

## **Dealing With Communication Challenges during Interpretation of Church Sermons in UASIN GISHU County, Kenya**

**Jane Jepkoech Sing'oei Biamah**

Department of Kiswahili and other African Languages

Moi University

P.O. Box 3900, Eldoret, Kenya.

### **Abstract**

*The study was to find out the problems encountered during sermon interpretations and attempts made by preachers and interpreters to overcome them. It was conducted in Uasin Gishu County in Kenya where data was collected from 10 randomly sampled churches. Six congregants, one preacher and one interpreter were randomly selected from each of the sampled churches to respond to items in the research questionnaires and interviews. The other methods used to collect data were participant observation and tape recording. The collected data was analyzed descriptively. The study concluded that a number of challenges affect the interpretation process in churches. These challenges include issues of language competence of preachers, interpreters as well as the congregants, and also interpreters' experience and understanding of the cultural contexts of the faithful. The study recommends that training should be offered to interpreters for their specific role of interpreting. It recommends that training should also involve development of linguistic and non-linguistic skills such as cultural knowledge. The study makes useful reading for those interested on interpretation issues, especially as far as ensuring maximum effect in terms of communicating the intended message is concerned. The preachers and interpreters may also benefit from the study, especially by learning how to respond promptly to unexpected challenges during preaching. The work will also be important to establishing a curriculum base for a course on interpretation for specific purposes.*

**Keywords:** Dealing, Communication Challenges, Interpretation, Church Sermons, Uasin Gishu County, Kenya

### **Introduction**

Language is one central and important pillar in communication. It is used to facilitate communication between individuals and groups. Besides being used as a tool for communication, language is also used as a tool and a means to resolve misunderstandings and to unite people of different languages and class backgrounds. Moreover, different thoughts and ideas are communicated to intended audiences through the use of language. Human beings are known to be able to identify and preserve different environmental conditions by use of language. Halliday (1973) postulates that almost all interactive and communication processes among human beings cannot succeed without the use of language.

In order for communication to succeed, language uses voiced symbols in order to pass a message from speaker to a listener and from the writer to the reader. However, in the event that one specific audience fails to understand a certain language, call it language "A", (English language in the context of this paper), then there is need to get the message and to communicate with the speaker of, say, language "B" (Kiswahili language speaker in the context of this paper). In such context, for the message and communication thus so needed to be realized it will be necessary to employ an interpreter, in order to complete the communication process. The interpreter then comes in handy as a communication bridge between the speaker of the source language and the audience who understands the second language. The translator therefore communicates the message from one language of the original speaker, to the audience using the language they understand. By so doing, the translator breaks the communication barrier which may be caused by a character in the communication process not understanding one of the languages used. The interpreter does not only take the role of bridging different people for communication purposes. He/she also has other roles in the community they serve. For example, the interpreter will also be passing cultural (traditional) messages from one community to another.

Interpretation is also used as a skill and a way of teaching a second language or a foreign language. In this context, the second language thus used is then interpreted into the first language in order to make the learner understand the whole process faster (Newmark, 1988b; Appel & Muysken, 1987). The field of interpretation has been researched on by many scholars. These include Schlosberg (1952), Bryson (1959), Catford (1965), Brierre (1978), Ali (1981), Ellis and McClintock (1990), and Okeiga (1998). They all recognize the interpreter as having an important aspect in communication; that the interpreter acts as a bridge over which communication and understanding crosses from the speaker, to reach his audience. In this context, successful communication highly depends on the interpreter.

The languages of Kiswahili and English are widely used in the field of interpretation in Kenya. Many scholars and researchers consider the English language as one that is important as it facilitates success in the fields of economy, education and in social issues (Mbaabu, 1985b; Osinde, 1986; Wardaugh, 1987; Okeiga, 1998). However, in the field of linguistics, there is no language that is of less importance than another. Language is considered dynamic as it grows and changes with its usage. The Kiswahili language is able to maintain and sustain various fields of usage as it has grown substantially in the field of vocabulary. On the other hand, Kiswahili as a language has been in use since the 18<sup>th</sup> century as a cooperate language. Even though the language is known to unite different social classes of people together, there are those who have the perception that it is not as important in its usage. It is also known that Kiswahili was used to facilitate different types of businesses and in the spread the Islam religion. With the coming of missionaries in the coastal region of Eastern Africa, Kiswahili was also used to spread Christianity (Whiteley 1969).

The missionary period was soon followed by the coming of the colonialists, in the context of Kenya. The colonialists, who were exclusively white, attended their own churches different from Africans. In this case, each group and the church they attended were free to choose and use whatever language best suited them. In the course of historical events, the colonialist left and Kenya became independent. The first president of independent Kenya, the late Mzee Jomo Kenyatta, was faced with a very big challenge of uniting Kenyans. In his leadership, it was therefore made a policy that Kiswahili be used as a national language, as an effort to bring unity to the nation (Republic of Kenya, 1974; Mbaabu, 1985a). With the initialization of the 8-4-4 system of education, Kiswahili language was elevated higher as it became one of the subjects in the syllabus. It was both compulsory and examinable upon completion of class eight and Form Four. This step contributed largely to making Kiswahili language widespread throughout the country and gain more importance.

Currently, Kiswahili language has gained ground among Kenyan of all social levels. Its use has been witnessed in many activities and in the facilitation of communication in such areas as in teaching, hospitals, the courts, the market places, in the churches to name but just a few. The place and use of Kiswahili language in many social and official places is an indication that a big percentage of Kenyans understand the language. This therefore gives the message that when Kiswahili language is used in the churches, the faithful understand the preacher and the message thus passed. However, despite the fact that many Kenyans understand Kiswahili, other churches prefer to employ the use of an interpreter. This is one of the main reasons the author carried out research to try and establish the reasons that contribute to the use of interpreters during preaching sessions while most Kenyans have competence in the use of Kiswahili language.

### **Limitations of the Study**

The study was conducted in only one county (Uasin Gishu) in Kenya. As such, the findings on the hindrances and coping strategies to achieving communication through interpretation in churches as discussed in this paper may not speak of the cases in other areas. Nevertheless, the study provides a framework for undertaking similar studies in other areas as well as contributing useful references for general studies in the field of interpretation.

### **Materials and Methods**

The research was conducted in Uasin Gishu County and focused on the Christian religion only. Sampling was done randomly. Initially, the author intended to select five churches in which preaching was done by way of interpretation from English to Kiswahili, and other five whereby preaching was done through interpretation from Kiswahili language to English. However, when she went into the field, she realized that churches that conducted preaching through interpretation based this on interpretation of English towards Kiswahili, only. Therefore, in all the churches where the author conducted the research, interpretation was done from English to Kiswahili.

In some of the sermons not researched on, preaching was conducted using purely one language, either English or Kiswahili. Therefore, there was no need for interpretation. In other churches, more than two services were conducted, but in each service a specific language was used to conduct the preaching.

Therefore, the sample of ten churches represented the larger number of churches that used interpretation as a means to transmit the sermon. This, research was conducted in the following churches: Deliverance, City Harvest, International Vision Centre, Pentecostal Assemblies of God, Christian Outreach church, Happy Church, Lost Glory Restoration Church, Winners Chapel, Eldoret Valley Baptist, and Gracious Mission. In each church, the author chose one preacher, one interpreters and six faithful as respondents. The age of the respondents did not matter. What mattered was that the faithful knew how to read and write either in English language or Kiswahili language. In total, there were 80 respondents; 10 preachers, 10 interpreters and 60 faithful. All the faithful could read and write in English and Kiswahili languages.

This research involved the use of questionnaires, tape recorder, question and answer method for data collection. The author also directly took part in the research by attending in person some of the sermons. She listened in on the preaching that she researched on. The main aim of taking part in the sermons was to collect data that could not be captured through tape recording and the filling of the questionnaires. The author therefore listened, watched and reflected on all the occurrences and took short notes that could lead to further oral questions, all meant to come up with more data that could help meet the research objectives. The data gathered was analyzed using a descriptive method, whereby the relation between the results and the objectives was shown. The description showed the situations by giving real examples. The recorded information and data was analyzed by first extracting examples that could justify the null hypothesis of the research.

### ***Results and Discussion***

The perception in the research was that some interpreters do not accomplish the intended communication. Instead, they contribute to the distortion of the message. There are many factors that bring about this, and all are centred on the methods of interpretation used. This paper shows the causes of failed communication during interpretation and how interpreters and preachers try to cope with these challenges.

#### **Unclear Vocabulary**

The results from the research show that sometimes the interpreters lack ideal synonym in the target language to some of the words that the preacher uses. The author witnessed some interpreters using complicated vocabulary that was beyond the comprehension of the faithful. Sixty percent of the 60 faithful interviewed attested to this. Seventy percent of the 10 preachers interviewed were of the opinion that for communication to be clear and successful, the interpreter has no option other than using simple and understandable vocabulary that does not confuse the faithful. These respondents agreed that the use of high level vocabulary distorts the intended message. In consideration that majority of the faithful in research area have learned Kiswahili as a second language, it is clear that the level of Kiswahili used by the interpreter can affect presentation of the message.

It is also evident that it is not only the interpreters who used a difficult vocabulary. Sometimes the preachers used a high level vocabulary which the interpreters did not understand. A clear 100% of the interpreters interviewed conceded that many times the preachers used a vocabulary they could not understand, this on top of some words which they could forget to grasp their meaning. Fifty of the interpreters interviewed attested to the above fact that sometimes they did not understand the meaning of the words used by the preachers. In order to circumvent this problem, the interpreters simply did not interpret such words; instead, they simply repeated the words as used by the preachers.

#### **Example 1**

Preacher: Using the capture recapture method, the devil will eventually ruin and kill you

Interpreter: Kwa kutumia mbinu ya capture and recapture, adui hatimaye atakuharibu na kukuuu.

In this example, the interpreter has repeated the preacher's words "capture and recapture" and presented them directly to the faithful. The faithful who did not understand the English language did not get the message. This example is clear proof that whenever the interpreter was presented with a difficult word or phrase, then the faithful bore the brunt by not getting the intended message as the interpreter would break the chain of communication by repeating the same difficult word or phrase.

Ten percent of the interpreters interviewed said that they would always prompt the preacher to substantiate their difficult vocabulary. Another 20% said that they would simply guess for a synonym that would best explain the difficult word depending on the preacher's theme, or depending on the meanings of the words in the rest of the sentence. A further 20% of the interviewed interpreters said that, in the event that the preacher used some difficult words, they would always be bailed out by the faithful who could understand the meanings of the said words. But if no help came in hand fast enough, they would simply skip the section with difficult words and proceed. The author witnessed the above scenario in three of the churches she visited. In one incident, the interpreter missed out on the meaning of a word; then one faithful came up to his aid.

Another interpreter was not able to give the intended message and neither did he get any help from the faithful. He therefore just mentioned a few words and hesitated. When the preacher continued, the interpreter as well continued and ignored the gap that was left by the uninterpreted words.

### **Example 2**

Preacher: The issue of Golan Heights was outrageous in Jerusalem.

Interpreter: Swala la Yerusalem la ---, la --- [After some time the preacher continued]

Preacher: This issue still lingers on the minds of many men.

Interpreter: Swala hili inagali inakumbukwa na watu wengi.

From this example, it is clear that the interpreter could neither understand nor interpret the phrase: '...Golan Heights was outrageous...' despite the fact that this was the phrase that carried the main message in the statement. The faithful therefore could not get the intended message. The interpreter was faced with several challenges: he could not understand or interpret the difficult section; was not aware of the historical events surrounding the Israelites and the Arabs. The interpretation could not carry this message home to the faithful. Some complex grammatical concepts based on morphology, semantics and syntax are difficult to understand and to be interpreted adequately. Many times the preacher could also use their knowledge of source language, or lengthen their turn of speech, and all these became too complex for the interpreter. Whenever the preacher used a simple language, the interpreter would get the message quickly and interpret it to the faithful. The above example is a proof of how a long complex sentence confuses the interpreters thus breaking the process of communication.

### **Preacher's Speed of Speech**

The author's participatory approach to the research enabled her to prove that there are clear differences that arise from the preacher's speed of speech. On the other hand, there is no clear recommended speed of speech during preaching. Earlier researchers have also shown that receptors of spoken speeches have individual ability to receive and understand messages. Some are fast while others are slow. There is no doubt then that these facts can affect the interpreter such that they may not match the preacher's speed while interpreting.

The research in Uasin Gishu County witnessed some preachers being fast during their preaching, and the interpreters' effort to match the same speed. Six (60%) of the 10 interpreters confirmed that some preachers could get carried away and increase their tempo of speech. This caused overlap of the preacher and interpreter, resulting in some form of noise and unclear message. The preacher's high speed of speech forced some interpreters to skip sections of their speech uninterpreted. At least 50% of the 10 interpreters interviewed confirmed that whenever the preacher was fast in their speech, they would get mixed up. In such a case, they would only use words according to the context of the sermon. These experiences occurring from the preacher's speed confirmed that at times the faithful could miss the intended message almost at 100% rate. In this case one would see no need of an interpreter, since the question would be: if the preacher was in need of the interpreter, then he would be given a chance to interpret.

### **Interpreter's Competence in Source Language and Target Language**

Competence is the ability that is associated with speaker of a language to speak eloquently, listen to others as they speak the said language and to understand others. Whenever a speaker or a listener of a language lacks competence in it, then communication becomes difficult (Chomsky, 1995). In the research, the author realized that knowledge in some areas like Agriculture and Anthropology, can actually better one's knowledge and use of language. This is because these fields help one to build their competence in the use of language. The skill of interpretation seemed to improve with the interpreter's knowledge of the source language and target language, the source of their knowledge notwithstanding.

The research also found out that some interpreters were not having enough competence in either English or Kiswahili, or even both languages. They therefore could not complete the required communication, by not giving the message as it was intended, to the faithful. This came as a result of not understanding some of the pronunciation from the source language, or simply not knowing how to present a particular phrase in the target language.

### **Example 3**

Preacher: Using the capture and recapture method, the devil will eventually ruin and kill you

Interpreter: Kwa kutumia mbinu ya capture and recapture, adui hatimaye atakuharibu na kukuuu.

The interpreter in this example expresses a low competence in the source language. That is why he could not interpret the English words 'Capture' and 'Re-capture'. Instead, he just repeated the way they were used by the preacher. Competence in a language also involves knowledge in its vocabulary. Ninety percent of the interpreters conceded that they could not understand some of the words used either in English or Kiswahili Language. They said that their success as interpreters is a result of competence in the vocabulary of the languages that one are commonly used during interpretation. It is therefore evident that the interpreter who has a 20% competence in the use of Kiswahili terminologies will have a poor performance than the one who has a 40% competence. It was, however, evident that competence in grammar is not enough for one to make good interpretation; competence in communication is more central for success in interpretation. This is because interpreters were seen to do better in message presentation when the right content was considered. These are the reasons that made some faithful to claim that some of the interpreters used complex terminologies, that the faithful could not grasp the meaning contained in it.

### **Example 4**

Preacher: It is time we elect godly men who will be transparent and accountable to us.

Interpreter: Imefika wakati tuwateue watu wanaomcha Mungu ambao watadhihirisha uwazi na watawajibikia kazi zao.

The author interacted with 30% of six faithful and asked questions after service. The aim was to find out if they understood the words "uwajibikaji" and "uwazi". They were in agreement that they did not understand the meanings of these words; they also did not make any effort to find out from the interpreter to give them a simpler version of what he meant. It is therefore clear that the message did not get to the faithful who entirely depended on the interpreter. Of all the interpreters interviewed during this research, eight had completed secondary school education. Two of them did not complete secondary school education. All did not have any formal training on interpretation. Ninety (90%) of the 10 preachers and 70% of the 10 interpreters were in agreement that formal training on interpretation skills would make the interpreters competent, while the rest claimed that formal training on interpretation skills were an abstract concept that could not make them better interpreters. Eighty percent of the 60 faithful interviewed said that such training would benefit the interpreters, whereas 20% were not sure if such training would benefit interpreters or not. It was also evident that interpreters who did not have competence in Kiswahili language used words that were closely related to the concept of the preaching, though they did not represent the exact concept in the target language. This is shown in the following example:

### **Example 5**

Preacher: In the same chapter verse 14 God says

Interpreter: Kwenye sura ile ile kifungu cha 14 Mungu anasema

Preacher: If my people shall humble themselves and pray

Interpreter: Ikiwa watu wangu watatulia na kuomba

Preacher: Watanyenyekea na kuomba

Interpreter: Ikiwa watu wangu watanyenyekea na kuomba.

From the above example it is evident that the interpreter missed the synonym of the word "humble" and instead used the phrase "watatulia", which closely resembles the meaning of the concept "humble". The concept of "wakenyenyekea" had to be elaborated by the preacher in his effort to rectify the interpreter. If the preacher had not realized the interpreter's weakness, the message would definitely not have been transmitted from original to target language. This proves that such a condition would hinder communication. These results are in agreement with the theory of functional comparative interpretation which states that interpretation can be successful only when the interpreter comprehends the culture and language of source language and that of the target language.

It is also clear that the interpreter who maintains continuity in communication must have competence in the first language as well as target language. The results also show that sometimes the interpreter may miss out on the words or whole phrases used by the Preacher. Because of this, some of the interpreters just placed words that did not appear in the preacher's message. This situation is contributed to by the interpreter's level of competence in the original and target language as evidenced in the example below.

#### **Example 6**

Preacher: A credible Christian cannot juggle both so as to uphold his reputation as a disciple.

Interpreter: Mkristo mwenyewe hausiki na zote kama mwanafunzi wa Yesu.

The interpreter in the above example did not interpret the words "Credible" (wa kweli), "juggle" (changanya) and "reputation" (hadhi). He therefore used a vocabulary that does not bring the intended meaning. One interpreter who was interviewed agreed that he did not know the meanings of the words 'credible' 'juggle' and 'reputation'. The following is the structure in which the sentence would have appeared: "mkristo wa kweli hawezi akachanganya mawili haya ili kwamba ashikilie hadhi yake kama mwanafunzi wa Yesu".

#### **Interpreter's Competence in the Source Language**

It has already been explained that the interpreter's competence affects his performance. Likewise, the preacher's competence can affect his usage of the source language. This is because such competence contributes towards making the message either simple or complex. Preachers, who presented their sermon in the English language and happened to have low competence in phonology and morphology of the same language, affected the interpreters' performance. This complicated the communication process. The following example elaborates the explanation:

#### **Example 7**

Preacher: Just before they closed Jordan

Interpreter: Punde kabla hawajafunga Jordan

This example shows that the preacher lacked the competence in English phonology and therefore used the /l/ phoneme instead of the /r/. The interpreter therefore interpreted the word 'closed' instead of 'crossed'. The interpreter may not have been very careful as to notice the preachers' effect of first language as mother tongue, but all the same communication was affected. This is because the interpreter brought out the meaning of the word 'close' (funga) instead of the intended cross 'vuka'. This situation may arise where the preacher may have been affected by mother tongue phonology, and especially if it happened that he was of the Bantu group of people. This may affect the way he may pronounce some of the English words. The interpreter then if he is not a Bantu by origin, fails to realize that the preacher's pronunciation of the word "closed" was actually meant to be phoneme /r/. This situation may appear repeatedly, especially if the interpreter is not used to the preacher's way of pronunciation. But with more practice this challenge would be overcome.

#### **Communication Systems Challenges**

The use of public address system is determined by the size of the church and the size of the congregation. Churches that are housed in large buildings with a large number of faithful use PA system. But churches in smaller buildings with a small size of followers do not use these systems. Six out of the ten churches that were researched on used the public address system. A situation where the amplifiers fail to function in the midst of a sermon, communication is made difficult as the faithful could not get the message. The author witnessed a situation where two public address systems failed in two different churches. Due to this failure, the interpreters' voices could not be heard and these lead to automatic breakdown in communication. Only the faithful who sat close to the altar could hear the interpreter's voice, but those who sat far away could not get the message.

#### **Relationship between the Preacher and the Faithful**

Eighty percent of the interpreters interviewed, 60% of the 10 preachers interviewed and 60% of sixty faithful interviewed all agreed that at times the relationship between the preacher and the faithful can affect the communication. These relations were based on the feelings and actions expressed during preaching. For example, 80% of the sixty faithful interviewed expressed that noisy response from the faithful interfered with the interpreter's passing of the message. When faithful answered in loud voices with 'AMEN' and HALLELUYA' and other appreciated voices in the course of interpretation, then the faithful who depended on the interpreter had a difficult time getting the message. Much of what reached them was affected by the shouts of those who could understand the English language.

### **Polysemy and their Context of Usage**

Polysemy is the concept that explains the use of words that have more than one meaning, such words when used may have the obvious or straight forward meaning and the hidden meaning. The obvious meaning is that which is found in the dictionary, whereas the hidden meaning could be derived from the context used. Some interpreters gave the meaning of words out of the context by giving the obvious meaning of word. This came about if the interpreter failed to realize that a certain word has been used according to the context. The following examples explain this:

#### **Example 8**

Preacher: Today I want us to discuss about being pregnant.

Interpreter: Leo tutajadiliana kuhusu kuwa mjamzito.

Preacher: (After realizing that the interpreter has missed in interpreting the word expectant he says; i mean to look forward to something)

Interpreter: (Correcting himself) Aha! Leo tutajadiliana kuhusu kutarajia.

In this example, the interpreter did not realize that the word expectant was used according to the context and therefore it did not mean 'pregnancy' rather it meant being hopeful or holding on to something. The preacher therefore had to come in to save the situation by correcting the interpreter. Had the preacher not corrected the interpreter, then the intended message would not have reached the faithful. From this example, the message could have been swayed or distorted if the preacher had not understood the target language and hence correct the interpreter.

### **Use of an Ideal Language**

The results of this research have also shown that the faithful competence of language has to be considered for the message to be delivered successfully. The English language for example the Kiswahili words 'mlima' refers to mountain and 'kilima' refers to hill. The example that follows contrary to this, the interpreter used different vocabularies.

#### **Examples 9**

Preacher: There is a big difference between a hill and a mountain

Interpreter: Kuna tofauti kubwa kati ya mlima na mlima mwingine

Preacher: Jerusalem is surrounded by mountains and not hills

Interpreter: Yerusalem imeingizwa na milima nyingi

Preacher: The righteous are similarly surrounded by the angels

From this example, the interpreter understands that the preacher is referring to two mountains and therefore talks of 'mlima na mlima mwingine'. The author interviewed six faithful who attended the service, where this example was extracted, to find out from them if they understood the interpreters usage of the words 'mlima na mlima mwingine' (a mountain and another mountain). They only showed that they did not understand the interpreter. Probably the use of a group of nouns example of 'milima mikubwa' (big mountains) and 'mlima midogo' (small mountains) would have made communication easier instead of ideal vocabulary used 'kilima' for hill or the way the interpreter had put it 'mlima mwingine' (another mountain). In such an example, the message would have been passed better if the interpreter would have used gestures and body movements to show or indicate the meaning of a big mountain and a small mountain (hill). However, this did not happen. By not doing this, the interpretation procedure failed in its delivery of message as was expected. This situation was supported by earlier researchers Ellis and McClintock (1990), who realized that the use of gestures assisted in delivery of message during interpretation.

### **Interpretation by Use of Word for Word Method**

The research results showed that there are two basic methods of interpretation that of direct method as word for word and the method of taking turns. The method of word for word considers the meaning of individual words, and it has been known to distort meanings of a whole sentence. When the interpreter uses this method, he dwells on the concert of each word as it appears, instead of considering the meaning of the whole sentence.

### **Example 10**

Preacher: The Bible

Interpreter: Biblia

Preacher: Is a traveller's map

Interpreter: Ni msafiri wa ramani

Preacher: It is the soldier's sword---

This example shows that the preacher has distorted the preacher's message because of considering the meaning of single words. The affected words are: 'is', 'traveller' and 'map'. The interpreter's phrase "Bibilia ni Msafiri wa ramani" comes out as a direct translation which shows the meaning of 'travellers' and 'map' wrongly, according to the preacher's intended message. Such examples show how the message is given during interpretation.

It was also evident in this research that sometimes the voice of the interpreter would overlap with that of the preacher. The result would be just noise that made no meaning to the faithful. Therefore, though this method takes a shorter period of time of the actual preaching, it is the most inappropriate because it always sends the wrong message to the faithful. In reference to this method of word for word, it was also evident that many times the preacher would not give the interpreter enough time to perform the actual interpretation. This state of affairs would leave the interpreter in a state of confusion. Sixty of the 10 interpreters interviewed said that many times the preachers would continue with his speech even when the interpreter is midway in his interpretation. This would always make the interpreter be in a mixed situation and therefore give the wrong message. Whenever this would happen, the interpreter would end up ignoring some of the preacher's words or just repeat the preacher's words. This is all as a result of not having enough time to interpret the preacher's words. Some preachers were said to speak at a high speed, partly as a result of the limited time set aside for the actual preaching. It was evident in the research that preachers whose sermons were interpreted using one method also happened to be the fastest speakers.

### ***Interpreter's Carelessness***

Sometimes the interpreters are careless in the way they listen to the preacher; many factors contribute to this, including fatigue on the part of the interpreter. When the interpreter is not keen in his listening, he will end up giving the wrong message to the faithful. This is because he will only interpret the words he heard and leave out what he did not hear. The words that are left out could end up being the key words in the message. The following example shows how the interpreter did not give the intended message. In the interactive session the author noticed that they were not keen during the preacher's speech.

### **Example 11**

Preacher: In South Africa it is normal for a Christian to have a boyfriend or girlfriend in the same church even when you are married.

Interpreter; Kule South Africa ni kawaida kuwa na boyfriend ama girlfriend hata kama umeoa.

### **Example 12**

Preacher: The God of love is the God of wrath.

Interpreter: Mungu ni Mungu wa hasira

Preacher: (Not contented with the interpreter's version) The God of love is the God of wrath.

Interpreter: Mungu wa amani ni Mungu wa hasira.

From example 11, we realize that the key words in the message were left out and therefore the main message was not delivered. The interpreter in this example did not interpret the words "Christian" and "in the same church" as a result of not being keen. The main message was in these words which were left out by the interpreter. Example 12 shows a similar occurrence where the main words are left out during interpretation. The interpreter was not keen and therefore did not interpret the words "of love". The original preacher's sentences had two characteristics of the nature of God; of love and wrath. The interpreter's sentence showed only one characteristic, that of wrath. The preacher realized that the interpreter did not bring out the original intended message and therefore repeats his original sentence. The second time the interpreter is careful and gives the exact interpretation. This proves that whenever the interpreter is not keen he distorts the message and breaks communication. In these two examples, the message during preaching is sometimes not maintained all because of the interpreter not being keen. In such a case the interpreter does not present the intended meaning or sometimes he says unrelated things. This is a situation that inhibits communication caused by interpretation.

### **Correcting the Mistakes of Interpretation**

Sometimes it is inheritable to avoid mistakes during interpretation. These mistakes will occur as a result of the interpreter not being keen or just out of fatigue. Sometimes the interpreter lacks an appropriate synonym of the target language and therefore ends up repeating the preacher's words. It was noted in the research that these were corrected using a numbers of ways. In the event that the interpreters realized their mistake in time, sometimes they would correct themselves. In other times, the faithful would correct them, or even the preachers would take his time to correct the interpreter, all these were meant to strengthen communication. The author witnessed a situation where the interpreters corrected themselves. Forty-eight percent of the 60 faithful after one of the services said that the interpreter was corrected either by the faithful or the preacher. This happened in situation where the interpreters got challenged and could not get the correct vocabulary in the target language. The following example shows how the preacher could correct the interpreter, especially in the situation where the interpreter could not realize his mistakes:

#### **Example 13**

Preacher: You say I have prayed it's not working

Interpreter: Unasema umeomba hujafanikiwa

Preacher: So I will look for a diviner.

Interpretes: Kwa hivyo nitamtafuta divines.

Preacher: (Correcting the interpreter) oh no look for a divines, yaani, mwaguzi.

Interpretes: (Correcting himself) kwa hivyo nitamtafuta mwaguzi.

The preacher in the above example realized that the interpreter did not get the correct word for 'diviner'. He therefore corrected the interpreter by giving him the correct word which is 'mwaguzi'. The situations whereby the preacher corrects the interpreter are common. But we also have those preachers who do not understand the target language. They therefore cannot assist the interpreter in any way. In this situation where the preacher or the interpreter cannot correct a mistake, then communication is always distorted or incomplete. The following example shows how some of the corrections of the interpreter can be done by a faithful.

#### **Example 14**

Preacher: If we were to be put on a see saw.

Interprets: Tungetiwa kwenye e...e...e (muumini anasikika akisema neno ratili naye mkalimani anadekia hilo neon) ratili.

The interpreter in this example was showing signs of failing in his interpretation through his hesitation. However, one of the faithful helped him out by providing the missing synonym. Such a faithful must be competent in the source language in order to be able to make such a correction. Such faithful will always play an important role during the sermons where interpretation is done. The preacher should also be on the alert in order to help out the interpreter whenever he is challenged.

### **Conclusion**

It has been argued that the main aim of interpretation of sermons to the target language of the audience is to enhance communication, but the research has shown that sometimes communication between the speaker of source language and target language can be impossible. This situation was evidenced in the research due to the presence of hindrances that made interpretational preaching difficult. In such a case, the importance and place of the interpreter of facilitating communication between the two parties is not realized. These hindrances included: fast speech on part of the preacher, use of ideal language during interpretation, the relations between the preachers and the faithful among others. It was also established that communication challenges that face one interpreter can also be faced by another. Preaching sessions that do not require an interpreter always take a shorter time. It was proven that when parallel interpretation method is used time taken during the preaching interpretation is always reduced. It was also evident that the high speed of speech during parallel interpretation always affects the quality of interpretation and communication. The extent or level of language competence among the faithful also affected communication. The competence in Kiswahili among the faithful and the interpreter can always differ. If the interpreter happened to use a complex vocabulary while interpreting to the faithful, there would always be a communication challenge. These results indicate that it is the interpreter's obligation to assess the psychological well being of the faithful before the interpretation session starts. The analysis of findings shows that the relationship between the preacher and the faithful can affect communication during interpretation.

Therefore, interpretation that is done when faithful are calm is always successful; on the other hand in the churches where the faithful will respond in loud voices of 'Amen! Halleluya' and clapping of hands when the interpretation is in session will always cause a disturbance in the message and communication. When we consider the work done by different interpreters we realise that there is no relation between the quality of interpretation and the numbers of years they have served as interpreters. Sometimes an interpreter who has had a long experience in terms of years will do a better job than those with a short time experience. But sometimes this tenet is overruled when an interpreter with an experience of fewer years does a better interpretation than those with an experience of many years. This research has also shown that when an interpreter has competence in the source and target language, communication during interpretation is always very successful. The results show the interpreter who has low competence in language of use may distort the message, as opposed to the one who has a higher competence in language of use. We therefore concur with Newmark's (1982) views concerning translation, that if a translator has to perform his duty successfully, then he must be competent in the two languages involved. It was also proved that the use of body language makes communication during interpretation successful.

### **Recommendations**

First, there is a relation between interpreter's competence in language and the performance of his work as an interpreter. Interpreters therefore need to join institutions of learning where they will improve their knowledge in the languages they use during interpretation. Many interpreters expressed the view that they did not have formal training on interpretation. They were just chosen randomly from among the faithful. They would do a better job if formal training were to be done. Probably the relevant syllabus is not available in the existing institutions. It is therefore recommended that these institutions look into the need and develop syllabus that will be ideal to give a formal training to interpreter. About competence of languages among the interpreters, many of them have not been trained as professionals. Most of the interpreters were of the opinion that interpretational training would better their performance. Considering these, it is therefore recommended that the current theology institutions should consider incorporating interpretational training in their institutions syllabus such training should consider giving knowledge on theories and performance in interpretation.

Second, communication instruments used, especially in big churches, should be given proper consideration. This is because they play a big part in the success or failure of communication. It is therefore recommended that such instruments be thoroughly checked and tested before they can be used during the service. This is because during interpretation, such instruments can contribute to poor communication between the speaker and the faithful.

### **References**

- Ali, C. (1981). Problems of translating from English into Kiswahili. Unpublished MA Thesis, Nairobi: University of Nairobi.
- Appel, R., & Muysken, P. (1987). *Language Contact and Bilingualism*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Brierre, E. (1978). Limited English Speakers and the Miranda Rights. *TESOL Quarterly*, 12(3): 235-242.
- Bryson, J. (1959). *Light in Darkness*. London: Scripture illustration Ltd.
- Catford, J. (1965). *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Chomsky, N. (1965). *Syntactic Structure*. M.I.T Press.
- Ellis, R., and McClintock, A. (1990). *If You Take My Meaning: Theory into Practice in Human Communication*. London: Edward Arnold Press.
- Halliday, M. (1973). *Exploration into the Function of Language*. London: Edward Arnold Ltd.
- Mbaabu, I. (1985b). *New Horizon in Kiswahili*. Nairobi: Kenya Literature Bureau.
- Newmark, P. (1988b). *A Textbook of Translation*. London: Prentice Hall.
- Okeiga, N. I. O. (1998). *Sajili ya Kisheria Katika Mahakama, Kenya: Vizuizi, Athari na Visaidizi Kwa Matumizi Zaidi ya Kiswahili*. Unpublished M.Phil Thesis, Eldoret: Moi University.
- Osinde, K. N. (1986). *Sheng: An Investigation into Social and Structural Aspects Of an Evolving Subject*. Unpublished B.A Chuo Kikuu Cha Nairobi.
- Republic of Kenya (1974). *The National Assembly House of Representatives Official Report*, Vol. xxx viii, 5 July-8 August 1974. Nairobi: Government Publishers.
- Scholesberg, H. (1952). The Description of Facial Expressions. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 44: 229-237.
- Wardaugh, R. (1987). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. New York: Basil Blackwell. Hiteley, W.H. (1969). *Kiswahili: The Rise of a National Language*. London: Methuen.