PAPER DETAILS

TITLE: A PRAGMATIC STUDY OF FOOTBALL INTERPRETERS' FACEWORK IN MEDIATED

PLAYER INTERVIEWS AND PRESS CONFERENCES

AUTHORS: Burak Özsöz

PAGES: 224-239

ORIGINAL PDF URL: https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/3795633

Burak ÖZSÖZ* (ID)

A PRAGMATIC STUDY OF FOOTBALL INTERPRETERS' FACEWORK IN MEDIATED PLAYER INTERVIEWS AND PRESS CONFERENCES	FUTBOL ÇEVİRMENLERİNİN OYUNCU RÖPORTAJLARI VE BASIN TOPLANTILARINDAKİ YÜZE YÖNELİK EYLEMLERİ ÜZERİNE EDİMBİLİMSEL BİR ÇALIŞMA

ABSTRACT

The paper explores the football interpreters' facework behaviour through a qualitative analysis of interpreted player interviews and post-match press conferences. It presents a case study based on examples from a small corpus of six transcripts of publicly displayed football-related multi-party interpreted talk. Characterized by an organized structure, press interviews and conferences can pre-determine the contributions of all parties to the interaction towards the common goal of the institution they represent. In this context, based on face negotiation theory that distinguishes between individualism and collectivism, the study aims to question interpreters' traditional role as impartial intermediaries in conflict situations. The analysis has shown that when football interpreters are faced with conflicting role expectations with respect to facework, they opt to reduce or omit threats in their renditions in attempt to protect the goals of the group they align themselves with.

Keywords: Face, Discourse of Football, Football Interpreting, Favouritism, Pragmatics

ÖZET

Bu makalede, sözlü çevirmenin varlığında gerçekleşen oyuncu röportajları ve maç sonrası basın toplantılarının nitel çözümlemesi ile futbol çevirmenlerinin *yüz*e yönelik eylem biçimleri ele alınmaktadır. Bu araştırma, görsel medyada kamuya açık olarak yayımlanan futbol içerikli altı farklı sözcelem durumunun çevriyazısından oluşan bir derleme dayanan bir durum çalışması niteliğindedir. Örgütlü bir yapıya sahip olan röportaj ve basın toplantılarında, tüm muhataplar eylem ve söylemlerini temsil ettikleri kurumun ortak hedefleri doğrultusunda şekillendirmek durumunda kalabilirler. Bu bağlamda, bireyci ve toplumcu anlayış arasında ayrım yapan yüz müzakere kuramı çerçevesinde, tercümanların çatışma durumlarında tarafsız aracılar olarak geleneksel rolünün sorgulanması amaçlanmaktadır. Ortaya çıkan sonuçlar, futbol çevirmenlerinin yüzle ilgili çelişkili rol beklentileriyle karşı karşıya kaldıklarında, ait oldukları grubun hedeflerini korumak amacıyla tercümelerinde kaynak sözcedeki tehdit unsurlarını hafifletmeyi ya da görmezden gelmeyi tercih ettiklerini göstermiştir.

Anahtar kelimeler: Yüz, Futbol Söylemi, Futbol Tercümanlığı, Taraftarlık, Edimbilim

* Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, Marmara Üniversitesi, İnsan ve Toplum Bilimleri Fakültesi, İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Bölümü, İstanbul/Türkiye, E-posta: burak.ozsoz@marmara.edu.tr / Asst. Prof. Dr., Marmara University, Faculty of Human and Social Sciences, Department of English Language and Literature, Istanbul/Türkiye, E-mail: burak.ozsoz@marmara.edu.tr

Introduction

The mobility of football professionals in the sports industry has created a demand for the employment of professional interpreters in public events, such as individual player interviews and post-match press conferences. Despite the obvious significance of football-related multilingual media events, "linguistic research on football is still a recent academic (sub)field" (Graf et al., 2023, p. 922) and there is relatively little research on the interactional dynamics of these mediated settings in terms of the macro-structural features that exert influence on interpreters' verbal behaviour (Sandrelli, 2012, 2015, 2018; Bulut, 2016, 2018). This study thus applies a discourse analytic lens to the interactional practices of facework in mediated football player interviews and post-match press conferences to unpack issues related to interpreters' face-saving behaviours in conflict situations.

Mediated interviews and press conferences are institutional contexts where the actions of the interlocutors are mostly pre-determined due to their institutional roles. The interpreters' traditional role of acting as transparent and impartial intermediaries, however, needs to be explored because of their perceptions of "in-group allegiance" (Mason, 2009 p. 81). The football interpreters may tend to act in the interest of the clubs they work for. In their renditions, they may place the positive image of the club above those of others as face-saving behaviour. This case study seeks to reveal through analysis of a corpus of publicly-displayed player interviews and post-match press conferences how interpreters' sense of belonging to a group influences their professional identities and translation performance. Originally proposed by Goffman (1955), the concept of face and the theory of facework will help examine the stance interpreters take on their evaluation of the other primary participants' original utterances. The paper begins with an overview of how football in Turkey is viewed through the lens of favouritism and group affiliation and how this affects the interpreters' decision-making processes.

The Discourse of Football in Turkey

Cuper's "Football Against the Enemy[1]" (1994) is a reference book pointing out that football goes far beyond a sports competition staged on the playground and that to recognise the depth of the game, it is essential to understand how personal and national identities are defined through football affiliation. Understanding how football-related terms are represented at the discourse level is equally important to appreciate how certain social values are reflected through football. Although common football terminology used in Turkey mostly consists of words of foreign origin (Benzer, 2010, p. 101), some of the unique expressions associated with football and their connotative meanings may help portray the current place of this game in the country. Colour idioms and expressions representing the supporters' loyalty to the national football clubs can make a good example. For instance, to show how passionately the fans are committed to their club, you may even hear them say that their blood runs in the team's colours. Regarding favouritism, every person has their own colour (Bora, 2006, p. 65).

Widdop and Collins (2016, p. 348) note that a better understanding of the discourse of football can be achieved by studying social interactions between actors involved in its social world as it is fundamentally structured and institutionalized. These actors take collective action in pursuit

---

[1] The title of book was translated into Turkish by Gürtunca (1996) as "Futbol asla sadece futbol değildir" (Football is never only football).

of a common goal and the individuals conduct most of their social relations based on the constraints and complexities of the social organization. Football actors in Turkey, including the interpreters, define themselves as social group members rather than individuals, which is why their social identities may override their personal and professional identities. *We*-orientation, for instance, is more dominant as a discursive practice than *I*-orientation when interpreters refer to the clubs. Bulut (2018, p. 18) emphasizes the "side-taking behaviour" that interpreters exhibit in the act of interpreting when the pragmatic meaning of an original utterance is shifted on the illocutionary level of language use (e.g., "takım-the team" being rendered as "takımımız-our team). The cheering crowds of different socio-economic classes in the stadium represent another organized structure that serves the common goals of the clubs. Regardless of which social class they belong to, they develop a common verbal and nonverbal behaviour shaped by the discourses produced within this organization. The crowd may even elevate this group affiliation to an extreme level, chanting that "they are the only permanent owners of the team" (Bora, 2006, p. 96). The following part deals with the discourse of football interpreting in player interviews and press conferences.

(Un) Mediated Individual Player Interviews and Press Conferences

In organizational settings, the conversational practices are institution-specific and the interactional contributions of the interlocutors are, for the most part, pre-patterned due to power relations and social distance. Interviews and press conferences are also institutional in character. However, unlike other institutional contexts such as healthcare interactions or courtroom settings, both speech events "are relatively unscripted encounters" (Clayman, 2004 p. 29) that adopt practices of talk from ordinary conversations, which reduce to a certain degree power asymmetry.

Organized to distribute information about a newsworthy event officially, press conferences are "one to many" (Sandrelli, 2012, p. 84) interactions, which usually serve as a platform for open dialogue between a public figure and a group of journalists. In this media event, the former is not the only epistemic authority who has advanced knowledge in a specific field. The conversation in unmediated press conferences is essentially based on question-answer sequences mostly initiated by the interviewers (journalists). These questions are not only intended to obtain information about the activities of the interviewees (players, coaches, and club executives) but also to provoke them with elaborative questions. When challenged with such uncomfortable questions, the interviewees may either refrain from answering them in order not to publicly conflict with the interests of the club or respond to them in more of an aggressive manner at the risk of offending an absent audience, who can only have an indirect access to public figures through these media events. Although the strategies of 'doing questions' in press conferences apply to the interviews, the question-answer design often differs to a certain extent. Unlike press conferences, journalists are allowed to ask complementary questions during interviews when resistant interviewees avoid revealing sufficient information about a topic.

In mediated settings, however, the interpreters may not always perform a "close rendition" (Baraldi and Gavioli, 2014, p. 336) of the interviewer's source questions and the interviewee's responses. They may tend to deviate from the source utterances in terms of form and content, especially when the interviewers resort to leading questions to constrain and manipulate the interviewees' responses. Their understanding of the institutional goals they pursue during the interaction may keep them from addressing accurately all pieces of information when in-group

interests supersede individual interests. Interpreter's in-group concerns become more visible when a club executive is used to act as an interpreter "in external communication […] in the public sphere" (Sandrelli, 2015, p. 89) in the absence of a professional one. The next part discusses the concept of face and facework, as well as mutual face concerns over self-face concerns.

The Theory of Face (Work) in (Un) Mediated Interactions

Originally proposed as a social image that "a person effectively claims for himself by the line others assume he has taken during a particular contact" (Goffman, 1967, p. 5), the notion of "face" is generally framed as "how we want others to see us and treat us and how we treat others in association with their self-concept and expectations" (Ting-Toomey, 2015, p. 325). This sociological concept was later analyzed from a linguistic perspective by Brown and Levinson (1987) as having a dual form that consists of "positive" and "negative" faces. While the former refers to "the positive consistent self-image claimed by interactants", the latter refers to "freedom of action and freedom of imposition" (1987, p. 61). Positive face is the desire for solidarity with other interlocutors. A negative face, however, is an individual's desire to be autonomous. When you construct your utterance "in a way as to emphasize solidarity between you and your interlocutor, you are appealing to their positive face" (Birner, 2013, p. 201). When you allow the other party to the interaction some space to decline this solidarity and acknowledge his need for autonomy, it is his negative face that you appeal to.

"Facework" is defined by Goffman (1967, p. 12) as "the actions taken by a person to make whatever he is doing consistent with the face". It is about how you present yourself to others in social interaction. Ting-Toomey (2015, p. 325) suggests that while the face is concerned with "a claimed sense of interactional identity, facework is about verbal and nonverbal communication behaviours that protect/save, the self, other, or mutual face". Since it is "discursively constructed" (Lee, 2011, p. 2) and is subject to constant negotiation in ongoing interaction, "one's face usually depends on the interlocutor's face being maintained" (Martinez-Gomez, 2016, p. 95). The concept of facework is used in this study to refer to the verbal and nonverbal actions of interlocutors in social-human interaction that are aimed at protecting/saving or threatening face.

Mason and Stewart (2001, p. 51) argue that issues of face and facework are essential interactional pragmatic variables to understand the dynamics of interpreted events. Pöllabauer (2015, p. 212) indicates that most authors who study facework in interpreter-mediated contexts prefer Brown and Levinson's (1987) theory as their theoretical framework. Martinez-Gomez (2016, p. 96) criticizes the theory in that "although interactants are immersed in a communicative event, the focus of their theory is the individual speaker" and suggests "complementing their approach with an interaction-based dynamic perspective, which considers any human activity that involves talking a joint activity that requires interlocutors, including the interpreters as ratified participants, to collaborate in the negotiation of face and identity".

Since "there is no faceless communication" (Scollon and Scollon, 1995, p. 38), facework also concerns interpreting as an interactionally and socially situated activity. Unlike unmediated monolingual talk, "interpreted communication functions on the premise that primary speakers' faces are represented by a third participant" (Merlini, 2013, p. 268), namely, by the interpreter as a fully pledged participant. In the conduit model of interpreting, the interpreter is viewed as "an invisible translation machine" (Pöchhacker, 2004, p. 194), prioritising faithful recapitulations of the original utterances in another language. Also known as the 'machine model', it excludes the

possibility that interpreters exert influence on the wider macro-social context of other primary parties' utterances in their renditions. However, such norms of impartiality and invisibility are a myth. Diriker (2013, p. 27) points out that "the traditional notion of interpreters as 'conduits' […] has been subjected to critical reassessment". Every social encounter involves risks for all participants and interpreters engage in facework in attempting to protect not only their professional faces but also those of the primary interactants against possible conversational threats.

Interpreter-mediated press conferences and interviews in football offer an excellent opportunity to explore facework in institutionally established multi-sided interactions. Lee (2011, p. 3) criticizes those who hold the view that "the interpreter […] is required to preserve the meaning and effect of original utterances and […] maintain any intended face threats". In press conferences and interviews, "[…] the interpreters' understanding of institutional goals and power relations between participants, as well as their status within each encounter" (Martinez-Gomez, 2016, p. 97) may lead the interpreters to make modifications to the illocutionary force of the original utterances that threaten the face of other participants. At this point, it may come in handy to distinguish 'group face' and 'self-face'. While the latter reflects the interpreters' individually based concerns to protect their professional face, the former is concerned with the place they belong to, or the place the interpreters stand to protect the face-wants of a group. In other words, as was suggested by Ting-Toomey (2015, p. 326), the threats to face in mediated institutional contexts "can be on a group membership level or an individual level". In a study on face as an indexical category in interaction, Ruhi (2010, p. 2134) emphasizes that face is not a fixed entity, and its content is determined concerning the features of the setting, in particular, in relation to an absent party (*image of other*) who/which may not be physically present in the immediate communication environment. In mediated football press conferences and interviews, the interpreter, through his perception of in-group allegiance, may sometimes tend to position himself as the authoritative voice of the club and mitigate threats to the institution posed by the interviewer's questions or interviewee's responses.

This study, without completely disregarding the previous theories and conceptual tools on the notion of the face (work), follows the "face-negotiation theory", proposed by Ting-Toomey (1985) to distinguish between "individualism" and "collectivism". In basic terms, individualism underlines the importance of "I" identity over "we" identity and it represents self-oriented face concerns. Collectivism, however, emphasizes the importance of "ingroup interests over individual interests and mutual-face concerns over self-face concerns" (Ting-Toomey and Kurogi, 1998, p. 189). It is argued by Ting-Toomey and Kurogi (1998, p. 188) that facework is a collection of behaviours that people use to "support or challenge other's social dignity", and that interactants' facework is shaped by "culture-based, individual-based, and situational-based factors" (Ting-Toomey, 2015, p. 2). Interpreters may engage in facework when they perceive that one of the interactants seeks different goals in conflict situations, or when the situated identities of one of the communicators are called into question. Ting-Toomey and Oetzel (2013, p. 99) define such situations as "the interpersonal aspect" of conflict, where the communicators tend to value patterns of self-oriented face concerns over mutual-oriented concerns. The main benefit of this theory to the present study is that it may help to answer whether interpreters "define themselves as individuals or group members" (Ting-Toomey and Dorjee, 2019, p. 25) to deal with face concerns in interpersonal conflict. The corpus data used and the methodology adopted are presented in the following part.

Corpus Data and Methodology

This study takes a 'discourse analytical approach' to interpreters' facework behaviour in football-related media events, with Ting-Toomey's (1985; 2015) 'face negotiation theory' as the preferred theoretical framework. Researchers adopting qualitative research methodology seek the richest possible data, often using transcripts of audio/video recordings in authentic settings. The data set in the present study comprises mediated press conferences and interviews in the consecutive mode (which is more suitable for rendering question-answer sequences), in which six different speech exchange situations were identified to involve interpreters engaging in facework in their respective responses. All exchanges in the data were transcribed verbatim, following an adapted version of Yılmaz's (2012) transcription guidelines[2]. The selected basic conventions were specifically developed for the written representations of spoken data in Turkish. The transcript conventions are not limited to representing only the interactants' verbal behaviour. For the purposes of the research, conventions that represent nonverbal resources in writing are included to account for the interactional aspects of oral communication, such as the prosodic features. As the corpus data were obtained from publicly displayed speech events, the researcher did not search for ethical clearance nor sought to preserve the anonymity of the interactants by omitting the names and other identifying details. Links to the digital video recordings of the media events retrieved from the electronic environment are given in separate footnotes. The news coverage of these interpreting situations in the printed press was not included. The languages involved in all events are Turkish[3] and/or English, and the turns of the interactants are numbered to facilitate the transcripts' readability. Apart from two stretches of talk, where a club executive[4] is engaged in the act of interpreting, the interpreters in the mediated oral data in the study are competent professionals under contract with the club. With only one exception, the native language of all of these interpreters is Turkish.

Data Analysis: Issues of Face-Saving and Group Affiliation

For an effective contact, while we show other interactants in communication our obvious intention for involvement we also need to maintain some degree of independence. Involvement can be demonstrated through discourse strategies such as prioritising common ingroup membership. This part, through analysis of transcripts of speech extracted from publicly displayed football press conferences and interviews, seeks to discuss the interpreters' facework in mediated discourse and reveal whether interpreters show commitment to group values in their renditions.

Abbreviations:

PI- Professional Interpreter/ **NPI**- Non-Professional Interpreter

J- Journalist/ **FP**- Football Player/ **C**- Coach

Extract I[5].

J1- herkes merak ediyo(r) # Kewellın bu sene sözleşmesi bitiyo(r) {Ga(l)at(a)sarayda}

---

[2] For transcription conventions, see *Appendix.*
[3] The utterances in Turkish were translated back into the target language through faithful rendition. Unless otherwise stated, the translations were made by the researcher.
[4] Ex-footballers or club executives with language skills can be an option to act as interpreters. Sandrelli (2015, p. 89) uses the term "factotum" to refer to the use of ad-hoc interpreters in the absence of professional ones.
[5] youtube.com/watch?v=vmDm0sKma_k (last retrieved 11.02.2024)

everyone wonders   Kewell's contract ends this year   with Galatasaray

kal(a)ıcak mı gid(e)icek mi (?) {%heskes% bu sorunun yanıtını bekliyo(r)}

will he stay   or leave   everyone looks for the answer to the question

NPI1- at the end of the season your contract will expire # will you go from Galatasaray or will you stay (?)

FP1- well again I mean uhm this club has given me (.) # you (.) I (.) I feel like I've been reborn here you know I (.) I enjoy my football now I enjoy (.) # enjoy (…) training I enjoy that the people I'm surrounded by so # you know I (.) I hope it continues but again you know that's # I can only let my football do the talking I don't know what's gonna happen at the end of the season

NPI2- şuanda ben oynadığım futboldan # arkadaşlarımla beraber olmaktan {bur(a)da}

right now I am happy with the football being with my friends   here

insanlarla beraber çalışmaktan son derece mutluyum oynadığım futboldan keyif alıyorum

working with people around me   I am overjoyed   I enjoy the football I play

ve bunu devam ettirmek istiyorum sezon sonunda görücez

and I want to continue it we will see what happens at the end of the season

J2- ama hanımıyla ilgili haberler çıkıyor hanımı istemediği için dönmek istiyo(r) {İngiltereye}

there is news about his wife that he wants go back to England as she does not want to stay

diye # <{haberler> çıkıyor}

such news is coming out

NPI3- <kendisi> (.) # kendisi açıklamasını yaptı {bence}

himself   he explained it himself   I think

Sacks (1995, p. 54) suggests that "the one who is in the position of doing questions is, in part, in control of the conversation". Some of the journalists' questions at a press conference may be specially designed to put considerable pressure on public figures. The journalists who fail to elicit the desired answer enjoy the privilege of asking the same question several times. In this question-answer sequence, the journalist enquires whether the player will extend his contract or not (J1) and it is rephrased in a different wording by a colleague who finds the answer unsatisfactory (J2). This follow-up question is used "as a hostile move to have the original question answered" (Sandrelli, 2018, p. 188). The interpreter, against an idealized practice, provides an answer (NPI3) on behalf of the player as an interpreter-generated response and in a sense refuses to render the question (Özsöz, 2023, p. 82). The interpreter's non-rendition behaviour in this interaction can be seen as a way of coping with an aggressive question to save the player's face.

Extract II[6].

J1- evet (!) # Harry Kewell şu an bizlerle birlikte # sayın Cenk Ergünü de yanımıza alalım #

well   Harry Kwell is now joining us   let's have Cenk Ergün here with us

---

[6] dailymotion.com/video/x6os6i (last retrieved 11.02.2024)

evet kendisine ilk olarak İstanbula (.) ki burada şampiyonlar ligi kupasını kaldırmış bi(r) isim

well first of all   as a person who lifted the Champions League torphy here in Istanbul

ve hoşgeldin diyoruz {kendisine}

we welcome him

NPI1- he says welcome to Istanbul %that% ee previously you have been champion of Champions League # <here> {Istanbul}

FP1-   <yeah>

J2- eee kendisi ilk kez Premier Lig dışına çıkıyor Galatasarayı tercih etmesindeki en büyük

he is going out of the Premier League for the first time what is the biggest motivation for him

faktör ne (?)

to choose Galatasaray

NPI2- this is your first experience outside of Premier League # why did you choose Galatasaray(?)

FP2- uhm it's some different (.) uhm thee (.) there's a lot of talk about the uh Turkish league # it's uh yeah (.) it's coming up in the world uhm the national team is doing well (…) in the major tournaments uh there's a lot of young talent here # uhm and it's different and that's what I'm looking forward to # {a new challenge}

NPI3- eee Türk futbolu çok yükselmekte olan bir trend içer(i)sinde Türkiye ligi de öyle #

Turkish football is on a rising trend and so is the Turkish league

Türk milli takımı da son birkaç şampiyona da başarılı işler yaptı # e çok güzel ee yetenekli

The Turkish national team has also done well in the last few championships there are

genç oyuncular var # değişiklik ee yeni bir challenge istiyorum {onun için bur(a)dayım}

good young players   I want some change a new challenge which is why I am here

J3- Galatasaray ile izlenimleri neler (?) # gelmeden önce Galatasaray ile ilgili ne biliyordu (?)

what are his impressions with Galatasaray what he knew about Galatasaray before he came

neler düşünüyo(r) (?)

what are his thoughts

NPI4- what is your first impressions about Turkey (?) # before coming here what do you know about Galatasaray (?)

FP3- uhm I didn't know about the football here {really} [regretful smile] uhm that's all I worry about I just worry about the football and everyone talks very highly about it

NPI5- ee bur(a)daki futbolun ne kadar önemli olduğunu biliyorum herkes bundan bahsediyor

I know how important football is here   everyone talks about it

{zaten} bu da yeterli {herhalde}

anyway that should be enough

The unique aspect of this interaction is that the interpreter is a club executive, and the interviewer is an employee of the club's television channel. It would thus be unreasonable to expect a club official or an employee who has already established a sense of affiliation with the club to provide oral translations or ask provocative questions that could threaten the club's positive face. However, as was noted by Ting-Toomey and Kurogi (1998, p. 187), "face is a vulnerable […] resource" and it can be threatened in any social interaction even when the interactants share a common purpose. In this extract, for instance, when the player is asked what he already knows about the team (NPI4) he clearly states that he barely knows anything about it (FP3). Although Sandrelli (2012, p. 85) suggests that "there is relatively little scope for variation from a scripted talk" on the part of a newly signed player welcomed at the airport, his response was not a preferred one in that it could damage the reputation of the club and offend its supporters. The interpreter's facework in this interaction is influenced by the view that "face is associated with status, reputation, network connection, loyalty, relational indebtedness, and obligation issue" (Ting-Toomey and Kurogi, 1998, p. 190). This is why, the interpreter provides information not found in the preceding original utterance and modifies its information content (NPI5) to protect the player's and the club's positive face while threatening the journalist's negative face.

Extract III[7].

J1- Fenerbahçe derbisi sonrası kırmızı kart görmesi gerektiğine yönelik bazı açıklamalar oldu

after the derby against Fenerbahçe there were comments that he should have been red-carded

PI1- (…) [inaudible]

FP1- (…) we should have come away with the win not about the referee {about decisions}

PI2- hıhı # biliyo(r)sunuz Fenerbahçe Galatasaray derbisi dünyanın en önemli derbilerinden

       you know this derby is one of the most important derbies in the world

bir tanesi # çok sert bi(r) maç geçeceği zaten belliydi biliyo(r)sunuz hakemin vereceği kararlar

       it was already expected to be a very tough game you know these are the referee's

bunlar # bence bu benim sarı kartım kırmızı kartımdam ziyade Galatasarayın bir galibiyetle

decisions I believe rather than my yellow or red card it is about Galatasaray's coming back

dönmesi gerekiyordu # galibiyet hak etmiştik bunun konuşulması lazım {kartlardan ziyade}

with a victory   we deserved it this is what needs to be talked about not the cards

J2- (…) [inaudible]

FP2- this is (.) %this <is football%

PI3-   <ama bu futbol> {biliyorsunuz}

       but this is football you know

---

[7] dailymotion.com/video/xmm9y9 (last retrieved 11.02.2024)

FP3- I'm not gonna come (.) I'm not gonna start arguing with players # play (.) you play the game and %you get hurt% you get hurt [shrugs recklessly]

PI4- kesinlikle ben bur(a)da kimseyle tartışm(aya)ıca(ğı)m eee oyununuzu oynarsınız (…)

   I am certainly not going to argue with anyone   you just play the game

veya sakatlanırsınız %ama% (…) en kısa zamanda sakatlıktan dönmesini # <diliyorum

or you get hurt   but   he returns from injury as soon as possible I hope

FP4-   <he is a baby> he
wants to be like a crazy baby

PI5- [smiles and gazes away]

After the derby, one of the Fenerbahçe players alleged that he was deliberately injured by Galatasaray players who still received preferential treatment from the referees. The Australian player of Galatasaray responded to the allegations (FP1) in an interview and stated that any mishap of things could occur to a player on the pitch (FP2-3). The interpreter employs a hedging strategy by adding information not found in the original utterance to down-tone the player's original words (PI4). Although the interpreter competently manages the conflict, the player takes another turn to openly accuse his opponent of being 'crazy' (FP4), demonstrating that he does not aim to support the interpreter's professional face. The interpreter prefers to avert his gaze to another interlocutor to signal detachment (PI5). His non-rendition behaviour conveys his intention to maintain the player's positive face.

Extract IV[8].

FP1- (…) I get on well with all the boys {I hope} [laughs and raises eyebrows]

PI1- ee ilk geldiğim zaman tesislerden çok etkilendim # %özellikle% çim sahalarımızdan

when I first came here I was impressed with the club facilities especially with the grass field

{içer(i)deki} tesislerden işte eee çalışma mekanımızdan çok etkilendim # onun dışında

with the interior facilities I mean I was very impressed with the environment other than that

arkadaşlığa gelince eee bi(r)çok futbolcumuz İngilizce konuştuğu için onlarla adaptasyonum

as for the friendship as many of our players speak English   my adaptation with them

daha kolay {iletişime geçmem daha kolay oldu} hepsiyle de aram iyi {çok iyi anlaşıyorum}

was easier it was easier to communicate and I am good with all of them I get along very well

The player expresses that many of the footballers in the team can speak English, which will help speed up his adaptation process. He also adds that he '*hopes*' to get along with his teammates (FP1). The word 'hope' in this utterance is a 'post rheme' devised to provide new information about the 'rheme' and here signals uncertainty. The nonverbal signs that follow the post-rheme show that he appears skeptical about it. The interpreter performs a divergent rendition of the original utterance and reduces the post rheme in his translation to protect the player's positive self-image (IP1).

---

[8] dailymotion.com/video/xfgfon (last retrieved 11.02.2024)

Extract V[9].

FP1- (…) I mean # the only ba(a)d thing *I could say about Turkey* is the %traffic%

PI1- bundan mesela bi(r) iki sene önce bana sorsalardı işte # İstanbula geleceksin

for example a couple of years ago if they told me   that you would come to Istanbul

Galatasarayda {en azından Türkiyede oynayacaksın} # hani # şş (.) şaşkınlıkla karşılardım

play for Galatasaray   play in Turkey   well   I would be surprised

çünkü farklı (.) kafamda farklı şeyler de vardı fakat buraya geldim # işte

because different I had in mind different things yet I am here   it is like

geldiğim ilk günden beri İstanbul %inanılmaz% güzel bi(r) şehir yani ee {yemek anlamında}

since the first day I came here Istanbul is an amazing city   I mean in terms of food

onun haricinde # eee {moda anlamında ve gece hayatı anlamı (.) } yani herşey (.)

except for that   in terms of fashion and night life   I mean everything

%yok yok% diyebiliriz # o yüzden şimdi inanılmaz mutluyum

everything you want is here so now I am extremely happy

The footballer is asked about his experiences and impressions about being in Turkey. After words of praise about life in Istanbul, he complains about the traffic in the city (FP1). However, his words of complaint were not rendered by the interpreter, for fear that both the club's and the player's positive face might be damaged. The interpreter clearly shows that he is not a mere neutral language converter. As a fully pledged participant, he tends to "judge the relevance and the usefulness of the statements voiced" (Pöllabauer, 2007 p. 39) by the player (PI1) and moves towards an ingroup-face saving act to minimize the face-threatening conditions. The interpreter's face-saving strategy indicates that he aligns himself with the interests of the club.

Extract VI[10].

PI1- first of all we'd like to welcome coach Parreira # {the coach of Al-Ahli} # the coach will give you %two minutes% to give a brief about the game after that we'll receive some questions from the reporters # %any question% will be out of the technical issues during the game we will not answer it # excuse me # turn off your flash or the camera [tense voice] # go ahead coach [giving the floor with a hand move]

C1- okay [clears throat] first of all uhhm what I saw (.) what I saw in this game # %I saw% # in first place (.) I saw a bad # professional # {player} # bad professional player ## <and then

PI2-   <excuse> me coach (!) excuse me # please # don't talk about individual players (!) # talk about the technical game [not gazing at the coach] ## [gazes at the coach]

C2- my friend I talk about what I want

---

[9] dailymotion.com/video/xfgfon
[10] youtube.com/watch?v=rcGRJAuPIBg (last retrieved 11.02.2024)

PI3- no no (!) I am controlling (.) [gazing at the coach] controlling the press <conference here

C3-   < I talk about

PI4- excuse me (!) <excuse me coach

C4-   <if you don't want> <I go

PI5-   <no no (!) here (.) we are here to give a brief about the game # individual players # you can talk about %this% outside # here # just give about (.)

J1- (…) [raising objections]

PI6- yeah yeah (!) but <the (.) [stopping journalists with his hand]

J2-   < (…)

PI7- no no no (!) # he is talking about technical issues # < (…)

C5-   <my friend> it is (.) it is the first time in my life that someone (.) someone [mutual gaze] tell me what (.) what I can # <say

PI8-   <I did> not (.) I didn't tell you (.) <excuse me

C6-   <you are the> police (?)

PI9- *no no no* (!) excuse <me

C7-   < I can say what I want %or not% # I ask you what I can say about the game (?)

Unlike other sequences of talk, the exchange between the coach and the interpreter is adversarial rather than cooperative in nature. In an idealized interpreting situation, the interpreter is often assumed by many people and even some users of interpreting services to play the role of a neutral intermediary between two interlocutors. However, "to maintain the interaction order" (Kerbrat-Orecchioni, 2011 p. 136), the interpreter here goes beyond the traditional role of a facilitator and tends to restrict the journalists' freedom to ask questions as they desire (IP1), which is a threat to their negative face. When the coach makes critical remarks about the individual performance of the players on the field, the interpreter explicitly states (PI3) that he alone coordinates the discourse flow of interaction. The interpreter's facework strategy to spare the player's face turns out to be a threat to the coach's negative face as well as a threat to his professional face (PI5). Disturbed by this situation, the journalists raise objections (J1) to the interpreter's restrictive behaviour. However, the interpreter maintains his uncompromising attitude and tries to stop them with hand gestures (PI6). This nonverbal behaviour gives him a more hostile image.

Discussing Findings and Conclusion

This study explores the concept of face as a claimed sense of interactional identity and interpreters' facework behaviour as a communicative strategy for managing face in specific text genres, such as post-match conferences and player interviews. These mediated football interpreting situations entail active facework management, which can either be 'preventive' to help avoid face-threatening acts or 'restorative' to help restore the face that has been lost. As part of their professional identity, interpreters in any situated activity are expected to render all messages

accurately without any modifications and take no stance on their evaluation of possible threats to protect and save the self, other, or mutual face. Taking sides with one of the interlocutors may call into question the impartiality of the interpreter. However, football interpreters' in-group concerns and their strong sense of group identity prevent them from relaying face-threatening utterances faithfully. This is consistent with early research (e.g. Mason and Stewart, 2001; Lee, 2011; Sandrelli, 2015; Martinez-Gomez, 2016), which has found that interpreters tend to omit or mitigate the face-threatening acts initiated by other parties to the interaction. In the "individualistic self" concept, people perceive themselves to be autonomous from the goals of the group they are involved in. In the "collectivist self" concept, however, people are more likely to define themselves by group affiliation and work towards achieving shared group objectives. The study has revealed that football interpreters prioritize institutional goals and do not relay face threats at the risk of their professional face being threatened for poor translation. This facework behaviour is consistent with the findings of previous research (e.g. Sandrelli, 2012; Bulut, 2018), although it contradicts some findings of Pöllabauer (2015, p. 50), which suggest that it is important for interpreters to "protect their own face as competent linguistic experts". The present study has also demonstrated that interpreters' nonrendition behaviour (e.g. when they answer on behalf of the public figure, or partially or completely leave out one of the primary participants' original utterances) threatens the other interlocutors' negative face, by inhibiting even declining their autonomy. In such instances of talk, the interpreters act as 'institutional voices' and adopt a protective attitude and orient to 'we-identity' as a discursive practice.

References

Baraldi, C. and Gavioli, L. (2014). Are Close Renditions the Golden Standard? Some Thoughts on Translating Accurately in Healthcare Interpreter Mediated Interaction. *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer*, 8 (3), 336-353.

Benzer, A. (2010). Türk Futbol Dili. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 6 (2), 88-103.

Birner, B. J. (2013). *Introduction to Pragmatics*. Wiley-Blackwell, Malden, MA.

Bora, T. (2006). *Kârhanede Romantizm: Futbol Yazıları*. İletişim Yayınları.

Brown, P. & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge University Press.

Bulut, A. (2008). *Basından Örneklerle Çeviride İdeoloji ve İdeolojik Çeviri*. Siyasal Kitabevi.

Bulut, A. (2016). Spor Tercümanlığı ve İltimas: Manipülatörler ya da Günah Keçileri. *RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 6, 1-14. https://doi.org/10.29000/rumelide.336533.

Bulut, A. (2018). *Türkiye'de Futbol Çevirmenliği*. Çeviribilim Yayınları.

Clayman, S. E. (2004). Arenas of Interaction in the Mediated Public Sphere. *Poetics*, 32 (1), 29-49.

Cuper, S. (1994). *Football Against the Enemy*. Orion Publishing House, Hachette UK.

Diriker, E. (2013). Simultaneous and Conference Interpreting in Conference Situations (Conference Interpreting). *Routledge Handbook of Translation Studies*, C. Millan-Varela & F. Bartrina (Ed.), Routledge.

Goffman, E. (1955). On Face-work: An Analysis of Ritual Elements in Social Interaction. *Psychiatry: Journal for the Study of Interpersonal Processes*, 18, 213–231.

Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction Ritual: Essays on Face-to-Face Interaction*. Aldine.

Graf, EM et. al. (2023). The Language and Discourse(s) of Football. Interdisciplinary and Cross-Modal Perspectives: Introduction to The Thematic Issue. *Soccer and Society*, 24 (7), 921-925.

Kerbrat-Orecchioni, C. (2011). From Good Manners to Facework. *Journal of Historical Pragmatics*, 12 (1-2), 133-155.

Lee, J. (2011). A Study of Facework in Interpreter-Mediated Courtroom Examination. *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology*, 21 (1), 1-18.

Martínez-Gómez, A. (2016). Facing Face: Non-Professional Interpreting in Prison Mental Health Interviews. *European Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 4 (1), 93-115.

Mason, I. (2009). Dialogue Interpreting. *Routledge Encyclopaedia of Translation Studies*, M. Baker & G. Saldanha (Ed.), 81-83, Routledge.

Mason, I. & Stewart, M. (2001). Interactional Pragmatics, Face and the Dialogue Interpreter. *Triadic Exchanges. Studies in Dialogue Interpreting*, I. Mason (Ed.), 51-70. St Jerome Publishing.

Merlini, R. (2013). Changing Perspectives. Politeness in Cooperative Multi-Party Interpreted Talk. *Interpreting in a Changing Landscape*, C. Schäffner, K. Kredens, & Y. Fowler (Ed.), 267-283, John Benjamins.

Özsöz, B. (2023). A Discourse-Oriented Approach to Interpreter's Non-Rendition Behaviour: A Case Study of An Interpreted Parent-Teacher Talk. *Journal of Language Research*, 7 (1), 80-94. https://doi.org/10.51726/jlr.1370174.

Pöchhacker, F. (2004). *Introducing interpreting studies*. Routledge.

Pöllabauer, S. (2007). Interpreting in Asylum Hearings: Issues of Saving Face. *The Critical Link 4: Professionalisation of Interpreting in The Community*, C. Wadensjö & E. Dimitrova (Ed.), 39-52, Benjamins Publishing Company.

Pöllabauer, S. (2015). Interpreting in Asylum Proceedings. *The Routledge Handbook of Interpreting*, H. Mikkelson & R. Jourdenais (Ed.), 202-216, Routledge.

Ruhi, Ş. (2010). Face as an Indexical Category in Interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42, 2131-2146.

Sacks, H. (1995). Lectures on Conversation. G. Jefferson (Ed.), (Vol. I-II), Blackwell.

Sandrelli, A. (2012). Introducing FOOTIE (Football in Europe): Simultaneous Interpreting in Football Press Conferences. *Breaking Ground in Corpus-Based Interpreting Studies*, F. C. Sergio & C. Falbo (Ed.), 119-153, Peter Lang.

Sandrelli, A. (2015). And Maybe You Can Translate Also What I Say: Interpreters in Football Press Conferences. *The Interpreters' Newsletter*, 20, 87-105.

Sandrelli, A. (2018). Interpreter-Mediated Football Press Conferences: A Study on the Questioning and Answering Strategies. *Making Way in Corpus-based Interpreting Studies.*

New Frontiers in Translation Studies, M. Russo, C. Bendazzoli & B. Defrancq, B. (Ed.), Springer.

Scollon, R. & Scollon, S. W. (1995). *Intercultural Communication: A Discourse Approach*. Basil Blackwell.

Ting-Toomey, S. (1985). Toward a Theory of Conflict and Culture. *Communication, Culture, and Organizational Processes*, W. B. Gudykunst, L. B. Stewart & S. Ting-Toomey (Ed.), 71-86, Sage.

Ting-Toomey, S. (2015). Facework/Face Negotiation Theory. *The Sage Encylopedia of Intercultural Competence*, J. M. Bennett (Ed.), Sage.

Ting-Toomey, S. & Kurogi, A. (1998). Facework Competence in Intercultural Conflict: An Updated Face-negotiation Theory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 22 (2), 187-225.

Ting-Toomey, S. & Oetzel, J. (2013). Introduction to Interpersonal Conflict. *The Sage Handbook of Conflict Communication: Integrating Theory, Research and Practice* (2nd ed.). S. Ting-Toomey & J. Oetzel (Ed.), 100-104, Sage.

Ting-Toomey, S. & Dorjee, T. (2019). *Communicating Across Cultures*, The Guilford Press.

Widdop, P. & Collins, M. (2016). Social Network Analysis: Towards an Approach for Football Studies. *Routledge Handbook of Football Studies*. J. Hughson et. al. (Ed.), 336-48, Routledge.

Yılmaz, S. (2012). Türkçede Sözlü Derlem Oluşturma Çalışmaları Üzerine Değerlendirmeler (Uluslararası Global COE Program Projesi Çerçevesinde). *Corpus-Based Linguistics and Language Education*. Y. Kawaguchi (Ed.), 165-184, Tokyo.

Appendix

Transcription Conventions

Symbols	Description and Meaning
"aaa/ooo"	vowel length indicating exclamative construction
"-"	indicating the speaker's turn
"#"	pause
"(.)"	unfulfilled sentences
"(…)"	incomprehensible sentence fragments
"eee"	hesitation
"{…..}"	post-rhematic structures
"[…..]"	extra-linguistic features
"< ….. >"	overlapping talk
"%....%"	stressed syllables or words
"_____"	pronounced with emphasis on underlined words/parts of words
"*……*"	pronounced more quickly