Variable embodiment of stance-taking and footing in simultaneous interpreting

Alan Cienki
Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam

Keywords: Stance, Footing, Simultaneous interpreting, Gesture, Mental simulation

Stance-taking (Biber & Finegan, 1989) involves different aspects of the speaker's mental state, e.g., the degree of *certainty* about what one is communicating (epistemic stance), the *importance* of the information and the degree to which it is in focus (relevance stance), or one's *affectual* and *attitudinal relation* to what is being communicated. Footing (Goffman, 1981), in turn, involves the speaker's epistemic authority over the content of the utterance (in the *principal* role), the speaker's responsibility for constructing the utterance (as the *author*), and their role as 'sounding box' producing the utterance (the *animator*).

We consider different functions of gestures and how viewing them through the lenses of footing and stance-taking can help us gain further insights into what may be involved in simultaneous interpreters' processes of thinking for speaking (Slobin, 1987). Our particular focus for this is on gestures produced during moments of disfluency in the interpreters' speech.

Forty nine interpreters working between Russian and either English or German interpreted ten minutes of a popular scientific lecture (e.g. TED Talk), only hearing the audio; any actions by the speaker were therefore not seen by the interpreter. Working in an interpreting booth in an otherwise empty classroom, the interpreter had no visible audience present. Two minutes of each video of an interpreting session were analyzed for speech disfluencies and functions of accompanying gestures by a team of three researchers, with cross-checking by another team, with discussion and resolution of all cases of disagreement.

Only 3% of the 4027 gestures produced during disfluencies were representational or deictic in function. While the interpreter is the animator and author of their gestures, the principal of these gestures could be the interpreter either based on their own thinking for speaking, or on the imagined (mentally simulated; Marghetis & Bergen, 2014) production of the original speaker being heard. The ambiguity reflects the laminated nature of interpreters in their task as speakers (Goodwin & Goodwin, 2004).

However, 39% of the gestures were pragmatic in function, involving presenting a stance, e.g. with a palm-up open hand. Here, the lamination may break apart, such that the gesture may more clearly reflect the interpreters' own stance on the content being interpreted (e.g. shrugging while interpreting a phrase), rather than that of the imagined speaker being heard.

In the interpreters' frequent use of self-adapters (41%) (e.g. rubbing one's own fingers with hands folded on the desk), the lamination breaks apart further, as these are less plausibly a rendition of what the original speaker giving a TED Talk might have done; they appear to serve the interpreters' own purposes of cognitive focussing (Freedman, 1972), making the interpreter the principal of these movements.

We see that interpreters are laminated speakers in more ways than just in their use of speech (Vranjes & Brône, 2021). There are varying degrees of differentiation as to whose stance and authorial footing they are expressing bodily. We will consider how further research on this phenomenon could contribute to the modeling of cognitive processes involved in thinking for interpreting.

References
Biber, Douglas & Edward Finegan. 1989. Styles of stance in English: Lexical and grammatical marking of evidentiality and affect. *Text 9*(1). 93-124.
Freedman, Norbert. 1972. The analysis of movement behavior during the clinical interview. In Aron Wolfe Siegman & Benjamin Pope (eds.), *Studies in dyadic communication*,153-175. New York: Pergamon Press.
Goffman, Erving. 1981. *Forms of talk.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
Goodwin, Charles & Marjorie H. Goodwin. 2004. Participation. In Alessandro Duranti (ed.), *A companion to linguistic anthropology*, 222-243. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
Marghetis, Tyler & Benjamin K. Bergen. 2014. Embodied meaning, inside and out: The coupling of gesture and mental simulation. In Cornelia Müller, Alan Cienki, Ellen Fricke, Silva Ladewig, David McNeill, & Jana Bressem (eds.), *Body – language – communication: An international handbook on multimodality in human interaction*, Volume 2, 2000-2007. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Slobin, Dan I. 1987. Thinking for speaking. In Jon Aske, Natasha Beery, Laura Michaelis, & Hana Filip (eds.), *Proceedings of the 13th Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 435-445. Berkeley: Berkeley Linguistics Society.

Vranjes, Jelena & Geert Brône. 2021. Interpreters as laminated speakers: Gaze and gesture as interpersonal deixis in consecutive dialogue interpreting. *Journal of Pragmatics* 181. 83-99.