

English as a Lingua Franca in telephone interpreting: representations and linguistic justice

SIMO K. MÄÄTTÄ
University of Helsinki (Finland)

Abstract

This paper analyzes the general impact and the potentially adverse effects of the use of English as a lingua franca (ELF) in a telephone-interpreted police interview in Finland, which was recorded and transcribed. The data were analyzed manually, both quantitatively and qualitatively. The analysis focuses on issues of mutual understanding and the organization of discursive flow from the interpreter's perspective, using theoretical and methodological tools from conversation analysis, critical sociolinguistics, and critical discourse analysis. Examples of repair initiations and candidate understandings in the data, divided into three categories based on the degree of interpreter intervention in interaction, illustrate the interpreter's prominent role as a coordinator of discursive flow and repairer of communication problems. However, while the ELF-speaking interpreter shows accommodation to the ELF-speaking migrant's linguistic resources, the outcome is not necessarily beneficial to the migrant. The service provider's command of English complicates the interaction. Thus, in dialogue interpreting, ELF may function as an instrument of linguistic unfairness in ways that are often unpredictable. The representations that the interpreter constructs of the other participants as persons with limited linguistic and discursive resources play an important role in such processes. The peculiar features of telephone interpreting intersecting with issues related to ELF intensify such phenomena.

Keywords

Telephone interpreting, English as a lingua franca (ELF), legal interpreting, community interpreting, interpreter-mediated police interviews.

Introduction: English as a lingua franca in dialogue interpreting

English as a lingua franca (ELF) has become an important field of inquiry in interpreting and translation studies. Some analyses have explored the general impact of ELF on translation and interpreting practices (Cook 2012) and translator/interpreter training (House 2013). Studies focusing on specific ELF-related phenomena include Abl-Mikasa's (2015) analysis of ELF speakers' limited power of expression as a source of both activation and retrieval constraints, with an adverse effect on interpretation. In community and legal interpreting studies, such inquiries have been rare. One of the few exceptions is the paper by Gavioli and Baraldi (2011) analyzing the achievement of intercultural communication in legal and health care settings. Corpus linguistic tools have not yet been widely used on community and legal interpreting corpora. In fact, the challenges related to creating interpreting corpora, such as the fact that several languages are involved (Bendazzoli/Sandrelli 2009), are even greater in community and legal interpreting. Thus, corpora are typically studied "manually".

While interpreting studies analyses of lingua-franca interpreting focus on the interpreter, sociolinguistics and linguistic anthropology have been more interested in the migrant's perspective. ELF, other lingua francas, and non-standard varieties of a particular language have been examined in such studies. Thus, Gumperz (1982) and Haviland (2003) have analyzed the case of Mexicans who are assigned interpreters of Spanish in the US legal system, although their first language is not Spanish. Similarly, Eades (2010: 88-91) has discussed research conducted on so-called second-dialect speakers, namely persons who use a variety other than the standard variety of a particular legal system. Much of this research has centered on Australian Aboriginal English speakers. Several studies have identified monolithic and monolingual language ideologies, that is, cultural conceptions of the nature and function of language, languages, and language varieties (Gal/Woolard 1995: 130), as the origin of linguistic injustice in complex multilingual encounters involving interpreters in the legal domain (e.g. Angermeyer 2008, 2014; Berk-Seligson 2008; Haviland 2003; Maryns 2006). In sociolinguistic studies, there have also been some attempts to create larger community-interpreting corpora that can be shared among several researchers (Angermeyer *et al.* 2012). However, it is particularly difficult to create larger corpora of sensitive data. For example, the present study is based on a small data set obtained through personal contacts and subject to significant restrictions governing its usage.

One of the goals of this paper is to inspire more dialogue-interpreting research focusing on ELF and telephone interpreting, as ELF is commonly used as a language of communication between interpreter and migrant in interpreter-mediated encounters in Finland and elsewhere in Europe. For example, based

on my experience as an interpreter in the greater Helsinki area and conversations and interviews with colleagues, I would estimate that in this region at least 80 percent of migrants communicating with the interpreter in English are ELF speakers. Most interpreters are ELF speakers as well (see Määttä 2017 for details). Therefore, it is important to understand the impact of ELF on interpreting strategies and the outcomes of interpreter-mediated encounters. Studies combining insights from interpreting studies and other disciplines such as sociolinguistics and conversation analysis would be particularly beneficial to the field.

This paper is inspired by critical discourse analysis, which means that the analysis is based on the identification of a social problem and the discursive and ideological processes related to it. Issues related to ELF in dialogue interpreting are manifold (Määttä 2015). For example, the practice of interpreting between two B (active) or C (passive) languages is relatively common, and many interpreters lack formal training. An important issue is the wide range of varieties spoken by both migrants and interpreters and the increased pressure to provide accurate renditions because most participants in the encounter have some knowledge of English. However, service providers and many interpreters are not aware of the complexity of the ELF phenomenon. In fact, ELF is an instrument that makes multilingualism invisible and therefore also disguises the power imbalance inherent in any complex multilingual context.

Most phenomena analyzed in the paper can be explained both by features related to ELF and by the special features of telephone interpreting. Existing research has identified the high cognitive load occasioned by efforts to understand the primary speaker in remote interpreting as having an adverse effect on interpreter renditions (Moser-Mercer 2005). Omissions and additions in the interpretation are attributable to the telephone interpreting mode (Braun 2013) as well. Moreover, telephone interpreting is characterized by the interpreter's prominent role as a coordinator of the interaction (Torres 2014: 413-415). Based on my experience as an interpreter and conversations with colleagues, the most significant challenge in telephone interpreting, at least in Finland, remains poor sound quality. The second most significant issue is the lack of non-verbal communication, which translates into problems in the following areas: turn organization, interpretation of written documents present in the situation and interpretation of speech related to objects that are present in the situation, and communication of affect. All of these issues appear in the data analyzed in this paper as well. In fact, issues related to the telephone interpreting mode intersect with the special features of ELF to such an extent that it is impossible to identify whether a communication problem is due primarily to telephone interpreting or the use of English as a lingua franca.

1. Data

The interview analyzed in this paper lasted 1 hour 46 minutes in total. The interviewee sat with the interviewer in the police department, whereas the interpreter, who has several years of experience as a community and legal interpreter

and is a trained interpreter, was in another location. The interviewer typed the *official record* during the interview – since this written document is not a verbatim rendering of the original speech, it would be misleading to call it a *transcript*. Both the interpreter and the interviewee were ELF speakers; the interpreter and the interviewer were native speakers of Finnish. The interviewee had arrived in Finland a few months before the interview took place from a country in which English is the most important lingua franca and an official language alongside several other languages. In order to protect the privacy of the persons involved, no details will be given about the exact nature or context of the interview.

The transcription was produced using Praat software for the scientific analysis of speech. The transcription contains 79,063 signs including spaces and 14,084 words, including indications of time (e.g. “00:15”) and pauses (e.g. “(0.5)”).

The following transcription conventions appear in the examples:

?	Rising intonation at the end of a prosodic group
^tall	Pitch prominence in the following word
womb	Increased loudness (word)
conflict	Stress (syllable)
in:	Lengthened sound
da-	False start
(.)	Micropause shorter than 0.2 seconds
(1.4)	Pause longer than 0.2 seconds
.hhhh=yes	Elements merging without overlapping
[okay]	Overlapping elements
<veli>	Word spoken more slowly than neighboring words
(-)	Short inaudible passage
(---)	Long inaudible passage
.h	Short respiration sound
.hhhh	Long respiration sound
((laughing))	Transcriber’s comments.

2. Analysis

2.1 Other-initiated repairs and candidate understandings

The analysis started by studying the transcript carefully in order to identify interactional and language problems related to ELF and the telephone interpreting mode. Since the data set was rather small and the focus was on interaction, the analysis was carried out manually and took into account both quantitative and qualitative features. This initial analysis exposed *reformulations* and *verifications* performed by the interpreter as the most salient feature in the data. In a reformulation, the speaker (typically the interpreter) repeats the information content of the previous speaker’s turn using different words and/or grammatical constructions. In a verification, the speaker checks whether s/he has heard or understood another speaker’s turn correctly. In terms of interaction, most

reformulations result from *other-initiated repairs* (Schegloff *et al.* 1977), whereas verifications can be characterized as *candidate understandings*, namely questions in which the hearer offers an interpretation of what the other speaker just said (Schegloff 1996). Both repair initiations and candidate understandings were counted and analyzed manually.

Out of 33 occurrences of other-initiated repairs (see Table 1) in this data, 9 were initiated by the interviewer, and the interpreter interpreted these in 7 cases, executed the repair in 1 case, and reacted by initiating another repair once. The interviewee initiated 8 repairs, and the interpreter executed the repair in 5 cases (informing the interviewer about the repair initiation once), interpreted the turn in 2 cases, and did nothing in 1 case. The interpreter initiated 16 repairs, out of which 2 were directed to the interviewer and 14 to the interviewee; in all of these cases, the person to which the repair was directed also completed it. Hence, repair organization was largely coordinated by the interpreter, and much of the repair work occurred between the interpreter and the interviewee.

<i>Producer</i>	<i>Number of repairs initiated</i>	<i>Action by the interpreter</i>
Interviewer	9	7: interpreted 1: repaired 1: new repair initiated
Interviewee	8	5: repaired 2: interpreted 1: no action
Interpreter	16	2: directed to the interviewer 14: directed to the interviewee
Total	33	

Table 1. Other-initiated repairs and the interpreter's action

A total of 44 candidate understandings were identified in the data (Table 2). The interpreter produced 31 candidate understandings (out of which 2 were directed to the interviewer and 29 to the interviewee), whereas the interviewer produced 5 and the interviewee 8 candidate understandings. The interpreter interpreted all candidate understandings produced by the interviewer to the interviewee. As for candidate understandings produced by the interviewee, the interpreter reacted twice with the response token *uh-huh*, twice by reformulating the word, twice by interpreting the turn to the interviewer, once by initiating a repair, and once by doing nothing. Hence, the solution to communication problems by means of candidate understandings was also coordinated mostly by the interpreter, and this activity mainly occurred between the interpreter and the migrant.

<i>Producer</i>	<i>Number of candidate understandings initiated</i>	<i>Action by the interpreter</i>
Interviewer	5	all interpreted
Interviewee	8	2: <i>uh-huh</i> 2: reformulation 2: interpreted 1: repair initiation 1: no action
Interpreter	31	2: directed to the interviewer 29: directed to the interviewee
Total	44	

Table 2. Candidate understandings and the interpreter’s action

Subsequently, occurrences of other-initiated repairs and candidate understandings were linked to the degree of interpreter involvement, namely the interpreter’s role as a coordinator of discursive flow, of which examples were chosen. No software was used in this analysis. The identity of the persons involved in the examples is protected and words that were deemed irrelevant for the analysis have been changed or removed. Since the goal is not to analyze grammatical equivalence between Finnish and English, only the content information of the Finnish utterances is glossed in English. These translations are italicized. Due to significant structural differences between Finnish and English, the translations are not word-for-word. For example, it is impossible to reproduce the Finnish word and constituent order in English, and there are no exact translations for hedges and discourse markers. Pauses in the original Finnish utterances are reproduced in the translation in order to make it easier for the reader to follow the flow of the interaction. For the same reason, turns instead of lines (as is customary in conversation analysis) are numbered in the examples.

The examples were analyzed taking into account the interactional, phonetic, lexical, and grammatical particularities that were salient in each case. I will start with an example in which the interpreter took no initiative to repair the communication problem. Subsequently, I will analyze an example in which such normative action (i.e. “just interpreting”) is combined with verification in the form of a candidate understanding, and continue with four examples of candidate understandings leading to different outcomes. Finally, I will analyze three examples in which the interpreter took a prominent role in initiating repairs and executing them.

2.2 The difficulty in maintaining normative interpreting strategies

Wadensjö (1998) has shown that interpreters play an active role as coordinators of interaction. However, deontological norms still disregard this fact. For example, the preamble to the code of conduct for Finnish legal interpreters (SKTL 2016) acknowledges that the interpreter has the right to intervene in turn organization if deemed necessary in order to guarantee exhaustivity and accuracy. However, Article 6 of this code states that the interpreter should just interpret. Such normative interpreting strategies are difficult to maintain in ELF and telephone interpreting. As a result, the interpreter inevitably becomes visible as a coordinator of the interaction.

Interpreter-mediated encounters involving ELF are often characterized by the fact that the service provider knows English, which has an impact on the interaction and on interpreting strategies (Pöllabauer 2004: 152). In this sample, several instances show that the interviewer knows English. In the following example, the interviewer's open acknowledgement of his/her command of English triggers a normative pattern of interpreting: instead of taking the initiative for the repair, the interpreter translates the interviewer's and the interviewee's repair initiations:

Example 1

- | | |
|---------------|---|
| 2 INTERPRETER | do you actively celebrate your religion? eh (0.7) da- do- do
you show does your religion show in your daily life? |
| 3 INTERVIEWEE | yes |
| 4 INTERVIEWER | millä tavalla
in what way |
| 5 INTERPRETER | .hh in: what ways: |
| 6 INTERVIEWEE | come again with the question maybe I didn't get you right |
| 7 INTERPRETER | voitko esittää kysymyksen uudestaan en ehkä ymmärtänyt
(.) kunnolla
could you repeat the question maybe I did not understand
(.) correctly |

In turn 4, the interviewer initiates a repair without waiting for the interpreter's rendition of the very short and simple answer *yes*, thus demonstrating a command of English. Naturally, this intervention does not prove that the interviewer is perfectly fluent in English and could therefore assess the interpreting. However, it signals that there is a possibility of both. In fact, in Finland even law enforcement agents who have an adequate command of English (or any foreign language used by the migrant) have to use an interpreter in interviews. The interpreter's respiration and lengthened sounds at the beginning of turn 5 indicate discomfort: since the interviewer knows English and does not wait for the interpreter's rendition of the interviewee's turn 3, there is more pressure to provide accurate renditions. In turn 7, interpreting the interviewee's repair initiation (turn 6) is an exceptional strategy in the data, as the interpreter usually performs the repair directly without interpreting the request to the interviewer. The interviewer's open acknowledgment of his/her English skills may have had an influence in the interpreter's choice.

Both the interpreter and the interviewer are ELF speakers, and both have idiosyncratic features in their English usage. However, although the interviewee's grammar is not always normative, mutual understanding does not appear to be affected by grammatical peculiarities. Instead, there are often lexical problems related to certain semantic fields, such as housing, as in the following sample where normative interpreting strategies and interpreter-controlled strategies merge. Thus, in turn 5, the interviewer's repair initiation is interpreted, whereas in turn 8 the interpreter informs the interviewer about the need to check the facts one more time prior to producing a repair initiation not prompted by the interviewer:

Example 2

- 1 INTERVIEWER .hh millainen asunto onks teillä kerrostalo vai rivitalo vai omakotitalo ja kuinka paljon siellä on (.) on neliöitä *what kind of dwelling do you have an apartment building a row house or a house and how many are there (.) square meters*¹
- 2 INTERPRETER what kind of apartment do you have (.) is it eh (0.6 .hh) is it an apartment eh (.) in a building? or is it a detached house or is it (0.7) is it eh a separate house?
- 3 INTERVIEWEE it's apartment
- 4 INTERPRETER se on (.) asunto
it's (.) a dwelling
- 5 INTERVIEWER mikä asunto
what dwelling
- 6 INTERPRETER eh (.) is it ehm like in a building with ehm (.) several floors?
- 7 INTERVIEWEE yeah we are (.) yeah (when we are) (.) the time I came (0.3) he was living in a smaller house. (1.0) then we moved out from that hou- (.) smaller house we're in a bigger (0.7) flat (.) two bedrooms flat
- 8 INTERPRETER okei eli eli ensin asuttiin pienemmässä asunnossa ja sitten muutettiin isompaan (0.6) öö (0.5) s- isompaan tota (0.5) asuntoon (0.5) mä toistan vielä ton kysymyksen tätä on vähä vaikee selittää tätä kerrostaloa=
okay so first we lived in a smaller apartment and then we moved to a bigger (0.6) eh (0.5) bigger like (0.5) dwelling (0.5) I will repeat the question one more time it is a bit difficult to explain this apartment building thing
=so (0.6 .hhh) is it an apartment ehm (1.8) is it like a ↗ tall ↗ building or is it eh (0.8) what kind of building is it. (0.3) where the where the flat is
- 9 INTERVIEWEE it's a tall building I think I think it's four floors [-] (0.7) yes
- 10 INTERPRETER [okay] (0.7) great (1.0) .hh se on kerrostalo (0.4) ö (.) taitaa olla nelikerroksinen
it's an apartment building (0.4) eh I think it has four floors

1 Finnish constituent order is reproduced in this gloss.

In turn 1, the interviewer enquires about housing by using the Finnish word *asunto*, which can be translated as ‘dwelling’, ‘house’, ‘apartment’, or ‘flat’. The interpreter (turn 2) uses the words *apartment*, *house*, and *detached house*, thus omitting *row house* and the number of square meters mentioned in the interviewer’s turn. When the interpreter (turn 4) uses the word *asunto* in his/her rendition of the word *apartment* in the interviewee’s turn 3, presumably with the meaning of ‘apartment’ or ‘flat’ in a block or a building, the interviewer initiates a repair (turn 5). In fact, the interpreter’s rendition does not make sense because the prototypical meaning of the word *asunto* is ‘dwelling’; as a result, the original question in turn 1 related to the type of dwelling is answered by the question itself. In turn 6, the interpreter reformulates the interviewer’s question with the assumption that the persons live in a building with several floors. The first part of interviewee’s answer in turn 7 shows that this assumption is correct. Nevertheless, in the latter part of turn 7, the interviewee uses the word *house*, followed by *flat*. As a result, the interpreter checks the facts one more time in turn 8. Three tasks are performed in this complex turn. First, the interviewee’s turn 7 is translated. Second, the interviewer is informed about the need to check one more time whether the dwelling is situated in an apartment building. Third, the interpreter switches to English and reformulates the question asked in turn 6 by explicitly inquiring whether the dwelling is situated in a *tall building*. Both the word *apartment* and the word *flat* are used, showing accommodation to the interviewee’s usage.

2.3 Monitoring errors

In the previous example, the interaction was complicated by a lexical field in which it is difficult to find exact equivalences both within ELF and cross-linguistically. The interpreter’s efforts to find the right equivalent can also be regarded as a strategy for monitoring potential interpreting errors. This subsection explores the outcome of such monitoring in more detail with four examples.

There are numerous studies on English accents and the language ideologies related to them (Moyer A. 2013; Lippi-Green 2011). However, little is known about the effects of an unfamiliar accent in interaction, and patterns identified in the existing literature are often contradictory (Moyer A. 2013: 93-99, 109). In this data, the interviewee’s pronunciation appears to engender communication problems on several occasions. In the following example, the interviewee’s pronunciation of the word *cupboard* blocks the interpreter’s processing of that word. As a result, the interpreter produces a candidate understanding and combines it with an explicit clarification request which ultimately leads to an erroneous rendition:

Example 3

- | | |
|---------------|--|
| 1 INTERVIEWEE | and the (0.5) there’s a TV in the living room? |
| 2 INTERPRETER | .h olohuoneessa on televisio?
<i>there is a TV in the living room</i> |
| 3 INTERVIEWEE | with a white carboard? |

4 INTERPRETER	ja ja tota siellä on valkea (1.5) <i>and and like there is a white (1.5)</i> cardboard you mean eh (1.5) with [shelves]?
5 INTERVIEWEE	[- yes] but (.) it's a it's like a shelf (.) I don't know how I [--]
6 INTERPRETER	[okay] (0.6 .hh) [siellä on valkoinen hylly?] <i>there is a white shelf</i>
7 INTERVIEWEE	yes?
8 INTERPRETER	yeah (.) and (1.0) and
9 INTERVIEWER	olohuoneessa on televisio ja valkoinen hylly [↑] tää ehkä riittää kiitos (0.7) ja tästä huonekalujen kuvauksesta <i>there is a TV and a white shelf in the living room this is perhaps</i> <i>enough thank you (07) and in terms of describing the furniture</i>

The reasons leading to this erroneous rendition are quite complex. In turn 3, the interviewee states that there is a *white cupboard* in the living room. However, the interviewee pronounces the word as if it were a “carboard”. As a result, the interpreter is confused: turn 4 starts with hesitation (the word *ja* – ‘and’ – repeated twice, followed by the discourse marker *tota* – ‘like’). After having pronounced the word *valkea* (‘white’), the interpreter takes a long pause (1.5 seconds), indicating that the following sequence is problematic. Subsequently, the interpreter switches to English, uses the word *cardboard*, and verifies whether the piece of furniture has *shelves*, thus introducing a word that the interviewee had not mentioned. This question is also preceded by a 1.5-second pause. There are several indications of hesitation in the interviewee’s answer (turn 5): the beginning of the turn overlaps with the interpreter’s turn and starts with the affirmative *yes*, immediately followed by the adversary *but*. The repetition of the relational process *it’s* indicates hesitation as well: the interviewee starts with a clear statement involving the indefinite article, then continues with a statement hedged by the discourse marker *like*. At the end of the turn, hesitation is lexicalized (*I don’t know how I*). The end of the interviewee’s turn is not audible because it overlaps with the interpreter’s turn 6. The pause after the initial *okay* in turn 6 indicates that the interpreter meant the initial *okay* to be a token showing active listening. However, the interviewee considers this *okay* to indicate a new turn. And since the interviewee does not continue, the interpreter decides to use the word *hylly* (‘shelf’) and omits the hedge *like*. Therefore, the pragmatic dimension of hesitation, which scholars such as Hale (2004: 3) have identified as a central requirement of a felicitous interpretation, is not conveyed. As turn 9 shows, the interviewer writes the interpreter’s version in the official record of the interview.

In example 4, an unfamiliar accent coupled with possible poor sound quality related to telephone interpreting lead to a situation in which the interpreter mishears or misunderstands and produces a candidate understanding, which the interviewee mishears or misunderstands. As a result, the problem persists in spite of verification:

Example 4

1 INTERVIEWER	joo? (0.8) noo (1.5) mitäs tää sus sisko tekee Amerikassa <i>ok (0.8) so (1.5) what does this sister of yours do in America</i>
2 INTERPRETER	what is your sister doing in America
3 INTERVIEWEE	that was just my cousin not my blood sister my blood sister she's living Africa
4 INTERPRETER	black sister [you said] (0.4) .hhhhh=
5 INTERVIEWEE	=yes (.) that one in America she's my cousin from my mother's side
6 INTERPRETER	.hh öö siis sisko ei ole Amerikassa että minun aa (0.5) ää musta siskoni on on Afrikassa että tuo (0.4) henkilö joka on Amerikassa on minun äidinpuoleinen serkkuni <i>eh like the sister is not in America like my eh (0.5) eh black sister is in Africa like that (0.4) person who is in America is my cousin from my mother's side</i>

The vowel in the word *blood* in the interviewee's turn 3 sounds more like [æ] than [ʌ]. This is a possible explanation for why the interpreter hears *black* instead of *blood*. However, there were no mentions of family members belonging to different ethnic groups previously in the interview. Moreover, only one sister has been mentioned thus far, which potentially explains the interpreter's candidate understanding in turn 4. The very long respiration at the end of the turn, preceded by a pause, indicates that the interpreter regards the candidate understanding as problematic. However, in turn 5, the interviewee confirms the interpreter's inquiry affirmatively. In addition, the fact that the "black sister" lives in Africa and the cousin in America reaffirms the interpreter's presupposition of an ethnically (and geographically) divided family. However, the interpreter's hesitation is still noticeable: instead of *serkku* ('cousin'), the word *henkilö* ('person') is used in turn 6. This can be regarded as an attempt to minimize the potential damage. There is a 47-second pause between the end of the interpreter's turn 6 and the interviewer's next turn, which suggests that the erroneous wording was written in the official record, too.

On other occasions, verification by means of a candidate understanding is felicitous:

Example 5

1 INTERVIEWEE	she (0.7) (-) (0.5) hmm (0.6) womb (.) I don't know (if the womb problem something like (0.3) I think it was (0.4) cancer (1.3) she was supposed be operated but she died before the operation
2 INTERPRETER	so eh (.) in her <i>womb</i>
3 INTERVIEWEE	womb yeah it's like (.) womb (.) womb problem (.) she had a womb problem was supposed to be operated (0.8) but she died before the operation [-]
4 INTERPRETER	[.hhh] okay. womb eh the place where babies are
5 INTERVIEWEE	yes

In this excerpt, the interpreter produces two candidate understandings: in turn 2 by repeating the word *womb* used by the interviewee, and in turn 4 by reformulating the organ in plain terms (*the place where babies are*). In this case as well, the unfamiliar accent may explain the problem: in two instances, the vowel sound in the word *womb* is close to [ɜ:], which would make it *worm*. Nevertheless, the verification is successful and the facts are written correctly in the official record.

Finally, in some cases the interpreter manages to rectify a misheard or misunderstood word:

Example 6

1 INTERVIEWER	o:kei mikä hänen ammattinsa on <i>okay what is her profession</i>
2 INTERPRETER	ehm what is your profession (1.4) your occupation
3 INTERVIEWEE	my occupation I'm? (0.6) business (.) lady?
4 INTERPRETER	cleaning lady
5 INTERVIEWER	business lady=
6 INTERPRETER	=business lady olen öö liikenainen <i>I am ehm a business lady</i>

The fact that the interviewee does not respond immediately to the question containing the noun *profession* in turn 2 prompts the interpreter to reformulate the question by using the noun *occupation* at the end of the same turn. The interviewee starts turn 3 with a candidate understanding prior to giving an answer. It is difficult to use accent as an explanation for the interpreter's hearing *cleaning lady* instead of *business lady* in turn 4. Lexical innovation related to unusual collocations as a typical feature of ELF (e.g. Cogo/Dewey 2012: 70) explains the communication problem partially. Nevertheless, the discursive construction of a particular representation of an ELF speaker coming from a third-world country, related to exaggerated generalization resulting from an unfamiliar accent (Moyer A. 2013: 104), is another plausible explanation.

2.4 Proactive interpreting

The interpreter is often a proactive participant, initiating and completing repairs. Thus, in the following example, the interpreter performs a reformulation in response to the interviewee's open repair initiation:

Example 7

1 INTERVIEWER	onko teillä ollu ristiriitoja tavallaan kahden kulttuurin kohtaamisesta <i>have you had conflicts so to speak due to the contact between two cultures</i>
2 INTERPRETER	.hh have there been any conflicts in the relationship because of the (0.5) clash between two cultures?

- 3 INTERVIEWEE come again?
 4 INTERPRETER .hh have there been any con- conflicts
 in your relationship because of the fact that you come
 from different cultures
 5 INTERVIEWEE no

In turn 2, the interpreter transforms the word *kohtaaminen* ('contact') used by the interviewer into *clash*. Since the interviewee initiates a repair (turn 3), the interpreter (turn 4) reformulates the question by changing the abstract process of a contact taking place between two cultures to a more tangible process in which the active participants are persons. The word *clash* is not mentioned in the reformulation. As a result, the interviewee (turn 5) understands the question immediately. In fact, the problematic nature of the abstract concept of contact between two cultures is present in the interviewer's turn 1, as indicated by the hedge *tavallaan* ('so to speak' or 'in a way'). In turn 2, the interpreter's respiration sound marks the upcoming rendition as problematic, and the pause preceding the word *clash* marks that word as problematic. In addition, the first syllable of the word *conflict* is stressed in turn 2, and the word is foregrounded as problematic in turn 4, as illustrated by the false start. One explanation for the interpreter-initiated reformulation in turn 4 resides in the fact that the interpreter judges the interviewer incapable of rephrasing the concept in a way that the interviewee would understand (cf. Maryns 2006), and regards such rephrasing as the interpreter's duty. At the same time, the reformulation is based on the interpreter's assumption that the problem resides in the interviewee's abstract-vocabulary limitations.

Example 8 illustrates interpreter-initiated repairs:

Example 8

- 1 INTERVIEWER minkäläinen (0.3) sitte niin niin koulutus sinulla on *what*
 kind of (0.3) then like like education do you have
 2 INTERPRETER what kind of education do you have
 3 INTERVIEWEE I'm (0.6) eh secondary but I didn't complete because (3.1)
 I didn't have enough money to complete it
 4 INTERPRETER okay how many years did you go to school
 5 INTERVIEWEE eight years
 6 INTERPRETER .hh olen käynyt koulua kahdeksan vuotta et en voinut
 käydä (0.3) peruskoulua loppuun koska minulla ei ollut
 rahaa
 I went to school for seven years like I could not finish (0.3)
 comprehensive school because I did not have money

The interpreter's repair initiation in turn 4 exemplifies problems related to the lexical field of education in ELF contexts: secondary education can cover different types of schools in various parts of the world. For example, in Finland, secondary covers the last three years of compulsory education and the two or three years following it, depending on the school chosen by the person. Therefore, the risk of an interpretation error is high. In addition, the repair initiation shows the in-

terpreter's goal orientation: typically, interviewers prefer to write the number of years spent at school in the official record of the interview.

In example 1, I analyzed the service provider's English skills as a potential factor leading to normative interpreting strategies (strategies in which the interpreter "just interprets"). The service provider's English skills can also have an adverse effect on the quality of the official record. Thus, on several occasions, it appears that the interviewer does not listen carefully to the interpretation and bases the record on fragments of the interviewee's original speech instead:

Example 9a

- 1 INTERVIEWEE her sister died I think three years (.) ago three to four years ago (1.0) sister
- 2 INTERPRETER .hh e- can you repeat please?
- 3 INTERVIEWEE (it's) her sister she died (0.5) three to: (0.3) four years ago I'm not sure exactly he told me but I forg(h)ot what she was [-] yeah
- 4 INTERPRETER [okay] (1.3) eli hänen siskonsa kuoli kolme tai neljä vuotta sitten en ihan tarkkaan muista (0.8) kummin se oli hän kyllä kertoi minulle sen
okay (1.3) so her sister died three or four years ago I do not remember exactly (0.8) which one is correct although he did tell me
- 5 INTERVIEWER joo? (6.0) joo? (.) eli siskonsa kuoli pari kolme vuotta / sitten entäpä sitten <veli> onko
okay (6.0) okay (.) so her sister died a couple of years ago what about the brother is he

In turn 1, the interviewee first says that the person died *three years* ago and subsequently corrects this to *three to four* years. This information is repeated in turn 3 following the interpreter's repair initiation in turn 2. The interpretation in Finnish in turn 4 reflects the corrected version (*three or four* years). The interviewer accepts this interpretation with the minimal response *joo* ('okay'), repeated twice at the beginning of turn 5. There is a long pause (6 seconds) between the two *joo* responses. During this pause, the interviewer is presumably completing the official record and preparing the next question. However, the record appears to be based on the interviewee's initial estimation (*three years*) at the beginning of turn 1, generating an idiomatic collocation *pari kolme* ('a couple of'; literally 'two or three'). The interpreter corrects the interviewer and subsequently checks the fact one more time, thereby acknowledging the service provider's failure to produce what is expected (Maryns 2006: 7):

Example 9b

- 6 INTERPRETER öö mäk- tulk- mä sanoin kyllä kolme neljä
ehm, I act- interp- I actually said three or four
- 7 INTERVIEWER aa kolme neljä okei ((laughing)) joo selvä (0.4) hyvä
(0.4) hyvä ku olit tarkkana
ah three to four okay ((laughing)) ok fine (0.4) good

(0.4) *good that you paid attention*
it was three or four years ago right?

The interpreter's turn 6 is characterized by hesitation and false starts, which indicates ethical stress (Ulrich *et al.* 2007) as a consequence of the interviewer's listening to the interviewee's original English. An experienced legal interpreter knows that minor differences related to numbers can have serious consequences at later stages of the procedure. Furthermore, the interpreter's name will appear on the official record of the interview, although the interpreter cannot sign the record in a telephone interview. Intervening beyond actual interpreting tasks in order to act in a morally sound manner and show responsibility for the outcome of the interview can be viewed as an act of breaking the professional code. In fact, according to the code of conduct for legal interpreters in Finland (SKTL 2016, art. 7), the interpreter should merely transmit messages without expressing an opinion about matters that are discussed. The code does not explicitly mention situations in which the written record does not correspond with what the interpreter has said. The interpreter must also know that errors in the record are often not corrected by the interviewees or their counsels during the sight translation of the record at the end of the interview.

3. Discussion

The analysis shows that it is extremely difficult to achieve perfect accuracy in ELF dialogue interpreting over the phone. Phonetic and lexical differences between different varieties of English and mismatching linguistic resources between the interpreter and the interviewer explain many of the issues identified in this paper. As a result of persistent communication problems, much of the interaction happens between the interpreter and the migrant, which has been identified as a characteristic feature of telephone interpreting (Torres 2014).

The interpreter's accommodation to the interviewee's speech emerges as a key phenomenon in the analysis. In addition, the interpreter shows accommodation to the service provider's needs and the institutional goals of the encounter. As a result, the words and formulations that appear in the official record of the interview reflect choices made by the interpreter, and these choices reflect the interpreter's accommodation to the institutional goals of the encounter. Therefore, the interpreter's role as a gatekeeper of information (Davidson 2000; Moyer M. 2013) is observable in the data.

The interpreter is clearly concerned about the interviewee's linguistic rights, as shown by constant verifications and corrections made to the official record. However, the interpreter also displays a stereotypical representation of the migrant as an ELF speaker with reduced power of understanding and expression (cf. Abl-Mikasa 2015). For example, the fact that the interpreter hears *cleaning lady* instead of *business lady* (sample 6) cannot be explained otherwise. The constant strategy of reducing the level of abstraction in renditions of the interviewer's questions, while contributing to successful communication, constitutes another example of this representation.

For the interpreter, the service provider is an untrustworthy user of institutional language and an unlikely person to resolve communication problems. Hence, the interpreter acts within a representation of the service provider as a non-expert in linguistic and discursive matters. At the same time, the interviewer acts within his/her own system of representations. The fact that the official record is not translated at the end of the interview illustrates such representations. Thus, since the interviewer has been able to monitor the interpreting, s/he may think that another check is not necessary, especially because the interviewer portrays a self-image of an experienced interviewer with superior transcribing skills. In addition, the interpreter's demonstrated concern about the accuracy of renditions, as shown by constant reformulation, verification, and correction strategies, produces a representation of a particularly qualified interpreter in the interviewer's mind, further enforcing the rationale behind non-translation of the record. The fact that the interpreter is a native speaker of Finnish probably reinforces this representation.

4. Concluding remarks

This paper constitutes a pilot analysis yielding results and hypotheses to be tested in larger corpora. Each interpreter-mediated encounter has its own dynamics of interplay between language and identity, representations, and power relations. Therefore, more research is needed in order to ascertain whether reformulations and verifications, resulting from repair initiations and candidate understandings, reflect general tendencies in ELF-mediated telephone interpreting. Such research is also necessary in order to address the main argument of this paper: the interpreter's efforts to remediate ELF-related problems can disguise and engender surprising issues of linguistic injustice and inequality, which are sometimes characterized as a key feature of ELF (Piller 2016: 165).

The analysis conducted in this paper is a combination of quantitative and qualitative analysis: a manually performed quantitative analysis of interactional phenomena formed the basis for a selection of examples that were analyzed qualitatively. In a small set of data, such a method works well. In fact, when the analysis is based on the premise that interpreting is a complex interactional phenomenon (Wadensjö 1998), qualitative methods are mandatory. These include a close reading of micro-level phenomena. In order to establish general patterns, larger collections of data would be beneficial. Such corpora could be studied quantitatively using corpus linguistic tools. Telephone-interpreting corpora collected within the EU-funded SHIFT project (SHIFT 2017) constitute a good example of such larger data. However, it is challenging to create larger sets of sensitive data such as police interviews.

To conclude, codes of conduct for legal and community interpreters should acknowledge ELF and other lingua francas, and critical reflection of lingua-franca interpreting through problem-based learning should be a natural part of interpreter training. As a result, future interpreters could foresee ELF-related problems not only in terms of linguistic and interactional features but also in terms of linguistic justice. In addition, the particular features of telephone interpreting should be tak-

en into account in interpreter training, as the telephone as a medium of communication has a major impact on interpretation and interaction in general.

References

- Albl-Mikasa M. (2015) "ELF speakers' restricted power of expression: implications for interpreters' processing", in M. Ehrensberger-Dow / B. Englund-Dimitrova / S. Hubscher-Davidson / U. Norberg (eds) *Cognitive Processes in Translation: Acts and Events*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 43-62.
- Angermeyer P.S. (2008) "Creating monolingualism in the multilingual courtroom", *Sociolinguistic Studies* 2/3, 358-403.
- Angermeyer P.S. (2014) "Monolingual ideologies and multilingual practices in small claims court: the case of Spanish-speaking arbitrators", *International Journal of Multilingualism* 11/4, 430-448.
- Angermeyer P. / Meyer B. / Schmidt T. (2012) "Sharing community interpreting corpora: a pilot study", in T. Schmidt / K. Wörner (eds) *Multilingual Corpora and Multilingual Corpus Analysis*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 275-294.
- Bendazzoli C. / Sandrelli A. (2009) "Corpus-based interpreting studies: early work and future prospects", *Revista Tradumàtica* 7, <<http://www.fti.uab.cat/tradumatica/revista/num7/articles/08/08.pdf>>.
- Berk-Seligson S. (2008) "Judicial systems in contact: access to justice and the right to interpreting/translating services among the Quichua of Ecuador", *Interpreting* 10/1, 9-33.
- Braun S. (2013) "Keep your distance? Remote interpreting in legal proceedings: a critical assessment of a growing practice", *Interpreting* 15/2, 200-228.
- Cogo A. / Dewey M. (2012) *Analysing English as a Lingua Franca. A Corpus-driven Investigation*, London, Continuum.
- Cook G. (2012) "ELF and translation and interpreting: common ground, common interest, common cause", *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca* 1/2, 241-262.
- Davidson B. (2000) "The interpreter as institutional gatekeeper: the social-linguistic role of interpreters in Spanish-English medical discourse", *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 4/3, 378-405.
- Eades, D. (2010) *Sociolinguistics and the Legal Process*, Bristol, Multilingual Matters.
- Gal S. / Woolard K. (1995) "Constructing languages and publics: authority and representation", *Pragmatics* 5/2, 129-138.
- Gavioli L. / Baraldi C. (2011) "Interpreter-mediated interaction in healthcare and legal settings: talk organization, context and the achievement of intercultural communication", *Interpreting* 13/2, 205-233.
- Gumperz. J.J. (1982) "Fact and interference in courtroom testimony", in J.J. Gumperz (ed.) *Language and Social Identity*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 163-195.
- Hale S. (2004) *The Discourse of Court Interpreting: Discourse Practice of the Law, the Witness, and the Interpreter*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins.

- Haviland J.B. (2003) "Ideologies of language: some reflections on language and U.S. Law", in F.E. Mascia-Lees / S.H. Lees (eds) *Language Politics and Practices*, Special Issue of the *American Anthropologist* 105/4, 764-774.
- House J. (2013) "English as a lingua franca and translation", *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer* 7/2, 279-98.
- Lippi-Green R. (2011) *English with an Accent: Language, Ideology, and Discrimination in the United States*, New York, Routledge.
- Määttä S. (2015) "Interpreting the discourse of reporting: the case of police and asylum interviews in Finland", in A. Remael / M. Carroll (eds) *Community Interpreting*, Special Issue of *Translation & Interpreting* 7/3, 21-35.
- Määttä S. (2017) "Community interpreters in Finland: a nexus analysis of a heterogeneous community divided by ethnicity", in K. Taivalkoski-Shilov / L. Tiittula / M. Koponen (eds) *Communities in Translation and Interpreting*, Montréal, Éditions québécoises de l'œuvre, 183-216.
- Maryns K. (2006) *The Asylum Speaker: Language in the Belgian Asylum Procedure*, Manchester, St. Jerome.
- Moser-Mercer B. (2005) "Remote interpreting: issues of multi-sensory integration in a multilingual task", *Meta* 50/2, 727-738.
- Moyer A. (2013) *Foreign Accent: The Phenomenon of Non-native Speech*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Moyer M. (2013) "Language as a resource: migrant agency, positioning and resistance in a health care clinic", in A. Duchêne / M. Moyer / C. Roberts (eds) *Language, Migration and Social Inequalities: A Critical Sociolinguistic Perspective on Institutions and Work*, Bristol, Multilingual Matters, 196-224.
- Piller I. (2016) *Linguistic Diversity and Social Justice: An Introduction to Applied Linguistics*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Pöllabauer S. (2004) "Interpreting in asylum hearings. Issues of role, responsibility and power", *Interpreting* 6/2, 143-180.
- Schegloff E.A. (1996) "Confirming allusions. Toward an empirical account of action", *American Journal of Sociology* 102/1, 161-216.
- Schegloff E.A. / Jefferson G. / Sacks H. (1977) "The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation", *Language* 53, 361-382.
- SHIFT (2017) "Report 2. Remote technologized interpreting (telephone-based and video-based remote interpreting): Main features and shifts with on-site bilateral interpreting", <<https://www.shiftinorality.eu/en/resources/2017/06/19/report-2-remote-technologized-interpreting-telephone-based-and-video-based/>>.
- SKTL – Suomen kääntäjien ja tulkkien liitto (in English, The Finnish Association of Translators and Interpreters) (2016) *Oikeustulkin etiikka* (in English, *Ethical Code for Legal Interpreters*), Helsinki, SKTL.
- Torres M. (2014) "La interpretación telefónica. El intérprete como coordinador: estudio de unas interacciones telefónicas", *Mutatis Mutandis* 7/2, 401-417.
- Ulrich C. / O'Donnell P. / Taylor C. / Farrar A. / Danis M. / Grady C. (2007) "Ethical climate, ethics stress, and the job satisfaction of nurses and social workers in the United States", *Social Science & Medicine* 65/8, 1708-1719.
- Wadensjö C. (1998) *Interpreting as Interaction*, Longman, London.