

**STRATEGIES ADOPTED BY STUDENT INTERPRETERS IN SI:
A COMPARISON BETWEEN THE ENGLISH-ITALIAN
AND THE GERMAN-ITALIAN LANGUAGE-PAIRS**

By
Valentina Donato
SSLMIT, University of Trieste

1. Introduction

The objective of the present study is to investigate whether and to what extent the language-pair involved in the interpreting process determines the choice of the strategies adopted by the interpreter during simultaneous interpretation. To this aim, the use of strategies in SI in two language-pairs has been analysed: English-Italian and German-Italian.

This study originates from the assumption that interpretation in general and simultaneous interpretation in particular are peculiar forms of communication that differ from monolingual communication. Numerous studies have emphasised the particular role played by the interpreter in mediated communication and the need for the interpreter to develop appropriate strategies to perform his/her task successfully. In particular, Kohn & Kalina (1996) have clearly illustrated the differences between monolingual communication and interpreting and the relevance of strategies.

In monolingual communication, the listener produces a text with the aim of providing an answer, a reply or a comment to the speaker's text and he/she is largely independent from the linguistic makeup of the speaker's text ('semantic autonomy') in formulating his/her text. The role of the interpreter is different. Firstly, as he/she is the recipient of the speaker's text, but not the addressee of the speaker's message, the interpreter is excluded from part of the knowledge (linguistic, extralinguistic or situational) shared by the speaker and the audience. Secondly, in his/her role as a linguistic mediator, the interpreter is required to produce a TL text that is equivalent to the original text and not an answer or a reply to the speaker's text. Consequently, the interpreter has little semantic autonomy over the text. In the choice of the linguistic means, the interpreter will be affected by the linguistic makeup of the original, thus being exposed to the risk of interference caused by the ongoing presence of SL text elements in the his/her short-term memory.

Finally, the role of the interpreter as a mediator prevents him/her from interacting with the speaker. For all these reasons, strategies normally used in unmediated communication prove insufficient; hence the crucial role of ad hoc strategies for interpretation (see Kohn & Kalina 1996: 124).

It is particularly in SI that strategies acquire a vital role. The constraints imposed on the interpreter are in fact magnified by the peculiar conditions of simultaneous interpretation: the overlapping of the listening and speaking phases, the inability of the interpreter to interrupt the information flow and to foresee the development of the text are only a few examples of the peculiar communicative circumstances with which the interpreter is faced (see also Riccardi 1999, Salevski 1987, Kalina 1998). Gile views interpreting as an operation of crisis management which requires appropriate techniques (1995: 191). In particular, drawing on his *modèle d'effort*, he describes SI as a set of three efforts: the Listening and Analysis, the Production and the short-term Memory Effort, all requiring mental resources which are available in limited capacity. Among the factors in SI that are most liable to jeopardise the interpreter's task, i.e. high information density, high speaking rate, signal disturbances, unusual speech signal and short speech segments, the author also mentions syntactic differences between SL and TL.

One of the most controversial questions that has long divided the scientific community is indeed the existence of language-dependent factors affecting the choice of strategies.

According to the *théorie du sens* worked out by the Paris School, interpretation is a natural process based on a synthesis between semantic-syntactic information in the SL text and extralinguistic knowledge, from which the *sens*, the meaning of the message, derives. Simultaneous interpretation is believed to be achievable with ordinary speech functions: "Understanding *sens* is the manifestation of ordinary human mental function" (Seleskovitch & Lederer 1986: 268-270). Provided that SL and TL are properly mastered, difficulties lie in the simultaneity between comprehension and production, not in the rendering of the message since interpreting consists in the transposition of the *sens*, not of the words with which it is expressed. Therefore, only factors that impair comprehension in monolingual communication can impair SI. Surface structures, e.g. syntactic differences between SL and TL, disappear and are replaced by non-verbal concepts and "a meaning is formed in the brain which can be expressed in any language" (Lederer 1981: 147). Hence the uselessness of ad hoc strategies for certain language-pairs.

Among the authors supporting the view of language-pair specific strategies, the authors of the so-called *Information Processing theory* have played a significant role in emphasising the peculiar conditions underlying the SI task and the need to develop strategies to allocate mental resources. An imbalance in mental resources, in fact, is claimed to be the major cause for poor performances or defaillances (see Gile 1995). According to IP authors, the surface structure of the message never entirely disappears in the cognitive intermediate processes underlying interpretation. Consequently, linguistic factors, such as structural

asymmetries between SL and TL, are believed to play a significant role in determining an imbalance in the interpreter's mental resources and therefore require language-specific strategies.

Numerous authors have supported the theory of language-specific strategies as a response to structural asymmetries between SL and TL. Kalina (see 1998: 114), Kirchhoff (see 1976: 59-60), Le Ny (see 1978: 294) and, in particular, Gile (see 1990: 20) underscore the impact of diverging syntactic structures in interpretation between languages that are syntactically very different: by forcing the interpreter to process longer chunks or to restructure the message completely, these structures may cause an overloading of the interpreter's total capacity of mental resources, thus causing the loss of vital information. Gile suggests the possibility that specific strategies need to be developed for certain language-pairs depending on the processing capacity required for production and/or comprehension:

there may well be 'easier' and 'more difficult' languages to interpret into [...]. In this respect, interpretation from German into English may be 'easier' than interpretation from German into French (1990: 20).

German has often been cited as a language requiring specific strategies. Many studies have concentrated on the difficulties posed by the German syntax. Ross (1997) analyses the impact of syntactic structures on interpretation from German languages and stresses the impact of structural asymmetries in the interpretation into Italian – in particular, the verb-last structure in German, the presence of elements separating the two components of the predicate in German and embedded clauses. Riccardi has dealt with language-specific aspects in the German-Italian language-pair in numerous studies (1997, 1998 and 1999). The author highlights differences of various nature between German and Italian. For example, the typological difference between a synthetic language like German and an analytic language like Italian will require more syntactic restructuring by means of additions in the Italian TT, aimed at rendering the accuracy of the German ST, or deliberate omissions in order to counter the tendency to add further elements in an attempt to imitate the accuracy of the original message. The author also addresses the well-known difficulties deriving from the German syntax, marked by its verb-final structure, left-branching NPs, embedded clauses, compound nouns and long chains of noun phrases or prepositional phrases. Riccardi proposes numerous strategies to deal with these structures (see 1997 and 1999), many of which have been taken as criteria for the present work and which will be indicated subsequently. Gile (1992) and Wilss (1978) concentrate on the relevance of anticipation, which is presented as a valuable technique in interpreting from German.

Another author who devoted particular attention to the question of structural asymmetries between SL and TL is Setton. In his study (1999), the author analyses the impact of these structures in two language-pairs: Chinese-English and German-English. The analysis has concentrated on two SLs, Chinese and German, traditionally considered as a source of structural difficulties for the interpreter, with a view to verifying if *departures from input forms*, in the author's terminology, depend on structural asymmetries or rather from a cognitive approach to the text, according to which, starting from the linguistic makeup of the text, the interpreter activates his/her extralinguistic, contextual and situational knowledge, thus inserting material which is not to be found in the SL and which is not a direct consequence of input structures. Without denying the relevance of strategies, the author criticises the absolute importance that IP authors often attribute to the so-called *strategies-for-structures*, claiming that other factors, such as the extralinguistic knowledge, may be of assistance to the SI task.

English has also been the focus of studies that have revealed certain language-specific aspects. De Feo (1993) tested three strategies – omissions, substitutions and additions – in the English-Italian language-pair. In her experimental study, the author observes that while syntactic structures were transposed automatically from English to Italian, without requiring significant restructuring, synthetic reformulation strategies concentrated primarily on the semantic content of the message. This approach might have been determined by a typological difference between English and Italian. Given the concise nature of the English language compared to the more digressive pattern of Italian expository style (see also Snelling 1992: 11-12), conceptualisation strategies used by the subjects of her study have involved entire clauses rather than lexical units, due to the difficulty of finding a similar concise lexical solution in Italian.

Viezzi's study (1993) has outlined a series of interesting aspects regarding the English-Italian pair. In comparing the written translation of an English text into Italian and the SI delivery of the same according to six parameters – TTs length, register, style, syntax, semantic accuracy, omissions and idiolect –, the author has found out that numerous differences between the written and the SI translation were a consequence of the fact that subjects adhered to the surface structure of the English ST. So, for example, the length of the simultaneously interpreted TT was shorter than the written translation

because it follows the SLT more closely. [...] English is tendentially shorter and more concise than Italian – relying on and reproducing the English structure may enable the interpreter, more often than not, to produce a translation meeting his time requirements (Viezzi 1993: 100)

Similarly, the analysis of style, register and syntax revealed that in the SI text subjects followed the English ST more often than in the written translation, where the delivery was free of the superficial structure of the original. While avoiding complex restructuring operations in SI may be prompted by the time constraints affecting the simultaneous modality with respect to written translation, it is suggested that this trend might have been encouraged by the morphosyntactic similarities between English and Italian.

Following the aim of this study, the strategies proposed by the above mentioned authors have been selected and integrated into an overall framework that has served as a basis for the experimental study described hereafter.

2. Analysis

2.1. Subjects

The experiment involved 20 subjects who were divided into two groups. The first group, the English Subjects Group (henceforth the ES group) consisted of 10 subjects who carried out a SI test from English into Italian while the other 10 subjects, the German Subjects Group (henceforth the GS group), carried out a SI test from German into Italian. The 20 subjects, all Italian native speakers, were selected among students who had passed at least their SI exam from German or English into Italian. Two subjects had already graduated, but they were nevertheless included in the sample because of their lacking professional experience.

All subjects had German or English among their working languages; no distinction was made as to whether subjects had German or English as their B or C language.

2.2. The source texts

The text selected for the experiment was a speech delivered before the European Parliament by the Swedish MP Cecilia Malmström. The speech was originally pronounced in Swedish and the two translations into English and German from the Official Journal of the European Union were used for the experiment.

The choice to use two translations as source texts derived from the need to have two texts in the two different SLs that presented the same features from the informative and expressive viewpoint and that could allow a comparison between the performances of the two groups of subjects. Indeed the question of comparability has often been a major obstacle in the study of language-pair specific strategies:

[...] empirical investigation is hampered by problems of multivariate comparability across languages, discourses, events and interpreters (Setton 1999: 55).

The theme of the speech, human rights and violence against women, was non-technical and did not present specialised terminology. Before their test, subjects were provided with general information on the text, i.e. the title of the speech and the time-space setting.

2.3. Methods

The source texts were recorded by German and English mother-tongue speakers at the SSLMIT of the University of Trieste.

In order to measure anticipation and the time-lag, the original texts and the students' deliveries were recorded on double-track tapes which enabled to detect possible differences in the use of these strategies by the two subject groups.

2.4. Descriptive criteria

The strategies proposed by the authors mentioned in the introduction have provided the theoretical framework for the experimental study. In particular, language-independent strategies have been mainly drawn from the studies carried out by Gile (1995), Kalina (1998) and Kohn & Kalina (1996), while strategies with possible language-specific implications have been drawn from the descriptions by De Feo (1993), Riccardi (1997, 1998 and 1999) and Setton (1999).

The 20 performances were analysed on the basis of the following criteria:

I. Comprehension strategies

The strategies comprised in this category are used "when comprehension problems arise, and when they threaten to arise under time-related or processing capacity-related problems" (Gile 1995: 192).

The strategies falling into this category are:

I.a. Stalling by using neutral material: this strategy aims at 'buying time' by producing generic utterings, absent in the SLT, which provide no new information, but enable the interpreter to delay production and to continue listening to the incoming text while avoiding long pauses when faced with comprehension difficulties.

The strategy defined here as 'stalling by using neutral material' is taken from the descriptions by Gile and Setton (see Gile 1995: 130, in Setton 1999: 50) and Kirchhoff (1976: 57-71) who described similar processes that involve the use of neutral, non-committal utterings at the beginning or in the

middle of a sentence when the interpreter is faced with long, embedded clauses or with comprehension difficulties.

I.b. Anticipation: this strategy has been described by Kalina (1998: 117) as involving the production of a TT chunk before it is actually uttered by the speaker in the ST.

I.c. Time-lag: the time-lag has been described by Goldman-Eisler (1972) as a variable that may be influenced by the specific language-pair. Hence the relevance of analysing this strategy as a way of identifying possible differences in the time-lag depending on the SL.

II. Reformulation strategies

On the basis of Falbo's categorisation (1999: 181-183), three types of processes have been included into the present category: morphosyntactic reformulation, synthesis and expansion.

II.a. Morphosyntactic reformulation includes:

- *Morphosyntactic transformations*, i.e. transformation of a subordinate clause into a main clause, of a negative clause into an affirmative clause and of a noun phrase into a verb phrase or viceversa (Riccardi 1999: 172).
- *Syntactic segmentation*: it consists in dividing long clauses into shorter clauses (Riccardi 1999: 173).
- *Least-commitment strategy*: it consists in leaving the clauses open to add coordinate or subordinate clauses if faced with the so-called 'garden path sentences' (Riccardi 1998: 178).
- *Changing the order of phrases or elements of other type within the clause*: this strategy, taken from Kirchhoff (1976) and Gile (1995), consists in reformulating ST elements of various type in a different position into the TT so as to enable better ST reformulation.

II.b. Synthesis, which entails the compression of the SL text through

- *Generalization*: it consists in "replacing a segment with a superordinate term or a more general speech segment" (Gile 1995: 197).
- *Simplification*: it consists in a lexical or stylistic simplification of the original message (see Kalina 1998: 120).
- *Deletion*: this strategy, taken from Kalina (1998), consists in reprocessing the SL text through the deletion of superfluous or redundant information by means of a selection of information (see Kalina 1998: 120).

II.c. Expansion, through

- *Explanatory additions*: it is a lexical and content expansion aimed at clarifying the message (De Feo 1993: 33).
- *Additions to maintain coherence*, i.e. a strategy aimed at explicating coherence relations with a view to conferring logical continuity to the

text. This strategy is drawn from De Feo (1993: 33), who takes it from Van Dijk & Kintsch (1978: 175).

- *Repetition*: it consists in repeating previously processed elements (see Messner 2001: 86) as a way of enhancing lexical accuracy by means of synonyms or synonymic phrases.
- *Paraphrase*: this strategy, described by Gile as "*explaining or paraphrasing*" (Gile 1995: 198), consists in explaining the meaning of a SL term or wording when the interpreter is unable to find the suitable TL correspondent.

III. Emergency strategies

These strategies, to be employed when comprehension strategies or TT-oriented strategies are insufficient or unsuccessful, aim at avoiding an *impasse* by resorting to operations that are advisable only in emergency situations. These include:

- III.a. Transcoding: it consists in "translating a source-term or speech segment into the target language word for word" (Gile 1995: 199):
- III.b. Approximation: "the interpreter finds a wording or term which is more or less what he was looking for and produces it, then adds one which he has meanwhile activated and which fits even better and so on" (Kalina 1992: 254):
- III.c. Evasion: it consists in the total deletion of a ST segment as a deliberate choice by the interpreter to evade the problem (see Kalina 1998: 120):
- III.d. Substitution: it consists in the use of a TL term or wording which, though different from those originally pronounced by the speaker, can be plausible in the speech context (see Kohn & Kalina 1996: 132):

3. Results

In the present section, the results that emerged from the experiment are presented.¹ Data revealed striking analogies in the use of certain strategies by the two groups as well as clear differences, some of which seem to be linked to language-specific factors, as will be outlined in the discussion.

It should be observed that different strategies were used by the subjects in the same text portion, as can be observed in numerous examples reported hereafter. In particular, the strategies of deletion, generalization and evasion were frequently applied on the same text elements, often overlapping. As to the

1 Here only the most relevant results have been reported. A more detailed description can be found in the author's unpublished dissertation: Donato V., "Strategie in Interpretazione Simultanea: Confronto delle Coppie Linguistiche Inglese-Italiano e Tedesco-Italiano" (2001), Trieste, SSLMIT, Università degli Studi

method used to count the number of occurrences when an overlapping of the above-mentioned strategies took place, Barik's approach was adopted:

These [omissions] refer to items present in the original version which are left out of the translation by the T [Translator]. Here we are dealing with clear omissions and not omissions resulting from the substitution of one thing for another by the T (1994: 122).

Therefore, omissions deriving from generalization were not counted in this category, since generalization always entails the deletion of redundant elements. Likewise, omissions deriving from substitution were not computed in this category either, since any substitution involves the deletion of the original text elements.

The results of the experiment will be presented on the basis of the above described criteria. For each strategy category, a table with the performances of the subjects of the two groups will be provided.

3.1. Comprehension strategies

Table 1: Comprehension strategies

SUBJECTS	COMPREHENSION STRATEGIES	
	ANTICIPATION	STALLING
ES1	0	0
ES2	1	0
ES3	0	0
ES4	1	0
ES5	1	0
ES6	0	0
ES7	0	0
ES8	0	0
ES9	1	1
ES10	1	1
TOTAL	5	2

SUBJECTS	COMPREHENSION STRATEGIES	
	ANTICIPATION	STALLING
GS1	7	0
GS2	6	0
GS3	5	0
GS4	6	1
GS5	6	1
GS6	6	1
GS7	1	3
GS8	3	1
GS9	5	0
GS10	4	1
TOTAL	49	8

Note that the data on time-lag are reported separately given the complexity of including the occurrences of each time-lag pattern into a single table.

3.1.1. Stalling by using neutral material

This strategy has hardly been used by either group: the total number of occurrences was 8 in the GS group and 2 in the ES group.

An interesting aspect emerged from the analysis of the present strategy: differently from the ES group, the GS group resorted to neutral verbal expressions aimed at 'buying time' while continuing to listen to the incoming text for the lexical verb to be uttered by the speaker:

GT: *Die EU muß mit einer Zunge reden und den Ländern, die die Menschenrechte mißachten, einheitliche Signale **vermitteln**.*

GS4: *L'Unione Europea....**deve far sì che** ai paesi che non rispettano i diritti umani vengano dati segnali chiari.*

[The European Union....**has to act so that** countries that do not respect human rights are given clear signals]

GS6: *L'Unione Europea.... **deve fare in modo di**... dare dei segnali chiari agli stati che non tutelano i diritti umani.*

[The European Union **has to act in such a way that** clear signals are given to countries that do not protect human rights]

3.1.2. Anticipation

Results showed significant discrepancies in the performance of the two groups.

Anticipation was found to be far more used in the GS group than in the ES group: 49 occurrences in the GS group and 5 in the ES group. Furthermore, a qualitative difference in the way subjects resorted to anticipation was observed. While the anticipated element in the GS group was almost always a verb (except for one single case of an anticipated lexical unit), all the anticipated elements in the ES group were lexical units.

Examples:

ET: *The EU is therefore in desperate need of a coordinated, strategic and consistent policy.*

GT: *Die Kommission hat das Jahr 1999 zum Jahr des Kampfes gegen die Gewalt gegen Frauen **erklärt**.*

ES9: *Ecco perché risulta assolutamente necessario un **approccio**..politico consistente ed omogeneo.*

[This is the reason why an **approach** (that is) political, consistent and homogenous is absolutely necessary].

GS7: *La Commissione ha **dichiarato** il 1999 come l'anno della lotta contro la violenza contro le donne.*

[The Commission has **declared** 1999 as the year of the struggle against the violence against women]

3.1.3. Time-lag

The experimental procedure used to analyse the time-lag will be briefly described hereafter before presenting the relevant results.

As previously indicated, the analysis of the time-lag was made possible by the use of double-track tapes which enabled the author to listen to both SL and TL texts simultaneously and to detect the lag with which the subjects started reformulation. The time-lag was measured at the beginning of each sentence by observing which syntactic segment is required by the interpreter to start his/her reformulation. Therefore, the measurement is of syntactic nature and is not expressed in seconds.

Drawing on Goldman-Eisler's terminology, the following time-lag patterns were detected:

1. Lexical Unit (LU): this type refers to the case when the subject starts reformulating after listening to one lexical unit only (underlined in the examples):

– *Unfortunately, these hopes have, in many respects, been dashed.*

– *Das Europäische Parlament hat die Wahrung dieser Rechte stets als einer seiner wichtigsten Aufgaben angesehen.*

2. Noun Phrase + Verb Phrase (NP+VP): according to this time-tag type, the subject starts reformulating after listening to a noun phrase and a verbal phrase:
 - *The European Community was formed in order to prevent the atrocities of the Second World War from occurring again.*
 - *Die EG wurde gebildet, um eine Wiederholung der Grausamkeiten der Zweiten Weltkrieges zu verhindern.*
3. Noun Phrase + Verb Phrase + Noun Phrase (NP+VP+NP): this time-lag type includes one or more NPs following the VP with the function of completing the verb, thus creating a "complete predicative expression" (Goldman-Eisler 1972: 131):
 - *In many respects, the EU has a good policy on human rights, but, unfortunately, it is much too 'straggly' and incoherent.*
 - *Wir benötigen eine verstärkte Koordinierung, nicht nur zwischen den Organen der EU, sondern auch zwischen der EU und ihren Mitgliedstaaten.*
4. Clause Continued (CLC): this time-lag type is mainly found in sentences consisting in several clauses; it extends over the VP and its NPs to include at least one phrase belonging to the next clause:
 - *The EU must speak with one voice and give consistent signals to the countries that violate human rights.*
 - *Damit müssen wir uns beschäftigen, denn wenn wir innerhalb der EU glaubhaft sein wollen, müssen wir auch eine positive Politik nach außen hin vertreten.*
5. Complete Clause (CC): it consists in waiting for the end of the clause to start reformulation:
 - *Women's rights are being systematically violated throughout the world.*
 - *Die Rechte der Frauen werden auf der ganzen Welt systematisch verletzt.*
6. Complete Clause plus beginning of the next clause (CC+): this type consists in waiting for the end of the clause and the beginning of the next clause to start reformulation:
 - *Obviously we need to deal with this. If we want to be credible internally, we also need to have a sound policy externally.*
 - *Dies war eine lobenswerte Initiative. Die Kampagne dazu war allerdings, gelinde ausgedrückt, gedämpft.*

The first two patterns, i.e. LU and NP+VP, are defined as short time-lag patterns, the NP+VP+NP pattern is defined as medium time-lag pattern and the CLC, CC and CC+ categories are defined as long time-lag patterns. It should be noted, however, that within the long time-lag patterns, the CLC pattern was found to be occasionally longer than the CC pattern because the latter often involved short sentences.

The results emerged from the analysis have been collected into the following table:

Table 2: Time-lag patterns

TIME-LAG PATTERNS						
SUBJECTS	LU	NP+VP	NP+VP +NP ^o	CLC	CC	CC+
ES1	16	20	11	0	2	0
ES2	8	9	19	4	6	1
ES3	7	9	17	6	8	1
ES4	14	21	10	3	1	0
ES5	15	15	13	3	3	0
ES6	6	9	13	9	9	0
ES7	7	16	13	5	5	1
ES8	4	5	16	12	8	1
ES9	7	16	16	4	4	1
ES10	12	17	11	3	5	0
TOTAL	96	137	139	49	51	5
GS1	11	15	8	4	2	1
GS2	12	13	4	8	5	1
GS3	13	12	4	10	4	0
GS4	20	15	3	2	3	1
GS5	12	15	7	5	4	1
GS6	14	15	0	6	1	1
GS7	8	15	3	10	8	0
GS8	10	17	4	4	5	1
GS9	6	20	5	7	6	0
GS10	5	12	5	8	12	0
TOTAL	111	149	43	64	50	6

Abbreviations:

LU: Lexical Unit

NP + VP: Noun Phrase + Verb Phrase

NP + VP + NP^o: Noun Phrase + Verb Phrase + Noun Phrase

CLC : Clause Continued

CC : Complete Clause

CC+: Complete Clause plus beginning of the next clause

The analysis revealed that within the ES group, the most used time-lag patterns were the NP+VP+NP type (139 occurrences), and the NP+VP type (137), followed by the LU type (96), while the CLC and the CC recorded a lower number of occurrences (49 and 51 respectively) and the CC+ type was hardly used (5 occurrences).

Within the GS group, the preferred time-lag was the NP+VP pattern (149 occurrences), followed by the LU type (111). The remaining patterns recorded a lower number of occurrences: the CLC pattern was used in 64 cases, the CC pattern in 50 cases, the NP+VP+NP pattern in 43 cases and, finally, the CC+ pattern in 6 cases only.

According to the above-mentioned data, subjects belonging to the ES group had a medium-short time-lag, with a clear tendency to adopt a short time-lag: their preferred time-lag pattern after NP+VP+NP are indeed the NP+VP and the LU pattern.

The results of the GS' tests revealed that the role of the verb was fundamental: if it followed the NP, then it was immediately released (hence the predominance of NP+VP occurrences). Otherwise, the GS subjects adopted two different options: either they uttered the lexical unit as soon as they heard it while listening to the incoming text for the verb to come or for elements enabling them to anticipate it (which explains why the LU was the second most frequent type) or, in a fewer number of cases (CLC and CC recorded 64 and 50 occurrences respectively), they extended their time-lag to include the verb or elements enabling anticipation before starting reformulation. The role of the verb in German, therefore, seems to determine the GS' approach to the text.

Another striking difference is that the NP+VP+NP pattern was far more used in the ES group than in the GS group (139 vs. 43 occurrences respectively). This might derive from a language-dependent factor, i.e. the prevalence of the NP+VP+NP structure in English, which is a syntactic pattern that is found more often in English than in German.

3.2. Reformulation strategies

3.2.1. Morphosyntactic reformulation

Table 3: Morphosyntactic reformulation

SUBJECTS	MORPHOSYNTACTIC REFORMULATION			
	MORPHOSYNTACTIC TRANSFORMATIONS	SEGMENTATION	LEAST COMMITMENT	CHANGING THE ORDER OF PHRASES
ES1	1	3	3	3
ES2	2	1	5	6
ES3	6	1	1	7
ES4	4	2	0	4
ES5	11	2	5	3
ES6	6	1	7	4
ES7	3	3	1	5
ES8	3	0	9	6
ES9	6	1	4	3
ES10	6	0	15	3
TOTAL	48	14	50	44
GS1	7	3	6	4
GS2	14	2	5	7
GS3	11	2	2	8
GS4	12	1	4	1
GS5	10	2	3	4
GS6	7	1	4	2
GS7	6	2	3	1
GS8	6	0	8	2
GS9	8	0	7	4
GS10	12	3	0	7
TOTAL	93	16	42	40

3.2.1.1. Morphosyntactic transformations

Data revealed that the use of morphosyntactic transformations was significantly different between the two groups. The GS group resorted to morphosyntactic

transformations more frequently than the ES group: the occurrences recorded by the GS group, 93, was far higher than those of the ES group (48).

In both groups, the most frequent type of morphosyntactic operation was the transformation of noun phrases into verbal phrases and viceversa (38 occurrences in the GS group and 24 in the ES). As to the remaining two morphosyntactic transformation types, i.e. transformation of a subordinate clause into a main clause and transformation of a negative clause into an affirmative clause, both groups performed similarly: the figure relating to the first transformation type was 7 in the ES and 9 in the GS group; the transformation of a negative clause into an affirmative clause recorded 6 occurrences in the ES and 11 in the GS group. Yet the low number of occurrences in both types might have been determined by the text in which negative clauses and subordinate clauses are rare.

The remaining occurrences refer to further morphosyntactic transformation types that were observed in the course of the analysis. The GS group resorted to these operations far more frequently than the ES group (35 vs. 11 occurrences).

3.2.1.2. Segmentation

Segmentation was not frequently employed and it does not appear to be a significant strategy for either group. It should be noted, however, that the rather limited number of total occurrences recorded by both groups (16 in the GS group, 14 in the ES group) partly derives from the type of text selected for the experiment, marked by simple short sentences which did not require complex restructuring processes.

3.2.1.3. Least commitment

The analysis of this strategy revealed a similar approach between the two groups, with a slight prevalence of total occurrences in the ES group (50) compared to the GS group (42).

Yet this data is influenced by the performance of one subject of the ES group (ES10) who recorded 15 of the total 50 occurrences, thus clearly influencing the overall figure.

3.2.1.4. Changing the order of phrases or other elements within the clause

No significant difference between the two groups was observed. The total number of occurrences in was 44 in the ES group and 40 in the GS group. The

use of the strategy was also similar, and it consisted, in both groups, in the re-positioning of independent phrases or NPs contained in an enumeration.

3.2.2 Synthesis

Table 4: Synthesis

SUBJECTS	SYNTHESIS		
	GENERALIZATION	SIMPLIFICATION	DELETION
ES1	4	6	18
ES2	8	5	29
ES3	6	2	24
ES4	6	10	19
ES5	3	8	27
ES6	3	3	36
ES7	5	5	18
ES8	7	7	18
ES9	5	1	23
ES10	3	4	35
TOTAL	50	51	247
GS1	6	2	39
GS2	5	2	18
GS3	6	2	41
GS4	7	8	24
GS5	2	7	28
GS6	5	1	23
GS7	1	2	29
GS8	5	2	24
GS9	3	0	29
GS10	2	1	29
TOTAL	42	27	284

3.2.2.1. Generalization

The analysis revealed a similar approach to generalization by the two groups, both quantitatively and qualitatively. This strategy has been frequently used by

both subject groups: 50 occurrences were recorded in the ES' deliveries and 42 in the GS group.

A similar approach was observed in the way the two groups applied the strategy: in the deliveries of both the ES and the GS group, generalization was applied lexically, by resorting to a superordinate term, and syntactically, by formulating a more general TL text segment.

An interesting aspect was observed in the course of the present study: the analysis revealed that the same text portions were subjected to generalization, not only by the subjects of the same group, but by both groups, thus indicating that in the present study the process underlying the choice of generalization is independent of linguistic features:

<p>ET: <i>I would also like to say a few words about womes's rights, an issue that I have chosen as a special theme in the report.</i></p>	<p>ES2: <i>Vorrei anche dire qualcosa riguardo..i diritti umani che è un tema di particolare importanza nella relazione.</i> [I also wish to say something on..human rights that is a theme of particular importance in the report].</p> <p>ES9: <i>Vorrei ora soffermarmi inoltre su eh..i diritti delle donne che costituiscono un tema importante anche all'interno della relazione.</i> [Now I wish to dwell upon eh..women's rights which represent an important theme also in the report]</p>
<p>GT: <i>Lassen Sie mich auch einige Worte zu den Rechten der Frauen sagen, eine Frage, die ich als gesondertes Thema in den Bericht angenommen habe.</i></p>	<p>GS6: <i>Permettetemi di..parlare brevemente dei diritti delle donne. ..Questa è una questione che è stata considerata come tema particolare nella relazione.</i> [Let me..speak about women's rights briefly. This is an issue that has been considered a special theme in the report].</p> <p>GS8: <i>Permettetemi di dire qualche parola sui diritti delle donne, una tematica che costituisce una vera e propria priorità nella relazione in questione.</i> [Let me say some words on women's rights, a theme that represents a real priority in the report under scrutiny].</p>

3.2.2.2. Simplification

A considerable difference emerged in the use of simplification by the two groups of subjects: while GS recorded only 27 occurrences, the occurrences among ES were almost double (51). In both groups, simplification consisted in the use of a simpler, more colloquial expression instead of a higher register term or expression.

Examples:

<p>ET: <i>A large proportion of the world's population is</i></p>	<p>ES4: <i>Una grande proporzione della popolazione mondiale sta ancora vivendo in oppressione. Molti non</i></p>
---	--

<p><i>still living under oppression, with many deprived of their basic rights.</i></p> <p>GT: <i>Nach den Schrecken des Zweiten Weltkrieges hegten sicherlich zahllose Menschen große Hoffnungen für eine bessere Welt und eine menschlichere Zukunft.</i></p>	<p><i>hanno i loro diritti fondamentali.</i></p> <p>[A large proportion of the world's population is still living in oppression. Many don't have their basic rights]</p> <p>ST5: <i>Dopo la seconda guerra mondiale molte persone avevano la speranza in un mondo migliore e per un futuro più umano.</i></p> <p>[After the second world war many people had the hope of a better world and for a more humane future].</p>
--	--

3.2.2.3. Deletion

This strategy is by far the most used strategy by both groups: the ES recorded 247 occurrences and the GS 284. The analysis of the deleted elements shows striking analogies between the two groups. In both groups, the most frequently deleted element was a lexical item: in the ES group, 216 out of 247 occurrences are examples of deletion of a word, while the remaining 31 occurrences are text segments. In the GS group, 239 out of 284 total occurrences are words and the remaining 45 are text segments.

As to the most deleted word type, the analysis has shown that in both groups qualifiers (i.e. qualifying adverbs and adjectives) were most frequently left out: in the ES group, 89 out of 216 are qualifiers, in the GS 96 out of 239 total occurrences.

The analysis has also revealed another striking pattern. As previously observed when presenting generalization, the strategy of deletion was found to be frequently used in the same text segments. This occurred not only among subjects belonging to the same group, but also between the two groups:

<p>ET: <i>Unfortunately, these hopes have, in many respects, been dashed.</i></p>	<p>ES2: <i>[...] ma sfortunatamente queste speranze sono state frantumate.</i></p> <p>[(...) but unfortunately these hopes have been crashed].</p> <p>ES3: <i>Sfortunatamente queste speranze sono state tradite.</i></p> <p>[Unfortunately these hopes have been deceived].</p> <p>ES6: <i>Però questa speranza non è stata realizzata [...].</i></p> <p>[But this hope has not been fulfilled]</p> <p>ES8: <i>Ma sfortunatamente tutto ciò non è successo.</i></p> <p>[But unfortunately all this has not materialised]</p> <p>ES10: <i>Ma purtroppo queste speranze sono state disilluse, disattese [...].</i></p> <p>[But unfortunately these hopes have been disillusioned, disregarded].</p>
--	---

GT: *Diese Hoffnungen sind leider in vieler Hinsicht zunichte gemacht worden.*

GS3: *Queste speranze purtroppo sono state distrutte.*
[These hopes, unfortunately, have been dashed].

GS4: *Queste speranze purtroppo non sono state ..ehm soddisfatte.*

[These hopes, unfortunately, have not been..ehm fulfilled].

GS7: *Queste speranze purtroppo sono andate deluse, sono state annientate.*

[These hopes, unfortunately, have been disappointed, have been destroyed].

This seems to indicate that in the present study the strategy of deletion is used regardless of the SL. Its use seems rather to derive from the same processing approach that consists in leaving out the information units that are viewed by the interpreter as superfluous and hence deletable.

3.2.3. Expansion

Table 5: Expansion

SUBJECTS	EXPANSION		
	ADDITIONS	REPETITIONS	PARAPHRASE
ES1	2	0	0
ES2	6	1	0
ES3	14	0	0
ES4	4	1	0
ES5	9	1	0
ES6	8	1	0
ES7	7	1	0
ES8	8	3	0
ES9	35	3	1
ES10	39	11	0
TOTAL	132	22	1

SUBJECTS	EXPANSION		
	ADDITIONS	REPETITIONS	PARAPHRASE
GS1	17	4	0
GS2	10	2	0
GS3	13	3	0
GS4	11	1	0
GS5	9	4	0
GS6	8	3	1
GS7	20	14	0
GS8	13	3	0
GS9	15	1	1
GS10	22	1	0
TOTAL	138	36	2

3.2.3.1. Additions

Both groups resorted to additions and there was no considerable difference in the total number of occurrences recorded by the two groups. In the GS group, the number of total occurrences was 138 and in the ES group 132 total occurrences were identified. Yet the data of the ES group was significantly influenced by the performances of three subjects, ES3, ES9 and ES10, in which 14, 35 and 39 occurrences respectively were recorded, compared to the average 2-8 occurrences of the remaining 7 subjects.

As far as the various types of additions are concerned, the use of *explanatory additions* was found to be similar between the two groups, both quantitatively (33 total occurrences in the ES group, 40 in the GS group) and qualitatively; in both groups, in fact, this type of additions consisted in the insertion of qualifying nouns and adjectives. The use of *additions to maintain coherence* has shown that the two groups adopted a similar approach. The total number of occurrences in the ES group is 17, while in the GS group 22 total occurrences were recorded. In both groups, additions to maintain coherence consisted in the use of declarative, adversative and conclusive conjunctions. However, the total number of occurrences recorded by the ES group is influenced by the performance of one subject, ES3, in which 9 of the total 17 occurrences were recorded.

The remaining occurrences refer to further types of additions which emerged during the analysis. These will not be dealt with here as they are not relevant to the objectives of the present paper.

3.2.3.2. Repetitions

The GS group resorted to repetitions more frequently than the ES group: the total number of occurrences was 36 in the GS group and 22 in the ES group. Yet it is worth noting that in both groups the total number of occurrences was clearly influenced by the performance of a single subject: in the ES group, ES10 records 11 of the total 22 occurrences, in the GS group, GS7 records 14 of the total 36 occurrences.

3.2.3.3. Paraphrase

This strategy was hardly used by both groups. One single case was recorded in the GS group and 3 in the ES group. The low number of occurrences recorded in the present analysis indicates that paraphrase is not one of the favourite strategies adopted for the language-pairs under examination. It must be observed, however, that data might have been influenced by the type of text selected for the experiment.

3.3. Emergency strategies

Table 6: Emergency Strategies

SUBJECTS	EMERGENCY STRATEGIES			
	TRANSCODING	APPROXIMATION	EVASION	SUBSTITUTION
ES1	5	4	1	3
ES2	6	0	1	5
ES3	6	0	0	4
ES4	11	1	0	0
ES5	5	0	0	4
ES6	2	2	4	12
ES7	4	0	1	5
ES8	3	0	2	6
ES9	4	1	1	4
ES10	4	1	0	7
TOTAL	50	9	10	50

SUBJECTS	EMERGENCY STRATEGIES			
	TRANSCODING	APPROXIMATION	EVASION	SUBSTITUTION
GS1	2	0	2	9
GS2	1	0	3	4
GS3	1	0	2	8
GS4	2	0	3	3
GS5	2	2	2	3
GS6	1	0	5	2
GS7	2	8	0	5
GS8	1	1	3	6
GS9	0	1	3	4
GS10	1	1	3	7
TOTAL	13	13	26	51

3.3.1. Transcoding

The analysis has shown that transcoding is by far more frequent in the ES group than in the GS group. While the total number of occurrences recorded by the GS is 13 only, the ES recorded 50 occurrences. Transcoding is achieved by adhering to the SL formulation (both lexically and syntactically):

ET: *These clauses can be used constructively, but they need to be more closely defined with respect to application, **implementation** and sanctions.* ES10: *Le clausole potrebbero essere utilizzate in maniera più costruttiva, ma dovrebbero essere comunque definite in maniera più chiara per quanto riguarda eh **l'implementazione**.* [The clauses could be used in a more constructive way, but these should be however more precisely defined with respect to eh **implementation**].

It should be noted here that the Italian rendering, translated in the above reported example as 'implementation', has a different impact on an Italian audience, compared to the same rendering in English, in that it sounds as a calque. A freer, not word-for-word translation would have been more satisfactory. Yet the possibility to opt for this kind of solution, fully understandable in Italian, when no better translation can be retrieved, provided a valuable strategy to avoid a possible *impasse*.

3.3.2. Approximation

The strategy of approximation was not frequently used by both groups. The number of total occurrences recorded by the GS group, 13, is slightly higher than that of the ES group (9). However, the data of the GS group has been influenced by the performance of one subject, GS7, in whose SI test 8 of the total 13 occurrences were recorded.

It is worth reminding that the low number of occurrences recorded by both groups might derive from the text chosen for the experiment.

In the ES group the strategy of approximation seemed to be used by the subjects to detach themselves from the SL surface structure, thus indicating that its use might have been influenced by the linguistic features of the SL and TL involved in the SI process:

ET: *Violence against women is a global issue which needs to be high on the international **agenda** [...].*

ES1: *La violenza contro le donne è una questione globale che dev'essere posta al vertice dell'**agenda, dell'ordine del giorno** internazionale.*
[Violence against women is a global issue that must be high on the **agenda, on the international agenda**].

Here the first translation into Italian (i.e. 'agenda') for the English word 'agenda' sounded as a calque from English. Therefore, the subject turned to the second solution, i.e. 'ordine del giorno', which is the correct rendering of the English original word 'agenda'.

3.3.3. Evasion

The use of this strategy has shown a clear difference between the two groups. While the ES recorded only 10 occurrences, the total number of occurrences recorded by the GS is more than double (26).

In both groups, this strategy consisted in leaving out an entire clause or an entire informative unit (indicated by empty brackets in bold type in the examples below), which, despite determining an inevitable loss of information, enables the subjects to avoid interrupting their outputs if faced with comprehension or reformulation difficulties:

GT: *Nach den Schrecken des Zweiten Weltkrieges hegten sicherlich viele Menschen große Hoffnungen für eine bessere Welt und eine menschlichere Zukunft. **Diese Hoffnungen sind leider in***

GS9: *Dopo la fine della seconda guerra mondiale sono eh cresciute le aspettative per un futuro migliore per molte persone. ...Tuttavia una grande parte della popolazione mondiale vive ancora eh nella assenza del rispetto dei propri diritti dell'uomo [...].*

<i>vieler Hinsicht zunichte gemacht worden. Immer noch lebt ein großer Teil der Weltbevölkerung in Unterdrückung und ist vieler Grundrechte beraubt.</i>	[After the end of the second world war eh hopes for a better future for many people increased (...) ...However a large part of the world's population is still living eh in the lack of the respect for their human rights].
--	---

3.3.4. Substitution

The analysis of substitution revealed a similar approach by the subjects of both groups, both quantitatively and qualitatively. The total number of occurrences recorded by the two groups was almost identical: 50 in the ES group and 51 in the GS group.

The use of this strategy was also similar in both groups: substitution consisted in replacing a single word or a text segment in the ST that was not fully understood or heard by a plausible word or text segment in the TT:

ET: <i>We need long-term work, not occasional campaigns.</i>	ES6: <i>Le campagne di sensibilizzazione non bastano.</i> [Awareness- raising campaigns are not enough].
GT: <i>Das Engagement in diesem Bereich, das sich u.a.in diesem Plenum zeigt, kann niemandem entgangen sein.</i>	GS3: <i>L'impegno in questo settore, dimostrato proprio in questa sede, è considerevole.</i> [The commitment in this sector, demonstrated precisely in this forum, is significant].

The analysis showed that this strategy was frequently used by subjects in the same text segments:

GT: <i>Damit müssen wir uns natürlich beschäftigen, denn wenn wir innerhalb der EU glaubhaft sein wollen, müssen wir uns auch eine positive Politik nach außen hin vertreten.</i>	GS2: <i>Se vogliamo essere credibili..nell'ambito dell'Unione Europea, dobbiamo anche portare avanti una politica coerente anche in tale ambito. Grazie.</i> [If we want to be credible..within the European Union, we also need to carry out a consistent policy also in this field. Thank you]. GS3: <i>Se infatti vogliamo essere credibili a livello comunitario, dobbiamo creare una politica che sia eh responsabile anche a livello internazionale.</i> [Indeed if we want to be credible at the Community level, we need to work out a policy that is eh responsible also at international level].
---	---

As already observed in the analysis of generalization and deletion, this strategy was also applied in the same text segments by the subjects of both groups:

<p>GT: <i>Es bedarf einer konsequenten, glaubwürdigen und voraussehbaren Politik.</i></p>	<p>GS3: <i>C'è quindi bisogno di una politica lungimirante e coerente.</i> [Therefore a far-sighted and consistent policy is needed]. GS4: <i>C'è bisogno di una.. politica credibile e eh a lungo termine.</i> [A..credible and eh long-term policy is needed]. GS5: <i>E' bisogno-c'è bisogno di una politica lungimirante, coerente.</i> [A far-sighted consistent policy is needed]. GS7: <i>Conseguentemente bisogna portare avanti una politica sostenibile, ad ampio respiro.</i> [Consequently a sustainable, wide-range policy must be implemented]</p>
<p>ET: <i>We need a consistent policy that is credible and predictable.</i></p>	<p>ES2: <i>Abbiamo bisogno di politiche coerenti, che siano credibili e che possano dare buoni frutti.</i> [We need consistent policies, that are credible and that can yield good results]. ES5: <i>[...] abbiamo bisogno di politiche coerenti, credibili e anche attuabili.</i> [(...) we need consistent, credible and practicable policies. ES6: <i>C'è bisogno di una politica coerente, credibile ..e ben programmata.</i> [A consistent credible and well planned policy is necessary] ES8: <i>C'è bisogno di una politica coerente, credibile..e organizzata.</i> [A consistent, credible and well organised policy is required].</p>

Consequently, according to the data that emerged from the present study, substitution appears as a language-independent strategy which is not linked to the linguistic features of the ST. It appears to be a response adopted by the subjects of both groups to address the same comprehension or reformulation difficulties.

4. Conclusions

The objective of the present study was to detect possible differences in the use of strategies during SI that could derive from specific features of the SL

involved in the interpreting process and to ascertain whether the language-pair plays a role in determining the interpreter's approach to SI.

The results of the study seem to corroborate the hypothesis of certain language-pair specific strategies.

In particular, anticipation, time-lag, morphosyntactic transformations and transcoding are the strategies that revealed clear differences in the two groups of subjects.

Anticipation has been confirmed as one of the favourite strategies adopted by the subjects having German in their language-pair in order to deal with verb-final syntax. Data indicate that both quantitatively (49 occurrences recorded by the GS group) and qualitatively (anticipation in the GS group involves almost exclusively a VP) anticipation is influenced by the existence, in the SL text, of a typical linguistic structure, i.e. the verb-final structure in German, whereas the absence of a similar structure in English makes the adoption of anticipation superfluous. This is confirmed by the fact that only 5 occurrences of anticipation were recorded in the English samples and that anticipation involved a lexical unit and not a verb. The presence of only 5 occurrences in the same text portion could also indicate that the use of this strategy was accidental. It is also worth noting that all the 5 English subjects that resorted to anticipation had also German in their language combination. Even though this aspect was not considered in the present study, it could indicate that subjects having German among their working languages might be influenced in the choice of SI strategies even when working with other language pairs.

The experimental data resulting from the present analysis confirm the role of anticipation in the SI between structurally dissimilar languages, as suggested by Kalina:

Antizipation ist im Dolmetschprozess ein sowohl bottom-up als auch top-down verlaufender strategischer Prozess, der in bestimmten Fällen (aufgrund starker struktureller Divergenzen in Sprachenpaaren bzw. bei bestimmten Verarbeitungsrichtungen) verstärkt als Basis für die Textproduktion dienen muss (1998: 117).

The analysis of the *time-lag* also revealed language-specific divergences, as already highlighted in the presentation of results. Data have shown that the segment from which subjects start reformulating the message is different in the two groups. In the ES group, it coincides with the NP+VP+NP, with a clear tendency of ES subjects to keep their time-lag as short as possible, while in the GS group time-lag is extended or shortened depending on the position of the verb within the clause.

This work partly confirms the suggestion by Goldman-Eisler in her study on time-lag during SI. Assessing the performances of 6 professional interpreters in

the English-French, French-English, English-German and German-English language-pairs, the author found, in line with the results of the present research regarding the GS group, that "the verb is the main determinant of meaning" (1972: 137). However, differently from her research, both ES and GS do not only rely on the verb to start reformulation, as shown by the high number of occurrences of the LU type in both groups. Therefore, her assumption that "[...] the crucial piece of information enabling interpreters to start translation is the predicate" (1972: 131) was not confirmed. Yet it should be highlighted that student interpreters and not professionals were involved in the present research: the lack of working experience could have therefore played a role in the choice of the time-lag.

The analysis of *morphosyntactic transformations* and transcoding have provided interesting elements as to how the subjects of the two groups deal with the incoming SL text and the structure of the message.

The more frequent use of morphosyntactic operations by the GS (38 to 24) show these subjects' ability to reformulate the message into the TL more freely than the ES. These results seem to confirm that, wherever possible, subjects tend to follow the surface structure of the ST. Given the morphosyntactic similarities between English and Italian, fewer restructuring operations are required in SI from English to Italian than in SI from German to Italian, where structural dissimilarities are deeper, as indicated by numerous authors:

Languages with predominantly parallel syntactic patterning, e.g. English and French, demand less syntactic restructuring than do languages which differ considerably in structure, e.g. German and English. Thus, a SL/TL transfer on the basis of parallel syntactic structures can [...] be regarded as easier to accomplish. In addition, large "chunks" of information can be recoded with little restructuring, as the "expectation patterns" are largely similar (Wilss 1978: 343).

Drawing on Wilss's description of translation strategies, Müller highlights the concept of structural isomorphism between SL and TL, arguing that restructuring processes intervene only when a parallel structure cannot be used:

Präferierte Wahlen sind nach Wilss gekennzeichnet durch Beziehungen hoher struktureller Ähnlichkeit zum AS-Text, insbesondere auf syntaktischer und lexikaler Ebene [...]. Überall, wo in dem zu übersetzenden Textabschnitt zwischen AS und ZS in der angeführten Weise 'feste interlinguale Äquivalenzbeziehungen' vorliegen [...] kommt der Übersetzer mit sehr allgemeinen 'prototypischen Verhaltensmustern' aus, über die er im Rahmen einer routinisierten 'Fertigkeit' verfügt [...]. Erst da, wo die Übersetzungsaufgabe die bevorzugte, einfache, auf sprachstrukturelle Ähnlichkeit oder Isomorphie gestützte Lösung nicht

zuläßt, wo also z. B. 'eine wörtliche Übersetzung einen eindeutigen Verstoß gegen die lexikalischen, syntaktischen und idiomatischen Regelapparate der Zielsprache zur Folge hätte' [Wilss 1989: 111], treten komplexere Suchstrategien in Kraft (Müller 1996: 281).

Given the time constraints imposed on the interpreter by SI, the possibility of applying parallel structures will play a crucial role:

[...] der Zeitdruck, der zu schnellen und 'automatisierten' Verfahrensweisen Veranlassung gibt, sowie die erhöhte Relevanz von Reihenfolgebeziehungen, lassen der weiter oben zitierte Präferenz für 'wörtliche Prozeduren' des Übersetzens ein zusätzliche Gewicht zukommen, wenn es sich bei diesem Übersetzen um Simultan-dolmetschen handelt. Dies gilt insbesondere dann, wenn wir 'Wörtlichkeit nicht nur auf die lexikalische Ebene einschränken, sondern insbesondere auch Reihenfolgebeziehungen syntaktischer und textueller Art einschließen [...] (Müller 1996: 285).

In conclusion, the author stresses again that

Global angesehen zeigt die Analyse von SD-Texten die Präferenz, syntaktische und textuelle Reihenfolgebeziehungen des AS-Textes beizubehalten in ausgeprägter Form [...] (Müller 1996: 285).

The analysis of *transcoding* integrates and reaffirms what has been observed so far. According to the data collected, the ES resort to transcoding much more frequently than the GS (50 occurrences compared to 11). Since the ST was identical for the two groups, except for the language in which they were uttered, this difference could derive from linguistic factors and, in particular, from the morphosyntactic similarities between English and Italian. In fact, the possibility to follow the SL structure more closely in this language-pair than in the German-Italian pair could provide a valuable clue as to how to interpret this phenomenon. The fewer cases of morphosyntactic transformations and the more frequent use of transcoding by the ES group can therefore be seen as two sides of the same coin.

This conclusion seems to be confirmed by the previously mentioned experimental study by Viezzi (1993) who, in analysing the differences between a text interpreted simultaneously and the written translation of the same text from English into Italian, points out that

The comparison of the two translations with SLT clearly shows that SI follows the SLT structure more closely than WT and its units tend to be shorter (or longer) accordingly (1993: 96)

The data provided by the present study seem to indicate that the subjects' ability to follow the SLT's structure depends on the SL and is indeed facilitated by closer morphosyntactic similarities between SL and TL.

Viezzi's study also provides interesting observations concerning *stylistic choices* that can be of assistance in commenting upon the results of the present analysis. The author notes that "[...] WT [written translation] tends to be more formal and is, in general, more elegant than SI" (1993: 97). While this is clearly due to the on-line nature of SI which does not allow an interpreter to dwell upon stylistic choices, the data provided by the present analysis may indicate that the use of solutions of lower register in the TL may be influenced by the language-pair. In the present study, the difference in the total number of occurrences of simplification between the two groups (51 in the ES group and 27 in the GS group) seems to confirm Viezzi's observations.

In Viezzi's study, simplification is achieved through structural and lexical adherence to the English ST. As previously outlined in this paper when referring to transcoding and morphosyntactic operations, the ES' tendency to follow both the lexical and syntactic structure of the SL text due to the similarities between English and Italian may lead to solutions that resemble the original, but sound less appropriate in a TL like Italian as far as register is concerned.

Evasion has also indicated a higher frequency in one group, i.e. the GS group, in the total number of occurrences (26 compared to 10 of the ES group). The fact that the dropped segments coincided among subjects of the same group, but not between the two groups may hint at a possible role of language-pair specific factors. However, further evidence is required to confirm or reject this hypothesis.

A strategy whose role as a possible tool to deal with structural asymmetries has not been confirmed is *stalling by using neutral material*. The low number of occurrences recorded by both groups (8 in the GS and 2 in the ES group) makes it difficult to ascertain whether linguistic factors and hence the language-pair play a role in the use of this strategy. Therefore, the assumption of certain IP-theory authors who stressed the importance of this strategy has not been corroborated by the present work:

'Stalling' is often cited in the literature as a technique by which an interpreter can deal with long-distance dependencies, such as left-branching structures (especially verb-last SL syntax) by 'buying time' without subjecting her listeners to a long and uncomfortable silence (Setton 1999: 50).

The data emerged from the analysis of *paraphrase*, *approximation* and *segmentation* have not indicated any significant difference between the two groups. It is therefore difficult to establish the existence of a language-specific

approach due to the low number of occurrences recorded by both groups. Further investigation would be advisable to shed light on the use of the above-mentioned strategies.

Other strategies, such as additions, have been mostly adopted by one or more subjects, thus influencing the number of total occurrences and preventing an objective evaluation of the possible role of language-specific aspects.

The analysis of *repetitions*, of the strategy of *changing the order of elements within the clause* and of *least commitment* has shown little discrepancy between the two groups as far as the total number of occurrences is concerned. However, the presence of a higher number of occurrences in the tests of a limited number of subjects or of one single subject has not elicited reliable conclusions on whether their use is linked to the peculiarities of the SL involved in the interpreting process or is rather the result of individual choices.

Interesting results have emerged from the analysis of *generalization*, *deletion* and *substitution*. Both groups have shown a similar approach in resorting to these strategies as far as the total number of occurrences and the type of elements subjected to these operations are concerned. In fact, the analysis has shown that in both groups the most frequently deleted elements were modifying adjectives and adverbs. This result is in line with De Feo in whose study a clear trend towards the deletion of qualifying elements had emerged (see 1993: 30).

Similarly, Kopczynski outlined that

A very striking pattern of omissions consisted of leaving out modifying elements of different kinds, from adjectives and adverbials to relative phrases and clauses and adverbial clauses. The strategy is then apparently to focus the attention in the first instance on the constitutive part of T1: the main clause, the main verb, the head noun. The modifying elements, [...], are evidently viewed as redundant and frequently dismissed (1982: 260).

Additionally, it has been observed that the SL text portions involved in these operations coincided in the performances of the two groups and that a high number of subjects applied the same strategy in the same text segments. This phenomenon provides important clues as to the general nature of the examined strategies.

Despite the limited scope of the experiment described here, the present analysis has attempted to shed light on the theme of language-pair specific strategies. Results seem to indicate that certain language factors have an impact on the choice of the strategies adopted by the interpreter. However, the conclusions presented in this paper cannot be generalized because of the existence of procedural constraints. Firstly,

the empirical investigation of this strategic interdependence and interaction of interpreting is anything but a straightforward matter. One is confronted with oral and spontaneous linguistic products, intended for one single short moment and not to be stored or repeated as such, providing only inadequate clues as to the processes of which they are the result (Kohn & Kalina 1996: 133).

Secondly, the selected text, a translation from Swedish into English and German, was originally pronounced in a language different from those involved in the experiment. This choice, determined by the peculiar circumstances of the study, might have had an impact on the overall results.

Thirdly, the limited number of subjects chosen for the experiment may have influenced the outcome.

Finally, the fact that the subjects of the present study were novice interpreters and not professional interpreters suggests that further studies would be necessary, since professional experience allegedly plays a role in determining the interpreter's choice of strategies. A different approach might thus emerge between novice and professional interpreters, which it would be interesting to investigate.

Therefore, further experimental studies, extending the scope of research to a wider corpus, a higher number of subjects and to professional interpreters, would be advisable in order to confirm or contradict the results of this study.

References

- Barik H. (1994): "A description of various types of omissions, additions and errors of translation encountered in simultaneous interpretation", in *Bridging the Gap: Empirical Research in Simultaneous Interpretation*. Ed. by B. Moser-Mercer & S. Lambert, Amsterdam-Philadelphia, John Benjamins, pp. 121-137.
- Bazzanella C. (1989): "I segnali discorsivi", in *Grande Grammatica italiana di consultazione*. A cura di L. Renzi, Bologna, Il Mulino, pp. 225-257.
- Caburlotto C. (2000): *Tipologie testuali e strategie di interpretazione simultanea dallo spagnolo all'italiano: il testo scientifico, giuridico e metaforico. Un contributo sperimentale*. Tesi di laurea non pubblicata, Trieste, SSLMIT, Università degli Studi di Trieste.
- De Feo N. (1993): *Strategie di riformulazione sintetica nell'interpretazione simultanea dall'inglese in italiano: un contributo sperimentale*. Tesi di laurea non pubblicata, Trieste, SSLMIT, Università degli Studi di Trieste.

- Falbo C. (1999): "Morfosintassi e riformulazione", in *Interpretazione simultanea e consecutiva. Problemi teorici e metodologie didattiche*. A cura di C. Falbo, M. Russo, F. Straniero Sergio, Milano, Hoepli, pp. 175-188.
- Giambagli A. (1990): "Transformations grammaticales, syntaxiques et structurales dans l'interprétation consecutive vers l'italien d'une langue latine et d'une langue germanique", *The Interpreters' Newsletter* 3, pp. 98-111.
- Gile D. (1990): "The processing capacity issue in conference interpretation", *Babel* 37, pp. 15-27.
- Gile D. (1995): *Basic Concepts and Models for Interpreter and Translation Training*, Amsterdam-Philadelphia, John Benjamins.
- Goldman-Eisler F. (1972): "Segmentation of input in simultaneous translation", *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, 1, 2, pp. 127-140.
- Kalina S. (1992): "Discourse processing and interpreting strategies- an approach to the teaching of interpreting", in *New Horizons- Teaching Translation and Interpreting: Training, Talent and Experience*. Ed. by C. Dollerup and V. Appel, Amsterdam-Philadelphia, John Benjamins, pp. 251-257.
- Kalina S. & Kohn K. (1996): "The strategic dimension of interpreting", *Meta* 41, pp. 118-138.
- Kalina S. (1998): *Strategische Prozesse beim Dolmetschen: theoretische Grundlagen, empirische Fallstudien, didaktische Konsequenzen*, Tübingen, Gunter Narr.
- Kirchhoff H. (1976): "Das Simultandolmetschen: Interdependenz der Variablen im Dolmetschprozess, Dolmetschmodelle und Dolmetschstrategien", in *Theorie und Praxis des Übersetzens und Dolmetschens: Referate und Diskussionsbeiträge des internationalen Kolloquiums am Fachbereich Angewandte Sprachwissenschaft der Johannes Gutenberg- Universität Mainz in Gernersheim, 2.- 4. Mai, Frankfurt/M.* Hrsg. von H.W. Drescher und S. Scheffzack, Frankfurt/M., Peter Lang, pp. 59-71.
- Lederer M. (1981): *La traduction simultanée*, Paris, Minard Lettres Modernes.
- Messner C. (2001): *Interpretazione consecutiva e interpretazione simultanea: confronto e analisi delle strategie interpretative*. Tesi di laurea non pubblicata, Trieste, SSLMIT, Università degli Studi di Trieste.
- Müller F.E. (1996): "Präferentielle Strukturen beim Übersetzen und beim Simultandolmetschen", in *Übersetzungswissenschaft im Umbruch. Festschrift für Wolfram Wilss zum 70. Geburtstag*. Hrsg. von A.

- Lauer, H. Gerzymisch-Arbogast, J. Haller und E. Steiner, Tübingen, Gunter Narr, pp. 281-289.
- Riccardi A. (1997): "Sintassi tedesca: vero o falso problema per l'interpretazione?", in *Nuovi orientamenti negli studi di interpretazione*. A cura di L. Gran e A. Riccardi, SERT 6, Trieste, SSLMIT, pp. 143-158.
- Riccardi A. (1998): "Interpreting strategies and creativity", in *Translators' Strategies and Creativity*. Ed. by A. Beylard-Ozeroff, J. Kralová and B. Moser-Mercer, Amsterdam-Philadelphia, John Benjamins, pp. 171-179.
- Riccardi A. (1999): "Interpretazione simultanea: strategie generali e specifiche", in *Interpretazione simultanea e consecutiva: problemi teorici e metodologie didattiche*. A cura di C. Falbo, M. Russo e S. Straniero, Milano, Hoepli, pp. 161-173.
- Ross D. (1997): "La struttura linguistica e l'elaborazione sintattica: strategie generali e specifiche", in *Nuovi orientamenti negli studi di interpretazione*. A cura di L. Gran e A. Riccardi, SERT 6, Trieste, SSLMIT, pp. 91-109.
- Salevsky H. (1987): *Probleme des Simultandolmetschens. Eine Studie zur Handlungsspezifik*, Berlin, Akademie der Wissenschaften der DDR, Verlag Enzyklopädie.
- Seleskovitch D. & Lederer M. (1986): *Interpréter pour traduire*, Paris, Didier Érudition.
- Setton R. (1999): *Simultaneous Interpretation: A Cognitive-Pragmatic Analysis*, Amsterdam-Philadelphia, John Benjamins.
- Viezzi M. (1993): "Written translation and simultaneous interpretation compared and contrasted: a case study", *The Interpreters' Newsletter* 5, pp. 94-100.
- Wilss W. (1978): "Syntactic anticipation in German-English simultaneous interpreting", in *Language Interpretation and Communication*. Ed. by D. Gerver and H.W. Sinaiko, New York, Plenum, pp. 343-352.