

Introduction to the volume

Cecilia Wadensjö, Laura Gavioli

Modern linguistics embraces the idea that human sense making of words and other communicative resources is a social, dynamic activity. Inspired by the literary scholar and philosopher Michail Bakhtin (1986), among others, language and communication scholars are increasingly applying a dialogical view of language and mind (see for example Linell 2009). Dialogic theory is also the basis for several studies of interpreter-mediated interaction. Applying a dialogical view of language and mind means, among other things, that interpreters are perceived of as active participants, with their own agency, rather than as passive instruments. Also, the everyday perception of interpreting of spontaneous talk in interaction as a simple transfer of clear-cut messages in one language to equally unambiguous messages in another language must be dismissed. A significant number of studies show that spontaneous interpreter-mediated interaction, spoken and/or signed, are complex events, both linguistically and socially. For instance, participants may produce talk not necessarily to add content, but also to organize the very talking. Nevertheless, in a certain sense, interpreting can be described as a ‘monologising practice in a dialogically organized world’ (Wadensjö 2004) in that, when interpreters perform consecutively, they tend to treat participants’ talk chunk by chunk, regardless of whether they have been allocated the turn or take it on their own initiative. When an utterance is rendered in another language, if not checked for ambiguities, it is thus treated as a more or less unambiguous chunk of talk. Doing so, interpreters are expected to be observant of linguistic details and of how talk fits in with the on-going exchange, an expectation which involves interpreters’ familiarity with the larger, institutional and cultural contexts.

Within interpreting studies, indeed all authors in this volume, perceive of interpreters as active participants with their own agency. Yet, it can be argued, in line with, for example, Inghilleri (2012) and Määttä (2015), that also researchers who do not see interpreters as translation machines, but assume that they are active, sense-making participants with their own agency, paradoxically still tend to cement the simple conduit metaphor in the view of both communication and interpreters’ work, by their exclusive focus on interpreters’ choice of words and expressions in the other language, that is, looking at (and evaluating) interpreting exclusively on the basis of the ‘monologizing’ component of their activity, as one would look at source texts in relation to target texts.

What is ‘the conduit metaphor’?

Interpreting, particularly in public service, has not been of interest exclusively to linguists and interpreting/translation scholars. In articles in Medicine and Law journals, one sometimes finds ‘the (generic) interpreter’ described in terms of a tool that, if only maneuvered correctly by the medical or legal expert, will work so as to not affect the case in question in any unpredictable way. This description may be motivated by a collegial request, that medical and legal professionals take responsibility for handling encounters with patients or clients with whom they do not share a language, rather than handing over what might seem in their view ‘too much’ responsibility to the

interpreter. Nevertheless, the tool metaphor for the interpreter is based on a simple but unrealistic idea that interpreters are, or can be, some kind of non-subjects, or translation machines, programmed to switch between languages in some automatized way. Moreover, this view of interpreters is based on a simplistic view of language and human communication, what linguists usually refer to as the conduit metaphor (Reddy 1979).

The conduit metaphor becomes visible in speech and writing in phrases such as ‘his words expressed strong feelings’, and ‘I took my ideas from her text’. In meta-language about language and communication, words and phrases appear as a kind of containers, into which the speaker or the writer puts thoughts, feelings and meanings, exactly the same thoughts, feelings and meanings that listeners and readers are expected to eventually be able to retrieve. The conduit metaphor ignores that all individuals are interpreting subjects, who create meaning of words and expressions based on their respective knowledge, experiences and expectations, in other words, that human communication is seldom completely predictable. At the same time, the conduit metaphor is firmly established in our everyday thinking and talking about words. The idea of words as containers of meaning is perhaps so familiar that we, in everyday life, even have a hard time to think about language and communication in a different way. But applied in the area of interpreting, the conduit metaphor, in Reddy’s (1979) sense, can be quite misleading, for various reasons.

In studies of interpreting, the conduit metaphor has sometimes been used also to depict interpreters, based again on a perception of words as containers of meaning, which interpreters allegedly have the task to retrieve and then load onto other containers, that is, words in another language. Again, interpreting is depicted as something individuals do in relation only to words that ‘have’ a meaning glued onto them, as it were, rather than in relation to other human beings in a social context. In her groundbreaking book on sign language interpreting, Roy (2000: 101–4), also drawing on Reddy (1979), notes that the conduit metaphor implies a number of basic assumptions about language, and simultaneously demonstrates that, in the professionalization process of sign language interpreters, the conduit metaphor in certain ways responded to the interpreters’ need to identify less as helpers and more as just this – professionals.

Strongly related to the conduit metaphor in meta-language about language and communication, is the everyday perception of (good) interpreters as performing word-by-word translation. In their review of interpreting practices within the Australian legal system, Laster and Taylor (1994) shed light on what appear to be conflicting attitudes between lawyers and interpreters as to how interpreting can and should take place. They believe that the professions’ different perceptions and knowledge of word-for-word interpreting in themselves constitute a breeding ground for mistrust and believe that this mistrust would rather increase if interpreters were to sign an unrealistic demand for word-for-word interpreting. Instead of thinking of the interpreter in terms of a channel or a machine, they suggest that the court should consider the interpreter as a communication promoter and point to the need to build mutual respect for how representatives of each profession exercise their professional discretion, that is, how the actors take decisions founded in well-established professional knowledge and professional ethics (Laster & Taylor 1994: 126). This argument, published already in the 1990ies, is no less valid today. In this volume, interpreters’

mandate and obligations in terms of professional discretion is discussed by Norwegian scholar Hanne Skaaden (chapter 3.1).

Definitions of 'interpreting'

Research on interpreting can roughly be divided into studies focusing on the interpreting *individual* and/or this individual's cognitive processes on the one hand, and, on the other hand, on interpreting as linguistic, communicative and social *interaction*. These two categories of studies are characterized by their different ways of delimiting interpreting as a research object. In the former case, a definition of interpreting similar to that proposed by Franz Pöchhacker is applied:

Interpreting is a form of Translation in which a **first and final rendition in another language** is produced on the basis of a **one-time presentation** of an utterance in a source language. (Pöchhacker 2016: 11, bold in the original)

In Pöchhacker's definition, translation is written with a capital T and refers to translation in a general sense. The definition emphasizes immediacy and volatility as characteristic features of interpreting that distinguishes it from translation of written texts, but the orality of interpreting is not specifically highlighted, which makes this definition possible to apply also to explorations of signed language interpreting. Following this definition, the interpreting individual, or the cognitive operations involved when producing renditions, are the primary objects of study. In this definition, interpreting means producing renditions of previously spoken utterances in a source language. This implies that those speaking with the assistance of interpreters basically are perceived of as producing utterances to be rendered in a target language. In other words, this definition tends to disregard participants' other communicative projects (such as organizing the interaction, searching for words, providing minimal responses like 'mm' and 'aha', and so forth), as well as situations and contexts. Seemingly, this definition of interpreting has grown out of an interest in simultaneous interpreting, where the performing interpreter is working with prepared (often in written form) talk, rather than in the conditions of spontaneous spoken interaction. No doubt, to interpret written speeches places different demands than to interpret spontaneous spoken exchanges.

Interpreting can also be defined as interaction, as suggested by Wadensjö (1992; 1998). With such an approach, the primary object of study is the interpreter-mediated *situation*. In order to explore situations of this kind, Wadensjö (1998) suggests to apply sociologist Erving Goffman's (1981) notion of *situated system of activity*. In other words, in order to fully understand participants' behaviour in a social encounter of some kind, the researcher considers not just their talk, but also the social, cultural and institutional frames which this situation entails. Defining interpreting as interaction, allows for studying interpreters' utterances not only on the basis of their function as translations, as source texts in relation to target texts, but also on the basis of their coordinating function in the situated activity. Exploring interpreting as interaction implies that all interpreter utterances are seen as having a potential impact on the content and the progression of an interpreter-mediated conversation. The notion of a *communicative pas de trois* (Wadensjö 1998:12), a

communicative dance for three, if you will, is to express that a triadic, bilingual, interpreter-mediated encounter has specific communicative conditions that are worthwhile exploring systematically in their own right.

In spontaneous spoken interaction, the meaning that participants attribute to what is said and done is instantly co-created as interaction unfolds. In interpreter-mediated conversations, the interpreter is deeply involved in this sense making. The content and the progression of talk will depend on how and when the interpreter renders in a new language what has been said in the other. In a social encounter where the interpreter interprets consecutively, most of the interpreter's renditions will function as *implicit coordinating moves* (Wadensjö 1998: 109). The interpreter's talk is a prerequisite without which the monolingual participants will have troubles going on with their exchange. The better they adapt to this specific communicative situation, by waiting for their turns and making room for the interpreter's renditions, the easier the interpreter's task will be. By speaking in parallel, by addressing the interpreter or someone else present for side comments, by speaking very fast, indistinctly or for a very long time, they may elicit *explicit coordinating moves* (Wadensjö 1998: 109) from the interpreter, such as asking for repetition, for clarification, for time to interpret or time to self-correct, or advising participants to respect each other's right to be updated. Obviously, the more competent an interpreter is in terms of vocabulary and contextual knowledge, interpreting and coordinating ability, and linguistic fluency in both languages, the better the conditions will be for the monolingual parties to participate in the interpreted conversation, provided though, they are focused on being each other's interlocutors. Clearly, talking through an interpreter is not an easy task and, for some, it may be unusual or even feel odd. So, explicit coordinating moves may sometimes be 'the way' in which the interlocutors learn how to participate in interpreted interaction. Thus, learning how to use explicit coordination smoothly and collaboratively may be an important issue in interpreters' professionalization.

Defining interpreting as interaction, opens up for studies not just of participants' speech production, but also of their sense making based on other communicative resources (gestures, body orientation, gaze direction, handling of artefacts, and more). From this broader definition of interpreting also follows that interpreters' profession-specific task in conversational situations is perceived of as two-fold – to render others' talk in a new language and, to facilitate the micro-organization of participants' turns at talk, which, in turn, enables translation to take place. In conclusion, while interpreting definitely includes translation activity, the risk in defining interpreting as 'a type of Translation' is that of narrowing the researcher's view specifically to focus on words spoken as a relation between source texts and target texts, while defining interpreting as interaction broadens the possible constituent parts of 'interpreting' and allows for looking at interpreters' and primary parties' agency in the light of the institutional structures and frameworks within which interpreters operate, and at the specific conditions for communication inherent in triadic or multiparty, bilingual and mediated encounters.

The significance of empirical studies

From the end of the 1990s, the interest of dialogue interpreting research has moved more and more to on-field inquiries, based on the collection and analysis of data. Following Wadensjö's (1998) primary focus on dialogue interpreting as a *situated* activity, video or audio recorded interactions seem to provide suitable material to inquire into such situations. Collections of recorded encounters, then transcribed in detail for analysis, have provided evidence of talk organization in interpreter-mediated settings and of interpreters' practices in rendering and coordinating talk in interaction. Other studies like Tate and Turner (1997/2002) or Leanza (2005; see Böser 2016 for a review) have instead collected data through surveys or interviews with the participants in the interactions, both interpreters and service providers, both individually and in focus groups. The latter data accounted for the perceptions of the interlocutors about the interpreter-mediated encounters, based on their expectations and experiences. The chapters in this volume refer, in various ways, to both types of empirical research.

Empirical research, either showing interpreter-mediated interactional practices or highlighting the participants' perceptions, has unveiled issues which make up for the debate in public service interpreting nowadays. We deem four of them are particularly worth mentioning. The first is related to the features of talk in interaction, made evident in analyses of authentic encounters. Studies on conversation, inspired to the work of sociologist Erving Goffman and then re-organized into an analytical methodology (Sacks et al. 1974), with a focus on institutional interaction (Drew and Heritage 1992), have shown that no talk can be produced without the interlocutors reacting to each other's contributions and making sense of them. In conversation, even small interactional signals like "mhm" or eye gaze, or even silence, contribute to the co-construction of the interaction (see Gardner 2001). These items may allow for the other interlocutor to go on or start speaking, or may indicate that they are expected to speak to someone else than the interlocutor who is keeping silent. The latter is for instance the case in TV political interviews where the journalists refrain from providing "mhm" to allow for the interviewees to speak to the audience at home (Clayman and Heritage 2002), or in courts, where witnesses' talk is aimed for the jury (Heritage 1984; Heritage and Clayman 2010: 30–31). The fact that, in talk, even silence is a form of participation created more than a challenge to a view of interpreting in which one of the interlocutors, the interpreter, needs to interfere as little as possible in communication. In fact, interpreters do contribute in talk sometimes with 'co-constructive' contributions like providing feedback to allow for the interlocutors to actually produce talk. This is for instance the case in healthcare interaction where the interpreters help hesitating patients to go on talking (Leanza et al. 2013; Theys et al. 2020) or in asylum seeking interactions where the interpreters collaborate with the applicants' narration development, while still allowing themselves space to render (Pöchhacker 2012: 64–6; Pöllabauer, this volume and also Wadensjö et al. 2022). How to precisely handle the features of talk, and participation in talk, in the profession and in the training of professionals is still a matter of debate (see Ticca et al. this volume, Niemants et al. this volume).

The second issue foregrounding empirical research concerns the subjects that are observed, the interpreters in particular. The following are some questions pointing to the problems raised. If an interpreter, in the interaction, provides *mhm* and allows for continuation of a participant's turn, co-constructing an extended one, is it evidence of a feature of talk or of the interpreter's lack of

professionalism? Is *mhm* the talk equivalent of note taking in speech consecutive interpreting or a manifestation that the interpreter has lost talk coordination? Focus groups and interviews show interpreters' recurrent complaints that institutional providers and service seekers do not appropriately relate to the interpreters' work, expecting machine-behaviour on the one hand or personal protection and even advocacy on the other. Is this an expression of the interpreters' non-expertise? Of their inefficiency in coordinating talk? Does it suggest the necessity of familiarizing interpreting service users with what it means to talk through an interpreter? These questions have to do with the actual reliability of the professionals observed in empirical studies. So, while on the one hand empirical studies provide an amount of information about the interpreter-mediated encounter, information may be skewed by the quality of informants. The quality of informants is, however, 'informative' *in se*, both in relation to the interpreting professionals available (as well as the professional service providers) and in the type of interaction they construe. The chapters in this volume show the relevance of inquiries based on informants, but the problem of *which* informants is likewise addressed (most explicitly in 3.1 by Skaaden).

The third issue raised by empirical research, has to do with the specificities of the services involved. While engagement in talk with one of the participants has been found relevant in healthcare interpreting to optimise talk, putting the patients at ease (Penn and Watermeyer 2012) or encouraging them to talk about their problems (Gavioli 2012: 213–4; see also Angelelli 2004), in other types of settings, such engagement may not work in the same way. In immigration procedures for instance, direct answers of interpreters to the service providers, though 'quicker' and possibly efficient in terms of talk exchange, reduce the opportunity for the immigration applicants to show themselves as capable and competent, an opportunity that is fundamental in this type of encounter (Mason 2009: 62). So, as in monolingual talk, in interpreted talk different practices come at stake in different settings and may account for the *situated* effectiveness of the interpreter's work. The characteristics of the main settings where PSI occurs, dealt with in section 2 of this volume, give a clear idea of the complexity of public service interpreting work and account for the necessity that interpreters are able to *interpret the situation*, together with (and 'in') the utterances that make it up, and are prepared to exercise discretion in accommodating their interpreting practices to the situated activity.

The fourth issue highlighted by empirical data is the human intensity of the situations involved in PSI. Illness, poverty, lack of freedom, rape, murder and other types of violence are often the object of healthcare, legal and support services offered to foreign residents. Such situations pose, more than others, the problem of empathic involvement of the interpreter as a person as well as the problem of the treatment of empathy in talk (how to show its relevance, how to render it). The problem is double-sided, calling for the management of both situations of potential sympathy for those who are perceived as the victims, and repulsion, for those who are in horrible faults, like violent people and murderers (see Gustafsson this volume). In these cases, it may not be easy for interpreters to discern what is the best possible service that they can provide.

The chapters in the volume tackle the four issues summarised above by providing concrete examples as well as reflections helping interpreters and providers to grasp the nuances and

responsibilities concerning their participation in situations that may involve various kinds of sensitivity and challenges. They provide more knowledge about the diverse situations and suggestions about how to provide effective service.

Interpreting as a resource for improving communication in the public services

In this volume, interpreting is shown as a powerful resource to improve communication in public services. There are at least three reasons why the public sector needs interpreting services. The first and probably most obvious is that it is extremely hard for service providers to communicate with users whose languages they cannot understand and speak. Although this point has been debated, for instance in medical interpreting literature, where providers have sometimes observed that the patients' feelings and sensations are visible through their bodies and faces and do not need translation (Hsieh and Nicodemus 2015: 1475), a desperate need for interpreting has been made fully evident in situations where none is available. Lack of availability has resulted, quite systematically, in an increasing involvement of 'anyone-translating-please', be it a bilingual relative or friend, or staff member. The problems of these *ad hoc* solutions have been underlined in the literature (for example by Pöchhacker and Kadrić 1999), and possible ways of making them fruitful have been discussed (Bührig and Meyer 2004; Jansson et al. 2017). What *ad hoc* interpreting has highlighted first and foremost, however, is an unequivocal necessity for interpreting services' availability in public service encounters.

The second reason is related to the participation, in service encounters, of an interlocutor, the interpreter, specifically working on communication. The difference in language is not the only difference highlighted in interpreter-mediated public service encounters, a difference in the type of knowledge possessed by service providers and seekers is very much at stake too. The work of interpreters (see for example Raymond 2014) has highlighted the amount of competence needed in building shared knowledge, by making clear or explicit those items that may not mean much to one of the interlocutors (see also Mason 2006). While such a difference in knowledge is well known from studies in monolingual interaction, interpreted interaction as well as narratives of interpreters' experiences give clear illustrations of: a. cases in which the differences may be more relevant and crucial, and b. ways in which they can be treated. These cases show the functioning of asymmetric communication and may improve communication in public services, not only when foreign speakers are involved, but for all service seekers.

The third and possibly less obvious reason why interpreting is a powerful resource for public services is that interpreters' experience provides an incredibly rich amount of information about what such services are in fact. A number of studies in this volume provide narratives showing that services may still be inadequate and unprepared to work in a changed environment where service-seekers are no longer monolingual and autochthonous and suggest possible improvements in the regulations or in the training of service providers. This point too, which is well argued in chapter 1.2 by Gustafsson, may provide benefits not only for PSI, but for public services more in general.

Despite these strong points which make PSI an undoubtable resource, some studies, particularly in healthcare settings, have found that interpreters may negatively interfere in the dynamics of public service encounters (Davidson 2000; Hsieh 2007; see Gavioli and Merlini this volume). This poses again the problem of staff adequate preparation and the search for effective ways of training both interpreting and service providers. In this volume we have dedicated an entire section, the third one to the problems associated to the training of the personnel involved in PSI. These problems are related to poor knowledge of the PSI situations, including little or no knowledge of how interaction works, the languages involved and the necessity to include also practical training; how to involve service providers, how to train those who train interpreters and service providers.

Public Service Interpreting and Mediation

Service seekers requiring interpreting services are typically people who not only speak a different language, but who often come from backgrounds with different institutional systems, traditions, habits and values. These differences, grouped together, are referred to as ‘cultural’ differences and provide a reason why PSI may be considered as a form of intercultural communication. Cultural differences create concern in the public services, for the possibility that the seekers’ different expectations about what the service can do for them might lead to non-compliance with the service requirements. Possibly for this reason, ‘mediating’ cultural differences in PSI has sometimes been considered prior and in some way additional to the interpreting activity at stake (Merlini 2009).

Indeed, as will be shown in the chapters in this volume, in an asymmetric type of interaction as we have in public service encounters, little or no familiarity with the services combined with little or no knowledge of the language used make interpreted PS interactions even more asymmetric, leading to argue that this, sometimes, huge imbalance needs to be addressed in interpreting to allow for communication to occur (Mason and Ren 2012). As explained by Baraldi in chapter 1.3, the concept of mediation comes from studies in monolingual conflict management, and, as such, conflict may easily be intended as an idea inherent to mediation, even in reference to interpreted mediation. Since huge asymmetries may provoke conflict, then mediation in PSI may involve dealing with potential or emerging ‘cultural’ conflicts.

While, as this volume shows, there is no doubt that PSI occurs in situations of strong asymmetry and with vulnerable participants, attributing asymmetry and vulnerability to cultural differences may have several drawbacks. First, using culture as an explanatory tool for obstacles in communication may result in ‘othering’ minority patients, thus hiding rather than highlighting communication problems (Felberg and Skaaden 2012). Second, interpreters’ attempts to explain what may be perceived as unusual participants’ behaviour in terms of different habits, traditions or values may in fact result in the production of stereotypes (Barbieri 2009). Third, mediating ‘cultures’ by attributing individuals to cultural groups deprives these individuals of the opportunity of participating in the interaction ‘as persons’, with personal expression being interpreted (and possibly misinterpreted) in the light of ‘group features’ (Baraldi 2012: 323).

While mediation of ‘cultures’, whatever it means, may be one way to look at mediation in PSI, restricting the concept to cultures has clear limitations. Studies observing interpreted interactions (for instance Wadensjö 1998; Angelelli 2004, 2012; Penn and Watermeyer 2012) have suggested that interpreting work can enhance both understanding and positive relationships through interactional practices. Possibly the strongest theoretical explanation of mediation as occurring through interpreting work is provided by Wadensjö’s concept of coordination (1998: 105), which we discussed above. In their coordinating activity, interpreters are active agents who influence and regulate communication, generating a common focus and sustaining the definition of encounters. Coordination occurs through the selection of rendition forms as well as other interpreters’ contributions, including forms of intercultural mediation: original utterances’ intended/possible meaning is negotiated interactionally and the renditions to follow are designed as to allow participants share understanding and rapport.

Shared understanding and rapport does clearly not necessarily mean that the interlocutors are empathic with each other or that they can accommodate with each other perspectives. Quite the contrary, as shown in the volume, problematic and even conflictual situations occur in PSI and there may be cases where ambiguity and deception are involved too. Interaction, even conflictual interaction, however occurs with at least two – in the case of interpreted talk at least three – participants ‘participating’ – even to construct ambiguities, deception and conflict. Even though the latter situations pose tough constraints on interpreting and possibly the necessity of pointing to the existence of ambiguity (or deception) quite explicitly, talk-coordination, we believe, is the type of mediation activity mostly at stake in interpreter-mediated work.

The contributions in this volume

The volume is divided in three parts. The first is dedicated to the main theoretical issues and debates which have shaped research on PSI; the second discusses the characteristics of interpreting in the settings which have been most in need of PSI services; the third provides reflections and suggestions on interpreter as well as provider training, with an aim to improve PSI services. Below, we provide a sketch of the main issues dealt with in each chapter, in the order given in the table of contents. The threads connecting the chapters are however many more than those that can be highlighted in this introduction: a section called ‘Related topics’ at the end of each chapter guides the reader to explore links and connections among the topics and problems dealt with in the contributions.

The opening chapter by Carmen Valero Garces offers an overview of the main challenges characterising the field of Public Service Interpreting, most notably, the great variety of languages to cope with (together with a lack of interpreters for many of these languages), the asymmetric relationships involved in situations where health, freedom and other fragilities are at stake, and the effort of the public sector in providing adequate (or sometimes inadequate) services in these situations. The main controversies are discussed regarding interpreters’ ethics and participation in the development of PSI as a profession.

The following three chapters deal with qualitative research perspectives and discuss, from different angles, ways in which interpreters' participation in public service encounters gives evidence of and may contribute to social change. Kristina Gustafsson in chapter 1.2 introduces an ethnographic approach to the study of PSI. On the basis of interviews with interpreters working in public settings, she shows unexpected features of building dialogic relationships guaranteeing equal access and representation in the interaction. Besides illustrating an application of the ethnographic approach to the study of PSI, Gustafsson suggests that the perspective of interpreters as well as the narration of their experiences may be a rich source of information not only about the provision of interpreting service, but also, and most notably, about the provision of public service to minorities, showing aspects that would otherwise get overlooked. In chapter 1.3, Claudio Baraldi discusses sociological approaches to the notion of agency suggesting that *agency* does not cover any action by participants in the interaction, but those which create visible social change. While this perspective on agency may be challenging for interpreters' participation, in that interpreters have the task to guarantee that *the other* participants participate first and foremost and in their own will, Baraldi shows examples from authentic interpreter-mediated interaction where mediators are given the opportunity and take the chance to make a difference, by promoting migrant women's inclusion and providers' attention for their health and psychological conditions. In chapter 1.4, Ian Mason's contribution discusses notions foregrounding a pragmatic view of PSI research. Starting from the ideas of identity, position and power, Mason first highlights a distinction between institutional and interactive power and then looks at how interactive power may affect institutional power through conversational uptake, reinforcing weak participants' voices or, alternatively, the power of institutional representatives. Mason's reflection offers a comprehensive outlook on the complex relationship between language and context, and shows that notions like positioning, cultural assumptions and power are dynamic ones. He suggests that the intersections among these notions account for the construction and rendition of meaning in context, thus moving towards what may be called a *social pragmatics* of interpreting.

An increasing interest of PSI studies for data, like transcripts of interpreted interactions, has brought to the creation of collections that can be stored and classified as to become shared research materials. Thus corpus-based methods of archiving, categorizing and interrogating the data are now finding their ways into interpreting studies in general, and PSI studies in particular. This expanding field of research is presented and discussed by Bernd Meyer in chapter 1.5, together with an illustration of one of the few, possibly the only publicly available corpus of PSI today, the *Community Interpreting Database* (Angermeyer, Meyer and Schmidt 2012).

The two chapters concluding part 1, reflect on the integration of different media in public service interpreting and translation. First, the use of technology to assist, complement and/or replace human interpreters has started to expand in the PSI area, with an increased demand for distant communication to both cope with the problem of finding suitable interpreting service when needed and to deal with isolation requirements, which not least the Covid-19 pandemics brought to the fore. In chapter 1.6, Sabine Braun, Khetam Al Sharou and Özlem Temizöz discuss the main types of technologies used in interpreting interaction in healthcare and focus on the ways in which technology re-shapes the interaction as well as the connected challenges for interpreters and service providers. In the seventh and last chapter of part 1, Mustapha Taibi discusses the issues involved in translating written documents for the public service. While the medium, written rather than spoken

language, allows for more consultation with the public service stakeholders, the issue of accessibility is one of fundamental importance in public service translation, requiring a strong commitment of translators to orient to the readers' expectations and knowledge as well as the situation in which these documents need to be read and understood. A possibly extreme example given by Taibi, still offering a clear idea of what 'situated' public service translation may mean, is that of crisis scenarios, in which full and clear information may help reduce the loss of lives.

Moving to part 2, the first three chapters deal with PSI in legal settings, face-to-face and remote. Philipp Angermeyer in chapter 2.1 highlights general as well as particular contextual issues affecting interpreting in court, for instance distinguishing between interpreting in cross-examination or inquisitorial proceedings, in which questions have different purposes and targets. The chapter also discusses the contribution of studies from different disciplines, like linguistics, anthropology, sociology, and law and addresses the crucial issue of personal deixis in situated court interpreting activities. In chapter 2.2 Sonja Pöllabauer outlines the development of the subfield 'interpreter-mediated asylum interviews', providing an overview of recurrent and salient issues on research exploring authentic discourse data. One of these issues is dealt with at length in chapter 2.3 by Christian Licoppe. Drawing on video recordings of naturally occurring courtroom proceedings concerning asylum cases, this chapter demonstrates how the introduction of video links in courtrooms can affect the conditions for interpreters' work, and also for the production of other participants' questions and narratives. Using ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis (EM/CA), Licoppe generates new knowledge about the impact of participants' location in relation to each other, and about the interdependence between actors' communicative projects. At the same time, he demonstrates the explanatory power of EM/CA as a theoretical and methodological approach to studies of consecutively interpreted interaction. A very particular type of legal setting is that of victim-survivors of domestic violence and abuse, dealt with in chapter 2.4 by Rebecca Tipton. Besides showing cases of testimony of women's experiences of domestic violence, the chapter offers a more general reflection on the idea of personal and contextual vulnerability.

The other major traditional area in which PSI services are most needed, besides court and other legal settings, is health care. Laura Gavioli and Raffaella Merlini in chapter 2.5 discuss clinician-patient interpreting on the basis of two apparently divergent purposes, that of providing appropriate medical therapy and that of giving patients care, attention and reassurance. Following studies on healthcare in monolingual contexts, eliciting patients' stories of experience, worries and fear is helpful for the clinicians to provide adequate cures and it is thus part of the task of interpreting to consider this double goal in medical encounters. Still in the medical area, chapter 2.6 by Charlotta Plejert deals with the specific situation of mental health. Here, patients' tests include work based on repeating sounds, naming familiar or unfamiliar objects, recognising situations. While such tests may not be easy for patients with mental disorders in general, in cross-cultural encounters where familiarity of sounds, objects and situations may not be shared, they may be particularly hard to handle and interpreters are tackled with the double task of: a. finding suitable equivalents in the patient's language, fitting the test purposes and b. refrain from supporting patients' comprehension, which would invalidate the test.

Public service interpreting in social care is the topic dealt with in chapter 2.7. As the authors Dorien Van De Mierop, Antoon Cox and Koen Kerremans state, interpreting in social care is less studied than interpreter-mediated legal and medical encounters. The chapter first provides an overview of

some of the most explored topics in this subfield. Among these is the issue of interpreters' involvement, which hardly is unique to the field of social care, but which has been scarcely explored on real life empirical data drawn from social care encounters. The very presence of an interpreter, or of a certain interpreter, as well as the absence of any interpreter, or the use of other bilingual professionals (or non-professionals) in the role of interpreter – all are factors that may complicate the establishment of rapport between institutional representatives and clients, the authors argue, emphasising that rapport is crucial in social care contexts. The last chapter in the second part – chapter 2.8, by Sigrid Slettebakk Berge, focuses on a likewise not much studied PSI area, that of educational settings. Drawing on unique video recordings from classrooms, where students with signed and spoken language respectively are together, she explores the conditions for interpreting, for learning and for teaching and concludes that these conditions can be considerably improved if interpreters and teachers collaborate in class in a systematic way.

Part three of the handbook has more on participants' collaboration. Interpreter education is discussed as a key element to enhance interpreter status and consequently their professionalization, but also as a way to improve public services. In the first chapter Hanne Skaaden, within a general model of professionalization, shows that although public service interpreting fulfils the performative aspects of professional activity, the organizational aspect in terms of education, is not sufficiently developed. The author argues that this situation does not only hold back the process of interpreter professionalization, but may also have negative consequences for the professional integrity of those in charge of institutional encounters and subsequently for the integrity of their clients. The following chapter, written by Christopher Stone, Cynthia Roy and Jeremy Brunson, suggests that the education of signed language interpreters for public service interpreting has much to offer for organizers of spoken languages PSI. In chapter 3.2 in fact the authors describe the development of signed language education in the European Union, the United States and in Australia and show that there are fewer differences between spoken and signed languages than many may think when it comes to education and practice. Quite some space is devoted to innovative curricula and teaching. For instance, video-recorded student role-plays and how these can constitute situated learning is discussed at length. Chapter 3.3 by Magnus Dahnberg is focused entirely on role play as a means of training and testing PSI for signed and spoken languages alike. The author draws on sound recordings of spoken role plays to demonstrate their various design and suitability for specific purposes. For example, role plays based on detailed manuscripts differ in significant ways from role plays relying on role cards, which also implies that their suitability for learning and testing purposes differ.

In chapter 3.4, Elisabet Tiselius and Birgitta Englund Dimitrova, using discourse data from scripted role plays, focus on interpreters' cognitive processes and suggest to use the concept of monitoring, as defined in three different research traditions, to discuss the impact and importance of interpreters' cognitive abilities in face-to-face encounters. As the authors demonstrate, interaction shows evidence of interpreters monitoring the discourse in adjusting their contributions (for instance in self-repair and in asking for clarification or repeat). It is not likewise easy to establish the relationship between interpreters' memory load to their coordinating competence, or to various types of contribution from the other participants, to participants' knowledge of institutional procedures, mutual expectations, and so forth. The chapter gives food for thought for reflections on

such a link/connection and suggests that exercises on monitoring cognitive load is needed in the training of interpreters for PSI.

Covid 19 accelerated the development of online education worldwide, even if the phenomenon is far from new. In chapter 3.5 Gry Sagli and Hanne Skaaden provide an overview of research on what has been called blended learning, that is, combination of online and on-campus education, as this has developed in various disciplines and educational programs. Subsequently, the authors account for the blended learning model that has been established in the BA programme for public service interpreters at Oslo Metropolitan University. The chapter shows what learning aims can be acquired online and for what aims on-campus activities seem more appropriate. Also, the authors emphasize that didactics that stimulate student interactivity is essential in creating opportunity for learning, whether on-site or online.

The two following chapters focus on the use of recordings and transcripts of authentic interpreter-mediated encounters in the training of interpreters. Natacha Niemants, Jessica Hansen and Elizabeth Stokoe in chapter 3.6 explore the use of the so-called Conversation Analytic Role-Play Method (CARM), originally developed to train for dispute mediation, in the training of interpreters. While this method, as other types of role-plays, involves simulation, it has the advantage of showing interpreting problems which really took place, selecting them over a range of authentic materials and asking trainees to discuss how the problem might be solved in the specific situation. Similar to what occurs in conversation analysis, in which recordings and transcripts allow researchers to repeat the event in a sort of 'slow-motion' mode which makes the event analysable, in CARM training, trainees can deal with the interpreting problem 'in slow-motion', discussing possible renditions and their consequences. Chapter 3.7 by Anna Claudia Ticca, Véronique Traverso and Emilie Jouin provides a recounting of the REMILAS (Refugees, Migrants and their Languages in healthcare services) research project. The project examines communication and mutual understanding in multilingual health, mental, and social care consultations, thus linking up to other contributions in the volume both dealing with asylum seeking and healthcare. The focus of the chapter is on the development of a training program used to train both interpreters and providers and based on natural interpreter-mediated talk. Besides providing more suggestions about how to use authentic data in training, the chapter shows a completely new program based on self-learning modality and accessible via digital instruments.

Chapter 3.8 aims at introducing a specific kind of interprofessional education (IPE) as a teaching and learning model in the field of PSI. Demi Krystallidou takes education in the healthcare sector – where IPE was first developed – as a case in point, and shares her experiences and critical reflections concerning the use of IPE in hands-on training sessions, where PSI students and medical students learn to collaborate in practice. In chapter 3.9, Tatjana R. Felberg and Gry Sagli share their experiences of training public service providers representing different institutions in how to communicate via interpreters. The authors argue for the importance of such training and for making it easily available for various groups of public service providers. The final and tenth chapter in the third part of the handbook is devoted to education and training of public service interpreter teachers. In chapter 3.10 Mira Kadrić and Sonja Pöllabauer outline research on the education of teachers for dialogue interpreting, with a specific focus on PSI, without differentiating between signed and

spoken language interpreting or any particular institutional setting. The chapter discusses methodological and didactic approaches to teaching and learning which implies that the issues, knowledge and skills brought up can be applicable not just for teachers, but in a wider field of interpreting.

References

- Angermeyer, Philipp S., Bernd Meyer & Thomas Schmidt. (2012) "Sharing community interpreting corpora: A pilot study", in *Multilingual Corpora and Multilingual Corpus Analysis*, Thomas Schmidt and Kai Wörner (eds). *Hamburg Studies in Multilingualism* 14, Amsterdam: John Benjamins: 275–94.
- Angelelli, Claudia (2004) *Medical Interpreting and Cross-cultural Communication*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- (2012) "Challenges in interpreters' coordination of the construction of pain", in Claudio Baraldi and Laura Gavioli (eds.) *Coordinating Participation in Dialogue Interpreting*. Amsterdam, Benjamins: 251–68.
- Bachtin, Mikhail (1986) *Speech genres and other late essays*, Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist (eds), trans. Vern W. McGee. Austin, University of Texas Press.
- Baraldi, Claudio (2012) "Interpreting as dialogic mediation: the relevance of expansions", in Claudio Baraldi and Laura Gavioli (eds.) *Coordinating Participation in Dialogue Interpreting*. Amsterdam, Benjamins: 297–326.
- Barbieri, Viola (2009) "La traduzione della diversità culturale nell'interazione mediata", in Laura Gavioli (ed.) *La Mediazione Linguistico-Culturale: una prospettiva interazionista*. Perugia, Guerra: 203–30.
- Böser, Ursula (2016) Interviews and focus groups, in Claudia Angelelli and Brian James Baer (eds.) *Researching Translation and Interpreting*. London & New York, Routledge: 236–46.
- Bühlig, Kristin and Bernd Meyer (2004) "Ad hoc interpreting and achievement of communicative purposes in briefings for informed consent", in J. House and J. Rehbein (eds) *Multilingual communication*, Amsterdam: Benjamins: 43–61.
- Clayman, Steven and John Heritage (2002) *The News Interview: Journalists and Public Figures on the Air*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Davidson, Brad (2000) "The interpreter as institutional gatekeeper: The social-linguistic role of interpreters in Spanish–English medical discourse", *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 4(3): 379–405.
- Drew, Paul, and John Heritage (1992) *Talk at Work*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Felberg, Tatjana R., and Hanne Skaaden (2012) "The (de)construction of culture in interpreter-mediated medical discourse", *Linguistica Antverpiensia, New Series. Themes in Translation Studies* 11: 67–84.
- Gardner, Rod (2001) *When listeners talk: Response tokens and listener stance*. Amsterdam, John Benjamins.

- Gavioli, Laura (2012) "Minimal responses in interpreter-mediated medical talk" in *Coordinating Participation in Dialogue Interpreting*, Claudio Baraldi and Laura Gavioli (eds). Amsterdam, Benjamins: 201–28.
- Goffman, Erving (1981) *Forms of talk*. Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Heritage, John (1984) A change-of-state token and aspects of its sequential placement, in *Structures of Social Action*, J. Maxwell Atkinson and John Heritage (eds). Cambridge, Cambridge University Press: 299–345.
- Heritage, John, and Stephen Clayman (2010) *Talk in Action: Interactions, identities and institutions*. Oxford, Blackwell.
- Hsieh, Elaine (2007) "Interpreters as co-diagnosticians: Overlapping roles and services between providers and interpreters", *Social Science & Medicine* 64: 924–37.
- Hsieh, Elaine and Brenda Nicodemus (2015) "Conceptualizing emotion in healthcare interpreting: A normative approach to interpreters' emotion work", *Patient Education and Counseling* 98: 1474–1481
- Inghilleri, Moira (2012) *Interpreting justice: Ethics, politics, and language*, New York/London, Routledge.
- Jansson, Gunilla, Cecilia Wadensjö and Charlotta Plejert (2017). "Managing complaints in multilingual care encounters" *Multilingua* 36(3), 313–46. (Published on-line 28.03.17) Open Access. DOI 10.1515/multi-2016-00043
- Laster, Kathy and Taylor, Veronica L. (1994) *Interpreters and the legal system*, Sydney, The Federation Press.
- Leanza, Yvan (2005) "Roles of community interpreters in paediatrics as seen by interpreters, physicians and researchers", *Interpreting* 7 (2): 67–192.
- Leanza, Yvan, B. Isabelle, E. Rosenberg (2013) "The patient's Lifeworld: building meaningful clinical encounters between patients, physicians and interpreters", *Communication & Medicine* 10: 13–25.
- Linell, Per (2009) *Rethinking language, mind and world dialogically: Interactional and contextual theories of human sense-making*, Charlotte, NC, Information Age Publishing.
- Määttä, Simo (2015) "Interpreting the discourse of reporting: The case of screening interviews with asylum seekers and police interviews in Finland", *Translation & Interpreting*, 7 (3): 21–35. DOI. 10-12807/ti. 107203.2015. a02
- Mason, Ian (2006) "On mutual accessibility of contextual assumptions in dialogue interpreting", *Journal of Pragmatics* 38: 359–73.
- (2009) "Role, positioning and discourse in face-to-face interpreting", in *Interpreting and Translating in Public Service Settings*, Raquel De Pedro Ricoy, Isabelle Perez, and Christine Wilson (eds). Manchester, St. Jerome: 52–73.
- Mason, Ian and Wen Ren (2012) "Power in face-to-face interpreting events", *Translation and Interpreting Studies*, 7 (2): 233–252.
- Merlini, Raffaella (2009a) "Seeking asylum and seeking identity in a mediated encounter: The projection of selves through discursive practices", *Interpreting* 11 (1): 57–92.
- Penn, Claire and Jennifer Watermeyer (2012) "When asides become central: Small talk and big talk in interpreted health interactions", *Patient Education and Counseling*, 88: 391–398.

- Pöchhacker, Franz (2008) "Interpreting as Mediation" in *Crossing Borders in Community Interpreting: Definitions and Dilemmas*, Carmen Valero-Garcés and Anne Martin (eds). Amsterdam, Benjamins: 9–26.
- (2012) "Interpreting participation: Conceptual analysis and illustration of the interpreter's role in interaction" in *Coordinating Participation in Dialogue Interpreting*, Claudio Baraldi and Laura Gavioli (eds). Amsterdam, John Benjamins: 45–70.
- (2016) *Introducing Interpreting Studies*, 2nd ed., London & New York, Routledge.
- Pöchhacker, Franz and Mira Kadrić (1999) The hospital cleaner as healthcare interpreter: a case study, *The Translator* 5 (2): 147–60. Special Issue on Dialogue Interpreting Ian Mason (ed).
- Raymond, C.W. (2014) "Epistemic brokering in the interpreter-mediated medical visit: negotiating 'patient's side' and 'doctor's side' knowledge", *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 47(4): 426–46.
- Reddy, Michael, J. (1979) The conduit metaphor: A case of frame conflict in our language about language, in *Metaphor and Thought*, Andrew Ortony (ed). Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Roy, Cynthia B. (2000) *Interpreting as a discourse process*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Sacks, Harvey, Emmanuel Schegloff, and Gail Jefferson (1974) "A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation", *Language* 50: 696–736.
- Tate, Granville and Graham Turner (1997/2002) The code and the culture: Sign-language interpreting – in search of the new breed's ethics, in *The Interpreting Studies Reader*, Franz Pöchhacker and Miriam Shlesinger (eds). London, Routledge: 373–83.
- Theys, Laura, Krystallidou, Demi, Salaets, Heidi, Wermuth, Cornelia and Pype, Peter (2020) "Emotion work in interpreter-mediated consultations: A systematic literature review", *Patient Education and Counseling* 103 (1): 33–43.
- Wadensjö, Cecilia (1992) *Interpreting as Interaction: On Dialogue Interpreting in Immigration Hearings and Medical Encounters* (PhD diss.). Linköping Studies in Arts and Science No. 83, Linköping, Tema Kommunikation.
- (1998) *Interpreting as Interaction*, London, Longman.
- (2004) "Dialogue interpreting: A monologising practice in a dialogically organised world", *Target. International Journal of Translation Studies*, 16(1), 105–24.
<https://doi.org/10.1075/target.16.1.06wad>
- Wadensjö, Cecilia, Rehnberg, Hanna Sofia and Nikolaidou Zoe (2022) "Managing a discourse of reporting: the complex composing of an asylum narrative", *Multilingua* (published online May 24, 2022), <https://doi.org/10.1515/multi-2022-0017>.