

María Teresa Sánchez Nieto (ed.)
Corpus-based Translation and Interpreting Studies/
Estudios traductológicos basados en corpus

Klaus-Dieter Baumann/Hartwig Kalverkämper/Klaus Schubert (Hg.)
TRANSÜD.
Arbeiten zur Theorie und Praxis des Übersetzens und Dolmetschens
Band 71

María Teresa Sánchez Nieto (ed.)

Corpus-based Translation
and Interpreting Studies:
From description to application

Estudios traductológicos
basados en corpus:
de la descripción a la aplicación

FFrank & Timme

Verlag für wissenschaftliche Literatur

Umschlagabbildung: Puente de Piedra (Soria), España © Dgarcia29/Wikimedia

ISBN 978-3-7329-0084-8

ISSN 1438-2636

© Frank & Timme GmbH Verlag für wissenschaftliche Literatur
Berlin 2015. Alle Rechte vorbehalten.

Das Werk einschließlich aller Teile ist urheberrechtlich geschützt.
Jede Verwertung außerhalb der engen Grenzen des Urheberrechts-
gesetzes ist ohne Zustimmung des Verlags unzulässig und strafbar.
Das gilt insbesondere für Vervielfältigungen, Übersetzungen,
Mikroverfilmungen und die Einspeicherung und Verarbeitung in
elektronischen Systemen.

Herstellung durch Frank & Timme GmbH,
Wittelsbacherstraße 27a, 10707 Berlin.

Printed in Germany.

Gedruckt auf säurefreiem, alterungsbeständigem Papier.

www.frank-timme.de

Índice / Contents

MARÍA TERESA SÁNCHEZ NIETO	
Introduction	7
MARÍA TERESA SÁNCHEZ NIETO	
Introducción.....	19
SARA LAVIOSA	
Corpora and Holistic Cultural Translation /	
Los corpus y el enfoque holístico de la traducción cultural.....	31
JOSEP MARCO	
Taking stock: A critical overview of research on (universal) features of translated language / A modo de balance: Una revisión crítica de la investigación sobre propiedades (universales) de la lengua traducida	53
ESTHER ÁLVAREZ DE LA FUENTE y RAQUEL FERNÁNDEZ FUERTES	
A methodological approach to the analysis of natural interpreting: bilingual acquisition data and the CHAT/CLAN tool / Un enfoque metodológico para el análisis de la interpretación natural: los datos de adquisición bilingüe y la herramienta CHAT/CLAN.....	77
CLARA PIGNATARO	
ELF pragmatics and interpreting /	
Pragmática del inglés como lengua franca e interpretación.....	105
MIRIAM SEGHIRI	
Determinación de la representatividad cuantitativa de un corpus <i>ad hoc</i> bilingüe (inglés-español) de manuales de instrucciones generales de lectores electrónicos / Establishing the quantitative representativeness of an E-Reader Users' Guide <i>ad hoc</i> corpus (English-Spanish)	125

BELÉN LÓPEZ ARROYO y RODA P. ROBERTS

The use of a comparable corpus: How to develop writing applications /
Aplicaciones de ayuda a la escritura en L2 basadas en corpus comparables ... 147

INMACULADA SERÓN ORDÓÑEZ

Cómo crear y analizar corpus paralelos. Un procedimiento con *software*
accesible y económico y algunas sugerencias para *software* futuro /
How to build and analyse parallel corpora. A procedure with accessible and
affordable software and some suggestions for future software..... 167

ANABEL BORJA ALBI and ISABEL GARCÍA-IZQUIERDO

Corpus-based knowledge management systems for specialized translation:
bridging the gap between theory and professional practice /
Sistemas de gestión del conocimiento basados en corpus para
traductores especializados: de la teoría a la práctica..... 191

ZURIÑE SANZ, NAROA ZUBILLAGA e IBON URIBARRI

Estudio basado en corpus de las traducciones del alemán al vasco /
Corpus based study of German-Basque translations..... 211

MARÍA TERESA SÁNCHEZ NIETO

Construcción de corpus virtuales comparables deslocalizados (DE/ES):
Análisis y comparación de recursos /
Building virtual delocalized comparable corpora (DE/ES).
Analysis and contrast of resources 235

ELF pragmatics and interpreting

[Pragmática del inglés como lengua franca e interpretación]

CLARA PIGNATARO

IULM University (Italy)

clara.pignataro@iulm.it

Abstract: English as a lingua franca (ELF) has become a worldwide phenomenon (Kellet Bidoli 2012), posing challenges to interpreters (Kurz 2008) and to interpreter trainers that have not been studied in depth (Albi-Mikasa 2010). With globalization most communication is taking place between second language users and the fact that English has become a worldwide lingua franca has significant linguistic (Cogo and Dewey 2012) and pedagogic implications. Against this background, a corpus-driven analysis is being carried out on video recorded face-to-face interactions (Cogo 2009, Straniero Sergio 2012) interpreted in consecutive mode, from English into Italian, by Italian conference interpreters during Literature Festivals with the aim to raise interpreting students' awareness about the impact that ELF pragmatics has on the interpreter's comprehension and production process and encourage them to develop their own ELF pragmatics (Keckses 2014, Murray 2013).

Keywords: English as a Lingua Franca (ELF); corpus-driven studies; conversation analysis; face to face interactions

1. Introduction

Interest in English as a lingua franca (henceforth ELF) has generated a growing amount of empirical research in the attempt to describe the nature of ELF interactions (Murray 2012) but it is only recently that the attention of researchers has focused on the implications for interpreters: "English is silently pervading interpreting settings in its many varieties and guises so that interpreters are increasingly confronted with a wide range of *Englishes* of different linguistic origins, more often than not with far from standard phonology, lexis and syntax" (Kellet Bidoli 2012: 14). ELF speakers use pragmatic and interactional strategies to promote communication, and create a positive communicative experience (Cogo and Dewey 2012: 139) to "prevent, avert or pre-empt problems of misunderstanding" (Mauranen 2006). The general point is that interpreting from ELF speakers is more demanding and requires the use of proactive strategies (Murray 2012: 321) such as repetition, paraphrase and self-repair to make the target text

(TT) more coherent, with an extra cognitive effort and involvement for the interpreter and pragmatic competence.

More specifically, my intent is to observe how language is used in ELF interpreter-mediated face-to-face interactions and how ELF pragmatics impact on the interpreter's work where he/she acts as an active participant in the co-construction of meaning. Drawing upon Cogo and Dewey (2012), the overall aim my work is to conduct a corpus-driven analysis of pragmatic strategies used in ELF face-to-face mediated interactions (Cogo 2010: 297) with a focus on the cooperative work of participants and on the interpreter's pragmatic competence (Kecskes 2014). More precisely, in this paper, I will focus on the participants' use of *interactional features* such as, *additions* and *paraphrase* to ensure "smooth delivery and efficiency of the exchange" (Cogo 2010: 302). Drawing on a larger ethnographic project on ELF pragmatics, this study focuses on a sub-corpus of recorded and transcribed interpreter-mediated ELF interactions which occurred in the context of Literature Festivals to which I apply a combination of corpus techniques and techniques of Conversation Analysis within a pragmatic framework in order to spot "patterned interactional behaviours" (Firth 2009: 164) focusing on the way interpreters participate in the interaction by accommodating and manipulating their target text to convey coherence (Beaugrande & Dressler 1981). The analysis is conducted using *Transana*, a software for qualitative analysis. The final aim of my corpus-driven investigation is to bring authentic data to the classroom of trainee interpreters, to show with authentic data how ELF language is used and manipulated through specific pragmatic strategies. My intention is not to outline general interactional norms to be applied to each and every ELF interaction context, but to identify the most recurring ones used by the interpreter to overcome hesitation moments in order to convey coherence to the TT. First, I will explore the peculiarities of ELF language and its research field, then I will focus on the context where the interactions take place, that is to say, Literature Festivals in Italy. The interpreter-mediated encounters involve non-native speakers (NNSs) using ELF as a language for communication. Then, drawing on my corpus, I will focus on the pragmatic strategies used by the interpreter to manipulate the target text to negotiate meaning (Firth 2009: 163).

2. ELF research field

English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) is a “thriving research field which has found its place in applied linguistics in the last decade”¹ and the body of ELF data available for analysis is substantial (Cogo and Dewey 2012). The first ELF corpus was launched in 2001, the Vienna Oxford International Corpus of English (VOICE²). In 2003 Mauranen announced another important corpus, the corpus of English as a Lingua Franca in Academic Settings (ELFA³). What’s more important is that the research continues to grow: “what we have now is a thriving, vibrant and dynamic field of enquiry devoted entirely to the study of this type of English use” (Cogo and Dewey 2012: 4). ELF is a young discipline, even younger than Interpreting Studies; they both belong to the field of Applied Linguistics but “it is only recently that the two fields have begun to consider the mutual relevance of each other” (Albl-Mikasa 2013: 192) and it is only in the last decade that scholars have focused their attention on ELF impact on interpreting (Albl-Mikasa 2010, 2012, 2013; Reithofer 2010).

ELF interactions among non-native speakers work, and they do so “in intriguingly creative ways” (Albl-Mikasa 2012:101): meaning negotiation and mutual intelligibility are secured on the basis of “pragmatic intercultural and collaborative skills, accommodation and negotiation strategies, and creative appropriation of linguistic resources (Albl-Mikasa 2013: 102). As argued by Seidlhofer (2011) “ELF users find ways of meeting their functional requirements by exploiting the resource of the virtual language, and this involves breaking free from the constraints of established norms” (Seidlhofer 2011: 143). In particular, in multilingual and multicultural environment “the language is not considered fixed but negotiated online and determined by particular situational contexts” (Hülmbauer 2008: 29) and the language may vary during a meeting, depending on tasks and practical purposes (Hülmbauer 2008: 29). As Firth states “seen in terms of the participants' orientations to their own concerted activities, the dominant impression is that lingua franca talk is not only meaningful, it is also '*normal*' and, indeed, '*ordinary*'. The crucial point, though, is that the talk is *made* '*normal*' and '*ordinary*' by the participants themselves, in their local discursive practices”

¹ < <http://www.english-lingua-franca.org/about/elf-ren> >

² < <https://www.univie.ac.at/voice/> >

³ < <http://www.helsinki.fi/englanti/elfa/elfacorp#citation> >

(Firth 1996: 242). It is this *normality* that the interpreter has to come to terms with, in order to overcome hesitations and become an active participant and co-constructor of meaning in the interactions. According to Firth, normality in ELF talk is achieved by the participants through a “situated application of a range of conversational mechanisms [...] and resources giving rise to different kinds of interactional work” (Firth 1996: 240). Norms and strategies are not to be applied or used in absolute terms: the context determines the most appropriate interactional strategies to be adopted.

The mobilization of conversational mechanisms and resources *can be* done differently in some circumstances, thereby giving rise to different kinds of 'interactional work' than has been accounted for previously in monolingual studies. Such 'interactional work' has two major aims: first, to pursue, through talk, substantive institutional goals (e.g. to agree upon conditions of economic exchange); second, to furnish the talk with a 'normal' and 'ordinary' appearance in the face of sometimes 'abnormal' and 'extra-ordinary' linguistic behaviour. (Firth 1996: 242)

and

ELF interactants are highly pragmatic, opting for a kind of communication that enables them to get business done without forcing them to adopt pragmatic behaviours with which they may be uncomfortable. It is that virtual willingness to compromise that makes ELF talk so apparently robust and consensus oriented, and, in part it works because participants are effectively agreeing to adopt an intersociety persona that does not threaten the individual (Murray 2012: 322).

Learning to behave as an *intersociety persona* is of vital importance for interpreters in ELF settings. And it is through the observation and analysis of professional interpreters working in real contexts that trainees can become aware of appropriate pragmatic behaviours.

2.1. The context: Consecutive interpreting for literary festivals

Consecutive Interpreting is the preferred translation methodology at Literature Festivals, but not a classical consecutive, a more flexible; notes are taken and not always read due to time constraints therefore the interpreter must memorize to convey the gist of the source text. Indeed, Consecutive Interpreting (CI) used during Literature Festivals is a *sui generis* consecutive interpreting: the dialogic context with rapid answer-question turns imposes time constraints that modify the way interpreters are used to applying their consecutive technique. First of all, the interpreter is forced to resort to what Mead describes a “non-linear approach with a view to maximizing impact” (2012:172). In most cases the event is “an

interview, reading or presentation involving one or more authors [...] the writers involved are mostly Italian-speaking; for those who are not, interpretation is provided in order to ensure that they can be followed by a largely Italian-speaking audience” (Mead 2012: 174). The classic interpreting format for these events is a one-to-one interview with an author, lasting about one hour and a half with the interpreter sitting next to the author/s. During the interview a whispered interpretation is provided to the author when Italian speakers ask questions and when the authors answer the interpreter uses a microphone to interpret consecutively the speaker’s answers for the target audience. The authors’ comments do not have a fixed duration, but they are kept short to enable the interpreter to transfer the content to the audience and to ensure fluidity of speech. Generally speaking, the “content of the interviews is not all the times literary” (Mead 2012: 175) and even “when the discussion is focused on writing and books the writer’s perspective and register are often not strictly literary” (Mead 2012: 176); speakers attempt to communicate and “establish a rapport with the audience” and authors tend to use “humour as an ice-breaker” (Mead 2012: 175) to involve the audience. The interpreter’s task here is thus to “convey information and a certain degree of explanation/argumentation” (Mead 2012: 176).

2.2. ELF and interpreting

Albl-Mikasa (2010) conducted an interesting study based on interviews and personal observations on how interpreters perceive ELF speakers. In her questionnaire survey among 32 professional interpreters it stands out that 69% of interpreters prefer source-text production by Native Speakers, because of their “reliable structures, accurate expressions, conscious choice of words, more pleasant idiomaticity, fewer mistakes/false friends, smoother word flow, fluency” (Albl-Mikasa 2010: 135) and only 6% prefer source text by NNSs. The interpreters complained that their work was increasingly challenging and tiring due to the additional cognitive load they had to expend in the comprehension phase to “grasp foreign accents and recover unfamiliar expressions, to resolve unorthodox syntactic structures and compensate for the lack of pragmatic fluency on the part of the non-native speaker” (Albl-Mikasa 2013: 192). More specifically, interpreters point to “capacity-related operational consequences” (Albl-Mikasa 2010: 135-136) when interpreting from non-native speakers, thus requiring “a higher level of concentration, additional listening effort, [...] additional

effort for the correction of the source text prior to interpreting, additional processes aimed at disambiguation, [...] at unraveling unusual word combinations” (Albl-Mikasa 2010: 136). Native speakers are not necessarily easier, but more pleasant to interpret “as their speech flow, speech structure and precision in expression are conducive to the interpreters’ task” (Albl-Mikasa 2010: 136). Moreover, it was also reported that their major hurdle was the restricted power of expression of ELF speakers. Non-native speakers have more difficulty in expressing the point they want to make, thus putting an extra effort on the interpreter’s cognitive load. This extra cognitive load imposed on the interpreter makes his target text more redundant, with a wide use of additions, repetitions and re-phrasing. In the following section I will briefly describe the work I am carrying out to develop a corpus of English as a lingua franca in interpreting scenarios with the intent to apply it during interpreters’ training sessions.

3. Developing the corpus: English as a Lingua Franca in Interpreting Scenarios (ELFIS)

ELFIS is an in-progress, parallel, multimodal corpus or speech corpus, compiled for research and training purposes, with the aim to studying interpreter-mediated interactions in ELF scenarios with a Conversation Analysis and Qualitative Analysis Approach. The media files are aligned with their transcript/s for analysis. The files are being downloaded from the web and they refer to Literature Festivals held in Italy. The data examined in this paper are a part of a larger work in progress of a corpus-driven research; they refer to an interview taking place on the occasion of Pordenone Legge, involving an Israeli writer and a singer, a guitarist and an Italian Interpreter. The first step was data collection and material selection. The process of data collection started in 2011 and the process is still continuing. The data are authentic and consist of 4 videos amounting to a total of 2 hours and 12 minutes involving the same interpreter. The source language is English and the target language is Italian. English is used by the participants as a contact language or lingua franca. The interpreting mode is consecutive (Mead 2012) and the directionality is English (B) into Italian (A). In particular, this interview was selected because it presents the interpreter “with the challenge of conveying emotional intensity” (Mead 2012: 178) which is often rendered by the interpreter through expansions/repetitions and additions to

make the text function appropriately in the target culture. As illustrated by the data, repetitions and addition are used by the interpreter to convey coherence to the target text that lacks fluency. As already pointed out by Albl-Mikasa in her studies, non-native speakers present problems of express-ability (2013) and although communication in ELF interactions works the interpreters involved in such interactions perceive heavy “adverse effects [...] on their cognitive processing” (Albl-Mikasa 2013: 101) and this is due to the non-native speakers’ “restricted power of expression” (ibid: 101). Therefore, as stressed by Albl-Mikasa (2013 b), an ELF pedagogy in interpreter training is needed, to make students aware (ibid: 11) about the changing working conditions and to work on comprehension and production strategies, “reconsidering their production competence” (ibid: 6). The idea to study ELF interpreter-mediated interactions goes towards the direction outlined by Albl-Mikasa (2013 a, 2013 b) in her preliminary suggestions for an ELF pedagogy in interpreter training⁴ and in her ELF-oriented training proposal (Albl-Mikasa 2013 b).

3.1. Transcription

The first step in analysing media-based audio data is to create a transcript. All transcripts are the product of important analytic choices: what information should I transcribe? What information is reflected in the transcript? Transcribing a media file provides vital information about the content of a media file; only the part of the data I need for my particular analysis will be transcribed (partial transcription). Transcription within *Transana* is a manual process, but *Transana* has some interesting tools that make transcription faster and easier. One of *Transana*’s most useful features is its ability to link specific points in a video

⁴ She outlines her suggestions in an interesting article: “Teaching Globish? The need for an ELF Pedagogy in Interpreter Training” (2013) with the aim to spark a debate on such orientations. Her considerations are based on a 90,000-word corpus of in-depth interviews with 10 professional conference interpreters. The implications of ELF on interpreting are worrisome and it is only recently that they have become the object of research activities (Albl-Mikasa 2010, 2012, 2013; Reithofer 2010). On the basis of her studies she has identified adverse effects on ELF usage on interpreters in marketing conditions and as far as the processing and capacity management is concerned (for an in depth analysis see Albl-Mikasa 2013: 102). For the purpose of our study I will take into account the processing and capacity management issues.

with the corresponding points in the transcription; this connection is created manually by the researcher by inserting time codes. Time codes are markers in a transcript that help *Transana* synchronize the transcript and the video. The researcher may decide to use time codes in a variety of ways and place them in correspondence with a pause or at the border of a chunks of speech in order to be better able to compare the source text and the target text and isolate analytically significant segments. Smaller segments of speech can be analyzed more readily, and then linked to the rest of the utterance. When we speak we process speech in chunks of up to five words (Mauranen 2006: 220) and this is something we do naturally; though the delineation of these sequences of elements or chunks is “strictly empirical” (Goffman 1981: 213), for my analysis, I will refer to the notion of “chunking” (Mauranen 2006: 219) and I will try to investigate what happens within and among these chunkings in terms of text production and text manipulation or editing. This is why I decided to place time codes for audio-text synchronization at the end of each chunk, which usually corresponds with a unit of meaning and/or a pause. Though “strict linearity is too rigid a model for the production and reception of speech” (Mauranen 2006: 30) I will refer to the “pause” principle as a “valuable evidence for boundaries” (ibid: 30) and to chunking as a “sequence of elements or segments” to analyse as a basic minimal structure. In principle I will analyse the way the interpreter constructs his/her target text in a real time manner, where “no invisible mending is possible in the spoken form” (Goffman 1981: 211) but “invisible patching” (Goffman 1981: 211) is sometimes possible, for example, through repairs and additions. The link between the transcription and the media file is very useful for trainees: reading what is being said as the media file plays is crucial when searching for and analyzing analytically significant segments in the transcript. Transcripts are automatically saved in .rtf and they can be queried. *Transana* allows users to work with multiple transcripts. For the purpose of my study I decided to work both on source (ST) and target text (TT) and I keep them separated for methodological and practical reasons; the corpus is being used for training purposes and ST is used by students for practice in the classroom and contrasted with the TT and its transcript. Students are also encouraged to transcribe both source and target text for their own analysis. The corpus has not been POS-tagged because

this is not the aim of the project; the purpose is to investigate interactions in ELF contexts and the impact of non native source speech on interpreters.

3.2. Research methodology

Lingua Franca interactions are being addressed from a Qualitative and Conversation Analysis (CA) approach to shed light on how ELF impacts on the interpreter's source text comprehension and production, more specifically on the interpreter's pragmatic competence and his ability to produce a coherent target text through the use of additions and paraphrase as "interactional resources deployed and required in order to conduct meaningful, orderly and indeed ordinary discursive practices" (Firth 1996: 240). My research questions: RQ1: What happens to the target text when we interpret from an ELF speaker and RQ2: How to apply a corpus of ELF communicative events to interpreters' training? These research questions are very much related to one another, in the sense that the interpreter's target text quality is determined by the interpreter's capacity management skills and concentration. We know that the comprehension effort is put under stress and the workload is greater when the source text is from a non-native speaker (Albl-Mikasa 2010) and these difficulties are reflected in the interpreter's output, such as in text redundancy and repetitions, as it will be illustrated by the examples.

3.3. Corpus extraction procedures

Creating a corpus involves a series of challenges: recording the material or looking for the material on the web, selecting the interviews to be included into the collection, converting file formats, importing the video files into *Transana*, transcribing and categorizing video files and creating clips with analytically interesting features to be used in the classroom. Defining parameters for the selection of the communicative event to be included in the corpus was an important step in devising my corpus. Therefore, tracing the profile of the interpretation and identifying the "eligible" ones to be included was the very first step of my research. Following Straniero Sergio and Falbo's considerations (2013) the communicative event involving an interpreter can be described by five superordinate macro-factors and these are "interpreter, situational context, mode, language and directionality, type of interaction" (Straniero Sergio & Falbo 2012: 12). The combination of these macro-factors provides an image of the communicative event and

a representation of the real world (Straniero Sergio & Falbo 2012). The selection of my corpus focuses on Literature Festivals and interpreter mediated interviews involving ELF speakers and an Italian interpreter, interpreting in consecutive mode from English into Italian. The videos were downloaded from the web, converted into MPEG1 and placed in *collections*. The video recorded interactions are imported, transcribed and analysed using *Transana*⁵, a software for qualitative analysis. *Transana* is a software for qualitative analysis of visual and auditory data. The software lets the researcher to transcribe, visualize, code and analyse auditory data in a wide variety of ways. In *Transana* meaningful portions or analytically significant segments of videos can be identified from larger media files, categorized and searched through using the Search Tool function. These analytically important segments are called clips in *Transana* and they are basic analytic units; clips are placed in collections. The first analytic act a researcher performs is naming clips within a collection. A collection is a place where clips with something in common are placed, a theoretical construct or a container used for holding clips that are somewhat related to each other and a clip contained in that collection is a piece of evidence for that theoretical construct. For example, if I want to study additions I will create a collection named additions and place clips where additions are exhibited in that collection. Collections normally evolve as the understanding of data widens. A collection might start out as a broader construct such as additions; as you proceed and understand that construct better you may want to create sub categories of that broad construct such as paraphrase. Clips will be sorted and placed in these more nuanced subcategories or “nested collections” to elaborate a more nuanced understanding that emerged from the data.

4. An attempt to address RQ 1: what happens to the interpreted target text when we interpret from an ELF speaker?

An issue interpreters are facing in ELF contexts is the quality of English used by NNSs having different levels of proficiency; interpreting from ELF speakers is demanding and I illustrate my argument by looking at the 1) “adverse effects of ELF speaker’s output” (Aibl-Mikasa 2013: 101) which is reflected on the interpreters hesitations and the ways interpreters manipulate their target text through

⁵ < www.transana.org >

repetitions. The analytical categories I am focusing on are proactive strategies: paraphrase, self-repair, repetitions that characterize ELF talk (Murray 2012, Mauranen and Ranta 2009, Hülmbauer 2008). Redundancy, repetitions and hesitations are typical manifestations of oral language and in consecutive interpreting they are used by the interpreter “to keep discourse smooth and open” (Straniero Sergio 2007: 341). Lichtkoppler (2007) focuses on the role of repetition in ELF highlighting its high frequency and stating that repetitions are used functionally and productively. Heike (1981 reported in Straniero Sergio 2007: 339) distinguishes between prospective repeats and retrospective repeats. The first is used to take time in speech planning and the second is used to establish cohesion with the previous part of the speech or to correct a wrong utterance. The active role of the interpreter is visible in the editing work in the TT. In order to cope with lack of smoothness in the ST the interpreter tends to produce a redundant text through additions, reformulations and repetitions. House suggests that “pragmatic fluency deficiency is responsible for non smoothness of the turn-making machinery and conversational mismanagement (House 2002: 236). The lack of smoothness of the TT makes the interpreter’s work even harder as it is shown in the following extract:

4.1. Lack of smoothness in the source text and the use of repetition⁶

1. Speaker 1: when you where reading the passage about Marianne Faithfull (.) and about how mus-your life 2. actually ehm (.) changes your music
3. Interpreter: quando ti sentivo leggere questo passaggio che hai citato (.) Marianne Faithfull (.) è che
4. davvero// *la vita ti cambia (.) ti cambia (.) cambia la tua musica (.) cambia il tuo modo di cantare*

Backtranslation:

When I heard you reading this passage that you quoted about Marianne Faithfull (.) is that (.) life really// changes you (.) it changes you (.) changes your music (.) changes your way of singing

⁶ Transcription conventions:

A: Anchorman

G: Guest

I : Interpreter

(.): pause < 3minutes

:: lengthening of vowel

In segment [1] the non-smoothness of the TT is determined by silent and filled pauses. Topic negotiation and self-rephrasing (“mus-your life eh changes”) are used by ELF speakers to make discourse explicit and clearer to the interlocutor (Cogo 2006: 256) and “it has been found that it is used more often as an adjustment of form, rather than as a change of meaning. These adjustments are aimed at improving clarity and increasing explicitness” (Cogo 2006: 256). Also Hülmbauer, Bohringer, Seidlhofer (2008: 30) point out the potential functions of silent and filled pauses in ELF and state that “apart from serving as a means of gaining time for speech encoding, pauses may also play a role in the interactive creation of meaning or even act as structural markers of the speech event.” Due to this pragmatic fluency deficiency, the interpreter displays involvement in the co-construction of meaning and this is evident in his editing work (“really changes// life really// changes (.) it changes you (.) changes your music (.) changes your way of singing”) by repeating the verb “to change” the interpreter buys time to think what to say next (micro-planning) and reinforces the meaning of the word. What the interpreter does, after all, is not so different from what any other speaker does when addressing an audience. In fact, in spoken communication – and especially when speaking before an audience, we always try to conceal our difficulties, to avoid appearing too hesitant. For this reason, “it is better to repeat oneself, rather than simply stop speaking while the mind searches for another idea” (Francesco Straniero 2007: 472), avoiding those pauses that in television are perceived as “silent indecision” (Goffman 1981: 215, cited in Straniero Sergio 2007: 472).

The hesitation or pause can constitute a negative notification, as it were: a blank is left where the speaker otherwise would have drawn attention to his error, the slot filled with what can be heard as silent indecision). The implication is that the speaker is intensely concerned with his predicament and is not in complete control of himself. It is as if he cannot contain his concern for whether or not he will manage himself as he would like; potential disaster seems to be in his mind. [...] and throughout, there is the sense that should the hearers turn on the speaker and remark on his error, he will have begun to show appropriate shame. (Goffman 1981: 215)

We know that “hesitations and doubt put the interpreter in a bad position, because they go against the expectations linked to his role as a professional of the spoken word” (Straniero Sergio 2007: 472).

Every time we outline the main differences between speech and writing the main feature that is mentioned is “its real time nature” (Mauranen 2009: 217) which is an “unavoidable hardship of life” (ibid). Although disfluencies and hesitations are “common features of normal speech” (ibid) we tend to describe these phenomena “in a somehow apologetic manner, as if in need of explanation or justification” (ibid). Boomer and Laver (1968:2 quoted in Goffman 1981: 206) suggest that:

It is important to recognize that in speech “normal” does not mean perfect. The norm for spontaneous speech is demonstrably imperfect. Conversation is characterized by frequent pauses, hesitation sounds, false starts, misarticulations and corrections...In everyday circumstances we simply do not hear many of our own tongue-slips nor those made by others. They can be discerned in running speech only by adopting a specialized “proofreader” mode of listening. In ordinary conversation it is as though we were bound by a shared, tacit, social agreement, both as listeners and as speakers, to keep the occurrence of tongue-slips out of conscious awareness, to look beyond them, as it were, to the regularized, idealized utterance.

Additions and repetitions are also used to stress a concept and are accompanied by a prosodic mark or rising intonation as the work “change” is reiterated. Repeating or reformulating already expressed concepts contributes to conveying coherence to the interpreted text as “coherence is not a mere feature of texts, but rather the outcome of cognitive processes among text users [...] a text does not make sense by itself but the sense is attained by the interaction of the knowledge present in the text with the receiver’s stored knowledge of the world” (De Beaugrande and Dressler 1981:6).

4.2. Addition to preserve inter-turn coherence

5. A: [...] il titolo (.) di (.) di questa raccolta di (.) di racconti Ruti vuole dormire è (.) che è quella del
 6. primo racconto (.) in realtà coglie un momento che è **importante per i bambini** (.) quello della sveglia o 7. dell'andare a letto e ehm: David Grossman ha: (.) ha raccontato anche in una: recente intervista fatta con noi
 8. (.) quanto sia **importante mantenere (.) questo momento** (.) un moment (.) trovare un tempo di lettura pe:r
 9. per i bambini e: (.) forse nello scrivere ehm (.) ehm (.) nello scrivere i racconti David (.) pensa anche a se stesso
 10. come lettore di racconti (.) no? è **un momento particolarmente importante questo**
- Backtranslation:

M. [...] the title (.) of this collection of stories of (.) stories Ruti wants to sleep is (.) that is the one of the first story (.) actually revolves around an **important moment for children** (.) waking up time or bed time and ehm: David Grossman has (.) has told in a: recent interview with us about the **importance of keeping (.) this moment (.) a moment finding a moment to read to children** and: (.) maybe ehm (.) ehm (.) in writing his stories David (.) also thinks of himself as a reader of stories (.) don't you? **This is a particularly important moment**

11.G: [...] and and when (.) when I write for children I think about these **ten minutes no more than that in 12. the evening**

13. I: beh (.) quando appunto scrivo per i bambini cerco da-davvero di pensare a **quei dieci importantissimi 14. minuti la sera**

Backtranslation:

I: well (.) when I write for children I try to rea-really think of **those ten extremely important ten minutes in the evening**

In segment [2], the interpreter adds a reinforcer, with the superlative “quei dieci importantissimi minuti la sera” (line 14 “those very important ten minutes in the night”), referring to what the moderator said previously. Indeed, the moderator uses the adjective ‘important’ three times (in line 6, 8 and 10). The guest indicates his agreement with the moderator’s statement, saying «yes» at the start of his reply. The interpreter uses the adjective “importantissimi” (line 13-14: “those ten extremely important minutes in the evening”) in in order to maintain inter-turn coherence between the moderator’s question and the guest’s reply.

4.3. Paraphrase

It is sometimes difficult to distinguish additions from paraphrase. Sornicola subdivides paraphrase into “inter-textual and intra-textual” (Sornicola 1999: 30). The former are produced between texts of different speakers, or between different texts by the same speaker, while the latter occur in a single text produced by one or more speakers” (Sornicola 1999:30). In particular, inter-textual paraphrase “can characteristically be produced by a fully developed “paraphrasal competence”. This consists of the ability to reformulate, which in addition to requiring a fairly ample stock of vocabulary and lexical structures (a necessary but not sufficient condition), but also a specific skill in transforming the text” (Sornicola 1999: 30). To Sornicola, paraphrase “is the most purely textual among the functions of discourse” (Sornicola 1999:30), with its own pragmatics. These can be divided into narrow-spectrum, or local paraphrases, and broad-

spectrum paraphrases. For example, local paraphrases are those in which one glosses a lexeme with another lexeme or in which the structure of a sentence is transformed into another sentence structure, without expansion processes involved in the transformation. Broad spectrum paraphrases instead involve transformations through expansions of various kinds. In this case, we can say that paraphrases of spontaneous speech are often "broad spectrum paraphrases" (1999: 43). Moreover, in narrow spectrum paraphrases "the structures in paraphrastic relation are always adjacent in the linear dimension of the text, or at the most separated by one or two intermediate structures; in this case they could be called discontinuous narrow-spectrum paraphrases" (Sornicola 1999: 43). According to Straniero Sergio (2007), the interpreter makes recourse to synonyms, hyponyms and hypernyms, creating genuine paraphrastic chains and re-laborating the antecedent lexical element and the ability to paraphrase is closely correlated with linguistic competence (Sornicola 1999) which is considered a useful tool for the identification of potential and reinforcement of linguistic skills.

The paraphrase is a "proactive strategy" (Murray 2012: 321) and it is used as a micro-planning device, as in the case of repetition (Straniero Sergio 2007). Straniero Sergio reports the observations made by Sornicola (1999: 48-49) apropos of the psycholinguistic nature of paraphrase, which, according to the author, apply perfectly to the interpreter:

The initial informational content is reformulated, with additions that represent small increments or detours from the "initial plan". In this sense one can say that paraphrases of speech, even those that most closely approximate ideal structures, contain shifts within themselves, minimal though they may be. This is entirely natural, if we consider paraphrase phenomena as the other side of the interface between thought and linguistic activity, what we might call "thought in movement" and "linguistic plan in movement".

This is a property of real speech rather than of ideal speech.

According to Straniero Sergio (2007), two factors determine the "paraphrasal development" of the source text by the interpreter, and these are 1) the principle of linearity, "which is an important requisite for producing a discourse" (Straniero Sergio 2007: 475) and 2) the speaker's communicative intent.

5. Trying to address RQ2: how to apply an ELF corpus to interpreter training?

Describing and understanding an emergent phenomenon which has become so prominent in our globalized world (Hülmbauer, Bohrlinger, Seidlhofer 2008: 33-34) requires observation of really occurring interactions (Laviosa 2002) and ELF research and corpus-driven interpreting (Straniero Sergio, Caterian Falbo 2012) studies can contribute to explore this world. Observing and analyzing interpreting strategies and norms through a corpus can become an interesting tool to raise students' awareness of intercultural phenomena in communication and pragmatic competence by focusing on the skills and strategies to be adopted in specific settings. As suggested by Murray (2012) these "awareness raising" sessions (Murray 2012: 320) provide trainees with the strategies "to negotiate their own hybrid pragmatics for each interaction and with whichever interlocutor they engage [...] so that they create a kind of temporary space where participants negotiate a new pragmatics for current purposes and mutually agree to relinquish any firm allegiance to their L1 pragmatic norms" (Murray 2012: 321). Murray (2012) suggests three complementary strategy types: 1) empirically based strategies, based on what we have learnt from ELF pragmatics studies; 2) inductive strategies to raise trainees' awareness by using an inductive, bottom up approach "whereby the observations of particulars leads to an understanding of general principles" (Murray 2012: 321) and 3) deductive strategies that raise trainees' awareness by using a deductive, top-down approach "through which learners develop an appreciation of those general, universal principles that govern linguistic choices and the way in which we are appropriate with language" (Murray 2012: 321). I adopt both an inductive and deductive approach, by asking students to listen to and observe how the interactions take place and how the interpreted text is being manipulated. The training session is organized a specific ELF module for first year MA interpreting students as a complement to consecutive interpreting workshop. A theoretical framework is provided to students and the thematic focus is on pragmatic features of ELF communication and interpreting norms and strategies. Video files and their transcripts can be used as training/practice materials in the classroom and at home; the session can be guided or the exercise can be carried out at home for self-assessment purposes. It is important to explain to students that their interpreting norms and strategies

can be analyzed only after a transcription of both source and target text has been made and *Transana* is a valuable tool that can be easily used by trainers and trainees to analyze and transcribe videos in the classroom and at home for practice. In the classroom, the teacher selects speeches by context and/ or by interactional features to illustrate a real life example of how interpreters act and react in specific ELF contexts and to encourage students to find their own pragmatic solution. The exercise in the classroom is organized as follows: the video is played and the students listen to the source language, then the video is stopped and the students are asked to take note of what they understood and they are asked to make their own consecutive; then the video is played again to listen to the consecutive interpretation performed by the professional interpreter and a discussion will follow. Students are asked to make their own comments on the interactional strategies used by the interpreter and on language-specific structures; the analysis is carried out both by listening and watching the video and by reading the transcript of the interpretation. Analyzing the interpreters' target text through transcription is extremely interesting for students who become easily aware of the pragmatic strategies adopted during interactions. At home, trainees can use *Transana* for assessment exercises and work on video files suggested by trainees or, more interestingly, they are encouraged to look for video files pertaining to the same speech genre, make their own transcription and analyze the interactions.

6. Concluding remarks

The unprecedented global spread of ELF poses challenges to the interpreting profession and interpreters' trainers (Albl-Mikasa 2010, 2013 b). Little research has been carried out on the effects of source text production on the interpreter's comprehension and production phase process in pragmatic terms (ibid).

The interaction discussed and analyzed in the context of Literature Festival has its peculiarities which can not be generalized. Nevertheless, the use of a corpus for the analysis of interpreted mediated interactions involving NNS provides learners with their own tools for analysis and the necessary strategies to negotiate their own "hybrid pragmatics for each interactional and with whichever interlocutor they engage" (Murray 2009: 321) and it can serve as a platform to "that raise learners' awareness by using an inductive, bottom-up approach

whereby the observation of particulars leads to an understanding of general principles” (Murray 2009: 321). Transcribing and analysing interactions is a practice that encourages learners “to become their own ethnographers and observe how speech acts are realized” (Murray 2009: 320) while providing them with an opportunity to use authentic data and discover how ELF speakers’ input affects their coping strategies (Albl-Mikasa 2013 b). In my approach I have been guided by 3 pedagogical principles. The first is that students can improve their interpreting skills by observing and analysing their own work and other interpreters’ work through the transcription of the interpreted text. The second being that encouraging students to analyse interpreters’ performances may contribute to sensitize them to the relationship between discourse practices and context. The third principle is a commonplace of interpreting pedagogy: people learn to interpret by interpreting. Students are asked to interpret particular passages to practice in imitation and to create their own interpreted text, helping them to understand that ELF conditions sometimes require. Through the observation of the pragmatic aspects of really occurring interpreted-mediated ELF interactions learners will be gradually encouraged to “induce those broader principles that govern the linguistic choices we make in order to communicate effectively and appropriately” (Murray 2009: 321) in a specific context and the “surprise effect” (Albl-Mikasa 2013 b: 8) and the frustration level produced by non-standard ELF language and pragmatic features would be lowered. This does not mean that new norms for interpreters working in ELF contexts will be proposed, rather, seen more in terms of a process rather than a product, the attempt is to raise the awareness of intercultural phenomena in communication.

7. References

- Albl-Mikasa, Michaela. 2010. Global English and English as a Lingua Franca (ELF): Implications for the Interpreting Profession. @ *Trans-kom* 3/2: 126-148. Retrieved May 20, 2014, from < <http://www.trans-kom.eu> >.
- Albl- Mikasa, Michaela. 2012. Interpreting Quality in Times of English as a Lingua Franca (ELF): New Variables and Requirements. @ L. Zybatow, A. Petrova & Michael Ustaszewski, eds. *Translation studies: old and new types of translation in theory and practice. proceedings of the 1st international conference translata, translation & interpreting research: yesterday? today? tomorrow?* Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang. ISBN: 978-3631635070, pp. 267- 273.

- Albl-Mikasa, Michaela. 2013 (a). Express-ability in ELF communication. @ *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca* 2/1: 101-122. DOI 10.1515/jelf-2013-0005.
- Albl-Mikasa, Michaela. 2013(b). Teaching Globish? The need for an ELF Pedagogy in interpreter training. @ *International Journal of Interpreter Education*, 5/1: 3-16. ISSN: 2150-5772.
- Beaugrande Robert de & Wolfgang U. Dressler. 1981. *Introduction to Text Linguistics*. London: Longman. ISBN: 9789027207852.
- Cogo, Alessia & Martin Dewey. 2012. *Investigating English as a Lingua Franca. A corpus-driven Investigation*. London/New York: Continuum International Publishing Group. ISBN 9781441137258.
- Cogo, Alessia. 2009. Accomodating difference in ELF conversations: a study of pragmatic strategies. @ A. Mauranen & E. Ranta, eds. *English as a Lingua Franca: Studies and Findings*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholar Press. ISBN 9781443817264, pp 254-273.
- ELFA. 2008. *The Corpus of English as a Lingua Franca in Academic Settings*. Director: Anna Mauranen. Available at <<http://www.helsinki.fi/elfa/elfacorus>> [Last accesses 20/05/14].
- Firth, Alan. 1996. The discursive accomplishment of normality: on lingua franca English and conversation analysis. @ *Journal of Pragmatics* 26/2: 237-59.
- Firth, Alan. 2009. The lingua franca factor. @ *Intercultural Pragmatics* 6/2: 147-170.
- Goffman, Erving. 1981. *Forms of Talk*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. ISBN 0812277902.
- House, Juliane. 2002. Developing Pragmatic Competence in English as a Lingua Franca. @ K. Knapp & C. Meierkord, eds. *Lingua Franca Communication*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang. ISBN 9783631364604, pp. 245-267.
- Hülmbauer, Cornelia, Heike Boheringer & Barbara Seidlhofer. 2008. Introducing English as a lingua franca (ELF): precursor and partner in intercultural communication. @ *Synergies* 3: 25-36.
- Kecskes, Isvan. 2014. *Intercultural Pragmatics*. New York: Oxford University Press. ISBN 9780199892655.
- Kurz, Ingrid. 2008. The impact of non-native English on students' interpreting performance. @ G. Hansen, A. Chesterman & H. Gerzymisch-Arbogast, eds. *Efforts and models in interpreting and translation research*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. ISBN: 9789027216892, pp. 179-192.
- Laviosa, Sara. 2002. *Corpus-based Translation Studies. Theory, Findings, Applications*. Amsterdam/New York: Rodopi. ISBN 9042014873.
- Lichtkoppler, Julia. 2007. Male. Male. Male? The sex is male. The role of repetition in English as a lingua franca. @ *Vienna English Working Papers* 16/1: 39-65. Available at <http://anglistik.univie.ac.at/fileadmin/user_upload/dep_anglist/weitere_Uploads/Views/views_0701.PDF> [Last accessed 26/05/ 2014].

- Mauranen, Anna & Elina Ranta. 2009. *English as a Lingua Franca: Studies and Findings*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Press. ISBN 978-1-443812962.
- Mauranen, Anna. 2006. Signaling and preventing misunderstanding in English as lingua franca communication. @ *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 177: 123-150.
- Mauranen, Anna. 2009. Chunking in ELF: expressions for managing interaction. @ *Journal of Intercultural Pragmatics* 6/2: 217-233.
- Murray, Neil. 2013. English as a lingua franca and the development of pragmatic competence. @ *ELT Journal Volume* 66/3: 318-326.
- Mead, Peter. 2012. Consecutive interpreting at a literature festival. @ C. J. Kellet Bidoli, ed. *Interpreting across genres: multiple research perspectives*. Trieste: EUT Edizioni Università di Trieste. ISBN: 9788883033650.
- Reithofer, Karin. 2010. English as a lingua franca vs. interpreting. Battleground or peaceful co-existence. @ *The Interpreters' Newsletter* 15: 143-157.
- Seidlhofer, Barbara. *Understanding English as a Lingua Franca*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press. ISBN 9780194375009.
- Sornicola, Rosanna. 1999. Un contributo allo studio sperimentale delle unità strutturali della parafrasi. @ L. Lumbell & B. Mortara Garavelli, eds. *Parafrasi. Dalla ricerca linguistica alla ricerca psicopedagogica*. Torino: Edizioni dell'Orso. ISBN 8876944206, pp. 29-49.
- Straniero, Sergio, Falbo, Caterina. 2012. *Breaking Ground in Corpus-based Interpreting Studies*. Bern: Peter Lang AG. ISBN: 9783034310710.
- VOICE. 2013. The Vienna-oxford international corpus of English (version 2.0). Director: Barbara Seidlhofer; Researchers: Angelica Breiteneder, Theresa Klimpfinger, Stefan Majewskij, Ruth Osimk-Teasdale, Marie-Luise Pitzl, Michael Radeka. Retrieved April 20, 2013, from < [http:// voice.univie.ac.at](http://voice.univie.ac.at)>