recharting territories

intradisciplinarity in translation studies

gisele dionísio da silva
and maura radicioni (eds)

Recharting Territories

Intradisciplinarity in Translation Studies

Edited by
Gisele Dionísio da Silva & Maura Radicioni

LEUVEN UNIVERSITY PRESS

With support of

KU LEUVEN

CETRA – CENTRE FOR
TRANSLATION STUDIES

GPRC
Guaranteed
Peer Reviewed
Content
www.gprc.be

Table of Contents

Part 3. Professional practices

Fundamental concepts in translation and interpreting reconsidered in light of ELF

Michaela Albl-Mikasa & Maureen Ehrensberger-Dow

Abstract

In previous work, we have outlined the effects that English as a lingua franca (ELF) or, more specifically, the increasing number of nonstandard English source texts (in specialized and public service translation) and speeches (in conference and community interpreting) can have on translation and interpreting (T&I) processing, performance, and quality (Albl-Mikasa and Ehrensberger-Dow 2019). We have also suggested that the respective research fields can be merged into the subdiscipline of Interpreting, Translation and English as a lingua franca (ITELF). In this chapter, we take a closer look at how Translation Studies and Interpreting Studies converge in facing and addressing similar issues and questions raised by the ubiquity of ELF in most places in the modern world. We consider fundamental translation and interpreting (T&I) concepts with different labels (e.g. speaker fidelity–loyalty) and contrast their relevance under what have been considered standard vs ELF conditions.

Keywords: ELF, ITELF, processing constraints, quality, cognitive load, professional image

1.   Introduction

Since Kade (1968) proposed it, the Latin-based term "translation" has been used as an umbrella term in German to cover both *Dolmetschen* (oral interpreting) and *Übersetzen* (written translation). This suggests major commonalities and convergences between the two subdisciplines, which can also be gleaned from the commonly used acronyms T&I (translation and interpreting) or TIS (Translation and Interpreting Studies) that combine the two (see Gile 2017). What specialized and public service translation certainly share with conference and community interpreting is that they all involve multilingual comprehension and production processes geared towards communicative

purposes and addressed to target audiences. They are cognitively demanding situated activities that constitute social practices involving agents with certain roles embedded in particular contexts and cultures (see Grbić and Wolf 2012 for more discussion of the common ground between the two). And in both interpreting and translating, the interlingual mediator is a necessary recipient of the message but is not the target audience. At the same time, there are undeniably aspects in which they differ. As Shlesinger and Malkiel (2005, 175) put it, "[t]here is still no consensus as to whether translation and simultaneous interpreting are essentially two variations on the same task, two fundamentally different endeavors, or two related undertakings".

Divergences become obvious when processing conditions are considered. Interpreting is an online, linear speech analysis and production process, often marked by simultaneity and tight time pressure with little room for self-correction, while translation usually involves a cyclical, possibly collaborative process of text comprehension and analysis, research, text production, and revision processes. These differences influence the capacity of the individuals performing the activity to deal with the varying constraints and demands imposed by other actors and agents involved (e.g. client, source speech/text producer, target audience) while still producing the expected level of quality. The individuals performing both activities are functioning as more or less invisible interlingual mediators with possibly differing understandings of their roles and responsibilities, whose training may or may not have prepared them for the current reality of professional translation and interpreting.

Against this backdrop, this chapter sets out to tease apart the various aspects of convergence and divergence and to do so with reference to the phenomenon of English as a lingua franca (ELF). ELF has been defined as the use of English "by speakers in the real world from professionals to tourists and asylum seekers" (Mauranen 2018, 10) who do not share another common language. In ELF situations, "speakers of any kind of English, from EFL [English as a foreign language], ENL [English as a native language], and ESL [English as a second language] contexts" (Seidlhofer 2011, 81), come together. This has led to interpreters and translators trained to work with language produced by native speakers dealing in their professional reality with an increasing proportion of speeches and texts produced under ELF conditions. Spoken and written ELF is an ideal basis for the examination of translational convergences and divergences, because here translation and interpreting start from a common denominator, namely that of varying degrees of nonstandard source input as a consequence of non-native speakers from all over the world outnumbering native speakers of English. Moreover, it is important to note here that, while "ELF does not exclude NSs of English,

(…) they are not included in data collection, and when they take part in ELF interactions, they do not represent a linguistic reference point" (Jenkins 2007, 3). In other words, what we are considering in particular here, and what translators and interpreters are concerned with when it comes to ELF, is the non-native use of English in international ELF scenarios, be it by EFL or ESL users.

While norm deviations and deficiencies in source texts and speeches are not a novel feature in T&I, since not every writer or speaker is equally eloquent, they are magnified under ELF conditions "on account of the variety and unpredictability of language parameters: interlocutors' accents, transfer features, and proficiency levels" (Mauranen 2012, 7). Some of the questions that need to be considered in this context include the following: What happens when central reception processes are disturbed or disrupted by unconventional or unfamiliar source language use? How do T&I professionals cope when co-text turns out to be unreliable on syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic levels or when contextual determinants such as the text producer's language and culture can no longer be gauged and norms become inaccessible? How do interpreters do justice to the basic tenets of speaker fidelity, accuracy, and complete rendition, when propositional content and illocutionary intent are unclear? How do translators draft idiomatic and natural-sounding target texts when the source texts may be quite the opposite? Our objective is to challenge some of the basic tenets of T&I and to propose a common conceptual basis for specialized and public service translation and for conference and community interpreting in the new era of interpreting, translation, and English as a lingua franca (ITELF).[1]

2.   Processing constraints

There are constraints inherent in any activity involving interlingual mediation, whereby processing conditions come into conflict with the comprehension and production strategies developed and rehearsed during monolingual first and foreign language acquisition. The four fundamental types of constraints are mode-based, temporal, task-specific, and situational constraints (list adapted from Kucharska 2009). While translation and interpreting diverge (to some extent) on mode-based (simultaneity and divided attention for interpreting) and temporal (externally-driven/imposed pace and time

---

1   The methodological basis is presented in Albl-Mikasa et al. (2020) and Ehrensberger-Dow et al. (2020).

pressure for interpreting) constraints, they converge on some of the "situational" (interpreter/translator as recipient, but not addressee of source text production; reliance on well-functioning technological support; knowledge deficit as compared to the expert producing the source text or speech) and, in particular, on the "task-specific" constraints. The latter include: "the [continuing] presence of source language structures [during production], translators' lack of thematic-semantic autonomy, and processing depth during source text comprehension" (Kohn 2004, 221, our translation). Under ELF conditions, these constraints are exacerbated by further complicating factors.[2]

1. *Prevailing presence of source language structures*: While interlocutors in an oral communication situation are tuned into shallow comprehension processes that stop when "good-enough" or sufficiently relevant meaning recovery is achieved, interpreters cannot discard bottom-up signals once they have fulfilled their comprehension-guiding function. For the purpose of continuously monitoring the translation process, they have to be kept in an activated state, while the interpreter searches for appropriate target language expressions, at the risk of a high potential for interference[3] (Kohn 1990, 2004). Such copresence of source speech structures goes far beyond co-activation of two or more languages in bilinguals (Grosjean 1997) and is at the basis of interpreters' need for extreme language control (Hervais-Adelman et al. 2015).
Translators must also be wary of the influence of interference, which Hansen (2010, 385) explains as "projections of unwanted features from one language to the other and from ST to TT. They occur because of an assumption of symmetry between the languages and/or cultures which may appear in some cases, but not in the actual case". The contrary of interference is positive crosslinguistic influence or positive transfer (Jarvis and Pavlenko 2008), which is thought to occur when the assumption of symmetry between languages is warranted and helps in the target language production. Negative transfer is more often discussed in the research literature than positive transfer because the latter is invisible (that is, indistinguishable from target language production being correct for a variety of reasons) and because strictly keeping source and target

2   The following points have been slightly adapted from Albl-Mikasa (2022) and expanded upon.
3   Interference is generally used in its negative sense in TIS, so can be considered equivalent to crosslinguistic influence that is detrimental to performance or "negative transfer", which is the more commonly used term in the fields of language learning and multilingualism (see Odlin 2003 for definitions).

languages apart and avoiding visible transfer are integral aspects of the translational task. Language selection and inhibition are, of course, among the cognitive processes that make T&I particularly demanding. When interpreters and translators deal with ELF input, both types of crosslinguistic influence are complicated by the presence of a third language in the mix (i.e. the dominant language of the ELF user[4] who is producing the source input). This can affect processing and performance in the target language in a number of ways. For one, reliance on positive transfer from certain standard English lexis, grammatical structures, etc. can be disrupted or misled if those are being used in unusual ways in the ELF input. The source speech items or text may markedly deviate from the standard stored as part of the interpreter's or translator's linguistic knowledge, which may result in additional cognitive effort being required to suppress misleading positive transfer in addition to the usual effort needed to inhibit negative transfer in the production phase. However, this may be partly compensated if the interpreter or translator happens to be proficient in the dominant language of the ELF user, since that might help them to recognize the intended meaning despite lack of adherence to standard English norms. This phenomenon has been identified elsewhere as the "shared languages benefit" or SLB (see Albl-Mikasa 2013, 105).

2. *Lack of semantic autonomy*: During ordinary, nonmediated speaking and writing, the propositional content and the actual forms of expression are assumed to evolve in close interaction, under the guidance of an overarching communicative goal. Linguistic expressions do not seem to be chosen to match preestablished and fixed messages in the mind but to represent more or less precisely developed ideas and intentions. These are progressively articulated in gradual meaning and form creation, influenced by target language items produced bottom-up. In interpreting and translation, with no thematic-semantic autonomy, the source language user's preformulated input gets in the way of free access to and intuitive and strategic activation of linguistic knowledge (Kohn 1990, 2004) and might give rise to the need for activating different possible readings of that input.
    Under ELF conditions, the assimilation of someone else's thematic-semantic specifications is further complicated if the input lacks conciseness

4   While in common ELF definitions an ELF user can also be a native speaker of English, in ITELF research the term is used to refer primarily to non-native, and therefore multilingual, speakers of English (see Albl-Mikasa and House 2020).

and clarity due to reduced express-ability on the part of the ELF user (see Albl-Mikasa 2013). It may become necessary to compensate by means of (more resource-intensive) higher-order inferences based on background knowledge and working memory operations. In addition to the usual need to activate different possible readings of input, the interpreter or translator might have to spend more effort on plausibility checks because of uncertainty concerning the intended meaning.

3. *In-depth comprehension*: Meaning recovery processes, as part and parcel of all communication, have to be carried out in an unusually diligent and exhaustive manner in contexts involving interlingual mediation (see Kohn 1990, 2004). Contrary to nonmediated language processing, the preferred approach in interpreting and translation is rarely to ignore, skip over, or omit parts of the message. If the source speech input does not allow for the unambiguous and precise determination of the intended meaning, target speech rendition by an interpreter cannot be spontaneous or complete. If a text is ambiguous and too little background information is available, a translator must expend additional time and energy in attempting to clarify the source text message.
    In processing input from some ELF users, such in-depth comprehension is rendered more difficult if the input is incoherent, imprecise, unconventional, incomplete, or simply incomprehensible. This requires a certain amount of "normalization" (see Hewson 2009, 119) or "pre-editing" of non-native speaker input. In the case of interpreting, this demands additional resources for attentive listening, enhanced meaning analysis, and the double-checking of source speech understanding. For translators, this might entail an additional step of actually pre-editing the source input during the orientation phase to clarify meaning before starting to draft the translation. Furthermore, additional time and effort might have to be expended in researching terms that are used in unconventional ways to determine whether that is acceptable in some specialized fields or simply a misuse.

The situatedness of interlingual mediation also imposes constraints on processing and performance that interact with the internal factors mentioned above and can be intensified or supplemented in the context of ELF. Interpreters are directly involved in the communicative event,[5] which provides

---

5   Even with remote interpreting, it is accepted as good professional practice for interpreters to have a view of the speakers and other participants (AIIC-CH 2020).

them with rich information about the situation, and often have additional contextual information in the form of visuals and conference materials. However, they usually have little access to external resources while actually interpreting, mostly because of the time pressure (although they might have a laptop with them or be able to check things during breaks). In the case of (mostly simultaneous) conference interpreters, the time pressure is intense because of the simultaneity of the task, but for all types of interpreting the rate of input delivery is under the control of the speaker, not the interpreter (see Kucharska 2009 for a discussion of interpreting-specific constraints).

In the case of ELF speakers, interpreters might be forced to deal with pauses at unexpected places that could disrupt their own pace of delivery. In addition, unusual disfluencies due to lexical searches, false starts, hesitations, and other processing phenomena typical of many non-native speakers (Mauranen 2012, 230), not to mention unfamiliar accents stemming, in globalized conference settings, from both native and non-native varieties, all aggravate the interpreter's externally controlled speech delivery pace and flow. Another aspect interpreters have to come to terms with is dealing with register shifts, which can be used in native speech for emphatic or rhetorical purposes. This, however, requires very advanced proficiency in English, but many ELF speakers might not have the same sensitivity to connotations. Entertaining doubts as to whether shifts in register, as observed in ELF speech (Albl-Mikasa 2017, 376), are placed deliberately and can be taken at face value may lead to further interruptions in the interpreter's processing.

Contrary to interpreters, translators are usually distant both in time and (virtual) space from source text producers. Even institutional translators and freelancers, who can expect to have more contact with their clients than translators working for language service providers, often have little or no direct contact with source text authors, who may be unknown, anonymous, or multiple individuals for a single text.[6] There is thus often little or no information available about the author and possibly no translation brief or background information. This does not mean that the source text is completely decontextualized, however. Client-related terminology and style guidelines constrain but also facilitate decision-making, as do translation memories (TM) and CAT (computer-aided translation) tools.[7] Translators have

6   This is very common in, although not unique to, institutional translation, in which the source texts (e.g. laws, guidelines, regulations) usually go through several iterations and hierarchical levels before being sent for translation (see van de Geuchte and van Vaerenbergh 2016).
7   See Ehrensberger-Dow and Massey (2017) for more discussion of various types of constraints in professional translation.

more time to check other external resources instead of relying as heavily on internal resources as interpreters must. This additional time and use of external resources are crucial aspects of translation since written texts are permanent and, as such, need to be more explicit, complete, and precise than the immediacy associated with interpreting might allow.

In English source texts produced by non-native speakers, nonadherence to client-related terminology and style guidelines might reflect a lack of awareness on the part of the text producer rather than intentional deviation for stylistic reasons. In the former case, the translator would be expected to nevertheless adhere to client requirements in the target text but, in the latter, stylistic variation should be reflected in the target text. Contacting the author (if known) or the client for clarification slows down the process and is resource-intensive. It also carries the risk of a non-native speaker being offended about their use of English when challenged by another non-native speaker of English (since much of professional translation, at least in Europe and North America, is done from the non-native into the native language). CAT tools might be of less use when translating texts produced by ELF users because of the lower probability of matches with standard formulations in the TM. In the extreme, this would force the translator to carry out the majority of a translation from scratch within a tool that is not designed for that and to overload the TM with idiosyncratic source text formulations that are unlikely to be useful for future translation work.

3.   Capacity management and cognitive load

Since the cognitive load of processing ELF input can be "unusually heavy" (Mauranen 2012, 7), interlingual mediators have to accommodate this in their capacity management, which in turn contributes to effort or to detriments in performance. This can have implications for any and, in extreme cases, all phases of the interlingual process. For example, comprehension of ELF input can require higher concentration and more attentive listening or reading as well as more effort directed towards disambiguation and meaning derivation to compensate for incomplete, vague, unconventional structures, and/or incoherent argumentative logic. The consequence is that translators need more time and effort for comprehension and possibly pre-editing of the source text and interpreters have to concentrate harder, invest more resources in analysis and plausibility checks, and improvise. For both interpreters and translators, this extra effort can result in a division of attention that can come at the expense of target language formulation. The guesswork, introduction of doubt

and distrust as well as lack of norms and control put language professionals in a constant state of vigilance or even alarm, requiring additional plausibility checks during comprehension that can strain their cognitive resources.

During the transfer phase, unconventional formulations in a source speech can cause interference and disruptions when accessing "long-established automatisms" (Albl-Mikasa 2010, 138) and established translation equivalents. Reliance on the mental (for interpreters) or mental and digital (for translators) translation memory built up over time is at the roots of automatization, without which time- and resource-saving expert behavior is not possible. By contrast, unexpected nonconventional ELF input acting as "brain stoppers", as observed by professional interpreters (Albl-Mikasa 2014, 23), may seriously disrupt processing flow. For translation, this adverse effect could be referred to as "flow blockers", because, unlike trainees, some professional translators have been shown to translate in a linear fashion from (text) beginning to end, with relatively few regressions for revisions (see Massey and Ehrensberger-Dow 2014).[8] Ideal-case immersion in the task, reported as a "trance-like state of flow" (Leppihalme 2011) for translators and a "detached, almost airborne position" (Gran 1989, 98) for interpreters is less likely under ELF conditions. What might be at stake is heightened cognitive load through a "drop" from top-down to bottom-up processing with increased monitoring on the part of the interpreter and "stop-and-go" research-writing alternation on that of the translator.

As discussed in the previous section, the cognitive effort associated with suppressing negative transfer and recognizing opportunities to exploit positive transfer is greater for the unconventional use that is typical of ELF input. If translators are not successful in extracting the meaning of the source text, they might resort to a default strategy of literal translation (see Tirkkonen-Condit, Mäkisalo, and Immonen 2008), staying close to source text formulations and lexis. Translators might later have the chance to compensate for nonoptimal formulations in the revision phase, assuming that the deadline allows this, but this option is definitely not open to interpreters, whose output is necessarily immediate. The only option left to interpreters is to use *décalage* modulation to their advantage. However, reducing the ear-voice span to stay closer to the source speech works only when the information is coherent enough for the interpreter to deduce content. When the input is insufficient, the default strategy of bottom-up word-for-word interpreting does not leave enough scope to produce an adequate or at least sensible interpretation.

8   For more consideration of flow in the translation process, see O'Brien et al. (2017).

Dealing with ELF input can, in fact, lead to a disruption of core inter-preting strategies such as anticipation, since it is very difficult to predict unconventional use, and the interpreter cannot jump ahead in the text as a translator can. Interpreters are often left with more intensive use of other habitual strategies such as reliance on visual aids (e.g. slides presented by the speaker) or intensified preparation, corresponding to the translator's research effort mentioned above. Novel strategies for both interpreters and translators are open to empirical exploration. SLB-reliance (i.e. relying on the shared languages benefit) is clearly an ELF-specific strategy that has emerged from the new (ELF) conditions. The implication is that interpreters and translators are well advised to inquire with clients about the language profiles and cultural backgrounds of their source text/speech producers.

A common phenomenon in translation, which has even been called a trans-lation universal or "law" (Toury 2012, 303–304) and is particularly relevant in the context of ELF source texts, is standardization or conventionalization. The claim is that, in the process of translation, the target text tends to exhibit more standard or conventional use of language than the source text. When the source text is already nonstandard and requires pre-editing and/or extra effort to comprehend it, then the risk is great that the tendency towards standardization in the target text might contribute to undesirable levels of vagueness. A competing phenomenon is explicitation, which both students and professionals have been found to engage in (see Englund Dimitrova 2005). The effort associated with adding explanations in a target text to compensate for lack of clarity in the source text would contribute to cognitive load. When dealing with ELF input, a translator is also forced into the position of constantly having to decide whether to try to produce a target text that reads as naturally as possible (i.e. to use an adaptation or domesticating strategy) or to transfer traces of the unconventional language use to the target text (i.e. a foreignizing strategy; see Paloposki 2011).

In effect, interpreters and translators dealing with ELF input have to decide whether their mandate is that of "creating the illusion of the non-hybrid text" (Pym 2001, 11) or of being loyal to the source text despite its idiosyncrasies. If they take compensation, normalization, and optimization measures (and perhaps even sell this as a USP) in the target audience's interest as a type of domestication, it is not clear whether clients will be prepared to cover the cost of the extra cognitive effort and temporal resources that this would require. The question of whether it would be disloyal to ELF text producers to engage in such domestication or adaptation, which might even verge on transcreation, is considered below.

4.   Quality

Some basic concepts associated with notions of quality in T&I include fidelity, faithfulness, loyalty, user expectations, accuracy, errors, and norms. In most of the literature on quality, the focus is on considerations of the product (translation) or performance (interpreting). While source input quality has been identified as a major factor and determinant of difficulty in interpreting (Gile 2009, 200; Kalina 2006, 253), there is little such discussion of its influence in translation,[9] although Gouadec (2010, 271) does mention that among other things it is important to "certif[y] (if possible) [the] quality of the material to be translated – either intrinsically or as the result of upgrading" to assure the quality of the output. However, the ISO 17100 (2015) norm for translation service provision makes no mention of the quality of source language content or how it should be ensured or improved upon. This is in contrast to professional translators, who have voiced their frustration in forums[10] about having to deal with source texts written by untrained writers or non-native speakers or have explicitly identified poor-quality source texts as an issue in survey and workplace studies (e.g. Ehrensberger-Dow and Massey 2017; Lafeber 2012). Similar frustration on the part of professional interpreters when dealing with non-native speeches has been well documented in the work of the first author and colleagues (e.g. Albl-Mikasa 2017; Reithofer 2010).

    Such expressions of disconcertedness are relevant in that they shed a problematizing light on one of the most fundamental interpreting principles, namely that of speaker fidelity as expressed by Déjean Le Feal (1990, 155):

> What our listeners receive through their earphones should produce the same effect on them as the original speech does on the speaker's audience. It should have the same cognitive content and be presented with equal clarity and precision in the same type of language if not better, given that we are professional communicators, while many speakers are not, and sometimes even have to express themselves in languages other than their own.

If an ELF speech is unclear and difficult to follow, this principle would imply delivery of the "same" effect and, as a consequence, poor output, while paradoxically obliging the interpreter to produce a speech of a similar or improved level of clarity.

---

9   For a rare exception, see Molnár (2013).
10   https://www.proz.com/forum/translation_theory_and_practice/329057-bad_source_text.
html

Interpreters, as communication experts mediating between delegates of different cultures and having to bear the event's purpose in mind, have always had to engage in a balancing act between speaker fidelity and audience design. This has certainly intensified under ELF conditions, in that speaker fidelity is less straightforward to determine (i.e. whether to interpret what was said or what the non-native speaker seemed to be trying to say). At the same time, the strict temporal constraints of the interpreting situation may prevent the interpreter from wasting time agonizing about whether to try to improve clarity, while translators may be forced into the dilemma of choosing between being faithful to the source text or loyal to the purpose of the target text and to the target audience. The GIGO[11] principle, more common in discussions of machine translation quality, is difficult to justify in the context of professional translation in which translators are expected to shape the target text in accordance with the translation brief and the needs of the target users. In a special issue about the reality and characteristics of what have been termed "hybrid texts", Pym (2001, 202) suggests "that the people sharing the translator's intercultural space are increasingly the authors of source texts, and that the real hybrids, the out-and-out weirdos, are more likely to be precisely those source texts". The question then becomes whether interpreters and translators should try to "create and project the illusion of the non-hybrid text" (Pym 2001, 205) if ELF input is essentially hybrid in nature. Taviano (2018, 257) points out that "[t]ranslators working for international organizations, such as the EU and the UN, face the complex task of translating such hybrid texts while being asked to produce clear and accessible translations". Not only does this require extra effort on the part of the translators, the natural-sounding and coherent target output might be at the expense of violating the conventional quality principles of fidelity, faithfulness, and loyalty if the intended meaning of the source text is not actually conveyed.

The concepts of accuracy and errors must also be reconsidered in the context of ELF input. Interpreting renditions are meant to be complete, accurate, and enable smooth communication. The interpreter's task is not to deliver a perfect text, but perhaps to iron out structural irregularities. According to Kucharska (2009), interpreters have limited freedom of choice with respect to style and form when trying to optimize their performance in "deficit situations". Translations, by contrast, are generally meant to be better than defective source texts, since translators serve as critical first readers and

11   GIGO is short for "garbage in – garbage out" and refers to the risks associated with poor-quality input.

are expected to have the domain knowledge and/or do the research necessary to be able to understand unclear texts. However, some passages may require the translator to simply make a best guess that is congruent with the rest of the text but risks deviating from the intended meaning if there is no recourse to checking with the source text author. It can be extremely difficult in the context of such ELF conditions to define on what basis accuracy or errors, or indeed the quality of the product in general, can be judged.

The concept of translational norms, introduced by Toury (1980) and expanded upon by Chesterman ([1993] 2017, [2006] 2017), is also relevant in the context of ELF, since one could argue that norms are blurring as communication becomes globalized. As translators and interpreters are increasingly confronted with source language content produced by non-native speakers, they are being forced to develop ways of dealing with it and their own norms, which include accepting compromises in their conventional notions of target product and performance quality as well as their accountability. This can also affect their understanding of their own role in the communication process and their professional image, as discussed in the next section.

5.   Professional image

The roles and responsibilities of professional interpreters and translators, which are based on and contribute to forming their professional image, have been discussed elsewhere in more detail (e.g. Albl-Mikasa 2020; Schäffner 2020), but it is worth reflecting on them here in the context of ELF settings. For example, Albl-Mikasa (2020, 92) points out that interpreting standards and codes of ethics provide guidance to interpreters (AIICC 2015, 2018) and that, "[by] observing these, conference interpreters were and still are assumed to know what to do and how to act and behave in order to promote successful multilingual communication". However, there is no mention in either of those AIIC documents as to the responsibilities of the interpreter when the input is difficult to understand for reasons of nonstandard input, let alone instructions as to how to deal with the abovementioned vagaries regarding speaker fidelity and T&I quality under ELF conditions.

The conventional understanding of professional interpreting has relied on the so-called conduit model: "under many circumstances which arise in conference settings, in press conferences, in technical and commercial seminars, in political speeches (…) the neutral conduit model is a useful ideal, still widely accepted within the profession as the default standard" (Gile 2017, 241). Since the social turn, which was especially noticeable in the

area of community interpreting (see Grbić and Wolf 2012, 7), there has been more discussion on the role of interpreters and the notion of professionalism. Intervention, discussed with reference to the construct of "agency" or "spaces of freer ability to determine interactional moves" (Hlavac 2017, 198), no longer seems to be frowned upon and, in the case of ELF input, may be essential. In their roles as multilingual facilitators, interpreters need to grapple with the questions of whether to reproduce source speech weaknesses, to normalize as far as possible within the temporal and situational constraints, or to attempt to produce a smooth, coherent target text that belies the quality of the source input. Striving to do the last-mentioned without being recognized for it might help to explain the decreasing levels of motivation and job satisfaction as well as increasing levels of stress and frustration that professional interpreters have reported as the proportion of non-native producers of source texts has increased (see Albl-Mikasa 2010). If instead professional interpreters recognize that their skills have uniquely prepared them for making sense of fleeting, incomplete, and sometimes incoherent speeches produced by either native or non-native speakers, they may be in a better position to deal with the special challenges that ELF input can present. They could rebrand themselves as intercultural consultants and multilingual communication experts (see also Albl-Mikasa 2017) and, with the appropriate training and experience with non-native varieties, be more confident and have access to the strategies they need when interpreting English speeches produced by non-native speakers.

The situation is very similar to interpreting with respect to the ethics that professional translators are meant to abide by. Chesterman (2001, 139) points out that "[t]he ethical imperative is to represent the source text, or the source author's intention, accurately, without adding, omitting or changing anything". In her discussion of translators' roles and responsibilities, Schäffner (2020) cites a relevant section of the ITI Code (2016, 7): "ensuring fidelity of meaning and register, unless specifically instructed by their clients, preferably in writing, to recreate the text in the cultural context of the target language". The International Federation of Translators (FIT) is even more explicit in this respect about translators' obligations in point 4 of its charter: "Every translation shall be faithful and render exactly the idea and form of the original – this fidelity constituting both a moral and legal obligation for the translator".[12]

Notions of fidelity and faithfulness depend on the ability of the translator to make sense of the source text in order to convey the message intended by

12   https://www.fit-ift.org/translators-charter

the producer. If the source text is not coherent enough to allow for meaning making or there are errors in linguistic usage that block or distort the intended sense, then translators are faced with a moral and legal dilemma. According to McDonough Dolmaya (2011), ethical codes do not provide translators with much guidance. In her review of 17 codes of ethics from around the world, she found that "[i]n many cases, even when the codes do address the issue of accuracy, they do not specifically state what translators should do when faced with ST errors, untruths or ambiguities" (2011, 32).

Rather than slavish loyalty to the source text, most professional translators seem to have an appreciation of their role in terms of juggling responsibilities to the author(s), client(s), and readers (see Ehrensberger-Dow and Massey 2013 for further discussion). Katan (2011) bemoans his survey results that suggest most translators see themselves in a low-autonomy profession and speculates what translation as a high-autonomy profession might look like. Although he does not include it in his list of "Language providers, Localizers, or Cultural interpreters" (2011, 84), translators who are comfortable dealing with ELF input could carve out a market for themselves. This would be consistent with Massey and Wieder's (2019, 76) calls for a broadening of "professional opportunities and range, developing an extended self-concept as intercultural mediators, adaptive transcreators and language consult-ants". A new understanding of roles and responsibilities would empower translators to move away from the source text when necessary, intervene appropriately when input is insufficient, and expand their professional image to include a specialization in the growing market of translation from ELF texts. Having said that, it must be remembered that few practicing translators or interpreters have had the benefit of specific training that would prepare them for the new roles arising from the spread of ELF (see Taviano 2013 for suggestions).

6.   Conclusion

In the 21ˢᵗ century, interpreters and translators are clearly facing the same key challenges, namely Internet-based technologies (especially in the form of remote interpreting and free machine translation) and coping with the rapid spread of ELF, manifested in source texts and speeches being increasingly produced by non-native English speakers. Despite differences in working conditions, interpreting and translation converge on a great number of factors impacting the profession and processes due to the same fundamental cognitive and communicative principles governing T&I. Not surprisingly, labels for

concepts in each domain can be readily matched with their counterparts in the other, as the nonexhaustive list in Table 3.1 illustrates.

Interpreting	Translation
Speaker fidelity	Loyalty
Word-for-word interpreting	Literal translation
Meaning-based interpreting	Free translation
Detached airborne position	Trance-like state of flow
Brain stoppers	Flow blockers
Plausibility checks	Normalization
Monitoring	Revising
Mental translation memory	(Mental and) digital translation memory
Audience design	Adaptation for target readership
Accommodation	Localization

Table 3.2 Concepts in interpreting and translation especially relevant in the context of ELF input.

Convergences are particularly salient when considering language mediation under ELF conditions, which seems to produce very similar consequences and repercussions that confront interpreters and translators with related questions, issues, and challenges. Varying degrees of nonstandard (spoken and written) source input as a result of increasing globalization accentuate topics related to the mental (cognitive load) and material (i.e. time-remuneration ratio) cost for the profession. By implication, this means that research should be directed towards both market- and processing-related studies. As regards the latter, an extension of existing vs the development of new, ELF-specific strategies and competences should be on the agenda for research and teaching. Since recent findings point to habituation effects or, more precisely, to exposure to ELF being a better predictor of ELF input comprehension than either domain-specific background knowledge (preparation) or English proficiency levels (Reithofer 2020), introduction to the various types of ELF and World English in the form of ELF-produced source texts and speeches should be prioritized. A similar shift away from a focus on teaching only local or prestige native speaker varieties has already been documented in the literature on World Englishes (e.g. Nelson, Proshina, and Davis 2020). Other topics of interest to T&I against the backdrop of ELF include directionality, language pairs (English as an important or even necessary part of professionals' language profiles), and addressing mixed audiences.

Finally, and in view of the parallels and convergences discussed in this chapter, the interplay between ELF and T&I is yet to be explored. According to Gaspari and Bernardini (2010), ELF (or non-native English, as outlined above) communication and translation can be seen as forms of language mediation sharing similar features (such as explicitation, normalization, or simplification), which has since been supported by corpus research (e.g. Kruger and van Rooy 2016). More recently, Kajzer-Wietrzny (2022) found that oral and written texts produced in the context of language mediation (i.e. T&I) and those by non-native (Polish) speakers showed evidence of being constrained relative to native speaker productions, but in different ways. How much more complex does the equation get when we consider translations from ELF-based source texts and speeches? ELF-based translations could be considered hybrid texts in that they retain traces of text producers' dominant multilingual background as well as of the source text (Mauranen 2008, 2012). Will such "ELF translations" and "ELF interpretations" turn out to be doubly constrained, explicit or overly simplified and expressly dehybridified? A large interdisciplinary research project we are involved in, which encompasses the investigation of both spoken and written ELF and builds on T&I parallels and commonalities, sets out to address the question of what it is that interpreters and translators actually do on the (target) text level when they interpret and translate such source speeches and texts.[13] Interpreters and translators may be uniquely placed to compensate the negative effects of non-native speech for readers and listeners, but the compensation and accommodation measures they take are under-researched and deserve closer description.

References

AIIC. 2015. *Professional Standards*. https://aiic.org/document/4201/15E-Profes-sional%20Standards.pdf

———. 2018. *Code of Professional Ethics*. https://aiic.org/document/4195/Code_of_professional_ethics_ENG.pdf

AIIC-CH. 2020. *Reference Guide to Remote Simultaneous Interpreting*. https://aiic.ch/wp-content/uploads/2020/05/aiic-ch-reference-guide-to-rsi.pdf

Albl-Mikasa, Michaela. 2010. "Global English and English as a Lingua Franca (ELF): Implications for the Interpreting Profession." *Trans-Kom* 3 (2): 126–148.

13   More information about the "Cognitive Load in Interpreting and Translation (CLINT)" project can be found at https://www.zhaw.ch/linguistik/iued/clint.

Albl-Mikasa, Michaela. 2013. "Express-Ability in ELF Communication." *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca* 2 (1): 101–122.

———. 2014. "English as a Lingua Franca in International Conferences." *Interpreting and Translation Studies (Korea)* 18 (3): 17–42.

———. 2017. "ELF and Translation/Interpreting." In *The Routledge Handbook of English as a Lingua Franca*, edited by Jennifer Jenkins, Will Baker, and Martin Dewey, 369–383. London: Routledge.

———. 2020. "Interpreters' Roles and Responsibilities." In *The Bloomsbury Companion to Language Industry Studies*, edited by Erik Angelone, Maureen Ehrensberger-Dow, and Gary Massey, 91–114. London: Bloomsbury Academic.

———. 2022. "Conference Interpreting and English as a Lingua Franca." In *The Routledge Handbook of Conference Interpreting*, edited by Michaela Albl-Mikasa and Elisabet Tiselius (in press). London: Routledge.

———, and Maureen Ehrensberger-Dow. 2019. "ITELF: (E)merging Interests in Interpreting and Translation Studies." In *Translation and Interpreting: Convergence, Contact, Interaction*, edited by Eugenia Dal Fovo and Paola Gentile, 45–62. Oxford: Peter Lang.

———, Maureen Ehrensberger-Dow, Andrea Hunziker Heeb, Caroline Lehr, Michael Boos, Matthias Kobi, Lutz Jäncke, and Stefan Elmer. 2020. "Cognitive Load in Relation to Non-Standard Language Input: Insights from Interpreting, Translation and Neuropsychology." *Translation, Cognition & Behavior* 3 (2): 261–284.

———, and Juliane House. 2020. "Introduction." *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca* 9 (2): 169–172.

Chesterman, Andrew. [1993] 2017. "From 'is' to 'ought' Laws, Norms and Strategies in Translation Studies." Chap. 13 in *Reflections on Translation Theory: Selected Papers 1993–2014*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

———. 2001. "Proposal for a Hieronymic Oath." *The Translator* 7 (2): 139–154.

———. [2006] 2017. "A Note on Norms and Evidence." Chap. 14 in *Reflections on Translation Theory: Selected Papers 1993–2014*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Déjean Le Féal, Karla. 1990. "Some Thoughts on the Evaluation of Simultaneous Interpretation." In *Interpreting: Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow*, edited by David Bowen and Margareta Bowen, 154–160. Binghamton, NY: SUNY.

Ehrensberger-Dow, Maureen, and Gary Massey. 2013. "Indicators of Translation Competence: Translators' Self-Concepts and the Translation of Titles." *Journal of Writing Research* 5 (1): 103–131.

———, and Gary Massey. 2017. "Socio-Technical Issues in Professional Translation Practice." *Translation Spaces* 6 (1): 104–121.

———, Michaela Albl-Mikasa, Katrin Andermatt, Andrea Hunziker Heeb, and Caroline Lehr. 2020. "Cognitive Load in Processing ELF: Translators, Interpreters, and other Multilinguals." *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca* 9 (2): 217–238.

Englund Dimitrova, Birgitta. 2005. *Expertise and Explicitation in the Translation Process*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Gaspari, Federico, and Silvia Bernardini. 2010. "Comparing Non-Native and Translated Language: Monolingual Comparable Corpora with a Twist." In *Using Corpora in Contrastive and Translation Studies*, edited by Richard Xiao, 215–234. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Gile, Daniel. 2009. *Basic Concepts and Models for Interpreter and Translator Training*. 2nd ed. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

———. 2017. "Editorial." *The CIRIN Bulletin: Conference Interpreting Research Information Network* 53, 1–3.

Gouadec, Daniel. 2010. "Quality in Translation." In *Handbook of Translation Studies, vol. 1*, edited by Yves Gambier and Luc van Doorslaer, 270–275. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Gran, Laura. 1989. "Interdisciplinary Research on Cerebral Asymmetries: Significance and Prospects for the Teaching of Interpretation." In *The Theoretical and Practical Aspects of Teaching Interpretation*: *Proceedings of the Trieste Symposium, 1986*, edited by Laura Gran and John M. Dodds, 93–100. Udine: Campanotto Editore.

Grbić, Nadja, and Michaela Wolf. 2012. "Common Grounds in Translation and Interpreting (Studies)." In *Handbook of Translation Studies, vol. 3*, edited by Yves Gambier and Luc van Doorslaer, 7–16. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Grosjean, François. 1997. "The Bilingual Individual." *Interpreting* 2 (1): 163–187.

Hansen, Gyde. 2010. "Translation Errors." In *Handbook of Translation Studies, vol. 1*, edited by Yves Gambier and Luc van Doorslaer, 385–388. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Hervais-Adelman, Alexis, Barbara Moser-Mercer, Christoph M. Michel, and Narly Golestani. 2015. "fMRI of Simultaneous Interpretation Reveals the Neural Basis of Extreme Language Control." *Cerebral Cortex* 25 (12): 4727–4739.

Hewson, Lance. 2009. "Brave New Globalized World? Translation Studies and English as a Lingua Franca." *Revue Française de Linguistique Appliquée* XIV (1): 109–120.

Hlavac, Jim. 2017. "Brokers, Dual-Role Mediators and Professional Interpreters: A Discourse-Based Examination of Mediated Speech and the Roles that Linguistic Mediators Enact." *The Translator* 23 (2): 197–216.

Institute of Translation and Interpreting. 2016. *ITI Code of Professional Conduct*. October 29. https://www.iti.org.uk/static/6909eff8-8571-4d23-9d6df933d33b732c/Code-of-Professional-Conduct.pdf

ISO 17100. 2015. *Translation Services: Requirements for Translation Services*. Geneva: International Organization for Standardization.

Jarvis, Scott, and Aneta Pavlenko. 2008. *Crosslinguistic Influence in Language and Cognition*. New York: Routledge.

Jenkins, Jennifer. 2007. *English as a Lingua Franca: Attitude and Identity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kade, Otto. 1968. *Zufall und Gesetzmäßigkeit in der Übersetzung. Beiheft zur Zeitschrift Fremdsprachen I*. Leipzig: VEB Enzyklopädie.

Kajzer-Wietrzny, Marta. 2022. "An Intermodal Approach to Cohesion in Constrained and Unconstrained Language." *Target* 34 (1): 130–162.

Kalina, Sylvia. 2006. "Zur Dokumentation von Maßnahmen der Qualitätssicherung beim Konferenzdolmetschen." In *Text and Translation: Theory and Methodology of Translation*, edited by Carmen Heine, Klaus Schubert, and Heidrun Gerzymisch-Arbogast, 253–268. Tübingen: Narr.

Katan, David. 2011. "Occupation or Profession: A Survey of the Translators' World." In *Profession, Identity and Status: Translators and Interpreters as an Occupational Group*, edited by Rakefet Sela-Sheffy and Miriam Shlesinger, 65–88. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Kohn, Kurt. 1990. "Translation as Conflict." In *Confli(c)t: Proceedings of the International Symposium "Contact + Confli(c)t", Brussels, 2–4 June 1988*, edited by Peter H. Nelde, 105–113. Brussels: Association Belge de Linguistique Appliquée.

———. 2004. "Zur Rolle des Übersetzens beim Sprachenlernen." In *Neue Perspektiven in der Übersetzungs- und Dolmetschwissenschaft. Festschrift für Heidrun Gerzymisch-Arbogast zum 60. Geburtstag*, edited by Juliane House, Werner Koller, and Klaus Schubert, 217–233. Bochum: AKS-Verlag.

Kruger, Haidee, and Bertus van Rooy. 2016. "Constrained Language: A Multi-Dimensional Analysis of Translated English and a Non-Native Indigenised Variety of English." *English World-Wide* 37 (1): 26–57.

Kucharska, Anna. 2009. *Simultandolmetschen in defizitären Situationen. Strategien der translatorischen Optimierung*. Berlin: Frank & Timme.

Lafeber, Anne. 2012. "Translation Skills and Knowledge: Preliminary Findings of a Survey of Translators and Revisers Working at Inter-Governmental Organizations." *Meta* 57 (1): 108–131.

Leppihalme, Ritva. 2011. "Three Published Literary Translators Analysing their own Translation Processes in their M.A. Theses." Paper presented at the Text – Process – Text conference, Stockholm, November 17–19.

Massey, Gary, and Maureen Ehrensberger-Dow. 2014. "Looking Beyond Text: The Usefulness of Translation Process Data." In *Methods in Writing Process Research*, edited by Jan Engberg, Carmen Heine, and Dagmar Knorr, 81–98. Bern: Peter Lang.

———, and Regine Wieder. 2019. "Quality Assurance in Translation and Corporate Communications: Exploring an Interdisciplinary Interface." In *Quality Assurance*

and Assessment Practices in Translation and Interpreting, edited by Elsa Huertas Barros, Sonia Vandepitte. and Emilia Iglesias-Fernández, 57–87. Hershey: IGI Global.

Mauranen, Anna. 2008. "Universal Tendencies in Translation." In *Incorporating Corpora: The Linguist and the Translator*, edited by Gunilla Anderman and Margaret Rogers, 32–48. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

———. 2012. *Exploring ELF: Academic English Shaped by Non-Native Speakers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———. 2018. "Conceptualising ELF." In *The Routledge Handbook of English as a Lingua Franca*, edited by Jennifer Jenkins, Will Baker, and Martin Dewey, 7–24. London: Routledge.

McDonough Dolmaya, Julie. 2011. "Moral Ambiguity: Some Shortcomings of Professional Codes of Ethics for Translators." *The Journal of Specialised Translation* 15: 28–49.

Molnár, Ondřej. 2013. "Source Text Quality in the Translation Process." In *Tradition and Trends in Trans-Language Communication*, edited by Jitka Zehnalová, Ondřej Molnár, and Michal Kubánek, 59–86. Olomouc: Palacký University.

Nelson, Cecil L., Zoya G. Proshina, and Daniel R. Davis, eds. 2020. *The Handbook of World Englishes*. 2nd ed. Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons.

O'Brien, Sharon, Maureen Ehrensberger-Dow, Marcel Hasler, and Megan Connolly. 2017. "Irritating CAT Tool Features that Matter to Translators." *Hermes Journal of Language and Communication in Business* 56: 145–162.

Odlin, Terence. 2003. "Cross-Linguistic Influence." In *Handbook of Second Language Acquisition*, edited by Catherine J. Doughty and Michael H. Long, 436–486. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Paloposki, Outi. 2011. "Domestication and Foreignization." In *Handbook of Translation Studies, vol. 2*, edited by Yves Gambier and Luc van Doorslaer, 40–42. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Pym, Anthony. 2001. "Against Praise of Hybridity." *Across Languages and Cultures* 2 (2): 195–206.

Reithofer, Karin. 2010. "English as a Lingua Franca vs. Interpreting: Battleground or Peaceful Co-Existence." *The Interpreters' Newsletter* 15: 143–157.

———. 2020. "Intelligibility in English as a Lingua Franca: The Interpreters' Perspective." *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca* 9 (2): 173–193.

Schäffner, Christina. 2020. "Translators' Roles and Responsibilities." In *The Bloomsbury Companion to Language Industry Studies*, edited by Erik Angelone, Maureen Ehrensberger-Dow, and Gary Massey, 63–89. London: Bloomsbury Academic.

Seidlhofer, Barbara. 2011. *Understanding English as a Lingua Franca*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Shlesinger, Miriam, and Brenda Malkiel. 2005. "Comparing Modalities: Cognates as a Case in Point." *Across Languages and Cultures* 6 (2): 173–193.

Taviano, Stefania. 2013. "English as a Lingua Franca and Translation: Implications for Translator and Interpreter Education." *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer* 7 (2): 155–167.

———. 2018. "ELF as a Translational Lingua Franca: Reciprocal Influences between ELF and Translation." *The Translator* 24 (3): 249–262.

Tirkkonen-Condit, Sonja, Jukka Mäkisalo, and Sini Immonen. 2008. "The Translation Process: Interplay between Literal Rendering and a Search for Sense." *Across Languages and Cultures* 9 (1): 1–15.

Toury, Gideon. 1980. *In Search of a Theory of Translation*. Tel Aviv: The Porter Institute for Poetics and Semiotics.

———. 2012. *Descriptive Translation Studies – and Beyond*. 2nd ed. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

van de Geuchte, Sofie, and Leona van Vaerenbergh. 2016. "Text Creation in a Multilingual Institutional Setting: The Translator as Part of a Cooperative System." *Translation Spaces* 5 (1): 59–77.