

We're in this together – joint and several

How interpreters in spoken languages cooperate in teams in Swedish courts of law

Lotta Hellstrand

Tolk- och översättarinstitutet,
Institutionen för svenska och flerspråkighet,
Examensarbete 30 hp
Masterprogram i tolkning (120 hp)
Vårterminen 2022
Handledare: Cecilia Wadensjö
Examinator: Helena Bani-Shoraka
Svensk titel: Tillsammans och i samförstånd –
Hur tolkar i talade språk samarbetar vid tolkning i svenska domstolar



Sammanfattning

Inom teckenspråkstolkning och konferenstolkning är det vanligt att två eller fler tolkar arbetar tillsammans. Det finns väletablerade normer för hur samarbetet ska genomföras. Svenska domstolar anlitar ibland två tolkar till uppdrag i talade språk, men det saknas forskning om hur domstolstolkare samarbetar. Föreliggande studie, baserad på 29 timmar inspelat material undersöker på vilket sätt tolkar med engelska som arbetspråk samarbetar vid konsekutivtolkning av förhör med tilltalade i svenska domstolar. Med Goffmans terminologi kan tolkarna sägas vara antingen *ratified* eller *bystander* vid varje given tidpunkt. Studien identifierar fem typer av samarbeten. Två av dem innefattar efterfrågat stöd där tolken som är *ratified* antingen ber om stöd eller agerar kommunikativt på ett sätt som får tolken som är *bystander* att dra slutsatsen att stöd behövs. Två andra kategorier beskriver situationer där tolken som är *bystander* tar initiativ att erbjuda en rättelse eller ett tillägg. Den femte kategorin täcker situationer där en tolk som är *bystander* använder sig av icke-återgivning för att explicit samordna interaktionen. Studien bekräftar att tolkar tar mer plats i en rättsal än vad den gängse uppfattningen är, men också att samarbetande tolkar för det mesta smidigt löser kommunikativa problem relaterade till tolkens två parallella praktiker, att översätta och samordna.

Abstract

In sign-language interpreting and conference interpreting it is common for interpreters to work in pairs and well-established norms exist for how that cooperation is carried out. Working in pairs is becoming more common in Swedish courts for spoken language interpreting. Yet how court interpreters collaborate in these situations is not well described. This study, based on 29 hours of audio-files, examines how interpreters working in English and Swedish cooperate during consecutive interpreting when defendants are questioned in Swedish courts. Using Goffman's terms, the interpreters can be said to be either *ratified* or *bystander* at any given point. Five types of cooperation were identified. Two show prompted support - the ratified interpreter either explicitly asks for support or her communicative behaviour makes the bystander conclude that support is needed, two show how the bystander interpreter self-selects to provide support. The fifth covers situations when a bystander interpreter is using non-renditions to explicitly coordinate the interaction. The study can confirm that interpreters are more noticeable in the courtroom than the traditional view of a good interpreter allows. It also shows how a team of two interpreters together can solve communicative problems related to the interpreter's parallel tasks of translating and coordinating.

Nyckelord

Domstolstolkning, samarbete, samordning, tolkning som interaktion, dialogtolkning, tolkens roll, rättstolkning

Keywords

Court interpreting, team interpreting, cooperation, coordination, interpreting as interaction, dialogue interpreting, ratified interpreter, bystander interpreter, interpreter's role, legal interpreting

Table of contents

Abstract	1
Table of contents	2
1. Introduction	3
1.1 Motivation	4
1.2 Research questions	4
2. Background	5
2.1 On interpreting in court	5
2.1.1 The court interpreter's role and responsibilities	5
2.2 On coordination and types of renditions	6
2.3 On turn-taking and repair	7
2.4 On cooperation, team interpreting and the interpreter's role.....	8
3. Data and method.....	11
3.1 Data	11
3.1.1 The cases	11
3.1.2 The interpreters.....	12
3.2 Method	13
3.3 Ethical considerations.....	14
4. Findings and analysis	16
4.1 Word/phrase	17
4.2 Clarification.....	21
4.3 Correction.....	24
4.4 Completion	29
4.5 Explicit coordination	32
4.6 Concluding remarks	39
5. Discussion	41
5.1 A broader view	41
5.2 Limitations.....	43
5.3 Even broader – further studies.....	43
References	45
Appendix 1	51
Appendix 2	52
Appendix 3	53

1. Introduction

Any court hearing in Sweden where the participants do not share the same language makes use of interpreters. The interpreters are necessary to ensure that judgements are based on correct information, and so that non-Swedish speakers can understand the proceedings and be able to express themselves before the court. As cases have become more complex (BRÅ 2017:8) and as understanding of the complexity of court interpreting has increased it has become more common, in Sweden, to assign two interpreters for longer trials. The idea is that the interpreters in courts take turns in interpreting in a similar way to conference interpreters working in a booth performing simultaneous interpreting. In court however, as well as segments when the interpreting mode is simultaneous, there are also long segments where there is consecutive interpreting. When a person who does not speak Swedish is questioned the most common interpreting mode is consecutive. In bigger and more complex trials, these segments may last several hours and sometimes days. Consequently, interpreters have developed a way of cooperating which is investigated in this study. There are no studies that I am aware of that have focused on interpreter cooperation from the perspective of spoken language consecutive interpreting.

Despite the lack of reliable statistics one can assume that several thousands of court cases in Sweden are carried out every month with an interpreter involved in all or part of the proceedings (Statskontoret 2015:20). It is believed that 9% of the hearings in Swedish district courts make use of an interpreter (Torstensson & Gawronska 2009:1). The cost for the courts for interpreters and translators was 182 million SEK in 2021 (Domstolsverket 2022:127) and 127 million SEK for interpreting alone in 2017 (SOU 2018:83 page 558).

The view of the interpreter as an advanced translating machine, and a mere conduit for messages was abandoned long ago by most scholars. Still the general view of interpreting seems to be that interpreting is a simple matter of translating non-ambiguous utterances in one language into equally non-ambiguous utterances in another.

Pöchhacker expresses one way of seeing interpreting as a form of translation as follows:

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. (2016:11)

Wadensjö (1998) on the other hand, suggested to explore interpreting not just as a kind of translation and to conceptualise interpreters not in terms of ‘tools’ or ‘translation machines’, but as living, reflecting and responsible subjects. Since the interpreter needs to take every other turn in the conversation, she is also constantly a coordinator. The coordination of interaction takes place at the same time as the translation of utterances. Hence, any instance of interpreting is a combination of translation and coordination. Sometimes the coordination becomes explicit in the sense that the interpreter offers utterances that are not translations of primary parties’ preceding utterances. These utterances can be called non-renditions (Wadensjö 1998:109).

This study is based on authentic recorded data from Swedish courts where two interpreters are present and cooperate to various degrees. It explores how interpreters cooperate, what it is that triggers the cooperation, and the implications of approaching interpreter cooperation using Wadensjö’s notion of interpreting as interaction and Goffman’s participation framework.

Previous research has given a somewhat depressing view on the quality of interpreting in Swedish courts. This is not a study that will focus on quality, but rather on how interpreters interact in court and what strategies they utilise to perform in the best possible way. I have not sought out to evaluate if the interpreters make mistakes or not, such observations are only peripherally relevant.

1.1 Motivation

I have been a practicing interpreter in Swedish courts since 2002, an authorised court interpreter¹ since 2005. As a practitioner and as the chair of the Swedish court interpreters' association, *Rättstolkarna*², I have through personal experience seen most sides of the profession. There are studies that have shown that interpreters have a much greater influence on the discourse of court proceedings than the code of conduct seem to allow (Berk-Seligsson 2017, Hale 2004). As a court interpreter I have noticed this myself. The fact that I have been a part of an interpreting team in court many times and that I have observed that this arrangement is appreciated by the interpreters as well as by the courts and other legal professionals played a major role in my choice to examine interpreter cooperation. In contrast to my personal experience there are many studies that have shown how court interpreters in various ways misrepresent statements, change the pragmatic content of utterances and in general are seen as nothing but a “piece of gum on the bottom of a shoe – ignored for all practical purposes, but almost impossible to remove” (Morris 1999:7). Since my own experience from the courts did not match up to those studies, I felt there was a gap in the research to explore in which way a team of experienced interpreters perform in Swedish courts.

1.2 Research questions

My questions as I approach my data are related to how interpreters act in court, specifically when it comes to cooperation. I will focus on the following aspects of cooperation:

- How do interpreters cooperate in court during consecutive interpreting?
- Are there any specific problems that trigger interpreter cooperation?
- Do the instances of interpreter cooperation typically lead to resolving communicative problems?
- How does the way the interpreters act in court compare to various views on the interpreter's role in court proceedings?

¹ *Kammarkollegiet*, the supervising authority, uses the phrase: Authorised interpreter with specialised proficiency as a court interpreter

² www.rattstolkarna.se

2. Background

2.1 On interpreting in court

Court proceedings are inherently formal and very strictly regulated. To introduce an extra language, or even in some cases several extra languages, and consequently one or more interpreters, has an unavoidable impact on the proceedings. This impact has been studied from several different perspectives. Berk-Seligson's book *The Bilingual Courtroom* (2017 (First published in 1990)) was the first larger study of empirical data and has since been followed by many others. There have been studies on the working conditions of court interpreters (Hale & Napier 2016, Staaf & Elsrud 2018), on the impact of interpreting on questions and answers (Hale 2001, Wadensjö 2010) as well as on how interpreting mode affects different aspects of court proceedings (Jacobsen 2012, Hale, Martschuk, Ozolins & Stern 2017). In recent years a lot of attention has been paid to the practice of remote interpreting in courts, see for example Licoppe & Veyrier (2020) or Braun, Davitti & Dicerto (2018). The difficulties concerning court interpreting have been thoroughly researched and there are many voices on what needs to or should be done about the poor state of domestic court interpreting around the world (Moeketsi 2000, Martinsen & Dubslaff 2010, Hale 2010, Stern 2012, Staaf & Elsrud 2018).

Most of the research performed on authentic material from interpreted court proceedings are from countries with legal systems that are very different from the one that applies to Sweden. However, there are some exceptions. Through an analysis of interpreter-mediated trials Wadensjö showed that both questioning and answering strategies “function somewhat differently in face-to-face interpreter-mediated court trials compared to single language ones” (Wadensjö 2010:24) and that interpreters' strategies can affect non-Swedish speakers' opportunity to tell their stories in the way that they want. Elsrud shows a similar situation where she investigates how interpreters add, omit and substitute, when they translate witnesses', victims', and defendants' statements into Swedish, which leads to a negative effect for both the non-Swedish speaker and for the entire judiciary (Elsrud 2014:36).

This study will not focus on quality of the translation work performed by the interpreters. It can be noted that the quality of translation in most cases is hidden from the primary participants, and that the interpreters have an unusual position “as the only ones with a full comprehension of both languages” (Hale 2004:163). In contrast, Martinsen & Dubslaff observe that “contrary to the interpreter's performance as a translator, her performance as a coordinator [---] may be observed by the primary participants” (2010:31). When interviewed, court interpreters seem to be oriented towards both the translating and the coordinating aspects of their profession (Hale & Napier 2016). Interpreters with English as a working language in Sweden know that most of the participants understand the main part of what is being said in English. That means that those interpreters have to take into account that the primary participants are likely to notice details regarding the translation as well as the coordination efforts. It is also possible that the fact that the other language is English affects how the legal professionals act towards the interpreter and the English speakers (Jacobsen 2012:223).

2.1.1 The court interpreter's role and responsibilities

Interpreters and legal professionals, as well as researchers have discussed the role of the court interpreter at length and there are many studies that over the years have paid particular attention to the court interpreter's role (Niska 1995, Mikkelsen 1998, Hale 2008, Lee 2009, Morris 2010).

Hale presents two extremes of views that can be held concerning the role of the court interpreter, on the one hand, she writes “there are those who believe that the role of the interpreter is to help disadvantaged non-English speakers to succeed in their case” and on the other hand the opinion “that

interpreters act as machines or conduits, repeating verbatim what they hear in one language in another” (Hale 2004:8). She conducted a survey among a group of practising Spanish interpreters in Australia and asked questions partly about their views on the court interpreter’s role (Hale 2004:229-233). The results showed that interpreters have conflicting perceptions of their role. In her opinion, for interpreters to find the middle ground between the extremes would be “interpreting what is said and mimicking the way in which it is said, so that the interpreted version is understood by its listeners in the same way as the original and achieve the same potential reaction”. One group of interpreters in her study suggested that the language itself should be seen as the interpreter’s client. (Hale 2004:9). In a study by Lee (2009) the attitudes to these extremes were examined as well as whether a court interpreter should explain cultural differences or not, another area where there is no clear consensus among professional performers of interpreting (Angelelli 2003, Mikkelsen 2008). While there are many studies that highlight the contradictions that there are between court interpreters’ view of their role and the views of other legal professionals, when it comes to certain aspects, interpreters and judges occasionally agree. This can for example be seen in a series of interviews conducted by Carstensen & Dahlberg. They report that both judges and interpreters stressed that an interpreter who does not draw attention to herself is considered the more competent. The best interpreter is one “that is neither seen nor noticed” (Carstensen & Dahlberg 2017:51). Wadensjö observes that the legal community, due to the structure of the judicial systems, has difficulties seeing the interpreters as doing “more than ‘just translating’” (Wadensjö 1998:75). Frantsuzova makes the observation that even though the expectation from the judiciary is for a verbatim translation and nothing else, another contradictory expectation is that understanding can be made better with an interpreter who can clarify messages (Frantsuzova 2019:194). Such expectations are voiced by a lay judge in Torstensson & Sullivan (2011:73).

Some studies have shown that judges explicitly voice the expectations they have directly to the court interpreter, and sometimes even reprimand the interpreter for what is considered unacceptable behavior (Torstensson & Gawronska 2009, Martinsen & Dubslaff 2010, Elsrud 2014).

This is not a comprehensive review of all the studies on the court interpreter’s role, but to summarise, most of the studies focus solely on the translation, or language aspect of interpreting, even if the discussion is about the interpreter’s role. Sometimes the focus can be on the issue of whether the court interpreter perceives herself as a cultural mediator or not (Angelelli 2003, Mikkelsen 2008), but the role of court interpreters as participants in court, with their own agency and specific mandate, remains largely unexplored.

2.2 On coordination and types of renditions

As mentioned above, Wadensjö (1998) suggests a two-fold model of interpreting, as coordination on the one hand and translation on the other. When looking at interpreting as translating, comparing utterances as one would source texts and target texts, she has identified eight categories of rendition (Wadensjö 1998:107–108). Not all of them will be presented here³. A close rendition is a rendition that has the same content and style as the original (the source text). Looking at it from a traditional viewpoint, that the ideal end result of interpreting is a target text that needs to be as precise as possible, then only close renditions would be acceptable. Having that in mind, it is important to note that renditions other than close renditions, any of the seven divergent renditions, should not be seen simply as mistakes but that they can be part of a strategy to deal with all sorts of aspects of the task of interpreting (Wadensjö 1998:146). Two of the divergent renditions are expanded renditions and

³ See Appendix 3 for an overview of all types of renditions

reduced renditions. These are renditions that contain respectively more and less of the information from the original utterance (Wadensjö 1998:107). Sometimes in interpreter-mediated communication there are times when an interpreter does not offer a rendition at all, this is called a zero-rendition. It is important to not confuse zero-rendition with a non-rendition, which is when the interpreter produces an utterance that does not have an original, thus coming from the interpreter herself (Wadensjö 1998:108).

This study will not specifically delve into types of renditions, but I will use the taxonomy in describing the interpreters' contributions. The types of renditions are primarily a way to describe the translating side of interpreting, but there are two aspects of dialogue interpreting: translating and coordinating. Translating and coordinating are not mutually exclusive in that the interpreter performs either one or the other, but both are happening at the same time (Wadensjö 2004:109).

From the interaction perspective, the role of interpreter can be seen as a combination of two central functions; on the one hand, translating and on the other hand, coordinating others' talk. The translating function is obvious for those taking part in the interaction. The coordinating function is obvious to the extent that the interpreter is expected to take every second turn at talk. Yet, the coordinating work of the interpreter's contributions can be more or less explicit and can have a stronger or weaker effect on the progress and the substance of the interaction. (Wadensjö 1997:51)

The implicit coordination is performed in the way that the interpreter takes every other turn. When it comes to explicit coordination it is often the case that these actions are performed through non-renditions, and they can be divided into text-oriented initiatives and interaction-oriented initiatives, where a request for clarification is an example of the former and a request to observe the turn-taking order is an example of the latter (Wadensjö 1998:109–110).

2.3 On turn-taking and repair

The theory of turn-taking is a way to gain an understanding of how conversation is organised, and how it can function. In any conversation it is important to be able to jointly agree on whose turn it is to talk. Conventionally it is considered most polite if one person speaks at a time, but informal conversation contains a lot of overlapping talk, often without it being seen as problematic (Norrby 1996:126).

To be able to gain the floor speakers need to analyse talk for the opportunity for them to come in. They need to be able to identify and anticipate a transition relevance place ((Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson 1974:703) which can be described as a possible transfer of speakership (Tiseliu & Englund Dimitrova 2021:332).

Turn-taking in interpreter-mediated discourse is different from in other discourse. As the previous section showed, one part of interpreter coordination is that the interpreter takes every other turn. However, there are also other aspects of turn taking that are affected by interpreting. Due to limitations in working memory (Tiseliu & Englund Dimitrova 2021:329) the interpreter sometimes cannot always allow the primary speaker to complete an answer or question. Then the interpreter has to adjust the length of the utterance to be interpreted, through active turn-taking (Tiseliu & Englund Dimitrova 2021:333). Several other studies have also described how interpreters do this both through verbal and non-verbal means (Licoppe & Veyrier 2020, Hansen & Svennevig 2021).

Overlapping talk is a common feature of conversation that the theory of turn taking takes into account. Interpreters use various strategies to handle overlapping talk. Some of the options are to either ignore the overlapping talk, stop one or more speakers and/or offer turns to primary speakers (Nakane 2014:18).

It is common for repair sequences to be related to turn-taking issues (Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson 1974:723). Repair is a concept used to describe "practices for dealing with problems or troubles in speaking, hearing and understanding the talk in conversation" (Schegloff 2000:207). If a repair is initiated by the speaker of the problematic talk it is referred to as self-initiated repair and if initiated by someone else, other-initiated repair. In general, the other-initiated repair "involves the recipient of the problematic talk *initiating* the repair, but leaving it for the *speaker* of the trouble source to deal with the trouble themselves in the ensuing turn" (Schegloff 2000:207). It is also relevant to note who is then providing the repair, if it is the repair initiator, the other primary speaker, or someone else (ten Have 2007:133). In the present study there are repair initiatives from interpreters who are not currently providing the renditions, and who in Goffman's terms would be considered a bystander at that point in the interaction, and who is certainly not the recipient of the talk. Thus, just as turn-taking, repair is also something that functions somewhat differently in interpreter-mediated interaction. It can either be the primary speaker who initiates repair, which is then relayed by the interpreter, but the interpreters can also initiate and perform repair themselves (Nakane 2014:108).

Turn taking norms in formalised institutional settings differ from those in everyday conversation. In very formal situations such as during a court hearing, it is assumed that the norm of one speaker at a time is particularly strong. Nevertheless, as can be seen from some of the examples in this thesis, even in court, overlapping talk can be found.

2.4 On cooperation, team interpreting and the interpreter's role

In conference interpreting the norm is for at least two interpreters to be assigned for each language pair used (Bartłomiejczyk & Stachowiak-Szymczak 2021:23) and in international criminal courts, such as ICC, interpreters sometimes even work in teams of three, and never alone (Stern 2012:10). Despite this fact there is lack of research into how interpreters cooperate in teams in spoken language interpreting, especially when it comes to consecutive interpreting. For sign language interpreting the norm of working in pairs during longer sessions is even stronger. This is commonly known as *team interpreting* (Hoza 2010). Hoza describes three different approaches to team interpreting; an independent view on team interpreting focuses on fatigue and relief where one interpreter is always resting while the other one works, often the interpreters are then referred to as the *on* and the *off* interpreter (Hoza 2010:4-5). Another way of viewing team interpreting is to focus on quality assurance, that the interpreter who is not producing the renditions is monitoring the target language output to ensure accuracy (Hoza 2010:6). Studies have shown that this approach can be quite unpopular with practicing interpreters in a conference setting (Duflou 2016:190). The third approach to teamwork, and the one that Hoza advocates is what he calls a collaborative and interdependent approach, where the interpreters relieve each other by taking turns producing the output as well as monitoring the output (Hoza 2010:8), but also that the interpreters are both constantly "involved in the whole process, although they may play different roles at different times" (Hoza 2010:9). Hoza analyses findings from a study of videotaped interpreted events, with interpreting between ASL and English, where five different teaming strategies could be identified. In his study Hoza identified the interpreters as the *lead* and the *monitor* interpreter respectively. Three of the strategies are called feeds

in Hoza's terminology. If the lead interpreter has made a mistake or is missing part of the content, then the monitor interpreter can correct or enhance the target language output, using the target language, in what he calls a *target language feed* (2010:69). This can be compared to a situation where a spoken language interpreter would intervene if a colleague in the team produced a substituting or reduced rendition. Sometimes the lead interpreter turns to the colleague for confirmation that she has understood something correctly, either with verbal or non-verbal behaviour, the answer can also be verbal or non-verbal. Hoza calls this *confirmation*. (2010:72-73) There are also ways of getting support from the monitor interpreter before a target language output has been produced. If the lead interpreter hesitates for example, then the monitor interpreter can supply the lead with the problematic term or phrase, a *process feed* (2010:75). Since the current study is based on audio files, and *confirmation* can be assumed to be mostly non-verbal, there are no examples of that, but the following sections will show examples of both corrections and help with a term or phrase.

Two additional strategies described by Hoza deal with collaboration and interdependence. Hoza shows that interpreters switch roles occasionally, that this is different from taking turns in interpreting and that it happens after a problem has occurred or is imminent in the output. According to Hoza this is "generally temporary and typically consists of rendering a sentence or two" (2010:88). He calls this *switching roles*, and it is a phenomenon that this study can confirm. There is also a category called *collaborating* which bears resemblance to Wadensjö's explicit coordination, but Hoza only applies it to teamwork. He explains that it does not have to do with relaying meaning but rather in coordinating the interaction (2010:90). The identifying feature of *collaborating* according to Hoza is when either interpreter addresses the other or a speaker without it being a rendition of a previous utterance, Wadensjö would call this a *non-rendition*.

The National association of Judiciary Interpreters & Translators (NAJIT 2020) has published a position paper in which they describe the associations' view on team interpreting in courts in the US. In that paper, team interpreting is defined as "the practice of using two or more interpreters who share the responsibility of providing simultaneous or consecutive interpreting for one or more individuals with limited English proficiency" (2020:1)⁴. They label the interpreters *active* and *support* interpreter respectively. The paper is a policy document rather than a result of research, but the different tasks of the interpreters are similar to the categories defined by Hoza. The support interpreter is expected to supply the active interpreter with any information that might be needed, such as numbers and difficult terminology. NAJIT points out that an important task for the support interpreter during witness testimony, is to be a monitor and ensure accuracy (NAJIT 2020:2). Although not explicit in the paper, one must assume that one of the support interpreter's duties is to intervene if an utterance is not rendered accurately.

In ISO 20228:2019 *On requirements for legal interpreting*, it is stated that two interpreters should be assigned if simultaneous interpreting is expected for more than 45 minutes, and that interpreters should be able to work with team interpreters. The standard does not go into detail on how the teamwork is supposed to be performed.

As it is still a rare occurrence to have a team of interpreters in spoken languages in national courts there is no available research on such teamwork. In Sweden, the National Courts Administration in 2017 came out with guidelines for the use of interpreters in courts of law, revised 2020. The recommendation is to assign two interpreters if a case is expected to last for more than half a day

⁴ Please note that, contrary to the NAJIT viewpoint, the international standard for legal interpreting ISO 20228:2019 identifies end users of interpreting services as both providers of legal services and people who do not speak the language of service.

(Domstolsverket 2020:15). Outside of Sweden it is still rarely the case that two interpreters are hired, even if cases are expected to go on for several hours without a break or even for consecutive full days. Stern has compared the use of interpreters in international courts and in national courts, primarily in Australia and writes:

There is no notion of teamwork amongst interpreters in domestic courts, where they work in isolation, generally with one interpreter per case or party. (Stern 2012:22)

The situation for interpreters to be able to work in teams in domestic courts has perhaps improved somewhat since Stern wrote her article in 2012, but there is still no research, or common view on interpreter cooperation in courts in spoken languages.

When looking at teamwork between interpreters taking place in a formalised setting such as the court hearing, it seems relevant to examine the role of the interpreter, or interpreters from the viewpoint of the ongoing interaction. Applying Goffman's participation framework to the courtroom, the defendant and the legal professionals are *ratified* participants and sometimes *bystanders* depending on which phase of the proceedings is taking place. The interpreter is normally seen as and treated as a non-person, they are "individuals who are "present during the interaction but in some respects do not take the role either of performer or of audience" (Goffman 1990:150 as cited in Wadensjö 2008:186). A non-person can have flexible participation status, they can involve themselves in what Goffman calls *byplay*, *crossplay* and *sideplay*. Goffman defines this as follows; *byplay* - "subordinated communication of a subset of ratified participants", *crossplay* - "communication between ratified participants and bystanders across the boundaries of the dominant encounter", *sideplay* - "respectfully hushed words exchanged entirely among bystanders" (Goffman 1981:34). Apart from the ratified participants and bystanders Goffman also introduces the category *overhearer*, a person who only accidentally hears the conversation. If the view is, that some suggest, that the interpreter who is not currently interpreting, producing the renditions, is not supposed to be actively listening but rather to be resting while the other one works, then one could describe that interpreter as an overhearer. On the other hand, if she is supposed to assist or monitor the active one, if urged to do so, or if she sees it as necessary, she could be described as a bystander.

Duflou uses the terms *passive/active* and *on-mic/off-mic* interpreters and introduces the notion that the off-mic interpreter could be seen as either an overhearer or a bystander in Goffman's sense (Duflou 2016:189). He also points out that monitoring the active interpreter to provide quality assurance, can be seen as very negative, as an indication of lack of trust in your colleague (Duflou 2016:189). This differs from the views of Hoza and NAJIT. Duflou has studied EU interpreters in the booth, and it is worth pointing out that in the booth, there are only two persons who need to be assigned roles in the participation framework, the audience, in this case the delegates, are not present in his study.

In a court room, where there are many persons present, it seems that the roles fluctuate depending on which part of the proceeding is taking place. This study only deals with questionings of the defendants, and it can be argued that at any given point there are only two ratified participants, the one asking the questions and the one who is supposed to be providing the answers. The other persons are bystanders. Both interpreters can be seen as non-persons, but within themselves and probably in the view of the other persons in the court room, only one interpreter at a time is the ratified interpreter and the other one a bystander. When I analyse the examples of interpreter cooperation in the following section, I examine both interpreters' respective roles within this framework. To apply the term *team interpreting* to the overall practice seems to be appropriate, and I will, when possible, relate my findings to Hoza's classifications.

3. Data and method

3.1 Data

The data in this study consists of 29 hours of recordings from seven cases from Swedish district courts, distributed in 43 audio files.

In Sweden, the courts record all questionings in a criminal case on video. The video recordings are accessible to the court staff and the court of appeal, but they cannot be removed from the court. However, any member of the public can request a copy of the sound recordings from the court administration, for a small fee, under the condition that the proceedings are not considered confidential. Typically, it is only very sensitive material that is classified as confidential. Sweden has a long-standing tradition of public access to documents. This is how I obtained access to the data upon which this study is based. With the help of the indictment and the judgement it is possible to determine the roles and identify the different speakers, despite not having access to images. Those documents were collected for the seven cases and form background material for the study but are not part of the actual data.

Since I only understand English and Swedish, at least to an extent where I can follow a court hearing I limited the data to cases with interpreting between English and Swedish. To obtain the recordings I first requested lists from the courts concerning all cases for a given period. The courts enter every action that is taken in each case in a record sheet, *dagboksblad* in Swedish. The next step was to search these for the Swedish word *engelsk* (i.e. English) to identify the cases where an English-speaking interpreter had been booked. When I had that information, I requested that the court send me all the recordings from those cases. I then deleted the rest of the documents containing information on cases I was not interested in. When deciding what type of cases to focus on I made a number of considerations. Firstly, I wanted to study just one case type and secondly, I wanted that case type to typically have long questioning sessions, long enough to generate a large enough corpus to be able to get comparable results. I decided to focus on money laundering cases. These cases are often longer and more complex and the questionings sometimes lasts several hours. I also considered what possibilities there were to preserve anonymity and integrity of the persons involved, and the topic of money laundering is not sensitive in the same way that a violent crime would be. Money laundering cases are furthermore very similar to each other and therefore easy to anonymise.

3.1.1 The cases

I collected audio files from seven cases resulting in 48 audio files with interpreting between English and Swedish. The number of audio files do not correspond to the number of questioning sessions as sometimes one questioning session is recorded in two or more sound files. The audio files vary in length, the shortest file is less than a minute and the longest is 121 minutes. The cases were numbered 1–7. Two of the cases have significantly more audio files than the other five. This is because Case 2 has 14 defendants and Case 7 has six defendants. However, in Case 2 only three of the defendants speak English so in that case there is only 222 minutes of audio with English interpreting. In Case 7 there is 878 minutes of audio with English interpreting. Part of Case 7 also concerns other crimes, so those audio files were not included in the data, leaving 733 minutes from case seven and 43 audio files in total instead of 48.

As stated, most of the cases have more than one defendant and some cases also have defendants who speak other languages than English. Many of the cases also include questioning of witnesses but only one witness is English speaking. In some cases, complainants are questioned but none of them are

English speaking. The latter sound files are not part of the data for the present study. It is also worth noting that none of the analysed interpreter-mediated questionings were carried out with the interpreter participating remotely, from outside of the court room. In a small number of questioning sessions, the person being questioned appears through video-link.

The defendants have been given anonymised initials for the purpose of naming the audio files but are just called *defendant* in the transcriptions and are separated through numbers if more than one defendant occurs in a particular example.

All the English-speaking defendants, apart from one, speak West African English and their countries of origin vary. There is one defendant who does not speak English on a native speaker level.

As previously states, in Sweden, at most courts, it is customary to book two interpreters per language for cases that last a full day or longer. I know through the courts record sheet that two interpreters were assigned to work together in all the seven cases, and I also know it from personal experience from parts of the data since I was one of the 11 interpreters in the study. However, at the time of the trials I had not yet decided on the scope of the thesis so I did not know when I was working, that I would be analysing my own interpreting.

When two interpreters are assigned to a court case in Sweden it is not usually the case that the interpreters sit next to the non-Swedish speaker. Most of the time the interpreters sit next to each other and interpret using one or more microphones. When simultaneous interpreting is used there is a separate audio channel for interpreting, allowing the listeners to hear the interpreter through an earpiece. The mode of interpreting is then almost exclusively simultaneous. When the non-Swedish speaker is questioned the mode is consecutive, most of the time. It happens that the court interpreter chooses to interpret the questions posed in Swedish simultaneously and the other language answers consecutively into Swedish, but this is not the case in my data.

3.1.2 The interpreters

There are eleven interpreters in the seven cases. Many of them interpret in several cases and in various combinations. I used the record sheets from the courts to identify the names of the interpreters and checked their formal qualifications with the supervising authority *Kammarkollegiet*. Ten of the interpreters are authorised court interpreters, which is to say they have the highest formal qualification a public service interpreter can have in Sweden. The one who is not a court interpreter is an authorised interpreter. In Sweden there is currently no university level education programme for public service interpreters with English as a working language.⁵ That means that none of the interpreters in this study have a degree in public service interpreting. However, they are all very experienced and most of them have attended other courses in interpreting. There are both male and female interpreters. None of the interpreters are of West African origin and there are both native and near native English speakers among them. The interpreters each have a unique number, and in the text as well as in the transcriptions, they are labelled IN1, IN2, IN3 and so on. Appendix 1 has an overview of the audio files used in this study, showing the cases and interpreters as well as how many instances there is of cooperation between interpreters in each audio file.

⁵ The languages currently offered are Arabic, Dari, Mongolian, Farsi, Somali, Tigrinya, and Uzbeki.

3.2 Method

When starting to collect my data, I did not set out to find instances where there were always two interpreters. My aim was to collect data from more extensive cases so that the questioning session with the English speakers would be long enough to contain a variety of the types of phenomena that I was interested in. I started to listen to the audio files, taking detailed notes, having no specific focus other than keeping an ear open for interpreter behaviour that seemed interesting. I did not specifically listen for close or divergent renditions but if something stood out, I noted that. My main focus was on explicit coordination, but I quickly realised that the form of interaction that was the most prominent was the teamwork performed by two interpreters.

The coordinating side of interpreting was the main area of interest rather than quality of translation, but I had not decided in advance exactly what my focus should be. There were very many instances of explicit coordination performed by just one interpreter, but it also very quickly became apparent that the interpreter's cooperated quite extensively, with both implicit and explicit coordination, and I decided to focus my study specifically on that, noting every instance of interpreter cooperation in my notes. The detailed notes form part of the data for this study but will not be presented in this thesis.

In eleven of the sound files, including all the ones from Case 1, there is no audible/noticeable cooperation between interpreters. That means that three of the interpreters, IN7, IN10 and IN11 are not included in the analysis in this thesis. In the remaining audio files, I located roughly 170 instances of cooperation between interpreters. I decided to make a simple transcription of 110 of those, feeling that having that number of examples would be sufficient to see if there were any tendencies or categories that could be found. The goal was to transcribe as representative a selection as possible. The distribution of audio files with interpreting in English is such that Cases 2–6 have little over half of the recorded hours and the rest are from Case 7. Therefore, almost all the spotted instances of cooperation from Cases 2–6 were transcribed. I decided to not transcribe all of the instances of cooperation from Case 7. That case had six English speaking defendants, three of whom were only questioned once. Since interpreters' strategies can depend on how individuals speak, I decided to include all those, but when it came to the other three defendants, I did not transcribe all the instances of interpreter cooperation.

For each transcription I had to decide on how much of the surrounding talk needed to be included in the transcription to understand what it is that the bystander interpreter reacts to, as well as transcribing the entire sequence until the problem has been resolved. I always transcribed the communication immediately preceding the cooperative exchange in order to identify possible triggers of what in conversation analytical terminology is called repair initiations (Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson 1974:723-724, Nakane 2014:107) as was described in section 2.3.

Once I had 110 transcriptions, I analysed them for common features. I ended up discarding eight transcriptions due to difficulties in analysing them. For example, listening to some of them again, I wasn't sure if it was an interpreter that I heard, providing assistance, or rather the prosecutor or a lawyer. Through the analysis it was possible to separate the instances of cooperation into five categories. A number of examples of each category were selected to be included in the thesis and those were transcribed in more detail. The transcriptions were done according to the principles in Norrby (1996) with addition of some symbols from Nakane (2014)⁶. Since the objective was not to focus on how words are pronounced, most of the transcribed words have traditional spelling. For example, in

⁶ See Appendix 2 for an overview of transcription symbols used.

Swedish adjectives ending in *-igt* in written language it is very common that there is no audible g-sound when spoken. For the purpose of this study, it is not relevant if there is such a sound or not, and hence I have used traditional spelling. Short words and contractions that are very common in spoken language have been transcribed the way that they are said.

Special attention was paid to overlapping talk, since that is a relevant feature when observing turn-taking and participation. Micropauses and pauses in general were considered important and any self-correction, hesitation, and false starts have been noted in as much detail as deemed necessary.

A simple translation into English of talk in Swedish is added in the transcriptions to facilitate understanding for non-Swedish speakers. To save space, the translations use figures for the numbers, as opposed to the transcriptions where numbers are spelled out, for it to be possible to see which language the numbers were uttered in.

3.3 Ethical considerations

Since the recordings from court proceedings were obtained in the same way as any member of the public can do, there is no informed consent given from any of the participants in the recordings. However, all participants knew that they were being recorded and it is common knowledge that sound recordings made in court can be accessed by the public. There are many true crime-pods and TV-productions that make use of authentic court recordings, so people in general are aware that this might happen. For this small study there is no major ethical problem with doing research without explicit consent. However, it is still very important to make sure that the anonymity of the defendants is preserved. As mentioned in section 3.1 I decided to focus on money laundering as that type of crime is not sensitive in the same way that a violent crime would be. It is also the type of crime that has a very predictable structure, the court cases are similar to each other and therefore easy to anonymise. Any statements that could give a clue to a defendant's identity were either not used or heavily altered. Since information about an individual in relation to criminal activities is sensitive personal data, it must be protected. What makes that even more important is that not all the defendants were considered guilty by the court. Having read the judgments from all the cases I would like to point out that some of the defendants were acquitted, and some of the cases are, as of May 2022, still pending before the court of appeal. There are male and female defendants, but I have used the pronoun *he* for all of them to further preserve anonymity.

There are many towns, banks and money transfer services mentioned in the data. In the transcriptions they go by bank1, bank2, service1, service2, town1, town2 and so on. When it is relevant for the analysis to be able to highlight a part of a proper noun a similar pseudonym was used. In the example below, one interpreter fails to hear a name of a place and is helped by the other interpreter. The place name used has been changed for another whereas the name of a person is just substituted by name1. This example illustrates two of the methods used in the study to anonymise the data.

Excerpt 1

DEF defendant

PRO prosecutor

IN3 interpreter 3, ratified

IN1 interpreter 1, bystander

01 DEF yeah they have met

02 IN3 ja dom har träffats

yes they have met

03 PRO kan du berätta hur de gick till

can you tell me how that happened

04 IN3 can you tell me about how that went

05 DEF like we met in eh (.) namels (.) where name1 lives in

österåker [(x)]

06 IN3 [vi trä]ffades där name1 bo:r [i:]

we met where name1 lives in

07 IN1 [°öster]åker°

08 IN3 österåker °thank you°

A slightly different approach was taken when it comes to the interpreters. Ten out of eleven interpreters participating on the recordings are certified legal interpreters between Swedish and English, which means that for those ten, there is a selection of only 27 potential persons. To anonymise the examples to the extent that no interpreter will recognise their own work, should they happen to read the thesis, is difficult, if not impossible. Hopefully the examples chosen are not too obvious and no-one other than him or herself can know who they are. The interpreters are both male and female but the pronoun *she* was used throughout rather than *s/he* or *he/she* or *they*, to facilitate readability and anonymity. In my analysis I wanted to be able to see if a particular interpreter could be associated with a particular style and consequently, I gave each interpreter a unique number that is used for each individual and does not change if the same interpreter is working on more than one case⁷.

The other persons involved are identified through their professional role in the proceedings. I have tried to avoid personal pronouns but would like to mention that there is basically an even distribution between men and women when it comes to prosecutors, lawyers and judges.

⁷ See Appendix 1 for an overview of the cases and interpreters.

4. Findings and analysis

When two interpreters work together during a questioning of a defendant it is assumed to be through a clear division of the roles. One interpreter is the one providing the translations/renditions and the other one is providing monitoring or support in various ways. As mentioned in section 2.4, by Hoza (2010:70) they are called lead and monitor interpreter and NAJIT uses the terms active and support interpreter (2020:1). For the purpose of this study, it makes more sense to identify them through their roles in the participation framework (Goffman 1981). They will be called ratified and bystander interpreter respectively. This makes it possible to avoid labelling one interpreter as non-active, since when cooperating, both interpreters are active. Monitoring is sometimes seen as negative and furthermore, the occurrences of interpreter cooperation found in this study are not only corrections of mistakes, so the term monitor interpreter also does not fully describe the role of the ‘other interpreter’, the bystander.

It should also be mentioned that the term cooperation is used in a narrow sense in this thesis. It is not used to describe interpreters changing over, relieving each other by taking turns interpreting. Nor is it used to describe collaboration before or after assignments such as sharing documents or term lists. This is of course also cooperating, on a larger scale but for the purpose of this thesis the term cooperation is used in a specific sense – to signify instances where two interpreters are involved to solve a local communication issue.

In analysing the 102 transcriptions of interpreter cooperation, I identified five separate categories of cooperation.

Four of the categories consist of the bystander interpreter producing a rendition of original utterances from primary speakers. Those four categories can be separated into two groups of two. There is a distinct difference between two types of prompted support, and two types of self-selected support. Prompted support is when the ratified interpreter either explicitly asks for support or when the ratified interpreter’s communicative behaviour makes the bystander conclude that support is needed. The support provided then is either to supply a *word* or a short *phrase* or to provide a *clarification* of a section of talk which has been unclear to the ratified interpreter. Self-selected support is when the bystander interpreter, without being prompted, decides to provide support. What is then provided is either a *correction* of a spotted mistranslation or a *completion* of a reduced rendition, when something has been omitted.

The fifth category encompasses all the occurrences when a non-rendition has been provided by the bystander interpreter. It can be classified as *explicit coordination* without any translation/rendition.

The categories are labelled according to what it is that the bystander interpreter is providing. So *word/phrase* and *clarification* are the two instances of prompted support, *correction* and *completion* is self-selected support performed by the bystander interpreter and *explicit coordination* is support from the bystander interpreter that is not related to the act of providing a rendition of talk.

In the following sections there will be a more detailed description of each category together with some examples of each from the data.

4.1 Word/phrase

When an interpreter gets stuck on a word or a phrase there are several different strategies that can be used. She can ask the speaker to rephrase, she can look the word up or she can paraphrase. Although not generally accepted as good strategies the interpreter can also omit the word or make a guess. When two interpreters collaborate one more option is available, and that is to use the colleague as a support. In the data for this study there were 49 instances when interpreters cooperate in solving problems with just one word or a short phrase. 19 of these were proper nouns, that were not heard or understood by the ratified interpreter. In section 3.3, Excerpt 1, an example of a placename causing trouble was shown and later in this section there will be an example of a name of a person causing the interpreter difficulties. I will here first present three examples of this that are not proper nouns. In these examples the bystander interpreter provides a target language rendition, after the ratified interpreter either has shown signs of hesitating or explicitly asked for support. Hoza would call what the bystander interpreter provides in these circumstances a process feed (2010:74). Hoza also has a category that is called target language feed but that only applies to corrections and enhancements. It is worth noting that the following examples show the bystander interpreter providing support in the target language. There were hardly any examples in this category that involved support being provided in the source language. These instances of cooperation are often very quickly and smoothly dealt with, by both interpreters. The bystander interpreter acts like a prompter at the theatre, allowing for the interpreted exchange to continue with minimal interruption.

Excerpt 2

DEF defendant
PRO prosecutor
IN1 interpreter 1, ratified
IN2 interpreter 2, bystander

01 DEF the money name1 eh sent to me was money that was sent by
02 my brother so e:h

03 IN1 pengarna som name1 skickade till mig det var pengar som
the money that name1 sent me that was money that
04 hade sk- som skickades av min bror
had se- that was sent by my brother

05 PRO förklara
explain

06 IN1 please explain

07 DEF yeah because eh my brother my brother (.) he's a (.) a
08 custom broker

09 IN1 a (.) a eh

10 IN2 mm tullmäkl[are]
mm customs broker

11 IN1 [°tull]mäklare° ah eh min bror (.) han är en
 customs broker ah eh my brother (.) he's a
 12 tullmäklare
 customs broker

Here the ratified interpreter, IN1 shows clear signs of problems. When she takes her turn on line 09 she immediately starts to hesitate. The bystander interpreter, IN2, recognises a difficulty and correctly concludes that it was the term ‘custom broker’, used on line 08, that caused the difficulty and supplies that term in Swedish on line 10. The ratified interpreter then includes that term, supplied by the bystander interpreter, in her rendition on lines 11 and 12. Once that has been resolved the exchange continues with IN1 continuing as ratified interpreter.

Half of the 30 instances, where there was input from the bystander interpreter concerning a word or a short phrase, were attributed to difficulties in finding an appropriate translation quickly enough. The other half concerned the ratified interpreter not remembering or not having heard a word or short phrase. In such situations the bystander interpreter can provide the missing word. In Excerpt 3 it is the last part of a number.

Excerpt 3

PRO prosecutor
 IN4 interpreter 4, ratified
 IN5 interpreter 5, bystander

01 PRO dom börjar me bank1 kontot då på då börjar ja på sidan
 they start with the bank1 account then at then I start at page
 02 e::h m: femtio: (.) åtta
 e:h m: fifty: (.) eight
 03 IN4 i'm going to start with the bank1 account and that's on
 04 page fiftyeight
 05 PRO då ser vi där utlandsinsättningen på tvåhundra sex tusen
 then we see this international deposit of 206 thousand
 06 IN4 we can see here a deposit from abroad of twohundred
 07 a:nd [e:::h]
 08 IN5 [°six°] [six]
 09 IN4 [six] °förlåt° six thousand °ja måste slå
 sorry *I have to look*
 10 upp [den°]
 up it

11 PRO [å de e] ju name1
and that is name1

On line 07, IN4 is hesitating as can be seen from the prolonged vowels. The bystander interpreter concludes that it is the figure six that she has not heard, or does not remember, and provides that on line 08. Then the ratified interpreter finishes the rendition on line 09, as well as saying quietly to herself that she needs to look it up, probably referring to the page mentioned by the prosecutor on line 02.

It deserves mentioning that in all the money laundry cases that I have worked on and in all the ones included in this study there is always some part of the questioning that is focused on account statements, very heavy in amounts and dates. It is almost impossible to handle this as an interpreter if the documents are unavailable. Because of this, to anticipate a later section, one common non-rendition by interpreters is to ask for page numbers.

Moving on to something else that is also notoriously difficult for interpreters, long lists of items. When two interpreters work together sometimes the bystander interpreter also takes notes and there is a possibility for the ratified interpreter to get immediate help from her colleague if needed. The next excerpt starts just after the prosecutor has asked what instructions the defendant had been given concerning what to write as a message when making a transfer of money.

Excerpt 4

DEF defendant, being questioned
IN2 interpreter 2, ratified
IN3 interpreter 3, bystander
Cliff - fictitious name, defendant 2, talked about

01 DEF yeah cliff will tell me like he can say that put car (.)
02 buy car (.) eh eh car purchase [(.)] you can put car=
03 IN2 [a]
04 DEF =purchase (.) we can put e:h eh buy [(.)] teve
05 IN2 [a]
06 IN2 okej så cliff har [sagt till mej] att ja kan skriva bil=
okay so cliff has told me that I can write car
07 DEF [all those things]
08 IN2 =köpa bil bilköp .h e:h (.) köpa: [e:h] what was that↑
buy car car purchase .h e:h (.) buy e:h
09 IN3 [°teve°]
10 IN3 teve
11 IN2 köpa en teve: såna saker
buy a TV that stuff

4.2 Clarification

Sometimes the trouble source is not just a word or a couple of words but rather an entire segment of talk. It can be related to the meaning, implication or logic of the segment and when that is not understood by the ratified interpreter. When that happens, she can get help from the bystander interpreter who takes over and renders that particular segment. I found seven instances of this in my data. Hoza has called this *switching roles* (or *taking it*) (2010:88) and it can be seen as a way of temporarily switching roles, so to apply the participation framework, the bystander interpreter temporarily takes the position of being the ratified one. Hoza comments that this can sometimes lead to a permanent switching of roles but there is not sufficient information in the data for this study to draw any conclusions on that. Rather, the conclusion that it is temporary can be deduced from the fact that the interpreter that was ratified before the trouble source occurred, resumes her task after the problematic segment has been rendered. In some cases, it is possible to hear the microphone being moved or the bystander interpreter moving closer to the microphone so that her voice is suddenly heard much louder. This is a difference from the previous category when only a word or a phrase is provided. Often when that happens it is said quietly, as could be seen in Excerpt 4 and 5 for example.

Finding out facts and making sense of them can sometimes be a lengthy procedure in court and in investigative interviews. Excerpt 6 starts after the prosecutor, for some time, has asked the defendant detailed questions on how it was that he could support himself and where he received his salary. The defendant has been explaining that he was using someone else's identity/papers to work.

Excerpt 6

PRO prosecutor

DEF defendant

IN4 interpreter 4, ratified

IN2 interpreter 2, bystander

John - fictitious name

01 PRO okej din lön ko- hamnade på John's konto
okay your salary ca- ended up in John's account

02 IN4 so your salary ended up in John's account

03 DEF because i'm working on his name

04 IN4 ja för ja jobbade i hans namn
yeah because I was working in his name

05 PRO okej
okay

06 DEF I don't know how i can give ehm the compan- ehm my own
07 konto while John I'm using (.) I'm using someone's name
account

08 (.) eh name to work

(1)

09 IN4 eh [wha-]

10 IN2 [dom] kan inte betala in eh pengarna på mitt konto om
they cannot pay eh the money into my account if
 11 jag jobbar i nån annans namn
I'm working in someone else's name

The prosecutor asks a question, on line 01, in the form of a statement which the defendant confirms on line 03. On line 05 the prosecutor's answer is not an unambiguously affirmative okay, to show understanding, but rather a hesitant one. The intonation does not go up at the end of the word, but it does not go down either which one would expect if the word okay was used to signal that a satisfactory answer had been given to the question. That is probably the reason for the defendant choosing to elaborate on his explanation as to why his salary was paid into someone else's bank account, on lines 06-08. After that there is a pause of one second, where the ratified interpreter does not take her turn immediately. On line 09 she also starts to show signs of hesitation. Consequently, it seems that that the bystander interpreter comes to the conclusion that the ratified interpreter has not understood the answer, and she delivers a rendition of the defendant's utterance on lines 10 and 11. It is not a close, but rather a substituting rendition that also summarises some information from the previous explanations given by the defendant (not part of this example). After this the prosecutor asks the next question and IN4 continues as the ratified interpreter.

In other cases, the ratified interpreter first tries to render the problematic statement, using common strategies of asking for clarification and repetition. When there is a bystander interpreter present, the ratified interpreter can use the colleague as an additional resource/strategy. Sometimes the clarification from the bystander interpreter can turn up several turns after the contribution or contributions that need to be clarified or explained. This can be seen in Excerpt 7.

Excerpt 7

PRO prosecutor
 IN1 interpreter 1, ratified
 IN3 interpreter 3, bystander
 DE1 defendant1 being questioned
 Peter, fictitious name for defendant2, being talked about

01 PRO haru (.) hur länge sen var det du hade kontakt med peter
you got (.) how long ago was it since you were in touch with peter

02 IN1 and how long ago is it since you were in contact with
 03 (.) peter

04 DE1 .hh I think eh (2.5) I think the last time I met with
 05 peter (2) it was in a party (1) >maybe he knows the date
 06 I don't know it< he eh in a party he was coming to town2
 07 and (.) I have a bag (.) I had a bag from africa from my
 08 family .hh so: that bag was in town1 to my brother (.)
 09 there in town1 so my brother b- was not going to come to

10 the party he send it back through him=
11 IN1 =just a [second (x)]
12 DE1 [that was] the last time I met [with him]
13 IN3 [(xx)]
14 IN1 .h eh (0.5) jag tror att senaste gången som jag träffade
I believe that the last time that I met
15 peter de var på en fest (.) .h e:h som eh han kom till
peter that was at a party (.) that eh he came to
16 festen den dagen och det var i town2 och i town2 så
the party that day and that was in town2 and in town2 then
17 >hade jag fått< en paket från afrika från min familj å
I had received a packet from africa from my family and
18 paketet skulle .h till min. bror i town1 (.) the packet
the packet was -h to my brother in town1
19 was going to be sent to your brother in town1 and then
20 what did you say
21 IN3 han [inte °sa de°]
he not said that
22 DE1 [yes (.)] th- the bag was from my brother in town1=
23 IN1 [ah↑]
24 DE1 =[so my] brother was not going to attend the party
25 IN1 ah okej [nu so]
okay now
26 DE1 [send it back through] peter=
27 IN1 =just a second so (.) nej pa- eh pakete- eh (.) bag↑
no pa- eh the packet
28 °do you under[stand°]
29 IN3 [yeah] eh väskan eh min eh väskan kom till
the bag eh my eh the bag came to
30 min bror å min bror skulle inte följa med till festen å
my brother and my brother wasn't going to come to the party and
31 eftersom peter skulle till festen peter skulle ta med .h
since peter was going to the party peter was going to bring
32 väskan till festen
the bag to the party

The defendant that is being questioned is participating through video conference and the defendant being talked about is in the room. Earlier in the questioning session the camera has panned to all the defendants and the person being questioned has identified “Peter” by name. When the excerpt starts the prosecutor asks for information on how long ago it was since the defendant met “Peter” and he then goes on to explain about the last time that they both met, as well as the reason why. From earlier in the questioning, it has been established that these two people do not know each other well according to the defendant being questioned, they are only loosely acquainted. On lines 04–10 the defendant gives the answer to the prosecutor’s question, and when it becomes too long for the interpreter to remember, she makes a request for him to pause for interpreting on line 11. That is not successful, and the defendant finishes his answer on line 12. On line 14 the ratified interpreter starts her rendition but perhaps she suspects that she does not remember everything, as she is using a strategy of repeating part of the original in the source language. She changes from rendering the English answer in Swedish and starts speaking English to the defendant repeating part of his utterance and encourages him to continue from there (lines 18–20). This is a repair initiative from her to encourage the defendant to repeat what he already said. However, it is the bystander interpreter who responds, with a repair initiative, to this on line 21, since the ratified interpreter in fact has made a mistake in her summary of what the defendant had said. The defendant has not observed the mistake it seems, since his answer on line 22 starts with ‘yes’. On line 23 IN1 makes an exclamation of understanding and tries to take the floor for interpreting. On line 27 she manages to take her turn, but at this point realises that the word used in English was ‘bag’ and not something else (the Swedish word used consistently by IN1 has been *paket* and she used the English word ‘packet’ on line 18). Facing yet another problem of understanding she then asks her colleague for help on line 28. This leads to the interpreters temporarily switching roles. On lines 29–31 the bystander interpreter takes the floor as ratified and makes a summarized rendition of the defendant’s utterances. Looking at the renditions produced by both interpreters the only part of the original utterances that did not turn up in any rendition was the fact that the defendant does not remember what date this happened, but maybe the other defendant, “Peter” remembers. Since “Peter” is in the court room it is not strange to refer to him in this way. After this communicative trouble has been resolved, the roles switch back and IN1 continues as the ratified interpreter.

4.3 Correction

Sometimes the ratified interpreter seems to be satisfied with her rendition, but the bystander interpreter does not agree and supplies a correction, self-selecting support, as was described in the introduction to this section. In the data for this study there are 19 instances of such corrections. Hoza would call this a target language feed in the form of a correction. In the data for this study, I have found some instances where the corrections made by the bystander interpreter were made in the source language, not often, but it occurs. Perhaps this is due to the differences between signed and spoken languages.

It can be hard to distinguish between when an interpreter believes that she has delivered a good enough rendition and when she is hesitating and taking help or support from a colleague (especially since the data is audio only). Some clues can be found in the intonation used by the ratified interpreter. One can also approach this from the perspective of repair and perhaps then it can be made clearer. In the previous two categories the ratified interpreter can be seen as the repair initiator since she is either hesitating or explicitly asking for support. In contrast, what has been defined as correction has the character of other-initiated repair. It is the bystander interpreter who offers the repair, and according to the structure of other-initiated repair it is the primary speaker who has the duty to perform the repair.

This is also what happens in these circumstances. Even if the bystander interpreter has offered the entire rendition, that rendition is repeated by the ratified interpreter. As opposed to the previous category of *clarification* this cannot be seen as a temporary switching of roles.

Another clue to determine if this should be seen as a correction of a mistake or not is to study how the ratified interpreter reacts to the input from the bystander interpreter. In the next excerpt it is obvious that IN2 realises that she has made a mistake.

Excerpt 8

PRO prosecutor

IN2 interpreter 2, ratified

IN3 interpreter 3, bystander

DEF defendant

01 PRO .hh (.) och (0.5) va ville han att du skulle göra med

and what did he want you to do with

02 dom pengarna

that money

03 IN2 and what did he want you to do with that money

04 DEF he did not told me about the money just eh e:h (.) since

05 he have my account (.) that he eh money will come in the

06 account when it come let me just inform him

07 IN2 .h eh han: berättade inte för mig va- va de skulle va

he: didn't tell me wha- what is was going to be

08 med dom pengarna eftersom han hade mitt kon:tonummer så:

with that money since he had my account number then

09 .h så va de så att pengarna skulle komma in å sen när

then it was the case that the money was going to come in and then when

10 dom hade kommit in så skulle ja bli informerad

they had come in I was going to be informed

11 PRO .h [och va]

and what

12 IN3 [inform]era honom

inform him

13 IN2 s- a å så förlåt tolken eh ble- asså s- när pengarna

and so sorry the interpreter go- well s- when the money

14 hade kommit in så skulle ja informera (.) honom om de

had come in then I would inform (.) him about that

When comparing line 06 with line 10, it can be determined that the phrase is given a substituting rendition. The ratified interpreter makes a mistake when it comes to who it is supposed to inform whom. Since there is no hesitation or rising tone at the end of the rendition it can be concluded that she believes that she is finished. On line 11 the prosecutor starts to ask the next question which can also be seen as confirmation that the ratified interpreter's turn is finished. However, the bystander interpreter has spotted a mistranslation and supplies a correction in the form of a repair initiative. As it is an other-initiated repair it is up to the speaker to perform the repair. On line 13 that the ratified interpreter performs the repair and produces her rendition, after some hesitating and an apology. She is also delivering the correction as an expanded rendition, replacing *it* with *money* and adding *about it* perhaps in an attempt to make the meaning clearer.

Even if the correction, or the repair has been heard by the entire room it seems that there is a preference for the rendition to be produced by the interpreter that is seen as currently ratified, leading her to repeat even very short phrases, as is exemplified in the next excerpt.

Excerpt 9

DEF defendant

IN5 interpreter 5, ratified

IN4 interpreter 4, bystander

LAW lawyer

01 DEF yes after like four four transactions then eh (.) i
 02 realised that its different names (.) so I asked why (.)
 03 so: he said that eh his girlfriend friend that is helping
 04 her (xx)
 05 LAW o:[kej]
 o:kay
 06 IN5 [eh] ja efter fyra transaktioner då inså- insåg jag
well after four transactions then I real- realised
 07 att de var olika namn (.) ja frågade honom varför han sa
that there were different names (.) I asked him why he said
 08 asså .h de e hans flickvän: h [eh
well .h it's his girlfriend
 09 IN4 [s vänner
s friends
 10 IN5 flickvänner som har olika namn
girlfriends who have different names
 11 IN4 flickväs vänner (.) (xx)
girlfriends friends
 12 IN5 flickväs vänner
girlfriends friends

13 LAW okej

okay

On line 08 the ratified interpreter hesitates somewhat which makes the bystander interpreter fill in the missing part, which is only the genitive -s and the word 'friends'. The ratified interpreter then repeats what she has heard, which is 'girlfriends' on line 10 as well as a substituting rendition of the last phrase, 'that have different names' instead of 'that is helping her'. On line 14 the bystander interpreter corrects this to 'girlfriend's friends', and the ratified interpreter repeats the bystander interpreter's exact words, marking her approval of the correction as well as the ownership of the turn (Bockgård 2004:200, Wadensjö 2008:191, Wadensjö, Rehnberg & Nikolaidou 2022:12). It can also be noted that on line 05 the lawyer introduces feedback without waiting for the interpreter to render the defendant's utterance into Swedish. This is done through saying 'okay' with a prolonged vowel, indicating that something more is expected. On line 13 on the other hand the word 'okay' is uttered without any such indication. After this, the lawyer goes on to ask the next question and thus seems satisfied with the answer given.

There are a small number of examples in the data when the bystander interpreter provides a perceived correction that is also wrong or corrects something that was not wrong in the first place. I will not present any examples of that. However, perhaps as a consequence of this happening occasionally, there are also times when the ratified interpreter does not immediately accept the correction from her colleague but needs confirmation or wants to double check that she has heard right, as in the excerpt below.

Excerpt 10

LAW lawyer

IN5 interpreter 5, ratified

IN4 interpreter 4, bystander

DEF defendant

UNK unknown (not an interpreter - probably the prosecutor)

01 LAW på sidan sex i det här förhöret >å åklagaren behöver inte
on page six in this interview >and the prosecutor doesn't need to
02 lägga upp det< men eh (.) så kommer man fram till att du
put that up< but eh (.) the conclusion is that you
03 har fått in ungefär sjuhundrafemtusen kronor som
have gotten in approximately 750 000 SEK that
04 polisen frågar dig om↑ (2) e de [rätt uppfat]tat
the police are asking you about (2) is that correctly understood
05 IN5 [on page (.)] e:h (.)
06 six e:h the prosecutor doesn't need to put that up .hh
07 (.) eh its (.) is obvious that you received three
08 hundred and fifty thousand crowns=

09 IN4 =°sjuhundrafemti° (.) (xx)
750

10 IN5 eh (.) I heard three hundred and fifty [thousand]
11 LAW [seven hundred]
12 fifty
13 UNK [fifty]
14 IN5 [seven] hundred and fifty sorry .h e:h (.) [e::]
15 IN4 [°is that]
16 correct°
17 IN5 tha- i-
18 LAW e de rätt upp[fat-]
is that correctly understood

19 IN5 [that] you get and that you said that to
20 the po::lice↑ (.) did i understand that correctly
(2)

21 DEF please take it again
22 IN5 kan du upprepa det
could you repeat it

The question on lines 01–04 is asked with an embedded instruction to the prosecutor which the interpreter decides to include in the rendition. Sometimes interpreters chose to leave those types of inserted subclauses out of their renditions. Wadensjö suggests that interpreters might produce reduced renditions in order to “minimize the time and space taken by the interpreter’s turn” (Wadensjö 1998:147) but that does not happen here. Of note is also the marked rising intonation followed by a two second pause by the lawyer on line 04, where the ratified interpreter does not take the turn. A possible reason for this might be that the contribution from the lawyer is a statement, posed as a prelude to a question, and not really a question. However, the lawyer must have been expecting some kind of response or feedback sine he then verbalises that expectation with the phrase *is that correctly understood*. In a monolingual conversation the rising intonation on line 04 would very likely have resulted in some form of feedback and an encouragement to continue. In interpreter mediated trials there is hardly any feedback between interlocutors (Jönsson 1990). However, the lack of feedback is not what causes the difficulty in the rest of the exchange. The trouble source that triggers IN4 to intervene on line 09 is that IN5 makes a mistake on a number. If IN5 had changed her contribution to the number provided by IN4, the bystander interpreter, this exchange might have been seen as a feed in Hoza’s view (2010:69). Note though that the bystander’s contribution is in the source language, and Hoza only discusses corrections as an example of a target language feed. What happens after that is that IN5 seeks confirmation that her colleague’s understanding was correct, and she makes a statement on line 10 about what she believes she has heard, in the target language, which seems unusual at first glance. It can happen that interpreters have a preferred language of communication between them however, and this comment is probably directed to her colleague, even though several other people

also hear it, understand it and respond. This makes a difference from almost any other language used in the courts of Sweden, since if something is uttered in English it is possible for more participants to have access to what is being said than if the interpreter had spoken Polish or French for example. From line 11 the issue of the correct sum becomes the main topic of the conversation. This can be seen as byplay involving several more participants, the lawyer as well as one more person offer their contributions as to the sum on lines 11–13. Consequently, the defendant is placed in a position of bystander for this part, even though most of the utterances are in a language that he can understand. After the problem of determining the correct sum of money has been resolved, IN5 goes back to rendering the rest of the lawyer's question. From the hesitation on line 14 it can be concluded that she seems to have forgotten the last part of the lawyer's utterance. IN4 steps in and offers the missing phrase, in English, and the lawyer does so too but in Swedish. IN5 then proceeds to give a somewhat summarised rendition of the last half of the question, and it is only then, on line 20, that the turn is handed over to the defendant for an answer. However, the question has not been understood by the defendant who asks for the question to be repeated. Here one can say that even though the initial communicative issue is resolved, the fragmented nature of interpreted conversation in combination with other-initiated repair from the bystander interpreter seems to have made the defendant lose track of the question that was posed to him. He initiates a repair on line 21 by asking for repetition, the lawyer rephrases the question and IN5 continues as ratified.

4.4 Completion

When it comes to what I have chosen to call completion it can be best described as the bystander interpreter identifying a reduced rendition followed by her offering a *completion* of what was omitted, by supplying the missing word or phrase. I found 10 of those. To separate a reduced rendition from instances where the ratified interpreter also does not provide a complete rendition but turns explicitly or implicitly to her colleague for help, one needs to pay close attention to prosody. As with the category *correction*, from the previous section, this category is based on whether it seems that the ratified interpreter believes she has delivered a complete rendition or not. If something is said in a hesitating voice or with a noticeable rising intonation, this has been taken to mean that the interpreter is unsure and hence it does not belong in this category. If, on the other hand, the intonation signals the end of the turn, through a neutral or falling intonation that can be seen as the interpreter being satisfied with her contribution.

If the rendition does not form a well-formed sentence it can also be a hint that the ratified interpreter knows that she has missed something whereas if it is well formed that can indicate that the ratified interpreter thinks she is finished even if a part of the original's message is missing in the rendition. The habit of *completion* seems to be closely related to the bystander interpreter not accepting reduced renditions. When the bystander interpreter intervenes in other forms of renditions, such as substituting renditions, I have called them *corrections* and provided examples in section 4.3. As with *correction*, *completion* is also a case of the bystander interpreter offering other-initiated repair. Excerpt 11 shows several communicative difficulties including the ratified interpreter failing to supply an important piece of information.

Excerpt 11

DE1 defendant - being questioned

IN2 interpreter 2, ratified

IN3 interpreter 3, bystander

Chris - fictitious name

01 DE1 so when chris is loading his container (.) they can join

02 IN2 (.) e:h å när chris pa- lastar sin container så kan dom
and so when chris pa- is loading his container they can

03 gå me

join in

03 DE1 they can join before send in in s- (.) in in country1

04 IN2 s- eh they can join the [c-]

05 DE1 [they] can join like one

06 container they can use one container eh he- in: country8

07 [(.)] [send]

08 IN2 [m] [(.)] så kan dom så kan dom gå med i den

so they can join in that

09 [containern]

container

10 DE1 [i was very] happy with

11 IN2 [så kan dom gå] me till den=

so then they can join to that

12 IN3 [just a moment]

13 IN2 =gå me till den containern innan den skickas till

join to that container before it is sent to

14 country1↓

15 IN3 från country8

from country8

16 DE1 [because he had]

17 IN2 [från country8]

from country8

18 DE1 he had another business partner in country8

19 IN2 ja i- eftersom han hade en annan affärspartner i

yes i- since he had another business partner in

20 country8

country8

This defendant is reluctant in giving up the floor as can be seen from the many overlaps. On line 12 the bystander interpreter tries to halt him, explicitly coordinating the turn-taking. This will be discussed in more detail in the next section. On line 14 one can conclude, by the falling tone, that the ratified interpreter, believes she is finished with the rendition. The bystander interpreter has noticed an omission and supplies the part of the defendant's answer that was missing from the ratified interpreter's rendition, the country that the container was sent *from*. IN2 repeats the same phrase on line 17, as she is the ratified interpreter.

As previously mentioned, it can be challenging for interpreters if the original talk contains a long list of items. In section 4.1, Excerpt 4, the ratified interpreter seems to have been suspecting that she was missing an item from a list. In the following excerpt it is the bystander interpreter who notices a missing item from the list and intervenes to complete the rendition.

Excerpt 12

PRO prosecutor

IN1 interpreter 1, ratified

IN3 interpreter 3, bystander

01 PRO .h e:h hrm (.) i förhör då som börjar med dig på sida:

in an interview then that starts with you on page

02 sexhundraåttifem

685

03 IN1 e:h in an interview which starts eh on page sixhundred

04 and eighty five

05 PRO de är ett förhör från den andra april tjugitjugi

that is an interview from 2 april 2020

06 IN1 it's an interview from the second of april twenty twenty

07 PRO så: (.) delges du misstanke då e:h om (.) dels

so: (.) you were served as a suspect of (.) partly

08 penningtvättsbrott å sen också dom här misshandel >olaga hot

money laundering and then also these assault >unlawful threat

09 å övergrepp i rättssak<

and obstructing the course of justice<

10 IN1 you are eh officially informed of the suspicions of

11 money laundering and also assault and also of the eh (.)

12 obstructing the course of justice↓

13 PRO [å:]

and

14 IN3 [(xx)]=

15 IN1 =å and threatening (.) and threatening

On line 08–09 the prosecutor lists four crimes that the defendant was informed that he was suspected of having committed⁸ during the interview referred to. The two last ones are said quicker than his usual talking speed. On line 12 the falling tone from the ratified interpreter indicates that she believes that all crimes mentioned by the prosecutor have been listed, but they have not. It is not possible to hear what the bystander says on line 14, but from the ratified interpreter’s response, repeating twice an English version of the omitted crime from the Swedish original utterance, one can assume that the bystander supplied that word in one of the languages. After the ratified interpreter has made the addition, the questioning session continues with IN1 still as the ratified interpreter.

4.5 Explicit coordination

The first four categories have all entailed some form of rendition by the bystander interpreter. In this last category the focus will be on non-renditions. These are utterances from interpreters that do not match a corresponding utterance from a primary speaker, when “the interpreter communicates their own message instead of offering a rendition” (Nakane 2014:23). The data in this study contains many non-renditions but most of them are uttered by the ratified interpreter without involvement from the bystander interpreter. Requests for repetition or for a speaker to pause is very common but almost exclusively performed only by the ratified interpreter. However, there are some examples of non-renditions provided by the bystander interpreter.

In non-renditions the coordinating efforts take over from translating (Wadensjö 1998:149) and can in some cases be necessary for translation to take place at all. If an interpreter has not heard the speaker and asks for a repetition the rendition cannot take place without a preceding non-rendition. Since this study is about interpreters cooperating, I have not specifically studied examples when only one interpreter is performing coordination through a meta-comment, by asking for a page number for example. I have only examined in detail the instances when the bystander interpreter provides a non-rendition. There were 17 such non-renditions. Hozas category of collaboration would fit into this category, but only as a subset. He defines collaborating as discussing and making decisions about the interpreting work, for example determining who is going to be lead, in his terminology. Since this thesis only covers cooperation during interpreting assignments that is not discussed here. However, asking if the colleague wants to take over temporarily or if she wants to change roles also belongs to this category according to Hozas. In the data for this study there are two examples non-renditions from the bystander interpreter asking the ratified interpreter if she wants to change over. It might seem strange that it is only twice, but one can assume that most of the time such a question is communicated non-verbally, and since the data is audio only, such cooperation is not available for study. Several examples can be found where the bystander interpreter requests a speaker to pause or give instructions to speakers to speak one at a time. This is also included in Hozas category of collaborating. One other common non-rendition that cannot be seen in Hozas study, probably because he has not studied interpreter cooperation during trials, is requesting a page number. As previously mentioned, money laundering cases can be large and complex, and it is much easier for the interpreters to follow what is talked about if they can see the information referred to. Often the relevant documents are shown on a large screen in the courtroom but for interpreters it is often easier to read on their own computers or tablets⁹. In the excerpt below it is the bystander interpreter who supplies the page number.

⁸ This can be compared to being charged with having committed one or several crimes, but the legal systems differ, so I am avoiding using that term.

⁹ *Domstolsverket* (The Swedish National Courts Administration) recommends that the courts shall provide the interpreters with relevant material in preparation for their assignments.

Excerpt 13

PRO prosecutor
IN6 interpreter 6, ratified
IN2 interpreter 2, bystander

01 PRO vi går vidare till nästa grova bedrägeri mot name1
we'll move on to the next gross fraud against name1

02 IN6 we'll move on to the next gross fraud against eh name1

PROSECUTOR LOOKS THROUGH PAPERS FOR 7 SECONDS

03 PRO här kommer de in (.) hundratusen den tju (.) sjunde
here it is paid in (.) 100 000 on the twenty (.) seventh

04 december

05 IN6 vilken sida är vi på nu
what page are we on now

06 PRO vi e på sida:n=
we're on pa::ge

07 IN2 =hundrafem
105

08 PRO eh hundrafem ja förlåt
eh 105 yes sorry

On line 05 the ratified interpreter asks for the page number, a request directed at the prosecutor who responds but hesitates, which prompts the bystander interpreter to provide the page number on line 07. The prosecutor acknowledges that providing the page number was his duty, as can be seen both from the fact that the page number is repeated by him on line 08 and by the apology on the same line.

As previously stated, overlapping talk is common in normal conversation but in court hearings the norm is very strong for speakers to speak one at a time. The traditional view of a court hearing is that it is always the judge who gives the floor to the speakers or instructs participants to wait for their turn. This is not always the case. In monolingual trials the participants can be allowed to hold the floor until they themselves give it up, under the condition that they were granted the floor by someone authorised to do so. Often questioning sessions contain long stretches of talk by one participant which makes it necessary for interpreters to manage the turns based on their working memory constraints (Tiselius & Englund Dimitrova 2021). This is sometimes done through verbal instructions (Licoppe & Veyrier 2020) by the interpreter. In the data for this study there are several examples of the bystander interpreter providing such verbal instructions, which at first glance can be a little hard to understand since the bystander does not have immediate insight into the ratified interpreters' memory capacity. However, analysing the examples it seems justified. On line 12 in Excerpt 11 in section 4.4 the bystander interpreter interjects with *just a moment* after the defendant does not wait for the ratified interpreter to finish her rendition and continues to give his answer. In Excerpt 14 below the ratified interpreter draws her breath to indicate that she is ready to take her turn and when the defendant does not notice this, the bystander interpreter requests him to stop.

Excerpt 14

PRO prosecutor

DEF defendant

IN1 interpreter 1, ratified

IN3 interpreter 3, bystander

01 PRO va menade du med de här

what did you mean by this

02 IN1 what did you mean by that

03 DEF som: e: ja: (2) e:h i jus- eh ja kommer inte ihåg men va

like: I: e:h eh I don't remember but what

04 men de va där ja s- it was what i said to them when they

but it was there I sa-

05 ask when they request for document (.) so that was eh i

06 write in my own words i told them e:h everything i know

07 about about the tran- transaction i don't know about any

08 any other transaction that was coming [in] my account=

09 IN1 [.h]

10 DEF =just that [just that] transaction

11

12 IN3 [just a moment]

13

14 IN1 ja: eh när dom ställde frågor de- där dom bad om att få

ye:s eh when they asked questions the- where they asked to get

15 e:h handlingar så eh svarade jag eh till dom i mina egna

documents then eh I answered eh to them in my own

16 ord och de: å ja svarade va ja visste om den

words and tha: and I answered what I knew about the

17 transaktionen (.) och att jag inte visste något mer om

transaction (.) and that I didn't know anything else about

18 någon annan transaktion att de skulle komma mera pengar

any other transaction that there would come more money

Lines 03–08 can be described as a long stretch of talk. Furthermore, it is delivered in a mix between Swedish and English, probably making it harder to remember. It is not unexpected that the ratified interpreter tries to take her turn on line 09, however apparently not with a strong enough initiative, since the defendant continues. That is most likely the reason why the bystander interpreter decides to step in on line 12.

When there is a lot of overlapping talk an interpreter might feel the need to instruct the speakers to speak one at a time. Excerpt 15 shows such a request coming from both the ratified and the bystander interpreters.

Excerpt 15

PRO prosecutor

IN4 interpreter 4, ratified

IN2 interpreter 2, bystander

DEF defendant

JUD judge

- 01 PRO men övriga betalningar e de för att (.) personer ska
but the other payments is that for (.) people to
- 02 köpa saker i country6
buy things in country6
- 03 IN4 but the other payments is that for people to buy eh (.)
- 04 stuff in country6
- 05 DEF yeah yeah tha- most of (.) most of the money (.)
- 06 IN4 ja dom me- mes[ta pengarna]
yes the mo- most of the money
- 07 DEF [(x) I can] not see where they transfer
- 08 when if I transfer it to bank3 from there
- 09 IN4 ja kan inte riktigt se här vart överföringarna gick om
I can't really see here to where the transfers went if
- 10 ja överför till [bank3 eller så]
I transfer to bank3 or so
- 11 DEF [or it went straight] [to service3=
- 12 JUD [har advokat name=
does the lawyer have
- 13 =den här sidan] (.) liggande [där]
this page (.) lying there
- 14 DEF =I don't know] (.) [but] most of the money
- 15 [thats (xxx)]
- 16 IN4 [nu kan inte tolken] tolka för nu var det t- eh sam-
now the interpreter can't interpret since it was t- e sam-
- 17 prat sam[tidigt]
talk at the same time
- 18 IN2 [en i taget] (x)
one at a time

19 IN4 okay please go ahead and i'll (.) interpret you first

Here there is overlap between the defendant and the judge on lines 11–14 which the ratified interpreter explicitly comments on lines 16 and 17. She states that it is not possible to interpret when people are speaking on top of each other. The bystander interpreter reinforces this on line 18, with the instruction for the speakers to talk one at a time. The ratified interpreter then coordinates the following exchange in such a way as she is giving the floor to the person that she wants to interpret first out of the available speakers which have produced overlapping talk (Nakane 2014:18).

When there is more than one person listening to consecutive interpreting it is especially important that all the renditions are heard in the entire court room. When a Swedish speaker is questioned the mode of interpreting is simultaneous most of the time but when someone gives the answers in English then the interpreting mode is consecutive. If the English-speaking person decides to change language, and answer in Swedish it makes it difficult for the interpreters to decide which mode to use. In one of the audio files in this study the interpreters solved it by one interpreter handling the interpreting into Swedish, when the defendant said something in English and the other interpreter simultaneously interpreting everything into English for the other defendants. In a similar situation in the excerpt below the bystander interpreter steps in to clarify for the defendant why he needs to wait for the interpreting into English even though he has already understood the question.

Excerpt 16

IN9 interpreter 9, bystander

IN8 interpreter 8, ratified

DEF defendant

LAW lawyer

JUD judge

PRO prosecutor

01 PRO å å eh förstår ja dig rätt (.) om de e att alla dom
and and eh do I understand you correctly if it is so that all of the
02 gånger som nån av dina vänner som du har räknat upp här
times that any of your friends that you have listed here
03 (.) tar emot pengar på de här bilderna (.) e de på
receive money on these images (.) is that
04 grund av att du säljer eu[ro å] (xxx)]
because you are selling euro and
05 DEF [yes all the] time they called
06 me [they]
07 IN8 [can you] please hold can you please hold=
08 DEF =ja förstår svenska så du behöver [inte tolka (x)]
I understand Swedish so you don't need to interpret
09 IN9 [but everybody] doesn't
10 so everything needs to be translated

11 DEF okej ja för[står]
okay I understand

12 IN9 [ursäkta] herr ordförande
excuse me your honour

13 JUD mm
mm

The defendant in Excerpt 16 has chosen to give his answers in English and not in Swedish. If he had been the only English speaker in the court room and answered the questions posed in Swedish without waiting for the renditions into English of the questions, it would not have created any major disturbance. However, in this case there are other defendants in the court room who need to listen to the interpreting into English. On lines 01–04 is the prosecutor’s question, in Swedish, that the defendant immediately starts to answer, in English on line 05. The ratified interpreter asks him to pause on line 07 and he answers, in Swedish, on line 08, that he understands and does not need interpreting. This is what causes the bystander interpreter to intervene with an instruction to the defendant on lines 09 and 10, explaining that interpreting the questions into English is not only for his benefit. The defendant answers this in Swedish, something which is not rendered into English, despite what IN9 has just said. Lines 8–11 can be seen as byplay between the interpreters and the defendant and can perhaps explain why neither of the interpreters chose to interpret any of that. Another thing of note here is that the bystander interpreter offers an apology directed to the judge on line 12. In some way she must have considered that she was breaking the implicit rules of the court room. It is not possible to know if she is apologising for speaking although she is not the ratified interpreter or for giving instructions to the defendant even though the judge is supposed to be the person in charge of the proceedings. The apology, and the acknowledgement, by the judge on line 13 can be seen as byplay between IN9 and the judge. After this, the ratified IN8 continues, and the defendant continues to answer the questions in English.

It has been shown that interpreters are more reluctant to instruct the professionals to make a pause for interpreting than to give the same instruction to the speakers of the other language (Hansen & Svennevig 2021:145). In the next and final excerpt, the atmosphere is agitated with a lot of overlapping talk, and both interpreters instruct the speakers to observe the turn-taking rules.

Excerpt 17

PRO prosecutor
 IN6 interpreter 6, bystander
 IN2 interpreter 2, ratified
 DEF defendant

01 PRO tidigare ida när du berättade fritt så sa du att det var
earlier today when you gave your own account you said it was

02 name2

03 IN2 earlier today when you gave your own account you said

04 that it was name2

05 DEF but you are confusing me for this question of this name=
06 PRO =a de e [ingen som (.) de e du som har] [berättat]
so there is nobody who (.) you are the one who has said
07 IN2 [asså du förvirrar mig] [(.)] ursäkta vi
so you're confusing me excuse me we
08 får vänta på övers[ättning]
must wait for translation
09 DEF [you're con]fusing me for this name
10 because there are two people that have the account
11 number (.) one is name2 and one is name1
12 IN2 asså du förvirrar mig [med de här] därför att
so you're confusing me with these because
13 DEF [because name1]
14 IN2 hang on a minute (.) därför att det finns två personer
because there are two persons
15 som har mitt kontonummer (.) en är name2 och en är name1,
who have my account number (.) one is name2 and one is name1
[---]
30 DEF yeah he- that is the person that promised me the one I
31 met in town6
32 PRO må- [måste du titta i] dina [pappe-]
mu- must you look in your pape-
33 IN2 [de va den som-]
that was the one who
34 IN6 [a men] [snälla]
oh but please
35 IN2 [lov-]
prom-
(4)
35 IN2 .h nu ta vi ett [ande]tag å lugnar ner oss lite=
now let's take a breath and calm down a bit
36 PRO [ja]
yes

37 IN2 =[alli]hopa tror ja
 all of I think
38 PRO [ja]
 yes

On line 06 the prosecutor does not wait for the defendant's answer to be translated into Swedish which the ratified interpreter comments on, on line 07–08, expressing a request to wait for translation. On line 14 the defendant is also requested to wait for the interpreting. Lines 16–29 have been excluded to save space but contain expansions on the answers about who it was that sent the money and the prosecutor challenging the defendant by pointing out that he has changed his statement several times. Later, while still questioning the defendant on the same subject, the prosecutor again forgets to wait for the interpreting, on line 32 causing the bystander interpreter on line 34 to say 'men snälla' which translates as 'but please'. Since she is using Swedish one might assume that she is directing her comment primarily to the prosecutor. She also says this with strong emphasis which is probably why the conversation comes to a complete standstill for four seconds, which is a long period of silence in conversation. The ratified interpreter takes the initiative after this and suggests for everybody to calm down, which the prosecutor agrees with, both on line 36 and 38.

4.6 Concluding remarks

In the 29 hours, distributed in 43 audio files I found 170 instances of cooperation between interpreters. Had they been distributed evenly over the recorded sessions it would have been five an hour. This shows that the behaviour is far from unusual.

102 of the instances of cooperation were analysed in more detail and divided into five categories. To give a brief overview of the categories, it can be stated that the largest category was *word/phrase*, in which there were 49 instances of cooperation. The other four categories were distributed as follows; 7 *clarification*, 19 *correction*, 10 *completion* and 17 instances of *explicit coordination* through non-renditions. It is worth noting that for most of the 29 hours of audio-files in this study only one interpreter can be heard at a time even if there are two interpreters there. Many times, the ratified interpreter corrects herself on a word, asks for a repetition or a clarification or for someone to pause and so on. In this thesis I have tried to demonstrate what happens when the bystander interpreter provides input. Further research can perhaps show how the phenomena studied are distributed between ratified and bystander interpreters.

The interpreters were given unique numbers so that it would be possible to identify strategies linked to individuals. There was not anything that stood out in that respect when it comes to cooperation between interpreters. In the audio files with three of the interpreters IN7, IN10 and IN11 there were no instances of cooperation, but those files are so short that it is not possible to conclude that these interpreters never cooperate in the way described in this thesis.

One of Hoza's categories is *target language feeds*, but only in the form of corrections and enhancements, what has been called *correction* and *completion* in this thesis. It is not clear to me why his notion of process feed, that is to give the lead interpreter a word or phrase when the monitor interpreter notices her colleague hesitating cannot be classified as a subcategory of a target language

feed. Nor do I fully understand why the language in which the feed is produced is a more relevant discriminating feature compared to the trouble source that triggers the feed. However, through the empirical data in Hoza's study and through the data in this thesis there is definite support to assume that interpreters who work in teams truly cooperate on a much wider level than just offering each other relief from fatigue or quality assurance.

5. Discussion

5.1 A broader view

Through examining the findings and the examples in section 4 it has been possible to conclude that interpreters cooperate to a large extent in court. It has been shown that bystander interpreters supply words or phrases, take over and provide renditions, thus perform as temporarily ratified interpreters. Bystander interpreters also correct mistranslations produced by ratified interpreters, complete omissions and coordinate the interpreting task through requesting information or at times making sure that speakers speak one at a time, so that everything that is said can be translated. When recognizing various ways in which interpreters act together in consecutive interpreting in courts, it can be determined that there is indeed teamwork. The idea, or ideal if you will, that one interpreter is supposed to be resting while the other one works or that the sole purpose of hiring two interpreters is for quality control has been shown to be inadequate. The interpreters have a mutual understanding of their roles and responsibilities and cooperate as a team throughout the assignment. By approaching team interpreting as interaction, and by describing it in terms of the participation framework referring to the interpreter's role as either ratified or bystander, it has been possible to avoid labelling any of the interpreters as inactive. This thesis shows that the bystander interpreter is anything but inactive and that her tasks go beyond mere monitoring.

Looking at various aspects of court interpreting there have been difficulties in reaching a consensus on what the interpreter's role and responsibilities are. When examining the roles from an interactional perspective and through the practice involving authorized interpreters it seems that the interpreters themselves are not confused concerning their role and responsibilities. The interpreters swap between bystander and ratified interpreter in a way that is predictable and devoid of misunderstandings. If presented with the excerpts from this thesis it is possible that legal professionals as well as interpreters would consider that the interpreters occasionally perform outside of their expected role. Nevertheless, the judges have not intervened or reprimanded the interpreters. Therefore, it seems that the judges in this study accept these roles, even though the interpreters are not as invisible as previous studies have indicated is the ideal among legal professionals. I believe that one reason why these interpreters are allowed to be so noticeable in the court room, is the fact that when the interpreters' voices are heard, it is to steer the interaction closer to what is the norm and the desired outcome of an interpreter-mediated trial. That is to ensure that everything is translated, through managing turn taking and overlap and to make sure that the translations provided are correct through helping and monitoring each other as a team. When it comes to situations with a lot of overlapping talk and persons competing for the floor Englund Dimitrova poses an interesting question; "Is the interpreter responsible for the interlocutors' chances of speaking – or is he only responsible for relaying what the interlocutors say, when they have taken the chance to speak?" (Englund Dimitrova 1997:162). When examining the interpreter's actions shown in this study it can be said that at least sometimes the interpreters act as if they consider themselves responsible for interlocutors' chance to speak, by explicitly stating that speakers need to wait for their turn. The fact that the other language is English is perhaps also a reason for why the interpreters are not instructed to behave differently. Could it be that it is easier for the legal professionals to have confidence in the interpreters when they have a good understanding of what is said in the other language? The fact that the interpreters have a high level of qualification might also be a contributing factor to why they are not reprimanded.

In formalised settings, such as a court hearing it can be easy to assume that the interpreters are powerless. This study shows that they have power over their own contributions and to a certain extent over the conditions in which they work, at least on a local level. It is not possible to conclude from this study that all interpreters work this way. The general view is rather that the main reason for hiring two interpreters for a long assignment is to avoid fatigue. To correct a colleague is also not always considered right in every context. *Kammarkollegiet*, the supervising authority for authorised interpreters has expressed views that interpreters who listen to recordings of interpreter-mediated interviews or questionings should refrain from evaluating them for mistakes. If they are specifically hired to do so, evaluation can be provided, but not as a side activity to interpreting, rather as an activity performed instead of interpreting. The data in this study shows that whatever the guidelines say and whatever the opinions are, there are interpreters who cooperate, who correct each other and who help each other out with coordinating the discourse.

The interpreters cooperate not only by relieving each other to prevent fatigue but they also monitor each other's output and initiate and perform repair related to renditions of utterances. Furthermore, they also cooperate in matters of explicit coordination and through that partly take responsibilities for making sure that participants have a chance to be heard.

It has been possible to identify several trouble sources that trigger the bystander interpreter to contribute. If she is spotting mistranslations and omissions, she seems to feel a duty to correct this and if the ratified interpreter is having difficulties she can assist. This shows that the interpreters are acting with the accuracy of language in mind, that they see the language as the client (Hale 2004:9).

The trouble source that triggers cooperation in the form of explicit coordination are related to turn-taking, overlapping talk, search for information to facilitate translation and offers to relieve the ratified interpreter. One such trouble source is unique for this language combination. The situation when the legal professionals in court forget to wait for the interpreting into Swedish and ask follow-up questions immediately after or sometimes even overlapping with the defendants, would not occur if the defendants were not English speaking. If the language of the defendants was not intelligible to them, they would have to wait for the interpreting to be able to interact. When defendants (or other participants) understand some Swedish they sometimes do not wait for interpreting as we saw in Excerpt 16. That can happen whatever the language combination.

In most of the instances of interpreter cooperation in this study, the trouble source or the communicative difficulty has been resolved through the act of cooperation. In the cases when the ratified interpreter knows she is missing something the bystander interpreter is used as an additional resource or strategy. Those difficulties would probably have been solved using another strategy had the interpreter been on her own. In the case of *correction* and *completion* it is important to note that most of the time any mistranslations or omissions would have gone unnoticed by the other participants in the trial, and not been resolved, especially if the language had not been English. This is where it can be said to be part of a quality assurance to assign two interpreters to a case, even if quality assurance is not the only reason.

It is not possible to conclude that team interpreting conducted in this way is generally common practice, but it is common in the 29 hours of audio files in this study. Further studies will have to confirm, but it is likely that studies from Swedish courts with other language pairs in similar situations would show similar tendencies.

5.2 Limitations

The limitation with the most impact on this study is the fact that only audio was available. I know from experience that there are many forms of cooperation between interpreters that is non-verbal. Some of these I have been able to deduce from the verbal interaction, but it is likely that I have missed 90% or more of anything non-verbal. Interpreters look up words for each other, pour water, give confirming nods, read off the colleague's screen and so on. That means that as a description of team interpreting, this study is far from complete. It only shows some aspects of team interpreting. Furthermore, some of the audio files were of poor quality. Had the study been based on recordings made with the intention of doing research it would have been possible to have better control over the quality of the audio. It is also a limitation for me to not have been present during most of the court cases since the audio files only represent one part of the trial. It is only through the written documents that I have gotten an idea of what more has transpired.

The lack of explicit, informed consent from the participants should also be mentioned as a limitation. Due to this a small number of the interesting examples of coordination could not be presented, since they were impossible to anonymise sufficiently. On the other hand, since the interpreters were not aware of the fact that their behaviour in court that day would be the focus of a study, it can be assumed that the behaviour is completely natural and authentic. That even applies to the audio files where I myself am one of the interpreters, as I did not know at the time, that I would collect recordings for this study.

As already mentioned, it is possible that the fact that the language combination is English and Swedish, has impacted the findings and yielded somewhat different results had another language pair been examined. It cannot be disregarded that most Swedish speakers have a good understanding of English which makes the dynamics of the court room interaction somewhat different from other interpreter-mediated trials. One limitation is also that the English variety spoken in the overwhelming part of the data is West African English. That can, to a certain extent, affect the level of understanding between the English speakers and the interpreters. Especially this can be assumed to affect the understanding of proper nouns since the interpreters might be less familiar with West African names. It is likely that misunderstandings of short words and proper nouns would have been less frequent if the interpreters and the defendants had spoken the same variety of English.

5.3 Even broader – further studies

For a comprehensive understanding of team interpreting during a trial, I would suggest a multimodal approach. To film a complete trial and make observations on how interpreters cooperate, verbally and non-verbally but also through artefacts such as computers/tablets and through referring to each other's notes and printed out documents. One would also need to observe how the microphone is handled. There are suggestions in my data that the microphone is moved at the point when the roles of bystander and ratified interpreter are reversed, but without video recordings it is not possible to come to any conclusions about that. If an entire trial was recorded and observed, it would also be possible to study cooperation between interpreters during the parts of the trial not covered by this study, such as the prosecutor's presentation of facts and the closing arguments, and through that also observe cooperation while interpreting in other modes than the consecutive.

Another suggestion for further studies is to investigate how interpreters who work in teams are perceived. In a session where there is extensive interpreter cooperation and perhaps a lot of explicit coordination, how do the other professionals and the lay persons perceive the quality of the interpreting? Is there a difference in that perception if the interpreters do not work in that way? How is it when the other language is not understood by the professionals?

As mentioned before this study has only looked at the language combination of English and Swedish, to perform a corresponding study with other languages would surely yield some interesting results.

Listening to the 29 hours of recording has also given rise to research ideas that could be carried out on the same data. There are instances when the judges take the lead and coordinate the proceedings. What triggers this? When it comes to the category *completion* it would be interesting to list at all reduced renditions and see how many there are and under what circumstances the bystander provides a completion. Furthermore, as in many of the examples presented in this thesis, there is often talk referring to what is written in documents, how is this done and how is it interpreted? At the start of their first questioning session every defendant is invited, by the judge, to give their own free account of the events before they start answering questions. How is this expressed? How is it interpreted? What happens after that?

Since Sweden, it seems, is in the forefront of using team interpreting in domestic courts it is highly relevant to continue research into this and to describe the practices to be able to evaluate and share information about what is successful and what needs some improvement. There is an overwhelming consensus amongst court interpreters over the world (Judicial Council of Cultural Diversity 2017, NAJIT 2020, Rättstolkarna No Date), that team interpreting is the only way to handle the high-pressure environment during long court cases, but there is very little research to support it. However, in this thesis I have shown that team interpreting has a real potential for raising the quality of court interpreting and even though this study is not comparative, it nevertheless demonstrates that cooperative efforts in team interpreting are performed with a strong focus on quality. Surely that can be seen as an indication that two interpreters are better than one.

References

- Angelelli, C. 2003. The interpersonal role of the interpreter in cross-cultural communication: A survey of conference, court and medical interpreters in the US, Canada and Mexico. In: L. Brunette, G. Bastin, I. Hemlin & H. Clarke (eds.), *The critical link 3: Interpreters in the community*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. P. 15–26.
- Bartłomieczyk, M. & Stachowiak-Szymczak, K. 2021. Modes of conference interpreting - Simultaneous and consecutive. In: Albl-Mikasa, M. & Tiselius, E. (eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Conference Interpreting*. London: Routledge. P. 19-33 doi:10.4324/9780429297878
- Berk-Seligson, S. 2017. *The bilingual courtroom: court interpreters in the judicial process*. (Second edition.) Chicago & London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Bockgård, G. 2004. *Syntax som social resurs: en studie av samkonstruktionssekvensers form och funktion i svenska samtal*. (Skrifter utgivna av Institutionen för Nordiska Språk vid Uppsala Universitet, 60.). Uppsala: Institutionen för Nordiska Språk vid Uppsala Universitet.
- Braun, S. Davitti, E. & Dicerto, S. 2018. Video-Mediated Interpreting in Legal Settings: Assessing the Implementation. In: J. Napier, R. Skinner & S. Braun (eds.), *Here or there: research on interpreting via video link*. Washington DC: Gallaudet University Press. P. 144-179.
- Brottsförebyggande Rådet. 2017. *Stora förundersökningar och brottmål*. (Rapport 2017:4).
- Carstensen, G. & Dahlberg, L. 2017. Court Interpreting as Emotional Work: A Pilot Study in Swedish Law Courts. *No Foundations: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Law and Justice*. 14. P. 45-64.
- Domstolsverket. 2020. Riktlinjer för tolkanvändning i domstol.
https://www.domstol.se/globalassets/filer/gemensamt-innehall/styrning-och-riktlinjer/strategier-och-riktlinjer/riktlinjer-for-tolkanvandning-i-domstol_webbversion.pdf
Unofficial English Translation:
<https://www.rattstolkarna.se/files/Tolkpolicy/guidelinesfortheuseofinterpretersincourtsoflaw.pdf>
- Domstolsverket. 2022. *Årsredovisning Sveriges Domstolar 2021*.
- Duflou, V. 2016. *Be(com)ing a Conference Interpreter: An ethnography of EU interpreters as a professional community*. (Benjamins Translation Library.) Amsterdam: John Benjamins. doi:10.1075/btl.124
- Elsrud, T. 2014. Othering the “other” in court: Threats to self-presentation during interpreter assisted hearings. *International Journal of Law, Language & Discourse*. 4:1. P. 27–68.
- Englund Dimitrova, B. 1997. 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*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. P. 147-164.
- Frantsuzova, A., 2019. Communication failure in court interpreting within a linguosemiotic approach: a mismatch of expectations, In: *Proceedings of the 1st International Scientific Practical Conference “The Individual and Society in the Modern Geopolitical Environment”*. Volgograd, Russia: Atlantis Press. P. 193-201. doi:10.2991/ismge-19.2019.38
- Goffman, E. 1981. *Forms of Talk*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

- Goffman, E. 1990. *The presentation of self in everyday life*. Reprinted edition. London: Penguin Books.
- Hale, S. 2001. How are Courtroom Questions Interpreted? An analysis of Spanish Interpreters' Practices'. In: I. Mason (ed.), *Triadic Exchanges: Studies in Dialogue Interpreting*. Manchester: St Jerome. P. 21–50.
- Hale, S. 2004. *The discourse of court interpreting: discourse practices of the law, the witness, and the interpreter*. (Benjamins translation library.) Amsterdam, The Netherlands & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Hale, S. 2008. Controversies over the role of the court interpreter. In C. Valero-Garcés & A. Martin (eds.), *Crossing borders in community interpreting*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins. P. 99–121.
- Hale S. 2010. Court interpreting – the need to raise the bar: Court interpreters as specialized experts. In: M. Coulthard & A. Johnson (eds.), *The Routledge handbook of forensic linguistics*. (Routledge handbooks in applied linguistics.) New York: Routledge. P. 440-454.
- Hale, S. & Napier, J. 2016. “We’re just kind of there”: Working conditions and perceptions of appreciation and status in court interpreting. *Target*. 28:3. P. 351–371. doi:10.1075/target.28.3.01hal
- Hale, S. Martschuk, N. Ozolins, U. & Stern, L. 2017. The effect of interpreting modes on witness credibility assessments. *Interpreting*. 19:1. P. 69–96. doi: 10.1075/intp.19.1.04hal
- Hansen, J.P.B. & Svennevig, J. 2021. Creating space for interpreting within extended turns at talk. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 182. P. 144–162. doi:10.1016/j.pragma2021-06.009.
- Have, P. ten, 2007. *Doing conversation analysis*. 2nd ed. Los Angeles: Sage.
- Hoza, J. 2010. *Team interpreting as collaboration and interdependence*. Alexandria: RID Press.
- ISO 20228:2019 Interpreting services — Legal interpreting — Requirements
- Jacobsen, B. 2012. The significance of interpreting modes for question–answer dialogues in court interpreting. *Interpreting*. 14:2. P. 217–241. doi:10.1075/intp.14.2.05jac
- Judicial Council of Cultural Diversity. 2017. *Recommended National Standards for Working with Interpreters in Courts and Tribunals*
- Jönsson, Linda, 1990. Förmedlade samtal: Om Återkoppling i tolkade rättegångar. In: U. Nettelbladt and G. Håkansson (eds.), *Samtal och språkundervisning: Studier till Lennart Gustavssons minne*. (Linköping Studies in Arts and Science, 60.). P. 71-86. Linköping: University of Linköping.
- Lee, J. 2009. Conflicting views on court interpreting examined through surveys of legal professionals and court interpreters. *Interpreting*. 11:1. P. 35–56. doi:10.1075/intp.11.1.04lee
- Licoppe, C. & Veyrier, C.A. 2020. The interpreter as a sequential coordinator in courtroom interaction: ‘Chunking’ and the management of turn shifts in extended answers in consecutively interpreted asylum hearings with remote participants. *Interpreting*. 22:1. P. 56-86.
- Martinsen, B. & Dubslaff, F. 2010. The cooperative courtroom: A case study of interpreting gone wrong. *Interpreting*. 12:1. P. 21–59. doi:10.1075/intp.12.1.02mar

- Moeketsi, R 2000. The do's and don'ts in court interpreting: a functional approach to a professional code. *Language Matters*. 31:1, P. 222-242, doi:10.1080/10228190008566166
- Mikkelson, H. 1998. Towards a redefinition of the role of the court interpreter. *Interpreting*. 3:1. P. 21–45. doi:10.1075/intp.3.1.02mik
- Mikkelson, H. 2008. Evolving views of the court interpreter's role: Between Scylla and Charybdis. In: C. Valero-Garcés & A. Martin (eds.), *Crossing borders in community interpreting*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins. P. 81–97.
- Morris, R. 1999. The gum syndrome: Predicaments in court interpreting. *Forensic linguistics*. 6:1. P.6-29.
- Morris, R. 2010. Images of the court interpreter: Professional identity, role definition and self-image. *Translation and Interpreting Studies*. 5:1. P. 20–40. doi:10.1075/tis.5.1.02mor
- National Association of Judiciary Interpreters and Translators (NAJIT). 2020. *Position Paper - Team Interpreting in Court-Related Proceedings*.
<https://najit.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/09/Team-Interpreting-5.2020.pdf>
- Nakane, I. 2014. *Interpreter-mediated police interviews*. Basingstoke & New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Norrby, C. 2000. *Samtalsanalys: så gör vi när vi pratar med varandra*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- Niska, H. 1995. Just Interpreting: Role Conflicts and Discourse Types in Court Interpreting. In: M. Morris (ed.), *Translation and the Law*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins. P. 293-316.
- Pöchhacker, F. 2016. *Introducing Interpreting Studies*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Rättstolkarna. No date. *Hur använder man tolk i en rättssal*
rattstolkarna.se/files/Foreningen/huranvndermantolkienrttssal_broschyr.pdf
- Sacks, H. Schegloff, E. A. & Jefferson, G. 1974. A simplest systematics for the organization of turn taking for conversation. *Language*. 50. P. 696-735.
- Schegloff, E.A. 2000. When 'others' initiate repair. *Applied linguistics*. 21:2. P. 205-243.
- Tolkutredningen. 2018. *Att förstå och bli förstådd - ett reformerat regelverk för tolkar i talade språk* (SOU 2018:83). Stockholm: Statens offentliga utredningar.
- Staaf, A. & Elsrud, T. 2018. Competent interpreters and enabling working conditions in court: Crucial prerequisites for a fair trial. *Retferd. Nordisk Juridisk Tidsskrift*. 3-4. P. 61-75.
- Statskontoret. 2015. *Sju förslag för effektivare användning av tolkar i domstol* (Rapport 2015:1). Statskontoret.
- Stern, L. 2012. What can domestic courts learn from international courts and tribunals about good practice in interpreting?: From the Australian war crimes prosecutions to the International Criminal Court. *T & I Review*. 2. P. 7–30.
- Tiselius, E. & Englund Dimitrova, B. 2021. Turn-taking in dialogue interpreting: Coping with cognitive constraints. *Cognitive Linguistic Studies*. 8:2. P. 328–355. doi:10.1075/cogls.00081.tis
- Torstensson, N. & Gawronska, B. 2009. Discourse disfluencies in bilingual court hearings. *Comparative Legilinguistics: International Journal for Legal Communication*. 1. P. 60-72

- Torstensson, N. & Sullivan, K. P. 2011. The Court Interpreter: Creating an interpretation of the facts. *International journal of Law, Language & Discourse*. 1:3. P. 59-83.
- Wadensjö, C. 1995. Dialogue interpreting and the distribution of responsibility. *Hermes. Journal of Linguistics*. 14. P. 111-129.
- Wadensjö, C. 1997. Recycled information as a questioning strategy: Pitfalls in interpreter-mediated talk. In: S. E. Carr, R. Roberts, A. Dufour & D. Steyn (eds.), *The critical link: Interpreters in the community*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins. P. 35–54.
- Wadensjö, C. 1998. *Interpreting as interaction*. London & New York: Longman.
- Wadensjö, C. 2004. Dialogue interpreting: A monologising practice in a dialogically organised world. *Target. International Journal of Translation Studies*. 16:1. P. 105–124. doi:10.1075/target.16.1.06wad
- Wadensjö, C. 2008. In and off the show: Co-constructing ‘invisibility’ in an interpreter-mediated talk show interview. *META: journal des traducteurs/META: Translators' Journal*. 53:1. P. 184-203.
- Wadensjö, C. 2010. On the production and elicitation of expanded answers to yes/no questions in interpreter mediated trials. In: M. Baker, M. Olohan & C. Pérez (eds.), *Text and Context - Essays on Translation & Interpreting in Honour of Ian Mason*. Manchester & Kinderhook: St. Jerome Pub. P. 9-26.
- Wadensjö, C. Rehnberg, H.S. & Nikolaidou, Z. 2022. Managing a discourse of interpreting: The complex composing of an asylum narrative. *Multilingua*. <https://doi.org/10.1515/multi-2022-0017> received 2022-02-16; accepted 2022-04-29; published online 2022-05-24

Stockholms universitet/Stockholm University
SE-106 91 Stockholm
Telefon/Phone: 08 - 16 20 00
www.su.se



Stockholms
universitet

Appendix 1

Case	Name/no	Interpreters	Co-ops	minutes
Case1	KU_1	IN11 and IN10	0	25
Case1	KU_2	IN11 and IN10	0	4
Case1	KU_3	IN11 and IN10	0	14
Case1	LL	IN11 and IN10	0	18
Case2	DS	IN7 and IN10	0	63
Case2	OH	IN10 and IN9	0	30
Case2	GG_1	IN9 and IN8	8	100
Case2	GG_2	IN9 and IN8	2	27
Case2	GG_3	IN7 and IN10	0	2
Case3	YI_1	IN2 and IN6	4	23
Case3	YI_2	IN2 and IN6	14	61
Case3	YI_3	IN2 and IN6	3	27
Case4	MY_1	IN4 and IN5	8	72
Case4	MY_2	IN4 and IN5	3	39
Case4	MY_3	IN4 and IN5	1	24
Case4	LI_1	IN4 and IN5	0	21
Case4	LI_2	IN4 and IN5	0	1
Case4	GU	IN4 and IN5	0	28
Case5	EI_1	IN2 and IN4	5	61
Case5	EI_2	IN2 and IN4	2	19
Case5	EI_3	IN2 and IN4	3	66
Case5	EI_4	IN2 and IN4	2	9
Case6	NN	IN2 and IN4	8	110
Case6	VB_1	IN2 and IN4	9	121
Case6	VB_2	IN4 and IN5	6	43
Case7	UD_2	IN3 and IN2	7	55
Case7	UD_3	IN3 and IN2	2	52
Case7	UD_4	IN3 and IN2	10	53
Case7	UD_5	IN3 and IN2	5	52
Case7	UD_6	IN1 and IN3	0	50
Case7	UD_7	IN1 and IN3	4	25
Case7	UD_8	IN1 and IN3	4	37
Case7	UD_9	IN1 and IN3	1	6
Case7	YC	IN1 and IN3	3	18
Case7	HG_2	IN1 and IN3	4	43
Case7	HG_3	IN1 and IN3	4	48
Case7	HG_4	IN1 and IN3	9	61
Case7	HY	IN2 and IN1	1	15
Case7	LM	IN1 and IN3	12	61
Case7	OS_1	IN3 and IN2	5	25
Case7	OS_2	IN3 and IN2	11	64
Case7	OS_3	IN3 and IN2	5	27
Case7	OS_4	IN3 and IN2	5	41

Appendix 2

Transcription symbols

[]	overlapping talk
NOISE	meta-comment in UPPER CASE
=	latching, no gap between stretches of talk
(.)	micropause
(1.6)	pause measured in seconds and tenths of seconds
↑↓	a falling or rising intonation
.hh	in- breath, the number of 'h' indicating the length
wha-	a word is cut off
(x)	inaudible word
° °	speech noticeably quieter than the surrounding talk
><	speech produced noticeably faster than the surrounding talk
<>	speech produced noticeably slower than the surrounding talk
<u>underline</u>	emphasis
e:h	lengthening of a sound

Appendix 3

Types of renditions according to Wadensjö (1998:107-108)

<i>close renditions</i>	Propositional content in original utterance is explicitly present in rendition. Similar style.
<i>expanded renditions</i>	More explicitly expressed information than the preceding original utterance.
<i>reduced renditions</i>	Less explicitly expressed information than the preceding original utterance.
<i>substituted renditions</i>	A combination of expanded and reduced renditions.
<i>summarized renditions</i>	A rendition which corresponds to two or several preceding original utterances (not necessarily from the same speaker).
<i>two-part or multi-part renditions</i>	Two interpreter renditions corresponding to <i>one</i> original utterance.
<i>non-renditions</i>	The interpreter's own initiative or response, not reflecting a prior original utterance.
<i>zero-renditions</i>	An original utterance left untranslated.

Table layout from Tiselius & Englund Dimitrova (2021:338)