DIRECTIONALITY TYPES AND FREQUENCY OF REPAIRS IN SIMULTANEOUS INTERPRETING.

Meliyeva Nargizakhon Bakhodirovna,
Lecturer "Renessans education university"
Khayitmuratova Yulduz Iskandarovna,
Student the 2 course of "Renessans education university"

***Abstract**: This article explores the concept of directionality in simultaneous interpretation, focusing on the challenges of categorizing different types of translation and their specific characteristics. It reviews existing research by both local and international scholars, examining the diverse perspectives on directionality in simultaneous interpretation. The study aims to analyze these viewpoints, refine our understanding of the issue, and present a unique perspective on the complexities involved.*

***Key words**: Simultaneous Interpretation, Directionality, Translation Types, Source Language (SL), Target Language (TL), Classification Interpretation Studies, Cognitive Load, Interpreting Process, Language Direction*

Simultaneous interpretation is a special act of communication where the interpreter receives a message in the source language and conveys that message in the target language, while still listening to the original input. In other words, the interpreter enters into some kind of loop where the production of the original message, its comprehension by the interpreter and the production of the target message are overlapping, i.e. simultaneous, processes. Some researchers like gerver (1976), Moser (1978), and gile (1997) have proposed mental models that describe the interpreting process as a complex cognitive process.To these three efforts the author adds a fourth one, the coordination Effort (c), which coordinates the other three. gerver (1976) underscores the interpreter's control through the distribu-tion of attention in the different phases of the activity. Moreover, the

author discusses the role of memory in SI and states that 'ear-voice span data suggests that some form of short-term buffer memory' (gerver 1976, 191) helps to inter-pret and receive the information and at the same time becomes involved in the SI process. gerver also refers to the output buffer memory as the one which helps the interpreter to monitor and correct the output, which is an inseparable part of SI and which will be addressed later in this study.[1]

Controlling and coordinating the above-mentioned overlapping activities in such a way that effective communication is ensured between the parties requires specific strategic efforts (Kohn & Kalina 1996, 129). The strategies applied by interpreters in order to carry out their overlapping tasks successfully have been the subject of numerous studies, however this article presents a reflection just on a few of them. Riccardi, for example, categorizes strategies in four main groups and states that this is the most common categorization: comprehension, production, over-all and emergency strategies. 'comprehension strategies generally include anti-cipation, segmentation, selection of information, stalling or waiting', whereas production strategies consist of comprehension, expansion, approximation strategies, generalization, use of prosody elements, etc. overall strategies include monitoring and décalage, and emergency strategies can include omissions, transcoding, etc. Kalina (1998) distinguishes mainly between comprehension and production strategies. Emergency strategies come into play if any one of these strategies fails and the interpreter does not want to jeopardize the essence of the message or the macrostructure of the source text and resorts, for instance, to omission or ap-proximation, or when, as a result of monitoring which is both an overall strategy and an automatism, an error in production is detected and repair strategies have to be applied.

There are different repair mechanisms used by interpreters, for example, post-articulatory appropriateness repairs, when the information needs qualification; post-articulatory error repairs, to correct a mis-take; post-articulatory D (different)

[1] Al-Khanji R., El-Shiyab S. & Hussein R. 2000. On the Use of Compensatory Strategies in Simul-taneous Interpreting. Meta 45 (3), 548–557.

repairs, when the interpreter realizes that a different arrangement of the word order of the message would be more effective; and mid-articulatory repairs, when the interpreter starts uttering a word and then stops and corrects the mistake.Kalina (1998) describes different self-correction or repair strategies that she has identified in her research. [2]

The most important of these are replacement (re-placing an already-produced segment with another, i.e. explicit correction), com-pletion (an already produced segment is not withdrawn and is followed by an-other segment that is more precise), approximation (one or more segments that bring the interpreter closer to the searched segment are produced; this strategy is defined elsewhere by Kalina (1998, 120) as a strategy that offers more precision or synonyms in order to conceal its corrective nature) and relativation (a less absolute statement is formulated after an absolute statement). Thus, replacements are the most frequently used among these repair strategies and take place at word, word group and segment level (Kalina 1998, 195–196).

This same argument could also be explained using gile's Effort Model. The in-terpreter might intentionally decide not to correct him/herself because this deci-sion would cost extra processing capacity that would no longer be available for the other vital processes. It may seem that no repair and error that slips by the interpreter unnoticed are the same. The author argues there is a fundamental difference between the two. The process of detecting something going wrong and making a decision not to repair requires some processing capacity and is a strategy in its own right.

Directionality in Simultaneous interpreting: One of the most controversial aspects of SI is that of directionality, i.e. whether interpretation into the mother tongue pro-vides a more accurate rendition of the message than interpretation into a foreign language. opinions seem to be divided as to which combination is best suited for the interpreter, and which allows for a more faithful or accurate interpretation.

[2] Al-Salman S. & Al-Khanji R. 2002. The Native Language Factor in Simultaneous Interpretation in an Arabic/English Context. Meta 47 (4), 607–626.

Whereas some authors argue that passive interpreting is not the most logical approach stating that 'the 'foreign language-to-mother tongue' mode of simultaneous interpretation to which most interpreters' schools are traditionally geared is not the most rational or optimal approach'[3], others such as herbert and Seleskovitch consider that SI can only be performed properly into one's mother tongue due to various reasons. Seleskovitch argues that, even if the interpreter has high flu-ency as a speaker in the B language, when interpreting 'his native-like fluency disappears. his words no longer flow easily and naturally, and his pronunciation and vocabulary reflect the influence of his native language'[4].

The author also points out that the native language is best suited to transmit information, since 'only in the A language will the speech production be spon-taneous and idiomatic'[5]. According to Donovan, this is basically the perception of the past that SI into B is easier. Denissenko believes that 'a full or near full message gotten across even if in a somewhat stiff, less idiomatic or slightly accented language serves the purpose much better than an elegantly-worded and an impeccably pronounced half message or less'[6].

In his opinion, com-prehension is the most important cog in the SI machinery, and 'it can hardly be denied that comprehension in the mother tongue is easier than in an acquired foreign language'. Besides, one's higher command of the mother tongue may turn into a disadvantage because there is 'a wider choice of possible ways and means of conveying the same message'. Therefore, it takes longer to make decisions for delivery since the interpret-er has a lot of options to choose from. on the other hand, a B language offers a more restricted choice of ways of conveying the message, so the effort allocated to re-encoding the message into the target language is less burdensome.

[3] Denissenko 1989, 157
[4] Seleskovitch 1978, 79
[5] Seleskovitch 1968, 43
[6] Denissenko 1989, 157