GUILTY AS CHARGED?

The Effect of Interpreting on Interviews with Suspects

SONIA CLAIRE RUSSELL

Doctor of Philosophy

THE UNIVERSITY OF ASTON IN BIRMINGHAM

January 2001

THESIS SUMMARY

The ways in which an interpreter affects the processes and, possibly, the outcomes of legal proceedings has formed the focus of much recent research, most of it centred upon courtroom discourse. However, comparatively little research has been carried out into the effect of interpreting on the interview with a suspect, despite its 'upstream' position in the legal process and vital importance as evidence. As a speech event in the judicial system, the interview differs radically from that which takes place 'downstream', that is, in court. The interview with suspect represents an entirely different construct, in which a range of registers is apparent, and participants use distinctive means to achieve their institutional goals.

When a transcript of an interpreter-mediated interview is read out in court, it is assumed that this is a representation of an event, which is essentially identical to a monolingual interview. This thesis challenges that assumption. Using conversation analytic techniques, it examines data from a corpus of monolingual and interpreter-mediated, taped interviews with suspects, in order to identify potentially significant interactional differences and describe ways in which the interpreter affects the processes and may affect the outcomes of the interview.

It is argued that although individually, the interactional differences may appear slight, their cumulative effect is significant, particularly since the primary participants in the event are unaware of the full force of the interpreting effect.

Finally, the thesis suggests that the insights provided by linguistic analysis of the interpreting on interviews may provide the basis for training, both for interpreters themselves, and for officers in techniques for interpreter-mediated interviews.

TO MY MOTHER AND FATHER

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

In the adversarial system of justice that prevails in the United Kingdom, defendants have the right to be heard in court, *viva voce*, in testimony and through the examination-in-chief of a defending barrister. During the proceedings, therefore, the defendant is present and, during Crown Court trials, can be both heard and seen by members of a jury.

The same is true where the defendant is not an English speaker; he can be heard and seen. However, the channels through which he communicates and by means of which he is perceived, are blurred and distorted. His utterances can be heard, but not understood, until an interpreter renders them, or her version of them, in English. Consequently, although the jury sees that he is speaking, many paralinguistic features of his speech are not matched by corresponding verbal utterances. Indeed, the visual perception itself may be distorted, since cultural norms of interaction may produce 'alien' facial expressions and gestures, so that they cannot be matched, even retrospectively, to the interpreter's subsequent rendering. Further, in the case of questions from Counsel, the defendant's utterances are replies, not to direct questions, but to the interpreter's rendering of these.

This, then, is the situation prevailing in court. However, long before a case comes to trial, an arrest is made and the suspect is interviewed. It is this interview that is the "upstream" event that sets in motion everything that leads to the trial, months later and miles "downstream".

Prior to the Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984 (PACE), interviews with suspects were recorded contemporaneously, by hand. The interviewing officer, or a colleague, was expected to write down, 'verbatim', his own questions and the suspect's answers to these. The process was very slow, about 20-25 words per minute, according to Coulthard, 1992:242, and was inevitably subject to inaccuracies, omissions and distortions (Coulthard, 1996). In the case of interpreted interviews, the process was slower still, since it was the interpreter who wrote down the questions in English, translated them verbally into the target language, received the reply and wrote it down in

English, often finding herself writing one language and speaking the other, in an attempt to speed up the exchange.

In what should have a been a revolutionary innovation, PACE (*ibid.*), now makes provision for the tape-recording of all interviews with suspects (except, according to the revised Codes of Practice, those with a person arrested under certain sections of the Prevention of Terrorism (Temporary Provisions) Act 1989, or the Official Secrets Act 1911). Consequently, the audio-taped recording of the interview now provides a faithful reproduction of all of the verbal and non-verbal sounds produced. A perfect opportunity, it would seem, for the intended audience, those deciding upon guilt or innocence, to hear what exactly went on at interview. However, the interview tapes themselves are rarely listened to in court. Instead, a written transcript is prepared from the tapes which, as this thesis will show, returns the process to a situation resembling that of pre-PACE.

In the case of the *monolingual* interview, (where all of the participants are English speaking), the transcript is prepared by an audio-typist, who simply types every 'word' uttered by the participants. This may be termed a 'secretarial' transcript, from which all prosodic and paralinguistic features are absent. Some repetitions may appear, although disfluencies such as hesitations and false starts are generally cleaned up. In indictable cases such as those that form the object of this thesis, the tapes may be played in court. However, unless there is some specific point which can only be made by playing the tapes to the jury, it is the transcript that is read out and that constitutes the main plank of the prosecution's evidence.

Where the *interpreted* interview is concerned, (where the suspect is a non-English speaker), the same procedure applies. A transcript is prepared from the audio-tapes. However, as will be seen from Extracts I:1 to I:3 below, the resulting transcripts bear even less resemblance to the original event than those prepared from the monolingual interview, since they are prepared by a non-linguist and are destined to be read out in an English-speaking court.

As an indication of the extent to which the interaction is altered, Extract I:1 shows a conventional, conversation analytic transcription of a short segment of interpreted interview, including every utterance in both languages. (Transcription conventions and back translations of the French appear in appendix 1). A transcription such as this would not, of course, be used in court.

Extract I:1

Full (CA) transcription of interpreter-mediated interview

1	O	was it *your* idea to (.) go to (.) Mexico
2	I	est-ce-que c'était *votre* idée d'aller au Mexique?
3		(1.0)
4	DP	.hh euh:: non euh <oui et non>
5	I	yes and no
6	O	did somebody (.) suggest that you might go ?
7	I	est-ce que quelqu'un vous a ↑suggéré d'aller au Mexique?
8	DP	non non (1.0) non
9	I	no nobody suggested it
10	O	so (.) you say yes and no what do you mean by yes and no
11	I	qu'est-ce que vous voulez dire par oui et non
12	DP	euh:: j'savais pas si j'allais au Mexique ou euh:: en Colombie
13	I	he wasn't sure whether to go to Mexico or Colombia

Here, then, are:

- the officer's questions in English (O);
- the interpreter's rendering of them into French (I);
- the detained persons answers in French (DP);
- and the interpreter's rendering of these into English (I).

It can be seen that, in an English-speaking court, all of the utterances in French would be considered 'superfluous', being incomprehensible to the majority of those present. These are therefore excluded from the transcript, resulting in one of two variants of the same segment shown below.

Extract I:2

Variant A.

1	O	was it your idea to go to Mexico?
2	I	IN FRENCH
3	DP	IN FRENCH
4	I	yes and no
5	O	did somebody suggest that you might go?
6	I	IN FRENCH
7	DP	IN FRENCH
8	I	no nobody suggested it
9	O	so you say yes and no what do you mean by yes and no?
10	I	IN FRENCH
11	DP	IN FRENCH
12	I	He wasn't sure whether to go to Mexico or Colombia

Here, the words 'IN FRENCH' appear on the transcript, and represent the detained person's turns, and the interpreter's renderings of the officer's questions into French. The reader of the transcript is thus made aware that DP and the interpreter have spoken and that the turns that do appear are in some way related to these representations. Variant B below, however, shows a more extreme version of the distortion:

Extract I:3

Variant B

1	O	Was it your idea to go to Mexico?
2	DP	Yes and no
3	O	Did somebody suggest that you might go?
4	DP	No nobody suggested it
5	O	So you say yes and no what do you mean by yes and no?
6	DP	He wasn't sure whether to go to Mexico or Columbia

11

In a version that has reduced a 13-line transcribed extract to 6 lines, it can be seen that, along with any prosodic indications, the interpreter has disappeared altogether. Not only are her French utterances not rendered in print, her English translations of the detained person's French turns are now attributed directly to him. Consequently, the detained person now appears to have become fluent in English and his hesitant reply in Extract I:1, L4, (.hh euh:: non euh <oui et non>) is now a concise "yes and no" in Extract I:3, L2. Further, he now appears to refer to himself in the third person (Extract I:3, L6.), since the interpreter had unfortunately used this pronoun in her translation.

Variants A and B above are exact reproductions of transcriptions of interpreted interviews, prepared by the Police and HM Customs and Excise for use in court. Although the members of the jury have copies of the transcript, it is read out loud by the prosecutor and the interviewing officer. However, in a further twist to the Chinese whispers scenario, the prosecutor may take the role of the interviewing officer, and the officer that of the detained person. The decision as to role allocation is taken by the judge. He may decide that, since the jury are used to hearing questions from the well of the court and answers from the witness stand, the above allocation should apply, although this is not always the case.

In the case of both the *monolingual* and the *interpreted* interview then, it can be seen that a process of degradation of the original speech event has taken place. It is as if they have been desiccated, reconstituted and presented to the jury in court as if they were the original event. As Shuy (1993:7) says, "Once jurors see a written transcript, they think of it in the way they might view a written play. One actor says one thing and the next actor responds to that person with clear understanding, complete recall and perfect hearing".

Not only are transcripts of both monolingual and interpreted interviews presented as if they were the original event, there is an institutional assumption that they are representations of *identical events*. That is, it is presumed that the presence of an interpreter at interview redresses the balance of inequality between the English-speaking and non English-speaking suspect.

An equally important, and often neglected corollary in the literature on institutional discourse, and particularly Critical Discourse Analysis (Fairclough & Wodak, 1997), is the loss of available linguistic strategies incurred by the interviewing officer, that is, the presumed, powerful participant. The pragmatic force or intent of his questions may not, for various reasons, be rendered by the interpreter. From a micro perspective, therefore, his next-turn question is contingent upon the detained person's response to the interpreter's rendering of his question. From a macro perspective, his interviewing technique, strategy and/or interview plan, may not only suffer distortion, but may do so without his knowledge.

The officer's aim, in interview, is to connect what the detained person offers as a series of discrete and innocent events into an account, for which the latter must take responsibility. In monolingual interviews, this connective function is achieved both at the level of content and that of textual signals.

The Caution itself explicitly establishes the detained person's obligation to take responsibility for what he says or does not say. As Chapter 4 demonstrates, interpreters' divergent versions of this notoriously difficult translation may mean that the officer fails to establish this responsibility at the very outset of the interview.

Textual signals such as *and*-prefaced questions and repetition, discussed in Chapters 5 and 6 respectively, exemplify linguistic means whereby officers try to set up a connected account attributable to and 'owned' by the DP. Whether these signals are untranslated or untranslatable, the effect is to break a linguistic connection, whether or not this was a conscious strategy on the part of the officer. In fact, informal discussions with officers have indicated that these micro-linguistic strategies are unconscious.

As discussed in chapter 7, interpreting can act as a barrier to phatic communication, as an eraser of discourse markers and social imposition, or as a contaminator of source text through contextual knowledge. The effect of this is to distance the officer from his own

strategies and to frustrate his requirement, attainable in the monolingual interview, to connect events into an account.

This thesis therefore contends that, when the transcript of interview is read out in court, not only is it a false representation of the original event, but that where monolingual and interpreted interviews are concerned, the events themselves were not the same. In ways that are at once both gross and subtle, the interpreter affects the processes and possibly the outcomes of the interview.

Translatory perfection is, of course, "...the unattainable Holy Grail" (Morris, 1995:31). The ideal situation where an interpreter-mediated exchange is identical in all aspects to an exchange between same-language participants, without an interpreter, does not exist. It is a goal for which interpreters strive, whilst knowing it to be unattainable. However, this thesis is intended to add to the growing body of research that examines the small, but demonstrably prevalent and *avoidable* ways in which the interpreter affects the processes of the interaction. (Davidson, 2000; Roy, 2000; Hale & Gibbons, 1999; Hale, 1999, Rigney, 1999; Wadensjö, 1998). Taken in isolation, each feature may appear insignificant. However, cumulatively, they amount to an overall distortion that should not be ignored.

Further, research in the field of legal interpreting has tended to concentrate upon courtroom dialogue (Hale & Gibbons, 1999; Morris, 1995, 1999; Berk-Seligson, 1999, 1992; Rigney, 1999; Fowler, 1995; Komter, 1994; Shlesinger, 1991). Data from court is relatively accessible in America, although much less so in the UK, and provides fertile ground for research into three modes of interpreting in a single event: *simultaneous, consecutive* and *liaison*. (These will be discussed in chapter 2). However, despite its primary position in the judicial process, comparatively little research has been carried out in the domain of the interview with suspect, following arrest. (Krouglov, 1999; Wadensjö, 1995; Linell & Jönsson, 1991). This paucity of research may be due, in part, to the difficulty of obtaining data (in the UK at least), given the confidential nature of the interview as opposed to courtroom proceedings, which are in the public domain.

From a macro perspective then, the examination of interview data in this thesis moves towards redressing the imbalance in research in the legal field. From a micro perspective, it focuses upon actual instantiations of phenomena where the intervention of the interpreter contributes to the divergence between monolingual and interpreted interviews.

Certainly, the implications for interpreter training are clear. Further, as chapter 8 suggests, there are also indications that training officers in the conduct of interpreter-mediated interviews may go some way to highlighting the avoidable pitfalls, and therefore to more effective investigative interviewing.

I:1 INTERPRETING STUDIES AND CONVERSATION ANALYSIS

Since the 1980s, interpreting studies as a field of research has diverged from its parent, translation studies, to become a genre *per se*. Whereas translation theorists appear still to be in search of a theory, or even theories, of translation (Gutt, 2000; Bassnett-McGuire, 1980; Bell, 1986), interpreting studies (henceforth IS), is preoccupied by no such quest. Although there is a body of theoretical research in the field, (Gile, 1998,1994; Hatim & Mason, 1997; Mason, 1999), much research in IS is empirical. This may be due, in part, to the fact that the majority of researchers, a number of whom are cited throughout this thesis, are themselves interpreters, with a vested interest in practical solutions.

As IS has split into the modes discussed in chapter 2:5, (simultaneous, consecutive, liaison), so research has addressed different aspects of interpreting, such as cognitive psychology (Tijus, 1994), cohesion (Shlesinger, 1995), stress patterns (Williams, 1995), processing strategies (Sunnari, 1995), cultural implications (Makarova, 1995), politeness (Krouglov, 2000), role conflicts (Niska, 1995), and tenor (Tebble, 2000).

Mason (2000) suggests that it is time for interpreting research to move on from its concentration upon the minutiae of linguistic equivalence, to examine the effects of pragmatic and semiotic constraints. However, as far as the discipline of legal interpreting is concerned, it is essential that rigor and precision are closely maintained, since language

15

and the law are so closely bound as to be mutually defining. Indeed, as Gentile (1993:254) insists:

> *"Any area where language is not only the means of communication, but also the means of diagnosis or the instrument by which professions achieve and exercise their power, **such as the legal profession** [my emphasis], presents challenges which, as interpreters, we need to meet"*

Consequently, as Gonzalez et al (1991:16-17) note, in the legal environment, the equivalence requirement must be adhered to more closely, "in that the *form* and *style* of the message are regarded as equally important elements of meaning". Mikkelson (2000:5) however, argues that the requirement to reproduce "the legal register, complete with Latin and French terms, wordy and pompous phrases, alliteration, doublets and triplets", pre-supposes not only that the legal register in other languages corresponds to that of English, but that all other languages have, in fact, a legal register. Mikkleson (*ibid*) raises the further problem that the high number of monosyllabic words in English compared to that, for example, in Spanish, means that basic time constraints would necessitate an unreasonably high output rate from the interpreter and consequent processing difficulties for the listener.

From these brief comments, it can be seen that, as far as interpreting in the field known as Forensic Linguistics is concerned, the question of word-for-word versus concept-for-concept is far from settled. However, it can be seen that analysis, particularly in this field, needs to focus closely upon the 'talk-in-interaction' that constitutes the interpreted event. It is often only through fine-grained analysis that the features and anomalies become evident. Consequently, the tools of Conversation Analysis have proved to be ideal, for the selection of data, preparation of transcripts and the analysis itself. Without the transcription conventions peculiar to CA, for example, it would be difficult to highlight or to compare certain paralinguistic features across languages. The notions of sequential organisation, and particularly turn-taking, for example, form the subject of chapter 2:5:1 of this thesis.

Conversely, in the same way that medical science is an application of biology and chemistry, so IS constitutes an application of CA. As ten Have (1999:162) says, "CA was developed as a 'pure' science, motivated by the wish to discover basic and general aspects", and is therefore descriptive. There are no problems and therefore no solutions to be sought, whereas much interpreting research is prescriptive, and therefore carries CA a step further, making explicit and problematising many of its features. Typically, research papers conclude with suggestions as to training applications or with procedural implications.

Given the mutual benefits of these two disciplines, the combination of CA and IS is used as the analytical tool for this thesis. The literature and developments in IS are referred to where appropriate, throughout the thesis, whereas the use of CA methodology is discussed in chapter 3:1.

I:2 SUMMARY OF CHAPTER CONTENTS

Chapter 1 situates the investigative interview within the criminal justice system in the UK. It offers a general overview of the interview process, from the moment of arrest until the end of the interview proper. The stated aims of the interview are discussed, from the point of view of Police and Customs training, and a brief comparison is drawn between the interview and trial.

Chapter 2 addresses the interview as interaction, discussing first the *monolingual* interview. Definitions of "normal" and "institutional" talk are discussed, using asymmetry of power as an illustration of the difficulty in drawing the distinction between the two. Question forms in the literature are related to those found in investigative interviews and a sectional analysis (Heritage, 1997:167) of the interview demonstrates its division into three clear phases, which I have termed *life-story, journey* and *probe-challenge* phases respectively.

The *interpreted* interview is examined in chapter 2:5. Modes of interpreting are explained and, following a review of some of the literature on interpreting, Roy's (2000) work on turn-taking is used as a baseline from which to examine examples of the interpreter-effect in the data for this thesis.

Chapter 3 sets out the methodological and theoretical considerations relative to this thesis. It situates the analytical methodology firmly in the field of conversation analysis, whilst nonetheless allowing for certain attitudinal factors that would have been remarkable by their absence, such as personal, empirical knowledge and informal discussions with interpreter colleagues and officers.

The data section of chapter 3 gives data sources and describes the specific offences concerned, those of Facilitation of Illegal Entrants and Illegal Importation of Drugs. It sets out the criteria by which the data set was selected. In the same chapter, a section on transcription issues looks firstly at the problems of transcription by the audio-typist, then outlines the decision-making process in selecting a method of transcription that is fit for the purpose of this thesis.

Chapter 4 provides an initial example of how the interpreter can affect not only the main body of the interview, but the preliminary proceedings before the interview 'proper' begins. Interpreters' difficulties with the translation of the police caution and its explanation by officers are discussed, with examples from the data.

Chapter 5 returns briefly to the 'question of questions', offering reasons as to why a number of *and*-prefaced utterances in the data can be treated as questions. Two types of *and*-prefaced questions are identified and discussed, and their treatment by interpreters is examined.

Chapter 6 traces the use of allo-repetition as a strategy and a function of the three phases of the interview (*life story, journey* and *probe-challenge*). It is found to be prevalent in all three phases of the monolingual interview, but to be far less present in the interpreted

event. Whereas it had a number of affective functions in the monolingual interview, it was found to function principally as a mechanism for clarification and repair in the interpreted interview.

Chapter 7 identifies and examines a number of other interpreter effects, such as *co-murmuring* (quiet, phatic exchanges) that is present in the co-operative stages of the monolingual interview, but which is entirely absent from interpreted interaction. The effect of perceived social imposition and interpreters' contextual knowledge upon the interpreter's renderings is also discussed. Finally, consideration is given to the prevalence of 'OK' used by officers as a discourse marker and its omission by interpreters.

Chapter 8 draws conclusions from the analysis in chapters 4-7, concerning the nature and extent of the effect of interpreting. It also suggests the implications of this analysis, not only for training both of interpreters and of officers, but possible avenues of exploration for public service organisations as users of interpreters.

CHAPTER 1

THE INTERVIEW AS A SITUATED ACTIVITY

Although Conversation Analysis takes the 'inside-out' view that institutional realities and context are invoked in and through talk (Heritage, 1997), there is a view that this should be balanced by the 'outside-in' or "extra-personal" (Saville-Troike, 1982:139) view of the event, whereby realities and context are also understood to be constituted by "documents, buildings, legal arrangements and so on." (Heritage, 1997:161). This does not imply hypothesising and speculating upon participants' understanding of, or orientation to, the situation (Atkinson & Heritage, 1984), it merely sets out the indisputable 'facts of the matter', the external realities.

In order to situate the interview within its wider context, this narrative chapter provides an 'outside-in' view of the event, firstly by showing its position within the legal system. It then focuses on the sequence of events immediately before the interview, at the police station or Customs custody area, in order to situate the interview within its immediate context. Finally, the immediate context of the interview itself is set out, thus providing a complete overview of the non-linguistic aspects of the event.

1:1 SITUATION OF THE INTERVIEW WITHIN THE LEGAL SYSTEM

> *The main principle that underpins the system of criminal justice in England and Wales is adversarial justice. This requires the police to identify a suspect from the evidence available and, if there is sufficient evidence against him or her, to prosecute that person and establish his or her guilt. An adversarial system does not seek to establish what happened or the truth about an incident, that is sometimes left to inquiries; the adversarial system only requires the police and prosecutor to identify a person; called a suspect. The logic of adversarial justice, however, requires that the police and the prosecutors will not continue with a case, even if they are convinced that they know who committed a crime, until they have sufficient evidence to show beyond reasonable doubt that the person they accused of the crime did it. They will have to convince the magistrates in a summary trial, or a jury in a Crown Court.*
>
> Davies, Croall & Tyrer(1995:11-12)

When a crime is alleged to have been committed, the suspect is arrested and cautioned and may then be taken to a Police or Customs Custody area to be interviewed. (The custody procedure and the interview itself are set out in the following two sections.). The interview is recorded simultaneously on two audio-cassettes. One of these is sealed and may only be opened upon the order of a judge, or in the presence of a representative of the Crown Prosecution Service. The other is kept open as a working copy, from which typewritten transcripts of the interview are prepared, for use both by prosecution and defence. Following interview, the suspect may:

a) be released without charge
b) receive an official police caution and then be released
c) be charged with an offence
d) be released on bail pending further enquiries

The interviewing officer reports to a superior officer, who decides whether or not there is a case to answer. If there are grounds for legal proceedings, the suspect is formally charged, in a police station, with an offence. He may then be released on bail, to attend court at a later date. One of the factors in the decision as to whether or not to bail a suspect, is the "risk of absconding" which is assessed by the custody officer. This means that, under Section 38(1) of PACE 1984, the officer may decide to refuse bail if he has reasons for believing that the suspect will not surrender to bail. In the case of a foreign suspect, the officer may feel that he might return to his country and not attend court when required.

Detained persons remanded in custody are produced at the next available sitting at a Magistrates' Court. If the defendant indicates a guilty plea in the magistrates' court, the magistrates may either sentence him themselves or, if they consider that their powers of sentencing are insufficient, will commit the defendant to Crown Court for sentencing by a judge. In the event of a not guilty plea, if the case is not considered suitable for summary trial, subsequent remand and committal hearings will eventually transfer the case to Crown Court for a Plea and Directions hearing followed by a trial before judge and jury.

The Crown Prosecution Service, (set up in 1986 as a prosecution service independent of the Police), monitors the progress of the case from Magistrates' court to Trial. It carries out a review of the papers, and should discontinue prosecution of the case if it fails either the Evidentiary Test or the Public Interest test (Davies, Croall & Tyrer, 1995). Certainly, police officers and prosecution are obliged to make decisions about guilt early in the process, based on the available evidence, (Dennis, 1999).

During the same period, (from Magistrates' Court to Trial), in a series of 'conferences' either at the solicitor's offices, or at the prison if the defendant is remanded in custody, the defence solicitor prepares the case for trial. As part of these preparations, the interview tapes and transcripts are carefully checked, in search of possible anomalies in questioning, or to identify points which may raise difficulties in trial.

In the event of a trial, in serious cases such as Facilitation (assisting illegal entrants or asylum claimants to enter the UK), or Illegal Importation of Drugs, the transcript of interview, which constitutes the main plank of the prosecution's case, is almost always read out in full. This is partly because, in Facilitation and Drugs cases, the background to the offence, which will have been covered in interview, is relevant to the purposes of the investigation, and therefore to the trial. In this way, it differs from, for example, the investigation of an offence such as shoplifting, which centres on the immediate event only.

Also, cases of facilitation (illegal importation of people), or drugs (illegal importation of drugs) almost always involve a journey, since the offence is committed at the port of entry. The details of the journey are elicited at interview and may constitute part of the prosecution case, which may in turn be challenged by the defence.

It can thus be seen that the interview, which took place in the first hours of the case, maintains a position of primary importance right through to the final minutes of the trial, where it constitutes a major piece of evidence for consideration by the jury in reaching their verdict.

The detained person's arrival at the police or customs custody area sets in motion a series of events culminating in the tape-recorded interview. He is "booked in" by the custody officer, who authorises his detention "for the purposes of obtaining further evidence by means of an interview" and his legal rights are explained, which are:

a) to receive free and independent legal advice;

b) to have someone informed of his arrest;

c) to consult a copy of the codes of practice under which he is detained

The decision as to whether a suspect requires or needs an interpreter is normally jointly taken by the interviewing and/or arresting officer and the Custody Sergeant at the police station. This decision is governed by section 13C(b) of the PACE Codes of Practice, which states that:

> ... *a person must not be interviewed in the absence of a person capable of acting as interpreter if:*
> *(a) he has difficulty in understanding English*
> *(b) the interviewing officer cannot speak the person's own language; and*
> *(c) the person wishes an interpreter to be present.*

The Codes of Practice do not, however, make clear whether any one, or all of these factors apply.

Legal representation

It is at this point that DP may decide to avail himself of the services of a solicitor or legal representative, in the form of a telephone consultation and/or the presence of a solicitor during the interview. As the offences examined in this study are considered serious in the United Kingdom, most, but by no means all, detained persons request the services of a solicitor.

Once the detained person has requested legal representation, he is placed in a secure area to wait whilst a solicitor is called from the duty list. Anything from fifteen minutes to several hours may elapse until a solicitor is able to attend. During this time, the case officer prepares for interview, obtaining preliminary statements from persons involved at or before the time of arrest. In cases involving importation of drugs or facilitation, these may be other officers present when the attempted importation was discovered, or ferry or airline staff who were witnesses to the event.

Upon his arrival at the custody area, the solicitor is briefed by the case officer concerning the events up to and following arrest, following which he has a private consultation with the detained person, who is now referred to as his 'client'. During this 'conference', the solicitor explains to his client the case against him, the interview procedure and any legal points he deems useful. He then encourages the detained person to give his own version of events, and advises him on the implications of answering questions when interviewed, or remaining silent.

The concept of a solicitor 'taking instructions' from his client is a difficult one for many detained persons to grasp. Although the solicitor may question the likelihood of an interviewing officer accepting the version of events given, it is not incumbent upon him to believe or to disbelieve his client. He accepts what he is told as his client's instructions and may not, under any circumstances, 'concoct a story' together. Further, he may feel it necessary to warn his client that if a different version of events is given at interview from that which constituted his instructions in conference, he may feel 'professionally compromised' and obliged to withdraw from the case. Further preparation of the detained person for interview may involve an explanation of the implications of the Caution, advice on the manner in which to reply to questions and the reminder that he can stop the interview at any time if he wishes to confer in private with his solicitor.

The decision whether to request legal representation rests entirely with the detained person. However, the (entirely legal) advice received from a solicitor in conference may mean that his client is more able to deal with the interview procedure than a detained person who has had no such advice. Whether or not this affects the processes or outcomes of the interview can only be a matter for speculation. Therefore, although it was felt necessary to mention this factor, it has not been taken into account when analysing the data for this study, some of which involves interviews where no legal representative is present.

1:3. THE INTERVIEW

When all of the preparations are made, the participants gather in a sound-proof interview room, containing nothing but a wall-mounted tape-recorder, chairs and a table. The interviewing officer and detained person face each other, sitting either side of the table and closest to the wall-mounted microphone. If there is a second interviewing officer, he sits beside the first, and the solicitor generally sits to one side, out of the line of vision of the main participants.

Two new tapes are opened in front of the detained person and are placed in the machine, which records both simultaneously. The officer explains that at the end of the interview, one tape will be sealed as the master copy. It may only be opened on the order of a judge, or in the presence of a representative of the Crown Prosecution Service an the defendant's solicitor. The other is left open to serve as a working copy, from which a transcript will be prepared and sent to both prosecution and defence.

A buzzing sound ('the tape buzzer') follows, as the machine is switched on. In the case of a police interview, the interviewing officer begins the proceedings by announcing that: "This interview is being tape-recorded". There follows a sequence of formalities which includes presentation of all persons present, a reminder of the right to free and independent legal advice (whether or not a solicitor is present), and the formal Caution.

Before proceeding to linguistic aspects of the interview and presentation and analysis of the data, it may be useful to consider the official view of the way in which an interview should be conducted. An interview with a training officer for Kent Police and with an officer of HM Customs & Excise, revealed general agreement that the stated aims of interview are: "to give and obtain information" and "to get at the truth" in a manner which is "robust, challenging and effective, as well as lawful and ethical".

Leaving aside philosophical questions as to what constitutes "the truth", one of the interviewing officer's principal objectives is to discover whether the suspect was *knowingly concerned* in the committal of the particular offence. The data for this study concern interviews with persons suspected of one of two serious offences:

1. FACILITATION, that is, assisting the entry into the UK of an illegal entrant (Section 25(1)(a) of the Immigration Act 1971) or an asylum claimant (Section 25(1)(b) of the Immigration Act 1971). The formal charge for this offence is that the suspect was "...*knowingly concerned* in the making or carrying out of arrangements to secure or to facilitate the entry into the United Kingdom of a person whom you knew or had reason to believe to be an illegal entrant/asylum claimant".

2. ILLEGAL IMPORTATION OF DRUGS. The formal charge for this offence is that the suspect was ".... in relation to a Class (X) controlled drug, namely (drug name and quantity) *knowingly concerned* in the fraudulent evasion of the prohibition on the importation thereof imposed by section 3(1) of the Misuse of Drugs Act 1971".

In either case, the key phrase in the indictment is *knowingly concerned.* The presence of drugs or illegal immigrants in a vehicle driven by the suspect, for example, or under his responsibility, is an established fact. He would not have been arrested if, for example, drugs had not been found. Therefore, *actus reus* (the guilty act) is established (Davies et al, 1998). However, this alone, is not sufficient. Unless it can be proved that the suspect *was aware* of the presence of drugs/illegal entrants in his vehicle, or that the person

26

whom he had assisted to enter the UK had no legal right to enter, that is to say, *mens rea* (the guilty mind) (*ibid.*), then he cannot be found guilty of the offence. Both *actus reus* and *mens rea* are generally required before a person can be convicted of an offence.

In interview, therefore, the 'truth' that the officer seeks to establish is whether or not there was *mens rea*. From the officer's point of view, this requirement is the framework that shapes the whole interview, from both macro and micro perspectives. It is the lens through which to view every question and the yardstick against which to measure its effectiveness.

The question of *mens rea* informs the training of police and customs officers. With this objective, training in interviewing skills at Kent Police, for example, is based on a mnemonic of PEACE:

P   Plan and prepare

E   Engage and Explain

A   Account – obtain a first account of events, suspending belief and disbelief. Review the account, picking a topic, probing and summarising it. Attempt to uncover any anomalies or inconsistencies and get the DP to commit to or compound any apparent lies he may have told. Move on to the next topic and repeat the process, finally challenging the first account.

C   Closure, in a polite and positive manner

E   Evaluate

The above mnemonic is self-explanatory, however, it does provide an indication of the overall framework within which police officers conduct interviews. Certainly, the gloss in section A (Account) makes explicit the fact that there is indeed a 'quest for *mens rea*'. Although police training has moved a long way from the overt intention to 'get a cough', and even from the less vernacular 'points to prove', A=Account demonstrates that the underlying aim is nonetheless to seek evidence of guilt, if guilt there is.

If PEACE is a model for investigative interviewing, PACE (the Police and Criminal Evidence Act, 1984) is the law under which such interviews are carried out. More specifically, Code C of the PACE Codes of Practice governs the way in which the Police handle the detention, treatment and *questioning* of suspects. This accounts for the admonishments to "Engage and Explain" and to "Close in a Polite and Positive manner" in the PEACE mnemonic, as PACE states that "No police officer may try to obtain answers to questions or elicit a statement by use of oppression" (Code C 11.3). Further, "As soon as [the officer]..... believes that a prosecution should be brought against him (DP) and that there is sufficient evidence for it to succeed, he shall ask the person if he has anything further to say. If the person indicates that he has nothing more to say the officer shall without delay cease to question him about that offence." (Code C 11.4).

It can be seen that one participant in this institutional event, the officer, has a role which may be unique in the extent to which it is overtly defined. Not only is the role minutely defined, the officer himself has been selected following certain strict criteria, trained in investigative interviewing skills, inculcated with the laws which govern them and constantly monitored in the performance of his duties. He is, one might say, an entirely predictable entity, one half of a "situated activity system" (Goffman, 1961:96), the other half of which (DP) is almost entirely unpredictable.

DP is neither selected nor trained in any conventional sense, although of course sociologists may argue that his birth and background constitute 'training', or at least pre-conditioning to certain modes of behaviour. Criminologists too, would invoke the 'profile' of the likely offender. His aims, in the interviews that constitute my data and where no guilt is admitted, are diametrically opposed to those of the officer. The linguistic aspect of this opposition of aims will be discussed in later chapters. However, at both a linguistic and a sociological level, this opposition of aims constitutes the defining feature of the interview. Put simply, the officer seeks to demonstrate *mens rea*, the detained person seeks to deny it. In this respect, the interview shares the adversarial nature of the trial.

In this sense, investigative interviews constitute a genre that differentiates them from other dialogue, whether everyday talk-in-interaction, or institutional dialogue. Police and Customs interviews are merely one sub-genre of investigative interviews among others, ranging from for example, a school head interviewing a pupil suspected of some misdemeanour, to torture aimed at extracting a 'confession'. In every case, there is something at stake, whether it is the interviewee's freedom, embarrassment among peers or life itself. In every case, the interviewee's 'story' is tested to destruction.

Sections 1, 2 and 3 of this chapter have provided a brief overview of the interview as a part of the legal system, as the culmination of events at a Police or Customs custody area, and as a dialogue of opposing aims.

Finally, having addressed, in general terms, the question 'what is an interview', it is appropriate at this point to indicate briefly what it is not. There may be a tendency among laypersons to view the interview as a minor version of the courtroom event, the trial. However, the reality is that, apart from their shared categorisation in the field of institutional dialogue, the two events are essentially very different. The final section in this chapter compares some features of courtroom and interview, in order to illuminate, briefly, this dichotomy.

1:4 SOME FEATURES OF COURTROOM AND INTERVIEW SETTINGS

By the time a case reaches court, most of the important issues have been identified. The case is nearing the end of the judicial process and, as Rigney (1999:85) says: "...lawyers already know, or believe they know, the answer they can expect from the witness...". Prosecution and Defence have both prepared their case and have determined the arguments and lines of questioning which will best serve their purposes. In the adversarial system prevailing in the UK, these purposes are to present opposing versions of 'the truth' in order to secure a conviction or an acquittal.

Conversely, the interview generally takes place at a time when, apart from immediate details surrounding the arrest, little is known about the case. The interviewing officer is asking questions to which he genuinely does not, or may not, know the answer. The stated aims of interviews with suspects, it will be remembered, are to gather information and to obtain evidence.

Linguistically, turns by legal representatives in court are easily identifiable as being in the legal register. Language in interviews, however, moves in and out of this register. The opening sequence, which the officer may read from an aide mémoire, includes the formal caution. The closing sequence returns, if not to legal, then at least to a more formal register with statements such as:

"I have no more questions. Do you have anything that you wish to add, change or clarify in what you have said?"
"The time is now fourteen twenty hours and I am terminating this interview."

These formal sequences, the Caution and formal closings, bracket the main body of the interview in which, although language is less formal than that used in court, it is nonetheless, at surface level, a hybrid of legal and "natural" talk. Turns are generally structured informally and contain either legal lexis:

a) 'Okay so how come I **secured** your **vehicle** then today?'

or the lexis of "normal conversation":

b) 'Yes but I've had a look at your central locking and it works doesn't it'

There is frequent style switching during the main body of the interview, between formal/legal and "conversational" style. This feature will be examined in later chapters, in an attempt to identify patterns of style switching which may emerge and whether interpreters reflect these in their translations.

The informality of structure or lexis does not preclude the officer's questions from being "highly designed" (Heritage, 1997:173). Indeed, they are designed both externally, in questioning procedures laid down by the authorities, and locally, by individual officers' "wind tunnel experiments" (*ibid.:*173) in which experience of questioning leads them to develop the personal style most likely to obtain results.

In court, Atkinson & Drew (1979:90) note that the transition move 'Be upstanding in court....' is "...remarkably successful and economical..." in bringing about the end of general talk, making space for the dyadic exchanges to follow. An equally effective transition occurs in interviews, first verbally, with a question such as: "Is everybody ready?", which has the illocutionary force of 'Be upstanding in court...', and then non-verbally, by the tape buzzer, which indicates that recording has started. These verbal and non-verbal moves form an extra pair of brackets around the main body of the interview, which is itself governed by special rules of interaction which differentiate it further from courtroom dialogue.

Although most courtroom proceedings are recorded on tape, the machine is physically and psychologically less 'present' than in an interview. The only participants who orient overtly to the tape are the judge, when ruling on a point of law, or barristers in order to ensure that a point is recorded that may be raised on appeal.

In interviews, however, not only does 'the tape' have a more salient physical presence, it is also accorded a *persona* by all those present. Physically, participants are seated round the table, with the interviewing officer and detained person closest to the microphone. The box containing the tape recorder is unlocked and the detained person's attention is explicitly drawn to the fact that new tapes are being unsealed before him. Mention is also usually made of the microphone on the wall and the necessity for giving verbal answers rather than head nods and shakes. The tape buzzer, marking the start and finish of the interview, provides a further indicator of physical presence.

Psychologically, the tape is a strong incentive to participants to orient towards their "institutional identities" (Drew & Sorjonen, 1997:97). The interviewing officer is aware of the tape's prime importance as evidence in court, and will formulate and re-formulate questions until either an explicit answer has been recorded, as in extract 1:1.

Extract 1:1

1	O	But what the Customs Officer is saying is that in reply to his questions as to
2		where you'd been .h you said (.) (place name) .
3	DP	Mm
4	O	You agree that's what you said
5	DP	Yeah

or until the detained person's answers become patently evasive, as in Extract 1:2 below:

Extract 1:2

1	O	a *long* journey
2	DP	we'd been *driving* yeah
3	O	a *long* journey?
4	DP	turning around hhhuh
5	O	is a long journey a fair question. was it a long journey

Detained persons also display evidence of orientation to the tape, (perhaps in some cases due to experience of being interviewed), as in Extract 1:3 below, where in line 4, DP uses metalanguage mirroring O's 'I put it to you' in line 1. This exchange comes after a previous 'I put it to you' statement' from O, which is why DP begins his reply with 'A:nd again...'.

Extract 1:3

```
1   O     yeah .hh I also put it to you that you are .hh being deliberately obscure about
2         everything because .hh <you're hiding the fact that you knew>...(continues)
3   DP    a:nd again I would say due to the lack of sleep I've had over the past few days
4         .hh my recollection of where we've been......(continues)
```

Further, non-verbal activity such as showing of documents, or a non-verbal response by the detained person, will entail explicit reference by a turn prefaced: "For the benefit of the tape ... "

e.g.   O   ' For the benefit of the tape, I am showing Mr. X a photocopy of passport ......'

Finally, part 3 of the formal Caution draws DP's attention to the fact that: "Anything you do say may be used in evidence". This means specifically that the interview is being tape recorded and that the tape constitutes part of the evidence.

From these brief comments, it may be seen that, although the interview and courtroom are both within the institutional field of legal interaction, they cannot be analysed, either linguistically or in general terms, as if they were identical events.

Before examining some specific features, Chapter 2 now turns to linguistic aspects of the monolingual and interpreted interview.

CHAPTER 2

THE INTERVIEW AS INTERACTION

2:1. "NORMAL CONVERSATION" v "INSTITUTIONAL TALK"

From Chapter 1, it can be seen that, within the field of institutional dialogue, taped interviews following arrest could be analysed by comparing them with courtroom interaction, or any other types of institutional interaction. What is less apparent, however, is the usefulness of comparing institutional dialogue with "normal conversation", whatever that may be. There is a strong suggestion in, for example, Drew & Sorjonen (1997) that the best way of approaching the analysis of institutional dialogue is to contrast it to "conversation". The latter has been termed variously: "ordinary conversation" (Atkinson & Heritage, 1984:13); "natural conversation" (Heritage, 1984:299); "sociable talk", (Drew & Sorjonen; 1997:106), "everyday informal talk" (Goffman, 1981:322); "casual conversation" (Silverman, 1993:133); "casual" or "intimate" style (Joos, 1967:39); "fresh talk" (Goffman, 1981), or simply "conversation" (ten Have, 1999:162). A further distinction has also been drawn between conversation and 'chat' by Antaki (2000) and McHoul & Rapley (2000). However, the literature does not, because it cannot, define exactly what is meant by any of these terms. It therefore seems unsafe to over-emphasise comparisons with such a vague concept.

Institutional talk, on the other hand, has been defined with precision. I reproduce here in full Drew and Heritage's (1997:163-4) definition:

> 1. *Institutional interaction normally involves the participants in specific goal orientations which are tied to their institution relevant identities: doctor and patient, teacher and pupil, and so on.*
> 2. *Institutional interaction involves special constraints on what will be treated as allowable contributions to the business in hand.*
> 3. *Institutional talk is associated with inferential frameworks and procedures that are particular to specific institutional contexts.*

In his detailed analysis of part of a television news interview, Schegloff (1992:123) notes how the participants orientate to the "constitutive properties of 'interview'" through the turn-taking system. The interviewee allows multi-part turns from the interviewer, and does not take the turn until the interviewer has produced a recognisable question. (See also Heritage & Greatbatch, 1991).

Ten Have (1999) notes a tendency of researchers to view institutional interaction as being in some way more restricted than that of 'normal' conversation. This view is shared by Heritage (1997:164) who suggests, following Atkinson (1982) that these restrictions may even be experienced as "... constraining and irksome – especially by the lay participants".

Atkinson's (1984:13) hypothesis concurs most closely with the general direction of this chapter, that institutional interaction contains a "... clustering of particular subsets of those found in conversation...". Drew and Sorjonen (1997:92) also admit that "...there is probably no clear definition which would precisely delimit the scope of the field of institutional dialogue...". Indeed, both institutional and 'normal' talk contain so many elements of each other that it is a case, not so much of blurred edges as of commingling.

Asymmetry, for example, whether of status or power, is frequently posited as a defining attribution of institutional dialogue, (Agar, 1985; Adelswärd *et al.*, 1987; ten Have, 1991; Thomas, 1985; Linell & Jönsson, 1991; Niska, 1995; Wodak, 1996). Although Van Dijk (1997) discusses aspects of institutional power in discourse, he includes *parents* in his list of powerful groups. Accordingly, he seems to be widening the scope of asymmetrical power beyond that of institutional discourse, to 'normal' conversation, if that is indeed what takes place within families. Conversely, of course, he may be widening his definition of *institutional* to include parents as an institution. In this case, the asymmetry of parent-child relationships would be germane to that of gender imbalance posited by writers such as Lakoff (1990), Cameron (1992), Tannen (1994) and Holmes (1995), with the more powerful (male) representing an institutional group.

In their discussion of language and power, Conley and O'Barr (1998:13), seriously begin to dismantle the *normal/institutional* dichotomy, by asserting that, contrary to the assumption that most 'normal' conversation is between people of equal power or status, "...relationships of equality are so rare as to be treasured". Heritage (1997) also notes that from certain standpoints, "...the contrast between the symmetry of ordinary conversation and the asymmetry of institutional discourse is indeed oversimplified...". Further, as long ago as 1984, Heritage (1984:240) noted that, "....'interrogation' or 'cross-examination' .... may also appear at the breakfast table. As a form of interaction, it is not restricted to the police station or to the court room". Indeed, examination of such (invented) sequences as Extract 2:1 below could reach the conclusion that this dialogue is institutional, at least in style. It closely resembles both the interactional style and content of Q/A sequences used in court and interviews, even featuring an *and*-prefaced question such as those which form the object of analysis of chapter 5 of this thesis.

Extract 2:1 (invented)

1	Mother :	where were you last night?
2	Daughter:	out
3	Mother :	who with?
4	Daughter:	friends
5	Mother :	and what time did you get in?
6	Daughter:	er quite late

Power is rarely absolute or irreversible; neither are its manifestations. *Silence*, for example, may be used by lawyers in the courtroom as a source of adverse inferences about the defendant, (Graffam Walker, 1985; Tiersma, 1995; Conley & O'Barr, 1998). However, as Kurzon (1992:94) notes, "The addressee who remains silent may use this as a means of attaining power in the interaction". The use of silence as a reversal of apparent power is also illustrated in my own interview data, as for example in Extract 2:2 below. Here, following O's challenging "no?" in L475, DP ignores the 6-second silence

which might be seen as a transition relevance point, forcing O to make another attempt at gaining his agreement that he has financial difficulties. O's failure to take the turn after DP's flat denial in L476 invites DP to expand on his denial after a 5-second pause. Finally, the "opening hesitation filler 'Well'" (Graffam Walker, 1985:72) precedes O's somewhat weak topic closure. Thus, although he has not usurped the officer's institutional power, the detained person has at least exerted his own power to influence turn-taking and has caused the officer to abandon a particular line of questioning.

Extract 2:2

```
472   O      (amount) (2.0) now am I right in saying that things are tight financially at
473          home ?
474   DP     no
475   O      no ? (6.0) a::hm I mean you've got a large family
476   DP     no (5.0) four's not large
477   O      well (1.0) it's a lot of mouths to feed
```

Silence, as either a strategy or as a manifestation of power, however, is by no means restricted to institutional situations. One can imagine any number of "non-institutional" situations where it might be used by one participant, in order to make the other feel uncomfortable, embarrassed or insulted. It has also long been posited as a powerful weapon in negotiation.

The asymmetrical exercise of power, then, by the supposedly dominant participant is by no means universal. In her study of disagreement among university professors and students, Rees-Miller (2000) found that professors used more politeness markers in disagreeing with students than vice-versa. This concurs with the evidence from my interview data, where officers used more politeness markers and mitigation than did detained persons.

Other types of asymmetry, such as asymmetry of topic and tasks (ten Have, 1991) and participation, interactional and institutional 'know-how' and access to knowledge (Heritage, 1997), have been attributed to institutional interaction. However, it would seem that the asymmetry of *power* can switch between participants, even in the most apparently asymmetrical situations. It is therefore not a reliable marker of the institutionality of dialogue.

Finally, placing "everyday conversation" in a box labelled "normal" and contrasting institutional dialogue with it (and, in this case, interviews with suspects), appears unsafe. Our purposes may be better served by identifying just "what it is that's going on..." (Goffman, 1974) in the interview, by examining it as a genre *sui generis*, with its own "fingerprint" (Heritage & Greatbatch, 1991:95) and leaving aside "normal conversation", the definition of which cannot be pinned down. For the purposes of this thesis, I would presume to re-write Heritage and Atkinson's (1984:2) definition of data from"... *naturally occurring* occasions of everyday interaction..." by '*naturally occurring occasions of everyday interviewing*'.

Certainly, the recently-coined term "talk-in-interaction", which is replacing "conversation", has gone some way towards removing this dubious dichotomy of 'normal-institutional'. Although no more than another linguistic label it does, at least, ease the categorical restrictions and provide a hyponymous link to the term: 'interactional sociolinguistics'.

2:2 ASPECTS OF THE INTERACTION

The reasons for the paucity of research on investigative interviews, in the UK at least, are self-evident, with problems of access being almost insurmountable. Research has been carried out in Sweden (Linell & Jönsson, 1991; Linell, 1994; Wadensjö, 1992, 1998). However, these include immigration hearings and do not, therefore, belong solely in the category under consideration in this thesis. It is hardly surprising that almost all of the available research in the legal field is centred upon courtroom interaction, where data is

38

more readily available. Chapter 1:4 above presented some situational differences between courtroom and interview. In this section, I shall focus on certain linguistic aspects of the interview, referring to such courtroom research as appears relevant.

Following Schegloff (1992:112), I shall first address the "interview-ness" of interviews through some of the interactional features that inhabit the genre. At a superficial level, investigative interviews appear to be a series of questions and answers. Indeed at the grossest of macro levels, the interview consists of one question: "did you?" and one answer: "No I didn't/yes I did". However, closer inspection reveals that:

a) not all of the officer's turns are questions. They include informing, challenging, agreeing, commenting, encouraging, narrative and evaluating moves;

b) not all of the detained persons turns are answers. They include challenging, agreeing, commenting, evaluating, narrative and even questioning moves.

Some of these are apparent in Extract 2:3 below:

Extract 2:3

228	DP	u:hm (3.0) .hh well 'cos the date on the ticket was for later on I went to (.)
229		when we got into the port I saw a (name) kind of a (1.0) ca- you know a
230		place=
231	O	=a kiosk?=
232	DP	=yeah a little kiosk sort [of place]
233	O	[yeah ?]
234	DP	[and I went in there] yeah I went in there and said (.) can I
235	O	[and you drive up to it don't you]
236	DP	go home please 'cos you know the time on this is different is can I (.) get on
237		the next ferry please=
238	O	=mm
239	DP	he said yeah (.) gave me another ticket
240	O	yeah .hh gave you duty free passes didn't they. (1.5) I've got them here

241   actually=
242   DP   =yeah probably
243   O   how many?
244   DP   I don't know (.) I mean literally I was looking forward to going to sleep,
245   O   they gave you two=
246   DP   =yeah?

The interview here is in the "journey phase" (see section 2:4 for a full description of the phases of the interview). The officer is eliciting an account of the detained person's journey immediately prior to his arrest. From this macro perspective, the extract is part of a prolonged questioning sequence.

However, it can be seen that DP is able to set up a narrative in L228-30, in which O collaborates by offering the suggestion "kiosk?" in L231 with rising intonation. DP takes up the suggestion, eliciting an encouraging "yeah?" from O (L233) before he has finished. With his simultaneous declarative question in L235, O attempts to move the story on, but is unsuccessful. DP simply acknowledges the attempt, but continues with his story. O's next turn in L238 is merely back-channeling. He does not succeed in taking back the turn until L240. Here, "yeah .hh" announces another declarative question, with a question tag, followed by an informing move "I've got them here actually", thus precluding any denial by DP. Nonetheless, DP's turn in L242 "yeah probably" resembles a comment on O's information that he has the tickets, rather than an answer to the first part question. He also deflects the next question, "I don't know", before attempting to change the topic back to his tiredness, which had been mentioned at an earlier stage. O's turn in L245 is framed as an informing move which does not take up DP's attempted change of topic and DP's next-turn "yeah", with rising intonation merely comments, with the intonation of "oh really?"

Thus it can be seen that, except in the grossest possible terms, it would be wrong to categorise the investigative interview as a series of simple questions and answers.

However, questions are massively present, and I will now compare some of these to the existing literature.

2:3 QUESTION FORMS

Following general taxonomies such as those of Quirk *et al.* (1972, 1985) and Tsui, 1992, the literature addresses various aspects of form and function. These include coerciveness (Danet & Bogoch, 1980; Woodbury, 1984; Conley & O'Barr, 1998; Berk-Seligson, 1999), dominance and control (Harris, 1984; Adelswärd *et al.*, 1987, Matoesian, 1993), form-function relations of questions and answers (Bishop *et al.* 1998), illocutionary meaning (Hudson, 1975) and prosody (Cruttenden, 1986; Brazil, 1997).

It is possible, in the context of the investigative interview, to find instantiations of most, if not all, of the forms and functions identified in the literature, whether these are based in institutional or so-called 'normal' conversation. For example, Officers' questions may be anywhere on a mitigated-coercive continuum, the extremes of which might be represented by:

a) extremely mitigated

236	O	right (1.0) .h so:: (.) a::hm (1.5) really I mean i- what I wanted from you *very*
237		very quickly [not in] to-too much detail is which route you travelled
238	DP	[right]
239	O	down to (country C)

b) extremely coercive

574	O	yeah .hh I also put it to you that you are .hh being deliberately *obscure* about
575		everything because .hh <you're hiding the fact you knew he was an illegal
576		entrant>

Question tags can be found from Berk-Seligson's (1999:36) less coercive example, "4. copy tag question"

a) less coercive

276   O   what did you show your return ticket did you?

b) more coercive example (*ibid:*36) "9. positive checking tag question"

542   O   you didn't give the car to somebody in (town A) to have whatever put inside
543   it (.) that was done in (town B) wasn't it.

An open WH question appears noticeably at the beginning of the interview proper, after introductions and caution, which I term an "invitation to account". It is present in interviews, in forms such as:

1. "What can you tell me about the events leading up to your arrest?"
2. "What can you tell me about the drugs found in your vehicle?"
    or, following an explanation of the alleged offence by the officer:
3. "What can you tell me about that allegation?"

Question 3 conforms to the E = Engage and Explain of the Police PEACE interview plan mnemonic, (see chapter 1:3), as it is frequently the final move in a multi-part turn which may begin:

Extract 2:4

36   O   you were arrested at (place) this morning after you arrived by ferry from
(country A) (1.0) you were arrested because it was suspected that you had
facilitated the entry of two illegal entrants into this country (.) which means
that it was suspected that you helped two illegal entrants to come in (1.0)
what do you have to say about the allegation.

However, questions 1-3 are sometimes, but not always, also preceded by an explanation which, as will be seen in Chapter 4, can cause considerable difficulties of interpretation.

Similar moves were also noted by Adelswärd *et al.* (1987) in Swedish courts, where the law requires the judge to allow the defendant to give an account in his own words, at the start of the hearing. It was also noted (*ibid:*319.) that although judges 'paid lip service' to the principle of inviting to account, a number of invitations finished with a closed question, in what was termed a "funneling technique" as follows:

Adelswärd *et al.* (1987:319)

(2) *Trial, No. 16*

    Defendant charged with bicycle theft.)

> J: Yes, OK. Well, John Lagesson, can you tell us a little about how it happened that you came to take this bike. Was it unlocked?

<∧ D: Yes, um, it was I think, there was a wire hanging round the bike stand and the front fork there, you know.

There was, however, no evidence of funneling in the opening questions of my data. Questions were either open as above, or closed, as follows:

4. "Do you understand why you have been arrested?"

Although the content of the above questions places them within the field of legal discourse, their institutionality can be compared to any situation where a lay person is questioned by a professional, such as doctor-patient exchanges. Here the doctor would invite the patient to give an account of his/her symptoms as a way of opening the consultation.

There is certainly a common core (Shiffrin, 1994) among interviews as speech events. However, where investigative interviews differ from the rest of the field is in the adversarial nature, whether overt or covert, of the exchange. As mentioned in section

2:1, this is by no means restricted either to the legal field, or to institutional situations. It includes any event where a question of guilt (or innocence) is contested and where one person's version of events is 'tested to destruction' by another.

This underlying and at times covert conflict is perhaps best revealed through relating it to Grice's (1975) co-operative principles, two of which, *quality* and *manner*, are 'flouted' not at a superficial level but at the deeper level of implicature. Extract 2:5 below, for example, shows how the maxim of quality is flouted, with overt co-operation concealing the underlying conflict:

Extract 2:5

342	O	right. (1.0) so you got lost in the continent of Europe and when you return
343		to England you got two passengers in the boot of your car. (1.5) how did
344		they end up to be in there.
345	DP	got as much idea as me. (1.5) when I opened up the boot for him just like
346		show there was nothing in and there was these two people lying in the
347		back of the car
348		(2.0)
349	O	I mean (.) it's not the normal thing that happens is it
350	DP	no (.) I wouldn't have thought so (1.5) it's the first time I've been abroad
351	O	right. (.) so how do you think they entered your car

The first part of O's two-part turn provides a summary of DP's explanation of the events, which he manifestly believes to be untrue, thus flouting the maxim of quality. Irony is partly conveyed by the use of the term "passengers" in juxtaposition with their situation in the boot of the car, and the apparent surprise in the question "how did they end up to be in there". O's question is therefore ambiguous, flouting the maxim of manner ('avoid ambiguity') and in his reply, (L345), DP has no evidence for believing that O has "as much idea" as him, (maxim of quality). O maintains the irony in L349, by appearing to seek agreement that such things do not happen in the normal course of events. Again, DP

makes a show of inferring a serious question, amplifying his response with an explanation, which may or may not be true, (L350). O's final question is revealed by subsequent turns (not shown here), to be a display question, since he already believes that DP put the illegal entrants into the car himself.

From the above, it can be seen that the co-operation in questions and answers obeys Grice's maxims at a superficial level, whilst flouting the same maxims at the level of implicature.

2:4 PHASES OF THE INTERVIEW

Much interaction can be mapped by identifying its interactional phases (Heritage, 1997), and indeed the interviews that constitute my data fall into clear sections, identifiable in the talk. However, it is appropriate to provide a brief overview of the interactional progression at this stage.

In the cases of Facilitation and Importation of Drugs, which constitute the data for this study, there appears to be a distinct pattern to the *content* of the interview. Following the preliminaries (introductions, offer of legal representation, caution), the officer questions the suspect on his personal circumstances, marital status and present employment. These questions generally appear to be seen by the suspect as not only innocuous, but as an opportunity to establish a helpful and co-operative persona for himself. As will be seen in the extracts in Chapter 6, which traces the phases of the interview through varying functions of repetition, his replies are therefore characterised by confirmatory repetition of the officer's questions, helpful additions and, at times, humour. This part of the interview may be termed the *life story phase*, although it may also include details of the background to the journey in question, such as in Extract 2:6 below.

Extract 2:6

1	O	okay and who else is in the company with you
2	DP	just me
3	O	just you=
4	DP	yeah
5	O	okay (1.5) and (.) d'you have anybody working for you?
6	DP	no

Having established details of the suspect's personal circumstances, the officer then proceeds to obtain a re-construction of the events leading up to the arrest. He may signal the move from background to journey with markers such as the pause, breath and metalanguage in Extract 2:7 below.

Extract 2:7

1	O	so you've no working partners? (1.0) no?
2	DP	no
3		.hh now tell me (1.5) what was the purpose of your trip a-abroad (.) on
4		this occasion please

Cases of Facilitation and Drug Importation always involve a journey immediately prior to arrest, as the offence consists of bringing illegal entrants or drugs into the UK. For various reasons, officers attempt to elicit a detailed description of the journey. This *journey phase* of the interview, as it begins to address the 'facts of the matter', may be perceived by the detained person as less 'safe' than the *life story phase*. However, both officer and DP still maintain at least the appearance of co-operation, as they map out the journey together, (often with the physical aid of a map). DP continues to reply readily, often spelling out place names, indicating on the map and volunteering extra information. As will be seen in Chapter 6, the officer is at pains to maintain the co-operative tenor, by avoiding confrontation and by hedging and mitigating.

It will be seen from the data then, that in order for both participants to achieve their aims in the *life story* and *journey* phases of the interview, co-operation, or at least apparent co-operation, is the most logical strategy. It might be termed "doing being co-operative" as opposed to "being co-operative".

Finally, having established a maximum of factual information, the officer proceeds to the third phase of the interview, the *probe/challenge*, where he begins to probe the facts and challenge the 'story'. In the early phases of the monolingual interview under discussion in Chapter 6, both officer and suspect avoid FTAs (Brown & Levinson, 1987) and their dialogue displays the numerous features of what I shall term *co-murmuring*. In the final phase, however, co-operativeness is no longer the optimum strategy, at least for the officer. He has gathered sufficient information in the *journey phase* to confront DP with what he sees as discrepancies in his account based, for example, on readings of the vehicle's tachograph. He makes claims and assertions, which may culminate in outright accusation at the end of the interview.

This shift from *journey* to *probe/challenge* phase is not always marked by discourse markers. Rather, it is the content and tenor of questions that may change either gradually or abruptly. However, it is frequently signalled by reference to the account which has been built up previously, followed by a challenge, such as in Extract 2:8. (It is coincidental that this example also features discourse markers).

Extract 2:8

1	O	okay .hh er in the first interview (name) (.) you told us you left (town
2		A) .hh ah on the Tuesday evening which would be the (date) (2.0) yes?
3	DP	yes
4	O	there is a receipt from the grey plastic wallet headed Carte Bancaire
5		dated (date). (2.0) are you still telling me you left (town A) on the
6		(date). (1.0) perhaps you would like to tell me the truth.

Even at this stage, it can be seen that O still gets DP to commit to the account by eliciting his agreement ("yes" in L3) that this is indeed what he said, before challenging it.

In Extract 2:9 below, the officer builds up to a challenge by shedding doubt on the detained person's previous account.

Extract 2:9

1	O	where (.) where were you when he gave you this piece of paper
2	DP	he gave it to me as we came out of the hotel
3	O	in (town B)
4	DP	yes because I never stayed in a hotel here
5		(2.5)
6	O	yesterday you said that you had this (2.0) from (name) (1.0) at (town
7		A) *railway* station.=
8	DP	=no
9	O	that was a mistake was it?
10	DP	it w- yes (1.0) I can't remember what I said to you (.) that comes from the hotel (.) that's a mistake that's a mistake
11	O	I think you can't remember because you are trying to hide something

Thus, it can be seen that, although both participants orientate to the different phases of the interview, it is the officer who is the prime mover in directing the discourse and connecting DP's events into an account. This "sectional analysis" (Heritage, 1997:167) is not a rigid framework into which the data should be fitted, but rather a product of the interaction produced by the participants' orientation to the tasks at hand.

The preceding sections have examined the general situation of the interview within the legal system and its discursive, conversational aspects that will inform the analysis of the data to be discussed. Section 2:5 turns to the interpreted interview and examines some of the situational and linguistic elements that distinguish it from the monolingual event.

The general view of translation as the transfer of that which is *written* in one language into another, and of interpreting as that which is *spoken* in one language into another, is now an established definition among linguists, including interpreters and translators themselves. The English-speaking judiciary, however, has adopted a different view, and defines *translation* as verbal or written transfer between language. *Interpreting*, as Morris (1995) notes, is viewed by the courts as an intralingual activity reserved for lawyers. Hence the judiciary admonition to court interpreters to "just translate, don't interpret", although this sits uncomfortably with the interpreters' oath, which is to:

> "...*well and faithfully interpret and true explanation make, of all such matters and things as shall be required of me, according to the best of my skill and understanding*".

Research in the field of interpreting *per se*, rather than it being an off-shoot of translation, is expanding rapidly. More specifically, legal interpreting has formed the object of much recent study, (Berk-Seligson, 1990, 1999, 2000; Shlesinger, 1991; Linell & Jönsson, 1991; Wadensjö, 1992, 1998; Linell, 1994; Morris, 1995, 1999; Niska, 1995; Baker, 1997; Alexieva, 1997; Hale & Gibbons, 1999; Krouglov, 1999; Rigney, 2000; Roy, 2000; Russell, 2000a, 2000b; Hale, 1999; Komter, 1994).

Alexieva (1997:156-7) identifies two "prototype" modes of interpreting:

1. *Simultaneous*: characterised by "non-stop delivery of the source text and parallel production of the target text", and
2. *Consecutive*: "... delivery of the source text in chunks of varying lengths followed by the production of the target text".

Liaison interpreting is classified as a "peripheral member" of consecutive interpreting, (*ibid.*:159), which tends to take place in more intimate settings, with a smaller number of

49

participants than in conference or large meeting situations. It is generally used in face-to-face interaction, where participants are directly involved in co-constructing the dialogue.

Interpreters in the courtroom use all three of these modes at different stages of the hearing. Barristers and judges addressing the jury speak either continuously (SI) or in chunks, allowing the interpreter space to interpret (CI). The interpreter, sitting in the dock beside the defendant, interprets for him as sole addressee, *en chuchotage* (whispering). In these phases, the defendant has no right to speak and plays an entirely passive role. During examination-in-chief and cross-examination of the defendant, however, the interpreter stands beside him on the witness stand, and switches to *liaison* mode, as speaking rights are shared between barrister and defendant.

Hewitt (1995:34) categorises these courtroom modes as two functions: *proceedings* interpreting and *witness* interpreting. Whilst seated in the dock, the non-English speaking defendant has, nonetheless, the right to be linguistically present and able to follow the proceedings. However, as Mikkelson (2000) suggests, it may not be necessary to convey all of the linguistic and paralinguistic aspects of those proceedings where he is not playing an active role. However, whilst the defendant (or witness) is speaking from the witness stand, every aspect of language used by the judiciary must be preserved, so that he may evaluate the facts of his case (González et al., 1991) and conversely, so that those that are trying him can judge his credibility.

In the investigative interview, where both principal participants are directly involved and where communication is 'dialogic' in the simplest sense of the word, *liaison* interpreting is used almost exclusively. That is, primary participants deliver source text in chunks, leaving space for interpretation in between.

Communication through a liaison interpreter is perhaps the most difficult mode for primary participants. Turn-taking, as discussed in section 2:5:1 requires strict discipline which cannot always be imposed by the interpreter. Arbitrary chunking of text in one

language can leave the interpreter unable to even begin her interpretation into another, since a vital syntactic or contextual element may be missing from the first chunk.

It is important that there is no simultaneous talk, since every utterance, in both languages, must be recorded on, and be recoverable from, the tape. Defence solicitors often have copies of the tapes checked by an independent interpreter, in order to identify any discrepancies in interpretation that would enable them to query or, in extreme cases, to have the whole interview ruled out as evidence.

The only exception to the *liaison* rule occurs when the officers and/or solicitor step temporarily out of their 'interview roles', to discuss a point of law or procedure together. At this point, the interpreter switches to *simultaneous en chuchotage*, in order to keep the detained person informed of what is happening. In view of the focus of this thesis, all future reference to interpreting, unless otherwise stated, indicates use of the *liaison* mode.

Echoing Bakhtin's (1981) view of all language as *dialogic*, recent research (Linell, 1994, 1996; Wadensjö 1998) has put forward a *dialogic* model of interpreting. This asserts that participants co-construct the text, as opposed to the *monologic* view, which sees it as a one-way transfer of the speaker's intentions, with the interpreter as uninvolved conduit. Wadensjö (1998) also suggests that the interpreter has two equally important roles, that of translating, and that of coordinating. Her extracts from immigration interviews do show a quite extraordinary level of intervention on the part of the interpreter, which might best be termed *community interpreting*, since the interpreter also serves, to some extent, as a mediator.

In support of this term, Roberts (1995) offers the explanation that community interpreting has evolved from the social services, that many of the interpreters are volunteers and that it is largely concerned with migrants who require assistance, implying that the interpreter will therefore have some mediating role. This is not to say that in *liaison interpreting*, the interpreter has no coordinating role at all, but merely that, in interviews with suspects, this role should be less prominent than Wadensjö appears to suggest.

51

However, this apparent tolerance of intervention does highlight one of the principal dilemmas of liaison interpreting and, more specifically, that of interviews with suspects. It is not the long discredited admonition to 'just translate', but a question of how much license the interpreter should accord herself in order to facilitate comprehension between primary participants. In an interview with a suspect she is, it must be remembered, facilitating interaction not only between two languages and two cultures, but also between two social spheres. The scope for miscommunication is tremendous, and the consequences are potentially grave.

On the other hand, besides avoiding any alteration of illocutionary force of the primary participants' utterances, the interpreter is barred from any intervention that might alter the *legal* implications of what is said. Viewed against a background of dissimilar legal systems in different countries and the consequent impossibility of assigning terminological equivalence, it can be seen that here is a major dilemma. The interpreter is caught between the extremes of translating for "skopos", or purpose/aim envisaged (Vermeer 1998:44) and the legal requirement for a 'faithful' rendering of the original. The problem is neatly encapsulated by Vermeer (*ibid.*:44) as follows: "A "faithful" translation of a source text can lead to an "unfaithful" target text, that is, one which misses the point; it does not render the source text meaning... "faithfully", nor is it adequate to the target-text skopos".

Problems of register are also inherent in the difference between social spheres of the primary participants, the "... clash of world perspectives" (Hale, 1997) between the officer as institutional representative and suspect as lay person. This question has been examined by, for example, Hale (*ibid.*) who noted a tendency for interpreters (in court) to raise the register when interpreting the defendant's utterances into English for the barrister, and to lower it when interpreting the barrister's utterances into Spanish for the defendant.

Shlesinger (1991) notes that interpreters tend to clean up the disfluencies and false starts of primary participants, and attributes this, in part, to a desire not to be seen as

unprofessional or incompetent. Morris (1995:31-2) adds that, like court reporters, interpreters are expected to clean up utterances from the judiciary, but to reproduce all of the disfluencies from witnesses, thus indicating that "...the 'translate, don't interpret' admonition turns out to be relativist in philosophical and practical terms". In her study of interpreters' treatment of leading questions, Berk-Seligson (1999:48-9) deduces that their reduction in coerciveness may simply mean that interpreters are not "keenly aware" of question form, or that they are trying to protect the witness from feelings of discomfort. Rigney (1999) also examines changes in register and pragmatic force in interpreting of questions in court, although she does not hypothesise on possible reasons.

In theory, interpreters should adhere rigidly to primary participants' choice of register, leaving them to sort out resultant miscommunication as best they can. This applies both in court and in interview, where certain ambiguities, both from officer/lawyer and suspect/defendant may well be strategic and therefore vulnerable to "divergent rendition" (Wadensjö, 1998:106) from the interpreter. The interpreter's perception of a successful communicative act may diverge from that of the primary participants in a specific context. However, this does not take into account instances of genuine cultural or linguistic misunderstanding, where a judicious intervention by the interpreter may prevent the interview from becoming 'bogged down' in extraneous and irrelevant exchanges.

It would seem that the solution to the dilemma lies somewhere along the continuum between interventionist and non-interventionist policies. This leaves the legal interpreter to exercise her own judgment to achieve the delicate balance in what she perceives as her normative role.

This role, it might be said, resembles that of a catalyst, with all of a catalyst's potential to cause an adverse reaction if the chemistry is wrong. Morris (1995:26) writes of the *traduttore traditore* tradition, whereby legal practitioners in court see interpreters as nothing but an annoyance and a barrier to communication. However, the interview data for this study, together with my personal experience have shown that there is a closer

relationship between officers and interpreters in interviews. Officers do not appear to view the presence of competent interpreters as a serious barrier to communication. Again, both the data and personal experience show a willingness to make the necessary adjustments to allow for the triadic nature of the exchange, even though officers may not be fully aware of just what these adjustments should be.

From their experience, both officer and interpreter adopt a common frame (Goffman, 1974) for the "interview with suspect" event. It includes not only "what it is that is going on here" (*ibid.*:8), but also the physical and spatial elements involved, (Kendon, 1992). At the start of the interview, they move to pre-designated places and carry out the preliminary formalities with, as will be seen in Chapter 4 on the *Police Caution*, very little reference to the detained person. This means that, for the first few minutes, the latter's role in relation to role others is ill-defined. The frame, or schema of a dyadic interaction that he might have carried into the room is rendered void by the presence of a third party, the interpreter, who controls all of his speaking rights. His prototypical "police interview" has an extra node.

The next section will use examples from the data to highlight one feature, turn-taking, with particular reference to overlapping talk, where the presence of an interpreter alters the dynamics of the interaction.

2:5:1 TURN-TAKING

Following Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson's (1974) seminal work on the local management of turns, Roy (2000:347) cites more recent work (Bennett, 1981; Edelsky, 1981; Tannen,1984) which has shown that turns are less rule-governed than originally posited by Sacks *et al* (*ibid.*). Specifically, that conversation contains overlapping talk, which is acceptable and is not considered as interruption. Indeed Tannen (1984) found that the overlapping talk of some of the interactants in her data signalled involvement and encouragement.

Despite the apparently rigid Q/A format of interviews, both interruptions and overlapping talk happen. The primary participants may both begin to speak at once, one may join in whilst the other is in mid-turn, or may start to speak again, having apparently finished a turn. However, as Roy (2000:84) succinctly puts it, "An interpreter cannot interpret two speakers at the same time", and it is the interpreter's strategies for dealing with this that bring into focus one aspect of the specific dynamics of the interpreted interview. Using Roy (2000) as a baseline, I shall present sections of data that appear to support this view.

The tape recording of interviews with suspects, (mandatory since the Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984), magnifies this interactional dilemma. Not only can the interpreter not interpret overlapping talk, the tape recorder cannot distinguish it and the transcriber cannot transcribe it. Thus, the record of the interview may be still further degraded before its arrival as a piece of evidence in court.

All three participants orientate in some way to the presence of the tape. The PACE Codes of Practice (Code E 2.2.1) state that:

> *Tape recording of interviews shall be carried out openly to instill confidence*
> *in its reliability as an impartial and accurate record of the interview.*

The officer and interpreter know from experience how to "do" tape-recorded interviews and the recording is explained to the detained person whilst sealed tapes are opened in front of him and placed in the machine. However, taking turns to speak through an interpreter requires a rigid discipline that is not always enforceable. Roy (2000:80) notes that tolerance for "lag", being the time during which a participant waits for an intelligible response to his first-part turn, varies according to conversational style and psycholinguistic factors. Certainly, this is a factor in her data of a meeting between a deaf student and a hearing professor, where the interpreter is 'signing' and the professor perceives a lengthy silence. However, it could well be a factor in overlap in spoken language situations also, particularly where one participant is from a culture where overlapping talk is acceptable and even desirable (see Tannen, 1984).

55

Extract 2:10 below shows an occurrence of DP-initiated overlap, where he has failed to allow time for within-turn interpreting and where the end of the interpreter's rendering in L4 becomes unclear.

Extract 2:10

1	O	but you're saying you- i- in your m- own mind (1.0) you (.) thought there
2		was nothing wrong with any of this.=
3	I	=vous êtes en train de dire donc que vous dans votre tête il n'y avait rien de
4		mal [unclear]
5	DP	[**non** 'y avait rien de mal]
6	I	no there w- yes there was nothing wrong

The end of the interpreter's utterance in L4 becomes untranscribable as DP's utterance covers her voice. Presumably the interpreter was finishing her rendering of "with any of this", but this cannot be recovered from the tape. (It is also interesting to note that, following DP's stressed "**non**", the interpreter matches her rendering to this negative confirmation, before changing to confirm the positive part of O's utterance, "but you're saying ... ").

Participants can initiate overlap with each other, or with the interpreter. Indeed, in extreme cases it is not uncommon for the interpreter to initiate overlap, that is, to interpret part of a segment simultaneously. This can occur where she is beginning to tire, or where, in spite of her best efforts at control, the participants continually deny her space to complete her interpretation. Further, many detained persons using an interpreter have at least a rudimentary knowledge of English, and may attempt to reply directly to a question from the officer, without waiting for the interpretation. Experienced officers will pre-empt this problem by saying during the preliminary formalities: "The questions will be put to you in English and will be translated into French. You will reply in French and your replies will be translated into English".

According to Roy (2000:85) the interpreter has four options, for dealing with overlapping talk:

1. *An interpreter can stop one (or both) speakers and allow the other speaker to continue. If an interpreter stops both speakers, then either the interpreter indicates who speaks next or one of the primary participants decides who talks next.*
2. *An interpreter can momentarily ignore one speaker's overlapping talk, hold the segment of talk in memory, continue interpreting the other speaker, and then produce the "held" talk immediately following the end of a speaker's turn. Decisions about holding talk in one's memory lie within the interpreter's ability to do so and the interpreter's judgment regarding the importance or impact of the talk to be held in memory.*
3. *An interpreter can ignore overlapping talk completely.*
4. *An interpreter can momentarily ignore overlapping talk and upon finishing the interpretation of one speaker, offer the next turn to the other speaker, or indicate in some way that a turn was attempted.*

In interviews, it is undesirable for the interpreter's voice to be heard on tape as a primary participant. That is, she should avoid taking a turn, except in extreme circumstances, such as a complete breakdown in communication caused by a cultural or linguistic equivalence problem. She should then identify herself by prefacing her turn with "interpreter speaking". This means that the first option of stopping one or both speakers can only be achieved by gesture. Since the data for this study is audio-taped, I can only confirm that this is so from personal experience and from informal conversations with other interpreters. My own gesture to stop is an extended hand, palm downwards, which I then turn over to palm upwards, when I am ready to offer the turn back to the speaker that I stopped. This communication by gesture does have the advantage that the interpreter disposes of two modes that she can use simultaneously, one to signal non-verbally to a speaker to stop, and one to continue verbally interpreting for the other.

Extract 2:11 shows an example of Roy's option no. 2, where the interpreter holds a segment in memory and delivers it in a subsequent turn. The officer in this exchange has taken over the interview from a preceding officer and is re-confirming information. The held segment appears in bold type.

Extract 2:11

```
1    O      I understand the keys were in the battery compartment or near the
2           battery and the vehicle was er: collected by (DP name)
3    I      et si je comprends bien les clés étaient dans la batterie ou près de la
4           batterie [et-  ]
5    DP                [non ]non sous le cache de la batterie=
6    I      =yes underneath the battery- battery [compartment (.) and you needed
7    DP                                          [fallait ouvrir le cache °et les clés
8    I      to open the ] battery compartment and the keys were there .hh et que
9    DP     étaient là°  ]
10   I      c'est vous qui avez été donc chercher [ le camion sur ce parking     ]
11   DP                                           [le camion à pied oui exacte oui]
12   I      yes on foot yes
```

DP overlaps in L5 to correct O's assertion that the keys were *in* the battery compartment. At this point, I suspends her interpretation of the last part of O's turn (in bold), acknowledges and interprets DP's correction. In L7, DP again does not wait for her to finish interpreting. He starts to expand his description of the keys' location whilst she is saying "compartment" This time, the interpreter holds on to her own turn and switches to simultaneous mode to render the expanded description. There are several possible reasons for this switch into a mode not normally allowable in an interview:

a) DP's final segment "°et les clés étaient là°" was spoken quietly, so she was sure of her voice being clear on the tape-recording;

b) she needed to keep the turn because of the un-interpreted segment that she was still holding from the officer's turn in L1/2;

c) the conversational style of that particular DP involved a great deal of overlapping talk, which at times obliged her to interpret simultaneously to keep up. (This strategy is particularly noticeable towards the end of this 4-tape interview, as the interpreter began to tire).

58

Roy (*ibid.*) posits that (among other reasons) the interpreter may predict that the overlapping talk is going to be short and therefore she will not have to hold the suspended segment in memory for long. This may also be true of Extract 2.7 above, since DP's turns are clearly an insertion sequence consisting only of repair and expansion.

Finally, in L8, having interpreted the complete insertion sequence of DP's repair and expansion, I takes a quick breath and renders the segment that she had been holding from L2. (In bold).

There are few instances of overlapping talk instigated by officers in my data. However, Extract 2:12 below, shows an example of overlapping talk by all three participants apparently caused by a mis-placed pause from the interpreter.

Extract 2:12

1	O	remind me did you visit Mister:: (name) in hospital
2	I	rappellez-moi est-ce que vous êtes allé rendre visite à (name) à l'hôpital
3	DP	oui Dimanche.=
4	I	=yes.(1.0) [yes on Sunday]
5	O	[did you vis....]
6	DP	[Dimanche] après son (.) son accident
7	I	after his (.) accident
8	O	OK
9	DP	en réanimation
		(1.0)
10	I	when he was:: (1.0.) er in intensive care
11	O	°fine° .hh did you visit him (2.0) alone?

DP appears to have finished his utterance in L3. However, I's utterance-final intonation on "yes." and the one-second pause in L4 lead both DP and O to think that she has

finished. Consequently, at the same time as she adds "yes on Sunday" as an afterthought, both O and DP attempt to take the next turn, O as a question turn and DP to expand on his own response. O gives up the turn, contenting himself with a receipt marker in L8 and allows DP to expand further, before finally managing to place his question in L11.

Generally, experienced officers allow space both for detained persons to give complete answers and for interpreters to interpret. The only exceptions in my data are those where the detained person is "rambling" or repeating himself and the officer wishes to bring him back to the point. These instantiations, however, are definitely classifiable as interruptions and are treated as such by the interpreter. She then switches from interpreting DP to interpreting O, as in Extract 2:13 below, where I abandons DP's turn in favour of a new question by O.

Extract 2:13

1	DP	et ils ont chargé du papier
2	I	and they loaded [paper]
3	DP	[les bobines]
4	I	the rollers
5	DP	ils ont ramené le camion à (place)
6	O	[and you saw paper]
7	I	[they brought-] (.) et vous avez vu (.) ce papier
8	DP	oui parce-que m-même euh le (company name) parce-que ça =
9	I	=yes=
10	DP	=ça c-c'est *moi* qui l'ai déchargé
11	I	even at (company name) it was *me* that unloaded

Interpreters' decisions concerning turn allocation in overlapping talk may be based upon immediate contextual considerations. In this extract, the officer's line of questioning seeks to establish the driver's awareness of various loads. The interpreter may have

perceived the importance of the officer's question in L6, leading her to abandon DP's unsolicited utterance, (he has not been asked whether they brought the lorry back.). This is possible because the overlapping speech in L6/7 is exactly simultaneous. By the time the interpreter had said "they brought-", she had heard the whole of the officer's question "and you saw paper". The significance of *and*-prefaced questions as a strategy in interviews (Russell, 2000b) forms the subject of analysis in Chapter 5. However, the on-going-agenda nature of these questions may also have been a factor in the interpreter's decision to prioritise the officer's next question.

Interpreters do not always give preference to the more powerful participant. Also, contrary to other findings (Anderson, 1975, Berk-Seligson 1990) there is no evidence in my data that foreign national interpreters align with detained persons of their own nationality, or that English interpreters align with English officers. In Extract 2:14 below, the interpreter, who was English, 'protected' the speaking rights of the detained person by interpreting first the utterance that he had begun simultaneously with that of the officer.

Extract 2:14

1	O	I see so you had a curtain trailer from (town A) to (town B)
2	I	c'était donc une remorque à bâches de (town A) jusqu'à (town B)=
3	DP	=voilà
4	I	yes that's [right]
5	DP	[une verte]
6	O	[you le-] you left the curtain trailer at (town B),
7	I	it was green (.) .hh vous avez laissé la:: la remorque à bâches à (town B),
8	DP	voilà [j'ai écouté moi c'est] ce qu'ils m'ont dit
9	O	[and you picked....]
10	I	yes that's right I listened that's what they told me to do
11	O	and then you picked up the tipper trailer at (town B) and brought that to
12		England

Here, both O and DP overlap the end of I's turn in L4. DP expands upon his answer and O begins a new question. In L7, I chooses to render DP's expansion "it was green" before switching to French in the same turn, to interpret O's question. In the next overlap, however, (L8-9), I gives precedence to DP's turn, ignoring O's beginning of a question, causing him to start it again in L11.

Finally, on the question of interpreters' decisions concerning overlap, it must be noted that these can have serious implications for the outcome of the interview. Although the admonition to 'just translate and translate everything', is unrealistic in real-life interviewing, it is self-evident that an interpreter's opinion as to what is important and what can be ignored is extremely unsafe. For example, where an interpreter perceives that the detained person's turn is continuing beyond the storage capacity of her short-term memory, she is faced with an impossible dilemma. She can:

a) stop the DP while she translates his turn so far, signalling for him to begin again when she has finished, or

b) allow him to continue to the end, knowing that she will not remember all that he has said and that some of it will be lost.

In either case, she influences the process by interfering with spontaneity. In the former case, she may prevent him from either inculpating or disculpating himself with the rest of his turn, since he now has more time to think before continuing. In the latter option, elements of his turn which she forgets may, in fact, be vital.

In conclusion, speaking rights in the *monolingual* interview, are negotiated between the two primary participants. However, in the interpreted interview, the dynamics are altered by the presence of the interpreter, who is empowered to allocate interactional space. Any challenge to this power results, at the very least, in the risk of miscommunication.

The specific examination of interpreters' treatment of overlapping speech further confirms that, far from being a transparent conduit, an invisible telephone line through which primary participants can interact, the interpreter's decisions concerning local

management of, for example, turn-taking can have far-reaching effects on both processes and outcomes.

The effects of the interpreter's presence are pervasive, not only in the main body of the interview. As will be shown in Chapter 4, they operate from the very first moments, during the preliminary formalities and what is known as the "formal caution". Chapter 3 now examines the methodological considerations that inform this thesis and sets out the methods for treatment of the corpus and transcription.

CHAPTER 3
METHODOLOGY, TRANSCRIPTION AND DATA

3:1 METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES

Analysis for this thesis proceeds from an ethnomethodological standpoint, using conversation analysis as the analytic tool. Indeed, even researchers outside conversation analysis, such as Gumperz (*ibid.*) and also Clayman and Maynard, (1994), suggest that the fields of ethnomethodology and conversation analysis, have much to offer as a combined force in the study of talk-in-interaction. Certainly, CA, as "...one of the research streams of ethnomethodology", (Heritage, 1984:21), provides a firm discipline, within which to explore the ways in which participants go about 'doing' interviews with suspects.

Although the methodology of CA has been written about extensively in recent years (ten Have, 1999; Heritage, 1999, 1997; Hutchby & Drew, 1995; Drew, 1994; Clayman & Maynard, 1994; Drew & Heritage, 1992; Schegloff, 1992; Wootton, 1989; Heritage, 1984), one of the most down-to-earth descriptions is given by ten Have, (1990). Having set out concisely what the data is not, (experimental data, field notes, interview data, invented examples), he states unequivocally that the basic data for CA are recordings. Further, he suggests that even transcriptions made from these are "...a convenient form to represent the recorded material in written form, but not [as] a real substitution" (*ibid:*25), and incapable of representing the recordings "...in their full detail", (*ibid:*26). In a seven-point model of CA's research practices, he notes that, following recording and transcription, a particular set of circumstances may be selected for analysis, or candidate phenomena may be identified, or one may simply be "intuitively intrigued by some materials", (*ibid:*33).

Common sense is applied in making sense of the episode, through examining its sequential structure and the ways in which the utterances "...can be held to be 'doing'

and how these 'doings' interconnect", *(ibid:*33). Finally, the analytic process continues with comparison to other instances since, says ten Have *(ibid:*34): " ...an analysis in CA is always comparative, either directly or indirectly".

In a later work, ten Have (1999:162) more specifically defines the field of Applied Conversational Analysis, where: "...interactions with an institutional purpose have been studied in order to discover how those interactions are organised *as* institutional interactions". This does not belie his strong statement *(ibid:*36) that "...explanations of what happens in any kind of interaction, institutional or not, that make reference to 'fixed' givens such as institutional identities and functions, institutionalised resources or relationships, or whatever, are not acceptable to a CA analysis, until their local procedural relevance is demonstrated".

The use of 'naturally occurring' tape-recorded data which I have taken the liberty of terming, *(pace* Heritage & Atkinson,1984:2) "naturally occurring occasions of everyday *interviewing*", has made it possible to scan the entire data-set, with no preconceived notions as to what might be found. The inevitable early selection of features, which may occur in the ethnographer's field notes, was avoided. The selection occurred through the identification of specific phenomena, followed by a search through the data to find the same phenomena inhabiting the same "constellation of circumstances" (Drew 1994:17).

CA also posits the absence, or near absence, of the 'observer paradox', by the fact that the researcher in person is replaced by the tape-recorder. As mentioned in Chapter 1, the participants do orient specifically, and at times explicitly, to the tape recorder. They are aware that it might be produced as evidence in court. However, I suggest that the effect of its presence on the participants of an interview, at least with an English-speaking suspect, is generally *less* marked than in any other type of interaction, whether institutional or 'mundane'. Whether from television, personal experience or talk, English lay-people 'know' that interviews with suspects are tape-recorded, as of course do the officers. As mentioned in chapter 1, the detained person's attention is drawn specifically to the tape in the last part of the Caution. Tape recording is therefore a feature of their

schema for this type of event. In other situations of talk-in-interaction, for example medical interviews, classrooms, counselling, or 'normal' conversation, the tape intrudes upon the 'normality' of the event, and cannot help but affect the interaction, however minimally.

Consequently, the collection of tape-recorded data from interviews with suspects fits the CA criterion of *researcher absence/no observer paradox* even more closely than most other forms of data collection. The researcher is truly invisible. Whether or not the same point can be made about French suspects is, of course, debatable and is beyond the scope of this thesis. However, one contact, a Law student in France, when shown a copy of the police caution and asked "what is the equivalent in France?", made the amused comment "It looks like something from an American police movie".

Evidence of participants' orientation to their institutional roles (Drew & Sorjonen, 1997), is apparent throughout the data, and although it has not been specifically addressed as part of this thesis, it is implicit in much of the analysis of extracts.

The theoretical foundations of this thesis, then, are firmly rooted in conversation analysis. However, although the data collection and analytical processes conform, there is some divergence in the following points:

1. Concerning context, it appears difficult to ignore either what Gumperz (1999:454) terms "...the taken-for-granted background assumptions that underlie the negotiation of shared interpretations", or indeed Sperber & Wilson's (1986:15) assertion that "Context is a psychological construct, a subset of the hearer's assumptions about the world". Heritage (1997) also appears to draw back from CA's original insistence that context is "only" to be found in the processes of the talk itself, as does Briggs (1986, cited in Shiffrin, 1994:146): "...the interview must be analysed as a whole before any of its component utterances are interpreted".

66

It would therefore appear that CA's original micro-perspective may not be entirely justified in this thesis. The context-shaping of the interview occurs not just through preceding talk but, inevitably, from both the cognitive and the physical environment of the participants. Whilst conscious of the dangers of, as Schegloff (1992:117) warns, "...labelling and announcing the occasion of talk-in-interaction as an interview", either *post hoc* or *pre-hoc*, there are nonetheless boundaries within which it can be described as such, regardless of what is said, and beyond which it ceases to be one. For example, the physical presence of a switched-on tape recorder is integral to the genre 'interview with suspect'. It is a part of the "frame" (Goffman, 1974). If the officer switches off the tape and continues to ask questions, the event can no longer be called 'interview with suspect'. If the "spatial-orientational organization" that Kendon (1992:329) sees as contextual should alter, (such as seating positions or body orientation), the event is no longer an 'interview with suspect'. The opposition here is, perhaps, between what is relevant to the participants, on the inside, or what they make relevant in their talk, (Schegloff, 1987) and what the 'outside world' sees as relevant to the event called an interview. The 'outside world' is represented by the law, judge and jury. The law says that an interview must be properly conducted, in a particular setting, under certain physical conditions. The future audience (judge and jury), on hearing the transcript read out in court, has expectations of the manner in which the interview should have been carried out. It would therefore be a distortion to discount this external aspect entirely.

2. This thesis has conformed to CA's avoidance of interviewing as a data-collection technique. Nonetheless, whilst commenting on features not directly evident in the extracts, such as the interpretation of non-verbal gestures in chapter 7:3:2, it was felt that informal enquiries as to interpreters' and officers' opinions would add interest to the discussion and should not be ignored.

It may be considered by purists that the forgoing two points constitute a shift towards interactional sociolinguistics, as defined by Schiffrin (1994:105), who sees "... Goffman's focus on social interaction..." and "... Gumperz's focus on situated inference..." as the

basis for interactional sociolinguistic theory. However, the conclusion may simply be that the present thesis is an example where complementarity, rather than opposition of methodologies produces optimum results.

Certainly, where the analysis of *and*-prefacing is concerned, (chapter 5), this thesis departs from the convention that CA tends not to use numerical analysis. The opposition under discussion in that chapter is one of "presence/absence" or, in this case, "translated/untranslated". It was therefore felt that, without some numerical indication of both the prevalence of the phenomenon and its treatment by interpreters, the analysis would have had little point. As Gile (1994:46) says, "...quantification in the behavioural sciences is not tantamount to attempting to equate a behaviour with a set of equations or figures. The idea is to find indicators that can be 'measured', if only approximately, and yield data that will contribute to a better knowledge of the phenomenon". From this perspective, the statistics used in chapter 5 are used "descriptively" rather than "inferentially", (Gile, 1998:86).

Further, Heritage (1999) suggests that the way forward for research in CA may now be a widening of its scope to include such quantitative analysis as can shed light upon the distributional aspects of features identified by qualitative methods. This, he suggests, might be a means of identifying who it is that deploys these practices, and in what circumstances.

Finally, this thesis examines the ways in which interpreters' linguistic and interactional choices affect the processes and dynamics of the interview. Initially, it was my intention to address only issues of interpreters' competence or incompetence where these became relevant to the analysis in hand. However, from as early as the data selection stage, when very poor interpreting rendered some tapes unusable, since it obscured the more subtle effects being researched, questionable renderings have continued to be a feature throughout the research.

3:2 TRANSCRIPTION ISSUES

Although absent from the recording of primary data, the researcher is nonetheless a "...socially located person", (Cameron et al, 1992:5), from the transcription stage onwards. However, two transcribers, and therefore two sets of transcription issues, are located in the present research:

(1) the audio typist who prepares the official English transcript to be read out in court;

(2) the researcher transcribing for sociolinguistic analysis.

3:2:1 TRANSCRIPTION BY AUDIO TYPIST

Concerning (1) above, an example of the English transcript prepared by an audio-typist was presented in the introduction. It was shown that this consists of a 'secretarial' version of the utterances in English, both for monolingual and interpreted interviews. That is, in interpreted interviews, only the interpreter's rendition of DP's answers appears, and these answers are responses to the interpreter's renditions of the officer's questions. In variant B transcript of the interpreted interview, the interpreter has disappeared altogether, and her utterances are ascribed to the detained person. As demonstrated, this led to an aberrant situation where the detained person appeared not only to speak fluent English, but to refer to himself in the third person.

The task of transcription is, at best, arduous and, in spite of the reasonably sophisticated equipment used in the case of interviews, it is complicated by the wide range of accents and speaking styles. Where the typists in my data have been unable to distinguish utterances, they have typed (INAUDIBLE), although in fact some sound must have been heard, although unclear. It is often the case that both officer and detained person spoke simultaneously, and one or both of their utterances has been obscured.

However, where interpreted interviews are concerned, the problem is magnified. Firstly, the detained person, being untrained in speaking through an interpreter, frequently

interrupts, overlaps or simply "shouts the interpreter down". Secondly, the interpreter herself may be a non-native speaker of English, and therefore less easily understood by the transcriber. As an illustration of this problem, extract 3:1 below shows how an *English* native-speaker interpreter was mis-heard by the audio-typist, upon a highly material fact of the case in question. The case concerned a number of illegal entrants found in the back of a van. The detained person, who denied knowledge, described how he had been told to drop the vehicle off to be loaded, allegedly, with machine parts for delivery to England. The English version transcript, however, appeared to show him admitting to *mens rea*.

Extract 3:1

1	O	and when did he tell you that you were going to England
2	DP	just after I dropped the lorry off. We got, he said that when I got to
3		the café he said "the people were loaded up". I gave him the keys,
4		he asked me for them. He said "they'll take care of loading the
5		van".
6	O	and did you see the van being loaded?

This transcription was queried, and a re-transcription of both English and French showed that the interpreter had, in fact, translated as follows:

Extract 3:2

1	O	and when did he tell you that you were going to England
2	I	et c'est à quel moment qu'il vous a dit que vous alliez en Angleterre
3	DP	là juste après qua::nd quand j'ai posé le camion
4	I	just after I'd dropped the lorry off=
5	DP	=il m'a dit comme ça euh arrivé au café euh <u>les gens ils chargent</u>
6	I	we got- he said that [when I got to the café]
7	DP	[et je lui ai donné les clés]

```
8    I       he said .h the people will load it up=

9    DP      =il m'a demandé les clés donc [je lui ai donné les clés ]

10   I                                     [I gave him the keys    ] (1.0) he asked

11           me for them

12   DP      il m'a dit on s'occupe de charger le camion

13   I       he said .h they'll take care of loading the v- the van
```

It becomes clear from the full transcription above, that "the people" referred to by DP were those at the place where the van was dropped off, who would see to the loading of the (alleged) machine parts. The interpreter had (correctly) interpreted the DP's vernacular present tense "les gens ils chargent" as the present tense for future reference and had therefore translated it using the auxiliary "will", ("will load"). However, "will" was poorly articulated, the "ll" of "will" ran into the "l" of "loaded" and apparently led the audiotypist to 'hear' "were". It naturally followed that s/he would also 'hear' a past participle, and "load it" therefore became "loaded".

Although simultaneous talk does not in fact obscure the relevant utterances in this extract, it is easy to see how it can obscure the interpreter's turns for the audiotypist. Consequently, because this is normally the only written record of the interview, it may pass unnoticed until it is read out in court.

In fact, in most serious cases such as this, the defence has a French translation made of the *audiotypist's monolingual version*, so that the defendant can see, in his own language, what the prosecution *says he said*. As mentioned in the introduction, this transcript may constitute the main plank of the prosecution's evidence. Clearly, however, this constitutes a further twist in the "Chinese whispers" scenario, since the translator is translating the original interpreter's renditions *back into French*. Not only are translation pairs not symmetrical (Halverson, 1997), no two interpreters translate in exactly the same way. Indeed, a single interpreter will render the same utterance in different ways on different occasions. Therefore, even in cases where there is no dispute about the original

71

interpreting at interview, the back translated version may cause the defendant to dispute the accuracy either of the interview interpreter or of the transcription.

It is hardly surprising that some defendants seek to discredit the interview interpreter as a way of denying the validity of the interview, and claims of not having understood the interpreter are common. Further, analysts have long been aware that people reading transcriptions of their own talk find it difficult to recognise their own speaking style. Indeed, as Blom and Gumperz (1972) found, people were unaware, and even denied, code switching between dialectal and standard speech. Specifically, a detained person in my own experience, upon seeing in writing his explanation that "c'était l'apât du gain" (gloss: "I was tempted by the money"), that had incited his smuggling, insisted that this was an expression that he never used. It was not "his kind of talk". However, examination of the interview tapes revealed that he had used the expression twice.

It can be seen, therefore, that the problems inherent in the process of transcription by the audiotypist can, in themselves, constitute a serious threat to evidential accuracy. Another kind of threat is posed by the detained person's attitude both to his own utterances and those of the interpreter. Section 3:2:2 of this chapter examines the less contentious, but nonetheless fundamental aspects of choices of transcription methods.

3:2:2 TRANSCRIPTION FOR THE PRESENT ANALYSIS (2)

Clearly, we cannot assume that transcriptions are a reliably accurate and faithful rendering of an interaction captured on tape, (Lapadat & Lindsay, 1999). They are, rather, a brave attempt at presenting, in the most accessible manner, those features of interaction that are relevant to the analysis in hand. Further, because transcription is inherently selective, analysis begins at this stage, since the researcher's assumptions about theory and practice influence his treatment of the text, (Lapadat & Lindsay, 1999; Gumperz & Berenz, 1993; Mishler, 1991; Psathas & Anderson, 1990; Cook, 1990). Both

of these points are true of the present thesis, and the style of transcriptions has been chosen as being fit for the purposes of this research.

As an illustration of both these points, consideration was given to ten Have's (1999) discussion of Watson's (1997:51-3) arguments for not showing membership categories of participants in transcription; that is, by simply using a random letter of the alphabet to denote each speaker. It is a purist approach that argues that by showing membership categorisation, the transcriber is already advancing down the road to " 'constructive analytic' reification and stabilisation of the categories involved", (Ten Have 1999:80). However, I tend to agree with Ten Have that to ignore categorisations when their identity is known, would be "too artificial an agnosticism". (*ibid.*). Further, the whole purpose of this transcription and analysis concerns the institutional nature of the interaction. Any feature that can serve as a short cut to already established facts should be preserved. For this reason, the present research uses the letters O, DP and I to denote Officer, Detained Person and Interpreter respectively.

A number of possible transcription methods were considered in preparing the written data for this thesis. Because of the focus of this project, on situated meaning and social interaction, it was felt that standard orthography, rather than IPA, would best preserve the flow in reading. This, and considerations concerning familiarity, proved to be overriding factors in all of the decisions concerning transcription.

The three spatial arrangements set out in Edwards (1993:11) - vertical, column and partiture - were considered. Certainly the partiture arrangement gives a better sense of flow than either vertical or column format. However, the extracts of transcribed talk in this thesis appear as part of the text, rather than in appendix. Accordingly, a partiture arrangement would necessitate switching to landscape layout, with the concomitant disruption of frequently turning the page sideways to read it.

Readability is enhanced by observation of "time space iconicity". This is "where temporally prior events are encountered earlier on the page (top to bottom or left to right)

than temporally later events", Edwards (1993:8). This point appears valid. Equally valid is Edwards' notion of "logical priority", i.e. the positioning of information concerning how to interpret an utterance in front of the utterance concerned.

Gumperz and Berenz's (1993:96) suggestion of line breaks at syntactic, prosodic or phrasal boundaries was also considered. However, it was felt that a) this did nothing to improve the flow of readability; b) it may give prominence to features which are not selected for analysis and c) the notion of prosodic boundaries, at least, is in any case, disputable. This is particularly so since this thesis presents interpreted talk, where syntactic, prosodic and phrasal boundaries of French often do not match those of English. This aspect is discussed in the final paragraphs of this chapter.

Returning to the question of orthography, although other and equally valid systems have been devised (Ehlich, 1993; Du Bois et al, 1993; Gumperz & Berenz, 1993; Tannen, 1989; Schiffrin, 1987), it was felt that Jeffersons's (1979) original system, cited in Schiffrin, 1994), is the most familiar and most easily readable. This system, with some additions, and time measured in tenths of a second, has therefore been used throughout this thesis, and a list of conventions appears in appendix 1.

Concerning transcription of dialect or non-standard English words, it does not seem relevant to the purposes of this thesis whether an officer says 'gonna' for 'going to', a DP says 'innit' for 'isn't it' or a French national interpreter drops initial 'h's. Certainly, Gumperz & Berenz's (1993:96-7) remark is apposite, that: "... *eye dialect* tends to trivialize participants' utterances by conjuring up pejorative stereotypes while neither representing the phonetic level more precisely nor capturing detail relevant to the analysis". It would also tend to emphasise the deviations where this is perhaps not the intention (ten Have, 1999). However, where 'non-standard' details appear to stand out from the text, or to be particularly relevant, these will be rendered in *eye dialect*. It is nonetheless felt that it would be particularly inappropriate and open to serious misconstruction to use *eye dialect* English renderings of a foreign-national interpreter's utterances.

74

Concerning the difficult issue of presentation of translated speech, ten Have (1999:93-4) briefly addresses the question and concludes that, as it is important for the translation in the language of publication to appear close to the original text, the translation should appear on the line immediately below the original. As he remarks, this is practicable where the two languages are relatively close, as they are in the context of this thesis (English/French).

Mazeland et al.(1995) place the entire foreign language (Dutch) transcription at the end of their paper, presenting only English in extracts in the text. However, ten Have (1999, 1995), Hale (1999), Rigney (1999) and Wadensjö (1998), place the translation into English on the line below the original language. Much, of course, depends on the purpose of the transcript. The focus of the last three research papers cited above was on aspects of interpreting, and therefore physical closeness of English translation to the original is relevant. The focus of Mazeland et al. (1995), on the other hand, was on aspects of negotiation *per se*, with language being a secondary consideration.

Whether full translation of every turn is included or not, it is clear that only a gloss can be given in back-translation, unless the system proposed by Sorjonen (1996:326:7) and cited in ten Have (1999:94), is used. In this system, "...a morpheme by morpheme gloss" is provided, including grammatical information, on the line immediately below the original, with a "free translation" (*ibid.*) on a third line.

An illustration of the difficulty in providing anything more than a gloss as back-translation can be seen from Extract 3:3 below. Here, the interpreter has trouble translating the expression "free and independent legal advice" and the back-translation has become ungrammatical in an attempt to remain close to the interpreter's word order.

Extract 3:3

1   O   I *must* remind you of your right to free and independent legal advice ,

2   (1.5)

3	I	Je dois vous rappeler de votre droit à avoir accès à:: à:: un avocat (.)
4		juridique ?
5	BT	I must remind you of your right to have access to:: to:: a lawyer (.) legal ?

Of course, features such as word and sentence stress, word order and intonation can often not be transferred across languages, and any attempt to do this in back translation would be inappropriate.

When the pilot project for this thesis was written, it was decided that, since the thesis is focused on interpretation, the English translation should be kept physically close to the original French. However, once analysis had been completed, it became clear that, particularly in cases of overlapping turns and simultaneous talk, where bracketing provides visual evidence of the feature under discussion, extra lines of back translation confused and obscured the text.

A decision was therefore taken that, for purposes of visual clarity, utterances would only appear in the language spoken, in extracts in the main body of the text, and that the same extracts would be reproduced for reference in appendix, with back translations on the line below.

3:3 DATA

3:3:1 SOURCES

The tapes that form the data for this thesis are the official recordings made during interviews with suspects, copies of which were made available to me by HM Customs & Excise, The Facilitation Support Unit, Dover, and Kent Police, under conditions of strict confidentiality. It was agreed that:

a) anonymity would be preserved by removal of all names, place names and other identifying features;

b) only short sections of text would be shown in transcription, to prevent recognition of circumstances which may serve to identify individual cases;

c) all material would be submitted to the relevant authorities for approval before completion of the thesis.

As explained in chapter 1:3, the cases concern interviews with persons suspected of one of two serious offences:

1. Facilitation of illegal entrants

2. Illegal importation of drugs

The explicit aims of interview are to gather information and obtain evidence of *mens rea*, of the suspect's being *knowingly concerned* with the offence. The parameters for interviews in both types of case are identical. For this reason, there is no differentiation in the analysis between Customs offences and Facilitation.

3:3:2 DATA SELECTION

The interviews are recorded on 45-minute tapes. However, the interviews may be as short as 2 minutes, or may span several 45-minute tapes. Further, an interview may be terminated at the end of a tape, and another interview started on the next tape, or the interview may simply be suspended at the end of the tape and the same interview restarted on a new tape. It is also possible for an interview to be suspended briefly and then re-started on the same tape.

The full corpus collected for this study consists of 40 monolingual interview tapes, comprising some 40 hours and 31 interviews, and 76 French interpreted tapes, comprising some 42 hours and 41 interviews. However, for reasons of focus and manageability, it was necessary to reduce the range of variables, before finalising the data-set for this thesis. Since the initial data-gathering, the following categories of tape have therefore been excluded:

1. Interviews where admissions are made.

Admission of guilt generally occurs either in the early stages of interview or even before, at the point of arrest. It may also occur as a result of advice given in pre-interview conference by the detained person's legal representative, in which case, admissions are made immediately following the preliminary formalities. Therefore, although these interviews do display many of the features of those where no admissions are made, the same sectional analysis does not apply. Participants have different goals and, in reflecting these, the interview does not fall into the three phases noted in chapter 2. For this reason, and because the significance of the research relates only to interviews where guilt is an issue, only interviews where there is no admission of guilt are included.

2. No-comment interviews

For various reasons too numerous and complex to mention here, the legal representative may advise the detained person not to reply to the officer's questions. In this case, he will simply reply "no comment" to all questions. However, the preliminary formalities must take place, and the officer will generally ask a number of questions, even though no reply is forthcoming. Clearly, an interview where there are no answers is aberrant, and these were therefore removed from the data.

3. Very poor quality interpreting

It is not the intention of this thesis to focus upon relative qualities of interpreting, but upon the subtle, and pervasive, effects of the presence and interventions of the interpreter. Therefore, where the quality of interpreting is so grossly inadequate as to distract attention from the points of focus of the research, these interviews have been excluded. The result of this selection is that, although quality of interpreting in the tapes used is varied, it varies at the average-to-good end of the scale, rather than average-to-poor. Quite coincidentally, this has also resulted in the exclusion of interviews where the interpreter did not have English or French as a mother tongue.

4. French not language of everyday use

Similarly, interviews have been excluded where French was not the language of everyday use of the detained person. A great number of interviews take place, especially in cases of facilitation, with non-native French speakers from, for example African or North African countries. Where the detained person has lived for a number of years in France or Belgium, French is deemed to be the language of everyday use, and a French interpreter is called. However, in cases where, for example Lingala is the mother tongue, and French the second language, detained persons may agree to be interviewed in French, where a Lingala interpreter cannot be obtained quickly, although they have, of course, the right to insist upon an interpreter in their own language. These tapes were excluded simply in order to avoid the addition of a further variable in the data-set.

5. Very short interviews.

A number of the French tapes were interviews lasting only 5 or 6 minutes. Since the preliminary formalities use up approximately the first 4 to 5 minutes of any tape, a very limited number of questions were asked. Very short interviews tend to serve merely to clarify a few points from a preceding interview or to accept an additional statement from the detained person. Accordingly, the three phases of the interview are not established.

6. General Police tapes

In the initial data-gathering stage, it appeared doubtful whether a sufficient number of French interpreted tapes could be found. Tapes were therefore accepted from general police interviews, that is, from a wide range of offences other than facilitation. However, it subsequently became apparent that there would indeed be sufficient French tapes and, simultaneously, analysis began to reveal the sectional nature of interviews, specifically in cases of importation of drugs and facilitation. Police interviews for other offences were therefore excluded from the final analysis.

7. Technical problems

There was a small number of tapes where the sound quality of copies was such that it was not possible to analyse with sufficient accuracy. Even where sound quality is near-perfect, there are occurrences of simultaneous talk, non-verbal sounds or external noise where utterances cannot be transcribed. These are marked "unclear" in my transcription. For example, officers bring to the interview room a number of papers and exhibits, some of which are contained in plastic bags. The rustling of these bags as the officer produces them often obscures the talk. However, it is only tapes where the technical recording quality itself is poor, that have been excluded from the data-set.

Having excluded all of the tapes in the above categories, the final data-set is as follows:

	TAPES	HOURS	INTERVIEWS
MONOLINGUAL INTERVIEWS	40	20	31
INTERPRETED INTERVIEWS	54	33	28

Given the sectional analysis of the three phases of the interview, *life-story*, *journey* and *probe-challenge*, a similar number of monolingual and interpreted *interviews* was required. In order to achieve this, it was necessary to include a greater number of tapes, and therefore hours, of interpreted interviews. It is self-evident that interpreted interviews take longer than monolingual ones. Indeed, the monolingual data contains only one 3-tape interview, whereas the interpreted data includes one 4-tape interview and six 3-tape ones. Further, not all of the analysis is directly comparative. The effects of social imposition and context that are examined in chapter 7, for example, do not make comparisons with monolingual data. It was therefore felt that some inequality in hours and interviews was acceptable.

The interpreted language in this study is French, this being my own second language and working language. However, advice has been sought, on an informal basis, from native French speakers, in order to confirm the usage of, for example, *and*-prefaced utterances in that language.

Since the primary data for this project are official recordings of interviews, carried out either at Police stations or at HM Customs & Excise premises at ports of entry to the UK, I was afforded the rare opportunity of being completely absent from most of the recording, avoiding at this stage at least, implication in the observer's paradox. Those interviews in which I was the interpreter, were recorded before I commenced this research. I therefore do not affect and am not affected by the recording process, thus satisfying the positivist view that the researcher should be "…absent from the scene." (Cameron et al, 1992:5). The implications of the tape-recorder's presence were discussed, briefly, in chapter 1.

Almost all of the interviewing officers and detained persons in the data are male and the majority of interpreters are female. This gender imbalance reflects the statistical breakdown in the real life context. Accordingly, it was felt that it should not be artificially redressed by seeking equal quantities of data for male/female officers, detained persons and interpreters.

As a corollary to this gender imbalance, I have chosen to use feminine pronouns when referring to the interpreter and masculine ones when referring to officers and detained persons, except where the gender of participants is clear from a specific extract. This also permits the avoidance of distracting forms such as s/he and use of 'their' in singular structures.

Finally, the proportion of French to English native speaker interpreters in the data was approximately 65% French to 35% English. This does not quite reflect the proportions in general, in the area of south-east England where this research was carried out, as the difference is more marked, at 80/20.

It would have been logistically very difficult to make full transcriptions of the whole 53-hour data-set. However, a number of English transcripts accompanied the tapes when received from data sources. Although these only provided a basic tool, they were sufficient to scan for evidence of "candidate phenomena" (Moerman, 1988:36), such as *and*-prefaced utterances in English interviews. The full data-set of tapes was then checked in order to confirm their presence and to make full transcriptions of extracts where the feature was evident. In these cases, the lines were numbered on the 'secretarial' transcript, and extra lines inserted in the extract for the thesis where, for example, pauses were present. There were not, of course, full French transcripts, so the analysis of interpreters' treatment of *and*-prefaced utterances originated from the tapes themselves

Having identified other features, such as change of person deixis in social imposition, (interpreted interviews), the full data-set was checked for further occurrences, to establish whether these were pervasive features. Full transcriptions were then made of extracts that clearly demonstrated the feature. It will be noted that line numbering in these extracts starts at L1, since they are not generally taken from a transcript of the whole interview.

The approach for Chapter 6, *Repetition*, was entirely different. Repetition marks the progression through the three phases of the interview, and the degree of presence or absence of this at each stage could only be revealed through fine-grained analysis of complete interviews. Further, it would have been logistically impossible for a single researcher to carry out such an analysis of the full data set. Therefore, one monolingual and one interpreted interview were taken from the data and fully transcribed. Extracts were then selected, to demonstrate participants orientation to the various phases. The rest of the data-set in monolingual and French interviews, was then checked to confirm that these interviews were representative.

Having identified the problem of translation of the police caution from a professional perspective, twenty interpreted interviews were taken at random and selection was made of extracts that demonstrated most clearly the specific areas addressed. It was notable that, of the twenty interviews, there was not one entirely adequate translation of both the caution and its explanation.

The transcribed data, then, for this thesis, consists of a number of full transcriptions, prepared for initial analysis, 'secretarial' transcriptions of monolingual interviews for scanning, close transcriptions of a number of complete interviews, and extracts prepared in order to illustrate various features.

CHAPTER 4

INTERPRETATION OF THE CAUTION AND ITS EXPLANATION

Research, particularly in Conversation Analysis, often represents short sections of interviews as a series of questions and answers, without clearly defining a beginning or an end. The opening of an interview with a suspect, however, constitutes an intrinsic part of the interview itself, and includes the formal Caution. This also means that the Caution is not an isolated linguistic event, but rather that it constitutes a move in a discourse sequence that begins with the tape buzzer and ends at the point when the officer proceeds to the facts of the case. Further, in terms of content, it is the most explicit of the officer's moves to establish the detained person's obligation to take responsibility for his account and, as will be shown, the most vulnerable to interpreters' divergent renditions.

The problems of interpreting that occur here are specific to this preliminary stage of the interview. The content of the Caution itself is formulaic and contains just 37 words. However, as this chapter shows, not one of the interpreters in the data offered an acceptable rendition. Further, even where officers provided an explanation of the Caution, interpreters experienced a higher proportion of difficulties than they did in the main body of the interview. In order to elucidate this problem, this chapter examines the sequence leading up to the caution and the events that follow, including the officer's explanation of the caution in "simple language". Through data from 20 interpreter-mediated interviews, it uses interpreters' apparent difficulties as a lens through which to focus on the linguistic problems of the sequence itself. It also examines shifts between form-based and meaning-based interpreting, as the interpreter attempts to follow the officer's "simplification".

Under the Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984 (see Cotterill, 2000) an interview is defined as:

> *the questioning of a person regarding his involvement or suspected involvement in a criminal offence or offences which, by virtue of paragraph 10.1 of Code C, is required to be carried out **under caution**.* [my emphasis]. (PACE Codes of Practice: C 11.1A).

Section C10(a) of the same Codes stipulates that a *caution* must be given to a person suspected of an offence:

> ...*before any questions about it* .... *are put to him regarding his involvement or suspected involvement in that offence if his answers or his silence (i.e. failure or refusal to answer a question or to answer satisfactorily) may be given in evidence to a court in a prosecution.*

Questions concerning identification, fitness for interview, the offer of free and independent legal advice and any related questions (such as "why do you not require a solicitor?", if legal representation has been refused by the suspect), are deemed to be outside the scope of the caution. However, once the tape is switched on and the buzzer has sounded, every utterance is recorded, including the caution itself, and the segments immediately preceding and following it. Further, the manner in which the caution, or its explanation, are delivered may itself become the subject of dispute in court.

In two thirds (13 out of 20) of the interviews that constitute the data for this chapter, the caution itself is followed by a *further* sequence. In this sequence, the officer explains, or attempts to explain, the meaning of the caution, before proceeding to question the suspect. The caution is often bracketed by an announcement, which serves as an opening, and a comment, serving as a closing. The announcement is examined in section 4:5. However, brackets notwithstanding, far from being an isolated, analysable event, the caution is embedded in a sequence, which includes pre-caution formalities and post-caution explanation. In the interpreted interviews examined, the preliminary proceedings, the caution and its explanation, take up the first 3 to 5 minutes.

Examination of the tapes reveals that interpreters appear to experience greater difficulty in interpreting the "tape-buzzer to facts-of-the-matter" sequence than they do during the main body of the interview.

Since the *discourse sequence* itself, that is, the order in which utterances are produced, appears to represent a major source of difficulty, I shall first examine the data from this

point of view. Secondly, I shall show how interpreters switch between *form-based* interpreting, (i.e. word-for-word equivalence) and *meaning-based* interpreting (i.e. interpreting "*le vouloir dire*" (Lederer, 1986:22)), in their efforts to deal with both caution and explanation.

This chapter also raises implications for interpreter training, as it may be felt that some of the difficulties highlighted here may be due to interpreters' lack of competence. Interpreting standards will be discussed in the final chapter, where mention is made of the National Agreement between criminal justice agencies. This agreement calls for the exclusive use of interpreters from the National Register of Public Service Interpreters, from the end of 2001. However, future National Agreement notwithstanding, the 20 interviews that constitute the data for this chapter represent the situation in the field, as it is at present.

Section 4:1 below examines the discourse sequence of the interview's preliminary proceedings and shows how this switches between different modes.

4:1. DISCOURSE SEQUENCE

The suspect's involvement in the preliminary proceedings is intermittent; that is, from the moment that the tape recorder is switched on, to the beginning of questions concerning the "facts of the matter". This involvement is limited, because the interviewing officer's remarks are addressed variously to him, to any other officer present, to the solicitor (if one is present), and to the future audience of the tape. The only constant factor is the interpreter, operating in *liaison* mode, as defined in chapter 2:2.

The interpretation must follow, as the officer's discourse switches between *monologic* mode, where the speaker creates meaning alone and other participants merely receive the message, and *dialogic* mode, where the speaker creates meaning jointly with other participants, (Linell, 1994; Wadensjö, 1998). These modes are illustrated in Extract 4:1.

86

As discussed in chapter 2:5:1, interpreters can and do control the exchange to a certain extent, by allocation of turns and control of turn length. This is achieved by intonation and by paralinguistic means, such as gestures, eye contact and intonation. However, as will be seen from the data extracts below, where problems concern sequential organisation and lexical choice, there is little that the interpreter can do to "train" the interviewing officer on the spot. She cannot re-organise the segments if she does not know what is likely to come next.

Although officers do not always use exactly the same order to deal with these preliminary proceedings, a crib sheet is provided for officers' use, in most police stations, which ensures that the same information is recorded on tape. It contains bullet points to be covered, followed by the full text of the caution. One might expect the presence of a crib sheet to result in an essentially monologic discourse, or at least one where monologic and dialogic sequences are clearly demarcated. However, Extract 4:1 below, taken from a French interpreted interview, shows that this is not the case. In this extract, the interpreter's turns have been removed, in order to give a clearer view of the discourse sequence, and *italics* have been used to highlight *dialogic* turns.

Extract 4:1

1	O	this interview is being tape-recorded (.) I am (rank and name) (.)
2		*also present,*
3	O2	(name) police officer
4	O	*I'm interviewing will you please give me your **full** name and your date of*
5		*birth.*
6	DP	euh (surname)? (first name) trente (1.0) onze quarante (1.0) (town)
7	O	°right° *also present,*
8	S	I'm (name) solicitor
9	O	before the commencement of the interview I must remind you that you are
10		entitled to free legal advice (1.5) you're here represented by (name) (4.5)
11		the date today (1.0) is (date) and the time by **my** watch is (.) thirteen oh

12	three .hh this interview is being conducted in the interview room at (name)
13	police station (.)
14	at the conclusion of the interview I will give you a notice explaining what
15	will happen to the tapes. you do not have to say anything but it may harm
16	your defence if you do not mention when questioned something which you
17	later rely on in court (.) anything you do say may be given in evidence (2.0)
18	I'll ex**plain** the caution to you (1.0) it comes in three parts. the first part is
19	you do not have to say anything (1.5) the last part is that anything you **do**
20	say may be given in evidence (.) and the middle (.) but you- it may harm
21	your defence if you do not mention when questioned something which you
22	later rely on in court, means that (.) should you give an account of the
23	incident to me now, a::nd should this matter go to court you give (.) a
24	different explanation, the court may ask themselves (.) why(.) (1.5)
25	*do you understand the caution*

The monologic and dialogic nature of the officer's turns also correlates with the functions 'inform' and 'elicit' respectively. For example, the monologic turn in L11-13 serves the function of recording relevant information on tape, concerning date, time and place. L1, although monologic, is rather more complex in that, although it appears to be addressed to the tape, it is actually addressed to the suspect, since the fact that the interview is being tape-recorded is self-evident to anyone listening to the tape.

L2 is dialogic and, in spite of the verbal ellipsis of "is" ("Also present [is] ,") it is a formulaic convention in interviews, the function of which is to elicit the name of the other officer present. Similarly in L7, (following the officer's receipt of the detained person's name and date of birth), the elicitation of the solicitor's name with verbal ellipsis is successful.

In this interview, L9-10 are monologic, in that no response is expected from the detained person, and function as information-giving. However, other tapes from the data and personal experience indicate that this sub-set is normally dialogic and the officer

88

typically goes on to elicit whether the detained person is satisfied with the legal representative present, as in Extract 4:2 below:

Extract 4:2

1	O	before the commencement of the interview I must (.) remind you that you
2		are entitled to **free** legal advice (1.0) and that you're being represented
3		here by (name), are you quite happy with that?
4		(1.5)
5	DP	yes

In L11-13 of Extract 4:1, the officer switches to monologic mode as he records information "for the benefit of the tape", and remains in monologic mode to address the detained person concerning the notice explaining what will happen to the tapes, the caution and the explanation. L25 shows a return to dialogic/elicitation mode, as the officer asks: "Do you understand the caution?"

The monologic/informing (M) and dialogic/eliciting (D) modes then, also have sub-types, depending on whether they are addressed to the other officer(**O2**), to the tape (**T**), to the solicitor (**S**), or to the suspect (**DP**).

Line	Discourse type
1.	Monologic, addressed to DP (M:DP)
2	Dialogic, addressed to O2 (D:O2)
4-5	Dialogic, addressed to DP (D:DP)
7	Dialogic, addressed to S (D:S)
9-10	Monologic, addressed to DP (M:DP)
11-13	Monologic, addressed to the tape (but also available to those present) (M:T)
14-24	Monologic, addressed to DP (M:DP)
25	Dialogic, addressed to DP (D:DP)

Rather than an event that is either all dialogic or all monologic, it is a mixture of both. The sequence of lines 1-25 is shown more graphically below.

$(M:DP) \rightarrow (D:O2) \rightarrow (D:DP) \rightarrow (D:S) \rightarrow (M:DP) \rightarrow (M:T) \rightarrow (M:DP) \rightarrow (D:DP)$

The next section addresses the effects of these discourse switches upon the interpreter's treatment of the text.

4:2. DISCOURSE SEQUENCE AND THE INTERPRETER

In her seminal work on interpreting as interaction, Wadensjö (1998:42) states that interpreters:

> *... understand themselves not only to be translating between two languages, but also to be performing on others' behalf various activities, such as persuading, agreeing, lying, questioning, claiming, explaining, comforting, accusing, denying, co-ordinating interaction, and so forth.*

The switching between different modes in the discourse sequence analysed above, restricts interpreters' 'room for manoeuvre' and makes it difficult for them to fulfil any of these roles adequately.

Extracts 4:3 and 4:4 below show how the interpreter can be confused by switches from one mode to the other. Extract 4:3 is the beginning of the same interview as Extract 4:1, but this time with the interpretations included. Extract 4:4 is from a different interview.

Extract 4:3

1	O	I am (rank) (name)
2	I	je suis (rank) (name)
3	O	also present,
4	O2	(name) police officer
5	I	mon- er je suis er également présent (.) (name) un un officier de police,

Here, the officer shifts from Monologic:DP in L1, to Dialogic:O2 in L3. Once the second officer has identified himself in L4, the interpreter is left to translate both L3 and L4 in a single turn. Consequently, he is no longer clear who he is speaking for or about. He

begins to present the second officer in the first person, before remembering to translate "Also present,". In an ideal world, the second officer would have waited for the interpreter to interpret "Also present", before giving his name, but one can imagine the interactional difficulty with this, since the officer was probably looking at him enquiringly whilst saying "Also present,".

In Extract 4:4, below, the officer has asked the detained person to speak in French, through the interpreter. The interpreter interprets this request and is then "caught out" by the abrupt switch from Dialogic:DP to Dialogic:S and Dialogic:I, and fails to interpret until a later turn, where she has to cut across the officer's turn in order to get the translation in.

Extract 4:4

1	O	what I would- what I would ask you is if you could (1.5) er reply in French
2		so that we can keep (.) the interview completely and utterly in French not
3		to confuse (.) the issue
4	DP	OK
5	I	pour des raisons de clarté il faut répondre en français
6		(2.0)
7	O	now also present is,
8	S	(name) solicitor's rep (name of firm)
9	O	and,
10	I	(name) French interpreter
11	O	thank you very much (.) er [I think….]
12	I	[on s'est présenté] votre avocat et moi-même

An experienced interpreter will, of course, be used to the general organisation of these preliminary proceedings and will deal effectively with the monologic/dialogic switches. However, as can be seen in Extract 4:4, officers can and do depart from the 'script' to

address matters that arise, and thus test more severely the interpreter's 'fleetness of foot'.

The next section moves from discourse sequence in the preliminary 'introductory' phase, to that used in the explanation of the caution.

4:3. DISCOURSE SEQUENCE AND THE EXPLANATION OF THE CAUTION

The UK police caution is also divided into 3 ideational sections, although these are *not* numbered, but are normally written as 3 consecutive sentences in a single paragraph:

(1)You do not have to say anything. (2) But it may harm your defence if you do not mention when questioned something which you later rely on in court. (3) Anything you do say may be given in evidence.

Although the PACE Codes of Practice (10.4) allow that:

> *Minor deviations do not constitute a breach of this requirement provided that the sense of the caution is preserved,*

personal experience has shown that officers rarely, if ever, deviate either from this wording or from this sequence.

However, as far as the *explanation* of the caution is concerned, there is variation in the discourse sequence chosen. Officers explain the caution either in the order 1-2-3 *or* in the order 1-3-2. Of the 13 officers in my data who explained the caution, 7 explained it in the order 1-2-3, and 6 in the order 1-3-2. Although interviews between researcher and officers do not constitute part of this data set, informal conversation with some officers revealed feelings that it is helpful to deal with the shorter sections, 1 and 3, first, before tackling the more complex middle section. In his paper about the Miranda warnings, Shuy (1997:177) questions whether a change in the discourse sequence in the Miranda warning could affect the suspect's response. In the case of interpretation, there is the

added consideration that the logical progression of the caution is lost as an aid to the interpreter.

Extract 4:5 below shows an example of parts 1 and 3 administered consecutively in a 1-3-2 sequence:

Extract 4:5

1	O	there are three parts to the caution
2	I	donc (.) il y a euh trois parties si vous voulez (.) lorsqu'on vous dit vos
3		droits
4	O	**the first** is that you do not have to say anything
5	I	la première c'est que vous n'êtes pas obligé de parler
6	O	I intend to ask you questions,
7	I	je compte vous poser des questions,
8	O	but it is up to you (.) if you choose to answer them or not .
9	I	mais (.) vous avez le choix de répondre ou pas
10	DP	mhm
11	O	**the last part** is that anything you do say may be given in evidence
12	I	et puis la dernière partie c'est que tout ce que vous dites peut être utilisé
13		comme preuve
14	O	as I've explained (.) the interview is being tape-recorded ,
15	I	comme j'ai expliqué cet interview est en train de-d'être enregistré,
16	O	should this matter go to court,
17	I	donc si ce cas va au tribunal,
18	O	the tapes can be played to the court,
19	I	les cassettes peuvent être rejoués au tribunal
20	O	or they can see (.) er the written record of the interview
21	I	ou bien ils peuvent voir euh les cassettes euh ce-ce qui est écrit euh les
22		cassettes en écrit
23	O	and that can be entered as evidence at court.
24	I	et cela peut être présenté comme preuve au tribunal.

It can be seen that, apart from some lexical difficulties, which will be examined in a later section, the explanation of parts 1 and 3 appears successful (L1-24). The detained person offers "Mhm" as a receipt marker in L10, although of course this does not necessarily confirm understanding. (The question of understanding is discussed below). However, he is required to make a considerable effort in comprehension and retention. He is told that the caution is in 3 parts (L1). Numbering of the parts is only mentioned in L1 "There are three parts to the caution". L4 states that "the first part is...". The next mention of parts in L11 now refers to "the last part" and (in Extract 4:6 below) L25 refers to "the middle part". This, together with the 1-3-2 presentation, means that, although the officer repeats the exact text of each part of the caution before explaining it (L4, L11 and L25-6), the original sequential organisation has been lost. Also, there is no overt statement that the sequence will be/is being broken, so the detained person could think he has missed the second or middle part.

Extract 4:6 below, which is a continuation of Extract 4:5, shows the officer's explanation of the middle part of the caution:

Extract 4:6

25	O	**the middle part** is that it may harm your defence if you do not mention
26		when questioned something which you later **rely** on in court
27	I	donc le le milieu de ça il dit que cela pourrait nuire à votre défense si
28		vous ne mentionnez pas (.) lorsqu'on vous questionne (.) une chose sur
29		laquelle vous pourrez compter plus tard lorsque vous serez au tribunal.
30	DP	donc si je ne dis pas quelque chose que je devrais dire quoi
31	I	so you mean if I **don't** say something that I should say
32	O	.hh well what this means is that (.) erm if you choose not to say anything
33		*now*
34	I	ce que cela veut dire c'est si vous choisissez de ne rien dire maintenant
35	O	and then if the matter goes to court you then choose to *give* an

		explanation
36	I	et puis si cela va au tribunal et en suite vous donnez une explication
37		lorsque vous êtes au tribunal
38	O	or if you give one explanation now and a different explanation in court ,
39	I	ou bien si vous donnez une explication maintenant et puis vous- vous dites
40		quelquech- une explication **différente** au tribunal,
41	O	the court can ask themselves (.) why did you do this
42	I	le tribunal peut se demander pourquoi vous l'avez fait
43	DP	ah oui d'accord
44	I	ah yes
45	O	and they can make what we call an inference
46	I	an?
47	O	and they can take what we call an *inference*

Here, the officer's repetition of the text of the caution itself in L25-6 provokes a 'checking response' from the detained person in L30, which pre-empts the officer's explanation and demonstrates incomprehension: "so like if I don't say something that I should say". It may be that, because that part of the text, the 'middle part', is relatively long, the detained person thinks he has just heard the explanation and is reacting to that.

The change in sequence to 1-3-2 also results in the loss of the adversative "but", (L25) which, in the caution, has the cohesive function of linking part 2 to part 1. Interestingly, although the interpreter *adds* a cohesive device in L12 (Extract 4:5), "et puis", "and then", she does not do so in L27 (Extract 4:6).

Loss of logical progression can be among the causes of difficulty for interpreters. It can affect the ways in which they deal with the text, leading to an unnatural style of French and, consequently, affecting the detained person's understanding. In L25 (Extract 4:6), where the officer returns abruptly to part 2 of the caution, the interpreter begins with the highly unnatural rendition: "Donc le le milieu de ça il dit que..." (*So the the middle of that it says...*). The detained person demonstrates his incomprehension immediately

afterwards, in L30: "Donc si je ne dis pas quelque chose que je devrais dire quoi". (*So like if I don't say something that I should say).*

Bearing in mind that, following arrest, the detained person may be shocked or frightened (Gentile *et al.*, 1996:91), tired, (Cotterill, 2000), threatened (Jönsson and Linell, 1991:436), or simply not in "...a reasonable frame of mind" (Morgan *et al.*, 1991:79), the need to follow unnatural language may impose an extra affective burden on him/her.

The next section highlights two different styles of interpreting, "form-based" and "meaning-based", Dam (1998:50) and shows how the problems outlined above, together with lexical and structural difficulties, can lead interpreters to adopt one style in preference to the other.

4:4. "FORM-BASED" V "MEANING-BASED" INTERPRETING

In her study on lexical similarity/dissimilarity in consecutive interpreting, Dam (1998:49-50) traces the emergence of the distinction between what Seleskovitch (1975) termed "(a) *transcoding* (or word-for-word, verbal, direct or literal translation) and (b) *interpreting proper* (or interpretative transposition)". Dam (1998:50) explains further that "In terms of the product, transcoding is supposed to result in a target language *reproduction* of the individual source text units, whereas interpreting proper manifests itself as a *reformulation* of the source text meaning".

Dam (1998:50) avoids the evaluative nature of the terms 'transcoding' and 'interpreting proper', by referring to these as: "**form-based** (or word-based) and **meaning-based interpreting**", although the concepts are the same.

Unlike the translator, who can view the whole text before starting translation, the interpreter only has access to as much text as the primary speaker (in this case, the policeman), has produced. (Hatim & Mason, 1997; Tijus, 1994; Shlesinger, 1995).

Therefore, whether she favours the form-based or meaning-based mode, the interpreter may opt for the former in order to deal with the style of delivery.

Dam (1998:52) reports on a study which analyses "lexical similarity" and "lexical dissimilarity". Her study shows that both form-based and meaning-based interpreting occur frequently, but with a preponderance of the former. The study, however, is limited to distributional factors and does not offer reasons as to why this may be so. Dam finds that the difference between the categories may not be binary, but rather a continuum, with the two types of interpreting at the extremes, with various mixtures of the types in between.

The term 'meaning-based' interpreting is closely linked to the requirement for interpreters to match the illocutionary force of the source language. Hale (1999:57) quotes Hatim and Mason's (1990:63-4) observation that:

> *it is perfectly possible for the interpreter to translate competently the locutionary act involved in an utterance (in the sense of finding appropriate equivalents for Source Text words and relating them correctly and appropriately in Target Language syntax) while failing to perceive or otherwise misrepresenting the illocutionary force of the utterance in context.*

Form-based interpreting would, in this sense, be related to translating the locutionary act.

Hatim and Mason (1997:50) also point out that the liaison interpreter has to treat each portion of source language text as a "self-contained unit". This is because, unlike simultaneous interpreting, where the next segment arrives almost immediately, the primary participants stop after each segment, however completely or incompletely structured. Indeed, primary speakers often produce short, incomplete segments, under the illusion of being 'helpful' to the interpreter.

If meaning-based interpreting is indeed associated with more effective interpreting for the recipient, then the high frequency of instantiations of form-based interpreting in the

caution-explanation section of the interview indicates that it represents a serious challenge and one which may present problems. Extract 4:7 provides a typical example from the data of the extent to which the wording of the caution itself can result in form-based interpreting, where the interpreter attempts a word-for-word rendering of the source text.

Extract 4:7

1	O	and the caution is that you do not have to say anything
2		(1.5)
3	I	.hhh la caution qui dit que vous ne devez- vous n'avez- vous n- n'êtes pas
4		obligé de dire quoique ce soit
5	I	mais ça peut faire du tort à votre défence,
6	O	if you do not mention when questioned,
7	I	si vous ne mentionnez- si vous ne dites pas .h lorsque vous êtes questionné
8	O	something which you later rely on in court
9	I	quelque chose dont vous avez besoin quand vous allez au tribunal

In L1, the officer's metalanguage to introduce the caution is somewhat complex, structurally, and the interpreter attempts to translate the individual segments of the utterance (L3) as follows:

| a) you do not have to... | vous ne devez- | *(you mustn't)* |
| b) you do not have... | vous n'avez- | *(you haven't)* |

He finally produces a meaning-based version:

c) vous n'êtes pas obligé de dire quoique ce soit

which is both structurally and lexically dissimilar to the original wording, but which conveys the sense of this section of the caution.

The passive form "...when questioned," in L6 is copied by I in L7, "...lorsque vous êtes questionné,", although French prefers the active to the passive and avoids the latter where possible.

L8 "something which you later rely on in court". It appears that the interpreter is aware that the word-for-word translation of "rely" is inappropriate, but he is unable, or unwilling, to move to a word as lexically dissimilar as "invoquerez", which might be a more appropriate meaning-based translation.

The *explanation* of the caution causes similar problems as in Extracts 4:8 to 4:10 below:

Extract 4:8

1	O	should this matter go to court ,
2	I	donc si cette affaire va au tribunal

Here, the interpreter's form-based translation follows both the officer's structure *and* lexical choice. A meaning-based translation would probably change the subject from "this matter" to the "detained person", and might use the expression "passer en justice". The addition of "donc" (so), appears to fulfil the function here (and elsewhere in the interview), of a particle to create thinking time, or of a "receipt marker" (Atkinson, 1992:201). In Extract 4:9 below, the problem is less clear:

Extract 4:9

1	O	I intend to ask you questions ,
2	I	je compte vous poser des questions

The interpreter may have selected the verb "compter" (to count on) in order to adhere to the officer's structure, thus avoiding the French structure using an auxiliary: "J'ai l'intention" (I intend). At the same time, he may have been attempting to capture the mental element of "intend", "plan" with the form-based version. A straightforward, meaning-based rendering might have been "Je vais vous poser des questions", (I'm going to ask you questions), utilising the periphrastic future that expresses intention. The form-

99

based version "j'ai l'intention de vous poser des questions", although syntactically correct, is just 'not French'.

Extract 4:10

1	O	I'll explain the caution to you
2	I	je vais vous expliquer maintenant l'avertissement
3	O	it comes in three parts
4	I	ça vient donc en trois parties

The interpreter's rendering: "ça vient" in L4 is a direct, form-based translation of "it comes", which is inappropriate in this context. As with many form-based renderings, it is not syntactically incorrect, it simply 'isn't French'. As in Extract 4:5, a simpler, meaning-based alternative might be "C'est en trois parties", (It's in three parts).

It is also interesting to note the interpreter's rendering of "caution " as "avertissement" (warning). As explained in section 4:5 below, there is no French equivalent to the caution, certainly not as a warning. Presumably the interpreter based his translation on experience of hearing the caution verbalised as a warning by this officer and others.

4:5. UNDERSTANDING AND MEANING THE CAUTION

4:5:1 THE INTERVIEWING OFFICER

There can be little doubt that officers "know" the meaning of the caution and its legal implications. Either they know the words by heart or they use their caution card or the police station's crib sheet from which to read at interview. However, as Cotterill (2000) points out, officers may conceptualise the caution as an explanation of rights, or as a warning, or as advice. The officers' explanations of part 2 of the caution in Extracts 4:1 and 4:5 of this study appear to conceptualise it as a warning, as indeed does the interpreter's lexical choice in L2, Extract 4:10 above: "avertissement" (warning). The 'result' clauses in each case: "...the court may ask themselves why" and "...the court

100

can ask themselves (.) why did you do this" appear to foretell a negative result. The relevant sections of extracts 4:1 and 4:6 are reproduced here for ease of reference, with the interpreter's and detained person's turns removed from 4:6 for clarity.

Extract 4:11 (4:1)

20 ... ...and the middle (.) but you- it may harm
21 your defence if you do not mention when questioned something which you
22 later rely on in court, means that (.) should you give an account of the
23 incident to me now, a::nd should this matter go to court you give (.) a
24 different explanation, the court may ask themselves (.) why(.) (1.5)

Extract 4:12 (4:6)

25 O **The middle part** is that it may harm your defence if you do not mention
26 when questioned something which you later *rely* on in court
32 O .hh well what this means is that (.) erm if you choose not to say anything
33 *now*
35 O and then if the matter goes to court you then choose to *give* an
 explanation
38 O or if you give one explanation now and a different explanation in court,
41 O the court can ask themselves (.) why did you do this

All officers who gave an explanation of the caution (two thirds), presented part 2 in similar terms to those above. This concurs with Cotterill's (2000:16) findings that officers: "...showed a strong tendency towards the communication of *personally* damaging outcome, with 62 per cent of officers emphasizing the individual and the effect such behaviour could have on a defendant's credibility before the judge and jury....".

The similarity of these findings appears to support the legitimacy of both methodologies, since Cotterill (*ibid.*) proceeds on the basis of officers' own perceptions of what they say, and the present study allows a detailed analysis based on recordings of what officers *do* say, in interview.

101

Parts 1 and 3 of the explanation sometimes received exhaustive treatment, as in Extract 4:5, were sometimes simply repeated 'verbatim' as in Extract 4:1, at the beginning of this chapter, and were sometimes not expanded, as in Extract 4:13 below:

Extract 4:13

O   You don't have to say anything unless you wish to do so (1.0) that means exactly what it says.

Officers 'know' the caution. However, the question arises as to what "knowing" actually means in this case. One would expect their training to result in a firm grasp of the legal implications of the utterance. But if this knowledge is conceptualised in a non-verbal way, it is perhaps unfair to ask them to verbalise it with the admonishment to: 'put it in your own words'. If linguists are battling with the wording of the caution, as Cotterill (*ibid.*) points out, it seems a great deal to expect police officers to paraphrase it *and* to alter the register for comprehension by detained persons. The problem is further compounded by the presence of an interpreter interposed between the two primary participants.

Officers' explanations of the caution are characterised by a high frequency of legal/formal lexis, much of which, as Cotterill *(ibid.)* notes, is a repetition of words used in the caution itself. Further, four out of five officers in my data announced the caution in metalanguage, before proceeding to the caution proper. Of those, some two thirds used the word "caution" in their announcement, as in the examples below:

"Before I ask you any questions I must *caution* you ... "

" ... and I have to say to you and to *caution* you that ... "

" ... and I've got to advise you of the *caution* and the caution is that ... "

"Before I go any further I must *caution* you ... "

102

As the caution has already been given once, at the point of arrest, the officer's announcement at interview may take the form of a reminder:

"I will remind you of the *caution* ..."
"I've got to remind you that you are under *caution* and that ... "
"Okay (name) you're still under *caution* ..."
"Before we go any further I must remind you that ... "

The fact that officers feel the need to announce the caution may indicate that they do not feel confident of its illocutionary force. The "read-aloud" mode of delivery used (whether recited by heart or read from a crib sheet), may be either the cause or the consequence of lack of "ownership" of the utterance. However, the effect is a singularly unnatural delivery. This is characterised, for example, by the lack of contractions in parts 1 and 2 ("You do not ...") and by falling intonation at the end of each part. This is particularly notable at the end of part 1, in the example given below, where falling intonation followed by a pause has the effect of cutting off part 1 from its "but" clause in part 2:

"You do not have to *say* ↓anything. (.) but it *may harm* your defence if you do not mention when questioned something which you later rely on in court . ...."

4:5:2 THE INTERPRETER

In this section, I shall again use Extract 4:6 to examine some aspects of the *explanation* that render the task of interpreting more difficult. I shall then move on to more general concepts of interpreting in interviews.

In Extract 4:6, it can be seen that, in L30, the detained person responds to the officer's "verbatim" re-stating of part 2 of the caution, believing, perhaps, that this was intended as the explanation. He makes what he believes is a re-formulation of the officer's turn: "so like if I don't say something that I should say", which has the illocutionary effect of a

polar interrogative, presupposing an affirmative answer. In other words, he makes a statement, to which he expects the answer "Yes".

However, the officer's response in L32 is not "yes". It begins with the particle 'well' which, in this context, according to Schiffrin (1987:105) announces a dispreferred response where: "... respondents do not select an answer from the options encoded by the linguistic form of the question". The particle is followed by "... what this means", referring anaphorically to the officer's previous statement in L25/6. There follows a series of three "if" clauses (L32/35/38), before a result clause is finally reached in L41, "The court can ask themselves (.) why did you do this". However, this is not the end of the matter as, in L45, the additive "and" introduces a supplement to the result. Also in L45, it appears that the officer is aware of the potential difficulty of the legal expression "inference", as she hedges it with "what we call...". The interpreter's query in L46 bears this out, eliciting a repetition from the officer in L47.

Although the officer rightly allows the interpreter time to interpret each segment, the cumbersome structure of the sequence of 'if' clauses and awkward result clause, means that each segment is interpreted in isolation, rather like a de-contextualised list, or like Rudyard Kipling's poem "If". Consequently, the interpreter deals with the sequence in form-based mode.

In her discussion of textual density, Palma (1995:221) makes the point that the "level of *abstraction* in a text will also contribute to its density. The more concrete a text, the easier it will be for the interpreter to *visualize*". When viewing the explanation as a whole, one can see that, although there are in fact few legal words, the loose structure and abstraction of the sequence may, and often do, cause difficulties for the interpreter.

In the preceding section, mention was made of the requirement on officers to paraphrase the caution and to *lower the register*. In reality, the burden for lowering the register falls squarely, if not fairly, upon the interpreter, as officers, untrained in linguistics, fail adequately to make the switch from the "legal" caution to the "in your own words"

explanation. Interpreters manage this with varying degrees of success depending, of course, upon their competence and experience, but also upon their own understanding of the caution, particularly as many interpreters are simply native speakers of the language and as untrained as the officers. It is certainly difficult to "mean" an interpretation when the source text is not clearly understood.

It should perhaps be pointed out that the explanation of the caution is one of the rare occasions when many UK legal interpreters tend to move closer to the 'mediation' style of interpreting, co-constructing the text with the officer.

4:5:3   THE DETAINED PERSON

If the interpreter has the responsibility for modifying the register, the detained person also carries a heavy burden. At the end of the caution, or of the explanation if it is given, s/he must respond either by claiming to understand, or by owning up to having failed to understand. All officers in my data asked the question, point blank, "Do you understand the caution?", or simply "Do you understand?". All detained persons replied "yes".

Two points arise, however, from this seemingly simple response. As Shuy (1997:178) notes "One might go so far as to say that *all* questions are, in some sense of the word, coercive", but the question "Do you understand?" appears singularly coercive. The detained person is faced here with a bare, polar interrogative, devoid of any mitigation that might have softened the illocutionary force, such as "Can you say...?" "Do you feel...?" The question may be perceived as a challenge, to which the detained person can only respond with a claim to equal status, ("Yes, I understand the caution as well as you.") or an admission of inferiority ("No, I can't understand what you said").

Also, in France at least, there is no concept of a caution as it is understood in the UK. The rights of the "gardé à vue" (detained person) are enshrined in written law (notably the Code de Procédure Pénale) and are guaranteed by the presence of a lawyer after the 20th hour of detention. Interviews by the Gendarmerie are not routinely tape-recorded

and there is therefore no obligation to get the formalities on tape. This means that the detained person has no cultural equivalent with which to match this experience in the UK, unlike an English detained person, for whom the existence of the caution is likely to be familiar from television.

Secondly, one might ask what the detained person means when he says: "Yes". Is it "Yes, I understand the caution and explanation that you have given", or is it "Yes, I hear what you just said". Again, I quote Shuy (1997:184), who states that: "…a self-reported measure of a person's ability to understand falls far short of adequacy in diagnosing that person's comprehension". In three of the interviews in the data for this paper, the officer asks the detained person to explain "in his own words", what the caution means. The explanations offered appear in Extracts 4:14 to 4:16 below:

Extract 4:14

1	DP	eu:::h j'ai bien compris que eu::h durant l'interrogatoire, (1.5) je dois
2		eu::h je ne dois pas omettre euh à répondre à des questions
3	DP	parce-que cela peut me nuire er à- à ma défense,
4	DP	eu:::h (2.0) pour- il a dit que:: le- le- l'interview est enregistré sur cassette
5	DP	eu::h à la fin de … .

The detained person has, in fact, reproduced from memory a verbatim re-iteration of some segments of the caution as rendered by the interpreter, such as "nuire à ma défense" in L3, without demonstrating any understanding of the content. His utterance in L5 is the beginning of the officer's information that "At the end of the interview I will hand you a notice that will tell you what will happen to the tapes and how you can gain access to them", which the detained person has mistaken for part of the caution.

In Extract 4:15 below, the detained person reproduces some of the words of the caution, without demonstrating any understanding of content, whilst the detained person in Extract 4:16, attempts an explanation in his own words, with no more success.

Extract 4:15

1   DP   eu::h tout ce que je peux dire euh (.) pourra euh c- être contre moi ou
2   comme preuve

Extract 4:16

1   DP   donc ça veut dire que (1.5) tout ce que je dis- toutes les paroles que je dis
            .hh sera contre moi .

It is notable that, *after* hearing the caution and *before* being asked to explain it "in your own words", all three detained persons were asked "Do you understand the caution?". *All three answered "Yes"*. The questions therefore remain: to what were they answering "yes", and what did they mean by "yes"?

There is no obvious solution to the problem of verifying comprehension of the caution. As can be seen from Extracts 4:14 to 4:16, asking detained persons to paraphrase it may be ineffectual. Paraphrasing can be a difficult exercise in any circumstances and even more so in the stressful situation of a tape-recorded interview. The best solution would therefore appear to be a thorough re-working at least of the explanation, if not of the caution itself.

CONCLUSION

This chapter has demonstrated that, quite apart from problems that occur in the main body of the interview, the entire preliminary sequence suffers from dislocation and inadequacy of form and lexis. Police officers are not linguists and their difficulties in explaining the caution are reflected in the way that interpreters resort to form-based interpreting to deal with the sequence.

In my data, the entire sequence is characterised by disfluency, inaccuracy and uncertainty on the part of interpreters, which reaches a peak during the explanation of the caution. Although unproven statistically, the data appears to show that, apart from problems with low-frequency lexis, the main body of the interview contains a far lower level of disfluency and inaccuracy than occurs during the opening sequence.

It is possible that there may be a brief "settling down" period at the start of an interview, during which the interpreter is not operating at full capacity. However, this cannot be proven. Moreover, one might expect disruption to be minimised by careful preparation involving learning of the caution itself by heart, and thorough understanding of its implications.

Conclusions concerning the interpretation of the caution and its explanation will be drawn, and solutions suggested, in the final chapter of this thesis. Chapter 5 now turns to the main body of the interview, to examine the 'question of questions' and to relate these to two types of *and*-prefaced utterances and their treatment by interpreters.

CHAPTER 5

AND-PREFACED QUESTIONS

5:1 THE QUESTION OF QUESTIONS

For the discussion of *and*-prefacing, I will define briefly what I mean by questions in the context of the interview with suspect. Conventionally, utterances are deemed to be questions if they are:

a) syntactically interrogative with questioning intonation;

b) syntactically interrogative without questioning intonation;

c) declarative with questioning intonation.

My concern here is with the function of declaratives. The interview contains a great many declaratives with flat or falling intonation that nonetheless appear to have the illocutionary force of questions, since they invariably receive an answer. Indeed, the rising question-tone occurs much less frequently than flat or falling intonation, even in syntactic interrogatives. Extract 5:1 shows an example of a declarative with rising intonation (arrowed), and extract 5:2 with falling intonation. Both presuppose a positive answer, and in both cases, the answer is "yes".

Extract 5:1

Rising intonation

811	O	and then you have a break, (1.0) yeah? and you're ahm at the (airport
812		name). (1.5) [yeah?]
813	DP	mhm]
814	O→	a:::nd y- (.) this is where you meet the two (nationality) drivers?
815	DP	yes

Extract 5:2

Falling intonation

1   DP   only this was getting on sort of for now phh (3.0) early afternoon I'd've
2   thought
3   O→   mhm (.) and this is where you stopped for diesel.
4   DP   yes

Apart from the absence of question intonation in Extract 5:1, there appears to be no formal difference between the two utterances. Both are, in Bishop *et al*'s (1998:416-7) terms, "utterances soliciting acknowledgement", where the interlocutor's agreement is presupposed. The absence of rising intonation does not appear to affect the questioning function of the utterance in Extract 5:2 L3.

In classifying declaratives as questions in Magistrates' Court hearings, Harris (1984), makes the point that these are calling for confirmation and should therefore, in this context, be considered as questions. Following Churchill (1978), Harris (*ibid.*) also shows that certain questions, such as declaratives, contain a completed proposition, and for this reason, it is harder for the respondent to disagree than to agree. This hypothesis, that disagreement, as the dispreferred response, entails more interactional work than does agreement, is conclusively born out in my data. An example appears in Extract 5:3, where, after a one-second pause, DP expands on his disagreement.

Extract 5:3

1   O   and the reason your (.) you didn't buy any beer (1.0) on the boat (1.0) is
2   that you knew the illegal entrants (.) were in the boot of your car at the
3   time.
4   DP   no I didn't (1.0) there's plenty of room on the back seat if I wanted to put
5   it on the back seat (2.5) it is a very big car, (1.0) you could fit at least
6   twenty cases I bet (.) on the back seat (.) or put some on the front seat,

110

In fact, DPs will frequently offer an alternative explanation, without expressing outright disagreement with a declarative question at all.

Further, as mentioned above, the relative infrequency of questioning intonation is almost a defining feature of questions in interviews. There are interviews in my data where only a few questions, out of over a hundred, have rising intonation, whether syntactic interrogatives or declaratives. Either there is no rise or fall at all at the end of the utterance, or else there is a fall.

If questions are, as Harris (*ibid:*6) says, "clearly attempts to get the hearer to *say* something", if declaratives may be questions rather than informing moves, and if the characteristic flat and falling intonation is typical of all question-types in interviews, then it would appear entirely justifiable, for the sake of brevity, to call all such utterances questions.

5:2 *AND*-PREFACING

And, notes Schiffrin (1987:129) has discourse as well as grammatical properties and has two roles: "...it coordinates idea units and it continues a speaker's action." In her work on sociolinguistic interviews (ibid.), she finds that *and*-prefacing marks a question as a continuation of the speaker's own prior talk. Heritage and Sorjonen (1994) and Drew & Sorjonen (1997) cite *and*-prefaced questions as an indication of the institutionality of dialogue. They suggest that prefacing a question with *and* imbues it with the qualities of an agenda, making it easier for the respondent to answer, "detoxifying" it (Heritage & Sorjonen, 1994:21), where there are potential difficulties as, for example, in cross-examination in court.

They also contrast *and*-prefaced questions to a variety of questions, which they call "contingent", and which are built so as to deal *ad hoc* with some contingency like a prior dispreferred response. These are certainly evident in my data, but cannot be described as a universal alternative to *and*-prefaced questions.

As far as the investigative interview is concerned, the agenda-like nature of the officer's *and*-prefaced questions is an indication of their connective function. They are textual signals that help to turn events into an account.

Further, the interview data examined reveals two distinct types of *and*-prefaced questions, as the following examples show:

Type 1. Syntactic interrogative forms

Extract 5:4

WH questions:

51	O	who booked the tickets
52	DP	I did
53		(1.0)
54	O	a:h and how many people went out
55	DP	two

Polar questions:

1025	O	but in other countries it can be used as a bank card
1026	DP	yes it can
1027	O	and have you reported its loss to the bank
1028	DP	no but you need a:: (.) a code number to er....

Type 1 (syntactic interrogative) questions do appear to index the utterance both to the content of the speaker's prior turn(s), and to an "upcoming coordinate" (Schiffrin, 1987:323), although topic sequences may be so lengthy that it is difficult to positively identify a start and a finish. The following question:

112

1.	O	**and** how did you pay for this ticket.

is the fifth question turn in a topic sequence about the purchase of a ticket, which then continues for a further seven question turns covering how the money was raised to pay for it.

Type 1 questions also have the agenda-like qualities that Drew & Sorjonen (1997) attribute to *and*-prefaced questions in institutional dialogue. They do appear more coercive than "bare" interrogatives, in that they contain a stronger pre-supposition of a next-turn answer. This is not to say that they are coercive in the sense of pre-supposing a particular answer, as in Berk-Seligson's (1999:36) typology of leading questions, but rather that an answer of some sort is strongly expected. They are neither "positive conducive" nor "negative conducive", to use Hudson's (1975) terms. That is to say, there is no pre-supposition concerning the polarity of the answer. DP's answers in lines 4 and 11, in Extract 5:5 below, could just as easily have been "no" and "no".

Extract 5:5

1	O	(town name) (.) is that in (county name) is it ?
2	DP	yeah it's in (county name)
3	O	**and** are you married
4	DP	yes
5		(1.0)
6	O	have you children ?
7	DP	yeah (number)
8	O	what are their ages.
9	DP	(ages)
10	O	okay **and** do you work
11	DP	just part time

Type 2. Narrative questions

Extract 5:6

1	O	<did you show any passports>
2		(1.0)
3	DP	no ?
4	O	°right° .hh **and** you got your return ticket ,
5	DP	yeah
6	O	you got back in the car ?
7	DP	yeah
8	O	**and** you drove off
9	DP	yeah drove off round [to the ...]
10	O	[into the port ?]

Type 2 (narrative) questions are not syntactically questions at all, but declaratives. However, as explained above, their status as questions appears to be indisputable, since every occurrence in the data gives rise to a next-turn answer. In this sense, they also constitute a first pair part of an adjacency pair, since the second part is immediately relevant. I have termed Type 2 "narrative" questions because they are features of an account which has the appearance of being built up by both participants. This goes beyond a simple "open/closed" dichotomy. DP has the option either to expand on his turn and contribute further to the story, (lines 7/8 in Extract 5:7, below), or to restrict himself to a short answer, (lines 4/13 below):

Extract 5:7

1	O	**and** now y- in the- (.) you're trying to tell me that (2.0) a- after getting lost in
2		(town A) you end up in (town B) (1.5) at lunch time
3		(1.0)
4	DP	hm hm
5	O	**and** then (4.0) it's obviously your intention to return to (town A) is it ?

6		(1.0)
7	DP	I was trying to get back (.) I was trying to find me way back and kept getting
8		lost on the different roads
9		(1.5)
10	O	but you end up in (town C)
11	DP	In (town C)
12	O	**and** that's a fair distance away again isn't it .
13	DP	it is

Similarly to Type 1, Type 2 questions strongly pre-suppose a next-turn answer. However, Type 2 pre-supposes agreement, whether that agreement is with a positive or a negative proposition.

Extract 5:8

Positive proposition:

363	O	and you was with him
364		(1.0)
365	DP	right
366	O	and you *saw* him go to the non-EEC counter
367		(2.0)
368	DP	right

Extract 5:9

Negative proposition:

106	O	are you saying (.) that you had *no* connection with this bloke (.) *except* (.)
107		that he was brought to your car by your brother
108	DP	yes
109	O	that's what you're saying=
110	DP	=yes
111	O	and you don't know where.

112   (1.0)

113   DP   no (1.0) I- I can't honestly say where we'd *been* either

Although Type 2 **may** be marked as questions by prosodic variation (rising intonation) and question tags, these markers do not appear to be defining features. Rising intonation is infrequent and seems rather to contribute towards the continuing-narrative or progressive character of Type 2 questions:

1   O   OK and you arrive in (town A) still fairly early in the morning I

2   presume?

According to Berk-Seligson (1999:37): "...tag questions, by definition, are leading questions". As Type 2 (narrrative) questions may also be defined as "leading", in the sense that they index a continuing narrative, the addition of tags can only serve to increase the force of the question. There are few instantiations of Type 2 questions with tags in my data, almost all of which are "normal" i.e. negative tags following positive main clause verbs and positive tags following negative main clause verbs. There is a single occurrence of a "copy tag" (Woodbury, 1984, in Berk-Seligson, 1999:37), that is to say, where the tag and the main clause are both positive.

SUMMARY

Type 1 questions, then, are syntactically interrogative forms that strongly pre-suppose a next-turn *answer*, although they do not pre-specify its polarity. **Type 2** questions are narrative forms, which may give the sense, or seek to give the sense, of a story being constructed co-operatively. These questions strongly pre-suppose a next-turn *agreement*, whether to a positive or a negative proposition.

Of the *and*-prefaced questions in the monolingual interview data, approximately 58% were Type 1 (syntactic interrogatives), and 41% were Type 2 (declarative interrogatives). An exact analysis of the distribution of these is beyond the scope of this thesis. However, it is generally true that Type 1 questions are more prevalent at the start of interviews,

where the Officer is obtaining initial information and asking questions to which he genuinely may not know the answer. Type two questions which indicate, or appear to indicate, prior knowledge on the Officer's part, occur further into the interview, when information has become available for sharing, such as in the journey phase. Both types become less frequent during the probe-challenge phase.

5:3 INTERPRETERS' TREATMENT OF *AND*-PREFACED QUESTIONS

Recent work on interpreter mediated courtroom proceedings has already begun to identify some of the ways in which interpreters may alter the illocutionary force of utterances (Berk-Seligson, 1999, 1990; Hale,1999; Rigney, 1999; Fowler, 1995; Hudson, 1975). These include politeness, level of coerciveness of questions, equivalence of register and treatment of discourse markers. Hale (1999) in her examination of interpreters' treatment of discourse markers in court, found that the markers *well, now* and *you see* used in lawyers' questions, were generally not translated by interpreters. She concludes that either interpreters viewed these as superfluous or they were unable to find a direct semantic equivalent of the marker having the same illocutionary force.

The findings of this thesis appear to match those of Hale (1999), in that interpreters tend either to omit or to mis-translate *and*-prefaced questions. However, unlike *well, now* and *you see*, the discourse markers examined by Hale, (see above), *and* has a direct equivalent in French, both syntactically and pragmatically. The omission cannot therefore be accounted for in terms of untranslatability. The remaining possibilities are therefore:

a)   they are omitted for the sake of speed

b)   they are considered superfluous

c)   they are in the interpreter's "dis-attend track" and are therefore not heard

117

Quite possibly, all three hypotheses are true. If the pragmatic force of a particle such as *and* is not appreciated, it may well be omitted for the sake of speed. In this case, not only is the agenda/narrative character of the question lost, but so are other pragmatic effects, such as sarcasm, as in Extract 5:10 below, concerning DP's stay in two hotels:

Extract 5:10

325	O	how many days in each hotel .
326	I	combien de:: de de jours par chaque hotel .
327	DP	la:: moitié euh [s::sept]euh sept sept huit jours dans un la moitié peut-être
328	I	[half] seven eight days in one (.) half roughly
329	O	tch **and** you can't remember the names .
330	I	mais vous pouvez pas vous rappeler des noms
331	DP	euh hhh non faut qu'ça revienne hein ?
332	I	no it's got to come back to me

In this case, the interpreter translated *and* as *but* which, as an adversative, fails to carry the illocutionary force of sarcasm in the English question. Had the sarcasm been conveyed, one might have expected a more defensive answer in line 331.

Extract 5:11 below, shows how an untranslated Type 2 *and* breaks the continuity of the narrative being constructed by O, and presents his *and*-prefaced question in L648 as 'new' in L649 ("Can you confirm that I have taken a bit of paper from the coin pocket"). The illocutionary force of the question is further modified by I's change to the syntactic interrogative form.

Extract 5:11

640	O	do you see this pair of black jeans ?
641	I	est-ce que vous voyez cette paire de jean noir ?
642	DP	oui

643	I	yes=
644	O	=do you confirm they were in the bag
645	I	est-ce que vous pouvez confirmer qu'ils étaient dans le sac ?
646	DP	euh: oui
647	I	yes
648	O	**and** you confirm I've taken this piece of paper out of the coin pocket .
649	I	est-ce que vous pouvez confirmer que j'ai retiré un peu de papier de la piè-
650		de la poche pour les petites pièces

Extract 5:12 below, shows how two untranslated Type 1 *'ands'* fail to convey the 'agenda' of a series of questions. The question in line 7 is crucial as an attempt to ease DP into 'naming names'. If it is the case that the omission of *and* takes away from the officer a resource that would have been available to him in a monolingual interview, then the interpreter is responsible for the failure of his questioning tactic.

Extract 5:12

1	DP	A (Town A)
2	I	In (Town A)
3	O	(Town A) (unclear) (.) thank you (.) **and** was that a ah factory there ?
4	I	C'est une usine ?
5	DP	C'est un euh parking routier
6	I	No it's a lorry park
7	O	**And** who told you to pick the trailer up there ?
8	I	Qui vous a dit d'aller chercher la remorque là-bas ?
9	DP	J'connais pas
10	I	I don't know them

Statistically, interpreters *omitted* 46.6% of and-prefaces to questions in the data. Of the 46.6% of untranslated *and*-prefaces, 77.2% of Type 1 and 22.8% of Type 2 were not translated. That is to say that more than three-quarters of Type 1, but less than a quarter of Type 2 were omitted.

It is difficult to identify the reason why such a relatively high proportion of Type 1 are omitted compared to Type 2. It may be that, at some level of consciousness, interpreters do not see Type 1 as being part of the propositional content of the question, and therefore of the interview. They may be attributed to the framing or structural aspects of the utterance and thus be perceived as being more disposable. This would appear to support Hale & Gibbons' (1999:203) findings, that framing moves by Counsel, such as "Can you tell the court...", which refer to the "internal, primary reality of the courtroom", tended to be omitted by interpreters, whereas utterances pertaining to the "secondary, external reality" of the alleged offence itself, tended to be translated. Similarly, *and*-prefaces to Type 2 utterances may be perceived as somehow being integral to the propositional content, to the facts of the matter, especially in view of their strongly narrative nature. "And" is a feature of narrative, as Labov (1972:77) points out. This is the case in French, just as it is in English.

Concerning form, then, Type 2 *and* may have a more conjunctive purpose than Type 1, as it links sections of the 'narrative' series of questions. Further, if the syntagmatic relationship is viewed as stretching across turns, Type 2 *and* may take on a more prominent role. Finally, semantically, Type 1 and Type 2 *ands* do not appear to be synonymous. For example, in its role as a framing device, Type 1 can also appear to serve as an indicator of topic switch, as in Extract 18. It is only from a pragmatic point of view that *and* appears to have the same degree of necessity in both question types.

The preceding paragraphs attempt a tentative hypothesis as to why interpreters omit more Type 1 than Type 2 *ands*. Analysis of the complete data set has neither supported nor disproved it, and informal discussions with officers and interpreters have proved fruitless since, significantly perhaps, but unsurprisingly, none were conscious of the use of *and*-prefacing in the first place.

It was also hypothesised that officers use fewer *and*-prefaces in interpreted than in monolingual interviews, and this is generally born out by the analysis of the full data set.

Since officers' turns are moved further apart by the intervention of an interpreter, one might assume that, interactionally, something of the agenda-like nature of a series of questions is lost, or at least, not perceived as available to the officer.

The question of rhythm, a significant and little-explored factor in interpreting research, may also be relevant. Although difficult to demonstrate in transcription, a sequence of questions and answers, in a monolingual situation, is likely to set up a certain rhythm. Indeed, the machine-gun style of questioning in Tannen's (1984) high-involvement style would be an extreme and perfectly rhythmical version. However, the presence of a third party, with protected turn-taking rights, would not only extend the time lag between the officer's own question turns, upsetting the psychological rhythm, it would also disrupt and unbalance any prosodic rhythm that might have been set up.

In order to test this possibility further, one monolingual and one interpreted interview by each of three officers were analysed statistically, with the following results:

	% *AND*-PREFACED QUESTIONS IN MONOLINGUAL INTERVIEW	% *AND*-PREFACED QUESTIONS IN INTERPRETED INTERVIEW
OFFICER A	26.02	15.67
OFFICER B	21.00	15.14
OFFICER C	22.50	10.62

The number of interviews sampled in this manner was restricted by the difficulty in finding officers doing each type of interview. Therefore, whilst aware of the need to guard against convenience sampling, it does nonetheless indicate that the slight difference in instantiations of *and*-prefaces between monolingual and interpreted interviews across the whole data set is born out when examining interviews by the same officers.

CONCLUSION

Whether they are termed *and*-prefaced questions or *and*-prefaced utterances, these interactional devices represent a phenomenon which is more prevalent in monolingual than interpreted interviews. It is suggested that the interpreter's turns disrupt not only the prosodic rhythm of question and answer, but also the psychological rhythm of the officer's own questions, reducing the officer's perception of it as an available option.

Treatment of *and*-prefacing by interpreters differs significantly, depending upon the type of question prefaced by *and*. Interpreters omit over three quarters of Type 1 (syntactic interrogatives) and less than a quarter of Type 2 (narrative interrogatives). A number of hypotheses have been presented as to why this ratio should be so.

It is suggested that this may be attributable to the opposition between structure and content, or to that between "internal and external realities" (Hale & Gibbons *ibid*.). Finally, it may be that interpreters simply do not appreciate the pragmatic and discoursal value of *and*-prefaces and treat these as disposable in the interests of speed.

Whether conscious or unconscious, the use of *and*-prefacing constitutes a strategy, to imbue questions with agenda-like properties, to "detoxify" them (Heritage & Sorjonen, 1994:21) or to give the impression of co-constructing a narrative. Not only do officers avail themselves of this strategy to a lesser extent in interpreted interviews, where they do use it, it tends to be omitted by interpreters. Informal discussions with officers themselves indicated that they are not aware of their own use of *and*-prefacing. If officers are unaware, or even vaguely aware that they, themselves, use it, they are certainly unaware that it is not translated by interpreters and therefore is a possible cause of failure in certain questioning tactics. Here again, interpreting has broken the connections that the officer seeks to establish.

This chapter has viewed the complete data set, in order to examine the prevalence and treatment of *and*-prefaced questions. Chapter 6 makes a fine-grained analysis of one monolingual and one interpreted interview, in order to trace the occurrence of repetition as a strategy through the three phases of the interview.

CHAPTER 6

REPETITION: A RESOURCE IN MONOLINGUAL INTERVIEWS

Whilst mindful of Schegloff's (1992) *caveat* that one must beware of allowing the known context of the interview to conceal the very features that provide the "distinctive stamp" (*ibid.:118*) of that particular type of talk, it is nonetheless evident, as discussed in chapter 2, that interviews consist of a series of utterances designed to elicit a response, and of the responses to these. "Questions" are asked by the officer; "responses" are given by the suspect. This particular format is among the features that not only place interviews within the category of institutional dialogue, but distinguish them as a genre, since any departure from it, such as a question as an initiating move from DP, is liable to sanctions. Interviews with suspects, in this respect, are similar to courtroom interaction but dissimilar to, for example, classrooms, medical consultations, or social services interviews.

However, for a number of reasons, as in "normal" conversation, some structural or pragmatic elements of the question may be repeated in the response, and the following question-turn may contain elements of the prior response. This means that one of the strategies available to participants in 'normal conversation', that of *repetition*, is equally available to both sides in interviews. When used by the officer, it is one of the connective devices whereby he seeks to get the detained person to commit to an account which can then be probed or challenged.

Repetition is used as a resource that functions both for co-operation and for disagreement. As explained in chapter 2, interviews with suspects begin in *co-operative mode*, but as the interview progresses to the *probe-challenge* phase, exchanges become more confrontational. The data examined in the present chapter show that, in the monolingual interview, this progression is reflected in a corresponding move from a co-operative to a more confrontational use of *repetition*. It is both a strategy for and a

function of the different phases, making it possible to map the progression of the interview through the repetitions.

However, in its simplest form, repetition performs an identifiable operation on a *preceding* speaker's turn (Jefferson, 1972). Given:

a) the non-consecutive nature of officer's and detained persons' turns, due to the interpreter's interventions, and

b) the meaning-based, as opposed to form-based nature of much interpreting,

repetition via the interpreter is unlikely. Examination of the data for this chapter has shown that, not only is it much less pervasive, but that where used, it serves a different, though overlapping, range of functions from that in the monolingual interview.

In order to achieve a thorough understanding of the functions of repetition in relation to the stages of the interview, two interviews were selected for analysis in this chapter. In this way, it was possible to avoid the danger of quantification concealing the feature under examination. Also, given the logistical constraints of analysing repetitions across the whole data set, this permitted the inclusion of multiple extracts to demonstrate the progressive nature of the phases and instantiations of repetition in each.

A 75-minute, monolingual interview (tapes 119 and 120), and an 88-minute interpreted interview (tapes 75 and 76) were analysed. Both interviews concern the same type of offence, that of Facilitation, and both fall into the three phases identified in Chapter 2:4, those of *life-story, journey* and *probe-challenge*. Although it may be argued that the two interviews represent only the interactional style of these particular participants, they nonetheless give an indication as to the pervasiveness of repetition in the monolingual interview and its relative infrequency in the interpreted event.

6:1. FUNCTIONS OF REPETITION

All language use is, at some level, dialogic (Bakhtin, 1981; Tannen, 1989; Wadensjö, 1998). As Tannen (1989:12) reminds us, "... both speaking and listening include elements and traces of the other". One of the most overt manifestations of this dialogism is the use of *repetition*. It provides cohesion, coherence, pattern and rhythm to talk in interaction, linking utterances as close as within turns, or as far apart as opposite ends of a speech event. Tannen (*ibid.*) also cites more philosophical assertions by Bolinger (1961), Hymes (1981) and Becker (1984) that repetition is part of the pre-patterning of language itself, inherited from countless other instantiations of a particular utterance used by countless speakers.

At a more local level, repetition is a strategy for and a function of, both positive and negative intention. Tannen (1989:9), focuses on repetition mainly as a strategy for co-operation, or "interpersonal involvement", whereas Norrick (1987:255), in his taxonomy of functions, gives equal weight to "statement-affirmation" and "statement-disagree". In the adjacency pair system of question and answer, Dumitrescu (1996:321) identifies "echo questions" as a sub-set of "interrogative allo-repetitions". That is, where the addressee answers a question with a question, whether rhetorical or not. They are also viewed by Schegloff, Jefferson & Sacks (1977) as invitations to self-repair and by Bunt (1981, cited in Dumitrescu, *ibid.*:335), as "...dialogue control acts... checking moves". Further, Norrick (1987:246) cites Jefferson (1972), who specifies that in order to be classified as a true repeat, it "... must pick out and perform some operation on a previous occurrence".

The interview data has proved to be fertile ground for identifying most, if not all, of these functions. However, my purpose here is not to offer a taxonomy of repetition types, but to demonstrate their presence and function at different phases of the monolingual interview. For the purposes of this thesis therefore, the most relevant opposition is that of *co-operative/confrontational*. Further, for the reasons set out below, the analysis will focus upon allo-repetition, (repetition of others), rather than self-repetition.

In her comprehensive analysis of repetition, Tannen (1989:48) identifies four main purposes served by repetition: production, comprehension, connection and interaction. Her treatment of the first three of these, centres upon self-repetition. It serves respectively as an economical aid to fluency in production, as a means of facilitating hearer comprehension by reducing the density of speaker output and as a connective device linking propositions in single-speaker output. Extract 6:1 demonstrates the third of these, from a monolingual interview, where the repetition serves as a connective between two parts of a same-speaker turn.

Extract 6:1

1	O	yes but you have already admitted that you were in (town A)
2	DP	uh huh
3	O	so you were in (town A) (1.0) why not *ask* the- where the supermarkets
4		are.

Certainly, the connective or cohesive function of self-repetition is evident in interpreted interviews, where the interpreter creates a greater distance between a single participant's turns. It is also noticeable that much of this repetition is nominal, where, as Linell (1994:56) also notes, legal professionals tend to avoid pronouns and pronominal adverbs, preferring to provide cohesion through repetition of full nominal heads, as in Extract 6:2

Extract 6:2

118	O	is this your <u>ticket.</u>
119	I	est-ce votre ticket.
120	DP	euh:: oui
121	I	yes
122	O	when did you purchase <u>this ticket</u>

123	I	quand avez-vous acheté ce ticket.
124	DP	euh il y a à peu près une semaine
125	I	about a week ago
126	O	and how did you pay for <u>this ticket</u>

The ticket is first mentioned three 'officer-turns' further up (omitted here for the sake of space). L118 is therefore already a repetition of a prior utterance.

Self-repetition, then, is a feature of both monolingual and interpreted interviews. However, apart from the temporal, intra-turn distance created by the interpreter, it could be argued that in interpreted interviews, the speaker (in this case the officer) is merely repeating himself as he would have done in the monolingual interview anyway. Therefore, whilst not denying the interactional function of self-repetition, the focus of this chapter is upon allo-repetition and the fourth of Tannen's (*ibid.*) functions, that of *interaction*, since we are concerned here with the effect of the interpreter upon the interaction process.

6:1:2 ALLO-REPETITION

This is the repetition of all or part of another speaker's turn. In the context of this study, it is manifested in the officer's repetition of elements of the detained person's turn, or *vice versa*.

To return to Jefferson (1972), I shall confine my analysis of allo-repetition to occurrences that perform an identifiable operation on a preceding speaker's turn, or, in the case of interpreted interviews, on a preceding primary participant's turn. Norrick (1987:247) uses a fragment from Svartvik & Quirk (1980:754) to illustrate this point:

(2) A I've got a [∂:] yes – a living in girl.

a A living in girl?

A Yes

Here, the identifiable operation performed by the second instantiation of "a living in girl" is to transform it into a question, with the aid of interrogative intonation. Norrick *(ibid.)* asserts that "By retaining the wording of the preceding utterance, this repeat concentrates the hearer's attention on the switch from declarative to interrogative form". (Norrick would here appear to be using "form" for "intonation".

From my own data, Extract 6:3 shows a similar, although not identical instantiation, since there is no interrogative intonation. It follows a sequence where DP has given an account of a complicated journey, purportedly just to buy cigarettes. The officer's repetition functions as a sarcastic question (as described in chapter 5), although the sarcasm is, in fact, ignored or misunderstood by DP, who merely repeats his original assertion. Different forms of repetition are discussed in section 6:3.

Extract 6:3

1	DP	and I thought like (.) oh it sounds <u>a good idea</u>
2	O	so having thought about all that you thought it was <u>a good idea</u>
3	DP	I thought oh that sounds like <u>a good idea</u>

6:1:3 FORM OF REPETITIONS

I return here to Tannen (1989:54) for a discussion of the forms of repetition that may be distinguished. She notes that "... instances of repetition may be placed along a scale of fixity in form, ranging from exact repetition (the same words uttered in the same rhythmic pattern), to paraphrase (similar ideas in different words)". The repetition may also vary in quantity, from a single word to a complete string. Further, the syntax of an utterance may be reproduced, with lexical differences or, conversely, the lexical items may be identical but embedded in a different syntactic structure.

Tannen *(ibid.)* also notes a temporal scale in repetition, which ranges from immediate (such as within-turn, self-repetition) to anywhere within the same discourse or even at a

distance of months or years. In the context of this thesis, the interview itself represents a repetition preceded by many such instantiations of the event.

Phonological considerations are, perhaps, the most difficult to pin down. The subjective nature of different hearers' aural perception and the consequent difficulty in identifying universally-agreed interpretations of the sounds that they hear, make it an inexact science, (Coulthard, 1992; Cruttenden, 1986; Coulthard & Brazil, 1982). Further, it cannot stand alone as a symbol of speakers' intentions. Its meaning is mutually dependent upon structural, pragmatic and contextual information, (Couper-Kuhlen, 1986; Kreidler, 1998). My interpretation of the officer's contribution as *sarcasm* in Extract 6:3 above, for example, relies heavily upon contextual information which I have not included in the Extract. Neither can I conceive of a way in which I could represent this attitudinal interpretation in notation. The analysis of the interpreted interview will show that these considerations become much more complicated with the addition of a second language and interposition of the interpreter.

6:2 REPETITION AS A CO-OPERATIVE STRATEGY IN THE MONOLINGUAL INTERVIEW

Although the interview is institutional in nature and therefore falls outside Tannen's (1989) conversational data discussed above, repetition is nonetheless a prominent feature and is used by both participants, in more or less equal measure, to express rapport. It is part of *co-murmuring*, which is the term I have given to the quiet, phatic exchanges that characterise the co-operative phase of monolingual interviews (see chapter 7), and is used collaboratively to build the story. For the purposes of this analysis, I shall focus upon instantiations of allo-repetition, forms of which are discussed in 6:4:1 below, and where:

- DP repeats O's utterances, henceforward **DP.AR** (DP's Allo-Repetition)
- O repeats DP's utterances, henceforward **O.AR** (Officer's Allo-Repetition)

Although mindful of the need to avoid a multiplicity of symbols, in order to discuss and compare these two categories, I shall refer to the first as type DP.AR (DP's Allo-Repetition) and the second as type O.AR (O's Allo-Repetition).

6:2:1 SOME COMMON FEATURES OF TYPES O.AR AND DP.AR

Apart from the obvious difference, that type DP.AR constitute, or are contained, in DP's answers to O's questions, and type O.AR are O's receipts of DP's answers, there are a number of factors common to both.

Concerning form, besides the range in fixity of form mentioned in 6:3, the syntax of an utterance may be reproduced, with lexical differences or, conversely, the lexical items may be identical but embedded in a different syntactic structure.

The change in either syntax or lexis may alter the proposition of the utterance, whilst still constituting a repetition. In Extract 6:4 below, for example, DP's switch of O's "quite" to "not", transforms O's proposition to a negative, in this case, a denial:

Extract 6:4

318	O	right (.) <u>quite happy with the *way* it was loaded</u>
319		(2.0)
320	DP	not <u>happy with the way it was loaded</u> but **hh** I'd no choice **hh**

As Tannen (ibid.) points out, there is also a phonological constituent to some repetition. Here the first utterance, which appears as 'new' has normal rising and falling intonation but the second, the repetition, which is 'given', is uttered in a monotone. The repetition becomes a single unit, or singularity. In my data, this is remarkably noticeable in both co-operative and confrontational repetition.

For the purposes of this analysis, I have applied fairly arbitrary criteria as to admissible distance between an utterance and what may be counted as its repetition. Generally, I have only counted those that appear within the same sub-topic. The practical result of this is that all of the repetitions counted as such are no further than four turns apart, as in Extract 6:5 below. This shows an insertion sequence with an O.AR repetition embedded in a DP.AR. The insertion sequence is, in fact, a blame avoidance move by the detained person. Although he is the agent for the removal of the disk, he ascribes responsibility to "the constable".

Extract 6:5

200	O	right
201	DP	(unclear)
202	O	who <u>removed</u> this tachograph
203		(1.5)
204	DP	ah the other <u>constable asked me for it</u>
205	O	the <u>constable asked you for it</u> so=
206	DP	=I <u>removed</u> it and gave it to him
207	O	right (.) so (.) and that was *after* that he'd found the illegals (1.0) or
208		not

6:2:2 CO-OPERATION IN TYPE DP.AR REPETITION

DP.AR, it will be remembered, is the repetition of O's utterance by DP. Whether or not O's utterance is structured as an interrogative, the fact that it gives rise to an answer from DP indicates both the perlocutionary effect of a question, and that it is the first pair part of an adjacency pair. Extract 6:6 below shows an apparent declarative from O, with an affirmative answer from DP in the form of a lexical repetition:

Extract 6:6

| 308 | O | you *load* <u>Thursday morning</u>= |
| 309 | DP | =<u>Thursday morning</u> |

Phonologically, the repetition above, and the majority of co-operative repetitions, resemble an echo, or a counterpoint in music, complementing the theme of the previous turn, in a lower key.

It is noticeable that in many instances, such as in Extract 6:7 below, DP could equally have replied simply "yes", but has chosen to repeat O's utterance in a display of co-operation:

Extract 6:7

| 206 | O | (country B) <u>just (country B)</u> |
| 207 | DP | <u>just (country B)</u> |

In Extract 6:8 no fewer than three elements that may be ascribed to co-operative discourse, or high involvement (Tannen 1984), are present. DP repeats O's question, latches to it and adds "yes", for good measure:

Extract 6:8

| 411 | O | °right° <u>that's the usual thing</u> is it= |
| 412 | DP | =<u>that's the usual thing</u> yes check (unclear) |

Extract 6:9 shows a longer display of co-operation, where DP not only repeats O's switch to the institutional "a.m.", (rather than "morning"), in L311, but extends it to "a.m. p.m." in his reply, in L312. In an instantiation of type B repetition, O continues the use of "a.m. p.m." in his receipt, before continuing with a raised, placatory intonation for "okay", followed quietly by " 's fine" and a one-second pause before a change of topic is signalled by a second "okay".

Extract 6:9

308	O	you *load* <u>Thursday morning</u>=
309	DP	=<u>Thursday morning</u>
310		(6.5)
311	O	<u>Thursday a.m. load</u> , now pl- probably t- =
312	DP	=<u>Thursday a.m. p.m. load</u>
313	O	<u>a.m. p.m.</u> ↑ okay °'s fine° (1.0) okay were you present when it- when
314		the vehicle was loaded ?

It can also be seen in lines 311-312 that DP repeats O's pronominal ellipsis. Extracts 6:10 and 6:11 below further demonstrate the use of elliptic forms in co-operative repetition:

Extract 6:10

71	O	°right° (6.5<u>) return to the lorry</u>?
72	DP	<u>return to the lorry</u>

Extract 6:11

534	O	right eighteen fifteen (.) <u>on your travels</u>=
535	DP	=<u>on me travels</u>

Latching of repetitions as in Extract 6:11 above is by no means prevalent in the monolingual interview under consideration. Of the 84 DP.AR repetitions, only 5 were latched, and only 11 of the 66 O.AR.

6:2:3 CO-OPERATION IN O.AR REPETITION

O.AR repetitions are the officer's repetitions of the detained person's turns. Whether they function as receipt markers, acknowledgements, evaluations, counter-claims or counter-assertions, they constitute some kind of comment upon DP's answers to O's questions. In this sense, they are a third turn in the sequence:

133

O : question

DP : answer

O : comment

whereby the officer retains control of the story. Conversely, DP's repetitions tend only to confirm or dis-confirm O's turns.

At first glance, some of these repetitions may appear to be phatic. However, O's repeats appear to have two distinct functions within the co-operative mood. Firstly, they serve as markers of conversational involvement and can clearly be identified as *co-murmuring*, (see Chapter 7:1) as in Extract 6:12 below:

Extract 6:12

81	O	you got *five* children
82	DP	<u>I lost one</u>
83	O	oh you <u>lost one</u> (.) sorry sorry about that (.) .hh °right° four children
84		(2.5) um (.) how old are they

A second type of O.AR repetition, although co-operative in the sense that it contributes to the co-construction of the story, appears to have both a checking function and one which orientates to the tape. In Extract 6:13 below, the officer and detained person are re-constructing the detained person's journey prior to his arrest. The first repetition (L417) is a checking move, to confirm understanding. However, the second (L419), is uttered in what I shall call "note-taking" mode, as if he were a motorist repeating directions, or a waiter taking orders. It may be termed a kind of self-talk and is generally, although not always, characterised by low volume as in Extract 6:14. However, although it is not unreasonable to suppose that the officer was indeed taking notes at the time, he may also have been ensuring that the information given was clearly recorded on tape. In this case it is not self-talk, but talk intended for "auditors" in Bell's (1984) audience design terms, that is listeners who are "known, ratified but not directly addressed" (Mason 2000:4).

Extract 6:13

414	O	... where (1.0) where'd you go from a:h (town R)
415		(1.5)
416	DP	came up as far as (town S)
417	O	sorry you came up to the ...
418	DP	(town S)
419	O	(town S) (2.5) yeah,

The note-taking or self-talk style is further exemplified in Extract 6:14 below, where O quietly repeats DP's turn, with ellipsis of the article:

Extract 6:14

594	O	right okay .h (1.0) right so you're heading (road number) any more
595		stops?
596	DP	.hh (1.0) the last stop before I hit (town H) (1.0) the last service station
597		before I hit (town H)
598	O	°last service station° (4.5) what time was that

Throughout the co-operative phase, the officer and detained person have been collaborating in the construction of a story, in this case details of the DP's background and employment, followed by a reconstruction of his journey immediately prior to his arrest. Personal experience reveals this to be a common interview strategy in cases of suspected facilitation or importation of drugs. The movements of the suspect are closely traced in order to build up an account, which can be confirmed or challenged later in the same interview, or in a subsequent interview.

6:3 REPETITION AS A STRATEGY FOR CONFRONTATION IN THE MONOLINGUAL INTERVIEW

In the present interview, following the co-operative reconstruction phase, the officer begins to probe and challenge the story that they have co-constructed. Repetitions continue; however, the tenor of these gradually changes. Extract 6:15 below shows the beginnings of disagreement:

Extract 6:15

```
192   O     =yeah ? just after twenty (.) ah zero zero thirty hours .hh a::nd obviously
193         that's- you then- for some reason you change the tachograph is that right ?
194   DP    I didn't change it no
195   O     no? (1.5) well we've got one written out
196   DP    I had one written out=
197   O     =you had one written out (.) but you hadn't put it in there  [yet  ]
198   DP                                                                 [that ] was one to
199         back up
```

In L193, the officer sets the challenging tenor by prefacing his question about changing the tachograph with "for some reason". DP's repetition as denial in L194 is emphasised by "no". In L195, O challenges again, repeating DP's "no" in a questioning tone before announcing "well we've got one written out". DP's explanation in L196 that he "had one written out" is readily accepted in a latched repetition by O, who appears to offer the further explanation on DP's behalf, that he had prepared a disk, but not yet put it in his tachograph.

It can be seen that O extends the repetition pair in lines 195 and 196 to form a three-turn sequence in line 197. An example of a more extended multi-part repetition can be seen in Extract 6:16 below. Following O's suggestion that DP was to be paid cash for committing the crime, DP initiates a series of assertions and counter-assertions:

136

Extract 6:16

597 DP .hh I don't <u>need money</u>

698   (3.0)

599 O   (name) everyone <u>needs money</u>

600 DP No not everyone don't <u>need money</u>

601 O   Everyone <u>needs money</u>

602 DP Do you <u>need money</u> ?

O's self repetition in line 601 fails to move the action forward, allowing DP to take the initiative, reversing the interview order in L602 and questioning the officer "Do you need money?" It is, in fact, difficult to classify this sequence as allo-repetition, since both O and DP could be said to be self-repeating.

The role reversal instigated by DP in L602 continues in Extract 6:17 below, following a three second, unfilled pause and O's filled pause:

Extract 6:17

603   (3.0)

604 O   a:::hm

605 DP <u>fair question</u>

606 O   <u>fair question</u> (1.0) a::h <u>fair question</u> is that why <u>do I do</u> the lottery each

607   week

608 DP <u>I don't do it</u>

609 O   right (1.0) I mean[(unclear)]

610 DP   [<u>I don't (.)] I don't do it</u>

611 O   right (1.0) now (1.0) well you- (2.0) are r- are you a religious man ?

612   (2.0)

613 DP No

137

In L605, DP successfully presses home his advantage, constraining O to produce what appears to be an evasive move (L606), prefaced by a repetition of DP's "fair question". O then uses "fair question" again as a preface to his evasion. DP's uncompromising reply in L608 is repeated in L610, where he takes back the turn from O, with "interruptive simultaneous speech" (Crown & Feldstein, 1985:33), refusing O's attempt at topic switch: "right (1.0) I mean ....".

6:3:1 CONFRONTATION IN DP.AR REPETITION

As with co-operative repetitions, DP.AR constitute or are contained in DP's replies to O's questions. However, in disagreement, the tenor of these becomes defiant and argumentative, as in Extract 6:18 below. The officer has remarked that there are no scuff marks on the trailer where people might have clambered in without the driver's knowledge. DP has countered by saying that there is no mud on the trailer to show marks because there has been no rain.

Extract 6:18

324	O	right (1.0) no <u>I mean</u> (.) the point I'm making to you is that...
325	DP	I know I know what <u>you mean</u> the- the the dirt marks on the side of the
326		trailer=
327	O	=yeah=
328	DP	= on the side of the cab yes I understand ex*actly* [what y- what <u>you]mean</u>
329	O	[right (1.0) okay]
330	O	.h and there was no sign *of* that (.) that's the point I'm making
331	DP	oh yes yes I ...
332	O	right (3.5) right now (3.0) I've removed a couple of bits from your erm cab ... ((continues))

It is notable that, although the exchange may be construed as co-operative when seen as written text, ("I know what you mean" is almost a caricature of co-operative conversation), the suprasegmentals heard on tape allow the repetition to be interpreted

as defiant or challenging. The full repetition is actually constituted by "I know what you mean", in L325 and then by the amplification with emphasis "I understand ex*actly* what you mean" in L328. The officer's unusual emphasis on '*of*' (L330) appears to be an instantiation of Cruttenden's (1986:85) "insists", used to counter a pre-supposition with nucleus placement on a word not normally stressed. In L331, DP attempts to persist in his apparent agreement, but for some reason, perhaps a sign or gesture from O, peters out and relinquishes the turn. Point made, O closes the topic in L332 and announces a new one.

Extract 6:19 shows a four-line assertion by O, where DP's reply, although much shorter, is almost entirely constituted of salient segments of O's turn.

Extract 6:19

587	O	right (3.5) you see (3.0) I be*lieve* that what happened is that you were- had
588		to stop at that service area to pick up your (1.0) load of (number) persons
589		(.) *my* belief is (1.0) right ? now (10.0) what I'm saying to you (name) is that
590		you're not the person I'm after (2.5) right ?
591	DP	wh- what you're saying to me is you believe I have (.) deliberately stopped
592		there to pick up ...

In L589-90, O is implicitly offering an "out" to DP, with an attempt to return to co-operative mode, including use of DP's first name. However, as in Extract 6:17, DP remains uncompromising and picks up first on O's metalanguage, "what I'm saying to you (name) is...", before going on to repeat O's hypothesis with 3 more repetitions ("you believe", "stopped" and "pick up"), amplified by "deliberately". DP could have paraphrased O's challenge, or simply denied it, using a completely different structure and lexis, but the point is that he is almost parodying the officer's turn. In fact, L591 is an example of an "upshot" (Thomas, 1985:230) where, following O's conciliatory move in L589-90, DP has assumed the role of the more powerful interactant and summarises in an "unpalatable" (*ibid.*) manner L587-8 of O's turn.

Although DP.AR and O.AR repetitions are more or less evenly distributed in co-operative mode, there are fewer instantiations of O.AR repetitions, compared to DP.AR in confrontational mode. That is, the officer repeats the detained person less than the detained person repeats the officer. Distribution of types across modes will be examined in the conclusion to the monolingual analysis. However, only two clear instantiations emerge from the data of this phase of the interview. The first was seen in Extract 6:16 above, including lines 597 to 602, where a set of assertion and counter assertion occurs.

Secondly, in Extract 6:20 below, which continues the theme of money, O suggests again that the need for money is material in this case. Following DP's assertion that mobile phones are expensive, implying that he would not have one if he were hard up, O's emphatic repetition in L501, "They *are* expensive" appears to have a different pragmatic force altogether. One might conjecture that *sous entendu* is "So where did you get the money to buy one?" DP's repetition of "hence" appears gratuitous and somewhat mis-placed in the context of his utterance. It *may* demonstrate the strength of the compulsion towards allo-repetition in argument.

Extract 6:20

496	O	°right° .hhh because: that pre-empts my next question (.) really because .hh
497		the majority of people that I interview li- I-I mean like l- like yourself (1.5)
498		a::hm (.) who (.) commit the offence of facilitation (.) have monetary
499		problems ((clears throat)) h-hence I asked that question
400	DP	hence I have a mobile phone .hh if I hadn't **hhh** and they're expensive **hhh**
401	O	they *are* expensive=

6:4 EVIDENCE OF THE PROGRESSION FROM CO-OPERATIVE TO CONFRONTATIONAL REPETITION

The monolingual interview under analysis conforms to the separate, although not distinct, phases mentioned in Chapter 2:4. The first phase, which extends over the first 49 minutes of the interview, is characterised by co-operative repetition and may be further sub-divided into:

a) *the life-story phase;*

b) *the journey phase.*

In the *life-story phase*, which begins immediately after the preliminary formalities, the officer's questions are centred on the detained person's personal circumstances and present employment. The co-operative repetitions are phatic in nature and, together with quiet speech and non-verbal vocalisations such as "Mhmm", display the features of *co-murmuring*. Extract 6:21 below, showing a DP.AR, has instantiations of both of these features.

Extract 6:21

175 DP just-s he: went bust in around about (5.0) last (month)

176   (7.5)

177 O   right so (#) you've been virtually unemployed for what (.) <u>ten months</u>

178 DP mhmm [°yeah°]

179 O   [°that's] a long time°

180 DP more or less in hospital for the <u>ten months</u>=

181 O   =oh *really*

182 DP °yeah°

183   (1.0)

184 O   ((sighs))

The life story phase covers the first 5 minutes after the preliminaries, that is, up to minute nine of the interview. From minute nine, following a nine-second pause, the officer announces a topic switch to the journey phase, with questions specifically concerning the journey leading up to DP's arrest. (Extract 6:22 below).

Extract 6:22

```
213         (9.0)
214    O    right (.) now (.) this is the third trip you've been on ,
215    DP   mhmm=
216    O    =ahm when did you leave (country E) on this (#) current trip
```

DP's replies are entirely co-operative, as discussed in chapter 2, as are O's receipts. In the journey phase of the interview, the officer's receipts are mostly of the "note-taking" type, as he seeks to establish clearly on tape the different stages of DP's journey.

The journey phase continues, in co-operative mode, up to the end of minute 49 where, as in extract 6:15 (reproduced below for ease of reference), the officer begins to probe and challenge the story.

Extract 6:15

```
192    O    =yeah ? just after twenty (.) ah zero zero thirty hours .hh a::nd obviously
193         that's- you then- for some reason you change the tachograph is that right ?
194    DP   I didn't change it no
195    O    no? (1.5) well we've got one written out
196    DP   I had one written out=
197    O    =you had one written out (.) but you hadn't put it in there  [yet ]
198    DP                                                               [that ] was one to
199         back up
```

The change from co-operative to confrontational mode is neither distinct nor sustained by both participants. DP continues to "do being co-operative" until its strategic value ceases, to be replaced by confrontation in the form of outright denial. O returns periodically to story-building mode. However, as can be seen from Extract 6:23 below, in minute 51, he is in fact beginning to probe a part of the story which has already been told:

Extract 6:23

243	DP	but (.) what I'm afraid is- the strain- it's only a new trailer (1.0) I'm afraid
244		of straining the doors (1.0) so I put the strap across to keep the doors
245	O	right .hh so it took you wh- a minute or two to undo (.) the strap ?
246	DP	yeah yeah
247	O	and then you got the er doors which ah (.) come out...
248	DP	the bar doors yes
249	O	bar doors which open (1.0) up (1.0) and you then showed (.) showed the er
250		detective ahm ,
251	DP	(unclear)
252	O	right (1.5) and you didn't initially see the movement is that right ?
253	DP	he says standing up there there's a foot **hhh** ((laughs)) (unclear)
254	O	°okay° (1.5) you see (1.5) the problem (.) I find with the case personally
255		(2.0) is that (1.5) how did they get in there .hh because (3.0) we've already
256		discussed that you had a strap holding in .h your rear door so the access to
257		(1.0) the- the trailer (.) through the rear would be quite difficult to
258		[(unclear)]
259	DP	[impossible]

In preceding turns, O has led DP to confirm that the rear doors of the trailer are secured by a strap, for which DP has offered an explanation in L243-4. O's declarative question in L245, repeating "the strap" is answered helpfully by DP, who continues "doing being co-operative", in what might be called a *clarifying* repetition, by supplying the completed

term "bar doors" in L248, before replying affirmatively. In L252, O's "Right" appears to announce a topic switch, which DP finds safe, since he laughs. However, O now reaches the point of the whole sequence. This was to use a description of events when the police caused the trailer to be opened for a search to establish how difficult it would have been for the illegal immigrants to gain access to the trailer during the journey, without DP's knowledge. L254-8 contain the challenge which causes DP to abandon "doing being co-operative" for a direct denial which overlaps the end of O's turn and is emphatic enough to render it inaudible.

From minute 62, DP has abandoned all pretence of co-operation. The tenor of his repeats becomes more confrontational, as the following extracts show, and there are no further co-operative repeats from here to the end of the interview.

Extract 6:24

472	O	(amount) (2.0) now am I right in saying that things are tight financially at
473		home ?
474	DP	no
475	O	no ? (6.0) a::hm I mean you've got a large family
476	DP	no (5.0) four's not large
477	O	well (1.0) it's a lot of mouths to feed

O's question (beginning with a repetition of the amount of money mentioned in the previous turn by DP) concerning family finances is not overtly confrontational. On the contrary, after repeating the amount of DP's pay from the previous turn, he uses highly mitigated meta-language to introduce his declarative question. Nonetheless, it elicits a flat denial from DP in L474 who, one might speculate, has guessed where this line of question is leading. Following his questioning repetition of "no" in L475, O leaves a significant 6 second pause. When DP fails to take up the turn, O is obliged to continue, filling the rest of the pause before producing another attempt. Again, DP responds flatly "no" and leaves a 5 second pause which O does not see as a transition relevance point,

allowing DP to amplify his denial. Finally, O appears to accept that the attempt has failed, closing the topic with a remark, rather than a further question.

A similarly argumentative tenor can be seen in extract 6:25 below, in minute 65, which degenerates into a sequence of assertion and counter-assertion:

Extract 6:25

549 O   .hh hh and the question I ask is that why d'you stop . and sorry but to obtain
550   a bottle of coke (.) packet of sweets and a cup of tea doesn't make sense
551   especially when you're on a tight- .hh tightly run thing to catch your
552   favourite ferry
553 DP   It's not my favourite ferry it's what I want to avoid- is avoid the gendarmes
554   yes he's=
555 O   =but what I'm saying to you is that you wouldn't have to avoid the
556   gendarmes ((clears throat)) because you wouldn't have to speed
557 DP   I would (1.0) because of this
558   (2.0)
559 O   You wouldn't have to speed at that speed if you didn't stop (1.5) for five
560   minutes .
561 DP   I would've (unclear)=
562 O   =yeah but not at that great a speed
563 DP   I would've (1.0) every time I pass that péage (1.5) I do the exact same thing
564   (4.0) every time I pass it
565   (3.0)

From L553, DP flatly contradicts O's assertions. In a classic example of the lexicalisation of a repeat (Pawley, 1986) "It's not..." is pronounced emphatically, with raised intonation, followed by the repeat "my favourite ferry", which is pronounced in a low monotone, almost as a single word.

As a sequence of "would/wouldn't" assertion and counter-assertion is set up, the tenor becomes argumentative, with faster turns and latching. The only between-turn pause (L558) is at a point where (in the context of O's turn in L521) it can be assumed that DP is silently indicating his tachograph.

It is remarkable that, although DP's unmitigated denials are responses to O's first pair parts, they do not appear to be mirroring any corresponding linguistic aggression from O. On the contrary, although the *content* of O's turns constitutes a challenge, linguistically, they are still mitigated, or highly mitigated, as in Extract 6:26 below:

Extract 6:26

629	O	See the point I'm making (.) really (1.0) is that (.) unfortunately in this
630		circumstances you've <u>been caught</u>
631	DP	I haven't <u>been caught</u> because I haven't done anything wrong (2.0) you're
632		surmising I've <u>been caught</u> .hh (1.0) but if you c'n get (.) we say five
633		minutes (.) if you can get four bodies into my trailer (1.0) in five minutes
634		(1.5) I'd like to see you do it (1.5) as you said (1.0) you don't know wh-
635		what how to do it now=

DP's "bald on record " (Brown & Levinson 1987) denials in the confrontational phase concur with the second and third categories in Rees-Miller's (2000:1094-5) taxonomy of disagreement types.

1. softened disagreement with linguistic markers for positive politeness (positive comment, humour etc.) and negative politeness (questions, *I think/don't know*, downtoners such as *maybe/sort of* and verbs of uncertainty);
2. disagreement not softened or strengthened, made explicit by contradictory statement or verbal shadowing;
3. aggravated disagreement, made explicit by rhetorical questions, intensifiers, personal accusatory *you*, judgmental vocabulary.

They can be contrasted with DP's disagreements which feature in the co-operative section, as in Extract 6:27 below, where his repetition disagrees with O's proposition, but with laughter in his voice, as in Rees-Miller's (*ibid.*) first category.

Extract 6:27

318 O   Right (.) quite happy with the *way* it was loaded
319   (2.0)
320 DP   Not happy with the way it was loaded but **hh** I'd no choice **hh**

CONCLUSION TO MONOLINGUAL ANALYSIS

From the foregoing analysis, it can be seen that repetition is a powerful and pervasive feature of the interview. It is used co-operatively to express agreement, understanding, empathy and confirmation. Conversely, in confrontational mood, it expresses disagreement, denial, counter-assertion and challenge. It is used equally by officer and detained person to express co-operation and as part of *co-murmuring*, and principally by the detained person in confrontation.

As an indication of the pervasiveness of repetition, there is a total of 178 repeats in the 76 minute interview, which breaks down as follows:

CO-OPERATIVE	CONFRONTATIONAL
DP.AR 64	DP.AR 31
O.AR 60	O.AR 23

It can be seen that the detained person produces more repeats overall. However, the discrepancy in co-operative mode is almost negligible. It is greater in confrontational mode, where DP produces 57% of the total, than in co-operative mode, where he produces 52%.

147

As in the courtroom, one of the defining characteristics of the investigative interview is purported to be asymmetry of power. (Harris, 1984; Thomas 1985; Jönsson & Linell, 1991; Komter, 1995). However, this appears to have virtually no effect on the relative frequency of DP/O co-operative repetitions. The co-construction of the story is achieved with almost equal contributions of repetition and *co-murmuring* from DP and O, despite their underlying, divergent agendas.

Further, it is difficult to ascribe the more marked difference in relative frequency in the confrontational phase to asymmetry of power, since this cannot be inferred from the data.

In conclusion, although the relative frequencies of DP.AR and O.AR are hardly significant, the high number of instantiations and variety of strategies that they serve indicate their utility to both participants as a resource in the monolingual interview.

Having traced the use of repetition in the progression from phase to phase of the monolingual interview, I shall now examine an interpreted interview, in order to compare its frequency and uses in the interpreted data.

6:5 REPETITION IN THE INTERPRETED INTERVIEW

The presence of an intermediary means that *direct* repetition of complete utterances between principal participants cannot occur in the interpreted interview. The detained person's replies are reactions to the interpreter's lexical, semantic and pragmatic choices in rendering the officer's questions. The officer's next-turn questions are, or may be, affected by the interpreter's rendering of the detained person's replies. This holds true, not only for identifiable questions, but for any utterances designed to elicit a next-turn answer, such as suggestions, confirmatory and clarifying moves, probes and challenges.

However, each primary participant appears to perceive the interpreter as the embodiment of the other, or rather, of the other's speech. Therefore, in repeating the

lexico-syntactic content of the interpreter's utterance, their *intention* is repetition of each other. Of course, although interpreting itself is inherently repetition, the interpreter cannot be said to be repeating in the sense described in section 6:1. Extract 6:28 below might therefore be seen as the paradigm case for repetition in the interpreted interview. In this case, the officer's repetition is a clarificatory move. The interpreter's turns perform no identifiable operation on the preceding turn and, if they were removed, we would see a simple O/AR.

Extract 6:28

311	DP	et puis <u>le passeport de mon fils</u>
312	I	and <u>my son's passport</u>
313	O	<u>your son's passport</u>?
314	I	<u>le passeport de votre fils</u>?
315	DP	oui

Lexical repetition, or at least similarity, in the interpreted interview is not impossible. Like English, French is a S-V-O language and, apart from obvious differences such as noun-adjective inversion, structure is broadly similar at the level of the sentence. Further, although French has stayed close to its Latin roots, there are sufficient lexico-semantic similarities to allow instantiations of the much-maligned 'word-for-word' translation between the two languages. These two similarities, structural and lexico-semantic, are demonstrated by the simple, confirmatory DP/AR repetition in Extract 6:29 below:

Extract 6:29

679	O	OK (.) and then <u>the bus left</u>?
680	I	alors <u>le bus est parti</u>?
681	DP	oui <u>le bus est parti</u>
682	I	yes

The difficulty of pinning down what, exactly, constitutes repetition in an interpreted exchange is perhaps best illustrated in the use of idiomatic expressions, which can only be retrieved as pragmatic or semantic wholes, since the component parts, translated word-for-word, have no equivalent meaning. Expressions such as "To sit on the fence", for example, translated by "Nager entre deux eaux" (lit. "to swim between two waters"), call for fleetness of foot ("le pied léger") on the part of the interpreter if these are the two parts of an allo-repetition.

However, it is the range of pragmatic uses of repetition that appears to be restricted by the intervention of an interpreter. In the monolingual interview examined for this chapter, its use was demonstrated in co-operative mode, to express agreement, understanding, empathy and confirmation, and in confrontational mode, to express disagreement, denial, counter-assertion and challenge. The interpreted interview, similarly analysed, revealed not only fewer instantiations of repetitions overall, (46, as opposed to 178 in the monolingual interview), but a restricted, and somewhat different, range of pragmatic uses.

Firstly, as noted in chapter 2, affective markers such as co-murmuring are entirely absent from interpreted interviews. There is therefore no use of repetition as *co-murmuring*, as demonstrated in extract 6:12, this chapter. At the other end of the co-operative-probe/challenge continuum, it is not used confrontationally, as in, for example, Extract 6:19, this chapter. This is not to say that there are no signs of participants' orientation to the probe/challenge phase. In Extract 6:30 below, DP issues an outright denial:

Extract 6:30

997	O	yes I-I do appreciate that but what I'm *saying* is that the immigra- the
998		immigration officer says that he found (1.0) this within the briefcase
999	I	Ce- ce que je dis en fait c'est que (.) [l'officier d'immigration]
		([tape buzzer sounds)]
1000		(2.5)
1001	I	l'- c'est que l'officier d'immigration a trouvé tous ces enveloppes et ce

1002		ce petit (.) euh (1.0) carte? dans dans votre sac à main
1003	DP	Non (.) c'était dans / mon / porte / feuille (.) [je sais où je le] mettais
1004	I	[it was in my wallet]
1005	DP	c'était *dans* mon portefeuille (continues)

The place in which the card was found is material to this case and DP's reaction in lines 1003-5 is reflected in his measured stress of the words "dans / mon / porte / feuille" ("in my wallet"). He even breaks portefeuille (normally pronounced as a single word) into two segments, for emphasis, further stressing *"dans"*, ("in") in L1005. Interestingly, the interpreter in this case has chosen to "co-ordinate", in Wadensjö's (1998) terms, by referring back to envelopes and a card that were mentioned by the officer five turns previously. The detained person, however, ignores the reference to the envelopes, which are not material, and maintains that "it" (the card) was in his wallet.

Secondly, a greater number of the repetitions in the interpreted interview can, perhaps unsurprisingly, be categorised as clarifying or confirming moves, or requests for clarification as in the O/AR of Extract 6:31, below. In Hallidayan terms, repetition is used here almost exclusively for *ideational* reasons, not, as in the monolingual interview, for *interpersonal* reasons. (Halliday, 1994).

Extract 6:31

440	DP	elle me connaît bien, alors elle [m'a appellé ...]
441	I	[she- she knows]me well so she (.) I saw
442		her
443	DP	en me disant qu'elle m'attendait depuis
444	I	and she- she had said that she was waiting for me
445		(1.5)
446	O	she was waiting for you?
447	I	elle vous attendait?
448	DP	mm

449   O   had you arranged to meet her?

The fact that the woman was waiting for the detained person is new information, and the officer checks understanding of this, before proceeding to establish in L449 whether the meeting was pre-arranged.

The DP/AR in Extract 6:32 below, is a checking move at the end of a sequence where choice of lexis and translation of prepositions of place, threaten to confuse a vital point.

Extract 6:32

908   O   so you put it in the compartment and then <u>put the newspaper on top</u> (.) is
909   that right?
910   I   donc vous l'avez mis dans un compartiment et vous avez mis <u>le journal</u>
911   <u>au dessus</u>
912   (1.0)
913   DP   j'ai mis l'enveloppe? non <u>je l'ai mis en haut</u> comme ça
914   I   <u>I put it on top</u> (1.0) like that
915   (1.5)
916   O   so you put it in the <u>compartment</u>,
917   I   donc vous l'avez mis dans le <u>compartiment</u>.
918   DP   c'est ce qu'on appelle <u>compartiment</u>?
919   I   that's what you call <u>compartment</u>?
920   O   well (2.5) yes
921   I   yes (.) yes
922   SOL   on the shelf may be a better=
923   O   =OK you put it on the shelf,
924   I   donc vous l'avez mis sur l'- l'é-étagère
925   DP   voilà

It becomes clear subsequently that DP was trying to say that he simply put the newspaper on the overhead luggage rack on top of the paper, whilst putting on his jacket, not in

order to conceal it. However, the officer suggests, L908-9, that he put the paper in the rack and then put the newspaper on top (to hide it). DP's repair "no, I put it up above, like that" is mis-translated by I in L 914 as "I put it on top". DP's repair therefore goes unremarked, and the clarifying sequence in L916-919 serves no purpose until the solicitor intervenes in L922. Several turns earlier, the officer had used the expression "the luggage compartment above your head". Had the interpreter translated this as "le porte-bagages" rather than as simply "compartiment", the mis-communication may not have taken place. Thus it can be seen that in extracts 6:31 and 6:32, repetition serves a cognitive or mechanical function, rather than an affective one.

Concerning intonation, two factors mitigate against the likelihood of echoed intonation in interpreted repetitions.

1. Intonation and stress patterns, or nucleus placement, differ between English and French. For example, French has a falling end tone on WH questions and may have a rise-fall on declarative questions. Further, as Cruttenden (1986) notes, not only is French a syllable-timed language, (whereas English is stress-timed), it also uses word order variation as an alternative to nucleus movement to accentuate certain items in an utterance, as in the following, where "moi" ("me") is added for stress before "je" ("I"):
   "You can stay, but *I'm* leaving"
   "Vous pouvez rester, mais moi, je pars".

2. The insertion of interpreter's turns between one speaker's utterance and the other's repetition means that the rhythm which can be set up in the dyadic exchange of the monolingual interview is broken by the interpreter's turn. This is true not only in repetition, but in the wider context of the interview as a whole.

A comparative study of intonation is beyond the scope of this thesis, however, the analysis has shown no instantiations of echoed intonation, either O/AR or DP/AR in the interpreted interview.

153

In conclusion, whether consciously or unconsciously, it would seem that, in spite of the diversity of its strategic uses in the monolingual interview, neither the officer nor the detained person perceives repetition as a strategy to be used pervasively in the interpreted interview. Indeed, there were almost four times fewer instantiations in the interpreted interview that in the monolingual. Where used, it functions principally as a mechanism for clarification and repair. It is the *affective* uses of repetition, as a feature of empathy or discord, that are not utilised by the primary participants. This indicates that, although there is no evidence in this interview to show that the interpreter acts as a barrier to the communication of emotion, repetition is less likely to be chosen as the means for expressing it. Together with features such as intonation mentioned in this chapter, the constraints on repetition simply add to the ways in which interpreting serves to create a distance between the discourses of primary participants.

CHAPTER 7

FURTHER FEATURES OF THE INTERPRETER-EFFECT

The preceding chapters have examined in detail the phenomena of translatability of *and-*prefaced questions and repetitions. However, a number of other phenomena are apparent in the data, and although these are treated here in less depth, this chapter suggests that they nonetheless contribute to the pervasive 'interpreter-effect'. The first of these, which I have termed *co-murmuring*, is used as a strategy in monolingual interviews, but is simply not available in those where an interpreter is present.

The last three features addressed in this chapter concern interpreters' divergent renditions where an equivalent, or near equivalent is:

a) technically available but routinely ignored by interpreters, as in the case of the discourse marker 'OK' (section 7:2);

b) available but avoided due to perceived social imposition (section 7:3)

c) modified or added to, as a product of the interpreter's contextual knowledge.

7:1 CO-MURMURING

During the co-operative phase of the *monolingual* interview, as described in chapter 2, officer and detained person jointly establish safe, unthreatening facts. They produce quiet, phatic exchanges, characterised by response tokens such as 'yeah', 'mhmm' and latching and over-lapping, which I have termed *'co-murmuring'*. Goffman (1981:342) terms these "...the clucks and tsks and aspirated breaths, the goshes and gollies and wows...". My term *co-murmuring* and description as "phatic" does not, however, refer solely to the phonological quality of these exchanges, but also to the content. There are excursions into unrelated matters, metalanguage about the organisation of utterances, ("Just tell me in your own words", "I just want to ask you, very quickly...". In this way, *co-murmuring* as an interpersonal metafunction (Halliday 1994) exemplifies both the

lexicogrammatical and phonological manifestations of solidarity (Martin 1992). It may also include "chat", a term that Antaki (2,000:1) says speakers use to "promote a description of a warm, informal and above all *blameless* event", (my emphasis). Participants finish each other's utterances and co-construct the 'story'.

Arminen (2,000:446) suggests that it is in "quasiformal" interactions that these shifts between specifically institutional exchanges and conversational exchanges take place. Indeed, as noted in chapter 2, the interview with suspect, unlike the trial, does shift between formal/legal style and informal style and therefore appears to fall within her category of "quasiformal". Ten Have (1989) also notes that there are moments in the medical consultation when the exchange is more akin to informal conversation than to a consultation. Further, Silverman (1999) makes the point that institutional talk covers a range of forms from, for example, the strict organisation of legal talk in court to that found in, for example, counselling sessions.

Extract 7:1 below, shows both phonological and propositional aspects of co-murmuring:

Extract 7:1

248 DP   we were all *very* tired
249 O   I'm sure you were it's a long drive isn't it=
250 DP   =well we hadn't slept for a few days and=
251 O   =sure that's right (1.0) hence the reason you've had your sleep period
252   here
253 DP   yeah (.) much appreciated as well thank you
254 O   °yeah° absolutely and when you got to the kiosk at (Town A)=
255 DP   =mhmm

In L248, the detained person blames lack of sleep for his inability to remember certain details. The officer swiftly agrees in L249, and his phatic addition "it's a long drive isn't it", invites DP to continue the excursion into 'chat'. The officer's further agreement in L251 is followed by a clear signal of his orientation to his institutional role of police

officer. From the tenor of the preceding turns, one might have expected "you've had a rest", or "you've had time for a sleep". However, detained persons are entitled to what is termed an 8-hour sleep period, or rest period, if it is deemed that they may be too tired for interview. In using "sleep period, the officer marks (for the tape) the fact that procedure had been respected, using "hence" to link cause and result, which could be paraphrased: "you were tired, so we let you rest".

The officer's quiet receipt of DP's thanks is followed by "and" to mark a return to the re-construction of the journey. However, DP's back-channel "mhmm", supplies a "continuer" in Schegloff's (1982:81) terms, or an "encouragement" according to Czyzewski (1995:77), which indicates that his perception of the co-operative mood continues.

Extract 7:2 below, also includes both phonological and content aspects of co-murmuring. In this extract, from the life-story phase, the officer allows DP an excursion into health problems, before re-orientating the talk to the interview. *Co-murmuring* is here marked in bold type, to differentiate it from its 'interview-talk' environment.

Extract 7:2

125	O	and where are they based
126		(2.0)
127	DP	(town name) (3.5) (county name)
128		(7.0)
129	O	°alright° (1.0) and how long've you been employed by them
130		(1.0)
131	DP	rhree weeks
132	O	**really** ((sniff)) (2.0) who were you er employed with prior to that
133	DP	I was off
134		(1.0)
135	O	sorry

136	DP	I was (.) I was in hospital
137	O	**you were in _hospital_ (.) is there something wrong with you or ...**
138	DP	**no two year ago I- I broke my shoulders in a car accident and I had to**
139		**go ba- I had to go back in**
140		**(1.5)**
141	O	**°right°**
142	DP	**to get 'em sorted out**
143	O	**°right° and .hh (.) who I mean prior to obviously you being employed**
144		**by (company name) you you [obviously]**
145	DP	[I was with](company name) in (place
		name)
146	O	(company name?)
147	DP	°mm° (place name)

The officer's receipt "really" in L132 marks an excursion into co-murmuring in this extract. It is a highly unusual receipt in the context of a police interview, more akin to Heritage's (1984) use of 'oh' as a change-of-state token, and gives a clear indication of the phatic nature of this section of talk. By phatic, I mean here talk that serves to communicate feelings, rather than to advance the propositional content of the interview. Again, in L137, O's whole turn is an invitation to DP to share the details of his illness, petering out ("or...") as a way of offering the turn. Having thus invited DP to enlarge upon his health, O leaves him the turn by uttering a quiet receipt, °right°. He does not take control of the topic again until L143, after another quiet receipt, at which point he uses "and", an aspirated breath and a brief pause to mark the topic switch. As in Extract 7:2 above, co-murmuring continues after the return to the interview topic. DP overlaps with O's highly mitigated request for the company name, providing not only the name, but the place where the company is located. O's checking move in L147 produces a quiet confirmation and helpful repeat of the place name in L148.

Other features, such as humorous asides, self-deprecating remarks, hedging and confirmatory repetition of each other, also pervasive in the co-operative phases, are present in extract 7:3

Extract 7:3

462	O	right so twelve hundred twelve-twelve midday (.) stop (1.0) a::hm diesel?
463		yeah?
464	DP	mhm
465		(2.5)
466	O	a:::h (.) that takes what ten minutes ?
467	DP	bout a half an hour
468	O	half an hour **hhh**
469	DP	I (.) took nearly six hundred litres of diesel **hhh=**
470	O	=okay (.) yeah alright I'm not a lorry driver ((laughter in voice)) I'm the first
471		to admit it (.) right (.) so twelve thirty off you go again
472		(1.0)
473	DP	mm

This extract is characterised by outright laughter in L468-9 and self-deprecating laughter in O's voice in L470. O's utterance here finishes with what might almost be termed 'nursery talk' as he resumes the journey topic with "off you go again".

It is, of course, difficult to make assumptions about the participants' state of mind. However, the phases of the interview can clearly be traced through the interaction. The "sectional analysis" (Heritage, 1997:167) of the interview is a product of the interaction, not a framework into which the data has been artificially fitted. Co-murmuring happens in the co-operative phase of the monolingual interview and, as I have demonstrated, is evident in the data. The officer uses it as a strategy in the life-story and journey phases to set up a friendly ambience in which DP will agree or commit to a story which might then be probed. The detained person also uses it as a strategy, to build an apparently co-operative persona for himself as an indication of innocence.

However, the presence of an interpreter makes such exchanges very unlikely, and their absence means that there is no way for both participants to implicitly mark their arrival on safe ground. It isn't as if the officer tries and fails to set up co-murmuring through the interpreter. He doesn't even try. Although many of the manifestations of co-murmuring are untranslatable, and although primary participants cannot, for example, finish each other's sentences, they are reproducible. Goffman's (1981:342) "clucks and tsks and aspirated breaths..." are no less effective in French than in English. Phatic communication exists in both cultures. The mood is generated by the officer and, from my personal experience, on the rare occasions when a foreign DP makes an attempt at humour, for example, as in extract 7:4 below, it is not treated as an allowable contribution by the officer.

Extract 7:4

515	O	°yeah° now do you *understand* that it is illegal (.) to import (1.5)
516		cocaine into this country
517	I	est-ce que vous comprenez que c'est illégal d'importer de la cocaïne
518		dans ce pays
519	DP	ben oui parce-que j'suis là (laughs)
520	I	(smile in voice) yes because he's here
521	O	OK .hh just come on to (2.0) this paper I've got this is er (1.0) obtained
522		from er (company name) from their um (.) records (1.0) ... ... (continues)

DP's attempt at humour in L519 is rendered by the interpreter, by what can only be described as a smile in her voice. The use of third person on her part is not an instance of distancing herself, since she makes use of it throughout most of the interview. On the contrary, it might be suggested that this close rendition of a paralinguistic feature such as laughter could demonstrate the interpreter's alignment with DP. There is, however, no other evidence of such alignment in this interview. The humour elicits no corresponding lightness on the part of the officer. He simply does not respond to it, and

160

therefore no co-murmuring is set up. He appears to perceive it as an inappropriate behaviour in the interpreted interview.

7:2 'OK' AS A DISCOURSE MARKER USED BY OFFICERS

'OK' used by officers as a discourse marker, is ubiquitous, almost to the point of characterising the genre, and is almost never translated by interpreters. It serves variously as:

a) a framing move, in Sinclair & Coulthard's (1978) terms announcing a change of topic:

.

1	DP	that it's (.) it's only the little people that are caught and not the big ones
2	O	OK .hh I'm showing (name) a piece of paper that he gave to a customs
3		officer earlier

b) a receipt marker:

1	O	and what was the purpose of your visit here
2	DP	me? I was going to see my wife because tomorrow is her birthday
3	O	OK (.) and where is she er living in (country)

c) an interruptor, used for taking back, or attempting to take back, the turn:

1	O	what's the address of the bank
2	DP	it's there=
3	O	=OK which is Agence ...

d) a device for *not* taking back the turn – meaning "please continue":

| 1 | DP | it was about tea time (.) about five o'clock-ish |
| 2 | O | OK |

161

3	DP	just rough at that time (1.0) I'm not quite sure

e) a request for agreement:

1	DP	I thought it was the same reference as my passport
2	O	the same initials but a different number (1.0) OK?
3	SOL	it's the same initials but a different number

Following Heritage (1984), Czyzewski (1995:75) says that response tokens, long ignored as unimportant and meaningless particles, are "interactional devices" and as such, are integral to the on-going organisation of the interaction. It can be seen from the above examples that the pragmatic value of a single response token can change according to its sequential environment. In interviews with suspects, 'OK' is the most commonly used discourse marker by officers and could be said to shape and direct the course of the interview. It is self-evident that 'OK' is rarely used by English-speaking detained persons, as it would be unusual to respond to the type of questions asked in interviews with a receipt. Where used, it may serve, for example, as a continuer in an interrupted narrative, as in extract 7:5 below:

Extract 7:5

511	O	whereabouts is this situated
512	DP	just as you- more or less there's about (4.5) (unclear) ans (.) the
513		motorway (2.0) from the (road number)
514	O	right
515	DP	OK I was i- I was in that for about (.) just chatting for about an hour (.)
		where you normally (continues)

There are no instantiations of 'OK' used by French-speaking detained persons in my data, and its treatment by interpreters is discussed in section 7:3 below.

Phonological clues to variations in the use of 'OK' are difficult to pin down and to represent in transcription. Certainly Coulthard's (1992:35) scepticism concerning the likelihood of finding "... some set of agreed and mutually exclusive attitudinal labels to match against the intonation choices ..." seems justified. Any attempt to ascribe definitive illocutionary force to variations in intonation would appear subjective in the extreme. From the data, no *consistent* intonational patterns have emerged, concerning rise and fall. In fact, the word 'okay' often appears to constitute a single tonic segment, in that neither syllable is higher in pitch or more prominent. Indeed, it is often reduced to a single syllable, ' 'kay'.

However, there does appear to be some correlation between length of pauses after 'OK' in a) and b):

a) is second in order of frequency and tends to be followed by no pause at all, or by one which is barely perceptible;

b) has by far the highest frequency and is almost always followed by a pause.

This does not appear to bear out Sinclair and Coulthard's (1975) findings, cited in Coulthard (1992:36) that 'OK' when used as a framing move, has a "following silent stress". It is possible that the difference relates to the particular institutional genre, since Sinclair & Coulthard's study centred on classroom discourse.

The use of 'OK' as a receipt marker bears similarities to Heritage's (1992) findings concerning 'certainly' as a receipt marker in data taken from small claims court recordings. He felt that, because of the obligatory neutrality of the arbitrator, 'certainly' was used to express neither affiliation nor disaffiliation with the replies of plaintiffs and defendants to his questions. Similarly, one of the two objectives of the interview is to obtain information (the other being to gather evidence), and in this respect, the officer's acknowledgement of receipt would appear to be most usefully non-evaluative. The unstressed pronunciation of 'OK' would assist in projecting this neutrality.

Heritage (*ibid:202*) found that receipts *always* occurred after the plaintiff or defendant had given a reply which went beyond that which was projected, for example a longer or different reply from that normally pre-supposed by a polar interrogative. However, no such pattern has emerged from my data. Further, although *type b* 'OK' as a receipt is usually followed by a pause, there is no predominance or otherwise of preceding pauses as in Heritage's (*ibid.*) court data.

The data has indicated the frequent use of 'right' synonymously with 'OK', both as an acknowledgement of prior turn (*type b*) and as an announcement of topic switch (*Type a*). Analysis indicates that it has a slightly more emphatic pragmatic force than 'OK'. There are instantiations of its co-occurrence with 'OK'. where 'right' appears to fulfill the role of *Type b* 'OK', and is immediately followed by a *Type a* instantiation of 'OK' itself, as shown in Extract 7:6 below:

Extract 7:6

1	O	OK (.) and did you realise those people were in the boot when you came to
2		England ?
3		(.)
4	DP	no
5	O	right (1.0) OK now you have been arrested on suspicion of facilitating illegal
		entry of an illegal entrant in the United Kingdom…. (continues)

Conversely, 'right' may *follow* 'OK' as in Extract 7:7 below, where 'OK' fulfills its acknowledgement role and 'right' signals the topic switch.

Extract 7:7

| 1 | DP | To buy like cigarettes and like beer and stuff like that . |
| 2 | O | OK (1.0) right (.) so I believe you come from the North East (.) is that right? |

Finally, discourse markers such as 'OK' and 'Right' appear to be used often as self-talk. Although the general frame-work of the interview is pre-structured, the sequence of questions is locally developed. Some questions are contingent upon the prior response, others are initiated as new topics, according to the officer's interview plan. Officers pause to reflect, to consult their papers or to construct the next question. These pauses are often filled by quietly spoken particles that do not appear to be addressed to anyone in particular, and the most prevalent of these is 'OK'.

7:2:1 INTERPRETERS' TREATMENT OF OK

Interpreters appear to ignore 'OK' completely. Together with other response tokens, it is treated as part of the "garbage" (Czyzewski, 1995:73) and left untranslated. Extract 7:8 below, shows an example where not only is OK ignored by the interpreter, but also the confirmatory response token "mm":

Extract 7:8

300	O	and this is a (town A-town B-town A) ticket
301	I	c'est un- un (.) billet (town A-town B-town A)
302	DP	mm
303	O	with your name here?
304	I	avec votre nom là?
305	O	OK?
306	DP	mm
307	O	er and this is for the (date),
308	I	c'est pour le (date),

It is interesting to note that, although DP in L306 responds directly to O's querying "OK?", the interpreter translates neither the 'OK' nor its response token 'mm'. It is only possible to conjecture upon the reasons for DP's response to 'OK'. DP would have heard the translation of "with your name here?" in French, then simultaneously heard the questioning intonation in 'OK?' and perhaps seen the officer's questioning expression.

165

Clearly the interpreter does not consider these two tokens as having a propositional content to be translated.

Concerning interpretation of 'OK', it is fair to say that there are a number of possible translations in French. Although the particle 'OK' *can* be used synonymously, its use is rare. The most natural (although not arbitrary) choices for the types *a* to *e* above would be as follows:-

a) *'bon'*; b) *'bien'*; c) *'bon'*; d) *'oui'* (with rising intonation); e) *'d'accord'* (with rising intonation).

Interpreters may feel, at some level, that 'OK' can be variously homonymous and synonymous in English and French, and may be unable to process all of the possibilities in the interactional space available to them. Whatever the interpreting mode, the constraint of time is pressing. A further explanation for interpreters' treatment of 'OK' as "disposable" (Hale, 1999:79) is that non-native speakers of English (i.e. the majority of interpreters in my data) simply do not recognise its pragmatic significance as an interactional device, or do not feel that it contributes to the propositional content of the utterance.

Shlesinger (1995:203), suggests that 'OK' used as a "dismissive or resumptive conjunction" to indicate topic switch may be omitted by interpreters because of the "linearity constraint", (*ibid.*). That is, that the interpreter may not, at the time of hearing 'OK', have sufficient foreknowledge of the impending topic-switch to realise its relevance. This seems an entirely plausible hypothesis, at least in the case of its use as a topic-switching device.

It is difficult to ascertain with any certainty the effects of interpreters' omissions in the case of 'OK'. However, its use by officers is pervasive. Therefore if, as suggested above, it has at least five possible pragmatic functions in the ongoing sequential organisation of the discourse, then these functions disappear from the interpreted interview.

7:3 CONSIDERATIONS OF DIVERGENT RENDITIONS

Wadensjö, (1998:106) views "close and divergent renditions" as manifestations of the interpreter's orientation to her co-ordinating role. Berk-Seligson (1990), on the other hand, examines the effect of interpreters' lengthening of primary participants' turns (in this case, witness testimony from Spanish into English), and concludes that the addition of, among other features, hedges, particles and disfluencies, imbues the testimony with a more powerless style.

Both of these elements are present in the data of interpreted interviews with suspects. However, two further aspects of "divergent renditions" (*ibid.*:106) have been revealed in the data:

1. the effect upon the interpreter of perceived social imposition
2. the effect of the interpreter's contextual knowledge.

7:3:1 SOCIAL IMPOSITION

There is no evidence in my data that interpreters align more closely with speakers of their own language. On the contrary, although the subject of culture and alignment is beyond the scope of this thesis, I will note in passing that, in my data, interpreters of both nationalities appear, unsurprisingly perhaps, to align with the more powerful participant, the officer.

However, a social feature has become apparent relating to the ways in which interpreters deal with what they perceive, consciously or unconsciously, to be social imposition. Interpreters, being neither officers nor suspects, have no direct, affective involvement in the proceedings. Therefore, when tension rises for the primary participants, resulting in

167

"face-threatening acts" (Brown & Levinson, 1987), they are expected to render these 'in cold blood'. Informal talk amongst interpreters often touches upon the affective problems cause by translating obscenities, or even milder swear words which, in the heat of an argument where they are primary participants, they may even produce themselves.

However, a subtler and more pervasive problem is apparent, where exchanges violate some social code of the interpreter. In extract 7:9 below, the detained person is suspected of being the 'minder' for an importation of drugs. That is, he was travelling in proximity to a car found to contain drugs. At an early stage in the interview, he begins to dissociate himself from the people in the car in question.

Extract 7:9

1	O	... and your name was used to book their room
2	I	et votre nom a été utilisé pour la réservation de leur chambre
3	O	so tell me what you have to do with those people
4	I	donc vous pourriez m'éxpliquer ce que vous avez à voir avec ces deux
5		personnes
6	DP	.hh j'ai rien à voir avec ça moi (.) j'ai rien à voir du tout et je ne sais
7		rien à voir du tout (.) j'ai rien à voir du tout
8	I	I am (.) nothing to do with these people
9		(1.5)
10	DP	j'ai rien à voir du tout (1.0)[qu'est-ce que vous voulez que je vous dise]
11	I	[again (.) he keeps repeating I have nothing]
12		to do with these people
13	O	why did you come to England
14	I	pourquoi est-ce que vous êtes venu en Angleterre

It can be seen in L6-7 that DP repeats the same answer (or a similar one, as can be seen from the back translation in appendix 2. However, the interpreter appears unable to sustain the aberrant repetition, which is produced in a monotonous, chanting tone.

Having translated one instantiation in L8, she changes person deixis in L11, switching to 3rd person following a fourth repetition from DP in L10. Her utterance "again he keeps repeating I have nothing to do with these people" masks DP's final "what am I supposed to say", and the officer abandons the topic.

In extract 7:10 below, concerning the gift of a mobile telephone, an assertion-counter-assertion sequence is set up, which the interpreter cannot sustain in the first person.

Extract 7:10

1	O	why did he give it to you
2	I	et pourquoi il vous a donné un téléphone
3		(3.0)
4	DP	pourquoi (1.0) parce-qu'il m'a- .hh il m'a fait un cadeau c'est tout
5	I	because it was- it was a gift that's all
6	DP	il m'a fait un cadeau pour me (unclear) le téléphone c- c'est pratique et
7		puis [c'est] pas cher
8	I	[b-] because telephones are quite handy and they're not
9		expensive
10		(1.0)
11	O	they *are* quite expensive
12	I	ils *sont* assez chers en fait
13	DP	non non
14	I	he says no

DP claims that telephones are not only handy, but also inexpensive. In L11, O makes a flat assertion to the contrary, which the interpreter mitigates with "en fait" ("in fact"). Following DP's counter-assertion, she switches to 3rd person to translate.

Extract 7:11 below shows a change of person deixis where the exchange is not overtly confrontational. It appears to be the officer's use of irony that causes the interpreter's change of person deixis.

Extract 7:11

877	DP	oui (.) je l'explique hein? .hh=
878	I	=I'll explain=
879	DP	=oui ce que ça c'était [pour moi]
880	O	[please do]
881	DP	hein?
882	I	elle dit je vous en prie expliquez
883	DP	oui OK merci .hh je vous explique ... (continues)

This sequence follows a lengthy and somewhat convoluted explanation of the journey phase. The officer overlaps with DP in L880 and it can be assumed that DP both hears and sees the overlap. He interrupts himself to query "hein?". The interpreter may have felt that the tone and content of this remark were somehow outside of the interview process.

Similarly, in extract 7:12 below, the interpreter makes a single switch to 3rd person, this time following a remark by DP which she may have judged inappropriate to the context of the interview.

Extract 7:12

1	O	the offence is you and your friend bringing those persons those
2		(nationality) persons (.) into the UK. that being (.) the ferry
3	I	le délit est le suivant que vous avez amené ces personnes illégalement
4		en Angleterre. (1.0) °sur le bateau°
5		(1.5)

6	DP	on se croirait dans un jeu de société
7	I	he says this is like a game

On hearing the officer's accusation, DP makes the incredulous comment "you'd think we were playing parlour games". It is common for some interpreters to switch to 3rd person when they are not sure of what was said and do not wish to commit themselves to a translation. Alternatively, she may have sought to dissociate herself from what seemed to be an aberrant remark.

Change of person deixis from first to third person, is frequently initiated by interpreters. From the extract above, this may be construed as distancing themselves from a particular utterance. However, it is not always possible to discover interactional evidence as to why an interpreter should want to dissociate herself from what is said. In her analysis of *courtroom* interaction, Shlesinger (1991) suggests that the switch to third person at times reflects the interpreter's need to stress that she has an independent *persona*, for example when participants attempt inappropriately to accord her participant status. Wadensjö (1998), on the other hand, suggests that the interpreter may switch at times when she feels personally addressed by the speaker.

Certainly the interactional effect is to create a sense of distance, of moving the interpreter away from the speaker and, further, of imposing an extra "person" between DP and O. The illusion of a dyadic exchange is destroyed as the third party (the interpreter), moves into focus.

Change of person deixis is not always restricted to interpreters. Indeed, in extract 7:13 below, it can be seen that a miscommunication arises not from a switch by any of the participants, but from a receptive slip on the part of the officer.

Extract 7:13

1	DP	j'ai mangé quatre fois au restaurant avec lui
2	I	We ate four times (.) I ate four times at a restaurant with him
3	O	and who paid
4	I	qui a payé
5	DP	lui
6	I	him
7	O	*you* paid
8	DP	moi? non
9	I	[me? no]
10	O	[who paid]
11	DP	lui
12	I	him
13	O	(name) paid.
14	I	(name).

The topic concerns DP's meal at a restaurant with someone else (first mentioned as "lui" in L1). Both DP and the interpreter maintain the third person pronoun to refer to the person who paid for the meal (lui/him). However, in L7, the officer is unable to sustain the deixis system set up by the sequence and takes the interpreter's "him" (L6) to refer to DP. It may be that the officer indicated DP whilst saying "you paid", or perhaps the emphasised "you" sounded sufficiently like "vous". DP answers without waiting for the interpreter's translation, and O becomes aware that the exchange has lost its sense. DP again answers directly in L11, and the officer finally ends the miscommunication by naming the person from the restaurant.

Although the trouble was cured quickly, this almost farcical exchange demonstrates the need for all participants to sustain the use of first and second person deixis, leaving use of the third person to refer to external bodies. It is, however, an artificial device and it is hardly surprising that it breaks down, particularly on the part of primary participants.

Tebble (1999) demonstrates the shift by a primary participant who is about to announce unpleasant facts, and Brennan (1999) suggests that, in a sign language interpreted exchange, it may have been due to one primary participant's inability to establish eye contact with the other.

It also serves to highlight the dilemma mentioned in chapter 2:5 concerning the desirability of repair work that the interpreter might carry out, in her co-ordinating role. In extract 7:13, she might have intervened to clarify the referent of DP's "lui", but in doing so, she would herself have been the cause of a change of footing.

Extract 7:14 below shows that, besides causing a change of person deixis, perceived social imposition can also a divergence in tenor on the part of the interpreter. The officer has moved to a confrontational style which is not reproduced in the interpretation.

Extract 7:14

1	O	…. that is four digits difference to the car carrying the cocaine
2	I	.h il y a donc euh quatre numéros de différence entre vous et la voiture qui
3		transporte de la cocaïne
4	O	will you *now* tell me the truth about your involvement with the car
5		carrying the cocaine
6	I	alors maintenant est-ce que vous pourriez s'il vous plaît nous- .h nous
7		expliquer euh le rapport que vous avez avec cette voiture qui transporte
8		de la cocaïne

The officers request for the truth in L4-5 is blunt, and the emphasis on "now" arises from a number of previous exhortations to "tell the truth". The interpreter, however, appears unable to sustain the challenging tenor and produces a highly mitigated rendition. It is introduced by "alors", a particle which is, in this case, redundant, since it is a "non-rendition" in Wadensjö's (1998:108) terms and serves to 'conversationalise' O's overt challenge. "Maintenant" ("now") is not emphasised, thus removing the covert reference

to previous lies, and "will you tell me the truth" loses its resemblance to an order, being rendered as "could you please .h explain to us". There is no evidence as to why the interpreter has rendered the officer's singular "me" to plural "us". It may simply have been an example of contextual knowledge, (see section 7:3:2 below), since the interview was being carried out by two officers.

Finally, concerning social imposition, it is noticeable that some foreign interpreters have difficulty in following the officer's use of first names. Informal inquiries among officers reveal that it is generally felt that using first names helps to set up a more relaxed atmosphere, where this is desirable, and the practice continues throughout the interview. That is, there is no change to surnames during the probe-challenge phase. This may be contrasted to the formal use of surnames throughout trials, further confirming the "quasiformality" (Arminen 2000:446) of the interview.

However, in France, the use of first names is much less prevalent than in Anglo-Saxon countries, and would generally not be used unless the social conditions also exist for the use of the familiar second person singular pronoun "tu". As Mikkleson (2000) confirms, the two are interchangeable, although there are, of course, many exceptions. A boss, for example, may address his/her secretary by first name + *vous*. However, first name + *vous* does imply a power difference (Brown and Gilman, 1960). Informal inquiries among French national interpreters have revealed that they are aware of this difficulty, and are faced with the choice of either orienting to cultural correctness and using surnames, or committing what feels to them to be a FTA (Brown and Levinson, 1987), or a "T-offense"(Jacquemet, 1994:298) in the interests of accuracy. Some officers do ask permission to use first names at the start of the interview. However, it is difficult to imagine a detained person saying 'no', in the circumstances, and one cannot assume that the simple granting of permission sets aside innate cultural sensitivities.

I turn now to another aspect of "divergent renditions" (Wadensjö, *ibid.*), that of the effect of the interpreter's contextual knowledge.

174

The exhortation to 'just translate and translate everything' has been shown by all of the research cited in chapter 2 to be fatuous. However, interpreters make *modifications* or *amplifications* to primary speakers' turns, the reasons for which are not immediately apparent. It is only by examining the internal and external context of the interview, that these can be explicated. Some of these causes can be retrieved from the immediate sequential environment and others from prior talk. It is also possible to deduce the gestures that give rise to some apparently divergent renditions. Instantiations of all three of these can be seen in extract 7:15 below, from the probe-challenge phase of an interview.

Extract 7:15

331	O	why were you carrying your son's passport. (.) [in the paper]
332	I	[pourquoi est-ce-] que
333		vous tranportiez le passeport de votre fils dans l- dans votre journal
334		(2.0)
335	DP	justement c'est moi qui garde le::: euh ses papiers donc c'était dans ma
336		mallette
337	I	mm mm can I ask him again I didn't ….
338	O	mhm
339	I	pardon vous pouvez [répéter]
340	DP	[justement] c'est moi qui garde ses papiers donc
341		c'était dans mon sac à main
342	I	it was er i- with my er my briefcase
343		(3.0)
344	O	well you've just said it was in the paper (.) why was it in the paper
345	I	pourquoi c'était tout- tout d'un coup a été mis dans le dans le journal
346	DP	euh parce 'quand on arrivait ahm::: (.) au restaurant là pour la pause de
347		quinze minutes
348	I	because when we arrived at the restaurant for the fifteen minutes break
349		(1.0) a-at the berth
350	DP	euh j'ai enlevé euh:: mon passeport, et son passeport (.) euh que j'ai mis
351		ici
352	I	that I put in my (.) breast pocket

175

The word "paper" in L331 is translated (correctly) in L333 as "journal" (newspaper). Although a piece of paper is also under discussion, the referent used by the interpreter is a first mention of a newspaper some ten minutes earlier in the interview (on the preceding tape). Therefore, although it would normally be a groundless assumption to translate "paper" as "newspaper", its use can be retrieved from prior talk. Here, then is an example of a successful rendition, referring anaphorically to another part of the same text, although the officer's anaphorical referent "the" was translated as "votre" ("your").

However, the divergence is unsuccessful in the following renditions concerning the passport. The officer's challenge in L344 is in two parts: "Well you've just said it was in the paper" and "why was it in the paper". The interpreter's rendition in L345 "why was it <u>suddenly</u> put in the newspaper" refers to the fact that DP had said it was in a briefcase, whereas now he is saying it was in the newspaper, therefore he has "suddenly" changed his story. However, since the first part of the officer's challenge "well you've just said it was in the newspaper", was not translated, (a "zero rendition" in Wadensjö's 1998:108) terms, DP takes the "non-rendition" (*ibid.*:108) "suddenly" to refer to the manner in which it was put there. He therefore begins to explain the logistics of the passport's transition from his briefcase to his newspaper, during a break in the journey. The divergence is further compounded since there were two stops on the journey, a fifteen-minute stop on the motorway and a twenty-five minute one at the port. By rendering "fifteen minutes" plus the gratuitous amplification "at the berth" (L348/9), the interpreter has confounded the two stops and made it appear that the passport was transferred to the newspaper just before boarding the ferry. In the context of this interview, that is a more sensitive point at which to put a passport inside a newspaper.

The same extract also provides an instantiation of non-verbal gesture translated into a verbal rendition. In L350-1, DP explains that, at the restaurant, he took out his own and his son's passports and put them "ici" (here). The interpreter's non-rendition "... in my breast pocket" can only refer to a gesture from DP, where he must have indicated the area of his breast pocket.

176

This last point raises the interesting and unresolved question of interpretation of gestures in an audio-taped interview. It is a general rule that interpreters should not verbalise non-verbal gestures. If a detained person nods or shakes his head, he is not considered to have spoken, since this is not recorded on tape. If the interpreter then verbalises "yes" or "no", there is no verifiable evidence of this as a rendition of DP's utterance. Indeed, officers usually comment "you're shaking/nodding your head. Does this mean no/yes?", or simply "please speak up for the microphone". Detained persons also frequently draw directions with a finger on the table or wall, during the journey stage.

Informal discussions with other interpreters reveal various ways of dealing with this. They may verbalise the gestures, preceded by the word "indicating". However, this would appear to be a dangerous practice in evidential terms. They may merely translate the verbal utterances that DP does produce, although without the gestures, this makes nonsense of the resultant recording, or they may intercede explicitly with a request to the officer to ensure that communication is verbal. The latter would seem to be the most appropriate choice since, although it involves a change of footing, it may be the most effective way of leaving control with the officer and protecting the interpreter from allegations of misinterpretation at a later stage. Officers, consulted informally, preferred merely to say that what is recorded on tape, is the interviewing officer's responsibility.

The following example of a "non-rendition" (Wadensjö:108) presents something of a conundrum:

Extract 7:16

1	DP	phh j'suis même pas resté je- je suis pas resté quatre heures en
2		Angleterre ce- ce matin c'est pas possible=
3	I	=I- I didn't stay for four hours in the UK this morning that's not
		possible
4		(2.5)
5	O	well (.) *two* hours (.) *three* hours what was it
6	I	oh disons deux heures (.) trois heures (.) on va vérifier (unclear)
7	DP	phh (2.0) et vous pensez qu'en ce temps j'ai eu le temps euh... ... ...

In L6, in place of "what was it", the interpreter renders "We'll check". At first glance, there appears to be no explanation for this. There is no overlapping talk in L5 that might have caused her to mis-hear. The sound quality is good and the officer speaks clearly. The only plausible explanation would appear to involve the interpreter's contextual knowledge of interviews with suspects *outside* of the present event. During the later phases, whilst probing and challenging the detained person's version of events, it is extremely common for officers to remark that they will check certain claims. DP's assertion that he cannot have spent four hours in England would, typically, elicit such a remark. It is therefore probable that the interpreter superimposed her external, contextual knowledge of other interviews upon the present one.

In their discussion of the prominence of context, compared to structure and texture in liaison interpreting, Hatim & Mason (1997) offer the explanation that the uncertainty about what is coming next, forces the interpreter to rely more upon contextual clues. In this way, it is unlike simultaneous interpreting, where the next segment follows instantly. Hatim & Mason (*ibid.*) also note that, as in Extract 7:9 of this chapter, interpreters' use of context can equally constitute the source of troubles.

7:4 OTHER CAUSES OF DIVERGENT RENDITIONS

The final extracts in this chapter demonstrate other causes of divergent renditions. Misunderstandings generated by the interpreter can have the effect of causing a change of 'footing' (Goffman, 1981:128), where participants are obliged to step out of their roles while the trouble is repaired. As with changes of person deixis, the illusion of a dyadic exchange is lost. Translatory inadequacies can bring about clarificatory interventions by any of the parties, including the legal representative, and a breakdown in the turn-taking organisation which renders whole sections of the tape incomprehensible.

Less catastrophic, but none the less distorting, are instances where interpreters amplify O's questions and/or DP's responses, slipping inadvertently into the role of mediator. In

Extract 7:17 lines 5/6 below, the interpreter's addition of the word "seul", ("alone") to O2's question in line 4, turns it into an "alternative interrogative" (Hudson 1975:13), by supplying "alone" as an option which DP takes up in his answer:

Extract 7:17

1	O2	U-uhm (2.5) yeah- did you when you *travelled* (.) um (.) to:: <(town name)
2		wasn't it>
3	O1	Yeah=
4	O2	=yeah did you travel (.) with anybody (.) else .
5	I	Quand vous êtes allé à (town name) pour voyager (.) est-ce que vous avez
6		voyagé ↑**seul** ou avec quelqu'un d'autre
7	BT	When you went to (town name) to travel (.) did you travel ↑**alone** or with
8		someone else .
9	DP	Non tout **seul**
10	I	**Alone**

A variant of amplification or expansion by interpreters has been termed "hyperformal style" by Berk-Seligson (1990:171), in her analysis of courtroom dialogue. In contrast to the more generally used term "hypercorrect speech", used to describe speech which is incorrect through over-generalisation of grammatical rules, or where lexis from a 'higher' socio-economic class is used, Berk-Seligson (*ibid:171.*) exemplifies "hyperformal" as:

"(1) the lack of ellipsis or syntactic deletions in surface syntax, which produces overly-complete surface constructions....; and (2) the failure to contract linguistic elements that are frequently contracted in consultative style".

Hale (1997) also found that court interpreters tended to raise the level of register when interpreting into English and, further, that they tended to lower it when interpreting into the foreign language.

Examination of the data for this thesis reveals a limited number of instantiations of hyperformality. For example, line 6, extract 7:18 below shows lack of ellipsis (coupled with amplification).

Extract 7:18

1	O	Is you- is your bank card also used for taking cash out of machines
2	I	Est-ce que votre carte bancaire est utilisée pour enlever de l'argent aux
3		points guichets ? (unclear)
4	BT	Is your bank card used for removing money from cash points
5	DP	Euh: pas en (country name)
6	I	Not in (country name) it cannot be used

Although instantiations of hyperformality are present in the corpus, it may be that this phenomenon is less frequent in interviews than in courtroom exchange, because the social distance between O and DP is generally perceived as being smaller. This would have the effect of lessening I's tendency to raise the level of register used by DP or to lower that used by O. Further, those instantiations found are limited to certain interpreters and would therefore appear to be a matter of style rather than a generalised tendency.

SUMMARY

Co-murmuring, then, is demonstrably present in the monolingual interview. However, the presence of an interpreter prevents its use as a strategy or as a function of co-operation in the early phases of the interview. The participants are thus deprived of a means to establish the relaxed, unthreatening atmosphere that allows them to pursue their institutional goals in this phase of the interview. Intuitively, the nodding, facial expressions and other non-linguistic indicators of co-operation would also be absent, although without video-taped evidence this cannot be demonstrated.

Divergent renditions, on the other hand, although they do not deprive participants of a strategy, can have procedural consequentiality. Changes of person deixis by the interpreter, resulting from perceived social imposition, destroy the sense of dyadic exchange. Further, interpreters' orientations to their contextual knowledge can have either a positive effect, as in the translation of "paper" as "newspaper", in extract 7:15, or a negative effect, as in the confounding of two meal stops, also in extract 7:15.

The preceding points are among some of the subtle, but nonetheless pervasive, procedural consequences of the presence of an interpreter. However, their very subtlety means that participants, including the interpreters themselves, are less likely to be aware of them and therefore less likely to guard against them. Although each one alone, it may be argued, cannot affect the process of the interview, their cumulative effect cannot but contribute to the altered state of the interview with suspect when an interpreter is present.

CHAPTER 8

CONCLUSION

8:1 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The importance of the interview with suspect has not gone unrecognised in recent years. Research in the field of forensic linguistics has, for example, addressed problems of validity of written records of interview (Woolls & Coulthard, 1998; Coulthard, 1997, 1992; Olsson, 1997). However, since tape-recording of interviews began in the UK, the focus of research has shifted *away* from the interview, to centre upon such events as the trial itself. And yet the vital importance of the "upstream" event remains unchanged. Anomalies in monolingual interviews can be deciding factors in the success or failure of a prosecution.

In the case of interpreted interviews, the ground is more fertile still, because of the occurrence of mis-communication, unsuspected by primary participants and possibly undetected by all parties concerned. As mentioned in the introduction, the presence of interpreters affects the interview in ways that are both subtle and pervasive. Individually, although the differences may affect the processes locally, they cannot be shown to alter the outcomes. Cumulatively, however, each of the features analysed in this thesis, together with those identified by researchers of courtroom discourse, (Hale & Gibbons, 1999; Berk-Seligson, 1999, 1992; Rigney, 1999; Fowler, 1995; Komter, 1994; Shlesinger, 1991), amount to a weight of evidence that, in spite of their treatment as identical events, the two interview events are indeed disparate.

The fundamental questions raised in this thesis centre around the interpreting effect which is indisputable. Evidence is offered of just some of the ways in which this effect is apparent; further research will no doubt reveal others. Perhaps the most important interactional effect identified in this thesis is the way in which interpreting deprives the officer of the means of connecting the detained person's presentation of events into an *account*.

In order to demonstrate this effect, a number of methodological approaches were used, within the discipline of conversation analysis, to compare and contrast the monolingual and interpreted interview. An examination of the initial segment of interview, the preliminary formalities, caution and explanation of the caution, demonstrated that the English wording of these, may create insurmountable problems of translation. Interpreters were shown to resort to form-based interpreting, in renditions characterised by disfluency, inaccuracy and uncertainty.

The importance of this initial sequence is not in doubt. In uttering the caution, the officer is explicitly establishing the detained person's responsibility for what he is about to say, or not say, in the interview. It connects not only the initial sequence to the main body of the interview, but also the interview to the subsequent (possible) trial. Chapter 4 has demonstrated how this connection may be broken through interpreting.

Further, the whole interview may be discounted as evidence if it can be shown that the caution was wrongly interpreted, since the suspect would then be deemed not to have been "cautioned". However, the interpreters' difficulties here appear to exceed those in the main body of the interview. Possible solutions to this particular problem will be discussed below.

Whereas chapter 4 inspected data from 20 interpreted interviews, chapter 5 analysed the complete data set of monolingual and interpreted interviews. The nature and prevalence of *and*-prefaced questions, or utterances, were discussed, and interpreters' treatment of these was examined. It was found that officers produced more *and*-prefaced utterances in monolingual interviews than in interpreted ones. *And*-prefaced questions, it was noted, serve as connectors in the officer's discourse, linking back and indexing forwards. However, this connective function was negated by interpreters, who were found to omit a total of 46.6% of *and*-prefaces. These were subdivided into syntactic interrogatives, of which 77.2% were omitted, and narrative, or declarative interrogatives, of which only 22.8% were omitted.

Possible reasons for this imbalance in omissions were suggested, such as the opposition between interpreters' perceptions of structure and content, or "internal and external realities" (Hale & Gibbons, 1999). The analysis provided support for Heritage & Sorjonen's (1994:21) assertion that questioners use *and*-prefacing as a strategy to "detoxify" their questions. Clearly, if interpreters omit these, then they unknowingly deprive the officers of a strategy and may be the cause of failure in certain lines of questioning.

Following the quantitative evaluation of *and*-prefacing, chapter 6 returns to the traditional methodology of CA, to carry out an in-depth, fine-grained analysis of one monolingual and one interpreted interview. It uses the occurrence of *allo-repetition* (repetition of others) to trace the progression of the interview through its three phases: *life story, journey* and *probe-challenge*. In the monolingual interview, it is used by both officer and detained person as a strategy for, and a function of *co-murmuring* in the early, co-operative phases, and its use continues in more confrontational mode in the later phase.

As Tannen (1989) notes, repetition has a connective function and is listed by Halliday and Hasan (1976) in their taxonomy of cohesive devices. This is no less true for allo-repetition than it is for self-repetition, as it indicates participants' orientation to each others' prior utterances. In the interpreted interview however, it was noted that, not only is the use of allo-repetition by both participants less prevalent, its use is restricted principally to clarification and repair. Its affective uses are not deployed, as in the monolingual interview, to express co-operation or confrontation. A number of possible causes were put forward. Since *co-murmuring* is absent from interpreted interviews, this particular function of repetition is redundant.

Further, from a prosodic viewpoint, differences in intonation and nucleus placement between English and French mitigate against the likelihood of echoic repetition. Rhythm is also broken by the intervention of the interpreter's turns, since both the psychological rhythm of question and answer and the prosodic rhythm of dyadic exchanges are interrupted.

184

Chapter 7 again views the complete data set, identifying several features of "divergent renditions" (Wadensjö, 1998:106) that serve to further emphasise the distancing effect of interpreting. *Co-murmuring*, a feature of the co-operative phases of the interview, is mentioned as an example of a feature that appears to be simply not perceived as available in interpreted interviews. In the monolingual interview, it is characterised by friendly, phatic exchanges that allow both participants to orient to the unthreatening nature of this phase. However, not only is it entirely absent from interpreted interviews, there is no attempt at its use by the officer, and any excursion by the detained person into humour, for example, is not treated as an allowable contribution by the officer.

The use of 'OK' as a discourse marker by officers is a feature of interviews which, although technically available, is routinely ignored by interpreters. Section 7:2 commented upon the fact that this particle is so pervasive as to almost define the genre. Its omission by interpreters was tentatively attributed to the difficulty of choosing among a number of alternatives in French, such as "bon", "bien", "d'accord" and "oui" with rising intonation, to the "linearity constraint" (Shlesinger, 1995:203), or to the fact that interpreters do not see it as having a propositional content. All three of these hypotheses involve the time constraint, which particularly characterises liaison and simultaneous interpreting, and would therefore explain the interpreter's treatment of these as "disposable", (Hale, 1999:79).

Section 7:3 examines perceived social imposition as another source of "divergent renditions" (Wadensjö, 1998:106). Whether or not the interpreter is of the same nationality as the detained person, there are a number of potentially face-threatening acts (Brown & Levinson, 1987) from which they tend to dissociate themselves. These include utterances that they perceive as aberrant to the interview genre, or as socially or culturally impermissible. One of the principal ways in which interpreters deal with this, is dissociation by change of person deixis. That is, a switch from the use of first to third person pronouns. It is noted that this strategy used by interpreters is particularly intrusive, as it has the effect of moving the interpreter into focus and destroying the impression of a dyadic exchange.

The final section in chapter 7 highlights "divergent renditions" (*ibid.*) that reflect contextual knowledge. The interpreter's addition to, or alteration of, utterances in the light of her contextual knowledge may not, at first, appear to be classifiable as "interpreter-effect", since the information is retrievable from prior text and therefore would presumably not affect the interaction. However, as the extracts in 7:4 have shown, when this wider knowledge is applied to the micro context of a rendition, it can result in an inappropriate addition, such as "suddenly" in Extract 7:12, or the confusion of two facts, in L348-9 of the same extract. The former of these alters the pragmatic force of the officer's utterance and the latter alters a material fact of the interview.

Related to the interpreter's contextual knowledge is the question of whether or not she should verbalise non-verbal gestures such as head nods or tracing maps with a finger on the table. Again, this may not at first glance seem to constitute "interpreter-effect", in view of the strong link between verbal and non-verbal language. However, from the perspective that the primary evidence is constituted by the audio-recording, if a source text is absent from the tape, it cannot be reproduced in the target text by the interpreter. Consequently, as far as the tape is concerned, the interpreter's utterance represents a "non-rendition" (Wadensjö, 1998:108), that is: "... a 'text' which is analysable as an interpreter's initiative or response which does not correspond (as translation) to a prior 'original' utterance".

As can be seen from the summary of findings above, the comparative study of monolingual and interpreted data makes explicit the bilateral nature of the interpreting effect. Whether or not they are aware of it, *both* primary participants are deprived in some way of linguistic strategies that would be available to them in monolingual interviews. Utterances emanating from both sides are subject to distortion, omission or amplification and these can be so subtle that neither the officer nor the detained person is conscious of any mis-communication. This means that no compensatory or repair moves are made and the interpreters' utterances are reified on tape and in the transcript and therefore at trial.

8:2 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

In order to limit the variables and re-create a manageable data set, it was necessary to restrict tapes used to those within the criteria set out in chapter 3:3. Of necessity, this constituted a process of selection which removed any possibility of random sampling. However, since the selection of tapes was carried out for 'technical' reasons, before beginning the analysis, and since the analysis proceeded inductively after initial selection, it is not felt that the validity of the process is compromised.

As a comparative study, it may be suggested that the data could have been compared to similar events, that is, interviews carried out in France between French officers and French suspects. Certainly, this would have provided a basis on which to draw absolute comparisons. However, interviews with suspects are not routinely tape-recorded in France, at least not by the Gendarmerie, where I made my enquiries. Indeed, requests for the text of the French Caution, or a similar pre-interview statement, were not even understood, leading to comments such as that of the young Law student mentioned in chapter 4. This thesis concerns the interview with suspect carried out in the *English* criminal justice system, and has demonstrated that it is a genre *sui generis*. Consequently, although it would perhaps have been possible to obtain recordings from other interview events in France, this would not constitute a comparison of like with like.

Further, as in most conversation analytic research, the data set for this thesis was relatively small. Because of the fine-grained nature of much of the analysis and time-consuming process of transcription, large-scale corpora simply cannot be managed, at least not by a single researcher. The 72 interviews analysed, covering 82 hours of tape, however, compare favourably with recent research, although as researchers such as Hale (1999, 1997), Berk-Seligson (1999), Rigney (1999) and Shlesinger (1991) tend to state the number of trials, rather than the number of hours of testimony (apart from Rigney, 1999, who specifies 2½ hours), direct comparisons are difficult. The number of trials covered by these researchers ranges from 1 (Shlesinger, 1991, *State of Israel v Demjanjuk*), to 17 local court cases (Hale, 1999).

However large the corpus, it would never be possible to exclude the variable of individual interactional styles. Consequently, it appears that, similarly to that in general conversation analysis, research in the field of legal interpreting will advance through a multiplicity of small and medium-scale studies, each one contributing towards a set of theories that both fit and work.

8:3 PRACTICAL APPLICATIONS

Three salient and inter-connected factors prevail concerning the criminal justice system at present, and each has a bearing upon the direction of this thesis:

1. The decision as to whether a suspect needs an interpreter is normally jointly taken by the interviewing and/or arresting officer and the Custody Sergeant at the police station or Customs custody area. This decision is governed by section 13C(b) of the PACE Codes of Practice, which states that:

> ... a person must not be interviewed in the absence of a person capable of acting as interpreter if:
>   (a) he has difficulty in understanding English
>   (b) the interviewing officer cannot speak the person's own language; and
>   (c) the person wishes an interpreter to be present.

2. Since 2nd October 2000, the Human Rights Act has brought much of the European Convention of Human Rights (Article 6) into domestic law. This means that, failing to engage appropriately qualified and competent interpreters in criminal proceedings can amount to a breach of the defendant's right to a fair trial.

3. From the end of 2001, the National Agreement will be implemented between criminal justice agencies, concerning use of interpreters from the National Register of Public Service Interpreters (N.R.P.S.I.) or the Council for the Advancement of Communication with Deaf People (C.A.C.D.P.). The Register was set up in 1994,

under the aegis of the Institute of Linguists, supported both by the Nuffield Foundation and by the Home Office, with the aim of providing a pool of qualified and experienced interpreters to the public services.

A detained person can therefore request the presence of an interpreter for his interview. Whether he requests an interpreter or not, officers can (and do) take the decision to supply one, if they feel that his grasp of English is insufficient for interview. Since the human Rights Act now enshrines in written law the right of a suspect to be linguistically present, not only at trial, but throughout the criminal procedure, this decision should be even more carefully considered by officers in the future.

If linguistic presence entails the assistance of a *competent* interpreter, then in theory the implementation of the National Agreement should ensure compliance. Qualifications for public service interpreters are already in existence, such as the Diploma in Public Service Interpreting (DPSI) offered by the Institute of Linguists. However, the situation concerning uptake of training opportunities is uneven. Market forces dictate that interpreters of languages where there is relatively low demand, or a high number of practitioners competing for work, will readily comply with measures to raise standards. On the other hand, interpreters of 'exotic' languages, where a low number of practitioners enjoy high demand, may perhaps tend to resist the implementation of standards and regulations. This latter situation is current in areas such as Kent, where high numbers of asylum claimants require interpreters in such languages.

A further complication arises in the wording of the National Agreement, where criminal justice agencies are only required to use registered interpreters 'where possible'. This dilution of the requirement is, on the one hand, entirely justifiable, given the shortage of qualified interpreters in 'exotic' languages. The initial custody time limit for a detained person is 24 hours. Therefore, if the officers are to spend much of this time searching for a registered interpreter, or waiting for her arrival before being able to interview the suspect, it is clear that this constitutes an impediment to due process. On the other hand,

189

the Human Rights of the detained person may be contravened by calling in an unqualified or inexperienced interpreter, if no member of the National Register is immediately available.

From the above, it can be seen that the argument is circular. Although the principle of a National Agreement to use registered, and therefore qualified, interpreters is sound, in practice it is unenforceable. It may be that improvements in standards will only be brought about slowly, by raising awareness of training needs and, at the same time, raising the status of interpreters within the criminal justice system.

The implications of this thesis for interpreter training are clear. Besides language and basic skills, interpreters should be made aware of the pragmatic importance of features which they tend to treat as disposable. In reality, no utterance is disposable, since each one has a communicative purpose without which it would not be produced. Omission of *and*-prefacing, as has been shown, deprives the officer of a questioning strategy. Interpreters' orientation to their own feelings of social imposition distort the pragmatics of primary participants' utterances, as do their divergent renditions in the light of their own contextual knowledge. Even the discourse particle 'OK', universally ignored by interpreters, 'says something'. In fact, one might envisage a training module based upon most of the chapters of this thesis.

Certainly, as far as the Caution is concerned, it is barely conceivable that not one of the interpreters in the 20 interviews analysed for that chapter had learned the Caution by heart in her own language. In this respect, there is clearly a case for:

a) producing a standard translation of the Caution that must, obligatorily, be adhered to, and

b) producing a standard explanation of the Caution, both in English and in foreign languages.

As far as my own practice is concerned, although not guilty of inaccurate translation of the caution, raised awareness of the importance of other features examined in this thesis has resulted in my paying greater attention to those which, together with other interpreters, I had tended to treat as disposable. I suspect that one of the most difficult types of divergent rendition to eradicate will be those caused by the interpreter's contextual knowledge, since this appears to be unconscious.

In view of the difficulties mentioned above, it is easier to envisage improvement through training in the case of HM Customs and the Police. Although the linguistic strategies of both primary participants are affected, it is the effect of interpreting upon the *officer's* aims and strategies that is most clearly demonstrated in this thesis. His purpose of formulating or eliciting a cohesive account through the use of textual signals as connecting moves has been shown to be frustrated.

Officers are already trained in interviewing techniques and one could imagine the addition of a training module in the effective use of interpreters, from an organisational and from an interactional viewpoint. Officers tend to attempt to pursue a monolingual strategy in interpreted interviews. It may be that, in consultation with interpreters, an interviewing format could be devised which takes into account the effects of interpreting in achieving the goal of DP responsibility for an account.

Although officers are not linguists, my personal experience is that they already show much consideration for interpreters, by attempting to speak in manageable chunks and by generally allowing time for interpretation. If they were made aware of the nature of their own conscious and unconscious linguistic strategies and the extent to which interpreting frustrates both, this may lead to the formulation of specific training modules. These might highlight such matters as question structure and management of triadic interaction. Concerning the latter, much could be done in terms of the control of turn-taking, to raise officers' awareness of the difficulties caused for the interpreter by simultaneous talk and the potential loss of evidence from the interview tape, where any participant becomes indistinguishable to the transcriber

This thesis has compared a set of features across monolingual and interpreted interviews with suspects. A search through the literature has not revealed any identical, or even similar studies. Research in the field of legal interpreting has, as mentioned in the introduction, concentrated largely upon courtroom discourse. One of the reasons put forward was the difficulty in obtaining data from interviews with suspects, and this will, rightly, always be the case. However, with proper guarantees of confidentiality and anonymisation, it should not be considered an impossibility, particularly since the advantages to training, and therefore to more effective interviewing, are demonstrable.

Although this study was restricted to French, since that is my working language as a legal interpreter, there is much to be gained in conducting a similar study in other languages. Recent research in courtroom interpreting appears to centre mainly around Spanish. (Berk-Seligson, 1990, 2000; Hale, 1997, 2000; Rigney, 2000; Hale & Gibbons, 1999; Bucholz, 1995). Presumably, it is also the major legal interpreting language in the southern United States and shares its Latin roots with French. It is also one of the more common interpreting languages in England and might therefore be considered as a possible avenue in order to broaden the scope of the present analysis.

The *comparative* research paradigm of the present interpreting study might also be extended to research in interviewing in other fields. Two studies in Spanish interpreting, for example, (Davidson, 2000; Dimitrova 1995) examine the role of the interpreter in medical consultations, which share certain features with the interview genre. A comparative study of monolingual and interpreted medical interviews would shed further light on the interactional effects of the interpreter's presence. A similar set of criteria would apply to data selection as that set out in chapter 3 of this thesis. Peräkylä (1997) notes that in many medical consultations, for example, there is no delivery of diagnosis. This might lead to the discarding of certain data, similarly to interviews where there is admission of guilt. As in interviews with suspects, problems of confidentiality would rule out the setting up of a generally available comparable corpus such as that proposed

for translation, (Laviosa, 1997; Baker, 1995). Nonetheless, much could be achieved by individual studies such as the present thesis.

Finally, some of the interactional features in this thesis have been discussed, informally, with officers and interpreting colleagues. The reaction to these discussions was extraordinarily positive and suggests that, in parallel with further conversation analytic investigation, a more ethnographic approach involving attitudinal research would prove fruitful, both as a supplementary research methodology and as a prelude to training.

Certainly, training should result from a *rapprochement* between interpreters and HM Customs and Police, perhaps at a level of that below management. One could envisage the organisation of contact and joint training days at local police stations or Customs offices, where officers and interpreters exchange views and work together to build up a partnership based on a fuller understanding of each other's needs.

This thesis has discussed the nature and causes of different effects of interpreting. The question remains as to whether there is such a thing as a single, identifiable "interpreter-effect", or whether research will continue to identify discrete features that add up, as in this case, to interference with the officer's established monolingual strategy for turning events into an account. However, in order to answer this question, it would be necessary to carry out a full ethnographic study, including attitudinal research among participants. Meanwhile, the jury is still out. Certainly, any one of the features examined here might form the point of departure for such a study. In view of the vital importance and primary position of the interview in the judicial system, there is a clear indication that further research is required.

In conclusion, this thesis has re-directed research on interpreting in the criminal justice system back upstream to its source. The trial, as end product, is largely contingent upon the linguistic events recorded on tape, several months before, as represented by the official transcript. However, as shown in the introduction, the transcripts of interview, which ostensibly form the tangible link between interview and trial, do no such thing. In

the case of monolingual interviews, they are a part of the process which degrades the original event, since all paralinguistic cues are lost between the speech event and preparation of the transcript, to be replaced by ersatz prosody when the transcript is read out in trial. In the case of interpreted interviews, the transcripts disguise a triadic, bilingual event as a monolingual one, erasing the interpreter from the cast and attributing her utterances to the detained person.

If there were such things as translatory perfection and absolute linguistic equivalence, the fact that the transcript shows no sign of interpretation taking place (Pym, 1999) would be of little significance. One could safely assume that the interpreter's renditions of the officer's questions were perfect in form, function, illocutionary force, and cultural and pragmatic equivalence. Similarly, her renditions of the detained person's replies would match the source text in every way. However, this thesis has demonstrated that, not only are monolingual and interpreted interview transcripts degenerate, as read out in court, they are also representations of *different events*.

REFERENCES

Adelswärd, V., Aronsson, K., Jönsson, L. & Linell, P. (1987) 'The unequal distribution of interactional space: dominance and control in courtroom interaction', *Text*, Vol. (4) 1987, 313-346

Agar, M. (1985) 'Institutional discourse', *Text* 5.3 1985:147-158

Alexieva, B. (1997) 'A typology of interpreter-mediated events', *The Translator*, Vol. 3, No. 2 1997:153-174

Antaki, C. (2000) 'Two rhetorical uses of the description of 'chat'' *MC: A Journal of Media and Culture* 3(4). [20/09/00] <http://www.api-network.com/mc/0008/uses.html>

Arminen, I. (2000) 'On the context sensitivity of institutional interaction', *Discourse and Society*, Vol. 11, No. 4, October 2000:435-458

Atkinson, J. (1992) 'Displaying neutrality: formal aspects of informal court proceedings', in P.Drew & J. Heritage (eds.) *Talk at Work*, Cambridge:Cambridge University Press, 1992:199-211

Atkinson, J. & Drew, P. (1979) *Order in Court*, London:The Macmillan Press Ltd.

Baker, M. (1995) 'Corpora in translation studies: An overview and some suggestions for future research', *Target*, Vol. 7, No. 2, 1995:223-243

Bakhtin, M. (1981) *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M.M. Bakhtin*, M. Holquist (ed.), translated by C. Emerson and M. Holquist. Austin:University of Texas Press

Bassnett-McGuire, S. (1980) *Translation Studies*, London:Methuen, cited in E-A. Gutt (2,000), *Translation and Relevance:Cognition and Context*, Manchester:St. Jerome Publishing

Becker, A.L. (1984) 'The linguistics of particularity: Interpreting superordination in a Javanese text', *Proceedings of the tenth annual meeting of the Berkley Linguistics Society*, 425-36. Berkley, CA: University of California, Berkely

Bell, R. (1986) 'Why translation theory is in a mess and what can we do about it', in *Proceedings of the GALLA Congress, Thessaloniki 1985*, GALLA/AILA, 280-287, cited in E-A. Gutt (2,000), *Translation and Relevance:Cognition and Context*, Manchester:St. Jerome Publishing

Bennett, A. (1981) 'Interruptions and the interruption of conversation' *Discourse Processes* 4(2), 171-188, in Roy, C. (1993) 'A sociolinguistic analysis of the interpreter's role in simultaneous talk in interpreted interaction', *Multilingua* 12-4 (1993) 341-363

Berk-Seligson, S. (1990) *The Bilingual Courtroom: court interpreters in the judicial process*, Chicago:University of Chicago Press

Berk-Seligson, S. (1999) The impact of court interpreting on the coerciveness of leading questions, *Forensic Linguistics* 6(1) 1999:30-56

Berk-Seligson, S. (2000) 'Interpreting for the police:issues in pre-trial phases of the judicial process', *Forensic Linguistics,* Vol. 7(2) 2000:212:237

Bishop, D., Chan, J., Hartley, J., Weir, F. (1998) 'When a nod is as good as a word: form-function relationships between questions and their responses', *Applied Psycholinguistics*, Vol. 19, 1998:415-432

Blom, J-P. & Gumperz, J. (1972) 'Social meaning in linguistic structure: code-switching in Norway'. in J. Gumperz & D. Hymes (eds.), *Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication* New York:Holt, Rinehart & Winston, pp 407-34

Bolinger, D. (1961) 'Syntactic blends and other matters', *Language*, 37.3: 366-81, cited in Tannen, D. (1989) *Talking Voices: Repetition, dialogue and imagery in conversational discourse.* Cambridge:Cambridge University Press

Brazil, D. (1997) *The Communicative Value of Intonation in English*, Cambridge:Cambridge University Press

Brenan, M. (1999) 'Signs of injustice', *The Translator,* Vol. 5, No. 2 (1999), 221-246

Briggs, C. (1986) 'Learning how to ask', Cambridge:Polity Press, quoted in Shiffrin, D. (1994) *Approaches to Discourse Analysis*, Oxford: Blackwell

Brown, R. and Gilman, A. (1960) 'The pronouns of power and solidarity', *American Anthropologist*, 4(6):24-9 (1962), cited in Fasold, R. (1990:3) *Sociolinguistics of Language*, Oxford:Blackwell

Brown, P. & Levinson, S. (1987) *Politeness. Some Universals in Language Use*, Cambridge:Cambridge University Press

Bucholz, M. (1995) 'Language in evidence: the pragmatics of translation and the judicial process', in *American Translators' Association:Translation and the Law*, Scholarly Monograph series Vol. VIII, 1995:115-129

Cameron, D. (1992) 'Not gender difference but the difference gender makes: explanation in research on sex and language'. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, Vol. 94, 13-26

Cameron, D., Frazer, E., Harvey, P., Rampton, M., Richardson, K. (1992) *Researching Language: Issues of power and method*, London:Routledge

Churchill, L. (1978) *Questioning Strategies in Sociolinguistics*, Rowley, Mass.:Newbury House, cited in Harris, S. (1984) 'Questions as a mode of control in magistrates' courts', *International Journal of Society and Language* 49 (1984), 5-27

Clayman, S. & Maynard, D. (1994) 'Ethnomethodology and conversation analysis', in P. ten Have & G. Psathas (eds.), *Situated Order: studies in the social organisation of talk and embodied activities.* Washington DC:University Press of America

Conley, J. & O'Barr, W. (1998) *Just Words:Law, Language and Power*, Chicago:The University of Chicago Press

Cotterill, J. (2000) 'Reading the rights: a cautionary tale of comprehension and comprehensibility', *Forensic Linguistics*, Vol. 7, no. 1, 4-25

Coulthard, M. (1977) *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis*, London:Longman

Coulthard, M. (1992) 'Forensic discourse analysis' in M. Coulthard (ed.) *Advances in Spoken Discourse Analysis*, London:Routledge 1992:242-257

Coulthard, M. (1997) 'A failed appeal', *Forensic Linguistics*, Vol. 4, No. 2, 1997:287-302

Coulthard, M. & Brazil, D. (1982) 'The place of intonation in the description of interaction', in D. Tannen (ed.), *Analysing Discourse: text and talk*, Georgetown Round Table on Languages and Linguistics. Washington DC: Georgetown University Press, 1982:94-112

Couper-Kuhlen, E. (1986) *An Introduction to English Prosody*, London:Edward Arnold

Crown, L. & Feldstein, S. (1985) 'Psychological correlates of silence and sound in conventional interaction', in D. Tannen & M. Saville-Troike (eds) *Perspectives on Silence*, Norwood N.J.:Ablex Publishing Corporation, 1985:31-54

Cruttenden, A. (1986) *Intonation* (2nd ed.) Cambridge:Cambridge University Press

Czyzewski, M. (1995) '"Mm hm" tokens as interactional devices in the psychotherapeutic in-take interview', in P. Ten Have & G. Psathas, (eds.), *Situated Order:studies in ethnomethodology and conversation analysis No. 3*, London:University Press, 1995:73-89

Dam, H. (1998) 'Lexical similarity vs lexical dissimilarity in consecutive interpreting: a product-oriented study of form-based vs meaning-based interpreting', *The Translator*, Vol. 4, no. 1, 1998:49-68

Davidson, B. (2000) 'The interpreter as institutional gatekeeper: the social-linguistic role of interpreters in Spanish-English medical discourse', *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 4/3, 2000:379-405

Davies, M., Croall, H. & Tyrer, J. (1998:38-9 second ed.) *Criminal Justice: an introduction to the criminal justice system in England and Wales*, Harlow:Addison Wesley Longman Limited

Denis, I.H. (1999) *The Law of Evidence*, London:Sweet & Maxwell Limited

Dimitrova, B. (1995) 'Degree of interpreter responsibility in the interaction process in community interpreting', in S. Carr, R. Roberts, A. Dufour & D. Steyn, (eds.), *The Critical Link: Interpreters in the Community*, Papers from the first international conference on interpreting in legal, health and social service settings. (Geneva Park, Canada, 1-4, 1995). Amsterdam/Philadelphia:John Benjamins Publisjing Company

Drew, P. (1994) 'Conversation analysis: the sequential analysis of intersubjectivity in conversation', in J. Smith, R. Harré, L. van Langenhove & P. Stearns (eds), *Rethinking Psychology*, Vol. 2 (Alternative Methodologies), London:Sage

Drew, P. and Heritage, J. (eds) (1992) *Talk at Work: interaction in institutional settings* Cambridge:Cambridge University Press

Drew, P. & Sorjonen, M-L (1997) 'Institutional dialogue', In Teun A. Van Dijk (ed) *Discourse as Social Interaction.* London:Sage Publications, 92-118

Du Bois, J., Scheutze-Coburn, S., Cumming, S., Paolino, D. (1993) 'Outline of discourse transcription', in Edwards, J. & Lampert M.D. (eds), *Talking Data: transcription and coding in discourse research*, Hillsdale N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates

Dumitrescu, D. (1996) 'Rhetorical vs nonrhetorical allo-repetition: The case of Romanian interrogatives', *Journal of Pragmatics*, 26, 1996:321-354

Edelsky, C. (1981) 'Who's got the floor?' *Language and Society',* in Roy, C. (1993) 'A sociolinguistic analysis of the interpreter's role in simultaneous talk in interpreted interaction', *Multilingua* 12-4 (1993) 341-363

Edwards, J. (1993) 'Principles and contrasting systems of discourse transcription'. In Edwards, J & Lampert M.D. (eds), *Talking Data: transcription and coding in discourse research*, Hillsdale N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates

Fabbro, F., Gran, L., Basso, G. and Bava, A., (1990) 'Cerebral lateralization in simultaneous interpretation', *Brain and Language* 39:69-89.

Fairclough, N. & Wodak, R. (1997) 'Critical discourse analysis', in Teun A. Van Dijk (ed.) *Discourse as Social Interaction*, London:Sage Publications Ltd. 1997:258:284

Fowler, Y. (1995) 'The courtroom interpreter: paragon and intruder?' In S. Carr, R. Roberts, A. Dufour, D. Steyn, eds. *The Critical Link:Interpreters in the Community*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia:John Benjamins Publishing Company, 191-200
Gentile, A. (1993) 'Community interpreting and languages of limited diffusion', Proceedings of FIT World Congress "Translation – the Vital Link, Brighton, 6-13 August 1993, 253-262

Gentile, A., Ozolins, V., Vasilakakos, M. (1996:91) *Liaison Interpreting: a handbook*, Melbourne: Melbourne University Press.

Gile, D.(1994) 'Methodological aspects of interpretation and translation research', in S. Lambert & B. Moser-Mercer (eds.), *Bridging the Gap: empirical research in simultaneous interpretation*, Amsterdam:John Benjamins Publishing Company

Gile, D. (1998) 'Observational studies and experimental studies in the investigation of conference interpreting', *Target* 10:1, 1998:69-93

Goffman, I. (1959) *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*, London:Penguin

Goffman, I. (1974) *Frame Analysis*: *an essay on the organization of experience*, New York:Harper & Row

Goffman, E. (1981) *Forms of Talk*, Oxford:Blackwell

González, R.D., Vasquez, V.F. & Mikkelson, H. (1991) *Fundamentals of court interpretation: theory, policy and practice*, Durham, NC:Carolina Academic Press, in Mikkelson, H. *Verbatim Interpretation: an Oxymoron.*
http://ww.acebo.com/papers/verbatim.htm. [01/11/00]

Graffam Walker, A. (1985) 'The two faces of silence: the effect of witness hesitancy on lawyers' impressions', in M. Saville-Troike & D. Tannen (eds) *Perspectives on Silence*, Norwood N.S.:Ablex Publishing Ltd. 1985:55-75

Gran, L. (1989) 'Interdisciplinary research on cerebral asymmetries: significance and prospects for teaching of interpretation', in L. Gran and J. Dodds (eds) *The Theoretical and Practical Aspects of Teaching Conference Interpretation*, Udine: Campanotto Editore

Gran, L. and Bellini, B. (1996) 'Short term memory and simultaneous interpretation: an experimental study on verbatim recall', *The Interpreters' Newsletter* 7:103-112.

Gumperz, J. & Berenz, N. (1993) 'Transcribing conversational exchanges', in Edwards, J. & Lampert M.D. (eds), *Talking Data: transcription and coding in discourse research*, Hillsdale N.J.:Lawrence Erlbaum Associates

Gumperz, J. (1999) 'On interactional sociolinguistic method', in Sarangi, S. & Roberts, C. (eds.) *Talk, Work and Institutional Order*, Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter

Gutt, E-A. (2000) *Translation and Relevance: Cognition and Context*, Manchester:St. Jerome Publishing

Hale, S. (1997) 'Clash of world perspectives: the discursive practices of the law, the witness and the interpreter', *Forensic Linguistics*, Vol. 4(2), 196-209

Hale, S. (1999) 'Interpreters' treatment of discourse markers in courtroom questions', *Forensic Linguistics* 6(1) 1999:57-82

Hale, S. & Gibbons, J. (1999) 'Varying Realities: patterned changes in the interpreter's representation of courtroom and external realities.' *Applied Linguistics* 20/2:203-220

Halliday, M A K (1994) *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*, London:Edward Arnold

Halverson, S. (1997) 'The concept of equivalence in translation studies: much ado about something', *Target*, 9:2, 1997:207-233

Harris, S. (1984) 'Questions as a mode of control in magistrates' courts', *International Journal of Society and Language* 49 (1984), pp 5-27

Hatim, B. & Mason, I. (1990) *Discourse and the Translator*, Essex: Longman, 63-4.

Hatim, B. & Mason, I. (1997) *The Translator as Communicator*, Routledge: London.

Heritage, J. (1984) 'A change-of-state token and aspects of its sequential placement', in J. Heritage & J. Atkinson, (1984) *Structures of Social Action*, Cambridge:Cambridge University Press, 1984:299-345

Heritage, J (1984) *Garfinkel and Ethnomethodology*, Cambridge:Polity Press

Heritage, J. (1992) 'Displaying neutrality: formal aspects of informal court proceedings', in Drew,P. & Heritage, J. (eds.) *Talk at Work*, Cambridge:Cambridge University Press, 199-211

Heritage, J. (1997) 'Conversation analysis and institutional talk: analysing data, in D. Silverman (ed) *Qualitative Research: Theory, Method and Practice*, London:Sage Publications, 1997:161-182

Heritage, J. & Atkinson, J. (1984) *Structures of Social Action*, Cambridge:Cambridge University Press

Heritage, J. & Greatbatch, D. (1991) 'On the institutional character of institutional talk: the case of news interviews', in D. Boden and D. Zimmerman (eds) *Talk and Social Structure: studies in ethnomethodology and conversation analysis*, Cambridge:Polity Press

Heritage, J. & Sorjonen M-L. (1994) 'Constituting and maintaining activities across sequences: a*nd*-prefacing as a feature of question design', *Language in Society* 1994, 23, 1-29

Hewitt, W.E. (1995) *Court Interpretation: Theory, Policy and Practice*, Durham, NC:Carolina Academic Press, cited in Mikkelson, H. *Verbatim Interpretation: an Oxymoron*. http://ww.acebo.com/papers/verbatim.htm. [01/11/00]

Holmes, J. (1995) *Women, Men and Politeness*, Harlow:Longman

Hudson, R.A. (1975) 'The meaning of questions', *Language*, 51:1-31

Hutchby, I. & Drew, P. (1995) 'Conversation analysis', in J. Verschueren, J-) Ostman & J. Blommaert, (eds.), *Handbook of Pragmatics*, Amsterdam:John Benjamins Publishing Company 1995:182-189

Hymes, D. (1981) *"In vain I tried to tel you: Essays in native American ethno-poetics"*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press

Jacquemet, M. (1994) 'T-offenses and metapragmatic attacks', *Discourse and Society*, Vol. 5(3):297-319

Jefferson, G. (1972) 'Side sequences', in D. Sudnow (ed) *Studies in Social Interaction, New York:Free Press 1972:294-338*

Jefferson, G. (1979) 'A technique for inviting laughter and its subsequent acceptance/declination', in G. Psathas (ed), *Everyday Language: Studies in Ethnomethodology*, New York:Irvington, 79-96

Jönsson, L. and Linell, P. (1991) 'Story generations: from dialogical interviews to written reports in police interrogations', *Text 11 (3)*, 419-440.

Kendon, A. (1992) 'The negotiation of context in face-to-face interaction', in A. Duranti & C. Goodwin (eds), *Rethinking Context*. Cambridge:Cambridge University Press, 1992:326-334

Komter, M.L. (1994) 'Accusations and defences in courtroom interaction', *Discourse and Society*, Vol 5(2):165-187, London, Thousand Oaks, CA and New Delhi:Sage

201

Kreidler, C. (1998) *Introducing English Semantics,* London:Routledge

Krouglov, A. (1999) 'Police interpreting': politeness and sociocultural context', *The Translator,* Vol. 5, No. 2, 1999:285-302

Kurzon, D. (1992) 'When silence may mean power', *Journal of Pragmatics,* Vol 18, 92-95

Labov, W. (1972:77) 'The transformation of experience in narrative syntax', *Language in the Inner City,* Oxford:Blackwell, 354-396

Lakoff, R. (1990) *Talking Power: the politics of language,* New York:Basic Books Inc.

Lapadat, J. & Lindsay, A. (1999), 'Transcription in research and practice: from standardization of technique to interpretive positionings', *Qualitative Enquiry,* Volume 5, Number 1, 1999:64-86

Lederer, M. (1986) 'Transcoder ou réexprimer?' in D. Seleskovitch and M. Lederer, *Interpréter pour Traduire,* Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne, 1986:15-36

Linell, P. (1994) 'Interpreting as communication', in Y. Gambier, D. Gile and C. Taylor (eds) *Conference interpreting:current trends in research. Proceedings of the International conference on interpreting:what do we know and how?* Turku, August 25-27 1994:49-67

Linell, P. (1996) 'Approaching Dialogue: on monological and dialogical models of talk and interaction, *Working papers from the Department of Communication Studies 1996:7,* Linköping:Department of Communication Studies

Linell, P. & Jönsson, L. (1991) 'Suspect stories: perspective-setting in an asymmetrical situation' in I. Markovà & K. Foppa (1991), Asymmetries in Dialogue, Hemel Hempstead:Harvester Wheatsheaf

Makarová, V. (1995) 'The interpreter as intercultural mediator', in J. Tommola (ed.) *Topics in Interpreting Research,* University of Turku, Centre for Translation and Interpreting, 1995:51-58

Martin, J. (1992) *English Text – System and Structure,* Amsterdam:John Benjamins. In Tebble, H. (1999) 'The tenor of consultant physicians: implications for medical interpreting', *The Translator,* Vol. 5, No. 2 (1999), 179-200

Mason, I. (1999) Introduction, *The Translator,* Vol. 5, no. 2 (1999), 147-160

Mason, I. (2000) 'Audience design in translating', *The Translator,* Vol. 6. Number 1, 2000:1-22

Mazeland, H., Huisman, M., Schasfoort, M. (1995) 'Negotiating categories in travel agency calls', in A. Firth (ed) *The Discourse of Negotiation: Studies of Language in the Workplace*, Oxford:Elsevier Science Ltd., 1995:271-297

McHoul, A. & Rapley, M. (2000) 'Still on holidays Hank? – 'doing business' by 'having a chat''. MC: A *Journal of Media and Culture* 3(4). [20/09/00] <http://www.api-network.com/mc/0008/holidays.html>

Mikkelson, H. *Verbatim Interpretation: an Oxymoron.* http://ww.acebo.com/papers/verbatim.htm. [01/11/00]

Mischler, E., (1991) 'Representing discourse: the rhetoric of transcription', *Journal of Narrative and Life History*, 1, 255-280, Cited in Lapadat J. and Lindsay A. (1999:73), 'Transcription in research and practice:from standardisation of technique to interpretive positionings. *Qualitative Enquiry,* Volume 5, number 1, 1999, 64-86

Moerman, M. (1988) *Talking Culture*, Philadelphia:University of Philadelphia Press

Morgan, R., Reiner, R., and McKenzie, L. (1991) *Police Powers and Police: a Study of the Work of Custody Officers* ESRC study, cited in Cotterrill, J. (2000) 'Reading the rights: a cautionary tale of comprehension and comprehensibility, *Forensic Linguistics,* Vol. 7, no. 1,

Morris, R. (1995) 'The moral dilemmas of court interpreting', *The Translator*, Vol 1, No. 1:25-46.

Morris, R. (1999) 'The Gum Syndrome: predicaments in court interpreting', *Forensic Linguistics*, Vol6(1), 1999:6-29

Niska, H. (1995) 'Just interpreting:role conflicts and discourse types in court interpreting, in M. Morris (1995) *Translation and the Law*, American Translators Association Vol VIII:293-316. Amsterdam:John Benjamins Publishing Co.

Norrick, N. (1987) 'Functions of repetition in conversation', *Text,* Vol.7/3 1987:245-264

Nuffield Interpreter Project (1992) *Access to Justice:Non English speakers in the legal system.* London:The Nuffield Foundation

Ochs, E. (1979) 'Transcription as theory', in E. Ochs & B. Schieffelin (eds), *Developmental Pragmatics*, London:Academic Press, INC. (London) Ltd. 1979:43-72

Palma, J. (1995) 'Textual density and the judiciary interpreter's performance', in *Translation and the Law. American Translators' Association.* Scholarly Monograph Series Vol. VIII, 219-31

Peräkylä, A. (1997) 'Reliability and validity in research based on tapes and transcripts', in D. Silverman (ed.), *Qualitative Research: Theory, Method and Practice*, London:Sage, 1997:201-220

Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984 (s.60(1)(a) and s.66), Codes of Practice A-E, London:The Stationery Office, 1997

Psathas, G. & Anderson, T. (1990), 'The "practices" of transcription in conversation analysis'. *Semiotica, 78, 75-99.* Cited in Lapadat J. and Lindsay A. (1999:73), 'Transcription in research and practice:from standardisation of technique to interpretive positionings. *Qualitative Enquiry,* Volume 5, number 1, 1999, 64-86

Pym, A. (1999) '"Nicole slapped Michelle": interpreters and theories of interpreting at the O.J. Simpson trial', *The Translator,* Vol. 5, No. 2, 1999:265-283

Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G. & Svartvik, J. (1985) *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language,* New York:Longman

Rees-Miller, J. (2000) 'Power, severity and context in disagreement', *Journal of Pragmatics,* Vol. 32 (2000), 1087-1111

Rigney, A.C. (1999) 'Questioning in interpreted testimony', *Forensic Linguistics* 6(1):83-108

Roberts, R.P. (1995) 'Community interpreting today and tomorrow', *The Critical Link: Interpreters in the Community,* Papers from the first international conference on interpreting in legal, health and social service settings, Geneva Park, Canada, June 104 1995. Amsterdam:John Benjamins Publishing Company, 7-26

Roy, C. (1993) 'A sociolinguistic analysis of the interpreter's role in simultaneous talk in interpreted interaction', *Multilingua* 12-4 (1993) 341-363

Roy, C. (2000) *Interpreting as a Discourse Process,* Oxford:Oxford University Press

Russell S. (2000)a ' "Let me put it simply": the case for a standard translation of the Police caution and its explanation', *International Journal of Forensic Linguistics,* Vol. 7, No. 1, 2000:26-48

Russell, S. (2000)b ' "The questions will be put to you in English..": the interpreter as forensic linguist in Police interviews with foreign suspects'. Paper given at BAAL 33rd Annual Meeting, Language Across Boundaries, Cambridge 2000.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. Jefferson, G. (1974) 'A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking in conversation, *Language,* Vol. 50:696-736

Saville-Troike, M. (1982) *The Ethnography of Communication.* Oxford:Blackwell Publishers

Schegloff, E. (1992) 'On talk and its institutional occasions', in P. Drew and J. Heritage (eds) *Talk at Work: interaction in institutional settings*, Cambridge:Cambridge University Press, 1992:101-134

Schegloff, E. (1982) 'Discourse as an interactional achievement: some uses of "uh huh" and other things that come between sentences', in D. Tannen (ed.), *Analyzing Discourse* (Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics 1981). Washington DC: Georgetown University Press. pp. 71-93.

Schiffrin, D. (1987) *Discourse Markers.* Cambridge:Cambridge University Press

Schiffrin, D. (1994) *Approaches to Discourse*, Oxford:Basil Blackwell Press

Schiffrin, D. (1996) Interactional sociolinguistics, in S. McKay & N. Hornberger (eds), *Sociolinguistics and Language Teaching*, Cambridge:Cambridge University Press
Seleskovitch, D. (1975) *Langage, Langues et Mémoire. Etudes de la Prise de Notes en Interprétation Consécutive*, Paris: Minard

Shlesinger, M. (1991) 'Interpreter latitude vs. due process:simultaneous and consecutive interpreting in multi-lingual trials', in S. Tirkonnen-Condit (ed) *Empirical Research in Translation and Intercultural Studies*, Tubingen:Gunther Narr Verlag

Shlesinger, M. (1995) 'Shifts in cohesion in simultaneous interpreting', *The Translator*, Vol.1, No. 2, 193-214.

Shuy, R. (1993) *Language Crimes: the use and abuse of language evidence in the court room*, Oxford:Blackwell

Shuy, R. (1997:177) 'Ten unanswered language questions about Miranda', *Forensic Linguistics*, Vol. 4, no. 2, 175-196

Silverman, D. (1999) 'Warriors or collaborators: Reworking methodological controversies in the study of institutional interaction', in S. Sarangi & C. Roberts (eds.), *Talk, Work and Institutional Order: discourse in medical, mediation and management settings.* Berlin:Mouton de Gruyter

Sinclair, J. & Coulthard, M. (1975) *Towards an Analysis of Discourse: the English used by teachers and pupils*, London:Oxford University Press, Cited in Coulthard, M. (1992:36), *Advances in Spoken Discourse Analysis*, London:Routledge

Sunnari, M. (1995) 'Processing strategies in simultaneous interpreting: "saying it all" vs synthesis', in J. Tommola (ed.), *Topics in Interpreting Research*, University of Turku, Centre for Translation and Interpreting. 1995:109-115

Svartvik, J. & Quirk, R. (1980) *A Corpus of English Conversation,* Lund:CWK Gleerup

Tannen, D. (1984) *Conversational Style: Analyzing Talk Among Friends.* Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Co.

Tannen, D. (1989) *Talking Voices: Repetition, dialogue and imagery in conversational discourse.* Cambridge:Cambridge University Press

Tannen, D. (1994) *Gender and Discourse,* Oxford:Oxford University Press

Tebble, H. (1999) 'The tenor of consultant physicians: implications for medical interpreting', *The Translator,* Vol. 5, No. 2 (1999), 179-200

Ten Have, P. (1989) 'The consultation as a genre', in B. Torode, (ed.), *Text and Talk as Social Practice,* Dordrecht/Providence, R.I.: Forts Publications, 1989:115-135

Ten Have, P. (1990) 'Methodological issues in conversation analysis', *Bulletin de Méthodologie Sociologique,* no. 27, June 1990:23-51

Ten Have, P. (1991) 'Talk and institution: a reconsideration of the "asymmetry" of doctor-patient interaction, in D. Boden & D. Zimmerman (eds) *Talk and Social Structure: studies in ethnomethodology and conversation analysis,* Cambridge:Polity Press 1991:138-163

Ten Have, P. (1995) 'Disposal negotiations', in A. Firth (ed) *The Discourse of Negotiation: Studies of Language in the Workplace,* Oxford:Elsevier Science Ltd., 1995:319-344.

Ten Have, P. (1999) *Doing Conversation Analysis: A Practical Guide,* London:Sage Publications

Thomas, J. (1985) 'Cross-cultural discourse as 'unequal encounter': towards a pragmatic analysis', *Applied Linguistics,* Vol. 5, No. 3, 226-235

Tiersma, P. (1995) 'The Language of Silence', in *Rutgers Law Review,* Vol. 48, Fall 1995, Number 1.

Tijus, C. (1994) 'Understanding for interpreting, interpreting for understanding', in Y. Gambier, D. Gile, C. Taylor (eds) *Conference Interpreting: Current Trends in Research. Proceedings of the International Conference on Interpreting: What do we know and how?* Turku, August 25-27, 1994. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 29-48

Tsui, A. (1992) 'A functional description of questions', in M. Coulthard (ed.), *Advances in Spoken Discourse Analysis,* London:Routledge

Van Dijk (1997) (ed.) *Discourse as Social Interaction*, London:Sage Publications Ltd.

Vermeer, H. (1998) 'Starting to unask what translatology is about', *Target*, 10:1, 1998:41-68

Wadensjö, C. (1992) *Interpreting as Interaction: on dialogue interpreting in immigration hearings and medical encounters.* (Dissertation, Linköping Studies in Arts and Science, 83). Linköping: Department of Communication Studies

Wadensjö, C. (1995) 'Recycled information as a questioning strategy:pitfalls in interpreter-mediated talk', In S. Carr, R. Roberts, A. Dufour, D. Steyn, (eds.) *The Critical Link:Interpreters in the Community.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia:John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Wadensjö, C. (1998) *Interpreting as Interaction*, Harlow:Addison Wesley Longman Limited
Williams, S. (1995) 'Observations on anomalous stress in interpreting', *The Translator*, Vol. 1, No. 1, 1995:47-64

Wodak, R. (1996) *Disorders of Discourse*, London:Addison Wesley Longman

Woodbury, H. (1984) 'The strategic use of questions in court', *Semiotica*, 48 (3/4):197-228. In Berk-Seligson, S. *The impact of court interpreting on the coerciveness of leading questions.* Forensic Linguistics 6(1) 1999:30-56

Woolls, D. & Coulthard, M. (1998) 'Tools for the trade', *Forensic Linguitics,* Vol. 5, No. 1, 1998:33-57

Wootton, A. (1989) 'Remarks on the methodology of conversation analysis', in D. Roger & P. Bull, (eds.), *Conversation Analysis: an interdisciplinary perspective*, Clevedon:Multilingual Matters, 1989:238-258

APPENDIX 1 TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTIONS AND ABBREVIATIONS

italics	emphasis
bold	picks out feature under discussion
°yeah°	spoken more quietly than surrounding speech
<did you show any passports>	faster than surrounding speech
.hhh	intake of breath
hhh	exhalation
↑	noticeably raised intonation
-	preceding syllable cut short
E:::r	preceding syllable lengthened
=	latched utterances
[ ]	overlapping speech
.	falling contour
,	continuing contour
?	questioning intonation
(unclear)	untranscribable due to poor sound quality
(1.5)	pause timed to nearest half second
(.)	pause of less than half a second
(#)	untimeable pause
(<u>gloss</u>)	English gloss of preceding turn

ABBREVIATIONS

O	Interviewing officer	I	Interpreter
DP	Detained Person	S	Solicitor

EXTRACTS WITH BACK TRANSLATIONS FROM FRENCH

The interpreted extracts from each chapter are reproduced below. In each case, an English gloss of the French spoken by both the interpreter and the detained person has been added in brackets and italics, on the line immediately below. These back translations are not line numbered, in order not to alter the line numbers referred to in the main body of the thesis.

Introduction

Extract I:1

Full (CA) transcription of interpreter-mediated interview

1	O	was it *your* idea to (.) go to (.) Mexico
2	I	est-ce-que c'était *votre* idée d'aller au Mexique?
		(was it your idea to go to Mexico?)
3		(1.0)
4	DP	.hh euh:: non euh <oui et non>
		(.hh er:: no er <yes and no>)
5	I	yes and no
6	O	did somebody (.) suggest that you might go ?
7	I	est-ce que quelqu'un vous a ↑suggéré d'aller au Mexique?
		(did somebody suggest you go to Mexico?)
8	DP	non non (1.0) non
		(no no (1.0) no)
9	I	no nobody suggested it
10	O	so (.) you say yes and no what do you mean by yes and no
11	I	qu'est-ce que vous voulez dire par oui et non
		(what do you mean by yes and no)
12	DP	euh:: j'savais pas si j'allais au Mexique ou euh:: en Colombie
		(er:: I didn't know whether I was going to Mexico or er:: to Columbia)
13	I	he wasn't sure whether to go to Mexico or Colombia

Chapter 2   Linguistic Aspects of the Interview

Extract 2:10

1	O	but you're saying you- i- in your m- own mind (1.0) you (.) thought there
2		was nothing wrong with any of this.=
3	I	=vous êtes en train de dire donc que vous dans votre tête il n'y avait rien de
4		mal [unclear]
		(you're saying then that in your own mind there was nothing wrong)
5	DP	[**non** 'y avait rien de mal]
		(no there was nothing wrong)
6	I	No there w- yes there was nothing wrong

Extract 2:11

1	O	I understand the keys were in the battery compartment or near the
2		battery **and the vehicle was er: collected by (DP name)**
3	I	Et si je comprends bien les clés étaient dans la batterie ou près de la
4		batterie [et-]
		(and if I understand rightly the keys were in the battery or near the
		battery and-)
5	DP	[non]non sous le cache de la batterie=
		(no no under the battery cover)
6	I	=yes underneath the battery- battery [compartment (.) and you needed
7	DP	[fallait ouvrir le cache °et les clés
		(you had to open the cover and the keys
8	I	to open the] battery compartment and the keys were there .hh **et que**
9	DP	étaient là°]
		were there)
10	I	**c'est vous qui avez été donc chercher** [**le camion sur ce parking**]
		(and that it's you who went to collect the lorry on the carpar)k
11	DP	[le camion à pied oui exacte oui]
		(the lorry on foot yes that's right)
12	I	yes on foot yes

Extract 2:12

1	O	remind me did you visit Mister:: (name) in hospital
2	I	rappellez-moi est-ce que vous êtes allé rendre visite à (name) à l'hôpital
		(remind me did you go and visit (name) at the hospital)
3	DP	oui Dimanche.=
		(yes on Sunday)
4	I	=yes.(1.0) [yes on Sunday]
5	O	[did you vis....]

210

6	DP	[Dimanche] après son (.) son accident
		(Sunday after his accident)
7	I	after his (.) accident
8	O	OK
9	DP	en réanimation
		(in intensive care)
		(1.0)
10	I	when he was:: (1.0.) er in intensive care
11	O	°fine° .hh did you visit him (2.0) alone?

Extract 2:13

1	DP	et ils ont chargé du papier
		(and they loaded paper)
2	I	and they loaded [paper]
3	DP	[les bobines]
4	I	the rolls
5	DP	ils ont ramené le camion à (place)
		(they brought the lorry back to (place))
6	O	[and you saw paper]
7	I	[they brought-] (.) et vous avez vu (.) ce papier
		(and you saw this paper)
8	DP	oui parce-que m-même euh le (company name) parce-que ça =
		(yes because even er the (company name) because that=)
9	I	=yes=
10	DP	=ça c-c'est *moi* qui l'ai déchargé
		=(that was me that unloaded it)
11	I	even at (company name) it was *me* that unloaded

Extract 2:14

1	O	I see so you had a curtain trailer from (town A) to (town B)
2	I	c'était donc une remorque à bâches de (town A) jusqu'à (town B)=
		(so it was a curtain trailer from (town A) to (town B))
3	DP	=voilà
		(that's right)
4	I	yes that's [right]
5	DP	[une verte]
		(a green one)
6	O	[you le-] you left the curtain trailer at (town B),
7	I	it was green (.) .hh vous avez laissé la:: la remorque à bâches à (town B),
		(you left the the curtain trailer in (town B))
8	DP	voilà [j'ai écouté moi c'est] ce qu'ils m'ont dit
		(that's right I listened that's what they told me)

9	O	[and you picked....]
10	I	yes that's right I listened that's what they told me to do
11	O	and then you picked up the tipper trailer at (town B) and brought that to
12		England

Chapter 4, Interpretation of the Caution and its Explanation

Extract 4:3

1	O	I am (rank) (name)
2	I	je suis (rank) (name)
		(I am (rank) (name))
3	O	also present,
4	O2	(name) police officer
5	I	mon- er je suis er également présent (.) (name) un un officier de police,
		(my er I am er also present (.) (name) a a police officer ,)

Extract 4:4

1	O	what I would- what I would ask you is if you could (1.5) er reply in
2		French so that we can keep (.) the interview completely and utterly in
3		French not to confuse (.) the issue
4	DP	OK
5	I	pour des raisons de clarté il faut répondre en français
		(for reasons of clarity you must answer in French)
6		(2.0)
7	O	now also present is,
8	S	(name) solicitor's rep (name of firm)
9	O	and,
10	I	(name) French interpreter
11	O	thank you very much (.) er [I think....]
12	I	[on s'est présenté] votre avocat et moi-même
		(your solicitor and I introduced ourselves)

Extract 4:5

1	O	there are three parts to the caution
2	I	Donc (.) il y a euh trois parties si vous voulez (.) lorsqu'on vous dit vos
3		droits
		(so (.) there are er three parts if you like (.) when you are told your rights)
4	O	**the first** is that you do not have to say anything
5	I	la première c'est que vous n'êtes pas obligé de parler
		(the first is that you do not have to speak)
6	O	I intend to ask you questions,

7	I	je compte vous poser des questions,
		(I intend to ask you questions ,)
8	O	but it is up to you (.) if you choose to answer them or not .
9	I	mais (.) vous avez le choix de répondre ou pas
		(but you have the choice whether to answer or not)
10	DP	mhm
11	O	**the last part** is that anything you do say may be given in evidence
12 13	I	et puis la dernière partie c'est que tout ce que vous dites peut être utilisé comme preuve
		and then the last part is that everything you say can be used as evidence)
14	O	as I've explained (.) the interview is being tape-recorded ,
15	I	comme j'ai expliqué cet interview est en train de-d'être enregistré,
		(as I explained this interview is being tape-recorded)
15	I	comme j'ai expliqué cet interview est en train de-d'être enregistré,
		(as I explained this interview is being tape-recorded)
16	O	should this matter go to court,
17	I	donc si ce cas va au tribunal,
		(so if this matter goes to court)
18	O	the tapes can be played to the court,
19	I	les cassettes peuvent être rejoués au tribunal
		(the tapes can be played again in court)
20	O	or they can see (.) er the written record of the interview
21 22	I	ou bien ils peuvent voir euh les cassettes euh ce-ce qui est écrit euh les cassettes en écrit
		(or they can see er the tapes er what- what is written er the tapes in *writing)*
23	O	and that can be entered as evidence at court.
24	I	et cela peut être présenté comme preuve au tribunal.
		(and that may be presented as evidence in court)

Extract 4:6

25 26	O	**the middle part** is that it may harm your defence if you do not mention when questioned something which you later **rely** on in court
27 28 29	I	donc le le milieu de ça il dit que cela pourrait nuire à votre défense si vous ne mentionnez pas (.) lorsqu'on vous questionne (.) une chose sur laquelle vous pourrez compter plus tard lorsque vous serez au tribunal.
		(so the middle of that it says that it may harm your defence if you do not *mention when questioned something on which you may rely later when* *you are in court)*
30	DP	donc si je ne dis pas quelque chose que je devrais dire quoi
		(so like if I don't say something that I should say)
31	I	so you mean if I **don't** say something that I should say
32 33	O	.hh well what this means is that (.) erm if you choose not to say anything now
34	I	ce que cela veut dire c'est si vous choisissez de ne rien dire maintenant

213

		(*what that means is if you choose not to say anything now*)
35	O	and then if the matter goes to court you then choose to *give* an explanation
36	I	et puis si cela va au tribunal et en suite vous donnez une explication
37		lorsque vous êtes au tribunal
		(*and then if it goes to court and then you give an explanation when you are in court*)
38	O	or if you give one explanation now and a different explanation in court ,
39	I	ou bien si vous donnez une explication maintenant et puis vous- vous dites
40		quelquech- une explication **différente** au tribunal,
		(*or if you give an explanation now and then you- you say someth- a different explanation to the court,*)
41	O	the court can ask themselves (.) why did you do this
42	I	le tribunal peut se demander pourquoi vous l'avez fait
		(*the court can ask themselves why did you do it*)
43	DP	ah oui d'accord
44	I	ah yes
45	O	and they can make what we call an inference
46	I	an?
47	O	and they can take what we call an *inference*

Extract 4:7

1	O	and the caution is that you do not have to say anything
2		(1.5)
3	I	.hhh la caution qui dit que vous ne devez- vous n'avez- vous n- n'êtes pas
4		obligé de dire quoique ce soit
		(*.hhh the 'guarantee' that says that you must not- you have not- you do not have to say anything*)
5	O	but it may harm your defence,
6	I	mais ça peut faire du tort à votre défence,
		(*but it may harm your defence*)
7	O	if you do not mention when questioned,
8	I	si vous ne mentionnez- si vous ne dites pas .h lorsque vous êtes questionné
		(*if you do not mention- if you do not say .h when you are questioned*)
9	O	something which you later rely on in court
10	I	quelque chose dont vous avez besoin quand vous allez au tribunal
		(*something which you need when you go to court*)

Extract 4:8

1	O	should this matter go to court ,
2	I	donc si cette affaire va au tribunal
		(*so if this matter "goes" to court*)

Extract 4:9

1	O	I intend to ask you questions ,
2	I	je compte vous poser des questions

Extract 4:10

1	O	I'll expl**ain** the caution to you
2	I	je vais vous expliquer maintenant l'avertissement
		(I'm going to explain the caution to you now)
3	O	It comes in three parts
4	I	ca vient donc en trois parties
		(so it comes in three parts)

Extract 4:11 (4:1)

20		… … … … … … … … … … … … … … .and the middle (.) but you- it may harm
21		your defence if you do not mention when questioned something which you
22		later rely on in court, means that (.) should you give an account of the
23		incident to me now, a::nd should this matter go to court you give (.) a
24		different explanation, the court may ask themselves (.) why(.) (1.5)

Extract 4:12 (4:6)

25	O	**the middle part** is that it may harm your defence if you do not mention
26		when questioned something which you later *rely* on in court
32	O	.hh well what this means is that (.) erm if you choose not to say anything
33		*now*
35	O	and then if the matter goes to court you then choose to *give* an explanation
38	O	or if you give one explanation now and a different explanation in court,
41	O	the court can ask themselves (.) why did you do this

Extract 4:13

O	You don't have to say anything unless you wish to do so (1.0) that means exactly what it says.

Extract 4:14

1	DP	eu:::h j'ai bien compris que eu::h durant l'interrogatoire, (1.5) je dois eu::h
2		je ne dois pas omettre euh à répondre à des questions
		(er::: I really understood that er::: during the interview, er::: I must not omit to answer questions)
3	DP	parce-que cela peut me nuire er à- à ma défense,
		(because it may harm my defence,)
4	DP	eu:::h (2.0) pour- il a dit que:: le- le- l'interview est enregistré sur cassette
		(er::: for- he said that the- the- the interview is recorded on tape)
5	DP	eu::h à la fin de ... .
		(er:: at the end of ...)

Extract 4:15

1	DP	eu::h tout ce que je peux dire euh (.) pourra euh c- être contre moi ou
2		comme preuve
		(er:: everything I might say could er be against me or as proof...)

Extract 4:16

| 1 | DP | donc ça veut dire que (1.5) tout ce que je dis- toutes les paroles que je dis .hh sera contre moi . |
| | | *(so it means that everything I say- all the words that I say .hh will be against me.)* |

Chapter 5, *and*-prefaced Questions

Extract 5:10

325	O	how many days in each hotel .
326	I	combien de:: de de jours par chaque hotel.
		(how many days for each hotel)
327	DP	la:: moitié euh [s::sept]euh sept sept huit jours dans un la moitié peut-être
		(half er seven er seven seven eight days in one half perhaps)
328	I	[half] seven eight days in one (.) half roughly
329	O	tch **and** you can't remember the names .
330	I	mais vous pouvez pas vous rappeler des noms
		(but you can't remember the names)
331	DP	euh hhh non faut qu'ça revienne hein ?
		(euh no I'll have to try to remember)
332	I	no it's got to come back to me

Extract 5:11

640	O	do you see this pair of black jeans ?
641	I	est-ce que vous voyez cette paire de jean noir ?
		(do you see this pair of black jeans?)
642	DP	oui
		(yes)
643	I	yes=
644	O	=do you confirm they were in the bag
645	I	est-ce que vous pouvez confirmer qu'ils étaient dans le sac?
		(can you confirm they were in the bag?)
646	DP	euh: oui
		(er yes)
647	I	yes
648	O	**and** you confirm I've taken this piece of paper out of the coin pocket .
649	I	est-ce que vous pouvez confirmer que j'ai retiré un peu de papier de la piè-
650		de la poche pour les petites pièces
		(can you confirm that I took a bit of paper from the coin pocket)

Extract 5:12

1	DP	à (town A)
		in (town A)
2	I	in (town A)
3	O	(town A) (unclear) (.)thank you (.) **and** was that a ah factory there ?
4	I	c'est une usine?
		(is it a factory?)
5	DP	c'est un euh parking routier
		(it's a er lorry park
6	I	no it's a lorry park
7	O	**and** who told you to pick the trailer up there?
8	I	qui vous a dit d'aller chercher la remorque là-bas?
		(who told you to pick up the trailer there?)
9	DP	j'connais pas
		(I don't know them)
10	I	I don't know them

Chapter 6, Repetition

Extract 6:2

118	O	is this your <u>ticket.</u>
119	I	est-ce votre ticket.
120	DP	euh:: oui
121	I	yes

122	O	when did you purchase <u>this ticket</u>
123	I	quand avez-vous acheté ce ticket.
124	DP	euh il y a à peu près une semaine
125	I	about a week ago
126	O	and how did you pay for <u>this ticket</u>

Extract 6:27

679	O	OK (.) and then <u>the bus left</u>?
680	I	alors <u>le bus est parti</u>?
		(then the bus left)
681	DP	oui <u>le bus est parti</u>
		(yes the bus left)
682	I	yes

Extract 6:28

997	O	yes I-I do appreciate that but what I'm *saying* is that the immigra- the
998		immigration officer says that he found (1.0) this within the briefcase
999	I	ce- ce que je dis en fait c'est que (.) [l'officier d'immigration]
		(what I'm saying in fact is that the immigration officer
		([tape buzzer sounds)]
1000		(2.5)
1001	I	l'- c'est que l'officier d'immigration a trouvé tous ces enveloppes et ce
1002		ce petit (.) euh (1.0) carte? dans dans votre sac à main
		(th- is that the immigration officer found all these envelopes and this
		little er card in in your handbag
1003	DP	non (.) c'était dans / mon / porte / feuille (.) [je sais où je le] mettais
		no it was in / my / wallet I know where I put it
1004	I	[it was in my wallet]
1005	DP	c'était *dans* mon portefeuille (continues)
		(it was in my wallet)

Extract 6:29

440	DP	elle me connaît bien, alors elle [m'a appellé ...]
		(she knows me well so she called out to me
441	I	[she- she knows]me well so she (.) I saw
442		her
443	DP	en me disant <u>qu'elle m'attendait depuis</u>
		(telling me she had been waiting for me since)
444	I	and she- she had said that <u>she was waiting for me</u>
445		(1.5)
446	O	<u>she was waiting for you</u>?

447	I	elle vous attendait?
		(she was waiting for you?)
448	DP	mm
449	O	had you arranged to meet her?

Extract 6:30

908	O	so you put it in the compartment and then <u>put the newspaper on top</u> (.) is
909		that right?
910	I	donc vous l'avez mis dans un compartiment et vous avez mis <u>le journal</u>
911		<u>au dessus</u>
		(so you put it in a compartment and you put the newspaper on top)
912		(1.0)
913	DP	j'ai mi l'enveloppe? non <u>je l'ai mis en haut</u> comme ça
		(I put the envelope? no I put it up on top like that)
914	I	<u>I put it on top</u> (1.0) like that
915		(1.5)
916	O	so you put it in the <u>compartment</u>,
917	I	donc vous l'avez mis dans le <u>compartiment</u>.
		(so you put it in the compartment)
918	DP	c'est ce qu'on appelle <u>compartiment</u>?
		(is that what's called a compartment?)
919	I	that's what you call <u>compartiment</u>?
920	O	well (2.5) yes
921	I	yes (.) yes
922	SOL	on the shelf may be a better=
923	O	=OK you put it on the shelf,
924	I	donc vous l'avez mis sur l'- l'é-étagère
		(so you put it on the shelf)
925	DP	voilà
		that's right

chapter 7, Four Features of Interpreted Interviews

Extract 7:4

515	O	°yeah° now do you *understand* that it is illegal (.) to import (1.5)
516		cocaine into this country
517	I	est-ce que vous comprenez que c'est illégal d'importer de la cocaïne
518		dans ce pays
		do you understand that it is illegal to import cocaine into this country
519	DP	ben oui parce-que j'suis là (laughs)
		well yes because I'm here (laughs)
520	I	(smile in voice) yes because he's here

| 521 | O | OK .hh just come on to (2.0) this paper I've got this is er (1.0) obtained |
| 522 | | from er (company name) from their um (.) records (1.0) ... ...(continues) |

Extract 7:8

300	O	and this is a (town A-town B-town A) ticket
301	I	c'est un- un (.) billet (town A-town B-town A)
		(it's a- a (town A-town B- town A) ticket)
302	DP	mm
303	O	with your name here?
304	I	avec votre nom là?
		(with your name here?)
305	O	OK?
306	DP	mm
307	O	er and this is for the (date),
308	I	c'est pour le (date),
		(it's for the (date))

Extract 7:9

1	O	... and your name was used to book their room
2	I	et votre nom a été utilisé pour la réservation de leur chambre
		(and your name was used to book their hotel room)
3	O	so tell me what you have to do with those people
4	I	donc vous pourriez m'éxpliquer ce que vous avez à voir avec ces deux
5		personnes
		(so could you explain to me what you have to do with those two people)
6	DP	.hh j'ai rien à voir avec ça moi (.) j'ai rien à voir du tout et je ne sais
7		rien à voir du tout (.) j'ai rien à voir du tout
		(I've nothing to do with that I've nothing to do with it at all and I know
		nothing to do with it I've got nothing to do with it)
8	I	I am (.) nothing to do with these people
9		(1.5)
10	DP	j'ai rien à voir du tout (1.0)[qu'est-ce que vous voulez que je vous dise]
		(I've got nothing to do with it at all what do you want me to say)
11	I	[again (.) he keeps repeating I have nothing]
12		to do with these people
13	O	why did you come to England
14	I	pourquoi est-ce que vous êtes venu en Angleterre

Extract 7:10

1	O	why did he give it to you
2	I	et pourquoi il vous a donné un téléphone
		(and why did he give you a telephone)
3		(3.0)
4	DP	pourquoi (1.0) parce-qu'il m'a- .hh il m'a fait un cadeau c'est tout
		(why because he he gave me a present that's all)
5	I	because it was- it was a gift that's all
6	DP	il m'a fait un cadeau pour me (unclear) le téléphone c- c'est pratique et
7		puis [c'est] pas cher
		(he gave me a present to (unclear) telephones are handy and they're
		not expensive)
8	I	[b-] because telephones are quite handy and they're not
9		expensive
10		(1.0)
11	O	they *are* quite expensive
12	I	ils *sont* assez chers en fait
		(the are expensive in fact)
13	DP	non non
		(no no)
14	I	he says no

Extract 7:11

877	DP	oui (.) je l'explique hein? .hh=
		(yes I'll explain it shall I?)
878	I	=I'll explain=
879	DP	=oui ce que ça c'était [pour moi]
		(yes what it was for me)
880	O	[please do]
881	DP	hein?
		(mm?)
882	I	elle dit je vous en prie expliquez
		(she said please do explain)
883	DP	oui OK merci .hh je vous explique ... (continues)
		(yes OK thank you I'll explain)

Extract 7:12

1	O	the offence is you and your friend bringing those persons those
2		(nationality) persons (.) into the UK. that being (.) the ferry
3	I	le délit est le suivant que vous avez amené ces personnes illégalement
4		en Angleterre. (1.0) °sur le bateau°

		(the offence is the following, that you brought these persons into England illegally on the boat)
5		(1.5)
6	DP	on se croirait dans un jeu de société
		(you'd think we were playing parlour games)
7	I	he says this is like a game

Extract 7:13

1	DP	j'ai mangé quatre fois au restaurant avec lui
		I ate four times at the restaurant with him
2	I	We ate four times (.) I ate four times at a restaurant with him
3	O	and who paid
4	I	qui a payé
		who paid
5	DP	lui
		hm
6	I	him
7	O	*you* paid
8	DP	moi? non
		me? no
9	I	[me? no]
10	O	[who paid]
11	DP	lui
		him
12	I	him
13	O	(name) paid.
14	I	(name).

Extract 7:14

1	O	.... that is four digits difference to the car carrying the cocaine
2	I	.h il y a donc euh quatre numéros de différence entre vous et la voiture qui
3		transporte de la cocaïne
		so there are er four numbers difference between you and the car carrying cocaine
4	O	will you *now* tell me the truth about your involvement with the car
5		carrying the cocaine
6	I	alors maintenant est-ce que vous pourriez s'il vous plaît nous- .h nous
7		expliquer euh le rapport que vous avez avec cette voiture qui transporte de
8		la cocaïne
		so now could you please explain to us er the connection that you have with this car carrying cocaine

Extract 7:15

331	O	why were you carrying your son's passport. (.) [in the <u>paper</u>]
332	I	[pourquoi est-ce-] que
333		vous tranportiez le passeport de votre fils dans l- dans votre <u>journal</u>
		(why were you carrying your son's passport in your newspaper)
334		(2.0)
335	DP	justement c'est moi qui garde le::: euh ses papiers donc c'était dans ma
336		<u>mallette</u>
		(that's just it, it's me that keeps his papers so it was in my briefcase)
337	I	mm mm can I ask him again I didn't ....
338	O	mhm
339	I	pardon vous pouvez [répéter]
		(sorry could you repeat that)
340	DP	[justement] c'est moi qui garde ses papiers donc
341		c'était dans mon <u>sac à main</u>
		(that's just it it's me who keeps his papers so it was in
		my handbag)
342	I	it was er i- with my er my <u>briefcase</u>
343		(3.0)
344	O	well you've just said it was in the paper (.) why was it in the <u>paper</u>
345	I	pourquoi c'était tout- tout <u>d'un coup</u> a été mis dans le dans le <u>journal</u>
		(why was it suddenly in- put in the newspaper)
346	DP	euh parce 'quand on arrivait ahm::: (.) au restaurant là pour la pause de
347		quinze minutes
		(er because we were arriving ahm at the restaurant there for the fifteen
		minute stop)
348	I	because when we arrived at the restaurant for the fifteen minutes break
349		(1.0) a-at the <u>berth</u>
450	DP	euh j'ai enlevé euh:: mon passeport, et son passeport (.) euh que j'ai mis
451		ici
		(er I took out er my passport and his passport er which I put here)
452	I	that I put in my (.) breast pocket

Extract 7:16

1	DP	phh j'suis même pas resté je- je suis pas resté quatre heures en
2		Angleterre ce- ce matin c'est pas possible=
		hh I didn't even stay- I didn't stay for four hours in England this- this
		mornong that's not possible
3	I	=I- I didn't stay for four hours in the UK this morning that's not possible
4		(2.5)
5	O	well (.) *two* hours (.) *three* hours what was it
6	I	oh disons deux heures (.) trois heures (.) on va vérifier (unclear)
		oh say two hours (.) three hours (.) w'll check that

| 7 | DP | phh (2.0) et vous pensez qu'en ce temps j'ai eu le temps euh… … … |
| | | *phh (2.0) and you think that in that time I had time to er…….* |

Extract 7:17

1	O2	u-uhm (2.5) yeah- did you when you *travelled* (.) um (.) to:: <(town name)
2		wasn't it>
3	O1	yeah=
4	O2	=yeah did you travel (.) with anybody (.) else.
5	I	quand vous êtes allé à (town name) pour voyager (.) est-ce que vous avez
6		voyagé ↑**seul** ou avec quelqu'un d'autre
		*(when you went to (town name) to travel did you travel **alone** or with someone else)*
7	DP	non tout **seul**
		(no all alone)
8	I	**alone**

Extract 7:18

1	O	is you- is your bank card also used for taking cash out of machines
2	I	est-ce que votre carte bancaire est utilisée pour enlever de l'argent aux
3		points guichets ? (unclear)
		(is your bank card used for removing money from cash points)
5	DP	euh: pas en (country name)
		(er not in (country name))
6	I	not in (country name) it cannot be used