
| RESEARCH ARTICLE

Diplomatic Interpreting and Risk Analysis: A Literary Survey

Wenxin Zhou

Graduate School of International Culture and Communication Studies, Waseda University, Tokyo, Japan

Corresponding Author: Wenxin Zhou, **E-mail:** wenxin@zhou.jp

| ABSTRACT

In a diplomatic setting, overcoming the language barrier is fundamental to the establishment of mutual understanding and effective communication. As a complex activity that entails mediating immediate and direct personal contact between individuals from different cultures, interpreting can sometimes be problematic. As there may be more than one way of rendering the same speech, the process of interpreting may also be seen as a process of constant decision-making. When relations of power and conflicting political standpoints are involved, the cost and benefit of each alternative must be carefully considered in order to avoid undesirable consequences. As the worldwide political landscape is becoming increasingly volatile, diplomatic interpreters and their state of art are often put under the spotlight, attracting more public attention than ever with the help of contemporary social media. In order to tackle the challenges that arise during the event, an analysis of the associated risk may help the interpreter find an optimal strategy. During the past two decades, an increasing number of researches within the field of Interpreting Studies are focused on the social and cultural aspects of interpreting. However, the area of diplomatic interpreting has not attracted much academic attention. Similarly, while risk management is not a new concept in Translation studies, it remains a territory that is largely unexplored. This essay presents a literary review that aims to serve as a basis upon which further research can be conducted on the risks involved in diplomatic interpreting. The paper begins by illustrating the history of diplomatic interpreting to explain the various roles often assumed by the diplomatic interpreter. After that, an overview of the basic concepts and theories in risk studies is given to establish a better understanding of the framework. Finally, previous research into risk in translation and interpreting is evaluated in detail, providing a sound foundation for future projects to continue analyzing risk and decision-making in diplomatic interpreting.

| KEYWORDS

Diplomatic Interpreting, Conflict Interpreting, Risk, Interpreter's Role

| ARTICLE INFORMATION

ACCEPTED: 09 August 2022

PUBLISHED: 14 August 2022

DOI: 10.32996/ijtis.2022.2.2.2

1. Introduction

According to Barston (2013:1), 'diplomacy is concerned with the management of relations between states and between states and other actors'. Statistically speaking, in most cases, the countries involved in a diplomatic relationship do not share the same official language. Therefore, it is not difficult to assume that translators and interpreters play an essential role in the communication between political powers. 'Without their services, there could have been no 'international relations'', Roland claims (1999:7). Indeed, how else would U.S. President Nixon understand Chinese Communist Party Chairman Mao Zedong during his visit in 1972? Yet interpreters are rarely documented in historical records and archives, and the men and women quietly trailing behind powerful political figures are often left working in their shadows and neglected by historians. According to Pöckhacker (2016:158), 'the ephemeral nature of an activity which left no tangible trace through the ages' might be one of the reasons why diplomatic interpreters are often left out in history. Spoken words may be evanescent. However, it does not mean that the interpreter's task is simple or insignificant.

In her book *Memo to the President-Elect* (2008:66-67), the first female U.S. Secretary of State, Madeleine Albright, mentions the following:

'When you travel, you will be crowded by top aides elbowing each other to be allowed into meetings. Ironically, the one person essential to have in the room may not officially be an advisor at all but your interpreter. The interpreter plays a pivotal role because negotiations demand precision in language and often some degree of personal warmth. An interpreter's job, therefore, goes well beyond the literal translation of words; he must convey the negotiator's desired emphasis, nuance, and tone. This is only possible if he has a sophisticated knowledge of the subjects under discussion'.

Interpreting is a process of constant decision-making, and in some situations, the same sentence may be translated in different ways. As Takeda (2007:176-177) argues, interpreting is a practice that is 'conditioned by social, political and cultural contexts. Therefore, in high-level diplomatic events where serious consequences may result, the interpreter must take social, cultural, and political risks into consideration. In other fields and disciplines, risk analysis tools have been used to help select the most optimal option; however, the relationship between risk and diplomatic interpreting has yet to be examined in depth. This essay aims to understand diplomatic interpreting as a risk management process. First of all, the history of diplomatic interpreting is summarised with a few examples described in detail, and the roles played by the interpreters are analyzed. An overview of risk analysis and management theories is then given in order to illustrate a framework in which decision-making in diplomatic interpreting may be explained and improved.

2. Diplomatic Interpreting In History

According to Pöchhacker (2016:24), diplomatic interpreting is defined as the following:

'Where the representatives of different linguistic and cultural communities came together with the aim of establishing and cultivating political relations, they will have relied on mediators practicing what is usually called diplomatic interpreting'.

Although often an essential element in the establishment of political relations, traces of interpreters and their state of the art are hard to locate in historical archives and records. It is as Gehman (1914:61) argues, historians tend not to be 'troubled by the difference of language'. Similarly, the academic field of Interpreting Studies is becoming increasingly inter-disciplinary, buzzing with exciting new developments in areas such as the cognitive processes involved in the task, technology related to remote interpreting and automation, etc., yet there has been a general lack of interest in the historiography of interpreting. According to Pöchhacker (2016:158), until the 1990s, our knowledge of interpreting in history was limited to a few dozen publications only. According to Lung (2011:xiii - xiv), one reason that explains why the historical pursuit of interpreting tends to be neglected by scholars is the idea that it has very little to contribute when it comes to the discipline's theoretical development. Nevertheless, she argues that 'the theoretical study of translation is best grounded in translation practice through which the nuances, features, and limitations of interlingual exchanges can be analyzed, specified, and explained. It warrants the investigation of, ideally, authentic translation practices – not just in modern times, but throughout history, not just in the Western setting, but applied in non-Western settings as well – ever since translation started to play a part in rudimentary human interaction' (ibid).

Pöchhacker (2016:159) describes the landscape of interpreting history studies as an 'uneven' picture. First of all, in terms of historical periods, he notes that most researches focus on the twentieth century or later, with only a few exceptions that reach as early as the late fifteenth and late eighteenth centuries. Secondly, there is an imbalance in terms of the geographical regions the research is mainly based on, as the emphasis is often placed on the Western or Greco-Roman contexts. Having said that, an increasing number of researches are conducted on interpreters from Asia and Africa. He also mentions that most historical studies on interpreting have primarily been based on particular events such as wars, expeditions, negotiations, and tribunals, instead of offering a broader and more comprehensive perspective on various types of interpreting throughout different historical periods. This could be associated with the scarcity of available resources as historical records of interpreting activities are extremely difficult to find. The thematic emphasis of a few most notable researches can be divided into three main geographical regions, namely Ancient Egypt and Rome, China and Korea, and early modern empires such as the Spanish Empire and the Ottoman Empire. Still, the historical landscape of interpreting is still far from being complete. As Takeda and Jalón assert (2016:viii), there is 'much-uncharted territory to explore to bring the canvas closer to completion. We are still at the stage of filling the gaps'. In a diplomatic context, the interpreter's task may require more than the translation of dialogues; in fact, it is not uncommon for them to assume multiple roles and serve as a social and cultural mediator between two countries. Before proceeding to examine the risks involved in their task, it is important to understand diplomatic interpreting as a multifaceted career.

2.1 Sillan Interpreters During Tang China

According to Lung (2016:2), the earliest record of interpreters in China dates back to around 1000BC in the Royal Institutions of the Book of Rites:

《礼记·王制》：五方之民，言语不通，嗜欲不同。达其志，通其欲，东方曰寄，南方曰象，西方曰狄鞮，北方曰译。

A literal translation can be found below:

The people of the five regions have different languages, predilections, and desires. Those who can help them express their ambitions and desires are called ji in the east, didi in the west, xiang in the south, and yi in the north.

According to Roland (1999:83), translators and interpreters are, in fact, among China's first civil service appointees after the introduction of Confucian-style examinations in 165BC. It is noted by Meng (1962:5) that these linguists were recruited to facilitate communication between China's tributary satellite states, where a total of ten different languages were spoken. However, very little has been written about these translators and interpreters in historical collections. According to Lung (2016:21), 'in China's standard histories, interpreters are mostly anonymous and textually transparent, as if they were obsolete in mediated exchanges'. In fact, in the Elder Dai's Book of Rites (大戴礼记·小辩), the interpreter's task is described by Confucius as a simple process: '传言以象, 反舌皆至, 可谓简矣', which can be translated as 'using xiang officials (interpreters) to transmit your words, and those who speak a different tongue will all come around, it is indeed simple'. As Araguás and Jalón (2004:129) note, 'most of the time interpreters are not newsworthy and are absent from the sources. What we often find is the fiction of intercommunicability between different cultures and languages'.

From 838 to 847AD, a Japanese monk named Ennin visited China and kept a detailed diary of his journey. Ennin's diary includes lengthy records of his experiences in seven provinces of China and is considered to be a precious resource to the historical studies of this era. In his travelogue, 38 references to interpreters from the Kingdom of Silla (located on the central and southern parts of the Korean Peninsula) were found, offering valuable insight into the lives they led during Tang China and their various roles as well as responsibilities as cultural mediators.

During the seventh, eighth, and ninth centuries, Japan sent missions to China frequently in order to learn from the Chinese civilization, culture, and science. A detailed account of the Japanese mission between 838 and 839 AD can be found in Ennin's diary, including descriptions of Sillan interpreters that were recruited to assist the Japanese officials during their expedition to China. According to Lung (2016:10), when Japan sent nine ships on their mission to China in the year 838, some of the interpreters were freelance professionals hired specifically for the trip. Judging from the spelling of their names, i.e., Kim Chōngnam and Bak Chōngjang, it could be inferred that they are of Sillan ethnicity. It may come as a surprise that the Japanese government employed Sillan interpreters to represent their country in diplomatic affairs. However, according to records in the Nihon Kōki (日本後紀, officially commissioned Japanese history text), it appears that it was common for the Japanese government to employ Sillan interpreters in various diplomatic missions, and Lung (2016:11) further suggests that in the 839 Japanese mission to Tang China, no trace of 'Japanese scepticism of the use of ethnic Sillan interpreters' could be found. As United Silla is located between China and Japan, it became an important commercial hub that dominated trade between China, Korea, and Japan during the 8th and 9th centuries. Edwin O. Reischauer was the US ambassador to Japan who translated Ennin's travelogue into English. According to Reischauer himself (1955:276-283), 'from what Ennin tells us, it seems that commerce between East China, Korea, and Japan was, for the most part, in the hands of men from Silla [...]. While there were limits to the influence of the Koreans along the eastern coast of China, there can be no doubt of their dominance over the waters off these shores [...]. The days of Korean maritime dominance in the Far East actually were numbered, but in Ennin's time, the men of Silla were still the masters of the seas in their part of the world'.

The Sillan interpreters were likely hired for their proficiency in Korean, Japanese, and Chinese, as well as their expertise in naval exploration. It is not possible to assess their language skills based on references in Ennin's diary; however, a few scholars have noted that translation and interpreting officials in Ancient China tend to have limited linguistic abilities. For example, according to Xing (2010:201), in 1058BC, a message from a country named Yue Shang (越裳) had to be translated into eight other languages before it could finally be rendered into Chinese. It is, therefore, likely that the Japanese government employed Sillan interpreters not because they had complete trust in them but also because they had no better choice.

According to references in Ennin's diary, interpreting was only one of the various types of tasks that Sillan interpreters were responsible for. Lung (2016:14) divides their activities into three categories: 1) Liaising, networking, and transferring messages; 2) Logistics (transport, manpower, room, storage, etc.); 3) Trading brokers. In fact, no record of interpreter-mediated encounters or dialogues was found in Ennin's diary. Therefore, it is possible that the Sillan interpreters did not directly interpret conversations between Chinese local authorities and Japanese officials; instead, as cultural and language mediators, they might have been put in charge of arranging for transport, maintaining supplies, storage, etc. A combination of these privileges could be one of the reasons why they were described in Ennin's diary as acting as trading brokers. During the Tang Dynasty in China, foreign embassies could only trade through official channels, and there were various restrictions for foreign citizens to trade within China. Those who violate the rules may be arrested and detained. Although not explicitly described, Ennin's diary gives the readers a glimpse into trader brokerage services offered by Sillan interpreters. According to some of the entries, Ennin himself gave 'two large ounces of

gold dust and an Osaka girdle' to the Sillan interpreter Yu Sinōn as 'gifts' and received 'ten pounds of powdered tea and some pine nuts' in return for the following day. According to Lung (2016:17), although the interpreter was of Sillan descent, he became a staff interpreter affiliated with the Sillan enclave office of the Chu prefecture, thus considered a Chinese civil servant who was allowed to trade freely within China. It can be assumed that Yu offered brokerage services under the disguise of 'gift giving' to foreigners without having to directly violate the law.

In the past, when resources required to learn a new language were not available to the average person, interpreters often emerged by happenstance. The Sillan interpreters in Tang China acquired their language skills through trading with Japan and China. In other parts of the world, however, learning how to speak a new language may be a means of survival.

2.2 Spanish Empire in the Americas

According to Bowen (2012:263), Doña Marina, or Malintzin or La Malinche, is one of the most documented interpreters during the Spanish conquest of the Americas. Vald on (2014:3) even claims that 'Doña Marina is probably the most famous interpreter in the history of Spain's involvement with the New World'. Portrayed as both 'the perfect metaphor, that of the women violated by the Spaniards' and also 'a traitor to her own people'.

Bowen (2012:264) notes that Marina was born around 1505 of noble lineage in the province of Coatzacoalcos and later sold to Mayan merchants after her father died. After living among the Tabascans for some time, she was able to speak Maya as well as her mother tongue - the language of the Aztecs. She was one of the twenty women that were offered by Tabascans to the Spaniards as a gift and chosen by Cort s to be his mistress. She is said to have learned Spanish very quickly, obtaining an important and powerful position as Cort s's 'tongue' and 'ears'. Vald on (2014:33) believes that 'from the very beginning, the encounter between Europeans and Native Americans, between the conquistadors and the indigenous was marked by translation (or the absence of it). Translation marked the establishment of the colonial administration and the evangelization process'. After she became Cort s' interpreter, Marina played an essential role in the encounter between the Europeans and the natives. As a result, she was regarded by many as the embodiment of betrayal, disloyalty, and treachery. Curiously, around the time when Marina was interpreting for Cort s, another mediator who speaks both Spanish and Maya turned against his own country, Spain. According to Vald on (2014:40), Gonzalo Guerrero, a Spaniard who survived a shipwreck in Yucat n, was initially enslaved by a Maya lord but then regained his freedom and married a local woman. When Cort s arrived in Yucat n, he wanted Guerrero to be his interpreter. However, not only did Guerrero refuse to offer his services and join the Spanish, he helped Mayan military forces by giving advice against the Spanish conquerors. 'Guerrero's defection', Vald on (2014:40) asserts, 'was not merely military but, above all, cultural'.

From the above examples, it can be seen that linguistic transfer is not the only function of diplomatic interpreters; their knowledge of languages allows them to exercise varying degrees of influence and power in the management of diplomatic affairs and relations between different peoples and cultures. Various roles are associated with being a diplomatic interpreter. They can be language and cultural mediators, trade brokers, saviours, traitors, etc. As Bowen (2012:247) argues, 'Whatever their spheres of activity, the interpreters of the past have served not only as witnesses to events but also as participants in the unfolding of the making of history'.

3. Risk: Theory, Analysis, and Management

According to Mythen (2004:4), 'threat and insecurity have always been among the conditions of human existence'. Indeed, risk has always been an integral part of our lives; however, without a doubt, its nature and significance have changed rather significantly throughout history. Risk is an important concept in a great variety of academic fields, including medical science, mathematics, physics, and political science, just to name a few. Therefore, depending on the context and the discipline, risk can be defined, assessed, and analyzed in many different ways. In order to establish a conceptual definition suited for the purpose of this essay, the notion of risk is explored in detail in this section, from its origin, definition, historical development, and perception, to its analysis and management.

3.1 History of Risk

According to Bernstein (1998:3), the modern concept of risk originated from the Hindu-Arabic numerical system, which was introduced to the West seven to eight hundred years ago. However, it was not until the Renaissance that people first began to study probability and risk in a serious manner. Interestingly, the theory of probability was not discovered as the result of long-term dedication and effort; rather, it was the coincidental outcome of a gambling problem. According to Ore (1960:411), it is likely that a French gentleman and gambler Antoine Gombaud, the Chevalier de M r , challenged his mathematician friend Blaise Pascal to solve the 'dice problem', i.e., the probability of getting a six in four rolls of dice and that of getting two sixes in thirty-six rolls. Pascal brought this puzzle to the attention of a lawyer named Pierre de Fermat, and their combined intellectual collaboration led to the theory of probability, which Bernstein considers to be 'the mathematical heart of the concept of risk' (Bernstein 1998:3). After their discovery, for the first time in history, people were able to predict future outcomes based on numerical calculations,

and the way in which decisions are made was fundamentally changed. The ability to forecast the future and make rational decisions can be seen as one of the most powerful instruments for processing information and one may even argue that without such an ability, scientific development cannot be made. As Stahel et al. (2017:1) argue, 'almost all significant inventions, innovations, and developments in science, economics, technology, and health care in the past 200–300 years originated from the ability to predict future events and to make conscientious, balanced decisions on the risk and probability of our actions'. Curiously, dice did not only provide the starting point of the probability theory, but it's also the origin of the word 'hazard', which comes from the Arabic word *Al-Zahr*, i.e., 'the die' (Merriam-Webster's Dictionary). Ever since the discovery of the theory of probability, various techniques of risk management have been developed. According to Bernstein (1998:5), Bernoulli's invention of the Law of Large Numbers in 1703 provided the key to understanding the concept of risk, and 'without that qualification, everything would be predictable, and in a world where every event is identical to a previous event no change would ever occur'. Nearly three decades later, the Law of Averages was established by Abraham de Moivre, which was used as an essential tool for quantifying risk. Meanwhile, as the English government promoted the sale of life annuities, risk management played a significant role in the planning of life expectancies, and marine insurance became a flourishing new business in England. Another major development in this field occurred nearly a century after Pascal and de Fermat built the theory of probability.

Bernstein (1998:5-6) argues that almost all of the risk management tools that are commonly used today stem from the developments that took place between 1654 and 1760, with the exceptions of Galton's discovery of regression to the mean in 1875 and Markowitz's mathematical theory of portfolio management in 1952.

3.2 Main Concepts

According to Molak (1996:15), risk analysis can be defined as 'a body of knowledge (methodology) that evaluates and derives a probability of an adverse effect of an agent (chemical, physical, or other), industrial process, technology, or natural process'. In other words, he believes that 'risk' essentially refers to 'an adverse effect'. Similarly, according to Adams (1995:8), in the Royal Society's 1983 report titled *Risk Assessment*, the risk is defined as 'the probability that a particular adverse event occurs during a stated period of time, or results from a particular challenge. As a probability in the sense of statistical theory, risk obeys all the formal laws of combining probabilities'. It would appear that the notion of risk is often associated with adverse consequences. Further examples include Beck's definition (2009:9) of risk as 'future events that may occur, that threaten us'. In his perspective, even though the risk may not be the equivalent of catastrophe, it is 'the anticipation of the catastrophe'. Likewise, Kates, Hohenemser, and Kasperson (1985:5) consider risk as 'the likelihood that particular adverse consequences will follow a hazardous event'. It is worth noting that although 'adverse events' seem to be mentioned very often in the definitions of risk, those events themselves are rarely clearly defined. According to Molak (1996:15), traditionally, risk assessments often deal with health effects, where an adverse result could be death or disease. In more recent cases, however, risk could also be a loss of invested money in business settings or even some rather vaguely defined terms such as 'quality of life' or 'sense of community', etc.

Nevertheless, risk has not always been solely associated with adverse effects. As Douglas claims (2003:2), 'the idea of risk in itself was neutral; it took account of the probability of losses and gains'. In fact, when the concept was first discovered in the seventeenth century, the risk was simply 'the probability of an event occurring, combined with the magnitude of the losses or gains that would be entailed'. (ibid) Jaeger, Renn, Rosa, and Webler (2001:17) also share this notion and argue that risk comes with both rewards and penalties.

The author of this paper agrees that risk-taking activity has a positive aspect to it as people have always been known to be risk takers, even before the concept itself was known to us. Gambling, what can be seen as the essence of risk-taking, has always been a popular entertainment activity in history. Adams (1995:17) goes so far as to argue that 'people do willingly take risks, and gambling could be a part of human nature'. What is even more intriguing is the fact that our society seems to glorify risk-taking. Many cultures have their own versions of idioms and concepts such as 'nothing ventured, nothing gained' and 'if you do not try, you will never know'. Even though adverse effects do exist as an objective fact, in general, we are not encouraged to 'never try, never fail'. According to Douglas (1992:11), 'it has found that 'the public' definitely does not see risks in the same way as the experts. Objective risk is always there; however, as she argues, 'the baffling behaviour of the public, in refusing to buy flood-plain or earthquake insurance, in crossing dangerous roads, driving non-road-worthy vehicles, buying accident- provoking gadgets for the home, and not listening to the education on risks, all that continues as before'. As Adam Smith says in *The Wealth of Nations* (1776, Book I, Chapter x:1), 'The overweening conceit which the greater part of men have of their own abilities [and] their absurd presumption in their own good fortune'.

This brings us to the topic of perceived risk. In the same Royal Society's 1983 report mentioned above (cited in Adams, 1995:8), a distinction is made between 'objective risk' and 'perceived risk'. The former is the probability of an adverse event estimated based on past occurrences and scientific observations, which can be measured. The latter, rather, refers to the public's intuitive anticipation of such an event taking place. Similar to Douglas' view that experts and the public do not see risk in the same way, Adams considers

the Royal Society's 'objective risk' as an expert's assessment and 'perceived risk' as 'a lay person's opinion' (1995:8). The credibility of regulatory decisions plays a significant role in how effective they are, and one may say that their credibility or trustworthiness has more to do with how these decisions are perceived by the public than the objective risk itself.

However, when one brings perceived or 'subjective' risk into the argument, it becomes increasingly difficult to measure and assess risk as a quantifiable object. In their 1992 updated version of the report, the Royal Society attempts to maintain their emphasis on the objectivity of the subject by claiming that 'if a risk assessment is to be more than an academic exercise, it must provide quantitative information that aids decisions'. (cited in Adams, 1995:9) Nevertheless, regarding the nature of the subject and the separation between 'objective' risk and 'subjective' risk, it is acknowledged in the report that this viewpoint 'has come under increasing attack, to the extent that it is no longer a mainstream position'. (ibid) Adams (1995:9) further explains that the Royal Society had since lost its collective authority on the subject of risk as a result of growing criticism coming from scholars in the field of social science, who argue that risk is to be seen as a culturally constructed concept. Their views will be outlined in the following section.

3.3 Risk Perception

The risk may exist as an objective element; however, how risk is viewed or perceived is highly dependent on individual differences. According to Adams (1995:9), 'both the adverse nature of particular events and their probability is inherently subjective'. There are two major approaches to the study of risk perception, namely the cultural theory and the psychometric paradigm. Through the prism of cultural anthropology and sociology, risks do not exist as an intrinsic part of nature; rather, they are socially constructed concepts based on shared norms, intellectual, juridical, and moral considerations, organizational structures, etc. In many academic disciplines, the risk is always analyzed and studied from a scientific and statistical point of view; thus, all subjectivity should be avoided, and personal emotions and experiences should be left outside of the laboratory environment. Nevertheless, Douglas (1992:12) asserts that 'Anger, hope, and fear are part of most risky situations. No one takes a decision that involves costs without consulting neighbours, family, or work friends'. In other words, in a 'real-life' risk-taking scenario, intersubjectivity, how consensus is reached, as well as the broader social influences on decision-making cannot simply be neglected. The cultural theory of risk was first introduced by anthropologist Mary Douglas in her book *Natural Symbols: Explorations in Cosmology*, and in order to illustrate how risk can be culturally constructed to serve one's social relations, she established the so-called 'grid/group analysis' approach based on the work of structural sociologist Émile Durkheim. 'Grid' and 'group' each represent one of the two principal dimensions of social relations. In summary, 'grid' refers to the extent to which one's options and choices are conditioned by their role and position within the society (rather than by their individual preferences), whereas 'group' identifies the degree to which members of the society are socially committed. Using 'grid' and 'group' as the central axis, four types of relational patterns may be generated: Individualist, Egalitarian, Hierarchist, and Fatalist.

According to Douglas (2003:64), a high 'grid' way of life demonstrates a stronger sense of shared classifications in roles and authority within the society, whereas the low 'grid' type gravitates towards a more private and egalitarian system. Likewise, the high 'group' pattern is characterized by a sense of ego that is heavily framed by other people's pressure, whereas the low 'group' exhibit an ego that is independent of the external society.

The 'grid/group' typology has been highly controversial and has received many criticisms from different fields, and one of the main debates is centred around its empirical validity. Attempts to provide survey data in support of the Cultural Theory have been made by Karl Dake, a Ph.D. student of Wildavsky, to operationalise these four cultural biases as worldviews in order to explain variations found in risk perceptions (1990). However, in an empirical test of its validity, Rippl (2002:154) has demonstrated that 'central assumptions of the measurement theory are violated and that Dake's instruments, in their published form, are inadequate measures of cultural theory'. Furthermore, Boholm (1996) and van der Linden (2015) both argue that the Cultural Theory is impossible to falsify because its logic is circular in nature. Other scholars such as Johnson and Swedlow (2019:2) comment that while both Douglas and Wildavsky claim that differences in risk perception are fuelled by cultural biases, the definition and origin of such biases remain unexplained. Another major issue with the Cultural Theory paradigm is the fact that it is difficult to qualitatively assess the perceived risk. According to Adams (1995:ix), 'where scientific fact falls short of certainty, we are guided by assumption, inference, and belief. In such circumstances, the deterministic rationality of classical physics is replaced by a set of conditional, probabilistic rationalities'. Lord Kelvin famously said that 'anything that exists can be measured'. However, when it comes to the quantifiability of risk, if the concept itself is culturally constructed and varies from person to person, to calculate risk would mean to calculate culture itself. As for the psychometric paradigm, its main purpose is to discover what the main factors are when it comes to the perception of risk and how the lay public's perception differs from that of an expert.

Tversky and Kahneman's experiment in 1974 was one of the first research projects that used psychometric measures to analyze a layperson's biases when it comes to perceiving probabilities. It is suggested that people tend to rely on heuristics such as 'representatives' (i.e., the degree in which an event is representative of a process); 'availability' (i.e., 'the ease with which instances

or occurrences can be brought to mind', Tversky & Kahneman, 1974:1127) and 'adjustment from an anchor' which refers to the process in which people use a piece of information as the starting point and then adjust it to yield the final answer.

A few years later, in 1978, Fischhoff et al.'s study showed that the public perception of risk is largely determined by the feeling of dread, thus demonstrating that risk reception is related to certain emotions. However, such judgment is not always correct. According to Slovic & Peters (2006:323), scientific research has shown that 'whereas risk and benefit tend to be positively correlated across hazardous activities in the world (i.e., high-risk activities tend to have greater benefits than do low-risk activities), they are negatively correlated in people's minds and judgments (i.e., high risk is associated with low benefit, and vice versa)'. This is often referred to as 'the affect heuristic'. Alhakami and Slovic's study in 1994 found that the way the public determines risk seems to be affected by whether they have a favorable view of the event itself. In other words, a seemingly promising or benevolent activity is perceived to have low risk and high benefit, whereas an unfavorable activity is often associated with high risk and low benefit. Furthermore, in Slovic, Monahan, and MacGregor (2000)'s experiment, it is discovered that when interpreting the probability of an event taking place, compared to percentage numbers, equivalent linguistic representations that carry with them frightening images are more likely to induce the perception of higher risk. In their study, two groups of experienced clinical psychologists were asked to judge the probability of a fictional hospitalized mental patient 'Mr. Jones' committed an act of violence after discharge. Among the group of psychiatrists who were told that '20 of every 100 patients similar to Mr. Jones are estimated to commit an act of violence', 41% refused to discharge him. On the other hand, only 20% of clinicians were against discharging 'Mr. Jones' when they were told that 'patients similar to Mr. Jones are estimated to have a 20% chance of committing an act of violence'. It would seem that numerical representations of risk-taking in the form of percentages often yield a more positive perception of the activity when compared to 'equivalent' relative-frequency representations which create affect-laden images. Further studies such as Loewenstein, Weber, Hsee, and Welch (2001) found that when particularly strong affective mental connections are involved in the potential consequences of certain events, the probability of such consequences carries very little weight when it comes to the public's judgment of risk. Furthermore, according to Slovic and Peters (2006:324), an 'insensitivity to numbers' can emerge as perceptual and cognitive entities as they increase in magnitude.

According to Pym (2015:67), although the differences between multiple types of risks 'can be confusing and require some careful definitions, the interactions between them offer a rich, non-essentialist view of translation as a social relation, as a product, and as a teachable mode of decisionmaking'. In the following part of this section, the topics of risk analysis, risk assessment, and risk management will be discussed.

Risk analysis and risk assessment are sometimes used interchangeably. However, clear definitions of these two concepts can be seen in Rausand and Haugen (2020:59). Risk analysis is defined as '[a] systematic study to identify and describe what can go wrong and what the causes, the likelihoods, and the consequences might be', whereas risk assessment is referred to as 'the process of planning, preparing, performing, and reporting a risk analysis, and evaluating the results against risk acceptance criteria'. According to Rausand and Haugen, risk analysis is an intrinsic part of risk assessment (2020:59). Rausand and Haugen (2020:60) further explain the six steps that are involved in the risk assessment process, namely 1) Plan the risk assessment; 2) Define the study, 3) Identify hazards and initiating events; 4) Develop accident scenarios and describe consequences; 5) Determine and assess the risk and 6) Risk presentation. It should be noted, however, that these procedures are not always performed in the same sequence.

3.4 Risk Management

In terms of the management of risk, however, many scholars tend to agree that any risk should be reduced or entirely avoided. According to Adams (1995:16), 'risk management in practice is overwhelmingly concerned not with balancing the costs and benefits of risk but with reducing it'. In risk management, one of the most widely acknowledged guidelines is known as the ISO 31000, which is a set of principles and standards that are compiled by the International Organization for Standardization. ISO 31000 (2018) defines risk management as 'Coordinated activities to direct and control an organization with regard to risks'. According to Rausand and Haugen (2020:168), as 'coordinated activities' covers the identification and description of the risk, 'risk assessment is thus a part of risk management'. A somewhat more detailed definition is given by the U.S. Department of Homeland Security (2010); risk management is described as the 'process for identifying, analyzing, and communicating risk and accepting, avoiding, or controlling it to an acceptable level considering associated costs and benefits of any actions taken'. In this definition, specific processes involved in risk management are listed. Nevertheless, ISO 31000 (2018) mentions additional procedures such as monitoring and reviewing, as well as recording and reporting the performance. In summary, the six common steps of risk management are as follows:

1. Scope, context, and criteria.
2. Risk assessment (which involves risk identification, risk analysis, and risk evaluation)
3. Risk treatment

Throughout these three steps, two processes are also run continuously, namely

- A. Communication and Consultation
- B. Monitoring and Review

Finally, Recording and Reporting is the last step.

Having discussed the main concepts and principles related to the notion of risk, the following section will now move on to the application of the risk framework within translation and Interpreting studies.

4. Risk in Diplomatic Interpreting

4.1 Risk in Translation Studies

If the translation is as simple as transferring words from one language to another, it would have been replaced by machines a long time ago. The nuances of language and the subjectivity of interpretation make the translation a complex activity, and a few scholars have described translation as decision-making and problem-solving process. As discussed in the previous section, decision-making is often accompanied by various types of risk. One of the earliest mentions of the concept of risk in translation studies is implied by Gile in 1995 (1995:108):

'After collecting as much information as possible, translators must decide what they will write. These decisions involve expected gain and possible loss. Gain can take the form of increased clarity, more readable and convincing texts, a lower probability of misrepresenting the author's ideas, etc. Loss may involve loss of information, lessened credibility because of inappropriate terminology, lower cultural acceptability because the Target Text says something or says it in a way that is not acceptable to Target-Text readers, etc.'

Most people are familiar with the phrase 'lost in translation'. However, Gile gives examples of both loss and gain during the translation process and suggests that translation decisions are made based on evaluations of 'expected gain and possible loss', which can also be interpreted as a form of risk analysis. As a result of the choices made by the translators, the target text may differ from the source in multiple ways. Nevertheless, in this context, the concepts of loss and gain are applied only at a text level. On this topic, Akbari (2009:511) takes a step further and includes the translator's personal motives in the definition of successful decision-making: 'self-satisfaction, financial reward in forms of monthly salary, bonus or a raise in the salary, successful communication, avoidance of criticism, getting published, being well received by the society, etc.'

It is true that in order to illustrate a comprehensive map of the risks involved translation and interpreting, multiple facets of the activity and the parties involved must be considered. Although the concept of risk is increasingly gaining recognition in Translation studies, literature on this topic is still highly limited. As Hui argues (2012:2):

'Although risk management is not a new concept, it is an uncharted area as applied to the translation process and translator training. The idea of risk (analysis and management) has been mentioned from time to time as advice to translators (Gile 1995/2009, Pym 2003/2010, Akbari 2009) but has been defined and developed by only one or two researchers. Very little research regarding risk management in the translation process has been conducted, and only a small sample of translated text has been studied'.

In the field of risk management in translation, Anthony Pym is one of the few scholars that have made an attempt to offer a systematic framework. He started exploring the idea of risk as early as 2005. In his article Text and risk in translation (2005:70), he defines risk as 'the possibility of not fulfilling the translation's purpose' and describes it in terms of 'high-level' and 'low-level' risks. In his model, the linguistic challenge that triggers decision making (i.e., there are one or more alternative ways to translate) is defined as a translation 'problem,' and the result (translator's rendition of the problem) is considered as a 'solution'. In order to reduce or maintain the levels of risk involved, translation strategies are employed. According to Pym (2005:72), the effort put into solutions 'should ideally correlate with the degree of risk involved'. Pym summarises his theory as the following (2005:73):

'In sum, problems are high-risk or low-risk; solutions can be high-risk or low-risk; strategies are different ways of expending effort to manage risk, and the translator's efforts should ideally correlate with degrees of risk'.

Ten years later, in 2015, Pym published an essay titled Translating as Risk Management (2015:67), where a more comprehensive and systematic description of the risk model is given. Pym divides translation risk into three categories.

The first one is credibility risk. According to Pym, in an author-translator-reader relationship, there exists an imbalance of information. The translator often is more knowledgeable about the foreign language and culture than the author or the reader. This asymmetry leads to a 'special dependence' of translation on credibility. This type of risk can lead to various negative

consequences, such as losing the client or the compensation. According to Pym (2015:69), 'when you perform a high-risk action, you could lose your money, your clients, your job, or all those things at once'.

If credibility risk is mainly associated with the social and psychological dynamics between the parties involved in the translation process, then the second type of risk, i.e., uncertainty risk, is more text-oriented. In translation, linguistic differences and cultural incommensurables often manifest themselves during the transfer from the source text to the target text, resulting in ambiguities and uncertainties. When more than one interpretation of the meaning is available, risk-taking and decision-making are unavoidable. In Künzli (2004)'s case study, risk-taking behaviour when faced with ambiguity and uncertainty is investigated, and a comparison is made between trainee translators and experienced translators. The results of the study show that, in general, trainee translators tend to be more willing to take a risk, and several explanations are proposed (Künzli 2004:45) '(1) they fear less a possible loss of credibility, should their interpretation turn out to be wrong; (2) they are not yet aware of the potential help they can get from colleagues or clients; (3) they fear appearing to be undecided, thinking a translator has to know everything; and (4) they do not yet know how to distinguish between cases where risk-taking is inevitable and where it may or even should be avoided'. By comparison, when ambiguities occur in the source text, experienced or professional translators show a tendency to try to reduce the amount of risk they have to take and transfer some of it to the client, either by directly discussing the issue with the client or in the form of footnotes and annotations (Künzli 2004:40). In Künzli's approach, risk in translation arises when the meaning of something in the source text is unclear. Therefore, the risk is considered an element that is entirely negative, and all risks should ideally be avoided. Likewise, Angelone argues that 'comprehension, transfer, or production indecision' (2010:19) in translation must be overcome through the use of strategies. Pym, on the other hand, disagrees. Although uncertainty risk is included in his approach and is based on the assumption that 'there must be uncertainty in order for there to be risks' (Pym 2015:71), he does not only view risk as a factor that is exclusively negative. Similar to Gile mentioned previously, Pym (2015:71) believes that the concept of risk-taking should be seen 'as an active, positive option, corresponding to possible enhanced social rewards'. It should be noted that Pym describes Künzli and Angelone's observations about risk as something that is 'internal to the translator's decision-making processes'. (ibid) Although he suggests that possible social rewards may be gained from risk-taking, it is not specified what types of rewards there might be and how they may be considered 'social'.

In another paper, Pym mentions the following:

'A text never fully determines (causes, explains, justifies, or accounts for) what a receiver understands of it. Each receiver brings a set of conceptual frames to the text, and the reception process is thus an interaction between the text and those frames. The same would then hold for translation: no source text fully determines a translation of that text, if only because translations rely on observations and interpretations'. (Pym, 2010:90) He further elaborates that 'different languages picture the relations in different ways, so no language can be assumed to be transparent to the world - we might be seeing only what our language enables us to see'. (2010:91)

In a way, Pym's definition of text can be seen as a culturally constructed reality, which corresponds to the Cultural Theory of risk perception discussed in the previous section; however, one may say that such an observation is of no practical use to the translator's task as it does not offer any practical guidelines to how these uncertainties may be dealt with during the process of translating. Furthermore, if we all accept the fact that people from different cultures are not able to understand text, in the same way, does that mean translation is an impossible task? As French theorist Paul Ricœur (2004:29) says, 'one must conclude, that misunderstanding is allowed, that translation is theoretically impossible, and that bilinguals must be schizophrenic'.

The third type of risk is known as communicative risk. According to Pym, risk management is capable of bringing benefits to the communicative purpose. He uses the example of birth certificate translations. As the source text, a birth certificate contains a relatively small number of information that needs to be translated. Pym suggests that, depending on the communicative function of each element, given that the level of uncertainty is the same, the level of risk may vary. In his example, the translation of the name and date of birth of a person entails more risk than that of the name of the midwife or the reporting officer. Even though it is used to illustrate his concept of 'benefits of communication', this approach is essentially functionalist, and criticisms about functionalism in translation studies also apply to this model - the communicative function of a translation is often defined on a subjective basis, and different translation decisions can be justified in more than one way, making this type of decision-making difficult to evaluate. Furthermore, although Pym puts emphasis on the fact that risk management can bring benefits to communication, prioritizing high-risk text for low-risk text can hardly be seen as a benefit or improvement of the quality. It is true that allocating more effort to the most important information may be more cost-effective for the translator, but it does not 'improve' the translation and nor can it be viewed as a form of 'gain' from the risk-taking. The relationship between levels of risk and effort is elaborated in his article below (Pym 2015:73):

'In this model, if the level of effort invested in a translation challenge is low and the chance of 'non-cooperation' is low, it results in a low level of risk, and it is suggested that a risk-averse approach should be taken by the translation through the means of

'omission, explicitation, simplification, generalization, attenuation' (Pym 2015:73). He also argues that is high effort is spent on a low probability consequence, it might lead to 'overwork' or 'inefficient labor'.

The author would like to argue that this model is highly anti-intuitive. First of all, the level of risk is described in relation to effort and the probability of consequence. It, therefore, assumes that effort has already been made, or the level of risk cannot be defined. Once the level of risk is determined, it then offers the translator different solutions and strategies. However, if an effort has been made, it suggests that the translator has taken some kind of action; either analysis has been performed, or the translator has put some thoughts into the decision. If the decision-making happens even before risk is defined, then very little value can be offered by this model in terms of applying risk management to facilitate the process of decision-making. Furthermore, according to this approach, when there is a high chance of non-cooperation, the level of risk is shown as higher when more effort is put in, suggesting that translators should not pay a high level of effort into a high probability of non-cooperative consequences. This notion is anti-intuitive, and no evidence has been found to prove its validity in practice.

4.2 Difference between Translation and Interpreting

It should be noted that translation studies and interpreting studies are often considered two connected but independent disciplines due to differences between the activities of written translation and oral interpreting. Although some aspects of risk in translation may not entirely apply to interpreting, there are indeed similarities.

For instance, the process of decision-making is also frequently discussed in interpreting studies. When examining the concept of 'creativity' in interpreting, Horváth (2015:94) believes that strategic decision-making or problem-solving in the interpreter's mental process can be seen as a level of creativity. Particularly, during simultaneous interpreting, the decision-making process 'consists in envisioning a variety of possible linguistic solutions for an interpreting problem while the source language message is still unfolding'. Furthermore, in Dean and Pollard's research into community interpreting, they developed a decision-making model based on four types of demands, namely 'environmental, interpersonal, paralinguistic, and intrapersonal (EIPI)' (Dean and Pollard 2015:101). In their outcome-oriented approach, the interpreter should reach a controlled decision after analyzing the different demands of the job and predicting the consequences that are likely to arise. In a way, this can also be viewed as a type of risk management.

Traditionally speaking, one of the key differences between written translation and oral interpreting (excluding sign language interpreting) lies in the 'orality' of the communication process. Even though Pym's research is mainly based on written translation, he also explores risks that may be involved in the spoken element of oral interpreting in a number of ways. According to Pym (2016:248), 'Interpreting is usually defined by its spokenness: interpreters speak, translators write, we are told', but there can also be an element of writing or writtenness in interpreting. For instance, note-taking or when speakers read from scripts, etc. If that is the case, then how does interpreting differ from translation? Pym poses this question and also points out that while it is widely acknowledged that simultaneity is a key feature in interpreting that does not exist in written translation - 'eye-tracking indicates that touch-typing translators can read while they write (so there is a degree of simultaneity in written translation)' (2016:249) Similarly, some would argue that there's no time for interpreters to correct themselves during an interpretation, unlike translators who may be able to correct their work later on. However, the truth is conference interpreters, and dialogue interpreters do correct themselves on certain occasions, 'so all the arguments about simultaneity and non-corrections logically fly out the window'. (Pym 2016:249) Therefore, Pym believes that one of the important differences between interpreting and translation is the 'relative mutual presence of the communication participants'. He further elaborates that this difference has two main features:

1. 'it theoretically enables the direct involvement of the participants in the spoken situation, with feedback and dialogic corrections becoming easier to enact than in written communication'.
2. 'possibility, in turn, allows for different intensities of interaction and different probabilities of recourse to non-linguistic action' (ibid)

Spatial presence is only a dimension of the 'presence' meant by Pym; according to him, the most important aspect of mutual presence lies not in the physical space but in the sharing of the 'same time frame'. Modern technology allows us to communicate directly from different physical locations; nonetheless, the shared time frame is what truly creates a sense of mutual presence. Furthermore, he argues that when words are exchanged simultaneously, it allows the participants to 'construct meaning together' (Pym 2016:250). In this way, when uncertainty arises, ideally, it is possible that clarification and explanations could be given by the speaker. The possibility of immediate feedback and adjustment is also what makes spoken encounters different.

Pym (2016:250) also believes in the importance of non-linguistic features of speeches in interpreting:

'Visual presence, body language, and awareness of multiple addressees all play parts in the creation of meaning. One might further suppose that visual identity and the possibility of feedback allow for greater individuation of the participants ('the' interpreter

becomes this particular interpreter), greater scrutiny of signals of trustworthiness, greater attention to the specific interests of each party, and perhaps greater communicative leeway (and less linguistic exactitude) so that those specific interests can be coordinated to a successful outcome'. To Pym, even though spokenness is not the only characteristic that separates interpreting from translation, it is nonetheless an important feature that indicates the level of risk involved in the process. He claims that 'the more spoken the situation, the greater the risk of alternative non-linguistic action'. (2016:248)

4.3 Interpreting as a Risk Management Process

The interpreting workflow encompasses three main stages. Prior to the event, during the interpreting, and after the event. A few scholars have described the preparation work involved in the first phase. For instance, creating a glossary of technical or context-specific terms that are likely used in the speeches. Also, when the translation of some of the terms is more difficult and challenging, it is suggested that interpreters should come up with solutions and multiple options to such problems beforehand. Therefore, the author would like to argue that if we try to consider the entirety of the conference interpreting as a risk management process, this preparation stage can be viewed as the risk assessment stage. As Rausand and Haugen (2020:61) believe, 'risk assessments are normally performed to provide input to decisions about risk – whether we need to do something with the risk and if so, what should be done'. As one of the key features of the activity of interpreting is its simultaneity, the decision-making process sometimes has to be finished within an instance. If we see the output of every interpreted word as an individual decision, that will significantly increase the level of complication involved in the quantification of the process. Prior to the interpreting event, a few generic criteria can be followed. These principles may include practical guidelines on the correct use of terminology and the language used to describe sensitive and controversial issues, etc., but cannot cover all challenges and ambiguities that arise during the interpretation. From a risk management point of view, these guidelines can be viewed as a reference when establishing risk acceptance criteria. Take political correctness as an example; in a political or diplomatic setting, being 'politically correct' is extremely important. In itself, political correctness is a relative concept; what may be considered normal in one country or region may be completely unacceptable in another country. Asserting one's status quo is very important in international relations, and therefore in diplomatic communication between two or more countries, it is often quite crucial to note the way particular words are supposed to be used and how not to use certain "taboo" words. When a part of the speech is considered not appropriate in the receptor culture, will it be more beneficial to try to mitigate the risk and "tone it down"? Or will that be seen as unfaithful to the original speech? There is no clear boundary as to when it becomes acceptable to tweak the original speech. One method that could be used in studying risk management in interpreting is to identify 'challenges' or 'what can go wrong', which could either be ambiguities, inappropriate or politically incorrect usage of language, metaphors, humour, etc. In an attempt to define risk, Rausand and Hauge (2020) pose three questions: 'what can go wrong?' 'What is the likelihood?' and 'what are the consequences'. If we are to understand interpreting as a risk management process, these three questions must be answered before we can identify the specific risks involved in the process. Some of the major challenges and difficulties that may occur during the interpreting process have previously been identified by a number of scholars; however, it is not so easy to answer the question of 'what is the likelihood' of such an event taking place. The preparation stage of interpreting, as mentioned above, mainly serves the function of reducing the likelihood of a mistake being made due to lack of. Due to the fast-paced nature of the activity, interpreting decisions are usually made very quickly. As a result, it is difficult to calculate the likelihood of something 'going wrong'. When a crisis happens, the interpreter often finds themselves in one of the following situations: either 'I do not understand this word', 'I understand this word but do not know what it is in the target language', or 'I do not think the speaker meant what he said', etc. Quantifying the probability of a hazardous event taking place, in this case, is a monumental task and one that is extremely difficult to start. One of the possible approaches that could be used is to associate the level of risk with the severity of different possible consequences and how likely they may happen. If the sentence or speech in question is extremely controversial or expected to be quoted verbatim and attract a high level of attention, the interpreter should perhaps take great measures to make sure that the speech is rendered in a way that best corresponds to the speaker's intention and mitigates the risk and possible adverse consequences they may be responsible for. In such cases, the main accountability lies beneath the role of the speaker. If the interpreting challenge is concerned with stylistic or rhetorical devices, on the other hand, ones that bare relatively little importance to the central topic, perhaps it would be reasonable for the interpreter to take a higher degree of liberty in adjusting or optimising the original utterance. Another aspect worth being taken into consideration is what is known as 'decision-making fatigue'. Decision-making fatigue is a concept in decision theory and psychology where the quality of our rationale decreases as more decisions are made. In conference interpreting and simultaneous interpreting, in particular, interpreters have to deal with an almost constant flow of information, and decisions are made sometimes on a word-to-word basis. Therefore, the AIIC (International Association of Conference Interpreters) suggests that interpreters should not be performing simultaneous interpretation for any longer than 15 minutes at a time. The same applies to consecutive interpreting, which is the most common mode of interpreting adopted in high-level political talks and events to guarantee the quality of the communication. Interpreters often need to rely on their note-taking skills to keep track of important information and are encouraged to notify the speaker if the speech is too long. Therefore, when modelling the interpreting activity as a risk analyzing and management process, it can be assumed that the longer the speech, the more likely mistakes and omissions may be made, and the length of the speech could have an impact on the level of risk based on the probability of a hazardous event happening.

5. Conclusion

Within the field of Interpreting Studies, many detailed guidelines and frameworks have been given in the past to facilitate the preparation and working process of the interpreter's task; however, most of them are based on previous experiences or heuristics, and little effort has been put into quantifying risks involved in the process or applying statistic models to the decision-making process. In an attempt to understand how the concept of risk could be used in the analysis of interpreting decision-making in a diplomatic context, this essay begins with exploring the history of diplomatic interpreting, in particular, the cases of Sillan interpreting during Tang China and local interpreters hired by the Spanish Empire in the Americas are discussed. Secondly, the concept of risk, the development of risk studies, and major principles and steps of risk assessment and management are examined in this essay. Thirdly, previous research in incorporating risk frameworks into translation and interpreting studies is evaluated, specifically, the notions of gain and loss and Pym's three types of risks in translation and interpreting. In order to consider diplomatic interpreting as a risk management process, the author also discusses the potential risks, consequences, and strategies that are related to the stages prior to, during, and after the interpreting event. Diplomatic interpreting is a complex activity conditioned by a number of external factors such as affiliations, linguistic and cultural differences, political standpoints, etc. In such high-stakes events, it is essential for the interpreters to be aware of the potential risks that lie in how they render speeches. Furthermore, when challenging situations arise, having an analysis and evaluation framework as a reference may be beneficial for them to arrive at the right conclusions. There are a few limitations that can be observed in this approach. For example, the definition of risk and hazard may involve a relatively high level of subjectiveness, and the fast-paced nature of the interpreting activity may decrease the validity and reliability of the risk management framework. However, the author believes that this literary survey provides a sound basis upon which further research on the quantification of risk in diplomatic interpreting may be conducted, and it is hoped that the knowledge may contribute to the development of the risk model within the field of Interpreting Studies.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Acknowledgments: First of all, I would like to acknowledge the precious guidance kindly offered by my research directors Dr. Fumi Morizumi, Dr. Azusa Sato, and Dr. Min Shu. They have been most encouraging and supportive during the production of this paper. I would also like to thank my parents, Jianguo Zhou and Yongmei Chen, and my husband, Connor Perrin, and his family for their immense support throughout this journey.

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

- [1] Adams, J., (1995). *Risk*, London: UCL Press.
- [2] Akbari, M., (2009). Risk management in translation. In: H. Omar, H. Haroon and A. Ghani, ed., *The sustainability of the translation field: The 12th International Conference on Translation*. Kuala Lumpur: Persatuan Penterjemah Malaysia [Malaysian Translators Association]. 509–518.
- [3] Albright, M. and Woodward, W., (2008). *Memo to the president-elect*. New York: HarperLuxe.
- [4] Alhakami, A. and Slovic, P., (1994). A Psychological Study of the Inverse Relationship Between Perceived Risk and Perceived Benefit. *Risk Analysis*, 14(6).1085-1096.
- [5] Angelone, E., (2010). Uncertainty, uncertainty management, and metacognitive problem-solving in the translation task. In: G. Shreve and E. Angelone, ed., *Translation and Cognition*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.17-40.
- [6] Araguás, I. and Jalón, J., (2005). Iconography of Interpreters in the Conquest of the Americas. *TTR : traduction, terminologie, rédaction*, 17(1).129-153.
- [7] Barston, R., (2013). *Modern diplomacy*. 4th ed. London and New York: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.
- [8] Beck, U., (2009). *World at risk; translated by Ciaran Cronin*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- [9] Bernstein, P., (1998). *Against the Gods: The remarkable story of risk*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- [10] Boholm, Å., (1996). Risk perception and social anthropology: critique of Cultural Theory. *Ethnos*, 61(2).159–178.
- [11] Bowen, M., (2012). Interpreters and the making of history. In: J. Delisle and J. Woodsworth, ed., *Translators through history*, 2nd ed. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company., 247-282.
- [12] Dake, K., (1990). *Technology on trial: Orienting dispositions toward environmental and health hazards*. Ph.D. dissertation. University of California at Berkeley
- [13] Dean, R., and Pollard, R., (2015). Demand Control Schema. In: F. Pöchhacker, ed., *ROUTLEDGE ENCYCLOPEDIA OF INTERPRETING STUDIES*, 1st ed. Abingdon: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group., .100-101.
- [14] Douglas, M., (1992). *Risk and Blame: Essays in Cultural Theory*, 1st ed. London: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.
- [15] Douglas, M., (2003). *Natural Symbols: Explorations in Cosmology*, 3rd ed. London: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.
- [16] Fischhoff, B., Slovic, P., Lichtenstein, S., Read, S. and Combs, B., (1978). How safe is safe enough? A psychometric study of attitudes towards technological risks and benefits. *Policy Sciences*, 9(2), .127-152.
- [17] Gehman, H.S., (1914). *The Interpreters of Foreign Languages Among the Ancients: A Study Based on Greek and Latin Sources*, Ph.D dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.
- [18] Gile, D., (1995). *Basic concepts and models for interpreter and translator training*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- [19] Homeland Security, (2010). *DHS risk lexicon. Terminology Guide DHS 2010 Edition*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Homeland Security.

- [20] Horváth, I., (2015). Creativity. In: F. Pöchhacker, ed., *ROUTLEDGE ENCYCLOPEDIA OF INTERPRETING STUDIES*, 1st ed. Abingdon: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group., 93-94.
- [21] Hui, T., (2012). Risk management by trainee translators: A study of translation procedures and justifications in peer-group interaction, Ph.D. dissertation, Rovira i Virgili University, Spain.
- [22] ISO 31000, 2018. Risk management – guidelines, International standard. Geneva: International Organization for Standardization.
- [23] Jaeger, C. C., Renn, O., Rosa, E. A., and Webler, T., (2001). Risk, uncertainty, and rational action. Abingdon: Earthscan.
- [24] Johnson, B. and Swedlow, B., (2019). Cultural Theory's Contributions to Risk Analysis: A Thematic Review with Directions and Resources for Further Research. *Risk Analysis*, 41(3), 429-455.
- [25] Kates, R. W., Hohenemser, C., and Kasperson, J. X., (1985). *Perilous Progress: Managing the hazards of technology*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- [26] Künzli, A., (2004). Risk-taking: Trainee translators vs. professional translators. A case study. *The Journal of Specialised Translation*, 2, 34-49.
- [27] Loewenstein, G., Weber, E., Hsee, C. and Welch, N., (2001). Risk as feelings. *Psychological Bulletin*, 127(2), 267-286.
- [28] Lung, R., (2011). *Interpreters in early imperial China*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- [29] Lung, R., (2016). Defining Sillan interpreters in first-millennium East Asian exchanges. In: K. Takeda and J. Jalón, ed., *New insights in the history of interpreting*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.1-26.
- [30] MENG, S.M., (1962). *The Tsungli Yamen: Its Origin and Functions*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- [31] Merriam-Webster., (n.d.,) Hazard. In Merriam-Webster.com dictionary. Retrieved August 10, 2021, from <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/hazard>
- [32] Molak, V., (1996). *Fundamentals of Risk Analysis and Risk Management*, 1st ed. Boca Raton: CRC Press.
- [33] Mythen, G., (2004). Ulrich Beck: a critical introduction to the risk society. London: Pluto Press.
- [34] Ore, O., (1960). Pascal and the Invention of Probability Theory. *The American Mathematical Monthly*, 67(5), 409.
- [35] Pöchhacker, F., (2016). *Introducing interpreting studies*. 2nd ed. London: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.
- [36] Pym, A., (2005). Text and risk in translation. In: K. Aijmer and C. Alvstad, ed., *New tendencies in Translation Studies*. Gothenburg: Göteborg University., 69–82.
- [37] Pym, A., (2010). *Exploring translation theories*. Abingdon: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.
- [38] Pym, A., (2015). Translating as risk management. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 85, 67-80.
- [39] Pym, A., (2015). Translating as risk management. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 85, 67-80.
- [40] Pym, A., (2016). Risk analysis as a heuristic tool in the historiography of interpreters. In: K. Takeda and J. Jalón, ed., *New insights in the history of interpreting*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 247-267.
- [41] Rausand, M. and Haugen, S., (2020). *Risk assessment*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- [42] Reischauer, E., (1955). *Ennin's Travels in T'ang China*. New York: Ronald Press Company.
- [43] Ricœur, P., (2004). *Sur la traduction*, Paris: Bayard.
- [44] Rippl, S., (2002). Cultural theory and risk perception: a proposal for better measurement, *Journal of Risk Research*, 5(2).147-165.
- [45] Roland, R. and Roland, R., (1999). *Interpreters as diplomats*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.
- [46] Slovic, P. and Peters, E., (2006). Risk Perception and Affect. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 15(6), 322-325.
- [47] Slovic, P., Monahan, J. and MacGregor, D., (2000). Violence risk assessment and risk communication: The effects of using actual cases, providing instruction, and employing probability versus frequency formats. *Law and Human Behavior*, 24(3), pp.271-296.
- [48] Smith, A., (1981). *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*, Volumes I and II. R. H. Campbell and A. S. Skinner, eds. Indianapolis: Liberty Fund
- [49] Stahel, P., Douglas, I., VanderHeiden, T., and Weckbach, S., (2017). The history of risk: A review. *World Journal of Emergency Surgery*. 12(15).1-8.
- [50] Takeda, K. and Baigorri Jalón, J., (2016). *New insights in the history of interpreting*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- [51] Takeda, K., (2007). *Sociopolitical Aspects of Interpreting at the International Military Tribunal for the Far East (1946-1948)*, Ph.D. dissertation, Universitat Rovira i Virgili, Spain.
- [52] Tversky, A. and Kahneman, D., (1974). Judgment under Uncertainty: Heuristics and Biases. *Science*, 185(4157)1124-1131.
- [53] Valdeón García, R., (2014). *Translation and the Spanish Empire in the Americas*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- [54] van der Linden, S., (2015). A Conceptual Critique of the Cultural Cognition Thesis, *Science Communication*, 38 (1).128–138.
- [55] Xing, Q., (2010). 我国古代翻译人员的特点初探 *Journal of Taiyuan Urban Vocational College*, 5, 200-202