Interpreting at a distance

A comparative analysis of turn-taking in video remote interpreting and on-site interpreting

Jessica P. Belisle Hansen

Masteroppgave
Retorikk og språklig kommunikasjon
Institutt for Lingvistiske og Nordiske studier

UNIVERSITETET I OSLO

Mai 2016

Interpreting at a distance

A comparative analysis of turn-taking in video remote interpreting and on-site interpreting

Jessica P. Belisle Hansen

Masteroppgave
Retorikk og språklig kommunikasjon
Institutt for Lingvistiske og Nordiske studier

UNIVERSITETET I OSLO

Mai 2016

2016

Interpreting at a distance

Jessica P. Belisle Hansen

http://www.duo.uio.no/

Trykk: Reprosentralen, Universitetet i Oslo

Abstract

Video remote interpreting is commonly seen as an efficient and future-oriented way of providing interpreting. Although the use of technology to provide interpreting services is increasing, and video remote interpreting is commonly appreciated as a better option to telephone interpreting, there is still much left to learn about interaction through video technology. Projects have reported that while the interpreter often experiences problems concerning turn-taking, the other participants do not experience the same type of problems. In this thesis I attempt to explore the interpreter's turn-taking through a comparative analysis of authentic video recordings of video remote interpreting and on-site interpreting in medical meetings.

To learn more about the interpreter's turn-taking in video remote and on-site interpreting, I have used conversation analysis as a methodological and theoretical framework to explore authentic interaction. I thus assume an understanding of interpreting as interaction. The material in the thesis illustrates how interpreting is a communicative activity which is carried out through the collaboration and orientation of the participants present. The participants display a range of resources available for organizing the activity.

The thesis shows that although the technology affected the interaction, it perhaps did not do so in the ways which were expected. In these extracts, the interpreter's turn-taking seemed to be more sensitive to the sequential environment in which a turn was claimed by the interpreter, than to the media through which the interaction was carried out. However, the way the participants interacted with the technical representation of an interpreter and through technology, differed from how the participants interacted while all in the same room. This affected the interaction. The activity of 'interpreting' in itself seemed to affect the interaction. Not only in the traditional notion that the activity of 'interpreting' involves the interpreter taking turns at talk, but furthermore, in how the participants accommodated their other ongoing interactional activities to the activity of 'interpreting'.

Preface

Video remote interpreting is commonly seen as an efficient, future-oriented way of providing interpreting. While the use of technology to provide interpreting services is increasing, there is still much left to learn about interaction through technology. In this thesis I have been given the possibility to learn more about interaction through technology and interpreting. Although I would have liked to begin this project all over again today, so I could build upon what I have learned during this process, I am very happy to have had the opportunity to carry out this project. Although all flaws and errors are mine and mine alone, there are several people without whom I would not have been able to complete this master's project.

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to: My supervisor, professor Jan Svennevig, who initially introduced me to conversation analysis during my earlier studies, and who has provided help, advice and support while guiding me through this project. Oslo University Hospital, (OUS), my employer, who has let me include this master's project in a more extensive R&D-project, thus letting me carry out this work partially in work hours, and who has provided an arena for support and discussions throughout the process. Tove Strand and Hanne Løfsnes from OUS for their support. The Directorate of Integration and Diversity, for funding the overarching project. Professor Hanne Skaaden at Oslo and Akershus University College of Applied Sciences, for discussions and advice. Camilla Sandrud, for discussions, support and late night phone calls. Andrzej Nyhus, Deborah Pedersen, Naima Hellmold and Randi Havnen, for their linguistic expertise and proof reading skills. My fellow students, for their support, advice and discussions during the process, especially, Alexander Kielland Krag and Kaja Bjølgerud. I am sincerely grateful to those I cannot thank by name; I would like to thank medical professionals, interpreters, patients and next of kin for giving me access to your encounters, and all others involved in the process.

I am grateful for the MA grant awarded to me by Multiling Center of Excellence. The grant has extended my library greatly and made my work with this thesis more flexible due to a new, lighter and faster computer.

Last, but not least, I would like to thank my husband, Vegard D. S. Hansen for discussions, support, dinners and accepting an ever growing pile of books in the living room.

Without all your help, I could not have done this.

Contents

Abstract V
Preface VII
Contents IX
1 Introduction 1
1.1 The relevance of video interpreting 3
1.2 Experiences with video interpreting 4
1.2.1 Experiences from Norway 5
1.2.2 Experiences from other countries 7
1.2.3 Systematic reviews 8
1.2.4 Research on video interpreting 9
1.2.5 Concluding remarks 11
1.3 Interpreting 12
1.3.1 Code of ethics and general guidelines 12
1.3.2 Interpreting and interaction 13
1.3.3 Conversation analysis and interpreting 15
1.4 Project outline 15
1.5 Some definitions 17
2 Methodological framework 18
2.1 Conversation Analysis 18
2.1.1 Talk-in-interaction 18
2.1.2 Sequential organization of talk 19
2.1.3 Institutional talk 20
2.2 The camera in the room 21
2.3 Matching method and research topic 21
3 Theoretical framework 24
3.1 Multimodality 24
3.2 Footing 25
3.3 Conversation Analysis 26
3.3.1 The turn-taking system 26
3.3.2 Turn-construction units 28
3.3.3 Turn allocation 29

3.3.4 Institutional talk and turn-taking 30
3.3.5 Collaboration and single parties 31
3.4 Grammar of the TCU 33
3.4.1 Turn-beginnings 33
3.4.2 Post-endings 34
3.5 Summary 35
4 Data and method 36
4.1 Data collection 36
4.1.1 Permissions 37
4.1.2 Making recordings 37
4.1.3 The recorded meetings 38
4.1.4 Data processing 40
4.1.5 Biases 41
4.1.6 Reliability and validity 42
5 Analysis 43
5.1 Part one: Interpreting in talk-in-interaction 43
5.1.1 Adjacency pairs 44
5.1.2 Multi-unit turns 48
5.1.3 Interpreter initiated repair 54
5.1.4 Summary 59
5.2 Part two: Comparative analysis 60
5.2.1 Co-organizing interpreting 61
5.2.2 Pre-beginnings 75
5.2.3 Post-endings 85
5.2.4 Summary 91
6 Conclusion 93
References 98

Overview of material 39
Example transcript 40
(1) VRI Polish 44
(2) VRI Polish 49
(3) VRI Polish 55
(4) VRI Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian 61
(5) F2F Polish 67
(6) VRI Bosnian/Croation/Serbian 75
(7) VRI Polish 76
(8) VRI Polish 77
(9) F2F Polish 79
(10) F2F Polish 80
(11) F2F Polish 82
(12) VRI Polish 86
(13) VRI Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian 87
(14) F2F Polish 89

1 Introduction

I completed my bachelor's degree in sign language and interpreting in the spring of 2008. During the preceding three years of studies, we had gone through a broad range of topics covering the complexity of interpreting for the very heterogeneous group which the deaf and hearing impaired constitute. Remote interpreting was not on the list of courses. On completion of my degree, I had no practical experience with remote interpreting whatsoever; I had barely heard about the phenomenon. However, shortly after having finished my exams, I was introduced to this through my own practice. Before I was to try it out myself, I was given some practical instructions explaining the technology and addressing some issues on production and perception of sign language through technology. Little attention was paid to the interpreting itself. One of the first assignments I interpreted "offsite" after my brief training, was the meeting between a deaf and a hearing person at a public office. It was an emotional meeting, and the deaf woman was seeking help for an urgent and sensitive matter. The meeting did not last for long. After just a short time in front of the screen I realized that this did not feel the same as on-site interpreting; something was very different. I could not quite identify what was different, but somehow I felt that this situation required something different from me, the interpreter. This very short meeting brought forth a number of issues that my training had not covered, and after interpreting a ten-minute conversation, I was exhausted. Remote interpreting has the interpreter participating in this communicative triad and partaking in establishing meaning in a complex communicative activity from a remote location.

My object of research in this thesis will be interpreting between spoken languages, although my practical background comes from sign language interpreting. In the following, I will give a short presentation of my interests and involvement in the field of video mediated interpreting. The phenomenon first caught my interest in the spring of 2009 and now, several years later, I work as an adviser in an interpreting unit at Oslo University Hospital. My work is now primarily focused on interpreting between spoken languages and especially video remote interpreting. Perhaps not that surprising, I soon realized that interpreters who interpret between spoken languages also had ambiguous feelings about using video technology to provide interpreting services. As part of my work I am project manager for a research and development project carried out at Oslo University Hospital and partially funded by The Directorate of Integration and Diversity (IMDi). The research project aims to describe

economical, technological and communicative aspects of video mediated interpreting. My master's thesis will be presented to IMDi as a part of this project. I have carried out the master's project partially in work hours and partially on my own time. The project is designed and carried out encouraged by my own interest for the topic. Placing my master's project within the research and development project, has been a great advantage for me by situating me in favor of gaining access to authentic medical interaction and by letting me participate in a rich specialist environment, enriching the project greatly. Furthermore, this has given me the opportunity to develop and carry out some of the research in work hours. What I intend to achieve by writing this paragraph, is to identify relevant parts of my background which might conflict with the integrity I wish to achieve in this research project. I will therefore spend a few more words on my situation as a researcher and advantages and disadvantages of having membership in the field.

Neumann and Neumann (2012) describe several aspects of how a researcher is situated during the research process. The way a researcher is situated in their field, may influence the data collection. The researcher's autobiographic situation, how the researcher's self-identity emerged, may reflect in what way the researcher approaches the research topic. The third aspect of the researcher's situation, is described by Neumann and Neumann as the text situation, and is reflected in what consequences the research may have. What researchers publish may, according to Neumann and Neumann (2012:19-20), be used to legitimate or marginalize what they are writing about. I am a practitioner, and I have brought along my curiosity from being the interpreter to being the advisor. Even further, this curiosity has followed with me throughout my rhetoric and communication studies. My background as a practitioner in this work will affect the way in which I approach the topic and what I seek to achieve by exploring this topic. My current work as an advisor within the field I am researching, will influence how I go about collecting the material. Furthermore, the possible consequences the research might have, affect the choices I make. I will return to the choices I have made during data collection in chapter "4 Method and material". In this master's project my aim is to take upon myself the observer's perspective and try to describe the phenomena occurring in authentic video recordings of video interpreted conversations. In the following, I will first identify video interpreting's relevance, thereafter provide an overview of experiences made with video interpreting in different settings, before I continue with some literature on interpreting, and finally, I outline the master's project.

1.1 The relevance of video interpreting

> *"But new information technology, will transform the nature of the work being performed, and typically does so in unanticipated ways. The new technology isn't just supporting that work, it is altering the work in ways that affect the cognitive functions of individuals and teams."*
>
> Barbara Moser-Mercer at InDialog, 2015

The Norwegian Official Report, *NOU 2014:8 Interpreting in the public sector* (NOU 2014:8, 2014), describes video interpreting as an important means to provide qualified interpreting services for a scattered population. The document explicitly leaves out sign language interpreting, as the committee's mandate did not include interpreting for the deaf and hearing impaired. The report spends several pages on remote interpreting, and discusses among other things the positive aspects of gaining access to qualified interpreters despite Norway's scattered population. The report states that there is a need for interpreting all over the country. However, access to qualified interpreters varies. The report claims that there is a need for "geographically independent interpreting services, like telephone and video interpreting" (NOU 2014:8, 2014:147, my translation). The report further suggests that remote interpreting can help gain access to interpreters who are neutral, seeing that they have no affiliation with the same local community as the speaker of the minority language. The report considers video interpreting to be better a better option compared to telephone interpreting. Although telephone interpreting is considered to have "qualitative limitations", telephone interpreting cannot, according to the report, be disregarded as a means of communication. Use of video mediated interpreting, on the other hand, is considered as vital for gaining access to qualified interpreters. Furthermore, video interpreting can lead to better utilization of the interpreters' capacity thus contributing to qualified interpreters being able to stay in the profession. Further technological development is thought to bring forth new and better possibilities (NOU 2014:8, 2014:151-152). Among several goals and recommendations that the report suggests for the further development of video remote interpreting services in Norway, one is that: "Video mediated interpreting should be the preferred method in suitable situations. The goal

should be that half of all interpreting assignments in the public sector should be video interpreted in 2023" (ibid, my translation). At the same time the report recognizes that "There is a need for more research on how the quality of the interpreting is affected by video technology (…). "(ibid, my translation).

While the official report focuses on the public servants' obligations to make their services available to the general public, video remote interpreting and video relay services for the deaf and hearing impaired, are services affiliated with the deaf person's right to interpreting services in certain situations. The Norwegian Labor and Welfare Administration (NAV) administer the National Insurance Act. While other legislation often focuses on the public servants' obligation to ensure communication in a manner available to the citizen, which in some cases means providing an interpreter (Health and Rights Act, 1999; Public Administrations Act, 1967; Courts of Justice Act, 1915), the National Insurance Act (1997) ensures deaf and hard of hearing the right to interpreting in certain situations. In NAV's directive supplementing § 10-7 of the National Insurance Act, «§10-7 Letter f – Interpreting services for hearing impaired», NAV writes the following about remote interpreting: "Interpreting service can be provided as on-site interpreting where the interpreter appears at the interpreting location, and as remote interpreting where the interpreter is in a remote interpreting studio. Considering whether video remote interpreting is an option, should be done through deliberation with the user before on-site interpreting is chosen" (NAV, 2015, my translation).

1.2 Experiences with video interpreting

There are strong political recommendations pointing in the direction of video remote interpreting as a means of gaining access to interpreting provided by qualified interpreters in the future. Video remote interpreting is suggested as a better option than telephone interpreting, a way of saving time and money and a way of overcoming geographical boundaries. Although video mediated interpreting is politically encouraged, the body of knowledge describing video interpreting is still limited. The Norwegian official report does, however, recognize the need for more research on the impact that the use of technology has on the interpreting (NOU 2014:8, 2014:152). In this chapter, I will first give an overview of some projects carried out in Norway testing video mediated interpreting and experiences with video interpreting from several countries. Thereafter I will summarize the findings from

systematic overviews considering video interpreting. And finally, I will present some of the studies that have focused on video mediated interpreting.

1.2.1 Experiences from Norway

While the Norwegian official report (NOU 2014:8, 2014) recommends that the preferred means of interpreting in the future should be video mediated interpreting, there is perhaps still little knowledge about how the interpreting, the product, is affected by a changed communicative situation. In the document "Bildetolking" (NAV, 2007), NAV states that video interpreting (for deaf and hard of hearing) works the same way as ordinary interpreting. They describe the difference to be that the interpreting is carried out via video phone and that the interpreter is not physically present on-site (NAV, 2007:2). The report concluding after a pilot project testing video interpreting for deaf and hearing impaired through use of a mobile phone in 2006, pointed out several differences between video interpreting and on-site interpreting (Haualand, Natvig and Ørsnes, 2006). First and foremost, the differences addressed were associated with perception and production of sign language through telecommunications. Another factor, which might perhaps be closer affiliated with the nature of interpreting and not communication in general, was the interpreter's lack of knowledge about the situation; The interpreter gets little access to what is going on outside the camera's range. The interpreter does not get full access to the context in which the communicative interaction is situated (Haualand et al., 2006:57).

Video interpreting between spoken languages has been tried out in Norway on several occasions, through several projects. The Norwegian Publics Road Administration tried out video mediated interpreting to avoid cheating on theory tests (Statens vegvesen, 2001). Video mediated interpreting is still used as a means to provide interpreting of theory tests (Løfsnes, Buzungu, Buzungu and Hansen, 2016:13). The Norwegian Directorate of Immigration (UDI) carried out an early trial systematically testing interpreting via video in asylum interviews. The challenges and reasons for the trial, were described in a pre-project as access to qualified interpreters, geographical hindrances and telephone interpreting not being a sufficient solution. The project aimed to "document and describe economic effects, organizational effects and the effect on the interpreting" in respect to this way of providing interpreting services (UDI, 2003:5, my translation). The report concludes that interpreting via video is an effective means of gaining access to qualified interpreters all over the country, and

furthermore it seems to be an appropriate supplement to on-site interpreting. Both the interpreters and the interviewer considered video mediated interpreting to be a better option to telephone interpreting. The interviewers considered the benefits to be that video interpreting is cost- and time-saving, it made it easier to gain access to a qualified interpreter, and they experienced less attempts to build alliances between interpreter and applicant. On the other hand, the project describes that they experience to have better control over the situation with on-site interpreting. The interpreters, on the other hand, reported of trouble if there were too many people in the room and also noise could cause problems in hearing. The project concluded that interpreting via video requires some accommodation to the activity of interpreting in the situation, and video interpreting should be considered a supplement to on-site interpreting (UDI, 2003). Video mediated interpreting is not only still in use, but the volume is increasing (Løfsnes et al., 2016:14).

In the report discussing use of videoconference in the justice sector, the Norwegian Courts Administration also reported on having used videoconference technology for carrying out interpreting (Domstoladministrasjonen, 2007). The Norwegian Courts Administration experience that the videoconference form is a better means of communication than the telephone. Concerns that were expressed regarding use of video conference for the purpose interpreting, where connected to technical equipment and room logistics rather than the communication itself. Video interpreting is still in use (Løfsnes et al., 2016:13).

In addition to being the provider of video relay services for deaf and hearing impaired (NAV, 2013), NAV has tested video mediated interpreting between spoken languages during a trial period (Bustnes, 2013). The officials considered the communication easier to control when using video interpreting, they also found it easier to get a hold of the right interpreter at the right time by use of technology. They found video mediated interpreting to be a good alternative to telephone interpreting. They expressed concerns regarding who might be next to the interpreter when the interpreting was provided by telephone. The interpreters reported that the quality was better than on the phone, since they had access to non-verbal communication (Bustnes, 2013).

The Norwegian Centre for Integrated Care and Telemedicine (NST) carried out a project on VRI to provide interpreting for Sami speaking patients in the period. The project reported that they had very few remote interpreted conversations. The technical equipment

worked well, except for some challenges regarding the sound quality (Furskognes, Eliassen, Molund and Christiansen, 2013:35).

Several trials have been carried out, testing video interpreting in Norwegian public sector. While some have reported on the interpreter's limited access to the situation (Haualand et al., 2006), some refer to video interpreting as an effective means of gaining access to qualified interpreting (UDI, 2003; Bustnes, 2013). On the one hand, some have reported that the video interpreting gave the public servant better control over the situation (Bustnes, 2013), while, on the other hand, some reported of the opposite (UDI, 2003). The interpreters did report of problems with noise and disturbances through actions on the other side of the technology (UDI, 2003).

1.2.2 Experiences from other countries

The Norwegian official report (NOU 2014:8, 2014) summarized the use of video interpreting in several countries comparable to Norway. Most of the countries had only little experience with video interpreting. Although video technology was available in Swedish courtrooms at the time, the technology was not suited for simultaneous interpreting. Telephone interpreting was mostly used when it was difficult to get an interpreter on-site (NOU 2014:8, 2014:90). In Finland, telephone interpreting was more common than video mediated interpreting. This was the case especially in North-Finland with great distances. Iceland reported of the same: little use of video mediated interpreting, but telephone interpreting was used in emergency situations and to avoid long travelling distances for the interpreter (NOU 2014:8, 2014:94). In Australia video mediated interpreting was used by police and courtrooms. However, the technical equipment was not yet available to a large extent, causing telephone interpreting to be the more common solution. The United Kingdom could also report of little experience with use of video mediated interpreting (NOU 2014:8, 2014:97).

According to the official report, in Denmark the government has worked to increase the use of video interpreting in hospitals. The national strategy for digitalization of the public Danish Healthcare Service, "Digitalisering med effekt" (Statens Serium Institut, 2013), claims that the experiences with video remote interpreting from Odense University Hospital show that the interpreted situation is experienced as more professional with the interpreter at a distance. According to the strategy document, this is because of the distance to the interpreter and inspires confidence between the doctor and the patient (Statens Serium Institut, 2013:8).

In a feature article in Fyens Tidende from February 2016, this notion is presented again. The article claims that in addition to gaining access to interpreters more efficiently through video technology, several other issues are solved by the use of technology. By using video technology to provide interpreting services "the problem with the duty of confidentiality" and the "man/woman-problematics" are solved. Furthermore, according to the feature article, the product, the interpreting, is shorter and more precise, and it is possible to avoid close relations between the interpreter and the citizen (Jest and Sodemann, 2016).

1.2.3 Systematic reviews

Several systematic reviews have compared international studies assessing remote interpreting and on-site interpreting in health care the last few years. Laksuktom (2015) aims to identify, critically assess and summarize research evaluating the effect of remote interpreting compared to on-site interpreting in medical settings. The review is, however, inconclusive as Laksuktom considers the documentation to be too poor to evaluate the effect. The Norwegian Knowledge Centre for Health Services has carried out several systematic reviews aiming to learn more about effect of interventions for people with minority language background in their meeting with public sector. Among other interventions scrutinized, the reports "Effect of interventions to improve the quality of health services for ethnic minorities" (Eike, Forsethlund, Kirkehei and Vist, 2010) and "Effect of interventions to facilitating communication between families with children or single young people with minority language background and public services" (Wollscheid, Munthe-Kaas, Hammerstrøm and Noonan, 2013) both aimed to find the effect of remote interpreting compared to other interpreting interventions. They both concluded that it was not possible to determine whether the use of remote interpreting leads to better communication compared to on-site interpreting. The note "Effect of and experiences with interpretation and translation services in the public sector" (Munthe-Kaas, Wollscheid, Hammerstrøm, Blaasvær, Johansen, Kurtze and Gundersen, 2015) conducted a systematic search on commission from the Directorate of Integration and Diversity (IMDi), aiming to map studies on the effect and experiences with interpreting and translation services in the public sector. They found that it was not possible to synthesize the results, and there were too few experimental studies to conduct a systematic review of interpreting and translation intervention within the public sector (Munthe-Kaas et al., 2015).

Azermina and Wallace (2005) conducted a systematic review comparing remote interpreting and on-site interpreting in medical encounters. They found that the doctors and the patients were equally satisfied with both solutions. The interpreters, on the other hand, preferred on-site interpreting. The study found that remote interpreting was an appropriate and precise alternative to on-site interpreting. The studies included both professional and ad hoc interpreters.

1.2.4 Research on video interpreting

While several of the projects mentioned above report good results from their video interpreting trials, few actually report on the communicative situation and the interaction itself. The complications that occur have been reported due to technical issues and user mistakes, for example causing auditory disturbances which have made the interpreting difficult (UDI, 2003). A different aspect of interpreting through technology, which was discovered during such trials, is that the interpreter's turn-taking strategies have been challenged by the medium. Based on questionnaires, it seems that the subtle turn-taking signals the interpreter often uses, like audible in-breath and embodied resources, are not as effective (Skaaden, 2001).

The AVIDICUS project, Assessment of Videoconference Interpreting in Criminal Proceedings, "set out to research the quality and viability of video-mediated interpreting in criminal proceedings" (Braun and Taylor, 2012a:3). To consider the quality of the interpreting under such circumstances the project conducted studies at three sites: Surrey, Antwerp/Ustrecht and Warsaw (Braun and Taylor, 2012b:100). They aimed to "provide a quantitative and qualitative assessment of the interpreting performance in criminal proceedings that involve a video link" (Braun and Taylor, 2012b:101). "Given the lack of an agreed research method for this novel area of research, it was decided to adopt an eclectic approach to the collection and analysis of the data". The three sites agreed upon certain common elements. Among several elements, were that the studies should be comparative and based on simulations (Braun and Taylor, 2012b:101). The Surrey site quantified the problems that arose in the interpreting sessions (Braun and Taylor, 2012b:107). The problems that occurred were given the labels 'inaccuracies', 'omissions', 'additions', 'linguistic problems', two categories of 'paralinguistic problems' and 'synchronization problems'. These labels are based on criteria for assessment of interpreting and categories for the analysis of non-verbal

and visual communication (Braun and Taylor, 2012b:106). The labels ‘inaccuracies’, ‘omissions’ and ‘additions’ also reflect the norms presented in the interpreter’s code of ethics (“1.3.1 Code of ethics and general guidelines”, no 4) that the interpreter should not alter the content, nor add or omit anything. Problems with synchronization and additions occurred approximately three times more often in remote interpreted interaction compared to on-site interpreted interaction. Braun and Taylor identify problems with the interpreters’ turn-taking strategies as the interpreter “begins to interpret while a primary interlocutor (…) is still talking but about to complete his/her utterance” (Braun and Taylor, 2012b:110). In the study this caused overlapping speech, which again “normally caused disruption and uncertainty”.

Balogh and Hertog (2012:119) describe the part of the AVIDICUS project carried out at the Antwerp/Ustrecht site, by the Lessius University College. These trials were carried out as role-plays without a script. They found eight times more additions in the face to face interpreting than in the video remote interpreting. There were more than twice as many problems in the synchronization and interaction in the video remote interpreting compared to the face to face interpreting, and there was nearly twice as many problems in the turn-taking in the video interpreting compared to the face to face interpreting (Balogh and Hertog, 2012:123).

Skaaden (2001) describes the interpreted interaction in an article based on the results from a pilot survey where both the interpreter’s and the interlocutors reported on their experiences with video remote interpreting. The interpreters more often than the other interlocutors reported on ‘other technical disturbances’. These disturbances where described by the interpreters as “the presence of children; too many people in front of the camera; noise created by the interlocutors; e.g. by touching of the microphone, or making noise with the chair; noise from external traffic; light conditions in the user’s studio etc.” (Skaaden, 2001:71). While the interlocutors reported of few problems related to the interpreters’ performance, the interpreters reported of discourse related problems more often. The problems were more often related to ‘seizing the floor’ or ‘taking the floor to interpret’, two phrasing of the same problem under the concept ‘turn taking’ (Skaaden, 2001:74). Skaaden compares this to on-site interpreting where the interpreter more easily can get the floor through hand and body movements or simply by beginning rendition. Also subtle strategies like inhalation “may be hampered by for instance a short time lag in sound transmission” (Skaaden, 2001:74).

Braun (2015) describes how there is yet not consensus on the quality of video interpreting compared to the quality of traditional interpreting. The settings vary, and findings from different fields of interpreting are difficult to compare. Braun points to Moser-Mercer (2005, as quoted in Braun, 2015:13) and Mouzourakis (2006, as quoted in Braun, 2015:13) who suggest that the "condition of remoteness or the lack of 'presence' may be the most likely common denominator for the problems with remote interpreting" (2015:13). Braun therefore suggests that the concept of 'presence' and the effects of this will require further research.

1.2.5 Concluding remarks

Several projects have been carried out aiming to test video mediated interpreting. The results have shown that the interpreters report problems more often than what the officials do (UDI, 2003), although they are reporting from the same situations. The systematic overviews have mostly given inconclusive results. The European AVIDICUS project has brought forth new insights through this extensive research project. Both of the aforementioned AVIDICUS studies seem to highlight the interpreter's turn-taking as more complicated or the cause of more problems in video remote interpreting than in face to face interpreting. To ensure comparability, however, the research is conducted on semi-scripted role plays, not on authentic conversations. Although there is reason to believe that problems concerning turn-taking are relevant and that authentic data might reveal findings according to this, studies based on role-plays will not necessarily reveal the full extent of the problems. There is nothing at stake for the participants in comparison to what would be the case in authentic interaction. The complications and misunderstandings may not unfold to full extent during a role-play as the role-players have some form of script or instructions to follow or to return to which is not the case in authentic interaction. The lack of this dimension in the existing studies of remote interpreted conversations is among the reasons for my motivation and intension to carry out this project on authentic, naturally occurring interaction.

The claims that video interpreting increases professionality from the Danish health care system, did receive uptake in the Norwegian official report: "The committee has noted with interest that the use of video mediated interpreting in Denmark results in that the interpreted situation is experienced as more professional because of a further distance to the interpreter" (NOU 2014:8, 2014:152).

1.3 Interpreting

In the following chapter I will introduce literature describing interpreting. The intention is not to cover all aspects of interpreting, but to present the ethical guidelines, certain normative approaches to interpreting and how to communicate through an interpreter, and finally, to introduce some of the literature describing interpreting as interaction. I have chosen to present literature related to interpreting here, as a background, and I am leaving the chapter "3 Theoretical Framework", available for the theory I consider necessary to conduct a conversation analysis.

1.3.1 Code of ethics and general guidelines

In 1997 the Norwegian Ministry of Local Government and Modernisation appointed a working group with representatives from the ministry, Norwegian Interpreter's Association, University of Oslo and The Norwegian Directorate of Immigration (IMDi, 2011). The working group produced a set of guidelines which interpreters entered in The Norwegian National Register of Interpreters are obliged to follow. The guidelines are recommended to be normative for any person who takes upon themselves interpreting assignments, whoever may be their employer (IMDi, 2011).

I will briefly introduce the guidelines related to interpreting here, leaving out number 9 about translation: 1) The interpreter should be qualified for the assignment; 2) The interpreter should not interpret assignments where they would be disqualified or prejudiced; 3) The interpreter is to be impartial and not permit his or her own opinions to influence the work; 4) The interpreter should interpret the content of everything that is said, nothing kept silent, nothing added and nothing altered; 5) The interpreter is bound by the duty of confidentiality; 6) The interpreter must not for the sake of own profit misuse information he or she has gained access to through the assignment; 7) The interpreter should not carry out other tasks than interpreting; and, 8) The interpreter should give notice when interpreting cannot be carried out in a justifiable manner.

The interpreter's code of ethics gives a guideline for interpreters and sets a norm or a standard for interpreters, on how to carry out their work. The participants in interpreted conversations are also often subject to sets of advice. The participants are often advised to direct their speech directly to each other (Jareg and Pettersen, 2006; Helsedirektoratet, 2011;

Tolkeportalen, 2014). Dimitrova (1991:90-91) recommends, among several things, that the interlocutors in need of interpreting make themselves acquaint with the interpreter's ethical guidelines and what they would have to do so the interpreter would be able follow these. She suggests that the interlocutors should realize and accept that all the interlocutors have a responsibility for the course of the interaction. Furthermore, the interlocutors should express themselves concisely, but in complete "meanings". By pausing on their own initiative, the interlocutors will not be interrupted by the interpreter. The interlocutors should gaze alternately at the interpreter and the other participant while the interpreter is speaking. While the other participant is speaking, the interlocutor should gaze at him or her (Dimitrova, 1991:91).

1.3.2 Interpreting and interaction

Wadensjö (1998) presents an analytical framework that takes in regard the dynamics of interpreter-mediated interaction. Wadensjö describes the monological model of language and mind as one that treats "interpreting as a transfer of messages from one linguistic system to another, and the interpreters as 'channels', which are temporarily hosting primary speakers' messages in their brains". As a contrast to the monological model, Wadensjö presents a "*dialogical* model of language and mind, which treats interpreting as interaction between participants in a social event" (1998:275). Through exploring authentic interpreter-mediated interaction, Wadensjö identifies two main activities which constitute interpreting: 'translating' and 'coordinating'. Understanding interpreting as interaction opens for the exploration of the interpreters' work accomplished through shifting between modes of speakership and listenership (Wadensjö, 1998:279).

The delay between speaking and listening in interpreted interaction alters the feedback in the interaction (Skaaden, 2013:120). Dimitrova (1991) also describes the lack of feedback signals in interpreted interaction; This deprives the interlocutors of valuable information. By gazing at each other during the interaction, the interlocutors can compensate somewhat for this lack of feedback. However, Dimitrova (1991) discusses that it might be an advantage for the interpreter not to be shut out of the interaction, which might become the case if the interlocutor's do not look at the interpreter at all during the interaction (Dimitrova, 1991:91).

Skaaden (2013:120) describes how the turn-taking in interpreted interaction is fundamentally changed seeing that the interpreter must interpret regularly for the conversation

not to come to a halt. Dimitrova (1991:33) describes how in dialogue interpreting, the interpreter must have the turn every other time. The interpreter has an important role in the process of turn-taking in interpreted interaction. However, it does not seem that she has the right to distribute or allocate turns (Dimitrova, 1991:94). The interpreter stores the previous turn in memory until the interpreter gains the floor. According to Dimitrova (1991:89) how long the interpreter is able to store the previous turn in memory will vary. The interpreter will probably have the capacity to remember longer utterances in their first language than in their second, also depending on whether the interaction is touching upon topics that the interpreter is confident with. Long experience might also improve the interpreter's memory capacity, while fatigue and stress may reduce the capacity. The interpreter's note-taking skills may also be a factor (Dimitrova, 1991:85).

Li (2010) uses conversation analysis to explore the mechanisms of turn-taking and turn-design in interpreted general practitioner consultations. Li finds that the interlocutors' interaction shares the most fundamental features of monolingual talk. Although people take turns at talk and they design the turns in collaborative interaction, in interpreted interaction, turn-taking and turn-design are realized in other ways (Li, 2010:220). Li identifies seven types of turn-taking organization: 1) In 'prototype turn-taking' the interlocutors alternate in speaking and the interpreter gets a turn in between each; 2) Occasionally one of the interlocutors produce 'extended turns' which cause the turn-taking to go back and forth between the interpreter and the one interlocutor; 3) In 'monolingual talk' the talk is no longer interpreted, but still a part of the interpreted discourse, e.g. back channeling and repairs; 4) Backup translation usually indicated a summarized rendition after a string of monolingual talk between the doctor and patient; 5) In semi-interpreted talk on of the interlocutors' turns did not need to be interpreted, e.g. the patient understood the doctor's speech and only the response needed to be interpreted; 6) Backtrack talk can be considered a kind of trouble where the interpreter has not initiated a repair before onset of the interpreting and therefore initiates the repair within the same turn; 7) Ignored turns typically occur when turns are produced in a troubled situation, e.g. when the patient brought up a topic not immediately related to the ongoing examination, and when the patient brought up a new topic or complaint close to the end of the consultation. Li further mentions that pauses and overlaps as related to the timing and speaker changes, have not attracted enough attention in research prior to Li's.

1.3.3 Conversation analysis and interpreting

Studies applying conversation analysis to interpreted interaction have made "it clear that interpreter-mediated interaction is a locally organized, socially situated activity" (Gavioli, 2016:189). This challenges the notion of the interpreter as a conduit or as invisible, which furthermore has a series of consequences of which Gavioli mentions three (2016:190). First, this challenges the traditional models of interpreting. Gavioli mentions in particular that "the idea that interpreters interpret "after each participants' (sic) turn" seems to clash with the ability of interpreters "to interpret" what is going on in the interaction (…) Therefore, more complex models that take into account the necessity of coordinating, in addition to translating, talk are increasingly used in T&I research" (2016:190). Second, Gavioli argues that the interactional perspectives move the notion of interpreting "from an essentially cognitive framework toward a more socially constructed, communicative one" (2016:190). It is necessary to see the interpreting "as a situated, locally organized activity embedded in particular settings (…)". Furthermore, this contradicts the idea of the interpreter not participating. Third, Gavioli argues that this raises the need to redefine the idea of 'equivalence' in interpreting, seeing that from a "pragmatic perspective, semantic-structural models may not suffice for functional equivalence" (2016:190). Gavioli discusses how working with conversation analysis on transcribed data, can allow researchers to observe different types of renditions used in different settings and for different functions or to compare perceptions about the interlocutor's activities. The description of what occurs in data does not necessarily imply that the code of ethics should take the description as a model of what interpreter's should do. However, the data could facilitate a design of more informed codes of ethics (Gavioli, 2016:191).

1.4 Project outline

On the one hand political aims, financial aspects and technological development are making remote interpreting possible and even a sensible means for providing access to qualified interpreters despite geographical boundaries. On the other hand, we still lack knowledge on how interpreting through technology actually affects the interaction (NOU 2014:8, 2014). Several of the studies and reports on video interpreting so far have emerged from varying scientific fields and traditions and measure the success of the interpreting based on a wide range of criteria and results from questionnaires. The perhaps most extensive research project

so far that explores video interpreting, has been carried out on simulated talk (Braun and Taylor 2012b). Although there is a need for further investigation of how the communication is affected when the interpreter is removed from situation, the experience made so far do indicate some relevant problems.

In this project I will explore interpreted interaction through conversation analysis. Although conversation analysis seeks to send the researcher out on a mission of "unmotivated looking" (Nielsen and Nielsen, 2005:23), we do know that the interpreter's turn-taking has been identified as problematic in most literature describing video interpreting. There is still little empirical evidence showing how the participants accommodate for the interpreter's turn-taking and even more so, how the turn-taking is organized in video mediated interpreting. The studies identifying the interpreter's turn-taking as more difficult or problematic (Skaaden, 2001; Ballogh and Hertog, 2012; Braun and Taylor, 2012b) all describe the interpreter's attempts to gain access to the floor as troublesome or the cause of trouble. My point of departure is therefore to explore the points in interaction where the interpreter would try to get the turn, either through ordinary turn-taking or repairs. Seeing that I identified the interpreter's turn-taking as a possible point of departure already before gathering data, and as I have experienced previously when conducting conversation analysis, I could risk having to revise any early ideas later on in the process. Prior research and project reports have shown that the interpreter's turn-taking strategies are challenged when the communication is carried out through video (Skaaden, 2001; Ballogh and Hertog, 2012; Braun and Taylor, 2012b), but I would have to keep an open mind throughout the course of the project in case the data would reveal something quite different. In this thesis, I am going to examine a selection of interaction interpreted on-site and via video technology. I will examine the recordings with conversation analysis (CA). The recordings are made in a rehabilitation institute. The problem in this thesis is:

How are interpreter initiated repairs and interpreter initiated turn allocation organized in remotely interpreted conversations between medical professionals and patients? In what way does the organizing differ from the organizing of corresponding actions in conversations which are interpreted on-site, with special regards to the conversation's progression?

By choosing conversation analysis as an approach for researching interpreted interaction, I have already taken an approach to interpreting as interaction, considering the interpreter a part of the interaction. In the following I will not differentiate between primary participants and

the interpreter, but will assume that all who are present are participants with different rights and obligations which are managed through the interaction. Although some of the literature describing interpreting (Li, 2010; Azermina and Wallace, 2005) include interpreters with no training or formal qualifications in their data, in this thesis I understand 'interpreter' as a person who has training or formal qualifications. The interpreters in my material are described as 'the interpreter', and are qualified and professional interpreters.

After a brief review of terminology, I will proceed with a chapter on methodology, a chapter presenting my theoretical framework, a chapter presenting my material and method, the analysis and finally, a conclusion.

1.5 Some definitions

In this chapter I will give a brief review of the definitions used in regards to video mediated interpreting. *Remote interpreting* is commonly used as a term for interpreting where the interpreter is somewhere else than the other participants. It includes both audio interpreting (telephone) and video interpreting. Even though *remote interpreting* might seem a pretty straight forward term, it leaves the question of who is remote unanswered.

Braun and Taylor (2012c) define *video remote interpreting* (VRI) as a situation where the interpreter is at a different location than the other participants that share a location. *Video conference interpreting* (VCI) is a when the interpreter is present with one of the parties and the two parties have communication through video technology. As a third option they describe a combination of the two, where the parties are connected via video technology and the interpreter is at a remote location from the two and connected via video technology.

The topic for my master's thesis is VRI, video remote interpreting, where the interpreter is at a remote location from the other participants who share a location. To vary I sometimes use *interpreting via video, video mediated interpreting, video interpreting*, but as described to further detail in chapter 4, the situations I describe have the interpreter in the one end and all the other participants at the other end of video technology. In contrast I include extracts from *on-site interpreted* talk, where the interpreter is present at the same location as the rest of the participants. *Face to face interpreting* is another expression describing on-site interpreting.

2 Methodological framework

Silverman (2013:11) writes that "[a]ny good researcher knows that choice of method should not be predetermined. Rather you should choose a method that is appropriate to what you are trying to find out …". In some ways I am not quite sure whether I chose the project or the method first; the two came together through the process of designing this master's project. In the following I will spend some words on an introduction to conversation analysis' methodological framework before I continue with a discussion on why I have chosen conversation analysis as a way of learning more about video remote interpreting.

2.1 Conversation Analysis

According to Mondada (2013:33) conversation analysis aims to describe how ordinary social activities are organized. Conversation analysis considers social interaction to be collectively organized by the co-participants in a locally situated way. The activities are achieved through temporal and sequential unfolding. Furthermore, the activities are carried out by use of vocal, verbal, visual and embodied resources. This interaction is "publicly displayed and monitored *in situ*" (Mondada, 2013:33). By applying the conversation analytic method to video recordings of video remote interpreted and on-site interpreted conversations at an institutional setting, I have chosen to consider the interpreting to be a communicative activity that requires joint effort. In the following I will introduce the methodology of conversation analysis before I finally discuss why I have chosen conversation analysis in this thesis. I will present the theoretical framework, among other the turn-taking system, in chapter 3, and the method and material selection in chapter 4.

2.1.1 Talk-in-interaction

Hutchby and Wooffitt define conversation analysis as the study of talk, and more detailed, "it is the systematic analysis of the talk produced in everyday situations of human interaction: talk-in-interaction" (2008:11). Conversation analysis (CA) is research based on transcribed recordings of authentic interaction, and the aim is to record 'naturally occurring' interaction. CA aims to discover how participants understand and respond to each other during their turns at talk, focusing on how sequences are generated (Hutchby and Wooffitt, 2008:12). CA focuses on the production and the interpretation of talk-in-interaction and how the participants

themselves orient to an orderly accomplishment of interaction (Hutchby and Wooffitt, 2008:13).

Sacks (1984:25) describes the notion of 'observation as a basis for theorizing':

> *"Thus we can start with things that are not currently imaginable, by showing that they happened. We can then come to see that a base for using close looking at the world for theorizing about it is that from close looking at the world we can find things that we could not, by imagination, assert where there. We would not know that they were "typical" (...). Indeed, we might not have noticed that they happen."*

Conversation analysis does not, according to Sidnell (2010:28), set out to prove a theory. Conversation analysis aims to describe "something in the world" (Sidnell, 2010:28). And while Sacks set out to describe real social events, conversation analysis, has over the years come to focus more and more on the organization of talk-in-interaction (Sidnell, 2010:28). CA aims to discover and describe the practices of human conduct. CA is a rigorously empirical approach to social interaction (Sidnell, 2010:35).

2.1.2 Sequential organization of talk

According to Heritage (1989:22) conversation analysis' orientation can be summarized in four assumptions:

> *"(1) interaction is structurally organized; (2) contributions to interaction are both contextually oriented and context-renewing; (3) these two properties inhere in the details of interaction so that no order of detail can be dismissed, a priori, as disorderly, accidental or irrelevant; and (4) the study of social interaction in its detail is best approached through the analysis of naturally occurring data".*

According to Hutchby and Wooffitt (2008:13), conversation analysis focuses on the sequences in talk, and the immediate sequential context a turn is produced within, is therefore important to CA. Speakers are thought to display their understanding of the prior turn in their production of the next turn. This is what is described as a 'next-turn proof procedure', a "basic tool used in CA to ensure that analyses explicate the orderly properties of talk as oriented to accomplishments of participants, rather than being based merely on the assumptions of the analyst" (Hutchby and Wooffitt, 2008:13).

According to Heritage and Clayman (2010) conversation analysis

> *"consistently and insistently asks a single question about any action (or indeed any component of any action): why that now? And in response to this question CA examines what the action does in relation to the preceding action(s), and what it projects about the succeeding action(s)."*
>
> Heritage and Clayman, 2010:14

Seeing that a central feature of conversation analysis is how it focuses on the turn-by-turn unfolding of interaction, an approach underpinning the view that the participants orient to this sequential order in understanding each other, CA focuses on the immediate sequential context in which an utterance is produced (Hutchby and Wooffitt, 2008:138). However, Schegloff (1992) addresses the issue of 'procedural consequentiality': "How does the fact that the talk is being conducted in some setting (e.g. "the hospital") issue any consequence for the shape, form, trajectory, content, or character of the interaction that the parties conduct?" (Schegloff, 1992:111).

2.1.3 Institutional talk

According to Sidnell (2010:16) there are two research traditions in CA. One is focused on ordinary conversation and the other, institutional CA, builds on the findings of the first as a means to analyze how other social institutions operate through talk. While both have developed from the same starting point, the first and original line of research was developed by Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson through studies of "everyday conversational interaction as an institution in its own right" (Sidnell, 2010:15).

Heritage and Clayman (2010:34) name three basic elements of institutional talk: 1) In institutional interaction the participants are often oriented to certain goals tied to their identities relevant to the institution; 2) there are certain constraints on the interaction considering what is treated as permissible contributions to the business at hand; 3) there are inferential frameworks and procedures particular to the institutional context that are associated with the interaction.

Considering this understanding of institutional interaction, it might seem that all interpreted conversations are institutional to some extent, as the activity of interpreting will

set certain constraints to the interaction, there are goals tied to at least one of the participant's identity in the interaction and there are frameworks and procedures associated with at least part of the interaction (e.g. the ethical guidelines).

2.2 The camera in the room

> "CA insists on the study of *naturally occurring activities* as they ordinarily unfold in social settings, and, consequently, on the necessity of recordings of actual situated activities for a detailed analysis of their relevant endogenous order (…) At the methodological level, most critiques against naturalism have used Labov's (1972c) *observers' paradox*, claiming that 'naturally occurring data' do not exist because the mere recording of an activity disrupts and transforms it."

Mondada, 2013:33

Merely by informing the participants about the project and placing the camera in the room the researcher can be said to have changed the situation.

Mondada discusses further the importance of fieldwork so it is possible to not only understand the situated activities that are going to be recorded, but also to identify which events should be recorded, good conditions for setting up the recording devices and which visual field to cover with the recording devices. In this way, ethnography shapes a form of proto-analysis, which makes it possible to choose what and how to record (Mondada, 2013:38). Before placing a recording device in a room, the researcher must make a number of choices, among others whether audio recording suffices or would video make a better option. There are choices to be made regarding perspective, all possible perspectives highlighting certain participants or parts of the activity before another. The technical equipment available to the researcher might lead to even further choices regarding microphone setups, camera quality and number of cameras (Mondada, 2013:39-41).

2.3 Matching method and research topic

Video remote interpreting has become a topic of interest since access to qualified interpreters on a distance represents a solution to several problems. As a practitioner, I experienced that the communicative situation was different than when the interpreting was carried out on-site.

Even without an interpreter in the situation, if all the participants could communicate direct, the communicative situation would be different when carried out via video compared to when carried out with all the participants together at the same place. Considering the differences between telephonic and face to face communications in comparison, the differences between video communication and face to face communication might not seem as evident. In video mediated communication, the participants can see each other and they can hear each other, all depending on the placement and control of microphone, camera and screens.

I am looking for the differences in the communicative situation. Conversation analysis provides the possibility for "observation as a basis for theorizing" (Sacks,1984:25), and gives unique insight to how the participants organize the communication on a micro level. Through video recordings of authentic conversation, conversation analysis also brings the researcher into the situation giving the researcher the possibility to observe the interaction and to watch and listen to the recordings repeatedly. Even though CA is considered a qualitative analysis, the evidence of the participants' actions is found in the participants' orientation in the conversation. This implies that it would not be the researcher who determines how something is to be understood, but the participants through their communicative actions (Hutchby, 2001:68). I will elaborate further on the methodological orientation in the proceeding paragraphs. However, to return to the matter of this paragraph; why did I choose conversation analysis to learn more about video remote interpreting?

Both the AVIDICUS project (Braun and Taylor, 2012b; Ballogh and Hertog, 2012) and Skaaden's (2001) article based on questionnaires identify the interpreter's turn-taking as problematic in the video interpreted conversation. These findings give reason to believe that video as a media might complicate the interpreter's turn-taking and that analyzing authentic data might reveal findings in accordance to this. On the other hand, recordings of authentic data might reveal other issues than both the analysis of the role-plays and the observations from the questionnaires. Role-plays will not necessarily reveal the extent of the problems that might occur in the conversation. There is nothing at stake for the role-players in comparison to what would be the case in an authentic conversation. The complications and misunderstandings may not unfold to full extent in a role-play as the role-players have some form of script or instructions which is not be the case in real life. Self-reporting in questionnaires does not necessarily reveal how the problem unfolded or how it was solved, but rather how it felt or was experienced by the participants present. Conversation analysis

relies on the next-turn proof procedure to identify not only what problems that might occur, but more importantly: How do the participants solve or orient to what does occur during the interaction? How do the participants organize the interaction? Recordings of authentic interaction might therefore shed new light to the phenomenon of video remote interpreting.

Several methods could be applied in the search to learn more about video remote interpreting, unveiling some of the circumstances to the implementation of new technologies in a communicative situation. Some aspects could be discovered through critical discourse analysis or text analysis. Some could be found through interviews or focus groups, or by conducting a rhetorical analysis. All combinations of method and topic would help in answering different questions and unveiling different aspects of the phenomenon.

One of my main interests and motivation to carry out this project is the lack of research on authentic data. Choosing conversation analysis as a method, would require that I should gather authentic data for the project. Silverman (2011:30) states that "There are no 'brownie points' given by most disciplines for having gathered your own data" and, furthermore, he points out the risk of having "less time to engage in the much more important activity of data analysis". Having some experience with conversation analysis from previous university courses, I had an idea of what I would be getting myself into by taking upon myself such a project. However, driven by my interest in the topic, and the need for more empirical based knowledge on how removing the interpreter from the situation affects the situation, I went for it. Video technology is becoming increasingly available and more commonly used to carry out a range of communicative activities. Interpreting is one such activity, and it is often combined with other activities. Furthermore, knowledge about the video mediated communication is still scarce. This project, though perhaps somewhat ambitious and demanding on a master student, might provide new and interesting insights.

I will return to the topic of material and method in chapter 4. First, in chapter 3, I will present the theoretical framework for this thesis.

3 Theoretical framework

Conversation Analysis provides both a methodological and a theoretical framework for studying talk-in-interaction. In the previous chapter I have accounted for some methodological aspects of CA and the implications of these for my master's thesis. In the following, I will account for the theoretical framework on which I will base the following analysis in chapter 5. The theoretical framework for my analysis is derived from the theoretical aspects CA provides, from sociology, and from sociolinguistics. Considering the multimodal aspects of communication, I have supplemented the abovementioned theory with literature taking into regard the multimodal resources available to the participants engaging in talk-in-interaction, multimodality and the video conference equipment as a "site of display". I start by presenting a theoretical approach to multimodality, thereafter Goffman's participation framework and a theoretical framework from conversation analysis, with special regard to the turn-taking system and the construction and distribution of turns. Finally, I summarize some of the implications of these theoretical approaches.

3.1 Multimodality

According to Jewitt, multimodality describes approaches that consider communication to be more than about language, and "attend to the full range of communicational forms people use – image, gesture, gaze, posture, and so on – and the relationships between them" (Jewitt, 2009:14). Jewitt describes four theoretical assumptions that underpin the understanding of multimodality: 1) "language is a part of a multimodal ensemble"; 2) "each mode in a multimodal ensemble is understood as realizing different communicative work"; 3) "people orchestrate meaning through their selection and configuration of modes"; and, 4) "multimodality is built on the assumption that the meanings of signs fashioned from multimodal semiotic resources are, like speech, social" (Jewitt, 2009:14-15).

Hutchby (2001:124) describes how the telephone's communicative affordances are connected to the constraints of telephone communication due to being available as voice-only. Video media afford a wider range of interactional procedures than those afforded by the non-visual channels, such as use of gesture, gaze and bodily comportment. However, Hutchby (2001:126) states that the technology cannot actually afford what it promises to afford. Hutchby illustrates how the use of hand gestures and movement of head and upper body and

torso, gestures that could function efficiently as strategies to attract attention at the periphery of another participant's vision if the participants were physically co-present, does not necessarily function through video technology. He further argues that while videophones appear to give the possibility for intimacy at a distance, a co-presence on a distance, it seems that the "technologies for communication do not always afford what they promise to afford" (Hutchby, 2001:130).

> *The fact that videophones enable interactants to see each other means that interactants may assume the effectiveness of communicative devise that function well in other forms of visually accessible co-presence. Yet the technology does not afford the specific congruence between the perceptual fields of participants that ordinary face-to-face interaction relies upon.*
>
> Hutchby 2001:130

Jones (2009:114) illustrates how information can be presented on different sites of display. Such "[s]ites of display are social occasions in which particular configurations of modes and media converge in a particular time and space in order to make particular social actions possible" (Jones 2009:114). The sites of display are embedded in different social practices. A media's affordances and constraints might not be the same when speaking generally about the media compared to when speaking about the media and modes in use in the performing of concrete social actions (Jones, 2009: 114).

3.2 Footing

Goffman (1981:128) describes changes in footing to be something that involves participants' alignment, set, stance, posture or projected self being of concern. The changes can be considered on a continuum from the subtle to the more pronounced. "A change in footing implies a change in the alignment we take up to ourselves and the others present as expressed in the way we manage the production or reception of an utterance. A change in footing is another way of talking about the change in our frame for events" (Goffman, 1981:128).

Goffman (1981:131-133) distinguishes between ratified and unratified participants in an encounter. Just as the ratified participants might not actually be listening, there might be non-official participants present in the encounter still following the talk. In talk with only two

participants, the ratified hearer will also be the addressed hearer to whom the speaker addresses his attention and to whom the speaker will expect to turn over the speaking role. In many cases there are more than two participants present. Although the speaker can address his utterances to all the participants in a situation, it is likely that the speaker will address the remarks to one listener, distinguishing the addressed recipient from the unaddressed, yet still ratified, recipients (Goffman, 1981:131-133). Goffman describes the "participation framework" for a moment of speech as the gathering of the "participation status" of all those participants in relation to an utterance and to an activity in the situation (1981:137).

Goffman (1981:144) distinguishes between different notions of speakership with three "production formats". The speaker can function as an animator, an author and a principal for his utterances. The animator is the person sounding the words. The author is someone who has put together the words and selected the thoughts and ideas. The principal is the person or group whose position is established by the words as they are spoken. "The notions of animator, author, and principal, taken together, can be said to tell us about the "production format" of an utterance" (Goffman, 1981:145).

3.3 Conversation Analysis

Conversation Analysis provides both a methodological and a theoretical framework. In chapter 2, I presented some methodological aspects of CA of relevance to this thesis. In this chapter, I will present some theoretical aspects of CA with my attention turned to the turn-taking system, turns, turn construction units, features of these and the permeability and possibility of conditional entries in a turn-in-progress.

3.3.1 The turn-taking system

"One of the most obvious things about conversation is that it involves people taking turns at speaking. (…) While the fact of turn-taking is obvious, how people actually bring it off is a matter of some considerable complexity" (Sidnell, 2010:36). In the following, I will present a theoretical understanding of the turn-taking system, before going into further detail in the description of the turn-construction units in the following chapter.

Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (1974) describe the turn-taking system as a 'local management system'. Allocation of turns is accomplished within each turn for the next, and

furthermore, the turn-size is determined locally, "i.e. in the developmental course of each turn, under constraints imposed by a next turn, and by an orientation to a next turn in a current one" (Sacks et al., 1974:725). This local management of the turn-taking system thus refers to how the turn-taking system organizes only the current and the next turn (Sidnell, 2010:39). In addition to being locally managed, the system is described by Sacks et al. as 'party-administered': "The character and organization of the rules that constitute it as a local management system themselves determine its more particular organization in not only allowing and/or requiring turn-size and turn-order to vary, but in subjecting their variability to the control of the parties to any conversation" (Sacks et al., 1974:726). Thus such party-administration refers to how the participants work out who should speak next and for how long, as there is no referee to determine this (Sidnell, 2010:39).

Sidnell (2010:42) shows how evidence suggests that the turn-taking system allocates the right to produce only one turn-constructional unit in a turn. When the single unit is completed, the transition to a next-speaker might occur, but need not occur. This makes relevant the transition to a next speaker at the possible completion of a current turn unit. According to Sidnell, both the current and the potential next speaker seem to orient to the relevance of a speaker transition at possible completion. Speakers who produce multi-unit turns display their orientation to the relevance of speaker transition at possible unit completion by picking up the pace of the talk through possible unit completions, thus foreclosing the opportunity for a possible next-speaker to self-select. Just as the speakers orient to the relevance of speaker transition, so do the recipients. The recipients orient to the possible completion of a turn construction unit as a relevant place for speaker transition by targeting such points as places relevant to start their own turn (Sidnell, 2010).

Sidnell (2010:43) expands further on this describing how hearers monitor the current turn with regards to syntactic, prosodic and pragmatic features, to find where the turn is in its progress. The hearers monitor these turns not only to find possible points of completion, but also to project and anticipate the possible points of completion before they actually occur. The point at which the unit will possibly complete, is the place for a possible speaker transition. While the participants in interaction orient to a set of rules for selecting a next speaker at such transition-relevant places (Sidnell, 2010:43), in institutional talk there might be other factors regulating the selection of a next speaker. Schegloff (1992:112-113) writes that "[t]o focus just on the turn-taking organization, it is the "courtroom-ness" of courtrooms in session which

seem in fact to organize the way in which the talk is distributed among the present, among the categories of persons present, in the physical setting". Schegloff further describes the limitation of potential next speakers in the courtroom, not just anyone present can be a potential next-speaker in the courtroom. There are social procedures determining when those who are potential next speakers they may speak, and what they can say (Schegloff, 1992:13).

3.3.2 Turn-construction units

The description of the turn-taking system above implies that there are 'turns' to be taken. Such turns are according to conversation analysis constructed of turn construction units (TCU), and the single turn-at-talk may be constructed of several such TCUs (Sidnell, 2010:41). To understand the turn's construction and to be able to recognize possible points of turn completion, i.e. points relevant for turn transition, in the preceding analysis, a more detailed understanding of the TCU might be of relevance.

> *"Turns display gross organizational features that reflect their occurrence in a series. They regularly have a three-part structure: one which addresses the relation of a turn to a prior, one involved with what is occupying the turn, and one which addresses the relation of the turn to a succeeding one. These parts regularly occur in that order, an obviously rational ordering for an organization that latched a turn to the turns on either side of it."*
>
> Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson, 1974:722

Sacks et al. (1974:702) write that "[i]nstances of the unit-types so usable allow a projection of the unit-type under way, and what, roughly, it will take for an instance of that unit-type to be completed." According to Sacks et al., having the turn, a speaker is initially entitled to one TCU and "the first possible completion of a first such unit constitutes an initial transition-relevance place." (1974:703). However, this initial rule will not always be the case, especially in institutional interaction.

Schegloff (1996:53) notes that Sacks et al. in "A simplest systematics for the Organization of Turn-Taking for Conversation" left some parts of understanding conversation to rest on contributions of linguists. Schegloff further describes "their exploration of this interface has been disappointing, perhaps because the point of articulation between language

organization and interaction has been insufficiently explicated on the interactional side" (1996:53). Schegloff brings up the multi-unit turn, considering that "the boundaries of the grammar may extend beyond those of a single TCU in their contexts of relevance" (1996:60). Schegloff considers the TCU's structure, or grammatical structure, to be adapted to the environment in which it occurs. The TCU's natural habitat is, according to Schegloff, the turn-at-talk, while he calls the TCU's organization grammar. In the case of talk-in-interaction, the grammar and the organization of talk will be reflexively related (Schegloff, 1996:56).

Several papers aim to define the grammar of the TCU (Schegloff 1996; Ford, Fox and Thompson, 2002) and furthermore, some discuss the challenges in doing so (Selting, 2000). "Although the notion of the TCU as introduced by Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson 1974 is now widely accepted, the details of its interpretation are far from clear" (Selting, 2000:477). In Selting's discussion of the TCU, she claims that while Schegloff describes the TCU as a unit "defined with respect to turn-taking" and not "as a linguistic unit", "Sacks et al. mostly used examples of one- or multi-unit turns in which the "units" where indeed TCUs in this sense, suggesting a systematic relation between TCUs and grammatical units" (2000:478-479). Working on defining the grammar of the TCU, this causes difficulties when dealing with the more complex TCUs. Selting also describes several activities that "seem to be constructed with more than one clause or sentence (…) e.g. the telling of stories or jokes, descriptions, direction-giving, and the formulation of complex arguments in argumentation sequences" (Selting, 2000:482).

3.3.3 Turn allocation

As previously mentioned, following Sidnell (2010:41), the turn-taking system often allocates the right to produce one TCU at a time. After the single TCU, the transition to a next speaker can, but does not always occur. This makes relevant the transition to a next speaker at the possible completion of a current turn unit. Both the current speaker and the potential next speaker are considered to orient to this relevance of transition at the possible completion. When a speaker produces a multi-unit turn, the speaker, according to Sidnell, displays an orientation to the relevance of speaker transition at possible unit completion. This is displayed as the speaker increases the pace of talk through the possible transition-relevance place, thereby foreclosing the possibility of the transition. The recipients, on the other hand, orient to the relevance of speaker transition by targeting such points as places relevant to start their

own turn (Sidnell 2010:42). They "monitor the syntactic, prosodic and broadly speaking pragmatic features of the current turn to find that it is about to begin, now beginning, continuing, now coming to completion (…) A point of possible unit completion is a place for possible speaker transition" (Sidnell, 2010:43). This orientation towards the relevance of speaker transition makes turn-taking "a closely monitored and coordinated joint activity, with many turn transitions achieved without any overlap or silence" (Ford et al., 2002:15).

Although hearers and speakers do orient to certain points in the ongoing talk as possible transition-relevance place, not all TCU-endings might be considered transition-relevance places. Selting discusses how Sacks et al. define the TCU with respect to turn-taking, and not the grammatical features of the TCU, and furthermore that the TCU cannot always be defined in respect to turn-taking. Schegloff (1996:55) describes how the TCU can on their possible completion constitute complete turns, thereby making transition to a next speaker relevant.

3.3.4 Institutional talk and turn-taking

In the chapter describing the methodological framework, I presented some elements common to institutional talk, identifying institutional CA as something building upon, but also with different context than ordinary CA. According to Heritage and Clayman (2010:36), Drew and Heritage in 1992 systematized a number of dimensions of difference, distinguishing institutional talk from ordinary conversation. Among several such dimensions of difference, Drew and Heritage (1992) draw up *turn-taking organization, turn design, sequence organization and overall structural organization of the interaction*. Drew and Heritage (1992:25) address among other things the turn-organization in formal settings in institutional interaction, showing that "the participant's talk is conducted within the constraints of a specialized turn-taking system". According to Drew and Heritage (1992:26): "These differences commonly involve specific *reductions* of the range of options and opportunities for action that are characteristic in conversation and they often involve *specialization* and *respecifications* of the interactional functions of the activities that remain."

According to Drew and Heritage (1992:26) "[s]uch institutional reductions and specializations of the available set of conventional options are (…) conventional in character", and they are furthermore associated with differing participant frameworks, with different footings (Goffman, 1981) and different rights and obligations and opportunities in how to

carry out the interactional activities. In less formal settings, according to Drew and Heritage (1992:26), like medical, psychiatric and social service, the interactions take place in more private settings. Although the interaction is clearly institutional and accomplishes task-based or role-based activities, the turn-taking procedures may approximate conversation or conversational-like modes. “When considered in turn-taking terms at least, the boundaries between these forms of institutional talk and ordinary conversation can appear permeable and uncertain” (Drew and Heritage, 1992:26). Meetings constitute specific speech exchange systems, according to Svennevig (2012:4), and the turn-taking can differ from the turn-taking model described by Sacks et al. (1974). Ford (2008) describes how the specification of a next-speaker action can project a longer turn, which is constructed of multiple grammatical and prosodic possible points of completions.

Drew and Heritages address two phenomena in their analysis of institutional interaction: “(a) the selection of an activity that a turn is designed to perform; and (b) the details of the verbal construction through which the turn’s activity is accomplished” (Drew and Heritage, 1992:32). On overall structural organization, Drew and Heritage (1992:43) discuss how many types of institutional encounters are typically structured into a standard order of phases. This standard “shape” is often task-related and organize the activities which are conducted (Drew and Heritage, 1992).

3.3.5 Collaboration and single parties

Schegloff (1995:33) shows how on some occasions, or in some particular interactional phase, topic or sequence, the ratified participants in the interaction are organized into parties. The party is formed by virtue of interactional contingencies and the participants’ behaviour. Furthermore, he describes how in understanding the simultaneous talk-in-interaction, it is important to discriminate between simultaneous talk between co-incumbents of a party and simultaneous talk between separate parties. Schegloff (1995:36) describes, among several matters in this regards, that there are various ways in which a speaker can give another participant a “conditional access to the turn”. The speaker of the not completed turn-in-progress thereby yields to another, and even might invite another to speak within their turn’s space, on the condition that the other speaker will further the initial “speaker’s undertaking” (1995:36).

Lerner (1992) describes how sometimes participants in talk-in-interaction work together to tell a story. In some cases, the co-teller of the story produces an entry designed to elaborate, rather than to produce a next component in the story (Lerner, 1992:264). In some cases, the consociates who are co-telling a story, will share authorship of the story the thereby both having contributed as the storyteller (Lerner, 1992: 266).

Lerner (1993) shows how colletivities can become social units in conversation. In some, the representatives of such a social unit can "demonstrate their co-participation with the prior speaker retrospectively by joining in the production of an ongoing action" (Lerner, 1993:221). Although many such social units which are made relevant in the interaction draw upon extra-interactional relationships, this need not be the case (Lerner, 1993:235).

According to Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson "a silence after a turn in which a next [speaker] has been selected will be heard not as a lapse's possible beginning, nor as a gap, but as a pause before the selected next speaker's turn-beginning" (1974:715). Lerner (1996:260) describes the use of intra-turn silence, a silence occurring in the current speaker's turn which is thereby treated as a pause within a turn. This "provides the recipients of the turn the chance to initiate talk without being implicated in overlap" (Lerner, 1996:260). Such "recipient contributions" can be considered to serve the further progress of the halted turn by furthering the "project of the turn-in-progress". Lerner further explicates that not all such intra-turn silences are available for 'opportunistic completion'; "[t]he circumstances, sequential position, method of "braking" (so to speak) and the position of the silence in the turn and within the TCU matter here" (Lerner, 1996:261).

Djordjilovic (2012) illustrates the differences between a single party status and team status. The single party status is an accomplishment made relevant through forms of address and gaze direction or through actions the party incumbents initiate themselves. The single party status and the team status differ in that the single party status can be based on local interactional contingencies (Schegloff 1995, as quoted in Djordjilovic), and that the party incumbency relates to speaking rights, but does not include shared authorship of an action. Such shared authorship of an action is a crucial feature to team displays, and the team status depends on "shared accountability in relation to the other meeting participants" (Djordjilovic, 2012:53).

3.4 Grammar of the TCU

In the following chapter I will elaborate on the turn construction unit with special attention to the beginnings and endings.

3.4.1 Turn-beginnings

Depperman (2013:93) discusses how turn-organization is organized multimodally and therefore needs to be studied taking such multimodal interaction into regards. The participants have four tasks in order to produce a turn which precisely fits the interactional moment in which the turn is placed (Depperman, 2013:93). These tasks are according to Depperman first of all to achieve joint orientation. Second they must display uptake. Third the participants must deal with projections from prior talk. And fourth, the participants must project the properties of the turn-in-progress.

"The participation framework often changes in terms of who addresses whom and who is interactively available for whom. (…) attention to possibly changing interactional partners have to be coordinated and updated continuously" (Depperman 2013:96). The participant's "availability for turns to be produced" as Depperman puts it, may be of interest in the interpreted conversation. Mutual visual availability, multimodal prerequisites for recipiency (Depperman, 2013:99). Depperman (2013:93) describes the grounds for a turn: "For a turn to become an intersubjectively grounded contribution to an ongoing conversation, it must be designed as to suit the precise interactional moment and environment". The factors a speaker must take into consideration are: 1) what went on in the interaction; 2) the participant framework; 3) "properties of the interactional site"; and 4) "the prospective speaker's entitlement to take a turn" (Depperman, 2013:93).

The pre-beginning, according to Depperman (2013:99) is not a part of the turn, but prepares the turn-beginning and projects its imminent onset. Audible in-breath is associated with preparing for speaking and can be used as a means for turn-claiming. Body movement and vocal and verbal means can also be used to summon the recipient's attention. These pre-beginnings serve to "claim the turn and to establish the necessary prerequisites of joint orientation to their upcoming turn" (Depperman, 2013:99).

Goodwin (1980) demonstrates the relevance of gaze for a speaker's construction of a turn, giving examples of situations where the speaker "begins a new sentence at the point at which the gaze of a recipient is secured (Goodwin, 1980:276).

3.4.2 Post-endings

According to Schegloff (1996:59), added talk can be carried out in two different ways with regards to the prior talk: either as an increment to within the same TCU or as a new TCU. Post-positioned accounts, for example grounds or justification, seem oriented to the recipient's beginning dis-alignment from the speaker just said.

Ford, Fox and Thompson (2002:16) define the increment as a non-main clause continuation after a possible point of turn completion, after a transition-relevance place based on prosody, syntax and sequential action. Ford et al. distinguish between two types of increments in their data: extensions and free constituents (ibid). While the extensions can be understood as a continuation of the prior possibly complete turn, the free constituents can be produced among other possibilities, as an unattached noun phrase (Ford et al., 2002).

Ford et al. (2002) identify both the extension increments and the free constituents to occur in an environment which lacks display of uptake at a transition-relevance place. The two groups, however, seem to serve different purposes and functions. The extensions provide a new transition-relevance place at which the recipient can display recipiency. The extensions continue the action of the extended turn rather than doing a new action and work retroactively on the preceding unit, thereby reinterpreting the unit as still in progress (Ford et al. 2002). The free constituents, in Ford et al. mainly focusing on unattached noun phrases, also provide a second transition-relevance place. Furthermore, the unattached noun phrases display an assessment and stance toward the referent, which serves as possible model alignment for the recipient, a model for which kind of response the speaker may be pursuing from the recipient (Ford et al. 2002:26).

3.5 Summary

Multimodality takes into account that communication is more than just language. In addition to providing a theoretical framework for understanding interaction, it provides a basis in which it is possible to understand how the media - video technology - can affect the interaction through its affordances and constraints and through embedding the technology in social interaction (Jewitt, 2009; Jones, 2009; Hutchby, 2001). Goffman's participant framework theory (1981) provides a framework in which the social interaction can be understood through the participants' actions and orientation during the interaction.

Conversation analysis provides extensive theory on the turn-taking system and the turn's construction. However, the single turn construction unit's boundaries and limits are not always obvious. The definitions arising from sociolinguistics and conversation analysis provide two complementary theoretical approaches to the units, and the understanding of these. In institutional interaction, the traditional understanding of the turn-taking system can be supplemented with theory based on institutional CA (Heritage and Clayman, 2010; Drew and Heritage, 1992; Ford, 2008; Svennevig, 2012). Schegloff (1995), Lerner (1992, 1993, 1996) and Djordjilovic (2012) provide insights on how participants can collaborate during interaction, making the boundaries between the single turns and turn construction units perhaps even more obscure.

Depperman (2013) and Goodwin (1980) provide an understanding of the turns design and multimodal traits. While Schegloff (1996) and Ford, Fox and Thompson (2002) add another dimension to the understanding of turns and turn construction units, by presenting increments.

4 Data and method

To look further into features of video mediated interpreting, I needed video recordings of authentic conversations. The tradition of Conversation Analysis insists on using recordings of authentic talk, and my aim with this work is to learn something about the features of video remote interpreting. Therefore, collecting video recordings of talk was essential if I was to carry out this project. Since there is not much research on video interpreted talk, collecting recordings of on-site interpreted talk would lay the grounds for a comparative analysis. In the following I will describe several aspects and processes I have gone through to gain access to, collect and process the data for this thesis.

4.1 Data collection

In the first chapter, I touched upon my situation in the field of interpreting and my interest in video remote interpreting with regards to how this might affect the design and thereby also the outcome of such a research project. However, on the other hand, my previous experiences with interpreting and video remote interpreting have provided background knowledge making it possible for me to understand the "situated activities to be recorded" (Mondada, 2013:38), without having to prepare for the project through fieldwork. Mondada describes the preparation for data collection to be a specific kind of fieldwork crucial to understanding the situated activities as well as being able to identify the events and knowing the best conditions for setting up the recording devices.

Being an interpreter myself and having worked as an advisor in the hospital for several years, I have some field knowledge making it possible for me to make some choices on how to carry out the recordings. In my previous studies, I have also been permitted to carry out an analysis of interpreted talk recorded at Akershus University Hospital as a part of a project evaluating communication (Gulbrandsen, Finset and Jensen, 2013). My previous experiences and knowledge about how interpreted conversations are carried out, thereby provided some initial thoughts on how to carry out the project. However, I was very aware before the meetings, that I would not know how and where place the camera before I saw the rooms. In addition to knowing what I would want to record and how I would want to record it, I knew would have to gain access to the situations. Being familiar with the project referred to in the previous paragraph at Akershus University Hospital with the recorded conversations, I knew

it was possible to get permissions to make recordings of medical encounters. However, I needed to decide on several factors and obtain necessary permissions before I could begin.

Since the aim of this master's project was to carry out a comparative analysis of video remote interpreting and on-site interpreting in a medical setting using conversation analysis, I would need to record both video interpreted and on-site interpreted conversations. I could choose to establish contact with one ward and make all the recordings in the same place, or I could follow one interpreter and make all the recordings of the same person. I could choose one or several languages and select only meetings in these languages. I finally found some team meetings in a rehabilitation institute to be a possible place to make recordings granted that I would get the necessary permissions to gain access to the situations.

4.1.1 Permissions

Seeing that the research would be conducted on conversations carried out in a medical setting, after gaining clearance from management in Oslo University Hospital and the rehabilitation institute, I sent a remit assessment to the REC, the Regional Committees for Medical and Health Research Ethics. REC concluded that the project was not considered medical or health care research as understood by the Health Research Act. I thereafter sent a notification form to the NSD, the Data Protection Official for Research for all the Norwegian universities, university colleges and several hospitals and research institutes. The project notification contained information on the project design, collection and storage of recordings, the consent form and a plan for deleting the recordings. The project was accepted and given advise. I sent a description of the project to the personal protection department at Oslo University Hospital, and to the involved institutes. The project was given the necessary recommendations. I was permitted to make video recordings of the conversations. I have informed all the participants about the project and collected signed forms of consent from all the participants. The recordings are stored in concurrence with the security recommendations from both the NSD and the personal protection department at Oslo University Hospital.

4.1.2 Making recordings

Video remote interpreting has received a great deal of attention, although the use is perhaps not that widespread yet. However, the numbers are rising (Løfsnes et al., 2016:14). There were not many video interpreted conversations carried out in health care settings at the time I

was collecting my data. It has been of importance to me to try to avoid altering the situation which I have been trying to research. The implication of this has been that although there weren't that many video remote interpreted conversations to record, it was important to me not to recommend or "push" video interpreting as an option to on-site interpreting and thereby tamper with the situation. It has also been important to me not to persuade institutes to consider video remote interpreting in situations I would otherwise consider on-site interpreting to be a better option. During this time, however, it perhaps somewhat surprisingly became apparent that it was easier for me to gain access to video remote interpreted talk than on-site interpreted talk.

Deciding on which conversations to record, has been of major concern. On which grounds I would choose the meetings to record (e.g. language, individual participants, ward and the matter of the conversation), might result in quite different outcomes. I have therefore spent a great deal of time considering whether to start by choosing with regards to certain criteria (language, ward or topic) or choose randomly. If I were to get recordings of rare languages, this might raise sensitivity issues as it would be easier to recognize both the interpreter and the patient or next of kin, even if the material has been anonymized. The patient's age might raise certain ethical issues. Also certain meetings might be of a more sensitive nature. If the same individuals, be it interpreter, patient, next of kin or health care staff, were to participate in several conversations, this may also effect the result. Should all the conversations be of the same type? I decided that it would be preferable to find conversations with several participants, so the camera would not be intrusive in an elsewise intimate setting. Furthermore, I would try to avoid rare languages. And finally I would try to limit the recordings to few languages.

4.1.3 The recorded meetings

The meetings I have recorded, are treatment team meetings where the rehabilitation institute meets with patients and next of kin. In the recorded meetings the patient and family members have a migrant background, and for this reason an interpreter has been booked. In all cases the interpreters have formal qualification. I have collected five recordings: two with on-site interpreting; three with video remote interpreting. In four of the recordings the migrant language is Polish, and in one it is Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian (BCS).

The recordings of on-site interpreting are of a different meeting type than the video remote interpreted ones. I have chosen to disregard one of the on-site interpreted conversations as it is an examination, and therefore differs from the other recordings which all bear more resemblance to meetings. I have also excluded one meeting with video remote interpreting, as the phases in the meeting differed from those in the meetings I have used. The on-site interpreted conversation I have chosen to include in this analysis, is a different kind of meeting than the video remote interpreted meetings with other phases. Still, this meeting bears resemblance to the video interpreted meetings with regards to the meeting's structure and participants. One pronounced difference between the two, is that the on-site interpreted meeting is carried out in the patient's room. In contrast, all of the video interpreted meetings are carried out in meeting rooms with video conference equipment. Another pronounced difference, is the course of the meetings. The on-site interpreted meeting has a different course of activities than the video interpreted meetings. I have therefore chosen to focus the analysis toward sequences of talk-in-interaction that are similar in the two types of meetings, avoiding examinations and other activities specific to either of the two meeting types.

Overview of material

Loc. Int.	**Language**	**Participants**	**Length**	**Material**	**Name**
On-site interpreter	Polish	2 Polish 3 Norwegian	55 min	1m 27 sec 1m 56 sec	F2F Polish
Remote interpreter	BCS	2 BCS 4 Norwegian	40 min	6m 20 sec	VRI BCS
Remote interpreter	Polish	1 Polish 6 Norwegian	27 min	3m 33sec	VRI Polish
Remote interpreter	Polish	4 Polish 3 Norwegian	57 min	Not used	
On-site interpreter	Polish	2 Polish 4 Norwegian	29 min	Note used	

1 Overview of material

F2F Polish is a meeting carried out with face-to-face (F2F), or on-site interpreting. There are three Norwegian speaking medical professionals in the room, a Polish speaking mother and a child and an interpreter. The meeting follows other phases than the other meetings. I have chosen extracts from phases similar to phases occurring in the other meetings, with activities of 'giving information' and 'giving report' rather than 'examination'.

VRI Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian is a meeting carried out with video remote interpreting (VRI). The interpreter is participating from a different location. There are six participants present in the meeting room. Four of the participants present are Norwegian speaking medical professionals and two are the BCS speaking patient and next of kin.

VRI Polish is a meeting carried out with video remote interpreting (VRI). The interpreter is participating from a different location. There are seven participants present in the meeting room. Six of the participants present are Norwegian speaking medical professionals, and the next of kin speaks Polish.

4.1.4 Data processing

In conversation analysis only the recordings are regarded to be data. The transcripts are not regarded to be data. However, both the act of transcribing and the written representation of the interaction make useful in the analysis of the talk-in-interaction. I have been working with video recordings, and have therefore had the opportunity to look not only at and for what is expressed verbally in the interaction, but embodied resources as well. Finding a way of both transcribing the talk-in-interaction with an appropriate level of detail considering the focus of the analysis, and at the same time finding a way of presenting embodied resources in the interaction, has been a process. Considering the number of participants in the room, I have limited the number of participants of which I describe in the transcripts to be those who are active in the verbal communication, unless their nonverbal actions seem to be of relevance to the ongoing activities. The transcribing is done using Transana, and I have added comments on embodied resources in the transcripts. In some cases, where the activities are carried by the current speaker or limited and easily placed in the transcript, I have inserted descriptions of gaze or gestures in the same line as the transcript of verbal utterances. When the descriptions of gaze or gestures have become more detailed, I have added an extra line to the transcript. Along the line, I have noted numbers under the words that were uttered as the activity was carried out. I have described the activity marked by each number in a line beneath.

Example transcript

```
14    Int: .h (.) e: (0.4) f- dobrze funkc- się sprawdziła lista
           .h (.)   e:   (0.4)  f- go well      func-   checked          the list
           ----------1-----------------------------------2-----------------------------------3
      Gaze:  1) Interpreter looks up. 2) Nora looks to screen. 3 Nora sits back
```

I have given the Norwegian speaking participants, names beginning with N. I have given the Polish speaking participants, names beginning with P. And I have given the Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian speaking participants, names beginning with B.

Since the meetings are carried out in Norwegian and BCS and Norwegian and Polish, I have added a layer to the transcript in English. In the English translation of the Norwegian utterances, I have keep the English version syntactically close to the Norwegian utterances, thereby placing the words close to the Norwegian ones. This makes it possible to follow the transcription in Norwegian on the one hand. On the other, it makes the English text less fluent and idiomatic. I have to the best of my knowledge chosen the same strategy with regards to the BCS and Polish utterances. Since this master's project is a part of the previously mentioned research and development project, I have had the possibility to pay the interpreters for time to help me note what they said in the respective languages in the clips I have identified as interesting. This implies that I narrowed down the clips which I wanted to study closer, before knowing what was said. With regards to the size of a master's thesis and the time available to carry out the project, I decided this would be my best option although this would both limit my understanding of the interaction to what was available to me during the selection process and it could affect to what I focused my attention, seeing that I might miss something. However, this made it possible to carry out the project. Ideally, I would also have liked to check notations in Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian (BCS) and Polish by running them by another independent source. This is among the reasons that I have chosen to approach the analysis in the way I have; most of the discoveries are in fact available to me without understanding everything that is said. The notations of the BCS and Polish utterances are not transcribed to the same level of detail as the Norwegian utterances are. I have timed silence up until the speech starts, and I have not explored the Polish and BCS speech further. In the analysis, I have therefore not spent a great deal of time exploring the interpreted speech, only commenting on this a couple of times. I have not gone through the speech to identify restarts, cut-offs, pauses and filled pauses in the Polish and BCS utterances, other than those that were identified when going through the notations and translations with the interpreter.

4.1.5 Biases

Seeing that my data material consists of only two interpreter languages, I acknowledge that other languages with other linguistic or para-linguistic features may reveal other findings.

Further, the fact that I have chosen to look at the turn exchanges between the interpreter and the medical staff rather than the patient or next of kin leaves a whole array of turn exchanges unexplored. One of the main arguments made for using role-plays in studies made on video interpreting, is to ensure comparability. However, as previously mentioned, some aspects may be missing when the interaction is carried out in a controlled environment. What this analysis lacks in respect to comparability, I hope it makes up for through authenticity. This is authentic interaction. Placing a camera in the room may in itself cause changes to a meeting. Given my involvement in the field of interpreting, the interpreter and the medical professionals, might feel evaluated and in regard to this behave according to what they would expect to be correct or normative. Since I am not looking for the motivations for different actions, an over attentiveness from any participant on being recorded, will not affect how a certain trajectories of interaction may cause a certain result.

Initially, I commented on my own involvement in the field, and I have furthermore discussed how the way I am situated in the field may affect my approaches to this project. One possible bias on my behalf is how what I write, the text situation (Neumann and Neumann, 2012), may have an effect. It may be tempting to present video interpreting from different angles depending on what I would like to achieve. However, what I do want to achieve through this project, is increased knowledge about video interpreting. I have therefore chosen conversation analysis as a method, to give me the possibility to observe authentic cases.

4.1.6 Reliability and validity

Nielsen and Nielsen (2005:218) describe reliability and validity in conversation analysis to be a question of authenticity and credibility in the data, match between the data and the problem, and the analysis' validity. The video recordings are sensitive, so the transcripts have been anonymized. However, I believe that through detailed, orderly and systematical transcripts, good grounds for the selection of extracts, analysis and arguments, and the description of the method above, will provide transparency and credibility to the process. Through my initial introduction to the topic and to my situation in the field, the discussion of choice of methodology in chapter 2 and the discussion of method and material above, I hope to have shed some light to the process.

5 Analysis

By using excerpts from face-to-face or on-site interpreted talk-in-interaction as a comparative backdrop in the analysis, I hope to present some relevant features of video remote interpreted interaction. Given the dimension of the master's thesis, this analysis cannot provide an exhaustive description of the interpreter's turn-taking in these meetings. This is not a quantitative analysis unveiling the entirety of the interpreter's turn-taking in video remote interpreting, nor is it a qualitative analysis with the same aim. This is a qualitative analysis where specific features of the video interpreted conversation will be highlighted. With my previously defined problem at hand focusing on how the interpreter is nominated speakership and assuming an approach considering the interpreting as a part of interaction, I will be looking closer at how the participants organize the interpreting in collaboration through local management of turns and party administration.

The analysis is divided into two parts. The first part of the analysis focuses on certain features of interpreted talk, demonstrates features of the turn-exchanges which will be further examined in the second part of the analysis and illustrates various shifts in the participant framework that occur. The second part of the analysis builds upon the opening analysis, and provides an in-depth comparative analysis of the interpreter's turn-taking in video interpreted and on-site interpreted interaction with regard to the turn exchanges between the interpreter and the medical professional and certain phenomena that occur in these surroundings.

5.1 Part one: Interpreting in talk-in-interaction

Rather than beginning with an in-depth comparative analysis of video remote interpreting and on-site interpreting, I will start by applying conversation analysis to three excerpts from one of the recorded meetings to introduce some characteristics of interpreted talk. The problem I presented initially identifies the interpreter's turn-taking as a relevant topic. In the following, I will present extracts illustrating an adjacency pair, a part of a multi-unit turn and an interpreter initiated repair. The three extracts display three different aspects of the interpreter's communicative actions and how the participants collaborate to accomplish the activity of interpreting within a meeting. Although the final extract, presented under the title "5.1.3 Interpreter initiated repair", is specially chosen to illustrate shifts in the participation framework and the interpreter's footing, all three extracts do illustrate how the participant

framework changes and how the interpreter assumes different alignments during the interaction.

5.1.1 Adjacency pairs

To demonstrate specific features of the interpreter's turn-taking, I will start the analysis with an adjacency pair. Hutchby and Wooffitt (2008:42) describe how "certain classes of utterances conventionally come in pairs". Questions and answers are examples of such, and this type of sequence is often called an adjacency pair, because the turns are ideally "produced next to each other" (Hutchby and Wooffitt, 2008:42). The extract below shows an example of this. The extract is from a meeting where the interpreter participates through video conference equipment, and Nora, Paulina and the interpreter are engaging in talk-in-interaction. The extract shows how the medical professional, Nora, asks Polish speaking Paulina a question in Norwegian. Then, after a pause, the interpreter speaks in Polish before Paulina responds in Polish, and finally, the interpreter repeats the answer in Norwegian.

(1) VRI Polish

```
1            (1.3)
2     Nora:  har du noen spørsmål Paulina?
             Have you got any questions Paulina?
3            (0.3)
4     Int:   .h (.) czy ma pani jakieś pytania pani Paulino?
             .h  (.)  does missis have any questions missis Paulina?
5            (1.7)
6     Pau:   nie
             No
7     Int:   nei
             No
8            [laughter]
9     Pau:   [((skazjest))]
             [((???          ))]
10           (0.5)
11    Nora:  he (0.4) [e:       ]
12    Int:            [e unnskyld] (0.6) przepraszam
                      Excuse me      (0.6)  Excuse me
             ----------------------------------------1----------------------2
      Gaze: 1) Nora turns to screen/camera.  2) Nora turns to Paulina.
13           (0.7)
14    Pau:   wszystko jest jasne
             (all is light)
15           (0.2)
16    Int:   .h (.) alt er klart.
             .h    (.)  all is clear.
```

```
                ----------1
        Gaze:   1) Nora turns to screen/camera
17              (0.9)
18      Pau:    hehehe
```
1VRI Polish

Nora asks Paulina a question in line 2, and in line 7 the interpreter provides a reply in the same language as the question was first asked. In this adjacency pair, the interpreter gets a turn between each of the other interlocutors' turns. This example demonstrates what Li (2015:77) calls *prototype turn-taking* in interpreted talk. First Nora asks a question in language A, then the interpreter speaks in language B. Thereafter Paulina speaks in language B, and finally the interpreter replies in language A. The turn-taking management in the interpreted interaction will in many cases be more complex than this. For example, while I chose this part of the sequence to illustrate the conditions for the interpreter's turn-taking through a fairly simple example, in truth this exchange occurs at the end of a multi-unit turn which I have left out at this early point of the analysis.

In this excerpt, the interpreter is already looking up from her notes to the screen by the time she produces an audible in-breath before her utterance. Even before the interpreter produces the audible in-breath in line 4, the former speaker has finished the ongoing TCU. The audible in-breath does not precede the completion of the TCU, and furthermore, it does not occur until after the TCU's first point of possible completion. The interpreter can anticipate the possible point of completion based on the TCU's syntax, beginning with an interrogative, and intonation which reveal that this is a question. Furthermore, a 0.3 second silence in the speech precedes the interpreter's turn. Norwegian speaking Nora has addressed Polish speaking Paulina both through her gaze and by referring to her. It might be fair to assume that the participants have an inferred understanding that the interpreter will interpret what is said in each language, thereby making what is said in each language available to the speakers of the other language. This implies that the interpreter should at some point begin to interpret what Nora said. The question, however, is at what point the interpreter will start interpreting; how much speech will she and can she collect and store in memory before she starts to interpret? In this excerpt the actions preceding the interpreters turn, make it seemingly easy to project a first possible point of TCU completion; Nora's question in line 2 comes to semantic and syntactic completion with rising intonation marking that it is indeed a question and it is directed to Paulina. Following Sacks and Schegloff (as quoted in Lerner,

2004:229), Lerner states that "[w]hen an adjacency pair first pair-part occupies a TCU, that unit is likely to be the last TCU a speaker produces prior to speaker transition" (as quoted in Lerner, 2004:229), this would be a likely place for the interpreter to start interpreting.

The silence in line 3 can be considered a gap or pause depending on whether it occurs intra-turn or inter-turn (Sacks et al., 1974:715). In this extract the next speaker is selected by Nora; Paulina is named explicitly. This turn crosses the linguistic barriers in the talk-in-interaction; Norwegian speaking Nora asks Polish speaking Paulina a question in Norwegian. This implies that the interpreter will be the next speaker. The interpreter must interpret the question before Paulina can answer. The 0.3 second silence in line 3 can by Sacks et al.'s (1974) definition be called a pause; in this case the interpreter is expected to interpret what has been said. In this extract, the adjacency pair crosses the linguistic barrier in the interaction and therefore initiates the activity of interpreting.

In the extract above, the interpreter does not follow the gaze pattern I have found more common in this material. In several extracts from earlier points in the meeting and in extracts from the other meetings in the material, a common gaze pattern involves the interpreter looking down, orienting visually to her note-taking during a medical professional's production of speech. At a possible point of speaker exchange, the interpreter first produces a pre-beginning, and in a following pause the interpreter lifts her head and upper body, and proceeds with her utterance while orienting to the screen or to the room if she is at the same location, e.g. extracts (2), (4), (5) and (6). In this extract, where the interrogative nature of the utterance is revealed already early in the utterance, the interpreter continues to look up rather than looking down to her note-taking when Nora begins speaking and then up again when the she is about to start speaking. Perhaps the interpreter recognizes this as a shortly upcoming transition-relevance place and by keeping her gaze lifted she indicates already early that she will be claiming a turn shortly.

Although the intonation, semantic meaning, pragmatic function and syntactic completion of the question all indicate that this is a transition-relevance place and the grammatical structure of the utterance addressed to Paulina furthermore implies that the interpreter will be the next speaker, the interpreter produces a pre-beginning before speaking. After producing the pre-beginning, an audible in-breath, the interpreter leaves another short pause before starting to produce the turn. The audible in-breath is commonly associated with preparing for speaking and is often used as a means for turn-claiming (Depperman, 2013:99).

The actions surrounding the interpreter's speech in line 4 imply that although Paulina is the addressed recipient of the speech and nominated next speaker by Nora in line 2, the interpreter is understood as the next speaker without need of further explanation at this point in the interaction. The other participants in this meeting will most probably await the interpreting before continuing, seeing that the question is addressed across the linguistic barriers of the communication. Although Nora has already accommodated for the activity of interpreting, the interpreter's pre-beginning might serve as assurance that she is in fact planning to interpret, there is no trouble at this point. The pre-beginning signals that she is preparing a turn and might serve to gain time to plan the utterance.

The interpreter is looking at the screen, and continues to do so while Nora asks the question and while she interprets the question. The long pause, seeing that Paulina has already been nominated next-speaker, in line 5, between the interpreted question in line 4 and Paulina's answer in line 6, might partially be caused by features in the technological medium itself. Although the interpreter and rehabilitation institute communicate through video conference infrastructure linked together through high-capacity internet, transport of data from the interpreter to the ward and back, does take time. The pause itself might be extended by the fact that it occurs at a point of changing speakership from the one side of the technology to the other. The camera recording the interaction is placed on the interpreter's side of the technological connection, perhaps causing this pause to be extended on the interpreter's side. If the camera were placed at the other side of the technology, in the institute's meeting room, perhaps the pause in line 3 might be experienced as equally extended on the institute's side. On the other hand, a delayed response to a question might indicate a problem in producing a reply. Dispreferred responses are according to Lee (2013:418) designed to incorporate among other inter-turn or turn-initial delays and accounts. In this extract Paulina replies after a 1.7 second silence. It is not possible to tell whether the delay was caused by technology or whether it indicates some trouble in producing an answer at this point. However, shortly after, Paulina produces an extension to her short reply, first in line 9 overlapping with laughter, and thereafter in line 14 after a repair sequence. This extension accounts for the dispreferred response in line 6, indicating that Paulina is treating her negative reply as a dispreferred response.

The repair is initiated by the interpreter at a point where several of the participants are laughing. Nora is just about to resume her speech after the turn, as the interpreter overlapping

with Nora's pre-beginning in line 11 first excuses herself in Norwegian, and thereby in Polish. When the interpreter speaks in Norwegian, Nora turns to the screen. At the end of the following Polish utterance, Nora turns back to Paulina. Paulina repeats what she said in line 14.

Since the nature of interpreted interaction implies that an interpreter will have to interpret in between the parts of an adjacency pair crossing the linguistic barriers of the interaction, the transition-relevance place no longer occurs between the speech of two interlocutors producing the two parts of the pair. The transition-relevance places are now likely to occur between the first interlocutor and the interpreter in language A, the interpreter and the second interlocutor in language B, the second interlocutor and the interpreter in language B and finally the interpreter and the first interlocutor in language A. While in talk-in-interaction without the ongoing activity of interpreting, the two interlocutors will monitor the TCUs, projecting at which point they will exchange speakership. A delay occurring between the two parts of an adjacency pair might project a dispreferred response or an upcoming repair of some sort. This will give the speaker who asked the question, some information about the next speaker's possible stance or alignment. Two questions then arise in regard to video interpreting. First, does the speaker asking the question have the same sensitivity or level of attention when monitoring transitions between an interpreter and the addressed recipient? And second, will delayed responses be revealed to the interlocutors when the adjacency pair parts occur at two different sides of the technological media? There might be reason to suspect that the activity of interpreting and the features of the technology each can contribute to camouflaging possible troubles in the interaction.

5.1.2 Multi-unit turns

In the extract above I provided an example of how the participants organized the interpreting of an adjacency pair. In the following extract, I will provide an example of how the participants organize the interpreting when one of the participants is producing a multi-unit turn. In ordinary talk-in-interaction the turns may be allocated according to the rules described by Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (1974:703). Most often the speaker is allowed to produce one single TCU at a time, and the production of several units at a time is done through extra effort. Some produce an announcement before beginning a story or keep the turn through possible transition-relevance places by picking up pace when approaching a transition

relevant place, through use of rush through (Clayman, 2013:159), According to Ford (2008:61), in workplace meetings, "specification of next-speaker actions may project longer turns", and in this case Nora has been appointed to start the round around the table. The specification of Nora as the next-speaker allows the participants to project that Nora will produce a longer turn. Furthermore, the activity Nora engages in, the activity of 'giving report', is an activity likely to extend over several TCUs. Although Nora has a bit to say in her report, the interpreter will need to be allowed turns during Nora's turn-in-progress, so she can interpret what is being said. Not only would the speech, if there was no need for interpreting, be carried out as a multi-unit turn, but medical professionals, patients and next of kin would most probably have different rights in respect to when it would be appropriate to speak, comment or respond during an ongoing turn-in-progress and what types of utterances they would be expected to produce.

The following extract is from an earlier part of the same meeting as the extract above. Nora has been asked by Nina to start a round around the table where medical professionals representing different occupational groups give their reports. Nora starts by giving a report on what they have been working on, before she continues with what they will be doing. In the extract below she is still reporting on what they have done so far. In this extract, what Li (2015) defines as *extended turns* occurs. Nora is giving a report, an activity extending over several TCUs. However, the interpreter has been permitted to carry out the activity of interpreting within Nora's multi-unit turn. This extract is taken from a longer sequence, and just prior to this extract, the interpreter has rendered Nora's previous utterance. A silence occurs in line 1 just before Nora continues on her turn-in-progress.

(2) VRI Polish

1		(1.4)
2	Nora:	e: han har behov for mest mulige: faste: rutiner
		e: he has need for most possible: regular: routines
	Gaze:	-------1
		1) Interpreter looks down
3		og repetisjoner for at han skal kunne klare sæ-
		and repetitions for that he should manage hi-
4		.h(0.3) e: klare å gjøre aktivitetene.
		.h (0.3) e: manage to do the activities.
5		(0.3)
6	Int:	.h (.) e: potrzebne mu są stałe czynności rytunowe i
		.h (.) e: needed for him is regular routine actions and
		----------1

Gaze: 1) Interpreter looks up.
7 powtarzanie po to żeby był
repetitions for him to be
8 w stanie wykonywać te czynności
able to carry out the actions
9 (1.0)
10 Nora: mm. (.) .h (.) e:m det har fungert å bruke
mm. (.) .h (.) e:m it has worked to use
----------1
Gaze: 1) Interpreter looks down.
11 en sånn liste i påkledning, e >så nå:< >skal vi og< lage:
this kind of list in dressing, e >so now:< >we shall also< make:
12 (0.3) flere sånne lignende lister. (0.2) for andre gjøremål.
(0.3) more such similar lists. (0.2) for other activities.
13 (0.5)
14 Int: .h (.) e: (0.4) f- dobrze funkc- się sprawdziła lista
.h (.) e: (0.4) f- go well func- checked the list
----------1----------2----------3
Gaze: 1) Interpreter looks up. 2) Nora looks to screen. 3 Nora sits back
15 wykorzystywana przy ubieraniu się i w związku
used when dressing himself and in connection
16 z tym wykonamy więcej takich list do innych
to that we will do more such lists for other
17 czynności rownież
actions also
18 (1.8)

2 VRI Polish

In the extract above Nora is giving a report. The interpreter is permitted conditional entries into Nora's turn-in-progress so she can interpret what Nora has said so far. Nora temporarily suspends her turn-in-progress so the interpreter can carry out the interpreting. This creates not an ordinary transition-relevance place (TRP), but what seems to be a 'temporary suspension point' (TSP), a term suggested by professor Jan Svennevig (personal communication, April 25th 2016), a point at which Nora temporarily suspends her turn-in-progress allowing the interpreter to produce an entry.

Nora directs her speech to Paulina, and does not turn her upper body toward the camera and screen representing the interpreter during her speech. She does not gaze towards the interpreter neither during turn exchanges nor during the interpreter's utterance, except for in line 14, where Nora casts a glance at the interpreter during the interpreter's production of speech. When the interpreter begins to speak after Nora's utterances in lines 2-4 and 10-12, she does not direct the speech to Nora, but to Paulina. Nora continues gazing at Paulina, while the interpreter speaks. Although it is not easy to define to whom the interpreter directs her

gaze, seeing that she gazes at a screen representing the other participants, the speech is directed to Paulina maintaining a production format (Goffman, 1981:144) similar to Nora's in her production of the utterance.

In line 11 Nora names a "we" that will carry out a later treatment intervention. The interpreter similarly conjugates the Polish verb "wykonamy" in the first person plural, which maintains the same alignment to the actions described by Nora as Nora displays through her talk, although the interpreter is in fact not a part of the "we" Nora refers to. The interpreter thus displays alignment to what is being said as if she was author of the utterance. Schegloff (1996) discussed how participants can accomplish single parties during the communication, and in this extract the interpreter aligns with Nora, producing an utterance directed to Paulina and with the production format of an author. As an incumbent member of Nora's single party in the talk-in-interaction, the interpreter co-authors Nora's utterances in Polish. Both Nora and the interpreter gaze toward Paulina, defining Paulina as the addressed recipient, although Nora and the interpreter are in fact the two exchanging speakership. Perhaps such sequences, where the turn goes back to the previous speaker after the interpreter's turn, require a different manner of collaboration between the participants than in the first extract illustrating an adjacency pair. In extract (1), first Nora spoke, then the interpreter, then Paulina and then the interpreter again. In this case the pattern is different. First Nora speaks, then the interpreter, then Nora, then the interpreter and so on. The monitoring of the turn-in-progress to identify points relevant for turn-exchanges between Nora and the interpreter does not revolve round the transition-relevance places only, but also involve identifying possible temporary suspensions points.

The interpreter acts as an incumbent member of a single party with Nora during this stretch of speech. The interpreter does not a need a visual sign of acceptance or recipiency from Nora before she begins producing her utterance; she produces the pre-beginning while still gazing down, oriented to her own note-taking. The interpreter does not look up until after having produced an audible in-breath, the pre-beginning. She looks up during a short pause in her own speech. Although Nora does not orient her gaze to the interpreter, the interpreter does look to the screen not only when producing speech, but she keeps looking up until they have passed the gap following the interpreter's utterance and until Nora has produced a pre-beginning and begins her utterance after a short pause following the pre-beginning. The interpreter thus seems to orient to the transition-relevance places or gap following the

interpreter's speech as a place in need of coordinating, a place where visual accessibility, perhaps even reciprocal, is desired. Nora, on the other hand gazes at Paulina, not only orientating to her as an addressed recipient of her speech, but also during points in the interaction where the interpreter and Nora are coordinating turn-exchanges.

While the silence after Nora's utterances and before the interpreter's speech are relatively short, both gaps after the interpreter's utterances and before Nora continues her turn-in-progress, occurring in line 9 and 18, are of a considerably longer durability. Although the interpreter is looking down to her note-taking, it seems that she is oriented to the activity of 'interpreting'. The activity of 'interpreting' includes the task of 'coordinating' (Wadensjö, 1998). This implies that the interpreter might be oriented to the possible 'coordinating' and thereby possibly upcoming turn-exchanges also while taking notes. Nora, on the other hand is interchanging between several activities. On the one hand, she is giving her report, and on the other accommodating for the activity of 'interpreting'. Although the silence after the interpreter's utterance is of some length, no other participant's step in to claim the turn; Nora's turn is still in progress.

Although Nora temporarily suspends her turn-in-progress in line 4 and 12, she does not do so in line 11. Nora's utterance in lines 10-12 contains what might be regarded as several TCUs. In later extracts, e.g. extract (3) and (5), the medical professional temporarily suspends the turn, leaving room for interpreting after a unit ending on a continuing intonation. The unit in lines 10-11, "it has worked to use this kind of list in dressing", ends on a rising intonation. However, syntactically and considering size of the TCU, this might be projected as an upcoming possible TSP by the participants. Nora does not indicate that she will suspend the turn, on the contrary, she continues speaking increasing pace just prior to the end of the TCU, producing a rush-through (Clayman, 2013:159). Through doing so, however, she indicates that she is in fact orienting to this as a possible TSP. Nora thus signals that she will continue speaking. I will return to this extract in chapter "5.2.3 Post endings" for a further analysis of the increment she produces in line 12. However, by using rush-through as a means to continue speaking, Nora does seem to orient to the relevance of this point as a possible point of temporary suspension. Seeing that the interpreter is the only participant "competing" with Nora for the turn, it is more likely that Nora orients to the relevance of this as a TSP than a TRP.

The interpreter produces pre-beginnings in each of her turns, in line 6 and line 14. The audible in-breath signals that she is claiming the turn, and it is followed by a short pause before the interpreter starts speaking. Again, like in extract (1), the interpreter produces an audible in-breath followed by a short pause, before the interpreter starts producing an utterance. Although there has already been left room for the interpreter's turn, the interpreter produces the pre-beginning. In the previous example Nora's turn design indicated that this would be the last TCU before speaker transition, it being an interrogative and the first pair part of an adjacency pair. In this example there are other surroundings in which the speaker transition occurs. The TCU is completed syntactically and semantically, and the intonation indicates that the TCU is complete. However, since Nora has been given the turn by the participant that opened the meeting, in this meeting with several participants, she is expected to produce a longer turn than one single TCU.

Not only does Nora permit the interpreter to carry out turns in the midst of her activity of giving report, but furthermore, it may seem like Nora is accommodating for interpreting as an activity within the activity she is carrying out and during her turn-in-progress. Although Nora's turn is permeable, it is most probably so only for the interpreter. The interpreter's contributions in Nora's turn can all be seen to be in the service of the progress (Lerner, 1996:261) of Nora's turn. First, by allowing the interpreter frequent entries into Nora's turn-in-progress, the collaboration between Nora and the interpreter gives Paulina the possibility to give feedback or to ask clarifying questions during the reporting activity. Second, taking frequent turns gives the interpreter smaller information packages to remember and interpret at a time. Cage (1996, as quoted by Svennevig, 2015:199) uses 'installments' about the 'information packages' a speaker might present on bit at a time. There are other participants in the meeting room together with Nora and Paulina, several medical professionals all belonging to different occupational groups. They are not addressed recipients of Nora's utterances, however, they are ratified participants. Considering the ongoing activities, there might only be certain circumstances in which it would be appropriate for other participants than Nora, Paulina and the interpreter to contribute to this ongoing interaction.

In line 10 Nora continues her turn after one of the interpreter's entries in her turn-in-progress. In this case she is still looking at Paulina, and utters "mm" and leaves a pause before she produces an audible in-breath and continues speaking. Such minimal responses seem to occur several times in similar surroundings, e.g. extract (4) and (5). The occurrence of this

minimal response when resuming the turn-in-progress after the temporary suspension of a turn seems to confirm Nora's perception of the interpreter's turn as complete. Nora produces the minimal response while she is physically oriented toward Paulina, thereby sitting with her back to the interpreter. In the collaborative turn-sequences, Lerner (2004:225) describes the receipt slot as the place where the original speaker, in this case Nora, can regain authority, authorship, over their turn. Seeing that Nora most probably does not understand Polish, and this occurs in several of the meetings, (see chapter 5.2.1 for more on the interpreted multi-unit turn), it does not seem like a response to what has been said. This minimal response might serve several functions in the ongoing interaction: 1) signaling that she perceives the interpreting as completed; 2) signaling that she is still claiming the turn; 3) gaining time to resume what she was saying; and, 4) regaining authorship over her utterance.

The extract above has shown how the participants in the interaction have a range of resources available for organizing interpreting and the interpreter's tur-taking. The participants have acted as single parties and designed their turns oriented to the activity of 'interpreting'. Although the other medical professional has oriented to the activity of 'interpreting' by suspending their turn in progress, the interpreter designs her turn with a pre-beginning. In part two of the analysis I will examine similar instances further. In the following chapter I provide an extract illustrating an interpreter initiated repair causing changes in the participant framework.

5.1.3 Interpreter initiated repair

The two previous chapters have shown how the interpreter can align with other participants during the interaction. This next extract is from a repair sequence in the same meeting. The repair sequence illustrates how shifts in the participant framework can occur during the interaction. While the participants in an interpreted conversation are encouraged to orient directly to each other as if there was no interpreter present (Jareg and Pettersen, 2006; Helsedirektoratet, 2011; Tolkeportalen, 2014), the talk-in-interaction displays that the participants do in fact orient to the interpreter in different ways during the talk-in-interaction. Goffman (1981:128) uses the term footing to describe the participants' alignment, set, stance, posture or projected self, and furthermore he describes the change in footing as a change in the alignment the participants take up to themselves and the others present. The change in participant framework displayed in this extract, illustrates a change in alignment where the

interpreter departs from her temporary membership of a party in the interaction and joint authorship with Nora, thus showing another aspect of the interpreter's rights and obligations in the interaction.

In the two previous extracts I have shown some ways in which the interpreting is organized by the participants during the talk-in-interaction. In the following extract, the sequence is initiated by the interpreter. This is a repair sequence initiated by the interpreter, causing some changes to the participant framework in the interaction. Based on Goffman's (1981) 'participant framework' theory, both the interpreter and Nora here display shifts in their orientation to each other and the ongoing interactional activities, 'reporting' and 'interpreting'. This extract is from an earlier part of the same meeting as the extracts above. In this excerpt, the interpreter asks Nora to repeat what she just said. Before asking for repetition, the interpreter produces several vocal utterances getting Nora's attention, thereby establishing recipiency and causing changes in the participant framework.

(3) VRI Polish

1	Nora:	mm. (0.2) e: ja, (0.5) Piotr er jo en fin mann å
		mm. (0.2) e: yes, (0.5) Piotr is after all a good man to
		1----------2
	Gaze:	1) Nora turns to Paulina. 2) Interpreter looks down, then up again.
2		[samarbeide me:,]
		cooperate with,
3		[(noise caused by scuffling on table)]
4		(0.2)
5	Int:	.h
	Gest:	Interpreter turns right ear to screen.
6		(0.2)
7	Nora:	positiv type.
		positive type.
8		(0.6)
9	Int:	e:m:
		1
	Gaze:	1) Nora turns to camera and screen.
10		(0.5)
11	Int:	e- kunne du gjentatt? Tolken fikk ikke med seg hva som ble
		e- could you repeat? The interpreter didn't catch what was
12		sagt.
		said.
13		(0.6)
14:	Nora:	Ja beklager. (0.6) Piotr er jo
		Yes sorry. (0.6) Piotr is after all
		1---------- 2

```
      Gaze:  1) Nora to camera. 2) Nora turns to Paulina and interpreter looks down.
15           en fin mann å samarbeide med.
             a  good  man  to  cooperate  with.
             |
      Gaze: Interpreter looks at screen and down again
16           ((microphone is drawn across the table))
17           en positiv type,
             a  positive  type,
18           (0.3)
19    Int:   .h (.) e: Piotr jest osobą z którą jest łatwo współpracować,
             .h (.)  e:  Piotr is a person with whom it is good to cooperate,
             ----------1
      Gaze:  1) Int. looks up. / Nora turns to screen.
20           jest nast nastawiony pozytywnie
             he is of positive attitude
21           (1.3)
```

3 VRI Polish

In line 1 Nora begins giving her report. In line 3 noise occurs while Nora is speaking. The interpreter produces an audible in-breath in line 5 and tilts her head carefully while slightly turning her right ear to the screen. Nora is gazing at Paulina, thereby sitting with her back to the screen representing the interpreter. She does not seem to react to the pre-beginning the interpreter has produced, nor does she see the interpreter's head movement which indicates that there is some trouble in perception. Nora continues her utterance in line 7, and after a 0.6 second pause in line 8, the interpreter produces a pre-beginning, "ehm". The interpreter is now explicitly initiating a repair sequence.

The interpreter cannot carry out the repair as a part of the team in which she consociated in the previous examples; she must produce an utterance on behalf of herself. In contrast to the previous examples, she starts with a pre-beginning and awaits visual display of recipiency before she starts producing her utterance. In line 9 the interpreter utters "ehm", a vocal pre-beginning followed by silence, thereby getting Nora's attention. In extract (1) and (2) the interpreter produces pre-beginnings, but she starts interpreting without waiting for a visual display of the participant's recipiency. In extract (3), however, she obtains visual display of Nora's recipiency before producing the utterance. Nora turns to the screen immediately when the interpreter produces the pre-beginning, "ehm". It seems that Nora has projected that there might be trouble already while the interpreter is producing the pre-beginning. While the first display of trouble occurred in line 5, this was not taken up by the

other participants. So the repair sequence was initiated when Nora temporarily suspended her turn.

In this extract the pause after Nora's utterance in line 8 was left, most probably, as a temporary suspension point for the interpreter to produce an utterance as a consociate with Nora. This would be the action expected from the interpreter at this point in the conversation. Nora would probably expect the interpreter to produce a Polish utterance at this point of the interaction. Already as the interpreter begins to utter "ehm", she deviates from the more common turn-design in this material, a turn designed with a subtle pre-beginning, e.g. the audible in-breath as in extracts (1), (2), (4), (5) and further examined in chapter "5.2.2 Pre-beginnings". Nora immediately turns to the screen and camera, seemingly orienting to a possible problem, or even a dispreferred format, in the action that was expected carried out by the interpreter at this point. The interpreter has shifted her alignment from acting as a part of the single party joining in co-authorship with Nora, to producing an utterance on her own behalf. And Nora responds to this by turning to the screen already while the interpreter is still producing the pre-beginning. Nora, like the interpreter, shifts from acting as a part of the party directing their speech toward Paulina, to acting as a possible recipient for the interpreter's upcoming utterance. Nora and the interpreter are no longer acting as a party, but are now directing their speech to each other.

In line 11 the interpreter begins producing her utterance in Norwegian, not in Polish as would be expected if the interpreter was carrying out the interpreting. She asks for a repetition of the utterance with the pronoun "du" (you), referring to Nora who was the previous speaker, after which she refers to herself as "tolken" (the interpreter). In the two previous extracts, the interpreter took on the other participants' words, acting as an animator and co-author, not only memorizing Nora's words, but having to adjust what is said to the other language and taking upon herself the same production format as Nora in her utterances. In this extract the interpreter acts as principal for her utterance, making this clear by referring to herself not as "I", but as "the interpreter". After obtaining the participant's visual display of recipiency, the interpreter, while explicitly referring to herself as "the interpreter", initiates a repair sequence. Although the interpreter used the pronoun "you", which could result in need for clarification seeing as there are several possible recipients in the room, the participants treat Nora as the only possible recipient, seeing that she was the last and only person speaking before the repair initiation. Yet, the interpreter chooses to refer to herself as "the interpreter". Skaaden

(2013:154) recommends that the interpreter makes it clear that it is the interpreter who is requesting the repair if there is need for any repair during the interpreter's rendition of what is being said. Although the interpreter probably could have referred to herself as "I" instead of "the interpreter" and it would still be clear to the participants who it was that initiated the repair, this way of formulating the repair leaves little room for misunderstanding and it explicates the interpreter's principal-ness to this specific utterance. The interpreter not only makes it clear that she is the one in need for the repetition, she also identifies the problem as being the interpreter not having heard, thereby taking upon herself the responsibility for the problem.

Nora has been nominated next-speaker by the interpreter and upon the interpreter's pre-beginning establishing recipiency, she turns her upper body so she is facing the video conference equipment opposite to Paulina. Nora now has her back to Paulina, and answers the question "could you repeat" with "yes" and an apology directed toward the camera and screen. Then, starting a very accurate repetition of what she just said, Nora turns back again to face Paulina, the original addressee of her utterance, turning her back to the video camera, microphone and screen. Although the interpreter initiated this repair sequence, and the need and relevance for repetition was acknowledged by Nora, thus ratifying the interpreter as a participant who has the right to hear what is said, the actual repetition is directed to Paulina. Paulina does not need to hear the utterance in Norwegian, it will be interpreted into Polish assuming that the interpreter will hear the utterance this time. The interpreter is the one who has requested the repetition as a result of not having heard and consequently not being able to interpret what was said; Nora ratifies this by accepting the action of repeating thereby displaying an accept of the interpreting as an activity within the activity. By turning back to Paulina, Nora displays an orientation toward the normative expectation that when communicating through an interpreter, the participants should direct their utterances to each other and not to the interpreter. Nora has changed footing again, already before the repair sequence is completed, from directing her speech to the interpreter to directing her speech to Paulina, now she assumes alignment with the interpreter, accommodating the position for consociating with the interpreter again, despite that is was the interpreter requested the repetition.

Nora has oriented to Paulina as the addressed recipient of the repetition although it was the interpreter who requested it. At the same time, however, while Nora turns to face

Paulina again, thereby turning away from the actual initiator of the repair sequence, one of the other participants present in the meeting room starts moving the microphone along the table, closer to an area within the physical direction where Nora is now directing her speech. The woman pushes the microphone along the table causing a noise heard on the interpreter's side of the technology. Though the act itself causes noise and possible disturbance, this seems to be a way of orienting toward the interpreting and the technology as a part of the meeting activities in which the participants are engaging and in which the activity 'interpreting' is carried out.

Although the interpreter first indicated trouble visually, this was not perceived by the other participants. This caused the interpreter to initiate a repair sequence at a point where Nora had temporarily suspended her turn-in-progress. I included this extract in the analysis as it provides a pronounced example of the participants' changes in stance and alignment to the activities being carried out and to each other. The participants thus orient to interpreting as an ongoing activity and the interpreter's rights and obligations during the talk-in-interaction and simultaneously to the overarching activities of the meeting, here 'giving report'.

5.1.4 Summary

In the extracts above, the participants have organized the interpreting in a way that gives the interpreter conditional entries in another participant's turn-in-progress. The interpreter is not only permitted to contribute to the progress of the turn in this way, but in these extracts Nora leaves room for the interpreter to carry out the interpreting. The interpreter acts as an incumbent member of a single party with Nora, and later the interpreter will join another participant's party. This way of co-organizing talk has similarities to how participants in interaction might tell stories together or act as parties in interaction.

In all three extracts above, the interpreter designs her turns with a pre-beginning. The pre-beginning can be designed to establish recipiency or as a signal of turn-claiming. The pre-beginnings in these extracts are followed by a short pause in which the interpreter looks up from her notes to the camera and screen before she starts producing speech. The audible in-breath, the short pause, the gaze and the upper body movement could all be ways of ensuring recipiency and reducing the risk of overlapping speech. However, in all three extracts, with one exception in extract (3), Nora and the other participants do not gaze towards the screen when the interpreter is producing the pre-beginning. Nora directs her speech toward Paulina,

which results in Nora having her back turned to the camera and screen representing the interpreter when the interpreter indicates that she is about to start speaking. Not only does Nora's orientation toward Paulina during the interpreter's speech come in the way of any visual access between the interpreter and Nora, it also comes in the way of Nora seeing any visual ques, gestures or signals from the interpreter during her speech. The interpreter does not treat Nora's visual orientation as problematic. The interpreter looks down, taking notes during Nora's speech, so she does not display any use of visual access to the situation during Nora's speech. And she looks up first after having produced the audible in-breath, all except for the first extract where the interpreter looks up all the way through Nora's utterance, perhaps projecting already early that this is a question to Paulina.

The participants display changes in footing during the interaction. In the first extract Nora and Paulina are looking at each other, while the interpreter looks at the screen. The camera is just above the screen and thereby creates an illusion of eye contact if they were looking at the screen and camera at their end of the technology. In the second extract Nora and the interpreter are carrying out a multi-unit turn through collaboration where Nora gives the interpreter conditional access to the communication through temporary suspension of the turn. In this sequence, the interpreter speaks as if she were Nora, thus aligning with Nora through verb conjugation and use of pronouns. In the final extract, however, the interpreter does not align with Nora in her utterance. She produces a pre-beginning, this time "ehm" and waits for visual display of recipiency before she continues, this time using the recipient pronoun "du" (you) about Nora and "tolken" (the interpreter) about herself. Although the repair itself causes a shift in participant framework, where Nora is now responding to the interpreter, the repetition the interpreter asks for is actually directed to Paulina.

I have analyzed some extracts with emphasis on certain features of interpreted talk. In the following and second part of the analysis, I will present a more thorough analysis of same or similar phenomena, however focusing on comparing video interpreted and on-site interpreted talk.

5.2 Part two: Comparative analysis

In the first part of the analysis I included three extracts showing different ways in which the participants organize the interpreting and how the participant framework can be organized and

re-organized during the talk-in-interaction. In this second part of the analysis I will present several extracts illustrating different phenomena which I will use as my point of departure for the following comparative analysis of how the participants organize video remote interpreting and on-site interpreting. The analysis will evolve around the co-organizing of interpreting as an activity, especially focusing on pre-beginnings and post-endings, seeing that these occur in this finely monitored point of interaction where exchange of speakership occurs.

5.2.1 Co-organizing interpreting

In this first part of the comparative analysis, I have included two extracts showing how the participants co-organize the interpreting as a part of the interactional activity during their production of multi-unit turns. In chapter "5.1.2 Multi-unit turns", the single extract illustrated how the interpreter participated as an incumbent member of a single party during stretches of talk in the interaction. The extracts below show similar collaborative actions carried out by the interpreter and a medical professional comparing how this type of collaboration is organized by the participants with the interpreter at a remote location and with the interpreter on-site. The first extract is with video interpreting, like extract (2), and the second is with the interpreter present at the same location as the other participants.

In the first extract below, extract (4), medical professionals are meeting with the patient and next of kin. Similar to the meeting in the first part of the analysis, this meeting starts with an introduction and a round around the table. Similar to in extract (2), the medical professional, Nelly, talks while the interpreter produces utterances intermittently within Nelly's turn.

(4) VRI Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian

1	Nelly:	e::m ts ja. .h (.)men da e: kan vi jo ta:
		e::m ts yes. .h (.) but then e: we can well take
	Gaze:	Nelly looks at patient and interpreter looks down
2		en liten e runde: ts rundt bordet med >de som<
		a little e round ts around the table with >those who<
3		er her. Og prøve å definere mål e:
		are here. And try to define aims e:
4		>i fire uker< fremover.
		>for four weeks< ahead.
5	Int:	.hhh (0.3) Dobro onda ćemo napraviti jednu rundu razgovora
		.hhhh (0.3) okay then we will do another round of talks
6		sa svima nama oko ovoga stola i definirat ćemo

		With all of us around the table and we will define
		----------1
	Gaze:	1) Patient and next of kin glance at screen
8		naše ciljeve za sljedeće četiri sedmice
		Our objectives for the next four weeks
9		(2.2)
	Gaze:	Interpreter is still looking up and nods carefully.
10	Boro:	u redu
		alright
	Gaze:	at Nelly
11		(0.4)
12	Int:	[greit]
		[alright]
13	Nelly:	[.h] nå- (0.4) ja. nå er fysioterapeut dessverre
		.h now- (0.4) yes. now the physiotherapist is unfortunately
14		fraværende i forbindelse med [((...))]
		absent because of [(…)]
15		[((coughing))]
		----------1
	Gaze:	1) Interpreter looks up and makes a grimace
16	Nelly:	men e: .h (0.5) e:mm ja. (.) e: vi har fått litt refer<at>
		but e: .h (0.5) e:mm yes. (.) e: we have got a little rep<ort>
17		på hva dere skal ha fokus på videre.
		on what you will focus on forward.
		1
	Gaze:	1) Interpreter looks down
18		(0.2)
19	Int:	.hh (.) dobro nažalost odsutna je fizioterapeutkinja
		.hh (.) well unfortunately absent the fysiotherapist
		----------1
	Gaze:	1) Interpreter looks up
20		sada nije mogla doći ali imamo jedan mali referat vezano za
		now could not come but we have a little paper regarding how
21		to kako je ona dosada pratila situaciju
		how is it so far the situation
22		(2.5)
23	Nelly:	mm. (0.6) ja. .h Da kan vi kanskje begynne med
		mm. (0.6) yes. .h Then can we maybe begin with
24		ergoterapeut e:m?
		occupational therapist e:m?
		----------1
	Gaze:	1) Interpreter looks down
25		(0.4)

4 VRI Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian

Nelly introduces the round around the table in line 1-4. After Nelly has completed the utterance in line 4, the interpreter produces a pre-beginning, an audible in-breath, leaving no

gap between Nelly's utterance and the interpreter's. She does leave a pause after the audible in-breath in her turn, before beginning her utterance. Nelly does not look at the screen representing the interpreter during her utterance nor during the interpreter's speech. However, she has oriented to the act of 'interpreting' by suspending her turn. Like in extract (2) and (4), although the interpreter's exchanges speakership with Nelly, she acts as an incumbent member of a single party directing the speech to Boro and Belma, the patient and next of kin. In this case, the interpreter produces the pre-beginning immediately after Nelly has completed her utterance. Although the interpreter is claiming the turn actively through production of a pre-beginning, Nelly does seem to have oriented to this point as a possible point to suspend her turn-in-progress seeing that no overlapping talk occurs.

After the interpreter completes her utterance, a 2.2 second silence occurs in line 9, during which the interpreter continues to gaze at the screen. Nelly gazes at Boro and Belma and her computer. After the 2.2 second gap, Boro utters "u redu" (alright). Similar to extract (1), where Nora asked Paulina a question and a 1.7 second pause occurred between the interpreter's rendition of the question and Paulina's response, a long pause occurs between the interpreter's speech and the response is received on the interpreter's side of the technology. In the earlier part of the analysis I discussed whether this could be caused by the technology or if it was due to an dispreferred response. In this extract, Boro's response might be a result of the long silence and Nelly's and the interpreter's gaze during the silence. Boro's response is not produced as a second part of an adjacency pair as Paulina's utterance was in extract (1), and seeing that Nelly has not produced a first pair part or nominated a next-speaker yet, it is not likely that Nelly is expecting a response at this point. In ordinary interaction, with no interpreting, both speakers and recipients orient to the TCU-endings as possible transition-relevance places and possible places of speaker exchange. In this extract, Nelly most probably does not know Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian (BCS) which was spoken by the interpreter. Therefore, she most probably cannot monitor the progress of the interpreter's utterance to the same level of detail as if she did understand the language. This might cause Nelly to wait longer rather than shorter before resuming her turn-in-progress. Nelly does not gaze at the interpreter during her utterance or the silence following, she does however, gaze at Boro and at her computer. And Boro does understand what is said by the interpreter. After this silence in which Nelly is gazing at him part of the time, he produces a response. It might be that Nelly's gaze and the silence are what call for his response, a response which might not have been produced in a similar situation with no interpreting and no technology.

The interpreter renders Boro's utterance in Norwegian simultaneously with Nelly producing an audible in-breath indicating that she is about to start speaking. Nelly utters "nå" (now) in line 13 before she cuts herself off. The interpreter's turn length is predetermined by the length of the previous speaker's utterance, not necessarily in time but in what content should be rendered. Nelly's cut off indicates that she recognizes the interpreter's utterance as possibly incomplete. Through cutting herself off, she might possibly be orienting to avoiding overlap. However, the interpreter does not continue speaking; she has already completed her utterance. After a 0.4 second pause in line 13, Nelly starts speaking again. Nelly does not continue where she cut off, but produces the complete utterance over again, thereby restarting. Despite the possible problem regarding potential overlapping speech with the interpreter indicated by Nelly in line 13, causing her to cut off her speech, Nelly does not gaze at the interpreter, but continues to gaze at Boro. Like in extract (2), the medical professional seems to avoid gazing at the screen, even in complex surroundings where gaze might offer an extra resource in coordinating speaker exchanges. Although Nelly does not gaze at the interpreter during the interpreter's speech, she does orient to the activity of interpreting through leaving room for the interpreter to produce her utterance.

During Nelly's utterance in line 14, a participant in the room coughs, making the speech uttered during the cough unperceivable from the interpreter's location. This causes the interpreter to look up and make a grimace. However, she does initiate a repair verbally, neither during this point in the interaction nor later. If the medical professional had gazed at the screen at this moment, the grimace itself might be perceived as a sign of trouble or even initiate a repetition. Instead, the interpreter's nonverbal signal of trouble goes completely unnoticed.

When Nelly's utterance has come to a possible point of suspension in line 9, the point in which she might let the interpreter produce a conditional entry, she stops speaking and continues to look at Boro. She does not indicate that this might be a possible point of suspension by other means than stopping her speech. The interpreter is looking down at this point, and after a short silence, she carries out what I have previously described as the more common gaze pattern for the interpreters in these extracts. The silence between Nelly's utterance and the interpreter's pre-beginning is short, leaving it safe to assume that the interpreter has projected this as an upcoming TSP, a point at which she can start interpreting. The interpreter is oriented to her note-taking during Nelly's speech and produces the pre-

beginning while still orientated to her notes. The pre-beginning signals that she is claiming a turn, and she shifts from her 'listening position' where she is visually oriented to her note-taking to her 'talking position', where she looks up at the screen, only glancing briefly at her notes. Although Nelly continues to gaze at Boro and Belma during the interpreter's utterance, the interpreter keeps gazing at the screen, the visual representation of the participants. She does not return to her 'listening position' until after Nelly has produced a pre-beginning and begun her utterance again in line 16. In both this extract and the previous extracts, the interpreters seem to keep their gaze lifted during speaker exchange after they have completed their utterance. Through temporarily suspending her turn, Nelly orients to the activity of interpreting. However, she maintains visual contact with Boro and Belma as addressed recipients of her utterance. By continuing to gaze at the addressed recipients of her utterance, Nelly can gain access to potential nonverbal feedback produced by her addressed recipients. On the other hand, she might lose touch of the fine mechanics regulating the turn exchanges between her and the interpreter. In addition to the effect the technology might have on the interaction, perhaps causing extended pauses, the lack of visual contact between the medical professional and the interpreter might be a reason for the longer silences during turn-exchanges after the interpreter's turn. Considering the topic at this point of interaction, procedural information about the meeting itself, it seems more that Nadia is oriented to Boro and Belma not for possible feedback, but rather the normative understanding that the interlocutors in interpreted interaction should address their speech directly to each other.

After the interpreter has completed her utterance in line 21, a 2.5 second silence occurs in line 22. Nelly still does not gaze at the interpreter during this silence, but continues to look Boro and Belma. Dimitrova's (1991) advice nuances the common notion and often recommended practice that the interlocutors direct their speech to each other, by recommending that the interlocutors should gaze alternately at the interpreter and the other participants while the interpreter is speaking. In both extract (2) and so far in extract (4) the medical professionals have mainly avoided to gaze at the interpreter. The long silences between the interpreter's speech and the medical professional's resumption of speech might be a result of this. Although the medical professionals do seem to accommodate for the activity of 'interpreting', gaze does not seem to be used as a resource in coordinating speaker exchanges. Extracts (2) and (4) may indicate that the participants prefer longer gaps to overlapping speech. This might be due to the activity of 'interpreting' where information might not get interpreted if overlapping talk occurs, or perhaps due to the media, where

overlapping speech can cause complications and problems with hearing. However, the long silences do seem to effect the way the participants understand the communication. On the one hand, the technology might contribute to camouflage participants' display of alignment or stance. On the other hand, extended silence, might affect how the participants understand the previous utterance.

Nelly produces a minimal response in line 23, similar to what Nora did when resuming her turn in extract (2). Like Nora, Nelly is physically oriented to Boro and not to the interpreter, although it seems that the minimal response functions as a receipt or signal of understanding that the interpreter has now finished her utterance. At the same time, it may function as a signal of turn claiming, allowing Nelly to reclaim and gain authority over the turn-in-progress. Nelly signals that she understands the interpreter's utterance as completed and at the same time that she will continue speaking. This minimal response in these environments might thus serve both reactive and projective functions simultaneously, it serves as a signal of acknowledgement and a signal of turn-claiming.

In line 16, Nelly produces several pre-beginnings before she produces the turn. This turn-initial delay with several intra-turn silences and pre-beginnings, might be a way of ensuring that she is claiming the turn while she is still preparing her upcoming utterance. Seeing that the next utterance is a directive, giving the turn to the occupational therapist, Nelly might be actively avoiding to talk aloud while checking that she has said everything she had planned to say. In the interpreted interaction, all utterances can initiate the activity of 'interpreting'. By avoiding to produce comments while gathering her thoughts, and at the same time continuously claiming the turn, Nelly might actually save time and keep focus in the meeting. The next TCU is a directive, suggesting that the aforementioned round around the table will start with the occupational therapist.

During the entire stretch of talk in this extract, there are several participants present in the meeting room. Although all the participants present are ratified participants in the meeting, not all are addressed recipients of Nelly's speech. Although the first utterance of Nelly's, in line 1, where she suggests that they can take around a table, is directed to Boro, the patient, and perhaps Belma, this is an information for the patient, not a directive. She produces the utterance with "vi" (we) as the subject, most probably referring to the medical team, and not to the "we" constituted by the participants in the meeting being present at the same place at the same time. This is further underpinned by her following utterance in line 2-

3: “with those who are here”. During the different medical professionals’ turns, they will refer to work they do with Boro. When Nelly informs about the following procedure in the meeting in this extract, the other medical professionals present might already be acquaint with the agenda of the meeting and the form it has. So when Nelly initially takes upon herself the role of a chair in the meeting, it is most likely that she and the other medical professionals present will not only act as a team during the meeting but also as a single party during the stretches of talk in which Boro is the addressed recipient. While the interpreter acts as an incumbent member of the party accomplished through the interaction, the team in which the medical professionals speak on behalf of does not cease to exist after the interaction (Djordjilovic, 2012).

This extract has shown how the interpreter assumes alignment as an incumbent member of a single party during stretches of talk, and how the medical professional orients to the activity of ‘interpreting’ through suspending the turn-in-progress so the interpreter can carry out the activity. The medical professional directed her utterances to first Boro and Belma and finally the occupational therapist through use of gaze, and did not use gaze to coordinate speaker exchanges between the interpreter and herself. She did however, glance at the interpreter occasionally. The lack of visual uptake during this stretch of speech caused the interpreter’s display of trouble in line 15 to go un-noticed. The participants seem to orient to avoiding overlap and redundant speech. However, this can also cause extended gaps which in itself can cause extra responses and altered understandings of the prior utterance.

Similarly, extract (5) below demonstrates a multi-unit turn with the interpreter on-site. At this point in the meeting, the doctor is giving the Polish speaking mother information about what they will do during this meeting and is doing so by producing a multi-unit turn. The interpreter produces utterances in between the doctor’s turns. In both line 8 and in line 17 the doctor starts her turns with the same minimal response as above, “mm.”, before she continues talking.

(5) F2F Polish

1	Naomi:	Så vi ↑snakker litt sammen ↑først,
		So we ↑talk a bit together ↑first,
		----------1
	Gaze:	1) Interpreter looks down
2		Og så skal jeg lytte:- undersøke han litt ↑etterpå,
		And then shall I listen- examine him a bit ↑afterwards,
		----------1----------2

3	Gaze:	1) The interpreter glances at Naomi. 2) Naomi gazes at the interpreter.
4		(0.6)
5	Int:	.h (.) ((looks up)) W związku z tym
		In this regard
6		najpierw trochę porozmawiamy potem go zbadam.
		First we talk a little afterwards I examine him.
7		(0.3)
	Gaze:	Naomi looks at interpreter and turns to mum
8	Naomi:	mm. (.) ((interpreter looks down)) Det blir bare
		mm. (.) It will only be
9		at jeg lytter på brystet foran og bak,
		that I listen to the chest infront and behind,
10		(0.2)
11	Int:	.h [To bę]dzie tylko osłuchanie klatki piersiowej
		.h [it will] only be auscultation of the chest
12	Naomi:	[e:m-]((gazing at interpreter, nods))
13		z przodu i z tyłu
		on the front and on the rear
14		(0.2)
15	Naomi:	mm. (0.5) .h (.) og så skal vi se om vi finner en sånn
		mm. .h and then we shall see if we find a
16		blodtrykksmansjett for barn (Int looks down))
		Blood pressure cuff for children
17		>for nå hadde de bare en sånn< stor ((int looks up)) der.
		Cause now they only had one of those big ones there
18		(.)
19	Int:	.h=
20	Naomi:	=så vi får måle blodtrykket [hans] også.
		So we get to measure blood pressures his too
21	Int:	[.h]
22		(.)
23	Int:	I zobaczymy czy znajdziemy taki mankiet do
		And then we see if we find a such cuff for
24		badania ci-ciśnienia krwi który będzie odpowiedniego
		measure pres- pressure blood which will be appropriate
25		rozmiaru dla dziecka.
		size for children.
26		((Naomi glances at interpreter))
27		(0.2)

5 F2F Polish

In line 1 and 2 Naomi is describing the plan or agenda for this meeting. Although there is most probably no written agenda available for the mother and child, perhaps the medical professionals have procedures and common practice indicating what they should do during the meeting. The doctor describes the activities they will be carrying out during this meeting. In this meeting there are also several participant's present who do not speak during this extract, but are yet ratified participants in the meeting. Considering that this is a meeting and

institutional interaction, like in the previous extracts illustrating multi-unit turns, it would be expected that Naomi produces a multi-unit turn ending first at the point where she has nominated a next-speaker. However, like in the previous extracts, the meeting is interpreted and the question that arises is then: at which point will the interpreter begin to interpret?

Using the word 'first' in her utterance in line 1, Naomi indicates that this will be a more complex TCU, a compound TCU (Selting, 2000:483). An ordinary transition relevance place will not occur until the final part of the compound TCU. The first part of the TCU in line 1 not only contains the word 'first' indicating that a latter element will be presented as well, but it is furthermore produced with a rising intonation indicating that there will be a continuation. Naomi produces a second part of the compound TCU shortly after. However, also the second part of the TCU in line 2 ends on a rising intonation. While the rising intonation often indicates that the speaker will continue, extract (3) illustrated how a rising intonation did not exclude the occurrence of a temporary suspension point in a turn-in-progress in which interpreting could be carried out. In this extract, in contrast to extract (2) and (4) with the interpreter participating via video, Naomi turns to the interpreter while approaching the possible TSP in line 2. The interpreter is looking down at her notes at this point in the communication. A 0.6 second silence occurs in line 4, after which the interpreter produces a pre-beginning similar to those produced by the interpreters in the extracts with video remote interpreting, an audible in-breath. The interpreter is still focusing on her note-taking. Considering the rising intonation on Naomi's utterance, she might not have projected the upcoming TSP, but might recognize this as a possible TSP during the silence. After having produced the audible in-breath, thus claiming the turn, the interpreter looks up from her notes during a short pause. In the short pause, the interpreter lifts her head and gaze and thereafter proceeds with the turn, with her head lifted and gaze focusing on the mother. The interpreter's turn-design is similar to the turn-designs with the interpreter participating from a remote location. During the 0.3 second gap occurring after the interpreter's speech and before Naomi resumes her turn-in-progress, Naomi gazes at the interpreter again. Naomi thus orients to the coordination of the speaker exchanges, and uses gaze as a resource in this coordination. She can thereby resume her turn just 0.3 seconds after the interpreter's completion, leaving a much shorter pause than what occurred in the video remote interpreting.

Naomi turns to the mum in line 8, and like Nora in extract (2) and Nelly in extract (4), Naomi starts the next utterance with "mm". Like in the previous extracts, Naomi is turned

toward the Polish speaking mother during the production of the minimal response. Quite similar to the previous examples, this minimal response seems to signal that Naomi understands that the interpreter's utterance in lines 5-6 has come to completion, while at the same time signalling that Naomi will shortly resume her temporarily suspended turn-in-progress. Naomi can thereby simultaneously address the mother as a recipient and orients to the coordinating of turn exchanges with the interpreter, thus acting as a part of the single party with the interpreter and accommodating for the ongoing activity of 'interpreting'. During the short pause following the minimal response, the interpreter looks down to her notes again. Her visual accessibility having been available past the speaker exchange point, when she shifts her gaze from being lifted and back to her notes, she indicates that she has completed her utterance and is resuming her note-taking. Although Naomi's turn in line 8 resembles the turn-design Nora and Nelly also produced when resuming their turns-in-progress with pre-beginnings preceding the turn, Naomi resumes her turn producing a pre-beginning after 0.3 seconds, compared to Nora's 1.0 second in extract (2) and Nelly's 2.5 second in extract (4).

In this extract, similar to what occurs in the meetings with video remote interpreting, the medical professional produces a minimal response before resuming her turn-in-progress. In this extract with the interpreter present, however, Naomi gazes at the interpreter during the short pause in line 7 preceding the minimal response. Naomi gazes at the mother while she is speaking, thus orienting to the Polish speaking mother as an addressed recipient of what she is saying. Through shifting gaze throughout the speech, she orients not only to the interpreting as an activity through temporary suspension of turns-in-progress like Nora and Nelly in extract (2) and (4), but she also orients to the interpreter as a participant, although with differing rights and obligations than the other participants, and their collaboration on carrying out the turn-taking. Naomi's glances at the interpreter do not seem to take focus from the mother as addressed recipient. The interpreter confirms this by keeping her gaze toward the mother during her speech.

Naomi resumes her turn-in-progress in line 8, and in line 9 she has produced what could be a syntactically complete TCU ending on a continuing intonation. The TCU in line 2 was designed similarly. However, no problems arose when the interpreter produced a pre-beginning in line 5 after a silence in line 4. Naomi and the interpreter thus treated this as a temporary suspension point, where Naomi gives the interpreter the possibility to produce an entry in her ongoing turn-in-progress. After a short silence in line 10, the interpreter produces

a pre-beginning followed by a short pause. And while the interpreter begins producing her utterance, Naomi produces a vocal pre-beginning, "ehm". Naomi does not continue, but lets the interpreter speak. Naomi gazes at the interpreter while she produces the pre-beginning, and nods to the interpreter while letting the interpreter continue. Towards the end of interpreter's utterance, the interpreter turns to Naomi, Naomi still gazing at the interpreter. After just a short silence, 0.2 seconds, in line 14, Naomi begins speaking again in line 15. Both Naomi and the interpreter orient to the turn exchanges through use of gaze. And although they do not direct speech to each other, the gaze is used as a resource in their collaboration.

In line 15 like in line 8, Naomi produces a minimal response. After a 0.5 second pause, she produces an audible in-breath, yet another pre-beginning followed by another short pause before she resumes her turn-in-progress. She starts the turn-in-progress with "and" connecting this utterance to her preceding one. This time the interpreter does not look down just after Naomi has uttered the pre-beginning. She looks down in line 16, approaching what could be projected as a possible completion of a TCU and a possible TSP. Naomi continues in line 17 by picking up pace when she approaches what might be considered by the participants to be a possible TRP or a possible TSP. She keeps the turn by producing a 'rush through'. The interpreter looks up after Naomi's hurried speech. After the possible completion of this TCU in line 17 and a short silence in line 18, the interpreter signals that she is claiming the turn through an audible in-breath. However, Naomi continues in line 20. This time producing what seems to be an increment to the prior speech. While increments are often produced in settings displaying lack of uptake (Ford, Fox and Thompson, 2002), the interpreted discourse often lacks feedback (Skaaden, 2013; Dimitrova, 1991). The pause preceding the increment is short, and it might perhaps seem unlikely that Naomi is already pursuing displays of uptake at this point. Although there seems to be an inferred understanding among the participants that Naomi gets her turn back at the end after silencing and thereby causing a temporary suspension point, the information Naomi has given at this point might cause questions or other understandings of the information if it is interpreted before she has produced the expansion. In this extract Naomi giving information about an examination she will carry out shortly. She explains that first they will speak together, then she will carry out the auscultation, and then she needs to find a blood pressure cuff. At the point of possible TSP, Naomi has not introduced the next part of the examination explicitly, measuring blood pressure. She has only mentioned that they need to find a blood pressure cuff. Adding this

information as an increment might serve to reduce the utterance's possible ambiguity and thereby further serve to reduce the possibility of causing a clarifying question or changing the course of the meeting. I will discuss the matter of increments further "5.2.3 Post-endings".

Although Naomi directs her speech to the Polish speaking mother, she gazes at the interpreter several times during the interaction. She gazes at the interpreter both when she is allowing the interpreter an entry in her speech in line 3 and before resuming speech in line 7, and 26. The interpreter lifts her head after producing audible in-breaths and before she is about to speak. She keeps her head up and gaze lifted not until she has finished speaking, but until Naomi has begun speaking again in line 8, consequently keeping her gaze available past the transition-relevance place. By keeping visual availability through the gaps following the interpreter's turn, the interpreter seems to orient to these points as points in need of extra attention or possible for trouble. Keeping the gaze lifted might also be a way for the interpreter to be attentive of possible feedback from the mother and possible indications of lack of understanding displayed by the mother during her speech.

In line 11 and 12 a potential problem occurs when Naomi produces a pre-beginning while the interpreter is simultaneously beginning to speak. Naomi's gaze was oriented toward the interpreter in line 11-12, thereby following the design resembling the transitions in the previous exchanges. After withdrawing, Naomi fixes her gaze to the interpreter during the interpreter's speech, and the interpreter does not look down when Naomi has begun her next utterance in line 15. The interpreter delays looking down until line 16, when Naomi has more than just begun the next utterance. In contrast to the previous turn-beginnings in this extract, the interpreter this time looks up before Naomi has completed a TCU in line 17. She orients a possible transition-relevance place after a short silence in line 18 and has produced a pre-beginning when Naomi continues speaking in line 20. This does not cause any overlapping speech. The interpreter produces a new pre-beginning, an audible in-breath, in line 21 and begins speaking in line 22 after a short pause.

I have previously argued that technology might be a factor causing extended gaps after the interpreter's turns in the video interpreted interaction. However, the reduced visual perceptibility and accessibility in the situation, seeing that the medical professional is gazing at the patient or next of kin and not the interpreter during the interpreter's turn, turn-endings and gaps following the turn, may also cause some delay in resuming the turn-in-progress. As suggested by Hutchby (2001) video mediated interaction promises to be more similar to face

to face interaction than the media's affordances actually allow. Seeing that hand gestures and movement of head, upper body and torso are more perceivable also in periphery vision during face to face interaction than in video mediated interaction, the increased perceptibility when the interpreter is at the same place, might allow shorter gaps between speakers without causing overlap or other problems.

In both the extracts with video interpreting illustrating the collaboration during multi-unit turns, extract (2) and (4), and the extract with on-site interpreting illustrating the multi-unit tur, extract (5), the medical professionals resumed to several of their turns by producing a minimal response perhaps signaling an understanding of the interpreting as completed and as a means to reclaim the turn. A pronounced difference between the video interpreted extracts and the on-site interpreted extract, is the use of gaze in the coordination of turns. In extract (2) the interpreter is the only one who shifts her gaze, although she shifts between orienting to her note-taking when the medical professional produces speech and orienting to the screen during her production of speech. She looks down again when Nora begins to speak again. In extract (4) Nelly looks at the patient while the interpreter provides the rendition and while she produces the receipt after the interpreter's conditional entry in her turn-in-progress. In the pause between her production of the minimal response and the utterance directed to the occupational therapist, Nelly turns to the occupation therapist. In extract (5), with on-site interpreting, Naomi glances briefly at the interpreter several times during the extract.

While the extract with on-site interpreting illustrates how the medical professional uses gaze actively as a resource in the coordinating of speaker exchanges, gazing at the interpreter recurrently did not cause any uncertainty in respect to who was the addressed recipient of her speech. The speech was directed to the mother. Although the interpreter in the on-site interpreted setting received more visual attention thus perhaps being more visible in the interaction, the turn-taking involving the interpreter seemed more flexible in the on-site interpreted setting. The medical professional used in the on-site interpreted interaction, and it seems that the turn-taking is more flexible and efficient when the medical professional gazes at the interpreter or screen representing the interpreter while approaching the gap or during the gap after the interpreter's speech.

Although this is a qualitative analysis, and not quantitative, I have calculated the average lengths of silences connected to speaker exchanges in multi-unit turns occurring in my material. I found that the silence before the interpreter's speech is shorter than the silence

that occurs after the interpreter's rendition and before the medical professional resumes her turn-in-progress. The silence before the interpreter's utterance was shorter in video remote interpreting than on-site. Comparing the length of the pauses when the interpreter is looking up to when the interpreter is looking down, the silence was shorter when the interpreter was already looking up and not oriented to her notes. When looking at the silence occurring after the interpreter's speech and before the medical professional resumed their turn in multi-unit turns, the silence was 123% longer in remote interpreting compared to on-site interpreting. And furthermore, the silence before the medical professional resumed their turn in on-site interpreting was 49% longer when the medical professional did not gaze in the interpreter's direction approximate to the possible turn-exchange. Similarly, the silence in remote interpreting was approximately 55% longer when the medical professional did not gaze in the interpreter's direction approximate to the possible turn-exchange. Now, these numbers must be taken with a grain of salt. First and foremost, the numbers are based on too few occurrences to generalize the findings. Second, I have not measured the length of silence under 0.2 seconds, leaving the numbers inaccurate. Third, the environments in which the silences occur, differ. Fourth, there are some discrepancies; Several extended silences occur during video remote interpreting. These might be exceptions. Fifth, overlapping talk has not been taken in account in this summary. And sixth, the material includes less on-site interpreting than video interpreting. However, the short silences between the medical professional's suspended turn and the interpreter's pre-beginning in video interpreting might be worth noting, as it might seem that reduced perceptibility due to the media itself, might cause the interpreter to be alert and ready to claim the turn at very short notice.

In the extract with the interpreter on-site the medical professional used gaze to a further extent then in the extracts without. In these extracts the medical professional and interpreter, similar to in extract (2), assumed alignment and acted as incumbent members of a single party. The participants at the institute did not perceive the interpreter's non-verbal indication of trouble in extract (4). In this chapter, the medical professionals have also used resources like rush troughs and increments as a possible way of way of managing orienting to the interpreter's turn-taking.

5.2.2 Pre-beginnings

While the previous chapters have explored how the participants have organized the turn-taking to accommodate for the activity of 'interpreting', this chapter focuses on the interpreter's turn-design. In the extracts presented so far the interpreter has designed her utterances with a pre-beginning, with only few exceptions. The pre-beginning is not a part of the turn, according to Depperman (2013), but serves as a means for turn-claiming and to establish joint orientation to the upcoming turn.

In the extracts from meetings with the interpreter participating in the interaction via video, the medical professionals do not seem to use gaze as a way of coordinating the interpreting within their turn-in-progress. However, they do seem to leave an opening for the interpreting during the ongoing turn, and they do seem to orient to a temporary suspension of turns at certain points, allowing the interpreter to produce utterances within in their own turn-in-progress. In the literature describing video remote interpreting (Skaaden, 2001; Braun and Taylor, 2012b; Ballogh and Hertog, 2012), problems arose when the interpreter tried to claim a turn when interpreting through video. The next few extracts provide further examples of this turn-design, first from meetings with the interpreting carried out via video, thereafter with the interpreter present, aiming to see if the interpreters design the pre-beginnings with regards to the media.

In this first example, Nadia is producing a multi-unit turn in which the interpreter is permitted entries. In line 4 the interpreter produces a pre-beginning before she begins interpreting. This time the pre-beginning is not an audible in-breath, but the interpreter opens her mouth like if she were to utter "A", an A-mouth (Depperman, 2013).

(6) VRI Bosnian/Croation/Serbian

1	Nadia:	å- (.) og så skal vi fortsette å <tilpasse> den
		An- (.) and then we will continue to <adjust> it
2		så den blir (0.4) helt perfekt til deg.
		So it becomes (0.4) just perfect for you.
3		(0.3)
		1
	Gaze:	1) Interpreter looks up and opens mouth
4	Int:	A onda ćemo to toliko prilagodavati
		And then we will do so adjusted
5		postepeno da bi to na kraju bilo perfektno sasvim
		Gradually to make it in the end was quite perfect

6 ----------1
Gaze: 1) Nadia glances at screen
7 perfektno za vas
Perfect for you
8 (1.0)

6 VRI Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian

The extract is from a sequence during which Nadia is producing a multi-unit turn. Nadia finishes her TCU with a terminal intonation in line 2. After a 0.3 second silence, the interpreter looks up and opens her mouth. Shortly after she begins to produce her utterance. Although the interpreter indicates that she will be claiming the turn visually in this extract, and not audibly through an audible in-breath like in many of the other examples, and Nadia is not looking at her at this time, nobody else claims the turn. Seeing that the pre-beginning, she opens her mouth, is most probably not actually perceived by anyone seeing that no one is looking toward the screen at the moment, it may seem that she is not actually competing with any participant about this as a place to produce an utterance. This point is treated by the other participants as the point to carry out the interpreting, thus orienting to this point as a temporary suspension point in Nadia's turn-in-progress. The ongoing turn of Nadia's is at the moment suspended until the interpreter has completed her rendition of speech. Nadia does, however, glance at the screen towards the end of the interpreter's utterance.

The next extract also has the interpreter participating from a remote location. Similar to several of the previous extracts, the interpreter in this extract produces an audible in-breath as a pre-beginning to her turn.

(7) VRI Polish

1 (1.3)
2 Nora: mm. (0.3) e: nå jobber vi med å få gode
mm. (0.3) e: now we are working to get good
1 2
Gest: 1) Nora turns to Paulina. 2) Interpreter looks down.
3 rutine:r e: på hverdagen hans, for at han skal
Routine:s e: on his everyday life, so that he shall
4 kunne fungere best mulig.
be able to function best possible.
5 (0.3)
6 Int: .h (.) e: w tej chwili pracujemy nad wypracowaniem
.h (.) e: at the momemt we are working with
------1
Gaze: Interpreter looks up/to screen.
7 codziennych procedur rutynowych procedur,

the establishement of daily procedures of routine.
8 tak żeby jak najlepiej radził sobie w
so that he will do the best in
9 dniu codziennym
everdyday life
10 (1.2)
7 VRI Polish

This extract is taken from a multi-unit turn, and as in several of the previous examples, Nora resumes her turn-in-progress with an initial minimal response in line 2. Nora is looking at Paulina during the entire utterance. The interpreter is gazing to the screen and orients visually to her note-taking after Nora has produced the filled pause and begins speaking. Nora finishes her utterance with a terminal intonation followed by silence. The interpreter produces an audible in-breath, and during the following pause, the interpreter looks up from her notes thus gazing toward the screen. Here, like in the previous example, Nora has suspended her turn-in-progress at this point, leaving time for the interpreter to interpret. She, like Nadia in the previous example, does not look at the screen or camera, thereby not using gaze as a resource for speaker exchange. Although there is left time for the interpreter to interpret, the interpreter produces a pre-beginning to claim the turn and looks up from her notes during the short pause between the pre-beginning and the turn-beginning. Nora does not turn to the interpreter in this extract.

In extract (8), Nina is nominating Nora next speaker. The interpreter produces a pre-beginning and begins to produce an utterance simultaneously with Nora.

(8) VRI Polish

1 (0.2)
2 Nina: Da lurer jeg på: (.) skal vi ↑starte med deg kanskje Nora?
Then I wonder (.) shall we start with you perhaps Nora?
1
Gaze: 1) Interpreter looks at screen
3 Nora: [det kan-]
4 Int: .h [to-] (0.6) to myślę, że zaczniemy od ciebie wobec
.h [then-] (0.6) then I think we shall start with
1----------2
Gaze: 1) Nora to Nelly. 2) Nora to the rest of the room.
5 tego Nora
you then Nora
----------1

Gaze: 1) Nora to camera.

```
6       Pau:  ((Coughs))
7             (1.6)
```

8 VRI Polish

In line 2, Nina nominates Nora as next speaker. In the first part of the analysis, the extracts demonstrated how the interpreter could participate as an incumbent consociate in a party. In extract (1) the interpreter was given time to interpret between the first and the second part of an adjacency pair crossing the linguistic barriers of the talk-in-interaction. In the extract above, Norwegian speaking Nina nominates Norwegian speaking Nora as next speaker. Of all the participants present, among them Polish speaking Paulina, Nora is the addressed recipient. Now, although there are several participants present, the interpreter is present so Polish speaking Paulina and the Norwegian speaking medical professionals will be able to speak with one another across the meeting's linguistic barriers. Nina addresses her utterance to Nora in this extract, and they both speak and understand Norwegian. Although the interpreter has been granted turns in between Nina's turn while Nina has been addressing meeting prior to this extract, Nora starts responding to Nina's question immediately, leaving no room for the interpreting.

By beginning her reply immediately, Nora orients to the question and the activity she has been asked to initiate, 'giving report', rather than to the activity of 'interpreting', although it is a pronounced activity in this meeting. Nora and the interpreter begin speaking simultaneously in line 3 and 4. Nora is looking at Nina, and the interpreter is looking at the screen. Both Nora and the interpreter cut off their speech, leaving a short silence. When Nora cuts off her speech, she is first gazing at Nina and then turns to the room, not to the screen representing the interpreter. The interpreter restarts after a 0.6 second silence in line 4. Nora gazes at the screen toward the end of the interpreter's utterance. When the interpreter finishes her utterance, a 1.6 second silence occurs before Nora continues speaking.

Nina asked Nora a question, thereby nominating her as the next speaker However, the participants orient to the interpreting as a prioritized activity in the setting. This gives the interpreter the right to produce turns in between the other participants' turns and even in between other participant's parts in adjacency pairs, thus making them a bit less adjacent. In this case Nina's question is not in fact a question necessarily expecting an answer, this question is designed to initiate an activity, in this case the activity of 'reporting'. The interpreter had produced a pre-beginning just prior to the speech. However, Nora and the

interpreter produce their turn simultaneously. When the participants did not orient to the activity of 'interpreting', the interpreter had trouble gaining the floor.

In both excerpts (6) and (7), the medical professionals, Nora and Nadia, direct their speech respectively to Paulina and Boro. And although they orient to the activity of interpreting through temporary points of suspension, they orient to Paulina and Boro as the addressed recipients of their utterances through gaze also during points of temporary suspension of their turn-in-progress and while coordinating the speaker transitions. In both extracts the interpreters produce pre-beginnings although the extracts provide two different ways of doing so. In both cases the activity of interpreting commences after the production of a pre-beginning and a short pause. In extract (8), however, Nina oriented her speech to Nora. Nora began producing her utterance immediately after, thus not orienting the activity of 'interpreting'. When the overlapping talk occurred, she cut herself off, letting the interpreter produce her utterance, thus orienting to the activity of interpreting again.

The following excerpt is from the meeting with an interpreter present. Similar to the two previous extracts, the interpreter produces an audible in-breath before she begins to produce the utterance.

(9) F2F Polish

1		(0.6)
2	Naomi:	Så vi ((interpreter looks down)) ↑snakker litt sammen ↑først,
		And we ((interpreter looks down)) talk together a little first,
3		Og så skal jeg lytte:- undersøke han litt ↑etterpå,
		And then shall I listen- examine him a little afterwards,
		----------1----------
	Gaze:	1. Naomi glances at interpreter. 2. Interpreter gazes at Naomi.
5		(0.6)
6	Int:	.h (.) ((looks up)) W związku z tym
		.h (.) ((looks up)) In reagard to that
7		najpierw trochę porozmawiamy, potem go zbadam.
		first a little we shall speak afterwards him will i examine
8		(0.3)
		((Naomi looks at interpreter))

9 F2F Polish

In this extract, (previously presented in extract 5) Naomi is opening the meeting, addressing her speech to the mother. The interpreter looks down to her notes after Naomi has begun her utterance. Naomi directs her utterance to the mother, but glances at the interpreter toward the possible temporary suspension point, thereafter leaving a silence after the utterance which

finished with a continuing intonation. After 0.6 second silence, the interpreter produces an audible in-breath while her gaze is still oriented to her notes. The interpreter looks up toward the mother during the pause and thereafter begins her utterance. During the short silence following after the interpreter's speech in line 8, before Naomi resumes her turn-in-progress, Naomi looks at the interpreter. In this extract, as in the extracts with the interpreter at a remote location, the interpreter produces a pre-beginning before beginning the activity of interpreting. The pre-beginnings seem to have the same design whether the interpreter is present on-site or participating through video technology.

The following extract shows another occurrence of this turn-design in interaction with the interpreter present. In this extract, Naomi first begins her utterance while gazing toward the mother, she cuts herself off and turns to the rest of the room before she produces a re-beginning. She leaves a short silence and the interpreter produces an audible in-breath before rendering what was said.

(10) F2F Polish

1	Naomi:	Ja. (0.5)((looks towards mother)) Da skal- e::
		Yes. (0.5) Then shall- e::
2		((looks at all the participants)) Hensikten med
		The purpose of
3		det møtet her er å: (.) få tatt opp o- eller å få: ts de
		This meeting here is to: (.) get to take up i- or get ts the
4		e: nødvendige opplysningene for at
		e: necessary information so that
		1
	Gaze:	1) Interpreter looks up
5		jeg skal skrive ↑innkomstjournal, og sykepleieren
		I shall write admissionsjournal, and the nurse
6		((looks at nurse)) skal ↑også skrive innkomstjournal.
		shall also write admissions journal.
7		(0.2)
8	Int:	.h (.) Celem tego tego spotkania jest uzyskanie koniecznych
		.h (.) the purpose of this this meeting is to get necessary
		----------1---------2
	Gaze:	1) Interpreter looks up. 2) Naomi looks at interpreter.
9		informacji do tego, żebym mogła yyy sporządzić wpis
		Informations so that I shall could e: write note
		1----------2
		1) Naomi looks at mother. 2) Naomi looks at interpreter.
10		yyy do karty pacjenta
		e: for patient journal
11	mum:	mm
	Gaze:	Mum and naomi look at each other, mum nods.
12	Int:	iiii tak, żeby pacjent eeu

		A:nd as at patient- e:
13		pielęgniarka także mogła to zrobić.
		nurse she also could do it.
		1----------2
	Gaze:	1) Naomi turns to interpreter. 2) Interpreter looks down.
14	Mum:	mm.
15		(0.4)

10 F2F Polish

In line 1 Naomi begins speaking, her utterance is directed to the Polish speaking mother. Although she has gained eye contact with the mother, Naomi cuts herself off and turns to the rest of the room, among others the interpreter. She thereafter completes what is to become the first utterance in a multi-unit turn. Although the interpreter is looking down and orienting to her note-taking, it might seem that the note-taking in itself is a visual display of recipiency. In line 1 Naomi cuts herself off, and in line 2 she reformulates what she is saying, with the result that the interpreter looks up from her notes and glances at Naomi. Naomi continues to produce the utterance. When Naomi has completed her utterance, a short silence occurs, before the interpreter produces a pre-beginning in line 8. The interpreter produces, like in the previous examples, an audible in-breath, before she begins her turn. The interpreter looks up during the short pause she leaves between the audible in-breath and her utterance in Polish.

In all five extracts so far, the interpreter produces a subtle pre-beginning. The interpreter's pre-beginnings illustrated in these extracts seem to contain several elements. The interpreter produces an audible in-breath and thereafter leaves a pause. During the short pause or just prior or following, the interpreter shifts visual orientation from her notes and note-taking to lifting head and gaze, orienting to the room or screen and other participants. In most extracts the pre-beginning is produced as an audible in-breath, although in extract (6) the interpreter looked up and opened her mouth just prior to the production of speech. In the on-site interpreted extract, Naomi glances at the interpreter several times during the talk. In extract (10) she even restarts her turn-beginning pursuing display of recipiency not from the mother, but perhaps from the interpreter (Goodwin, 1980).

The extract below is from a later phase of the on-site interpreted meeting. Naomi has opened the meeting and conducted an examination. At this point in the meeting, she mentions Nicolette and the Polish speaking mother's activities from earlier the same day. Nicolette responds to Naomi in line 4 and begins reporting on their earlier activities in line 7. The interpreter produces a pre-beginning for claiming the turn in line 6, but cuts off as her

utterance overlaps with Nicolette's. Naomi thereafter takes the role of a chair and nominates the interpreter next speaker several times during the extract.

(11) F2F Polish

1	Naomi:	.ja (0.3) e:m. (.) ts. (0.9) ja? (.)
		.yes (0.3) e:m. (.) ts. (0.9) yes? (.)
2		>skal ↑vi se< jeg kan e: (.) bare. Kjapt
		>let us see< I can e: (.) just. Quickly
3		gå gjennom det du har tatt her jæ.=
		go through what you have taken her I.
	Gaze:	Looks at papaers, nods to Nicolette.
4	Nico:	=[jaja]
		=[oh well]
5	Naomi:	[hvis ikke] du kommer på noen ting-
		[if (you) don't] you think of anything-
6	Int:	.h [do-]
		--------1
	Gaze:	1) Interpreter looks up, and looks down again.
7	Nico:	[nei↑] (.) jeg var. vi [hadde spis-]
		[no↑] (.) I was. we [had eat-]
8	Naomi:	[°hun kan.]
		[°she can.]
		----------1
	Gaze:	1) Naomi looks at the interpreter.
9	Nico:	vi spiste lun- lunsj i ↑dag.
		we ate lun- lunch to↑day.
10		(0.2)
11	Naomi:	mm. du kan oversette til henne.
		mm. you can translate to her.
		-----1
	Gaze:	1) Nods to interpreter.
12		(.)
13	Int:	mm. (.) .h (.) e: (.) ja zerknę na to i trochę
		mm. (.) .h (.) e: (.) I look at it and then
		jeg kikker på det og så
	Gaze	looks up
14		porozmawiamy no dzisiaj jedliśmy razem lancz
		talk a little well today we ate together lunch
		----------1
	Gaze:	1) Looks at Nicolette
15		(.)

11 F2F Polish

In this extract Naomi is going through Nicolette and the Polish speaking mother's activities from earlier the same day. Naomi looks at the papers with notes from these activities, referred to as "what you have taken here" in line 3, and nods to Nicolette. Nicolette replies quickly

“jaja” (oh well) which overlaps with the doctors continuing speech in line 5. In line 6 the interpreter produces an audible in-breath indicating that she is claiming a turn. She leaves a short pause during which she lifts her head and gaze from her note-taking, and she begins to speak in line 6. The interpreter’s turn-beginning overlaps with Nicolette’s response to Naomi’s utterance, causing the interpreter to cut off her speech and look back down to her note-taking. Nicolette begins giving a report from the day, and the interpreter has not yet rendered Naomi’s utterance from lines 1-3. While Nicolette produces several restarts in line 7, Naomi utters “hun kan” (she can) while gazing at the interpreter in line 8. This utterance overlaps with Nicolette’s talk. Nicolette continues speaking, not paying any notice to this. A short silence occurs in line 9 after Nicolette has presumably completed a TCU. Naomi produces a minimal response after the gap and turns to the interpreter. She produces a directive, now, while gazing at and nodding toward the interpreter, “you can translate to her”. Naomi has thus taken upon herself the role of the chair.

The material in this thesis contains only institutional settings, meetings between laypeople and medical professionals, and this is possible to detect among other places in the turn-organization. All the meetings have a person opening the meeting, initiating the next activities and nominating the next speaker. However, up until now, the interpreter’s turns have not been nominated explicitly. In this extract, however, when Nicolette is speaking, Naomi takes upon herself the role of a chair, and gives the interpreter a directive, “you can translate to her”. While Nicolette is reporting from the day’s activities, she is gazing at the mother. The mother was, however, present during these activities, so the report itself might actually be a summary for Naomi and the other participant’s present. As was mentioned by Naomi in extract (10), both Naomi and the nurse are going to write journal entries based on the meeting. When Naomi focuses on the activity of ‘interpreting’ within the activity of ‘giving report’, she addresses the interpreter both in gaze and through use of the pronoun “you” to the interpreter and “her” about the mother. In her fist attempt to chair the interpreting in line 8, she uttered “she can”, thus directing an implicit suggestion to Nicolette and not to the interpreter. While the first attempt does not receive any uptake, the second does.

The interpreter produces a minimal response “mm” and leaves a pause, thereafter she produces an audible in-breath, a pre-beginning, and leaves yet another pause. The receipt in line 13 can both serve as a response to Naomi’s utterance, and a placeholder while the interpreter prepares her rendition. The interpreter produces several pre-beginnings before

beginning the turn, indicating that she is actively claiming the turn while still preparing the utterance. I have previously stated that I will not engage in in-depth analyses of the interpreters' renditions. However, it is worth noting that the consequence of not letting the interpreter gain access to the floor over several speaker exchanges, is a less precise rendition of speech. It seems that both Naomi's and Nicolette's speech in lines 1-3, 7 and 9, have been merged into one single utterance in the interpreter's rendition of their speech in lines 13-14. In this case, rendering the two utterances together as one, might not have any further consequences. However, under other circumstances, with other topics, conjoining several participant's utterances may have other consequences.

In this extract, although the interpreter is present, the interpreter's pre-beginnings did not seem to give the interpreter access to a turn. Nicolette, compared to Naomi, did not temporarily suspend the turn-in-progress to give the interpreter access. Naomi chaired the situation, thus explicitly coordinating the 'interpreting' and giving the interpreter the possibility to interpret.

In these extracts, and in several of the other extracts in this thesis, the interpreter's turns are designed with pre-beginnings. The pre-beginning and following pause might not only be a way of holding the turn while preparing for speech or tur-claiming, it might be a means of avoiding or reducing overlap. The pre-beginning in extract (3), where the interpreter uttered "ehm", did not follow the more common turn-design illustrated in these extracts. The changed turn-design indicated that this was not an ordinary turn, but an indication of trouble. Considering the extracts (6) and (7) with the interpreter at a remote location, the medical professionals do not orient to the screen representing the interpreter before or during the interpreter's speech. They are participating in the meeting from a meeting room with several participants present. Seeing that the recording is carried out from the interpreter's side of the technology, and not the institute's, it may not be possible to determine whether the interpreter's production of the audible in-breath is perceivable on the other side of the technology. The acoustic conditions in the other room are not perceivable from the interpreter's side of the technology. The A-mouth produced as a pre-beginning in extract (6) will not be perceivable to Nadia, seeing that she is not gazing at the interpreter, but at Boro. The pre-beginnings used in these extracts are subtle signals, and with the interpreter present in the room, even subtle movements might be perceivable in the other participants' peripheral vision. When the interpreter is represented in the room through technological artifacts, the

microphone and camera representing the interpreter's perception and the screen and loudspeakers representing the interpreter's production, these subtle signals might not be as easily accessible to the participants. In extracts (9) and (10) from the on-site interpreted meeting, the interpreter produced pre-beginnings similar to those in the video interpreted meetings. In both the extracts from the on-site interpreted meetings and the video interpreted meetings, the medical professional had already temporarily suspended their turn-in-progress, thus leaving room for the interpreter to interpret.

In extracts (8) and (11), with on-site and video interpreting, the interpreter's pre-beginnings did not receive any uptake. Seeing that the same problem occurred in both extracts, the problem did not seem to be caused by the technology. In the video interpreted extract Norwegian speaking Nina had addressed Norwegian speaking Nora. Through producing a pre-beginning, the interpreter signaled turn-claiming. Although, the medical professional and the interpreter started simultaneously, the medical professional immediately cut off her speech leaving the turn to the interpreter. In the on-site interpreted interaction, the medical professional did not, and this resulted in a second participant chairing the interaction. This might indicate that the interactional surroundings in which the pre-beginning is produced, is more decisive for the success of the interpreter's pre-beginning for claiming the turn than the nature of the pre-beginning and the media.

In the following chapter, the extracts illustrate how the medical professional in some cases extend their TCU after a possible TRP or TSP.

5.2.3 Post-endings

So far, I have attempted to illustrate how the activity of interpreting is treated as a part of the interaction, pinpointing the activity of 'coordinating' carried out by the medical professional and the interpreter. Their joint effort centers around the possible transition-relevance places and points of temporary turn suspension especially designed for interpreting. In this subchapter, I will illustrate some circumstances in which the interpreting is not the object of joint attention at an upcoming possible turn suspension place or a transition-relevance place. Instead, the medical staff extends their turn by producing an increment at a possibly completed TCU, a point projected by the interpreter to be relevant for interpreting. The two first extracts illustrate video remote interpreting.

In this extract, Nora is giving and produces what could be assumed to be a complete TCU based on grammatical completeness, when she extends her utterance by adding an increment to the prior utterance.

(12) VRI Polish

1	Nora:	mm. (.) .h (.) e:m det har fungert å bruke
		mm. (.) .h (.) e:m it has worked to use
		----------1
	Gaze:	1) Interpreter looks down.
2		en sånn liste i påkledning, e >så nå:< >skal vi og< lage:
		a such list in dressing, e >so no:w< >shall we also< make
3		(0.3) flere sånne lignende lister. (0.2) for andre gjøremål.
		(0.3) more such similar lists. (0.2) for other tasks.
4		(0.5
5	Int:	.h (.) e: (0.4) f- dobrze funkc- sie sprawdzila lista
		.h (.) e: (0.4) f- well func- it checked the list
		----------1----------2----------3
	Gaze:	1) Interpreter looks up. 2) Nora looks to screen. 3) Nora sits back.
6		wykorzystywana przy ubieraniu sie i w zwiazku
		Used when dressing of himself and in connection
7		z tym wykonamy wiecej takich list do innych
		with this we will do more such lists to other
8		czynnosci rowniez
		actions also
9		(1.8)

12 VRI Polish

In line 1-2 Nora first produces what seems to be a grammatically complete TCU, “it has worked to use a such list in dressing”. However, the TCU is produced with a rising intonation indicating continuation. Previous extracts have shown that the silence after a syntactical complete unit can indicate a possible turn suspension point designed for interpreting although the intonation indicates continuation. However, Nora increases the pace of speech, thus producing a rush through. Nora does, by using a rush through to keep the turn, orient to this as a possible temporary suspension point. After completing the next TCU syntactically, “so now shall we also make more such similar lists” with terminal intonation, a 0.2 second pause occurs. However, just shortly after having completed the utterance, Nora extends the prior unit with an extension (Schegloff 1996; Fox, Ford and Thompson, 2002) starting with a preposition, “for other tasks”. According to Fox et al., the extension increment occurs in surroundings lacking display of uptake, giving yet a possibility to respond to the TCU. Interpreted interaction has been described as lacking feedback signals (Skaaden, 2013;

Dimitrova, 1991). Seeing that Nora's utterance in lines 1-2 has not yet been interpreted when the utterance is extended, it is not yet possible to display any uptake at this point.

Extensions serve to provide new transition-relevance places and often occur in surroundings with lack of display of uptake. Interpreted talk will often lack display of uptake and feedback signals during for example a multiunit turn, as the slots available for feedback signals are used to interpret. The nature of the interpreted conversation is not ideal for feedback signals seeing that the interpreter has to interpret what the speaker has said before the recipient can respond in any way. There are several participants present in the room, yet Nora is directing her utterance to Paulina. And although there are several medical professionals present, ratified participants, they are not the addressed recipients in this sequence of talk, and they are most probably not who Nora would ordinarily seek display of uptake from. In the interpreted interaction, although temporarily suspending a turn serves the turn-in-progress by making the medical professional's speech available to the addressed recipient bit by bit, leaving out some relevant information related to the just prior utterance, could cause queries for clarification or other responses at a point where this is perhaps not called for. In this case, leaving out the increment "for other tasks", would leave the just prior TCU somewhat ambiguous. It might therefore seem that Nora's increment in line 3 treats the prior TCU as still in progress and serves to clarify the content, and by producing it clarifying the installment as a whole.

Several of the previous extracts showed how the medical professionals have left a turn suspension point in their multi-unit turns, also in cases where the TCU seems to be syntactically complete, but ending on a continuing intonation. In this next extract, Nadia's utterance seems to have come to completion. In this case she seems to have completed a TCU syntactically, still leaving it with a continuing intonation. After a short silence, the interpreter produces a pre-beginning indicating that she is about to start speaking, and in the next line Nadia continues speaking, producing an extension.

(13) VRI Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian

1	Nadia:	e: det første måle: vi skal jobbe med Boro er å øke styrke
		e: the first aim we shall work with Boro is to gain strength
2		i håndledd,
		in wrist,
3		(.)
4	Int:	.hh((looks up))

5	Nadia:	spesielt høyre hånd, specially the right hand,
6		(0.3)
7	Int:	ovako prvi naš cilj Boro što na čemu ćemo raditi je Like this our first goal Boro as to what we will do is
8		da radimo na jačanju lijevog zgloba ručnog. venstre håndledd? To work to strengthen the left wrist. (Norwegian) Left wrist?
9		(0.8)
	Gaze:	Nadia glances at screen
10	Nadia:	hånd. (0.2) høyre. Hand. (0.2) right.
11		(0.3)

13 VRI Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian

After a short pause in line 3 the interpreter produces a pre-beginning indicating that she understands this as a turn suspension place in Nadia's turn-in-progress. In line 5, however, Nadia extends the turn by specifying which wrist the previous TCU concerns. Ford (1993, as quoted in (Ford, Fox and Thompson, 2002:19) argues against understanding the increment as an afterthought. Ford suggests that the researcher treat the increment as "products of speaker recipient negotiation specifically aimed at achieving interactional ends" (Ford, as quoted in Ford et al., 2002:19). The increment serves interactional functions within the environment it is produced. In Ford, Fox and Thompson's material, the increment was however used at points with lack of uptake, providing a second possible TRP. In this extract, the speech is directed to Boro. The interpreter has not yet interpreted what was said, and it is unlikely that the possible uptake is expected from the other medical professionals that are present. In this extract, like the previous, the increment adds information to the TCU just prior. In this extract the medical professional's next utterance also contains a new activity they will be carrying out, a new topic in the interaction. In this extract it may therefore seem that the increment in addition to clarifying the installment being produced, also may be a resource used for topic organization in interpreted interaction.

In this extract, the interpreter initiates a repair within her turn. After rendering Nadia's utterances produced in line 1-5, the interpreter produced the repair in line 8. By producing the repair within the ongoing turn, the interpreter did not have to claim a turn to initiate the repair. In the two previous extracts with video remote interpreting increments were seen to occur. In the next extract an increment occurs in the meeting with on-site interpreting.

(14) F2F Polish

1	Naomi:	Det blir sikkert litt av de samme spørsmålene
		It will probably be some of the same questions
2		((points to Nicolette)) som du har svart på til Nico↑lette,
		which you have replied to Nico↑lette
		1----------2
	Gaze:	1) Naomi looks at mum. 2) Interpreter looks up.
3		(0.2)
4	Int:	[.h]
5	Naomi:	Tidli[gere]. Men
		Previ[ously]. But
		----------1
	Gaze:	1) Naomi looks at mum. Interpreter looks down.
6		det blir litt sånn overlapp da.
		there will be some overlap then.
		----------1
	Gaze	1) Naomi looks at nicolette
7		(0.2)
8	Int:	.h (.) Być może niektóre z pytań bedą takie same jak do
		.h (.) Perhaps some of the questions will be the same as for
		----------1
	Gaze:	1) looks at mother
9		Nicolette yyy będzie trochę zakładki jeśli o to chodzi.
		Nicolette e: it will be some overlap if when it comes to this.
		1----------2
	Gaze:	1) Naomi glances at interpreter. 2 Naomi gazes at interpreter and the interpreter looks down
10		(0.6)

14 F2F Polish

In line 1-2 Naomi produces a syntactically complete utterance, ending on a rising intonation indicating continuation, “it will probably be some of the same questions which you have answered to Nicolette”. In previous extracts, the participants have oriented to TCUs ending on a rising intonation as possible TSPs. The interpreter looks up at this point. After a short pause, Naomi continues, extending this TCU with “previously”. The interpreter produces an audible in-breath in line 20 simultaneously, overlapping with Naomi’s extension. The interpreter looks down again after Naomi has uttered “previously”, although she utters this with a falling intonation, indicating that the TCU is now completed. “Previously” functions as an extension to the TCU just prior, extending the TCU grammatically as well, after a point of possible suspension. Naomi does not leave a gap after the extension, indicating that this is a temporary suspension point, she produces a new TCU now summarizing what she has said in lines 21-22, “but there will be some overlap then”. Considering that this again would be a likely point of temporary turn suspension, Naomi’s addition can be considered an increment. This one is produced as a complete syntactical unit, providing a summary. Furthermore, increments occur

in an environment lacking display of uptake at a transition-relevance place. Although it is unlikely that Naomi is producing a further increment because of lack of uptake, by producing the increment, a new transition relevance place occurs. In line 5, after having produced an audible in-breath, the interpreter looks down again, and does not indicate that she is waiting for Naomi to finish. By producing an increment without introducing new information, Naomi provides a new transition-relevance place or rather TSP, where the interpreter can produce her turn.

The medical professionals have left silence after TCUs with rising intonation in several extracts, thus indicating the TSP's relevance within such environment. In all three of the extracts above, the increment did occur in an environment lacking uptake. However, whether displays of uptake causes the increments, might be debatable. In the two first extracts, it seems that the extra information given through the production of an increment, provides an extra specification associated with the preceding utterance. The added information reduces possible ambiguity in the prior TCU, and the installment which it becomes a part of, which might be perceived differently and even responded to if the utterance were to stand alone without the increment. The fact that the medical professionals in these extracts have had to break up their multi-unit turn into installments to serve the activity of interpreting, might influence how they are likely to organize the transition to different topics and furthermore how specific or dis-ambiguous they might seek to produce each installment. In extract (14), the medical profession first produced an extension specifying the just prior TCU, and thereafter an increment which created a new possible TSP, a new possibility for the interpreter to claim a turn. Although the increments in these extracts have caused the interpreters' attempts at turn claiming to fail, the extracts display how the medical professionals use increments as a way of organizing topics, organizing the interaction and even producing new possible TSPs.

Like in the previous chapter, it seems that the success or failure of the interpreter's turn-claiming through subtle pre-beginnings, depends more on the interactional surroundings and the ongoing activities in which the pre-beginning is produced rather than the media in use.

5.2.4 Summary

In the second part of the analysis, the extracts illustrate how the participants co-organize on-site interpreting compared to video remote interpreting. The extracts above illustrate different interactional surroundings in which the interpreter is attempting to get a turn. The extracts display how the participants co-organize interpreting in multi-unit turns, how the interpreter designs turn-beginnings and how the medical professional produces post-endings.

The medical professional seemed to use gaze as a resource in coordinating the interpreting to a greater extent when the interpreting was carried out on-site than in the extracts where the interpreter was participating through video technology. This resulted in longer pauses after the interpreter's turn before the medical professional resumed their turn. The medical professional and the interpreter assumed alignment during the interaction and acted as incumbent members of single parties during stretches of talk. The medical professional in these extracts temporarily suspended their turn-in-progress regularly so the interpreter could interpret.

The extracts have shown that the interpreters produce pre-beginnings before beginning their utterance. The pre-beginnings are designed similarly whether the interpreter is on-site or participating from a remote location. The interpreter produces an audible in-breath or other subtle signal of turn claiming, and during a short pause following the pre-beginning, the interpreter looks up from her note-taking. Whether the interpreter's pre-beginning is perceivable or not to the other participants, does not seem to be relevant when the medical professional has already suspended their turn-in-progress. However, in more complex interactional surroundings, the interpreter does not always get the turn at the point they signal turn-claiming.

In some extracts, the medical professional produced increments, thus extending their talk at a possible temporary suspension point. In several of the extracts the increments caused more complex interactional environments for the interpreter to claim the turn. These increments seemed to serve other interactional functions than in ordinary conversation. In some extracts the increment could be seen as a way of topic organization and as a way of organizing the information in installments during the multi-unit turn, rather than pursuing uptake. In one extract, however, the medical professional produced several increments. After producing an extension, the medical professional added an increment summarizing the

previous speech, thus creating a new possible transition-relevance place for the interpreter after a previously missed turn.

In the following chapter “6 Conclusion”, I will relate my previously defined problem to the findings from this analysis.

6 Conclusion

In the first part of the analysis, I provided three extracts illustrating different aspects of the interpreter's actions. The three extracts illustrated an adjacency pair, a multi-unit turn and an interpreter initiated repair. These extracts, as well as the extracts in the second part of the analysis, have shown how interpreting is a communicative activity which is carried out through the collaboration and orientation of all the participants present. The three extracts in the first part of the analysis, illustrate different aspects of how the activity of 'interpreting' is carried out. The accomplishment of single parties in interaction, done jointly by the interpreter and the medical professional during stretches of talk, is a way of accomplishing the activity of 'interpreting'. During these three extracts, the participants have displayed changes in footing and in production format, underpinning the activities which according to Wadensjö (1998) constitute 'interpreting': both 'translating' and 'coordinating'.

In the second part of the analysis, I explored extracts displaying several of the participants' actions during the point of speaker exchange and near surroundings. Although focusing mainly on the exchanges between interpreter and medical professional, I have included extracts illustrating exchanges between the interpreter and layperson and between the medical professionals. In my problem at hand, I asked: "How are interpreter initiated repairs and interpreter initiated turn allocation organized in remotely interpreted conversations between medical professionals and patients? In what way does the organizing differ from the organizing of corresponding actions in conversations which are interpreted on-site, with special regards to the interaction's progression?". In the following I will attempt to answer these questions and summarize other relevant findings.

Several studies and reports describing video interpreting (Skaaden, 2001; Braun and Taylor, 2012b; Balogh and Hertog, 2012; UDI, 2003) have shown that problems occur in respect to the interpreter's turn-taking when the interpreting is carried out via video. The problems described have caused overlapping talk and omissions, and are considered to be caused by the interpreter's subtle turn claiming signals, which have not been perceived through the technology. Although I have differentiated between repairs and turn allocation in the problem above, when trying to initiate a repair the interpreter needs to get a turn. So, I will start by describing the interpreter initiated turn allocation.

When trying to identify the interpreter's turn-taking signals and find how they would get the turn, I discovered that the interpreter's turn-taking occurs in several different environments. The multi-turn and the adjacency pair crossing linguistic barriers in the interaction, for example, provide quite different conditions for the interpreter to try to produce an utterance. While producing the multi-unit turns, the medical professionals have regularly suspended their turns on their own initiative. The interpreters have used this temporary suspension point in the medical professional's turn-in-progress to produce an utterance. The interpreters followed a consistent turn-design, and produced a pre-beginning to claim the turn before beginning the turn itself. The turn-design included gaze shifts, from the interpreter gazing at her notes, to the interpreter looking to the addressed recipient or screen in the meetings with video interpreting, while producing the utterance. The interpreters used subtle pre-beginnings to claim the turns both when interpreting via video and on-site. In the sequential environment sketched above, the interpreter had no problems gaining the turn whether the interpreter was on-site or participating through video interpreting. In the example with the adjacency pair crossing the linguistic barriers in the interaction, the interpreter had no trouble in gaining access to the floor. Similar to the interpreting within multi-unit turns, the participants waited for the interpreting before they continued.

In some situations, as shown in "5.2.3 Post-endings", the medical professionals expanded their utterances at a possible temporary suspension point during their turn-in-progress. In these cases, whether the interpreter was on-site or participating via video, the interpreter's pre-beginnings were not given uptake. The interpreter waited until the medical professional temporarily suspended the turn-in-progress. Although the interpreter missed a turn in this sequential environment, increments seemed in some extracts to be used by the medical professional as a resource in topic organization, by clarifying single installments and as means of creating a new transition relevance places after a missed turn.

In the on-site interpreting, the extracts showed that when the medical professional used gaze in the coordinating of turn exchanges, gazing at the interpreter during speech within the proximity of transition-relevance places and temporary suspension points, the turn exchanges and turn-taking organizing were more flexible. The gaps after the interpreter's speech and before the medical professional resumed the turn-in-progress, were shorter. In the video remote interpreting, the medical professionals gazed less at the interpreter than in the on-site interpreted meeting. The gaps following the interpreter's speech were generally longer

in the meetings with video interpreting. The gaps were, however, longer when the medical professional did not gaze at the interpreter within the proximity of temporary suspension points in both video interpreting and on-site interpreting.

In this material, the silence preceding the interpreter's turn was a great deal shorter than the silence after the interpreter had spoken and before the medical professional had resumed speech. One of the two main activities which constitute the activity of 'interpreting' according to Wadensjö is 'coordinating'. As a part of the interpreter's coordinating talk during the interaction, it is not unlikely to believe that the interpreter might be oriented to the turn-taking in a different way than the other participants. My brief calculation in 5.2.1 indicated that the silence before the interpreter's turn in video interpreting was shorter than when the interpreter was present.

In regard to the interpreter initiated repair sequences, two extracts, (2) and (4), illustrated how the interpreter indicated trouble during the medical professional's utterance. In both extracts, the interpreter chose not to initiate a repair sequence, but indicated the troubles through head movement and facial expressions. In neither of the cases, this was taken up by any of the participants at the other end of the technology. It might seem that the participants orient to overlapping talk as problematic in the meetings using video technology. Seeing that two different interpreters indicated the trouble through use of non-verbal expressions before and instead of initiating a repair sequence verbally, it may seem like the interpreters also tried to avoid overlapping talk. The consequence of this lack of uptake was in the one case that the interpreter later asked for repair, thereby initiating a repair sequence at a point where the medical professional had suspended the turn-in-progress and expected the interpreter to interpret. In the other, that the repair sequence was not initiated. In these extracts, the interpreter initiated repairs were due to overlapping talk and noise at the other end of the technology. In extract (1) the interpreter initiated a repair sequence verbally at a point where the medical professional was about to resume speech after some laughter, and in extract (13) the interpreter initiated repair as a part of her ongoing turn-in-progress thus not experiencing any trouble in claiming the turn. In the on-site interpreted material, no such interpreter initiated repairs occurred. The topic of interpreter initiated repair in video remote interpreting is worth further scrutiny, I have only explored a few examples here in regard to how and when they are initiated and the outcome.

In both the video and the on-site interpreted meetings, the interpreters seem to follow a certain turn-design. The turn is preceded with a pre-beginning and a short pause. It is questionable whether the subtle pre-beginnings, like audible in-breath and A-mouth, are perceivable in the video remote interpreting. However, the interpreter seems to produce the pre-beginning disregarding the sequential environment at the point in the interaction. This means that in cases where the medical professionals have temporarily suspended their turn or whether they are awaiting the interpreter to interpret the first pair part of an adjacency pair in another language, the interpreter produces a pre-beginning. In the cases where the medical professional expanded their turn by producing a post-ending or when they had nominated a next speaker of the same language, the pre-beginning did not receive uptake, whether the participating via video or on-site. In the video interpreted meetings, the medical professional and the interpreter both seemed to orient to avoiding overlap, giving up their turns rather than proceeding with overlapping speech. It might seem that the sequential environment in which the interpreter is claiming a turn, can be of more relevance than the turn-design in regard to whether the signal to claim a turn is not only perceived, but accepted.

While I was initially aiming to find possible differences between remote interpreting and on-site interpreting in the interpreter's turn-taking and interpreter initiated repairs and the further progression of the interaction, it seems that one of the most relevant differences I have found in this material with this approach, is the way the medical professionals related to the interaction with an interpreter through a camera, screen, microphone and loudspeakers compared to the interpreter on-site. Video remote interpreting has been suggested as a means of keeping a professional distance to the interpreter and furthermore resulting in more professional interpreting situations (Jest and Sodemann, 2016). However, it seems that when the participants did not orientate to coordinating the activity of interpreting, whether the interpreter was on-site or at a remote location, through gaze or temporary suspension points, the activity of interpreting demanded more explicit coordinating.

Through carrying out this comparative analysis of video remotely interpreted and on-site interpreted medical meetings, I have not found clear differences in the way the participants organized the interaction in video remote interpreting compared to on-site interpreting. However, the analysis raised several questions for further exploration: Can video technology change the course of interaction through the media's affordances and constraints? The questions I raised in 5.1.1, are still relevant for further exploration: Are participants

engaging in interpreted interaction attentive to dis-preferred responses in second pair parts of adjacency pairs crossing the linguistic barriers of the interaction? Might the technology further camouflage subtle displays of troubles, alignment and stance in the interaction? Exploring how the media affects the interaction and how the participants display their understanding of the ongoing interaction, might give access to new and valuable insights concerning interpreting and video remote interpreting.

Now knowing a bit more about the nature of the video interpreted and the on-site interpreted interaction, several topics seem relevant for further pursuit. How do the medical professionals accommodate for the participation of a patients speaking a minority language in interaction where the interpreter is not present? How do the participants achieve intersubjectivity? How and when are interpreter initiated repairs carried out, and how do different approaches succeed? Topic organization in interpreted interaction might be interesting to pursue further. Seeing that the technology is here to stay and remote interpreting can be an efficient means of providing interpreting, it is still relevant to learn more about video interpreting. Much research aims to compare video remote interpreting to on-site and telephone interpreting, and much of the current research is based on either questionnaires or analyses of role-plays. Further empirical studies exploring the nature of video interpreting might reveal more about video interpreting as a product in its own right. Seeing video remote interpreting in regard to the lack of 'presence' and the media's affordances might provide useful knowledge in regard to which situations seem suitable for video remote interpreting and how to best accommodate for the activity of 'interpreting' through video technology.

References

Azermina, P. and P. Wallace (2005) *Remote interpretation in medical encounters: a systematic review*, Journal of Telemedicine and Telecare, Volume 11, No3, 2005, p. 140-145.

Braun, S. (2015) *Remote Interpreting* (final draft), In H. Mikkelson & R. Jourdensals (Eds.) (2015). In: *Routledge Handbook of Interpreting*. London/New York: Routledge

Braun, S. and J. Taylor (2012a) *Introduction.* In Braun, S and J Taylor, *Videoconference and Remote Interpreting in Criminal Proceedings*, Cambridge: Intersentia

Braun, S. and J. Taylor (2012b) *AVIDICUS comparative studies – part I: traditional interpreting and remote interpreting in police interviews*. In Braun, S and J Taylor, *Videoconference and Remote Interpreting in Criminal Proceedings*, Cambridge: Intersentia

Braun, S. and J. Taylor (2012c) *Video-mediated interpreting in criminal proceedings: two European surveys*. In Braun, S and J Taylor, *Videoconference and Remote Interpreting in Criminal Proceedings*, Cambridge: Intersentia

Balogh, K. and E. Hertog (2012) *AVIDICUS comparative studies – part II: traditional, videoconference and remote interpreting in police interviews*. In Braun, S and J Taylor, *Videoconference and Remote Interpreting in Criminal Proceedings*, Cambridge: Intersentia

Bustnes, H. (2013) *Video som kanal for språktolk. Erfaringer fra NAV sitt skjermtolkningsprosjekt*. Presentasjon. (URL: https://www.tolkeportalen.no/Documents/Presentasjoner/2013/Tolkekonferansen_Hartvig_Bustnes.pdf)

Clayman, S. E. (2013) *Turn-Constructional Units and the Transition Relevance Place.* In: Sidnell, J. and T. Stivers (eds), *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis*, West Sussex: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Courts of Justice Act. (1915) Lov om domstolene.

Depperman, A. (2013) *Turn-design at turn-beginnings: Multimodal resources to deal with tasks of turn-construction in German*, in Journal of Pragmatics, 46 (2013), 91-121

Dimitrova, Elisabeth Englund (1991) *När två talar genom den tredje. Interaktion och icke-verbal kommunikation i medicinxka möten med tolk*. Stockholms University. Centre for Research on Bilingualism. Stockholm: Akademitryck

Djordjilovic, O. (2012) *Displaying and Developing Team Identity in Workplace Meetings – a Multimodal Perspective.* In: Djordjilovic, O, Managing Tasks and Relations in Meeting Interaction. Oslo: University of Oslo

Domstoladministrasjonen (2007) *Videokonferanseprosjektet i justissektoren. Evalueringsrapport.*

Drew, P. and J. Heritage (1992) *Analyzing talk at work: an introduction.* In: Drew, H. and J. Heritage (eds), *Talk at work.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Eike MC, Forsetlund L, Kirkehei I, Vist GE. (2010) *Effect of interventions to improve the quality of health services for ethnic minorities.* Rapport fra Kunnskapssenteret nr. 24 – 2010. (URL: http://www.kunnskapssenteret.no/en/publications/effect-of-interventions-to-improve-the-quality-of-health-services-for-eth-nic-minorities)

Ford, C., B.A Fox and S.A. Thompson (2002) *Constituency and the Grammar of turn increments*. In: Ford, C., B.A. Fox, S.A. Thompson (eds), *The Language of Turn and Sequence*. New York: Oxford University Press

Furskognes, AK, I. Eliassen, B. Molund, E. K. Christiansen (2013) *Prosjektrapport. Tolkeprosjektet.* Tromsø: Nasjonalt senter for samhandling og telemedisin.

Gavioli, L., (2016) *Conversation analysis*. In Angelelli Claudia V. and Brian J. Baer (eds), *Researching ranslation and interpreting*. New York: Routledge

Goffman, E. (1981) *Footing,* chapter 3, in Goffman, Erving, *Forms of Talk.* Philadelphia: Pennsylvania Press.

Goodwin, C. (1980) *Restarts, Pauses, and the Achievment of a State of Mutual Gaze at Turn-Beginning*, Sociological Inquiry 50 (3-4) pp 272-302

Gulbrandsen, P., A. Finset, and B. F. Jensen (2013) *Lege-pasient-korpus fra Ahus.* Tekstlaboratoriet, ILN, Universitetet i Oslo.

Haualand, H., J. E. Natvig and A. Ørsnes (2006) *Tolk i lomma. Prosjektet «Utprøving av tegnspråktolketjenester via 3G mobiltelefoner».* Fafo-rapport 516. Fafo.

Health and Rights Act. (1999) Lov om pasient og brukerrettigheter

Helsedirektoratet (2011) *Veileder om kommunikasjon via tolk for ledere og personell i helse- og omsorgstjenestene*, Oslo.

Heritage, J. (1989) *Current developments in conversation analysis.* In Rogers, D. and J. Potter (eds), *Conversation: An Interdisciplinary Perspective.* Clevendon: Multilingual Matters, pp 21-47

Heritage, J. and S. Clayman (2010) *Talk in Action. Interactions, Identities, and Institutions.* West Sussex: Wiley Blackwell

Hutchby, I. (2001) *Conversation and technology*. Cambridge: Polity

Hutchby, I. and R. Wooffitt (2008) *Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: Polity

IMDi (2011) January 31st, URL:

https://www.tolkeportalen.no/no/For-tolker/Tolkens-yrkesetikk/

Jareg, K. and Z. Pettersen (2006) *Tolk og Tolkebruker – to sider av samme sak*. Bergen: Fagbokforlaget.

Jest, P. og M. Sodermann (2016) February 18th 2016, *Tolkning på video*, Fyens Tidende, p 22, Baglandet.

Jewitt, C. (2009) *An introduction to multimodality.* In Jewitt, Carey, *The Routledge Handbook of Multimodal Analysis,* New York: Routledge

Jones, R (2009) *Technology and sites of display*. In Jewitt, Carey, *The Routledge Handbook of Multimodal Analysis*, New York: Routledge

Laksuktom, P. (2015) *Fjerntolking for minoriteter i helsetjenesten – En systematisk oversikt.* Master thesis. Høgskolen i Bergen, Bergen.

Lee, S.H. (2013) *Response Design in Conversation*. In Sidnell, J. and T. Stivers, *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis.* West Sussex: Wiley Blackwell

Lerner, G. (1992) *Assisted Storytelling: Deploying Shared Knowledge as a Practical Matter.* Qualitative Sociology 15(3):247-271

Lerner, G. (1993) *Collectivities in Action: Establishing the Relevance of Conjoined Participation in Conversation.* Text 13(2): 213-241

Lerner, G. (1996) *On the "semi-permeable" character of grammatical units in conversation: conditional entry into the turn space of another speaker*, in Ochs, E, E. Schegloff and S. A. Thompson, *Interaction and Grammar.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Lerner, G. (2004) *Collaborative turn sequences*, in Lerner, G., Conversation Analysis, Studies from the first generation, John Benjamins

Li, Shuangyu (2010) *Understanding Interactions in Interpreted Triadic Medical Consultaions in Primary Care.* (Doctoral thesis). University of Leeds

Løfsnes, H., V. Buzungu, H. F. Buzungu and J. Hansen (2014) *Skjermtolking – et spørsmål om organisering eller teknologi? Teknologisk rapport fra prosjektet «Skjermtolking – når tolken er et annet sted»*.

Mondada, L. (2013) *The Conversation Analytic Approach to Data Collection*. In Sidnell, J. and T. Stivers, *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis,* West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell

Moser-Mercer, B. (2015) *The ABCs of Technology.* Presentation at InDialog 2015, *Community interpreting in dialogue with technology*

Munthe-Kaas HM, Wollscheid S, Hammerstrøm KT, Blaasvær N, Johansen S, Kurtze N, Gundersen M., 2015, *Effect of and experiences with interpretation and translation services in the public sector*. Notat – 2015. (URL: http://www.kunnskapssenteret.no/en/publications/effect-of-and-experiences-with-interpretation-and-translation-services-in-the-public-sector)

National Insurance Act. (1997) Lov om folketrygd.

NAV (2007) *Bildetolking. Et landsdekkende tilbud for hørselshemmede i arbeid.* Informasjon fra NAV Hjelpemiddelsentraler og spesialenheter.

NAV, 2013, November 21st, *Bildetolktjenesten.* URL: www.nav.no/bildetolk

NAV, 2015, June 8th, *Rundskriv § 10-7 Bokstav f – Tolkehjelp for hørselshemmede.* URL: https://www.nav.no/rettskildene/Rundskriv/10-7-bokstav-f-tolkehjelp-for-h%C3%B8rselshemmede

Neumann C.B. and I.B. Neumann (2012) *Forskeren i forskningsprosessen,* Cappelen Damm

Nielsen, Mie Fernø and Søren Beck Nielsen, 2005, *Samtaleanalyse,* Fredriksberg: Samfundslitteratur

NOU 2014:8 (2014) *Tolking i offentlig sektor – et spørsmål om rettssikkerhet og likeverd.* Oslo: Departementets sikkerhets- og serviceorganisasjon. Informasjonsforvaltning. 2014.

Public Administrations Act. (1967) Lov om behandlingsmåten I forvaltningssaker

Sacks, H. (1984) Notes on methodology, in Atkinson, J. Maxwell and John Heritage, 1985, *Structures of Social Interaction. Studies in Conversation Analysis,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Sacks, H., E.A. Schegloff and G. Jefferson (1974), *A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn-Taking for Conversation, in Language*, Vol. 50, No4, Part 1, (Dec., 1974), pp 696-735

Schegloff, E. A. (1992) *On Talk and Its Institutional Occasions.* In: Drew, P and Heritage J (eds) *Talk at Work: Interaction in Institutional Settings.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff, E. A. (1995) *Parties and Talking together: Two Ways in Which Numbers Are Significant for Talk-in-Interaction.* In: Ten Have P and Psathas, G, (eds) *Situated order: Studies in Social Organization and Embodied Activities.* Washington DC: University Press of America, 31-42.

Schegloff, E A. (1996), *Turn organization: one intersection of grammar and interactions.* In, Ochs, E., E.A. Schegloff and S.A. Thompson, *Interaction and grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Selting, M. (2000) *The constructions of units in conversational talk.* In Language and Society, 29, pp 477-517

Silverman, D (2011) *Interpreting Qualitative Data,* London: Sage Publications Ltd

Silverman, D (2013) *Doing Qualitative Research,* London: Sage Publications Ltd

Skaaden, H. (2001) *On-screen Interpreting*. I K. Nordby (red.) *Human Factors in Telecommunication*. *Proceedings 18th International Symposium on Human Factors in Telecommunication.* Bergen. HFT.

Skaaden, H. (2013) *Den topartiske tolken*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget

Svennevig, J. (2012) *Interaction in workplace meetings.* In Discourse studies, 14(1), 3-10

Svennevig, J. (2015) *Én porsjon om gangen. Multimodal koordinering i samtaler med andrespråksbrukere.* In Engebregtsen, M. (eds), *Det tredje språket. Multimodale studier av interkulturell kommunikasjon i kunst, skole og samfunnsliv*. Kristiansand: Portal Forlag.

Statens vegvesen (2001) *Rapport. Forsøksprosjekt med tolkeprøver via skjerm ved Stavanger og Oslo trafikkstasjoner.* Transport og sikkerhetsavdelingen, Kontor for trafikkpedagogikk.

Statens Serium Institut (2013) *Digitalisering med effekt. National strategi for digitalisering af Sundhedsvæsenet 2013-2017*

Tolkeportalen, 2014, August 4th, *Kommunikasjon via tolk*, URL: https://www.tolkeportalen.no/no/For-tolkebrukere/Kommunikasjon-via-tolk/

UDI (2003) *Skjermtolking. Fra prosjektet Tolk & Telematikk.* Bergen: Hordaland fylkeskommune/Utlendingsdirektoratet

Wadensjö, C. (1998) *Interpreting As Interaction*. London: Addison Wesley Longman.

Wollscheid S, Munthe-Kaas HM, Hammerstrøm KT, Noonan E. (2013) *Effekt av tiltak for å bedre kommunikasjonen mellom minoritetsspråklige barnefamilier eller enslige unge og offentlig tjenesteapparat.* Rapport fra Kunnskapssenteret nr. 15 – 2013. (URL: http://www.kunnskapssenteret.no/publikasjoner/effekt-av-tiltak-for-a-bedre-kommunikasjonen-mellom-minoritetsspraklige-barnefamilier-eller-enslige-unge-og-offentlig-tjenesteapparat)