

UDC 81'42:81'367.3

DOI <https://doi.org/10.52726/as.humanities/2025.4.19>

I. M. MISHCHUK

*Ph.D. in Pedagogy, Associate Professor,
Associate Professor at the English Philology Department,
Lesya Ukrainka Volyn National University, Lutsk, Ukraine
E-mail: aykido10@ukr.net
<http://orcid.org/0000-0001-8478-7442>*

O. M. HALAPCHUK-TARNAVSKA

*Ph.D. in Philology, Associate Professor,
Associate Professor at the English Philology Department,
Lesya Ukrainka Volyn National University, Lutsk, Ukraine
E-mail: otarnavska@vnu.edu.ua
<http://orcid.org/0009-0006-0527-9567>*

I. V. CHARIKOVA

*Ph.D. in Philology, Associate Professor,
Associate Professor at the English Philology Department,
Lesya Ukrainka Volyn National University, Lutsk, Ukraine
E-mail: mytwins@ukr.net
<http://orcid.org/0000-0002-5080-5216>*

PRACTICAL TECHNIQUES FOR EFFICIENT COMPRESSION IN UKRAINIAN-ENGLISH INTERPRETING

This article examines the practical use of compression in Ukrainian–English interpreting, highlighting its importance for efficiently conveying essential meaning despite linguistic and cognitive challenges. It outlines key strategies such as omission, summarization, reformulation, and lexical compression, illustrated with examples from various contexts including political, media, legal, and academic settings. The paper discusses challenges like preventing excessive compression and preserving the speaker's original intent. It also provides training recommendations, emphasizing summarization exercises and corpus-based analysis. Overall, the article underscores that effective compression is crucial for delivering accurate, clear, and efficient interpretations, particularly in fast-paced and demanding environments.

The article further delves into the cognitive demands placed on interpreters when employing compression techniques, noting that successful application requires not only linguistic proficiency but also strong memory and quick decision-making skills. It emphasizes the importance of understanding cultural nuances and discourse conventions in both Ukrainian and English to ensure that compressed interpretations remain faithful to the original message while being accessible to the target audience. The discussion also touches on the potential risks of compression, such as loss of critical information or unintended shifts in meaning, underscoring the need for careful balance.

In addition, the paper advocates for targeted training approaches to enhance interpreters' compression abilities. It suggests incorporating practical exercises that simulate real-life interpreting scenarios, encouraging interpreters to practice summarization and reformulation under time constraints. The use of corpus-based analysis is recommended to identify common patterns and effective compression strategies in authentic interpreting data. By integrating these methods into interpreter education, the article argues that practitioners can better manage cognitive load and improve overall interpretation quality in Ukrainian–English settings.

Key words: Ukrainian–English interpreting, compression, cognitive load, omission, summarisation, reformulation, lexical compression, interpreter training, discourse patterns, communicative efficiency.

Introduction. Compression plays a key role in interpreting by allowing professionals to deliver the core message while managing mental effort and following the communication standards of the target language. In Ukrainian–English

interpreting, this technique is particularly important because of the differences in sentence structure, discourse flow, and rhetorical styles between the two languages. This article explores the practical use of compression in Ukrainian-to-English

interpreting, emphasizing real-life examples, common difficulties, and the decision-making process of interpreters. Based on well-known interpreting theories such as Gile's Effort Model and the interpretive translation theory, it demonstrates how compression enhances precision, clarity, and effective communication. Additionally, it offers practical advice for training interpreters [Gile 2009].

Interpreting from Ukrainian to English involves various linguistic and mental challenges that demand interpreters to quickly and strategically adjust. A commonly used technique in this context is *"compression"*, which means shortening the source language content while keeping the essential meaning intact in the target language. This approach is particularly important for interpreters operating in high-speed settings like conferences, political events, media interviews, and legal contexts [Pöschhacker, 2016].

The effective application of compression is based on limitations in cognitive processing and the distinct linguistic features of the languages. Ukrainian typically has a flexible sentence structure, numerous modifiers, and repetitive rhetorical elements, while English requires brevity, straightforwardness, and clarity. Consequently, interpreters need to constantly restructure, shorten, and rephrase the material to keep the message clear and understandable for English audiences [Gile 2009; Hertog, van Gucht 2008; Kurz 2001].

The aim of this article is to examine the practical application of compression in Ukrainian–English interpreting and explain how interpreters utilize this technique to preserve meaning, ensure coherence, and achieve effective communication.

Tasks of the article:

1. to identify the linguistic and cognitive reasons that necessitate the use of compression;
2. to examine the practical methods interpreters employ to compress Ukrainian source material;
3. to explore typical difficulties and the interpreter's decision-making during compression;
4. to offer suggestions for improving interpreter training programs.

Theoretical Background. Compression is frequently addressed in interpreting research as a method to reduce cognitive strain and improve the clarity of communication. According to the interpretive theory of translation, the focus is on conveying meaning rather than literal wording,

which naturally involves the use of compression [Seleskovitch, Lederer 1995].

Gile's Effort Model views simultaneous interpreting as a process that combines listening, speaking, and memory tasks, which can sometimes overwhelm an interpreter's cognitive resources. To cope with this, interpreters employ techniques like omission, summarization, and compression to sustain the quality of their performance [Gile 2009].

Studies on cognitive processing show that compression is a deliberate process, directed by the interpreter's evaluation of what is relevant, the audience's requirements, and the pragmatic context [Seeber 2011; Moser-Mercer 2000].

Compression in interpreting is fundamentally linked to the cognitive limitations faced by interpreters during simultaneous processing of source language input and production in the target language. According to Gile [Gile 2009] the Effort Model highlights how interpreters must allocate limited cognitive resources across listening, memory, and speech production tasks, often necessitating strategies like compression to manage overload and maintain interpretation quality. This model underscores that compression is not merely a linguistic choice but a cognitive necessity to balance these competing demands effectively. Furthermore, Seleskovitch and Lederer [Seleskovitch, Lederer 1995] emphasize the interpretive theory of translation, which prioritizes the transfer of meaning over form, inherently supporting the use of compression as a means to convey essential information without being bound to literal equivalence.

Recent studies have also explored the role of pragmatic and cultural factors in guiding compression decisions. Seeber and Moser-Mercer [Seeber 2011; Moser-Mercer 2000] argue that compression is a strategic process influenced by the interpreter's assessment of relevance, audience expectations, and discourse conventions in both source and target languages. This approach requires interpreters to possess not only linguistic proficiency but also cultural competence and situational awareness to ensure that compressed renditions remain faithful to the speaker's intent while being accessible to the target audience. Such findings highlight the complexity of compression as a multifaceted skill that integrates cognitive, linguistic, and cultural dimensions in the interpreting process [Moser-Mercer 2000; Seeber 2011].

2. Linguistic elements that promote compression in Ukrainian–English interpreting:

1) repetitive expressions. Formalities and repeated phrases are common features in Ukrainian public and political speech.

Example:

Ukrainian: «Хотів би ще раз наголосити на тому, що...»

English (compressed): “I want to emphasize that...”

2) extended, complex sentences with multiple clauses. Ukrainian frequently uses participial or subordinate clauses.

Example:

Ukrainian: «У зв'язку з тим, що ситуація продовжує змінюватися...»

English (compressed): “As the situation changes...”

3) abstract noun structures. Ukrainian often employs nominalisations.

Example:

Ukrainian: «Здійснення впровадження реформи...»

English (compressed): “Implementing the reform...”

Methodology/Methods. This study employs a qualitative approach to analyze the practical application of compression in Ukrainian–English interpreting. Data were collected from authentic and simulated interpreting scenarios, focusing on political and public discourse where compression is frequently necessary due to linguistic and cognitive constraints. The analysis centers on identifying specific strategies such as omission, summarization, reformulation, and lexical compression, as outlined by Pöchhacker and Gile, who emphasize the cognitive load management and communicative clarity in interpreting [Gile 2009; Pöchhacker 2016].

The methodology also draws on cognitive theories of interpreting, particularly Gile's Effort Model, which highlights the interplay of listening, production, and memory efforts that influence interpreters' use of compression techniques to maintain performance quality [Gile 2009; Kurz 2001]. Additionally, the study considers the interpretive theory of translation by Seleskovitch and Lederer, which supports the focus on transferring meaning rather than form, inherently encouraging compression [Seleskovitch, Lederer 1995].

Data analysis involves comparing source texts with their interpreted English renditions to identify patterns of compression and evaluate their effectiveness in preserving meaning and coherence. This approach aligns with previous research on interpreter decision-making and cognitive processing [Seeber 2011; Moser-Mercer 2000], which underscores the strategic nature of compression based on relevance and audience needs.

Results and Discussion. The analysis of interpreter performance revealed that effective compression relies heavily on the interpreter's ability to quickly identify and prioritize key information while discarding redundant or non-essential elements. This selective process aligns with Gile's Effort Model, which emphasizes the need to manage limited cognitive resources by balancing listening, memory, and production efforts. Interpreters who skillfully apply omission and summarisation techniques can reduce cognitive overload and maintain the flow of interpretation without compromising the message's integrity. Such strategies are particularly important in fast-paced settings like conferences and media interviews, where time constraints demand concise yet accurate renditions [Albl-Mikasa 2013; Gile 2009; Hertog, van Gucht 2008].

Moreover, the study highlighted the importance of reformulation and lexical compression as complementary strategies that enhance clarity and coherence in the target language. Reformulation allows interpreters to restructure complex Ukrainian sentences into more linear and accessible English expressions, while lexical compression involves choosing concise equivalents that preserve meaning but reduce verbosity. These techniques not only improve listener comprehension but also reflect the structural differences between Ukrainian and English, where the former often employs elaborate modifiers and rhetorical devices that are less common in English discourse [Chernov 2004; Pöchhacker 2016]. Training programs that focus on developing these skills can therefore significantly improve interpreters' efficiency and effectiveness in Ukrainian–English interpretation [Chernov 2004; Pöchhacker 2016].

3. Practical strategies of compression:

1. Omission of non-essential elements. Interpreters exclude parts of the message that are not essential to the main meaning [Albl-Mikasa 2013; Chesterman 2016; Pavlović 2010].

Example:

Ukrainian: «Шановні колеги, пані та панове, дозвольте висловити глибоку подяку...»

English: "Thank you..."

2. Summarisation. Lengthy portions can be shortened to prevent exceeding memory capacity [Baker 2018; Napier, Rohan 2007].

Example:

Ukrainian (long description of background): 120 words.

3. Reformulation. Sentences are reorganized to improve clarity and coherence [Gile 2009; Setton, Dawrant 2016].

Example:

Ukrainian: lengthy clause chains.

English: broken into short, logical units.

4. Lexical compression. Using concise equivalents [Pöhhacker 2016; Shlesinger 1995].

Example:

Ukrainian: «мати на меті реалізацію»

English: "aim to implement"

Practical examples from interpreting contexts [Chesterman 2016; Kurz 2001; Pavlović 2010; Timarová, Čeňková, Meylaerts 2014]:

1. Political interpreting. Ukrainian political speech frequently features lengthy openings, repeated phrases, and formal expressions.

Example 1:

Ukrainian: «Шановні пані та панове, дозвольтевисловитищируподякузаможливість сьогодні звернутися до вас і наголосити на важливості подальшого реформування нашої держави...»

English (compressed): "Thank you for the opportunity to address you today and emphasise the importance of continued reform."

Example 2:

Ukrainian: «Україна стоїть перед серйозними викликами, які потребують негайної реакції та рішучих дій...»

English (compressed): "Ukraine faces serious challenges requiring urgent action."

1. These examples demonstrate how interpreters shorten elaborate rhetorical content into brief, factual summaries [Chernov 2004].

2. Media interpreting. Interpreting in broadcast settings such as television or radio demands quick information processing and the use of compression techniques to keep up with the flow of communication [Albl-Mikasa 2013].

Example 1:

Ukrainian: «Подія викликала надзвичайний резонанс у суспільстві, адже вона стала справжнім викликом для всіх нас...»

English: "The event sparked a strong public reaction and challenged us all."

Example 2:

Ukrainian: «Ми спостерігаємо значне зростання інтересу до цієї теми, особливо серед молоді...»

English: "Interest in this topic is growing, especially among young people."

3. Legal interpreting. Legal interpreting demands accuracy, but compression is applied to remove unnecessary repetition [Moser-Mercer 2000].

Example 1:

Ukrainian: «Підсудний наполягає на тому, що він ніколи не мав наміру завдати шкоди потерпілому...»

English: "The defendant insists he never intended to harm the victim."

Example 2:

Ukrainian: «Він підтвердив, що не заперечує факту своєї присутності, але заперечує участь у правопорушенні...»

English: "He admits he was present but denies involvement in the offence."

4. Academic interpreting. Scholarly presentations frequently include extended sentence structures and the use of nominalized forms [Hertog, van Gucht 2008].

Example 1:

Ukrainian: «У своїй доповіді я прагну окреслити основні результати проведеного нами дослідження, що стосувалося ефективності використання цифрових інструментів...»

English: "My presentation outlines the main findings of our study on digital tools."

Example 2:

Ukrainian: «Питання забезпечення якості освіти набуває все більшої актуальності в умовах глобалізації...»

English: "Ensuring education quality is becoming increasingly important in a globalized world."

Difficulties encountered in applying compression in practice:

1. Preventing excessive compression. Excessive reduction can result in the loss of subtle details or accuracy, especially in legal contexts [Hale 2007; Shlesinger 1995].

2. Balancing speed and accuracy. Interpreters need to make immediate decisions about which information can be condensed without compromising accuracy [Moser-Mercer 2000; Napier, Rohan 2007].

3. Preserving speaker intent. Compression should preserve the intended pragmatic meaning of the message without distortion [Chernov 2004; Setton, Dawrant 2016].

4. Managing emotionally loaded discourse. Media and political language frequently contains metaphors and emotional nuances that demand careful handling to maintain balance [Albl-Mikasa 2013; Shlesinger 1995].

The results of the study indicate that compression strategies such as omission, summarisation, and reformulation are consistently employed by Ukrainian–English interpreters to manage cognitive load and maintain communicative effectiveness. These strategies enable interpreters to condense lengthy and complex Ukrainian source texts into concise English renditions without significant loss of meaning. For example, the omission of non-essential formalities and redundancies typical in Ukrainian political discourse helps streamline the message for English-speaking audiences, aligning with findings by Gile and Seleskovitch and Lederer on the necessity of compression to balance cognitive efforts and preserve core meaning [Gile 2009; Seleskovitch, Lederer 1995].

Furthermore, the discussion highlights the challenges interpreters face in balancing speed, accuracy, and speaker intent during compression. Over-compression risks omitting critical nuances or altering pragmatic functions, especially in emotionally charged or legally sensitive contexts. Interpreters must therefore exercise professional judgment and cultural competence to ensure that compressed output remains faithful and contextually appropriate. This aligns with Seeber's emphasis on cognitive load management and the interpreter's role

in adapting discourse to target audience expectations. The findings also suggest that targeted training in summarization, reformulation, and memory enhancement can improve interpreters' ability to apply compression effectively under pressure [Kurz 2001; Seeber 2011].

Suggestions for interpreter training [Chesterman 2016; Seleskovitch, Lederer 1995]:

- Shadowing combined with summarization exercises to enhance quick identification of key information.
- Sight translation activities with constraints, such as summarizing each paragraph in two to three sentences.
- Memory training exercises aimed at improving information retention.
- Reformulation tasks that emphasize clarity and brevity in English.
- Practice using corpora by examining authentic Ukrainian speeches to recognize common redundancies.

Conclusion. Compression plays a key role in Ukrainian-to-English interpreting, allowing interpreters to preserve effective communication despite intense cognitive demands. Successfully applying this technique involves quick processing, strong language skills, and sound professional decision-making. By understanding common features of Ukrainian speech and the needs of English-speaking listeners, interpreters can use compression effectively while retaining the core message. Consequently, training programs should prioritize exercises in summarization, reformulation, and strategies for managing cognitive load.

Future developments could explore the integration of advanced cognitive training techniques to enhance interpreters' ability to manage compression under pressure. Additionally, incorporating real-time feedback technologies may help interpreters refine their compression strategies to better balance accuracy and efficiency.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Albl-Mikasa, M. *Developing interpreting expertise: The impact of practice and experience. The Interpreters' Newsletter*, 2013. 18, 1–25. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.21256/zhaw-4081>
2. Baker, M. *In other words: A coursebook on translation* (3rd ed.). London, England: Routledge. 2018.
3. Chernov, G. V. *Inference and anticipation in simultaneous interpreting*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands; Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 2004.
4. Chesterman, A. *Memes of translation: The spread of ideas in translation theory* (Rev. ed.). Amsterdam, The Netherlands; Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 2016.
5. Gile, D. *Basic concepts and models for interpreter and translator training* (Rev. ed.). Amsterdam, The Netherlands; Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 2009.

6. Hale, S. *Community interpreting*. Basingstoke, England; New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan. 2007.
7. Hertog, E., & van Gucht, J. (Eds.). *Status and training of interpreters in the EU member states*. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities. 2008.
8. Kurz, I. Conference interpreting: Quality in the ears of the user. *Meta*, 2001. 46(2), 394–409. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.7202/003364ar>
9. Moser-Mercer, B. Simultaneous interpreting: Cognitive potential and limitations. *Interpreting*, 2000. 5(2), 83–94. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1075/intp.5.2.05mos>
10. Napier, J., & Rohan, M. *Applied linguistics and interpreting research: Understanding the connection*. *Interpreting*, 2007. 9(2), 167–192. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1075/intp.9.2.03nap>
11. Pavlović, N. What makes sense? Student interpreters' appraisal of their target texts. *The Interpreters' Newsletter*, 2010. 15, 129–142. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.5167/uzh-42860>
12. Pöchhacker, F. *Introducing interpreting studies* (2nd ed.). Abingdon, England; New York, NY: Routledge. 2016.
13. Seleskovitch, D., & Lederer, M. *A systematic approach to teaching interpretation*. Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf. 1995.
14. Seeber, K. G. *Cognitive load in simultaneous interpreting: Existing theories and new modelling perspectives*. *Interpreting*, 2011. 13(2), 176–204. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1075/intp.13.2.03see>
15. Setton, R., & Dawrant, A. *Conference interpreting: A trainer's guide*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands; Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 2016.
16. Shlesinger, M. *Shifts in cohesion in simultaneous interpreting*. *The Translator*, 1995. 1(2), 193–214. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13556509.1995.10799163>
17. Timarová, Š., Čenková, I., & Meylaerts, R. *Working memory in conference interpreting: A pilot study*. *The International Journal of Translation and Interpreting Research*, 2014. 6(1), 1–18. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.12807/ti.106201.2014.a01>

REFERENCES

1. Albl-Mikasa, M. (2013). *Developing interpreting expertise: The impact of practice and experience*. *The Interpreters' Newsletter*, 18, 1–25. Retrieved from : <https://doi.org/10.21256/zhaw-4081>
2. Baker, M. (2018). *In other words: A coursebook on translation* (3rd ed.). London, England: Routledge.
3. Chernov, G. V. (2004). *Inference and anticipation in simultaneous interpreting*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands; Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
4. Chesterman, A. (2016). *Memes of translation: The spread of ideas in translation theory* (Rev. ed.). Amsterdam, The Netherlands; Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
5. Gile, D. (2009). *Basic concepts and models for interpreter and translator training* (Rev. ed.). Amsterdam, The Netherlands; Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
6. Hale, S. (2007). *Community interpreting*. Basingstoke, England; New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
7. Hertog, E., & van Gucht, J. (Eds.). (2008). *Status and training of interpreters in the EU member states*. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.
8. Kurz, I. (2001). Conference interpreting: Quality in the ears of the user. *Meta*, 46(2), 394–409. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.7202/003364ar>
9. Moser-Mercer, B. (2000). Simultaneous interpreting: Cognitive potential and limitations. *Interpreting*, 5(2), 83–94. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1075/intp.5.2.05mos>
10. Napier, J., & Rohan, M. (2007). *Applied linguistics and interpreting research: Understanding the connection*. *Interpreting*, 9(2), 167–192. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1075/intp.9.2.03nap>
11. Pavlović, N. (2010). What makes sense? Student interpreters' appraisal of their target texts. *The Interpreters' Newsletter*, 15, 129–142. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.5167/uzh-42860>
12. Pöchhacker, F. (2016). *Introducing interpreting studies* (2nd ed.). Abingdon, England; New York, NY: Routledge.
13. Seleskovitch, D., & Lederer, M. (1995). *A systematic approach to teaching interpretation*. Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf.
14. Seeber, K. G. (2011). *Cognitive load in simultaneous interpreting: Existing theories and new modelling perspectives*. *Interpreting*, 13(2), 176–204. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1075/intp.13.2.03see>
15. Setton, R., & Dawrant, A. (2016). *Conference interpreting: A trainer's guide*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands; Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
16. Shlesinger, M. (1995). *Shifts in cohesion in simultaneous interpreting*. *The Translator*, 1(2), 193–214. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13556509.1995.10799163>
17. Timarová, Š., Čenková, I., & Meylaerts, R. (2014). *Working memory in conference interpreting: A pilot study*. *The International Journal of Translation and Interpreting Research*, 6(1), 1–18. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.12807/ti.106201.2014.a01>

І. М. МІЩУК

*кандидат педагогічних наук, доцент,
доцент кафедри англійської філології,
Волинський національний університет імені Лесі Українки, м. Луцьк, Україна
Електронна пошта: aykido10@ukr.net
<http://orcid.org/0000-0001-8478-7442>*

О. М. ГАЛАПЧУК-ТАРНАВСЬКА

*кандидат філологічних наук, доцент,
доцент кафедри англійської філології,
Волинський національний університет імені Лесі Українки м. Луцьк, Україна
Електронна пошта: otarnavska@ynu.edu.ua
<http://orcid.org/0009-0006-0527-9567>*

І. В. ЧАРІКОВА

*кандидат філологічних наук, доцент,
доцент кафедри англійської філології,
Волинський національний університет імені Лесі Українки м. Луцьк, Україна
Електронна пошта: mytwins@ukr.net
<http://orcid.org/0000-0002-5080-5216>*

**ПРАКТИЧНІ АСПЕКТИ ЗАСТОСУВАННЯ КОМПРЕСІЇ
В УСНОМУ ПЕРЕКЛАДІ З УКРАЇНСЬКОЇ НА АНГЛІЙСЬКУ МОВУ**

У статті досліджується практичне застосування компресії в українсько-англійському усному перекладі, підкреслюючи її важливість для ефективної передачі основного змісту незважаючи на лінгвістичні та когнітивні виклики. Окреслено ключові стратегії, такі як опущення, узагальнення, реформулювання та лексична компресія, проілюстровані прикладами з різних контекстів, включно з політичним, медіа, юридичним та академічним середовищами. Обговорюються проблеми, пов'язані з уникненням надмірної компресії та збереженням початкового наміру мовця. Також наведені рекомендації щодо підготовки перекладачів, з акцентом на вправи з узагальнення та корпусний аналіз. Підкреслюється, що ефективна компресія є ключовою для точних, зрозумілих і ефективних перекладів, особливо в швидкому та вимогливому середовищі.

Також розглядаються когнітивні навантаження, які виникають у перекладачів при застосуванні компресії, зазначаючи, що успішне використання цієї стратегії потребує не лише лінгвістичної компетентності, а й розвинутої пам'яті та швидкого прийняття рішень. Наголошується на важливості розуміння культурних особливостей і дискурсивних конвенцій як української, так і англійської мов, щоб стислі переклади залишалися вірними оригінальному повідомленню та були доступними для цільової аудиторії. Обговорюються також потенційні ризики компресії, такі як втрата важливої інформації або небажані зміни значення, що вимагає обережного балансу.

Крім того, у статті пропонуються цілеспрямовані підходи до навчання, спрямовані на покращення навичок компресії у перекладачів. Рекомендується включати практичні вправи, що імітують реальні ситуації усного перекладу, заохочуючи практику узагальнення та реформулювання в умовах обмеженого часу. Також пропонується використовувати корпусний аналіз для виявлення типових моделей і ефективних стратегій компресії на основі автентичних даних. Інтегруючи ці методи в освіту перекладачів, стверджується, що практики зможуть краще управляти когнітивним навантаженням і підвищувати загальну якість перекладу в українсько-англійському контексті.

Ключові слова: українсько-англійський усний переклад, компресія, когнітивне навантаження, опущення, узагальнення, реформулювання, лексична компресія, підготовка перекладачів, дискурсивні патерни, комунікативна ефективність.

Дата першого надходження рукопису до видання: 27.11.2025
Дата прийнятого до друку рукопису після рецензування: 15.12.2025
Дата публікації: 31.12.2025