Journal of Language, Culture, and Translation (LCT), 8(1) (2025), 158–188

Tapping into Consecutive Interpreting Courses: A Comparative Study of Cathartic, Catalytic, and Supportive Interventions

Mohammad Fazli[1], Ghasem Modarresi[*2]

[1, 2]*Department of English, QU. C., Islamic Azad University, Quchan, Iran*

DOI: 10.71864/LCT-2025-1216667

Received: 28/05/2025

Revised: 02/09/2025

Accepted: 11/09/2025

Published: 15/09/2025

Keywords: Cathartic; Catalytic; Supportive; Engaging; Self-discovery; Self-efficacious; Interpreting

Abstract: Despite the theoretical importance of intervention in interpreting practice, there is a paucity of experimental research into this concept in interpreting courses. Using facilitative interventions, teachers involved in interpreting training can provide scaffolding strategies for students to properly fulfill the demanding tasks of interpreting. The present study, following an explanatory sequential mixed-methods design, mainly aimed to examine the effect of facilitative interventions on consecutive interpreting performance and to explore the students' reactions to the use of facilitative interventions in consecutive interpreting courses. The sample consisted of 46 homogeneous BA translation-major students in the quantitative phase of the study, and a pool of eight students participated in the qualitative phase of the study. The students were divided into three experimental classes, and each class was exposed to a type of facilitative intervention, including cathartic, catalytic, and supportive. To gather the relevant data, two reliable tests and a semi-structured interview question protocol were used, and to analyze the data, one-way ANOVA and theme-based categorization, including inter-rater and inter-coder reliability, were conducted. The results confirmed that there was a statistically significant difference between the three groups at the $p<.05$ level, and the effect size was large. The findings showed that cathartic and supportive groups outperformed the catalytic group. Following this, after measuring the inter-coder reliability, seven themes were elicited from the students' responses to the interview questions, namely novel, challenging, motivating, engaging, self-discovery, self-efficacious, and eustress. Using facilitative interventions, teachers can provide students with actions and techniques through which they can enable students to foster positive emotions and overcome negative emotions regarding interpreting job.

1. Introduction

Interpreting practice is interwoven with listening skill, which is generally considered the least explicit skill among the four language skills

[*] Corresponding Author's E-mail address: qasem.modarresi@gmail.com

Cite this article: Fazli, M., & Modarresi, Gh. (2025). Tapping into Consecutive Interpreting Courses: A Comparative Study of Cathartic, Catalytic, and Supportive Interventions. *Journal of Language, Culture, and Translation*, *8*(1), 158–188. https://doi.org/10.71864/LCT-2025-1216667

(Vandergrift, 2003). Buck (2001) emphasizes that this skill is multi-dimensional in nature, including a wide range of sources of information in no fixed order. Indeed, listening has been an important concept in the domain of interpreting practice inasmuch as the development of interpreting competence requires both linguistic processing and real-time cognitive control, especially under task-induced pressure (Wen et al., 2022). Over the past few decades, considerable literature has grown up around the theme of interpreting since it implies the facilitation of spoken interaction between different languages (Modarresi & Jalilzadeh, 2020). According to Pöchhacker (2004), for people engaged in intercultural communication, interpreting serves as the instant form of translational activity. Interpreting is typically categorized into simultaneous and consecutive interpreting (Gerver, 1976). As clearly explained by Gile (2009), in consecutive interpreting, the interpreter listens to a few minutes of a talk by the speaker in the original language, takes notes, and then delivers the whole segment in the target language, and then, while the speaker keeps talking for a few minutes, the interpreter orally translates the next segment, and so on to the point that the talk is terminated. According to Rahmanpanah (2022), consecutive interpreting encompasses a number of challenging cognitive and affective processes for the interpreter. To provide students involved in interpreting with training courses, instructional tools, and new insights, such as technology from other disciplines, are welcomed (Pöchhacker, 2023).

Intervention, as an effective instructional tool, is a highly researched area in language learning and teaching (Negueruela & Lantolf, 2006; Jalilzadeh et al., 2020); however, in translation studies, little research has been conducted to implement such techniques in translation and interpreting courses (Schiavi, 1996). The point is that the way teachers provide feedback for students in interpreting training courses would be effective in re-motivating demotivated students. Whereas feedback mainly focuses on the information provided by the teachers to raise awareness and reinforce self-correction, intervention chiefly deals with the actions and strategies that the teachers employ to enable improvement. According to Lai (2012), the *how* of delivering the interventions, such as the verbal/oral channels and the emotive sentences used to implement such interventions, has been rarely investigated in the realm of interpreting studies. That is why the existing empirical findings highlight the role that dynamic scaffolding and targeted intervention perform in enhancing student engagement and fostering autonomous learning in interpreter training contexts (Huang et al., 2023).

Actually, the concept of intervention focusing on the provision of instructional feedback can provide students with a scaffolding tool that would involve them in accomplishing translation skills (Modarresi, 2009). As for the distinction between feedback and intervention, some scholars believe that teachers offer direct responses to interpreting tasks in the traditional model of feedback, which is time-consuming and taxing for teachers (Shen et al., 2020). Heron (2001) defines intervention as an identifiable piece of verbal and non-verbal behavior that is provided by the person in charge to facilitate learning. The background witnesses that the usefulness of feedback should be evaluated not only by its quality but also by the extent to which the learners become engaged in the task (Guo et al., 2024). This involvement can comprise different dimensions, among which four components of engagement are more cited by the researchers, including cognitive, behavioral, social, and emotional engagement (Handley et al., 2011; Hosseini & Modarresi, 2015; Koltovskaia, 2020). Nevertheless, there is a severe lack of research into the use of intervention in interpreting practice, whereas research in translator training demonstrates that structured scaffolding through self-and peer-assessment interventions leads to significant gains in both assessment literacy and translation performance (Chen et al., 2023). Moreover, recent studies in interpreter training have underscored the effectiveness of scaffolded interventions in students' autonomy and cognitive engagement (Xu & Ouyang, 2023).

More specifically, Heron's (1976) six-category intervention analysis can be implemented in interpreting courses. Among many existing types of interventions (Sloan & Watson, 2002), the framework put forward by Heron (1976) has been frequently used in a variety of fields where there is a pressing need for promoting interpersonal skills (Ashmore, 1999). To elucidate, Heron (1991) developed two main categories for interventions, namely authoritative and facilitative. In the authoritative intervention, he introduced three subcategories entailing informative, prescriptive, and confronting interventions. On the other hand, the facilitative intervention further breaks down into three subcategories, which encompass cathartic, catalytic, and supportive interventions. The rationale for choosing facilitative interventions in the study is that, whereas the existing research has confirmed that informative and supportive interventions are most frequently used by teachers, facilitative interventions have not been touched by practitioners in translation and interpreting studies despite their potential for interpreting development (McMahon et al., 2023); therefore, the present study mainly focuses on facilitative interventions.

It is hoped that this research will contribute to a deeper understanding of the concept of intervention since it can be employed in interpreting to provide guidance, increase motivation, promote self-discovery, and elevate engagement. Actually, by applying interventions, teachers can create a stimulating and friendly environment for the students to participate attentively in class activities while doing interpretation tasks from the original language into the target language. Recent research in translation education has shown that integrating peer collaboration and structured mediation promotes deeper cognitive engagement and improves translation outcomes (Chen et al., 2023). According to Alinouri and Badpa (2025), a successful translator takes both linguistic and extra-linguistic factors into account. By employing interventions, teachers can successfully challenge to the task students while playing back to make students find their own mistakes, and helping them avoid making the same mistake again (Heron, 2001; Sloan, 2006; Modarresi et al., 2020). Additionally, studies in educational settings indicate that scaffolded interventions, which raise learners' self-efficacy through teacher modeling and peer interaction, endorse sustained motivation and develop interpreting skills (Guo et al., 2023).

Meanwhile, Pöchhacker (2011) noted that few researchers have focused on aspects of interpreting, in general, and on the quality of interpreting performance, in particular. Actually, interpreting courses introduced to translation-major students are mostly presented based on a listening and testing format with a teacher asking the students listen to a message and interpreting it into the target language whereas such courses should be presented in a teaching and assessing format with a teacher training the students interpreting strategies and techniques and then, assessing their performance based on the most recent assessment types such as dynamic assessment. To Graham (2011), the major challenge in interpreting courses is that the students are required to listen to someone speaking in one language and try to render it in another language, and this may demotivate them. Recent inquiry into interpreting practice reveals that interactive scaffolding and appropriate feedback help sustain motivation (Wei et al., 2022). The problem is that teachers are mainly accustomed to offering the answer to the students, abruptly or directly, and they address the students' mistakes. However, the way of behaving with students in interpreting tasks can be more interesting and inspiring to them if the teachers are equipped with the most recent types of interventions and do not just provide them with the right answer, but help them to find the answer themselves by means of facilitating interventions. Furthermore, longitudinal findings in interpreting suggest that

transitioning from directive to facilitative intervention over time encourages learner independence and fosters sustained skill development (Xu & Ouyang, 2023).

However, intervention models for teaching and working on interpreting courses have rarely been used to improve the interpersonal relations in the instructional contexts of the classroom. Employing such interventions has been neglected in the translation scope, although Schiavi (1996) attempted to promote feedback as a facilitative technique in interpreting practice. When Niranjana (2023) called for an interventionist approach to translation, he mainly focused on those intervention types that teachers employ rather than the intervention types that the translation students prefer. Neurocognitive findings from interpreting training indicate that trainees who receive structured guidance and feedback exhibit improved attentional alertness and executive control, both of which correlate with better interpreting accuracy under pressure (Xing & Yang, 2023). Therefore, this debate requires further investigation in order to shed light on the extent to which applying facilitative interventions could enhance interpreting performance, and the present study aims to tackle this knowledge gap in interpreting courses.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Interpreting: A Brief Overview

In recent years, much of the greater part of the literature has acknowledged that research into interpreting has been interwoven with applied perspectives emerging from multidisciplinary works, which are welcomed to deal with the multiple dimensions of interpreting competence (Riccardi, 2011; Sistani, 2024). Over the past two decades, interpreting has been largely recognized as a distinct profession from translation studies (Darwish, 2006). As Gile (2009) mentions, “interpretation is the oral translation of oral discourse as opposed to the oral translation of written texts” (p. 43). The existing background in interpreting practice acknowledges that although there are hot debates on the definition of interpreting ability, two of the main factors contributing to the definition of interpreting are the cognitive and emotional processing approaches (Gerver, 1975; Gile, 2009; Baghery Moghadam & Modarresi, 2025) in which scholars attempt to model the important linguistic, cognitive, and emotional factors pertinent to interpreting performance. Moreover, recent research highlights the growing role of psychological and neurocognitive approaches in interpreter training, demonstrating that (neuro) feedback can significantly improve interpreting performance (Christoffels et al., 2006; Modarresi, 2021). According to Arjmandi and

Ghafari (2025), metaphoric ecology remarks that interpreting necessitates interdisciplinary approaches to deal with sociocultural issues. According to Riccardi (2011), the most straightforwardly identifiable methods to examine interpreting have been "the cognitive-psychological, the neurophysiological or neurolinguistic, the translational, the linguistics-centered, the intercultural, and the sociological" (p. 15).

Furthermore, professionals in interpreting have reviewed interpretation skills based on different kinds of interpreting, such as consecutive, simultaneous, and whispering interpreting (Méndez et al., 2001), and it has been construed that such approaches, often interrelated, result in a more all-inclusive method to interpreting practice. More recently, Xing and Yang (2023) have found that interventions are conducive to interpreting performance. In this respect, different models have been developed to evaluate interpreting performance. In his pioneer model, Gerver (1975) suggested the notion of mental structure in simultaneous interpreting. Later, Setton (1999) suggested a practical model, categorizing the possible steps in understanding source-language input and target-language output. However, to Chen (2017), the cognitive demand factor is closely linked to less success in interpreting performance. Additionally, the effort model suggested by Gile (2009) is deemed to be the most frequently-used model of interpreting processes in which four major efforts of listening and analysis, memorization, production, and coordination are offered (Han et al., 2021). For instance, in quantitative experimental studies, one way to assess interpreting performance is propositional analysis, that is, the analysis in terms of meaning units (e.g., Gieshoff, 2021; Hild, 2015; Modarresi & Ghoreyshi, 2018). More recently, Rahmanpanah (2023), following the guidelines suggested by Gile's (2009) gravitational model, found that lexical items are not stimulated equally in the oral and written systems.

Recent findings using EEG and self-reported workload measures reveal that interpreting students experience significantly higher cognitive load compared to professionals, which could lead to a decline in interpreting accuracy under complex conditions, whereas providing guidance and mediation could lessen mental loading (Boos et al., 2022). For example, Khorami and Modarresi (2019), using Rasch measurement and structural equation modelling, developed and validated a rubric for consecutive interpreting performance with four major constructs, namely language competence, interpreting strategies, communication ability, and personality traits, and including 22 items, among which there are items which highlight the importance of mediation and feedback in enriching consecutive interpreting performance. Furthermore, a systematic review

of cognitive load in distance interpreting highlights how cognitive mediations such as chunking and anticipation mediate the demands imposed by interpreting tasks and support improved performance in digitally mediated settings (Zhu & Aryadoust, 2022). More recently, Xing and Yang (2023) found that mediated interpreter training can significantly enhance cognitive flexibility, central to managing interpreting tasks, which suggests that scaffolding interventions could improve interpreting readiness.

2.2. Feedback in Interpreting Practice

The existing literature on feedback in education is extensive, which is referred to as the information offered by textbooks, teachers, and peers while interacting with students in the class (Hattie & Timperley, 2007). Likewise, in the domain of translation, this concept performs a key role in accomplishing learning goals, helping interpreting students to reflect on their works from the outlooks of listeners, and to enhance self-assessment skills (Washbourne, 2014; Rouhani & Modarresi, 2023). In this regard, Rollinson (2005) found that peer feedback could significantly improve interpreting skills by nurturing self-awareness and collaborative learning. Moreover, practitioner surveys in interpreter education reported that structured instructor-led feedback sessions correlate with higher learner motivation and more sustained engagement compared to solely peer-mediated feedback (Lee, 2017). In the same vein, Yu et al. (2020) confirmed the effectiveness of different types of feedback in translation, such as written corrective feedback, based on which students with low L2 proficiency could benefit more from direct feedback. Recently, Sha et al. (2022), using anonymous online peer feedback in translation training, found that students experienced higher self-efficacy and cognitive engagement in doing translation tasks.

More specifically, in translation experiments, feedback usually refers to comments or reactions, either corrective or evaluative, that guide translators toward better choices in their work (Xu, Su, & Liu, 2025). However, intervention is defined as a deliberate step that researchers add to observe how it affects performance, such as applying a method, introducing a tool, or using a protocol (Guastaferro & Pfammatter, 2023). In written translation research, feedback is often given as comments on drafts, while interventions may include systematic training or the use of AI-supported revision tools (Pietrzak, 2014). While feedback in interpreting contexts can be in the form of prompt corrective comments, interventions can include scaffolding, guided practice sessions, or technology (Neunzig & Tanqueiro, 2005). Neunzig and

Tanqueiro (2005) found that corrective feedback improved immediate accuracy in interpreting, whereas intervention through guided practice and scaffolding led to more sustainable long-term progress. In other words, intervention is proactive and intended to test its impact on outcomes within experimental designs, whereas feedback is reactive and appears after a performance (Guastaferro & Pfammatter, 2023).

Several scholars (e.g., Gao et al., 2024; Xu et al., 2025; Abbasian & Modarresi, 2022; Kashanizedeh et al., 2025) maintain that whereas the merits of translation feedback and artificial intelligence feedback are well-documented, the implementation of feedback has remained a time-intensive process, especially in large classes that need more time and effort to interact with the students. For such reasons, teachers encountered the issue of adjusting the quality of intervention while working on interpreting skills (AlGhamdi, 2024). Meanwhile, Han and Lu (2023) have encouraged researchers to delve into translation feedback that could lessen the accountability for teachers while sustaining the quality of feedback. Furthermore, longitudinal facilitation studies have demonstrated that facilitators who dynamically shift from directive to non-directive interventions over time, in response to learners' emerging competencies, significantly enhance learner agency and engagement (Harvey et al., 2023). Taken together, Heron (2001) outlines two major types of intervention, including authoritative and facilitative interventions, which are further divided into six subcategories, to account for the way teachers intervene while doing the tasks. Recent research that adapts Heron's model in higher education settings confirms that facilitators' ability to shift flexibly between directive and non-directive roles enhances learner autonomy and group cohesion (Masek et al., 2022).

The present study followed the guidelines suggested by Heron's (2001) facilitative interventions that include the followings: 1) cathartic intervention which seeks to enable the other person to discharge and express painful emotion, usually grief, anger or fear, 2) catalytic intervention which seeks to elicit self-discovery, self-directed learning, and problem solving, and 3) supportive which intervention seeks to affirm the worth and value of the other person, and their qualities, attitudes and actions (Heron, 2001). It is hoped that these interventions could provide us with a new pathway to increase students' motivation, elevate their engagement and self-esteem, and enrich their interpreting skills in social communication. Furthermore, a longitudinal evaluation of novice facilitator development reveals that, over time, an incremental transition from authoritative to facilitative intervention leads to greater student self-regulation and sustained engagement in learning tasks (Harvey et al.,

2023). Taken together, the current study poses the following two questions:

1. Is there any significant difference between cathartic, catalytic, and supportive facilitative interventions with respect to consecutive interpreting performance?
2. How do translation students react to the role of intervention strategies in improving their consecutive interpreting performance?

3. Method

The present study followed an explanatory sequential mixed-methods design, including a quasi-experimental phase, and was complemented with a semi-structured interview method, which could largely fortify the internal validity of this research work.

3.1. Participants

The study included 46 students (females: n=31, 67.4%; males: n=15, 32.6%; Mean age=21.87, SD=3.19) who were studying English translation at the BA level. They were selected based on convenience sampling from Islamic Azad University of Quchan and Islamic Azad University of Mashhad, Iran. They were in their junior year of academic study, so they had already passed the audio-visual interpreting course as a prerequisite course, and they were taking the two-credit course of consecutive interpreting. Nevertheless, first of all, their homogeneity was specified by means of the listening section of the preliminary English test (PET). The study considered scores with one standard deviation above or below the mean; hence, taking the mean and standard deviation (M=17.12; SD=4.23), students whose scores were between 21 and 13 were chosen; consequently, out of 53 participants, 46 students joined the study. Moreover, eight students (females: n=5, 62.5%; males: n=3, 37.5%; Mean age=21.59, SD=2.71) were selected to contribute to the qualitative phase of the study based on purposive sampling following a data saturation approach. To clarify, the pertinent data were gathered to the point that no new information was added.

3.2. Instruments

Initially, to homogenize the students, PET, developed by Cambridge ESOL, was utilized. The test is composed of three main sections: Reading/writing, listening, and speaking. The listening part consists of four parts, ranging from short exchanges to more extended dialogues and monologues. This section consists of 25 items to be answered in 35 minutes, and the scoring procedure is calculated out of 25.

To assess students' interpreting performance, two texts were selected from VOA Dateline news as the pretest and posttest, appropriate for students at the intermediate level. The tests were approximately at similar degrees of difficulty. As calculated by the Gunning fog formula, the readability level of the texts for the pretest was 15.35 and for the posttest was 15.77, which were considered satisfactory for junior college students, following the guidelines by Gunning (1952). Moreover, having conducted a pilot study, the reliability of both the pretest and posttest, as estimated by Cronbach's alpha, was acceptable (r=0.76 & 0.78, respectively).

To evaluate consecutive interpreting performance, the study employed the rubric suggested by Angelelli (2009) for measuring interpreting performance. The scale used to allow for assessment of interpreting competence, ranging from poor to advanced level. The sub-competencies could be broken down and scored separately. The students' scores are measured from one to four, which could be multiplied by 10 for the ease of further analysis, so that the scores' range is between 10 and 40.

To explore the role of facilitative interventions in improving students' consecutive interpreting performance, four semi-structured interview questions were constructed. The contents of the questions centered on the extent to which the students were familiar with the concept of intervention, kinds of facilitative intervention, their feelings, and the extent to which they found these types of mediation fruitful. The questions were checked by three experts in translation studies, who were faculty members and provided us with constructive feedback. To ensure the content validity of the questions, we applied their changes meticulously.

3.3. Procedure and Data Analysis

The study followed a straightforward procedure to carry out the study, including 16 sessions. Initially, in session one, PET was administered to the students to ensure the homogeneity of the representative sample based on which they were divided into three experimental groups; one group was provided by cathartic intervention (n=16), another group was provided by catalytic intervention (n=15), and the other group was provided by supportive intervention (n=15). During the second session, which was regarded as the pretest session, the teacher assessed the students' performance on consecutive interpreting in each class. To clarify, the students were provided with thorough instructions on how to respond to the questions. The guidelines were useful because most of the students had no previous experience with such tasks. First, they listened to high-quality audio clips on a sound recorder and then interpreted them after each pause in front of two raters who were the authors of the present

study, measuring their interpreting performance. The treatment phase lasted 13 sessions in each group with the same teacher, who was one of the authors of the present study. Meanwhile, during the course, the teacher held two compensatory sessions because the regular sessions were cancelled due to the holidays. Throughout the treatment phase, the teacher scaffolded the students in the three experimental groups by means of facilitative interventions so that the students could receive the feedback in a face-to-face manner. In each group, the teacher worked with the students energetically, employing illustration and exemplification to clarify the point. Each type of intervention was applied according to a standardized protocol developed for the study, which included specific criteria for when to intervene, step-by-step procedures, and a scripted approach to ensure uniformity across students and sessions. In addition, to ensure that interventions were implemented consistently, some sessions were observed by the second author of the study. Some examples which were put forward by the teacher in each group were as follows:

Examples of cathartic interventions:

- Would you like to share your problem with us?
- You don't look Ok today. Is there any problem?
- Don’t worry. This is quite common. Many other students have this problem.

Examples of catalytic interventions:

- Tell me about the last time you had to work with a classmate whom you found particularly difficult. How did you deal with him?
- What would you do to solve the problem?
- Your classmate Reza has some problems with… How would you act if you were him?

Examples of supportive interventions:

- Wow! That was a precise interpretation. Thanks!
- It sounds like you managed that in a confident way.
- Well done! I am really proud of you.

To be more exact, the weekly sessions were thematically organized as follows: During sessions three to five, the students were introduced to consecutive interpreting, and the teacher helped and provided feedback with a focus on psychological factors such as engagement, anxiety, and personal attributes. In sessions six and seven, the teacher worked with the students on interpreting strategies such as shadowing and anticipating, through which everyday conversations and social interaction scenarios were presented to them. During sessions eight and nine, workplace dialogues and professional communication were presented by means of VOA news so that the students could become familiar with various

authentic interactions occurring in authentic situations such as hospitals, travel agencies, and courts. In sessions 10 and 11, the teacher worked on cultural topics, making the students encounter cultural differences so that they could enrich their intercultural competence while doing interpretation tasks. In sessions 12 and 13, longer input segments were presented during the class time to help the students tolerate higher mental loading pressures of interpreting processes. Furthermore, the teacher worked with the students on various topics so that they could gain experience for the roles they should perform in different situations, and more importantly, the teacher could provide facilitative interventions in different situations so that the effectiveness of interventions in improving interpreting skills could be assessed more precisely both cognitively and emotionally. To clarify, each group received interventions consistent with its designated facilitative strategy, based on which cathartic interventions promoted emotional expression and stress management, catalytic interventions focused on self-discovery and problem-solving through reflective questioning, and supportive interventions emphasized encouragement, confidence-building, and affirmations.

Following the treatment phase, during session 14, the students were required to take the posttest of consecutive interpreting in which they listened to high-quality audio clips on a sound recorder and then interpreted them after each pause in front of the two raters who measured their interpreting performance. Following this, during sessions 15 and 16, the researchers held semi-structured interviews with the students, and each interview lasted approximately 15 minutes. Each interview was lengthened to the point that the interviewees' responses provided no more new information. The students had the choice to reply to the questions in the Persian language since they might express their views more easily; however, their responses were then transcribed into English.

Regarding the first research question of the study, one-way ANOVA was performed because the independent variable had three levels, including cathartic, catalytic, and supportive interventions. Moreover, to ensure the consistency of ratings, the inter-rater reliability of the scores was calculated by means of the Pearson correlation coefficient. Concerning the second research question, theme-based categorization (Dörnyei, 2007) was applied, through which the information gathered was organized and classified. Following this, the transcripts were sorted into categories through which any unnecessary information was removed. Finally, the inter-rater reliability for coded transcripts was calculated based on the measurement guidelines (Garrison et al., 2006).

4. Results

4.1 Facilitative Interventions and Consecutive Interpreting Performance

As for the first research question, initially, the researchers reported the inter-rater reliability of the pretest scores, which was acceptable for each group, including cathartic, catalytic, and supportive groups (r=0.82, 0.75 & 0.78, respectively). Before running the ANOVA test, the normality of the data was inspected. The results obtained from the Kolmogorov-Smirnov statistic confirmed that the distribution of scores was normal since the significant values were 0.18, 0.06, and 0.20 for cathartic, catalytic, and supportive interventions, respectively. Moreover, the Levene's test showed an insignificant value (p=0.83), suggesting that the homogeneity of variance assumption was not violated.

Table 1. *Descriptive statistics for pretest scores*

Group	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
cathartic	18.13	2.99	15
catalytic	18.50	2.73	15
supportive	20.43	2.92	16
Total	19.04	2.99	46

As shown in Table 1, the results obtained from descriptive statistics for mean and standard deviation were as follows: Cathartic intervention (M=18.13; SD=2.99), catalytic intervention (M=18.50; SD=2.73), and supportive intervention (M=20.43; SD=2.92).

Table 2. *ANOVA test for students' pretest scores*

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	48.24	2	24.12	2.90	.06
Within Groups	365.67	44	8.31		
Total	413.91	46			

As displayed in Table 2, the results of one-way ANOVA showed that there was no statistically significant difference for the three sets of scores prior to the treatment phase [$F_{(2, 44)} = 2.90$, $p = .06$].

Following the treatment phase, the inter-reliability of the posttest scores was also acceptable for each group, entailing cathartic, catalytic, and supportive groups (r=0.75, 0.84 & 0.71, respectively). Before running the ANOVA test, the normality of the data was checked. The results of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov statistic indicated no violation of the assumption of normality since the significant values were 0.20, 0.06, and 0.10 for cathartic, catalytic, and supportive interventions, respectively.

Moreover, the significance value for Levene's test was 0.22, and since this was greater than .05, the homogeneity of variance assumption was not violated.

Table 3. *Descriptive statistics for posttest scores*

Group	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Cathartic	22.73	3.34	15
Catalytic	19.87	2.47	15
Supportive	23.62	3.38	16
Total	22.06	3.43	46

As shown in Table 3, the results obtained from descriptive statistics for mean and standard deviation of each group were as follows: Cathartic intervention (M=22.73; SD=3.34), catalytic intervention (M=19.87; SD=2.47), and supportive intervention (M=23.62; SD=3.38).

Table 4. *ANOVA test for students' posttest scores*

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	122.37	2	61.18	6.40	.00
Within Groups	420.43	44	9.55		
Total	542.80	46			

As displayed in Table 4, the results of one-way ANOVA confirmed that there was *a* statistically significant difference for the three sets of scores [$F_{(2, 44)}$ =6.40, p=.00]. After dividing the Sum of squares for between-groups (122.37) by the total sum of squares (542.80), the resulting eta squared value was .22, which in Cohen's (1988) terms would be considered a large effect size. Cohen classifies .01 as a small effect, .06 as a medium effect, and .14 as a large effect.

Table 5. *Multiple comparisons for students' posttest scores*

(I) group	(J) group	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
cathartic	catalytic	2.85*	1.11	.03
	supportive	-.89	1.11	.70
catalytic	cathartic	-2.85*	1.11	.03
	supportive	-3.75*	1.09	.00
supportive	cathartic	.89	1.11	.70
	catalytic	3.75*	1.09	.00

As displayed in Table 5, post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test showed that cathartic and supportive interventions were significantly different from catalytic intervention at the p<.05 level, after checking the asterisks next to the values listed. To be more exact, to provide the exact

answer to the first research question, the students in cathartic and supportive groups outperformed those in the catalytic group since the significance values for these constructs were less than 0.05.

4.2 Results Obtained from the Interviews

Regarding the second research question of the study, the researchers explored the reactions of the students towards the role of facilitative interventions in their interpreting performance. The main themes extracted from the interviews are reported below:

The responses elicited from the students in the cathartic group revealed that they, initially, were confronted with the stressful environment of interpreting classes; however, they were provided with some emotional feedback from the teacher. One of the students noted:

> *While I was involved in interpreting, I felt that I couldn't do interpreting very well, so I was embarrassed and I had tension; however, the teacher said to me, "Your interpretation seems very nice, so why are you so anxious?" This sentence relaxed me and I felt that the teacher was there around to reduce my tension. Such behavior from the teacher increased my engagement, motivation, and self-efficacy.*

Indeed, students felt that interpreting is a demanding job since they should gain mastery over both listening and interpreting simultaneously, and since listening skill increases memory loading, the students feel tired and confused while doing interpreting tasks. The results of the interviews with the students in the catalytic intervention group revealed that the learning culture in the interpreting courses is based on listening to the segment and interpreting it, and the teacher expected the students to respond promptly and correctly; otherwise, the teacher provided the correct answer. One of the students said:

> *I was listening to the clip, trying to translate it orally, but what I was listening to was too hard to understand and do interpreting so that I thought the teacher would tell the right answer, but the teacher said to me, "Let's see how you try to solve this problem", and I found that I should try again, and this type of help from the teacher was challenging and involving since I was expected to find the answer myself.*

Actually, teachers should not teach from A to Z to the students, but they can provide them with hints and learning questions so that the students can become autonomous and direct their own learning; however, it was hard for some students to become involved in problem-solving

activities, so that they became much more tedious instead of exerting more effort. The responses obtained from the students in the supportive intervention group indicated that valuing the students' attempts could galvanize their endeavor, and students would perform better when the teacher acted as a scaffolder and facilitator rather than responder. One of the students mentioned:

> *During the classwork, I could see how my teacher helped me. Whenever I could not get the meaning of the words to provide good equivalents while listening and interpreting, I became frustrated and disengaged; however, my teacher highlighted that I should focus on the task since progress requires tolerance. When he told me, "I have noticed you are making good progress. Good job!", this intervention was so inspiring that it decreased my embarrassment*.

The results of the interviews revealed that the students like a teacher who affirms their qualities and values their actions and behaviors. Indeed, a teacher who makes the students happy establishes rapport, builds confidence, and fosters learning. The sociopsychological bonds between the teacher and students can be enhanced by means of interventions. Therefore, teachers can replace distress (harmful stress) with eustress (beneficial stress) and help students become engaged in the task cognitively, emotionally, and socially by providing interventions that discharge students' tension and nervousness. Providing students with emotional feedback to ponder on the message and activate their mental processing would yield better results, and students could apply what they learn inside the class in real situations.

Following this, after classifying the themes obtained from the responses to the interview questions, the first author accomplished the coding task by asking the second author of the present study to elicit the common themes. Next, the second author coded the common factors by eliciting the similarities and, to a great extent, reached the same conclusion. Following the guidelines proposed by Campbell et al. (2013), the researchers divided the number of coding agreements by the total number of agreements and disagreements to calculate the inter-coder reliability. Taken together, initially, 14 themes emerged to which at least one of the authors assigned a code, and in nine cases, both coders applied the same code, so that the inter-coder reliability of the data was 64 percent (9/14). However, after resolving discrepancies to achieve inter-rater agreement by the authors, the number of shared themes was reduced to seven, achieving an inter-coder reliability of 81%, which is considered acceptable in qualitative research (Miles et al., 2014). Consequently,

seven themes were finalized from the students' responses, and examples of the excerpts from which these themes were derived are presented in the following table.

Table 6. *Some excerpts emerged from the interviews*

Participants	Excerpts	Themes
Interviewee A	The way the teacher reacted to our problems and mistakes was really different.	novel
Interviewee B	The teacher's interventions were both interesting and problem-posing since he helped us mostly implicitly.	challenging
Interviewee C	Interpreting courses were always stressful to me and I preferred to postpone taking these courses, but I am becoming more willing to take these courses because of my teacher's encouragement.	motivating
Interviewee D	The teacher was available for making us involved and I didn't feel how the time was passing in the class.	engaging
Interviewee E	Whenever the teacher intervened to help us, he acted as a kind facilitator who did not teach from A to Z, but he provided us with leading questions and prompts so that we could try to accomplish the task ourselves.	self-discovery
Interviewee F	I can express my abilities and I would like to take part in question-and-answer interactions with the teacher since the teacher is there to encourage me and I feel that I can express my abilities freely.	self-efficacious
Interviewee G	I felt that the teacher had such a rapport with us that I became eager to attend the class with a positive stress.	eustress

As illustrated in Table 6, to provide the answer to the second research question, the themes that emerged from responses included: *novel, challenging, motivating, engaging, self-discovery, self-efficacious, and eustress*.

5. Discussion

The results of the present study confirmed that employing facilitative interventions had a significant effect on interpreting performance. More specifically, students in the cathartic and supportive groups outperformed those in the catalytic group. Moreover, the responses emerged from the semi-structured interviews revealed that students had a positive reaction to the use of facilitative interventions since the interventions were challenging, motivating, and involving them.

Taking the first research question into consideration, the results of the study are aligned with a previous study conducted by Loerscher (1997), who concluded that in every stage of process-oriented translation, such as translating and revising, the feedback and mediation offered by the teacher would help students improve their performance. The findings are also in agreement with an earlier study conducted by Shore (2001), who concluded that intervention assists students in enhancing their translation competence. Correspondingly, employing efficient intervention techniques would lead to pleasant changes in classroom settings (Dörnyei & Murphy, 2003). Likewise, the findings are consistent with the research work carried out by Chernov et al. (2004), who concluded that providing students with interpreting techniques and feedback could enrich their listening and interpreting abilities. In the same vein, Pietrzak (2014) confirmed that intervention and feedback from the teacher acts as assistance in process-oriented translation in both the translating and editing phases. Moreover, the findings are in line with the earlier study undertaken by Mahmoodzadeh and Mousavi Razavi (2014), who came to the conclusion that instructional feedback could enhance interpreting performance.

Indeed, as accentuated by Mellinger and Jiménez (2019), whereas language ability is useful in interpreting courses, gaining mastery over instructional techniques can enrich interpreting skills. This is why Woang (2021) emphasized that students can opt for those techniques and strategies that are conducive to interpreting competence so that teachers can focus on those kinds of intervention that work best for the students themselves. Meanwhile, it can be argued that there exists some shared discourse among the students with respect to the intervention types that are more effective, taking psychosocial and cultural aspects into account. For instance, this study showed that cathartic and supportive interventions are more conducive to students than catalytic interventions in certain contexts. Furthermore, Han and Zhao (2021) found empirical evidence that peer evaluators in interpreting training can accurately assess quality dimensions, thereby reinforcing the potential of peer-mediated intervention as a complementary mechanism to teacher feedback in interpreting courses. In the same vein, more recently, Chen et al. (2023) concluded that scaffolding through structured peer and teacher interactions yields greater gains in translation accuracy compared with traditional feedback-only methods, confirming the findings of the present study.

This study found that catalytic intervention was less effective than cathartic and supportive approaches. This may be due to contextual

factors: in cathartic and supportive interventions, teachers offer encouragement and invite students to express themselves, whereas catalytic intervention requires learners to engage in self-discovery and problem-solving, which demands deeper reflection and greater involvement. Hence, students may experience confusion and frustration when unable to find solutions independently, as they are often used to spoon-fed instruction rather than prompt-based pedagogy, which is designed to cultivate critical thinking, promote self-regulation, and strengthen autonomous learning. An important aspect of this debate is the need to adopt teaching methods that stimulate students' mental alertness, strengthen critical thinking, and encourage them to solve problems independently through the use of implicit prompts and hints. This approach has also been emphasized by Shahrokhi and Nikbakht (2024). Moreover, it should be noted that the absence of a control group because of practical constraints raises questions about the validity of the findings; the results of the study can only suggest that certain facilitative interventions are more effective than others, rather than proving they are superior to standard practice.

Concerning the second research question of the study, the results of the responses from the interviews indicated that the integration of cognitive and emotional interventions would help the students empower their interpreting skills, which has been accentuated by Shore (2001) and Khorsand and Modarresi (2023), who found that cognitive and emotional interventions from the teacher are conducive to learning development. Actually, the emotional encouragement and supportive behaviors by the teachers would arouse positive feelings and make students involved in accomplishing the tasks. In this regard, the findings are consistent with the earlier research project carried out by Riccardi et al. (1998), who came to the conclusion that emotional factors are meaningfully associated with interpreting performance. Moreover, the results of the interviews revealed that students find the role of interventions motivating and challenging, which is in line with the findings by Çayırdağ (2011), who concluded that those who are more engaged in accomplishing an interpreting task navigate more emotions and express inspirations towards the tasks they do.

Moreover, the responses emerged from the interviews revealed that students who were exposed to facilitative interventions were mostly satisfied with the instructions provided by the teacher and they found the interventions new and different which were engaging and increased their self-efficacy and this is aligned with the conclusions reached by Pietrzak (2014) who found that interventions could act as facilitative tools for the

students to become engaged and succeed in their translation practice. Likewise, the study conducted by Azizi and Modarresi (2017) revealed that attention to intellectual, cognitive, and emotional factors is conducive to translation performance. Likewise, Chiu and Hew (2018) confirmed that attending to cognitive processes was strongly associated with comprehending the message uttered by the speaker. Similar to the findings of the current study, Modarresi (2019) concluded that translation students who are more involved create better translations. The results of the interviews showed that knowledge of interpreting assessment galvanizes the students to focus on different aspects of interpreting, and similarly, the study undertaken by Modarresi et al. (2021) indicated that knowledge of assessment literacy, including techniques and strategies, is helpful in translation performance. The study is in line with the earlier study by Guo et al. (2023), who found that interventions increase learners' self-efficacy through teacher modeling, which in turn fortifies sustained motivation.

Likewise, Harvey et al. (2023) confirmed that facilitative interventions over time largely enrich learner agency and engagement. Similarly, an interview-based investigation in graduate language education (Wang & Wang, 2024) revealed that students who employed diverse emotion regulation strategies received varied types of teacher support, which jointly heightened their emotional and behavioral engagement, thereby extending the conclusions of Baghery Moghadam and Modarresi (2025), who found that the regulation of emotions is closely related to translation engagement and performance. In the same vein, recent observational research in public service interpreting (Campanella, 2024) highlights that emotional labor regulations are critical and must be explicitly addressed in interpreter training to support both performance quality and emotional well-being.

6. Conclusion and Implications

Working on facilitative interventions while working on interpreting skills highlights the fact that during the last two decades, there has been a shift in paradigm in interpreting studies from a product-based perspective to a process-based perspective, focusing on what is going on in the mind of the interpreters. According to Laviosa (2008), the attention to psychological factors positively influences students' interpreting performance, and this study illustrates that psychological factors contribute to the quality of interpreting as they can be reinforced by emotional feedback and interventions from the teacher. The empirical findings in this study provide a new understanding of the provision of interventions, both cognitively and emotionally, which can accelerate the

process of interpreting. Working on direct and indirect interventions, along with heated debates on the issues related to the merits and privileges of interventions, professionals in interpreting studies can develop a structured verbal/aural framework to deliver mediation, intervention, and assistance in the interpreting context. This verbal behavior can enormously contribute to building, fostering, and expanding teachers' immediacy in the classroom, leading to creating a more positive learning atmosphere, replete with support and assistance. Hence, teachers' awareness of intervention types and knowledge of facilitative interventions to implement these interventions play a fundamental role in preparing the grounds for successful learning. In brief, it can be concluded that interpreting courses are in special need of an interactive learning atmosphere in the Iranian context so as to build a unification of instruction and assessment, highlighting dynamic assessment. Interpreting courses should be based on a training and assessing paradigm, not a listening and testing paradigm. A learning atmosphere in which, through employing proper intervention models provided by interpreting teachers and geared to individuals' preferences, needs, and differences, their teacher immediacy is promoted and assistance is provided through a more efficient helping paradigm.

Interpreting students should try to reduce their boredom, distress, and anger while working on interpreting especially because the task of interpreting is taxing and need higher tolerance on the part of students, and they should focus on interpreting the tasks themselves and try to engage themselves in problem solving activities and not waiting for the teacher to provide them with the correct answer; otherwise, they regret for the lack of investment through which they could spend more time and exert more effort. As for the interpreting teachers, the role of mediation and scaffolding is crucial in interpreting courses since a more capable expert should provide hints and prompts to a less capable individual to precisely perform a learning task. The more they engage in providing cognitive and emotional interventions, the better the quality of their prompts, since facilitative interventions allow the classroom teacher to be a guide or facilitator who can enhance students' self-discovery and autonomy. To elucidate, interventions in interpreting courses provide teachers with rich feedback regarding the quality of their hints and emotional propositions, and they can improve the quality of the interventions they offer so as to accommodate the learners' needs. They are responsible for acting as energy boosters for the students since their accountability can create a positive environment through which competition can be incorporated into cooperation. Using the information

obtained from the intervention phase, teachers can understand the students' current levels of engagement and competency and try to elevate their engagement and empower their interpreting competence. Furthermore, teachers who are involved in interpreting training courses can help students to foster positive emotions and overcome negative emotions regarding the interpreting job. Finally, teachers can design lesson structures that incorporate and mix facilitative interventions, thereby scaffolding students' progression from guided reflection and practice to autonomous engagement in independent learning.

Although this study recommends some enlightening information, it has a number of limitations too. First, regarding the external generalizability of the findings, researchers need to be cautious because the sample is not representative of all BA translation students. Furthermore, more longitudinal research is needed to delve into the extent to which interventions can improve interpreting performance. Additionally, this study entailed no control group because of the limited number of students available. Indeed, according to Gass and Mackey (2016), while the use of a control group is normally suggested, in some circumstances, the inclusion of a control group might not be possible for practical reasons. Finally, there is a need for further research to compare facilitative and authoritative interventions with respect to interpreting skills across different universities. All in all, in order to provide a more comprehensive picture of interventions in interpreting courses, further studies may expand their scopes to examine how software tools and artificial intelligence can affect the correlation between interventions and interpreting competency.

Funding: This research received no external funding from any agency.
Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

Abbasian, M., & Modarresi, G. (2022). Tapping into software for oral communication: A comparative study of Adobe Connect and Skype. *Journal of Business, Communication & Technology, 1*(2), 34-43. https://doi.org/10.56632/bct.2022.1204

AlGhamdi, R. (2024). Exploring the impact of ChatGPT-generated feedback on technical writing skills of computing students: A blinded study. *Education and Information Technologies*, *29*(14), 18901-18926. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-024-12594-2

Alinouri, L., & Badpa, H. (2025). A form-focused translation criticism: A case study of the Persian translation of As I Lay Dying by Dara

Bandari. *Journal of Language, Culture, and Translation, 7*(2), 40-61. https://doi.org/10.71864/lct-2025-1199540

Angelelli, C. (2009). Using a rubric to assess translation ability: Defining the construct. In C. Angelelli, & H. Jacobson, *Testing and assessment in translation and interpreting studies* (pp. 13-48). John Benjamins Publication Company.

Arjmandi, A., & Ghafari, M. R. (2025). From adaptation to survival: Metaphoric ecology in translation and language systems. *Journal of Language, Culture, and Translation, 8*(1), 27-42. https://doi.org/10.71864/lct-2025-1213874

Ashmore, R. (1999). Heron's intervention framework: An introduction and critique. *Mental Health Nursing*, *19*(1), 24-27.

Azizi, M., & Modarresi, Gh. (2017). The relationship between crystallized intelligence and translation performance of undergraduate translation students. *Iranian Journal of Translation Studies, 15*(57), 87-102.

Baghery Moghadam, F., & Modarresi, Gh. (2025). Exploring the role of reading emotions, emotion regulation, and translation involvement in translation performance. *Forum, 23*(2). Online Available. https://doi.org/10.1075/forum.24020.bag

Boos, M., Kobi, M., Elmer, S., & Jäncke, L. (2022). The influence of experience on cognitive load during simultaneous interpretation. *Brain and Language, 234*, 1-14. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bandl.2022.105185

Buck, G. (2001). *Assessing listening*. Cambridge University Press.

Campanella, A. G. (2024). Emotional labor and affective skills in public service interpreting: expanding the competence models. *FITISPos International Journal*, *11*(1), 44-64. https://doi.org/10.37536/FITISPos-IJ.2024.11.1.379

Çayırdağ, N. (2011). *Creativity in adulthood*. MA Thesis, University of Georgia.

Chen, S. (2017). The construct of cognitive load in interpreting and its measurement. *Perspectives*, *25*(4), 640-657. https://doi.org/10.1080/0907676X.2016

Chen, G., Wang, X., & Wang, L. (2023). Developing assessment literacy among trainee translators: scaffolding self and peer assessment as an intervention. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *48*(6), 888-902. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2022.2142515

Chernov, G. V., Hild, A., & Setton, R. (2004). Inference and anticipation in simultaneous interpreting.

Chi, M. T. H. (2006). Two approaches to the study of experts' characteristics. In K. A. Ericsson, N. Charness, P. J. Feltovich & R. R.

Hoffman (Eds.). *Cambridge handbook of expertise and expert performance* (pp. 21-30). Cambridge University Press.

Chiu, T. K., & Hew, T. K. (2018). Factors influencing peer learning and performance in MOOC asynchronous online discussion forum. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, *34*(4), 16-28. https://doi.org/10.14742/ajet.3240

Christoffels, I. K., De Groot, A. M., & Kroll, J. F. (2006). Memory and language skills in simultaneous interpreters: The role of expertise and language proficiency. *Journal of memory and language*, *54*(3), 324-345. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jml.2005.12.004

Cohen, J. W. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Darwish, A. (2006). Standards of simultaneous interpreting in live satellite broadcasts: Arabic case study. *Translation Watch Quarterly*, *2*(2), 55-88.

Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics*. Oxford University Press.

Dörnyei, Z., & Murphey, T. (2003). *Group dynamics in the language classroom* (Vol. 10). Cambridge University Press.

Gao, X., Noroozi, O., Gulikers, J., Biemans, H. J., & Banihashem, S. K. (2024). A systematic review of the key components of online peer feedback practices in higher education. *Educational Research Review*, *42*, 1-27. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2023.100588

Garrison, D. R., Cleveland-Innes, M., Koole, M., & Kappelman, J. (2006). Revisiting methodological issues in transcript analysis: Negotiated coding and reliability. *The internet and higher education*, *9*(1), 1-8. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iheduc.2005.11.001

Gass, S. M., & Mackey, A. (2016). *Stimulated recall methodology in applied linguistics and L2 research*. Routledge.

Gerver, D. (1975). A psychological approach to simultaneous interpretation. *Meta*, *20*(2), 119-128. https://doi.org/10.7202/002885ar

Gerver, D. (1976). Empirical studies of simultaneous interpretation: A review and a model. In Richard W. Brislin (Ed.), *Translation: Applications and research* (pp. 165-207). Gardner Press.

Gieshoff, A. C. (2021). The impact of visible lip movements on silent pauses in simultaneous interpreting. *Interpreting*, *23*(2), 168-191. https://doi.org/10.1075/intp.00061.gie

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

Graham, S. (2011). Self-efficacy and academic listening. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 10*, 113-117. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2011.04.001

Guastaferro, K., & Pfammatter, A. F. (2023). Guidance on selecting a translational framework for intervention development: optimizing interventions for impact. *Journal of Clinical and Translational Science, 7*(1), e119. https://doi.org/10.1017/cts.2023.546

Gunning, R. (1952). *The technique of clear writing*. McGraw-Hill.

Guo, K., Pan, M., Li, Y., & Lai, C. (2024). Effects of an AI-supported approach to peer feedback on university EFL students' feedback quality and writing ability. *The Internet and Higher Education, 63*, 100962. https://doi. org/10. 1016/j.iheduc.2024.100962

Guo, Y., Wang, Y., & Ortega-Martin, J. L. (2023). The impact of blended learning-based scaffolding techniques on learners' self-efficacy and willingness to communicate. *Porta Linguarum Revista Interuniversitaria de Didáctica de las Lenguas Extranjeras*, (40), 253-273. https://doi.org/10.30827/portalin.vi40.27061

Han, C., & Lu, X. (2023). Can automated machine translation evaluation metrics be used to assess students' interpretation in the language learning classroom? *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, *36*(5-6), 1064-1087. https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2021.1968915

Han, C., Xiao, R., & Su, W. (2021). Assessing the fidelity of consecutive interpreting: The effects of using source versus target text as the reference material. *Interpreting*, *23*(2), 245-268. https://doi.org/10.1075/intp.00058.han

Han, C., & Zhao, X. (2021). Accuracy of peer ratings on the quality of spoken-language interpreting. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *46*(8), 1299-1313. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2020.1855624

Handley, K., Price, M., & Millar, J. (2011). Beyond 'doing time': Investigating the concept of student engagement with feedback. *Oxford Review of Education, 37*(4), 543–560.

https:// doi. org/ 10. 1080/03054 985. 2011. 604951

Harvey, G., Collyer, et al. (2023). Navigating the facilitation journey: a qualitative, longitudinal evaluation of 'eat walk engage' novice and experienced facilitators. *BMC Health Services Research*, *23*(1), 1-13. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-023-10116-3

Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of educational research*, *77*(1), 81-112. https://doi.org/10.3102/003465430298487

Heron, J. (1976). A six-category intervention analysis. *British Journal of Guidance & Counseling, 4* (2), 143-55. https://doi.org/10.1080/03069887608256308

Heron, R. P. (1991). The institutionalization of leisure: cultural conflict and hegemony. *Society and Leisure*, *14*(1), 171-190. https://doi.org/10.1080/07053436.1991.10715378

Heron, J. (2001). *Helping the client: A creative, practical guide* (5th ed.). Sage Publication.

Hild, A. (2015). Discourse comprehension in simultaneous interpreting: The role of expertise and redundancy. In A. Ferreira, & J. W. Schwieter (Eds.), *Psycholinguistic and cognitive inquiries into translation and interpreting* (pp. 67-100). John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Hosseini, H. S., & Modarresi, Gh. (2015). Construction, validation, and application of CALL knowledge scale for EFL learners and its relationship with their L2 writing skills. *Foreign Language Research Journal, 5*(2), 309-311. https://doi.org/10.22059/jflr.2015.62552

Huang, D. F., Li, F., & Guo, H. (2023). Chunking in simultaneous interpreting: The impact of task complexity and translation directionality on lexical bundles. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *14*, 1-14. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1252238

Jalilzadeh, K., Modarresi, G., & Rouhani, H. (2020). A Comparative study of instruction types and reading comprehension for young learners. In H. H. Uysal (Ed.), *Political, pedagogical and research insight into early language education* (pp. 123-132). Cambridge University Press.

Kashanizadeh, I., Ketabi, S., & Mohsen Shahrokhi, M. (2024). Designing and validating a technological innovation scale for the English as foreign language learning context. *Journal of Language, Culture, and Translation, 7*(1), 19-42. https://doi.org/ 10.71864/lct-2024-1129883

Khorami Nia, F., & Modarresi, Gh. (2019). A Rasch-based validation of the evaluation rubric for consecutive interpreting performance. *Sendebar, 30*, 221-244. https://doi.org/10.30827/sendebar.v30i0.8512

Khorsand, M., & Modarresi, Gh. (2023). The relationship between teachers' emotions, strokes and academic achievement: the case of BA English-major students. *Language and Translation Studies*, *56*(2), 71-107. https://doi.org/10.22067/lts.2023.81620.1179

Koltovskaia, S. (2020). Student engagement with automated written corrective feedback (AWCF) provided by Grammarly: A multiple case study. *Assessing Writing, 44*, 100450. https:// doi. org/ 10.1016/j. asw. 2020. 100450

Lai, W. (2012). *Concept-based foreign language pedagogy: Teaching the Chinese temporal system.* Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. The Pennsylvania State University. University Park, PA.

Laviosa, S. (2008). Translation. In R. B. Kaplan, *The Oxford Handbook of Applied Linguistics* (pp. 474-489). Oxford University Press.

Lee, J. (2017). Professional interpreters' job satisfaction and relevant factors: A case study of trained interpreters in South Korea. *Translation and Interpreting Studies*, *12*(3), 427-448. https://doi.org/10.1075/tis.12.3.04lee

Loerscher, W. (1997). *Process analytical approach to translation and implications for translations*. The Kent State University Press.

Mahmoodzadeh, K., & Razavi, M. S. M. (2014). Interpreter-Training-Specific Techniques: A Didactic Approach. *Iranian Journal of Translation Studies, 12*(46), 1-15.

Masek, A., Salleh, K. M., & Alias, M. (2022). A hybrid facilitation model for inexperienced students via integration of teacher-centered and student-centered roles. *Journal of Engineering Education Transformations, 35*(2), 156-164. http://dx.doi.org/10.16920/jeet/2022/v35is2/22126

McMahon, A., Seery, C., Moorhead, S., & O'Brien, G. (2023). Analysis of supervisory interventions in a transdisciplinary youth mental health service. *Psychological Services, 20*(2), 256-266. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/ser0000695

Mellinger, C. D., & Jiménez, L. G. (2019). Challenges and opportunities for heritage language learners in interpreting courses in the US context. *Revista Signos. Estudios de Lingüística, 52*(101), 950-974. https://doi.org/10.4067/S0718-09342019000300950.

Méndez, F. Z., Ingles, C. J., & Hidalgo, M. D. (2001). The shortened Spanish version of the personal report of confidence as speaker: Reliability and validity in adolescent population. *Behavioral Psychology 12*(1), 25-42.

Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (3rd ed.). Sage.

Modarresi, Gh. (2021). The effect of dictogloss vs. debating on L2 writing proficiency: A mixed-methods study. *Journal of Teaching Language Skills*, *40*(4), 121-160. https://doi.org/ 10.22099/jtls.2021.39939.2954.

Modarresi, Gh. (2019). Developing and validating involvement in translation scale and its relationship with translation ability. *Forum: International Journal of Interpreting and Translation, 17*(2), 225-248. https://doi.org/10.1075/forum.18015.mod

Modarresi, G. (2009). Collocational errors of Iranian EFL learners in written English. *TELL*, *3*(1), 135- 154.

Modarresi, G., & Ghoreyshi, S. V. (2018). Student-centered corrections of translations and translation accuracy: A case of BA translation students. *Translation Studies, 15*(60), 11-28.

Modarresi, Gh., & Jalilzadeh, K. (2020). A comparative study of two ways of presentation of listening assessment: Moving towards internet-based assessment. *Language Teaching and Educational Research, 3*(2), 176-194. https://doi.org/10.35207/later.742121

Modarresi, Gh., Jalilzadeh, K., & Zolfaghary, R. (2020). Interpretation strategies and interpretation performance in interlingual and bilingual subtitling: A case of Iranian BA translation students. *REiLA: Journal of Research and Innovation in Language*, *2*(3), 109-120. https://doi.org/1031849/reila.v2i3.5589.

Modarresi, Gh., Jalilzadeh, K., Coombe, K., & Nooshab, A. (2021). Validating a test to measure translation teachers' assessment literacy. *The Journal of Asia TEFL, 18*(4), 1503-1511. https://doi.org/10.22132/tel.2014.53816.

Negueruela, E., & Lantolf, J.P. (2006). Concept-based pedagogy and the acquisition of L2 Spanish. In R. M. Salaberry & B. A. Lafford (Eds.), *The art of teaching Spanish: Second language acquisition from research to praxis* (pp. 79-102). Georgetown University Press.

Neunzig, W., & Tanqueiro, H. (2005). Teacher feedback in online education for trainee translators. *Meta*, *50*(4). https://doi.org/10.7202/019873ar

Niranjana, T. (2023). *Siting translation: History, post-structuralism, and the colonial context*. University of California Press.

Pietrzak, P. (2014). Towards effective feedback to translation students. *Intralinea*, 1-9. https://www.intralinea.org/specials/article/2095.

Pöchhacker, F. (2023). History, community, accessibility: Interpreting studies extended. In A. Biernacka, & W. Figiel (Eds.), *New insights into interpreting studies: Technology, society and access* (pp. 17-36). Peter Lang.

Pöchhacker, F. (2004). *Introducing interpreting studies*. Routledge.

Pöchhacker, F. (2011). Quality assurance in simultaneous interpreting. In C. Dollerup & A. Lindegaard (Eds.), *Teaching translation and interpreting 2* (pp. 233-242). John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Rahmanpanah, H. (2023). The gravitational model of language availability and interpreting: A critical review. *Journal of Language,*

Culture, and Translation, 6(1), 163-176. https://doi.org/ 10.71864/lct-2024-1123077

Rahmanpanah, H. (2022). Consecutive interpreting in a nutshell. *Journal of Language, Culture, and Translation, 4*(2), 46-65. https://doi.org/10.30495/LCT.2022.1949877.1051

Riccardi, A. (2011). Language-specific strategies in simultaneous interpreting. In C. Dollerup & V. Appel (Eds.), Teaching translation and interpreting 3: New horizons (pp. 213-222). John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Riccardi A., Marinuzzi G., & Zecchin S. (1998). Interpretation and stress. *The Interpreters' Newsletter 8*, 93-106.

Rollinson, P. (2005). Using peer feedback in the ESL writing class. *ELT journal, 59*(1), 23-30. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/cci003

Rouhani, H., & Modarresi, Gh. (2023). The role of translation-based, meaning-based, and hint-based instructions in vocabulary acquisition: A mixed-methods study. *Iranian Journal of Applied Language Studies, 15*(1), 83-100. https://doi.org/10.22111/ijals.2023.38276.2156.

Schiavi, G. (1996). There is always a teller in the tale. *Target*, *8*(1), 1-21. https://doi.org/10.1075/target.8.1.02sch

Setton, R. (1999). *Simultaneous interpretation*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Sha, L., Wang, X., Ma, S., & Mortimer, T. A. (2022). Investigating the effectiveness of anonymous online peer feedback in translation technology teaching. *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer*, *16*(3), 325-347. https://doi.org/10.1080/1750399X.2022.2097984

Shahrokhi, M., & Nikbakht, L. (2024). Investigating the association among Iranian intermediate EFL learners' critical thinking, L2 grit, problem solving, and resilience: A structural equation modelling. *Journal of Foreign Language Research, 14*(3), 385-401. https://doi.org/10.22059/jflr.2024.379089.1140

Shen, B., Bai, B., & Xue, W. (2020). The effects of peer assessment on learner autonomy: an empirical study in a Chinese college English writing class. *Student Educational Evaluation, 64*,100821. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2019.100821

Shore, S. (2001). Teaching translation. In E. Steiner, & C. Yallop (Eds.), *Exploring translation and multilingual text production: Beyond content* (pp. 249-276). Walter de Gruyter.

Sistani, H. (2024). Review of critical applied linguistics: A critical re-introduction (Pennycook, 2021). *Journal of Language, Culture, and Translation, 6*(2), 46-51. https://doi.org/10.71864/lct-2024-1122701

Sloan, G. (2006). *Clinical supervision in mental health nursing*. Whurr Publishers.

Sloan, G., & Watson, H. (2002). Clinical supervision models for nursing: Structure, research and limitations. *Nursing Standard*, *17*(4), 41-46. http://dx.doi.org/10.7748/ns2002.10.17.4.41.c3279

Vandergrift, L. (2003). Orchestrating strategy use: Toward a model of the skilled second language listener. *Language Learning*, *53*(4), 463-496. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9922.00232

Wang, K., and Han, C. (2013). Accomplishment in the multitude of counselors: peer feedback in translation training. *Translation & Interpretation, 5*, 62-75.https://doi.org/10.12807/ti.105202.2013.a05

Wang, Y., & Wang, S. (2024). The joint roles of emotion regulation and teacher support in shaping academic engagement among Chinese graduate students majoring in foreign languages: A qualitative study. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, *12*(3), 93-111. https://doi.org/10.30466/ijltr.2024.121578

Washbourne, K. (2014). Beyond error marking: Written corrective feedback for a dialogic pedagogy in translator training. *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer*, *8*(2), 240-256. https://doi.org/10.1080/1750399X.2014.908554

Wei, W., Yu, Y., & Gao, G. (2022). Investigating learners' changing expectations on learning experience in a MOOC of professional translation and interpreter training. *SAGE Open*, *12*(4), 1-11. https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440221134577

Wen, Z., Teng, M. F., Han, L., & Zeng, Y. (2022). Working memory models and measures in language and bilingualism research: Integrating cognitive and affective perspectives. *Brain Sciences*, *12*(6), 1-16. https://doi.org/10.3390/brainsci12060729

Woang, J. P. (2021). Translation activities on oral translation and written translation. *Applied Translation*, *15*(1), 28-38. https://doi.org/10.51708/apptrans.v15n1.1402

Xing, S., & Yang, J. (2023). The Impact of interpreting training experience on the attentional networks and their dynamics. *Brain Sciences*, *13*(9), 1-16. https://doi.org/10.3390/brainsci13091306

Xu, Q., & Ouyang, Q. (2023). Unleashing the power of meta-knowledge: Towards cumulative learning in interpreter training. *Interpreting and Society*, *3*(2), 169-194. https://doi.org/10.1177/27523810231193337

Xu, S., Su, Y., & Liu, K. (2025). Investigating student engagement with AI-driven feedback in translation revision: A mixed-methods study. *Education and Information Technologies. Online available.* https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-025-13457-0

Yu, Y., Ji, Z., Han, J., & Zhang, Z. (2020). Episode-based prototype generating network for zero-shot learning. *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 14035-14044.

Zhu, X., & Aryadoust, V. (2022). A synthetic review of cognitive load in distance interpreting: Toward an explanatory model. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *13*, 1-18. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.899718