COMMUNICATION STYLE OF INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATORS:
A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF TWO SERMON INTERPRETERS

by
June Lee

A thesis submitted to Johns Hopkins University in conformity with the requirements for
the degree of Master of Arts

Baltimore, Maryland
September 2019

Abstract

As globalization accelerates, intercultural communication becomes essential in all aspects of society. The linguistic and cultural barriers that hinder communication require the involvement of interpreters who play a key role in facilitating understanding among interlocutors. Besides the familiar fields of intercultural encounters such as business interactions and foreign affairs, religious activities also have a long history of an interpreter's engagement. With a strong mission to share the Gospel, the message travels beyond cultural boundaries and reaches the foreign ears through the interpreter's mediation, now as in the past. The often misunderstood identity of interpreters as conduits leads to unrealistic expectations that an interpreter will create a target-language duplicate of the original speaker's utterance. In this regard, the present study examined the communication style of two sermon interpreters who rendered Christmas sermons from Korean into English, highlighting stylistic features that distinguish the two communicators. Based on a discourse analysis incorporating Garner's (2007) analytical framework for sermon discourse analysis, the findings support the claim that interpreter's contribute to meaning-making in a communicative event with their unique voice and participate as partners in generating a sermonic discourse. This study offers several significant insights for interpreters as intercultural communicators and may help guide future research on interpreter-mediated communication in religious settings and beyond.

Primary Reader and Advisor: Dr. Taylor Hahn

Secondary Readers: Dr. Kristen Willett, Dr. Jennifer Todd

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank my advisor, Dr. Taylor Hahn, for his unwavering support in completing this thesis. His insightful comments and questions guided me through the project and his feedback was critical in shaping the final outcome of this research. I am also grateful to Dr. Kristen Willett and Dr. Jennifer Todd for their thoughtful critiques. This thesis project would not have been possible without the guidance of such dedicated professors. Also, I am indebted to Professor Yongsung Lee and Professor Joong-chol Kwak for their continuous support.

My special thanks goes to Euna Kim who offered her precious time to assist the research analysis at the final stage for further refinement. I also thank my devoted family, especially my mother, for her constant faith and sacrifice, and my husband and son for their steadfast love and encouragement. Finally, I would like to thank my Savior for giving me the grace and strength I need for each day.

Contents

List of Tables

List of Figures

Chapter 1

Introduction

Living in an interconnected world, nation-state borders tend to become blurred as globalization proceeds. Yet, despite the increasing speed and volume of various types of exchanges that take place across the borders, language and cultural barriers continue to exist and create a need for competent intercultural communicators. According to Neuliep (2015), "an interculturally competent communicator is motivated to communicate, knowledgable about how to communicate, skilled in communicating… and sensitive to the expectations of the context in which communication occurs" (p. 30). These capabilities are also required of a competent interpreter who is entrusted to undertake the role of cultural mediator, which Taft (1981) defines as "a person who facilitates communication, understanding, and action between persons or groups who differ with respect to language and culture" (p. 53).

Interpreters are probably best known for their role in political negotiations and business deals, as well as their services for immigrants who need access to medical care or the court system (Davies, 2012). Another example of these services can be found in societies where multicultural communities require the assistance of an interpreter in religious activities. As Watt (2012) points out, "religion is a prominent, if not central, domain of most human societies, and therefore easily becomes a natural locus for intercultural communication" (p. 482). It is important for religious organizations to engage in effective interaction and communication with the multicultural congregation to allow personal maturation and institutional expansion.

Religious institutions are strongly motivated to reach out to potential believers beyond national borders, and Christianity is no exception. In fact, Christianity has a long history of spreading its doctrine to potential followers of faith and engaging them in Christian services and practices to strengthen their conviction by the means of intercultural communication. Chung (2015) indicates that the Great Commission to dispatch Gospel messengers throughout the world as recorded in Matthew 28:18-20 "plays a crucial role as a motif in almost every Christian gathering, causing people to recall the significance of mission and evangelism" (p. 276)." Based on this commission, the Christian message is bound to travel beyond borders and invite people of different cultures to the walk of faith, hence the pressing need of effective intercultural communication.

South Korean churches are well known for their passion to evangelize and commission missionaries throughout the world. In 2012, Korea World Missions Association announced that over 23,000 missionaries were commissioned abroad. According to The Economist (2014), only the United States sends more missionaries around the world than South Korea. Such spiritual fervor to share the Gospel not only motivates devoted Korean believers to be commissioned to foreign countries, but it also attracts Christians and potential believers around the globe to local Korean churches both offline and online. With this international demand it is imperative for churches with global reach to enhance the accessibility of their messages to diverse and multilingual audiences.

Interpreters are hired by churches to meet this communication need, who interpret the Korean sermons into English for the global audience. Despite the contribution of

these interpreters, however, their role has not received adequate attention from researchers in the intercultural communication field. As a matter of fact, the linguistic aspect of intercultural communication has been a relatively neglected area due to the "limited to nonexistent attention to language" in this discipline (Piller, 2012, p. 9), let alone studies related to translation and interpretation, which can be understood as intercultural communication services.

This study aims at promoting understanding on interpreting as a unique type of intercultural communication, and explore how interpreters get involved as a mediator to facilitate communication among the interlocutors. More specifically, this research seeks to gain insight in how sermon interpreters communicate in partnership with the preacher, giving special attention to the modifications made to the original text and the stylistic differences reflected in the interpreted discourse. The results of this study can advance our knowledge on the role and status of interpreters as intercultural communicators who assist in overcoming linguistic and cultural barriers.

Based on a comparative discourse analysis, the interpreted text of Korean sermons provided by two interpreters will be juxtaposed to analyze the motivations, communicative effects, and implications related to intercultural communication. The goal of this research is to: 1) understand the communication styles of sermon interpreters and their effect on intercultural communication; 2) extend knowledge on the role and status of sermon interpreters as intercultural communicators; 3) contribute to the current literature on intercultural communication that has a gap to be filled regarding the engagement of a cultural mediator as communication facilitators.

Understanding how interpreters fulfill their task is critical for successful intercultural communication where a linguistic and cultural barrier exists. The findings of this study can be extended to other interpreter-mediated communication situations in all aspects of society where the collaboration of an interpreter is essential to preventing communication breakdowns, enhancing understanding among the interlocutors, and guaranteeing a successful communicative outcome.

Chapter 2

Literature Review

Whenever we encounter a new culture with different languages, lifestyles, and values, the need for intercultural communication naturally arises. Schott and Henley (1996) define culture as "a set of norms, values, assumptions and perceptions (both explicit and implicit), and social conventions which enable members of a group, community or nation to function cohesively" (p. 3). According to Neuliep (2015), "culture provides the overall framework wherein humans learn to organize their thoughts, emotions, and behaviors in relation to their environment" (p. 48). Typically, communication occurs between people with diverse mental frameworks, which can cause miscommunication even for members of homogeneous cultures. When members associated with heterogeneous cultures come into contact, we can anticipate this problem to aggravate. Opportunities for cultural contact and exchange increase exponentially with technological progress, as it allows people from different cultures to interact both offline and online. However, with this increased access to different communities and cultures comes increased risk of miscommunication. Without proper intercultural communication, ideas cannot be exchanged, conflicts cannot be resolved, and the cultural contacts which enrich our lives will be extremely limited.

2.1 Interpreting as a Unique Form of Intercultural Communication

Interpreting and intercultural communication share common traits as they both deal with communication barriers created by interlocutors coming from diverse cultural backgrounds. Due to such commonalities, Davies (2012) argues that "the link between

translation and intercultural communication might seem too obvious to need stating" (p. 367). What is unique about interpreting though, is the fact that it invites a third party, in many cases a total stranger, to join the conversations, with expectations that the interpreter's involvement would facilitate communication among the interlocutors. Whether it is in a formal setting such as an international conference or a community setting such as parent-to-teacher interpreting, the interpreter who is experienced and capable of performing the role of intercultural communicator will step in to enhance understanding between the present parties. So, it could be said that interpreting is basically a "three-party interaction" (Anderson, 1976/2002), while intercultural communication refers to a two-party exchange.

Pöchhacker (2004) defines interpreting as "a form of Translation in which a *first and final rendition in another language* is produced on the basis of a *one-time presentation* of an utterance in a source language" (p. 11). According to Pöchhacker, the capitalization of Translation indicates the translational activity in its hypernymic sense, with translation and interpreting as its hyponyms. Both translation and interpreting are seen as a translational activity since they transfer the original message from the source text (or utterance) into a target text (or utterance); translation pertaining to written communication and interpreting pertaining to oral communication. The two types of transitions share several commonalities as stated in Pöchhacker's "basic conceptual ingredients" of Translation: "an *activity* consisting (mainly) in the *production* of *utterances (texts)* which are presumed to *have a similar meaning and/or effect as previously existing* utterances in *another language and culture*" (ibid., p. 12).

Despite the similarities of translation and interpreting, it is the immediacy, the "here and now" of the communication situation that distinguishes the two most succinctly (ibid., p. 10). In other words, interpreting is mostly performed in a live context (Pöchhacker, 2010, p. 154) and is "produced under time pressure, with little chance for correction and revision" (Kade, 1968; as cited in Pöchhacker , 2010, p. 154). Compared to translation that allows the translated text to be revised multiple times until the final rendition is sent to the client, interpreting is the on-the-spot transfer of the original message in the target language as a one-time communicative event.

Interpreting can take various forms such as seminar interpreting, court interpreting, medical interpreting, media interpreting, business interpreting, church interpreting and many more. These different types of interpreting services can be categorized under "two broad prototypical domains, that is, international conference interpreting and community-based dialogue interpreting" (Pöchhacker, 2010, p. 155). Conference interpreting is typically performed in "high-level formal meetings and negotiations" by practitioners who "receive intensive initial training" in a simultaneous or consecutive mode (Setton, 2010, p. 66). Conference interpreters usually acquire necessary skills and techniques through a graduate school program, specialized for this vocation. They are trained to meet the pressing demands for an accurate rendition in instances such as UN conferences, summits, international seminars and workshops, executive business meetings, to name a few.

Unlike conference interpreting that "takes place in international gatherings or meetings," community interpreting "takes place between people who live in the same community, society or country but who do not share a common language" (Hale, 2015,

pp. 65-66). Typical community interpreting settings include medical settings such as hospitals or child care centers, legal settings such as court or police stations (Hertog, 2010) and public administrative settings such as central or local government offices for immigrants or foreign residents. They may also include business settings such as working-level negotiations on taxation, investment, industrial relations, etc. (Gentile, Ozolins and Vasilakakaos, 1996, p. 116) or religious settings such as worship services (Hild, 2015). Community interpreting is mostly performed by bilinguals who may or may not have received professional training, and the interpreters' linguistic proficiency and working experience may vary. Harris (1990) labeled the untrained interpreters as "natural interpreters" who are "very often unremunerated bilingual individuals who act as linguistic and cultural (inter)mediators in a variety of formal and informal contexts and situations" (Antonini, 2011, p. 102). Due to their ability to speak a foreign language other than their mother tongue, they are relied on to provide the communication service in community settings.

There are two different modes in which interpreting can be provided: the simultaneous mode and consecutive mode. When multiple languages need to be interpreted at the same time, it is usually the simultaneous mode that is relied on to achieve the communicative goal. Since the interpreters listen to and analyze the source utterance and then relay it in the target language within a few seconds' interval to the original speech, it becomes an effective and time-saving method. As for consecutive interpreting, the interpreter would wait for the main speaker to deliver a portion of his/her message (usually five minutes or less) and then begin to interpret the message into the target language consecutively. The main speaker and interpreter take turns addressing the

audience, and the interpreter takes notes when the main speaker's utterance is too long to rely on memory alone, which is referred to as notetaking. This mode will consume twice as much time compared to simultaneous interpreting as the total time of the utterances will be the sum of the speaker's and the interpreter's speech duration.

In conference interpreting situations, the monologic form of the consecutive mode would be commonly used to deliver the longer stretches of the main speaker's prepared speech (which is referred to as the long consecutive mode), and in community interpreting situations, the dialogic form of the consecutive mode would be relied on to render the participants' short spontaneous conversations (which is referred to as the short consecutive mode) (Dam, 2010). The latter is also known as "dialogue interpreting," which Mason (1998/2009) describes as "the two- or three-way exchange of utterances and meanings that are the basis of conversation, rather than monologue" (p. 81). It is identified as dealing with "spontaneous speech", being conducted in "face-to-face" interactions, and deploying the "consecutive mode" (ibid.). However, Merlini (2015) points out that the most distinct feature of dialogue interpreting is that it is in contrast with the "monologue-based communication of most conference interpreting events" and that the other conditions cannot readily apply to various domains of dialogue interpreting such as telephone interpreting, signed language interpreting, and talk show interpreting (p. 102). Some typical settings in which dialogue interpreting may be carried out are medical consultations, welfare interviews, immigration hearings, courtroom trails, parent-teacher meetings, business encounters, and broadcast interviews (ibid.).

In terms of interpreting mode, sermon interpreting is unique because although it would be classified as community interpreting, it is delivered "in mainly monologic form

in a one-to-many church setting" (Tison, 2016, p. 17). In other words, contrary to the dialogic form which prompts the interpreter to be attentive to both sides of the story, as in typical community interpreting settings, the sermon interpreter would work one-way, delivering only the preacher's message to the audience in short consecutive mode. Due to certain attributes sermon interpreting shares with both community interpreting and conference interpreting, it cannot be classified into either and as such "there has consequently been some debate as to how church interpreting should be classified in a taxonomy of interpreting practices" (Tison, ibid., p. 14). The following section will describe some special features of sermon interpreting, and discuss the communication style of sermon interpreters.

2.2 Sermon Interpreting and Communication Style

Sermon interpreting can be distinguished from other interpreting types by several unique qualities. First, as mentioned above, they engage in a special interpreting mode which is both consecutive and monologic. It is common for Korean sermon interpreters to speak from the pulpit standing by the preacher and deliver the message one utterance at a time, following the original speech. This separates them from dialogue interpreters who interpret both ways. Second, in most cases, an "insider" is entrusted with the interpreting task since s/he is familiar with the doctrine and terminology of the sermon discourse, and has personal faith. Tison (2016), in her study on the sermon interpreter's involvement, also indicated that church interpreters are mostly voluntary in-house interpreters, who are not outsourced but provided from within the institution. Third, the spiritual dimension is another distinguishing factor (ibid.). Hokkanen (2017) notes that interpreters in religious settings receive and support the messages they interpret on a spiritual level (p. 5). These

interpreters "view their service as a mission to fulfill rather than a commission" (Balci, 2008, p. 43). Fourth, a majority of sermon interpreters are untrained "natural interpreters" (Antonini, 2011, p. 102). That is why it may be preferred to choose a sermon interpreter among the church members, someone who is trusted to be a devoted believer and a strong advocate to the church missions as well as a knowledgeable person in terms of the teachings of the Bible and terminology so that they can fulfill the expectations of the congregation who desire to be spiritually inspired by the message as much so as the listeners to the original message.

The purpose of sermon interpreting is to achieve the communicative goal set by the preacher and the church. Park (2010) states that "the ultimate purpose of preaching is to deliver the Gospel to the audience for their salvation (p. 21). In order to effectively engage the congregation and persuade them to believe in the message being preached, it is essential for preachers to be good communicators. This is also true for sermon interpreters who are working as partners to the preacher in intercultural communication settings. Several studies (Malmström, 2015; Aijmer, 2002; Craddock, 1985; Immink, 2004; Rose-Atkinson, 1997; Wilson, 1995) point out that "preaching is a good example of public, highly interpersonal, and persuasive religious communication" (Malmström, 2015, p. 80). As such, we can expect the preachers to "make use of an array of different linguistic/communicative strategies" to make their message more appealing (Malmström, 2015, p. 80), and sermon interpreters would be expected to speak in a style that maximizes this communicative effect.

Quite contrary to what is typically expected of interpreters to produce an identical version of the original speech, once the speech is encoded in a different language and

embedded in a different cultural context it becomes a different version of the original. The gap between the original and interpretation is even more widened once the personal communicative style is incorporated. Just like a novel once translated into a foreign language by a different writer is to be perceived as a recreated version, a speech interpreted into a foreign language by a different speaker is not to be received as identical with the original. Johnstone (2008) points out that "even in the most scripted, controlled discourse situations… different people sound different, not simply for biological reasons but because unless they can be heard as expressing individuated human identities they sound like machines" (p. 158; see Johnstone, 1991; Cheng & Johnstone, 2002). Interpreters definitely do not communicate like machines because the individual traits of their personal communication style are bound to be reflected in the rendered utterances. Johnstone (ibid.) emphasizes this point as in the following:

> However constrained individuals may be by the interactional and social roles they are called on to adopt and the stances and styles available to index these roles, by their relationships with one another and the adaptation and accommodation these relationships call for… the fact that participants in discourse are individual human beings means that discourse is fundamentally creative, even if the linguistic decisions made by one individual are often the same as those made by others (p. 157).

Johnstone's analysis reinforces the fundamentally personal nature of interpreting and demonstrates the need for researchers to grapple with the various ways that the target language might be expressed when undergoing translation. The need to consider stylistic traits among interpreters is well-founded among theorists. According to Verdonk (2002),

style in language can be defined as "a set of conscious or unconscious choices of expression, inspired or induced by a particular context" (p. 121). When interpreting a sermon, we can expect the interpreter to make stylistic choices that take into consideration the purpose of the communicative event as well as the needs of the congregation that is confronting a linguistic and cultural barrier. In which style the interpreter chooses to communicate may influence the overall tone and communicative effect of the sermon. Francesco (2012) explains that stylistic features of an individual interpreter "are regularities of translational behaviour and concern characteristics, habits and idiosyncrasies" (p. 211). If an interpreter serves the church community on a regular basis, rather than as a one-time event, the stylistic features they display during the sermon interpreting will distinguish them from other interpreters, making each interpreter an intercultural communicator with a unique style.

The style of interpreters communicating in diverse settings have been examined in various studies. For instance, Besien and Meuleman (2008) demonstrated style differences of two simultaneous interpreters rendering a Dutch interview into English. They investigated the global strategies (output presentation, additions, omissions) and local strategies (pause, anticipation, chunking, transcoding, backtracking, content correction) deployed by each interpreter. A tentative distinction is made between the two interpreting styles and the produced texts are labeled as a "lean" target text and an "abundant" target text. The former referring to a shorter and compact version, and the latter referring to an extended and detailed version compared to the original. The authors comment that "different interpreters can solve similar problems in equally acceptable ways whilst adopting different styles of interpretation" (ibid., p. 135). This statement

supports the fact that differences in interpreting styles can be acceptable as long as the communicative goal is met. As for sermon interpreters, we can anticipate that style differences may not necessarily be a hindrance to intercultural communication if the persuasive effect in the translated sermon message is retained.

In sensitive cases like witnesses' testimonials in court interpreting, however, special attention must be given to the original utterance's style. Hale (2002) warns of the negative impact on court decisions that can be caused by neglecting to respect and reflect what the original speaker has said. She examined the interpreter's rendition style in Spanish-English court proceedings and recognized that although the content of witnesses' answers are accurately interpreted, the style of the speech was altered either favorable or detrimentally, creating a possibility to change the outcome of the case. For instance, interpreters seemed to disregard features of powerless speech in the original testimonies. The renditions had substantially fewer fillers, hedges, and discourse markers, but a significantly higher frequency of hesitations compared to the witnesses' speech. In other words, they did not faithfully reflect the powerless speech features of the witnesses, and added their own style, which could distort the witnesses' character and damage their credibility. This study may serve as a caveat to sermon interpreters against employing random or radical styles of communication that may harm the authority of the preacher, the message being preached, and the Bible that serves as an ultimate reference.

An exemplar case of sermon interpreters' communicative style is presented in Tison's (2016) dissertation on the sermon interpreter's involvement in a religious institutional setting. Her research devoted a section to illustrate how explicitation was practiced in the rendering of the sermons from English to Turkish in Smyrna Church,

which is an Evangelical Protestant church in Izmir, Turkey founded by an American and a German pastor in 1994. Explicitation is known to have been first introduced in translation studies by Vinay and Darbelnet in 1958, who defined it as "a stylistic translation technique which consists of making explicit in the target language what remains implicit in the source language because it is apparent from either the context or the situation" (Vinay & Darbelnet, 1995, p. 342). Tison (2016) purports that "any translator or interpreter who feels that their rendition is not sufficient to communicate the message may resort to explicitation" (p. 89). Conducting a discourse analysis on five sermons preached by three pastors, which was interpreted by four interpreters she examined how the target language was explicitated in terms of lexical addition, repetition, or rewording. The results indicate that interpreters frequently relied on all three strategies to either facilitate understanding of the preacher's message, emphasize certain aspects of the original speech, or to reinforce meaning of the original English sermon. Tison (ibid.) concludes that the three recurring strategies demonstrate the interpreters' "alignment with institutional ideology" (p. 227). The notion of explicitation, termed "restatement" in my study, is also highlighted as a common feature sermon interpreters resort to in an effort to make their message more comprehensible for the audience or stress certain parts of the original sermon that they consider worth emphasizing. The analysis of the present study will reveal how the interpreters made their renditions more explicit by incorporating various methods, which reflect a distinct communicative style for each interpreter.

In the professional arena, interpreters are often required to "reproduce a message from one speaker to another faithfully, accurately, and without emotional or personal bias", "maintaining a stance of impartiality and neutrality" (Roy, 1993, p. 347). This type

of "extreme personal non-involvement" is "best represented by the metaphorical concept of a conduit" (ibid., p. 348). However, in "real-life" situations, where cultural differences and linguistic barriers can create major challenges to intercultural exchange and the conduit metaphor becomes an illusion, the interpreter may have to "take an active, participatory stance in the communication" (ibid., p. 352), thus reflecting his/her unique communication styles in the process.

2.3 Communication Accommodation Theory and Its Application to Interpreting Practice

Communication style in intercultural encounters can be illustrated with the theoretical concepts associated with Communication Accommodation Theory (CAT). CAT originated from Giles's (1973) Speech Accommodation Theory (SAT), which "proposed that speakers use linguistic strategies to gain approval or to show distinctiveness in their interactions with others" (Gudykunst, 2002, pp. 187-188). It was later expanded to CAT (Giles, Mulac, Bradac, & Johnson, 1987) and explored various ways "we accommodate our communication, our motivations for doing so, and the consequences" (Giles & Ogay, 2007, p. 293). Accommodation refers to the level of social distance between communicators that is altered by the speaker's communicative behavior (ibid.) Giles and Ogay (ibid.) present four basic principles of CAT as follows:

> (1) Communication is influenced not only by features of the immediate situation and participants' initial orientations to it, but also by socio-historical context in which the interaction is embedded…
>
> (2) Communication is not only a matter of merely and only exchanging information about facts, ideas, and emotions (often called referential

communications), but salient social category memberships are often

negotiated during an interaction through the process of accommodation…

(3) Interactants have expectations regarding optimal levels of accommodation.

These expectations are based on stereotypes about outgroup members as

well as on the prevailing social and situational norms…

(4) Interactants use specific communication strategies (in particular,

convergence and divergence) to signal their attitudes towards each other

and their respective social groups. In this way, social interaction is a subtle

balance between needs for social inclusiveness on the one hand, and for

differentiation on the other… (p. 294).

The two main communication strategies deployed by communicators, which are

convergence and divergence were "the original cornerstone of CAT" (ibid., p. 294).

According to Gallois, Ogay, and Giles (2005), "convergence is defined as a strategy

through which individuals adapt their communicative behavior in such a way as to

become more similar to their interlocutor's behavior", while divergence "leads to an

accentuation of differences between self and other" (p. 123). They also add *maintenance*,

which is similar to divergence, "in which a person persists in his or her original style,

regardless of the communication behavior of the interlocutor" (ibid., p. 123). The

principal motive behind convergence is the need for approval, whose premise is

similarity attraction theory (Byrne, 1971), while for divergence and maintenance, the

motive is the need for distinctiveness, whose premise is social identity theory (Tajfel &

Turner, 1979) (ibid.). When these strategies are examined in actual instances of

communication, it can present a complicated picture due to the multiple factors that affect

the communicative effect such as personal intention and situational pressure, to name a few.

CAT may be compatible to interpreting practice if considerations are made to apply it to a "three-party interaction" (Anderson, 1976/2002). While CAT pertains to the interaction of speaker A and listener B, interpreter-mediated situations can be more complex due to the interpreter's role as both listener and speaker. Moreover, in sermon interpreting settings the address will be one-way with the interpreter taking the place of the second orator. In this case, CAT would not be applied to the conversations between speaker A and listener B, but rather to the discourse of the interpreter who is directing the renditions to listener C who attempts to maintain a communicative relationship with speaker A. The focus will be placed on the interpreter's speech and the choice of his/her convergence and divergence strategies, with the goal of delivering the sermon message as a successful intercultural communicator.

In terms of convergence, the sermon interpreter will probably aim at a "similar" communication style shared with the preacher, which is also in line with the norms of sermonic discourse. In other words, the interpreter is likely to be conscious of "the norm-constrained immediate interaction situation" (Gallois, Ogay, & Giles, 2005, p. 135) and perform in a way that may earn the trust of the listeners and enhance the communicative effect. This may pertain to the accurate use of terminology, correct biblical reference, and appropriate style of religious communication.

In terms of divergence, the sermon interpreter might deploy a communicative style that is "distinctive" from that of the main orator in order to reinforce his/her own social identity as a "preacher." Giles and Ogay (2007) assert that "the motive lying

behind divergence is precisely the desire to emphasize distinctiveness from one's interlocutor, usually on the basis of group membership" (p. 296). The idiosyncrasies portrayed in the interpreted discourse may be tolerated if the interpreter is considered an ingroup member and shares the faith and mission of the congregation. This is why commonly, sermon interpreting is delegated to members of the church who have a better chance of avoiding miscommunication and misinterpretation.

2.4 The Role of Sermon Interpreters

Prior to investigating the communication style of sermon interpreters, it is important to understand their role because this factor may influence how the intercultural communicators present themselves. As for the role of interpreters, Pöllabauer (2015) posits that "interpreter role constructions oscillate on a continuum between non-involvement and active agency (even intrusiveness)" (p. 356). She highlights that "narrow role constructs view interpreters as mechanistic conveyors of language: passive, neutral and invisible" while "broader role constructs" "perceive interpreters as actively participating third parties (Knapp-Potthoff & Knapp, 1986)" (ibid., p. 356). Based on Pöllabauer's description, the characteristic of an interpreter's role could be summarized in two types; the non-involved and the active. Depending on which stance the interpreter decides to take in the communicative event, we can expect variations in the communication style; a more formal and detached style for the neutral position and an engaging and personal style for the involved. However, this assumption can only be verified by empirical research based on discourse analysis.

In sermon interpreting, the congregation view interpreters as "co-creators of the worship event and consequently share responsibility for the success of the sermon, taking

on the role of co-preachers and co-constructors of charismatic meaning" (Hild, 2015, p. 345; see Giannoutsou, 2014; Hild, 2016). In this regard, for sermon interpreters "the norm of neutrality is thus superseded by the requirement of embodied experience and close involvement on an interpersonal level" (Hild, 2015, p. 346). These statements explain why in typical cases, the prerequisite of a sermon interpreter would be their affiliation with the church (Tison, 2016). The discussions so far lead us to presume sermon interpreters will communicate in a way that reflects their involvement, which can only be confirmed by discourse analysis of actual interpreting instances.

Hokkanen (2017) describes the involvement of interpreters in religious settings on three levels:

(1) socially, by having kinship and other close relations to the other participants (Karlik, 2010) or by being members of the religious community in which they interpret

(2) interactionally, by being involved in the co-construction of the interpreter sermon or other speech act (Vigouroux, 2010; Downie, 2014)

(3) spiritually, by personally receiving and supporting the religious messages they interpret (Tison, 2016; Hokkanen, 2016) (p. 5).

These levels of involvement inspire sermon interpreters to reproduce a similar spiritual experience for their target audience. In such interpreting situations where the circumstances encourage the interpreter to get deeply involved, Angelleli's (2003) claim that "the interpreter is visible" (p. 16) holds true. She emphasizes that "the interpreter brings the self" in the interpreted communicative event, "not just the knowledge of languages and the ability to language-switch or assign turns" (ibid., p. 16). How this

"self" is represented in the communicative act is the focus of this study. The study seeks to address the following questions:

RQ1: What features characterize the sermon interpreter's communicative style, if any?

RQ2: What implication does the sermon interpreter's communicative style have on interpreters as intercultural communicators?

Chapter 3

Methodology

3.1 Case Study

According to Yin (2009), "a case study is an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon in depth and within its real-life context, especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident" (p. 18). Gillham (2000) defines a "case" as "a unit of human activity embedded in the real world; which can only be studied or understood in context; which exists in the here and now; that merges in with its context so that precise boundaries are difficult to draw" (p. 1). In sociology, case study has been defined as follows:

> a method of studying social phenomena through the thorough analysis of an individual case. The case may be a person, a group, an episode, a process, a community, a society, or any other unit of social life. All data relevant to the case are gathered, and all available data are organized in terms of the case. The case study method gives a unitary character to the data being studied by interrelating a variety of facts to a single case. It also provides an opportunity for the intensive analysis of many specific details that are often overlooked with other methods. (Theodorson & Theodorson, 1969; as cited in Punch, 1998, p. 153).

Duff (2008) pointed out a number of advantages and (claimed) disadvantages of case studies. What makes case studies attractive is the high degree of completeness, depth of analysis, potential to generate knowledge "by capitalizing on either unique or typical

cases in theorizing about particular phenomena that challenge current beliefs" (p. 43), to mention a few. On the other hand, weaknesses include limitations on generalizations, issues connected with triangulation, subjectivity in research, data-driven approach, and small sample data, to name a few. Especially, for the case of triangulation, it is believed that the incorporation of triangulated perspectives can help solidify the evidence sought in the data. Although the present study relied on discourse analysis alone rather than deploying multiple methods, the findings is based on sufficient evidence from eight transcribed sermons that reveal personal stylistic traits manifested in the interpreted discourse.

In conducting case studies related to translation and interpreting studies, Saldanha and O'Brien (2013) emphasize the importance of establishing clear boundaries in three dimensions: temporal, social, and spatial. It must be clear whether the case study is investigating a contemporary case or a historical one, whether the population of cases shares key characteristics, and whether the case is based on a particular field or genre. In the present study, the boundaries of the research were set to explore the contemporary interpreting practices of community interpreters serving in church settings.

Yin (2009) indicated that case studies are designed to answer "how" or "why" questions. Although the research questions of this current study ask "what" the characteristics of the sermon interpreters' communication style are and "what" the analysis implies for interpreters as intercultural communicators, it explores why interpreters communicate in a certain style and how this influences the communicative effect of the interpreted sermon, as well as how the findings of this case study can be further extended and applied to other intercultural communication situations.

23

3.2 Discourse Analysis

This study deployed discourse analysis to investigate the stylistic features embedded in a sermon interpreter's discourse, and discuss the implications it has on the interpreter's role as intercultural communicators. According to Johnstone (2008), "'discourse' usually means actual instances of communicative action in the medium of language" (p. 2). In other words, discourse is the "language in use and in context, as opposed to artificially constructed sentences" (Hale & Napier, 2013, p. 118).

Hale and Napier (2013) define discourse analysis as the "systematic analysis of language in use, through the application of a variety of different methods, theories and approaches" (p. 119). Paltridge (2012) elaborates on the characteristics of discourse analysis as follows:

> … discourse analysis is a view of language at the level of text. Discourse analysis is also a view of language in use; that is, how people achieve certain communicative goals through the use of language, perform certain communicative acts, participate in certain communicative events and present themselves to others. Discourse analysis considers how people manage interactions with each other, how people communicate within particular groups and societies as well as how they communicate with other groups, and with other cultures. It also focuses on how people do things beyond language, and the ideas and beliefs that they communicate as they use language (p. 7).

The description outlined by Paltridge can also be applied to the discourse analysis of sermons, or interpreted sermons in particular. Viewing the sermon at the discourse level, the interpreter's language can be analyzed in the form of a complete message as a

communicative event, along with the analysis of each single utterance as a separate communicative act. The results of the discourse analysis can also provide evidence for the analyst to make implications on how the interpreter views his/her role in performing the intercultural communication service, and illustrate how the interpreters' convictions are embedded in their communication.

Stubbs (1983) summarized the three preconditions of discourse analysis: to have authentic data, to analyze beyond the sentence level, and to take context into consideration, which means the analyst must understand in what situation and condition the communication is taking place. Johnstone (2008) emphasizes that discourse analysis is "useful in answering questions that are posed in many fields that traditionally focus on human life and communication, such as anthropology, cultural studies, psychology, communications, and sociology… " (p. 7). In this regard, discourse analysis is considered an appropriate method in studying the communicative aspects of the sermon interpreter's discourse. Studies on sermon interpreting that incorporated discourse analysis include Vigouroux (2010), Kirimi, Peter and Njogu (2012), Odhiambo, Musyoka and Matu (2013), Musyoka and Karanja (2014), and Tison (2016).

The present study will deploy discourse analysis with a focus on stylistic analysis. According to Verdonk (2002), stylistics, the study of style, can be defined as "the analysis of distinctive expression in language and the description of its purpose and effect" (p. 4). He emphasizes that a stylistic analysis does not investigate "every form and structure in a text, as on those which stand out in it" (p. 6), and highlights that "the concept of style crucially involves choice" and the "fundamental assumption" to this is "that different choices will produce different styles and thereby different effects" (p. 6).

In this regard, my study will focus on idiosyncratic traits that characterize the sermon interpreter's communication style from that of the pastor and other sermon interpreter(s). The following section will present the analytical framework that was used to conduct the discourse and stylistic analysis.

3.3 Analytical Framework

The discourse analysis of the interpreter's sermon in this present study was based on the analytical framework introduced by Garner (2007) who aimed at presenting an analytical tool that "embodies both language and communication" (p. 45). He emphasized that "if sermons are to be analyzed as events, that is, as situated discourses, we need an analytical framework that is in principle applicable to every sermon, in any context and period…" (p. 46). As such, interpreted sermons are also to be perceived as "sermons" in its own right as they serve the need of the congregation as a meaningful communicative event. In that regard, it was considered appropriate to apply this framework to the present study of analyzing sermon discourse in the target language, in which both language and communication are key concepts in the discussions. Garner (2007) holds the view that "discourse analysis is predicated on a view of language as a form of communicative behavior characterized by complex patterning on several levels" and the "analyst's task is to describe systematically the relationship between linguistic patterns and the communication they effect" (p. 52). In his discourse analysis of Robert Rollock's sermons, he asserts that "all discourse is situationally embedded; analysis seeks to establish how the linguistic make-up of a sermon is related to the preacher's objective of communicating in a way that was situated, appropriate, and meaningful to the hearers" (p. 47). To apply this approach to my study, it is the linguistic make-up of an interpreted

sermon that is the central focus of my analysis, and its relation to the interpreter's aim to address the audience in a manner that is "situated, appropriate, and meaningful" (ibid., p. 47) to the listeners.

According to Garner (ibid.), a sermon is seen as a "communicative event" consisting of a range of linguistic elements that are viewed as "communicative acts" (p. 53). He introduces five communicative acts, which are discourse markers, embedded conversations, restatement, questions, and reference to other Scripture (ibid., pp. 57-62). The first communicative act is discourse markers which are used to enhance "the cognitive processing of the message" and either signals to the audience "whereabouts in the discourse they are in relation to what has gone before and what will follow" or "the relative importance that the speaker places on different points" (p. 57). The second communicative act is embedded conversations which "typically comprise one or two utterances by hypothetical participants" and serve two functions: they "make a point in a more dramatic way than an indicative statement" and "personalize the point in a way that an abstract or generalized statement does not" (p. 58). The third communicative act is restatement which is used to "impress the point upon the mind and memory" of the listener and can be realized in multiple ways: repeating a clause, paraphrasing, or deploying negative contrast (p. 59). The fourth communicative act is questions which refer to either the vicarious question which is "a question asked… on behalf of the listeners, to which the speaker provides the answer" or the rhetorical question "which the answer is self-evident, and is to be supplied (usually silently) by the listener" (p. 60). The fifth communicative act is reference to other Scripture which pertains to referring to the

Bible either "by direct quotation or paraphrase" generating the communicative effect of setting "the day's passage in the context of the whole Bible" (p. 61).

Based on Garner's analytical framework, my study explored the stylistic characteristics of the communicative acts practiced by the two interpreters. However, it should be noted that Garner's perspective cannot be applied to my analysis as it is, due to the fact that an interpreter's speech is restricted by what has been said by the original speaker. Moreover, the interpreting process of creating a sermon in the target language might require the inclusion of additional sub-types in the framework in order to accommodate the stylistic features that is manifested in the interpreter's communication. For example, for the communicative act of restatement, there were no cases detected which were compatible to Garner's sub-type of negative contrast. On the other hand, explication and emphasis, which were common features in the present interpreted discourse, had to be included in the sub-types to provide a complete description of the interpreter's communicative style.

It should be noted that the framework applied to the interpreters' discourse is based on the digressions of the target text from the source text. In other words, the analysis focuses on the interpreter's style that distinguishes the speech from that of the main speaker, the pastor. For instance, if the pastor uses a question to direct the audience and the interpreter does likewise, this utterance of the interpreter would not be considered as a case for analysis in the present study. Rather, if the interpreter uses a direct question to address the audience when the pastor has not, this would be a case to be considered as a "question" in the present study. It is the communicative style of the interpreter that is the focus of this study, especially the style that distinguishes him/her from the main

speaker and other interpreters. In other words, the communicative style that is a personal trait of the communicator, and that which makes him/her a unique intercultural communicator. The following two sections will illustrate how the artifact for my search was selected and the procedures that were taken for the analysis.

3.4 Artifact Selection

The convenience sampling method was used to obtain data for this study. According to Reinard (1998), convenience sampling "involves selecting events that are most readily available" (p. 267). Although convenience sampling, a nonrandom method, can display biases and limit the researcher from generalizing the results of the study, it is considered useful for obtaining artifacts that would be unavailable otherwise (ibid.). Jones and Kottler (2006) explain that "the key in evaluating the adequacy of a convenience sample is whether the subjects seem likely to be representative of the actual target" (p. 65). In the case of this thesis, the selected texts are representative because they are typical Christmas sermons of a Protestant Korean church that have been interpreted into English.

As for the data collection, the inclusion criteria were online video recordings that presented both Korean and English spoken versions of sermons, and were retrievable via a database that had several years of sermon collections organized by date and uploaded on a regular basis. The exclusion criteria were sermons provided only in one language without any interpretation, or those that were not accessible via the internet. Mega church websites were searched to find uploaded recordings that contained both Korean originals and English interpretations. According to Hartford Institute for Religion Research, the megachurch "generally refers to any Protestant Christian congregation with a sustained

average weekly attendance of 2000 persons or more in its worship services, counting all adults and children at all its worship locations." The institute explains that there are approximately 1650 of such megachurches in the United States, and significant numbers of them worldwide including Korea, Brazil, and several African countries. Compared to small or mid-sized churches, these mega churches attract many people from home and abroad and usually have the capability, both in terms of facility and experienced interpreters, to provide interpreting services to the foreign listeners.

Immanuel Church, located in Busan, Republic of Korea, satisfied this condition, by providing recorded bilingual sermons online on a weekly basis. Other mega churches, such as Yoido Full Gospel Church, did not meet my research criteria because they only provided voice-over versions of the English message. Still other churches, including Sarang Church, offered English messages directly preached by an English-speaking pastor rather than have the Korean version interpreted into English. For this reason, artifacts including both video clips and summarized transcriptions retrieved from the Immanuel Church website (www.darak.net) were selected. Also, because Immanuel Church has a pool of English interpreters who takes turns doing the interpreting service, the video recordings of multiple interpreters allowed the comparison of communicative styles as intercultural communicators.

Among the sermons preached throughout the year, Christmas sermons were selected because of the representative quality it has for Christianity. Lie (2018) indicated that traditional reading of the Bible "dictates that when read correctly all narratives point to the Gospel" (p. 43), which means "the good news" that Jesus Christ was sent as a ransom to be crucified on the cross for the salvation of humanity (1 John 4:10, New

International Version). She emphasizes that this "is considered the essence, the main message of the Bible" (ibid., p. 43). Christmas sermons typically highlight this Gospel and comparing interpreted sermons with the same theme may help place the focus on stylistic differences of the interpreters' discourse rather than on the stylistic varieties of the original sermon discourse itself. Tison (2016) indicated that there are various types of sermons such as expository sermons, textual sermons, topical sermons, sermons by subject, and sermons by occasions. She also mentions Broadus's (1870, 1979) classification of "the church program sermon" which is "designed for events in the church year, such as Easter and Christmas" (p. 74). She explains that "depending on the occasion and purpose, the preacher drafts his sermon in terms of the focus, the duration, Scripture, and other factors" (ibid., p. 74), which may justify the reason to choose sermons for the same occasion to better focus on the interpreter's communicative features.

A total of eight Christmas sermons were selected from year 2006 through 2017. Because there is only one Christmas sermon per year, providing so few artifacts for each year, the period to choose the sermons were extended back to year 2006 to include a considerable number of sermons for analysis. Prior to 2005, not all recordings were uploaded so those videos were not available. In the time period selected, all sermons were preached by the same Korean pastor, Ryu Kwangsu and English interpretations were provided by five interpreters who are regular members of the church and who take turns each week interpreting. They were all native English speakers who have Korean origins, but have lived in the United States or the Philippines. Because of their ability to understand the Korean language, they could transfer the Korean sermon into English for the foreign audience. Years in service ranged from approximately ten years to twenty

years, and most of them did not receive professional interpreting training, which is common practice for community interpreters who are bilinguals. As Antonini's (2011) reference to Harris (1973) states, "the ability to translate and interpret is not the exclusive realm of professionals, but a natural aptitude for bilingual speakers" (p. 102).

Standing next to the pastor on the pulpit, they interpreted from Korean into English in real-time, alternating with the pastor after the pause of each utterance. Among the five interpreters who interpreted Christmas sermons from 2006 to 2017, two interpreters (referred in this paper as interpreter A and interpreter B) who did the most interpretations (more than four sermons) were selected. Table 3.1 shows the list of sermons that were included in the discourse analysis.

Table 3.1. List of Christmas Sermons for Analysis

Year	Title	Interpreter
2007	His Name will be Immanuel (Matt. 1:18-22)	A
2008	Let's Enjoy the Blessing of Immanuel (Matt. 1:18-25)	B
2009	Christmas 365 (Matt. 28:16-20)	B
2010	The Day the Light Comes (John 1:1-14)	A
2011	Glory and Peace (Luke 2:1-14)	A
2013	The Day You Find "That Day" (Luke 2:8-14)	A
2014	Offspring of Woman (Isaiah 7:4)	B
2016	Christ Laid in a Manger (Luke 2:1-14)	B

Though the sermon was videotaped in its entirety, the screen only captured the pastor's and the sign language interpreter's upper torso due to spatial limits. The interpreter's voice was the only accessible source available to the English-speaking viewers watching the video online (see Figure 3.1).

Figure 3.1. Captured image of online Christmas sermon (Dec. 25, 2016)

Although the nonverbal communication signs may contribute greatly to the overall meaning-making, this aspect was not included in the analysis because the interpreter is invisible from the scene and therefore cannot provide the resources to make this analysis. The intended audience for these online videos was pastors, missionaries, lay believers, or anyone who wishes to listen to the recorded material online. The average running time for the recorded videos was approximately 40 minutes, with half of it devoted to the Korean pastor's message and the other half to the interpreter's English rendition.

3.5 Procedures

Hale and Napier (2013) introduce seven basic guidelines that must be considered prior to conducting discourse analysis in interpreting research. They are summarized as follows:

    (1) Decide on the setting or domain you would like the discourse to come from

    (2) Decide on the genre

(3) Decide on the mode of interpreting

(4) Decide on the data to be analyzed

(5) Decide on the approach to be taken

(6) Decide on the theoretical framework

(7) Decide on what will be analyzed (p. 135).

Applying this to my research, the result would be as follows: (1) religious setting, (2) preacher-to-congregation church sermon, (3) short consecutive interpreting, (4) video recordings of authentic interpreted speech, uploaded on the church website, (5) top-down approach, (6) Garner's framework for sermon analysis, and (7) communicative styles of interpreted Christmas sermons.

Hale and Napier (2013) also point out that there are two main approaches to discourse analysis, "the top-down approach and the bottom-up approach":

> The top-down approach is a deductive-type approach… where the researcher has determined the structures or characteristics of the discourse that s/he wants to find… The bottom-up approach allows the data to tell the researcher what to analyze, without any preconceived ideas. This is a type of inductive approach (p. 121).

My study took the top-down approach relying on the features of Garner's analytic framework as the pre-determined set of codes to apply in my analysis. Blair (2015) explains that "codes used are defined by the researcher, which involves a priori codes drawn from research, reading or theory" (p. 19). The analytical tool was complemented with additional codes that reflected the characteristics of the interpreted sermonic discourse. Blair (ibid.) also points out that "any coding is likely to be a subjective and

interpretive process" (p. 17) and that the process and result of a research are "not the product of a heteronomous approach but the considered 'best try' of a situated, autonomous individual" (p. 18). My analysis was also conducted with the awareness of potential subjectivity and biases, and included a second coder to refine the coding results based on a general agreement. The codebook that was presented to the additional coder included instructions, definitions, and samples of each code. The second coder was a Ph.D. candidate in translation studies and was familiar with the sermonic discourse even though she was not a member of the church.

The discourse analysis of this present study referred to the process of qualitative data analysis proposed by Clark & Creswell (2010) as a step by step guidance: (1) data collection, (2) data preparation, (3) reading through data, (4) coding, (5) building findings, and (6) validating findings. For my study, the sermon video recordings were downloaded from the church website, it was then transcribed in both languages, Korean and English, in excel format. The discourse of both the preacher and the interpreter were compared utterance by utterance to detect any distinctive styles that the interpreter had incorporated in the renditions. Naturally, the unit of analysis for the present study is the English utterance of the interpreter, each separated as a single unit by the immediately preceding and following Korean utterance of the main preacher, as they are taking turns speaking to their respective audience. Despite the fact that there were errors detected in the interpreted discourse such as incorrect meaning, omissions, and slip-of-tongue, to name a few, these were ruled out of the analysis because the purpose of the present study is not to evaluate the quality of the interpreting, but rather examine the personal traits of communication style.

The completed analysis served as the basis for building and validating findings, and making a claim about the implications the individual's communicative style may have on the interpreter's role as intercultural communicator. The following sections will explore the result of the analysis of each communicative act. Based on the analysis, we will be able to witness that interpreters become visible in the communicative event by utilizing various stylistic resources deliberately and voluntarily, and displaying their idiosyncratic traits as intercultural communicators.

Chapter 4

Results and Discussion

The discourse analysis conducted in this study examines the language of the sermon interpreters to understand the communicative effect it generates as the interpreters perform their role as intercultural communicators. Malmström (2015) points out that "in attempting to engage sermon listeners interpersonally and in trying to be persuasive, preachers can, and do, make use of an array of different linguistic/communicative strategies" (p. 80). Sermon interpreters must also employ multiple strategies to cope with the linguistic and cultural barriers, and to make their message appealing. In order to investigate these strategies in the interpreted discourse Garner (2007)'s framework was deployed for data analysis. The five communicative acts are discourse markers (DM), embedded conversations (EC), restatement (RE for repetition, PA for paraphrase, EX for explication, EM for emphasis), questions (QU), and reference to other Scripture (BI, short for Bible), which will be examined in this order in the following sections. The frequency of each communicative style was checked to verify the pattern and preference the interpreter relied on to produce the interpreted message.

4.1 Communicative Acts: Discourse Markers

According to Fraser (1999), discourse markers "impose a relationship between some aspect of the discourse segment they are a part of… and some aspect of a prior discourse segment…" (p. 938). In other words, discourse markers contribute to maintaining coherence between discourse segments. The analysis of the two interpreters'

sermon discourse showed that both interpreters used a variety of discourse markers in various frequency.

Table 4.1. Discourse Markers Used by Interpreter A and B

Speaker	Interpreter A					Interpreter B				
Year of Sermon	2007	2010	2011	2013		2008	2009	2014	2016	
Duration of Sermon	46:57	48:00	44:12	39:22		47:05	52:14	35:25	35:50	
Total Number of Utterances	447	428	378	362		526	544	341	314	
					Average					Average
Frequency	123	81	64	103	92.8	118	152	98	61	107.25
Percentage	27.5	18.9	16.9	28.5	23.0	22.4	27.9	28.7	19.4	24.6

Table 4.1 presents the frequency and percentage of the discourse markers that appeared in each interpreter's utterances. Frequency refers to the total number of discourse markers used in the interpreted sermon. Percentage refers to the proportion of the usage of discourse markers compared to the total number of utterances in the rendered sermon. Discourse markers that were absent in the original preacher's message but were incorporated in the interpreted English message by the discretion of the interpreters were considered valid cases and were included in the total count. The results demonstrate that both Interpreter A and B utilized DMs to a somewhat similar extent (19.1% vs 21.8%). The discourse marker types employed by the interpreters include and, but, because, now, so, first, well, yes, at first, also, then, perhaps, maybe, no, etc. The highest frequency rate was that of "and" followed by "but" for both interpreters. It seems that both interpreters relied heavily on "and" because it is a convenient way to link discourse segments in the limited time to produce a target text. Below are examples of how this discourse marker "and" was used by the two interpreters.

38

Excerpt of Interpreter A (2013)

(1) If you really grab hold of this covenant of Christ, the true meaning of
Christ, Christ-mas, then all the forces of darkness in your workplace will run
away.

(2) *And* all the curses that are bringing disasters upon your businesses will
also be crumbled.

(3) *And* all the forces of darkness working in your family line that cause you
so much anxiety, that, too, will be broken down in Christ.

Excerpt of Interpreter B (2014)

(1) *And* this is the appearance of all the people who are seized their entire
lives by Satan.

(2) *And* when I was an assistant pastor I once went to evangelize in a college
and I saw something on the wall.

(3) *And* I think it was a poster that maybe a Christian had written.

(4) Nitche said that God is dead.

(5) *And* it is a quote that said, "God is dead," by Nitche.

(6) *And* then "Nitche is dead," by God.

(7) Who do you think is right?

(8) I laughed when I saw that.

The excerpts above show the excessive use of "and" to maintain coherence
throughout the sermon discourse. This would probably not be the common practice of
English speakers in natural conversations. However, given the fact that the utterances

above were produced in a few seconds, alternating with the preacher to address the audience, while considering the linguistic and cultural transformation of the message, it is a viable choice for the interpreters to rely on for meaning-making. The following are additional examples that show how discourse markers were deployed by each interpreter.

Excerpt of Interpreter A (2010)

(1) He came to save you that was lost in sins and darkness.

(2) *And* that was the promise of the Bible.

(3) *And* when you go back to your conscience, you will know which one is right.

(4) If you return to your own conscience, you will truly know which is correct.

(5) If you really see it to your own conscience, you will see that we are sinners.

(6) Even after being saved, we sin.

(7) We are children of God, and yet we have so many failures.

(8) *But* God said he would send the Christ so that we will never be destroyed.

(9) That is Christmas.

(10) *And* you need to hold on to this as your covenant.

Excerpt of Interpreter B (2009)

(1) God has planted in so many great blessings inside of our heads.

(2) People say that Einstein developed only about 10% or so of his brain.

(3) *And* we just live our lives and die after developing only 3 to 5% of our brain power.

(4)   Then in the same manner, God has given us so many spiritual blessings as well.

(5)   *And* God sent Jesus Christ to restore the light of Genesis 1:3.

(6)   You must restore this blessing today.

(7)   *And* the reason why God sent the Christ was to fulfill the three offices.

4.2 Communicative Acts: Embedded Conversations

There was very limited use of embedded conversations throughout the interpreting as outlined in Table 4.2. Contrast to discourse markers, interpreters can only insert these conversations when the original speaker's comments create the possibility to do so.

Table 4.2 Embedded Conversations Used by Interpreter A and B

Speaker	Interpreter A					Interpreter B				
Year of Sermon	2007	2010	2011	2013		2008	2009	2014	2016	
Duration of Sermon	46:57	48:00	44:12	39:22		47:05	52:14	35:25	35:50	
Total Number of Utterances	447	428	378	362		526	544	341	314	
					Average					Average
Frequency	3	2	0	0	1.3	3	1	2	0	1.5
Percentage	0.7	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.6	0.2	0.6	0.3	0.3

Below are the embedded conversation samples of the two interpreters.

Excerpt of Interpreter A

(2007) General Wallace, as you know, he says, *"why do we need to believe in Jesus?"*, so he began to write a book about that.

(2007) This man named Nietzsche, even though he was a pastor's son he says, *"Where is God?"*

(2010) The woman who had been bleeding, she had received her answer before she got healed. She says, *"As long as I touch his cloak, I will be healed."*

Excerpt of Interpreter B (2008)

(1) And later on even the President called Wanamaker.

(2) And he was appointed as one of the cabinet officials of America.

(3) And at that time Wanamaker rejected the offer.

(4) He said, *"I'm not learned."*

(5) He said *"I'm not educated, how can I stand as a cabinet official?"*

Although the instances are few in number, we can identify examples where the interpreters made effort to incorporate the dramatic effect of imaginary conversations, or in the cases above, monologues. These resources allow the interpreters to create a lively image of the scene being depicted and help the audience get more engaged and immersed in the ongoing discussions.

4.3 Communicative Acts: Restatement

Garner (2007) mentions three sub-types of restatement which are repetition, paraphrase, and negative contrast. There were no cases of negative contrast present in the discourse. However, the interpreted sermons in the present study displayed a high level of explication and emphasis, so they were added to the list of sub-types in the communicative act of restatement to present a full description of the communicative styles. Therefore, the four sub-types used for the present analysis are repetition (RE), paraphrase (PA), explication (EX), and emphasis (EM). RE refers to instances in the target utterance that repeated a word or phrase in verbatim or as a synonym not present in the source utterance, as in "*How severe and how great* is the spiritual problems of mankind? He promised the offspring of a woman would come to crush the head of the serpent" (Interpreter B, 2008). PA refers to instances in the target utterance that replaced

a word or phrase with similar meaning not identical to the source utterance, as in "when you *meet* Christ, that's the way to meet God" (Interpreter A, 2011). The original utterance was "when you *know* Christ." EX refers to instances in the target utterance that provided additional information not present in the source utterance, as in "You gave your confession of faith *through the Apostle's Creed*, and that part when it says conceived by the Holy Spirit, born of the virgin Mary" (Interpreter A, 2011). The original message did not explicitly mention the Apostle's Creed. EM refers to instances in the target utterance that included intensifiers not present in the source utterance, as in "And yet, God still created man in His *very* image" (Interpreter B, 2014). The emphasis was absent in the original message.

According to Tison (2016) sermon interpreters' strong sense of mission to deliver "a divine message to the congregation" motivates them to be more explicit in their messages through lexical addition, repetition, or rewording (p. 227). The following analysis supports this fact by indicating how the interpreters tend to communicate in an explicit manner. Table 4.3 outlines the result of the analysis.

Table 4.3. Restatement Used by Interpreter A and B

Speaker	Interpreter A					Interpreter B				
Year of Sermon	2007	2010	2011	2013		2008	2009	2014	2016	
Duration of Sermon	46:57	48:00	44:12	39:22		47:05	52:14	35:25	35:50	
Total Number of Utterances	447	428	378	362		526	544	341	314	
					Average					Average
RE Frequency	13	25	15	13	16.5	24	35	11	15	21.25
Percentage	2.9	5.8	4.0	3.6	4.1	4.6	6.4	3.2	4.8	4.7
PA Frequency	31	34	30	39	33.5	10	17	2	3	8
Percentage	6.9	7.9	7.9	10.8	8.4	1.9	3.1	0.6	1.0	1.6

EX Frequency	10	16	23	18	16.8	15	27	10	20	18
Percentage	2.2	3.7	6.1	5.0	4.3	2.9	5.0	2.9	6.4	4.3
EM Frequency	40	36	46	35	39.3	82	68	57	17	56
Percentage	8.9	8.4	12.2	9.7	9.8	15.6	12.5	16.7	5.4	12.6

Among the four sub-types of restatement, the most salient feature that distinguished the communicative styles of Interpreter A and B was paraphrase (8.4% for Interpreter A and 1.6% for Interpreter B). Emphasis was relied on heavily by both interpreters, even more so for Interpreter B (9.8% for Interpreter A and 12.6% for Interpreter B). This communicative act of restatement highlights the differences of the two interpreters' communication style. The intercultural communicators displayed personal preferences for the variety of resources available to them to restate what the original speaker had said. Among the four sub-types, the two most salient features that distinguish the two interpreters' communicative style (paraphrase for interpreter A and emphasis for interpreter B) will be illustrated below with some representative samples.

Excerpts of Interpreter A - paraphrase

(2007) But this Gospel *has so much power*, it could bring great change to an individual.

(2010) We would have to come home and *sit by the fire to be warm*, everywhere else it would be so cold.

(2013) Isaac was about to die, but instead of his death, the death of the ram, and what does this mean? That *through Christ all of our sins have can, have been forgiven.*

In the 2007 sample, Interpreter A replaces the original "amazing Gospel" with "has so much power," choosing to paraphrase the original utterance, making it clearer why the Gospel is considered amazing. In the 2010 sample, the original cultural term which literally means "warm oneself lying on the heated stone floor" was replaced with "sit by the fire." Since the focus of the original utterance was "how cold it was outside," the interpreter opted for a cultural adaptation rather than burden the listeners with an unfamiliar term. In the 2013 sample, the interpreter replaced the original "all our problems are resolved" with "all our sins have been forgiven," based on her understanding that the preacher was referring to the "sin problem." The samples above demonstrate how Interpreter A adopted an audience-oriented communication style by making the renditions more compatible to the audience's cultural background and clarifying the contents of the original message in order to create a more comprehensible discourse for the listeners.

Excerpts of Interpreter B - emphasis

(2008) And today, *on this very day*, may all the forces of darkness of curses and destruction in the future be *completely* bound.

(2009) And we call it the Septuagint because 70 people translated the Bible. And this is a *very* famous Bible.

(2016) No sword, no danger, no harm can come across all the people who are held *fast* in the hands of Christ.

The samples above show how Interpreter B amplifies the message by employing intensifiers to add emphasis to the original meaning. Although emphasis was also

deployed by Interpreter A in high frequency, Interpreter B deployed this style in greater

extent, displaying a communicative style that can be seen as preacher-oriented. In other

words, the interpreter is undertaking the role of the second preacher and taking the

initiative to underscore certain parts of the message considered worth emphasizing. The

result of these choices could promote the imprinting process in the minds of the listeners.

4.4 Communicative Acts: Questions

Questions embedded in the interpreted sermons are not for the audience to answer,

but rather to engage them in the discourse. Most of the answers to the questions are either

self-evident or designed to arouse interest in the listeners. The percentage of the

questioning was rather low, however when it was used it served as an effective

communicative device.

Table 4.4. Questions Used by Interpreter A and B

Speaker	Interpreter A					Interpreter B				
Year of Sermon	2007	2010	2011	2013		2008	2009	2014	2016	
Duration of Sermon	46:57	48:00	44:12	39:22		47:05	52:14	35:25	35:50	
Total Number of Utterances	447	428	378	362		526	544	341	314	
					Average					Average
Frequency	2	6	2	4	3.5	4	3	2	3	3
Percentage	0.4	1.4	0.5	1.1	0.9	0.8	0.6	0.6	1.0	0.7

Below are excerpts of the two interpreters' questions.

Excerpt of Interpreter A

(2013) Isaac was about to die, but instead of his death, the death of the ram.

And what does this mean? That through Christ all of our sins (have can), have

been forgiven.

(2010) *What does this mean?* In verse 14 it says, the Word became flesh and

made his dwelling among us, that means God became man.

(2010) *Why?* Because there are disasters that have no choice but to come, but

the Gospel blocks all of that.

(2010) *How about you? Have you discovered that?*

Excerpt of Interpreter B

(2009) He should have rightfully born in a palace. *Right?*

(2009) *Why?* Because I keep saying these strange things.

(2008) Everybody wants to live well off, nobody has a dream to live difficulty.

But why does that not happen? Because we do not enjoy the blessing of

Immanuel, we cannot do so.

The samples above reveal the interpreter's decision to pose a direct question to

the audience instead of maintaining the statement in the original message. For example,

in Interpreter A's 2013 excerpt, the original "and this means…" was transformed into an

inquiry in the interpreter's discourse as in "what does this mean?" Interpreter B also

opted to replace the original "why that does not happen is because…" with the question

"why does that not happen?" in the 2008 excerpt. The examples above illustrate the

intention of the interpreters to enhance the level of engagement of the congregation and

invite them into the ongoing conversation.

4.5 Communicative Acts: Reference to Other Scripture

The last communicative act to be discussed is the interpreter's style of referring to

the Bible. In most cases, the preacher's style was replicated: if it was a direct quote, the

official translation of the Bible would be mentioned; if it was a paraphrase, the interpreter would explain the contents in plain English. Table 4.5 illustrates the cases in which the interpreter chose to deviate from the original referring style.

Table 4.5. Reference to Bible Used by Interpreter A and B

Speaker	Interpreter A					Interpreter B				
Year of Sermon	2007	2010	2011	2013		2008	2009	2014	2016	
Duration of Sermon	46:57	48:00	44:12	39:22		47:05	52:14	35:25	35:50	
Total Number of Utterances	447	428	378	362		526	544	341	314	
					Average					Average
Frequency	0	0	1	0	0.3	0	1	0	0	0.25
Percentage	0	0	0.3	0	0.1	0	0.2	0	0	0

Below are excerpts of the two interpreter's deviation.

Excerpt of Interpreter A

(2011) The angel appeared to him and gave the message, don't be afraid, today *in the town of Bethlehem*, the savior has been born to you.

Excerpt of Interpreter B

(2009) 1Peter 2:9 says, "He has called us as royal priests that we may *declare the praises of Him who called us out (into darkness… out) of darkness* into His wonderful light.

In Interpreter A's sample, the preacher did not mention the place of birth. However, the interpreter chose to add "in the town of Bethlehem" which is a slightly modified version from the Luke 2:11, in the town of David. Interpreter B quotes the English version of 1Peter 2:9 instead of transferring the paraphrased version mentioned by the preacher. Although these samples are mere glimpses of the discourse produced by

the interpreters, it reflects their proactive role as co-preachers as they try to enhance the sermon message with their own Biblical knowledge.

4.6 Summary

The discussions above were based on the discourse analysis of the interpreters' sermon discourse, adopting the framework proposed by Garner. Although his five communicative acts are not an exclusive list of acts that are incorporated in producing a sermon, they represent the basic acts in a model sermon. Examining how the interpreters display distinctive communicative styles in each act, we can claim that these intercultural communicators are not invisible beings merely replicating the original speech, but communicators who have a voice and style who are undertaking the role of co-preacher in this religious communicative event. With this assertion, the research questions for this study will be answered below.

RQ1: What features characterize the sermon interpreter's communicative style, if any?

Among the five communicative acts, "restatement" contrasts the distinctive stylistic characteristics of the two interpreters the most. For instance, interpreter A draws on paraphrasing with higher frequency, aiming to produce a message that tends to be more audience-oriented. This style can enhance the understanding of the congregation, based on the additional information provided or contents modified to be more acceptable in the target culture. On the other hand, interpreter B shows a tendency to resort to emphasis more than interpreter A, deploying a preacher-oriented communicative style that highlights certain aspects of the original message that is deemed worth emphasizing or imprinting.

The features of restatement share commonalities with explicitation, which is considered "one of translation's universals" and is "understood as increased explicitness of a target text as compared to a source text" (Gumul, 2015, p. 156). Blum-Kulka (1986) asserted that explicitation was a "universal strategy inherent in the process of language mediation, as practiced by language learners, non-professional translators and professional translators alike" (p. 21). Due to the "pervasiveness of this textual phenomenon" (Murtisari, 2016, p. 64), a great deal of research has been conducted on this issue in translation studies (see Becher, 2010; Blum-Kulka, 1986; Klaudy & Károly, 2005; Konšalová, 2007; Pym, 2005). However, there is limited research regarding this phenomenon in interpreting studies, and even more so in the Korean-English context. Interestingly, Lee's (2014) study on explicitation in simultaneous interpreting examines the renditions of eight student interpreters and reveal contradictory results to the so-called "explicitation hypothesis" held by Blum-Kulka (1986). She states that implication was more frequent due to the intrinsic constraints posed on simultaneous interpreting. More research is needed to confirm or confront the claims pertaining to the explicitation phenomenon in interpreting practice. The analysis presented by my study contributes to further exploring how interpreters formulate the renditions by deploying explicitation; either in the form of repetition, paraphrase, explication, or emphasis.

As for the other communicative acts, the percentage was rather low to make a claim on any distinctive traits of the communicators. However, whenever a chance was created for the interpreters to get involved proactively, they seized the opportunity to promote coherency of the overall discourse utilizing various discourse markers, produced

a lively discussion employing embedded conversations, enhanced listeners' engagement relying on questions, and mentioned biblical reference when needed.

RQ2: What implication does the sermon interpreter's communicative style have on interpreters as intercultural communicators?

From the viewpoint of translation studies, it was understood that interpreters were perceived as 'invisible participants' (Wadensjö, 2008) or 'non-persons' who are individuals "present during the interaction but in some respects do not take the role either of performer or audience" (Goffman, 1990, p. 150). Despite the fact that these communicators "actually assume a very active and visible role as agents in interlingual/intercultural communication" (Angelelli, 2015, p. 215), they are not regarded as interlocutors who are involved in the co-construction of meaning by exercising his/her agency in the interaction (Angelelli, 2004). Fortunately, recent studies mostly in the community interpreting field have shed light on the proactive role of interpreters in the communication process and have acknowledged the problematic issue of interpreters' low occupational status.

The present study, conducted from the viewpoint of communication studies, posits that an interpreter is as much a communicator as the preacher is. They both share the sermon discourse and deliver it to their respective audience in their own unique communicative style, with an aim to be effective and persuasive. It could be claimed that the interpreter owns the sermon content as much as the preacher does, if only during the communicative event. This fact puts the interpreter on equal standing during the performance, and rightfully so since the task entrusted to him/her is to 'preach' in a way that can motivate, inspire, and transform the congregation. In that sense, the co-preaching

partnership could be labeled as an instance of 'symbiotic communication,' that which calls for interdependence and collaboration of the paired communicators to fulfill their mission in a successful manner.

Viewing the sermon interpreter's communicative style from the perspective of CAT, it can be said that the interpreter does not aim at creating a duplicated version of the pastor's discourse, but rather address the audience using divergence strategies that solidifies his/her identity as a legitimate "preacher." As a precondition, the interpreter must be granted the status and power to speak as an authoritative figure when s/he stands on the pulpit. This is important not only for the sake of the message itself, but for the overall success of the communicative event. Interpreters working alongside the pastors should not be subordinate participants, but equal partners who are empowered by the support and trust of the institution and its members. This also implies the importance of information sharing and assistance in the preparation stage prior to the communicative event, because when access is limited to pre-event preparations for the interpreters and the contents are withheld in the sole possession of the main speakers, a successful partnership cannot be guaranteed. When interpreters are motivated to speak in their own voice and are allowed to enjoy equal status during the communicative event as respectful intercultural communicators, there is a higher possibility that they will be able to provide communication service that meets the satisfaction of their audience and contributes to accomplishing successful communication that turns into a rich, rewarding, and replenishing intercultural experience for all participants.

Chapter 5

Conclusion

This study was designed to investigate intercultural communication styles of sermon interpreters working in religious settings, in particular, in a protestant church targeting an English-speaking audience. This is a unique type of interpreting that motivates the interpreter, usually a member of the church community, to perform as the second speaker, or second preacher, and create a sermon discourse that is effective for the target audience.

The analysis of the eight interpreted sermons performed by two interpreters show that these intercultural communicators communicate in distinct styles; interpreter A displaying audience-oriented features especially highlighted in paraphrasing, while interpreter B adopts a more preacher-oriented stance that is demonstrated in a high frequency of self-emphasis. However, this study was more than just detecting additions or modifications of the interpreter's sermon discourse in contrast to the preacher's message. It placed the focus on investigating how the interpreter performed their role as intercultural communicator and "preacher".

The interpreter's role can be best illustrated by referring to Erving Goffman's "theatrical metaphor" which posits that "in most of the situations in which you participate, you decide on a role and enact it, selecting the characterization you think will best fit the scene and facilitate the achievement of your goals" (Littlejohn & Foss, 2011, p. 102). Based on this point, it could be claimed that sermon interpreters should position themselves as "preachers" in church services, taking a proactive stance in reaching out to

the congregation with a message that is effective and persuasive. In this way, they would be performing as co-preachers and enacting their role as intercultural communicators who preach to their audience with an aim to achieve the communicative goal shared with the main pastor. They cannot maximize the communicative effect nor reach the communicative goal when they are relegated to "invisible beings."

Despite the limitations of this study that will be discussed below, the results of this research have contributed to enhancing understanding of the communicative styles of sermon interpreters in intercultural communication situations. Currently, there is a lack of research on sermon interpreting in the Korean-English context, and those that have been conducted are not related to individual communicative styles. The present study produced meaningful results based on a comparative discourse analysis of two interpreters working for the same pastor, interpreting sermon messages that were produced for the same occasion of Christmas. It is hoped that future research will build on the current findings and further promote our understanding of the interpreter's role as intercultural communicators in various intercultural communication settings.

5.1 Study Limitations

There are several limitations to this study. First of all, this is a case-study that provides an analysis on the sermons produced by one evangelical Korean church with two sermon interpreters serving as intercultural communicators. The limited results cannot serve as a basis for any generalizations, but presents some noteworthy features of sermon interpreting, as well as religious interpreting in general and intercultural communication in the larger context. Second, the communicative styles discussed in this study may only be temporary glimpses of what is present in the given discourse. A

person's communicative style may not remain consistent but rather fluctuate in diverse circumstances. Some external factors that may alter the communicative style are feedback from the congregation or professional training at an accredited institution. Even in the present study, the analysis showed that the interpreter's stylistic preferences didn't always remain constant from sermon to sermon. Third, since the present analysis focused on features pertaining to Garner's framework only, other elements in the discourse worth discussing may have been neglected. It would be advisable to conduct multiple analyses from different perspectives to gain an overall understanding of how a communicative style can be portrayed. Fourth, the data may have been biased due to the fact that the interpreters have been long time members of the church and have known the Pastor and his speaking style for many years. The results may have been much different if the interpreters were not members of the church or were not Christian. However, considering the fact that church interpreting is frequently performed by insiders, the artifacts used in this case-study should not be perceived as exceptional but rather typical incidents that reflect common practice. Fifth, the non-verbal elements such as voice volume, speed, intonation, gestures, etc. were not included in the analysis despite the fact that they may contribute greatly to the communicative effect. Kress (2009/2011) highlights how the multimodal resources pertaining to sound such as intonation, pitch and pitch variation, vowel quality and length, to name a few, can enhance verbal communication. For instance, in English, "the contours of intonation form *intonation units*, which frame semiotic entities, *information units*" (p. 55). The appropriate use of intonation can facilitate communication by producing "chunkings of meaning similar to paragraphs in writing" (ibid., p. 55). Further exploration of different modes of communication may

promote our understanding of the communicative acts taking place in religious settings. The limitations mentioned here should be incorporated in future studies to deepen our understanding of intercultural communication in religious settings.

5.2 Suggestions for Future Research

In order to expand our knowledge on intercultural communication in religious settings, the current research should extend its boundaries to include interpreter-mediated situations for multiple churches, various denominations, and different religions. The interdisciplinary work of intercultural communication studies, interpreting and translation studies, and religious communication studies will benefit those who are interested in learning the communicative nature and mechanism of this unique intersecting field.

Also to be considered is the non-verbal modes that contribute to the exchanges in intercultural communication. Jewitt (2009/2011) indicated that "language is part of a multimodal ensemble" and that multimodality "proceeds on the assumption that representation and communication always draw on a multiplicity of modes, all of which have the potential to contribute equally to meaning" (p. 14). For instance, gaze, gesture and posture are considered to support speech (ibid.). The study of these non-verbal aspects in sermon interpreting and religious intercultural communication could provide further evidence in the communicative role of participants and their communicative styles.

Appendix

<div align="center">Codebook</div>

1. Purpose of research: This research is conducted to investigate communicative styl es of sermon interpreters serving in religious settings.

2. Methodology : Discourse Analysis, special emphasis on stylistic analysis

3. Data: 8 Christmas sermons, interpreted by two interpreters (4 sermons each)

4. Analytical Framework: Garner's framework (2007)

No.	Communicative Act	Description	Sub-types or samples
1	**DM** Discourse markers	discourse markers contribute to maintaining coherence between discourse segments	and, but, because, now, so, first, well, yes, at first, also, then, perhaps, maybe, and no, in other words, right now, of course, simply put, instead, probably, just, etc.
2	**EC** Embedded conversations	A statement in ST is transformed into an embedded conversation in TT to produce a dramatic effect for the listeners	Ex The woman who had been bleeding, she had received her answer before she got healed. She says, **"As long as I touch his cloak, I will be healed."**
3	Restatement	Restatement is used to "impress the point upon the mind and memory" of the listener and can be realized in multiple ways	1) **RE**, Repetition - repeat a word or phrase, that has not been repeated in ST Ex) **How severe and how great** is the spiritual problems of mankind? He promised the offspring of a woman would come to crush the head of the serpent. (2008) 2) **PA**, Paraphrase – replace a word or phrase with a similar expression, but not identical with that of ST Ex) But this Gospel **has so much power**, it could bring great change to an individual. (2007) 3) **EX**, Explication –

			provide additional information that is not in ST Ex) That's the very first Gospel **proclamation**. (2011) 4) **EM**, Emphasis – add intensifiers that are not present in ST Ex) God knows mankind **so very** well. (2009)
4	**QU** Questions	Questions embedded in the interpreted sermons are not for the audience to answer, but rather to engage them in the discourse. Most of the answers to the questions are either self-evident or designed to arouse interest in the listeners.	Ex) Isaac was about to die, but instead of his death, the death of the ram. **And what does this mean?** That through Christ all of our sins (have can), have been forgiven. (2013)
5	**BI** Reference to Bible	A direct quotation of the Bible in ST is paraphrased in TT, or a paraphrase in ST is modified in TT	Ex) The angel appeared to him and gave the message, don't be afraid, today **in the town of Bethlehem**, the savior has been born to you. (2011)

5. Instructions

   (1) Compare ST and TT and detect stylistic features that pertain to one of the sub-types (highlighted in red; **DM, EC, RE, PA, EX, EM, QU, BI**) presented in Garner's framework that is NOT PRESENT in the ST

   (2) Type in the information in the "Style" column, choosing one of the highlighted terms

   (3) In cases where you are in doubt, highlight the box in yellow for discussions with coder 1

   (4) After the discussion, the highlighted items must be re-coded

References

A. F. C. (2014, August 12). Why South Korea is so distinctively Christian. *The Economist*. Retrieved from http://www.economist.com/blogs/economist-explains/2014/08/economist-explains-6

Aijmer, K. (2002). *English discourse particles*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Anderson, R. B. W. (1976/2002). Perspectives on the role of interpreter. In Richard W. Brislin (Ed.), *Translation: Applications and research* (pp. 208-228). New York: Gardner Press. According to Pöchhacker, F. & Shlesinger, M (Eds.), *The interpreting studies reader* (pp. 208-217). New York: Routledge.

Angelelli, C. (2003). The interpersonal role of the interpreter in cross-cultural communication: Survey of conference, court, community and medical interpreters in the US, Canada and Mexico. In L. Brunette, G. Bastin, I. Hemlin, & H. Clarke (Eds.), *The Critical Link 3: Interpreters in the community: Selected papers from the third international conference on interpreting in legal, health and social service settings* (pp. 289-302). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Angelelli, C. (2004). *Revisiting the Interpreter's Role: A Study of Conference, Court, and Medical Interpreters in Canada, Mexico, and United States*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Angelelli, C. (2015). Invisibility. In F. Pöchhacker (Ed.), *Routledge encyclopedia of interpreting studies* (pp. 214-214). New York: Routledge.

Antonini, R. (2011). Natural translator and interpreter. In Y. Gambier, & L. van

    Doorslaer (Eds.), *Handbook of translation studies* (Vol. 2, pp. 102-104).

    Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Balci, A. (2008). *Interpreter Involvement in Sermon Interpreting*. (Minor dissertation,

    Rovira I Virgili University, Tarragona, Spain).

Becher, V. (2010). Abandoning the notion of translation-inherent explicitation:

    Against a dogma of translation studies. *Across Languages and Cultures, 11*(1),

    1-28.

Besien, F. V., & Meuleman, C. (2008). Style differences among simultaneous

    interpreters: A pilot study. *The Translator, 14*(1), 135-155.

    doi.org/10.1080/13556509.2008.10799252

Blair, E. (2015). A reflexive exploration of two qualitative data coding techniques.

    Journal of Methods and Measurement in the Social Sciences, 6(1), 14-29.

Blum-Kulka, S. (1986). Shifts of cohesion and coherence in translation. In J. House

    & S. Blum-Kulka (Eds.), *Interlingual and intercultural communication:*

    Discourse and cognition in translation and second language acquisition

    studies (pp.17-35). Tubingen: Gunter Narr Verlag, 17-35.

Byrne, D. (1971). *The attraction paradigm*. New York: Academic Press.

Cheng, M. S., & Johnstone, B. (2002). Reasons for reason-giving in a public-opinion

    survey. *Argumentation, 16*, 401-420.

Chung, Y. (2015). A postcolonial reading of the Great Commission (Matt 28:16-20)

    with a Korean myth. *Theology Today, 72*(3), 276-288.

Clark, V. L. P., & Creswell, J. W. (2010). *Understanding Research: A Consumer's Guide*. Boston: Merrill.

Craddock, F. (1985). *Preaching*. Nashville: Abingdon Press.

Dam, H. V. (2010). Consecutive interpreting. In Y. Gambier, & L. van Doorslaer (Eds.), *Handbook of translation studies* (Vol. 1, pp. 75-79). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Davies, E. E. (2012). Translation and intercultural communication: Bridges and barriers. In C. B. Paulston, S. F. Kiesling, & E. S. Rangel (Eds.), *The handbook of intercultural discourse and communication* (pp. 367-388). West Sussex: Wiley Blackwell.

Downie, J. (2014). Towards a homiletic of sermon interpreting. *Journal of the Evangelical Homiletics Society, 14*(2), 62-69.

Duff, P. A. (2008). *Case study research in applied linguistics*. New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Francesco, S. S. (2012). Using corpus evidence to discover style in interpreters' performances. In F. S. Sergio, & C. Falbo (Eds.), *Breaking ground in corpus-based interpreting studies* (pp. 211-230). Viena: Peter Lang.

Fraser, B. (1999). What are discourse markers? *Journal of Pragmatics, 31*, 931-952.

Gallois, C., Ogay, T., & Giles, H. (2005). Communication Accommodation Theory: A look back and a look ahead. In W. B. Gudykunst (Ed.), *Theorizing about intercultural communication* (pp. 121-148). London: Sage.

Garner, M. (2007). Preaching as a communicative event: A discourse analysis of sermons by Robert Rollock (1555-1599). *Reformation & Renaissance Review, 9*(1), 45-70.

Gentile, A., Ozolins, U., & Vasilakakos, M. (1996). *Liaison interpreting: A handbook*. Victoria: Melbourne University Press.

Giannoutsou, M. Z. (2014). *Kirchendolmetschen: Interpretieren oder Transformieren?* Berlin: Frank & Timme.

Giles, H. (1973). Accent mobility: A model and some data. *Anthropological Linguistics, 15*(2), 87-109.

Giles, H., Mulac, A., Bradac. J., & Johnson, P. (1987). Speech accommodation theory. In M. McLaughlin (Ed.), *Communication yearbook 10* (pp. 13-48). CA: Sage.

Giles, H., & Ogay, T. (2007). Communication Accommodation Theory. In B. B. Whaley, & W. Samter (Eds.), *Explaining communication: Contemporary theories and exemplars* (pp. 293-310). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Gillham, B. (2000). *Case study research methods*. London: Continuum.

Goffman, E. (1990). *The presentation of self in everyday life*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

Gudykunst, W. B. (2002). Intercultural communication theories. In W. B. Gudykunst, & B. Mody (Eds.), Handbook of international and intercultural communication, (2nd ed.) (pp. 183-205). London: Sage.

Gumul, E. (2015). Explicitation. In F. Pöchhacker (Ed.), *Routledge encyclopedia of interpreting studies* (p. 156). New York: Routledge.

Hale, S. (2002). How faithfully do court interpreters render the style of non-English speaking witnesses' testimonies? A data-based study of Spanish-English bilingual proceedings. *Discourse Studies, 4*(1), 25-47.

Hale, S. B. (2015). Community interpreting. In F. Pöchhacker (Ed.), *Routledge encyclopedia of interpreting studies* (pp. 65-69). New York: Routledge.

Hale, S., & Napier, J. (2013). *Research methods in interpreting: A practical resource*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.

Harris, B. (1990). Norms in interpretation. *Target, 2*(1), 115-119.

Hartford Institute for Religion (2018, August 4). Megachurch definition [Website post]. Retrieved from

http://www.hartfordinstitute.org/megachurch/definition.html

Hertog, E. (2010). Community interpreting. In Y. Gambier, & L. van Doorslaer (Eds.), *Handbook of translation studies* (Vol. 1, pp. 49-54). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Hild, A. (2015). Religious settings. In F. Pöchhacker (Ed.), *Routledge encyclopedia of interpreting studies* (pp. 344-346). New York: Routledge.

Hild, A. (2016). Constructing the profile of voluntary interpreters in religious settings. In R. Antonini, L. Cirillo, L. Rossato, & I. Torresi (Eds.), *Non-professional interpreting and translating in institutional settings*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Hokkanen, S. (2016). *To serve and to experience: An autoethnographic study of simultaneous church interpreting* (Doctoral dissertation, University of

Tampere, Tampere, Finland). Retrieved from

https://tampub.uta.fi/handle/10024/99865

Hokkanen, S. (2017). Experiencing the interpreter's role: Emotions of involvement

and detachment in simultaneous church interpreting. *Translation Spaces, 6(1)*,

62-78. http://dx.doi.org/10.1075/ts.6.1.04hok

Immink, G. (2004). Homiletics: the current debate. *International Journal of*

Practical Theology, 8(1), 98-121.

Jewitt, C. (2009/2011). An introduction to multimodality. In C. Jewitt (Ed.), *The*

Routledge handbook of multimodal analysis (pp. 14-27). New York: Routledge,

14-27.

Johnstone, B. (1991). Individual style in an American public-opinion survey:

Personal performance and the ideology of referentiality. *Language in Society,*

20(4), 557-576.

Johnstone, B. (2008). *Discourse analysis* (2nd ed.). MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Jones, W. P. & Kottler, J. A. (2006). *Understanding Research: Becoming a*

Competent and Critical Consumer. New Jersey: Pearson.

Karlik, J. (2010). Interpreter-mediated scriptures: Expectation and performance.

Interpreting, 12(2), 160-185.

Kirimi, I. H., Peter, M. K., & Njogu, W. (2012). Misinterpretations in English-

Kimuthambi church sermons. *English Linguistics Research, 1*(2), 88-101.

Klaudy, K. & Károly, K. (2005). Implicitation in translation: Empirical evidence for

operational asymmetry in translation. *Across Language and Cultures, 6*(1), 13-

28.

Knapp-Potthoff, A., & Knapp, K. (1986). Interweaving two discourses: The difficult

    task of the non-professional interpreter. In J. House, & S. Blum-Kulka (Eds.),

    Interlingual and Intercultural Communication. Tübingen: Gunter Narr, 151-168.

Konšalová, P. (2007). Explicitation as a universal in syntactic de/condensation.

    Across Languages and Cultures, 8(1), 17-32.

Kress, G. (2009/2011) What is mode? In C. Jewitt (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of*

    multimodal analysis (pp. 54-67). New York: Routledge.

Lee, J. (2014). Explicitation and implicitation in simultaneous interpreting.

    Interpretation and Translation, 16(1), 105-128.

Lie, S. (2018). How best to evangelize to nonbelievers: Cultural persuasion in

    American and Chinese Indonesian evangelical Christian discourse on relational

    evangelism. *Journal of International and Intercultural Communication, 11(1)*,

    42-57.

Littlejohn, S. W., & Foss, K. A. (2011). *Theories of human communication*, 10th ed.

    Illinois: Waveland Press, Inc.

Malmström, H. (2015). The "other" voice in preaching: Intertextual form and

    function in contemporary English sermonic discourse. *Journal of*

    Communication and Religion, 38(2), 80-99.

Mason, I. Dialogue interpreting. In Baker, M., & Saldanha, G. (Eds.), *Routledge*

    encyclopedia of translation studies (pp. 81-84). New York: Routledge.

Merlini, R. (2015). Dialogue interpreting. In F. Pöchhacker (Ed.), *Routledge*

    encyclopedia of interpreting studies (pp. 102-107). New York: Routledge.

Murtisari, E. T. (2016). Explicitation in translation studies: The journey of an elusive
concept. *Translation & Interpreting, 8*(2), 64-81.

Musyoka, E. N., & Karanja, P. N. (2014). Problems of interpreting as a means of
communication: A study on interpretation of Kamba to English Pentecostal
church sermon in Machakos Town, Kenya. International Journal of Humanities
and Social Science, 4(5), 196-207.

Neuliep, J. W. (2015). *Intercultural communication: A contextual approach.* L.A. &
London: Sage.

Odhiambo, K., & Musyoka, E. N., & Matu, P. M. (2013). The impact of consecutive
interpreting on church sermons: A study of English to Kamba interpretation in
Machakos town, Kenya. *International Journal of Academic Research in
Business and Social Sciences, 3*(8), 189-204.

Paltridge, B. (2012). *Discourse analysis*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.

Park, J. (2010). An analysis of pastor Sunhee Gwark's sermons by using hermeneutic
methods of practical theology for improving sermon paradigm. (Doctoral
dissertation, Liberty Theological Seminary, Lynchburg, Virginia).

Piller, I. (2012). Intercultural communication: An overview. In C. B. Paulston, S. F.
Kiesling, & E. S. Rangel (Eds.), *The handbook of intercultural discourse and
communication* (pp. 3-18). West Sussex: Wiley Blackwell.

Pöchhacker, F. (2004). *Introducing interpreting studies* (2nd ed.). New York:
Routledge.

Pöchhacker, F. (2010). Interpreting. In Y. Gambier, & L. van Doorslaer (Eds.),

    Handbook of translation studies (Vol. 1, pp. 153-157). Amsterdam: John

    Benjamins.

Pöllabauer, S. (2015). Role. In F. Pöchhacker (Ed.), *Routledge encyclopedia of*

    interpreting studies (pp. 355-360). New York: Routledge.

Punch, K. (1998). *Introduction to social research: Quantitative and qualitative*

    approaches. CA: Sage.

Pym, A. (2005). Explaining explicitation. In K. Károly & Á. Fóris (Eds.), *New trends*

    in translation studies: In honour of Kinga Klaudy (pp. 29-43). Budapest:

    Akademiai Kiado.

Reinard, J. C. (1998). *Introduction to Communication Research*. Boston: McGraw-

    Hill.

Rose-Atkinson, L. (1997). *Sharing the word: Preaching in the roundtable church*.

    Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.

Roy, C. B. (2002). The problem with definitions, descriptions, and the role

    metaphors of interpreters. In F. Pöchhacker, & M. Shlesinger (Eds.), *The*

    interpreting studies reader (pp. 345-353). New York: Routledge.

Saldanha, G., & O'Brien, S. (2013). *Research methodologies in translation studies*.

    Manchester: St. Jerome.

Schneider, P. D. (1992). Interpreter/conciliator, an evolving function. In E. F. Losa

    (Ed.), *Frontiers: Proceedings of the 33rd Annual Conference of the American*

    Translators Association (pp. 57-64). Medford, NJ: Learned Information.

Schott J., & Henley, A. (1996). *Culture, Religion and Childbearing in a Multiracial Society*. Edinburgh: Butterworth – Heinemann.

Setton, R. (2010). Conference interpreting. In Y. Gambier, & L. van Doorslaer, *Handbook of translation studies* (Vol. 1, pp. 66-74). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Straniero Sergio, F. (1998). Notes on cultural mediation. *The Interpreters' Newsletter* 8, 151-168.

Stubbs, M. (1983). *Discourse analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Taft, R. (1981). The role and personality of the mediator. In S. Bochner (Ed.), *The mediating person* (pp. 53-88). Cambridge Mass.: Schenkman Publishing Company.

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 33-53). CA: Wadsworth.

Tison, A. B. (2016). *The interpreter's involvement in a translated institution: A case study of sermon interpreting* (Doctoral dissertation, Rovira I Virgili University, Tarragona, Spain). Retrieved from https://www.tdx.cat/bitstream/handle/10803/378648/Thesis.pdf?sequence=1

Verdonk, P. (2002). *Stylistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Vigouroux, C. B. (2010). Double-mouthed discourse: Interpreting, framing, and participant roles. *Journal of Sociolinguistics, 14*(3), 341-369.

Vinay, J. P., & Darbelnet, J. (1995). Comparative stylistics of French and English: A

    methodology for translation. (J. C. Sager & M. J. Hamel, Trans.). Amsterdam:

    John Benjamins.

Wadensjö, C. (2008). In and off the show: Co-constructing 'invisibility' in an

    interpreter-mediated talk show interview. *Meta,* 53(1), 184-203.

Watt, J. M. (2012). Religion as a domain of intercultural discourse. In C. B. Paulston,

    S. F. Kiesling, & E. S. Rangel (Eds.), *The handbook of intercultural discourse*

    and communication (pp. 482-495). West Sussex: Wiley Blackwell.

Wilson, P. S. (1995). *The practice of preaching*. Nashville: Abingdon Press.

Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case study research: Design and methods* (4th ed.). London: Sage.

Curriculum Vitae

June Lee was born in April 1975 in Busan, Republic of Korea. She is a lecturer and freelance interpreter and translator. She graduated from Hankuk University of Foreign Studies, Graduate School of Interpretation and Translation with a Ph.D. in Interpretation and Translation Studies. After graduation, she lectured at Pusan National University teaching Korean-English interpretation and translation, and currently is teaching at Korea Maritime and Ocean University. Since 2013, she served as simultaneous interpreter in national ceremonies and interpreted for the President of the Republic of Korea. As a translator, she created English subtitles for Korean movies submitted to Cannes Film Festival. In the Johns Hopkins M.A. in Communication program, she has focused her studies on intercultural communication, communication theory, and persuasion.