Strategies and Errors in Interpreting Conversational Implicatures of Political Discourse

Thaher M. T. Gharabeh

Doctoral School in Humanities, Social Sciences and Law, Granada University, Spain

Thaher0gh@gmail.com

Abstract

This study aims to examine Barik's (1971) categorization, as strategies or errors, in the interpretation of implicatures in English>Arabic and Arabic>English political discourses and, further, to find the effect of employing the categorization on the original message's recovery. Qualitative content analysis methodology is used in this study. Occurrences of Barik's (1971) categorization were collected to be examined. The study finds that interpreters' use of Barik's (1971) categorization in implicature interpreting is as errors rather than strategies in English>Arabic interpretation, but as strategies rather than errors in Arabic>English interpretation. The use of errors can be attributed to a lack of source message comprehension. Substitution was the dominant strategy in English>Arabic implicature interpreting; gross phrasing substitutions, which entail differences in meaning, were the dominant type of substitution. Misinterpreting implicature includes a partial or total loss of the source message. However, instances of coining unstated, unintended meanings were detected, which does not only lose the communicative function but also misleads the audience.

1. INTRODUCTION

Simultaneous interpreting (SI) is a cognitively demanding task that comprises a complex of processes. In their consideration of SI, Dong & Li (2020, p.716) state that "interpreting is a complex bilingual task, placing high demands on both language control (i.e., source language not interfering in target language production) and processing control (i.e., multi-tasking carried out in concert under time pressure)." Also, in the SI process, a number of processes, "listening, comprehension, conversion of a message from one language to another, speech production, and self-monitoring," are executed at the same time (Hervais-Adelman & Babcock, 2019, p. 1).

In order to overcome SI challenges, interpreters use certain interpreting strategies. Researchers define a strategy as a method to enhance interpreters' performance or to prevent or solve a problem related to the SI process (Dong et al., 2019; Alfadda et al., 2024). However, interpreting strategies do not include implicatures' interpreting so far.

Grice (1975, p. 3), creator of the theory of implicature and the cooperative principle (with its namesake Gricean maxims), defines conversational implicature as "a set of non-logical inferences that contain conveyed messages that are meant without being part of what is said in the strict sense." According to Kroger (2018, p. 142), "Grice proposed that there are certain default assumptions about how conversation works. He stated these in the form of a general Cooperative Principle and several specific sub-principles, which he labeled 'maxims'." Moreover, Setton (1999, p. 10) states that "the interpreter must form a representation of the speaker's intended meaning at one remove from linguistic forms, "which asserts the importance of conveying implicated meaning as part of the original message. Many recent studies have investigated implicatures in political discourse. Researchers like Al-Qaderi & Alduais (2019); Lazim (2020) in Arabic political discourse; Rosyida & Asror (2019); Asmar & Kusumaningrum (2021) in Indonesian political discourse; and Ngozimad & Okpal (2020) in Nigerian political discourse; however, investigating implicatures was limited to the function and the intended meaning of implicatures without regard to their interpretation.

Barik (1971) examined interpreters' departure from the original message and categorized the departures into three categories: omission, addition, and substitution, which he considered errors rather than strategies. However, Matsushita (2019, p. 85) considers Barik's (1971) categories as "conceptually broad enough to cover the main strategies identified by prior research on news translation."

In Moser-Mercer's (1996) consideration of interpreting quality, the researcher considers quality as related to the interpreter's role, which should not be only to provide a complete and accurate rendition that does not distort the original message but also to capture extralinguistic information from the speaker (as cited in Gabrych, 2020, p. 36). Moreover, Pöchhacker (2001) considers interpreters' products to provide access to the original message. All in all, the interpreter's product can be a clue to the interpreter's performance, which in turn determines the quality of the interpretation.

1.1. Political Discourse Criticality

Baranov and Kazakevich (1991) defines political discourse as "the totality of all speech acts used in political discussions, as well as rules of public policy, sanctified by tradition and proven by experience" (as cited in Valerevna and Rakhmatovna, 2022, p. 88). Usmonove (2018) discusses political discourse's special function in forming intentions and as an instrument for political power. Such functions would increase the importance of interpreting political discourse due to its criticality.

The concept of 'criticality' is not often used in interpreting studies. However, Bunch (2001) defines criticality as "the level of harm associated with performing the task poorly," as cited in Chen (2017, p. 645). In this sense, the criticality of political discourse interpretation can be defined as the level of harm associated with interpreting political discourse poorly.

Political discourse interpreting is naturally more critical than other discourse interpreting. That is to say, a political speaker is, usually, a high-profile person who considers topics related to and touches the lives of a great number of people.

Political discourse interpretation is critical, with a high probability of harm, for the following reasons:

1. The speaker's high profile makes his words quite weighty.
2. The topics considered in political discourse are universal and have an effect on public opinions, future events and plans, peace and conflict, solidarity, and promises.
3. The number of audiences, which can be millions of people, locally or internationally.

4. The political speakers tend to have different styles, speeds, and quoting references according to the context of the discourse to serve their intentions, which burdens interpreters.

1.2.Risk

Gile (2021, p. 57) adopted the 'risk' definition as "the probability of an undesired outcome as a consequence of an action." Pym (2020, p. 448) introduced three types of risk:

1. Credibility risk: this type of risk is related to the trust relationship between the involved parties in communication. The risk in this type is losing trust.
2. Uncertainty risk: the risk in this type is in interpreters' ability to handle certain items in source text.
3. Communicative risk: this risk is related to the desired communicative function not being fulfilled.

The first type of risk is related to the involved parties, who are the speaker, the audience, the employer, and the interpreter. However, the center of trust relations is the interpreter; that is, the trust relations are between the speaker and the interpreter, the audience and the interpreter, and the employer and the interpreter. Any undermining of trust between the interpreter and other parties would affect the interpreter. The second uncertainty risk constitutes a reason for credibility risk. Also, uncertainty risk can lead to communicative risk, which in turn can lead to credibility risk. However, the study of risk would require a certain frame to be investigated further. In other words, the assumption that the study of risk in different types of discourse would lead to the same results may be unreliable. For that reason, this research is concerned with political discourse. Austin (2013, p. 751) defines communicative function as "the purpose of gestural, vocal, and verbal acts intended to convey information to others." In this sense, political discourse's communicative function is limited to speakers' communicative purposes, whether explicated or implicated, which signifies the importance of implicatures' interpreting. Fulfilling speakers' communicative function plays a key role in deciding how successful or unsuccessful interpretations are. In other words, when a strategy is employed, success can be a relative issue since the difference between impressive success and epic failure can be a partial loss in source discourse or meaning. Such loss is possible in Barik's (1971) categories since all of the categories suggest a change to the original discourse, whether by substituting parts, omitting parts, or adding parts to the original discourse. Such changes should be approached as a failure or a success, considering implicatures' interpretation. The communicative function fulfillment can provide a clue on interpreters' comprehension and intention, since Bartlomiejczyk's (2006) considers comprehension and intention as conditions for strategy recognition.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Conversational implicatures' study has attracted many researchers around the world. However, the pragmatic investigation of conversational implicature in political discourse got the most attention from the researchers; Khairat (2018) aimed to explain and describe the forms of conversational implicature. Moreover, Guțu (2024) investigated the politicians' strategic use of implicatures as a tool to influence public perception. Lazim (2020) asserted the validity of conversational implicature in performing a number of functions, thus making the talk more effective and persuasive.

In translating conversational implicatures, Cheikh & Rabab'ah (2024) aimed to assess the ability of BA Arab EFL students to translate implicatures; the study emphasises the

necessity of training Arab students on comprehending and interpreting implicatures. Further, Sanatifar (2016) asserted the difficulty of translating conversational implicatures in political discourse; the researcher concluded that explication of implicatures reduces the cognitive effort of the readers. However, on the simultaneous interpretation of conversational implicatures, a study by Abuarrah (2016) found in his empirical study that misinterpreting implicatures in political discourse may produce a different message with different implicatures. Also, considering political discourse, Gharabeh (2018) recommended a deeper understanding of the pragmatic function of conversational implicatures.

Although the use of conversational implicatures in political discourse and its impact are evident, there is a clear scarcity in the investigation of conversational implicatures' interpreting strategies. To the researcher's knowledge, interpreting conversational implicatures' strategies has not been addressed before. This article aims to fill a part of this gap by adhering to Barik's (1971) categorization.

2.1. Why Barik's (1971) strategies?

In Barik's (1971) examination of interpreters' departure from the original message, he considered omission, substitution, or addition as errors rather than strategies. However, Korpal and Stachowiak-Szymczak (2019) argue that Barik's (1971) categorization is an error when it causes a significant deviation of meaning from the source text or discourse and causes damage to communication. Korpal and Stachowiak-Szymczak's (2019) view stands at a reasonable position where Barik's categorization can be a strategy or an error. Moreover, researchers like Vančura (2017), regarding Croatian language, Matsushita (2019), regarding Japanese language, and Mohamad (2023), regarding Arabic language, adopted Barik's categorization for the same reason. Next, Barik's categorization (1971) is introduced.

2.2. Substitution

Researchers define substituting in different ways. One of which is paraphrasing or repeating interpreted segments instead of interpreting current segments to avoid embarrassment in cases of miscomprehension (Dong et al., 2019; Kirchhoff, 2002). However, according to Al-Khanji et. al. (2000, p. 555), substitution is employed "when interpreters use a lexical item in the target language that does not communicate the desired concept, nor does it basically retain the meaning of the item in the source language." Both of the definitions consider substitution as a strategy to yield in cases of miscomprehension and to retain the desired meaning of the original message. However, making a substitution in implicatures' interpreting cases requires preserving the implicated messages as part of the original message.

Table 1. *Barik's (1971) classification of substitution*

	Substitution type	Source of error	Impact on source message
1.	Mild semantic error	Inaccuracy of interpreting a lexical item	Slightly distort the intended meaning
2.	Gross semantic error	Mistranslating a lexical item due to misunderstanding or false reference	Substantially affect the original message

3.	Mild phrasing change	Interpreter changes the structure of a sentence	The gist of the original remains
4.	Substantial phrasing change	A marked phrasing by the interpreter	The overall gist remains
5.	Gross phrasing change	Interpreter does not comprehend what is said, mistranslation, and making up an interpretation.	Considerable difference in meaning

In Jaradat (2010), Arab interpreters use substitution to facilitate audience understanding; however, in other cases, substitution changes the source political discourse meaning. Moreover, Bozok & Kıncal (2022) use Barik's (1971) categorization to analyze substitution occurrences in Turkish-English language pairs. In their analysis, the researchers find that the fifth type, gross phrasing change, has the highest occurrence. Jaradat (2010) and Bozok & Kıncal (2022) assert the idea of having a difference in meaning in the interpretation product. Such a product may affect the quality of interpretation as it may distort the original message.

2.3. Omission

According to Ahmed (2018, p. 474), "there is much controversy on the definition of omission itself, its causes, the cases where it can be acceptable or unacceptable, and the adjectives describing the quality of the product." In the same sense, omission is treated by researchers in different ways: as a mistake, a strategy that improves quality, or as a strategy to resort to in special cases. As a mistake, Altman (1994) considers omissions as errors that lead to a loss or at least a slight change in information. From another point of view, omission is regarded as a strategy by many researchers (Zhong, 2020; Pym, 2008). In Zhong's (2020) study, he concludes that "there is strong evidence showing that the student interpreters use omission as a strategy not only to respond to emergencies but also to improve the quality of their performance and later to meet the demands of the audience." The strategy of omission is not only used to overcome difficulties but also to facilitate interpretations' comprehension for the audience. Moser-Mercer (1996) considered omission as a strategy to resort to in extreme cases of difficulty. In the same sense, Marco (2019) defines omission as eliminating redundant or unimportant information from the translation (as cited in Amenador & Wang, 2022, p. 4). Li (2015, p. 74) defines omission as the cases where "the interpreter, in particular under high time pressure or when facing interpreting difficulties, deletes superfluous or redundant expressions, repetitions, unimportant utterances, incomprehensible input, untranslatable elements, or message that is unacceptable in the target discourse." Omission from this perspective is used to handle difficulties that burden interpreters, in addition to what interpreters decide to be superfluous, redundant, etc., and for certain cases that do not affect the source message (see Table 2):

Table 2. *Barik's (1971) classification of omissions*

Omission type	Source of error	Impact on source message
Skipping omission	Omission of word or short phrase	Very little loss in meaning
Comprehension omission	Interpreter is not able to comprehend part of discourse and omits it	Definite loss in meaning

Delay omission	Delay in the interpreter's side	Loss in meaning
Compounding omission	Compounding previously omitted materials into a new sentence.	Delivering a gist of the original message

2.4. Addition

The addition strategy is discussed from different points of view. The first one is related to being part of the explication of implicit meanings in source discourse (Vinay and Darbelnet, 1995). Also, addition can be used to add information that is not implicit but not inferable or not common for the audience (Krüger, 2013). However, Barik (1971, pp. 202–203) identifies the following types of addition (see Table 3):

Table 3. *Barik's (1971) classification of additions*

Addition type	Source of error	Impact on source message
Qualifier addition	Interpreter adds a new qualifier or qualifying phrase	Emphasis
Elaboration addition	Interpreters add new words or information to explain something in ST for audience	Elaborating speaker's words
Relationship addition	Interpreters add connecting phrases or connecters to ST	Introducing non-explicitly stated relations
Closure addition	Give closure to a sentence	Does not add anything substantial

Considering the difference between strategy and error, Bartlomiejczyk (2006, p. 161) states that "when the interpreter decides to omit something that has been both heard and understood, presumably because he or she assesses the information as redundant, not important, or not transferable due to differences between the SL and TL cultures," In this sense, Bartlomiejczyk (2006) asserts a simple way to differentiate between strategies and errors. The interpreter's comprehension and intention constitute conditions for the recognition of a strategy. Moreover, other strategies can be treated the same way. That is, a substitution is a strategy when the substitution emerges from the understanding of the original message and makes a successful substitution that facilitates audience understanding, prevents a problem, or solves a problem. And the same applies for addition.

2.5. Aims and Questions

Considering conversational implicatures' interpretation, there is a lack of studies that consider the topic. This study aims to address the simultaneous interpretation of conversational implicatures in political discourse. The investigation includes instances of Barik's (1971) categorization usage in interpreting implicatures. By analyzing the retrieved examples, the study tries to find the strategies and errors used and the impact of using Barik's (1971) categorization as errors. To attain its aims, the study will try to answer the following questions:

1. What is the method, strategy, or error that simultaneous interpreters follow in using omission, addition, and substitution in implicature interpreting?
2. What is the impact of using omission, addition, and substitution as errors on implicature conveyance in political discourse?

In order to answer the raised question, the study adopts the following method.

3. METHOD

3.1.Sample\ participants

The article adopts the purposive sampling technique; that is, the samples contain instances of Barik's (1971) categorization in implicatures' interpretation. The research investigates fourteen, English to Arabic, and seven, Arabic to English, implicatures occurrences. The examples are retrieved from the news agency's official *YouTube* channels. Retrieved interpretations are by professional interpreters who work for well-known news agencies in the Arab region.

3.2. Instrument(s)

The researcher uses descriptive research, where qualitative content analysis methodology will be used to answer the previously raised question. According to Mayring (2000, p. 2), qualitative content analysis can be defined as "an approach of empirical, methodological controlled analysis of texts within their context of communication, following content analytic rules and step by step models, without rash quantification." Substitutions, omissions, and addition occurrences will be analyzed according to Barik's (1971) classification.

3.3.Data collection procedures and data analysis

The data will be unobtrusively collected. Interpreted examples will be retrieved from official news agencies' *YouTube* channels. Substitutions, omissions, and additions in implicatures' interpretation will be examined, following Barik's (1971) classification, to define the success and failures and their impact on the source message. The analysis starts with identifying the implicature in the source discourse's examples; then, Barik's (1971) employed categories and their types will be identified. After that, the success or failure in interpreting the implicature will be traced. Finally, the research will look into the impact of using the identified strategies or errors on implicatures' rendering.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This part will show the results and discussions from the investigation of implicatures' interpreting strategies, omission, addition, and substitution based on Barik's categorization.

4.1. English > Arabic Interpretations

As shown in table 4, out of 14 examples, 10 examples were interpreted by employing substitution strategy.

Table 4. *English – Arabic Implicatures' interpreting strategies*

Example 1.		Example 2.	
Speaker	American President, Joe Biden, Warsaw, Poland. on 22nd of February, 2023.[i]	**Speaker**	American President, Joe Biden, Warsaw, Poland. on 22nd of February, 2023.

Source discourse	One year ago, the world was bracing for the fall of Kiev.	**Source discourse**	When Russia invaded	
Implicature	+ a year ago, the fall of Kiev was very close.	**Implicature**	+Russia enters Ukraine by force in order to conquer.	
Interpretation (Arabic)	ومنذ سنة كانت هذه الحرب قد أخذت تداعياتها ووصلت إلى كييف	**Interpretation (Arabic)**	عندما قامت روسيا بشن عملها العدائي	
Backtranslation	One year ago, this war had taken its repercussions and reached Kiev	**Backtranslation**	When Russia launches its hostile act	
strategy\error	Substitution (Substantial phrasing change)	**strategy\error**	Substitution (Mild semantic error)	

Example 3.		**Example 4.**	
Speaker	American President, Joe Biden, Warsaw, Poland. on 22nd of February, 2023.	**Speaker**	American President, Joe Biden, Warsaw, Poland. on 22nd of February, 2023.
Source discourse	Putin left with burned out tanks and Russia's forces in disarray.	**Source discourse**	He found himself at war with a nation led by a man whose courage would be forged in fire and steel, president Zelensky.
Implicature	+Russia lost a lot of tanks and soldiers.	**Implicature**	+Putin is facing a hard time. +Zelensky is a brave man.
Interpretation (Arabic)	واستطاعت القوات الاوكرانية ان تحرق الدبابات الروسية	**Interpretation (Arabic)**	واجه العالم نفسه في حالة حرب مع بلاد يقودها رجل بعيد عن المنطق
Backtranslation	The Ukrainian forces were able to burn the Russian tanks	**Backtranslation**	The world faces itself in a war with a country led by a nonsense person
strategy\error	Addition (elaboration)	**strategy\error**	Substitution (Gross phrasing change)

Example 5.		**Example 6.**	
Speaker	American President, Joe Biden, Warsaw, Poland. on 22nd of February, 2023.	**Speaker**	American President, Joe Biden, Warsaw, Poland. on 22nd of February, 2023.

Source discourse	Our support for Ukraine will not waiver,	**Source discourse**	President Putin's craven lust for land and power will fail and the Ukrainian people's love for their country will prevail
Implicature	+ NATO and USA, will continue supporting Ukraine.	**Implicature**	+Putin aims to take over Ukraine's sources.
Interpretation (Arabic)	أوكرانيا لن تتراجع عن موقفها	**Interpretation (Arabic)**	الرئيس بوتين يبدو أنه ماض في حربه الشعواء في حين أن الشعب الأوكراني ما زال مستمرا في وقفته القوية
Backtranslation	Ukraine will not back down its position	**Backtranslation**	President Putin seems to be continuing his fierce war, while the Ukrainian people are still continuing their strong stand.
strategy\error	Substitution (Gross phrasing change)	**strategy\error**	Omission (delay)
Example 7.		**Example 8.**	
Speaker	American President, Joe Biden, Warsaw, Poland. on 22nd of February, 2023.	**Speaker**	American President, Joe Biden, Warsaw, Poland. on 22nd of February, 2023.
Source discourse	You know, this has been an extraordinary year in every sense, extraordinary brutality from Russian forces and mercenaries, they've committed depravities, crimes against humanity without sham	**Source discourse**	No one, no one can turn away their eyes from the atrocities Russia is committing against the Ukrainian people. It's abhorrent. It's abhorrent.
Implicature	+Russian military and mercenaries are both responsible for the war crimes in Ukraine.	**Implicature**	+Everyone should stand with Ukraine.
Interpretation (Arabic)	لقد كانت سنة غير عادية فقد ارتكب الجيش الروسي جرائم حرب وجرائم ضد الإنسانية	**Interpretation (Arabic)**	ما من طرف يمكنه أن يغير من طبيعة الوحشيات والويلات والفظائع التي ارتكبتها روسيا في هذه الحرب
Backtranslation	It has been extraordinary year, the Russian army committed war crimes	**Backtranslation**	No party can change the nature of the brutalities, scourges and atrocities committed by Russia in this war

	and against humanity crimes		
strategy\ error	Omission (delay)	**strategy\error**	Substitution (Gross phrasing change)

Example 9.		**Example 10.**	
Speaker	American President, Joe Biden, Warsaw, Poland. on 22nd of February, 2023.	**Speaker**	Israeli Prime Minister Netanyahu at AIPAC, on 6th of March, 2018.[ii]
Source discourse	President Zelensky still leads a democratic elected government that represents the will of the Ukrainian people.	**Source discourse**	That improves on Moses. You remember Moses? He brought water from a rock? They bring water from thin air.
Implicature	+Zelensky is still the elected president of Ukraine.	**Implicature**	+ Netanyahu reads the Bibl. + The suffering of Jews is mentioned in the Bible
Interpretation (Arabic)	والرئيس زيلينسكي لا يزال حتى اللحظة في عهدة السلطة	**Interpretation (Arabic)**	وهي تصنع المياه من الهواء
Backtranslation	President Zelensky is still in power	**Backtranslation**	It brings water from the air.
strategy\ error	Substitution (Substantial phrasing change)	**strategy\error**	Omission (comprehension)

Example 11.		**Example 12.**	
Speaker	American Secretary of the State, Antony Blinken, and the Israeli prime minister, Netanyahu conference on 25th of May, 2021.[iii]	**Speaker**	American President, Biden, and Palestinian President, Mahmoud Abbas, on 15th of July, 2022.[iv]
Source discourse	And as the Talmud teaches, to lose a life is to lose the whole world, whether that life Palestinian or Israeli.	**Source discourse**	That's why, when I came to office, I reserved the policy — I reversed the policies of my **predecessor** and resumed aid to the Palestinians — more than a half a billion dollars in [since] 2021.
Implicature	+ Judaism instructions reject killing.	**Implicature**	+Biden reversed Trump's policies in providing aid for Palestine.

Interpretation (Arabic)	كما يقول لنا المعلمون: في حال خسرنا حياة واحدة فنحن خسرنا كامل العالم	**Interpretation (Arabic)**	ولهذا عندما استلمت سدة الحكم عكست سياسة أكثر من نصف مليار دولار في. السيد ترامب العام 2021 وفرت الدعم
Backtranslation	As teachers tell us, if we lose one life then we lose the whole world.	**Backtranslation**	And that's why when I came to office, I reversed the policies of mister Trump. More than half billion dollars, in 2021, provided to support….
strategy\error	Substitution (Gross phrasing change)	**strategy\error**	Substitution (explication)
Example 13.		**Example 14.**	
Speaker	American Secretary of State, Antony J. Blinken, in his visit to Ramallah, Palestine on May 25th, 2021.[v]	**Speaker**	American president Joe Biden (Poland, on 22nd of February, 2023) *another interpretation source.[vi]
Source discourse	Durable resolution of the conflict between Palestinians and Israelis, which ultimately *requires* two states.	**Source discourse**	He thought he could weaponize energy to crack your resolve, Europe's resolve. Instead, we're working together to end Europe's dependence on Russian fossil fuels.
Implicature	+ Two states solution is essential for durable resolution of the conflict.	**Implicature**	+ the European dependence on Russian fossil fuel has not ended.
Interpretation (Arabic)	وفي النهاية نطالب بحل الدولتين	**Interpretation (Arabic)**	كان باعتقاده أن يستخدم الطاقة كسلاح كي يكسر عزيمتكم لكن بتنا أكثر استقلالية عن موارد الطاقة الروسية
Backtranslation	At the end, we demand a two-state resolution.	**Backtranslation**	He thought he could use energy as a weapon to break your resolve, but we became more independent from Russian energy sources.
strategy\error	Substitution (Gross phrasing change)	**strategy\error**	Substitution (Gross semantic error)

Out of the 10 substitutions, 6 gross phrasing changes, 1 Gross semantic error, 1 mild semantic error, and 2 substantial phrasing changes. For omission, 3 examples were interpreted using this type of strategy, 2 of which were delay omissions and one comprehension omission. The data also included one elaboration addition.

Starting with gross phrasing change, examples 4, 5, 8, 11, 13, and 14. None of the interpretations could render the implicature. However, there is a difference considering the impact on implicatures and political discourse. In example **4**, losing the original implicature would be of minor importance if we consider the interpretation's coined meaning, that is, the interpretation includes an offense by the speaker, Biden, towards the Russian president, and consider him a 'nonsense man'! The interpretation does not communicate the speaker's intentions but goes further to coin an unstated, unintended meaning. The interpreter has made up the interpretation since there is no trace of such a statement in the original discourse.

The same idea applies for example 13, where the interpretation makes the American Secretary of State, Antony J. Blinken, say something he did not say in the original discourse. The speaker is expressing his vision without any further promises; however, the interpretation claims a false demand by the speaker.

In example 5, although the interpretation does not betray the sense of the context, it betrays the speaker's intention in communicating a serious point the speaker wants to make. The implicature is not delivered at all, but no contradicting messages are generated. The same discussion can be carried over to example 8. The interpretation does not communicate the speaker's implicature although it does not contradict the sense of the context or the speaker's beliefs. In example 11, the interpretation fails to communicate the speaker's implicature and comes up with an incomprehensible statement, which may not make sense for the audience. The speaker uses a religiously specific item, 'Talmud'; the interpreter has no reference for the concept and substitutes it with 'teachers'; such substitution fails to encounter the implicature of the original message in example 14, while the original message implicates that:

+ The European dependence on Russian fossil fuels has not ended.

The interpretation generates a new implicature:

+ The European dependence on Russian fossil fuels decreases.

Biden's words do not indicate any decrease, or any level of dependency, on Russian fuel. However, the interpretation has such indications.

In example 2, the speaker implicates that:

+Russia enters Ukraine by force in order to conquer.

The use of 'invaded' carries such implicature and serves the speaker's functions of political discourse. The interpreter made a mild semantic error substitution, which preserves the context but betrays the intended function of the discourse. According to Pym (2020), this is a case of communicative risk.

However, the opposite can be noticed in Example 12. The interpretation explicates what the speaker implicated. Biden does not mention the former American president but refers to him as 'predecessor'. Although Biden uses this term, the interpretation substitutes and elaborates on it by explicating the item 'predecessor' with its clear reference to 'Trump', which would constitute a facilitator for audience comprehension.

The substantial phrasing change includes preserving the general gist of the source. However, for implicature interpretation, preserving the gist does not include preserving the implicated meaning. Moreover, the implicature in examples 1 and 9 is not interpreted as

indicating that the speaker wishes to communicate his intentions. In example 1, the speaker implicates that:

+ a year ago, the fall of Kiev was very close.

The interpretation included the existence of an attack against Ukraine but did not communicate the implicated message. In example 9, the implicature is:

+Zelensky still the elected president of Ukraine.

However, the interpretation includes the existence of Zelensky in power in Ukraine but does not include the way that keeps Zelensky in power, which is elections. Such interpretation does not serve the speaker's intention of supporting Zelensky and regarding him as the elected president of Ukraine.

Omission has three occurrences in the examples. Example 10 is a comprehension omission due to the speaker, Netanyahu, use of religious reference, the Bible. The implicatures of Netanyahu's words are:

+ Netanyahu reads the Bible.

+ The suffering of Jews is mentioned in the Bible.

The interpretation omits the source discourse along with its implicature. As a result, the communicative function of the discourse is not achieved.

Examples 6 and 7 are instances of delay omissions. The interpretation omits part of the source discourse to avoid further delay. This category includes a loss of meaning. In example 6, the interpretation is harmonious with the context and the speaker's general aims. From another point of view, the interpretation does not serve the intention of the speaker, expressed implicitly. Thus, the communicative function is not fulfilled since the implicatures, or the elements that carry the implicatures, are omitted. The same discussion applies to example 7. The speaker wants to assign the responsibility of war crimes to the military and mercenaries, but the interpretation does not fulfill this intention.

The last example is an elaboration addition case. Example 3 shows the addition of Ukrainian forces as an explanation for Biden's words. However, such an addition may betray the implicated message of the speaker, Biden. The source discourse avoided mentioning the exact side that burned Russian tanks and left its forces in disarray, which may carry another deeper message, which may be the participation of other sides than the Ukrainians. In this case, the intended message, which has a function, is not fulfilled.

4.2. Arabic > English Interpretations

This part includes Arabic-English-interpreted implicatures, as shown in Table 5.

Table 5. *Arabic – English Implicatures' interpreting strategies*

Example 1		Example 2	
Speaker	Jordanian prime, Ayman Al Safadi minister at the UN Security Council Addresses Israel-Gaza Crisis on the 24th of October, 2023.vii	**Speaker**	Jordanian prime, Ayman Al Safadi minister at the UN Security Council Addresses Israel-Gaza Crisis on the 24th of October, 2023.
Source discourse	تقتل حق الشعوب المنطقة بالسلام دون اكتراث.	**Source discourse**	ماذا تقول ام فلسطينية لابنها اذ يطلب شربة ماء فلا تقدر ان تلبيه.
Backtranslation (of source discourse)	It carelessly Kills the region's people's right in peace.	**Backtranslation (of source discourse)**	what would a Palestinian mother say to her child when he asks for water and *she cannot* meet his demand
Implicature (of source discourse)	+Israel is deliberately threatening peace	**Implicature (of source discourse)**	+Palestinian mothers are suffering for not being able to provide essential life demands for their children.
Interpretation (English)	Omission	**Interpretation (English)**	what would a Palestinian mother say to her child when he asks for water *and there is no* water
strategy\error	Omission (Delay omission)	**strategy\error**	Substitution (Substantial phrasing change)
Example 3		Example 4	
Speaker	Jordanian prime, Ayman Al Safadi minister at the UN Security Council Addresses Israel-Gaza Crisis on the 24th of October, 2023	**Speaker**	Jordanian prime, Ayman Al Safadi minister at the UN Security Council Addresses Israel-Gaza Crisis on the 24th of October, 2023
Source discourse	ان انت في اذنه وسط هدير الموت ان حرمانك من الغذاء والماء والدواء جريمة حرب، لكنك فلسطيني حقك مهضوم، القانون الدولي لم يوجد لمثلك، *ليست لحياتك قيمة حياة غيرك*	**Source discourse**	العنف ان تجذر اقتناعا ولد من موت الامل او من اي دافع اخر لا ينهيه الا واقع يسوده العدل ويتيح فرص الحياة بحرية وكرامة

Backtranslation (of source discourse)	If it came to his mind, during death roaring, that depriving you of food, water, and medicine is a war crime, you are a Palestinian, your rights are trampled, international law was not founded for people like you, your life does not value others' lives.	**Backtranslation (of source discourse)**	if violence rooted in conviction, out of hope death or any other reason, it would not end unless there is a reality prevailed by justice and provides opportunities for life with freedom and dignity.
Implicature (of source discourse)	+ international law does not serve Palestinians, which underestimates their lives' value	**Implicature (of source discourse)**	+Violence only ends with current reality change
Interpretation (English)	Normally, depriving you from water from food and medication is a war crime, but you're Palestinian that means that the international law does not serve you	**Interpretation (English)**	violence is born out the death of hope or born out of any motive that would completely undermine justice
strategy\error	Omission (Delay omission)	**strategy\error**	Omission (Delay omission)
Example 5		**Example 6**	
Speaker	Jordanian prime, Ayman Al Safadi minister at the UN Security Council Addresses Israel-Gaza Crisis on the 24th of October, 2023	**Speaker**	Palestinian president, Mahmoud Abbas, speech on 23rd of September, 2022 at the UN.[viii]
Source discourse	وقصف المستشفيات والمساجد والكنائس على رؤوس من احتمى فيها من المدنيين ليس دفاعا عن النفس	**Source discourse**	لماذا عندما يصدر قرار هنا او هناك الكل يقوم الله أكبر فازعا فارعا دارعا تنفيذ الشرعية الدولية. واحنا **هاد كله** ولا واحد يسأل عن قرار، قرار واحد
Backtranslation (of source discourse)	Bombarding hospitals, mosques and churches down on civilians who took them as refuge is not self defense	**Backtranslation (of source discourse)**	Why when a resolution is taken everyone rushes instantly to implement the international legitimacy, while despite our situation, no one is asking about a resolution, a single resolution.
Implicature (of source discourse)	+Israel is intentionally bombarding civilians' and causes death	**Implicature (of source discourse)**	+Israel is intentionally bombarding civilians' and causes death

Interpretation (English)	Hospitals, schools, places of worship were bombarded *to target civilians* taking shelters in those buildings not for self defense	Interpretation (English)	Why when a resolution is taken here or there, everyone *calls* for its implementation. And calls for implementing international legitimacy while *all these resolutions adopted for Palestine* and no one cares. Not a single resolution.
strategy\error	Addition (Elaboration addition)	**strategy\error**	Substitution (Mild semantic error) Substitution (explication)

Arabic-English-interpreted examples include three delay omissions. In example 1, the original discourse carries a serious point: the accusation of deliberate peace threats. The delay caused a full omission of the original discourse, which carries the implicature. The communicative function of the source discourse naturally vanishes when the source discourse is lost. The second delay omission, example 3, causes a total loss of the implicated meaning that the speaker desires to communicate. The international does not serve Palestinians; however, the underestimation of their lives' value was omitted along with the communicative function of the source discourse. The third delay omission, in example 4, can be controversial since, from one side, a partial loss in meaning occurs. From the other side, and contextually speaking, the loss has a minor impact due to the speaker's previous mention of the same point and, as a result, the previous communicative function fulfillment in the discourse, which does not affect the speaker's intentions.

The examples have three substitutions in examples 2 and 6. The first substitution is a substantial phrasing change, which includes preserving the source discourse gist. The interpreter succeeded in communicating the speaker's communicative function without using the same words. In example 6, a mild semantic error substitution occurred. The error in this substitution is to slightly distort the intended meaning. The interpreter succeeded in omitting the redundancy of using three expressions to indicate the instant rush of resolution implementation but could not provide a strong enough interpretation for the source message.

The second part of Example 6 includes a substitution that cannot be related to any of Barik's (1971) categorizations. The substitution is used as a successful strategy by the interpreter. The interpreter used the substitution to clarify the speaker's words and maintain the implicature's effect in pointing out the bias in implementing resolutions. This type of substitution can be regarded as an *elaboration substitution*, which Dayter (2020) called an 'explication strategy', where interpreters substitute words or phrases to explain something in the source discourse. Although a partial loss in meaning appeared in the first part, the communicative function is preserved contextually in the second part, and the interpreter reflected the speaker's intention by elaborating on the opposite idea, which is not implementing resolutions that are in Palestine's favor.

In example 5, the interpreter used elaboration addition. The speaker implicated the intentional targeting of civilians. However, the interpreter explicated this idea. Such explication does not contradict the context of the speaker, i.e., targeting schools, hospitals, and other civilian institutions includes the direct targeting of civilians. The communicative function is preserved and elaborated for the audience.

To sum up, out of 7 occurrences of implicatures, 2 delay omissions can be regarded as errors. However, one delay omission, one elaboration addition, and three substitutions can be regarded as strategies.

4.3. Quality, Risk, and Errors

Pym (2008, p. 90) states, "Quality, in the broadest sense, must thus be a measure of the extent to which a communication act achieves its aims." SI quality is the product's success in communicating the source discourse and, thus, the speaker's ideas and intentions. According to Pym's definition of quality, the interpretations discussed do not fulfill their communicative function, and as a result, they are of low quality.

Although Pym's (2020) categorization of risk is mainly related to omission, the risk of substitution and addition can be noticed. The first, credibility risk, which considers losing trust, has taken another step forward. That is, in some examples, the substitutions provide unstated and unintended messages by politicians, which affect the credibility of the news agency and the interpreter. The failure exceeds the lack of fulfillment and goes to assigning additional intentions to the speaker. As a result, the criticality, or level of harm, of political discourse interpreting can be very high due to betraying the source speaker's intentions by assigning non-intended messages to the political speaker.

The effect of misinterpretation is on the whole situation since the interpretive situation parties are all connected in some way. The speakers' intentions were not communicated, which brings forward the credibility risk, communicative risk, and uncertainty risk. The employer, the news agencies, did not attain its aims by delivering the speakers' words to the audience, which in turn will lead to trust issues with the interpreter; in other words, the highest risk for the employer is the highest risk for the interpreter. The risk for interpreters can be expected in terms of possible legal consequences and in their future careers.

5. CONCLUSIONS

Based on the results of the study (see Section 5), the researcher concluded several points related to implicature interpreting in political discourse. Interpreters' use of Barik's (1971) categorization of omission, substitution, and addition as errors rather than strategies in English-to-Arabic interpretations fails to communicate the source message. However, Arabic-to-English interpretations used Barik's (1971) categorization as strategies rather than errors. Moreover, in some cases, the substitution of the source message could not achieve that deeper level of communicating implicature, which makes the interpretation inaccurate. Furthermore, in some cases, the substitution of one item from the original message can alter the implicated intended message. Interpreters' comprehension and intention constitute conditions to distinguish between strategy and error. In this sense, and as errors' use was predominant, we can suggest an absence of intention and a lack of comprehension on the interpreters' side. The interpreters' intention in achieving such errors is definitely unintended. However, the reason for such errors' appearance can be regarded as a lack of comprehension.

The effect of errors on source discourse varies according to the interpretation's deviation from the source discourse. That is, in the introduced cases, the error makes a partial loss of meaning, a full loss of meaning, or, most seriously, coining an unstated message of the source discourse. Such coinage would not only betray the original discourse but also go further to communicate hearsay to the audience. Such hearsay delivery would jeopardize the employer's and news agency's credibility. As a result, legal risks and future career risks, in addition to Pym's (2020) risk types, may appear for the interpreter. Such consequences may

not appear in other types of discourses, which signifies the criticality of political discourse interpretation.

Interpreting implicatures requires great attention and a deeper understanding of the original message. Also, interpreting implicatures in political discourse can be one of the 'risk' sources. Therefore, interpreters have to be aware and try to prevent strategies from turning into 'critical' errors. In this case, interpreters are required to deepen their understanding of the implicatures' pragmatic function and the political context in which the situation is taking place, as this may aid the interpreters in comprehending the intended unstated message.

REFERENCES

Abuarrah, S. (2016). Towards a New Account of Interpreting: Levinson's Heuristics in the Interpretation of Press Conferences. *Studies in Literature and Language*, *13*(4), 15–22. http://dx.doi.org/10.3968/8903

Ahmed, S. A. (2018). Omission in Simultaneous Interpreting: A Multidisciplinary Perspective to U.S. Presidential Debates. *CDELT Occasional Papers in the Development of English Education*, 65(1), 469-511. https://doi.org/10.21608/opde.2018.106586

Alfadda A, N. A., Mohammed, O. S., & Qadha, A. M. (2024). The Translation of Complaint Speech Act in Business Communication: A Cultural Perspective. *Al-Andalus journal for Humanities & Social Sciences*, *11*(96).

Al-Khanji, R., El-Shiyab, S., & Hussein, R. (2000). On the use of compensatory strategies in simultaneous interpretation. *Meta*, 45(3), 548–557. https://doi.org/10.7202/001873ar

Al-Qaderi, I., & Alduais, A. (2019). The cooperative principle in political discourse: flouting Gricean maxims in Modern Standard Arabic political speeches. *Research result. Theoretical and Applied Linguistics*, *5*(3). https://doi.org/10.18413/2313-8912-2019-5-3-0-1

Altman, J. (1994). Error analysis in the teaching of simultaneous interpretation: A pilot study. In S. Lambert & B. Moser-Mercer (Eds.), *Bridging the Gap* (Vol. 3). John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.3

Amenador, K. B., & Wang, Z. (2022). The Translation of Culture-Specific Items (CSIs) in Chinese-English Food Menu Corpus: A Study of Strategies and Factors. *SAGE Open*, *12*(2), 215824402210966. https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440221096649

Austin, S. (2013). Communicative Functions. In: Volkmar, F.R. (eds) *Encyclopedia of Autism Spectrum Disorders*. Springer, New York, NY. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4419-1698-3_964

Baranov, A.N., Kazakevich, E.G. (1991). Parliamentary Debates: Traditions and Innovations. Moscow: Znanie.

Barik, H. C. (1971). A description of various types of omissions, additions, and errors of translation encountered in simultaneous interpretation. *Meta*, 16(4), 199-210. https://doi.org/10.7202/001972a

Bartłomiejczyk, M. (2006). Strategies of simultaneous interpreting and directionality. *Interpreting. International Journal of Research and Practice in Interpreting*, 8(2), 149-174. https://doi.org/10.1075/intp.8.2.03bar

Bozok, N. & Kıncal, Ş. (2022). Strategies and Errors in Simultaneous Interpreting: A Student - Oriented Experiment in English-Turkish Language Pair. Current Trends in Translation Teaching and Learning E, 32 – 75. https://doi.org/10.51287/cttl20222

Bunch, M. B. (2001). *The SSTI/NAJIT translation and interpretation national certification examination*. In annual meeting of the American Translators Association, Los Angeles. Retrieved from http://www.najit.org/certification/ATAPRESR20on20Exam20History20and20development20dlm.PDF

Cheikh, M., & Rabab'ah, G. (2024). Translation of Conversational Implicatures by Arabic-Speaking EFL Learners. *Journal of Southwest Jiaotong University*, *59*(2). https://doi.org/10.35741/issn.0258-2724.59.2.3

Chen, S. (2017). The construct of cognitive load in interpreting and its measurement. *Perspectives*, 25(4), 640–657. https://doi.org/10.1080/0907676x.2016.1278026

Dayter, D. (2020). Strategies in a corpus of simultaneous interpreting. Effects of directionality, phraseological richness, and position in speech event. Meta, 65(3), 594–617. https://doi.org/10.7202/1077405a

Dong, Y., Li, P. (2020). Attentional control in interpreting: A model of language control and processing control. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 23, 716–728. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1366728919000786

Dong, Y., Li, Y., & Zhao, N. (2019). Acquisition of interpreting strategies by student interpreters. *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer*, 13(4), 408–425. https://doi.org/10.1080/1750399x.2019.1617653

Gabrych, M. (2020). *Quality assessment of interpreting in Polish-English police-suspect interviews. A multi-method study* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Surrey]. https://doi.org/10.15126/thesis.00852970

Gharabeh, T. (2018). *Implicature in Simultaneous Interpretation* [MA thesis, An-Najah National University]. https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.11888/15785

Gile, D. (2021). Risk Management in Translation: How Much Does It Really Explain? *International Journal of Interpreter Education*, 13(1), 56–65. https://doi.org/10.34068/ijie.13.01.08

Grice, H. Paul. (1975). Logic and conversation. In Peter Cole & Jerry L. Morgan (eds.), *Syntax and semantics 3: Speech acts*, 41–58. New York: Academic Press.

Guțu, I. (2024). Implicature and Indirect Communication in contemporary political messaging. In *Probleme de Lingvistică Romano-Germanică Şi Comunicare Interculturală*, 280–286. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10652983

Hervais-Adelman, A., & Babcock, L. (2019). The neurobiology of simultaneous interpreting: Where extreme language control and cognitive control intersect. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 23(4), 740–751. http://doi.org/10.1017/S1366728919000324

Jaradat, S. (2010). *Culture in Simultaneous Interpreting of Political Discourse: Obama's Speech in Cairo* [MA thesis, American University of Sharjah]. https://dspace.aus.edu/xmlui/handle/11073/84

Khairat, M. E. (2018). Implicatures in Political Discourse on Indonesia Lawyers Club Show. *Journal Polingua: Scientific Journal of Linguistic Literatura and Education*, 5(1), 4–24. https://doi.org/10.30630/polingua.v5i1.18

Korpal, P., & Stachowiak-Szymczak, K. (2019). Combined problem triggers in simultaneous interpreting: Exploring the effect of delivery rate on processing and rendering numbers.

Perspectives: Studies in Translation Theory and Practice, 28(1), 126-143. https://doi.org/10.1080/0907676X.2019.1628285

Krüger, R. (2013). A Cognitive Linguistic Perspective on Explicitation and Implicitation in Scientific and Technical Translation, *trans-kom*, 6(2), 285-314.

Lazim, M. J. (2020). Conversational Implicatures in the Political Talk of Sayyed Hassan Nasrallah. *Palarch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt/Egyptology, 17*(6), 15608-15627.

Li, X. (2015). Putting interpreting strategies in their place: Justifications for teaching strategies in interpreter training. *Babel*, 61(2), 170-192. https://doi.org/10.1075/babel.61.2.02li

Marco, J. (2019). The translation of food-related culture-specific items in the Valencian Corpus of Translated Literature (COVALT) corpus: a study of techniques and factors. *Perspectives*, *27*(1), 20–41. https://doi.org/10.1080/0907676x.2018.1449228

Mayring, P. (2000). Qualitative Content Analysis. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, *1*(2). https://doi.org/10.17169/fqs-1.2.1089

Mohammed, M. J. (2023). Investigating Omission in Simultaneous Interpreting from English into Arabic. *Nasaq Journal*, *40*(1), 1290-1310.

Moser-Mercer, B. (1996). Quality in interpreting: some methodological issues. *The Interpreters' Newsletter*, 7, 43-55.

Ngozimad, B., & Okpal, F. (2020). Conversational Implicatures in Political Interviews Selected from Two Nigerian Newspapers (Vanguard and Punch). *Sapientia Global Journal of Arts, Humanities and Development Studies, 3*(4), 95-108.

Pöchhacker, F. (2001). Quality assessment in conference and community interpreting. *Meta*, 46(2), 410-425.

Pym, A. (2008). On omission in simultaneous interpreting: Risk analysis of a hidden effort. In *Efforts and Models in Interpreting and Translation Research* (pp. 83–105). John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.80.08pym

Pym, A. (2020). For a sociology of translator training. *Translation Education*, 9-19. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-15-7390-3_2

Sanatifar, M. S. (2016). How to treat implicatures in the translation of political speech: A Relevance Theory perspective. *Journal of Translator Education and Translation Studies*, *1*(2), 97-114.

Setton, R. (1999). *Simultaneous interpretation: A cognitive-pragmatic analysis*. John Benjamins Publishing.

Rosyida, F., & Asror, A. G. (2019). Implication in The Political Advertising of Prospective Legislative Members Bojonegoro District 2019. *Prosiding Seminar Nasional Unimus*, *2*, 181-185. Retrieved from http://repository.ikippgribojonegoro.ac.id/374/1/384-686-1-SM%281%29.pdf

Usmonov R.A. (2018) Politicheskii diskurs v yazyke kul'tury: soderzhaniei funktsii [The traditions of the documentary features of Russian literature in Yury Trifonov's prose]. *Yazyk. Slovesnost'. Kul'tura [Language. Philology. Culture]*, 8(4-5), 48-60

Valerevna, P. N., & Rakhmatovna, K. F. (2022). The Concept of "Political Discourse". *European Scholar Journal (ESJ)*, 3(2), 88-91.

Vančura, A. (2017). Speech characteristics as progress indicators in simultaneous interpreting by trainee interpreters. *Govor/Speech*, 34(1), 3-32. https://doi.org/10.22210/govor.2017.34.01

Vinay, J., & Darbelnet, J. (1995). Comparative stylistics of French and English. *Benjamins Translation Library*. https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.11

Zhong, H. (2020). *Re-examining Omission in Simultaneous Interpreting: A Multi-method Study Involving Student Interpre*ts [Doctoral dissertation]. https://research.manchester.ac.uk/en/studentTheses/re-examining-omission-in-simultaneous-interpreting-a-multi-method

About the Author

Thaher M. T. Gharabeh *is a PhD student in Language, Text, and Context at University of Granada, Spain. His primary research area focuses on translation and interpreting studies. Recently his focus is on the interpretation of implicatures in political discourse.*

---

[i] AlHadath [AlHadath]. (2023, February 21). كلمة للرئيس الأمريكي جو بايدن من بولندا عن الحرب الأوكرانية: *American President, Joe Biden, Speech about Ukrainian War from Poland* [Video]. YouTube. Retrieved January 7, 2024, from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vmkv3YXyNl8&t=4s

[ii] Aljazeera Mubasher [Aljazeera Mubasher]. (2018, March 6). نتنياهو في آيباك: إسرائيل أصبحت تقود العالم في مجال الأمن الإلكتروني: *Netanyahu from AIBAC: Israel is leading the world in cyber security Now* [Video]. YouTube. Retrieved January 7, 2024, from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OdCEOgFS224

[iii] Asharq News [Asharq News]. (2021, May 25). شاهد وقائع المؤتمر الصحفي المشترك لوزير الخارجية الأميركي ورئيس الوزراء الإسرائيلي - أخبار الشرق[Video]. YouTube. Retrieved January 4, 2024, from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Xe7kmkBPqGU

[iv] AlJazeera Arabic [AlJazeera Arabic]. (2022, July 15). كلمة الرئيسين الأمريكي والفلسطيني في مؤتمر صحفي جمعهما في بيت لحم[Video]. YouTube. Retrieved January 4, 2024, from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vhtShfNRgjA

[v] Alghad TV - قناة الغد. (2021, May 25). شاهد المؤتمر الصحفي للرئيس الفلسطيني محمود عباس ووزير الخارجية الأمريكي أنتوني بلينكن[Video]. YouTube. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Lov9ImpAVtI

[vi] AlJazeera Arabic [AlJazeera Arabic]. (2023, February 21). كلمة الرئيس الأمريكي جو بايدن في قصر وارسو ببولندا[Video]. YouTube. Retrieved January 2, 2024, from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NBhJFFSns7o&t=394s

[vii] United Nations [United Nations]. (2023, October 24). *UN Security Council Addresses Israel-Gaza Crisis (continued) | United Nations (24 Oct 2023)* [Video]. YouTube. Retrieved January 25, 2024, from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=o34SRxOQZW0

[viii] United Nations [United Nations]. (2022, September 23). *State of Palestine - President Addresses UN General Debate, 77th Session (English)* [Video]. YouTube. Retrieved January 5, 2024, from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MqUemsuPP8U&t=242s