

Teaching cross-cultural pragmatics through AVT

Vasiliki Papakonstantinou

National and Kapodistrian University of Athens

There is fairly little research on using translation to advance pragmatic competence in learners of English and highlight how translation can advance cross-cultural pragmatic awareness in EFL. The study attempts to explore how audio-visual translation (AVT) can introduce cross-cultural pragmatics to Greek learners of English. The data derive from the animated film *Inside Out* (Pixar 2015). The study takes dubbed dialogues to be a target-oriented data set, with the subtitles as an intermediate, constrained type of transfer where pragmatic shifts may be least visible or not at all. The research uses (a) the positive/negative politeness distinction as manifested through interpersonal proximity/distance (Brown and Levinson 1978; Sifianou 1992; Yule 1996; Horn and Ward 2006), and (b) the un/certainty avoidance communication style (Hofstede, Hofstede, and Minkov 2010). The aim is to familiarize learners with the significance of cross-cultural pragmatic awareness and its use in EFL teaching and learning. Analysis of the data is followed by a questionnaire

addressing bilingual participants who confirmed the findings of the study. Results show types of pragmatic variation across English and Greek: for instance, the subtitles showed less signs of positive politeness strategies and more uncertainty features, while dubbing manifested more positive politeness strategies and stronger uncertainty avoidance, i.e., in alignment with features of the target language. Findings allow learners to look beyond grammaticality, at the level of pragmatic preference.

Keywords: pragmatics, im/politeness, cohesion, certainty, vagueness, EFL

1. Introduction

Children's films usually bring up social, psychological, environmental issues and so on, engaging both children and adults. The Greek AVT industry provides excellent subtitled and dubbed versions of children's films, which allows exploration of cross-cultural pragmatic variation in a meaningful, pleasant and impactful way.

Linguistic analysis of film subtitles (Días-Cintas 2009; Petillo 2023) and their dubbed dialogues show some differences in the

discourse of the two modalities. Because of the acoustic presence of the original script and soundtrack, subtitling is often closer to the English source text (ST), and it has to conform to time and space constraints; by contrast, the audio material in dubbing makes a more natural target discourse. Less space for domestication may be available in subtitling, although dubbing may also be constrained by duration of utterances and lip synchronization. Discourse in dubbing is more natural and target-oriented (Díaz Cintas and Remael 2007; Díaz Cintas 2009; Días-Cintas and Anderman 2009; Sidiropoulou 2012), so the study will draw attention to pragmatic features manifested in dubbing. The multimodal perspective of AVT data is likely to motivate learners to engage in the learning process more actively.

The study selected the 2015 computer-animated film *Inside Out* (Pixar Animated Studios), which raises mental health awareness in young viewers. The plot is as follows: 11-year-old Riley moves to a new city, and her Emotions team up to help her through the transition. Joy, Fear, Anger, Disgust, and Sadness work together in the Headquarters (Riley's mind) and attempt to guide her. Joy and Sadness coexist along with the other emotions. The trouble begins when Joy does not allow Riley to feel Sadness and does anything to

suppress her; the result is disastrous, assuming that every emotion is significant for a person's emotional and psychological balance.

2. Literature review

The study turns to societal pragmatics in order to highlight aspects of cross-cultural variation in social behaviour, because “[a] linguistic interaction is necessarily a social interaction” (Yule 1996, 59). It focuses on (a) social proximity/distance as manifested in positive and negative politeness patterns, respectively (Brown and Levinson 1978; Yule 1996). In the English and Greek contexts, politeness preferences may vary per genre, but it is more typical for negative politeness strategies to prevail in English (Yule 1996) in order to avoid imposition threats, whereas positive politeness patterns are more common in a Greek context (Sifianou 1992).

Another pragmatic variation, which the study focuses on, is the preference for vagueness or specificity in discourse, which may be accounted for theoretically in terms of the uncertainty avoidance/tolerance dimension (Hofstede, Hofstede, and Minkov 2010). Greece has a top position on the Uncertainty Avoidance Index (UAI), in contrast with English-speaking countries, which appear on the lowest

ranks (57 to 69 out of 76) (Hofstede, Hofstede, and Minkov 2010, 192).

Other dimensions are also interrelated, e.g., the binary individualism vs. collectivism, which seems to run parallel with aspects of negative-positive politeness; for instance, the fear of imposition (negative politeness) may assume an individualistic concern, whereas the fear of not being accepted and included in one's social group may signal a collectivistic concern. Greece ranks fairly low (45 out of 76) on the Individualism Index Values (IDV) (Hofstede, Hofstede, and Minkov 2010, 92-97), whereas English-speaking countries (such as the US, Australia, Great Britain, and Canada) rank high on the IDV (Hofstede, Hofstede, and Minkov 2010, 95). Findings may suggest that English is more individualistic, while Greek values collectivity (in certain genres) and promotes feelings of inclusiveness through language. In the latter context, one is supposedly not only more willing to help others, but to expect help from others (Shirayev and Levy 2020).

Such tendencies are reflected in language use, and the study assumes that they can be taught through AVT. The use of modals, for instance, may be connected to the uncertainty tolerance dimension. Palmer (1990) has suggested that modal verbs are a

danger to certainty, favouring ambiguity, and Sidiropoulou (2015) found that modal markers are treated differently across English-Greek. The data will also show that AVT into Greek avoids ambiguity and heightens certainty, unlike English. This is a type of variation which learners should take into account when transferring their thoughts into English.

3. Methodology

The film was viewed on the Disney+ streaming platform with a total runtime of 1 hour and 34 minutes, but only half of it – 45 minutes – was enough to highlight aspects of pragmatic variation between the two modalities and across English-Greek. The first 45 minutes introduce the main characters, both the ‘inside-the-head’ ones and real people, explain what triggered the plot, as well as the actual events that initiated it.

The study theoretically analyzed the types of variation between the original English script of the film, the Greek subtitles, and the Greek dubbed script. The intention was to make learners/students aware of un/naturalness in discourse.

A questionnaire addressing 18 English-Greek bilingual respondents, aged 14-44, confirmed the dissimilarities between the English ST and

the Greek TT modalities, using theoretical notions of cross-cultural pragmatics. The questionnaire was filled out in Google Forms and results confirmed the analyst's view, showing an overwhelming preference for certain features in Greek. The study then used the selected verbal data to create sample exercises, which could help EFL learners acknowledge the variation across English-Greek.

4. Data analysis

As mentioned, the pragmatic phenomena the study focused on were (a) interpersonal proximity/distance between fictional interlocutors and (b) the treatment of English 'vagueness' as manifested at the level of certainty/doubt, connectivity and deixis, which Greek dubbing displays.

4.1 The interpersonal dimension

This subsection shows that the dubbed version manifests signs of interpersonal proximity between fictional interlocutors, which the subtitles may ignore. For instance, dubbing (TT^{dub}) showed signs of collectiveness, which TT^{sub} ignored, showing higher affinity to the ST. This is manifested through the *I show you* option, in example 1.

Example 1 (00:02:45).

Riley is a happy baby, then she starts crying; Joy and Sadness meet for the first time. Sadness controls the ‘console’ (Riley’s mind), namely it makes baby Riley cry, and Joy tries to regain control: she addresses Sadness in TT^{dub} by making use of the pronoun (*you*), highlighting awareness of her presence and being cooperative and protecting her positive face (Brown and Levinson 1978).

ST1 I just want to fix that.

TT^{sub} Θα το φτιάξω εγώ αυτό.

BT. I shall fix this.

TT^{dub} Θα σου δείξω πως γίνεται.

*BT. I'll show **you** how it works.*

Example 2 (00:18:38).

Riley is sleeping and has a nightmare about her new home and the rats that live there; she saw one when she first entered her room earlier.

The rats address Riley:

ST2 Come live with me, Riley.

TT^{sub} Έλα να μείνεις μαζί μου Ράιλι.

BT. Come live with me, Riley.

TT^{dub} Έλα να μείνουμε **μαζί** Ράιλι.

*BT. Come, let **us** live **together**, Riley.*

TT^{dub} highlights togetherness (*together*) and a collaborative intention, whereas TT^{sub} does not. Awareness of the interpersonal dimension also appears in example 3.

Example 3 (00:28:18).

Riley and her family have dinner together. Her mum has noticed her strange behaviour and she tries to signal her husband about this. He is rather absent-minded, thinking of football, as we can see from his emotions in his Headquarters. He asks:

ST3 What did she [the mother] say?

TT^{sub} Τι είπε;

BT. What did she say?

TT^{dub} Τι **μας** είπε;

*BT. What did she tell **us**?*

In TT^{dub}, Dad's discourse uses *us* (signalling togetherness), when the ST and the TT^{sub} do not. The data show that TT^{dub} displays more traces of a collective identity awareness, by including the recipient of the speech act in the communicative situation. This is a positively

polite device, making addressees feel included in the communicative situation; it is a positive politeness strategy, which enhances the sense of belonging (Yule 1996).

This subsection suggests that TT^{dub} (unlike the ST and TT^{sub}) overtly highlighted the interpersonal dimension, which Greek learners of English may need to avoid in their English production.

4.2 Avoiding/tolerating vagueness

Another pragmatic feature of variation between the subtitling and dubbing data is that, in the latter, certainty is raised and modal vagueness is avoided also as a realization of positive politeness in Greek and a negative politeness in English. The Greek dubbed data show a tendency to make utterances more specific, with a clearer meaning, rather avoiding uncertainty in social behaviour (Hofstede, Hofstede, and Minkov 2010); Greece was first on the Uncertainty Avoidance Index: Greeks tend to feel threatened by ambiguity and have created ways of avoiding it. In translated Greek discourse, uncertainty avoidance may be manifested through higher certainty, enhanced cohesion (e.g., through a dense conjunctive network) and high definitiveness (Sidiropoulou 2019). Below are instances of higher certainty, stronger discourse connectivity and definiteness – which are preferred in dubbing, but not in subtitling.

4.2.1 Higher certainty

The hedges favoured in negative politeness contexts (Brown and Levinson 1978; Palmer 1990) tend to disappear in Greek, because it often favours higher certainty, as shown in examples 4 and 5.

Example 4 (00:16:40).

Riley's emotions are at the Headquarters and list all the reasons she shouldn't be happy right now, except Joy, who is always optimistic.

They discuss what they could do and Sadness adds:

ST4 JOY: It **could** be worse. [...]

SADNESS: We **could** cry until we **can't** breathe.

TT^{sub} ΧΑΡΑ: **Θα μπορούσε** να ήταν και χειρότερα. [...]

ΛΥΠΗ: Να κλάψουμε μέχρι να σκάσουμε.

BT. JOY: *It could be worse.* [...]

SADNESS: Let's cry until we burst.

TT^{dub} ΧΑΡΑ: **Υπάρχουν** και χειρότερα. [...]

ΛΥΠΗ: Να κλάψουμε μέχρι να πλαντάξουμε.

BT. JOY: *There is worse (than that).* [...]

SADNESS: Let's sob until we cry our eyes out.

Joy's utterance *It could be worse* becomes *there is*, in TT^{dub}, manifesting higher certainty; in Sadness's utterance both *could* and *can't* are rendered in Greek through the subjunctive mood (*να κλάψουμε*), which makes a more direct suggestion.

Example 5 (00:37:33).

Joy and Sadness, who are in the Longterm Memory room, come across Bing Bong, Riley's old imaginary friend, who picks up some memories from the shelves and talks to them, as if to people: in TT^{dub}, elimination of the modal shows higher determination.

ST5 I **can't** leave you.

TT^{sub} Δεν μπορώ να σε αφήσω.

BT. I **can't** leave you.

TT^{dub} Δεν σ'αφήνω.

BT. I am not leaving you.

4.2.2 Connectivity

Another manifestation of avoiding vagueness in Greek, is enhanced connectivity, often manifesting itself in English-Greek transfer. This is a positive politeness device, because speakers interfere to assist addressees with understanding (by contributing conjunctive links

which highlight the relationships between propositions). Enhanced connectivity is evident in TT^{dub} (see *όμως* [though] and *ενώ* [while]), in contrast to TT^{sub} and ST, which show no connective markers. The added conjunctions manifest conventional implicatures, assuming there is a contrast between the propositions (see Horn and Ward 2006), which are made explicit in dubbing, as elsewhere in Greek.

Example 6 (00:15:18-00:15:45).

Headquarters. After Sadness touched one of Riley's happy memories and accidentally turned it into a sad one, Joy tries to make her happier. She gives her books about Longterm Memory and argues that Riley has the chance to be reading books, while she (Joy) has to go to work:

ST6 Well, have you read this one? [...] You're reading these cool things. I got to go work.

TT^{sub} Αυτό το έχεις διαβάσει; [...] Διαβάζεις τόσα πράγματα. Εγώ θα πρέπει να δουλέψω.

BT. Have you read that? [...] You are reading so many things. I'll have to work.

TT^{dub} Αυτό το έχεις διαβάσει **όμως**; [...] Εσύ καλοπερνάς **ενώ** εγώ πρέπει να δουλέψω.

*BT. Have you read that **though**? [...] You are having fun **while** I have to work.*

Here again, TT^{dub} acknowledges a preference in Greek for enhanced connectivity, which English rather neglects on the assumption that the viewer may wish to be left alone (negative politeness) to make out how the argument goes.

4.2.3 Deixis/definiteness

Deixis is another pragmatic phenomenon used differently across cultures, with the participants understanding what the indexicals refer to from context. Example TT7^{dub} displays definiteness and spatial deixis, with ST and TT7^{sub} favouring indefiniteness.

Example 7 (00:22:33-00:24:31).

Riley is at school reminiscing a happy memory from Minnesota, in front of her whole class, when suddenly she gets sad. The emotions, who were looking at the screen in the Headquarters, turn around and realize that Sadness touched the memory. Joy says to her:

ST7 You touched **a** memory? [...] What are you doing?

TT^{sub} Άγγιξες **κάποια** ανάμνηση; [...] Τι κάνεις;

*BT. Did you touch **a** memory? [...] What are you doing?*

TT^{dub} Άγγιξες **την** ανάμνηση; [...] Τι κάνεις **εκεί**;

*BT. Did you touch **the** memory? [...] What are you doing **there**?*

An indefinite article in the ST and TT^{sub} is changed into a definite one in TT^{dub} (she touched the particular memory which they were watching on the screen, not a random one). In TT^{dub}, the spatial indexical *εκεί* (there) is another marker enhancing the specific. Example TT8^{dub} conveys a temporal indexical *σήμερα* (today) also favouring specificity.

Example 8 (00:20:48).

Headquarters. The emotions get ready for the first day at school and Joy asks Anger to unload the daydreams:

ST8 JOY: In case things get slow in class.

TT^{sub} ΧΑΡΑ: Μήπως γίνει βαρετό το μάθημα.

BT. JOY: In case class gets boring.

TT^{dub} Μήπως και βαρεθούμε στην τάξη **σήμερα**.

*BT. JOY: In case we get bored in class **today**.*

The dubber felt the need to specify time, thus realizing temporal specificity.

Example 9 (00:33:29).

Longterm Memory. Joy makes sure Sadness knows how they can get back to the Headquarters and Sadness replies.

ST9 JOY: So you know the way back to...

SADNESS: *I guess.*

TT^{sub} ΧΑΡΑ: Ξέρεις πως να γυρίσουμε...

ΛΥΠΗ: *Μάλλον.*

BT. JOY: You know how to go back...

SADNESS: Presumably.

TT^{dub} ΧΑΡΑ: Δηλαδή ξέρεις τον δρόμο...

ΛΥΠΗ: *Ναι.*

BT. JOY: That is, you know the way...

SADNESS: Yes.

Her higher certainty in TT^{dub}, see a definite *yes* (*ναι*), does not match the rather vague ST item *I guess* and the TT^{sub} modal adverb *μάλλον* (*presumably*). This subsection shows that avoiding ambiguity is a notable feature of the Greek dubbed dialogue, in contrast to more vague information in English. It highlights a tendency in the dubbed version of the data for avoiding uncertainty. This suggests that Greek

speakers should tone down their uncertainty avoidance impetus when conversing in English.

5. Questionnaire analysis

The section analyzes questionnaire data received from 18 respondents, whose age varied from 14 to 44; their English competence varied from (B2) to fully proficient (C2) according to CEFR levels (Council of Europe 2020). Respondents had to use their insight to pick options ‘a’ or ‘b’: one option came from the subtitled version, the other option from the corresponding dubbed extract, especially at points where the extracts indicated closeness of the subtitles to the ST and where the dubbed extract carries signs of interpersonal and specificity awareness. Participants were unaware of which utterance came from which modality, and options were not presented in the same order. The questionnaire provided (a) the link to the film trailer for respondents to contextualize themselves with the film situation and (b) a relevant snapshot for each example. The Google Forms format of the questionnaire does not appear in this paper, because the questions are reproduced below along with back-translation into English and the corresponding measurement of the findings. Questions in the Google Forms questionnaire appeared in order of appearance in the film, but in this section, they are grouped according to their theoretical

relevance, namely, the ‘interpersonal dimension’ and the ‘avoiding vagueness’ feature. The *BT*, below, did not appear in the questionnaire because respondents were bilinguals and the relevant items per question did not appear in bold, in the Google Forms questionnaire – they appear in bold here for convenience.

5.1 The interpersonal dimension

THE QUESTION

(4). 00:17:13 Riley is very disappointed by the whole new situation after moving to their new home and has started acting up. Riley is in her room laying in her bed when her mum comes into the room to talk to her. She tells her, among others, that the truck with their furniture is late.

Where does mum assume that their family is a team?

Mum: Τώρα λένε ότι θα έρθει την Τρίτη.

BT. Now they’re saying it will come on Tuesday.

Mum: Τώρα **μας** λένε ότι θα έρθει την Τρίτη.

*BT. Now they’re telling **us** it will come on Tuesday.*

THE RESULT

All 18 participants (100%) agreed that the second utterance (dubbed version) conveyed the assumption that Riley's family is a team, which highlights a collective identity (a positive politeness device). The *μας* (*us*)

pronoun triggered
the answer.

(7). 00:19:00 After a difficult day, Riley falls asleep but sees a nightmare. Joy takes matters into her hands, while watching it on the screen of the Headquarters, and changes the dreams programme.

Which version portrays Joy as more caring?

Joy: Στο υπόσχομαι.
BT. I promise **you**.

Joy: Το υπόσχομαι.
BT. I promise.

100% of the respondents found Joy as more caring in the first option (dubbed version), as she verbally includes Riley to her promise: Στο υπόσχομαι (I promise you).

(8). 00:20:16 Riley's first day at her new school is about to start. Joy is overexcited at the Headquarters when she talks to the rest of the Emotions.

Which version portrays Joy as more concerned about the shared project?

17 out of 18 participants thought that the second (dubbed) option showed a more concerned Joy about their shared project, possibly because she

Joy: Ξαγρύπνησα για να βρω ένα νέο σχέδιο.
BT. I stayed up to come up with a new plan.

Joy: Ξενύχτισα για να ετοιμάσω το σχέδιό **μας**.
*BT. I stayed up to prepare **our** new plan.*

uses the possessive *μας* (our) when talking about the plan. This inclusivity is confirmed and preferred by 94,4% of the participants.

5.2 Greek avoiding vagueness

(1). 00:02:55 Joy and Sadness are introduced, the first to appear in Riley's Headquarters. Joy narrates the timeline; the rest of the Emotions started appearing, after them.

Which version do you think makes Joy a better narrator?

Joy: **Από εκεί και πέρα** το κέντρο ελέγχου γέμισε κόσμο.
*BT. **From that point on**, the Headquarters got crowded.*

Joy: Το κέντρο ελέγχου γέμισε κόσμο.
BT. The Headquarters got crowded.

15 out of 18 respondents judged that Joy was a better narrator in the first (dubbed) instance due to the temporally specific adverbial *[α]πό εκεί και πέρα* (from that point on): 83,3% vs. 16,7%.

(2). 00:04:45 Headquarters. Joy explains the place where the memories are stored, which is like a shelf.

Where does Joy appear more conscious of the Headquarters space?

Joy: Όμως οι πιο σημαντικές βρίσκονται εδώ.

BT. But the most important ones are here.

Joy: Αλλά οι πιο σημαντικές αναμνήσεις βρίσκονται εδώ **μέσα**.

*BT. But the most important ones are **in** here.*

100% of participants agreed that, in the second (dubbed) utterance, Joy is more conscious of space, because of *εδώ μέσα* (in here) instead of just *εδώ* (here).

(3). 00:17:00 Headquarters. The Emotions - except Joy - list all the reasons why Riley shouldn't be happy and what they could do. Anger suggests to lock themselves into Riley's room and shout the curse word which they like.

Where is Anger more suggestive of which curse word to use?

Anger: We should lock the door and shout the curse word we like.

Anger continues: **Εκείνη** την καλή.
*BT. **That** good one.*

15 out of 18 answered that Anger appears more specific in the first (dubbed) option, because he uses the deictic *Εκείνη* (demonstrative pronoun): 83,3% vs. 16,7%.

Anger continues: Είναι καλή βρισιά.
BT. *It's a good curse word.*

(5). 00:18:10 Mom talked to Riley kindly and lovingly about their unfortunate move. Before that, the Emotions were disappointed, but after that they felt reassured.

Which version is more reassuring?

Anger: Έχει δίκιο η μαμά.
BT. *Mum is right.*

Anger: **Αφού** το λέει η μαμά.
BT. *Since [causal] mum says it.*

11 out of 18 participants chose the second (dubbed) utterance as the most reassuring version: the *Αφού* ([causal] *since*) was preferred 61,1% vs. 38,9%

(6). 00:19:00. After a difficult day, Riley falls asleep but sees a nightmare. Joy takes matters into her hands, while watching the event on the screen of the Headquarters, and changes the dreams programme.

Where does Joy appear more conscious of the time this happens?

Joy: Δεν θα κλείσουμε τη μέρα έτσι.
BT. *We won't close the day like this.*

Joy: Δεν θα τελειώσει έτσι **η σημερινή** μέρα.
BT. *The present day won't end like this.*

12 respondents decided that Joy is more conscious of the time in the second option (dubbed), as she has added *σημερινή μέρα* (*today*). 66,7% vs. 33,3%

(9). 00:38:15-00:38:30. Joy and Sadness are in Longterm Memory (a place like an archive room with countless huge corridors). They have come across Bing Bong, Riley's old imaginary friend. Joy remembers him and asks him to help them go back to the Headquarters.

Where is Bing Bong less convinced that Joy knows him?

Bing Bong: Αλήθεια με ξέρεις;
BT. Do you really know me?

Bing Bong: **Δηλαδή**, στ' αλήθεια με ξέρεις;
*BT. **That is**, do you really know me?*

(10). 00:38:15-00:38:30. *Where does Joy sound more reassuring, and having a better contact with the interlocutor?*

Bing Bong: Από το κέντρο ελέγχου είστε;
Joy: Ναι, από **εκεί**.
BT. Bing Bong: Are you from the Headquarters?
Joy: Yes, from **there**.

14 participants believed that Bing Bong seemed less convinced in the second option (dubbed), as the dubber added *δηλαδή* (*that is*) signalling his attempt to avoid vagueness.

77.8% vs. 22,2%

17 respondents agreed that the first option (dubbed) was more reassuring, because Joy was more spatially specific in

Bing Bong: Είστε από το αρχηγείο;
Joy: Ναι.
*BT. Bing Bong: Are you from the
Headquarters?*
Joy: Yes.

her answer: *Ναι, από
εκεί* (Yes, from
there). 94,4% vs
5,6%

The questionnaire confirmed and enhanced the findings of the data analysis (by adding more data) which differentiate the two audio-visual modalities on a pragmatic level. The dubbed version of the film shows higher preference for inclusivity and collectiveness, and raises certainty through extended use of personal, spatial, temporal, and discourse deixis as well as connective markers. These are aspects of cross-cultural pragmatics which are preferable in Greek and should perhaps be focused upon in teaching English as a second/foreign language. The goal is to make learners aware of which features they should avoid transferring into their English production. Table 1 summarizes the questionnaire results per phenomenon and degree of preference.

[INSERT TABLE 1 HERE, PLEASE}

6. Discussion

The study has attempted to engage in a “systematic investigation of translation and language education” (Laviosa 2014, 145) by pointing towards an AVT-based methodology as a means for improving learners’ intercultural competence. It also points towards a corpus-based pedagogy, which uses corpora as resources for pedagogical purposes. It made use of the potential of subtitling to stick to the source version (which is heard) and the potential of dubbing to produce more natural target discourse in order to make learners aware of cross-cultural pragmatic variation. It has attempted to reply to a problem which Laviosa et al. (2017, 12) have identified, namely, how we can use resources to develop ‘translingual and transcultural competences’:

How can corpora be used to unearth cross-cultural differences and similarities in research as in practice? I think an effective way of achieving this goal is to work towards a multilingual pedagogy that espouses the tenets of holistic cultural translation and incorporates corpora not only as tools for acquiring technical skills, but also as resources for developing translingual and transcultural competences.

The assumption has been that using such data sets can enhance bilingualism and biculturalism, as defined in Byram (2012), namely,

the potential to keep one's "languages and identifications with two groups separate" (Byram 2012, 85).

The study used naturalistic and experimental translation data to help raise awareness of pragmatic variation cross-culturally, for advancing pragmatic competence in EFL. It focused on two pragmatic variables, interpersonal proximity/distance and uncertainty avoiding/tolerance, with the first options often being preferred in Greek target versions of discourses.

The present study sought evidence of pragmatic variation in the dubbed version of an animated film and attempted to show the usefulness of AVT in raising awareness of pragmatic variation across English-Greek for learners of English.

After juxtaposing the English script, the Greek subtitles, and Greek dubbing data, the study identified shifts in the dubbed version which did not appear in the often source-oriented subtitled version: the dubbed version enhanced interpersonal proximity and uncertainty avoidance (through deixis, connectivity, and shared awareness of the community situation). Findings matter because they show the potential of AVT to contribute to EFL.

The assumption is that instructors should promote a pragmatically oriented view of language. The Common European Framework of References for Languages (CEFR 2020), which is predominantly used in the EU for learning, teaching, and assessing, acknowledges that pragmatic competence is interwoven with language use and could be considered in language teaching. The assumption is that even learners with lower proficiency can learn some aspects of the target language's pragmatics (Eslami-Rasekh 2005; Takahashi 2010; Basturkmen and Minh Nguyen 2017). Pragmatic learnability increases when learners “push themselves to process the target pragmatic features” (Takahashi 2010, 411); hence, instructors should motivate learners by using authentic texts which (naturalistically) depict pragmatic phenomena cross-culturally.

Dubbing data seem to be rich in pragmatic shifts which may be used for conducting exercises, thus highlighting cross-cultural pragmatic variation. For instance, after familiarizing learners with a film and a couple of pragmatic phenomena with varied manifestations across cultures, instructors may present them with selected instances of variation, drawing on subtitling (assumed to be ST-oriented) and dubbing (assumed to be target-oriented) and ask them to infer which phenomenon the data shifts pertain to.

Another more-open ended option is for the instructor to provide the target dubbed version and ask learners what the English text would be like, taking into consideration the discussed pragmatic preferences.

Basturkmen and Minh Nguyen (2017) also refer to teaching pragmatics in EFL, as grammar, syntax, and vocabulary are not the only necessary components in a foreign language. Cross-cultural pragmatics used in teaching English to learners of other languages has not been fully explored yet, and translation seems to offer an innovative way of approaching the issue (along with monolingual research).

Audio-visual material has been beneficial to EFL classrooms when teaching cross-cultural pragmatics, as “students can put themselves in the vivid atmosphere created by the video materials and understand the pragmatics of the language used by the characters” (Bajrami and Ismaili 2016, 504). The present study expands the view to include the translation context, suggesting that AVT can offer a unique opportunity for introducing cross-cultural differences and advance learner’s pragmatic competence; it is an important addition to the “impoverished” ESL/EFL teaching materials (Rodríguez Peñarroja 2020).

An animated film like *Inside Out* may motivate learners to improve their potential in a foreign language. The Appendix presents sample exercises introducing pragmatic phenomena to EFL.

References

- Bajrami, Lumturie, and Merita Ismaili. 2016. "The Role of Video Materials in EFL Classrooms." *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 232: 502-506.
- Basturkmen, Helen, and Thi Thuy Minh Nguyen. 2017. "Teaching Pragmatics." In *The Routledge Handbook of Pragmatics*, ed. by Barron, Anne, Yueguo Guo, and Gerard Steen, 563-574. London: Routledge.
- Brown, Penelope, and Stephen C. Levinson. 1978. *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Byram, Michael, 2012. "Conceptualizing Intercultural (Communicative) Competence and Intercultural Citizenship." In *The Routledge Handbook of Language and Intercultural Communication*, ed. by Jane Jackson, 85-96. London: Routledge.

Council of Europe. 2020. *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment – Companion volume (CEFR)*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing. Accessed December 15, 2022.

<https://www.coe.int/en/web/common-european-framework-reference-languages/>

Díaz-Cintas, Jorge. 2009. *New Trends in Audiovisual Translation*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Díaz-Cintas, Jorge, and Gunilla Anderman, eds. 2009. *Audiovisual Translation - Language Transfer on Screen*. London: Palgrave-Mcmillan.

Díaz-Cintas, Jorge, and Aline Remael, eds. 2007. *Audiovisual Translation: Subtitling*. London: Routledge.

Eslami-Rasekh, Zohreh. 2005. "Raising the pragmatic awareness of language learners." *ELT Journal* 59 (3): 199–208.

Hofstede, Geert, Gert Jan Hofstede, and Michael Minkov. 2010. *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the mind*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

- Horn, Laurence R., and Gregory Ward. 2006. *The Handbook of Pragmatics*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Laviosa, Sara. 2014. *Translation and Language Education: Pedagogic Approaches Explored*. London: Routledge.
- Laviosa, Sara, Adriana Pagano, Hannu Kemppanen, and Meng Ji. 2017. *Textual and Contextual Analysis in Empirical Translation Studies*. Singapore: Springer.
- Palmer, Frank. 1990. *Modality and the English Modals*. 2nd ed. London: Longman.
- Petillo, Mariacristina. 2023. "The Use of Subtitles in Foreign Language Teaching – Exploring Some Sociolinguistic, Cultural and Translation Features." *Translation and Translanguaging in Multilingual Contexts* 9 (2): 239-260.
- Rodríguez Peñarroja, Manuel. 2020. "Pragmatics: Why Use Audiovisual Input in Second and Foreign Language Learning Contexts." *Revista Docência E Ciberultura* 4 (3): 161–178.
- ShiraeV, Eric B., and David A. Levy. 2020. *Cross-Cultural Psychology Critical Thinking and Contemporary Applications*. 7th ed. New York: Routledge.

- Sidiropoulou, Maria. 2012. *Translating Identities on Stage and Screen: Pragmatic Perspectives and Discoursal Tendencies*. Newcastle-upon-Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Sidiropoulou, Maria. 2015. "Translanguaging Aspects of Modality: Teaching Perspectives through Parallel Data." *Translation and Translanguaging in Multilingual Contexts* 1 (1): 27-48.
- Sidiropoulou, Maria. 2019. "Vagueness-specificity in English-Greek Scientific Translation." *The Routledge Handbook of Translation and Pragmatics*, ed. by Rebecca Tipton, and Louisa Desilla, 259-278. London: Routledge.
- Sifianou, Maria. 1992. *Politeness Phenomena in England and Greece: A Cross-Cultural Perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Takahashi, Satomi. 2010. "Assessing Learnability in Second Language Pragmatics." In *Pragmatics across Languages and Cultures*, ed. by Anna Trosborg, 391-422. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Yule, George. 1996. *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Film

Docter, Pete, and Ronnie Del Carmen. 2015. *Inside Out*. United States: Walt Disney Studios Motion Pictures.

[INSERT APPENDIX HERE, PLEASE].

Address for correspondence

Vasiliki Papakonstantinou

Department of English Language and Literature

School of Philosophy

National and Kapodistrian University of Athens

Panepistimioupoli Zographou

GR-157 84 (Athens)

GREECE

vaspapak@enl.uoa.gr

Publication history

Date received: 30 June 2023

Date accepted: 12 January 2024