Processes of Translation and Interpreting from a Native into a Foreign Language: Psycholinguistic Aspects

Психолінгвістичні аспекти процесів письмового та усного перекладу з рідної мови на іноземну

Leonid Chernovaty

Dr.Sci in Pedagogy,
Full Professor

Леонід Черноватий

доктор педагогічних наук,
професор

E-mail: leonid.m.chernovaty@meta.ua
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3411-9408>

Natalia Kovalchuk

Ph.D. in Pedagogy,
Associate Professor

Наталя Ковальчук

кандидат педагогічних наук,
доцент

E-mail: kovalnatalya@bigmir.net
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9483-4297>

*V.N. Karazin Kharkiv
National University*

✉ 4, Svoboda Square, Kharkiv,
Ukraine, 61022

*Харківський національний
університет імені В.Н. Каразіна*

✉ майдан Свободи 4, Харків,
Україна, 61022

Original manuscript received September 16, 2019

Revised manuscript accepted February 10, 2020

ABSTRACT

The aim of the paper deals with the preliminary verification of D. Gile's (2009) hypothesis (Effort Model) concerning the dependence of the translation quality not only on the command of the two languages involved, but also on the degree of the translator's or interpreter's processing mechanism saturation.

The methods of the research included a comparative analysis of two target texts (English) translated by the same subjects from the same non-fiction source text (Ukrainian) related to the domain of law. The said source text was first rendered into English orally (sight translation) and then translated in the written form within a predetermined time limit. The subjects, first-year MA students majoring in Translation, whose command of English ranged between B2 and C1 levels within the CEF classification, were properly motivated to achieve the maximum possible result. The analysis of both English target texts (oral and written) was based on a number of parameters, which included the preservation of the source text information in the target texts, their grammar and lexical accuracy, as well as their coherence. The sight translation analysis additionally assessed fluency, while the written translation – orthographic control.

Results. It was established that the preservation of the source text information in the target texts is equally high in both types of translation. The same is generally true concerning their grammar and lexical accuracy as well. A slight growth of the number of mistakes in the article use and an insignificant amount of more elementary errors, non-compatible with the subjects' level of English, may be accounted for by the restricted monitoring capacity in sight translation due to the processing mechanism saturation. By coherence criterion, the sight translation target text does not meet the requirements of the B2+ level the written translation target text belongs to. In some fragments, it slides down to level B1 or even A2, especially in relation to fluency, whose quality is often deteriorated by unmotivated pauses, false starts, repetitions, self-corrections and reformulations.

Conclusions. The authors suggest an assumption that the said deterioration in sight translation is accounted for by a higher degree of simultaneous efforts concentration in it as compared with the written translation. The paper outlines the prospects of further research.

Key words: translation process, sight translation, written translation, Effort Model, monitoring, simultaneous efforts concentration.

Introduction

The interlingual translation process investigation is important for understanding the brain functioning in general, the nature of the language-related processes, as well as for an efficient control of the translation competence development in translator and interpreter training. This kind of research has been conducted for quite a while, beginning with W. Lörscher's contributions (Lörscher, 1992, 1996, 2005). Contemporary research has focused on various aspects of the problem – empirical (Tirkkonen-Condit & Jääskeläinen, 2000; Carl, Bangalore & Schaeffer, 2016), integrative (Alvstad, Hild &

Tiselius, 2011), neurocognitive (Annoni, Lee-Jahnke & Sturm, 2012) and interdisciplinary (Ehrensberger-Dow, Gupferich & O'Brien, 2014). In particular, the authors focus on the specific features of various types of translation and interpreting, such as simultaneous and consecutive interpreting (Gile, 2009), summary translation (Shreve, 2006). In spite of a considerable amount of research, the problem remains to be important due to the lack of a comprehensive model of translation/interpreting, both in general and concerning each of their types.

The comparative study of various types of translation/interpreting is especially valuable as each of them has its own distinctive features. According to Daniel Gile's assumption, the translation/interpreting process is provided for by three groups of efforts: The Reception and Analysis Effort, the Production Effort (which involves the decision-making effort) and the short-term Memory Effort (Gile, 2009: 190). Each of those groups consume a portion of the general processing capacity in the brain. If the processing capacity requirements for the specific task accomplishment exceed the particular individual's available processing capacity, then it is saturated and the quality of the said accomplishment deteriorates (Gile, 2009: 190).

This assumption has been partially confirmed in Daniel Gile's research (Gile, 2009: 183), where the author compared the relative efficiency of simultaneous and consecutive interpreting from a foreign (English) into a native (French) language of the same source text. However, the data concerning the correlation of other types of translation or interpreting, or those related to translation and/or interpreting from a native into a foreign language have not so far been known to the authors of this article. Consequently, this paper aims at a preliminary assessment of the validity of Daniel Gile's assumption concerning the relative efficiency of written and sight translation from a native (Ukrainian) into a foreign (English) language for formulating the hypothesis and its further investigation on a broader population of subjects.

To achieve this aim, we had to complete a number of tasks: to select a source text and the subjects, to organize written and sight translation from a native (Ukrainian) into a foreign (English) language, recording the latter with appropriate equipment, carry out a comparative analysis of both target texts according to pre-established criteria, compare the results, formulate preliminary conclusions, and outline the prospects of the further research.

Methods

Taking into account the aim of our research, we selected the subjects – five female first-year MA students (majoring in Translation) of the School of Foreign Languages at V.N. Karazin Kharkiv National University, 21 to 23 years of age, who studied English as their second foreign language (French being the first one). Their experience in studying English included at least eight years at the secondary school and four years – at the undergraduate level in the said School of the said University. According to the results of the regular testing as an integral part of their training, their command of English ranged between B2 and C1 levels within the CEF classification (Common European Framework, 2002). As the subjects were half-way through the course of legal translation, and had just finished the module ‘Trial in the US legal system’, we selected (translated into Ukrainian and adapted for the purpose of the research) the properly oriented 205-word source text (see the Addendum) from the original source (Burnham, 1999). The subjects had five minutes to look through the text, then they interpreted it while having the text in front of them (sight translation), and then they translated the same text in writing. The subjects’ sight translation was recorded with a digital voice recorder. The total amount of time for the two tasks – 60 minutes per subject. The subjects were properly motivated to achieve the maximum possible result as both tasks were part of their regular modular assessment, and were taken into account when assessing their progress throughout the semester.

Both target texts (oral and written) were evaluated according to the following criteria: the degree of the source text information preservation in the target text, grammar and lexical accuracy, as well as coherence. Basing upon the requirements of the Common European Framework of Reference (Common European Framework, 2002), we also took into account the subjects’ fluency in the sight translation and orthographic control – in the written translation.

Results and Discussion

Because of the restrictions imposed by the limited amount of space allotted for this paper, let us compare the two types of translation

(oral and written) on the example of one subject who is entirely representative of the rest of them. The subject completely preserved the source text information in the target text. The generally slight deviations from the target language (English) norms (see below) did not have a substantial impact on the content of the target text. Specifically, there were six errors in the use of prepositions. They are mostly related to the preposition *on*, which in English, depending on the context, may render space, temporal or other relations. Sequentially, the first to be acquired are the means to indicate space relations, i.e. the situations where an object is on the surface of a plane, e.g., *on the table* – *на столі*. Within this category, the only equivalent of the English preposition *on* is always the Ukrainian preposition *на*. It turns into a source of the interlanguage interference and induces the use of the English preposition *on* as a universal equivalent of the Ukrainian preposition *на* even in situations, which go beyond space relations and, subsequently, may be marked by other prepositions in English, e.g. *на зборах* – *at the meeting*. Five instances of the misuse of *on* were found in the subject's written translation. First, she consistently (four times) used *on* to render the word combination 'право *на* (відкритий судовий процес)' (the expected translation: *the right to (a public trial)*, which the subject invariably rendered as *the right on*. In two other instances the subject used the preposition *on* (*to be present on the hearing*) instead of *at* in rendering the word combination 'бути присутніми *на* (судовому розгляді)' (the expected translation: *to be present at (the hearing)*, and instead of the preposition *for* (*demand on (a public trial)*) while translating the word combination 'вимога *про* (відкритий судовий процес)' (the expected translation: *demand for a public trial*). In another instance, while rendering the word combination 'виключення з доказів' (the expected translation: *disallowing of evidence*), the subject, under the influence of the interlingual interference, literally translated it as *cancelling from evidence*, though the target language norms did not require any preposition in this case at all.

The amount of other deviations from the target language norms is relatively negligible, as well as their impact on the the degree of the source text information preservation in the target text. There were three mistakes in the article use – one omission of the indefinite article in the situation of nomination while rendering the word combination 'право на відкритий судовий процес' – *the right on public trial* instead of

the right to a public trial. Taking into account the fact that this word combination is used in the text four times, and in other instances, the correct article was used, its omission may be explained by the residual interlingual interference, due to the absence of articles in the Ukrainian language. In two other instances, though the subject did use the articles, but in both cases she used its definite form (*the public trial*) instead of the indefinite one (*a public trial*). However, taking into account the absence of other errors of this type, we may conclude that the development of the subject's article use mechanism has been generally completed.

Three mistakes are related to the position of the adverbs *also* and *only* in the sentence – in translating the word combination ‘вносилися **навіть** пропозиції’ (*There have been also proposals* instead of *There have also been proposals*), ‘йому потрібно **лише** вказати’ (*he has to only say* instead of *he only has to say*) and ‘має тільки відповідач’ (*has only the defendant* instead of *only the defendant has*). As it is evident from the examples, the interlingual interference, i.e. copying the word order in the source text, is responsible for all these errors (which do not affect the meaning of the target text).

In two instances the subject omitted the particle *to* in front of the verbs while translating the word combination ‘спонукати (свідків) давати’ (*compel ... give* instead of *compel ... to give*) and ‘допуск публіки на судове слухання’ (*permission ... be present* замість *permission ... to be present*). In both instances, we see the impact of the interlingual interference. The omission of the subject in the impersonal construction (*is not considered* instead of *it is not considered*) may be explained by the complicated structure of the source text fragment (‘недопущення до залу суду публіки, якщо відповідач відмовляється від свого права, не є порушенням закону’ – literally: *the disallowance of public to the courtroom, if the defendant waives his right, is not a violation of the law*). The subject, trying to transform the structure of the sentence (*if the defendant refuses his right to permit the attendance of the public to the courtroom*), finally got under the influence of the interlingual interference – the word order in the source text (*is not considered as a violation of this right*).

Several lexical errors may be explained by the impact of the intralingual interference – the confusion of words with similar forms: the use of *prosecution* instead of *persecution* to translate the word

‘переслідування’ (*persecution*), *proof* instead of *prove* (‘доводити’ – to *prove*), *attendance* instead of *admission* (‘допущення публіки’ – *admission of the public*), *publicity* instead of *public* (‘публіка’ – *public*).

Thus, basing on the written target text features, we may conclude that its lexical accuracy corresponds to level **B2**, i.e. it is ‘generally high, though some confusion and incorrect word choice does occur without hindering communication’ (Common European Framework, 2002: 112). The grammar accuracy of the subject’s written target text also corresponds to the same level (**B2**). According to the CEF classification (Common European Framework, 2002), this level is characterized by ‘good grammatical control; occasional ‘slips’ or non-systematic errors and minor flaws in sentence structure may still occur, but they are rare’ (Common European Framework, 2002: 114).

By the coherence criterion, the written target text is consistent, specifically, due to the correct application of cohesive devices.

Now let us compare the subject’s performance during sight translation of the same text for making conclusions concerning the degree of similarity between the two types of translation processes.

We can see both similarities and discrepancies here. In sight translation, the subject completely preserved the source text information in the target text in the sense that the addressee would generally understand it correctly. However, we can also see certain deviations from the target language norms caused by a variety of factors. The impact of the interlingual interference is evident in the excessive use of the preposition *from* as the result of the word-for-word translation of the Ukrainian word combination ‘відповідач відмовляється **від** свого права’ (*the defendant waives his right*): *the defendant refuses **from** his right*. In sight translation, in all five instances (four – in the written translation) we see the consistently incorrect use of the preposition **on** in rendering the Ukrainian word combination ‘право **на** відкритий судовий процес’ (*the right to a public trial*): *the right **on** instead of the right to*). Literal translation fueled by the interlingual interference also caused the wrong choice of the preposition *from* while rendering the word combination ‘виключення з доказів’ (*disallowing of evidence*): *cancelling **from** evidence*. On the other hand, while translating the source text fragments with the preposition **на** in other meanings, the subject, unlike in the written translation, avoided the pitfalls of the interlingual interference in interpreting. Compare: in the written translation, while

rendering the word combination ‘бути присутніми **на** судовому розгляді’ (*be present **at** the hearing*) the subject resorted to the literal approach (*be present **on***), while in interpreting, her choice was more acceptable (though not ideal) – *during*. The latter preposition was also used in rendering the word combination ‘на досудових слуханнях’ (*at the pretrial hearing*) – *during the prejudicial hearing*. In addition, in translating the word combination ‘вимога **про** (відкритий судовий процес)’ (*the public trial requirement*), the subject, instead of a poor choice of the preposition in the written translation (*demand **on***), found a better option in interpreting (*demand **of***).

In interpreting, errors in the article use occurred twice as often as in the written translation. Under the influence of the interlingual interference, in rendering the word combination ‘право на відкритий судовий процес’ (*right to **a** public trial*) the indefinite article was omitted five times in interpreting against three times in the written translation. In addition, the definite article was omitted in front of the last word in the word combination ‘це право відповідача’: *this right of **defendant*** instead of *this right of **the** defendant*. In both types of translation, under the influence of the intralingual interference, the subject used the definite article (***the** public trial*) instead of the indefinite one (***a** public trial*) in rendering the already mentioned word combination (‘відкритий судовий процес’). Moreover, in interpreting, while rendering the word combinations «з порушенням закону» (literally: *with the violation of the law*) and «порушення права» (literally: *violating the right*), we see the overuse of articles related to the situations that require a different article or no article at all: (*with **a** breaking of the law* and ***the** breaking of this right*). Thus, we may conclude that the subject’s article use mechanism in interpreting is less balanced as compared to the written translation, which may be explained by broader possibilities of monitoring in the latter.

The intensive operation of consciousness focused on almost simultaneous reception of the source text and the target text generation in interpreting caused a number of other errors on the morphological and syntactic levels. In both types of translation we see the errors related to the impact of the interlingual interference, such as the position of *also* and *only* in the sentence. Compare: ‘вносилися **навіть** (пропозиції)’: *there have been **also*** (instead of *there have **also** been*) and ‘має **тільки** відповідач’: *has **only** the defendant* (instead of ***only** the defendant*

has) – in both types of translation ; «йому потрібно **лише** вказати»: written translation – *he has to **only** say*, sight translation – *he has to say **only*** (замість *he **only** has to say*).

Other instances of deviations from the target language norms under the influence of interlingual interference in the written translation (omission of the particle *to* in front of the verb, subject omission in impersonal sentences) have already been discussed above. In interpreting, we also see some more elementary errors, specifically, confusion of different forms of the verb *to be* (*there **are** no place* instead of *there **is** no place*), as well as *no* and *not* (***no*** (instead of ***not***) *enough places for everyone*). Usually, such errors occur at the levels, which are lower than the one the subject belongs to. However, we may assume that because the processing capacity requirements for some fragments of the interpreting task exceeded the subject's available processing capacity, the brain was compelled to restrict the monitoring of some speech mechanisms elements, which resulted in the deterioration of the subject's speech.

Another group of errors is related to failures in the recall of words from the subject's memory. In some cases, she tried to compensate by means of using a common literary word instead of a specialized term. For example, instead of the legal term *persecution* in rendering the Ukrainian word 'переслідування', the subject, on two separate occasions, used common literary words *following* and *chasing*. As it was mentioned earlier, in the written translation, the subject used the noun *proof* instead of the verb *prove*, but in interpreting she correctly used the verb. However, most of such errors are caused by the intralingual interference of the similar form lexemes, which resulted in the wrong recall of homographs or homophones. For example, in both types of translation – the use of *cancelling* instead of *dismissal* to render the word 'виключення (доказів)' (*dismissal (of the evidence)*), *publicity* instead of *public* ('публіка'); in the written translation only – *attendance* instead of *admission (of the public)* ('допущення (публіки)'), *prosecution* instead of *persecution* ('переслідування'); in interpreting only: *prejustice* instead of *prejudice* ('упередженість'), *accepted* instead of *admitted (public)* ('допущена (публіка)'), *acceptance* instead of *admission (of the public)* ('допуск публіки').

However, the main difference between the written and the sight translation is the target text coherence. While the written text

is completely coherent, its oral counterpart is not. First, it abounds in repetitions: *The right on... on public trial* ('право на відкритий судовий процес' – *the right to a public trial*), *to... to the proclaiming (the verdict)* ('до винесення (вердикту – literally: *before the verdict*) – the word *proclaiming* is not needed in the English target text and was used by the subject only because she assumed the word-for-word approach. Such errors signal the problems with the selection of the lexical equivalent or the sentence structure, for example, *The 6th Amend... Amendment* ('шоста поправка').

False starts, which also indicate the problems in the choice of the sentence structure, present another prominent feature of interpreting: 'унеможлиблює' (literally: *makes it impossible*) – *makes imposs... makes it impossible*; 'в залі суду можуть сидіти люди' (*there may be some people in the courtroom*) – *there can be pre... the people can be present*; 'передбачає допуск публіки на судові слухання' (*provides that the public in general has free access*) – *foresees that... that... that during the public hearing*; 'допуск публіки на судові слухання' (*admission of public to the hearing*) – *during the public hearing can be... a!... public hearing of the criminal case can be*; 'якщо місць у залі суду не вистачає' (*if there are not enough seats in the courtroom*) – *If... if there are no place...*; 'Це не є порушенням...' (*it is not a violation...*) – *it's... it's not considered*; 'довести упередженість суду' (*show prejudice of the court*) – *to prove the breach jus... breach prejudice...*; 'упередженість суду' (*prejudice of the court*) – *prejudice of the... of the court*.

False starts may also show problems in the choice of lexical equivalents: 'правдиві свідчення' (*truthful testimony*) – *truthful... truthful... evid... truthful witnesses*; 'призначається новий судовий розгляд' (*new hearing is appointed*) – *new criminal hearing had to... had to take place*; 'ось чому недопущення' (*that is why the non-admission of the public*) – *that is why... that is why... the acceptance*; 'недопущення до залу суду публіки' (*non-admission of the public to the courtroom*) – *acceptance to the hall of the court... of the... of some public*; але преса (*but the press*) – *but... pre... but press*; 'мають окреме право' (*have a separate right*) – *have the... the... the special right*.

Both repetitions and false starts are similar to the mechanism of build-up, which is observed in the first language acquisition (Ingram

1992), and which might participate in the development of translation competence as well. This assumption requires further research.

Another mechanism of this kind is completion (Ingram, 1992), whose indicators in the subject's speaking were unmotivated pauses signaling the problems related to the equivalent selection (see also Kumpulainen, 2015): 'використання судової влади' (literally: *the use of the judicial power*) – *to use... the judicial power*; 'в залі суду можуть сидіти люди' (*there may be some people in the courtroom*) – *some people present... in the hall*; 'щоб довести факт порушення права' (*to prove the fact of the violation of the right*) – *to prove the fact of... the breaking of this right*; 'публіку не допустили на слухання' (*the public was not admitted to the hearing*) – *public ... could not...*; 'у такому випадку призначається новий судовий розгляд' (*in this case, a new criminal hearing is appointed*) – *in such case... the new criminal hearing had to... had to take place*.

The subject also often resorted to self-corrections, which affirmed her realization of a better version in the process of actual interpreting: 'карної справи' (literally: *of a criminal case*) – *in a criminal case... of a criminal case*; 'на досудових слуханнях' (*at the preliminary hearing*) – *on... during the prejudicial hearing*; 'право на відкритий судовий процес' (*the right to a public trial*) – *right on trial... on the open trial*; 'інструмент переслідування' (*instrument of persecution*) – *instrument of following... of chasing*; 'спонукати потенційних свідків' (*make potential witnesses*) – *make potential evid... witnesses*; 'правдиві свідчення' (*truthful testimony*) – *evid... truthful witnesses*; 'вимога про відкритий судовий процес' (*the requirement of a public trial*) – *the demand of an open trial... of the public trial*; 'публіку не допустили на слухання' (*the public was not admitted to the hearing*) – *the public could not... has not been accepted*; 'за першою поправкою' (*under the First Amendment*) – *of the... under the First Amendment*.

Finally, the subject's change in her strategy of sentence construction is indicated by reformulations: 'неналежний' (literally: *inappropriate*) – *as a... in an inappropriate way*; 'через побоювання' (*because of fear*) – *because of having... because they can have fear*; 'але преса' (*but the press*) – *but... pre... but the press*; 'в залі суду можуть сидіти люди' (literally: *there may be some people in the courtroom*) – *the people can be pre... there can be some people present*; 'які знають правду' (*who know the truth*) – *who know the whole... the truth*; 'допуск публіки

на судове слухання' (*admission of the public to the court hearing*) – *can be... some people present... public present*; 'мість у залі суду не вистачає на всіх' (*there are not enough seats in the courtroom for everyone*) – *no place... no enough places for everyone*.

Thus, taking into account the characteristics of the subject's sight interpreting, we may conclude that it does not differ much from the written translation in its lexical accuracy, the use of prepositions and adverbs in the sentence. There is a slight growth of the number of mistakes in the article use, probably caused by the restricted monitoring capacity in interpreting as compared with the written translation. The latter factor presumably explains the insignificant amount of more elementary errors, non-compatible with the subjects' level of English, in her speaking.

However, by other characteristics the subject's interpreting falls behind the written translation level (B2+). As far as the subject's range of language is concerned, it rather belongs to B1 level, i.e. she has 'enough language to get by, with sufficient vocabulary to express herself with some hesitation and circumlocutions,... but lexical limitations cause repetition and even difficulty with formulation at times' (Common European Framework, 2002: 110). The following fragment of the subject's speaking in the process of interpreting illustrates it.

The Supreme Court held that the right on trial... on the open trial can prevent the usage of judges as an instrument of following... of chasing and makes imposs... makes it impossible to use... the judicial power as a... in an inappropriate way.

Things are not better with fluency – some fragments of the subject's speech in the process of interpreting correspond to level B1, where the speaker 'can keep going comprehensibly, even though pausing for grammatical and lexical planning and repair is very evident, especially in longer stretches of ... production' (Common European Framework, 2002: 129). Some fragments of the subject's interpreting even have some features characteristic of level A2, where 'pauses, false starts and reformulation are very evident' (Common European Framework, 2002: 129):

The demand of an open tria... of the public trial foresees that... that... that during the public hearing can be... a!... public hearing of the criminal case can be... some people present... public present.

Conclusions

Basing on our analysis, we may assume that in the written translation the individual's processing capacity is rarely saturated, because this type of translation is essentially discrete. i.e. the efforts related to the source text reception, its analysis, decision making and the target text production are applied sequentially. That is why the available processing capacity is usually enough to provide for the acceptable quality of translation. The load on the short-term memory is minimal as both the source and target texts are permanently in front of the translator's eyes and do not require memorizing. In contrast to the written translation, the level of effort cumulation per unit of time in the sight translation substantially increases and it results in the translation quality deterioration.

The sight translation requires a greater amount of parallel efforts (see also Balling, Hvelplund & Sjørup, 2014) because it is less discrete. The interpreter has to simultaneously perceive the source text, analyse it, make translation decisions and generate the target text, providing for its relatively fluent and loud production without unmotivated pauses, false starts, repetitions, self-corrections and reformulations. It calls for substantial efforts on the part of short-term memory to retain the general strategy of translating a specific fragment of the source text and coordinating the structural components within a phrase or a paragraph. Because the storage time of this type of memory does not exceed 20–30 seconds, this time is often insufficient to meet the said requirements. It results in the poor coordination of separate fragments of speech, a considerable deterioration of interpreting quality and the errors, which are not typical of the interpreter's actual level of the target language command, but of the lower levels of their interlanguage (see Selinker & Douglas, 1985) they had passed in the process of their lingual development. To solve the various multi-level problems in the process of interpreting, the interpreter resorts (among others) to strategies characteristic of the earlier stages of language acquisition, specifically to the build-up, completion (Ingram, 1992) and reformulation.

Thus, we may formulate a preliminary assumption (which requires an additional verification on the broader population of subjects) that a higher degree of parallel efforts cumulation in sight interpreting from a native into a foreign language (as compared to the written translation)

results in the deterioration of its quality. The latter depends not only on the level of the two languages command, but also on the interpreter's ability to effectively coordinate their own parallel efforts in the process of interpreting to avoid the processing capacity saturation. The said ability may probably be developed by means of special training, whose nature requires a separate investigation, which is one of the prospects of our further enquiry. Another prospect is the research into a comparative psycholinguistic nature of translation/interpreting from a foreign into a native language, as well as the processes in other types of interpreting – consecutive without note taking, consecutive with note taking and simultaneous.

References

- Alvstad, C., Hild, A., & Tiselius, E. (Eds.). (2011). *Methods and Strategies of Process Research: Integrative approaches in Translation Studies*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.94>
- Annoni, J., Lee-Jahnke, H., & Sturm, A. (2012). Neurocognitive Aspects of Translation. *Meta*, 57 (1), 96–107. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1012743ar>
- Balling, L.W., Hvelplund, K.T., & Sjørup, A.C. (2014). Evidence of Parallel Processing During Translation. *Meta*, 59 (2), 234–259. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1027474ar>
- Burnham, W. (1999). *Introduction to the law and legal system of the United States*. St. Paul, Minn.: West Group.
- Carl, M., Bangalore, S., & Schaeffer, M. (Eds.). (2016). *New Directions in Empirical Translation Process Research*. Berlin: Springer International Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-20358-4>
- Ehrensberger-Dow, M., Gupferich, S. & O'Brien, Sh. (Eds.). (2014). *Interdisciplinarity in Translation and Interpreting Process Research*. Amsterdam /Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1075/bct.72>
- Gile, D. (2009). *Basic Concepts and Models for Interpreter and Translator Training*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. <https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.8>
- Ingram, D. (1992). *First Language Acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kumpulainen, M. (2015). On the operationalisation of 'pauses' in translation process research. *Translation & Interpreting*, 7 (1), 47–58.
- Lörscher, W. (2005). The Translation Process: Methods and Problems of its Investigation. *Meta*, 50 (2), 597–608. <https://doi.org/10.7202/011003ar>
- Lörscher, W. (1992). Investigating the Translation Process. *Meta*, 37 (3), 426–439. <https://doi.org/10.7202/003517ar>
- Lörscher, W. (1996). A Psycholinguistic Analysis of Translation Processes. *Meta*, 41 (1), 26–32. <https://doi.org/10.7202/003518ar>
- Selinker, L., & Douglas, D. (1985). Wrestling with 'context' in interlanguage theory. *Applied linguistics*, 6 (2), 182–190. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/6.2.190>

- Shreve, G. (2006). Integration of translation and summarization processes in summary translation. *Journal of the American Translation and Interpreting Studies Association*, 1 (1), 87–109. <https://doi.org/10.1075/tis.1.1.06shr>
- The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages*. (2002). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tirkkonen-Condit, S., & Jääskeläinen, R. (Eds.). (2000). *Tapping and Mapping the Processes of Translation and Interpreting: Outlooks on empirical research*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.37>

Appendix

Source text

Право на відкритий судовий процес. Поправка 6 Конституції Сполучених Штатів Америки гарантує право на «відкритий судовий процес». Це право відповідача поширюється на всі стадії розгляду карної справи: від вибору журі до винесення остаточного вердикту. Вносилися навіть пропозиції застосовувати це право на досудових слуханнях про виключення з доказів. Верховний суд постановив, що право на відкритий судовий процес запобігає «використанню судів як інструменту переслідування» та унеможливорює неналежне використання судової влади. До того ж відкритий процес може спонукати потенційних свідків давати виключно правдиві свідчення через побоювання, що в залі суду можуть сидіти люди, які знають правду. Вимога про відкритий судовий процес передбачає допуск публіки на судові слухання карної справи. Якщо ж місць у залі суду не вистачає на всіх і хтось не зміг бути присутнім, це не вважається порушенням такого права. Щоб довести факт порушення цього права, відповідачу не потрібно доводити упередженість суду в його справі; йому потрібно лише вказати, що публіку з порушенням закону не допустили на слухання. У такому випадку призначається новий судовий розгляд. Право на відкритий процес, за поправкою 6, має тільки відповідач, тому недопущення до залу суду публіки, якщо відповідач відмовляється від свого права, не є порушенням закону. Проте преса та представники громадськості, за поправкою 1, мають окреме право бути присутніми на судовому розгляді.

АНОТАЦІЯ

Метою роботи є попередня перевірка гіпотези Д. Жіля (2009) (модель зусиль) про залежність якості перекладу не тільки від рівня володіння двома мовами, задіяними в перекладі, але й від ступеня навантаження на механізм обробки інформації в свідомості перекладача.

Методика дослідження включала порівняльний аналіз передачі англійською мовою попередньо відібраного одного й того ж самого українськомовного тексту у сфері юриспруденції, спочатку у формі усного перекладу з аркуша, а потім – письмового перекладу з обмеженням часу. Випробуваних, студентів першого курсу магістратури (спеціалізація «Переклад»), якість володіння англійською мовою яких коливалася між рівнями B2+ та C1, було належним чином мотивовано на досягнення максимального результату. Параметри аналізу обох текстів перекладу (усного й письмового) включали ступінь збереження змісту тексту оригіналу в текстах перекладу, граматичну й лексичну правильність, а також когерентність. В усному перекладі враховувались також плавність та швидкість мовлення, а в письмовому – орфографічний контроль.

Результати аналізу засвідчили, що ступінь збереження змісту тексту оригіналу в обох текстах перекладу є однаково високим. Це стосується також лексичної правильності та граматичного аспекту загалом. Звуженням можливостей моніторингу в усному перекладі можна пояснити невелике зростання кількості помилок на вживання артиклів та наявність незначної кількості більш елементарних помилок випробуваних, непридатних їхньому рівню володіння англійською мовою. За параметром когерентності усний переклад випробуваних не відповідає рівню (B2+) письмового перекладу. В деяких фрагментах тексту перекладу він зісковзує на рівні B1 або навіть A2, особливо стосовно плавності й швидкості мовлення, якість яких знижується внаслідок невмотивованих пауз, фальстартів, повторів, виправлень і переформулювань.

Висновки. Сформульовано попереднє припущення, що зниження якості під час перекладу з аркуша спричинюється вищим ступенем кумуляції паралельних зусиль. Окреслено перспективи подальшого дослідження.

Ключові слова: процес перекладу, усний переклад, письмовий переклад, модель зусиль, моніторинг, кумуляція паралельних зусиль.

Черноватый Леонид & Ковальчук Наталья. Психолингвистические аспекты процессов письменного и устного перевода с родного языка на иностранный

АННОТАЦИЯ

Целью работы является предварительная проверка гипотезы Д. Жилья (2009) (модель усилий) относительно зависимости качества перевода не только от уровня владения двумя языками, вовлеченными в перевод, но и от степени нагрузки на механизм обработки информации в сознании переводчика.

Методы исследования включали сравнительный анализ передачи на английском языке содержания предварительно отобранного одного и того

же україномовного тексту в області юриспруденції, спочатку – в формі усного перекладу з листа, а потім – письмового перекладу з обмеженням часу. Испитуємі, студенти першого курсу магістратури (спеціалізація «Переклад»), якість володіння англійською мовою котрими коливається між рівнями B2+ і C1, були належним чином мотивовані на досягнення максимального результату. Параметри оцінювання обох текстів перекладу (усного і письмового) включали ступінь збереження змісту оригіналу в текстах перекладу, граматичну і лексичну правильність, а також когерентність. В усному перекладі додатково враховувалися плавність і швидкість мовлення, а в письмовому – орфографічний контроль.

Результати аналізу свідчать, що ступінь збереження змісту оригіналу в обох текстах перекладу є однаково високим. Це стосується також граматичної і лексичної правильності в цілому. Зменшення можливостей моніторингу в усному перекладі можна пояснити незначительним збільшенням кількості помилок при використанні артиклів і наявність невеликої кількості більш елементарних помилок іспитуємих, не пов'язаних з їх рівнем володіння англійською мовою. За параметром когерентності усний переклад іспитуємих не відповідає рівню (B2+) письмового перекладу. В деяких фрагментах тексту перекладу він соскальовує на рівень B1 або навіть A2, особливо стосовно плавності і швидкості мовлення, якість котрої знижується внаслідок немотивованих пауз, фальстартів, повторів, виправлень і переформулювань.

Висновки. Сформульовано припущення, що причиною зниження якості в усному перекладі з листа є більш висока ступінь кумуляції паралельних зусиль. Окреслені перспективи подальших досліджень.

Ключові слова: процес перекладу, усний переклад, письмовий переклад, модель зусиль, моніторинг, кумуляція паралельних зусиль.