British Journal of Applied Linguistics
ISSN: 2617-0299 (Online); ISSN: 2708-0099 (Print)
DOI: 10.32996/ijllt
Journal Homepage: www.al-kindipublisher.com/index.php/ijllt

Language skills under cognitive pressure in simultaneous interpreting toward an integrative conceptual framework

Prof. Omer Elsheikh Hago Elmahdi ✉[1], Dr. Hanan Mahgoub Hamed Mohamad[2], Nadhim Aldubai[3], Nawal Abderrahman Mohammed Daffaallah[4] and Halima HassabElrasol Abdelgadir Mohamed[5]

[1] *Department of Languages & Translation, Taibah University, Saudi Arabia*

[2] *Tabuk University, Saudi Arabia*

[3] *Department of Languages & Translation, Faculty of Arts and Humanities Taibah University, Madinah, Saudi Arabia*

[4] *Department of English Language & Literature, College of Languages & Humanities, Qassim University, Saudi Arabia*

[5] Department of English Language & Literature, College of Languages &Humanities, Qassim University, Saudi Arabia

Corresponding Author: Prof. Omer Elsheikh Hago Elmahdi**, E-mail:** Ohago65@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Simultaneous interpreting requires interpreters to comprehend source speech and produce target speech under time pressure and competing cognitive demands. This conceptual paper synthesizes research on cognitive pressure, language skills, memory, problem triggers, coping, training, and interpreting performance to develop an integrative framework. The synthesis indicates that these topics are often examined separately, leaving unclear how language skills relate to processing demands and performance. The proposed framework links task and speech demands to cognitive pressure and attention and working-memory demands, with language availability, language separation, coordination, and coping potentially shaping the relationship between pressure and outcomes. Performance is considered across accuracy, omissions, shifts in meaning, and fluency. Seven propositions are offered to guide empirical research and interpreter education. Because the framework is derived from a conceptual synthesis rather than primary data, its proposed relationships require empirical testing.

KEYWORDS

simultaneous interpreting; cognitive pressure; language availability; language separation; working memory; interpreting performance

ARTICLE INFORMATION

ACCEPTED: 02 September 2026 **PUBLISHED:** 58 October 2026 **DOI:** 10.32996/bjal.2025.6.5.2

1. Introduction

Simultaneous interpreting (SI) requires interpreters to comprehend a source-language message and produce a target-language message while speech continues to arrive. These activities draw on attention, memory, and language processing at the same time. As a result, the interpreter works under substantial cognitive pressure, particularly when speech is fast, dense, unfamiliar, or difficult to anticipate. The papers in the attached bundle repeatedly address this pressure through discussions of working memory, problem triggers, stress, omissions, language proficiency, and interpreter training (Gile, 2016).

A central contribution in the bundle is Daniel Gile's Language Skills Under Pressure: The Case of Simultaneous Interpreting. Gile (2016) argues that knowing vocabulary and grammatical rules is not enough: interpreters must also be able to use their language knowledge rapidly and efficiently. When comprehension or production takes too long, processing demands can accumulate, increasing the risk of errors or omissions. The paper also highlights language separation—the ability to keep the source and target languages distinct—as an important skill in simultaneous interpreting. Related studies in the bundle examine factors such as memory, problem triggers, stress, and training, but these factors are often discussed separately.

Copyright: © 2026 the Author(s). This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC-BY) 4.0 license (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). Published by Al-Kindi Centre for Research and Development, London, United Kingdom.

This paper proposes an integrative conceptual framework to explain how cognitive pressure, rapid language availability, language separation, and coping or coordination processes interact to shape interpreting performance. The framework treats language availability as the accessibility of language knowledge during real-time processing, rather than as general language proficiency alone. It proposes that rapid access to meaning and target-language forms can help interpreters manage pressure, while effective language separation may reduce interference between the languages. Conversely, slow access, weak separation, or increased task demands may contribute to processing delays and lower performance.

1.1. Research Objectives

This paper has three objectives:

To synthesize the bundle's recurring concepts concerning cognitive pressure and language skills in SI.

To propose a framework linking these concepts to interpreting performance.

To identify propositions and research questions that can guide future empirical work and interpreter education.

1.2. Research Questions

What task and speech demands contribute to cognitive pressure during simultaneous interpreting, and how are these demands discussed in the literature?

How may language availability and language separation interact with memory, attention, coordination, and coping to shape interpreting performance?

What implications does an integrated account have for interpreter training and future empirical research?

The paper's contribution is conceptual. The framework organizes relationships suggested by the attached literature; the propositions require empirical testing.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Simultaneous Interpreting as a Concurrent Processing Task

Definition. Simultaneous interpreting (SI) requires the interpreter to comprehend incoming source-language speech while producing a target-language rendition, with listening and speaking processes overlapping in time (Gile, 2016; Mankauskienė, 2018).

Concurrent processing demands. Interpreters must coordinate comprehension, temporary retention of information, and speech production as the source message continues. Research on working memory and interpreting expertise suggests that memory is relevant to performance, while Gile's account emphasizes the limited processing capacity available for managing concurrent tasks (Gile, 2009; Liu et al., 2004).

Theoretical lens: Gile's Effort Model. The Effort Model offers a way to describe SI as several concurrent activities that draw on limited processing capacity. It provides the main theoretical lens for this section (Gile, 2009, 2016).

Efforts involved. The model describes a Listening and Analysis Effort for receiving and understanding the source speech; a Production Effort for producing the target speech; a Memory Effort for temporarily storing and retrieving information; and a Coordination Effort for managing the other efforts (Gile, 2009, 2016).

The "tightrope" account. Gile's "tightrope hypothesis" proposes that interpreters often work close to cognitive saturation. When a segment demands more processing capacity—for example, because it is difficult or unexpected—or attention is not managed effectively, the interpreter may be more vulnerable to errors, omissions, or infelicities (Gile, 1999, 2016). Analyses of problem triggers in SI also examine how features of source speech can affect processing and interpreting output (Ocelková, 2019).

2.2. Cognitive Pressure and Processing Capacity

Sources of pressure. Cognitive pressure in simultaneous interpreting can arise from both the speech and the interpreting situation. Fast delivery and time pressure can make it harder to keep pace with the speaker; unfamiliar vocabulary, numbers, or technical content can increase the effort needed for comprehension and reformulation. Dense or complex speech may add demands on memory and attention. Stress research in the bundle also identifies delivery rate, lexical search under time pressure, and problems in an earlier part of the speech as reported stressors (Gile, 2016; Gumul, 2021; Ocelková, 2019).

Problem triggers. A problem trigger is a feature of the speech or task that raises processing demands or makes information harder to perceive, understand, retain, or reformulate. Examples discussed in the bundle include numbers, proper names, technical material, and rapid or dense speech. A trigger does not necessarily cause an error by itself; its effect depends on the demands already placed on the interpreter's processing capacity (Gile, 2016; Mankauskienė, 2018; Ocelková, 2019).

Possible performance effects. When several efforts compete for limited processing capacity, the interpreter may fall behind the speaker or have less capacity available for subsequent segments. This may contribute to omissions, shifts in meaning, hesitations, pauses, false starts, or reduced fluency. Research on trainee interpreters links reported stress with disfluencies,

while studies of interpreting difficulties examine how processing demands and experience relate to errors and omissions (Gile, 2009; Gumul, 2021; Liu et al., 2004; Mankauskienė, 2018).

Different effects across interpreters. The presence of a trigger does not determine the outcome on its own. Interpreters may differ in language proficiency, experience, memory resources, and ability to coordinate processing or use coping strategies. The papers comparing interpreters at different experience levels suggest that interpreters can encounter difficulties yet differ in how successfully they manage them. Stress reports likewise describe differences in the strategies interpreters use to cope with pressure (Gumul, 2021; Liu et al., 2004; Mankauskienė, 2018).

2.3. Language Proficiency and Language Availability

Language proficiency refers to a person's knowledge of a language, including vocabulary and grammatical rules. In simultaneous interpreting, however, knowing a word or structure does not necessarily mean being able to use it quickly enough during live processing. Gile (2016) distinguishes this underlying knowledge from language availability: the speed and efficiency with which interpreters can access language knowledge for comprehension and production. This distinction matters because the source speech continues while the interpreter is processing and speaking.

Gile (2016) emphasizes that successful interpreting requires rapid processing in both directions: interpreters need to understand source-language speech efficiently and produce well-formed target-language speech without undue delay. He discusses availability in terms of comprehension and production, including Listening Comprehension Availability and General Production Availability. He also describes Equivalence-based Production Availability, or the ability to retrieve target-language expressions that convey the source-language meaning. Together, these dimensions frame availability as real-time access for the distinct stages of interpreting, rather than as a single measure of language knowledge.

This distinction connects with research in the bundle on working memory, expertise, and skill acquisition. Liu et al. (2004) examine the relationship between working memory and expertise in simultaneous interpreting, while Mankauskienė (2018) considers how interpreting difficulties relate to skill acquisition and interpreters' ability to manage processing demands. Read alongside Gile's account, these studies suggest that interpreting performance involves more than possessing language knowledge: interpreters must access and coordinate that knowledge under time pressure.

A conceptual issue follows: general language proficiency measures may not capture how quickly or efficiently a person can retrieve language during simultaneous interpreting. A learner may demonstrate strong vocabulary or grammar knowledge in a conventional assessment yet experience difficulty accessing that knowledge while listening, retaining information, and speaking at the same time. This is a framework implication rather than a conclusion established by the cited papers. Future research could therefore measure general proficiency separately from the speed and efficiency of comprehension and production in interpreting tasks (Gile, 2016; Liu et al., 2004).

2.4. Language Separation and Cross-Language Interference

Language separation can be understood as an interpreter's ability to manage the source and target languages during interpreting so that activation of one language does not unduly disrupt comprehension or production in the other. In Gile's (2016) discussion, separation is a cognitive skill relevant to successful SI, alongside rapid language availability. This framing makes it useful to distinguish separation from proficiency: an interpreter may know both languages well but still need to manage their concurrent activation under pressure.

Separation matters because interpreters listen in one language while producing speech in another. These activities overlap, so the interpreter must comprehend the incoming message and select appropriate target-language forms while continuing to monitor the source. Work on comprehension and error monitoring in simultaneous interpreters examines language processing during this kind of demanding bilingual activity, providing related evidence for considering how comprehension and monitoring operate during SI (Yudes et al., 2013). However, that study does not directly measure "language separation" as a distinct construct.

Language separation also relates to language availability. Rapid access to words and meanings is useful only if the interpreter can select forms appropriate to the intended language and task. Taken together, Gile's account suggests that real-time performance may depend on both the speed of access and the management of competing language activation (Gile, 2016). This relationship is a conceptual synthesis for the proposed framework, rather than a causal finding established by these sources.

The bundle establishes the relevance of language separation but offers less clarity about how to define and measure it independently from proficiency, language availability, or general interpreting performance. For the proposed framework, language separation could be operationalized through indicators of cross-language interference during comprehension and production, assessed separately from speed of lexical retrieval and general language knowledge. Further empirical work

would be needed to validate those indicators and determine whether separation predicts performance under different levels of cognitive pressure (Gile, 2016; Yudes et al., 2013).

2.5. Memory, Attention, and Coordination

Working memory and short-term memory are recurring topics in the bundle's discussion of interpreting under cognitive pressure. The Effort Model describes a Memory Effort involved in temporarily retaining and retrieving information during SI, while Liu et al. (2004) examine the relationship between working memory and expertise in simultaneous interpreting. Together, these sources make memory a relevant part of the framework, while leaving open how much performance differences can be attributed to memory capacity itself.

During SI, an interpreter may need to retain a source-speech segment while continuing to listen, interpret its meaning, and formulate target-language speech. If processing is delayed, the interpreter may have to hold more information while new material arrives. This can increase demands on memory and on the other concurrent efforts (Gile, 2009, 2016). Studies of interpreting difficulties and problem triggers likewise discuss the possibility that increased processing demands are associated with errors and omissions (Mankauskienė, 2018; Ocelková, 2019).

Attention management and coordination are relevant because comprehension, memory, and production occur at the same time and draw on limited processing resources. In Gile's (2016) model, Coordination Effort manages the allocation of capacity among the other efforts. This suggests that performance depends not only on whether an interpreter has a given memory or language skill, but also on how effectively those skills are coordinated under pressure.

For the proposed framework, memory, attention, and coordination are therefore treated as potential links between cognitive pressure and interpreting outcomes, rather than as isolated abilities. A key research need is to distinguish the contribution of memory capacity from the contribution of rapid language access and coordination. Future studies could assess these constructs separately and examine how each relates to accuracy, omissions, and fluency under different task demands (Gile, 2016; Liu et al., 2004).

2.6. Coping Strategies, Preparation, and Training

Advance preparation and contextual knowledge may help interpreters anticipate a speech's subject matter and terminology, supporting comprehension during SI. In an experimental study of professional interpreters and students, both groups performed more accurately and maintained a shorter ear–voice span when they received preparation materials beforehand (Díaz-Galaz et al., 2015). Preparation can therefore be understood as a way to reduce uncertainty and processing demands during the task. It does not, however, directly demonstrate that interpreters have developed faster language access or stronger language separation.

Interpreters also use strategies while interpreting, such as adjusting the level of detail in their output to keep pace with the speaker. Research on trainee interpreters' reports describes economy of expression among the strategies used to cope with stress (Gumul, 2021). Such strategies may help manage immediate demands, while training exercises aim to develop skills that support performance under those demands. The distinction is useful for the framework: preparation and online strategies may change how demands are handled, whereas practice in language access, separation, and coordination may develop the abilities used to process speech in real time.

Papers in the bundle address structured approaches to interpreter training. Mudawi (2025), for example, proposes targeted corrective exercises based on challenges reported by undergraduate students. Ahmed and Toma (2023) discuss challenges in teaching and learning SI and strategies for addressing them. Gile (2016) also calls for more systematic investigation of language-enhancement practices, including how training activities relate to the cognitive language skills required in the booth. Together, these sources support connecting training design to specific skills and challenges, while recognizing that proposed training approaches still require evaluation.

For the proposed framework, training could target rapid lexical and grammatical access, language separation, and coordination alongside interpreting techniques. Exercises should be linked to defined mechanisms—for example, whether an activity is intended to improve access speed, reduce cross-language interference, or help distribute attention across comprehension, memory, and production. Their outcomes could then be evaluated using measures such as accuracy, omissions, fluency, and processing delay. The bundle points toward this mechanism-based approach, but further research is needed to establish which exercises develop which skills and whether those gains improve performance under pressure (Díaz-Galaz et al., 2015; Gile, 2016; Mudawi, 2025).

2.7. Interpreting Performance Outcomes

The papers in the bundle assess interpreting performance through several outcomes. Accuracy concerns how well the target rendition conveys the source message; omission refers to source information left out; and a shift in meaning occurs when information is conveyed inaccurately. Fluency concerns features of delivery such as pauses, hesitations, and false starts.

Some studies also assess overall quality or use measures such as ear–voice span to examine processing during performance (Díaz-Galaz et al., 2015; Gumul, 2021; Ocelková, 2019).

No single outcome fully captures performance. An interpreter may preserve the source content but produce hesitant or delayed speech; another may speak fluently while omitting important information. For example, Díaz-Galaz et al. (2015) assessed both accuracy and ear–voice span, while Gumul (2021) examined reported stress alongside disfluencies in the target output. These studies illustrate why content and delivery measures can provide complementary information.

Future research should examine multiple outcomes and define them explicitly. Researchers should specify how they identify an omission, distinguish a shift in meaning from an acceptable reformulation, and measure fluency or overall quality. Clear definitions would make it easier to compare findings across studies and determine whether a training intervention improves one dimension of performance while leaving another unchanged (Díaz-Galaz et al., 2015; Gumul, 2021; Ocelková, 2019).

This supports the need for a framework that links processing conditions and language skills to observable outcomes. In the proposed framework, cognitive pressure, language availability, language separation, memory, and coordination are potential explanatory factors; accuracy, omissions, shifts in meaning, and fluency are possible performance indicators. Specifying these links can guide future studies in testing how interpreters' skills and task demands relate to different aspects of performance (Gile, 2016; Gumul, 2021).

2.8. Synthesis and Conceptual Gap

Across the papers reviewed, a shared insight is that simultaneous interpreting (SI) requires interpreters to manage several concurrent processes under time pressure. Comprehension, memory, production, and coordination draw on limited processing capacity; when task demands rise, performance may be affected (Gile, 2009, 2016; Liu et al., 2004). Studies of speech difficulty, stress, preparation, and training show how particular demands and resources may shape interpreters' experiences and outputs (Díaz-Galaz et al., 2015; Gumul, 2021; Mankauskienė, 2018; Ocelková, 2019).

However, the bundle addresses language skills, memory, problem triggers, stress, coping strategies, and training across separate discussions and studies. This makes it difficult to see how these factors may work together. In particular, the literature reviewed here points to a need for an integrative account of how rapid language availability and language separation relate to cognitive pressure, coordination, and observable performance outcomes. Gile (2016) foregrounds language availability and separation, while related studies examine aspects such as working memory, stress, and interpreting performance (Gumul, 2021; Liu et al., 2004).

To address this gap, this paper proposes a conceptual framework connecting task demands and cognitive pressure with language availability, language separation, memory, attention, and coordination, and linking these processes to outcomes such as accuracy, omissions, shifts in meaning, and fluency. The framework treats language availability and separation as distinct but related skills that may shape how interpreters manage concurrent processing demands. The following propositions are offered for future empirical testing:

Greater task demands are associated with increased cognitive pressure during SI.

Greater language availability is associated with more efficient real-time comprehension and production.

Greater language separation is associated with reduced cross-language interference during concurrent listening and speaking.

Higher cognitive pressure is associated with poorer performance outcomes, including more omissions, shifts in meaning, or disfluencies.

Language availability, language separation, and coordination may influence the relationship between cognitive pressure and performance.

Training designed to develop rapid language access, language separation, and coordination may improve performance under pressure.

These propositions summarize the framework's proposed relationships; they should not be interpreted as established causal findings. Future research can test them by measuring the constructs separately and examining their relationships across interpreting tasks and levels of experience.

3. Methodology

3.1. Research Design

This paper used a conceptual literature synthesis to develop an integrative framework for language skills under cognitive pressure in simultaneous interpreting (SI). It did not collect primary participant data or conduct statistical analyses. The synthesis examined recurring concepts and proposed relationships in the papers supplied with the draft, then organized them into themes, a conceptual model, and propositions for future empirical testing.

3.2. Source Corpus and Selection

The source corpus comprised the focal paper by Gile (2016) and papers in the supplied bundle that addressed one or more of the framework's central topics: processing capacity, task and speech demands, language proficiency and availability, language separation, memory, stress, coping, training, or interpreting performance. Sources were selected purposively for conceptual relevance. The bundle was not treated as an exhaustive literature search, and the paper does not claim the coverage or reproducibility of a systematic review.

3.3. Analytical Procedure

The synthesis proceeded in four stages. First, relevant passages were identified and grouped under the framework's core constructs. Second, definitions and descriptions were compared to distinguish related concepts, particularly general language proficiency from rapid language availability and language availability from language separation. Third, relationships described in the source papers were mapped among task demands, cognitive pressure, memory and attention, language skills, coordination and coping, and performance outcomes. Fourth, these themes were integrated into a proposed framework and research propositions.

During synthesis, claims reported by a source were distinguished from relationships inferred for the conceptual model. Where papers differed in population, language pair, interpreting mode, or outcome measure, their findings were treated as related evidence rather than as directly interchangeable results. The framework was assessed for grounding in the supplied literature, clarity of constructs, integration of the themes, and potential for empirical testing.

3.4. Methodological Scope and Limitations

This is a conceptual synthesis of a user-supplied paper bundle, not a systematic or exhaustive review. The included papers vary in research design, participant experience, language pair, and measurement. Some concepts, especially language availability and language separation, are not consistently operationalized in the source literature. Accordingly, the framework and propositions are proposed interpretations of the literature and are not validated causal claims.

4. Results of the Conceptual Synthesis

The synthesis yielded five connected themes. Together, they suggest that SI performance is shaped by the interaction between task demands, the interpreter's available processing resources, language skills, and the way performance is evaluated. The results below report patterns in the supplied literature and the conceptual relationships derived from those patterns; they are not findings from a new participant study.

4.1. Task Demands Can Increase Processing Pressure

Across the focal paper and related studies, pressure is associated with features such as rapid speech, information density, unfamiliar or technical material, and local problem triggers. Preparation and contextual knowledge can reduce uncertainty, while delivery rate, lexical search, and difficulties in an earlier segment are reported as stressors. These factors may raise demands on comprehension, memory, and production as the interpreter continues to process incoming speech. The stress study by Mohammed (2024) also identifies delivery rate, comprehension problems, time pressure, and lexical difficulty among reported stressors.

4.2. Language Availability and Separation Are Related but Distinct

The focal paper places rapid language availability and language separation among the skills required for successful SI (Gile, 2016). Availability concerns efficient access to language knowledge for comprehension and production. Separation concerns managing the source and target languages during concurrent processing. The synthesis suggests that these concepts should be represented as distinct constructs in the framework: rapid access alone does not describe how language selection is managed, and language separation does not by itself capture access speed. The supplied literature motivates this distinction but does not provide a shared measurement approach.

4.3. Memory and Coordination Link Pressure to Processing

Working memory and temporary retention are relevant because source information must be held while interpretation proceeds and new speech arrives. Gile's Effort Model treats memory and coordination as part of the simultaneous allocation of limited processing capacity, while research on working memory and interpreting expertise examines individual differences relevant to performance (Gile, 2009, 2016; Liu et al., 2004). The synthesis therefore places attention, working memory, and coordination between cognitive pressure and performance, rather than treating them only as background characteristics.

4.4. Preparation and Coping Operate Alongside Skill Development

The papers distinguish, implicitly, between reducing or managing task demands and developing the skills used to process them. Advance preparation can improve familiarity with specialized content and has been associated with improved accuracy and shorter ear–voice span (Díaz-Galaz et al., 2015). Online coping strategies, such as economy of expression, may

help trainees manage stress during a task (Gumul, 2021). Training proposals emphasize structured, targeted activities, but the synthesis identifies a need to connect each activity to a specified skill and outcome (Gile, 2016; Mudawi, 2025).

4.5. Performance Is Multidimensional

The reviewed papers assess performance through content-related measures, including accuracy, omissions, and shifts in meaning, as well as delivery or process-related measures such as fluency, disfluencies, and ear–voice span (Díaz-Galaz et al., 2015; Gumul, 2021; Ocelková, 2019). These measures capture different aspects of interpreting. The synthesis therefore supports examining multiple outcomes and defining each measure clearly rather than relying on a single overall performance score.

4.6. Integrated Conceptual Framework

The resulting framework proposes that task and speech demands increase cognitive pressure, which places additional demands on attention and working memory. Language availability and language separation may support processing under those conditions, while coordination and coping strategies may shape how demands are managed. These interacting factors are proposed to relate to interpreting outcomes, including accuracy, omissions, shifts in meaning, and fluency (Gile, 2009, 2016; Gumul, 2021; Liu et al., 2004).

Task and speech demands (rate, density, novelty, problem triggers)

↓

Cognitive pressure and demands on attention and working memory

↓

Language availability + language separation + coordination and coping

↓

Interpreting performance (accuracy, omissions, meaning shifts, fluency)

4.7. Propositions for Future Research

The following propositions translate the conceptual synthesis into relationships that can be tested empirically. They are theoretically motivated and should not be interpreted as established causal findings.

Proposition 1. Greater task demands, including rapid delivery, information density, unfamiliar content, and problem triggers, are associated with increased cognitive pressure during SI (Gile, 2016; Gumul, 2021; Ocelková, 2019).

Proposition 2. Greater language availability is associated with more efficient real-time comprehension and target-language production (Gile, 2016).

Proposition 3. Greater language separation is associated with reduced cross-language interference during concurrent listening and speaking (Gile, 2016; Yudes et al., 2013).

Proposition 4. Greater cognitive pressure is associated with less favorable interpreting outcomes, including omissions, shifts in meaning, and disfluencies (Gile, 2009, 2016; Gumul, 2021; Ocelková, 2019).

Proposition 5. Language availability and language separation may moderate the relationship between cognitive pressure and adverse performance outcomes; this proposed moderation requires direct testing (Gile, 2016).

Proposition 6. Coordination and coping strategies may influence how task demands relate to interpreting performance (Gile, 2009, 2016; Gumul, 2021).

Proposition 7. Training designed to develop rapid language access and language separation may improve performance under pressure; studies should test whether changes in these skills are associated with changes in performance (Gile, 2016; Mudawi, 2025).

5. Discussion

The synthesis answers the first research question by identifying both global task conditions and local speech features as potential sources of cognitive pressure. It answers the second by positioning language availability and language separation as distinct skills that may operate alongside memory, attention, coordination, and coping. It addresses the third by indicating that interpreter training and future research should connect specific processing mechanisms with observable outcomes.

5.1. Theoretical Contribution

The framework's main contribution is to connect topics that the supplied papers often discuss separately. Gile's Effort Model explains the concurrent efforts and limited processing capacity involved in SI, while the focal paper emphasizes the importance of rapid access to language knowledge and language separation (Gile, 2009, 2016). The proposed framework places these language skills within a broader pathway that also includes task demands, attention and memory, coordination, coping, and performance outcomes. It thereby treats language skills as part of how pressure may translate into performance, not as a substitute for processing capacity or task conditions.

5.2. Implications for Interpreter Education

The framework suggests that training design should distinguish between activities that reduce uncertainty and activities that develop processing skills. Advance preparation can build topic and terminology familiarity, while targeted practice may aim to improve rapid lexical and grammatical access, language separation, and coordination (Díaz-Galaz et al., 2015; Gile, 2016). Exercises should have explicit objectives and outcomes, such as retrieval speed, accuracy, omissions, fluency, or handling of dense speech. This alignment would make it easier to evaluate whether training affects the mechanism it is intended to develop.

5.3. Implications for Empirical Research

The propositions call for studies that measure the framework's constructs separately. Researchers could manipulate speech rate, information density, or terminology familiarity; assess language proficiency separately from retrieval speed; and measure working memory, language separation, coordination strategies, and multiple performance outcomes. Experimental studies could test immediate relationships, while longitudinal training studies could assess whether targeted practice changes a skill and whether that change corresponds to improved performance. Because the framework is conceptual, such research is required before its proposed pathways or moderating relationships can be treated as supported.

5.4. Limitations

The framework is based on the supplied bundle rather than a systematic search of the field. The source studies differ in research design, language pairs, participant experience, and the outcomes they measure, so their results cannot be combined as if they arose from a single comparable dataset. Language separation is especially in need of a clear operational definition. In addition, the proposed links among language availability, separation, coordination, and performance are theoretical interpretations that require direct empirical testing.

6. Conclusion and Recommendations

This conceptual paper developed an integrative framework for understanding how language skills may relate to cognitive pressure and performance in simultaneous interpreting. The synthesis indicates that interpreting outcomes should be considered in relation to task demands, attention and memory, language availability, language separation, coordination, and coping. It also highlights the need to distinguish rapid access to language knowledge from general proficiency and to assess language separation as a separate construct. The framework organizes relationships suggested by the supplied literature; it does not establish causal effects.

6.1. Recommendations

For researchers: define and measure language availability and language separation separately from general proficiency, working memory, and overall interpreting quality.

For experimental studies: vary task demands such as speech rate, information density, and terminology familiarity, while using multiple performance indicators including accuracy, omissions, meaning shifts, and fluency.

For training research: evaluate targeted exercises against explicit mechanisms and outcomes, and use longitudinal or pretest–posttest designs to determine whether skill changes are associated with performance gains.

For interpreter educators: combine preparation and coping instruction with deliberate practice in rapid lexical and grammatical access, language separation, and coordination under progressively demanding conditions.

For future reviews: extend the present bundle-based synthesis through a transparent search strategy across relevant databases and include studies using comparable constructs and measures.

Future empirical testing of the propositions will determine whether the proposed relationships hold across language pairs, interpreter experience levels, and interpreting settings.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Publisher's Note: All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers.

References

Ahmed, A. K., & Toma, S. S. (2023). Teaching and learning simultaneous interpreting at Kurdistan Region universities: Challenges and strategies. *Academic Journal of Nawroz University*, 12(4). https://doi.org/10.25007/ajnu.v12n4a1478

Díaz-Galaz, S., Padilla, P., & Bajo, M. T. (2015). The role of advance preparation in simultaneous interpreting: A comparison of professional interpreters and interpreting students. *Interpreting*, 17(1), 1–25. https://doi.org/10.1075/intp.17.1.01dia

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

Gile, D. (2016). Language skills under pressure: The case of simultaneous interpreting. *Proceedings of Sophia University Linguistic Society*, 31, 65–81. https://www.academia.edu/82142913/Language_skills_under_pressure_the_case_of_simultaneous_interpreting

Gumul, E. (2021). Reporting stress in simultaneous interpreting: The analysis of trainee interpreters' retrospective reports and outputs. *Onomázein, Special Issue VIII*, 16–42. https://doi.org/10.7764/onomazein.ne8.04

Liu, M., Schallert, D. L., & Carroll, P. J. (2004). Working memory and expertise in simultaneous interpreting. *Interpreting*, 6(1), 19–42. https://doi.org/10.1075/intp.6.1.04liu

Mankauskienė, D. (2018). Problems and difficulties in simultaneous interpreting from the point of view of skill acquisition. *Studies in Applied Linguistics and TEFL*, 18(1), 105–119. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/325320019

Mohammed, M. J. (2024). The investigation of interpreters' stress during simultaneous interpretation from English into Arabic and vice versa. *Journal of Education for Humanities*, 4(Special Issue).

Mudawi, G. (2025). Addressing the challenges of simultaneous interpreting for undergraduate students: A structured training approach. *Arab World English Journal for Translation & Literary Studies*, 9(2), 120–138. https://doi.org/10.24093/awejtls/vol9no2.8

Ocelková, T. (2019). Problem triggers in simultaneous interpreting and their impact on the processing capacity of an interpreter [Bachelor's thesis, Palacký University Olomouc].

Yudes, C., Macizo, P., Morales, L., & Bajo, M. T. (2013). Comprehension and error monitoring in simultaneous interpreters. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 34(5), 1039–1057. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0142716412000112