Title: Negotiating discursive norms; Community interpreting in a Belgian rest home

Name of the authors: Dorien Van De Mieroop, Giovanni Bevilacqua, Lotte Van Hove

Abstract

In spite of the theoretically clearly defined task of an interpreter to translate only what was said by the other interlocutors, naturally-occurring data taken from interpreted interaction show quite a different picture, as many previous studies have already indicated. The discursive norms to which an interpreter in reality orients are interactionally negotiated, rather than prediscursively determined. This article analyses these norms as interactional accomplishments in interpreted interaction that took place in a Belgian home for the elderly. This is not only a setting in which community interpreting has not been studied so far, but it is also a context that is ideally suited for this research topic, since its discursive institutional norms are not as strictly defined as in many other institutional settings, thus implying room for negotiating discursive norms on a turn-by-turn basis. The results demonstrate significant variation in the way breaches of interpreting norms are dealt with, both by the interpreter and the professional, and especially the latter has an important influence on the norms that are oriented to in the course of the interaction. Finally, the implications of these deviations for the particular 'activity type' and the interpreter's situated identity are discussed.

Keywords: discourse analysis, discursive norms, home for the elderly, discourse ecology, situated identity

1. Introduction

Given the Flemish deontological code of social interpreting (COC 2008), a community interpreter's task seems to be quite strictly defined. This deontological code is often explicitly voiced by the interpreter in the introduction to an interpreting session in Flanders. De Keyser describes this introduction, of which the second element is of particular importance here, namely: 'I will interpret everything that is being said, without additions, omissions or adjustments' (De Keyser 2009: 62, authors' translation). By means of this introduction, the discursive norms, i.e. the norms which the interpreter is supposed to adhere to in his or her contributions to the interaction, are clearly set. However, as many studies focusing on naturally-occurring data within an interpreting context have indicated (for a brief overview, see Wadensjö 2008a: 184-185), this is a theoretical scenario that is not consistently attainable in real life. As Wadensjö observes: 'It has been demonstrated that interpreters' work is primarily structured by their understanding of the situation, the ongoing activity and its logic, and secondly by the task of translation' (Wadensjö 2008a: 185). Regarding the interpreter's understanding of such situational elements, the context and goals of the interaction are of course crucial.

First of all, interpreters typically operate in 'institutional or explicitly defined, goal-oriented discourses' (Davidson 2002: 1275), which are also characterized by significant limits on discursive rights. As Agar observes, institutional interaction is surrounded by a number of circumstances such as

‘efficiency, economy, time pressure and background knowledge’, ‘over which neither the institutional representative nor the client have any control’ (Agar 1985: 156). Even though these circumstances, which Agar calls ‘the discourse ecology’ (Agar 1985), are often determined before the actual interaction takes place (e.g. the amount of time that is scheduled for an interpreted doctor’s appointment, see e.g. Davidson 2000; 2001), they are negotiated in the interaction itself on a turn-by-turn basis. Drawing on Drew and Heritage (1992), we start from the idea that the institutional character of an interaction is not determined by its setting, rather it is *talked into being* by its interlocutors.

Secondly, there are several genres of institutional interaction and they all have specific goals and particular norms. For example, diagnostic interviews between doctors and their patients are concerned with making a correct diagnosis and this is done for instance by question-answer sequences in the anamnesis-phase of the interview (Mishler 1984). These genres thus entail particular discursive expectations, for example, a doctor is supposed to ask questions while a patient is expected to answer them (Frankel 1990). Levinson described these genres as ‘activity types’ or ‘social episodes’ which play a central role in language usage for two reasons:

‘[...] on the one hand, they constrain what will count as an allowable contribution to each activity; and on the other hand, they help to determine how what one says will be “taken” – that is, what kinds of inferences will be made from what is said.’ (Levinson 1992: 97)

Of course, these constraints only surround the actual interaction, rather than determine it, but nevertheless it has been observed that interlocutors more often than not incorporate the institutionally expected roles, or situated identities (Zimmerman 1998). As such, they are often found to produce hegemonic, normatively expected identities in their interaction (Holmes 1997). These hegemonic identities are not without variation, especially in the context of community interpreting (see e.g. Leanza (2005) for different interpreter roles in healthcare settings). In general, the situated identity or roleⁱ of an interpreter can be regarded as constantly shifting on a continuum between translator and cultural mediator (Rudvin 2007: 67).

In a triadic speech event, it is highly interesting to study the way the discourse ecology and the discursive norms are negotiated by the three parties. There is usually an imbalance between these parties, since quite often the professional is in a powerful position and is often viewed as the embodiment of the institutional norms of which the interpreter is also fully aware and to which he orients his actions (Davidson 2001). On the other hand, the client is typically powerless and he or she is sometimes even unaware of the particular discursive norms of an interpreted interaction (see e.g. Bot (2005)). This situation sometimes results in the interpreter taking up a gatekeeper role, as described in detail by Davidson (2001: 177), while the client’s role is reduced to that of a passive recipient, but the presence of the interpreter may also empower the client and ‘promote change in medical systems, from doctor-centred to patient-centred communication’ (Baraldi 2009: 134) or interactional control may turn out to be a shifting variable, thus reflecting the polymorphic nature of medical encounters, especially in intercultural and interlinguistic settings (Merlini 2009: 111).

In this article, we aim to contribute to the analysis of the negotiation of discursive rights and norms within naturally-occurring data. In particular, we will look at the way the interlocutors (the interpreter included) orient to the interpreter’s role on the continuum between translator and cultural mediatorⁱⁱ. Both roles have different discursive rights, since the ‘allowable contributions’ of

each role differ, both on a sequential level and on a wider discursive level. We will try to integrate both levels of analysis and we will thus look at the way all the participants' orientate to the two sets of norms, which, generally speaking, can be defined as follows: as a translator, the interpreter's rights are limited to strictly transmitting information from one language to another without any personal additions or omissions, thus providing an 'equivalent' translation (cf Bot 2009: 117), and he or she only has second turn rights. As a cultural mediator however, the interpreter's discursive rights are similar to those of a participant in the interaction, who can contribute whatever he or she wishes at any point in the interaction. Basing ourselves on previous research on interpreted interactions that take as 'a starting point the by now largely accepted and documented view of the dialogue interpreter as an active participant in the interaction' (Merlini 2009: 90) and in line with the findings of for example Bot (2009), we expect to find a shifting orientation on the continuum between both roles (translator or mediator) and thus to both sets of norms related to the discursive rights of each role.

In order to do that we explore a setting within which community interpreting, to our knowledge, has not been described so far, namely the setting of a home for the elderly. Within this context, we collected interpreted interaction between residents of the rest home and members of the staff (see data description below). We chose this context for three reasons:

- (1) The discourse ecology of interactions within such a context is generally less strict than in other contexts in which interpreted interaction has been studied so far, as for example legal (Hale 2002; Jacobson 2008), immigration (Tillmann 2009), media (Wadensjö 2008b), medical (see Pöchhacker and Shlesinger (2005) for an overview) and business (Gavioli & Maxwell 2007) contexts.
- (2) The interpreter is a full-time employee at the rest home, where he is employed as a social worker who is often called upon to fulfil interpreting tasks (see data description below). Thus he is a bilingual professional whose expert knowledge and familiarity with the context give him a potential for autonomy which would be unthinkable for a "mere" interpreter. Because of this, this interpreter potentially has a much more powerful position in the interaction.
- (3) All the interlocutors knew each other rather well in advance, which resulted in a fairly informal atmosphere during the interaction.

For these reasons, quite a lot of explicit negotiations of discursive norms are to be expected. As such, this context of interpreted interaction with a bilingual professional functioning as an interpreter in a home for the elderly is an ideal locus for analyzing these norms as interactional accomplishmentsⁱⁱⁱ.

In particular, we focus first on what we perceive to be the normatively expected 'turn type pre-allocation' for interpreted interaction, which can be defined as the fact that 'participants orient to there being special restrictions on what sort of action may be done in any particular turn' (Atkinson 1982: 103). Secondly, we look at deviations to this pattern, both from a turn-taking point of view as from a wider interactional perspective. These deviations are still situated within the realm of institutional interaction, since it is clear that the interlocutors in these instances do not orient to informal, conversational norms as explicated by Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (1974). Rather, they orient to the norms of 'formal' (as defined by Atkinson 1982: 110-111), purposeful institutional interaction in which the interpreter would then take on the role of a full participant. In the final

section of this article, we draw conclusions regarding the implications of these deviations and their co-constructed nature for the situated identities of the interpreter and for the interactional negotiation of the specific 'activity type'.

2. Data description

The data were collected in a home for the elderly in the province of Limburg in the northeast of Belgium. Using interpreters in this setting is fairly common because this region has a large number of elderly first generation Italian immigrants who used to work in the coal mines (for example in villages such as Beringen, Waterschei, Genk, Heusden). This was the result of a large wave of immigration that started at the end of World War II. At that time, the Belgian government needed to increase the number of mine workers by 50% (Scocci & Tanini 1997) and at that very moment, the Italian government asked Belgium to deliver a considerable amount of coal. The Belgian government agreed to this in exchange for mine workers, and thus many Italians emigrated to work in the mines. After a little while, the families were reunited and the Italians lived near each other in a close knit community, a sort of 'little Italy' in Belgium. The first generation immigrants did not really try to integrate nor did the Belgian authorities undertake any measures to enhance integration. The Italian women were especially isolated since they stayed at home and had little contact with the local population, whereas their husbands needed to communicate with their local co-workers. In his anthropological study on an immigrant community originating from a Sicilian province, Leman (1982) describes how these immigrants did not really arrive in 'Belgium', but rather they arrived in 'social structures' prepared by other immigrants from that region who had arrived earlier. The situation improved with the second generation of immigrants who went to school in Belgium and even married Belgian citizens.

More than sixty years later, these first generation immigrants have now retired. Instead of having returned to Italy, they have stayed in Belgium because their children and grandchildren were living there as well and because in the meantime, they had become strangers in their home towns or villages. Many wives survived their husbands who often died early (many from work related diseases) and so they ended up in homes for the elderly. These homes are run by Flemish authorities and Flemish, a language which these immigrants never had to learn, is the working language that these first generation immigrant are confronted with on a daily basis.

Our data consist of three interpreted conversations that took place in a home for the elderly in a typical coal mining village in the province of Limburg. The conversations were both audio- and videorecorded and took place between February and May 2010. The interpreter is a second generation immigrant, and he is perfectly bilingual. He works at the rest home as a social worker and, following Jalbert (1998), he can thus be characterized as a bilingual professional. Because of this, he is regularly called upon (about six times a month) to function as an interpreter during conversations that take place with the many first generation immigrants who are residents in the rest home and who only speak Italian. He has not received any professional training as an interpreter, but in his professional practice, he is often asked to fulfil this role^{iv}.

The following table gives a brief overview of the content and the participants of each interview.

Number	Name	Length (in minutes)	Participants	Content
1	Expectations	30'	Resident Interpreter Senior nurse	The 86 year old male resident is new in the rest home. Since he always gets up at 4 a.m., he expects to be bathed before breakfast. This is not possible and the nurse tries to come up with a solution for this problem. Other expectations of the resident are discussed as well.
2	Incontinence	18'	Resident Interpreter Senior nurse	The 82 year old female resident has recently developed some physical problems, such as a shortness of breath, aches in the arm, and most importantly, incontinence. These problems are discussed and a solution is proposed: by moving the resident to another room, she will be closer to the nursing staff and it will be easier for her to get help.
3	Mini mental	26'	Resident Interpreter Occupational therapist	This interview consists of the Mini Mental State Exam. This is a Folstein test that contains standard questions that probe for the condition of the respondent's memory. It is used to screen residents for dementia. This resident is an 87 year old woman.

Table 1: overview of the three interviews

3. Analyses

In order to describe how the discursive norms of interpreted interaction are negotiated on a turn-by-turn basis, we will first describe what we understand by these norms in terms of turn-taking. So we will first show an example of the normatively expected pattern of an interpreted question-answer sequence. After that, we gradually widen the scope from turn-taking to more general interactional phenomena and we will then illustrate in detail how the interpreter deviates from these discursive norms, for example by inserting his own additions. Finally, we demonstrate the interpreter's discursive orientation towards interpreting norms, for example by analysing the way such self-initiated topics are being negotiated. As such, we aim to provide a multi-faceted view of the way in which discursive norms are interactionally oriented to in the interpreted interactions under study here.

3.1 Normative sequential expectations

From a theoretical point of view, the interlocutors have a different status regarding discursive turn taking rights. As such, their discursive rights are closely related to their situated identities of being either professional, resident or interpreter. The interpreter's contributions are normatively limited to second turns. The professional and the resident are the only interlocutors with first turn rights. We now give an example that illustrates this turn type pre-allocation (Atkinson 1982). This extract

contains a question-answer sequence from the mini mental interview. This interview is highly structured, since in this case, the professional's task is to ask a list of predefined and preformulated questions which she had brought to the interview. The interpreter's task is also extremely clear-cut, since he actually received an Italian translation of these questions on paper which he brought to the interview. In spite of the interpreter having a list of questions to ask, the interpreter hardly looked at his paper, because the professional still led the interview, and she asked the questions in a different order than on the paper. Because of the discourse ecology of this particular interaction, the resident's turn-taking rights were thus actually limited to giving answers - typically in the third position. The final turn of such a sequence (i.e. the fourth turn) is pre-allocated to the interpreter, who translates the resident's answer. We see an example of this turn distribution in extract 1.

Extract 1 (mini mental)^v

159. P: °vraag eens of het een ziekenhuis is°
 °ask whether it is a hospital°
160. I: Si: t- ti trovi all'ospedale qua
 One: are y- you in a hospital here
161. R: No
 No
162. I: No nee zegt ze
 No no she says

In line 159, the professional asks the question (the source text). This is translated in line 160 (the target text) by the interpreter. The resident immediately answers the question in line 161, which is then translated in line 162 by the interpreter. So both the first pair part, the question, and the second pair part, the answer, are spread over two turns and the interpreter's discursive rights are normatively expected to be limited to the second turn of each pair part. So sequentially speaking, this fragment is perfect, since it gives an exact illustration of the theoretically expected pattern^{vi}.

3.2 Deviations from the discursive norms

3.2.1 Deviations within the normatively expected sequential pattern

There are many deviations that occur within this normatively expected sequential pattern. Some of these deviations are not very problematic at all, as described in the context of doctor-patient interviews (Van De Mierop & Mazeland 2009). We see an example of such a non-problematic deviation in the following extract, which on the one hand follows the sequential pattern as described above, but on the other hand deviates because there is overlap between the first turn and the second turn, thus between the question in the source text and the question in the target text.

Extract 2 (mini mental)

64. P: En welk jaar °da was ik nog [vergeten vragen°°

- And which year 'I forgot [to ask that°°
65. I: [Quale anno siamo (.)
[Which year is it (.)
66. in quale anno viviamo adesso
in which year are we living now
67. R: Siamo::: (.) do domiledieci
It is::: (.) two two thousand and ten
68. I: Tweeduizend en tien
Two thousand and ten

In this fragment, the professional adds a comment to her question (*I forgot to ask that*). Both the content of this comment and the fact that its delivery is noticeably quieter than the surrounding talk, indicate its non-essential nature to the interview. The interpreter overlaps near the end of the professional's turn, but due to the nature of the last words of this turn and contextual elements, in particular, the fact that the interview had a very clear-cut goal and was fully laid out in the predefined list of questions, this overlap is not problematic at all since no information is lost, the only thing that is potentially gained is time. This indicates the interpreter's (by means of overlap) and professional's (by means of the low speaking volume) joint orientation to the goal of the interaction and its discourse ecology, namely getting the results of the mini mental test within a reasonable time span. However, it is highly doubtful that time is gained because of the paraphrase in the translation in line 66. In this fragment, the paraphrase probably functions as complementary to the initial question, and it can be regarded as an 'overlap absorption technique' (Schegloff 1987: 80), since the professional and the interpreter are speaking at the same time and a repetition is possibly needed in order to ensure a successful continuation of the question-answer sequence. Because of the decreasing volume of the professional's comment, which results in almost a whisper on the one hand, and the high sound intensity of the interpreter's turns on the other hand, this repetition is probably not needed to solve hearing problems. Instead, we argue that this post-overlap repetition is needed here in order to enable the switch in participation frameworks (Goffman 1981). This notion refers to the participation status that all people who hear a word being spoken, have towards it (Goffman 1981: 3). Usually, participation frameworks are not very complicated, since it is often sufficient to discern simply a speaker and a hearer, the latter being divided further between primary addressees and overhearers. As explained in Van De Mierop (forthcoming), this concept is highly useful for interpreted data since it enables us to view an interpreted interaction as a constant switch between two linguistically discernable participation frameworks in which the interpreter is always a speaker or a primary addressee, while the professional and the resident are either (1) speaker and primary addressee or (2) inactive overhearer, depending on the type of participation framework. This is shown in figure 1, which contains illustrations that are accurate conversions of screenshots that were taken from the first interview but of which only the line drawings are retained for reasons of anonymity^{vii}.

Figure 1

In this interaction, the switch in participation frameworks is extremely clear, since the resident always explicitly faces the person who is talking, both in the Dutch framework in which she is a passive overhearer, and in the Italian framework in which she is a speaker and a primary addressee. The analysis of the video data of this fragment reveals that the resident is still facing the professional

during the overlap and even during the pause in line 65 and she actually switches positions right after the pause during the paraphrase of the translated question in line 66 (see Figure 2).

Figure 2

As figure 2 illustrates, it is only in line 66 that the resident's eye gaze is directed at the interpreter. As Goodwin discussed, face-to-face conversation is characterized by 'systematic procedures for achieving appropriate states of mutual gaze' (Goodwin 1981: 93). In cases in which the hearer is not gazing at the speaker, as in the beginning of this fragment, restarts and pauses are quite typical features that help the speaker to 'await the gaze of a recipient before developing the sentence further' (Goodwin 1980: 285). Thus it is not surprising that after the initial question, the interpreter pauses and then reformulates his original question at the point in which the gaze of the resident is obtained and the switch in participation framework is thus achieved.

However, the interpreter's frequent use of paraphrases and repetitions in his translations does not only occur at switches in participation framework, rather it is a highly frequent non-sequential deviation that often emerges within the turn. A comparison of the average sentence length of the professional's questions and the interpreter's translations of the mini mental interview^{viii} indicates that this is a general tendency: on average, the professional uses 5.8 words per turn, while the interpreter needs 12.7 words to translate these turns. A similar, although weaker, tendency is found in the comparison of the resident's versus the interpreter's turns: on average, the resident uses 4.7 words per turn, while the interpreter's turns contain 7.4 words. These numbers indicate several things. First of all, we cannot speak of a language-specific tendency since it is not the case that one language as opposed to another typically requires more words. Secondly, these numbers are a generalization of what is actually going on. While the additions to the translations of the resident's turns are predominantly quotatives (see for example fragment 1, line 162), the additions in the translations of the professional's turns are more fundamentally breaking institutional expectations and the accompanying discursive norms. That is why we focus here only on paraphrases that occur during these translations and which occur within the same participation framework, since these additions can thus not be viewed as absorbing the switch in participation framework, as was the case in extract 2. The following extract gives a good illustration of such a paraphrase within the Italian participation framework.

Extract 3 (mini mental)

92. P: en welke stad zijn we
and which city are we
93. I: e quale città siamo adesso >dove ci troviamo adesso< la città
and which city are we now >where do we find ourselves now< the city
94. R: città:: città (di) ((name of the city))
city:: city (of) ((name of the city))
95. I: ((name of the city))

In line 93, the interpreter first translates the professional's turn quite literally, even maintaining the grammatical error of the deletion of the preposition 'in' which occurs both in the source text and the target text (*and which city are we*). Other than that, this question is grammatically complete, but the interpreter adds an interrogative sentence, which is actually unnecessary both from a grammatical and from a content perspective. During this turn he also adds hand gestures (repetitive tapping on the table with one finger) that suggest the current location. He ends his turn by adding a noun that is clearly separate from the previous grammatically complete utterance and that functions as hint for the specific item of information that is needed as an answer. This hint is picked up by the resident, since she repeats it twice in line 94 before providing the correct answer.

This form of providing hints is still fairly implicit, but there are also non-sequential deviations which are more intrusive, especially given the nature of this particular interview and its goal of determining whether, or to what extent, the resident suffers from Alzheimer's disease. What happens quite often is that the interpreter not only paraphrases or repeats the question, but that he also changes the format of the open-ended question to a multiple choice question by listing the options from which the resident can choose.

Extract 4 (mini mental)

54. P: Nog een vraagje over de tijd welk seizoen is het
Another question about the time which season is it
55. I: Quale stagione siamo ((name)) (.) quale stagione (.) le >stagioni
Which season is it ((name)) (.) which season (.) the >seasons
56. ci sono quattro stagioni all'anno c'è la primavera estate
there are four seasons in a year that is spring summer
57. autunno e inverno< quale s- quale stagione siamo adesso
autumn and winter< which s- which season are we now
58. (1.5)
59. R: Io p- (1.7) penso per me la primavera
I t- (1.7) think for me spring
60. I: Zij denkt dus e:h lente
So she thinks u:h spring

In this extract, the interpreter starts his turn by literally translating the question. After a pause he repeats the keywords of his question (line 55: *which season*), which he repeats again after another pause (line 55: *the seasons*). Then he expands his turn by means of a rush through, which typically enables a speaker to maintain floor holding rights when he approaches 'a possible completion of a turn constructional unit' (Schegloff 1981: 76), and which is used here also as a device to quickly insert a hint after the pauses in line 55 that together with the resident's facial expression and vocalizing movements of her lips suggest the resident's difficulty in answering the question. This is confirmed afterwards by the fairly long pauses (lines 58 and 59) and the tentative answer by the resident, as indicated by the addition of 'I think', which functions as a quality hedge here that suggests that 'the speaker is not taking full responsibility for the truth of his utterance' (Brown & Levinson 1987: 164). A very similar example can be seen in extract 5, in which the question is first translated and paraphrased (line 47). Then a justification of this question is added, which is a follow-up question on

a previous question. The latter concerned the date which the resident had answered by stating that it was the sixth of May. After this, the format of the question is changed by quickly naming the possible answers (line 48-49).

Extract 5 (mini mental)

46. P: De vraag is welke dag van de week is het
The question is which day of the week is it
47. I: Quale giorno il giorn- siamo il sei maggio è giusto ma quale giorno siamo vuol dire
Which day the day- It is the sixth of May, that is right, but which day, that means
48. >lunedì martedì mercoledì giovedì venerdì sabato e
>*Monday Tuesday Wednesday Thursday Friday Saturday and*
49. [domenica<
[*Sunday*<
50. R: [A:h oggi oggi siamo: giovedì
[*A:h today today is Thursday*
51. I: °donderdag (.) juist°
°Thursday (.) right°

As mentioned above, these turn expansions change the format of the open-ended question to a multiple choice question which is of course easier to answer and by which the difficulty of the mini mental-test decreases. From a normative perspective, this is of course problematic since the interpreter's alterations to the original may have an effect on the practical outcome of the interview, namely the score on the mini mental test. Also from an emic perspective, on several occasions, the professional explicitly marks the interpreter's additions and hints that facilitate the resident's responses as problematic. This is demonstrated in the following fragment in which the resident has to spell the word 'mondo' backwards, and which also deviates from the normative sequential pattern (see discussion below).

Extract 6 (mini mental)

347. R: M
348. I: M
349. P: °ja laat haar maar gewoon eerst doen°°
°*yes just let her do it first*°°
350. I: °jaja°°
°*yes yes*°°
351. R: E:::h N
352. I: N
353. R: T
354. I: D
355. R: D?

356. I: D
357. R: °mondo° D D
358. I: E cosa ti rimane ancora
And what is still left for you
359. (5.8)
360. I: Hai detto la M la N la D e ti rimane ancora una consonante
You have said the M the N the D and one consonant still remains
361. (1.9)
362. °Consonante o vocale°
°Consonant or vowel°
363. P: Ge moet nie zoveel zeggen [ge zegt ge helpt te veel @@@@
You must not say that much [you say you help too much @@@@
364. I: [ja nee nee ma klinker of medeklinker
[yes no no but vowel or consonant
365. P: [@@@@@@
366. I: [@@@@@@

In this spelling task, the resident's answer is immediately repeated by the interpreter (lines 348 and 352) and even corrected (lines 353-356), although he is of course 'duty-bound to repeat the (...) misspelling' (Mason 2009: 58). In the beginning of the resident's answer and in a voice that is noticeably quieter than the surrounding talk, the professional makes a remark about the interpreter's verbal behaviour which is affirmed by the interpreter in the subsequent turn (line 349-350). The latter's behaviour does not change and further prompts are added (lines 358, 360, 362), especially after long pauses which mark the resident's inability to complete the task. In line 363, the professional again comments on the interpreter's hints in a more direct way, as is shown by the repeated use of the direct form of address 'you' and the modal verb *niet moeten* ('must not') which indicates negative obligation. This comment is bald on record (Brown & Levinson 1987: 69), but its face threatening nature is mitigated by the laughter that is latched on the statement. The interpreter overlaps the professional's comment by a justification in which he explains the nature of his prompts. The turn ends in joint laughter. So both comments of the professional explicitly point to the problematic nature of the interpreter's additions to his translations, but these comments are also both mitigated, either by the quiet delivery (line 349) or by the laughter that is latched on (line 363 and 365). In spite of this mitigated nature, these comments clearly sanction the interpreter's breach of his discursive rights. In line 364, the interpreter's justification which overlaps the professional's turn-in-progress, demonstrates the interpreter's awareness of his lack of discursive rights to add hints or comments to his translations.

3.2.2 Deviations from the normatively expected sequential pattern

Sequential patterns in the interaction often deviate from the pattern that is theoretically expected. This means that instead of always having two turn trajectories, which consist of the statement in the source text and its translation in the target text, there are also statements that are not translated by the interpreter (as we already saw in the fragment above). These occur in many forms, as was

already observed for example in the context of interpreted doctor-patient interaction (e.g. Bolden 2000; Van De Mierop & Mazeland 2009). An example of such a single turn trajectory is the unmediated response, which occurs in the following question-answer sequence.

Extract 7 (expectations)

181. R: mi pare che ce ne erano tre di docce
It seems to me that there were three showers
182. I: sì sì
Yes yes
183. R: tre docce tutte grande
Three very big showers

In this sequence, the interpreter gives an unmediated affirmative reaction (line 182) to a comment of the resident in line 181. This unmediated turn by the interpreter is ratified by the resident, who then immediately continues his comment (line 183).

These unmediated responses are not always ratified, thus signaling that the discursive rights of the interpreter are limited in these second positions. It is a remarkable fact that it is quite often the interpreter himself who implicitly does not ratify his own response, as such demonstrating an orientation to the discursive norms of interpreting. In these cases, the interpreter mostly continues with a post-hoc translation of the question which functions as a verification of his previous unmediated answer, which thus results in a sequential inversion of the theoretically expected pattern. An example of this can be seen in the following extract.

Extract 8 (mini mental)

431. I: Eh te lo do fai con calma c'è tutta la parte qua disegni
And I'll give it to you do it calmly you have all the room here draw
432. copii dunque il disegno che si vede là
so copy the drawing that you see there
433. R: Devo fare piccola o ↑grande
Do I have to do it small or ↑big
434. I: Come vuoi
As you like
435. Mag ze moet [ze het klein of
Can she must [she it small or
436. P: [da maakt nie [uit
[that does not [matter
437. I: [maakt niet nie uit
[does not not matter
438. P: Alst maar de juiste vorm heeft
Provided it has the right shape
439. I: Soltanto se ce ha le giuste forme ma puoi fare piccolo o grande

It only has to have the right shape but you can do it small or big

In lines 431 and 432 the interpreter translates the instructions as given in the prior turn by the professional (omitted here). The resident asks for a further explanation in line 433 and the interpreter immediately answers this question without translating, thus generating an unmediated response (line 434). After the termination of this question-answer sequence in Italian, the interpreter does translate the question of line 433 in line 435. This verifying question is paralinguistically latched onto the Italian answer in line 434, as can be derived from the video data. These show that line 434 is spoken together with a large hand gesture and a nodding of the head, which continues during the beat of silence between line 434 and 435 that is further marked by the beginning of an explicit forward movement towards the table in the direction of the professional, whom he is facing while voicing line 435 (see Figure 3).

*** Figure 3***

The professional then confirms the response (line 436), which is mirrored by the interpreter (line 437), who again responds in an unmediated way. This unmediated response is ratified by the professional, who elaborates on her answer in line 438. The interpreter then provides a summary translation in line 439, which not only translates the elaboration of the answer, but which also repeats his initial unmediated response of line 434, albeit now in a version that has been ratified by the professional. So, even 'after an unmediated response, the authorisation of the given information is still a normative restriction which the participants try to fulfil' (Van De Mierop & Mazeland 2009: 135; authors' translation).

As previous research has already demonstrated, such unmediated responses are not always limited to a single turn, as was the case in the previous extract. Instead, there may be long unmediated questioning sequences, which come to a close when the interpreter provides a summary translation of the previous turns. The latter has often been observed to be accompanied by one or more comments by the interpreter (Bolden 2000: 393). Apart from the third interview that contained the mini mental test which had a fixed content and was structurally predefined, such unmediated questioning sequences are ubiquitous in our data. We see this especially in the first interview which is quite loosely structured and is characterized by sequences that deviate significantly from the theoretically expected pattern. The following fragment is a very typical one and it gives a good idea of the rest of the interview. It starts with a vaguely formulated question in the Dutch speaking participation framework (lines 21-22) and twenty lines later, it ends with the summary translation of the mediated response by the interpreter (lines 42-50). The length of the fragment, and in particular of the unmediated questioning sequence in the Italian framework, is quite remarkable from a theoretical point of view, but it is very unremarkable in comparison to the rest of the interaction. In order to enhance the readability of the analyses, we have broken the fragment down into three extracts (9, 10 and 11).

Extract 9 (expectations)

21. P: E::h misschien moete toch ne keer peilen naar zijn

22. *U::h maybe you still have to probe once for his*
verwachtingen daaromtrent of wat hem daaraan stoort
expectations regarding that or what bothers him regarding that
23. I: *Quale sone le tue aspettative riguardo l'andare dunque nel*
What are your expectations regarding taking a
24. *bagno in bagno il venerdì'e[::*
bath the bathing on Friday e[::
25. R: [scusa ()
[excuse me

In this extract, the professional formulates the question in lines 21-22. This question is remarkable for two reasons. Firstly, it is formulated in an indirect way since it directly addresses the interpreter instead of the resident and it explicitly gives the interpreter the task of formulating the question (*you have to probe*). Both of these elements are often omitted in triadic speech events, in which the interpreters are normatively treated as ‘non-persons’ (Wadensjö (2008a: 186), drawing on Goffman (1959)). Secondly, the question is very tentatively formulated, as the initial hesitation, the hedges (*maybe, once*), and the lack of clarity regarding the focus (*probing for expectations or irritations?*) clearly show. We argue that the combination of these two elements, namely treating the interpreter as a full participant in the interaction on the one hand and vagueness in the question on the other hand, is crucial since it implicitly reveals the professional’s orientation to more general institutional discursive norms instead of the discursive norms of an interpreted interaction. In the subsequent turn, except for the addition of the temporal reference (*on Friday*) which was actually voiced by the professional in the turn immediately preceding the fragment, we see a fairly literal translation of this tentatively formulated question. So, if we only look at this turn, we could say that the interpreter initially orients to the discursive interpreting norms, but this orientation is not visible in the rest of the sequence.

Extract 10 (expectations)

26. I: adesso s- adesso tocca a te parlare
Now s- now it is your turn to talk
27. P: [()]
28. R: [sì sì a- alle sei sei e mezza mi vado a fare o bagno aspetta
Yes yes at six half past six I take a bath I wait
29. alle otto otto e mezza e devo mangia m'asciugo asciu-
till eight half past eight and I have to eat I dry myself dr-
30. I: Tu vorresti essere già lavato prima di andare a fare colazione=
You would like to be washed before you go to breakfast=
31. R: =Ja ja=
=Yes yes=
32. I: =Perché ti alzi presto
=Because you get up so early
33. R: Eh sì
Uh yes

34. I: Perché prima ho capito bene prima all'altra casa di riposo
Because before if I understood correctly before in the other rest home
35. andavi in bagno all'↑e=
you took a bath ↑at=
36. R: =alle quattro
 =At four
37. I: Alle quattro
At four
38. R: Sì
Yes
39. I: Allora tu sei abituato a questo sistema
So you are used to that system
40. R: alle sei alle sei e mezza sono contento aaaaha nel bagno
At six at half seven I am happy to take aaaha a bath
41. coi pantaloncini è freddo fuori e aspetta e aspetta
in underpants it is cold outside and I wait and I wait

After a prompt by the interpreter to start talking, which is probably elicited by the overlap in the previous extract (line 24-25), the resident starts answering the question. Initially, this is briefly in overlap with the professional, but since both of the other interlocutors orient to the Italian participation framework, as is also paralinguistically evident since both the interpreter and the resident continue to face each other during the overlap. The lack of eye gaze directed at the professional thus clearly signals that the resident is oriented at the talk of the interpreter, whom he is gazing at (Goodwin 1980) and it is thus not surprising that the professional's turn ends rather quickly. During the rest of the unmediated interaction of the extract above the professional remains silent and occasionally writes something down or nods slightly. After the resident's response to the initial question, the interpreter asks four follow-up questions (lines 30, 32, 34-35 and 39) and takes a turn which is hearable as checking understanding (line 37). These questions are not based on information previously formulated by the professional, but they are based on the interpreter's contextual knowledge of the system and of the resident's habits, both in the current rest home and in his previous rest home, as is implicitly hinted at in line 34 (*if I understood correctly*). As such, the interpreter is orienting to general interactional norms of institutional contexts, in which the professional is typically asking questions and the lay person is giving the answers (Atkinson 1982: 111). This orientation is in line with the implicit orientation of the professional's question (see discussion of extract 9). Thus it is not surprising that the breach of the discursive interpreting norms is not sanctioned by the professional, as was the case in extract 6, since the latter was the first one to orient to these general interactional norms by formulating a question in which the interpreter was addressed as a full participant.

The final part of this long fragment from the first interview shows the interpreter's summary translation of the unmediated interaction of the previous 20 lines.

Extract 11 (expectations)

42. I: Hij heeft me da dus hij staat heel vroeg op dus om

- He has me that^{ix} so he gets up very early so at*
43. *zes uur halfzeven staat hij op en eigenlijk zou hij eigenlijk*
 six o'clock half seven he gets up and actually he would actually
44. *in bad willen geweest zijn vooraleer hij gaat ontbijten*
 like to have been in the bath before he goes to have breakfast
45. *ontbijt is om half negen hij zegt als ik in bad moet gaan tegen*
 breakfast is at half nine he says if I have to take a bath at
46. *een uur of kwart na moet ik inderdaad de hele tijd daar*
 a quarter past then the whole time I indeed have to walk
47. *in m'n peignoir rondlopen e eigenlijk ben ik graag (.) gewassen*
 around there in my dressing gown and actually I like to be (.) washed
48. *vooraleer ik naar ontbijt ga .hhh hij heeft de gewoonte*
 before I go to breakfast .hhh he has the habit
49. *dat heeft hij mij ook verteld toen ie hier binnen-*
 he has also told me that when he here inside-
50. *dus in het vorige rusthuis ging die om vier uur 's morgens in bad.*
 so in the previous rest home he took a bath at four in the morning.

This translation starts with a summary in the third person, in which the resident's implicit request to take a bath before breakfast (lines 43-45) is tentatively (cf repeated hedge 'actually' in line 43) formulated at the end. After that, a direct quote (lines 45-48) is introduced, of which the boundaries are distinctly marked by means of the introductory quotative verb (*he says*, line 45) and the closing audible in-breath (*.hhh*, line 48). The content of this direct quote is modified in comparison with the source text: while the resident referred to feeling cold because he has to walk around in his underpants (line 41), the interpreter refers to walking around in his dressing gown (line 46-47). But also metadiscursively, the content is altered slightly: while the description of the problem is boosted (*indeed*, line 46), the request is hedged (*actually*, line 47). After the audible in-breath, the interpreter switches back to a translation in the third person in which he formulates the background of the problem, namely the previous rest home's habit of bathing the residents at 4 a.m. Interestingly, the interpreter initiated this topic himself (previous extract, line 34), but this is not reflected in the translation: the use of the *verbum dicendi* 'vertellen' (*to tell*, line 49) in this particular 'activity type' of interpreted interaction determines how this translation will be "taken" (Levinson 1992: 97) and thus it is inferred that the patient initiated this topic. So, the fact that this topic was initiated by the interpreter, which is quite an explicit breach of an interpreter's discursive rights (cf section below), is actually blurred in his summary translation.

So in this summary translation of the preceding questioning sequence in the Italian framework, the interpreter shifts footing twice: first, he uses the third person reference, he then shifts to a clearly marked direct quote and then he shifts back to a third person reference. The latter has been described as a distancing tactic in interpreted interaction which thus implicitly 'avoids alignment with the source speaker' (Angermeyer 2009: 5), and in certain cases, also the quotative has been observed to have this function (Van De Mierop forthcoming). However, in this summary translation it is fairly doubtful that these formulations have a distancing function since, as we discussed earlier, this way of formulating merely reflects the mundane way of talking that was implicitly set as a norm by the professional in the initial question of this fragment (extract 9, lines 21-22). So this fragment showed

that, rather than being prediscursively determined, the discursive norms that the interlocutors orient to are interactionally negotiated on a turn-by-turn basis.

3.3 Justifying own contributions

As an interpreter, one is not supposed to initiate topics; comment on prior turns; or make additional remarks. This is because these activities are not a part of the discursive rights of an interpreter and they go beyond all the roles described in the 'reception format' which Wadensjö (1998) developed for interpreter roles and which parallels Goffman's 'production format' (Goffman 1979). Based on the previous analyses however, we have already demonstrated that the interpreter in these data often orients to general interactional norms and that his discursive rights are thus not always limited to merely reproducing talk, rather these norms are discursively negotiated.

So we could expect that the initiation of topics for example by the interpreter is not signalled as problematic in most cases^x, especially since it is usually not sanctioned by the professional in the interviews. Interestingly, however, the data demonstrate that the interpreter explicitly marks his own comments and topic initiations in all three interviews. This indicates the interpreter's awareness of what is, and what is not, considered to be an allowable contribution to this 'activity type' (Levinson 1992: 69). As such, these justifications demonstrate an explicit orientation to the discursive norms of interpreted interaction. Even though these interviews differed quite a lot regarding the negotiation of the interpreter's role, such justifications occur in all three conversations. We first show an example of such a justification.

Extract 12 (expectations)

127. I: Maar hij hij als ik het goed begrijp hij heeft dus echt
But he he if I understand correctly he has so really
128. hij is vroeg wakker [maar dat
he is awake early [but that
129. P: [ja: ja
[ye:s yes
130. I: krijg ik hem niet uitgelegd inderdaad dat hij om vijf uur
I don't seem to be able to explain to him indeed that he at five o'clock
131. en als hij alleen zou gaan douchen?
and if he went to take a shower on his own?
132. kben kben zelf iets aant voorstellen
I am I am proposing something myself
133. P: Ma daarbij weet ik ni of hij [da kan
But on top of that I don't know if he [can do that
134. I: [weetnie of hij da kan (.)
[don't know if he can do that (.)
135. misschien kan hij dat
maybe he can do that

136. (0.4)
 137. nee 'k denk het niet
no I don't think so

The excerpt above is situated in the Dutch participation framework and consists of an unmediated interaction between the interpreter and the professional. It starts with a multi-unit turn by the interpreter consisting of a recapitulation and an understanding check (lines 127-128), followed by a meta-comment regarding the interpreter's difficulty to get the message across. In line 131, the interpreter then self-initiates a proposal for a solution to the problem. This proposal is quite different from the previous comments, since these were oriented to previous talk, while line 131 is oriented to advancing the discussion towards a solution and thus topic closure. As such, it is a clearly marked contribution which falls outside the boundaries of an interpreter's discursive rights. This is also signalled by the interpreter in the following line, in which he explicitly marks his speech act as a proposal, thus implicitly indicating the breaching of the discursive norms of interpreted interaction. In the subsequent line, the professional on the one hand implicitly acknowledges the interpreter's linguistic meta-comment (*ma daarbij*, 'but on top of that'), but on the other hand, she ratifies the proposal by responding to it in the rest of line 133. The interpreter mirrors the professional's response in overlap with the final words of the professional's utterance, then rephrases these words (line 135) and after a pause closes the topic with a tentative evaluation of the resident's abilities (line 137) which is in line with the professional's remark in line 133.

Such self-initiated additions also occur in the Italian participation framework, but the justification for these additions by a meta-comment typically occurs after a switch in participation framework, as we see in the fragment below. This excerpt deals with solutions for the resident's incontinence and it is preceded by the resident's explanation that she used her own pampers at night and that she was unaware of the solution offered by the rest home.

Extract 13 (incontinence)

164. I: E loro ci hanno anche dei pannolini spe[ciali
And they also have special pam[pers
165. R: [Speciali ja
 [Special yes
166. I: Quelli molti fini [e te lo mettono loro
 167. *Those very thin ones [and they put them on*
168. R: [sì sì sì sì
 [yes yes yes yes
169. I: [e così senza che che fai le spese perché è tutto
[and so without making expenses because that is all
170. R: [ho capito ho capito
[I got it I got it
171. I: comprese nel hai già paghi °guard
included in you have you already pay ° look
172. ja da zeg ik erbij ja ze betaalt daar al voor
yes I say that with it yes she already pays for that

In this fragment, the interpreter translates the professional's explanation of how they deal with incontinence. During this talk, the resident overlaps with partial repetitions (line 165), affirmative particles (line 168) and confirmations of understanding (line 170). The interpreter then adds his own comment on the translation in lines 169 and 171, which refers to the previous explanation of the patient's incontinence and the fact that she used to have someone buy pampers for her. This addition is self-initiated by the interpreter and he immediately continues with a translation of this self-initiated addition (line 172). This Dutch translation can be read either as a way of involving the professional back in the conversation or, as in fragment 12, as a justification for this addition, which then interestingly occurs after a switch in participation framework, thus being explicitly addressed to the professional. In either case, the interpreter shows awareness of the norms which regulate interpreted interaction and orients to the professional as a gatekeeper who has a powerful role in constructing the discursive norms of the interpreted interaction. These findings are in line with previous research, for example by Angermeyer in a court context, who found instances of interpreters' 'self-correction towards the institutional norms when translating into English [= the institutional / professionals' language]' and a significant absence of such self-correction when translating into the language of the defendants, which is explained by the potential 'evaluation of the interpreter's performance by others' (Angermeyer 2009: 11), in this case by the professionals. Of the relatively frequent occurrences of such meta-comments by the interpreter across the three interviews, there is only one such comment that occurs in the Italian participation framework. This thus demonstrates the orientation to the discursive norms as embodied by the professionals. In the following extract, we see this unique example of a meta-comment in the Italian framework.

Extract 14 (incontinence)

311. I: ma ci- ja ik ben aant denken waarschijnlijk
but ci- yes I am thinking probably
312. heeft ze ook een bel he die ze kan [gebruiken en alles he
she also has a bell hey that she can [use and everything hey
313. P: [ja: ja ja ja tis da: ja ja ja
[ye:s yes yes yes that's i:t yes yes yes
314. Maja ze wilt da ni toe[geven omda ze zo fier is ook he
But yes she does not want to give [in because she is also so proud hey
315. I: [toegeven
[give in
316. P: op haar lichaam en °op haar lijf°
of her body and °of her body°
317. I: Perciò quello che io ho detto stesso ma anche lei
Because what I said myself but she as well
318. è che c'è il personale qua
is that there is also personnel here

The first lines are preceded by the interpreter's translation of the resident's turn in which she describes her discomfort and shame when she has incontinence problems. The interpreter ends this

turn by self-initiating the topic of the bell which the resident could use in case of such problems. This topic is preceded by the meta-comment in line 311 which stresses its marked character and introduces a shift in footing in comparison with the preceding lines in which the interpreter took on the role of 'reporter' (Wadensjö 1998). By adding *I am thinking* (line 311), the reception format is shifted to a production format, in which the interpreter takes on the role of 'principal' of the statement, who is 'the party to whose position the words attest' (Goffman 1979: 17). This topic is then further discussed and explored with the professional. Interestingly, when the participation framework switches and the interpreter starts his translation of the preceding unmediated turns for the resident^{xi}, he immediately adds a meta-comment regarding the source of the words, which he attributes to both himself and the professional (line 317). The reference to the other primary interlocutor, a senior nurse, is an indication of the interpreter's need to reinforce the authoritativeness of the advice he is giving to the Italian resident. So in spite of the fact that the interpreter is himself a professional who works in the same facility and whose standing is therefore presumably well recognised by the residents, his words are thus to be read as an orientation to the discursive norms of interpreted interactions. This can be considered to be a bit surprising given the fact that it occurs in the Italian participation framework. In this framework, the resident is the main interlocutor and this is typically a context where discursive norms of interpreted interaction are less strictly orientated to. This is especially so since often these parties are unaware of the particular interactive role of the interpreter (Bot 2005: 244). In this case however, the interpreter maintains his primary focus to constructing his situated identity as an interpreter and its corresponding discursive rights.

4. Discussion and conclusions

The extracts in section 3.2 show a range of different deviations from the normative expectations. Since these fragments all present typical excerpts from the interviews, and the fragment in section 3.1 is rather the exception than the rule, as Davidson also suggested (2002), a superficial conclusion would be that the interpreter is mostly orienting to general interactional norms and to discursive rights that are related more closely to those of a participant in the interviews than to those of a 'linguistic parrot', as interpreters used to be regarded (Davidson 2002: 1275). However, the inverted sequential pattern in which the interpreter gives an unmediated response but then provides a post-hoc translation, as such implicitly asking for authorization (extract 8), indicates that even when general interactional norms within an institutional context seem to take over, the interpreter sometimes still orients to the discursive norms of interpreting. Furthermore, a shift to general, institutional interactional norms does not always emerge without a reason: as the discussion of extracts 9-11 also illustrated, it can be implicitly initiated by the professional as well. Finally, section 3.3 demonstrated that an orientation to the discursive rights of the interpreter-as-'reporter' (Wadensjö 1998) is definitely present as well, even during deviations from the pre-allocated turn types. This is the case when the interpreter marks his own contributions by means of a justifying meta-comment, thus clearly showing an orientation to his role as an interpreter, rather than that of a bilingual professional, who would of course have a much more powerful discursive position and this would obviate the need for justifications. Since these justifications occur mainly within the

professional's participation framework, the presence of such comments explicitly demonstrates how discursive norms are acknowledged and negotiated with the institutional representatives, rather than the clients.

This shows that these professionals are indeed constructed as the embodiment of the institutional norms, which of course has implications regarding the participants' discursive rights. And thus it is not surprising that in these data most negotiations of discursive norms are situated within the Dutch participation framework, since this is the framework within which the most powerful participant, namely the professional, is the main interlocutor. This participant's orientation towards discursive norms and his or her accompanying way of addressing the interpreter either as a non-person or as a full participant is often decisive for the distribution of discursive rights in the subsequent turns. This orientation may shift, however, and thus an interpreter's additions can either be sanctioned or ratified within the same context. This is because the norms are negotiated on a turn-by-turn basis. So an interlocutor's participatory status should be regarded as being in a constant flux since it is constructed and negotiated in the course of an interview. For example, extract 9 showed that the professional explicitly handed the control of the interaction over to the interpreter, whose discursive rights increased considerably in the following turns, while in extract 6, additions by the interpreter were explicitly sanctioned by the professional using turns which involved extensive face work. As such, these data illustrate the fact that discursive norms are constantly under negotiation and by shifting discursive norms, the situated identity of the interpreter shifts back and forth on the continuum between translator and cultural mediator (Rudvin 2007: 67). The situated identity of translator is linked to limited discursive rights and close adherence to the pre-allocated turn types typical of interpreters, while the situated identity of cultural mediator entails discursive rights similar to those of the professional. Thus this orientation to discursive norms is indicative of the participant role that the interpreter, in negotiation with the professional, constructs in the interaction.

Furthermore, the specific institutional goals of each interaction can have a guiding influence on the acceptable boundaries of this movement of the interpreter's situated identity. Within the context of a rest home, the goals of the interaction are usually not as clearly laid out as for example in court or in a doctor's practice. This leaves much more room for discursive negotiation and this, as explained in the introduction, is one of the reasons why we selected this context in the first place. On top of that, there is a significant amount of variation in the types of interaction that take place in this rest home setting. This is especially so regarding the 'activity types' and their corresponding goals, as this dataset illustrates. For example, when comparing the first interview, which had quite an exploratory character, with the third interview, where the goals (namely obtaining the resident's score on the mini mental test) are much more predetermined, it is obvious that not only the interpreter, but also the other interlocutors have to adjust their behaviour according to these goals and the particular norms of the 'activity type' that is talked into being. For example, while one of the goals of the first interview was to obtain any type of information from the resident, the professional asked many vague, open ended questions encouraging, on the one hand, the resident to answer them as broadly as possible and on the other hand, the interpreter to obtain as much information as possible, treating thus any type of answer as an 'allowable contribution'. This is quite the contrary in the third interview, in which what counts as an 'allowable contribution' is strictly predefined in order to obtain valid results on an Alzheimer test. Furthermore, the discursive rights of the interpreter are also limited so that the rigid requirements of this particular 'activity type' are met. However, this also works the other way around: while and through talking, the 'activity type' may change as well. In

particular, minor shifts typical of the 'polyphonic and shifting' nature of the 'voice of interpreting' (Merlini & Favaron 2005: 294) are expected which occur on the continuum between interpreted two-party interaction between a professional and a resident and a three-party interaction between a professional, a resident and a bilingual professional. These shifts from one 'activity type' to another are talked into being on a turn-by-turn basis and are negotiated by the interlocutors, in this case by the professional and the interpreter. This is closely related to the latter's situated identity, since the specific institutional character of an interaction is talked into being by its interlocutors by making their particular institutional and professional identities relevant to the activities they are engaged in (Drew & Heritage 1992: 3-4).

In conclusion, this study has demonstrated that the fine-grained analysis of the interlocutors' utterances and their gestures, facial expressions and eye gaze can uncover the fact that discursive norms, although explicitly predetermined by the community interpreter's deontological code, are by no means as predetermined in real life, rather they are in-situ interactional accomplishments which are open to negotiation. However, it is quite clear that the professional's powerful position still has a guiding influence, even (1) in interaction with an interpreter who has a double, potentially powerful, status as a bilingual professional and (2) in this particular context of a home for the elderly. This is a bit surprising since this context is characterized by a less strict discourse ecology than that of most other contexts in which interpreters usually interact. We have shown that the professional's influence is not limited to the content of the conversation, but that it also extends to projecting discursive rights onto the interpreter. As such, attempts are made to alter the latter's orientation to particular discursive norms. This potentially entails a shift in 'activity type' and in the interpreter's situated identity from translator to cultural mediator. Whether this projection is successful or not, is of course also open for negotiation, thus rendering discursive norms, 'activity types' and identities truly interactional accomplishments.

References

- Agar, M. (1985). Institutional discourse. *Text* 5 (3), 147-168.
- Angermeyer, P.S. (2009). Translation style and participant roles in court interpreting. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 13, 3-28.
- Antaki, C. (2002). *An Introductory Tutorial in Conversation Analysis*. [Online] 2002. <http://www-staff.lboro.ac.uk/ssca1/notation.htm> (accessed 3 March 2011).
- Atkinson, J.M. (1982). Understanding formality: the categorization and production of 'formal' interaction. *The British Journal of Sociology* 33, 86-117.
- Baraldi, C. (2009). Forms of mediation: the case of interpreter-mediated interactions in medical systems. *Language and intercultural communication* 9, 120-137.
- Bolden, G. (2000). Toward understanding practices of medical interpreting: Interpreters' involvement in history taking. *Discourse studies* 2, 387-419.
- Bot, H. (2005). Dialogue interpreting as a specific case of reported speech. *Interpreting, International Journal of Research and Practice in Interpreting* 7, 237-261.
- Bot, H. (2009). Role models in mental health interpreting. In R. de Pedro Ricoy, I. Perez & C. Wilson (Eds.), *Interpreting and Translating in Public Service Setting; Policy, Practice, Pedagogy*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing, 115-126.
- Brown, P. & Levinson, S.C. (1987). *Politeness, some universals in language usage*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.

- COC (2008). *Pedagogisch dossier sociaal tolken en vertalen [Pedagogic file social interpreting and translating]*. [Online] 2008.
http://www.sociaaltolkenenvertalen.be/uploads/pedagogisch_dossier_website.pdf
 (accessed 8 June 2010).
- Davidson, B. (2000). The interpreter as institutional gatekeeper: The social-linguistic role of interpreters in Spanish-English medical discourse. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 4, 379-405.
- Davidson, B. (2001). Questions in cross-linguistic medical encounters: the role of the hospital interpreter. *Anthropological Quarterly* 74, 170-178.
- Davidson, B. (2002). A model for the construction of conversational common ground in interpreted discourse. *Journal of Pragmatics* 34, 1273-1300.
- De Keyser, R. (2009). Grensoverschrijdend gedrag. Nieuwe uitdagingen voor de sociaal tolk [Cross-border behavior. New challenges for the social interpreter]. In Jürgen Jaspers (Ed.), *De klank van de stad; stedelijke meertaligheid en interculturele communicatie [The sound of the city; urban multilingualism and intercultural communication]*. Antwerpen: Acco, 57-78.
- Drew, P. & Heritage, J. (1992). Analyzing talk at work: an introduction. In P. Drew & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Talk at work - Interaction in institutional settings (Studies in Interactional Sociolinguistics 8)* Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 3-65.
- Frankel, R.M. (1990). Talking in Interviews: a Dispreference for Patient-initiated questions in Physician-patient Encounters. In G. Psathas (Ed.), *Interaction competence* Washington DC: University Press of America, 231-261.
- Gavioli, L. & Maxwell, N. (2007). Interpreter intervention in mediated business talk. In H. Bowles & P. Seedhouse (Eds.), *Conversation analysis and language for specific purposes* Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 141-182.
- Goffman, E. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life*. Allen Lane The Penguin Press: London.
- Goffman, E. (1979). Footing. *Semiotica* 25 (1/2), 1-29.
- Goffman, E. (1981). *Forms of Talk*. Basil Blackwell: Oxford.
- Goodwin, C. (1980). Restarts, Pauses, and the Achievement of a State of Mutual Gaze ad Turn-Beginning. *Sociological Inquiry* 50, 272-302.
- Goodwin, C. (1981). *Conversational organization, Interaction between speakers and hearers*. Academic Press: New York.
- Hale, S. (2002). How faithfully do Court Interpreters render the style of non-English speaking witnesses's testimonies? A data based study of Spanish-English bilingual proceedings. *Discourse Studies* 4, 25-47.
- Holmes, J. (1997). Women, language and identity. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 2 (1), 195-223.
- Jacobson, B. (2008). Interactional pragmatics and court interpreting; An analysis of face. *Interpreting, International Journal of Research and Practice in Interpreting* 10, 128-158.
- Jalbert, M. (1998). Travailler avec un interprète en consultation psychiatrique. *P.R.I.S.M.E.* 8, 94-111.
- Leanza, Y. (2005). Roles of community interpreters in pediatrics as seen by interpreters, physicians and researchers. *Interpreting, International Journal of Research and Practice in Interpreting* 7 (2), 167-192.
- Leman, J. (1982). *Van Caltanissetta naar Brussel en Genk: De ontwikkeling van een sociale praxis bij Siciliaanse migranten. Een antropologisch onderzoek zowel in de streek van herkomst als in het gastland [From Caltanissetta to Brussels and Genk: The development of a social praxis by Sicilian migrants. An anthropological study both in the region of origin as in the host country]*. Leuven: Acco.
- Levinson, S.C. (1992). Activity types and language. In P. Drew & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Talk at work - Interaction in institutional settings (Studies in Interactional Sociolinguistics 8)* Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 66-100.
- Mason, I. (2009). Role, positioning and discourse in face-to-face interpreting. In R. de Pedro Rico, I. Perez & C. Wilson (Eds.), *Interpreting and Translating in Public Service Setting; Policy, Practice, Pedagogy*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing, 52-73.

- Merlini, R. (2009). Interpreters in emergency wards; An empirical study of doctor-interpreter-patient interaction. In R. de Pedro Ricoy, I. Perez & C. Wilson (Eds.), *Interpreting and Translating in Public Service Setting; Policy, Practice, Pedagogy*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing, 89-114.
- Merlini, R. & Favaron, R. (2005). Examining the "voice of interpreting" in speech pathology. *Interpreting, International Journal of Research and Practice in Interpreting* 7 (2), 263-302.
- Mishler, E.G. (1984). *The Discourse of Medicine: Dialectics of Medical Interviews*. Norwood/ New Jersey: Ablex Publishing Corporation.
- Pöchhacker, F. & Shlesinger, M. (2005). Introduction; Discourse-based research on healthcare interpreting. *Interpreting, International Journal of Research and Practice in Interpreting* 7, 157-162.
- Rudvin, M. (2007). Professionalism and ethics in community interpreting; The impact of individualist versus collective group identity. *Interpreting, International Journal of Research and Practice in Interpreting* 9, 47-69.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E.A. & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language* 50, 696-735.
- Schegloff, E.A. (1981). Discourse as an interactional achievement: some uses of 'uh huh' and other things that come between sentences. In D. Tannen (Ed.), *Analyzing Discourse: Text and Talk; Georgetown University Roundtable on Languages and Linguistics* Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press,
- Schegloff, E.A. (1987). Recycled turn beginnings: A precise repair mechanism in conversation's turn-taking organization. In G. Button & J. R. E. Lee (Eds.), *Talk and social organization* Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters, 70-85.
- Scocci, S. & Tanini, A. (1997). *Per un sacco di carbone*. Brussels: Acli België-Belgique.
- Tillmann, M. (2009). The pragmatic significance of modal particles in an interpreted German asylum interview. In R. de Pedro Ricoy, I. Perez & C. Wilson (Eds.), *Interpreting and Translating in Public Service Setting; Policy, Practice, Pedagogy*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing, 156-170.
- Van De Mierop, D. (forthcoming). The Quotative 'He/She Says' in Interpreted Doctor-Patient Interaction *Interpreting, International Journal of Research and Practice in Interpreting*.
- Van De Mierop, D. & Mazeland, H. (2009). Modificaties van vraag-antwoordsequenties in getolkte arts-patiëntgesprekken [Modifications of question-answer sequences in interpreted doctor-patient interactions]. *Tijdschrift voor Taalbeheersing* 31, 124-141.
- Wadensjö, C. (1998). *Interpreting as Interaction (Language in social life series)*. London/New York: Longman.
- Wadensjö, C. (2008a). In and Off the Show: Co-constructing 'invisibility' in an Interpreter-Mediated Talk Show Interview. *Meta* LIII, 184-203.
- Wadensjö, C. (2008b). The shaping of Gorbachev: On framing in an interpreter-mediated talk-show interview. *Text & Talk* 28, 119-146.
- Zimmerman, D.H. (1998). Identity, Context and Interaction. In C. Antaki & S. Widdicombe (Eds.), *Identities in Talk* SAGE: London, 87-106.

Figure 1: line drawings of video footage illustrating the two participation frameworks of interpreted interaction

[illegible]

A line drawing of three people sitting at a long table. The person on the left is gesturing with their hands while speaking. The person in the middle is looking towards the speaker. The person on the right is looking towards the speaker and has their hand near their face. Vertical lines extend from the table to labels below.

interpreter speaker primary addressee	resident speaker primary addressee	professional passive overhearer
--	---	--

Figure 2: line drawings of video footage of lines 65-66

Figure 3: line drawings of video footage of lines 434 -435

Appendix: transcription symbols (based on and taken from Antaki 2002)

Transcription symbols in examples taken from the fragments	Explanation
(.)	Brief pause
(1.7)	Timed pause
↑ grande	Onset of noticeable pitch rise
24. I: bagno in bagno il venerdì'e[:: 25. R: [scusa	Square brackets '[' aligned across adjacent lines denote the start of overlapping talk.
Ja:	Colons show that the speaker has stretched the preceding sound

(di)	Uncertain transcription due to audio-problems
35. I: e= 36. R: =alle quattro	The equals sign shows an example of latching, which means that there is no discernible pause between a speaker's or two speakers' turn(s)
gew <u>assen</u>	Underlined sounds are louder
°op haar lijf°	Words between degree signs are quieter, words between double degree signs are even quieter
>dove ci troviamo adesso<	Inwards arrows show faster speech
@@@	Laughter tokens
((name of the city))	Representation of something that is not literally transcribed
()	Unclear talk

Short biographical sketches:

Dorien Van De Mierop is an assistant professor of Dutch linguistics at the University of Leuven. She is a discourse analyst whose research focuses mainly on identity construction, both in institutional contexts (e.g. speeches, social work interaction) and in narratives and life stories. She has published a number of articles on this topic (e.g. in *Discourse Studies*, *Journal of Pragmatics*, *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, *Discourse & Society* and *Journal of Sociolinguistics*).

Giovanni Bevilacqua is currently a research assistant at HUB (Brussels) and Lessius (Antwerp), where he is teaching Italian language courses and interpretation from Dutch into Italian. He works as a freelance interpreter for German, Dutch and French. At present he is also working on his doctoral dissertation on community interpreting.

Lotte Van Hove obtained her Master's degree in Interpreting sciences from Lessius in 2010.

Notes

ⁱ As Mason (2009:53) points out, 'discussion of the interpreter's role can (...) give the impression that a role is a fixed stance, adopted in advance and sustained throughout an encounter', but, following Mason (2009), we aim to refute this and highlight the fluidity of such roles in this study.

ⁱⁱ Bot (2009) refers to these two roles as ‘the translation machine interpreter’ and ‘the interpreter as participant’ and also describes a third role, namely that of ‘the interactive model of interpreting’, which takes an in-between position on the continuum described here.

ⁱⁱⁱ Since it is particularly the way these norms are interactionally shifted and negotiated that interests us here, we use the term ‘interactional accomplishments’, as such drawing particular attention to the negotiable nature of these norms.

^{iv} Since this is a descriptive, and not a normative, study (cf Mason 2009: 52), we will use the term ‘interpreter’ throughout the article. Some readers may find this problematic because the interlocutor in this corpus did not receive any professional training as an interpreter. By using this term however, we only intend to point at this interlocutor’s institutional role in the interactions under study.

^v The transcription notation is based on the Jefferson system as described by Antaki (2002). The transcription symbols that are used here are explained in the appendix. The participants are indicated by the first letters of their institutional roles, namely Interpreter, Professional and Resident.

^{vi} Of course, one could comment on the formulation of the translations, for example on the addition of the quotative in line 162 and on the reformulation from an impersonally asked question in the source text to a personally formulated question in the target text (lines 159 – 160), but this falls outside the scope of the discussion of this fragment.

^{vii} We are largely indebted to Thijs Van Hove, a professional graphic designer, who meticulously converted our screenshots to these anonymous line drawings.

^{viii} We focused here solely on the mini mental interview since this consists predominantly of question-answer sequences which result in fairly comparable turns. Quantitative analyses of the other two conversations would be such generalizations that the results would not be meaningful.

^{ix} The Dutch source text is equally incomprehensible as the English translation of this fragment.

^x We will come back to the generic differences between the interviews which may have an influence on the interpreter’s discursive rights.

^{xi} Only the opening fragment of this translation is provided here for reasons of space.