



STRUCTURAL DIFFERENCES IN ABBREVIATION USAGE IN SIMULTANEOUS INTERPRETATION (ACRONYMS)

Laylo Khudayberdieva

MA student

Uzbekistan State University of World Languages

e-mail: lailohudajberdieva@gmail.com

+998916746041

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.12165648>

ARTICLE INFO

Qabul qilindi: 10-June 2024 yil

Ma'qullandi: 15-June 2024 yil

Nashr qilindi: 19-June 2024 yil

KEY WORDS

Simultaneous interpretation, Abbreviation usage, Clippings, English-Russian translation, Political discourse, Interpretation strategies, Linguistic structure, Cultural context, Real-time translation, Interpreter training, Cross-linguistic communication, Translation challenges, Terminology management

ABSTRACT

This article explores the structural differences in the usage of abbreviations and clippings during simultaneous interpretation from English to Russian in the context of political discourse. By analyzing interpreter strategies and considering linguistic structures, cultural contexts, and real-time constraints, the study reveals distinct approaches to handling English clippings and abbreviations. The findings highlight variations in usage frequency, adaptation strategies, and the influence of political context. This research contributes to the understanding of linguistic strategies in simultaneous interpretation, offering insights for improving interpreter training and enhancing cross-linguistic political communication.

INTRODUCTION

Simultaneous interpretation is a demanding task requiring interpreters to convert spoken language into another language in real-time. Political discourse, with its dense use of specialized terminology, abbreviations, and clippings, presents unique challenges. Clippings and abbreviations in political speeches often represent institutions, policies, agreements, and key concepts, making accurate translation crucial for maintaining the integrity of the discourse. This study explores how English clippings and abbreviations are managed in simultaneous interpretation into Russian, examining the structural differences and strategies employed by interpreters.

Abbreviations and Clippings in Political Discourse

Abbreviations and clippings play a significant role in political discourse, serving as concise representations of lengthy or complex terms and concepts. They enhance brevity and efficiency in communication, making speeches more accessible and impactful. In political contexts, these linguistic tools often represent key institutions, policies, agreements, and initiatives. Political speeches and documents often contain complex and technical terms. Abbreviations and clippings allow speakers to refer to these terms succinctly, saving time and making communication more efficient. For instance, using "NATO" instead of "North Atlantic Treaty Organization" or "GOP" instead of "Grand Old Party" reduces the cognitive load on both the speaker and the audience. These linguistic tools are typically easier to remember than

long phrases or names. This is crucial in politics, where key messages need to be retained by the audience. For example, acronyms like "EU" (European Union) or "UN" (United Nations) and clippings like "Rep" (Republican) are instantly recognizable and remembered, facilitating easier recall of the associated concepts. Abbreviations and clippings help standardize terminology in international political discourse. Organizations, policies, and agreements often have different names in different languages, but abbreviations and clippings can provide a common reference point that transcends linguistic barriers. This standardization is vital in ensuring clear and consistent communication across different countries and languages. Abbreviations and clippings help standardize terminology in international political discourse. Organizations, policies, and agreements often have different names in different languages, but abbreviations and clippings can provide a common reference point that transcends linguistic barriers. This standardization is vital in ensuring clear and consistent communication across different countries and languages.

Structural Differences in Abbreviation Usage

The structural differences between English and Russian significantly affect how abbreviations and clippings are handled in interpretation, posing unique challenges for interpreters. These differences can be attributed to linguistic patterns, phonetic structures, and cultural contexts that influence the translation process. English abbreviations and clippings often follow straightforward phonetic or initialism patterns. In initialisms, the first letters of each word in a phrase are combined to form the abbreviation. The phonetic simplicity of English abbreviations often allows them to be easily integrated into spoken and written discourse without modification. This straightforward approach is a significant advantage in political speeches, where clarity and brevity are paramount.

In contrast, Russian often requires transliteration for English abbreviations, where the English abbreviation is phonetically adapted into the Russian alphabet. Transliteration ensures that the sound of the abbreviation is preserved as much as possible, making it recognizable to Russian speakers. However, this process can be complex due to differences in phonetic and orthographic systems between the two languages. By reducing the length of commonly used terms, abbreviations like "gov" (government), "admin" (administration), and "sec" (secretary) enhance efficiency and clarity. However, they also introduce complexities related to ambiguity, audience familiarity, and technical jargon. Effective handling of abbreviations is crucial for interpreters to deliver accurate and comprehensible translations. Understanding these nuances helps interpreters navigate the cognitive and communicative demands of simultaneous interpretation, ensuring effective and efficient communication.

Examples of Translation Strategies

Interpreters employ various strategies to manage the translation of acronyms in simultaneous interpretation. These strategies include Direct Transfer, Transliteration, Descriptive Translation, Combining Strategies.

Clippings are shortened forms of words: *e.g. Gov (Government)*

The gov is implementing new policies to boost the economy.- Правительство внедряет новые политики для стимулирования экономики.*e.g. Admin (Administration)*

The current admin is facing significant challenges.- Текущая администрация сталкивается с серьёзными вызовами.*e.g. Sec (Secretary)*

The Sec of State held a press conference yesterday.- Госсекретарь провёл пресс-

конференцию вчера.e.g. *Dem (Democrat)*

The Dem candidate is leading in the polls.- Кандидат от Демократической партии лидирует в опросах.e.g. *Rep (Republican)*

The Rep senators are opposing the new bill.- Сенаторы-республиканцы против нового закона.e.g. *Info (Information)*

The latest info on the election results has been released.- Последняя информация о результатах выборов была опубликована.e.g. *Prez (President)*

The Prez is scheduled to speak at the summit.- Russian: "Президент запланирован выступить на саммите.

e.g. *Comm (Committee)*

The comm will review the proposal next week.- Комитет рассмотрит предложение на следующей неделе.e.g. *Pol (Politician)*

The pol spoke out against the controversial policy.- Политик выступил против спорной политики.

Conclusion

The study reveals that simultaneous interpreters employ a range of strategies to manage English abbreviations and clippings in Russian political discourse. The choice of strategy depends on factors such as linguistic structure, cultural familiarity, and real-time constraints. Understanding these strategies can enhance interpreter training programs, providing interpreters with the tools and techniques needed to handle abbreviations and clippings effectively. Improved training and awareness can lead to higher quality interpretations, facilitating better cross-linguistic political communication. Further research could explore these dynamics in other language pairs and discourse contexts, contributing to a more comprehensive understanding of simultaneous interpretation practices.

References:

1. Gile, D. (2009). Basic Concepts and Models for Interpreter and Translator Training. John Benjamins Publishing.
2. Pöchhacker, F. (2004). Introducing Interpreting Studies. Routledge.
3. Setton, R., & Dawrant, A. (2016). Conference Interpreting: A Trainer's Guide. John Benjamins Publishing.
4. Seleskovitch, D., & Lederer, M. (1995). A Systematic Approach to Teaching Interpretation. SIL International.
5. Moser-Mercer, B. (2000). Simultaneous interpreting: Cognitive potential and limitations. *Interpreting*, 5(2), 83-95.
6. Kurz, I. (2001). Conference interpreting: Quality in the ears of the user. *Meta: Journal des traducteurs*, 46(2), 394-409.
7. Kutz, W. (2002). Issues of Cognitive Load in Simultaneous Interpreting. *The Interpreters' Newsletter*, 12, 43-54.
8. AIIC. (2020). International Association of Conference Interpreters. Retrieved from <https://aiic.net>
9. United Nations. (2021). Guidelines for the Use of Acronyms in Political Discourse. UN Publications.
10. European Commission. (2019). Translation and Interpreting: Best Practices in Multilingual Settings. European Union Publications.