IJAAR PUBLISHING®

International Journal of Education and National Development | ISSN: 3027-0626
Vol. 3, Issue 2 (2025) | www.ijaar.org

Lexical Insertion as a barricade to English-Hausa Courtroom Interpretation and its Effects on Legal Justice in Jigawa State Magistrate Courts.

By

Jamilu Aminu
07066182680
aminujamilu84@gmail.com
English Department, School of Secondary Education (languages),
Jigawa State College of Education, Gumel.

And

Abubakar Uba Abubakar
08037478887
Arabic Department, School of Secondary Education (languages),
Jigawa State College of Education, Gumel.

Abstract

This paper discusses the insertions of lexical items in Jigawa state's magistrate courts English-Hausa interpretation, the main objective of this paper is to find out how these lexical items are inserted into the target language as well as their impacts in the minds of the two parties involved. The research adopts an ethnography method for the collection of data and a descriptive approach for the data analysis. It is a known fact that the exchange of precise meanings is basically the bedrock of interpretation via which meanings are directly communicated into another language. Thus, the concise equivalents should directly be incorporated for the transfer of meaning to be exact, however, items of the receptor language are unnecessarily thrust which mostly creates problem in comprehending the meanings intended to communicate. The study finally proves that the insertion of the items in courts' interpretation is indeed a barrier that renders it so ineffective. And therefore, recommended that Courts' interpreters should avoid insertion of lexical items that are unnecessary.

Keywords:

- *Lexical.*
- *Insertion.*
- *Interpretation.*
- *Source Language.*
- *Target Language.*

Aminu, J., & Abubakar, A. U. (2025). Lexical Insertion as a barricade to English-Hausa Courtroom Interpretation and its Effects on Legal Justice in Jigawa State Magistrate Courts. *International Journal of Education and National Development. 3*(2), 53-58. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.15459029

Introduction

Interpretation is an aspect that is commonly undertaken within the realm of translation. It is the exchange, transfer or transmission of meanings from one language into another, and it is believed that, the meanings exchange is functionally impractically without substituting linguistic items between the two languages (source and receptor languages). Meaning being the bedrock of communication, is sometimes universal across languages therefore, the conveyance of this conceptual meaning imperatively must involve the linguistic items interplay between the concerned languages as such, some unnecessary items are many a times thrust into the interpretation which causes problem in comprehending the exact meaning. This phenomenon therefore, serves as barrier which impedes the effective understanding. This paper therefore, attempts to look into the effects of linguistic items insertion in English-Hausa courtroom interpretation of magistrate court proceedings in Jigawa state.

The concept of lexical Insertion

Lexical insertion is the process of inserting lexical items into the syntactic structures in forming utterances. It is the act of putting or adding a lexical item(s) of the target language into an interpretation. It is the process whereby the Courtroom interpreter in Jigawa magistrate courts, inserts or thrusts an unnecessary lexicon in the English-Hausa interpretation which indeed in many instances make it to be ineffective.

The concept of Interpretation

Interpretation or interpreting refers to a non-written re-expression of a non-written source text (Gile 2004). Interpretation is an oral form of translation, it is the process where a person repeats what is said out loud in a different language; it is basically the act of listening to a speaker in one language, understand the content of what is being said, and then paraphrase it using the tools or lexicons of the target language. An interpreter replaces words into meaning, and then meaning back into words of another language. It is furthermore, concerned with spoken language into another spoken language, and sometimes, from spoken language into the sign language and vice-versa. It is indeed an activity believed in conveying meaning of the spoken word from one language to another.

Interpretation from the above definitions is generalized to be the art or science of substituting, changing or transferring the meaning of a language into another language; it is the subsequent reproduction of an equivalent language. Interpretation is characterized with some peculiar features which include: An excellent public speaking skill, an extraordinary listening skill or ability, face-to-face interaction with audience, Quick reflexes and good memory, real-time operation and the knowledge of the subject matter (Stern 2019).

Interpretation has been divided into five (5) forms which include: Simultaneous, Consecutive, Whispered, Relay and Liaison Interpretation (Ablio 2015). However, the consecutive form is predominantly carried out in magistrate courtroom interpretation of Jigawa state.

Method and Theoretical Framework

The researcher uses an ethnography method in collecting the data which involves the use of participation, observation and recording. The data was collected from three (3) proceedings of magistrate court in which the judge's, lawyers' as well as prosecutor's utterances were carefully monitored, recorded in written, analyzed and presented for the study. The source language English utterances are then correlated with interpretive Hausa expressions so as to

determine the effectiveness or otherwise of the interpretation. The descriptive approach is also applied for the analysis of the data.

Data Presentation and Analysis

This section deals with presentation of the data for the study, it consists of only four (4) examples of the phenomenon that are used in court interpretation which renders it ineffective. In the sample data collected during the conduct of this research, the English utterances are written in plain, while the Hausa interpretations are italicized followed by the analysis under each interpretation, and then the suggested correct version by the researcher is written in bold below the analysis. The following are some of its examples used in Magistrate Court interpretation of Jigawa state:

1) a. Judge: The case is fixed today for hearing.

b. Interpreter: *An sa wannan qara domin sauraron shedu.*

The interpretation in the above example is a consecutive and therefore very inappropriate because, the target language word '**shedu**' added at the end of the sentence is unnecessarily needed in the interpretation and it certainly introduces something not part of what is intended by judge and hence, alters the meaning, again, the word '**qara**' mismatches the ideal equivalent to the 'case' and then, the source language word 'today' is furthermore omitted which is importantly essential in the interpretation. It is thus more appropriate to be interpreted as:

c. An sa kawannan shari'a yau domin sauraro.

2) a. Judge: In line with Constitutional provisions.

b. Interpreter: *Bisa gundarin tanadin dokar qasa ta 1999.*

This is similarly a consecutive interpretation and is of course ineffective, because, the two of the target language lexicons '**gundarin** and **ta 1999**' thrusts by the interpreter are basically unwanted because, without, the meaning will be more acceptable while their presence will little bit confuse the listeners, more so, the source language plural word 'provisions' is assigned the target language (Hausa) singular form 'tanadin' which is not an equivalent but 'tanade-tanaden'. Is therefore more effective to interpreted as:

c. Bisa tanade-tanaden dokar qasa.

3) a. Prosecutor: That is all what you know with regards to this case?.

b. Interpreter: *Shine kwata-kwata zahirin iyakar abin da ka sani dangane da wannan case tun daga farko har qarshe?*

The interpretation here is a consecutive one which is therefore wrong, because, so many target language lexicons that are not needed were inserted into the interpretation, which include: 'kwata-kwata zahirin, as well as a phrase 'tun daga farko har qarshe', these certainly will change the intended meaning to something different. Also, the English word 'case' as it has been used is mixed into the target language which as well confused the witness being a less educated man to fully comprehend what has been interpreted to him.it is more precise to be interpreted as:

c. Wannan shine iyakar abin da ka sani dangane da wannan taqaddama?

4) a. Counsel: We have an oral application we intend to move.

b. Interpreter: *Muna da roqon baka da muke so mu gabatar yau a gaban Wannan kotu.*

This interpretation is finally a consecutive one which as well very deficient, because, the target language word and an adverbial phrase 'baka' and 'yau a gaban wannan kotu' are not necessary to be added into as they may make the meaning casually understood. It isproper to be interpreted as:

c. Muna da roqo da muke so mu gabatar.

The data analysis of the research above has suggested six linguistic aspects that are especially used in Courts' Interpretation, which include: Code-mixing, lack of equivalence, evidence for polysemy, linguistic mismatch, Omission of lexical items as well as insertion. The study discovered that interpreting the whole of the legal proceedings from English into Hausa is commonly carried out in the magistrate Courts of Jigawa state. The phenomenon is imperative for the fact that there is a dare need for better comprehension of the proceedings. Thus, the study further established the fact that, the courts' interpretation is mostly ineffective or poor as a result of the assignment of such linguistic items by the assigned interpreters. The data plainly proved the use of only one type of interpretation i.e consecutive. The consecutive form of interpretation is generally used by the interpreters as against the four other types that areshown up in all the examples. It similarly proved that interpretation is more difficult than translation as it is instantly carried out orally within a short period of time which indeed necessitates the commission of many errors. Moreover, the study discovered that the Courts' interpreters are not linguists and therefore, professionally untrained in the domain.

Conclusion

It is believed that unnecessary insertion of linguistic items in courtroom interpretation are commonly undertakenby the interpreters which renders it ineffective. Many of the target language words or lexical items are fused into the phenomenon that are basically not needed without which the meaning would exactly be communicated. The phenomenon certainly alters the extension of the semantic meaning of the produced utterances to the parties involved in the proceedings.

Research findings

The findings of the research include the following:

- It also proves that the insertion is widely perpetrated by interpreters while interpreting.
- The study proves that lexical insertion in courts' interpretation is certainly a barrier that renders it ineffective.
- It also proves that courts' interpreters are mostly not linguists and therefore, lack interpreting skills.

Recommendations

- Courts' interpreters in Jigawa state should be careful in using the vocabularies while interpreting.
- Courts' interpreters should avoid insertion of lexical items that are unnecessary.
- Courts' interpreters should exactly communicate in the target language what is derivedfrom the source.
- Seminars on interpretation should also be organized by the judiciary to update the knowledge of the court interpretation.

References.

Ablio, (2015). *Five Types of Interpretation- Communication without barriers*. https://blog.ablio.com

Auer, P. (1998). *Code-switching in conversation,* London: Routledge.

Baker, M. (1992). *Routledge Encyclopedia of translation studies*, London & New York: TJ International Ltd. Padstow, Cornwall.

Barnwell, D. (1989). *Court interpretation: A need for a certification process*. Paper presented at the Annual meeting of the Southeast Conference on Languages and Literature. (Orlando, FL., Feb. 24, 1989).

Blom, J.P and Gumperz, J. (1972). Social meaning linguistic structures: Code-switching in Northern Norway. In J.J. Gumperz and D. Hymes (Eds) *Directions in sociolinguistics.* New York: Holt Rinechart and Wistom.

Cartensen, G. and Dahlberg, L. (2015). Court Interpreting as Emotional Work: A Pilot Study in Swedish Law Courts, Sweden: Dalarna University.

Gile, D. (2004). Interpreting Studies: A Critical View from within. Esit, University of paris 3-Sorbonne Nourelle.

Stern, L. (2019). Ensuring Interpreting Quality in Legal and Courtroom settings: Australian Language Service providers' perspectives on their role. *In the journal of specialized translation;* Xin Liu, Dalian University of technology, China.

Ozolins, U. (1995). Liaison Interpreting: *Theoretical challenges and practical problems around the world;* Amsterdam: Philadelphia.

Vivalang (2013). Whispered Interpretation: modern translation company; www.vivalang.com

Wadensjo, C. (1998). *Interpreting as Interaction*, London: Longman.