같이 안 나가는게 낫는 거 같이 안 같이 다니는게. [I: Just better not going out together, not together, hanging out together....]	I: 아버씨는 존이 그런 나쁜 친구들이랑 같이 안 어울렸으면 하시죠? [I: You(Mr.) don't want John to hang out with those bad friends, do you?]
10	V2 52:18	P: You got up waiting for John.	I: 자다가 깨우고 존을 기다렸어요? [I: Wake (someone) up while asleep and waited for John?]	I: 자다가 깨서/일어서 존을 기다렸죠/? [I: (You(Mr.)) woke up from sleeping and waited for John.]
14	V2 01:09:25	P: Did you get in the car and drive to go find him?	I: 차안으로 들어가고 나가고 찾으러 나갔어요? [I: Did (you) get in the car and go out to find (him)?]	I: 차타고(존을) 찾으러 나갔어요? [I: Did (you(Mr.)) get in the car to go out and find (him)?]
15	V3 01:26	P: You know that happened last night. Okay? And we, we know what happened last night, Minsoo. We know. We're getting, we're getting all the evidence at the, at the station. Okay? I	I: 아버지 집 안에서 손 닦은 것도 다 알아요	I: 아버지 어제 무슨 일이 있었는지 기억 나시잖아요. 저희도 어제 (밤에) 무슨 일이 있었는지 다 알고 있습니다. 저희가 증거도 다 모으고 있습니다. 아버지가 집에서 손 씻은

		know that, I know that you went and washed your hands. Okay? I know that you washed your hands at your house after, after you --. [K:---.] I know all this stuff, okay? But what I, I need to know now is what, what really happened, okay? I need to know this.	[I: (We know) you(Mr.) wiped your hands inside of your house.]	것도 알고 있습니다 그렇지만 저희가 어젯밤에 진짜로 무슨 일이 있었는지 알아야 합니다 [I: You(Mr.) remember what happened last night. We know what happened last night, too. We're getting all the evidence and (we) know that you(Mr.) washed your hands at your home/house. But We need to know what actually happened last night.]
16	V3 04:18	P: Okay. But did you get in the car and drive?	I: 차안에 들어가고 나갔어요? 찾으러 나갔습니까? [I: Did (you(Mr.)) get inside of the car and go out? Did (you) go out to find him?]	I: 차 타고 (존을) 찾으러 나갔습니까? [I: Did (you) get in the car and go out to find (John)?]
17	V3 05:25	([V3 02:12] P: ...You wake up and it's 1 o'clock in the morning. John's not in his bedroom. John's not in his bedroom. You're angry. ... So you go downstairs. And John's not in the house. You tell your wife that John's not in the house?) P: ...How long, how long were you awake waiting for him to come home?	I: 아저씨 한 시 반에 깨웠죠 한 시 반에 깨우고 민수가 집에 없다 생각하고 근데 민수, 민수가 집에 몇 시에 왔어요? [I: You(Mr.) woke (someone) up at 1 o'clock, right? (You(Mr.)) woke (someone) up at o'clock and thought Minsoo wasn't home. But what time did Minsoo, Minsoo come home?]	I: 아저씨가 새벽 1 시에 일어나시고 존은 방에 없었죠 존이 방에 없으니까 아저씨는 화가 나셨습니까 그리고 1 층으로 내려갔는데 집에도 존이 없었습니다 그래서 아내에게 존이 집에 없다고 말씀하셨습니까? 존이 집에 올 때까지 얼마 동안 깨어서 기다리고 있으셨습니까? [I: You(Mr.) woke up 1 in the morning and John wasn't in (his) room, right? John wasn't in (his) room, so you were angry.]

				And you(Mr.) went downstairs and John wasn't in the house. So you told your wife that John's not home? How long were you awake waiting for John to come home?]
23	V3 16:51	P: You know who grabbed the knife. Did you grab or did he grab the knife? Did you get scared? ([K: I didn't.]) Were you afraid that he pushed you down [K: Yeah. I think so.] so grabbed?	I: 겁이 있었죠 [I: Was there fear/fright, right?]	I: 아저씨는 누가 칼을 잡았는지 아시잖아요. 누가 칼을 잡았습니까? 아저씨가 겁이 나셨습니까? 존이 아저씨를 밀쳐서 넘어뜨리니까 겁이 나서 아저씨가 칼을 잡으셨습니까? [I: You(Mr.) know who grabbed the knife. Who grabbed the knife? Were you(Mr.) scared? Did you(Mr.) grab the knife because you(Mr.) were afraid that John pushed you down?]
25	V3 18:41	P: ... How did it happen? Did you, did you grab him and when you, when you went at it like this, did it cut his throat? When you swung the knife, [K: I think so.] and you cut his neck? Did you then, how did you cut the rest of his neck? [K: I don't know.] Did you have him? Did you get him in a headlock and go like this? Were you holding him? Yes or no?	I: 막 싸우고 있을 때 왜 칼이. 완전 덩비잖아요. 만수가 덩치가 보니까 덩치가 크던데 덩치 크고 근데 어떻게 첫 번째 잘린 게 어떻게 잘렸어요? [I: When fighting the knife.... (He) totally came at (you). Minsoo (did). (It) seems (Minsoo's) build/body (his) build/body seemed	I: 어떻게 일어-게 된 겁니까? 아저씨가 칼을 잡었고 이렇게 했을 때 그게 존의 목을 베었습니까? 아저씨가 칼을 휘두르다가 존 목을 베는 겁니까? 그럼 나머지는 어떻게 베었습니까? (존한테) 헤드락을 걸어서 이렇게 했습니까? 아저씨가 존을 잡고 있었습니까? [I: How did (it) happen? Did you(Mr.) grab the knife and went like this, did it cut his throat? Did you(Mr.) cut John's neck while you(Mr.) were swinging the knife? Then, how did (you(Mr.)) cut

			big. (His) body's big, but how did the first snip get snipped?]	the rest of his neck? Did you(Mr.) get him in a headlock and go like this? Were you(Mr.) holding him?]
--	--	--	---	--

Table 4.7 Examples of Inaccurate Vocabulary or Phrase

Table 4.7 shows all the examples of inaccurate vocabulary or phrases from the three police interrogation videos excluding explanations of Miranda Rights. Item 3, 14, 15, 16, 17, 23 and 25 are examples of using inaccurate vocabulary in interpretation. As item 3 indicates when the interpreter was interpreting what the police officer asked Kim– if John, the son hit/beat up Kim or not -, he used 건네 줬습니까 ‘past form of “to hand” plus question form instead of ‘to hit or to beat’ which changed the core meaning of the original message. Just like item 3, item 15 and 25 show quite drastic changes in meaning due to a change of one word. In translation of item 15, the police officer used 씻고(씻다) ‘to wash’, yet the interpreter used 닦고(닦다) ‘to wipe’. Although these two words share the same idea of cleaning, but each word delivers a different idea. Therefore, they cannot and should not be used interchangeably. In item 25, the interpreter used 잘랐(자르다) ‘to snip or to cut’ in place of 베다 ‘to cut’ or 찌르다 ‘to stab’. The reason why 자르다 ‘to snip or to cut’ cannot be used here is because it shows a different type of cut compare to 베다 ‘to cut’. The verb phrase 자르다 ‘to snip or to cut’ that the interpreter used denotes cutting something with scissors, or a cutter. However, when it’s used with a body part, it means the body part is completely cut off from the body. However, John’s neck was not completely cut off from his head, and it was only cut and stabbed. Therefore, it is incorrect to use 자르다 ‘to snip or to cut’.

Inaccurate vocabulary usage was also indicated by item 14 and 16. The word the interpreter used 들어가고 ‘to get in’ rather than 타다(타고) ‘to get on or to ride’. In Korean, 타다 ‘to get on or to ride’ should be used when a person gets on a car and goes somewhere, and 들어가고(들어기타) ‘to get in’ is usually used when a person goes inside of a building. If 들어기타 is used together with a car, that would mean a person gets in the car, but not going anywhere by driving the car. As these examples reveal, a change of one word brought a significant difference in meaning, and lowered the quality of interpretation.

Item 10 is an example of adding inaccurate words to the interpretation. The interpreter added 깨우고(깨우다) ‘to wake someone up’ which was not in the original message. By adding the word to the interpretation, it could be understood as if Kim woke up to wake John up and waited for him to wake up, or Kim woke up to wake someone else up and waited for John.

Item 4, 7, 8 and 17 are examples of using inaccurate phrases in interpretation. All four items are incorrect translations that include more than one defective word. In item 4, the meaning of the original message was to ask if John ever stayed away from the house for a few days. However, what the interpreter said could cause confusion since it could be more likely to be understood asking if John never left the house at all for a few days.

- **Inaccurate grammar**

Item	Time	English: source language	Korean: target language	Ideal Interpretation
5	V2 44:47	P: You don't like it if he goes out with some of these friends that are not good people. To you, you don't	1: 아니 아저씨가---보면 그 애가 다른 나쁜 친구들하고	1: 존이 나쁜 친구들이랑 같이 나가서 놀면 아저씨는 싫지 않습니까 그 친구들은 좋은

		think they are good people, right?	나키면 아저씨가 안 좋아할 거냐고요. [I: No, Mr. (you) --- If he goes out with other bad friends, you're (Mr.) not going to like them.]	친구들이 아니라고 생각하지 않습니까? [I: You(Mr.) don't like it when John goes out to hang out with bad friends? (You (Mr.)) think those friends are not good friends, right?]
9	V2 47:52	P: So if John went out and he was with these people and he came home late, he was out with these people that you didn't like, would that make you angry?	ㄱ: 그 사람들이 그 사람들하고 같이 나고(나가고) 같이 나고 들어오면 안 화나요? 나쁜 친구들하고 놀았다고요? [I: The people, (You) wouldn't be mad if (John) went out with the people and came (home)? For hanging out with bad friends?]	ㄱ: 만약에 존이 나가서 그런 아저씨가 싫어하는 나쁜 사람들이랑 같이 있다가 집에 늦게 들어오면 아저씨가 화 나지 않겠습니까? [I: If John went out with those bad people that you don't like and came home late, wouldn't that make you angry?]
17	V3 05:25	([V3 02:12] P: ...You wake up and it's 1 o'clock in the morning. John's not in his bedroom. John's not in his bedroom. You're angry. ... So you go downstairs. And John's not in the house. You tell your wife that John's not in the house?) P: ...How long, how long were you awake waiting for him to come home?	ㄱ: 아저씨 한 시 빈에 깨웠죠 한 시 빈에 깨우고 만수가 집에 없다 생각하고 근데 만수 만수가 집에 몇 시에 왔어요? [I: You(Mr.) woke (someone) up at 1 o'clock, right? (You	ㄱ: 아저씨가 새벽 1 시에 일어나시고 존은 방에 없었죠 존이 방에 없었니까 아저씨는 화가 나셨습니까 그리고 1 층으로 내려갔는데 집에도 존이 없었습니다 그래서 아내에게 존이 집에 없다고 말씀하셨습니다? 존이 집에 올 때까지 얼마 동안 깨어서 기다리고 있으셨습니까? [I: You(Mr.) woke up 1 in the morning and John wasn't in (his) room, right? John wasn't in (his) room, so you(Mr.) were angry. And (you) went downstairs and John wasn't in the house. So

			woke (someone) up at o'clock and thought Minsoo wasn't home. But what time did Minsoo, Minsoo come home?]	did (you) tell your wife that John's not home? How long were (you) awake waiting for John to come home?]
24	V3 17:14	P: ... Do you have it outside of the drawer so you just grabbed it? How did you grab it? Did you just grab the knife?	I: 그냥 잡을 수 있었어요? [I: Can (you) just grab (it)?]	I: 칼을 (원래) 밖에 뒀서 아저씨가 그냥 잡을 수 있었습니까? (칼을) 어떻게 잡았습니까? 그냥 잡았습니까? [I: Do you (Mr.) (usually/originally) have the knife outside of the drawer so you just grabbed it? How did you grab (it)? Did you just grab (the knife)?]

Table 4.8 Examples of Inaccurate Grammar

Table 4.8 exhibits all the examples of inaccurate grammar from the three police interrogation videos excluding explanations of the Miranda Rights. Item 9 is an example of wrong conjugation. The interpreter said ‘나간다’ which is an incorrect conjugation form of 나가다 meaning ‘to go out’. This doesn’t necessarily cause confusion, yet the interpreter needed to be careful as ‘나간다’ has a totally different meaning, ‘to grow’; although this seems to be more like a verbal typo.

Items 5 and 24 are examples of using the wrong tense in the interpretation, thus causing a somewhat ambiguous meaning to the interpretation. In item 5, what the police officer asked was Kim’s opinion of the moment and of the present, but 르가예요 ‘be going to’ in the interpretation is for asking future plans. Therefore, the interpreter’s using 르가예요 ‘be going to’ can’t deliver the

original meaning of the police officer’s question. Item 24 also has a grammar that brings vagueness to the interpretation. Even though the police officer asked questions mostly with past tense in English ‘How did you grab it?, Did you just grab the knife?’ , the interpreter used present tense, ‘있어요’, to interpret. This can be a problem because the interpretation done by the interpreter is to ask Kim’s ability to grab the knife now, rather than to ask his ability to grab the knife the night of the incident.

Item 17 is an example of using the wrong voice in the interpretation. What the police officer wanted to confirm was that Kim woke up in the middle of the night and waited for John to come home. However, by using the wrong voice now the interpretation means if Kim woke someone up, which is not displayed yet implied by using the passive voice, in the middle of the night. As a result, this can cause confusion.

- **Inadequate vocabulary or phrase**

Item	Time	English: source language	Korean: target language	Ideal Interpretation
18	V3 08:03	(P: ...when John came into the door. Where were you? K: I think is uh, I think is uh front is... Dining [P: Living room?] living room? Yeah.) P: Or are you in the hallway? Were you by the door?	I: 아저씨가 응접실에 있었어요? 어디에 있었어요? [I: Were you(Mr.) at the reception room? Where were you?]	I: 아저씨가 어디에 계셨습니까? 아저씨가 복도에 계셨습니까? 아니면 문 쪽에 계셨습니까? [I: Or were you(Mr.) in the hallway? Were you(Mr.) by the door?]
22	V3 13:32	P: So when he came in the door, were, were, did you yell at him and he got angry? Did he come after you?	I: 들어올 때 막 소리 지르고 막 악을 썼어요? [I: When (you/he) coming in, did (you/he) yell badly?]	I: 존이 집에 왔을 때 아저씨가 존에게 고함쳤습니까? 존이 아저씨를 공격했습니까? [I: Did you(Mr.) yell at John when he got home?]

				Did John come after you(Mr.)?]
--	--	--	--	--------------------------------

Table 4.9 Examples of Inadequate Vocabulary or Phrase

Table 4.9 shows examples of vocabulary and phrases that are insufficient to be used in the interpretations. Item 22 is an example of both inadequate vocabulary and phrase. There are several options that could have been used to interpret the sentence asking if Kim yelled at John. Certain words must be matched with certain verb phrases, but the word and the verb phrase here are mismatched. The verb that usually comes with 악 ‘anger’ is 쓰다 ‘to use; in a way someone yells’. Similarly, when the verb phrase 쳤어요(차다) ‘to shout out’ is used, the correct noun that should come before is 고함 ‘shout’.

- **Inadequate endings**

Item	Time	English: source language	Korean: target language	Ideal Interpretation
1	V1 34:56	P: But you got into an altercation with him then? (K: Oh, yeah. I: 손으로 때리고? K: Ah, no.) ([K: Oh, yeah. I: Hit with hand(s)? K: Ah, no.]	I: 그 때 싸웠습니까? [I: Did (you) fight at that time?]	그 때 몸으로(치고 박고) 싸우셨습니까? [Did you have a physical fight at that time?]
3	V1 35:14	(continuing)	(K: 폭력 그걸 폭력이라고 해야하니까) I: 아 아아나쥌 근데 때렸어요? 이들 이들이 혹시나	I: 이들이 아저씨에게 손자검을 했습니까? 혹은 아저씨를 때렸습니까?

			<p>아저씨한테 손 그렇게 건네 줬습니까 뭐</p> <p>[K: Violence? Should (I) call it violence? I: Ah, Ah no. But did (you/he) hit (him/you)? Maybe did he hand you like that? Something?]</p>	<p>[I: Did (your) son smack/strike you (Mr.)? Or hit you (Mr.)?]</p>
5	V2 44:47	<p>P: You don't like it if he goes out with some of these friends that are not good people. To you, you don't think they are good people, right?</p>	<p>I: 아니 아저씨가---보면 그 애가 다른 나쁜 친구들하고 나기면 아저씨가 안 좋아할 거냐고요</p> <p>[I: No, Mr. (you) --- If he goes out with other bad friends, you're (Mr.) not going to like them]</p>	<p>I: 존이 나쁜 친구들이랑 같이 나아서 놀면 아저씨는 싫으시죠 그 친구들은 좋은 친구들이 아냐라고 생각하시죠</p> <p>[I: You(Mr.) don't like it when John goes out to hang out with bad friends? (You (Mr.)) think those friends are not good friends, right?]</p>
6	V2 45:40	<p>P: John has friends. Okay? And he's got a group of friends. And here's here. Here's a group of friends that you, you think are okay for John to hang around with. Here's a group of friends that you don't approve of, that you think might be bad for John. You understand that?</p>	<p>I: 하나는 좋은 친구들이 있고 나쁜 친구들이 있더라고요 아하하세요?</p> <p>[I: One is good friends, and is bad friends. Do you understand?]</p>	<p>I: 존 친구들 중에 좋은 친구들도 있고 나쁜 친구들도 있지않습니까 아저씨가 생각하기에 존이 같이 어울려도 괜찮은 친구들이 있고 또 존이랑 같이 어울리지 않았으면 하는 친구들이 있지않습니까 아하하십니까?</p> <p>[I: Out of all the friends that John has, there are some good friends, and (there are) bad friends. In your opinion, there are friends that you(Mr.) think are fine for John to hang out, there are friends that you don't want for John to hang out, right? Do you understand?]</p>

7	V2 47:03	P: How many people of his friends do you not like? Or you think that are bad for him?	I: 아저씨 안 좋은 사람을 몇명 얘기하는 거예요? [I: How many bad people are you(Mr.) talking about?]	I: 아저씨가 안 좋아하시는 나쁜 친구들이 몇 명 있습니까? [I: How many bad friends are there that you(Mr.) don't like?]
9	V2 47:52	P: So if John went out and he was with these people and he came home late, he was out with these people that you didn't like, would that make you angry?	I: 그 사람들이 그 사람들하고 같이 나고 들어오면 안 화나요? 나쁜 친구들하고 놀았다고요? [I: The people, (You) wouldn't be mad if (John) went out with the people and came (home)? For hanging out with bad friends?]	I: 만약에 존이 나가서 그런 아저씨가 싫어하는 사람들이랑 같이 있다가 집에 늦게 들어오면 아저씨가 화나지 않았습니까? [I: If John went out with those people that you(Mr.) don't like and came home late, wouldn't that make you(Mr.) angry?]
10	V2 52:18	P: You got up waiting for John.	I: 자다가 깨우고 존을 기다렸어요? [I: Wake (someone) up while asleep and waited for John?]	I: 자다가 깨서/일어서 존을 기다리셨습니까/? [I: (You) woke up from sleeping and waited for John.]
11	V2 57:28	P: You go and check his bedroom? You wake in the middle of the night and you ask your wife. You're gonna find out if he was in his bedroom.	I: 일어나고 방가가지고 확인했죠? [I: (You) woke up and went to the room and checked, right?]	I: 한밤중에 존 방에 가서 확인하고 아내 분한테 묻지 않았습니까? 존이 자기 방에 있는지 없는지 확인하려고 하지 않았습니까? [I: You went to John's bedroom to check and asked (your) wife? (You) tried to check if John was in his room or not?]

12	V2 57:41	P: You're gonna find out that he's not in his bedroom, right?	I: 확인했죠? [I: (You) checked, right?]	I: 존이 존 방에 없다는 걸 확인하려고 하셨지 않습니까? [I: (You) tried to check that John was not in his room, right?]
13	V2 01:03:59	P: Remember we talk to people. We've talked to other people. We know what happened. We know what happened and that's why we just want you to tell us what happened. Listen. We know what happened.	I: 어떻게 된 거 알아요? [I: (We) know how it happened.]	I: 우리 쪽에서 다른 사람들과 얘기하고 있습니다 그 날 무슨 일이 있었는지 알고 있습니다 그러니까 아저씨가 직접 말씀하십시오 [I: Our side (detectives) are talking to other people. (We) know what happened that night, so you(Mr.) directly tell us what happened.]
14	V2 01:09:25	P: Did you get in the car and drive to go find him?	I: 차 안으로 들어가고 나가고 찾으러 나갔어요? [I: Did (you) get in the car and go out to find (him)?]	I: 차 타고(존을 찾으러) 나가셨습니까? [I: Did (you) get in the car to go out and find (him)?]
16	V3 04:18	P: Okay. But did you get in the car and drive?	I: 차 안에 들어가고 나갔어요? 찾으러 나갔습니까? [I: Did (you) get inside of the car and go out? Did (you) go out to find him?]	I: 차 타고(존을 찾으러) 나가셨습니까? [I: Did you get in the car and go out to find (John)?]
18	V3 08:03	(P: ...when John came into the door. Where were you? K: I think is uh, I think is uh front is... Dining [P: Living room?] living room? Yeah.)	I: 아저씨가 응접실에 있었어요 어디에 있었어요? [I: Were you(Mr.) at the reception room? Where were you?]	I: 아저씨가 어디에 계셨습니까? 아저씨가 복도에 계셨습니까 아니면 문 쪽에 계셨습니까?

		P: Or are you in the hallway? Were you by the door?		[I: Or were you in the hallway? Were you by the door?]
19	V3 09:05	P: Were you angry? When he walked in the door?	I: 집에 왔을 때 화 났었어요 [I: (Were you/was he) angry when (he/you) came back home?]	I: 존이 집에 왔을 때 아저씨가 화가나 있었습니까/나셨습니까? [I: Where you(Mr.) angry when John got home?]
20	V3 11:40	(P: So you asked him if he was smoking marijuana? K: Yeah. P: Yeah? K: I think no.) P: Yes or no? (K: No.)	I: 물어봤다고 안 물어봤다고 [I: Did (you) ask (John) or not?]	I: 물어 보셨습니까 안 물어 보셨습니까? [I: Did you ask (John) or not?]

Table 4.10 Examples of Inadequate Endings

Table 4.10 shows all the examples of flawed endings. Every ending presented in each example has a problem with respect to honorifics in Korean. The problems can be divided into two different kinds. One is ‘반말’ banmal, or dropping suffixes to reflect social status differences, as shown in item 20. As the lowest form in the hierarchy of Korean speech levels, it is usually used among people who are in a similar age range such as students who are in the same school year. It can also be used among people who have very close relationships with each other regardless of age difference such as a mother and a child, or between spouses. In these cases, it is agreed that it is okay to use banmal between each other. Overall, it is okay to think that banmal is used among people who share close relationships. However, the interpreter and Kim are not close to each other in a sense that they can use banmal to each other. Furthermore, it is not too rude of Kim, who’s older than the interpreter, to use banmal to the interpreter. Yet, it could be seen as bad-mannered for the interpreter to do so since he’s much younger than Kim. Thus, the

interpreter should have not used banmal. Rather, it would have been a better choice to use formal honorifics.

The other is ‘informal raising a listener a lot’ which applies to the rest of the items in the Table. There are various speech styles to choose from depending on the formality of a situation and the relationship that the people have. It would be best to use ‘formal raising a listener a lot’ in this legal setting. However, he kept using ‘informal raising a listener a lot’ in many cases as shown in the Table 4.10. Any informal styles are to use in a situation where people in a conversation share a close relationship with each other or when they get to know each other as time goes by. Kim and the interpreter didn’t have a close relationship, and they definitely were not getting to know each other to be friends. Most importantly, they were in a legal setting where formal speech is highly encouraged. Therefore, it would have been more appropriate if the interpreter used ‘formal raising a listener a lot’ rather than ‘informal raising the listener a lot’.

	Formal				Informal
	declarative	interrogative	requesting	imperative	
The listener’s status is very high(raising the listener a lot)	-seup.ni.da	-seup.ni.da	-eup.shi.da	-eup.shi.o	-eo.yo
Raising the listener a little	-o	-o	-o	-o	-eo
Lowering the listener a little	-ne	-na	-se	-ge	
The listener’s status is very low(lowering the listener a lot)	-neun.da	-neu.nya	-ja	-eo.ra	
Not differentiating the listeners	-neun.da	-neu.nya	-ja	-(eu)ra	

Table 4.11 Different Types of Formal and Informal Ending depending on the Listener(s)

- **Missing vocabulary or phrase**

Item	Time	English: source language	Korean: target language	Ideal Interpretation
1	V1 34:56	P: But you got into an altercation with him then? (K: Oh, yeah. I: 손으로 때리고? K: Ah, no.) ([K: Oh, yeah. I: Hit with hand(s)? K: Ah, no.]	I: 그 때 싸웠습니까? [I: Did (you) fight at that time?]	그 때 몸으로(치고 박고) 싸우셨습니까? [Did you have a physical fight at that time?]
2	V1 35:14	P: Has he ever hit you?	I: 때린 적이 있습니까 폭력을 [I: Have (you/he) hit (him/you)? Violence.]	I: 존(아들)이 아저씨를 때린 적이 있습니까? [Has John(son) hit you?]
3	V1 35:14	(continuing)	(K: 폭력 그걸 폭력이라고 해야하냐?) I: 아 아아니쥬 근데 때렸어요 이들 이들이 혹시나 아저씨한테 손 그렇게 건네 줬습니까 뭐 [K: Violence? Should (I) call it violence? I: Ah, Ah no. But did (you/he) hit (him/you)? Maybe did he hand you like that? Something?]	I: 아들이 아저씨에게 손찌검을 했습니까 혹은 아저씨를 때렸습니까? [I: Did (your) son smack/strike you? Or hit you?]
6	V2 45:40	P: John has friends. Okay? And he's got a group of friends. And here's here. Here's a group of friends that you, you think are okay for John to hang around with. Here's a group of friends that you don't approve of, that you think might be bad for John. You understand that?	I: 하나는 좋은 친구들이 있고 나쁜 친구들이 있다고요 이해하세요?	I: 존 친구들 중에 좋은 친구들도 있고 나쁜 친구들도 있지않습니까 아저씨가 생각하기에 존이 같이 어울려도 괜찮은 친구들이 있고 또 존이랑 같이 어울리지 않았으면 하는 친구들이 있지않습니까 이해하십니까?

			[I: One is good friends, and is bad friends. Do you understand?]	[I: Out of all the friends that John has, there are some good friends, and (there are) bad friends. In your opinion, there are friends that you(Mr.) think are fine for John to hang out, there are friends that you don't want for John to hang out, right? Do you understand?]
8	V2 47:39	P: You don't want him to hang out with these people.	I: 그냥 같이 안 나가는게 낫는 거 같이 안 같이 다니는게. [I: Just better not going out together, not together, hanging out together....]	I: 아저씨는 존이 그런 나쁜 친구들이랑 같이 안 어울렸으면 하십니까? [I: You(Mr.) don't want John to hang out with those bad friends?]
9	V2 47:52	P: So if John went out and he was with these people and he came home late, he was out with these people that you didn't like, would that make you angry?	I: 그 사람들이 그 사람들하고 같이 나/고 들어오면 안 화나요? 나쁜 친구들하고 놀았다고요? [I: The people, (You) wouldn't be mad if (John) went out with the people and came (home)? For hanging out with bad friends?]	I: 만약에 존이 나가서 그런 아저씨가 싫어하는 사람들이랑 같이 있다가 집에 늦게 들어오면 아저씨가 화 나지 않았습니까? [I: If John went out with those bad people that you don't like and came home late, wouldn't that make you angry?]
11	V2 57:28	P: You go and check his bedroom? You wake in the middle of the night and you ask your wife. You're gonna find out if he was in his bedroom.	I: 일어나고 방 가가지고 확인했죠	I: 한 밤 중에 존 방에 가서 확인하고 아내 분한테 묻지 않았습니까? 존이 자기 방에 있는지 없는지 확인하려고 하지 않았습니까? [I: You went to John's bedroom to check and

			[I: (You) woke up and went to the room and checked, right?]	asked (your) wife? (You) tried to check if John was in his room or not?]
12	V2 57:41	P: You're gonna find out that he's not in his bedroom, right?	I: 확인했죠? [I: (You) checked, right?]	I: 존이 존 방에 없다는 걸 확인하려고 하셨지 않습니까? [I: (You) tried to check that John was not in his room, right?]
14	V2 01:09:25	P: Did you get in the car and drive to go find him?	I: 차안으로 들어가고 나가고 찾으러 나왔어요? [I: Did (you) get in the car and go out to find (him)?]	I: 차타고 (존을) 찾으러 나가셨습니까? [I: Did (you) get in the car to go out and find (him)?]
15	V3 01:26	P: You know that happened last night. Okay? And we, we know what happened last night, Minsoo. We know. We're getting, we're getting all the evidence at the, at the station. Okay? I know that, I know that you went and washed your hands. Okay? I know that you washed your hands at your house after, after you --. [K:---.] I know all this stuff, okay? But what I, I need to know now is what, what really happened, okay? I need to know this.	I: 아저씨 집 안에서 손 닦은 것도 다 알아요 [I: (We know) you(Mr.) wiped your hands inside of your house.]	I: 아저씨 어제 무슨 일이 있었는지 기억 나시겠습니까 저희도 어제 (밤)에 무슨 일이 있었는지 다 알고 있습니다 저희가 증거도 다 모고 있습니다 아저씨가 집에서 손 씻은 것도 알고 있습니다 그렇지만 저희가 어젯밤에 진짜로 무슨 일이 있었는지 알아야 합니다 [I: You(Mr.) remember what happened last night. We know what happened last night, too. We're getting all the evidence and (we) know that you(Mr.) washed your hands at your home/house. But We need to know what actually happened last night.]
19	V3 09:05	P: Were you angry? When he walked in the door?	I: 집에 왔을 때 화났었어요?	I: 존이 집에 왔을 때 아저씨가 화가나 있으셨습니까/ 셧습니까?

			[I: (Were you/was he) angry when (he/you) came back home?]	[I: Were you(Mr.) angry when John got home?]
21	V3 13:13	P: ... Did you grab the knife? Did you grab the knife? Minsoo. Did you grab the knife? Did he come after you? Was he trying to hit you?	I: 민수가막 --- 때리고 그랬어요 [I: Did Minsoo beat (you) severely?]	I: 아저씨가 칼을 잡으셨습니까 존이 아저씨를 공격했습니까 존이 아저씨를 때리려고 했습니까 [I: Did you(Mr.) grab the knife? Did John attack you(Mr.)? Was John trying to attack you(Mr.)?]
22	V3 13:32	P: So when he came in the door, were, were, did you yell at him and he got angry? Did he come after you?	I: 들어올 때 막 소리 지르고 막 악을 썼어요 [I: When (you/he) coming in, did (you/he) yell badly?]	I: 존이 집에 왔을 때 아저씨가 존한테 고함치셨습니까 존이 아저씨를 공격했습니까 [I: Did you(Mr.) yell at John when he got home? Did John come after you (Mr.)?]
23	V3 16:51	P: You know who grabbed the knife. Did you grab or did he grab the knife? Did you get scared? ([K: I didn't.]) Were you afraid that he pushed you down [K: Yeah. I think so.] so grabbed?	I: 겁이 있었죠 [I: Was there fear/fright, right?]	I: 아저씨는 누가 칼을 잡았는지 아세요 누가 칼을 잡았습니까 아저씨가 겁이 나셨습니까 존이 아저씨를 밀쳐서 넘어뜨리니까 겁이 나서 아저씨가 칼을 잡으셨습니까 [I: You(Mr.) know who grabbed the knife. Who grabbed the knife? Were you(Mr.) scared? Did you(Mr.) grab the knife because you were afraid that John pushed you down?]
24	V3 17:14	P: ... Do you have it outside of the drawer so you just grabbed it? How did you grab it? Did you just grab the knife?	I: 그냥 잡을 수 있었어요	I: 칼을 (원래) 밖에 두서 아저씨가 그냥 잡을 수 있었습니까 (칼을) 어떻게 잡았습니까 그냥 잡았습니까

			[I: Can (you) just grab (it)?]	[I: Do you(Mr.) (usually) have the knife outside of the drawer so you just grabbed it? How did you grab (it)? Did you just grab (the knife)?]
25	V3 18:41	P: ... How did it happen? Did you, did you grab him and when you, when you went at it like this, did it cut his throat? When you swung the knife, [K: I think so.] and you cut his neck? Did you then, how did you cut the rest of his neck? [K: I don't know.] Did you have him? Did you get him in a headlock and go like this? Were you holding him? Yes or no?	I: 막 싸우고 있을 때 왜 칼도. 완전 덩비잖아요 민수가 덩치가 보니까 덩치가 크던데 덩치 크고 근데 어떻게 첫 번째 잘린 게 어떻게 질렸어요? [I: When fighting the knife.... (He) totally came at (you). Minsoo (did). (It) seems (Minsoo's) build/body (his) build/body seemed big. (His) body's big, but how did the first snip get snipped?]	I: 어떻게 알아-게 된 겁니까 아저씨가 칼을 집었고 이렇게 했을 때 그제 ^{존의} 목을 베었습니까 아저씨가 칼을 휘두르다가 존 목을 베 겁니까 그럼 나머지는 어떻게 베 겁니까 (존한테) 헤드락을 걸어서 이렇게 했습니까 아저씨가 존을 잡고 계셨습니까 [I: How did (it) happen? Did you(Mr.) grab the knife and went like this, did it cut his throat? Did you(Mr.) cut John's neck while you(Mr.) were swinging the knife? Then, how did (you(Mr.)) cut the rest of his neck? Did you(Mr.) get him in a headlock and go like this? Were you(Mr.)holding him?]

Table 4.12 Examples of Missing Vocabulary or Phrase

Table 4.11 shows interpretations not using Korean vocabulary and/or phrases equivalent to original English messages. It also shows all the interpretations that omitted interpreting a sentence or sentences from English to Korea. There were 14 examples of missing vocabulary, and/or phrase and sentence. Some fell into one category such as vocabulary, but others fell into more than one category such as both vocabulary and sentence.

Item 2, 3, 8, 14, 19, 22, 23 and 24 are examples of missing vocabulary in the interpretations. Roles of vocabulary dropped in the translations were either subject or object. In most of the

cases, both subject and object were dropped at the same time. Thus, it could cause confusion because it was not clear who did what to whom. For example, the police officer asked if John has hit Kim in item 2 and item 3 (continued interpretation). However, the subject, John, and the object, Kim were both dropped when the interpreter interpreted the question ‘Have (you/he) hit (him/you)?’, and the interpretation of the question ended up being able to ask either ‘Has John hit you?’ or ‘Have you hit John?’ as a result. In Korean, if one is involved in a conversation from beginning, distinguishing omitted subject and object would not be a problem due to context. However, when one is not following and understanding the conversation in a situation such as this research is studying, leaving out subjects and/or objects could be very problematic.

Examples of missing phrase could be found in item 6 and 9. It is understood that interpretation doesn’t necessarily require one on one interpretation. However, the intention of the questions that the police officer asked couldn’t be exactly delivered or one could have a hard time understanding what the interpreter was saying because some phrases were dropped during translation. For instance, one phrase was dropped in interpretation in item 9. The police officer wanted to ask Kim if John’s hanging out with people that Kim didn’t like made him angry. However, the interpreter omitted ‘the people you (Kim) didn’t like’ and it didn’t quite deliver the intention that the police officer was trying to get to. (It seems that the police officer wanted to say ‘if he hangs out with the people you don’t like, that would make you angry. – and that’s why you did what you did last night -)

Item 6, 11, 12, 15, 21, 23, 24 and 25 are missing one or more than one sentence that were asked by the police officer, but omitted in the process of interpretation. Rather than it caused notable confusion between the police officer and the suspect, it couldn’t deliver what the police officer wanted to ask for the police interrogation since entire sentences were dropped in the

translation. For instance, in item 21 the police officer asked Kim several questions such as, ‘Did you grab the knife?’ and ‘Did he come after you?’ and especially, ‘Did you grab the knife?’ was asked multiple times. However, these were all left out and only one part in the questions was interpreted.

- **Missing endings**

Item	Time	English: source language	Korean: target language	Ideal Interpretation
2	V1 35:14	P: Has he ever hit you?	I: 때린 적이 있습니까 폭력을 [I: Have (you/he) hit (him/you)? Violence.]	I: 존(아들)이 아버지를 때린 적이 있습니까 [Has John(son) hit you?]
8	V2 47:39	P: You don't want him to hang out with these people.	I: 그냥 같이 안 나가게 낫는 거 같이 안 같이 다니게요. [I: Just better not going out together, not together, hanging out together....]	I: 아버지는 존이 그런 나쁜 친구들이랑 같이 안 어울렸으면 하십니까 [I: You(Mr.) don't want John to hang out with those bad friends?]
17	V3 05:25	([V3 02:12] P: ...You wake up and it's 1 o'clock in the morning. John's not in his bedroom. John's not in his bedroom. You're angry. ... So you go downstairs. And John's not in the house. You tell your wife that John's not in the house?) P: ...How long, how long were you awake waiting for him to come home?	I: 아버지 한 시 반에 깨웠죠 한 시 반에 깨우고 만수가 집에 없다 생각하고 근데 만수 만수가 집에 몇 시에 왔어요	I: 아버지가 새벽 1 시에 일어나시고 존은 방에 없었습니다 존이 방에 없으니까 아버지는 화가 나셨습니다 그리고 1 층으로 내려갔는데 집에도 존이 없었습니다 그래서 아내에게 존이 집에 없다고 말씀하셨습니다 존이 집에 올 때까지 얼마 동안 깨어서 기다리고 있으셨습니까

			<p>[I: You(Mr.) woke (someone) up at 1 o'clock? (You) woke (someone) up at o'clock and thought Minsoo wasn't home. But what time did Minsoo, Minsoo come home?]</p>	<p>[I: You woke up 1 in the morning and John wasn't in (his) room. John wasn't in (his) room, so you were angry. And you went downstairs and John wasn't in the house. So did you tell your wife that John's not home? How long were you awake waiting for John to come home?]</p>
20	V3 11:40	<p>(P: So you asked him if he was smoking marijuana? K: Yeah. P: Yeah? K: I think no.)</p> <p>P: Yes or no? (K: No.)</p>	<p>I: 물어봤냐고 안 물어봤냐고</p> <p>[I: Did (you) ask (John) or not?]</p>	<p>I: 물어 보셨습니까 안 물어 보셨습니까</p> <p>[I: Did you ask (John) or not?]</p>
25	V3 18:41	<p>P: ... How did it happen? Did you, did you grab him and when you, when you went at it like this, did it cut his throat? When you swung the knife, [K: I think so.] and you cut his neck? Did you then, how did you cut the rest of his neck? [K: I don't know.] Did you have him? Did you get him in a headlock and go like this? Were you holding him? Yes or no?</p>	<p>I: 막 싸우고 있을 때 왜 칼도. 완전 덩비잖아요 만수가 덩치가 보니까 덩치가 크던데 덩치 크고 근데 어떻게 첫 번째 잘린 게 어떻게 잘렸어요?</p> <p>[I: When fighting the knife.... (He) totally came at (you). Minsoo (did). (It) seems (Minsoo's) build/body (his) build/body seemed big. (His) body's big, but how did the first snip get snipped?]</p>	<p>I: 어떻게 일어나게 된 겁니까 아저씨가 칼을 집었고 이렇게 했을 때 그제 존의 목을 베었습니까 아저씨가 칼을 휘두르다가 존 목을 베었습니까 그럼 나머지는 어떻게 베었습니까 (존한테) 헤드락을 걸어서 이렇게 했습니까 아저씨가 존을 잡고 계셨습니까</p> <p>[I: How did (it) happen? Did you(Mr.) grab the knife and went like this, did it cut his throat? Did you(Mr.) cut John's neck while you(Mr.) were swinging the knife? Then, how did (you(Mr.)) cut the rest of his neck? Did</p>

				you(Mr.) get him in a headlock and go like this? Were you(Mr.) holding him?]
--	--	--	--	--

Table 4.13 Examples of Missing Endings

Table 4.12 shows all the examples of interpretations that do not have any explicit endings in Korean interpretations. Item 2 and item 25 are examples with missing endings that do not clearly deliver the meanings of the originals messages as a result. In Item 2, the interpreter partially interpreted the original message correctly. However, when he attempted to interpret it better, he didn't finish his sentence. Instead, he only used one word, which doesn't express any message at all. This is even more so when it's combined with inaccurate grammar because one can't tell which one is receiving or giving the violence. Item 25 is also the same way. The interpreter didn't give any verb to an implicit subject in the sentence and finished the sentence in the middle, no one would be able to know what the police officer was trying to ask Kim just by listening to the interpreter's interpretation of the first sentence.

Unlike Items 2 and 25, Items 17 and 20 are missing verbs, yet the meanings can be understood to some extent.

4.2.2 Interpretation from Kim (Korean) to the Police officer (English)

- Inaccurate vocabulary or phrase

Item	Time	Korean: source language	English: target language	Ideal Interpretation
1	V2 15:40	<p>(P: So when you were in the, when you were in college, you were military training? You training military? ... What did they teach you?)</p> <p>K: 어떻게 했으면 우리 우리 다닐 때(interruption) (I: 군대를 안 다녀오셨어요?)</p> <p>K: 어 군대는 안가고(interruption) (I: 한국에서 어떻게 군대를 안 들어갔어요?)</p> <p>K: 학교에서는 학교 선생들은 그(interruption) (I: 학교 선생님이었어요?)</p> <p>K: 응 응 학교 선생을 할 경우에는 그걸 일종의 면제 해주는 제도가 있어요 그런데 거기서 그 대신에 트레이닝은 받지 줄 스고 줄 스고 따르거 줄 스고 총 어떻게 한들하고 이런 정도</p> <p>[K: How we did it when we were there(interruption) I: You didn't do military service? K: No, I didn't do military service(interruption) I: In Korea... How did you not go do military service? K: In schools, school teachers were(interruption) I: Were you a school teacher?</p>	<p>I: They were like military techniques like um, formation and stuff like that, but no actual training. No nothing with weapon. Because he was a school teacher and he's exempt from military because there's a lot of Korean that all male over 18 were required to serve in the military, but because he was a school teacher he's exempt from that and because he was a school teacher they didn't require him ---.</p>	<p>I: There was an exemption (system) for school teachers back then. There I got a training such as formation and handling guns.</p>

		K: Yeah, yeah. There was a system where (they) exempt you from doing the military service if you were a school teacher. However, you get some training instead. (Such as) lining up, lining up and following (the rules) lining up and learning how to handle guns, this much.]		
--	--	---	--	--

Table 4.14 Example of Inaccurate Vocabulary or Phrase

Tables 4.14 shows an example of incorrect interpretation from Korean to English. Kim clearly did say that he got training involving guns even though he was exempt from military service. However, the interpreter entirely changed what Kim said and interpreted ‘No nothing with weapon’. It can be seen as a trivial mistake, but this can put both the police department and the suspect in jeopardy for not providing quality interpretation and thus giving incorrect information to the police department.

- **Missing vocabulary or phrase**

Item	Time	Korean: source language	English: target language	Ideal Interpretation
2	V2 16:36	K: I got this 그걸 뭐라고 해이되나 철봉에서하는 거저 뭐야 (I: 철봉이요?) K: 거 이렇게 돌리고 ---고 뭐 이런 거 있잖아 I: 역기 같은 거요? K: 역기 같은 것도 하지만 그왜 two line is a 올라켜서 ---. (P: Pilates?)	I: I have no idea. Like some sort of --- big things and fall back...	I: He exercises on the horizontal bars.

		[K: I got this. What should I call it. The thing that you do on the horizontal bars. (I: Horizontal bars?) K: (You know) the thing that you turn and such. I: Something like barbell? K: (I do) something like barbell, but you know (I) go on (top of) two lines... (P: Pilates?)]		
--	--	--	--	--

Table 4.15 Example of Missing Vocabulary or Phrase

Presented above in Table 4.15 is an example of lack of vocabulary that was originally in Korean (source language), but omitted in English (target language). The problem involved the word was ‘철봉’ (horizontal bar(s)). The interpreter tried to explain it to the police officer, but he couldn’t correctly do so since he didn’t know what ‘철봉’ (horizontal bar(s)) was, which can be assumed from item 2. As a result, the equivalent word of ‘철봉’ (horizontal bar(s)) could not be interpreted and ended up missing in English interpretation.

4.3 Inter-rater Reliability Test Results

Once the analysis was concluded by the researcher, an inter-rater reliability test was done by another rater. Her test result and the researcher’s result were compared after she finished the test. Surprisingly, the first comparison didn’t show a good match. Both results showed similar answers (features), but the second rater’s results exhibited some inconsistency.

Item	English: source language	Korean: target language	Feature(s)
21	P: ... Did you grab the knife? Did you grab the knife? Minsoo. Did you grab the knife? Did he come after you? Was he trying to hit you?	1. 민수가 막--- 때리고 그랬어요? [I: Did Minsoo beat(you) severely?]	(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

Table 4.16 Example of the second rater’s result

For example, the second rater answered that item 21 has features of (1) inaccurate vocabulary or phrase, (2) inaccurate grammar, (3) inadequate vocabulary or phrase, (4) inadequate ending, and (5) missing vocabulary and phrase. The reasoning for this was that since it's missing vocabulary and phrases (5), it means all features from (1) through (4) apply. After this misunderstanding, both results were compared and cleared up by a follow-up phone call. Once the results were cleared up, they both exhibited a good match except for one item: it is given below in the Table.

Item	Time	English: source language	Korean: target language	Feature(s)
10	V2 52:18	P: You got up waiting for John.	I: 자다가 깨우고 존을 기다렸어요? [I: Wake (someone) up while asleep and waited for John?]	(1) (2) (4) (5)

Table 4.17 Example of disagreement between the first and the second raters

The second rater marked (2) inaccurate grammar for item 10 because of the differences of sentence type between the source language and the target language. Her reasoning was that it's incorrect because the police officer used declarative, but the interpreter used the interrogative. However, this came about from having to decide features from given texts only without being able to watch the police interrogation videos. In the interrogation video, it seems that the police officer was trying to confirm that Kim waited for John. There was no possible way for the second rater to know the context, so this difference was not counted as a disagreement.

Chapter 5 Discussion

5.1 Introduction

In this chapter, I will review the research questions and provide interpretations based on the data first. Then, I will briefly discuss the limitations and possible solutions to them, and address suggestions for future research in this area of linguistics.

5.2 Discussion: Answers to Research Questions

As noted, the research questions for this study are:

1. How accurate is the interpretation in three police interrogations involving a Korean non-native English-speaking suspect accompanied by a heritage speaker of Korean acting as an interpreter with respect to the provision of the suspect's Miranda Rights?
2. How accurate is the interpretation in three police interrogations involving a non-native English-speaking suspect accompanied by a heritage speaker of Korean acting as an interpreter with respect to the non-Miranda Warning segments of the interrogations?

As it is shown in chapter 4, the interpreter made some critical mistakes across all the linguistic features during the police interrogation sessions. For example, one of the most fatal mistakes he made with respect to Miranda Rights was translating Miranda Rights to (basic) Human Rights in Item 1 (Miranda Rights) as each word carries two entirely different meanings. Other mistakes such as asking '(He) didn't go out for a few days.' for the original message of 'He never moved out. He didn't stay away from home a couple days.' in Item 4 (General Interpretation) was imperfect enough to add extra confusion. Also, omitting important words such as subjects and objects in one sentence at the same time as well as skipping some sentences entirely could create even more confusion.

All of these results can challenge the competence of the heritage speaker as an interpreter in this legal case. Since he tended to get confused with basic grammar such as differentiating voices found in item 17 of general interpretation, it may safely be said that he may not be completely qualified to interpret in legal settings like the legal case he was involved in.

5.3 Limitation

This research entails a couple of limitations. First of all, the current research was carried out with only one legal case. Since it is entirely focused on one case alone, it cannot show us what other heritage speakers' heritage language competence is like. It would have been a more balanced and reliable research project if I included several more cases to be able speculate and show the average language competence of heritage speakers.

The other limitation is that there are only two raters: the researcher and one other rater. I could have used a lot more of raters to conduct the inter-rater reliability test to increase results credibility.

5.4 Future Research

The next step after this research can be carrying out a study with more than one legal case including a Korean heritage speaker as an interpreter in order to analyze, find and set more accurate and detailed linguistic features of Korean heritage speakers as interpreters. This will allow researchers to start building a standard for linguistic features of Korean heritage speakers as interpreters and eventually let potential Korean heritage speaking interpreters know what they need to pay attention to.

Also, it would be beneficial to expand the scope of the future research to heritage speakers of Spanish since the Hispanic population is the second largest ethnic group behind Caucasian in the United States (Flores, 2017).

5.5 Summary

This research proves that not every heritage speaker has solid competence of their heritage language(s) even if they may have been speaking the language(s) while growing up. American jurisprudence should be well-aware of this issue and realize that employing not fully qualified, which doesn't necessarily mean employing those who have interpreter certifications, can put both potential suspects and jurisprudence in jeopardy. Having an inadequate interpreter won't be able to provide reasonable quality of interpretation and give the suspects fair outcomes. Likewise, it can negatively affect the police department where they can be accused of offering not-suitable services. Thus, American jurisprudence should be highly cautious when they hire heritage speakers as interpreters.

References

- Ammerlaan, T. (1996). "You get a bit wobbly ...": exploring bilingual lexical retrieval processes in the context of First language attrition (Doctoral dissertation, Proefschrift: Nijmegen: Letteren).
- Benmamoun, E., Montrul, S., & Polinsky, M. (2013). Heritage languages and their speakers: Opportunities and challenges for linguistics. *Theoretical Linguistics*, 39(3-4). doi:10.1515/tl-2013-0009
- Breland, H. M. (1996). Word frequency and word difficulty: A comparison of counts in four corpora. *Psychological Science*, 7, 96–99.
- Brière, E. J. (1978). Limited English Speakers and the Miranda Rights. *TESOL Quarterly*, 12(3), 235. doi:10.2307/3586051
- Flesch, R. (1980). *How to test readability*. Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms International.
- Flores, A. (2017, September 18). How the U.S. Hispanic population is changing. Retrieved January 18, 2018, from <http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2017/09/18/how-the-u-s-hispanic-population-is-changing/>
- Grisso, T. (1998). Instruments for assessing understanding and appreciation of Miranda rights. Sarasota, FL: Professional Resource Press.
- Montrul, S. (2010). Current Issues in Heritage Language Acquisition. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 30, 3-23. doi:10.1017/s0267190510000103
- Hulsen, M. (2000). Language loss and language processing: three generations of Dutch migrants in New Zealand (Doctoral dissertation, Proefschrift Katholieke Universiteit Nijmegen).
- Peyton, J. K. (2001). *Heritage languages in America: preserving a national resource*. McHenry, IL: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Rogers, R., Harrison, K. S., Shuman, D. W., Sewell, K. W., & Hazelwood, L. L. (2007). An analysis of Miranda warnings and waivers: Comprehension and coverage. *Law and Human Behavior*, 31, 177–192. doi:10.1007/s10979-006-9054-8
- Rogers, R., Hazelwood, L. L., Sewell, K. W., Harrison, K. S., & Shuman, D. W. (2008, May). The language of Miranda warnings in American jurisdictions: A replication and vocabulary analysis. *Law and Human Behavior*, 32(2), 124-136. doi:10.1007/s10979-007-9091-y
- Rogers, R., Rogstad, J. E., Steadham, J. A., & Drogin, E. Y. (2011). In plain English: Avoiding recognized problems with Miranda miscomprehension. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, 17(2), 264-285. doi:10.1037/a0022508
- Rubin, D. L., Hafer, T., & Arata, K. (2000). Reading and listening to oral-based versus literate-based discourse. *Communication Education*, 49(2), 121-133. doi:10.1080/03634520009379200

Stahl, S. A. (2003). Vocabulary and readability: How know word meanings affects comprehension, *Topics in Language Disorders*, 23, 241–247.

The Limited English Proficient Population in the United States. (2017, March 02). Retrieved January 18, 2018, from <https://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/limited-english-proficient-population-united-states>

Valdés, G. (2000). *Spanish for Native Speakers*(Vol. I). New York, New York.

Viljoen, J. L., Zapf, P. A., & Roesch, R. (2007). Adjudicative competence and comprehension of Miranda rights in adolescent defendants: a comparison of legal standards. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law*, 25(1), 1-19. doi:10.1002/bsl.714