The Power of the Interpreter in the Business Domain: A CDA Approach to the Professional Interpreter's Mediating Role

Zhong, W.

The Power of the Interpreter in the Business Domain—A CDA Approach to the Professional Interpreter's Mediating Role

A thesis submitted to The University of Westminster for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
in the Faculty of Humanities

May 2021

Wei Zhong
College of Liberal Arts and Sciences

Table of contents

[Final word count: 107,663 following the permission from the college of Liberal Arts and Sciences]

Dedication

To my mother,

who always believes in me and encourages me,

no matter how far my dream takes me.

List of abbreviations

CDA   Critical Discourse Analysis

AUSIT   Australian Institute of Interpreters & Translators

AIIC   International Association of Conference Interpreters

BNI   Business Negotiation Interpreting

NRPSI   National Register of Public Service Interpreters

MR   Member Resources

M 1,2,3…   Meeting No.1,2,3…

List of tables

Declaration

I declare that no portion of the work referred to in the thesis has been submitted in support of an application for another degree or qualification of this or any other university or other institute of learning.

Copyright statement

i. The author of this thesis (including any appendices and/or schedules to this thesis) owns certain copyright or related rights in it (the "Copyright") and s/he has given The University of Westminster certain rights to use such Copyright, including for administrative purposes.

ii. Copies of this thesis, either in full or in extracts and whether in hard or electronic copy, may be made only in accordance with the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (as amended) and regulations issued under it or, where appropriate, in accordance with licensing agreements which the University has from time to time. This page must form part of any such copies made.

iii. Further information on the conditions under which disclosure, publication and commercialisation of this thesis, the Copyright and any Intellectual Property and/or Reproductions described in it may take place is available in the University IP Policy.

Acknowledgments

First and foremost, to my wonderful parents, thank you so much for everything! You have been tremendously giving (and forgiving) my whole life. Doing a Ph.D. was a long journey and you encouraged me to take this journey in the first place and you always believe in me and support me. I am so lucky to be your daughter.

I would like to thank my supervisor, Prof. Gerda Wielander, a kind, wise, and calm person who has walked me through all the stages of this Ph.D. journey. Without her illuminating instruction and patience, this thesis could not have reached its present form. She is a true role model for me and I really felt the benefits of her standards of excellence throughout all stages of the PhD. Hopefully I can continue the tradition of excellence in future.

I am also greatly indebted to my co-supervisor, Miss Alexa Alfer. She has been the major source of inspirations to my thoughts in this whole process. I do appreciate her extraordinary patience and consistent encouragement, her providing me with necessary materials, advice of great value and inspiration of new ideas. It is her suggestions that draw my attention to some deficiencies and room for improvement for this study. She taught me the essence of the whole Ph.D. experience, which is gaining awareness that research is never complete, and that a Ph.D. is not an end, but a beginning.

Sincere thanks go to the interpreters, staffs of Chinese and international organizations, clients of the business meetings in China who kindly agreed to be recorded, thus allowing me to gather the necessary data to explore a setting which is still uncharted territory in interpreting studies.

A special thanks to my husband Yihua Lin, who has moved to London for me, encouraging and looking after me through every stage of this journey. I am fortunate to have you as my husband. Thanks for your love, unfailing support and belief in me throughout these years. I love you with all my heart.

Abstract

This study explores current practices in business interpreting in China with the aim of identifying the power of the interpreter from the perspective of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). Given the dramatic increase in trade and economic exchanges between China and Western countries, business dialogue interpreting is the most frequently adopted type of interpreting in China. Cross-cultural business negotiation, with its intricate nature and fluctuating dynamics, is highly relevant to its social and situational context. Universally recognized professional norms and interpreter codes of conduct are not always applicable.

This study proposes the following hypothesis: when practicing in a business scenario, the interpreter has power (defined as "control") derived from linguistic, social, and cultural resources that are unavailable to others in the discourse. Conceptualizing the interpreted business encounter as a discursive practice, the study examines data selected from authentic, naturally-occurring business interpreting events in China. The research draws on CDA theory to explore the power of the interpreter, looking at how the actual role of the interpreter deconstructs a shared fiction of interpreters – as invisible, detached, and totally neutral in such discourse – through the use of scarce bilingual and bicultural resources.

Fairclough's (1989) three-dimensional CDA model consists of description, interpretation and explanation. The model makes empirical examination of the interpreter's power in specific discourse possible by allowing for transcript analysis across different dimensions and levels. This research makes an innovative contribution to the field by integrating CDA theory with theories of social and Interpreting studies, such as Goffman's (1981) participation framework and Wadensjö's (1998) typologies. It adapts relevant methodology to examine how the interpreter's power was established and enacted.

The power of interpreter is represented in the capacity to exhibit ownership and accountability when taking individual decisions and actions to influence the development of the dialogue. This capacity is explored primarily in terms of following three categories: the variation of renditions, personal pronoun shifts, and the management of turn-taking within the discursive practice of business interpreting. The results show that when performing in the context of business negotiation interpreting, the interpreter assumes a substantial role. This role disrupts a prescribed, idealized image of the interpreter as invisible and totally neutral within the activity of interpreting. Interviews with interpreters then explore their awareness of power as well as how their intervening behaviors and shifts in subject position are influenced by the situational and social context of business negotiations.

The role of the interpreter within the setting of business negotiations is uncharted territory in Interpreting Studies. This study aims to improve interpreter awareness of their actual role and subject position in the domain of business. It also carries the potential to enhance the quality of pedagogical practice and the effectiveness of interpreter-mediated business meetings.

CHAPTER 1 Introduction

This study explores the interpreter's role in business negotiation meetings from a Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) perspective. Examining the current practices in business dialogue interpreting in China, the study aims to identify the actual role of the interpreter in the business domain. It uncovers how the interpreter's power manifests itself in the discourse of business interpreting, a neglected domain when it comes the study of the interpreter's role with the difficulty in accessing real-life business meetings.

With the "social turn" [1] of studies on the role of the interpreter, the perceptions of the interpreter's role have moved away from the assumption of the "conduit" metaphor (Reddy, 1979, p.286). Multiple empirical studies (e.g. Anderson 1976; Bochner 1981; Wadensjö 1998; Angelelli 2001; Davidson 2001) have deconstructed the tranditional description of the interpreter's role as invisible, neutral, and detached in professional codes of conduct (detailed literature review in Chapter 2). The sociological perspective has challenged the neutral and impartial codes long existing in the industry. In these studies, the interpreter is no longer sketched as a neutral agent (who should not align personally with any side of the interaction even the side which pays them), or an invisible participant (who assists the communication as if they do not hold any substantial position). Instead, the interpreter's mediating role is acknowledged and situational and social factors contributing to this shift are explored.

The evidence provided by these studies serves as the premise of my current research. To date, the scholarships on the interpreter's role in business contexts are limited. However, the dynamics of business discourse arehighly interactive, and bound to exert influence on the position of the interpreter who is located in

---

[1]The "social turn" refers to a trend in Translation and Interpreting Studies which emerged in the 1990s when the professionalization of community interpreting was taking shape. Interdisciplinarity was foregrounded in this shift, as scholars started to look at the role of the interpreter through sociological frameworks, such as discourse analysis and sociolinguistics. On Angelelli's (2014, p.1) account, the sociological turn in Translation and Interpreting Studies occurred "as increasing attention has been paid to the agency of translators and interpreters, as well as to the social factors that permeate acts of translation and interpreting"

between the primary interlocutors. This is largely because the stakes of the business dialogue, the institutional culture involved, and the buy-and-sell relations, which have made the discursive practice of interpreting highly subject to its social, institutional and situational context. Therefore, the interpreter's positioning or non-neutral role in such settings (being located in between the primary interlocutors on both ends) is arguably interesting to explore, considering the influence of the personal relations, stakes of the negotiation, and the situational or social context at large. The study is empirical and qualitative in nature, which aims to fill the gap of the study on the interpreter's role in business scenario relying on the authentic recordings of the naturally-occurring business meetings. To gain a more comprehensive understanding of the interpreter's subject position in such scenario, the study also draws on the reflexive interview data to investigate interpreters' perceptions of their role and their awareness of the strategies they adopted while co-participating and intervening in the business negotiation setting.

1.1 Research Rationale

With the growth of globalization, we are more commonly witnessing communication between different countries and regions. To this end, interpreters play a pivotal role in facilitating exchanges between individuals of diverse cultures in various domains. China in particular, has become an epicentre of business activity and trade negotiations. With its booming economy and sheer density of business activity, interpreters have never been more necessary to expediting and enabling economic growth. However, the interpreter's role, especially in business dialogue interpreting, did not attracted academic attention until the 1990s. On Pöchhacker's (2016) account, "it was only with the professionalization of interpreting in the 20th century that the interpreter's role became codified in the more specific term" (p.170). Thanks to burgeoning academic discourse, the interpreter's role then becomes a much-debated topic that has undergone profound changes in the studies surrounding it in academia.

To date, academic attention paid to the role of the interpreter has focused on Public Service Interpreting (PSI) settings. In this regard, multiple empirical studies have already proved that interpreters are not neutral agent in such settings, which serve as a starting point of my current research. This includes the study of the interpreter's coordinating role in police interviews and medical settings (Wadensjö 1998), their coordinating and mediating role in medical and healthcare settings (e.g. Merlini and Favaron 2003; Angelelli 2012; Zhan and Zeng 2017), their multi-faceted role, and social positioning in legal settings (Tipton and Furmanek 2016), and finally the interpreter's role as a mediator in legal settings, parent-teacher meeting and tribunal hearings (Hlavac 2017). Beyond these domains, however, limited academic attention has been paid to the interpreter's role in business contexts where the dynamics of discourse is highly interactive. The stakes of the business dialogue, the buy-and-sell relations for instance, have made the discursive practice highly subject to its social, institutional and situational context. Thus the interpreter's positioning in such settings (being located in between the primary interlocutors on both ends) is largely subject to the influence of the personal relations and stakes of the negotiation.

Owing to the difficulty in accessing real-life business meetings (which is largely because of their strict confidentiality), it precludes external parties from bearing witness to live deal-making transactions, let alone the positioning of the interpreter in such context. Among the limited number of studies in the business domain, few explore the interpreter's mediating role from a power angle. Power, a loaded term that is traditionally described as a dominating force to monopolize, control, or as a set of rules related to the institutions, seems to be far from the interpreter, a language provider in a conversation. Those studies portray the interpreter's role as a cultural mediator who provides the solution in the receptor's language and culture (Makaroa 1998; Garzone 2003); alternatively, they view the interpreter as a language facilitator or mediator (Gavilio and Nick 2007). Besides, few empirical studies are based on authentic data from naturally-occurring

interpreting of business negotiations. Most of them investigate the interpreter's role with data collected through surveys or interviews (Karanasiou 2016).

This study aims to fill this gap. Besides, with my seven-year experience in interpreting practice and pedagogy in China, I have discovered that most dialogue interpreting in China occurs in business settings instead of PSI as few encounters in PSI settings are assisted by an interpreter in China. Furthermore, based on my personal experience in business interpreting meetings, the client's expectation more often than not exceeds the description of an interpreter's role in the Interpreting Studies literature and the professional codes of conduct. During the briefing stage of the assignment, the client would always explicitly or implicitly express the expectation, wishing that I would be on their side or advocate for them while informing me of their goal in the upcoming business negotiation. I also find it challenging to maintain the neutral position in a business conversation. This is especially true when I am expected by primary speakers to seek clarification or explanation; or when I feel obliged to intervene in the interactional and conversational order to speak for the client or smooth the talk. All these cases occurred because I am the only bilingual and bicultural individual in the interpreted encounter. I am expected by primary speakers to align with them regarding the goal they want to achieve in the talk. Although I am aware that this is an infringement of the Code of Conduct of an interpreter, it seems that the business discourse I am involved in requires language skills and interpersonal skills. The ability to assess situational dynamics with the cultural background of the negotiating cultures also seems to be instrumental for the efficiency of the meeting.

However, the interpreter training and practicing in China, similar to its international context, are both underpinned by a basic understanding of the idealisation of the interpreter as a neutral and impartial agent. The interpreter is expected to assist with the communication as if they do not hold any substantial position (invisibility), and in which they should not align personally with any side of the interaction, even the side who pays them (impartiality or neutrality).The frequently occurring internal conflicts regarding the ethical standard prompted me

to reflect on the interpreter's actual role in the business domain in the Chinese context (more about the Chinese context of business interpreting in 1.5) for a more comprehensive understanding of why and how the interpreter's partiality occurred in business encounter.

1.2 Research Hypothesis and Research Questions

In this study, I consider the business interpreting between parties from different countries with an interpreter's assistance as a particular type of discursive activity. It holds inherent discursive and ideological nature, and it involves a network of relations—the buyer and the seller, and the interpreter and his/her client (employer). Following Mason and Ren's (2012) statement, "although interpreters often lack institutional power, they may be equipped with power within the exchange as a result of their bilingual and bicultural expertise" (p.115). Indeed, I find it intriguing to look at the interpreter's intervening moves from a power perspective because, according to CDA studies, "language is centrally involved in power, and power struggles, and that it is so involved through its ideological properties" (Fairclough, 1989, p.17). In this study, power is defined as the interpreter's privilege drawing from their bi-lingual and bi-cultural capacity in the discourse. It enables interpreters to make adjustments and intervening moves in the discourse of business interpreting. As I have considered business negotiation interpreting as a discursive practice, the exercise of power refers to the shifts of the interpreter's subject position in discourse. Such shift is also subject to the dynamics of the buy-and-sell relations as well as the situational and social context at the specific moment of the discourse.

As mentioned above, although the subjects of this research generally hold a shared group belief of the ethics of impartiality, neutrality and invisibility, the current codes in Chinese context as well as international one does not relate to business interpreting scenarios or the categorization of scenarios. However, interpreters, especially the participants of this study are more often than not seen disrupting the order of the discourse and the traditional norms described in various

Codes of Conduct. It will be worth investigating how the power of the interpreter influences the business conversation and how interpreters perceive their shifts of subject position concerning the immediate context of the business tug of war. Such investigation will provide a more comprehensive understanding of the actual role assumed by the interpreter in discourse.

In terms of the definition of power, I hypothesize that the scarce resource of bilingual and bicultural capacity enables interpreters to control the contributions of primary interlocutors within business negotiation discourse. Interpreters exercise control by reformulating the utterances of primary speakers in renditions, managing the order of turn-taking, and shifting their subject positioning within the discursive event. When intervening in business communication, their subject position may shift to that of a co-participant, co-negotiator, and even a consultant or team member of the client. These shifts disrupt idealized norms about interpreter invisibility and neutrality.

To test my hypothesis and to explore the power of the interpreter in interpreted business discourse, I posed two essential overarching research questions:

1. How does the power of the interpreter manifest itself in the Chinese business domain?
2. Is the interpreter aware of the power exercised in the discourse?

I then formulated a series of follow-up questions: what is the actual role of the interpreter in a naturally-occurring business encounter? How do social and situational contexts influence the subject position of the interpreter? How does the interpreter influence the buyer-seller relationship and corresponding power relations? What is the interpreter's perception and level of awareness about their individual power within the negotiation itself? Answers to these questions allowed me to test the hypothesis that professional interpreters working in business settings do not merely translate on a linguistic level; they also hold the power to control and intervene in communications. Interpreters do so by engaging with primary interlocutors to co-construct the dialogue with them. This activity

disrupts the shared fiction of the interpreter playing an invisible, detached, and neutral role in the discourse. Interpreters are expected to influence negotiations by shifting their subject positions to ensure smooth talks and gate-keep negotiations.

I test the hypothesis by using authentic data from business negotiations. Through analysis of the data, I examine the manifestation of interpreter power in business negotiations. Power is captured in how the interpreter exercises control over the interpreted business negotiations: through management of turn-taking, shifts of "footing", and discrepant renditions. Situating the role of the interpreter role within a wider social and cultural context, the research focuses on the social positions adopted by interpreters in business negotiations. To better understand the role and influence of social factors in specific settings, it also examines interpreter awareness and perceptions of power dynamics within the discourse. This is carried out through follow-up interviews that interrogate whether interpreters are aware of their own power and what social factors come into play in the exercise of this power within the discourse of interpreted business negotiations.

1.3 The Theoretical Basis for Research

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is an appropriate framework as it combines an analytical practice with a critical language-centred approach to the study of discourse. CDA examines "opaque as well as transparent structural relationships of dominance, discrimination, power, and control as manifested in language" (Wodak, 1995, p.204). However, Gu (2019) argues that "interpreters' agency and mediation have rarely been investigated critically from the vantage point of power and ideology" (p.2). The CDA study of interpreter power is still in its infancy, particularly for the domain of business (Gu, 2019). Reasons for this could be related to the heavy application of CDA in studies of political and media discourse (Fairclough, 1989; Van Dijk, 1986; Wodak, 2001).

Since its inception in the late 1980s, CDA has shown a demonstrable vitality. This is because it provides a critical perspective for investigating "language in

relation to power and ideology" (Wodak and Meyer, 2001, p.6). CDA has been used to uncover the discursive nature of much contemporary social and cultural change, including that of British society alongside the English language in Fairclough's seminal 1989 work. Fairclough and Wodak (1997) summarise the central CDA tenet as "power relations are discursive" (p. 275). In this study, I use CDA as a framework to investigate the power of the interpreter manifested in the discourse of business interpreting based on authentic data from business meetings. CDA is an appropriate choice for this investigation because it focuses on the relationship between language and power. At the same time, it "asks further questions, such as those of responsibility, interests, and ideology" (Van Dijk, 1986, p.4). Such questions are extremely relevant to the exploration of interpreter awareness of power and control exercised in this discursive practice.

This CDA study examines the interpreter's power in business interpreting by highlighting the ideological positioning and alignment in interpreting. Because the interpreter's alignment and shifts in positioning often tend to be subtle, the adoption of critical, in-depth, manual, textual readings is justifiable as this approach (compared to a quantitative one) can serve the research aim. The conceptual framework for analysis draws on Goffman's (1981) participation framework, Wadensjö's (1998) taxonomy of interpreter renditions, and Fairclough's CDA analysis framework regarding aspects of social practice influenced by power. I intend to examine the role of the interpreter in the business domain from the following aspects: 1) analysis of the divergence between the interpreter's renditions and the primary speaker's utterances; 2) shifts in the "footing" or positioning of the interpreter; and 3) turn-taking management, which is a salient feature of discourse.

The study advances insights into the role of the interpreter in Translation and Interpreting Studies. It is also hoped that this critical study will have further implications for the pedagogy and learning of interpreting. To achieve this aim, it provides both trainer and trainee with a comprehensive picture of the potential roles an interpreter might assume in business settings.

1.4 The Research Context

Although business interpreting plays a pivotal role in China's economic development, the role of the interpreter in the business domain is an under-researched topic in Interpreting Studies, and it has received by far the least attention from academia. So far, the role of the interpreter in the business context has not been "examined or analysed as a separate, distinct type of interpretation" (Karanasiou, 2016, p.191) in the field of Interpreting Studies. To contextualize the discussion, the unique features of specific settings studied in this chapter should be clarified.

1.4.1 The Unique Feature of Business Dialogue Interpreting

Business interpreting in China usually assumes a liaison/consecutive mode. However, this mode differs from the consecutive mode in Conference Interpreting, where most of the interpreted speeches are ceremonial and unidirectional for the audience. Multiple studies acknowledged the uniqueness of business scenario as a highly interactive and dynamic discourse in which the interpreter's partiality occurs frequently.

Negotiation is defined by Firth (1995) as a specific type of discourse where communicative attempts are made "to accommodate potential or real differences in interests to make mutually acceptable decisions on the substantive matter" (p.6-7). As a goal-directed activity with the overriding aim of gaining profit, business negotiation is "the process of reaching an agreement between parties who begin from different bargaining positions" (Gentile et al., 1996, p.119). With the nature of interaction, business negotiation comprises verbal communicative activity involving interactional aspects of "floor access, topic selection, contextual assumptions or the (mis) interpretation of messages" (Dannerer, 2001, p.92). Such interactive processes and dialogic discourse are further complicated by a cross-language and cross-cultural nature. This means the interpreter is in a position to undertake a coordinating responsibility for the proceeding of the interaction.

As a specific type of discourse, the interpreted business negotiation bears similarity with the interpreting taking place within Public Service Interpreting (PSI) settings (such as medical, healthcare, police-interviews, and court settings). Still, interlocutors in business meetings usually enjoy relatively equal authority or social status within their companies or industries. In PSI settings, there is always one interlocutor whose status or authority is superior to the other participant in the conversation, i.e. doctor and patient, magistrate and the accused, policeman and suspect, etc. The seemingly equal status between primary interlocutors further complicates the relation matrix of business discourse. When two parties of similar status are pursuing their own goals in a negotiation, there can be a subtle tug-of-war in their talk. This induces the dynamic to change in terms of personal and power relations within the discourse.

Most business negotiation interpreting in China is aimed at gains or opportunities to buy and sell between two or more than two interlocutors. For the business negotiation interpreting studied in this research, interlocutors represent a variety of companies working in the same industry. They sit at a negotiation table to discuss the issues related to their field of business with the assistance of an interpreter, seeking agreement or looking for potential opportunities for cooperation. Although it can seem as if the interlocutors attending the business talk share a common goal, they may still take very different stances when seeking mutual benefits. The stakes of the talk, for example, can be very different if a buyer needs a product desperately, or if a seller's product or technology is competitive and exclusive within the industry. Above all, business negotiation interpreting often occurs "when there are two or more ideas, positions, suggestions or products on the negotiating table" (Karanasiou, 2016, p.200). Negotiations themselves are a process through which two or more parties can discuss these ideas, seek a solution to a problem, bargain over price, or propose a deal. The activity is a social interaction within a specific context that involves "negotiations happening among two or more people interacting socially" (p.202). Business negotiations "inherently involve a number of different variables which can determine the success or failure of the

negotiation itself" (Garzone and Rudvin, 2003, p.21), such as verbal interactions among individuals from diverse ethnic, national, and cultural backgrounds, or subtle changes in the stakes of the buy-and-sell relations.

Located between the two negotiating parties, the interpreter is the only person who understands both sides because they hold the responsibility to provide renditions, which serves as the basis of the proceedings of the talk. This implies that the interpreter holds the key for the primary participants to understand the intention of their counterparts. Such discursive feature makes the subject position of the interpreter extremely interesting in this business tug of war. Although interpreters (include the subjects of this research) hold the shared understanding and group belief of neutrality/impartiality and invisibility, they easily identify that such positioning is hard to maintain in the actual discourse. This is because business negotiation interpreting does not occur in a social vacuum. On the contrary, it is a socially-situated activity that people (including the interpreter) engaged in — one that is governed by different social beliefs and cultural norms. The complex nature of discourse is further compounded by the fact that the interpreter is often hired by one side of the primary participant, which they refer to as "the client". The buyer-seller and employer-employee relationship can add additional layers of complexity to power-relation in interpreted business encounters.

Although I make a comparison between business negotiation interpreting (abbreviated as "BNI") and PSI interpreting, it does not necessarily imply that BNI is a PSI sub-category. Given the scarcity of PSI in a Chinese context along with the complexities of business negotiations, we can conceive of BNI as a unique genre of interpreting. This genre is subordinated to the PSI sector, which deserves more attention. By understanding the nature and properties of the genre, we can uncover challenges or specific requirements for interpreters posed by this particular discourse.

1.4.2 The Responsibility of the Interpreter in Business Dialogue Interpreting
Aside from the characteristics of BNI in this research, it is also vital to have a

comprehensive understanding of the role and responsibilities of the interpreter within such specific dyadic social discourses. In the social sciences, the concept of "role" is used to explain behavior and examine attitudes between at least two participants in any social situation. The hypothesis for this study assumes that in BNI, the interpreter does not merely function as a language transmitter or code switcher. Instead, they are also a participant who co-constructs interactions with the interlocutors in the discourse.

Given their bilingual ability, the interpreter is the only person who understands most thoroughly the intention of the client and the other negotiating party. They are the only one with the full picture of the negotiation process. Company executives from different countries may start the discussion from different stances within their own cultural or social perspective. But the executives all depend on the interpreter to proceed with the talk. The interpreter has a "strategic and potentially powerful position whenever on duty in conversation" (Wadensjö, 1998, p.237) because they speak on behalf of the negotiating parties. Sometimes, clients expect an interpreter to act in the interests of the client's company. The presence of the interpreter manifests as the individual processes information or assesses the situation for "the attaining of shared understanding and for suppressing and counteracting instances of misunderstanding" (Wadensjö, 1998, p.237). In BNI, the interpreter engages with primary speakers to ensure mutual understanding through seeking clarification for certain issues. This is because that it is the interpreter's responsibility to accurately convey client intentions along with those of other negotiating parties.

The role of the interpreter is further defined largely by specific contexts in BNI. The interpreter assigned to the business negotiation has to perform with the presence of at least two primary interlocutors. Ideally, the interpreter should remain neutral and clients should have "equal claim [to] the interpreter's expertise" (Gentile et al., 1996, p.36). But reality often presents another story. In the context of business negotiations, the interpreter becomes a co-participant in the talk. Sometimes, they even align themselves with the primary interlocutors – often the one who hires them, persuading the other negotiating party into agreement or helping promote products.

As one freelance interpreter explains in a post-assignment interview (Interview 2, 15 October 2018), business interpreting assignments often come with an implied rule wherein the interpreter must side with the client to ensure maximum attainment of client goals within the negotiation. In other words, the interpreter is expected to correctly assess the situational context with the interpersonal skills and actively engages in the interaction on behalf of the client within the negotiation process. From this perspective, the interpreter indeed plays a powerful role in business encounters.

Foregrounding the concept of interpreter's power, the research adopts a CDA perspective to approach the role of the interpreter in naturally occurring business negotiations. Examining the interpreter's responsibility within the discourse of interpreted business negotiations gives us a more comprehensive picture of the potential roles an interpreter might take on at specific moments of discourse. The generalization of findings from study of the interpreter's role is not plausible, as subject positions may vary in a different situational context.

1.5 The Chinese Context

As mentioned in the previous section, the professional landscape of interpreting in China is quite different from that in Western countries. In China, PSI interpreting is not considered a separate category of interpreting as little PSI takes place at all. Since the research aims to explore the actual role of the interpreter alongside role perceptions of Chinese interpreters in the business domain, it is vital to sketch out features of the interpreting scene in China from the perspective of training, professional status, and regulatory context.

Professional training for interpreters in China lags behind by about half a century compared to that in Western countries. Before the 1970s, "no higher learning institution in Mainland China could claim to have a 'professional' interpreter training program" (Zhan, 2014, p.36). Most interpreting training is embedded in degree programs aimed at teaching foreign language as a major (Zhan 2010). Interpreting jobs are largely carried out by some "excellent graduates from foreign language programs in the top-tier universities" who go on to pursue careers

in interpretation, often for political purposes (Zhan, 2014, p.36). This means most interpreting jobs in the market are done by interpreters with an institutional status.

As China engages actively with the international community and communicates intensively with various countries, demand for quality interpreting services has surged especially in the past two decades. Established professionals are now joined by "a small community of conference interpreters" (Setton, 2011, p.4) working as freelance interpreters, as well as by a graduate from a language training programme with some early exposure to international doctrines and associations (such as the AIIC)[2]. They serve in a robust private market in Chinese megacities such as Beijing and Shanghai. But there is still a huge gap created by interpreter under supply matched by sharply increasing demand. This has drawn the attention of Chinese authorities. Interpreting Studies is gradually emerging as "an autonomous discipline" (Wang and Mu, 2011, p.157), and interpreting is now considered a profession requiring skill-sets that cannot be acquired in foreign language degree programs.

Given increasing enthusiasm for the booming young discipline, Guangdong University of Foreign Studies (GUFS) established a department for Translation and Interpretation in 1997. This ushered in a trend of professional interpreter training programs in China. Following the pioneering practice of GUFS and in the recognition of the need for dedicated professional training, several top foreign studies universities in China applied for official approval to establish Institutes for Interpreting and Translation Studies. These institutes offer a graduate degree program in Translation and Interpreting (MTI) for professional interpreter training. However, these programs teach either translation or interpreting. This means students study either subject but not both, and the vast majority of students enroll in the translation program only

The interpreting training program thus shifted to a "professional pole" by separating training in interpreting from language teaching (Gile 2010, p.12). The

---

[2]The *AIIC* is an international non-profit organization representing professional conference interpreters worldwide.

category of interpreting took shape in the syllabus for this professional degree course. Table 1 is drawn from a report on "interpreter training and research in mainland China" by Wang and Mu (2011, p. 161) that outlines the curriculum and skill-sets students are expected to acquire in the training program.

Table 1.1 Curriculum template for Master of Interpreting (MI) in mainland China

Category of curriculum component	Courses	Semester	Credit value
Compulsory for Master courses in China	Political theory	1st	3
	Chinese language and culture	2nd	3
Compulsory for all MTI	Foundation course in interpreting	1st	2
	Foundation course in translation	1st	2
	General theory & practice of translation	3rd	2
Compulsory for MI (interpreting majors)	Consecutive interpreting	2nd	4
	Simultaneous interpreting	3rd	4
	Topic-based interpreting practice	1st	2
(Interpreting)	Sight interpreting	2nd	2
	Mock-conference interpreting	4th	2
	Business interpreting/court interpreting/Diplomatic Interpreting	2nd	2
Internship	Internship	3rd	2

 (Resource: National MTI Commission, 2007)

Based on the framework for training, compulsory courses in the syllabus indicate that consecutive and simultaneous interpreting are considered central to professional training. This aligns with the categories referenced for the interpreting market when assigning professional interpreters to specific jobs. As optional courses, business or court interpreting are rarely mentioned as separate categories in the job market. Instead, they are classified as "other types of interpreting" or liaison interpreting (*pei tong fan yi* or 陪同翻译).

This is quite different from the categories in the U.K. market, which has established clearly defined categories for Conference Interpreting and PSI Interpreting (Public Service Interpreting). Conference Interpreting includes modes of consecutive interpreting and simultaneous interpreting. PSI includes all interpreting jobs taking place in public scenarios, which includes hospitals, courts, police stations, or the immigration offices, and so on. In other words, there is no established category for PSI or any conceptual frame related to it in China due to specific market demands and social context. Moreover, business interpreting is not identified as a distinct category in either country – despite the fact that the amount of business interpreting has increased sharply over time, especially in China. The focus of accreditation courses is the development of interpreting competencies as "most of the compulsory credits proposed for the MI[3] are in skills-oriented courses" (Wang and Mu, 2011, p.160). Most trainee interpreters focus more on skills acquisition, paying less attention to developing a comprehensive picture of the profession in different scenarios.

Another feature characteristic of the Chinese interpreting market is related to the accreditation and layout of professional institutes. In China, all accreditation schemes are test-based. They are designed by either the government or universities with experience in training. Among these, the most widely acknowledged is the China Accreditation Test for Translators and Interpreters (CATTI) designed by the Ministry of Personnel. The certificate is graded at two different levels. Test takers

---

[3] MI refers to the Master of Interpreting and Translation in China.

include MTI students, civil service interpreters, and in-house interpreters for whom the certificate is proof of their professional ability and can serve as a medium of promotion. Other accreditation mechanisms in China include National Accreditation Examinations for Translation and Interpreters (NAETI) and the Shanghai Interpreters Accreditation (SIA), which was previously introduced as similar but less popular. All certificates are designed to assess candidate language competencies and interpreting skills.

As discussed by Wang and Mu (2011), professional accreditation should not merely assess linguistic competence. It should also take into account the "professional related competence and professional ethics" (Wang and Mu, 2011, p.167) of candidates. This has not yet been included in assessment mechanisms in China. Professional bodies in China include commercial translation companies and various interpreting associations. Unified or official codes of conduct or interpreting ethics for the Chinese interpreting market were only designed in 2009[4].This design was carried out by the Translators Association of China and did not draw much attention from most professional bodies, given the late development of interpreting as a profession. Topics related to interpreter ethics and codes of conduct are either neglected entirely or under discussed in various training programs, especially commercial ones conducted by translation companies. Even if these topics are mentioned, the AIIC model is introduced as a replacement without consideration for the Chinese social context and the trajectory of the professional development of interpreting in China. Furthermore, no codes of conduct are designed specifically to regulate business interpreting or any other types of scenarios of interpreting in China. This has drawn the attention of scholars who have made statements such as "rather than assume that institutions in mainland China should adopt the AIIC model, we must carefully consider whether it suits emerging conference interpreting markets like China" (Wang and Mu, 2011, p.170).

The composition of the body of interpreters working in the professional market is also multi-layered. The market is dominated by in-house interpreters from

---

[4] The Code of professional ethics for Chinese translators and interpreters was published in 2009.

government at all levels, translation companies, and international agencies. The boom in both the academic discipline and industry has seen the number of freelance interpreters grow. The majority of interpreters with an institutional status are typically assigned roles beyond mere interpreting. These could include roles in liaison, public relations, or administrative work. In contrast, freelance interpreters take interpreting assignments mainly for economic reasons. They are hired by either individual clients or professional agencies.

The Chinese context in which this research takes place shows that study of the role of the interpreter concerning codes of conduct or the "order of discourse" is essential. Given the boom in interpreting as a profession, interpreters working in various scenarios (and a business scenario, in particular) must have a more thorough understanding of the roles they could take on as well as the nature of the interpreting task. After all, interpreting is considered a service industry that requires both linguistic competence and comprehensive skill-sets to facilitate the client in achieving a goal.

1.6 Chapter Outlines

The thesis is structured as follows:

Chapter 1 elaborates on the rationale of the research, which gives rise to the hypothesis and the overarching research question of the study. The research's theoretical base is briefly explained with the definition of power, which is a key concept to explore in the context of BNI. The context of the research is introduced with particular emphasis on the features of business interpreting. To let the reader better contextualizes the research, I also introduce the Chinese context of interpreting training and accreditation, professional bodies, and professional market.

Chapter 2 reviews the development of the research conducted on the interpreter's role. It contextualizes the research with the introduction of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) theory, which serves as a theoretical foundation to explore the power of the interpreter. The basic concepts and the literature related to CDA are

introduced to explain why CDA is applied in this study and how it can be drawn on to explore the power of the interpreter. Besides, the studies of the interpreter's power in PSI and business discourse are reviewed as the foundation for this study.

Chapter 3 presents the methodology and research design of this study. In the methodology part, the rationale for adopting Fairclough's CDA theoretical base is explicated. Goffman's (1989) participation framework and Wadensjö's (1998) taxonomy of the interpreter's rendition are introduced as research tools for the data analysis. The categories of the analysis are presented together with the theoretical framework for the reader to have a macro picture of the study chapters. The research design provides basic information of the data from the naturally occurring interpreted business encounters, the study participants, the meetings recorded, and the interview structures.

Chapter 4 is a study chapter that examines the interpreter's renditions from a CDA perspective. With the introduction of the analytic framework and the categories for analysis, the interpreter's power is explored concerning the reformulation of the utterances of the primary interlocutors, which is classified as addition, omission, and substitution.

Chapter 5 is the second analysis chapter, focusing on the manifestation of power in the shifts of pronouns adopted by the interpreter. The analysis of the change of pronouns uncovers the interpreter's shifts of subject position or social positioning, which has been influenced by the discourse's situational context.

Chapter 6 examines how the interpreter's power manifests itself in the interpreter's turn-taking management strategy. The examination of the interpreter's intervention in the conversational order provides a glimpse of how the interpreter functions or regulates the talk when there emerges the need for clarification and repetition.

Chapter 7 highlights the study's ethnographical aspects by presenting the interpreters' perceptions of their roles in the discourse of business interpreting. Based on the interview transcripts, the chapter explores the interpreters' motives and views regarding the intervening moves adopted in the business interpreting discourse from the three major aspects.

Chapter 8 discusses the findings of the research. The research questions and the hypothesis mentioned at the beginning of the thesis are revisited. The study's significance and contribution are presented along with the limitation and suggestions for future avenues of study.

CHAPTER 2   Literature Review

This chapter consists of the literature review of the role study of the interpreter and the introduction of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), the conceptual framework adopted for the analysis of the interpreter's power. The literature reviewed reflects the shift of the research on interpreting activity concerning the role of the interpreter. To illustrate the profound changes in the development of Interpreting Studies, the chapter reviews the studies that deconstruct the traditional views of the interpreter's role. To support the argument of the interpreter's subject position shift, the chapter draws on studies that situate interpreting activities in a social and sociological context, such as Goffman (1981), Wadensjö (1998), and Angellili (2004). Reviewing the empirical studies that illustrate interpreter's role with authentic data from a wide range of settings (medical, healthcare, legal, police interviews, asylum-seeker, etc.), a research gap is identified in the business domain, which is still uncharted territory for the study of the interpreter's power. To further explicate the interpreter power, I also draw on literature relating to the interpreter's mediating and coordinating role in the business domain, such as Blinstrubaité (2000), Gavilio and Maxwell (2007), and Karanasiou (2016).

The following section reviews literature related to Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) with the explanation of why CDA serves as a useful tool to analyse the interpreter power manifested in the agency and interventions in the discourse. Besides, I also review the CDA studies concerning the power relations and interpreter's agency in business interpreting, which lays the foundation for the methodology and analysis chapters.

2.1 The "Social Turn" of Studies on the Role of the Interpreter

Traditionally, the role of the interpreter has been described as someone who is invisible and totally neutral in an interpreted social encounter. Interpreting Studies in early-stage was actually dominated by a perception regarding the interpreter's role as "the person in the middle", who is passive and non-involved, and often

compared to "a machine, a window a bridge or a telephone line" (Roy, 2000, p.101). Such perception of the interpreter's role is much in line with the "conduit metaphor" proposed by Reddy (1979, p.286), which is used to describe the model of communication among people. According to Reddy (1979), in this communication model, ideas are essentially considered as objects, and words as containers for those objects, and communication is sending those objects from a speaker to a hearer, who then unpacks the containers for the ideas or message of the primary speaker.

This communication model has been drawn upon in Interpreting studies and was supported and accepted for long both by practising interpreters and by professional associations (AIIC, NRPSI, AUSIT, etc). Instead of being considered a participant of the interpreted encounter, the interpreter is rather viewed as a machine-like linguistic transmitter, who is expected to render in a second language the utterance of the primary participant in the interaction. Knapp-Potthoff and Knapp (1986) point out that the interpreter is considered as a person who is totally "neutral" and is conceived of "as an intermediary between two communicating parties (a speaker and a hearer)", the (professional) interpreter was generally not considered a "third party" in the interaction but as "a mere medium of transmission" (p.153). Knapp-Potthoff and Knapp (1986) describe the interpreter as a "non-person" who acts as a "switching device" or "transmission belt", whose function is "comparable to that of a machine, giving a more or less literal translation of what is said in language A in language B" (p.152). The early studies clearly describe the interpreter's role as an invisible party in the interpreted interaction who functions as a language machine. However, these views on the interpreter's role have been challenged by several scholars arguing for the complexity of the role, which should be well situated in a social and cultural context.

In 1976, the American sociologist Anderson (1976) deconstructed people's views on the interpreter's role. He argues in his pioneering sociological analysis of the interpreter's role that "the interpreter's position as the person in the middle has the advantage of power inherent in all positions that control scarce resources"

(p218). Later, Bochner (1981, p.3) raised the concept of "intercultural mediator" referring to interpreters' role. Since then, the study on the interpreter's role has been situated in a social and cultural context. Several scholars started to analyse the interpreter's role from the sociological perspective, challenging the notion of neutrality and impartiality of the interpreter's role.

Goffman (1981) in *Forms of Talk* introduces the relationship between the participants and their positions (speakers, listeners, and their "footing"), which has drawn academic attention to the actual interacting behaviour of the speakers in a dialogue or conversation. Introducing the theory of "participation framework", Goffman emphasizes the structure of interactive discourse in dyadic and multi-party encounters. He provides a new angle for the study of the interpreter's role since his theory indicates that interpreters do hold participatory positions in the interpreted triad.

Applying Goffman's (1981) theory to Interpreting Studies, Wadensjö (1998) proposes in her book *Interpreting as Interaction* that the interpreter actually works as a "coordinator" who "alternately oriented towards emphasizing the translating aspect and the coordination aspects" of the interpreted social encounter (p146). She explores the interpreter's involvement in communicative interaction, drawing heavily on Goffman's (1981) participation framework. With reference to Goffman's production format, Wadensjö (1998) analyses the interpreter's role as a "hearer" and "speaker" in the interactive communicative process. She also complements Goffman's model by putting forward the notion of "reception format" (p.91), which comprises three different modes of listening: "reporter" who repeats the utterance of the interlocutor, "responder" who reformulate utterances by taking them further, and "recapitulator" who recapitulates the meaning expressed in an authorized tone as if he/she is the person who produces the utterance. She points out that the framework helps trace the interaction's participation status and explains how the interpreter assists the communication. Wadensjö (1998) considers interpreting as a case of interaction where the interlocutors "continuously evaluate other's and one's relation to a focused discourse" (p.92). She explores the role of an interpreter in

dialogue interpreting as "a combination of two central functions; on the one hand, translating and on the other hand, coordinating other's talk" (p.51). She also points out that to thoroughly understand the interpreter's role, we should situate any study in a social context and adopt an interactionist perspective. To Wadensjö (1998), the interpreter in the cross-cultural interaction "potentially has a unique possibility to understand everything and therefore a unique possibility to overview and coordinate the interaction" (p.113).

Wadensjö's (1998) research deepens academia's understanding of interpreting. She furthers Goffman's (1981) study and applies it in Interpreting Studies, emphasizing the need to situate the study of the interpreter's role in a social and institutional context. Based on the pioneering study of Goffman (1981) and Wadensjö (1998), many researchers argue for the recognition of the complexities of the interpreter's role in different social settings. Studies of the interpreter's role witnessed a shift of the interpreter's role from a "language conduit" to a pivotal role in a cross-cultural dialogue interpreting as a co-participant, coordinator, or cultural mediator.

Mason (2009) refers to the interpreting activity as a "triadic exchange". With the data from an array of immigration interviews, Mason (2009) emphasizes the interpreter's "positioning" (p.71). He highlights the range of moves such as "gate-keeping, footing, manipulation of preferred/dispreferred responses, contextualization cues, in-group identity, gaze and lexical choices" (p.71) in the interpreted sessions. Drawing on Goffman's (1981) theory of "footing" and "participation status" (p.128), Manson raises the concept of "positioning", which is similar to "footing", seeking to explore how participants position themselves and others by their discursive practices and how the parties in the interaction are affected by each other's positioning. To Manson, the concept of "positioning" complements Davies and Harré's (1990) theory related to "role" as it emphasizes the evolving nature of the interactive triad. Mason argues for the complexities of the interpreter's role and places it in the dynamics of the interactive activities, emphasizing the non-static positioning of the interpreter.

Based on Mason's (2009) theories, Merlini (2009) carried out a study to investigate the interpreter's shifting and dynamic role as a cultural mediator during the triadic exchanges. Applying Wadensjö's (1998) model, Merlini describes the role of the interpreter as "detached translator", "involved translator", and "fully ratified participants" (p.64). Merlini also engages with Davies and Harré's (1990) socio-psychological theories to put forward the concept of "relevance theory", presenting the cultural mediator's shifts in positioning and identity in interpreting activity. Merlini's most significant contribution is to complement Mason's (2009) taxonomies of the interpreter's role by adding a fourth label to the role of the interpreter as a "service provider" (p.207).

The aforementioned studies mark the "social turn" of Interpreting Studies, which has broadened the scope of research to include "all sorts of spoken and sign language mediation and instances of inter-lingual transfer, which also focuses on "the (micro) sociology of the interaction and/or the (macro) sociology of societal institutions" (Hlavac, 2017, p.198). Researchers advocate for the need to situate the studies in a social and sociological context, emphasizing the interpreter's rich cultural and social attributions in interpreting dynamics. The emerging trend of the social and inter-disciplinary approach to the interpreter's role study has pushed researchers towards the analysis of the naturally occurring data in an array of social encounters. As Wadensjö (1998) states, researchers' attention moves away from the error, correctness, and source-text/target-text comparisons to the interaction of the interpreted conversations, where the interpreter acts as the coordinator and mediator of the communication. The influence of the "social turn" is that an increasing number of researchers begin to examine the non-linguistic dimensions of the interpreted encounters by applying the theories of cultural studies, anthropology, sociology, and sociolinguistics to Interpreting Studies, drawing the academia's attention to interpreters' multi-faceted roles as well as power relations in the dialogue interpreting.

2.2 The Departure from the "Invisible and Neutral" Stance

With the ushering of the "social turn" in Interpreting Studies, a growing number of studies have deconstructed the myth of the interpreter being an "invisible" party who always needs to remain "neutral" in the process of dialogue interpreting, examining what happens in interpreted encounters instead of what the interpreters are supposed to do according to the traditional perceptions.

Gentile et al. (1996) observes that the prevailing social and institutional norms strongly affect the way in which the interpreter's function is understood. He points out that the interpreter's role clearly evolves within two distinct but inextricably intertwined dimensions: the interpreting function itself and the context in which that function is performed. Gentile et al. (1996) states that "it is not a matter of keeping these two dimensions separate, but of evaluating to what extent the functional task is modified or extended by the particular text" (p.32). They examines the relationship between the social context and the role of the interpreter and points out that every single interlocutor exists only in relation to the other, and "not only the relationships and attitudes of the clients to each other but also the relationships between the interpreter and each client in turn" are essential for the liaison interpreting (p.32). Gentile et al. (1996) explores the interpreter's role in a variety of settings (mental health, legal, and business) with authentic data to construct the role of the interpreter as a "facilitator of communication" who has to "exercise certain control" to keep the conversation flow (p.101). While questioning the "invisible" and "neutral" stance taken by the interpreter, Gentile et al. (1996) puts the role of a professional interpreter in a social context, arguing for the inter-dependence of the relations between the clients and the interpreter and the facilitating role of the interpreter.

Similarly, Wadensjö (1998) also examines the professional ethics of interpreters' neutrality, detachment, and impartiality. Analyzing the interpreter's renditions with authentic data in police settings, she identifies that while translating messages between interlocutors, the interpreter plays a coordinating role in the interaction. Drawing upon Bakhtin's (1979) interactionist views on speech genre,

Wadensjö (1998) points out that "Since neutrality is the relational notion, a certain reporting of other's speech may stand out as partial or not, depending on the speech it is compared to" (p.284). She looks at how different communicative styles of the interlocutors influence the interpreter's choice of renditions in interpreted encounters. With regard to the features of the interaction in dyads and triads, Wadensjö (1998) states that "in an interpreter-mediated conversation, the lack of communicative contact between two parties not talking to each other's language is effectively remedied thanks to the interpreter" (p.12), which has explicitly emphasized the coordinating role of the interpreter in community interpreting settings. She also draws on Simmel's (1964) theory regarding how social interaction is influenced by its participants to explain the complexities of the interpreted interaction, arguing that PSI is a task of translating and mediating.

Wadensjö (1998) examines the interpreter's renditions with the "talk as text paradigm" (p.21) and highlights the concept of "situated sense-making", which is termed as "talk as activity" (p.153). She presents two simple and mutually compatible taxonomies of loose and divergent renditions contrasted with explicit and implicit coordinating moves. To Wadensjö, the interpreter's rendition is closely associated with agency and the social context they are situated in. Therefore, as a coordinator of the interpreting event, it is not possible for the interpreter to always remain "neutral" and "faithful". Wadensjö (1998, p.157) also emphasizes the mediating role of the interpreter in an interpreted encounter as someone who "actively, immediately and constantly engage in various aspects of sense-making", while the primary interlocutor's understanding of interaction "is assumed to be achieved with a certain delay and always via the mediating of certain party" (ibid., p.157).

Wadensjö (1998) has similar remarks referring to the monologist and dialogism in Interpreting Studies. She observes that interpreters not only translate on a linguistic level but also perform various activities on behalf of the other parties, "such as persuading, agreeing, lying questioning, claiming, explaining, comforting, accusing, denying, coordinating interaction and so forth" (p.42). She

argues that interpreters are supposed to engage proactively with the primary interlocutors in interpreting the activity to get the meaning across and facilitate communication. The authentic data from the police interview settings provides ample evidence of the interpreter's social position as a mediating third party who is no more invisible in the interpreted interaction.

To further deconstruct the invisible and neutral nature of the interpreter's role, Davidson (2001) describes the interpreter in medical settings as "gate-keeper", "co-diagnostician", and "co-interviewer" (p.173). Situating the study of the interpreter's role in the historical and institutional contexts, he analyses the data of the hospital-based professional interpreters in medical discourse. Davidson (2001) examines how the interpreter acts as the co-participant of the medical interview. He points out that the interpreter proactively evaluates the "value" of the information and interprets accordingly without letting other interlocutors understand their information screening process. To Davidson (2001), interpreting is "a contextual activity" (p.171), and the qualitative and quantitative data reveal that the function of the interpreter is to keep the interview on track.

So far, I have reviewed the literature examining the interpreting and the interpreter's role in social and institutional contexts. The research findings demonstrate that interpreting is an interactive activity where all sorts of interpersonal relations and social factors come into play. As different social settings constrain the interpreting activity, the interpreter is expected to act more than a mere "linguistic transmitter". They engage proactively with the primary interlocutors in the interaction to facilitate communication. Interpreting is no longer considered a "purely technical job", and the interpreter's intervening role in the interaction is acknowledged. With the deconstruction of invisibility and neutrality, some researchers look into how interpreters exercise control in interpreted interaction and how their performance may be affected by different communication factors. Moreover, the interpreter's perception of their roles has also drawn academic attention.

2.3 Examination of the Interpreter's Power from the Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) Perspective

In the previous sections, I provided an overview of the studies that situate interpreting as an interactive communicative event where all sorts of interpersonal relations and social factors come into play. Studies reviewed show that interpreting is an activity that is highly relevant to its social and situational context. Therefore, I consider it to be a particular kind of discourse, which is "a form of language use" or "a communicative event" where "participants use language to communicate ideas and beliefs" and interact with each other (Van Dijk, 1997, p.2). As Van Dijk states, the property of a specific discourse is that the participants use language to express ideas and beliefs and interact in specific social events. It is also "a social action accomplished by language users when they communicate with each other in social situations and within society and culture at large" (Van Dijk, 1997, p.14). Therefore, one can argue that interpreting, as a communicative and interactive event occurring at specific social occasions, can be considered a discursive activity in which the language is "actually uttered by people who are engaged in social interaction to accomplish a goal" (Mills, 1999, p.4).

Besides, interpreting is a remarkably complex social discourse. It involves participants from different countries with different cultural or social beliefs, and it occurs in a wide range of social and institutional contexts. To illustrate power relations in the discursive practice of interpreting, I found Critical Discourse Analysis (often abbreviated as CDA) a handy tool to explore the power dynamics in the discursive practice of interpreting. It aims to examine how societal power relations are established and reinforced through language use. The literature reviewed in this section explicates why I see interpreting as a form of discourse and how CDA is applied in the definition and analysis of the interpreter's power in the business context.

2.3.1 What is CDA？

CDA is an analytic practice with a critical approach to the study of discourse that

considers language a form of social practice. The focus of CDA is to examine how societal power relations are established and reinforced through language use and "the significance of language in the production, maintenance, and change of social relations" (Fairclough, 1989, p.1). Therefore, CDA highlights issues of power asymmetries, manipulation, exploitation, and structural inequities in domains such as politics, media, etc. The frequently-mentioned keywords feature "notions such as power, dominance, hegemony, ideology, class, gender, race, discrimination, interests, reproduction, institutions, social structure, and social order" (Van Dijk, 2015, p.468).

It is impossible to talk about CDA without mentioning Foucault, as he contributes to the notion of "discourse" and "discourse analysis" substantially, which provides roots for the fruitful theoretical and methodological premises for CDA. According to Foucault (1972, p.117):

> We shall call discourse a group of statements in so far as they belong to the same discursive formation […] Discourse is made up of a limited number of statements for which a group of conditions of existence can be defined. Discourse in this sense is not an ideal, timeless form […] it is, from beginning to end, historical – a fragment of history […] posing its own limits, its divisions, its transformations, the specific modes of its temporality.

Foucault's interest in discourse study results from his belief that there are rules which determine the acceptance, truthfulness, and significance of statements in a specific historical epoch. To put it simple, Foucault's theory resides in the social constructionist premise, which asserts the truth as a discursive construction. Different regimes of knowledge determine what comprises truth and false. Foucault asserts that the formulation of statements within a specific domain is produced similarly and repetitively.

It is also in Foucault's genealogical work, a theory of power and knowledge is proposed, which provides the premise for CDA study: a study that focuses on power and discourse with the aim to make explicit the power relations in a specific discourse. To Foucault, power is spread across various social and discursive

practices, which is not oppressive but productive, and "it needs to be considered as a productive network which runs through the whole social body, much more than as a negative instance whose function is repression" (Foucault 1980, p.119). Foucault's definition of power suggests that power is a product of discourse that is not negatively dominating but a shaping force of societal and cultural development. Situating it in the whole social context also denotes its close relation with the discourse, which is an essential element in modern society's social process. Foucault (1984) also emphasizes the concept of the power struggle over the determination of discursive practices. He believes that "discourse is not simply that which translates struggles or systems of domination, but is the thing for which and by which there is a struggle, discourse is the power which is to be seized" (p.110).

Foucault's theory is seminal for the CDA approach, which does not limit its analysis to language use or the specific structures of text or talk, but also the power relations and the social or situational factors which is constituted and constitutive of the relations. CDA owes to Foucault, as its focus on power and language has its root in Foucault's proposition of the power concept. Foucault's (1980) definition of power connects it with the concept of discourse. He considers power a product originating from and developing in social practices. As proposed by Foucault, power does not belong to any particular agent, political body, or social interest group. Instead, it is distributed across all social practices. Such views provide a standpoint for the development of CDA, as CDA aims to shed light on social relations, including power relations and social identities in discourse. It also aims to explicate the assumed knowledge about the constitution of the social world.

CDA aims to analyse "opaque as well as transparent structural relationships of dominance, discrimination, power, and control as manifested in language" (Wodak, 1995, p.204). CDA systematically relates its analysis of the text or talks to the structures of the social and situational context. The concepts of ideology, power, hierarchy, and gender are all viewed as significant and relevant aspects for an interpretation or explanation of the text in CDA. In other words, CDA is adopted as an analytical tool for authentic social interaction to make explicit "the ideological

loading of particular ways of using language and the relations of power" which underlie them (Fairclough and Wodak, 1997, p. 258). Besides, CDA foregrounds the discourse's dependence on social context and the relevance of the interlocutors' subject positions and relations to the analysis. As Wodak and Meyer (2002) argue, the critical examination of discourse would "require a theorization and description of both the social processes and structures which give rise to the production of a text and of the social structures and processes within which individuals or groups as social-historical subjects, create meanings in their interaction with texts" (p.3). CDA provides a useful perspective for my research of the interpreter's power in interpreted business encounters. It highlights the significance of investigating language use in institutional and social settings, which is central in CDA study.

As Wodak and Meyer (2002) advocate, CDA focuses on the relationships between discourse and social power with the major themes of power, history, and ideology. To be more specific, it means that "every discourse is historically produced and interpreted, that is, it is situated in time and space; and that dominance structures are legitimated by ideologies of powerful groups" (p.3). CDA investigates the social practices based on their discourse moments. It analyses "the substantively linguistic and discursive nature of social relations of power" and how they are used and discussed in discourse (Fairclough and Wodak, 1997, p.272). The CDA analysis of texts aims at unveiling how "structures, strategies or other properties of text, talk, verbal interaction or communicative events play a role" (Van Dijk, 1993, p.250) in shaping and producing the unequal power relations in the discourse. In other words, CDA aims to discover the unequal relations of power enacted discursively in the discourse, which is totally in line with the aim of this study. It offers a lens to examine the interpreter's power and the power dynamics in the scenario of BNI discourse with the dynamic, dialogic, and highly interactive nature.

2.3.2 Major Approaches of CDA

Among all the representative scholars in CDA, Norman Fairclough was the most prominent one. He develops an approach to discourse analysis that synthesizes linguistically-oriented discourse analysis and the insights of recent social theory on

language and discourse. This is also why I choose his approach as opposed to other CDA approaches (see section 3.2.1 in Methodology Chapter). His CDA approach is theoretically adequate and practically usable for me to adapt it into research in the field of Interpreting Studies.

Fairclough (1989) systematically illustrates the significant role language plays in producing and reinforcing, and changing the social relation of power in his book *Language and Power,* which is considered the cornerstone of the social study of language with a CDA approach. Fairclough (1989) points out that the CDA study aims to "help increase consciousness of how language contributes to the domination of some people by others because consciousness is the first step towards emancipation" (p.1). On Fairclough's (1989, p.22) account, language can be considered a form of social practice that is socially shaped and socially shaping from three aspects:

-Firstly, that language is a part of society, and not somehow external to it.

-Secondly, language is a social process.

-And thirdly, that language is a socially conditioned process, conditioned that is by other (non-linguistic) parts of society".

Fairclough (1989) explores the relationship between language and society with the emphasis upon power and ideology. He argues that "language is centrally involved in power, and struggles for power, and that it is so involved through its ideological properties" (p.17). With the analysis of dialectic structures and the social and institutional context of conversations between the police and witness, the professor and students, Fairclough explicates how social practices are discursively shaped and the discursive effects of social practices. For example, in the police and witness dialogue, he argues that the police officer's firm control of the conversation, as well as the restricted contribution of the witness, are determined specifically "by the nature of the relationship between the police and members of the 'public' in our society, and indeed they are *part* of that relationship" (p.19). He advocates for the significance of social conditions or institutional conditions, which determine certain discursive properties.

To explore the social conditions of discourse, Fairclough (1989) introduces the notion of the "orders of discourse" (p.28), which is defined as "the way in which actual discourse is determined by underlying conventions of discourse" (p.28). He points out the social discourse practice is constrained by these "underlying conventions" of a certain discourse type, such as the police and witness dialogue or the interrogation procedure in a police station.

Exploring the relationship between social order and order of discourse, Fairclough (1989) also argues that there are always "social preconditions for action on the part of individual persons" (p.28). Therefore, individuals act within the constraints of different types of discourse. Fairclough (1989) highlights that inter-relationship between the order of discourse and ideology — "the conventions and orders of discourse embody particular ideology" while the "orders of discourse are ideologically shaped by power relations in social institutions and in society as a whole" (p.17). In order to present how a close analysis can contribute to our understanding of relationships and ideological process of power and control in discourse, he sketches a framework for the study of interaction with a CDA approach, which contains three stages (Fairclough, 1989, p.108):

1) description of text;

2) interpretation of the text which is related to the relationship between text and interaction,

3) explanation of the text concerning the relationship between interaction and social context".

Such framework decodes how language plays a role in shaping the ideology and the exercising of power in the society through the "common sense assumptions which treat authority and hierarchy as natural" (Fairclough's, 1989, p.2). Fairclough's (1989) seminal study in CDA explicates the relation between language and institutional practices within the broader political and social context. It is considered a landmark in CDA study as it marks a critical turn in the language study by providing a methodological blueprint for studying the relation between language and power relations or even society at large. As Blommaert and Bulcaen

(2000) put forward, Fairclough successfully "identifies multiple ways in which individuals move through such institutionalized discursive regimes" (p.449).The critical analysis of the interactions in advertising, marketing, and political or media discourse presents to the reader that how a close analysis of texts in terms of grammar, vocabulary, as well as textual features" can contribute to our understanding of power relations and ideological processes in discourse" (Fairclough, 1989, p.109). In other words, CDA aims to uncover and reveal the otherwise hidden ideologies and power relations enacted, transmitted, and reproduced in discourse.

More significantly, Fairclough's (1989) conceptual framework regarding the language and power or the ideological process in society is aimed for change. He holds that power and hegemony struggle considers the order of discourse to be a stake. While making the hidden power relations in the social and institutional context more explicit, CDA increases people's awareness of how social inequality or power are enacted, reinforced, and reproduced by language and the emergency of new orders of discourse the resistance against the power regime. Fairclough's (1989) approach in CDA takes a particular interest in "the substantively linguistic and discursive nature of social relations of power" (Fairclough, 1989, p.272), highlighting how power is exercised through language in social discourse. Fairclough's (1989) approach stemmed from linguistics sociolinguistics focusing on language in its social context. His view on discourse considers "language as a form of social practice" (ibid., p.22), which implies the dialectical relationship between language and society.

Based on Fairclough's critical approach to the correlation between language, power, and ideology, Wodak's (2001) CDA study mainly engages with the political discourse. Wodak (2001) defines discourse as "a complex bundle of simultaneous and sequential interrelated linguistic acts, which manifest themselves within and across the social fields of action as thematically interrelated semiotic, oral or written tokens, very often as 'texts'" (p.66). She explicates the dialectical relationship between discursive practices and the context in which they are situated.

She also argues that "the situational, institutional and social settings shape and affect discourses, and on the other, discourses influence discursive as well as non-discursive social and political processes and actions" (ibid., p.66). Similar to Fairclough (1989), Wodak (2001) also views discourse as a form of social practice that is shaped or influenced by the context in which it occurs. She views the text as the product of discourse and defines texts "as materially durable products of linguistic actions" (p. 66) and argues for the inter-textual and inter-discursive relations between different texts or discourses and genres. Wodak (2001) builds a framework of "triangulation" (p.67), which focuses on:

    (1) the immediate language or text internal co-text;

    (2) the inter-textual and inter-discursive relationship between utterances, texts, genres and discourses;

    (3) the social/sociological variables and institutional frames of a particular context of the situation; and,

    (4) the broader socio-political and historical context which the discursive practices are embedded within and related to."

Wodak (2001) employs this framework to explore the issue of discrimination and the discursive construction of national identity in Austria with the case study of "'Austria first' petition" (p72). Wodak (2001) examines the discourse from the category of "content of topic", "discursive strategies", "linguistics means and the specific, context-dependent linguistic realizations (as tokens) of the discriminatory stereotypes" (p.72). To Wodak, the CDA approach in the historical context serves as an instrumental framework to examine the discursive enactment of races, ethnicities, nations, or national identities and the interrelationship between discursive and other social practices and structures.

      Van Dijk's CDA approach highlights the importance of social cognition. To Van Dijk (1993) defines the social recognition as "socially shared representations of societal arrangements, groups, and relations, as well as mental operations such as interpretation, thinking and arguing, inferencing and learning" (p.257). He proposes that CDA aims to explore "the ways specific discourse structures are

deployed in the reproduction of social dominance" (Van Dijk, 2015, p.468), which indicates the relevance of societal structures to discourse structures through different actors and their minds. Appling CDA in media discourse, and he reviews the theories and application of different academic researchers regarding the role of media discourse. In the 2nd edition of *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis* (2015)*,* Van Dijk also argues that the CDA "should bridge the well-known gap between micro-level (agency, interactional) and macro-level (structural, institutional, organizational)" (p. 468). To Van Dijk, macro-level is represented by power, dominance, and inequality between social groups, while micro-level by language use, discourse, verbal interaction and communication.

Van Dijk (2015) considers social power as the central notion in CDA as he believes that the particular kind of discourse, such as "those of politics, the media, education, or science---is itself a power resource" (p.469). Suggesting that "mind-control" through such discourse "is a fundamental way to reproduce dominance and hegemony" (ibid, p.472), Van Dijk (2001) defines social power as control and asserts that groups have power if they can control the acts and minds of other groups. He also distinguishes two main types of power (Van Dijk, 2001, p. 355):

(1) the "coercive power" based on force. i.e., power of the military, power of violent men, etc.; and

(2) the "persuasive power", which is "based on knowledge, information, or authority" such as "the power of parents, professors, or journalists".

Van Dijk's (2001) CDA approach is based on the understanding of ideological structure and power sitting within the social relations in specific discourse. The major CDA approaches introduced in this section all illustrate the correlation between language, power, and ideology with a different focus. Fairclough's (1989) critical discourse research views discourse as a form of social practice, which serves as a foundation for the further CDA studies: Wodak (2001) builds the historical discourse approach exploring the discursive construction of races, ethnicities, nations, or national identities, while Van Dijk (2001) develops the social-cognitive approach considering discourse as a form of memory and

knowledge. All these studies and approaches provide a rich set of theories and methodologies for the critical study of text and discourse.

2.3.3 Rationale for the Choice of Fairclough's CDA Theory and the Limitations

As discussed in the literature review, CDA is mainly applied to the study of monolingual settings. Only recently has it entered into translation and interpreting studies, particularly within the political domain (Bayani, 2016; Liambo and Triyono, 2018; Gu, 2019a, 2019b). One advantage of the CDA approach is that it provides a means through which the researcher can examine relations between a subject and language. CDA also offers theoretical and methodological premises for exploring and reflecting on the role of language use in a broad social and cultural context. The core notions of power and ideology of CDA also shed light on the power relations in discourse. Most importantly, the critical sense of CDA provides a lens for the analysis of power relations and potential changes of the traditional norms within the context of BNI.

The previous section showcases how CDA owes a clear debt to Foucault (1980) by reviewing his influence on the development of the CDA theory. Foucault contributes to CDA theory by providing insights into the relationship between discourse and power, the function of discourse in social change, and the discursive construction of social subjects and knowledge. However, Foucault's approach mainly focuses on abstract theoretical development, which does not comprise a useable framework to operationalise his insights and theories in discourse analysis. Moreover, Foucault's CDA theory is based on discourse in the human sciences, such as medicine, psychiatry, and economics.

In contrast, this study is concerned with conversation and dialogue in a very specific discourse. Given the dialogic and interactional nature of the business negotiation interpreting settings, Fairclough's (1989) CDA approach is adopted as an instrumental theoretical framework to empirically explore the discursive construction of the interpreter's power in business encounters. Fairclough's (1989) CDA framework is chosen over other CDA approaches because it is text-oriented and can serve as a

practical tool for text analysis. Fairclough (1992) argues in his work *Discourse and Social changes*, "greater attention to texts and language analysis would increase the value of discourse analysis as a method in social research" (p.5). His CDA approach focuses on the linguistic dimension of social and cultural phenomena, which provides an excellent theoretical foundation to support its application in Interpreting Studies. Cosidering language a form of social practice, CDA aims to explicate the opaque power and control relations, or ideologies manifested and reproduced in language, therefore it can be adopted to analyse the transcripts of authentic interpreter-assisted interactions. CDA also makes it possible to explore the interpreter's intervening strategies, positioning, relations with the primary interlocutors, and their influence on the development of the interpreted event.

As aforementioned, it is universally acknowledged that CDA can yield substantial insights into the relations of power and language, discourse and the social structures, with far-reaching implications for the understanding of the interaction in social and situational context. As CDA continues to extend its range of application, it is adopted for researches in fields as diverse as Media, Cognitive Science, and Interpreting Studies. However, theoretical and methodological position of CDA has been criticised by a number of scholars (eg. Widdowson 1995; Hammersley 1997; Slembrouk 2001; Blommaert 2001; Peter E 2007) and it has remained controversial regarding the selection of data and the objectivity or the validity of the findings.

As one of the most straightforward critics of CDA, Widdowson (1995) completely deconstructs the concept of "critical", which is what Fairclough claims and flags in the theory's proposal and in his analysis of the discourse. To Widdowson (1995), Fairclough conflates the two perspectives of "scope" and "commitment", which respectively refers to "with what phenomenon you are analysing" and "the relationship between analysis and interpretation" (Widdowson, 1995, p.158). On Widdowson's (1995) account，Fairclough's claim of interdisciplinarity by bringing together the reference of Linguistics and the perspective of Sociology is confusing, since it would be difficult for the researcher

to strike a balance between the two perspectives. Instead, the researcher "will inevitably privilege one perspective over the other" (ibid., p.159), which generates bias and influences the selection of the data.

Widdowson (1995) also addresses to the failure of CDA in self-reflexively considering its own limitations. He points out that the methodology of CDA is a form of interpretation rather than critically standing above or outside of discourse as Fairclough claims to do. The confusion of analysis and interpretation means that Fairclough fails to realize that analysts may have preferences and may subsequently give priority to their preferences while interpreting data. Such behaviours potentially put into question the representativeness, objectiveness and validity of the findings.

These critiques are certainly valid and particularly relevant to the present study with the reference to authentic business data while doing the analysis under the framework. CDA may not be self-sufficient as a paradigm, however, it is undeniable that it offers a powerful interpretation of conversation as a dynamic, interactive achievement. The defense for CDA would start from Fairclough's (2001b) argument that his theories are "based upon a view of semiosis as an irreducible part of material social processes" which considers language as "an integral element" of such processes (p.122). Moreover, it is CDA which moves the study of linguistic phenomenon beyond the mere description and interpretation of the role of language in society. CDA shifts the academia's attention to the explanation of the role of language in the wider context of society and to how and why language functions, and what is behind this (Fairclough 1989). On Fairclough's (1992) account, "critical implies showing connections and causes that are hidden" (p.9). For the current study, CDA does serve as a tool to facilitate the investigation of how interpreters' positioning is influenced by their linguistic, cultural and institutional expertise, and how they reposition themselves in the web of power relations (e.g. buy and sell relations) in the business discourse.

By considering "language" as an integral part of the discursive practice, CDA serves as a useful tool for the researcher to tease out the changing power landscape

and the manifestation of the interpreter's agency in the discourse. It offers a lens to look at what is behind the interpreter's intervention, such as the change of personal perspective, turn distributing, asking for clarification or giving explanation. This is also why the current study combines CDA with other sociological framework of Goffman (1981) to generate more comprehensive and richer views concerning the interactive nature of the social practice, thus making up for the limits of CDA and shifts the conversational and linguistic activity into a practice which is fundamentally social.

Moreover, although the critique regarding the bias selection of the data seems to be compelling and persuasive, it does not rule out the value of the authentic recordings of the naturally-occurring interpreted business encounters, which is uncharted territory in the role study of the interpreter. The precious data obtained offers an opportunity for a close scrutiny of transcripts, which serves as a "publicly available record of the interaction that can be repeatedly returned to and scrutinised by researchers" (Elena, 2012, p.70).

However, the awareness of the critiques in such perspective does remind me to be cautious of my positionality as a researcher with the experience of being a professional interpreter and an interpreting lecturer who shares the experience with the participants of this research. Reflexivity is a crucial strategy in qualitative study (Roni 2013; Hammersley and Atkinson 2002; Horsburgh, 2003; Koch and Harrington 1998;). Being aware of the "researcher's social position (e.g., gender, age, race, immigration status, sexual orientation), personal experiences, and political and professional beliefs" (Roni, 2013, p.1) is extremely helpful for the researcher to better understand their self-role "in the creation of knowledge". Adopting a reflexive approach in the research helps the researcher self-monitor the "impact of their biases, beliefs, and personal experiences on their research" (ibid, p.2). This means that, although I am an insider from the field of study, I would need to constantly remind myself to keep a distance with the data, and always self-monitor if my experience and expertise in interpreting may influence my selection and perceptions of the data to maintain a balance between the personal perspective and

the universal objectivity. However, being an insider from the field of the study also means that the researcher is more knowledgeable about the researched subjects and the data. Moreover, the research participants might be more outspoken and willing to share their views with someone who they believe is resonating and sympathetic to their situation (De Tona, 2006), e.g., the interpreter may be more willing to explicate their feeling and views in the interview process, which generates more authentic data for study. With reflexivity, I am more aware of the potential engagement and detachment of my self-positionality as a researcher, which enhances the credibility and validity of the study and its ethics.

2.3.4 Definition of the Interpreter's Power

The interpreter's role has rarely been explored systematically from the perspective of power and ideology, and "the research on ideology and interpreting are still in its infancy" (Martin, 2016, p.239). This is especially the case for the performance of interpreting in the business domain. As shown by the studies mentioned above, the goal of the CDA is to explicate the otherwise hidden power exercised through language in a specific discourse, thus it serves as a valuable tool for the critical investigation of the interpreter's power in the context of the current study. This section defines the interpreter's power regarding the basic features of CDA theories, meanwhile, it also includes the theorization of agency, which is closely related to the study and the concept of power in this study

Interpreting, a discursive activity for communication, is highly relevant to its social and situational context. The interpreter-mediated business encounter is considered a discourse with a dynamic, dialogic, and highly interactive nature. Fairclough and Wodak (1997) argue that discourse is a form of social practice that is both socially shaped and socially shaping, which "implies a dialectical relationship between a particular discursive event and the situations, institutions and social structures which frames it" (p.258). The interpreter's engagement with the primary participants in a business setting makes the potential ideological positioning of the interpreter particularly interesting. The interpreter's rendition of

the primary speaker's utterance is always the basis for the primary participants to figure out the business partners' intention and make decisions for further talk. Besides, the interpreter is often hired by one side of the primary participant, whom he/she refers to as "the client". Being located between the primary speakers and his/her client, the interpreter is the only person with the bilingual ability and bi-cultural expertise in this business tug of war, which makes their agency and subject position an interesting and subtle topic.

In Social Sciences, the concept of agency has a philosophical origin that can be traced back to Hume and Aristotle. It denotes the capacity of an individual to take independent action and to act on one's own will (Stanford Encyclopaedia of Philosophy, 2015). The concept of agency has attracted increasing amount of scholarly attention in Translation and Interpreting Studies. Many researchers have drawn upon the sociological approach, such as Bourdieu's (1993) proposal of the concept of "field" in sociological cultural production (p.163), and Latour's (1996) Actor-Network theory (ANT), to explore the notion of agency within the interpreting and translation process which involves multiple actors. In these studies, particular scholarly attention is paid to the interpreters/translators themselves (e.g. Baker 2006; Inghilleri 2010; Milton and Bandia 2009; Khalifa 2014). The ATN theory, while reconceptualising human agency as a temporally embedded process of social activity, aims at "accounting for the very essence of societies and natures" with the interpretation of agency (Latour, 1996, p.369). ATN focuses on the relations of the social subjects from an ontological perspective, and an actor or actant can "literally be anything provided it is granted to be the source of an action"（ibid., p.373）in ATN theory.

In this study, agency and power are two interconnected concepts. Agency is considered to be the interpreter's ability to take initiative and to make independent decisions in the course of the business interpreting encounter. To be more specific, agency refers to the interpreter's subject position in the interaction, which enables them to step in the talk and take on a substantive role in the discursive practice. Interestingly, in Translation and Interpreting Studies, the discussion of the agency

of the interpreter/translator is mostly relevant to the "capital" (Wolf, 2011, p. 4) the agent holds in a field or discourse. This means that the interpreter's exercise of agency in a social context is highly influenced by the social and cultural resources they hold in the discourse. Such resources can be understood as the "power and force" that are "created around those agents who dispose of the strongest forms of capitals" (ibid., p.6). This definition is highly relevant to the notion of agency foregrounded in my study. In the business scenario, the capital the interpreter holds which enables them to exercise their agency is related to their bilingual and bicultural resources in the discourse.

To be more specific, the interpreter is the person who understands both languages used in the business negotiation, which is essential for the communication in the cross–culture context. Besides, "culture is acquired, socially transmitted, and communicated in part by language" (Grosjean 1982, p. 157), which indicates that the biculturalism is also a crucial component of the social resources held by the interpreter. Interpreting is apparently not a linguistic exercise aiming at word-for-word equivalencies. As De Jongh (1991) argues, "factors such as dialect and geographic variation, educational level, register, style, intonation and nonverbal cues are integral components" (p.99) need to be considered by the interpreter to facilitate the cross-cultural communication. The connotation of biculturalism is arguably multi-layered and the dynamic contextual and situational feature of the business scenario endows it with more components.

In BNI, the bicultural capacity of the interpreter also refers to their knowledge of the background information of the business discussion, such as the profile of both companies, the divergent institutional culture of the businesses of both countries, and the preferred way of communicating of negotiators on both ends. The understanding and grasp of the above knowledge can be understood as "cultural" resources in a broad sense. In a word, the notion of "biculturalism" of the interpreter in the current study comprises their ability to "interpret experiences in a manner appropriate to both cultures involved" (ibid., p.100) with their "capital" within the business context. This is where CDA can be harnessed as a tool to

examine the manifestation of the interpreter's use of their capital in the discursive practice to exercise their agency and to look at it from a power angle.

On Wodak's (1995) account, the purpose of CDA is to analyse "opaque as well as the transparent structural relationship of dominance, discrimination, power, and control as manifested in language" (p.204). To be more specific, CDA highlights the relationship between language and power by examining "real and often extended, instances of social interaction which take (partially) linguistic form" (Wodak, 1997, p.173). In other words, CDA emphasizes how languages are used in various forms and manipulation of power. Therefore, the CDA study of business interpreting scenarios can also shed light on the interpreter's agency and power and how the situational and institutional context shapes it. However, to understand the power relations within the business interpreting context, I will first clarify the definition of power in CDA theories.

Van Dijk (2015) argues that "a central notion in most critical work on discourse is that of power, and more specifically the social power of groups or institutions" (p.469), which implicates that the notion of power is central in the CDA framework. Van Dijk also points out that CDA "primarily studies the way social power abuse and inequality are enacted reproduced, legitimated and resisted by text and talk in the social and political context" (ibid., p.466). He further defines power as control, and he argues that "groups have (more or less) power if they are able to (more or less) control the acts and minds of (members of) other groups" (p.469). He also highlights the base of power as "having privileged access to scarce social resources, such as money, status, fame, knowledge, information, culture, or indeed various forms of public discourse and communication" (ibid, p.469). This has implications for the illustration of the interpreter's agency and power dynamics in business interpreting scenarios. For CDA, language gains power "by the use powerful people make of it" (Wodak, 2002, p.10), and language is also the site and stake for a power struggle. We could argue that the interpreter holds power in business interpreting discourse based on the following three aspects:

1) they have the producing rights for the renditions of the primary participants'

utterances with their scarce bilingual and biculturalism source.

2) The "scarce resource" enables them to control the primary interlocutor's contribution or the order of discourse, such as controlling the turn-taking order.

3) Their professional skills and awareness of the institutional and situational context enable them to determine how renditions are presented and how they are positioned in the interpreted business negotiation, eg, making the decision of edited renditions, or adjusting their subject positions by either aligning with or distancing from the clients.

As mentioned in the previous section, the interpreter is typically expected to act as a "voice exmachina" (Müller, 1989, p.714), who must give a "more or less literal translation of what is said in language A in language B" (Knapp-Potthoff and Knapp, 1986, p.152) and "interpret fully and faithfully everything said by the primary parties" (Wadensjö, 1998, p.59). However, with the CDA perspective, this study demonstrates that the interpreter holds power within the business interpreting context. CDA aims to reveal the "common-sense" assumptions, which are "implicit in the conventions according to which people interact linguistically, and of which people are generally not consciously aware" (Fairclough, 1989, p.2). Fairclough (1989) defines this common-sense as "order of the discourse" (p.28), which refers to the underlying conventions of discourse and how people assume the way a discourse should be formed, such as the shared fiction of the idealized role of the interpreter. This study intends to illustrate that the interpreter, an agent in the discursive practice of interpreting, disrupts the order of discourse with the power deriving from the possession of "scarce resource".

Of course, power is never absolute, as it is "never definitely held by any one person, or social grouping" (Fairclough, 1989, p.43). The interpreter's power is not always overwhelmingly positive in an interaction; their behaviour or mistakes made in the interpreting process might also be monitored by the primary interlocutors who have a basic command of the foreign language and the jargon

used in a specific industry. Moreover, it could be dangerous and inevitably risky for the interpreter to intervene in the communication of the primary interlocutors, especially in a business scenario involving concrete things like price or contract terms. Although such scenarios do not occur in my data, it has to be acknowledged and the researcher must always be aware of it when discussing the power of the interpreter.

Nevertheless, the data in this research does provide evidence and demonstrates to us the fact that interpreters, while facilitating the business talk's communication, also "maintain and reinforce these power relations and occasionally even altered them" (Ren and Mason, 2012, p.116). Therefore, I believe it is justifiable to adopt CDA as a framework to operationalise the critical examination of the interpreter's power in the changing landscape of the power dynamics of the business encounter. CDA focuses on the relationship between langue and power and how language plays a part in the struggling over power in the discourse of business interpreting, which is central to the aim of the present research. With the critical perspective of CDA, this study can make more explicit the interpreter's power and agency in the interpreted business encounters. Meanwhile, it may also raise the trainees' and trainers' awareness regarding an interpreter's full-scale role in this social and institutional discourse.

2.4 Power Enacted in Social and Institutional Discourses

From the perspective of the CDA, the interpreting activity can be viewed as an interactive communicative event in which the participants' relations are discoursal. Therefore, researchers are interested in how interpreters exercise power and the power dynamics of the interaction. This section reviews the literature relating to the control or discoursal power displayed by the interpreter in interpreting activities occurring in various social and institutional contexts.

2.4.1 Studies of the Interpreter's Power in Discourse of PSI

Merlini and Favaron (2003) investigate the interpreter's role in the power dynamics of mediated interactions in medical settings. They draw on functional linguistics and discourse analysis to explore the existing power relationships in the interactive medical triad. Merlini and Favaron (2003) put forward the concept of "management of power", which refers to the interpreter's power to control the "power wielded by his/her two clients" (p.214). With the authentic data obtained through observation of interpreted sessions in hospitals in Australia, Merlini and Favaron look at the degree of the interpreter's power management in medical encounters by analysing the interpreter's speech rate, intonation, change of footing, as well as divergent renditions. A post assignment interview is adopted to explore the interpreter's awareness or lack of awareness of their power in interpreting activity. They also state that the "awareness and acceptance of the interpreter's powerful role might be promoted by making it more transparent to clients" (p.226). Their research's significance is that it describes how interpreters function in the naturally-occurring medical consultation and how interpreters exercise power through the verbal and non-verbal choices, which alter or influence the interpersonal relationships in the interactive encounter. More importantly, their research also investigates the interpreters' awareness regarding their power in the interpreted encounters, which explains the reasons and intentions behind the meditating behaviour.

Angelelli (2001) also explores the interpreter's visibility and the awareness of power in her Ph.D. thesis *Deconstructing the invisible interpreter: A critical study of the interpreter's interpersonal role in cross-cultural/linguistic communicative event*s. To further her argument, she explores the interpreter's visible role in her later work *Revisiting Interpreter's Role, A study of conference, court, and medical interpreters in Canada, Mexico, and the United States* (2004) with the authentic data collected in medical settings. Angelelli (2004) argues that the intermediating behaviour of the interpreter is necessary for successful provider-patient interactions. She defines a visible interpreter as "one that exercises agency

within the interaction in order to bridge a communication gap" (p76). Visibility in this context is seen as medical interpreters' extension of their role beyond that of a "language switcher", emphasizing the interpreter's control over the interaction. She defines the interpreting process as ICE (interpreted communicative event) and refers to the "situational practice" as the innate nature of ICE. Angelelli explores the complexities of the interpreter's role at three different levels: (1) societal; (2) interpersonal; and (3) discourse. Drawing on Bourdieu's (1990) theory of practice, she argues that the interpreter's role is influenced by the specific settings or the particular institutions and rules. She emphasizes that the interpreter cannot adopt a totally neutral stance in the interpreting activity as "no interaction happens in a social vacuum, none of them are parties invisible or unbiased. They all bring to the interactions their deeply held views and values, prejudices, and biases" (p.28). Therefore, it is unwise to assume that interpreters can be immune to social factors' interplay in any social encounters. She further elaborates on the visibility of the interpreter from the perspective of the linguistic elements of ICE as well as the interpersonal role of the interpreter, encompassing the five subcomponents: alignment with the parties; establishing trust with/facilitating mutual respect between the communicating effect as well as message; explaining cultural gaps/interpreting culture as well as language; establishing communication rules during the conversation.

As part of the study, Angelelli (2004) constructs an instrument called IPRI (interpreter's Interpersonal Role Inventory) for the survey of interpreters' awareness of themselves playing a visible role in the process of ICE. The survey instruments draw on relevant principles used in psychology and have proven highly reliable and valid. The rationale to design the survey instruments is out of her curiosity about the interpreter's perception of their role in ICE. She points out that "the current understanding of how interpreters perceive themselves lacks a systematic approach to the question of the interpreter's perception of and attitudes towards her role" (p46). This survey instrument's application aims to investigate whether interpreters are aware of themselves being a visible participant in the ICE

and how they perceive the impact of the specific settings on their performance or perception of their roles. The survey results show that the interpreter's perceptions of their role are largely influenced by the specific settings,which expands and broadens the study of interpreting beyond the cognitive element of the practice.

Angelelli's (2004) work provides a full-fledged explanation of the interpreter's visible role in the interpreted interaction, which has drawn academia's attention to the complexities of the interpreter's role and the interpreter's reflection of the "self" in the situational practice. Pointing out the pressing need for academia to examine the interpreted communicative event, Angelelli's (2004) study provides insights into the intervening role of the interpreters. It investigates interpreters' perceptions of their role in community interpreting settings. Her study offers a detailed explanation of what actually happens when professional interpreters perform the duty and how interpreters perceive themselves concerning the patient and the doctor in a medical context.

Similarly, Ren (2010), in her Ph.D. thesis, also examines the power of the interpreter by exploring liaison interpreters' subjectivity consciousness and the relation between translation and cultural construction from an interdisciplinary perspective. As Ren (2010) defines, the visible interpreter is "one who transcends the traditional role of a mere code switcher, takes an active part in the interaction and exercises agency in order to help the parties involved bridge the communication gap" (p16). To Ren, the interpreter's awareness of the different roles they take on is the "visibility consciousness", which guides the interpreter to act as "a gate-keeper of the speaker's message，a co-interlocutor of the talk and a coordinator/mediator of the interactional process" (p17). Ren puts forward the concepts of the interpreter's subjective consciousness and ethical consciousness, which offers interpreters guidance to adopt translation strategies per the specific situations in different settings, facilitating the mutual understanding between the primary participants in the conversation.

Ren (2010, p.16-19) constructs the subjective consciousness of the interpreter by explaining three forms of the interpreter's role in the interactional

communicative process:

    (1) the interpreter's visibility consciousness;

    (2) the interpreter's empowerment consciousness;

    (3) the interpreter's notion on non-neutral position.

She points out that the interpreter exercises control in the intercultural conversation by filtering specific contents of the primary speaker's utterances. Drawing on Angelelli's (2004) theory of text-ownership, Ren observes the degree of the involvement of the interpreter in creating the "text-ownership" and "specific content" in the conversation, stating it the evidence to the visibility of the interpreter. To further emphasize the impact of the interpreter's subjective consciousness, Ren proposes the concept of the "empowerment consciousness". She draws on the Dialogic theories of Bakhtin (1986) to explore face-to-face communication and points out the "meaning" in the process of inter-mediated communication is co-constructed by all the parties engage in the conversation. She argues that with the deconstruction of the primary party's dominating position, "the concept of the interpreter being absolute 'neutral' or 'faithful' is also no more a golden-standard in the interpreting process" (p.80). Ren (2010) steps forward by applying Foucault's (1977) theory related to power. She argues that Foucault's (1977) discursive power relation theory offers strong theoretical support to analyse the intermediating-role of the interpreter and strategies adopted by him/her to become visible and act as a power figure. She defines the interpreter's power as the holding of the bi-cultural and bi-lingual resources and the control of the discourse. According to Ren (2010), the liaison interpreter holds power to interprets, regulates, mediates, or even gate-keeps the talk by adopting different social positions in the interpreted encounters.

Examining the power differentials permeated in the inter-mediated conversations from different settings, Ren (2010) observes that the interpreter can empower the party who is in a less important or vulnerable position by leveraging the scarce source bi-lingual and bi-cultural expertise which "readjust, though partially and momentarily, the unbalanced power relations among the parties

involved" (p.19). Ren's research into the liaison interpreter's visible role and the interpreter's subjective consciousness serves as a complement to the earlier studies of the interpreter's intermediating role in cross-communication. It also further deconstructs the prevailing interpreter's professional ethics of "neutrality" and "invisibility" by considering the interpreter as someone who holds power in the interaction. In an assertive tone, Ren (2010) highlights the concepts of power and empowering capacity of the interpreter, which provides firm theoretical support to the study of the interpreter's mediating role and social positioning in interpreted encounters.

In a later study, Ren and Mason (2012) foreground the interpreter's power by deconstructing the interpreter's idealized role as an invisible, detached, or neutral figure in interpreting activity. Adopting Michel Foucault's theory of power, Ren and Mason (2012) further the argument of power and define the power of the interpreter as "a kind of strategy, disposition, maneuver, tactic, or technique, functioning in a network of relations" (p.116) instead of a dominating force. They argue that the interpreter, while lacking institutional power, has the "interactional power" (p.123), which could be exercised by adopting a variety of verbal and non-verbal strategies for the balance of the power relations in the interpreted communication. With authentic examples of interpreting events, Ren and Mason (2012) also illustrate how the interpreter exercises power by adopting a non-neutral stance and being a co-interlocutor or empowerment figure. Mason and Ren's study problematizes professional interpreters' traditional image described as transparent, invisible, neutral, and detached. They also deconstruct the notion of an idealized interpreter who is not entitled to intervene in the communication by illustrating how such an idealized role construct can be challenged in real-life face-to-face interpreting events.

From the perspective of coordination, Baraldi and Gavioli (2012) also explore the power of the interpreter in thesis collection, *Coordinating Participation in Interpreting.* They focus on the coordinating and interactive nature of interpreting, emphasizing the interpreter's efforts to "empower participants as

agents in the interaction and to distribute talk in a way that allows all the parties to contribute and the interaction to actually take place" (p.2), which refers to the fact that interpreters distribute turns and empower the primary parties to speak, talk and express their views and beliefs in the interaction. The chapters in this book look specifically at the coordinating activities of interpreters and institutional representatives and how they relate to the management of talk. In particular, Baraldi and Gavioli (2012) focus on "the ways in which coordination affects participants' chances to make an active contribution by giving them a space to talk and possibly empowering (or failing to empower) them as agents" (p.2). They point out that coordination is a fundamental characteristic of interaction in general, interpreter-mediated interaction in particular.

Baraldi (2012) observes that the reflexive coordination of the interpreter promotes the active participation of the primary participants, which displays their sensitivity to the interlocutors' interests and needs. Drawing on Mona Baker's (2006) theory of narrative, which highlights forms of mediation in interpreting (and translation), Baraldi (2012) puts forward the concept of "narrative mediation", which refers to "the dialogic mediation that produces equity, empathy and empowerment" (p.298). To Baraldi, interpreting activity can be seen as "a narrative mediation, and interpreters can be considered as mediators who actively distribute opportunities to participate, by giving voice to participants' stories and (re-) authoring the current story as a story of cooperation" (p.298). Baraldi considers interpreters "agents and editors" of new stories. He argues that interpreters exercise their power by distributing the turns to enable the participants to vocalize their stories, views, and attitudes in the interpreted communication. Analyzing the factual data drawn from a large corpus within medical settings, Baraldi further explores the complexities of the interpreter's role by examining the sequences of interpreters' autonomous questions and multi-part expansions in the communication. She points out that the interpreter's mediating behaviour has facilitated the medical conversation by promoting the patients' active understanding of their problems and stories. The significance of the study is that it

highlights the facilitating role of the interpreter and proves that the interpreter's mediating role has, in most cases, positively influenced the medical consultations.

Zhan and Zeng (2017) elaborate on the Chinese medical interpreter's visible role through "text ownership" by replicating Angelelli's (2004) model used in the analysis of Spanish/English interpreting in medical settings at California Hope. Zhan and Zeng (2017) highlight Angelelli's (2004) definition of the visible interpreter as "one that exercises agency within an interaction, in order to bridge a communication gap" (p.76). They argue that the interpreter's visibility in this context is involved with the interpreter's agency and active participation to smooth the conversations between the two interlocutors. Zhan and Zeng (2017) transcribe and examine the four staff interpreters' Chinese/English interpreting for qualitative analysis to investigate how interpreters become visible in medical interpreting. As Angelelli (2004) states, "visibility is manifested when interpreters realize the need to establish text ownership, totally or partially" (p.56). Zhan and Zeng (2017) conclude from the analysis of the interpreters' visibility and their reflection in follow-up interviews that the interpreters are aware of their facilitating role in medical consultations, which enables them to adopt translation strategies accordingly to smooth the conversation.

The research of the interpreter's power in medical settings provides substantial support for the current study of the interpreter's role in the business domain. The research results can be drawn on to explain how the interpreter exercises power in interpreted social encounters by balancing the parties' power relations in the business interaction. The research also shows that the interpreter, equipped with bilingual and bicultural expertise, can exercise control by empowering the less powerful participant to express their views or gate-keeping the interaction to ensure the conversation flows smoothly.

The study of the interpreter's role is prevalent in medical or healthcare and a multi-layer of social settings such as political, legal, police interviews, and signed language with various aims. With the authentic data collected from the interpreted communication between a university professor and a deaf graduate student, Roy

(1996) elaborates on the interpreter's behaviour to intermediate the interaction and analyses the impact of the interpreter's intervening strategies on the outcome of the communication. Roy (1996) observes the interpreter's management of turns by examining the "pauses, lag, overlapping talk, and turns" of the interpreted conversation (p.39). The data analysis in Roy's study illustrates how the interpreter actively engages in the conversation as a communication facilitator and a bilingual and bicultural specialist. Foregrounding interpreting as a situated social practice, Roy (2000) applies the approach of discourse analysis to explore the interpreting activity as discourse, "a process of conversational exchanges between two primary speakers and through an interpreter" (p.3). Roy examines how the interpreter manages the discourse process between two participants who do not speak the same language. She focuses on the interpreter's turn-taking management in the discussion of the interpreter's full-scale participating role, and she argues that "the interpreter is the only one who knows or can easily use the conversational or discourse strategies of both languages" (p.6). Roy's (2000) study adopts discourse analysis as a holistic approach to examine the features of discourse in interpreting, demonstrating the interpreter's active, actual participating role. She also demonstrates that an interpreter can influence both the direction and outcome of the event and that the interpreting activity itself features intercultural and interpersonal rather than merely mechanical and technical.

Tipton and Furmanek (2016) carried out studies of the interpreter-mediated events to illustrate the connection between research and education. Their research aims to support a structured approach to reflect on interpreting practice and professional development. They argue that it is vital to consider the "wider interactional and institutional parameters" (p.18) related to interpreted events situating in socio-cultural and socio-historical contexts and the parties involved in the interaction. Such a perspective facilitates the examination of the interpreter's position shifts. Drawing on the authentic data from peer-reviewed research in interpreter-mediated events in settings like legal, police interviews, etc., Tipton and Furmanek (2016) explore the interpreter's multi-faceted role and social positioning

in the interactional communicative event. They analyse the importance of socio-cultural and situational knowledge in the interpreting process, problems and tensions caused by the deontological terms (where the interpreters follow the Codes of conduct to play a totally neutral role), and the impact of omissions of specific words on police interviews. Tipton and Furmanek (2016) points out that the analysis draws people's attention to the complexities of interpreter decision making in police interviews. They highlight Krouglov's (1999) expertise on interpreters' output in interaction, which should take account of: (1) the relative social status of the interlocutors; (2) the tenor of the discourse, that is, the nature of participant relations; and (3) cultural factors such as cultural inheritance and life experience. On Tipton and Furmanek's (2016) account, it is vital for interpreters to better control their "accountability and decision making, knowledge of police procedure" at a fine-grain level to guarantee "institutional procedures unfold with minimal compromise" (p. 65). They also argue that the interpreter's role needs to be evaluated, taking into account several factors such as the interpreter's educational background and specific institutional procedures in the social encounters.

The review of the interpreter's role in various settings in Tipton and Furmanek's (2016) work demonstrates that interpreting practice regularly deviates from established guidelines or norms, whether explicitly or implicitly, primarily due to the interpreter's understanding of their role and how it should be executed. Tipton and Furmanek's (2016) study provide a theoretical support for the CDA analysis of the interpreter's social function in the interpreted social encounter. It explores the nature of participant relations concerning the socio-cultural and socio-historical context of the discourse. It also calls for greater interest in and reflection on actual methods, standards of practice, and perceptions of the interpreter's work. The research findings foreground the significance of interpreter's mediation. Demonstrating the extended role of the interpreter working in different PSI settings, the research proves that dialogue interpreting is strongly affected by the intricate nature of these settings and social factors, such as the interpersonal relationships,

the style of questions, the responsibility of the profession, as well as professional ethics.

Similarly, Hlavac (2017) revisits the interpreter's role through the extracts of three domain-specific interactions (legal, parent-teacher meeting and tribunal hearing), in which the mediators play different roles: language broker; dual-role mediator; accredited professional interpreter. Examining the mediated interaction from both a micro-and macro-level, Hlavac highlights the mediating roles of the accredited professional interpreter and the non-professional ones (the language broker and the dual role mediator). He compares the stance taken by the professional interpreters and the non-professional ones. He discovers the former has enacted various kinds of situational and social roles as the interaction evolves. Hlavac draws heavily on Merlini and Favaron's (2005) theories, which complements Goffman's (1981) theories of "footings" (p.128) with a more fine-grained classification of interpreters' potential roles in interactive communications based on the alignments between interpreters and primary interlocutors.

Hlavac (2017) further identifies the communicative strategies indicating the footings, the roles, and positions assumed by the three mediators; the reasons behind the shifts of footing, and how the mediators restore, maintain or alter social relations that enable the performance of the mediated interaction. Examining the alignment of interpreters with the primary speakers, Hlavac (2017) argues for the multi-faceted nature of the interpreter's role, stating that the functions of the interpreter shift from linguistic mediating, tension-mitigating, counselling to co-constructing. To Hlavac, the interpreter proactively participates and the "requests and prompts from interpreters can occur on the basis of source referential content or on the basis of interactional dynamics themselves" (p.213). By revealing the interpreter's mediating and coordinating role, Hlavac's study sheds light on the potential roles enacted by professional interpreters. It highlights the interpreter's evolving social positioning as not only a mediator but also a co-constructor in the interpreted encounters.

Drawing upon Bakhtin's notion of dialogized heteroglossia, Gu (2019)

explores the government-affiliated interpreter's agency and positioning within the CDA framework. With the critical reading of transcripts of the interpreted Premier Press Conference, an "institutionalized discursive event" (p.1), Gu illustrates how the interpreters are caught up in an ideological tug-of-war between the government and (foreign) journalists. He explores how the interpreter exercises power to "cushion the blow of the journalists' adversarial questions and downplay the severity of issues covered in a cumulative and less noticeable manner to protect the face and image of the Chinese premier and government" (p.16). Gu argues that the interpreter in such a highly dynamic and volatile political and institutional setting assumes a powerful role as "institutional gate-keepers" or "spokespersons of China's English discourse" (p.16) to control the flow of the information and protect the image of the Chinese government. In the data analysis of the authentic interpreter-mediated Press conference, the interpreters' ideological alignment or ideological adjustment surfaces when they are confronted with sensitive and challenging questions, most of which are related to China's national interests and important decisions of the CPC government and are posed by foreign journalists. Such ideological positioning and institutional alignment are achieved through direct as well as indirect and cumulative mediation. Gu's CDA study in the political domain is a prime example of how CDA is used to explore the interpreter's power and agency in interpreting events. It also sheds light on the impact of the cultural identity and institution and situational context on the agency of the interpreter.

The previous studies focus on the power and empowering capacity of the interpreter in interactive communication events. However, as Fairclough (1989) states, "power is never definitely held by any one person, or social grouping, because power can be won and exercised only in and through social struggles in which it may also be lost" (p.43). It means that power is not absolute, especially in the social and institutional context where interpreting occurs. The interpreter's power is not only enacted by empowering the primary speaker to talk and to express their own views and beliefs in the coordination in the interaction, but is also realized by the primary speaker's efforts to empower the interpreter to avail of

their linguistic or cultural expertise to coordinate and facilitate the communication. As Baraldi and Gavioli (2012) observe, the interpreted interaction in a social context "does not have a single author" (p.7), which means that the primary participants or the institutional parties can also help achieve coordination through their contributions.

Penn and Watermeyer (2012) state that interpreters and the institutional parties involved in the interpreted encounter can jointly establish collaborative relationships to facilitate communication. Exploring the notion of a cultural brokerage in an interpreter-mediated clinical interaction in the context of aphasia, Penn and Watermeyer (2012) argue that interpreters "not only act as a language translator, but also as a bridge across the different cultures, worldviews and life worlds present in an interaction" (p270). The interpreter's coordinating role is essential in the medical context in particular, "because patients may hold different cultural beliefs or understandings about the cause of their illness which may not be congruent with the health professional's medical view" (p.271). They also explain how institutional parties can make their contribution to empower the interpreter by "encouraging the interpreter to take action (to explain or translate), by insisting on a translation (inviting the interpreter to repeat or summarise what has been said) and/or by questioning a rendition (inviting the interpreter to 'translate accurately')" (Baraldi and Gavioli, 2012, p.7). Penn and Watermeyer observe that the clinician (CL1) has given the interpreter the freedom to do the patient's introductions (PT). In this case, the institutional party and the interpreter both make contributions to maximize the understanding in the course of the medical consultation, where the interpreter exercises control by providing cultural expertise, managing turns, and seeking clarification or having side conversations with the patients. The institutional parties empower the interpreter by encouraging and allowing the interpreter to engaging with the patient in the conversation.

From the primary interlocutor's end specifically, Dubus (2015) also explores the notion of "power role" and "empowerment" of the interpreter with authentic data from interpreted conversations between the Cambodian refugee elder women

and a group of the white licensed clinical social worker in a clinical setting in the United States. Dubus contextualizes the situation where she is a white clinical provider with authority. Simultaneously, the Cambodian refugee elder woman with trauma and the bi-lingual Cambodian interpreter share similar experiences and cultural norms. With her previous experiences of working with interpreters, Dubus decides to consider the interpreter as the "co-facilitator" in communication, which is different from how the interpreter is traditionally used in the Centre. Dubus explains the rationale to place the interpreter in a coordinating position as "to empower her to use her cultural expertise to co-facilitate the group" (p.50), which clearly shows the awareness of power differential in the conversation. The interpreter's power becomes salient when their cultural expertise deconstructs the dominance of the primary speaker's position in the dialogue. As Dubus states (2015, p.48):

> I was aware that I was no longer the primary provider, but part of a team where my expertise was based in the primary provider, but part of a team where my expertise was based in Western-trained clinical skills, and the interpreter's contributions were cultural and language-based skills.

As Dubus unfolds, the interpreter both aligned with the refugee for better mutual understanding and joined by the doctor to redirect the therapeutic process in the interaction. Thus, the interpreter's visible role becomes salient. The interpreter in such context, with their bi-lingual and specifically the bi-cultural expertise, not only acts as a co-facilitator of the conversation but also a member of the team who holds the power to intervene in the conversation for a smoother communication.

The aforementioned literature offers strong theoretical support for my study of the interpreter's power in business settings. These studies explicate that interpreters' roles in dialogue interpreting have deviated from the traditional view of the interpreter portrayed as invisible or detached. Interpreters are neither "impartial" nor "neutral" in the interpreted social encounter; on the contrary, they co-construct the speech or text with the primary interlocutors to facilitate the communication. The awareness of the interpreters of their own role and the primary interlocutors'

perception has also become a focus of the academic research relating to the "role" study. The interviews and surveys conducted not only shed light on the nature of the interpreter's role and interpreting activity but also present a full-fledged picture concerning the interplay of the contextual and institutional factors that could influence the interpreter's subject position. In a social activity like a business negotiation, it is even more interesting to look at the interpreter's mediating role as the interpreter's subject position is located between the primary interlocutors' buyer and seller relation. Besides, the employer and employee relation between the interpreter and his client further complicates the power relation in the broad context of business interpreting.

2.4.2 Examination of the Interpreter's Power in Business Discourse

Based on my seven-year experience in the pedagogy and practice of interpreting, I have discovered that the traditional image of an interpreter who acts as a "voice box", being transparent, neutral or invisible, is not well-received by all clients, especially in business dialogue interpreting. When a certain goal is to be achieved, the coordinating function of the interpreter is to a certain extent being valued as a positive force for the smooth proceeding of the event. Examining the original data of interpreted business encounters and the interpreters' perceptions of their subject position will reveal how the interpreter functions in the institutional business context. However, the interpreter's role in the business domain has been an under-explored topic to date though there is abundant literature in other social or institutional contexts. The systematic empirical research on the power of the interpreter in business settings has hardly had its debut. Most research on dialogue interpreting that uses recorded and transcribed data is limited to the study of community interpreting or public services interpreting, among which healthcare and legal settings have been studied the most. The few studies of interpreter-mediated business meetings are also not systematic, focusing on analysing the "lexical, structural and semantic level of utterance" (Karanasiou, 2016, p.192), regardless of the interpreter's subject positions and the power relations dynamics in

the specific social setting.

With the increase of business cooperation between Chinese and foreign enterprises in China, interpreted social encounters occur more frequently in the business domain than ever. The study on how interpreters actually function in business settings and how they influence the negotiation is significant. As a contextual social activity, the interpreted business negotiation bears similarity with the interpreting taking place within the PSI settings (the medical, healthcare, police-interviews court and etc.). However, as a profit-directed activity, business negotiation holds the innate nature of resource-exchange, which means that a subtle power struggle will occur for the deal to be made. For example, bargaining activity between the buyer- and seller, where concessions or compromise might take place, or even "deadlocks" when the negotiating parties "push forward their own goals to a breaking point" (Gentile *et al.*, 1996, p.122). The interpreter, hired by one of the primary interlocuter in the business negotiation, is endowed with a subject position of a complex nature. They may need to coordinate and smooth the business communication while sometimes aligning with the client who pays them for the work, as they always want to get the second assignment from the client. Interpreters may hold the "interactional power" (Mason and Ren, 2012, p.120) when they inevitably adopt strategies relying on their "bi-lingual and bi-cultural" expertise to negotiate, coordinate, check and balance power relations in the interaction. Such may bring changes to the assumed order of the discourse because the interpreter's intervening in the business talk may induce "the possibility of change or challenge to the existing social relations and social practice" (Inghilleri, 2003, p.262). As the present research aims to examine the interpreter's power manifested in business negotiations, it is essential to closely examine the literature related to the interpreter's power in the business domain. The following section will first review the research regarding the unique features and characteristics of the activity itself. It will then summarize the studies focusing on how the interpreter exercises power in naturally-occurring business negotiations.

Gentile et al. (1996) examines the liaison interpreter's role in business

negotiation and defines negotiation as "the process of reaching agreement between parties who begin from different bargaining positions" (p.119). Gentile et al. summarizes the nature of the IBN (interpreted business negotiation) in terms of the place, forms, and challenges of the job. Regarding the content of business negotiations, he points out that the business discussion is specifically detailed, covering things as "commercial arrangements, production and warehousing techniques, contracts and deadlines, specific descriptions of products or detailed arrangements for delivery and payments" (p.118). Gentile et al. (1996) further explores the interpreter's role from the perspective of the aim of the negotiation and the client and interpreter relationship in the interaction. He points out that "deadlocks are very likely" (p.22) in the business negotiation, as both parties may compete to get the maximum benefit from the business negotiation or business deal. Interpreters working in such a subtle context will have to play a mediating role when emotions run high and tensions emerge to facilitate the conversation's progress. Gentile et al. (1996) points out that the interpreters can exercise a good deal of control in such context in business negotiation. Based on the nature of the IBN, Gentile et al. (1996) observe the interpreter's alignment with the clients. They analyse the challenges to the interpreter's ethical role posed by the interpreter's economic dependence on the client in a situation where the interpreter is called upon to voice his/her opinions on the deal, which is often the case in business negations. Certain ethical principles have to be modified or applied differently in business settings.

Literature from the social and sociological perspective shows that the interpreter's power and the interpreter's perceptions of their role are influenced or constrained by the specific settings where the interaction occurs. The study of Gentile et al. (1996) on the characteristics and specific business negotiation rules provides a framework to examine the interpreter's positioning in business settings. As the discrepancies in values, the negotiation expectations, and the perceptions of business relationships all come into play in the business interaction, it is difficult for the interpreter to retain neutrality, impartiality, or invisibility in the negotiation

process. To Gentile et al. (1996), it is often the case for the interpreter to align with one side to keep the negotiation in progress, co-construct the meaning with the primary interlocutor, or make adjustments and clarifications to maximize the mutual understanding and facilitate the smooth proceeding of the talks. During this process, the power of the interpreter becomes salient.

The following paragraphs review several studies examining the power of interpreters from different angles in interpreted business encounters. Makaroa (1998) elaborates on the Slovak-English interpreter's role as a cultural mediator in business settings. Presenting a detailed investigation into the cultural references in the Slovak-English context, Makaroa examines an array of aspects that influence the interpreter's role in the business environment, most of which are related to business's intrinsic nature negotiation. Makarova also explores the interpreter's mediating role in business interaction by examining "what solutions an interpreter can apply when rendering them in the receptor's language and culture" (p.6). Based on different views on social hierarchy in the U.K. and Slovakia, Makarova points out that the interpreter is "in a position for introducing innovation in a language" and the interpreter "may be instrumental in bringing about changes in the use of academic and similar titles" (p.180). This means the interpreter needs to alter their rendition compared with the text produced by the primary speaker to ensure a pleasant atmosphere for the ongoing business talks. She points out that in a business environment, the interpreter's task is also to maintain and establish relationships. Thus the strategies adopted by the interpreters vary based on "the situational context of interpreting, the status of a language of limited diffusion, the consecutive mode of interpreting, and the particularities of the business environment, where certain components figure more prominently, for example, numbers, proper names, enumerations, levels of politeness, degree of directness, form of address" (Makaroa, 1998, p.184). Interpreters hold power to render cultural references in different forms by adding to the text or providing a briefer version of the original rendition. To Makarova, the Slovak-English interpreter is more like a cultural mediator to facilitate interaction in the business environment, as the

cultural references are crucial for the interlocutors to understand the points made by their trading partners.

With authentic data of a business meeting and some examples from research made by other authors, Blinstrubaité (2000) examines the interpreter's role in business settings. She reveals the lack of impartiality of the interpreter with several examples, which demonstrate that interpreters are sometimes not able to avoid voicing their own views or engaging with the interlocutors in the interpreting activity of a business negotiation. Blinstrubaité (2000) observes that the interpreter might be in a difficult position in the communicative event where interaction sometimes turns into intervention. Blinstrubaité argues that it is not easy for a liaison interpreter to work impartially or to refrain from intervention in the business setting due to the factors such as "physical exhaustion, long sessions, conflicts of interest and contrasting ideas" (p.127). Interpreters may need to co-construct the conversations with the primary interlocutors and to intervene in the conversation. Such occasion has placed interpreters in an ethical dilemma. Blinstrubaité also points out that interpreters' renditions often differ from the original ones because it is "seldom possible to interpret words one by one into the target language" (p.131). Blinstrubaité further describes the interpreter as "the expert in language and culture, who deprived the primary parties of the power and responsibility of controlling the procedure and making decisions" (p.113). To Blinstrubaité (2000), interpreters hold power in the business negotiation, as they both "relay the messages and coordinate communication" (p.114), which is in line with the definition of the power of the interpreter featuring the access to "control" with the bicultural and bilingual resources in hand. Blinstrubaité's (2000) study explicitly acknowledges the power and empowering capacity held by interpreters in the business domain. She points out that the conversations in different settings show that interpreters do disrupt the conduit-like norms and exercise control in the interaction. The interpreters' renditions may deviate from those of the primary interlocutors' by adding or omitting information. Interpreters facilitate communication by giving advice or providing additional information to fill the cultural knowledge gap.

Garzone (2003) also states that "business negotiations inherently involve several different variables which can determine the success or failure of the negotiation itself" (p.21). She argues that business negotiation involves the verbal interaction of individuals with diverse ethnic, national, and cultural backgrounds in the business context. Such attribution has further complicated the interpreter's role, as the business negotiation variables pose significant challenges to the performance of the interpreter to please both sides.

Gavilio and Maxwell (2007) put forward a similar line of argument when summarizing the action sequence in interpreter-mediated business interactions, in which dialogue interpreters do not necessarily translate on a turn basis. On their account, the interpreter in business interpreting enacts the role of language facilitator or mediator, who co-constructs the dialogue with principal speakers. They investigate the nature of talk employed by principal participants and interpreters in naturally occurring business settings. They aim to describe some of the activities produced jointly during the interactions of the participants and interpreters and the conversational procedures employed by them.

With the authentic data collected from the business domain (in-house business negotiations and business exhibitions), Gavilio and Maxwell focus on the interpreter's role and their interventions in the mediated business negotiations. The analysis considers procedures used by the interpreter to produce "recognizable translations" of principal participants' talk and then focuses on interpreter productions of "non-translation interventions" (Gavilio and Maxwell, 2007, p.142). They examine how interpreters produce and organize the "translational and non-translational" renditions in business conversations.

Drawing on Wadensjo's (1998) theories, which emphasize the importance of the interactional function in dialogue interpreting and the distinction between "talk as text" and "talk as an activity", Gavilio and Maxwell (2007) explore how the interpreters intervene and expand the business dialogue through the means of "provide and ask for clarifications or explanations, 'redesign' their contributions concerning the background knowledge of the talk, provide paraphrase or a partial

translation, initiate repairs on primary speaker's talk in trouble sequences" (p.144). The data analysis of the study shows that interpreters do not take the invisible and neutral stance in the interaction. On the contrary, they engage in complex activity and promote the relations between primary interlocutors by eliciting information, arranging and smoothing potential tensions, or even initiating talk of their own. Gavilio and Maxwell's study highlights the actual role of the interpreter, who is responsible for both translation and facilitation of the interaction. It provides us with an important reference in the training and learning of interpreters.

Karanasiou (2016) elaborates on the interpreter's role within the business negotiation context from a social perspective, encompassing the reciprocity of the communication event and the dynamics that are being developed in interpreter-mediated business negotiation settings. Karanasiou's rationale results from his professional experience, where he discovers interpreters are acting as active and visible parties in the business settings. He defines the interpreter working in such settings as a "team member", who is often found "exceeding their prescribed roles as recorded within any existing literature or by various Association's Code of Conduct and become part of the team" (p.193). Karanasiou argues that the study of the interpreter's role in business settings should also be situated within the social context. Moreover, interpreting cannot be considered in isolation from the constraints of the specific settings in which it occurs; interpreters perceive and practice their role differently each time, under each discursive setting. Karanasiou (2016) examines the nature and attributes of negotiation and defines the business negotiation as an "undercover battle" (p.199), which means business negotiations inhenrently involve no physical fights or battles, but a power struggledriven by the controversial interests.. She points out that the interpreter has to take sides or become a member in negotiation in a communicative activity that combines the conflicting positions into a unified position.

Interestingly, to further the argument of the interpreter's non-neutral position, Karanasiou (2016) also discovers that in a business context, the client's expectation plays a pivotal role in influencing the performance and contributing to the power of

the interpreter. Unlike PSI interpreting, interpreters working in a business context are often hired by one of the primary interlocutors instead of being assigned by an institution like a court or hospital. They are expected to "facilitate the needs and protect the rights of the company or client employing them for that particular setting" (Gentile *et al.*, 1996, p.118), which instantly positions the interpreter within a team. With a team member's subject position, the interpreter is expected to interpret in the hiring company's interests. Karanasiou also observes that interpreters mediate business negotiations by practicing their arts of "persuading, negotiating, and coordination of the dynamics, according to their own ongoing perceptions and beliefs, which are governed by the client's needs" (p.193). As a part of the team, interpreters sometimes side with their employers to negotiate meaning, to persuade and to coordinate the talk. They exercise control in the interactional communicative event by acting as "cultural bridges", creators of "face-works", negotiators, and loyal team members. To further explore the complexities of interpreter's role, Karanasiou (2016) applies the conceptual framework of Kramer and Messick's (1995) three types of social context research to analyse "the negotiator relationships, the social knowledge and beliefs of negotiators and how they affect negotiation, social norms, common knowledge effect" (p.202) of the discursive practice within the business context. Her study sheds light on the mindset of the negotiator in the social context of negotiation. Karanasiou (2016) argues that to understand the negotiator's mind or how the interaction proceeds, it is necessary to analyse the background knowledge, cultural context, beliefs, and social context, which will facilitate the understanding of the multi-faceted role of the interpreter. Karanasiou concludes that the interpreter is expected to abide by an unwritten or invisible code of conduct or norms of the social procedures to ensure the negotiation's smooth proceeding. Her research indicates that the interpreter, being considered a team member, consciously, or unconsciously aligns with the clients to perform the team-oriented task. It is often because the clients, the person or group of people who hired the interpreter, share the same emotions and values with him/her and expect him/her to perform the team

task.

Drawing on Angelelli's (2004) theory of "professional survival" (p.21), Karanasiou (2016) explains the interpreters' sense of responsibility to satisfy the targets and the expectation of the person who hires them. Karanasiou states that interpreters are expected to influence or mediate the business negotiation positively with his/her professional expertise. Examining the fundamental difference existing between the role of interpreters in BNI and interpreters in other PSI liaison interpreting, Karanasiou argues that the interpreter in the business domain becomes a substantial part of the communication as he/she "manages turn-taking" and "coordinates dynamics" (p.210). Karanasiou's argument deconstructs the shared fiction of the traditional professional norms, in which the interpreter's subjective position is described as totally neutral. The interpreter in business discourse becomes a team member who shoulders equal responsibility with other team members. Such a subject position endows the interpreter with the power in the discourse to positively coordinate the business talk by aligning them the clients, controlling the topics, seeking clarification for to the clients, persuading the clients, "controlling and constraining the contribution of the non-powerful participants" (Fairclough, 1989, p.46). The study provides a pathway for us to understand the "visible" and "non-neutral" role of the interpreter in interpreter-mediated business negotiation, pinning down the positioning of the interpreter as a team member. It also explains the particular requirements of business negotiation interpreting compared with other PSI settings, which is of great value to my research of the interpreter's power role in a business setting. The views considering interpreters shoulder equal responsibility as a team member and their alignments with the clients in business negotiation provide theoretical support for my argument of the interpreter's power in business interpreting. The interpreter in business settings not only facilitates their clients at a linguistic level but also coordinates the interaction by aligning themselves with the clients, controlling the topics, seeking clarification for the clients, or even persuading the clients.

CHAPTER 3   Methodology and Research Design

The studies reviewed in the preceding chapter show that the academic endeavors to explore the social positioning of the interpreter in relation to clients as well as the power dynamics in various social discourses. Research on interpreting in business discourse demonstrates how interpreting in a business context is a collaborative and highly interactive activity involving some primary interlocutors and an interpreter. Negotiations require coordination between all parties for the smooth proceeding of the event. The interpreter plays a role far exceeding that of language transmitter. In such a context, the interpreter is a language facilitator, a mediator, a consultant, and even a team member.

As mentioned in the previous chapter, power is defined as the ability to control from a CDA perspective. This definition presupposes "a power base of privileged access to scarce social resources" (Van Dijk, 2015, p.469). Arguably, the interpreter's agency or mediation within business encounters can be viewed from a power angle as the interpreter has access to the scarce resource of bilingualism and biculturalism. The argument implies that the interpreter is the only person who understands the utterances or intentions of both sides and engages with the primary speakers on both sides. Moreover, interpreter renditions of the utterances of primary speakers are always the basis for understanding. This is how primary participants in the negotiation understand the intentions of their potential business partners and make further decisions about the conversation.

This makes the interpreter's positioning an extremely relevant topic since it can influence the understanding of primary interlocutors regarding the meanings and intentions of other parties to the negotiation. Based on their assessment of the situation or different moments of the discourse, the interpreter may consciously or unconsciously influence communication by distancing or aligning themselves with the primary interlocutor, managing turn-taking order, or reformulating the utterances of the primary speaker in their renditions.

The introduction chapter detailed how most academic studies on the role of the

interpreter occur within the PSI domain, such as studies of the coordinating role performed by the interpreter from an interactive perspective within police interview and medical settings (Wadensjö,1998); the coordinating and mediating role of the interpreter within medical and healthcare settings (Merlini and Favaron, 2003; Angelelli, 2012; Zhan and Zeng, 2017); the multifaceted role and social positioning of the interpreter within legal settings (Tipton and Furmanek, 2016); and the mediating role of the interpreter within legal, parent-teacher conference, and tribunal hearing settings (Hlavac, 2017). There are few studies on the intermediating or power role of the interpreter supported by audio data or transcripts. Confidential by nature, the business conference is difficult to access. Empirical research on interpreter power in the business domain from a CDA perspective is even more scarce.

To fill this gap in the literature, the present research is designed as an empirical CDA study that explores the manifestations of the interpreter's power in business discourse. It further investigates whether (or to what extent) the interpreter is aware being a visible participant in business negotiation. The research focuses on the interpreter's power within the changing dynamics of interpreted business negotiations, looking into the factors contributing to the exercise of the power and how the shifts of the interpreter's subject positions influence the business negotiation itself.

3.1 The Research Question

The research question for this study stems from the author's seven years of experience in interpreting pedagogy and practice. The author discovers that the interpreter plays a role far exceeding that of a "linguistic transmitter". The complex and collaborative nature of business negotiation may at times require the interpreter to either adjust their subject positions by aligning with (or distancing from) primary speakers, or mediate the conversation through discursive strategies, such as managing the turns to speak or reformulating the renditions.

The overarching research question for the study is: how does the interpreter's power manifest itself in the business domain? The research critically explores the manifestations of the interpreter's power within the discourse of business interpreting.

82

In this study, power refers to the capacity of the interpreter to consciously and unconsciously control or constrain the contributions of primary interlocutors. The interpreter's power derives from their possession of bilingualism and biculturalism, which are social resources. It manifests in the interpreter's reformulations of the utterances of primary speaker, management of the turn-taking order, and shifts in the subject position within the discursive social event. While intervening in business communication, the subject position of the interpreter can shift to that of a co-participant, a co-negotiator, and sometimes even a consultant or team member of the client. These shifts disrupt traditional norms, portraying the role of the interpreter as transparent, invisible, and neutral. This study critically analyses the interpreter's power (constructed discursively in the mediated business interpreting discourse), the changing landscape of power relations, and the interpreter's awareness of their power within this context.

The study examines the power of the interpreter in the business domain by responding to the following relevant questions: what is the actual role of the interpreter in a naturally-occurring business encounter? How do social and situational contexts influence the subject position of the interpreter? How does the interpreter influence the buyer-seller relationship and corresponding power relations? What is the interpreter's perception and level of awareness about their individual power within the negotiation itself?

Answers to these questions allow me to test the hypothesis that professional interpreters working in business settings do not merely translate on a linguistic level; they also hold the power to control and intervene in communications. Interpreters do so by engaging with primary interlocutors to co-construct the dialogue with them. They are expected to influence negotiations by shifting their subject positions to ensure smooth talks and gate-keep negotiations.

The hypothesis will be tested using authentic data of business negotiations. Through data analysis, I will examine the manifestation of the interpreter's power in business negotiation dynamics. Such manifestation of power is captured in how the interpreter exercises control over the interpreted business negotiations: through turn-

taking management, shifts of "footing", and renditions deviating from the original utterances. Situating the role of the interpreter in a wider social and cultural context, the research focuses on the social positions adopted by interpreters in business negotiations. To better understand the role and influence of the social factors of specific settings, the current study also examines the interpreter's awareness and perceptions of power dynamics within the discourse. This is carried out through follow-up interviews that interrogate whether interpreters are aware of their own power and what social factors come into play in the exercise of this power within the discourse of interpreted business negotiations.

3.2 Theoretical Framework

Over the last two decades, the term "discourse" has appeared in the studies from many different fields. According to Jorgensen and Phillips (2002), the word discourse represents a general idea that "language is structured according to different patterns that people's utterances follow when they take part in different domains of social life" (p.1). Discourse analysis aims to reflect on these patterns. Such analysis is not comprised of a single approach, but an array of interdisciplinary approaches that can be adopted to explore different social domains in various types of research.

As mentioned in the Literature Review chapter, CDA approach aims to explore power relations in society. Exploration leads to the formulation of normative perspectives that can then be adopted to critically examine such relations in light of possibilities for social change. There are many different approaches of CDA, all of which start with the view or perception that our patterns of interaction and ways of talking are manifestations of our world, identities, and social relations. In fact, our patterns of interaction actively shape in the world, identity, and social relations. As explained in the previous chapter, the CDA perspective provides fruitful theories and research methods on communication, culture, and society. The main principles and notions of CDA are used to map out and analyse the most common phenomena within the discursive practice of business dialogue interpreting, forming the conceptual design for this research. The following section explains how CDA is situated in the

theoretical framework adapted in this study.

3.2.1 The Adapted CDA Framework and Major Categories for Analysis

This study considers business interpreting a discourse of communicative social practice – one that is embedded with dominance and control relationships. Fairclough (1989) describes discourse as "a place where relations of power are actually exercised and enacted" (p.43), which enables me to describe recurring intervening patterns and phenomena in discursive activity. It also allows me to examine how interpreter power is constructed discursively over the course of a business encounter, and how this construction dismantles the totally neutral and conduit-like professional image of the interpreter in interpreting activities.

Through the lens of CDA, the study further explores how the discourse of business interpreting shapes (or is shaped by) power struggles within situational and social contexts. I mentioned a struggle for power in this discourse because power is not absolute. It is also "never definitely held by any one person, or social grouping" (Fairclough, 1989, p.43). This is especially true considering the fact that the interpreter is located in between a primary interlocutor and a client who employs them, as well as within the discourse of interpreted business communication with an inherent nature of "profit-gaining". Power dynamics can thus be influenced by employment relations between interpreter and client, and the seller-buyer relationship of the primary interlocutors.

Given the monolingual nature and the limitations of CDA framework as mentioned in Chapter Two, I believe Goffman's (1981) participation framework and Wadensjö's (1998) typologies of the interpreter's renditions are useful tools for examining the interpreter's agency and positioning in business discourse. These tools allow the analysis of the utterances of primary interlocutors and corresponding interpreter renditions. I decided to position the CDA framework as a theoretical anchor for Goffman's participation framework due to a trend of monolingualism in CDA studies (Fairclough, 1989; Van Dijk, 1997; Chouliaraki and Fairclough, 1999; Wodak, 2001). Moreover, its heavy engagement with the media and political

85

worldviews makes it seem inapplicable within the context of business interpreting, therefore, it would be necessary to complement the approach with the interpreting theories, which enables the manual reading and analysis of the transcripts of the authentic business interpreting scenario.

The reason to combine CDA with Goffman's (1981) participation framework is because they share several things in common: a dialogic nature and the capacity to examine social relations and positioning through language use in different contexts. The context for this research features the discursive practice of interpreting in business encounters. Interpreting is understood as a form of social practice in which the interpreter holds power through the scarce resource of bilingualism, intervening in or controlling the contributions of the primary speakers.

The analysis of the interpreter's power mainly revolves around the interpreter's reformulation of texts and the changes in power relations brought about by the choices and decisions they make within the interpreting process. The dialogic and interactive nature of interpretation thus stands at the forefront of the study, as the social positioning of the interpreter shifts with changes in dialogic power relations. Social positioning is central to Goffman's (1981) theory of participation frameworks. Here, he introduces the relationship between participants and their positions (as speakers or listeners and their corresponding "footing"). He defines the speaker's role as a "principal", an "author", and an "animator" (p.144) to explain the speaker's changing subject positions in the conversation. This can be drawn upon as a tool for analysis of the interpreter's footing or subject positioning.

Goffman's (1981) emphasis on the interactive discourse structure of dyadic and multi-party encounters serves as a theoretical base for Wadensjö (1998) to look specifically at the role of the interpreter. Wadensjö (1998) points out that the framework helps trace participation status within the interaction, and accounts for how the interpreter assists communication. In her 1998 book *Interpreting as Interaction,* Wadensjö posits that the interpreter actually works as a coordinator (p.146) within the interpreted social encounter, and she proposes the taxonomy of the interpreter's renditions. She classifies the interpreter's renditions as "close,

expanded, reduced, substituting, summarized renditions, [and] non-renditions" (p.107). I draw upon and adapt these classifications for analysis of interpreters' renditions in this study. In the next section, the categories for analysis will be introduced, which illustrates how the combination of CDA with Goffman's (1981) Participation Framework and Wadensjö (1998) typology is operationalised.

As business interpreting is a communicative social interaction involving subtle changes of power relations – one that is profit-oriented in nature – a close reading of the business meeting recordings should reveal interpreter positioning or alignment with clients and the interactional strategies they adopt. To uncover how interpreters shift their subject positions and adjust renditions, engaging with the power play through the employment of linguistic and discursive means, the main categories for analysis are:

1) the discrepancies between interpreter's renditions and the utterances of primary interlocutors;

2) the interpreter's shifts in positioning or footing; and

3) turn-taking management.

The category of analysis is based on ten questions organized by Fairclough (1989) as "a mini reference manual" (p.109) in his critical study of the textual features of a discourse. He proposes ten questions that can be grouped into three levels (vocabulary, grammar and textual structures), in line with the categories proposed above. Questions raised at each level can then be described in terms of three types of value: experiential, relational, and expressive.

Experiential value is related to "the text producer's experience of the natural and social world" (Fairclough, 1989, p.112), while relational value and expressive value concern "social relationships" and the "subjects and social identities" (ibid, p.112), respectively. The analysis further adopts Fairclough's (1989) three-dimensional model comprised of description, interpretation and ultimately explanation. This not only enables me to look at the text properties and linguistic features of the discourse, but also provides me with a lens to examine relations within the discursive practice of interpreting. Through this lens, I can explicate

otherwise-hidden power relations along with the social and cultural factors they are subject to in the discourse (for detailed explanation, see Chapters 4-6 in this study).

At the vocabulary level, Fairclough (1989) investigates the experiential, relational, and expressive meaning of a word. For example, he examines whether there is "any rewording or over-wording", "markedly formal or informal words", or "any metaphors used in the discourse" (p.111). This is relevant to the analysis of the interpreter's reformulation of renditions. In this category, I critically examine how interpreters adjust wording to filter and alter certain aspects of the utterances of primary speakers. This can be viewed as a manifestation of the interpreter's exercise of power by controlling the contributions of the primary interlocutors, because "what gets translated or not and why is always (at least partly) a matter of exercising power or reflecting authority." (Khalifa, 2014, p.4). Wadensjö's (1998) taxonomy and the typologies of Merlini and Favaron (2003) are useful for this particular analytical category of vocabulary. Wadensjö classifies the interpreter's renditions as "close, expanded, reduced, substituting, summarizing renditions and no renditions" (p.111). Later, Merlini and Favaron (2003) complement Wadensjö's taxonomy by putting forward classifications of "omission, addition and substitution" (p.223).

Based on these two typologies, the research looks at how the interpreter reformulates the original texts produced by the primary interlocutor in the following three subcategories: addition, omission, and substitution. Here, addition refers to expanded renditions; omission refers to reduced or no rendition(s); and substitution refers to the substitution or summary of renditions. Addition typically occurs when the interpreter repeats a phrase or the whole sentence of the primary party to reassure their understanding of the meaning. The interpreter may explain specific culturally-loaded terms or concepts to primary interlocutors, initiate a question for clarification of certain concepts or jargon, or correct the primary speaker's understanding of a situation through more accurate interpretation. Omission typically occurs when the interpreter simplifies what a primary speaker said due to time constraints or redundancy in the original renditions. It also appears when the interpreter assumes answers based on the context of the talk and responds directly to

a question. Finally, substitution often occurs when the interpreter does face work to omit vulgar or unclear expressions, which happens quite frequently in the Chinese context. Negotiation itself is the bargaining and decision-making activity that inevitably involves "the subtle balancing of facework and power" (Dannerer, 2001, p.93). In such context, the discrepancies in the cultural and social norms of negotiating parties may bring about problems in communication. The interpreter can leverage their bicultural expertise to gate-keep the negotiation by omitting some renditions from primary interlocutors to avoid discomfort or tension. There will be overlaps between omissions and substitutions in such contexts, as the interpreter may also tone down or rephrase original renditions to ensure the talk proceeds smoothly. Substitution thus mainly refers to toning down or modifying emotional expressions in business negotiation, which happens quite rarely. Data analysis falls into the categories mentioned above, which are used to explore how divergent renditions influence the proceedings of negotiations and reasons behind renditions. The interpreter's control over the contributions of primary interlocutors will provide a clear indication of their power in business negotiations.

At the grammatical level, Fairclough (1989) focuses on the relational values of grammatical features concerning "modes of sentence, modality, and pronouns" (p.125). This focus inspired me to examine pronoun shifts in the renditions of the interpreter. Interpreter-led shifts in pronouns have relational value. The shifts show how the interpreter relates to primary interlocutors, reflecting the subject position and stance of the interpreter within the mediated conversation. Goffman (1981) defines position and stance in his proposal of the participation framework as "footing" in the interactional process. He notes that "the alignment we take up to ourselves and the others present [is] expressed in the way we manage the production or reception of an utterance" (Goffman, 1981, p.128). This means that the linguistic choices made in a conversation are all based on one's perceptions of their relationship to others. Participants in an interaction may adjust their alignment to others through shifts of footings based on contextual and linguistic cues signaled in

utterances. To explain his theory of footing, Goffman (1981) also characterizes the speaker's role as a "principal", an "author", and an "animator" (p.144) to describe the changing subject position of a speaker within a conversation. A principal is the person who is "committed to what the words say" (Goffman, 1981, p.144), being responsible for the meaning conveyed. The author originates the content and form of an utterance, while the animator is the person who is "active in the role of utterance production" (Goffman, 1981, p.144).

As previously discussed, Fairclough's (1989) critical analysis is mainly based on monolingual texts such as political speeches, media reports, and even advertisements. Goffman's (1981) theory is a complementary tool well suited for a critical examination of the changing stance and positioning of the interpreter in the interpreted business dialogue. I examine the interpreter's use of personal pronouns and direct or indirect speech in their renditions of the primary speakers' utterances. Through a critical reading of the data, I investigate how the interpreter regulates the conversation or influences the contributions of primary interlocutors through these changes. Shifts in footing provide a lens to examine the choices made by the interpreter in terms of personal pronouns and direct or indirect speech. In business interpreting settings, interpreters may choose to maintain the first-person singular used by the primary interlocutors, change it to third-person singular pronouns (he/she), or even use first-person plural pronouns (we). Such adjustment displays a conversational alignment with the client. It also indicates how the interpreter adopts certain social positions to co-construct the interpersonal relationship, mediating social distance within the business triad

I also explore the power of the interpreter by looking at shifts in their stance or subject positions. The interpreter is responsible for presenting the ideas and positions of others in a foreign language. They may take different social stances within the interaction, acting as a principal, author, or animator. Interpreters speak as a principal when they initiate conversation, such as by seeking explanations and clarification or

rephrasing renditions. They act as an "animator" when translating an utterance without any alteration of the original rendition, such as by using first-person singular pronouns. When acting as an "author", interpreters recapitulate the rendition by changing a first-person singular pronoun into the third person or even the first-person plural. Taking different stances in the interaction makes it possible for the interpreter to either bring primary speakers closer or maintain distance between them within a business negotiation. Therefore, observation of interpreter shifts in footing and positioning helps identify how interpreter power manifests itself in their mediation of conversation.

The category of turn-taking management draws on Fairclough's (1989) critical study of text on a structural level, in which he foregrounds the notion of turn taking. Turn taking is considered by Fairclough (1989) as a necessary "organizational feature" (p.134) that indicates interactional conventions used in dialogue. Fairclough (1989) argues that the turn-taking convention in dialogue is tied to the "relational value of organizational aspects of talk" (p.134). It implicitly links to power relations in the discourse. Exploring inequality in turn-taking rights in conversations such as teacher-student dialogue, Fairclough (1989) points out that "power in discourse" can be characterized as when "the more powerful participants [put]constraints on the contributions of less powerful participants" (p.135). He further proposes four devices used to exercise power: "interruption, enforcing explicitness, controlling topics and formulation" (Fairclough, 1989, p.135). I build subcategories for analysis of turn-taking mechanisms in interpreted business talks based on these four devices.

In this particular category, I explore the power of the interpreter within the power dynamics of the scenario through critical analysis of the turn-taking sequence of the interactional order. In order to convey the message, interpreters are expected to take every second turn immediately after each primary speaker. My primary focus is to look at how interpreters disrupt interactional norms and the conventional order of discourse. I also intend to investigate how interpreter power is manifested through interventions in the talk to control the contributions of primary interlocutor by managing the turn-taking order. Based on the devices proposed by Fairclough (1989), data analysis focuses on the interpreter's mediation of the turn-taking sequence in

business negations by looking at the 1) interruption of turns; 2) termination of turns; and 3) interpreter mediation when turns overlap. Results from this analysis shed light on how the interpreter exercises power to guarantee smooth proceedings by creating or relaying a turn, stepping in and redirecting a turn, or holding and terminating a turn. Analysis of spontaneous verbal sequences also demonstrates manifestations of the interpreter's power as they mediate the beginning, development, and close ofaconversation. In a nutshell, turn-management analysis primarily exhibits the role of the interpreter as a substantial participant who holds power in interpreted business encounters.

3.2.2 The Reflexive Positionality of the Researcher

As mentioned in Chapter Two, the positionality of the researcher is central in the CDA research considering the limitations of the framework. To avoid the selective reading of the data, reflexivity is a crucial strategy in qualitative study (Berger 2013),. According to Berger (2013), reflexivity is viewed as "the process of a continual internal dialogue and critical self-evaluation of researcher's positionality as well as active acknowledgement and explicit recognition that this position may affect the research process and outcome" (p.2). The researcher's positionality may influence the research in the following three aspects (ibid., p.2-3):

1) the access to the "field";

2) the nature of the relationship between researcher and researched;

3) the way in which the researcher constructs the world, uses language, poses questions, and chooses the lens for filtering the information gathered from participants and making meaning of it.

As the researcher of the current study, I have taken all these factors into consideration while designing and conducting the research. With the positionality of a practitioner researcher who holds an "insider" position for the research, I have more chances to access the authentic business scenario. This is because the interpreters (research participants) are more willing to grant me access when they discover I have in-depth knowledge of their profession and can relate to their situation. Of course, being

knowledgeable may also intimidate some of the interpreters and introduce pressure for them, especially the less experienced ones, which did occur in the data sourcing process. However, after the explanation of the nature of this research (objective and descriptive analysis, having nothing to do with evaluation and assessment of their performance), most of the interpreters granted me access. This has enabled the interpreters to follow their regular working approach, which increased the validity of the authentic data.

The nature of the researched and researcher relationship refers to the impact of the researcher's identity on the information the researched participants are willing to share. Being an experienced practitioner, I try to make use of my expertise when communicating with the interpreter, especially in the interview process. This includes expressing empathy when discussing the difficulties in the interpreting process, and to acknowledge the complexity of business interpreting, which helps me elicit more information from the research participant and increase the credibility of the research.

Being aware of the influence of the researcher's subjectivity also allows me to understand my "self-role" as both a researcher and a practicing interpreter. This prevents me from making any assumption about the collected data and ensures the objectivity of the manual reading the data and creation of knowledge (making sense of the data) in the analysis process. As a practitioner researcher, I am well aware of the potential influence of the "self" (an experienced practicing interpreter and an interpreting lecturer) on the objectivity of the analysis. Therefore, I have constantly placed the "self" under scrutiny while exploring the multiple layers of the interpreter's agency in order to keep a distance with the data and to try to reduce as much as possible the impact of the researcher's subjectivity in shaping the conclusion and findings of the research, thus ensuring the reflexivity of the research. Besides, the adoption of interviews as additional methodology provides a further solution to the objectivity and credibility of the research. The interviews with producers and consumers of discourse in CDA ensure that the analysis of the data is not just based on the analyst's position of what a discourse might convey (Widdowson, 1998 & 2004).The examination of the role of the audience in the consumption and

interpretation of discourse largely prevents the researcher from mistaking themselves as one of audience whom the discourse directs at, which rules out discrimination or pre-assumption and consolidates the objectivity of the research.

The reflexive approach and the awareness of the researcher's positionality have, to a certain extent, prevented a selective reading of the data and a biased understanding of the research participants' role description. Moreover, the identification of the researcher's position in the knowledge production process has enabled "a more self-conscious approach to authorship and audience" (Coffey, 2003, p. 321), which consolidates the accredibility and validity of the research findings.

3.3 Research Design

The research adopts an integrated approach. To begin with, I use audio recordings as the primary instrument for data collection. I then complement this collection with pre-designed observational sheets and semi-structured, post-assignment interviews. The stages of the research are five-fold:

1）pre-meeting with the interpreters or the meeting participants to explain the aim of the observation, and the confidentiality of the data would be explained by the researcher; considering that the researcher is also an experienced interpreter, interpreters would be informed that the research is not of an assessing nature so as to ensure that they are not working under extra pressure and they would follow the normal trajectory while working on the assignment;

2) data collection: the researcher recorded the meetings onsite while also taking notes on the observational sheets;

3) the recordings were then transcribed by the researcher with the "Xun fei ting jian" software, and initial data analysis of will be done, where the interpreter's intervention will be highlighted in the transcripts for the subsequent interview;

4) the interview with the interpreters was conducted based on the transcripts (interviewees had a copy of the transcript of the specific business meeting);

5) The interview recordings were transcribed for further analysis with the

transcripts of the meetings.

Data analysis centers on the following five themes: 1) the participatory role of the interpreter in the business encounter; 2) dynamics within the business negotiation triad; 3) the interpreter-client relationship; 4) discourse dependence on social and institutional context; and5) the self-awareness of the interpreter. To uncover regularities in manifestations of the power of the interpreter in audio transcripts, I use CDA as the major analytical tool for understanding the mediating role of the interpreter. Analysis of different categories sheds light on the discursive construction of interpreter power, the dynamics of power relations, and interpreter awareness of their power in the interpreted business interaction.

For the structure of the analysis, I mainly draw on CDA analytical procedures sketched by Fairclough (1989) in his seminal work on critical language study in *Language and Power*. There are three stages to the procedure: "1) description of text; 2) interpretation of the text which is related to the relationship between text and interaction; and 3) explanation of the text concerning the relationship between interaction and social context" (Fairclough,1989, p.108). For the description category, analysis highlights "three aspects of a social practice": contents, relations, and subjects, which may be constrained by power" (Fairclough, 1989, p.140). The task of the second stage of analysis, interpretation, is exploring the relationship between text and social structure. The third stage of analysis is explanation, which concerns "the relationship of discourses to process of struggle and to power relations" (Fairclough, 1989, p.141). Analysis of interpreter power and their awareness of it from a CDA perspective is thus not limited to describing textual or discursive features.

To complement the analysis, there is also interpretation and explanation of societal and institutional contexts along with common-sense ideological assumptions embedded in the discourse. I adopt this frame for analysis due to the dependence of discourse on broader social or institutional contexts, and the relevance between common ideological assumptions and power relations that are not evident to the participants (the interpreter and primary interlocutors) of the discourse. Fairclough (1989) argues that the interpretation and explanation stages can be taken as "two

successively applied procedures" (p.141) to unveil and demystify the power of the interpreter along with their awareness of it.

3.3.1 Meetings and Primary Interlocutors

Data for this research was collected in Chengdu, a central city in southwest China, over a period of three months that lasted from the beginning of September to the end of November in 2018. Ten business meetings (B2B) between representatives from six foreign companies and seven Chinese companies were used for data collection. Among these, three meetings were organized privately by the companies themselves while the rest occurred at a networking event following an official forum held by an international organization. Each session lasted for an average of 60 minutes, with the longest extending to 120 minutes. All the meetings took place in Chengdu, China. Representatives from foreign companies came because either they had discovered opportunities for cooperation or they were invited by potential business partner working in the same industry in China. All primary interlocutors at the meetings sought a common goal: cooperation with mutual benefits. Table 3.1 lists all interlocutors' positions in their companies. The names of all the participants and the companies involved in the business meetings were anonymized following conventions for address in the relevant culture or country.

Table 3.1   Business Meetings Recorded for the Research

No	Time	Chinese	Interlocutors	Foreign	Interlocutors	Interpreters
		Names	Title	Names	Title	Names
M1	19/09/2018	Ms. Zhang Miss Wu	Manager of Greenland PR Manager	John	President of YZ China office	Wendy
M2	20/09/2018	Mr. Deng	Director of Foreig Investment Promotio Bureau	John	President of YZ China office	Wendy

M3	11/10/2018	Mr. Long Mr. Li Mr. Sun Mr. Meng	Director of BC Institute Engineer Engineer Host of the meeting	Mike Steve Tony	Technical Head of NEC Engineer of NEC a Chinese staff	Wang
M4	10/11/2018	Miss Wu	Managing Director	Frank	PR Manager of a Research institute in the Czech Republic	LEE
M5	10/11/2018	Lisha	Marketing Manager of an Advanced Material Company	Frank	PR Manager of a Research institute in the Czech Republic	LEE
M6	18/11/2018	Tim	DM of Chengdu Travel agency	Mark	Marketing Director of Italian Travel agency	Chang
M7	18/11/2018	Tim	DM of Chengdu Travel Agency	Adam	Manager Director of Switzerland Hospitalit Group	Chang
M8	18/11/2018	Tim	DM of Chengdu Travel Agency	Linda	Manager Director of Europe Spa Association	Chang
M9	25/06/2019	Hui	Switzerland Manufacturer Internet Influencer	Elin	Sales Manager of a Swiss company	Fion
M10	25/07/2019	Lin	DM of a Chinese Travel Agency	Kevin	Sales Rep of a Swiss Travel Agency	Cindy

The first three meetings were privately arranged between Chinese and foreign parties who had already been in prior contact. Primary interlocutors in M1 and M2 sought either an agreement or an MOU (Memorandum of Understanding) for foreign investment or joint projects. The third meeting was held between a user and a producer for an equipment manufacturer before the tendering process for purchase in order to have a technical exchange over equipment performance. Meetings at networking events

(M4, M5, M6, M7, M8, M9, M10) involved companies that had no prior direct contact with each other. Meetings were arranged by the organizer of the event to enable business conversation as both parties worked in the same field and had a similar business presence in their respective countries. Topics for interpreted business dialogue covered the real estate, foreign investment, tourism, advanced material, and nuclear physics equipment manufacturing industries. All topics demanded specific knowledge or highly technical expertise and explanation.

The languages used for all recorded meetings are Mandarin Chinese and English. Some foreign-language speakers are from countries where English is not the native language, such as Italy, the Czech Republic, France, and Switzerland. English is used as a *lingua franca* in the conversation. Most have a good command of English although some speak with a strong accent, which poses a challenge for the interpreter.

All meetings were recorded with consent from the interpreters and all interlocutors involved. All company names and personal details of research participants have been altered to protect anonymity. Some specific business jargon has been omitted or replaced with an asterisk to avoid the exposure of personal information. As with most of the previously mentioned empirical studies related to interpreter roles in interactive interpreted sessions, the present research is qualitative. Data for analysis consists mainly of transcribed sequences. Since divergences in original utterances and renditions are subtle, and the proportion of or statistics from cases may not be as impressive as a critical descriptive analysis, this study does not employ corpus techniques.

As the research data consists of audio recordings of naturally occurring business meetings, there is a certain amount of repetition and modal particles in the utterances of primary interlocutors as well as interpreters. I decided to retain all of these details in the transcripts to ensure the data is original and authentic.

3.3.2 The Interpreters

All interpreters participating in this study are native Chinese speakers who can be categorized into three groups: the freelance interpreter who interprets for M3, M9, and M10; the in-house interpreter for M1 and M2; and interpreters working for translation

companies for M4, M5, M6, M7, and M8. All interpreters hold a Master's degree in interpreting and translation. All interpreters have either received professional interpreting training or been awarded the CATTI (the China Accreditation Test for Translators and Interpreters). The ages of interpreters range from 25 to 42 years with at least two years of professional experience. The most experienced ones have worked for more than ten years as practicing interpreters. All interpreters are taking notes while interpreting for the business meetings.

Interviews with these interpreters show that they share a similar training background and are well-aware of the context for the business meetings. All interpreters are aware of interpreters' codes of conduct either from the qualification training they received or the rules designated by the companies that employ them. The table (table 3.1) below contains the demographic details of the six interviewees who participated in this study. For ethical reasons, the interviewees' real names have been substituted with random names to protect their privacy.

Table 3.2 Demographic Details of the Interviewees

No	Name	Gender	Education Background	Work Experience
1	Wendy	Female	B.A. in Applied Languages, China	Has worked as an in-house interpreter and event Manager in YZ for over 10 years. Extensive experience in business interpreting as YZ China office engaged with both British and Chinese businesses.
2	Wang	Male	M.A. in Applied Languages, China	Practising interpreter for more than 11 years. Owns his own Translation company. Extensive experience in business interpreting, both in China and abroad.

3	Chang	Female	M.A. in Conference Interpreting, UK	Currently works as an in-house interpreter in a Translation company in China after graduation. More experienced in Conference interpreting, but also has some experience in business settings.
4	Lee	Male	M.A. in Conference Interpreting, China	Has worked as a freelance interpreter for 2 years after graduation.
5	Fion	Female	M.A. in Conference Interpreting, China	Has worked as a freelance interpreter for 3 years after graduation. Extensive experience in business settings.
6	Cindy	Female	M.A. in Conference Interpreting, China (HongKong)	Has worked as a freelance interpreter for 2 years after graduation.

3.3.3 The Post-Assignment Interview

Semi-structured post-assignment interviews were conducted to examine whether interpreters were aware of exercising power in business negotiations. The interview aimed to find out how interpreters viewed specific verbal choices in the course of interpreting and how they perceived the impact of the specific settings or social factors on their performance.

Based on data generated from observation and transcripts, interpreters were asked to explain whether the renditions they provided were conscious choices. This gives a comprehensive picture of how the interpreter actually functions in the interpreted encounter. All interviews were recorded, and an interview list was generated to include information regarding the time, the name of the interpreter, the number of meetings, and the locations of the interviews (see Table 3.3).

Table 3.3   The Interview List

No	Time	Interpreter	Meeting	Location
1	25/09/2018	Wendy	M1 and M2	Chengdu
2	15/10/2018	Wang	M3	Chengdu
3	20/10/2018	Wang	M3	Chengdu
4	15/11/2018	Lee	M4 and M5	Chengdu
5	23/11/2018	Chang	M6 and M7	Chengdu
6	30/11/2018	Chang	M8	Via Phone

Interview questions were both structured and unstructured. Structured questions basically concerned intervention strategies. In contrast, unstructured questions asked interpreters to describe their perception of their role. These were intended to potentially uncover insights the researcher had not considered in the design phase of the research. An interview question sheet was pre-designed with topics arranged from broader to more specific perspectives. Structured questions covered broader themes, while unstructured questions focused on more specific categories of discussion.

The observation form is an adapted version of the one used by Merlini and Favaron (2003) in their study of the interpreter's management of power in community settings. It is comprised of three parts: 1) basic information on the interpreter, participants, and assignment times and locations; 2) observations on interactions in the business negotiation (i.e., the interpreter's shifts of footing, turn-taking management, and renditions discrepant from the primary speaker's utterances); and 3) added notes. The observational form allows the researcher to take notes on specific examples of the power of the interpreter within interpreted interactions that were referred to in the interview.

Before the interpreted session starts, I briefed the three parties on the research

purpose to obtain consent from the respondents. In all cases, agreement was obtained in writing. I explained the importance of the research, reassured participants of confidentiality and anonymity, and informed them that their identities would not be revealed in the study findings. I also explained to interpreters and primary interlocutors that they could withdraw from the study at any time (e.g., ask me to stop recording and/or to destroy or otherwise not use collected data). Interpreters were told that the study would neither assess the quality of interpreting nor affect their employment status. Anonymity for all participants was guaranteed in the final transcriptions to avoid any revelation of participant identities and company names. Interviews took place either after business meetings (with reference to notes on observational sheets) or by replaying recorded data via email or phone if the interpreter had to leave at the same time as clients. Interview questions were pre-designed

CHAPTER 4   The CDA Analysis of the Interpreter's Power
in the Discrepant Renditions

This Chapter provides a clear exposition of how the power of the interpreter manifests itself in their reformulation of the original utterances of the primary interlocutor. With the CDA definition of power, I intend to explore the evidences of how interpreters exercise control and intervene in the contribution of primary interlocutors while reformulating their utterances. I will examine how the interpreter's performance in this social practice of discourse shatters the idealistic portray of the interpreter as a "conduit-like", neutral and detached figure described in the norms of interpreting. Critical discourse analysis (CDA) provides the theoretical support for the analysis, with the adapted categories of rendition based on Wadensjö's (1998) category as the analytical tool. As Khalifa (2014, p.14) argues, "what gets translated or not and why is always (at least partly) a matter of exercising power or reflecting authority", the discrepancies between the utterances of the primary interlocutors and renditions of the interpreters at the lexical and semantic levels will be useful to reveal how the power relations in the social context of business interpreting influence the output of the interpreter, and how the interpreter breaks the norms of interpreting by controlling the contribution of the primary speakers in the discursive practice of BNI.

4.1 Analytical Framework

The CDA analysis follows Fairclough's (1989) three-dimensional model comprising description, interpretation and ultimately explanation. According to Fairclough (1989, p.26):

Description is the stage which is concerned with formal properties of the text.

Interpretation is concerned with the relationship between text and interaction - with seeing the text as the product of a process of production, and as a resource in the process of interpretation;

Explanation is concerned with the relationship between interaction and social context - with the social determination of the processes of production and

interpretation, and their social effects.

Fairclough (1989) proposes "a mini reference manual" (p.109) in his critical study of the textual features of a discourse, according to which we can explicate the otherwise hidden power relations and ideologies in the discourse. The analysis of this section focuses on the interpreter's power manifested in their reproduction of primary interlocutors' utterances on the vocabulary-level, where the semantic and lexical aspect is central in the discussion. The questions raised can be described by three types of value: the experiential, relational and expressive. The experiential value is related to "the text producer's experience of the natural and social world" (p.112), while the relational value and expressive value concern the "social relationships" and the "subjects and social identities" (p.112). In other words, a CDA analysis on vocabulary level is related to the comparison of texture features on semantic, syntactic, and lexical level. The aim of the CDA analysis is to look at how social context and social relations which give rise to these discrepancies in the renditions in the discursive practice of business interpreting, because "social conditions determine properties of discourse" (Fairclough, 1989, p.19). I also intend to explore the way interpreters understand and interpret the features of the utterances or texts, which from a CDA perspective, always depend on "which social- more specifically, discoursal-conventions they are assuming to hold" (Fairclough, 1989, p.19). In other words, I intend to examine how the interpreter's power is enacted through language use in the renditions produced in the discursive practice BNI.

The analytic tool consists of the categories adapted from Wadensjö's (1998) classification of interpreter's renditions as "close, expanded, reduced, substituting, summarizing renditions and no renditions" (p.107). Wadensjö (1998) proposes that "rendition" is the "second and thus, in at least some respect, a new version of an original" (p.107). Therefore the discussion of the differences between the two versions can best proceed from the textual and interactional aspects. The comparison of the differences in the aspects of diction, syntactic and other linguistic matter can demonstrate how the interpreter intervenes in or exercise control over the

contribution of the primary speakers in the dialogic process.

Based on Wadensjö's (1998) taxonomy, I have proposed categories of Addition, Omission and Substitution to examine the data collected in the business meetings. The category is generated during the coding process of the data I collected. I did not include the "close rendition" from Wadensjö's (1998) taxonomy because I focus on the divergent rendition of the interpreter discovered in my data set. Addition refers to the "expanded renditions" proposed by Wadensjö (1998) where the interpreter "includes more explicitly expressed information" (p.107) compared with the utterance of the primary speakers, and it also refers to the repetitive information provided. Omission corresponds with Wadensjö's description of "reduced renditions" (p.107) or "zero renditions" (p.108) where the primary interlocutors' utterances are less explicitly conveyed or even left untranslated. Substitution refers to the renditions classified by Wadensjö as "summarizing renditions" (p.107), where interpreter provides a translation which combines "two or more individuals" (p.108). It also represents the rephrasing of the original by either strengthening or downplaying the interlocutors' utterances in the business dialogue.

With a CDA perspective, I will firstly describe the vocabulary-level properties of the transcribed texts, such as the explicitly expressed diction or linguistic matters, and then move to the steps of "interpretation" and "explanation" (Fairclough, 1989, p.26) to explore the relationship between the participators of the conversation and the situational context which may have influence on the interpreting process. With this goal in mind, I will focus on the four layers of situational context proposed by Fairclough (1989, p.146) in the steps of interpretation and explanation process which includes the contents, subjects, relations, and the role of language in the discourse. I consider the business interpreting a discursive social practice whose "process of production" will be influenced by the relationship between interaction and social context. The analysis is generally based on the transcripts of the naturally occurring sequences of the interpreted business encounters and the interviews of the interpreters after the assignment. The analysis of the data is based on the source text and the interpreter's renditions presented in a parallel format.

4.2 Mediation through Addition

In this section, I will investigate how the interpreters' power manifests itself by comparing expanded renditions of the interpreter to the primary speakers' "original" in the business conversation. The analysis contends that interpreters, though being aware of the norms of relaying the form and style of the "original" as closely as possible, hold the bilingual and interactional power in the discourse to re-produce or reformulate the original with explicit information based on their understanding of the social and situational context. The additions occurred most frequently in the renditions are repetitive renditions (the repetition of a words, a phrase or even a sentence), most of which are emphatic, and expanded renditions which are mostly explanatory. All interpreters were interviewed after the assignment by the author to explore the contextual, social and relational factors which influenced their moves or led to the intervention in this discursive activity and whether the moves are a conscious or choices out of instinct.

The following examples are from M1, which takes place between the property company GLN Group Chengdu office and the YZ China office with the aim for further cooperation between British and Chinese businesses in an array of industry based on the incumbent cooperation in Shanghai. John, the president of YZ China office tries to explain the needs of British businesses to Rui, the PR manager of GLN Chengdu. Wendy is the staff interpreter of YZ who is also in charge of the organization of various business communication events.

M1-Example 1

1 John: So, um, and also they they need a one-stop shop **<u>solution</u>** for handling tax friendly, uh, customs, handling stock, the whole process.. that that actually is where most of the risk is, the labeling, etcetera, etcetera, where most of the risk is, uh, for for these businesses coming into China

2 Wendy: 对，那么他们同时也非常需要有一个, 这个有一个<u>合作方</u>能够提供这种一站式税收方面的，包括这个海关方面贴牌方面的帮助。这块可能

会造成很大的一些对品牌和公司的风险。所以说他们也是**非常希望**有一个能够有提供这个"一站式"服务的机构**能够进行合作**。

（Yeah, they at the same time also very much in need of a, huh, **a cooperative body** to provide this one-stop tax aspects, including the customs labeling aspects help. This aspect will have very big risk to the businesses and brands. Therefore they do need an agency which can provide this one-stop services for cooperation.）

3   John: So the reason we…we signed an agreement with GLN in Shanghai was uh, particularly shanghai at the moment, is already very much focusing on importing goods. And, and I think GLN there provided uh, a very strong brand and very strong, uh, offer, that we can then working cooperation to promote GLN, cross border, um, centers to British businesses. And that's something that we beginning to do. So as this launches next year, I think it's certainly something we can do here as well.

4   Wendy：那么我们为什么能和上海的 GLN 能签署 MOU 呢，是因为上海现在是非常就是侧重在进口商品消费这块，那么上海 GLN 提供了很强的这个品牌的支持还有其他的服务。所以说，我们也可以合作来宣传 GLN，那么我们也是在看明年上海这个菜桥的项目，之后呢，可能我们还是有在成都的一些类似的这个合作的这个这个空间和机会的。

(Why we can sign a MOU with GLN Shanghai, is because shanghai currently focus on importing of goods consumption. Therefore GLN Shanghai provides very solid brand support and other services. Therefore we can cooperate to promote GLN and we are looking at the **Caiqiao project in Shanghai**. Then it is very possible that we can have space and opportunities for **similar cooperation in Chengdu.**)

5   Rui: 好的好的，太好了。

(Ok Ok, that's great!)

In this quoted sequence, John initiates the talk by expressing the concerns and needs of British businesses regarding the cooperation with Chinese enterprises. If we

regard the two pairs of utterances as separate texts of "original" and "rendition" to compare the interpreter's utterance (1-2, 1-4) with the primary speaker's utterances (1-1, 1-3), we can identify at least two kinds of additions: expanded rendition and repetition. To start with, the word "solution" used by John in his first line of thought is expanded by Wendy as "a cooperative body", which is a more specific expression of the need of British side.

In the same utterance (1-2), Wendy also repeats what she translated in the beginning part to conclude the rendition ("Therefore they do need an agency which can provide this one-stop service for cooperation"), which is not only repetitive with no correspondence in the "original", but also expanded with more explicit information, emphasizing the words like "an agency", "can provide", "one-stop service", and "cooperation". A similar addition occurs in the send pair of original and rendition where the interpreter also explicitly points out what John mentioned as: "this is something we are beginning to do" as "Caiqiao project in Shanghai", "it's certainly something we can do here as well" as "we can have space and opportunities for similar cooperation in Chengdu". Apparently, Wendy makes the narrative of John's utterance more proactive in attitude with the expanded expression such as "space and opportunities for cooperation". She also mentions the location of the cooperation to make the utterance more relevant to the primary speakers from CLN Chengdu.

If we look at the relational and social context of this conversation, it is not difficult to understand why the interpreter, Wendy, makes adjustment in her rendition. YZ agency's major responsibility is to facilitate British businesses to establish their business presences in China. As the staff interpreter of YZ who is also in charge of events organization and external affairs, Wendy has an expertise not only in interpreting skills but also the institutional goal and the background of the talk. Obviously, John represents the British company's position with more urgent need to the resources or help of the Chinese partner in the first place to have a safer market access. Making use of her bilingual and background resources, Wendy identifies with the goal of the institution she works for and emerges as an

actual party in the talk, turning the interactional structure into a triadic pattern. Wendy has the "text-ownership" (Angelelli, 2004, p.76) to the additions occurred in her rendition. In other words, the interpreter speaks for her client (also her boss), and stresses the need of her company. Meanwhile, the interpreter's explicating the location for the cooperation is also a sign of her accommodating to the goal of the primary interlocutors from Chengdu. As Wendy said in the interview, "It is a conscious move as I am the person who has the more thorough understanding of the occasion as well as the need of both companies. I am also responsible for the liaison of the two, therefore, I added the information John did not mention, such as the location of the cooperation, the form of the solution being a cooperative body, to make the utterance more clearly directed" (Interview 1, 25th Sep 2018).

Based on the interview and the analysis of the social context in which the conversation took place, the interpreter's agency manifests itself in the discourse. The interpreter's ability to intervene in the interaction not only derives from the interpreter's bilingual ability, but also the social resources the interpreter holds and her institutional identity as a liaison person. Her expertise of the institutional culture and the institutional aim of the talk can be regarded as the social resources in the discursive practice. It is observable that the interpreter shifts her subject position and controls the contribution of her client by adding the information, an act foregrounding her company's proactive attitude for cooperation. Expanding the word "solution" as "cooperative body" also makes the need of the British side more concrete for the Chinese side. Apparently, the interpreter takes a "contextual approach" (Van Dijk, 1997, p.20) in which she involves her social identity and institutional property in the conversation. By doing so the interpreter clearly breaks the norms of "conduit" (Reddy, 1979, p.285) interpreting model by employing her interactional power and assessment of the business relations. She made the "special move" (Van Djik, 1997, p.29) in which the "language users apply expedient interactional strategies in the accomplishment of discourse" (p.29). In a sense, the interpreter faciliatatess her client/boss to achieve the communicative and social goal

in the discourse. The feedback from the Chinese primary speaker "太好了" (That's great) tells us that the interactional strategy applied yields a quite successful outcome.

A similar case occurs in the later conversation when John tries to answer the Chinese company's question regarding the arrangement for the follow-up communication.

M1-Example 2

1   John: Um, well, we also need to get our retail team and our food drink team especially to talk with whoever is the specific person that will work on the kind of developing a program. And then we can also prepare an MOU uh, similar to the one that we...we did in um, in Shanghai.

2   Wendy: 他就说接下来可能就会有我们，**因为**我们是分了很多团队的，就是我们有就是食品饮料行业的。

(He said to follow up, our team, because we have a lot of dedicated teams, including team in food and beverage industry.)

     John: 他们都在北京。

(They are all in Beijing)

4   Wendy: 他们在北京。接下来他们会跟进一下，我们也可以签一个和上海就是非常类似的一个合作协议。

(They are based in Beijing. They will follow up the case, and we can also sign an agreement similar to the Shanghai one.)

5   John: We got Jack and Sabina here that can help locally to develop it.

6   Wendy: 我们在成都也有同事，他们也是负责西南地区的这个零售行业的，就是在成都办事处，他们也可以帮忙，然后你们也跟他们聊一聊这样。

(We also have colleagues in Chengdu. They are responsible for the retail industry in Southwest region, namely the Chengdu Representative Office. They can also help, and you can talk to them as well.)

7   John: 和他们聊天。

        (Chatting with them.)

8.   Both Sides: Hahahaah

9   Rui: 就在 HT 大厦嘛？

        (Located in HT building?)

10   Wendy: 对。

        (yes)

11   Rui: 好的好的。

        (Ok Ok!)

As can be seen in the quoted sequence, Wendy (2-2) once again makes use of her social resources of the background knowledge or "social property" (Van Dijk, 1997, p.29) to expand John's utterance and explain that "because we have a lot of dedicated teams" to avoid the confusion might be caused by the new information which is mentioned by John all of sudden.

> "This is also a conscious act, as John mentioned the team without any background information, I consider it is my responsibility to add the information of the structure of our team and our operational approach, to get the meaning across more accurately" (Interview 1, 25th Sep 2018).

Wendy's rendition in 2-5 is another prime example of addition. John (2-4) makes a complementary remark of his previous utterance by mentioning "Jack and Sabina here that can help locally" to further convince the Chinese primary interlocutor that he has a team who can facilitate locally in Chengdu. Wendy's rendition (2-6) is not a complete one at all, and she fully expands it by adding the information of the category and function of the teams in Chengdu. In this immediate institutional matrix of business, we can see the agency of interpreter from her reproduction of her client's (John) text. The production of the content reveals Wendy's "nature of subject position" (Fairclough, 1989, p.178) as not merely a linguistic conduit, but also a substantial party who promotes the partnership by educating the Chinese side of her company. In other words, the "relational value" (Fairclough, 1989, p.178-179) of the text and the vocabulary items has placed Wendy in a dominant position in the

discourse because all the content she produced violates the norms of translation. And she holds full text-ownership of the content, which is oriented to the Chinese side in the business talk. The power the interpreter holds in the talk is enacted with her subject position as both an interpreter and a business promoter.

Of course, one may argue that Wendy exercises the agency because she is the staff interpreter who understands the company so well and who manages organizing work of the business talk, which endows her with a special power in the communicative discourse. Therefore, the following examples are selected from the meetings where the interpreter works as a freelance with no additional social connections with both primary interlocutors.

The sequence in Example 3 is selected from the Meeting 10, where the freelance interpreter Cindy facilitates her Chinese client Lin to communicate with a Swiss travel agency. The Swiss travel agency comes to China trying to sale their tourism product of cruise ship. The sequence further illustrates how the interpreter's subject position emerges as a co-participant in the business talk instead of a "conduit" by looking at the additions in the interpreter's renditions..

M10-Example 3

1   Lin: 我问一下他们是一个中间那一段的游轮呢，还是说两边的那个城市观光都安排？

    (Can I ask if they do cruise ship for in between or also the sightseeing in the two cities at both ends?)

2   Cindy: The cruise ship is, is only your service in between uh, or those two places' sightseeing are also included?

3   Kevin: No, it is not included.

4   Cindy: 那是那是另外的，<u>如果安排就要另外安排</u>。

    (It is separated, if you need it requires additional arrangements.)

5   Kevin: But we can we can organize it

6   Cindy: 那个…但是就是他们可以安排，….<u>但是他们主要就是做这个游轮</u>。

          (Uhh they can arrange for it, …but their main business line is the cruise ship.)

7   Kevin: Actually. we are the number one for local people, uh, the most popular ship for local people. And the reason is that we are the only one which has music, there is no entertainment and other ships from Finland to Estonia,

8   Cindy: 啊他就是他们这个游轮是当地最受欢迎的，然后并且他们也是唯一一个拥有音乐的这种娱乐设施。

          (Their cruise ship is the most popular one locally speaking, and they are the only one whose ship is equipped with the entertainment equipments.)

9   Lin: 啊啊，我知道了。

          (Ok ok, I understand.)

10   Cindy: 嗯所以我感觉你们的话，如果是要定这个从芬兰到爱沙尼亚的话，然后就可以定这个。

          (Therefore, I feel that for you, if you want to book service from Finland to Estonia, you can book this one)

The sequence took place at the beginning of the business conversation, when both sides just started to get to know each other's lines of business and needs. The addition in the interpreter Cindy's rendition occurs in turn 3-4 when Kevin answers Lin's question with a simple sentence "No it is not included." As can be seen, Cindy's rendition expands the utterance of the Swiss primary speaker as "if you need it requires additional arrangements". When asked if she is aware of this in interview, Cindy said that it is a move with reason, "I added the information because I tried to avoid any occasion of embarrassment, because the faithful translation of Kevin's words might seem too short and abrupt in this occasion" (Interview 8, 25[th]July, 2019). Interestingly, Kevin claims the next turn (3-5) adds a sentence "But we can organize it" which echoes Cindy's addition. In turn 3-6, Cindy again translates Kevin's utterance with the additional information to stress the main

business line of the Swiss travel agency is the cruise ship.

If we look at the situational context from the perspective of the content, subjects, and relations, it is not difficult to see the interpreter's agency in the discourse. Kevin is the one who is trying to talk the Chinese client into buying his product. The Chinese client, of course, will also benefit from this business deal which is the reason why he wanted to understand the route of the cruise ship, in other words, the profit making point of the product. However, Cindy assessed that Kevin's straightforward feedback, though sufficient to answer Lin's question, might not be enough to boost the interest in the Chinese Client Lin for further query, and culturally speaking, it might be quite short for the ice-breaking phase of the talk. Therefore, she intervenes in the talk to further expand the information without changing the direction of the talk.

It can be argued that the interpreter actually adopted a different social position as a co-participant when performing this and the nature of relationship between her and the primary speakers changed by her control of their contribution. To the Chinese client, she stimulates his interest to the project; while to the Swiss primary speaker, she acts as a helper to avoid any embarrassment and bring him closer to the Chinese client. As an observer, I can also perceive that Kevin gave this short answer partly because it is the warming up phase for the talk, neither of the speakers tends to be very proactive or both try to take it slow to warm it up. However, with the language barrier, this might unavoidably incur some embarrassing moments. Obviously, the interpreter's bilingual and bi-cultural ability has been instrumental in regulating the talk, because in a lot of cases, the function of expanded rendition is to "specify referential/interactional meaning of an utterance in order to rule out misunderstanding" (Wadensjö, 1998, p.123).

Such case is even more salient in turn 3-10. Cindy has the text-ownership to the majority of the rendition. In turn 3-8, Cindy translates Kevin's introduction of the strength of the tourism product, which flags the equipment of the music system. With the feedback from Lin chipped in 3-9, Cindy continues to translate the information regarding the place of departure and destination "Finland to Estonia"

(3-10). However, she expanded it in the way as if it is a piece of suggestion she offers to the Chinese client. This is a very obvious violation of the norms of complete and faithful information transfer, as the interpreter's personal view or suggestion is added in the rendition. The reason behind it is similar to the previous renditions in this example, which is "a conscious act to stimulate the interest of the Chinese client" (Interview 8, 25th July 2019). It is worth noting that in such a context, the interpreter positions herself as not only   a "principal" speaker, but also a business facilitator and a team member who holds a substantive position in this conversation. The interpreter's knowledge of the background of the company and the aim of her client has enabled her to engage with the interaction, and she emerges as an ally with the Chinese client who, at times offers suggestions for the business deal. The resource held by the interpreter is not only constrained to the bilingual ability, but is also related to her knowledge of background and her awareness of the institutional goal of the talk. Her move is also extremely significant for Kevin, the representative of the Swiss company who comes here in search of a business partnership. With the interpreter exercising the interpersonal skills in interaction and participating in the dialogue of the primary speakers, we could argue that a new type of social relationship and identities between the interpreter and the primary speaker are shaped as opposed to the traditional assumption of the interpreter'ssocial identity merely as a language transmitter. The interpreter therefore disrupts the "order of discourse" in a coordinating way.

A similar case occurs in the latter part of the conversation after the client made queries of the prices and ways to order the service.

M10-Example 4

1   Kevin: I will send to your email. Okay？

2   Cindy: 他会给你发 email，然后里面有他的就是价格，然后还有怎么订。

(He will send you an email which includes the prices and ways to order for it.)

3   Kevin: I will send you an email.

4   Lin: Thank you!

This sequence occurs in the latter part of the conversation before Kevin leaves the room. The Chinese client Lin becomes quite interested in the project and asked a series of questions. Before leaving, Kevin proposes that he will send Lin a mail (4-1), which is expanded by Cindy in her rendition with the explicit information of "which includes prices and ways to order" (4-2). This addition clearly shows that the interpreter is "interaction-oriented" (Wadensjö, 1998, p.109), which means that the interpreter's utterance is actually phrased to fulfill the interactional goal of the Swiss primary speaker. Here Cindy explicates Kevin's utterance to clarify the aim of sending an email. The addition is generated based on the context of the discourse. "All the conversation before this sequence revolves around the details of the cruise ship products, the price, the time, booking information, etc.," (Interview 8, 25th July 2019), explains the interpreter for the reason of the explication.

In this sequence, the interpreter again expands and explicates the Swiss primary speaker's utterance to "specify referential/interactional meaning of an utterance in order to rule out misunderstanding" (Wadensjö, 1998, p.123). In my view, ruling out the possible misunderstanding is what we can perceive from a text level. Examining the situational context, it has a further implication. From Fairclough's (1989) perspective, people rely on and draw upon "members' resources" (MR) when they produce or interpret texts, which includes "their knowledge of languages, representations of the natural and social worlds they inhabit, values, beliefs, assumptions" (p.24). Therefore, the dynamics of relation and change of power matrix also depend on the change of MR, the reshaping of the understanding and assumptions of participants' social relations and identities in the social process of interaction. It can be perceived that the interpreter in this context actually takes the responsibility of a reminder. The interpreter disrupts the assumption that she should take the position of a conduit-like language service provider who is invisible and supposed to be secondary to the dominant primary speakers. On the contrary, she exercise her agency and shifts to a social position of a team member of the Chinese client, who conveys and clarifies the meaning expressed in the negotiating

table, tracing any potentially useful information for the client. In other words, the professional status and identity of the interpreter, to a certain extent, enables her to intervene in the contribution of the primary speakers and make adjustments to their subject positions.

The following sequences are quoted from Meeting No.3, a meeting before the tendering process of the accelerator purchase between the American manufacturer and the Chinese buyer. The exchange is quite lengthy and technical, and the issues discussed are related to the result of the tendering as well as the Chinese side's decision for purchasing. The two excerpts reflect two types of additions in renditions. The first excerpt exemplifies the repetition as a form of addition, while the latter includes the interpreter's rendition with expanded and explicit information. In these cases, the interpreter further demonstrates the disruption of the traditional assumption of the order of discourse with the sole producing rights of renditions in the discourse.

M3-Example 5

1   Host: 啊，最后我们想请，两位代表，啊 Mr.Eric, Mr.Mike，还有其他的
             要补充吗？

             (Ahh, lastly we would like to ask two representatives, Mr.Eric, Mr,
             Mike if you have anything to add?)

2   Wang: Do you have anything else to say to them before we leave?

3   Mike: My first…I guess my most important question for **you**is..what is the
             most important thing for an accelerator system for you?

4   Wang: 他最想问就是说，咱们用这个呃加速器系统哈，最重要的一点是
             什么？咱们最看重的是什么？

             (He wants to ask most that, while we use this accelerator, what is the
             most important thing for us? What do we value most?)

5   Mr.Li: 是应用方面吗？

             (In terms of application?)

6   Wang: Are you talking about the application?

7   Mike: Um, no, I mean, from a manufacturer's point of view…

8   Wang: 从制造的角度..就对你们来说最重要的是什么？

       (From the perspective of manufacturing, <u>what is the most important
       thing for you?</u>)

Example 5 occurs at the end of the meeting after the Chinese side asked rounds of questions. In the first turn, the Host tries to remind the two American primary speakers whether they have any questions as the whole meeting was anchored as a Q&A session catering to the need of the Chinese buyers. The addition in the interpreter's rendition can be found from the second turn where Wang adds "before we leave" (5-2) to remind his American client of the time point. The exact temporal phrase seems to imply that any questions should be raised immediately, as the agenda approaches the end and we are about to leave. In the following turn Mike quickly comes up with a question in his mind which concerns the point the Chinese buyer values most for the accelerator. This question is quite important as it is very much related to the selling point of the product in the up-coming tendering process or the cooperation process in the near future if a deal is made. That could possibly explain the reason for Wang's repetition in the next turn (5-4) "咱们最看重的是什么" (what do we value most), which finds no correspondence in the "original". The Chinese primary speaker Mr.Li potentially thinks the question is too broad and attempts to narrow it down to the aspect Mike actually refers to in a short abbreviated syntax (5-5), which is replied by Mike also with a short abbreviated incomplete sentence "from a manufacturer's point of view" (5-6). When Wang takes the next turn for interpreting, he renders it into a full sentence. "It is difficult to say whether the repetition is a conscious act or not. But I only feel obliged to specify the question again after a round of Q&A" (Interview 3, 20th Oct 2018), explained Wang in the interview.

       Apparently, though not certain of the consciousness of the move, the interpreter realizes the importance of the specific moment in this business dialogue

and opts to adjust the rendition to remind the Chinese buyers of the question and prompts their attention to it. What Wang expressed in the interview actually reflects his awareness of the importance of this moment in the business talk and his assessment of the situational context. He is the only one with privileged access to the whole picture of the sequences of talk. With the scarce social source of bilingualism, knowledge of the situational context of the discourse, the interpreter emerges as a participant who holds power to not only translates, but also makes the decision to edit the primary speaker's utterance. The interpreter's agency literally disrupts the order of the discourse with the ability deriving from the social resources he holds.

Example 6 is an even more typical example of how the interpreter exercises power with his agency. The sequence actually demonstrates very salient shifts of MR, the assumptions of the interpreter's subject position, and his relations to the primary speakers. It is also a prime instance of the interpreter breaking the norms of complete translation by expanding his client's utterances to advocate for the product and service of his client.

M3-Example 6

1   Mike: Hmm uh，<u>That's exactly</u>. Our number one goal is to make you feel comfortable buying an accelerator system from NEC. And we have provided accelerators as to everyone from private companies to national labs all around the world. Some of our customers are more experienced in the accelerator technology than I am. And other customers um, have no idea what to do with an accelerator.

2   Wang: <u>那这一点大家可以放心啊</u>。就是说，让您用的放心是我们首要的目标。我们 NEC 公司呢，嗯目前在全球我们客户有很多类型，有些是私人公司，那么有一些是大型的国家实验室。有些客户嗯，他们在加速器方面的经验可能比 Mike 还要丰富，但有些客户呢，可能完全就是门

外汉。<u>所以说我们不管客户懂不懂行，但是我们都给他提供最好的产品，最好的技术支持</u>。

(<u>For this point, all of you can be rest assured of it.</u> Our priority is to make you feel comfortable using an accelerator system from NEC. Namely, well, we NEC now have a lot of customer type in the whole world, some of which are private companies, while some of them are large national laboratories. Some customers, well they may be more experienced in accelerator than Mike, but some customers, may be completely a layman, <u>so no matter the customer understands it or not, we provide to all of them the best products and the best technical support.</u>)

3   Mike: We had one customer uh, in Vietnam maybe about ten years ago, and I think the government had told them to buy an accelerator for ion beam analysis. And they ended up buying it and coming to the NEC factory and having no idea what to do with this system. So we <u>walked them through the entire process</u>, and now they're running very regular.

4   Wang: 大约十年前呢，我们有一个越南的一个订单，当时是越南政府要求我们那个越南客户呢，让他们,买我们的加速器,来做那个粒子束流分析，然后当这个客户就完全是门外汉，他到我们厂来了之后，根本不知道怎么样开始整个流程，然后我们就带着他就一步一步的按，严格按照我们的规程一步一步这么过来，然后从..从购买然后到生产，然后到发货，运维，运行维护，整个…现在这个设施呢，还在他们那儿呢，非常平稳的运行。

(About ten years ago an order, we have an order from Vietnam, and it was the Vietnamese government, who required the Vietnam customer to buy our accelerator for the ion beam analysis. The customer is entirely a layman, after he had come to our factory, he did not know how to start the whole process, then we guide him step by step strictly following our procedures. <u>So from the purchase and then to the production, then to the delivery, operations, operations and maintenance</u>, the whole current facility, they still have it running very smoothly.)

5 Mr.Long: 那就好，那就好。

（That's good, that's good.）

The sequence starts with Mike's feedback to the Chinese buyer's concern regarding the long-term smooth running of this large-scale scientific platform of the accelerator. It can be seen that Mike, in his utterances (6-1, 6-3), advocates for the reliability of his company's product. The vocabularies and phrases like "number one goal", "feel comfortable", "walk them through entire process", "still running regular" are the expressions he uses to assure the client of the quality of their product. If we compare these two utterances with Wang's translation in turns 6-2 and 6-4, we can discover that Wang actually strengthens the meaning conveyed by Mike and reassures the Chinese speaker at the same time in his rendition with additional information "all of you can be rest assured", "so no matter the customer understands it or not, we provide to all of them the best products and the best technical support". He also expands Mike's expression of "walk them through entire process" (6-3) into "guide them…from the purchase and then to the production, then to the delivery, operations, operations and maintenance" (6-4).

It can be argued that all the expanded renditions are based on the meaning initially conveyed without changing the direction of the talk; instead, it plays a vital role to reassure the Chinese buyers on one side and promote the American company on the other.

> "I decided to stress it because I believe it is in line with the aim of the talk he is giving. Besides, I believe this is also what the Chinese buyer wants to hear at this point. Chinese vocabularies I used will better transfer the meaning implicit in English and will be well-received by the Chinese buyers as opposed to the direct translation of the English ones" (Interview 3, 20th Oct 2018).

I was very much in agreement with Wang when I heard him say this in the interview. Discursively, the addition in rendition conveys a strong sense of certainty which indirectly constructs the positive image of the American company as considerate,

responsible and effective. The expanded rendition transferring what is implicit in the client's utterance is also a very good example of the interpreter exercising his agency and assuming the role of a co-participant, rather than being a language service provider who abides by the norms of complete information transfer in this discourse. The addition he made shows that the subject role he adopts also includes being an ally of this client and giving reassurance to the Chinese buyers. The interpreter's subject position manifests itself in the combined use of the strategies. The way Wang regulates the talk fully displays that the interpreter does hold discursive power in the talk, which manifests itself in the interpreter's the producing right of the renditions and interactional power to control or adjust the primary speaker's utterance. The emergence of this power in regulating interaction highly depends on the situational context, or in other words, it is also produced by the social and situational context of business interpreting.

I would like to close this section with Example 7, an excerpt quoted from Meeting 6 in which the Italian travel agency tries to promote a tourism route in Italy to the Chinese company. Chang is an in-house interpreter working with a translation company who assigns her to Tim, the Chinese client for business interpreting. The business exchange exemplifies the interpreter's changing subjective social positioning in the encounter where she functions as a link not only linguistically but also socially in the situational context.

M6-Example 7

1   Mark: I recommend this one，this is the location where to sleep, which is uh
          by feet close to the Temple, <u>two minutes from the temples</u>.

2   Chang: 我推荐的住的地方就是这个地方，因为这个地方的话它离刚刚的
           那个神庙比较近，走路的话两分钟就到了。
           (I recommend this accommodation it is this place, because it is very
           close to the temple, 2 minutes walking distance.)

3   Mark: So it is a really a <u>charming house</u>..

4   Chang: 然后看里面的<u>装修的话其实是很有风格的，</u>很吸引人。

            (<u>And the decoration in side is very stylish, </u>very charming.)

5   Mark: Ok, with a view of the temple from the rooms.

6   Chang: 然后从房间就能看到那个神庙。

            (And there is a view of the temple from the rooms.)

7   Tim: 哇哦.. (Looking at the picture)

            (Wow..!)

8   Chang: <u>It is really beautiful</u>!

Mark initiates the turn to recommend the accommodation to Tim by showing him the booklet of the hotel. Comparing the primary interlocutors' utterances (7-3, 7-7) with Chang's renditions, additions can be easily identified in the sequence. Mark uses the phrase "very charming" (7-3) to promote the hotel he features. In the next turn when Chang takes the floor to translate, she expands Mark's utterance with explicit information "decoration inside is very stylish" while looking at the brochure Mark points at. Obviously, the interpreter provides details in the picture to let the client have a more descriptive introduction of the room. She also simultaneously promotes for the Italian primary interlocutor businesswise, building up a very positive image of the product introduced.

      As the talk goes on, Mark further introduces the details regarding the "view of the temple" from the room with the pictures, and Tim's exclaimed "wow" (7-7) as feedback, expressing his amazement. In the following turn (7-8), Chang adds that "It is really beautiful", an emphatic expression in her verbal feedback, explicating the exclamation word "wow" used by her client in the previous turn. Sitting quite close, I could tell it is very likely that Chang provided this expanded version of feedback which she holds the total text-ownership to because Mark kept gazing at her and Tim. Tim did provide feedback with his eyes fixed on the pictures, and Chang was the only one who was having eye contact with Mark. "It was a conscious act and I just feel quite embarrassed without adding this information, for Mark was looking at me as if seeking for feedback and Tim just buried his head in these

pictures" (Interview 5, 23th Nov 2019). As Fairclough (1989) argues, "talk is interwoven with gesture, facial expression, movement, posture to such an extent that it cannot be properly understood without reference to these 'extras'" (p.27). Therefore, Chang actually takes this visual cue from Mark for the Chinese client on this occasion and helps the client finish the communication since "visuals can be an accompaniment to talk which helps determine its meaning" (p.27). The interpreter in this case apparently did not function only as a language service provider but also a substantive participant who intervenes in the situation socially.

Interestingly, the interpreter in the interview actually spontaneously mentions the Codes of Conduct (AUSIT, NRPSI) and the invisible and impartial codes as well as detached role of interpreter, which she believes herself being loyal to. However, in the actual scenario, the interpreter acts otherwise and disrupts this idealistic shared assumption of the relations between the interpreter and the client, which shows that the nature of the assumption "is dependent on the social relations and struggles out of which they were generated" (Fairclough, 1989, p.24). In the immediate situational context of the business talk context, Mark endeavors to promote the product to Tim. Therefore, the interpreter actually spontaneously situates herself in the position who also shoulders the responsibility to facilitate the client's understanding of the introduction while adjusting the atmosphere with a concrete compliment to Mark, which to some extent leads the talk in a positive direction. The interpreter's power to do so is absolutely endowed by the bilingual and bicultural resources she has in this interpreted business encounter.

4.3 Mediation through Omission

In this section, the analysis focuses on the omissions occurring in interpreters' renditions in recorded business meetings. The omissions refer to the occurrence of what Wadensjö (1998, p.104) termed "reduced rendition" and "zero rendition", which includes "less explicitly expressed information" or renditions which are left untranslated, compared with the "original" of the primary interlocutors'. Omissions are not discussed in different categories as "reduced rendition" and "zero rendition",

which are often juxtaposed with each other in the interpretation. Most of the omissions occurred for the simplification or selective translation of the original utterances. The selective translation took place due to different reasons: some of them have a time economizing effect which saves the time from the discussion of an known or already clarified fact; other cases occurred as the interpreters tried to employ it as a strategy to emphasize the more relevant or important information or get more rapidly to a particular important point in the interaction. In other words, the interpreter also considers the priority of the information; of course, it is unavoidable that some omissions are also due to the cognitive constraints such as the capacity of working memory. However, most of the interpreters in the meetings recorded are intensively-trained therefore such cases are rare. The analysis aims to examine how the power of interpreter manifests itself in the intervention of the interpreter in the business interpreting discourse, such as the selective translation of the interlocutor's utterance. On Khalifa's (2014) account, "what gets translated or not and why is always (at least partly) a matter of exercising power or reflecting authority" (p.4). Owing to this, I intend to explore how the interpreter's subjective position shifts as he/she disrupts the order of discourse and norms of being totally neutral, and how the social and situational context play a role in reproducing the power relations in this process.

The following instances are excerpts from Meeting 1 when John tries to determine whether the third-party service company would fit in the industry cluster built by the Chinese company in Chengdu. Rui, the manager of the Chinese company talks with a very proactive attitude and the expressions she uses are somehow quite verbose. Their talk was assisted by Wendy, the in-house interpreter from the British company, who is also in charge of the external affairs and relations.

M1-Example 8

1 John: We have kind of third-party services sector, like logistics, e-commerce
      application provider, because we have companies like that as well, they
      can also come here?

2   Wendy: 就是因为我们也有一些就是这种类型公司，在英国的会员企业，也有做这种类型的公司。他们也是电商应用提供商。他们是做这个第三方服务的，就是他们也可以吗就是….

(Just because we have some of these companies, some of our member companies in the UK, they are this type of companies, and they are also e-commerce application providers, and they are doing third-party service, and can they also..just...

3   Rui: 唉可以啊! 第三方服务的公司我也很欢迎，因为他可能更了解英国企业需要哪些服务。

(Ahh, yes of course! Third party company I also welcome a lot, because it may understand better what services British businesses need.)

4   Wendy: 啊，是的，对。对对。

(Ah, yeah, right. Right, right.)

5   Rui: 对他就可以就作为我这个, 我还可以, 我们专门联合了青羊区, 对做第三方服务的这种有专项的补贴政策。

(Right, it can be my this, I can also, we have allied explicitly with the Qingyang District, to provide a particular subsidy policy for third-party services.)

6   Wendy: Specific subsidies from the government for the third-party companies.

7   John: Very good.

8   Rui: 所以这个第三方服务平台公司也是我们的招商对象。

(Therefore, this third-party service platform company is also our target for investment invitation.)

9   Wendy: 嗯嗯。

(Hmm hmm)

At the beginning of the sequence (8-1), John explains that they have member enterprises, who are "third-party service companies", intending to come to establish a business presence in Chengdu. In the next turn, Wendy translates John's utterance closely. However, an overlap occurs between Wendy and Rui (8-2, 8-3) when Rui

speaks in an exciting tone that she also welcomes the third-party company (8-4). A zero-rendition occurs in the next turn when Wendy expresses her agreement with what Rui states in the previous turn, a move adjusted to the immediate situational context and aligned with her responsibility of liaison person. Rui again claims the next turn (8-5) to promote the "subsidy policy", but in a very verbose and even ungrammatical fashion "Right, it can be my this, I can also", which might have occurred because she has so much to offer. Wendy quickly claims the next turn with a reduced rendition with the key point "subsidies" introduced by Rui, so as to emphasize the point Rui tries to promote as well as to re-engage John in the interaction. Such informed assumption gets confirmed in the interview when Wendy explains that "It is a conscious choice as Rui tends to be quite talkative and I intend to pass the most useful information to John as I know what John concerns most for British businesses" (Interview 1, 25th Sep 2019).

Two other cases of zero-rendition can be found in the closing part of this sequence, where the primary speakers' utterances overlapped and are both left untranslated (8-7, 8-8). Wendy explains the reasons behind as "I feel it is the information explained already, therefore, I gave feedback directly so that we could move into the next topic faster" (Interview 1, 25th Sep 2019). It is noticeable that the interpreter in this sequence breaks the norms of being detached and invisible by taking on a dual identity of an interpreter and an external affairs officer. With a clear understanding of her boss John's aim and concern, Wendy employs the strategy of omission (both zero rendition and reduced rendition) by avoiding any redundant information to facilitate John to grasp the key message conveyed by Rui. Rui's redundant utterance in 8-5, and two overlapped utterances in 8-7 and 8-8 could be the additional strain to Wendy in the complex activity of interpreting, a situation where she has to speak while listening and decoding the utterance of the primary interlocutor. Therefore, she makes the decision to selectively translate the utterance with the consideration to the relevance of the information. She also assesses the situation to manage the time and pace of the meeting, in which numerous topics are to be covered. The power the interpreter holds clearly manifests itself in the

strategies she employs in this interaction, and the interpreter clearly also assumes the role of coordinator, setting the pace for a more effective progression of the business encounter.

A similar case occurs after a discussion in the same conversation. In this excerpt, Wendy continues to select information from the primary interlocutors' utterances and to produce reduced renditions in the interaction.

M1- Example 9

1 John: <u>So I mean, for example, if you're having a launch event at some point over the next six months before you launch the project,</u> I mean, that will be a great time for us to sign an MOU, and I'm happy to come down and do it.

2 Wendy: 他就说，方才提到你们下半年是有个发布会是吧？嗯，<u>他说他很愿意过来</u>。可以顺便找个合适的时间签《谅解备忘录》。
       (He said just now you mentioned that you have a launch event in the 2H of this year, right? hmm, he said he would be very willing to come over for it and sign the MOU as well if time is opportune.)

3 Rui: <u>哦，好好。下半年一定。</u>
       (Oh ok ok definitely the 2H of this year.)

4 John: <u>Yeah, either something.. I am here every six months, maybe maybe more. And and maybe if it's coinciding with something that would be great to do it</u>. **But** in the meantime, we should start to begin to develop some list of companies that we can and introduce the retail and food and drink teams too. Prepare a list of…

5 Wendy: 现在呢，我们倒是可以做的是，就是，我们双方坐下来，可以去整理一些公司名单。和我们的那个…零售行业的团队来筛选一些品牌公司。有意向比较感兴趣我们可以介绍的，把你们介绍给零售团队，这个是接下来我们可以做的事情。
       (Currently, what we can do is that, literally, we two sides sit down to

list some companies. Together with our retail team we can select some brands and companies with interest and intention to come, which we can also introduce. We will also introduce you to our retail team, this is want we can do next.)

6   Rui: 对，那这个是需要我们和北京的团队联系还是怎么呢？<u>因为刚才说零售和食品饮料都是在北京</u>。

(Yeah, then it requires us to contact the Beijing team or what? <u>Since just now you mentioned the Retail Food and Beverage team is based in Beijing.</u>)

7   Wendy: <u>Do they need to contact the Beijing team for this?</u>

8   John: Talk, talk directly to the Beijing. <u>It's easier because they know the companies.</u>

9   Wendy: 后续和北京的团队沟通就行。

(For the follow-up, just contact the Beijing team.)

From the initial turn of this sequence, John shows his goodwill for cooperation by offering the choice of "sign the MOU" with his personal presence for a launch event. Wendy obviously realizes the importance of this suggestion, and she reformulates it into a reduced rendition in turn 9-2, which simplifies the first half of John's words tohighlight the information in the latter half of the sentence with explicit expressions like "he would be **very** willing to come over" and "sign the MOU if time is opportune". It is apparent that the reformulation has an end focus to flag John's intention. It is also worth noting that Wendy changes the syntax from a statement to a question which calls more of the Chinese primary speaker's attention and strengthens the sense of engagement in this interpreted encounter. In the next turn (9-3), Rui approves of John's suggestion while nodding her head. John takes the visual cue immediately and claims the next turn to further explain his plan. Here Rui's turn became a zero-rendition, which finds no correspondence in the interpreter's rendition. "It would be pretty unnatural if I chipped in just to provide the translation of the feedback. Besides, John obviously understands the non-verbal

129

gesture of nodding is self-explanatory, and he has more to offer in the next turn", explains Wendy (Interview 1, 25th Sep 2018). She leaves the primary speaker's feedback untranslated, and then she recedes her turn to distribute it back to John for further explanation.

It can be argued that the interpreter apparently understands that in the immediate situational context, the dialogue is essentially a relational activity and "dry, formal and detached interpreting style is not always the best way to serve one's clients, especially when their intention is to engage in a friendly and cooperative dialogue" (Merlini and Favaron, 2005, p.296). This is also certified in the following turn of 9-5, 9-7, 9-9, which are all renditions reduced to various extent reformulated by Wendy to convey the key and more relevant information in this talk. Among them, Rendition 9-5 is a prime example where Wendy omits John's roundabout expression regarding the thought over the "opportune moment" and attaches more importance to "what we can do currently". On Wendy's account, this is owing to "What John said in the first half was something discussed and his focus is things we can do at the moment" (Interview 1, 25th Sep 2018). Wendy's discursive strategy of selectively translating may disrupt the idealized norms of professional conduct, but it does ensure effectiveness of the communication, especially on the occasion when primary speakers' expressions are verbose or redundant, which is also unavoidable. The interpreter's discursive strategy is based on her overall intention to ensure that primary speakers arrive more quickly at the critical information. The agency she exercised displays the interpreter's substantial participating role in the interaction, in which she shifts into the subject position of a coordinator with her assessment of the situational context.

Similar instances can also be found in the business meetings assisted by some freelance interpreters. The following example is quoted from Meeting 9. Hui, a Swiss Chinese who owns a company in Switzerland which manufactures Swiss Army Knife. Hui is seeking opportunities for cooperation with a Swiss company who plans to produce cycling navigator in China. Fion, a freelance interpreter, is hired by Elin, the representative of the Swiss company to assist the communication.

In the exchanges before the quoted sequence, Hui proposes a plan to help Elin's company for promotion with his influence on social media, which is approved by Elin. In the following turn, Elin specifies their customer base to Hui for him to have a more concrete understanding of the promotional need.

M9-Example 10

1 Hui:现在我其实有一种合作的模式，<u>因为接下来我会，因为我本身在中国的社交网络里面有很多粉丝</u>，对瑞士的文化，对瑞士的产品、瑞士的旅游感兴趣的一些粉丝，<u>那么其实我后来接下来我们因为咱们产业园这边基于对绿色文化的一个宣传</u>，在这个过程当中，其实我也可以覆盖的,对咱们瑞士的一些产品,进行一个宣传，通过我的一个社交媒体, 就是这种形式。如果他们生产的话，我觉得挺感兴趣的合作。

   (Now I actually have a cooperative mode, because then I would, because my own Chinese social network has many fans, fans interested in Swiss culture, Swiss products and Swiss tourism. Actually later, because our industrial park here publicizes the green culture, in this process, in fact, I can also cover, or some of our Swiss products, for some promotion. It can be done through one of my social media, this is the form. If they produce, I feel quite interested in the cooperation)

2 Fion: My co-operation mode is that I have many fans on Chinese social-network so they are very interested in Swiss culture products and tourism. So when I establish my office in this Industrial Park, I can help you to promote Swiss culture as well as your products. So if you manufacture your products here s**o I can help you.**

3. Elin: I think we are, when the product is ready, we are interested to have a good promotion and I think we can also count on this Swiss effect. But our focus is in the sports industry. So all our people who are our customers need

to be people who like sports.

4. Fion: <u>就是说宣传方面想要有一个瑞士效应</u>，但是我们的顾客主要是那些非常喜欢运动的，所以说我们的顾客必须是那种对于自行车行业非常感兴趣，对运动非常充满热情的。

(Just to say that in the promotion aspect we would like to have a Swiss effect. But our customers are those who are keen on sports. Therefore our customers are the people who are very interested in cycling industry, very passionate about sports.)

5. Hui: 对。我这边我现在有很多圈子，包括运动的，<u>因为瑞士军刀是户外产品</u>，我有很多这种户外的一个生活，<u>我想</u>他们对自行车，对户外运动他们也是有需求。

(Yes, on my side I have many circles, including the one for sports, <u>as Swiss Army Knife is an outdoor product.</u> We have a lot of outdoor living and I believe they also need bikes and outdoor activities).

6. Fion: So I have many friends in different circles, some of them are very interested in outdoor activities, including cycling.

Comparing Fion's renditions (10-2, 10-4, 10-6) with those of the primary speakers' original (10-1, 10-3, 10-5), it can be easily identified that the reformulation produced by Fion are ones with reduced information. In the first turn, Hui actually introduces his proposal for cooperation. However, he expresses it in a very roundabout and redundant language (10-1). Obviously, Fion reduces Hui's utterance in her rendition in the following turn, emphasizing that "I have fans who can promote for you, and I want cooperation". Likewise, Fion's rendition in 10-4 also omits the information regarding the intention for cooperation, which is mentioned repeatedly in the exchange prior to this sequence (It is quite lengthy and I did not insert the transcripts here). "All this talk occurs because they want to cooperate, therefore, I just decide to highlight the most relevant information" (Interview 7, 25th June 2019). Owing to this, Fion focuses on the information provided by Elin to specify her need for this promotion, such as the "Swiss effect", and the customers should be "passionate about sports". Then, Hui in the next turn (10-5) explicates the

common ground between his "friends circle" and Elin's potential customers with the additional information of "Swiss Army Knife". Fion's rendition in the following turn (10-4) is apparently a discrepant one, which puts the information "friends in different circles" and "interested in outdoor activities, including cycling" at the forefront of the rendition. Such reduction of information is somehow similar to that of Wendy's in the previous examples, "I figured that the most relevant information to the context is the one I included in my rendition. The omitted part is either known information or less relevant to the question" (Interview 7, 25th June 2019). Again, the sequence exemplifies that the interpreter does adopt a strategy of omission to ensure the effectiveness of the dialogic interaction with the relevant information conveyed by her. It is salient that the interpreter exercises her agency to control the contribution of the primary speakers.

Interestingly, the interpreter in the interview mentions her general tendency to reduce information when she interprets from Chinese into English, her renditions in 10-2 and 10-6 in particular. As a practicing interpreter, I do feel likewise in my own interpreting activity. Chinese is a highly repetitive language and many synonymous phrases or words might be used only to express one single wish or hope. Besides, Chinese people habitually leave the most important aim or intention till the last bit of a conversation. Hui's utterance in 10-1 is a prime example of this feature of end focus, as all those expressions he used in the first half of the utterance actually pave the way for his proposal in the last bit sentence, which can be concluded as "I have fans, I can promote for you, and I am interested in cooperation". Therefore, omission is adopted by interpreters sometimes as a strategy to generate the critical message and convey the most relevant information to improve the effectiveness of the dialogue, especially in business dialogues when both sides are keen to hear the thoughts of the business proposal as well as any tangible information and facts related to the intended cooperation.

Of course, omission sometimes also occurs when the interpreter loses track of the information or simply don't understand what the primary interlocutor said. This is also unavoidable as interpreters are not almighty no matter how experienced

they are. Some interpreters are afraid of showing their lack of understanding as it might interrupt their already distracted attention in the interaction, and it may decrease their trustworthiness. Therefore, omission on such occasion is sometimes employed as a strategy by the interpreter to convey the primary speaker's general message. On Wadensjö's (1998) account, "not occupying too much communication space is a way to demonstrate professionality" (p.130). The following case shows that the interpreter leaves the space for the questioning of a place's name with reduced rendition without occupying too much communicative space. To fulfill the communicational function, the interpreter finally produces a reduced one with the key message of the primary speaker.

M6-Example 11

1   Mark：This is like a restaurant, but they can also set it up for meetings or parties...

2   Chang: 这个是餐馆，但是也可以开会或者聚会。

7.   Tim:是在哪个城市？

(Which city?)

8.   Chang: Which city?

9.   Mark: Orvieto, South Italy.

10.   Chang: <u>Ov.?</u> .

11.   Mark: Orvieto, do you not know Orvieto?

12.   Chang: <u>欧维耶多 ..</u>(shaking her head).

(O-VI-YE-DO..)

13.   Tim: <u>不知道。</u>（shaking his head）

(Don't know.)

14.   Mark: <u>Oh you don't know? you must know Orvieto!</u> It is the off beaten part, part of the Italy, which is very trendy now. We have Madonna, this kind of people going there to marry.

15   Chang: 这个现在是当地一个婚礼度假的胜地，像麦当娜这样的明星他们都是在那边去结婚的。

> (This is a local popular wedding resort, stars like Madonna had their weddings there.)

16   Tim: 哦哦。

         (Oh oh.)

As can be seen in the first turn of the sequence, the Italian travel agency Manager Mark is promoting a restaurant in South Italy that is suitable for the organizing of several events. In turn 11-3, Tim makes a query about the location of the venue, and Mark provides the answer "Orvieto, south Italy" in 11-5, a name of Italian city which Chang is not aware of. Chang produces a reduced rendition in 11-6, which signifies that she is trying to figure out the translation of the city's name. She also looks at Mark with a puzzled look as if seeking more clarification from Mark. Mark obviously takes the visual cue from Chang. In the next turn (11- 7), his question "Do you know Orvieto?" is to confirm if either Chang or Tim has the background information of this city. Chang, in the next turn, again provides a reduced rendition to her Chinese Client, however, in an interesting way by mimicking the pronunciation of the city's name. Chang accounts the motivation behind the move:

> "I did so because we often employ the strategy of transliteration when it comes to names, I wish that by providing this information only, my client could figure out the name in Chinese as he might be more familiar with names of places in Italy working in the tourism industry" (Interview 5, 23th Nov, 2018).

Indeed, in dialogue interpreting, some detailed information such as dates and figures are hard to memorize, but at least note-taking could be of assistance. However, the names of cities and countries are more difficult, which involves a large number of vocabularies and no specific shortcut is available except memorization. The interpreter here tactically reduces her rendition to mimic the sound of the city's name "O-VI-YE-DO" pronounced by the Italian primary speaker, but she discovers that the Chinese client is also not familiar with it. Therefore, in her next rendition (11-11), when she translates Mark's utterance (11-10), she again reformulates it into a reduced rendition, omitting Mark's half comments half question of "Oh you don't

know? you must know Orvieto". Such intervention is potentially adopted to quickly convey the latter part of his utterance, which is also the selling point of the place ("Madonna, this kind of people going there to marry"). This sequence best exemplifies the on-the-spot nature and the unexpectedness of interpreting. At first, the interpreter repetitively reduces the "original" in her rendition to leave some space for herself to think about the answer to her client's query. Obviously, her professionality did not allow the exchange to linger, taking too much space in the interaction. The interpreter ultimately takes control and generates a reduced rendition to quickly end this ineffective communication as well as to stress the highlight of the place as a "popular wedding resort".

In this discourse, the interpreter adopts the social position of a coordinator by engaging with the primary interlocutors and orienting the renditions towards the interaction. Interestingly, I have discovered that the primary interlocutors seem to accept naturally the fact that they need to give time for the interpreter to think. It can be argued that such situational context has shaped the social and power relations among the three, as the interpreter's subjective position becomes visible among the three with her exercising the agency. The interpreter is not a secondary or detached figure to the primary interlocutors in the discursive practice. On the contrary, she is an indispensable part for the discursive practice who takes a substantial position in this dialogic discourse, without whom the smooth progression of the talk would be impossible.

4.4 Mediation through Substitution

In this section, I will focus on how the interpreter's power manifests itself through the occurrences of substitution in the discourse process. In other words, I will examine how the interpreter breaks the professional norms of close rendition and employs substitution as a strategy to facilitate the business encounter. There are two types of substitution:

1) the summarized rendition, which is similar to what is proposed by Wadensjö (1998, p.107), where the interpreter provides a translation which "combines

utterances of two or more individuals" (p.108) or two or more turns in a sequence.

2) it also represents the replacements occurring in renditions, the rephrasing of the original words, phrases, or even sentences original for the adjustment of the tone of the interlocutors' utterances through either strengthening or downplaying in the business dialogue.

Substitution does not occur as frequently as the two categories discussed in the previous sections. However, it is a category which is extremely interesting to be explored since it can reflect the power relations between the buyer and the seller in a business talk; to be more exact, it represents at least the interpreter's understanding of the power relations at the specific moment of the interaction. The discussion of the cases will highlight how the interpreter intervenes in the talk and reformulates the utterances of the primary speakers, and how the social situational context reproduces the power relations in the business discourse.

I will first look at the summarized rendition. The following excerpt is quoted from Meeting 5, where Frank, the representative of a Research Institute in the Czech Republic, briefs Lisha on their research in advanced materials. Lisha is the Manager of a Chinese company, a potential business partner working in the same industry. Lee is a freelance interpreter hired by Frank.

M5-Example 12

1   Frank: So, the research areas related to nano are in different application areas, for example, ah, filtration, also um, medical applications, uh, acoustics applications and and many others.

2   Lee: 我们纳米相关的研究的一些领域，是一些不同的应用领域，包括一些医学呀，还有我们的……

(Our research areas include the different application area, including medical, and also…)

3   Lisha: 纳米医药?

(Nano Medicine?)

4　Lee: 对纳米医药，还有一些声学上面的，声学应用方面的啊这些技术，

还有应用。还有过滤，都是我们一些研究的范围。

(Yeah, and also includes the acoustic, acoustic application and technology,

and filtration, these are all our research area.)

5　Lisha: 材料过滤?是本身这个材料的过滤还是……

　　(Material filtration? Is it the filtration of the material or..)

6　Lee: 嗯..材料的过滤？您..

(Filtration of material? You mean…)

7　Lisha: 我是说它是本身的这个材料的过滤吗？

(I mean, is it the filtration of the materials?)

8　Lee: <u>So She actually wants to know more specifically about your research</u>

<u>regarding the filtration. What do you mean by filtration means?</u>

9　Frank: The filtration is based on the nano fibers, nano fiber material.

10　Lee: 就是主要基于这种纤维材料的过滤。

(Mainly the filtration based on nano-fiber.)

11　Lisha: 哦哦，明白了。

(Oh, I got it.)

In this sequence, Lee's renditions were interrupted by Lisha, the Chinese primary speaker, for a couple of times (12-3, 12-7). This leads to single-language exchanges for a few turns between him and the Chinese speaker. In the first overlap, the question raised by the Chinese primary speaker was answered by Lee directly. Lee explains that his behaviour is owing to "the needs to move on with the interpretation", and he believes that "it is pretty long and the question is a piece of known information according to the context and background knowledge I have for the company" (15th Nov, 2018). The interpreter decides for this zero-rendition considering time-economizing reasons. In the next turn, Lisha raises another question which Lee apparently cannot make sense of; therefore, Lee starts this single language exchange with Lisha to clarify on it (12-6, 12-7), which turns Frank into an outsider in this conversation. In turn 12-8, Lee's "summarized rendition" recapitulates the conversation between him and Lisha with expressions like "She

actually wants to know", which explains the why he was having a separate dialogue with Lisha. He also renders Lisha's question as "what you do mean by filtration", which is less specific than Lisha's (12-7). It is actually a summarized version provided by the interpreter when he finds the question of "filtration of material" challenging to understand.

In such a dialogue that is highly technical, interpreting is entirely a demanding activity, especially when the question comes up without any background briefing. On Lee's account, he summarizes the question because he regards it as "the safest way to interpret it. I can't resort to direct translation as it doesn't make sense for me in the first place" (Interview 4, 15th Nov 2018). Based on the interpreter's explanation, we can see that he apparently understands the importance of correct translation of the question. He is also aware that his translation holds the key for the two sides to get the meaning across. To Lee, the direct translation without his reformulation might lead the talk astray, especially in the business dialogue which is highly technical. Here, substitution is employed by the interpreter as a strategy to ensure the conversation being on the right track. The interpreter did not abide by the assumed order of the discourse that constrains him to the conduit-like model of translation. Instead, he flexibly adopts the summarized rendition to convey meaning, which proves to be efficient in the last two turns. Hearing Lee's elaboration on Lisha's question, Frank in turn 12-9 details what he means by filtration, which is what Lisha expects to hear in this sequence of communication.

In this sequence, summarized rendition is an effective strategy adopted by the interpreter to get the meaning across with the maximum accuracy in the business talk. The immediate situational context actually prompted the interpreter to adopt a subject position to render utterance of the primary interlocutor while assessing the process of communication between him and the speaker. His generalization of the meaning aims to accurately convey the messages and intention of the primary speaker generated in the course of interaction. The outcome of the intervention reveals that the interpreter holds the ability to influence the contribution of the primary speakers in the business encounter. With the linguistic resources and the

knowledge of the background of the talk, the interpreter is well situated in a social position to provide summarized renditions in order to smooth the talk and to control the topic development of the interaction.

The next example confirms that summarized renditions can be used as the strategy to summarize the scattered information and convey the key message for the smooth proceeding of the cross-language business talk. The excerpt is quoted from Meeting No.2 between YZ China office and GLN Groups, which is held to promote the cooperation between the British and Chinese enterprises. The meeting is assisted by YZ's in-house interpreter Wendy.

M2-Example 13

1   John: Uh, I also like learn more about <u>Tianfu area and see, uh.. the...</u> because one of the things Britain, we decided this year, we're going to analyse many of the zones around China, because for many British business, <u>very complicated, very difficult to understand.</u> So we'd like to work with…you, and see if we can help make it very clear to UK businesses, <u>what the opportunities might be, what differences, what sectors, what priorities.</u>

2   Wendy: 对，他说他也想了解一些关于那个，天府新区的一些情况。因为，全国很多地方都在做这个自贸区，呃但是….嗯，**就是希望<u>你们帮这些外国人去知道这些，这个区别在哪里</u>，这个自贸区和自贸区之间的区别在哪里**，他们有的时候。

(Yeah, he said he wants to know something related to the Tianfu New Area. Because many parts of the country are working on this Free Trade Zone. But, hmm, actually, we hope that you can <u>help these foreigners to understand the different zones, what is the differences between these zones, they sometimes</u>..)

3   Mr:Deng: 都不一样的……

(<u>They are all different…</u>)

4   John: 他们没有想法，这个东西是什么意思，so to make it <u>much more simple</u>…

(They have no thoughts, this thing means what? So to make it much more simple.)

5   Wendy: 就是说他们怎么去选择，那么所以说我们现在也，正在做的一
        个项目，主要就是说要让他们更，呃就是简明扼要去了解，就是 每
        个区之间的一些特点。区别和机会都在哪儿。

        (He just meant that how they can make a choice. Therefore we are also
        currently doing a project to let them have more simplified explanation
        of the features of different zone, and where opportunities and differences
        lie.)

Let us look at the situational context first. John, in the first turn of this sequence (13-1), states his concern to the complexity of the Free Trade Zones, which is always a reason hindering the British companies from establishing their business presence. We can see that the information provided by John is quite scattered, which can be quite challenging for the interpreter because many of the sentences are incomplete, with subordinations comprising dense parallel information (the underlined part). Beside, the logic links of these sentences are not explicit, which requires specific deduction for a crystal clear interpretation.

If we examine the interpreter's reproduction process in such a textual scenario, it is noticeable that Wendy, with her expertise in the background knowledge of John's intention and expectation, summarizes and restructures the utterance in the next turn (13-2). She also substitutes "British companies" with "help these foreigners to understand". In other words, her subject stance shifts from talking on behalf of the British side to talking about the British side with the Chinese primary speaker. "It was a conscious act as I was talking to the Chinese primary speaker, using such an expression is quite straightforward for both of us, and probably it can also draw more attention to the need to clarify the concept of FTZ" (Interview1，25th Sept, 2018). Based on Wendy's explanation, I could see a shift of her subjective position. Summarizing John's utterance from her perspective, Wendy actually aligns her social and ideological positioning with the Chinese potential partner. Such

141

alignment is potentially brought about by Wendy's cultural identification with the Chinese primary speaker. She tries to relate herself to the audience, Mr.Deng, and constructs a relationship between her and the audience to emphasize her client's question regarding the necessity for further clarification on FTZ system.

As the conversation continues, an overlap occurs in turn 13-3 and 13-4, where Deng and John both interrupt Wendy's rendition to express their views. Deng makes an emphatic expression to repeat what was rendered by Wendy, while John uses the few Chinese words he knows to explicate his concern over the issue raised a moment ago. The Chinese expressions John uses are grammatically correct but colloquially awkward (13-4). Immediately, Wendy claims the next turn (13-5) and produces a summarized rendition of what John said in Chinese as well as a part of his utterance in the first turn. From the audience's perspective, Wendy's summarized rendition here is at an appropriate moment for the situational context, as John will take it as a rendition of what he added while Mr.Deng will consider it a feedback to his emphatic expression. It is also a very good way for this sequence to wrap up, since Wendy actually takes control of the overlapped talk and summarizes all is scattered information into a logically linked rendition. With her social resources— the expertise of YZ's ongoing work, as well as the bilingual resources, Wendy flexibly adopts the strategy to keep the talk on track. Her discursive strategy avoids the presence of scattered and disordered information in the conversation, which is also a good manifestation of the interpreter's power to take control in the interaction with the linguistic and social resources she holds.

The following case studies exemplify the other form of substitution, where the interpreter replaces the words, phrases or even sentences to either adjust the tone of the utterances delivered by primary interlocutors, or to render them into the version which is more culturally acceptable for primary speakers. Let's look at the how interpreters exercise agency in the interaction to change the tone of the primary speakers. Example 14 and Example 15 display how interpreters downplay the tone of the primary speaker by substituting some of the phrases and adjusting sentence patterns in the "original".

M3-Exmaple 14

1 Mr.Long: 它的性能得有保证吧？我买回来这回的目标就是出中子束，但是后面我们还要扩展，但出中子束本身这个是要求的，他肯定是稳定和可靠的吧？

(The performance **must be** guaranteed, right? I bought it for this time to produce the neutron beam, but we will scale up later, but the fundamental requirement is the neutron beam. It **has to be** stable and reliable, right?)

2 Wang: 嗯嗯。

(Hmm hmm.)

3 Mr.Long:不能说是我用了几年或者是在抽查会出现….故障哈?

(It **can't be** that I used it for few years or so and there is a breakdown of the machine right?)

4 Wang: Another thing they **care about** is the convenience of maintenance and smooth operation of the platform, the stability, and the sustainability of the whole system. They will use this accelerator to generate neutron beams. So **they want a highly, uh, stable and reliable system, which they can use for decades.**

5 Mike: That's not a problem.

This quoted sequence shows that there will be moments of intention in a business talk when the content of the discussion is very relevant to the money spent in a project or the quality of the product on purchasing. The interpreter, in such occasions, takes control and shifts to the subject position of a "buffer", to smooth the talk. In this meeting, Mr.Long is the potential buyer of the accelerator manufactured by an American company. The conversation occurs when the Chinese buyer expresses his concern to the reliability and stability of the accelerator his company intends to purchase, a substantial scientific platform which costs a fortune. In such situational context, the interpreter's reformulation process shows how he

perceives the utterance of the Chinese primary speaker and how he adjusts it. We could imagine how the interpreter's client, Mike, would feedback on it if the Chinese primary speaker's utterance is interpreted directly and completely. It is also noticeable the interpreter intervenes to downplay the tone, which potentially aims to avoid the problem that might be induced by the direct translation of the blunt questions raised by the Chinese primary speaker. In turn 14-1 an 14-2, we can perceive from the transcript the strong tone of the Chinese speaker with the repetitive use of questions with modalities such as "must be", "has to be " and "can't be", expressions which are referred by Fairclough (1989) as words with "relational meaning of 'obligation'" (p.183), and are symbolic of the personal authority. On Fairclough's (1989) account, "must" conveys "the personal authority of the speaker", while "have (got) to" implies the "obligation based upon some external compulsion, which may for instance be the rules of an institution" (p.184). In this situational context, the institutions are definitely the two business companies who seek to get a deal done. The modalities dominating Mr.Long's utterance have actually placed Mr.Long in a more powerful position in this conversation, as his company's decision to buy is central to the completion of the deal. Mr.Long's expression with the use of these modalities is actually a way for him to elicit guarantee, at least orally from the American Manufacturer. However, it can easily be identified that in the interpreter's rendition, all these modalities are softened in tone, being replaced by phrases like "they want" "they care about". The questions raised by the Chinese primary speaker are all turn into statements such as "they want a highly, uh, stable and reliable system, which they can use for decades". There expressions definitely sound more pleasant to Mike. He then gives the positive feedback of "That's not a problem".

Wang's intervention in the talk to downplay the tone actually reshapes the power relations in this talk, which softens the tone to make the Chinese primary speaker seem an actor with less power to his client. In the immediate institutional context of business talk and interpreting, Wang's subject position is supposed to be an interpreter who interprets what is said by the primary speakers completely.

However, Wang obviously did not allow this social and situational matrix to constrain him. He steps in with the bilingual and cultural resources in hand to tone down the utterance. He explains the motive for such intervention as:

"I just feel that the tone is too strong, and I assume that the Chinese primary speaker said so not because that he has doubts but only trying to get reassurance from my client. The question is rhetorical instead of substantial" (Interview 3, 20th Oct 2018).

We can see the interpreter's agency based on his decision to step in the talk as a substantial participant, which reconstructs the power relations between the Chinese speaker and his client. The disruption of the conventional order of discourse takes place as the interpreter actually does hold the ability to influence the contributions of the primary speakers by downplaying the authoritativeness of the tone. His intervention and shifts of subject position avoid the potential embarrassment that might otherwise occur.

The following sequence also reveals how the interpreter reformulates the "original" and downplays the tone of the primary interlocutor by rephrasing and changing the sentence pattern. Example 15 is quoted from meeting No.8 in which Linda, the Manager Director of Europe Spa Association, promotes the spa route in European countries to the Chinese travel agency. Chang is assigned to the Chinese client Tim by the translation company she works for full-timely.

M8-Example 15

1   Linda: if you have a bit of luxury segments, luxury clients, to choose
         like Avène, Vichy, big brands, which are known in China, but **nobody**
         knows they are spa cities, using the thermo..
2   Chang: 那……
         (Then…)
3   Linda: **They** think it is only cream on the shelves, **but nobody knows** that they
         are spa cities.
4   Chang: 嗯，那其实呢，<u>我们在中国知道的</u>有一些品牌，比如说是薇姿、

雅漾，它们其实都是那种温泉的城市，那对于如果有想要有这种
奢华感受的客户，人们就会发现，唉，这些品牌不仅仅是在商店里
了，我可以自己去到这些城市去感受它，其实也是一种很好的体
验。

(Hmm, actually, we, in China, know some of the brands, like Vichy,
Avene. They are actually spa cities. If you have clients who want luxury
experience, <u>people will know, oh, these are not only brands in the shops</u>
and I can go to these cities for experience.)

5   Tim: 这是比较新的一个概念，比较新，在中国需要有推广过程，因为老年
人市场为主体，但是就是中国的富人越来越多，啊所以追求体验越越
来越好，这是很好的概念，需要我们去推广去做

(This is a relatively new concept, it is relatively new. It requires a
promoting process in China. Since the elderly people are the major
customer base. But in China the number of rich people multiplies, therefore
they pursue better experience. Good Concept, but it needs our promotion.)

6   Chang: yeah I think it is a very good and new concept for us to promote
because at present in China we have more old people in the market，
and the rich people are getting more and more and so they actually
need..

7   Linda: **Educate them,** they spend money on their health.

8   Chang: 嗯哼是的，他们自己呢也知道要为自己健康去多花一些钱。
(Yeah, they **would understand the need** to spend more money on
their health.)

9   Tim: 是，是的。
(Yeah yeah.)

Linda starts the talk to explain to Tim that the luxury skincare brands like Vichy
and Avène are also famous spa cities (15-1). She uses a negative syntax of "Nobody
knows...", which alludes to the assertion of "people need to know" or "people
would want to know". The negative assertion makes the tone quite authoritative.
This is apparently in line with Linda's goal in the talk. On an overt level, the

situational context is that Linda provides information of the tourism product, while on the covert level, Linda actually tries to promote the uniqueness of the spa cities and emphasizes the potential market opportunities. The power relation is more pronounced in the next turn when she interrupts the interpreter's turn. Linda continues with her promotion using negative phrases "nobody knows" (15-3). As Fairclough (1989) argues, "Power in discourse is to do with powerful participants controlling and constraining the contributions of non-powerful participants" (p.46). Based the transcripts of the first three turns in the conversation, we could perceive that Linda apparently assumes a positioning with more power by adopting the authoritative tone in her utterance. The interpreter then steps in to take control. With her bilingual resource, Chang tones down Linda's utterance and shift it to a positive tone "people will know….I can go" (15-4). Chang's rendition explicates the alluded meaning of the Linda's utterance in a softer tone. Similar interventions also occur in the turns at the closing part of this sequence. In turn 15-5, Tim feedbacks on Linda of his agreement, and he stresses the market demand in China with the information like "in China the number of rich people multiplies, therefore they pursue better experience" And "it needs our promotion". Such remark brings subtle changes to the power differential with the implied meaning of "yes, your program is attractive, but you need our market and our promotion". When Chang claims the next turn to translate, Linda interrupts her again by the end of the rendition to add to Tim's utterance. Linda uses the phrase "Educate them", which can be classified as the "directive speech acts" while giving orders (Fairclough, 1989, p.46), which places Linda in a powerful position once again. Interestingly, the interpreter rephrases Linda's utterance as "they would understand the need" in her rendition, which downplays Linda's authoritative tone into a narrative one. In the interview, the interpreter explains the reason behind the intervention:

> "It might be a move out of instinct or my common sense, because negative sentence makes me feel that the tone is too absolute. I think this is also due to the different convention of language use, Western people are quite

straightforward and Chinese people are more euphemistical" (Interview 6, 30thNov, 2018).

Obviously, the interpreter also considers the cultural appropriateness of the rendition she produces. From my perspective, the phrases used by Linda are also somehow quite abrupt if translated directly, such as "educate", if we translate it into "教育" (educate)，it has a sense of authority, which represents the absolute power differential between people, particularly in China. The Chinese equivalent of "educate" is always used in the situational context of schools or teacher-and-student scenario. It is used to describe someone with an institutional status in the educational system, which is largely discrepant from our immediate context of the dialogue. The interpreter is apparently aware of this discrepancy. Therefore she produces a version which conveys the key message of the "original" but in a softer tone.

Based on the analysis of this sequence above, I would argue that the interpreter is the person who holds the power to balance the power relations in the talk. The interpreter's rendition is the basis for the primary interlocutors to understand the intention of one and other in a business discourse. Disrupting the norms of complete and accurate translation in the context of business dialogue, the interpreter holds the ability to gate-keep the talk by putting constraints to the understanding as well as the contributions of the primary interlocutors. She assumes this subject position due to the fact that she is the only one who is bilingual and bicultural in this discourse practice. The interpreter's power manifests itself in her disruption of the discourse order. Assuming a substantial subject position, the interpreter actively engages in the power struggle of the primary speakers. Her awareness of the cultural appropriateness in this situational context enables her exercise of agency, through which she substantially imposes the influence to the power relations in the discourse of the business negotiation. Her intervention is also potentially related to her employment relations with the Chinese client, who she also shares the same cultural background and identified culturally with. In a way,

toning down the foreign speaker's authoritative tone can avoid the potential embarrassment for a more relaxing or friendly atmosphere for the business talk.

Example 16 is a case where the interpreter rephrases the Chinese interlocutor's utterance and orients it culturally towards the Swiss client. The interpreter bridges the gap culturally for the understanding of the primary interlocutors with the exercise of her agency.

M9-Example 16

1 Hui: 我是这样，我介绍一下我自己，我本身呢，就是我有几个事情在做首先我本身自己是有一个公司做一些工业产品。

(It is like this, I would like to introduce myself first. For I myself, actually I have several things doing at the same time. Firstly I myself have a company and make some industrial products.)

2 Fion: 工业产品？

(Industrial product?)

3 Hui: 是, 我们的这个产品其实是的，我是瑞士军刀的一个专家。

(Yea, Our product is actually, I am an expert of Swiss Army Knife.)

4 Fion: 瑞士军刀？ (Swiss Army Knife?)

5 Hui: 对。其实在瑞士的话,瑞士军刀领域也是比较出名的……这次瑞士工业产业园，瑞士的<u>西南领事馆</u>把我邀请过来想入驻这边，然后我在这边身份其实是<u>**瑞士文化的一个宣传的一个点**</u>。他们会在这儿修一个私人博物馆。

(Yes. In fact, in Switzerland, the Swiss Army Knife is also relatively famous...This time, the Swiss industrial park, the Southwest Consulate of Switzerland invited me to come here and to settle here, then my<u> identity here is actually a point of promotion for Swiss culture.</u>)

6 Fion: Actually, I have many jobs. First of all, I have a company which focuses on industrial products. By the way. I am also an expert in Swiss Army Knife, the military knife. So actually, I'm very famous in this area. And the Swiss Consulate invited me to come here. So I am actually **<u>like a</u>**

cultural ambassador here to promote Swiss culture, through my business. We will build a private museum here.

7   Elin: That's interesting!

Hui is a Social Media influencer, and he owns a Switzerland-based Chinese company. In the beginning of this sequence (16-1), he tries to introduce his business to Elin, the representative of a Swiss company. Fion, the interpreter, is hired by Ein to assist the talk. It can be seen that Fion actually claims the turn for clarification twice in this sequence (16-3, 16-4)，the reason is described by Fion as "I would like to check the information is correct as it seems belonging to a different industry as opposed to my client's" (Interview 7, 25th, June, 2019). Upon clarification, Hui also adds information such as "I am an expert of Swiss Army Knife" (16-3), "a point of promotion" phrases which make his identity quite authoritative and complicated. The implied meaning can be assumed as "I have resources", or "my company is quite resourceful".

In 16-6, Fion produces a summarized-rendition of Hui's utterances in which she integrates the most relevant information. Noticeably, Fion also replaces "a point of promotion for Swiss culture" with the sentence "I am actually like a cultural ambassador here to promote Swiss culture", which makes it easier for her Client Elin to understand. "I adjusted it as I don't think the close translation fit into the cultural understanding of my client, as in western culture the connotation is similar to that of an envoy, an ambassador of culture" (Interview 7, 25thJune, 2019). In Chinese, especially colloquial language it is acceptable to say "My identity is a point" in this context. However, the discrepancy grammatically and culturally makes it an awkward phrase in English, which the interpreter is apparently aware of. If we look at the situational context from the covert level, it is also perceptible that Hui uses all these expressions in his utterance to appeal to Elin. The interpreter's intervention successfully constructs this appealing image of Hui to her client in a culturally acceptable way. Breaking the conventional and ideal norms of interpreting, the interpreter steps in and promotes the positive image of the Chinese interlocutors, which is well-received from Elin's perspective (16-7).

4.5 Discussion

In this chapter, based on the data collected from ten naturally-occurring interpreted business meetings, I have drawn upon Fairclough's (1989) CDA theories and framework in combination with Wadensjö's (1998) rendition categories to investigate the interpreter's subjective positioning and its influence on the power relations in BNI. Based on Fairclough's (1989) argument of "Power in discourse is to do with powerful participants controlling and constraining the contributions of non-powerful participants" (p.46), I have considered business interpreting as a discursive practice, and the interpreter's exercising of agency is defined as the interactional power to put constraints on the understanding and contributions of the primary interlocutors.

As illustrated in the above examples, the interpreter's power manifests itself mainly in three categories of renditions to which they hold the sole producing right. The "scarce resource" of the interpreter in the discourse includes the bilingual ability, the professional skills and their sensitivities to the social, and situational context. This has endowed the interpreter with the power to disrupt the conventional order of discourse where the interpreter is a conduit or detached person. The "holding of resource" is not only manifested in the interpreter's bilingualism, but is also evident in the interpreter's biculturalism, which can be unpacked as the interpreter's understanding of the institutional culture and the backdrop of the business negotiation; their knowledge of the profiles of both companies and the relation-building liaison process of both companies. This situates the interpreter in a very critical place in the negotiation, which endows the interpreter with the expertise of the appropriateness (both culturally and situationally) of the utterance she produces in the discourse. Such ability could be described as the "interactional power" within the business context. The interpreter, with the interactional power, actually reconstructs the discourse and its order, in which they shift their subject positions as a substantial participant or as the ally of the primary interlocutors. As the interpreter exercises their agency in the discourse, the interpreter reformulates

the primary speaker's utterance with three different strategies: addition, omission, and substitution. Instead of transferring information completely as an invisible or detached agent, interpreters in the highly dynamic business settings assumed the role of a gatekeeper, who controls the flow of information, adjusts the tone of the speakers to ensure the situational and cultural appropriateness of the rendition. Meanwhile, taking the subject position of a spokesmen of their clients, interpreters also offer suggestions or engage substantially to promote the product or to speak for the company. The agency exercised clearly transcends the description of the idealized role of the interpreter as mere invisible persons or conduits that are prevalent in various versions of codes of conducts designed by professional bodies, which brings changes to the power relations of the business discourse.

CHAPTER 5　CDA Analysis of the Interpreter's Power

Manifested in Shifts of Footing

The previous chapter explores how the power of the interpreter manifests itself in the discursive practice of interpreting within the business context based on the discrepancies identified in interpreters' renditions compared to the primary speakers' utterances. As the study shows, the interpreter functions as a "coordinator" (Wadensjö, 1998, p.105) with the power to break the assumed order of the discourse. As mentioned in the previous chapter, business negotiation interpreting is considered a discursive practice. The power of the interpreter derives from their holding of the bi-cultural and bi-lingual resource, which manifests itself in the mediating moves conducted by the interpreter in the discursive practice.

According to Foucault (1977), "discourse transmits and produces power" (p.100), which implies that discourse produces, reinforces, but also potentially undermines, and exposes power. On Foucault's (1977) account, discourse is the carrier of power, which brings power everywhere in society. It is considered to be a form of social practice in which the social identity and social relations are formed and constituted. In other words, in every discursive practice, there exists a "dialectical relationship" which "contributes to the shaping and reshaping of social structures" (Jorgensen and Philips, 2002, p.62). In the context of business interpreting, the interpreter plays a visible and active role in which he/she "exercises agency within interaction, in order to bridge a communication gap" (Angelelli, 2004, p.76). The interpreter not only facilitates the conversation linguistically, but also regulates and mediates the talk, which potentially leads to a change of the social positioning and reshapes the assumed order or discursive relations in the discourse. With a CDA perspective, I intend to explore the evidence of interpreters' intervention in the business talk by shifting their footings while engaging with the primary interlocutors based on their understanding of the context and the interpersonal relations in the course of the business negotiation.

All interpreters were interviewed after the assignment by the author to

explore their perceptions of their performance and their awareness of the shifting of positions in the discourse of BNI. The data analysis is based on the transcripts of the naturally occurring sequences of the interpreted business encounters, with the source text and the interpreter's renditions presented in a parallel format.

5.1 Analytical Framework

Fairclough (1992) argues that "Every instance of language use is a communicative event consisting of three dimensions (p.73):

-it is a *text* (speech, writing, visual image or a combination of these);

-it is a *discursive practice* which involves the production and

consumption of texts; and

-it is a *social practice*.

Similar to chapter 4, the framework for analysis in this section draws on Fairclough's (1989) three-dimensional model of description, interpretation, and explanation. As Fairclough (1989) proposes, "a close analysis of texts in terms of such features can contribute to our understanding of power relations and ideological processes in discourse" (p.109). Following his approach, I intend to examine the textural features at the grammatical level and specifically focus on the relational value of personal pronoun changes introduced by interpreters in their renditions compared to the original texts produced by the primary interlocutors. I will mainly focus on the shifts of personal pronouns and use of reported speech identified in interpreters' renditions, because according to Fairclough (1989), the choice between pronouns "is tied in with relationships of power and solidarity" (p.127) in a discourse. Examining the textual features of the interpreter's rendition on the grammatical level, such as the shifts of the pronouns, I intend to reveal how and why interpreters adjust their social positioning in relation to their clients and primary interlocutors within the business context.

To highlight the interactive nature of the discursive practice of the business interpreting, I also draw on Goffman's (1981) theory of "production format" (p.144) to explore the speaker-hearer relations in this discourse. As mentioned in the Methodology chapter, Goffman's production format provides several examples of

the dynamic and ever-changing relationships between the participants of the conversation. The distinction between the "animator", the "author" and the "principal" is closely relevant to the performance of interpreters (p.144). This is because that the interpreter's responsibility in dialogue interpreting is to "animate in a second language the ideas and position of others" (Metzger, 2014, p.331), which means that the interpreter may take substantive positions and engage in the interactional process.

To perform the task, the interpreter may shift back and forth between these three roles ("animater", "author" and "principal"). They may at times animate the words of one primary speaker or another, while voicing their own position or ideas in the circumstance of explanation of something related to the interpreting process. Shifting between these three roles will inevitably trigger the change of the interpreter's "footing", which is defined by Goffman (1981) as "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" (p.128). This can be reflected by the interpreter's use of personal pronouns or direct and indirect speech as the subsequent speaker to the primary speaker. Therefore, to examine the interpreter's mediating role in dialogue interpreting, the interpreter's choice of personal pronouns and direct or indirect speech in response to the primary speaker offer a useful perspective.

In this study, I have considered the interpreting practice as a discursive practice. In addition to the interpersonal relations between the interpreter and the others, I also examine the change of the order of discourse, the assumed conventional order of the discourse, which provides the cornerstone for us to explore the interpreter's agency and shifts in subject position in this dynamic process. Professional interpreters are always trained to use the first person pronoun when performing an interpreting assignment. As argued by Tannen (1989, p.89), the professional interpreter is expected to adhere to the principle of "direct reported speech", which means the direct form of reporting. For example, when the primary party says, "I would like to know more about your business scope", the interpreter

155

will render it as "I would like to know more about your business scope", without changing the subject employed by the primary speaker. Tannen's argument is also echoed by Torikai (1998, p.263), who believes that the interpreter should use the first-person pronoun to align with the primary speakers so that the renditions of the interpreter will be regarded as the speaker's stance instead of the interpreter's own stance. It is also a golden standard in the training of interpreters in China as well as the U.K., where the research subjects of this study receive their interpreting training. However, the data analysis in this research shows that professionally trained interpreters at times deviate from this norm of interpreting by:

1) changing first personal pronouns or second personal pronouns into the first-person plural;

2) changing the first or second personal pronouns to the third personal pronoun;

3) changing the personal pronouns "I, he, she" to reported speech prefaced by "he said, or she said".

As business dialogue interpreting is an interactive discursive practice in a specific social context, the pronoun shifts adopted by interpreters reflect, to a certain extent, how they approach the inter-personal relations in the business encounters. The use of personal pronouns in the discourse is considered by Fairclough (1989) as "grammatical features of texts which have relational values" (p.125). This has implications for our understanding of the shifts of the pronouns in interpreters' renditions, which are based on the understanding of their positioning in relation to the others and the situational context of interactive discourse in dyadic or multi-party business encounters. It shows evidence of the interpreter's agency in the discursive practice, which mostly derives from their holding of bilingual and bicultural resources in the discourse.

In this study, I have identified from the transcripts of the naturally occurring interpreted business meetings that interpreters change the personal pronouns adopted by their clients and primary interlocutors on many occasions. Such shifts of footing unveil how they situate themsleves socially in relation to the client and

primary interlocutors in the business interaction.

Like the preceding study chapter, the analysis from a CDA perspective follows the four layers of situational context steps proposed by Fairclough's (1989, p.146) to examine the content, the subject, and the relations in the discourse. The analysis unveils how the interpreter's power manifests itself when the interpreter intervenes in the business talk by shifting their social positioning. The examination of the data will present evidence to prove that interpreters sometimes has the privilege to break the norms of adhering to the primary interlocutor's use of personal pronouns, a shared fiction of the interpreter's professionalism. Such disruption of the norms is a salient manifestation of the interpreter's power in the interaction. In fact, by doing so, the interpreter may even function as public relation official who ties to remove any potential confusions and communicative inadequacy to facilitate and smooth the proceeding of the business talk.

5.2 Mediation through Personal Pronoun Shifts

The analysis of the data recorded shows that interpreters change the personal pronouns used by the primary speakers at different frequencies. The analysis is made at a turn level, where the primary speaker's utterance is followed by the interpreter's rendition with the aim to closely examine the discrepancy of the pronouns used by the interpreter and the primary speaker in BNI. Taking advantage of my presence in the meetings, I managed to interview the interpreters after the meetings to investigate if they were aware of the shifts and explore the reasons behind the shifts.

5.2.1 Shifts to the First Plural Personal Pronoun and Second Personal Pronoun

In the following cases, interpreters align themselves with primary speakers by introducing the personal pronoun shifts from first-person singular pronoun to first-person plural or second person pronoun.

Example 1 is a B2B meeting that occurred after a tourism forum. The interpreter, Chang, holds an MA degree of Conference Interpreting and is professionally trained in the U.K. She is a full-time interpreter working with an

interpreting agency that provides the service for the meeting. The Managing Director, Adam, from a Switzerland-based Hospitality Group, is having a meeting with Tim, the manager of the Chinese travel agency, for the first time. Adam has introduced his company, and he is seeking information about the demands and requirements of the Chinese travel agency. The Chinese company provided feedback on the services offered by Adam's company and engaged in further conversation by raising some questions regarding the hotels.

M7-Example 1

1   Adam: About groups, and how does <u>he</u> book his group? Does he have groups to Switzerland?

2   Chang: 噢，那<u>您</u>是如何去预定这种团队？<u>您</u>在那个瑞士有团队吗？

(Oh, how did <u>you</u> book your group? Do <u>you</u> have groups in Switzerland?)

3   Tim: 有，<u>他</u>那个酒店嗯整个标准，啊包括这个整个分布的位置应该还算比较适合于，就是说旅游。嗯，<u>我</u>之前呢，通过当地旅行社预订的，<u>我</u>想了解一下，就是就是<u>他</u>这一块的话,之前有没有接过相关中国旅游团，然后包括价格这一块大概是多少？

(Yes, I have. <u>His</u> hotels' standard, including the locations, are relatively suitable for tourism. Before, I actually book through the local agencies. I would like to know, did his company receive any of the Chinese tourism groups? And what is the price roughly?)

4   Chang: Hmm huh

5   Tim: 对，旅游团这个价格

(Yes, the price for the package tour.)

6   Chang: Hmm huh

7   Chang: And <u>**we**</u> found that your location is suitable for <u>**our business,**</u>

8   Adam: Yes

9   Chang: your location of the hotel. And before <u>**we**</u> contact the local agencies.

10   Adam: yes

11   Chang: to help <u>us</u> to book the hotel.

12   Adam: yes

13   Chang: And so **<u>we</u>** are wondering, uh, do you have received the Chinese group

       before? And what about the price?

14   Adam: Yes, I mean, **we** have we have many many Chinese groups in

       Switzerland from China. And we are also working with ***, Justjust

       show you one thing you see,I am working with ** and I am working

       with C-trip, ok so it is data connectivity to my reservation system,

       and **<u>we</u>** have so many so many Chinese groups in Switzerland

15   Chang: 嗯哼是就是接接待过很多旅行团了，然后像这像这些，然后还有

       这个，都都是<u>他们的</u>这个合作伙伴，(指向册子。)

       (huh hmm, received many tourist groups, and like this and these, and

       this, is<u>their</u> business partners.) (pointing at the booklet)

16   Tim: 嗯嗯，明白。

       (hmmm, understood.)

Interestingly, primary speakers on both sides consider the interpreter a ratified and substantial participant of the conversation, as they both use third person pronoun "he" to refer to each other while directing the questions to the interpreter (1-1, 1-3). The interpreter changes the third personal pronoun to the second person pronoun "you" in her rendition (1-2), which gives a sense that the Swiss primary speaker is speaking directly to the Chinese primary speaker. Moreover, the interpreter also uses "we" instead of "I" when she translates the utterances of her Chinese client in turns 1-7, 1-9, 1-11, 1-13, and she also uses an additional possessive pronoun "our" in turn 1-7. When Adam goes on in turn 1-14 to answer the questions Chinese speaker's questions, Chang shifts the pronoun "we" to the third plural personal pronoun "they" (turn 1-15) to distance herself from the Swiss interlocutor. The shifts are strikingly fascinating to witness. According to the professional norms of interpreting, the interpreter is supposed to follow the personal pronouns used by the primary interpreter. If we look at the data closely, it is obvious that the interpreter

shifts "I" (我) to "We" and "Our" (我们). The use of the personal pronoun "we" and possessive pronoun "our" (我们的) has the relational value, which denotes a meaning of inclusiveness referring to both the interpreter and her Chinese client, the person she interprets for.

On Fairclough's (1989) account, using pronouns with the sense of inclusiveness "is making an implicit authority claim", which shows that the speaker "has the authority to speak for others" (p.128). Such intervention is a prime example of the interpreter's exercising of agency in the interaction between the client and the primary speaker. It shows that the interpreter's decision-making process is based on the situational context of this discourse and the subject position she adopts exceeds a mere linguistic transmitter who is entirely neutral. The interpreter obviously identifies herself as a member or the Chinese company representative instead of only a linguistic facilitator who works in the conduit mode. Rather than directly translating the primary speakers' utterances, the interpreter speaks for her client by aligning herself with him, and the rendition produced by the interpreter does show that the interpreter places herself in a position with the "implicit authority" to convey the interest of her client to the Swiss interlocutor. Her subject position shifts from an "animator" to an "author", and she not only animates the words of her client and primary speaker but also voices her own position and the alignment with her client by explaining her client's interest. The act of speaking on behalf of her client actually shows that the interpreter holds the autonomy to her own subject position in the discourse. Her decision-making process while producing the rendition is at times subject to the situational context, the employment relationship, and the aim of interpersonally and socially appropriateness within the business context.

The follow-up interview confirmed my hypothesis of why the interpreter changes the personal pronoun in her renditions. The interpreter Chang explains that because she was assigned by her company to the Chinese company, she met the Chinese client first place before the foreign company came to join them at the table (Interview 5, 23rd November, 2018). The Chinese company executive also explained

to her the aim of the meeting and the services they are provide before the meeting, which made her feel obliged to introduce the changes of the personal pronoun "we" in her rendition. Besides, the interpreter (Interview 5, 23rd November, 2018) also felt quite awkward when both parties seemed to address her directly in their renditions by using "he" or "his" to refer to each other (1-1, 1-3). Therefore, she tends to introduce the second person pronoun to direct the remarks directly to the primary speakers, and shifts "I" to "we" in the following turns (1-7, 1-9, 1-13) to let the primary parties feel they are the negotiating entities. Interestingly, the Swiss primary participant follows the personal perspective used by the interpreter and starts to speak to the Chinese speaker directly (as could be seen in 1-14). According to the interpreter, she is not sure why these shifts occurred, but she assumes that it is because shedoes not want the client to talk to her directly. She explains that she wants to create the atmosphere where "it is they two who are talking about the business" and all the information she translates "is provided by the primary speakers instead of myself, therefore the pronoun *'we' instead of 'I' gives a feeling of speaking from a company's perspective.*" (Interview 5, 23rdNovember, 2018).

Interestingly, the interpreter seemed to align herself only with her client rather than with both parties in this sequence, which again shows the inevitable influence of the employment relations on the interpreter's subject position. The interpreter's consideration reflects her understanding of the situational context in a business context and the social boundaries of their role. The interpreter's power is manifested in her act to adjust her social positioning in the talk. She mediates the conversation by regulating the distance between her client and the Swiss primary participant based on her assessment of the context. Though the interpreter breaks the norms of direct translation of the personal pronouns of the primary interlocutors, she does successfully "sustains the definition of the encounter" (Wadensjö, 1998, p.105), a business talk where both parties should engage with each other when expressing interest or making enquiries.

The following example is extracted from the same meeting. As the conversation continues, a similar type of personal pronouns shift is introduced by

the interpreter.

M7-Example 2

1   Adam: Which, which destination does**he** go in Switzerland?

2   Chang: <u>您</u>在瑞士的话一般都是去哪些地方？

　　　　(Where do you go in Switzerland?)

3   Tim: 瑞士一般是去..嗯琉森，或者英特拉肯，苏黎世..

　　　　(Switzerland, normally Lucerne, or Interlaken, Zurich..)

4   Adam: yeah, Lucerne and Interlaken.

5   Chang: And Zurich

6   Adam: Zurich. Yes. In Lucerne, <u>**we**</u> used this hotel. There are three or four-star

　　　　hotels <u>**he**</u> uses?

7   Chang: 嗯那您使用的是三星级还是四星级的酒店呢？

　　　　(hmm, do you book for three-star hotels or four-star hotels?)

8   Tim: 瑞士段一般三星四星都会有，所以<u>我刚刚说他</u>那个酒店还是比较符

　　　　合旅游团的这方面需要的。

　　　　(In Switzerland both three and four star, so <u>I</u> just mentioned <u>his</u> hotel

　　　　is suitable for the demand of the package tour.)

9   Chang: <u>We </u>use both three or four stars, so <u>we</u> think **yours** is suitable for <u>our</u>

　　　　demand.

10   Adam: Yeah, <u>it is a very good</u>, I mean **he** can just request the groups here, and

　　　　we give **him** an answer within two hours

11   Chang: <u>您</u>就可以去联系他，然后<u>他们</u>两个小时之内然后就可以给您回复，

　　　　如果<u>您</u>有这种团队的需要的话。

　　　　(**You** can contact him, and they within two hours can give you reply

　　　　if **you** have the demand from this kind of package tour)

12   Tim: 嗯。

　　　　(Hmm.)

Adam, the Swiss primary speaker, again addresses the interpreter directly by using
the third-person pronoun (1-1, 1-6). Similar to the preceding example, the
interpreter introduces the second person pronoun to redirect the questions. The

Chinese client makes comments on the hotels of the Swiss supplier by using the reported speech "I mentioned" (1-8), and the interpreter translates it as "we think yours" in the next turn. The interpreter again aligns herself with her client and shifts to the first plural personal pronoun to speak as a company representative. When asked the reason for this shift, the interpreter (Interview 5, 23rdNovember, 2018) explains that she believes "the aim of this business talk is to find some common grounds" in the business scope of both companies. By using the possessive pronoun to represent the company, the interpreter tries to create a better interactive atmosphere for both parties to understand that they are having this conversation on behalf of their companies. It can be argued that the interpreter may wish to "signal the commonality of the purpose" (Merlini and Favaron, 2005, p.279) with her client through the use of the first plural pronoun.

Interestingly, when the interpreter conveys the Swiss speaker's utterance to her client in the last turn (2-11), she again opts for the second personal pronoun "you", instead of adhering to the third personal pronoun "he". Obviously, the interpreter realizes that the Swiss speaker is talking to her directly other than her client. To let her client feel the questions is actually posed by the Swiss speaker and to set the business ongoing conversation between the two primary speakers, the interpreter shifts her social positioning again by talking to her client on behalf of the Swiss interlocutor.

Again, the interpreter breaks the order of the discourse and shifts her footing as an "author" in this excerpt. She opts for the subject position of a company representative and adjusts the social distance between her client and the Swiss primary speaker in the business discourse. The social-positioning adopted by her clarifies that it is the utterance of the company instead of her own ideas, which avoids the possible confusion that might arises from direct translation of the personal pronoun.

The following excerpts are from a multi-party business meeting in Chengdu (M2 shown in Table 1). It further explicates how the interpreter brings the interlocutors closer by introducing personal pronoun shifts. Wang is a freelance

163

interpreter hired by Mr.Meng, the host of the meeting. The latter recommends the American facility supplier to their potential Chinese user/buyer of the equipment produced in America. It is a multi-party meeting before a public tendering process for the user and buyer to be better informed about each other. Mr.Long, the Chinese company director, together with his two engineers (Mr.Li and Mr.Sun), came to meet Mike, Steve, and two other Chinese staff representatives of the American accelerator supplier for a discussion on issues related to the technology as well as the prices.

Example 3 is a case that reflects how the interpreter shifts his social positioning by introducing the changes of personal pronouns.

M3-Example 3

1   Mike: So now specifically to talk about the system **we**'re proposing for **you**, this is a 1.7 megavolt accelerator with the single ion source that we call it tau, this has one high energy beamline.

2   Wang: One what?

3   Mike: One high beamline

4   Wang: 嗯嗯，那我，我现在给大家介绍一下，准备给**咱们**的这个系统。这个加速器呢，它的那个最大的电量电压是 1.7 兆伏，那么它是一个单离子源的一个加速器。那么它有一个嗯高能的嗯….束流线。

(Hmmm, now I, I would like to make some introductions. The accelerator being provided to **us**, its maximum voltage is one point seven megavolt, and it is a single ion source accelerator. It has a high energy beamline.)

5   Mike: And uh, so you see this type of system is also modular, because in the future, you can also expand it to add a second ion source, and more high energy beamlines if you decide to do future experiments.

6   Wang: 那这个系统呢，它也是模块化了，它可以允许**咱们**以后哈，为了扩展**我们的**这个产能也好，或者应用也好，可以**我们**可以增加，增

加第二个，第二个高能的嗯束流线，都可以。

(And the system is also modular, it can allow **us,** in the future to expand **our** capacity or application. It also enables **us** to add a second, second ion source. Both are possible.

7   Mike: This type of accelerator we have sold and manufactured and sold approximately fifty times

8   Wang: 像这这种，这种机器哈，我们大概已经卖出了有大概有 50 台。

(Like this, this type of machines, we have already sold roughly 50 times.)

Mike introduces the equipment they want to sell to the Chinese users in turn 3-1 by using first-person plural pronoun. While Wang interprets Mike's statement, he follows Mike's first-person perspective. But Wang changes "for you" (给你) to "for us" (给咱们), a pronoun in Chinese which explicitly includes the person who is addressing and addressed. Similar shifts also occur in his rendition of the primary speaker in turn 3-6 where all the second personal pronouns are rendered into the first personal plural pronoun "we" (咱们 or 我们). The interpreter was actually sitting closer to the American clients; however, in his renditions in this sequence, he aligns himself with the Chinese interlocutors on the other side of the table, and opts to not only report his American client's message but also recapitulates the rendition to include himself in the utterance as if he is a member of the Chinese company.

Adopting the alignments, the interpreter breaks the norms of a direct interpretation of the personal pronouns used by the primary speaker, which highlights his presence and his alignment with the Chinese speakers in the interaction. Similar to "我们"（we），the Chinese person pronoun "咱们" (we) has a sense of inclusiveness. The slight difference is that "咱们"（we）includes the person who is at the receiving side of the information, while "我们" (we) only includes the interpreter and the person they interprets for. Besides, it originates from the dialect spoken in the Northern area of China, mainly used in colloquial language with a strong sense of affability and friendliness. Therefore, it not only intensifies the sense of inclusiveness in the client's utterance by situating the interpreter in a

social position very close to the Chinese primary participants, but also creates a casual and pleasant atmosphere for the discourse. The interpreter opts to assume the footing of an "author" to talk as if he is a member of the Chinese side, which clearly breaks the norm of direct translation. As he actually represents the American client, the shift of footing also, to a certain extent, brings his client closer to the Chinese primary, because the pronoun emphasizes the membership and interconnection between the two negotiating parties.

In the follow-up interview, when asked why such changes occurred in his translation, Wang (Interview 2, 15thOctober, 2018) explains that it is a conscious move to change the personal pronoun. He believes that shifting to the pronouns of "我们" (we) or the informal person pronoun "咱们" (we) can shorten the social distance between two primary speakers, which ensures the highly technical exchange to proceed in a more casual atmosphere as expected by his client. The shifts of footing unveil that the interpreter exercises agency in the business discourse, which enables him to adjust not only his own social positioning but also that of the primary interlocutors. Such moves showcase the interpreter's ability to provide linguistic service with his expertise in interpersonal relations. In other words, the interpreter almost functions as a public relation official who holds the resource of bilingualism and biculturalism in the discourse to manage the talk and eliminate the potential awkwardness caused by communicative inadequacy.

5.2.2 Shifts to Third Personal Pronoun

The shifs of personal pronouns to the third-person perspectivealso occur in the data collected. In such cases, the primary interlocutors typically use the first-person or second-person pronoun, singular or plural, which is then translated by the interpreter in the following turn into a third-person pronoun. In Goffman's theory (1981, p.128), interpreters function as an "author" on such occasions, which means that they are responsible not only for the rendering of content but also the form of the utterance. Interpreters narrate the intended message of primary speakers while keeping their own identities by separating themselves from primary interlocutors.

The interpreter does not work as a "talking machine" (Mertzger, 2014, p.331) in such cases; instead, they break the norms of the discourse and changes the forms of the utterances through footing shifts.

The interviews with interpreters show that the reasons behind such changes differ as the situation varies; however, the present research shows that the primary reason for the occurrences of such shifts is related to interpreters' understanding of the addressing and the addressed party.

M3-Example 4

1   Mr.Li: 我想问一下，出厂的时候，那边可不可以做一些中子测试？

        (I want to ask when it is delivered, is it possible to do some neutron test?)

2   Wang: In the acceptance of testing , can <u>we</u> do some neutron testing?

3   Mike: Yeah, definitely at <u>your</u> facility, we can.

4   Wang: <u>在咱们的, 咱们的</u>工厂里边可以做。

        (yea, in our, our factory, it can be done.)

5   Mr.Li: 啊对，<u>我们</u>肯定要做。

        (Yes, we will definitely do it on our site.)

6   Wang: 啊，如果<u>他们</u>这边，NEC 这边，是吧？

        (Oh, on their NEC's site?)

7   Mr.Li: 对。

        (Yes.)

8   Wang: <u>They</u> want to do the neutron testing at <u>your</u> site.

9   Mike: <u>We</u> have done that in the past before. We may be able to do it. At slightly reduced beam currents, uhh beam energies. Because we do not have   the nuclear facility, or good radiation shielding for this type of experiments.

10   Wang: 过去呢<u>我们</u>做过这种，但是现在因为我们没有一些相应的放射的放射源了，所以说嗯…做的话那个束流能量可能会将有有一点点降低。(In the past, we have done this, but now we do not have the related radiation source facility. If we do it, the energy of the beam

current will be reduced.)

In Example 4, the Chinese engineer Mr.Li raises a question (4-1) regarding the neutron test before delivering the equipment, which is an essential requirement for Health and Safety Standard. However, he does not mention at which site the neutron test should be conducted. In the interpreter's rendition of the question (4-2), he adds the personal perspective of "we", which is responded by Mike immediately as "at your facility, we can". The interpreter continues to use the possessive pronoun "咱们的" (our) to explain the location of the test, while the Chinese user responds that is the test is definitely a must on the Chinese side. The interpreter then picks up that the Chinese client is indicating if the location of the test can be in America, therefore, in turn (4-8), he retranslated the question using possessive third person pronoun "their NEC site" to clarify and confirm the issues with the Chinese client. Then the interpreter shifts to the third-person plural pronoun "they" and the second-person possessive pronoun "your" to clarify the Chinese client's intention.

We can perceive that the interpreter opts for the third personal pronoun in turn 4-6 and 4-8. Distancing himself from the client, the interpreter chooses to report the utterance of the Chinese primary speaker. In the course of the meeting, he changes his footing to ensure that the positions of his client and the Chinese interlocutor are clarified. The interpreter potentially realizes the problem regarding the neutron test location (4-5, 4-6, 4-7), which is an essential piece of information in this business tug of war. He thus mediates the talk by shifting to the third personal pronoun to clarify the question regarding the location of the neutron test, taking on the role of an "author". However, in turn 4-10, the interpreter again shifts his footing, and follows the personal perspective used by the primary speaker. Notably, the interpreter is well aware of the norms of interpreting, and he is trying to abide by the norms and keep his identity and subject position as a professional interpreter.

In the post-assignment interview, the interpreter (Interview 2, 15[th]October, 2018) explains that he discovered that the Chinese side didn't initially specify that they wanted to do the test in America upon delivery; as a result, he decided to use the third personal pronoun to clarify the issue concerning the sites of the neutron

test. "I think it is more accurate to translate into 'they want to do the test on your side' to clarify the user's question actually lies in the location of the test" (Interview 2, 15th October, 2018). This case shows that the interpreter changes his footing based on his understanding of "who is talking and who is being addressed" (Zhan, 2012, p.201). Realizing the issues discussed are quite subtle and important for the ongoing business negotiation, the interpreter adjusts his footing and opts to report the utterance of his client in the following conversation. Such case is a good reflection of how the interpreter functions as a gate-keeper (Davidson, 200, p.379), who holds power to gate-keep the conversation. The interpreter tries to avoid any potential confusion while considering the seller-buyer relations in the business discourse. After all, the discussion in this example is involved with concrete details of the cooperative contract, which is of primary importance for the parties on both sides of the negotiating table. The interpreter evidently takes all these parameters into consideration when he makes the intervening moves.

Example 5 is another prime example of how the interpreter introduces the personal pronoun changes based on his assessment of the situational context of the business talk. The following sequences occur following a lengthy technical Q&A session, in which the Chinese users make some detailed queries of the accelerator they intend to purchase. The American seller finally gets a chance to listen to the Chinese buyer's feedback on the deal.

M3-Example 5

1   Mr.Long:是这样的，首先<u>我，我</u>现在场地都还没有,对吧..

(It is like this, first <u>I, I</u> now do not have a venue, right?)

2   Wang: Currently, <u>they</u> don't even have a site for, for the accelerator.

3   Mike: OK, Hmmmhuh

4   Mr.Long: 所以我们现在是通过我们的加速器的这个构造来<u>反推我们的土建</u>…是吧…这是第一…

(So, we are now through the structure of the accelerator, to calculate the size of the factory, right? This is the first issue.)

5   Wang: So <u>they</u> want to first know about this accelerator's structure and then
       they will know what kind of earthwork <u>they</u> have to do..

6   Mike: hmmm

7   Mr.Long: 摆放要合理嘛对吧？要摆得下嘛…

         (Put it in a reasonable place is a must, right? It needs to be
         accommodated properly..)

8   Wang: To ensure very good placement, the installation…

9   Mike: OK, OK.

10   Mr.Long: 这是第一个。第二个呢就是刚才**我们这边的同事**也问了很多细
         节的问题。第一是加速器性能指标能不能达到我们的要求，这
         个首先通过两位代表专家的这个给我们的讲解，啊我们认为是
         满足我们要求的，这是肯定的。

         (This is the first. The second is just now <u>our colleagues</u> asked a lot of
         detailed questions. First is about the performance of the accelerator
         can hit our standard. Through the two experts' explanation, <u>we</u>
         believe it can satisfy our requirements. It is a sure thing.)

11   Wang: And their..**<u>their engineers</u>** asked you some technical questions, and
         now **<u>they're</u>** sure that your accelerator is able to, meet the
         performance requirements that **they** want to have.

12   Mike: OK.

13   Wang: 明白。

         （Understood.）

In this sequence, Mr.Long, the director of the Chinese company, is talking about
their thoughts about the accelerator in the first few turns, and then he concludes how
they think of the equipment produced by the American company (turn 5-1, 5-4, 5-7,
5-10). Mr.Long uses the first personal pronoun "I" in the initial turn, and the first
personal plural in the following turns to express the views of their team. It is unclear
whether the first personal pronoun "I" refers to the director himself, the company, or
the staff who attended the meeting. The interpreter opts for the third-person plural
pronoun "they" in turn 5-2, which includes all of the implied meaning of the

personal perspective used by the primary interlocutor. In turn 5-10, the Chinese primary speaker mentions a lot of parties involved in the talk ("our colleagues", "two experts", and "we"). The interpreter again shifts to the non-canonical footing of a "narrator" (Merlini and Favaron, 2005, p.279) or an "author" (Goffman, 1981, p.128) in his rendition of the speaker's utterance. The interpreter distances himself from the utterance of the speaker to narrate the source content, and he even produces a different rendition ("their engineers" as opposed to "our colleagues") to specify the parties involved in the talk. The footing shifts are potentially based on the interpreter's assessment of the situational context and his thorough understanding of the sequences of the talk. As the only party who masters both languages, he is able to adjust the social positioning in the business triad based on the nuances of interpersonal relations in the discourse. In the follow-up interview (Interview 2, 15[th]October, 2018), the interpreter explicates the reasons behind such changes as:

> Since it is a multi-party business dialogue with at least 2 interlocutors on both sides, they all rely on me to explain their views, wishes, and intentions. I think sometimes it is necessary to clarify who is making the comments and who is referred to in the rendition through the shifts of personal pronouns.

Apparently, the interpreter believes that it is unavoidable to adopts the footing of an "author" within the business context, especially one that involves more than two primary participants. It is essential to take the interpersonal relations and the immediate situational context into consideration when producing renditions. The interpreter exercises his agency to separate himself from the client and primary participants for effectiveness and clarity in this interaction. He successfully avoids the confusions over the addressing party and addressed party which may emerge otherwise.

As the conversation proceeds, the following excerpt again shows how the interpreter mediates the multi-party business talk by introducing personal pronoun shifts.

M3-Example 6

1   Mr.Long: 还有就是没有什么贸易壁垒的问题吧？

　　　　　　(The other thing, there won't be any issues like trade barrier, right?)

2   Wang: Does this kind of technical trade involve any trade barriers？In either U.S., um, between the U.S. and China?

3   Mike: <u>We</u> are not restricted, but I know it gets complicated because of the tariff issue.

4   Wang: <u>他们</u>本身在<u>美国</u>是知道是没什么限制。但是不知道在未来中国和美国会不会有贸易摩擦的问题了。

　　　　　(They themselves do not have, in America at least there is no restriction. But it is unknown in the future if China and U.S will have any such issue due to trade frictions.)

5   Others: 对这个就要看以后了,一些关税的问题，不知道什么时候会有影响。

　　　　　(yeah, this depends on the future condition, the tariffs issue, it is unknown when it will has any influence.)

6   Mr.Long: 孟总，<u>我们</u>这边就没有了，感谢。

　　　　　(Mr.Meng, **we** are done, thank you.)

7   Mr.Meng: 好的。

　　　　　(OK.)

8   Wang: **<u>They</u>** are done. No more questions**.**

9   Mike: ok.

Mr.Long in this sequence continues to raise their concern about the tariffs issue, which might influence the deal. Mike responds to his concern, explaining the company doesn't have any restrictions in America. Wang again opts for the footing of the third-person plural to render the utterance of the American client. He also specifies his client as "they themselves in America" in turn 6-4, which is a different rendition compared with "we". The shift of the personal pronoun is not unmotivated. The conversation took place when the trade friction was first sparked between America and China. The concern raised can be considered a quite sensitive issue in

the business talk. The interpreter shifts to the third personal pronoun in his rendition of the American client's utterances and specifies the location where the trade restriction exists is "not in America". Such a shift indicates that "the barriers" is in China, which is opposed to the notion of "restriction in America". Obviously, the interpreter not only adopts the footing as an "author" but also a "principal" in this sequence. While animating other's views in a second language, he engages with the business talk by voicing his positioning and views to clarify on certain concepts.

As an observer who witnessed the interaction at a close distance, I also believe that the footing shifts are, to some extent, resulted from the interpreter's social group identification. As pointed out by Tajfel (1978, p.131), "group identification is that part of an individual's self-concept which derives from his knowledge of his membership in a social group (or groups) together with the value and emotional significance attached to that membership". In this sequence, the interpreter seemingly aligns himself more with the Chinese interlocutors, because he shares more common emotions and values with them. Owing to this, he distances himself from the American clients and introduces the personal pronoun change.

However, such a move is also facilitative for his client: In such context, any confusion or misunderstanding regarding the sensitive issue of trade barriers or conflicts may cost the American company the contract and a large sum of revenue. The interpreter's agency becomes evident as he stays alert for his client of any issue that might lead to the collapse of the deal. At the same time, he also aligns himself with the cultural group he identifies with, which eases the tension that might potentially be triggered by the sensitive issues in the wider business context.

When the staff representatives from the American side reiterate Wang's rendition, the Chinese speaker turns to the host, Mr. Meng, with a concluding utterance (6-6). In the following turn, Wang again mediates the talk by rendering the Chinese primary speaker's utterance with the third personal pronoun ("They are done"). The interpreter opts for the third personal pronoun, turning to the American primary speaker to narrate the conclusive remarks of the Chinese speaker. Such a move prevents the American speakers from being excluded in this interaction. In the

interview, the interpreter provides a similar line of comment on his choice of personal pronouns:

> "The trade barrier is an over-heated topic recently. Therefore I feel compelled to clarify with the third person pronoun with a specific location, which facilitates the Chinese speaker to understand clearly the American client does not have any restrictions from the American authorities in trade" (Interview 2, 15[th]October, 2018).

In this interaction, the interpreter identifies with the primary participants both on "personal and professional level" (Karanasiou, 2016, p.204). Personally, he shares more common ground with the Chinese primary speakers because of the similar cultural background, language, or ethnic elements. Therefore, he constructs the identity of "they themselves in America", which also distances himself from the American client; the identity of the "self" is also constructed for his subject position as a Chinese and an interpreter at the same time. However, because of the awareness of "professional survival" (Angelelli, 2001, p.23), a feeling of obligation to satisfy the targets and expectations of the person who hires them to be hired again, Wang also feels obliged to help the American client clarify that the trade barrier is not on the American side. Above all, it is the American client who hired him to facilitate the business talk, whose expectation is the get the Chinese company's order of the facility.

The following case is extracted from Meeting No.5, where the shifts of footing are introduced due to similar reasons. Example 7 is an excerpt of a business talk occurring at the networking event during the EU-China Partenariat, an officially held forum facilitating the trade and technological exchange between Chinese and European companies. At the networking event, Frank, the Czech research institute executive, is sitting in the business booth to meet Lisha, the Managing Director of a Chinese advanced material company, to have a business discussion over the potential cooperation between them. Lee is a freelance interpreter who is assigned to the event by an interpreting agency.

M5-Example 7

1   Frank: Okay, okay. Because ah, there's also uh, there's also uh, the Faculty of Textile of **our University** in Czech, ah, which is dealing with a new uh, technologies, uh, like textile technologies and new textile materials. So **we** also, dealing with the carbonized fibers. And we huh, <u>we</u> treat the fibers for different applications. We also do some carbonized fibers. <u>We</u> do some metal, metalizing of the fibers. And uh, **we** cooperate with the companies which, which can use it for different applications.

2   Lee: 啊，现在我们学校的这个纺织学院，<u>他们在捷克</u>主要也是在研究一些纳米科技的纤维，碳纤维这方面。所以呢在<u>他们国家</u>也和一些不同的产业进行着合作，有不同的应用。<u>所以</u>我觉得这个方面我们是不是可以比较有兴趣。

    (Now the Textile Department of **our** university, **they** in Czech is also doing research on new materials related to the nanotechnology and nanofibers or carbonized fibers. Therefore, **they in their countries** also cooperate with a variety of industries for different applications. So I feel in this aspect we could possibly be quite interested.)

3   Lisha: 嗯嗯。

    (hmm hmm.)

4   Frank: It could be, it could be very interesting to uh, to combine you're your materials with our materials or with the other, like treatments or with our research activities

5   Lee: 嗯啊我觉得我们两方的材料是不是可以相互借鉴一下，然后可以运用一些，运用在其他一些领域的研究，会处理一些污水，啊包括..

    (hmm, I think we can combine the materials of the two side, and to do some research activities in the fields like sewage treatment, including..)

6   Lisha: 对对，我们这个可以就是也可以处理污水，就是吸附，吸附很多就是那个啊，就是那个什么…比如说原油泄漏的，我们那个都可以

吸附，然后就是像海绵一样，然后直接把它那个直接就是把它挤出来。

(Yes yes, ours can also be used, to treat sewage. It can actually absorb, absorb that…how to put it, for example, petrol leakage, ours can absorb, like a sponge, and squeeze it out directly.)

7　　Lee: Um, yes, our material can also be used to um, treat sewage, and also the petrol leakage. It is like a sponge to absorb and squeeze out.

　　　　…………

8　　Frank: Now uh, for example, <u>we're</u> running two of the cooperation, because it's it's not easy to cooperate sometimes. But um, there's a program in the <u>Czech Republic</u> called Delta. Uh, when <u>we</u> cooperate, like it's a Czech university Czech company and your Chinese university and the Chinese company, they cooperate on the, on the research of some some products. For example. Now we're running two projects like that. One is for new composite materials for wind blades, four winds, electricity plants. So we do a development of of that nanocomposite material, uh, new composite materials for that. So that could be some kind of corporations. So this course of these programs,

9　　Lee: 啊我们现在捷克政府,<u>它</u>出台了一项计划叫三角洲计划，这个计划呢，比如<u>他们</u>捷克的企业和捷克的大学，和中国的企业和中国的大学都可以进行合作，啊,关于一些产品项目啊，这些项目呢，比如说，我们可以合作生产一些新型的合成复合材料，新型的合成材料，然后这些材料可以用到像电站上啊。

(Now our Czech government, <u>it</u> initiated a program called Delta. In this program, <u>they</u> Czech university Czech company and Chinese university and Chinese company can cooperate for some projects and programs. For example, in this project, we can cooperate to produce some new nanocomposite materials to be applied in places like electricity plants.)

As can be observed in Example 7, Frank dominates the talk as he is trying to

explain the university's cooperation with industry (7-1, 7-4) and the project of the Czech Republic government, which might offer some opportunities for cooperation between his agency and the Chinese company (7-8). Lee animates Frank's utterance by following the personal pronoun ("our university") in the beginning part of his rendition. Then he shifts to the third personal pronoun "they in Czech" and "they in their country" in the following rendition. A similar shift occurs in turn 7-9, when the interpreter renders "our Czech government" into "he" and "Czech university Czech company" into "they Czech university Czech company". The interpreter is obviously aware of the norms of direct translation to follow the personal perspective used by the primary speaker, as he moves back to follow the speaker's perspective "we" in the latter part of his rendition in these two turns. The interpreter explains that he is not aware of the shifts into the third-person pronoun in his rendition,

> "I am not quite sure of the reasons behind this shift, but I simply believe that it is awkward to say 'we Czech government Czech companies' (我们捷克政府捷克公司) and 'your Chinese government Chinese companies' （你们中国政府中国企业）" (Interview 4, 15th November, 2018).

The interpreter shifts to the third personal pronoun in his rendition, which distances himself from his client, thus demonstrating his identification of social and cultural groups he belongs to. As Zhan (2012) states, "the socio-cultural construct of identity is not fixed and final but is rather continuously reconfigured and adjusted by linguistic means in different contexts" (p.206). In this sequence, the interpreter establishes the "identity of self" (who I am) and adjusts his social position through the footing shifts with his understanding of the evolution of the interaction. Though he was assigned by interpreting agency to the Czech client, he felt quite embarrassed to produce renditions like "you Chinese company" (你们中国公司) or "we Czech government" (我们捷克政府) to the Chinese primary participant if he follows the personal perspective of the possessive personal pronouns used by his Czech client. By doing so, he seemingly excludes himself from being a Chinese compatriot with the Chinese primary participant. The interpreter's shifting back and forth in his use of the personal pronouns in this sequence shows that the interpreter

continuously reconfigures and constructs his social and cultural identity by linguistic means. Being conscious of the subject position he opts for, he does not work in a conduit model, and his language capacity and bi-cultural expertise enable him to mediate the talk with renditions that are socially and culturally appropriate to the situational context.

Example 8 illustrates how the interpreter introduces the personal pronoun shifts to explicate the referents of the person pronouns.

M5-Example 8

1 Lisha: 嗯…那你看我们是，帮<u>我</u>询问一下，那<u>我们</u>后续就是…

   (Hmm…you see, we will...help me to ask, we in the follow-up should..)

2 Lee: Oh, how about the um, following up on cooperation between the **two companies**?

3 Frank: I write you an email, uh, I know the technologies you could be interested in, and I send you more information about technologies. You can send me more information about your products. And I'll try to find out the way, ah, which can cooperate to exchange some samples, or just send me what you're looking for about which area are you looking for in sales or...

4 Lee: 嗯这样，我们主要是这边可以有一些不同的科学技术信息啊，可以给你们提供，然后啊你们这边呢，我就是对于我来说，我们想更了解一下你们产品有哪些特性，然后之后呢我们会双方交换一下样品，然后进行一个啊…进行后续的合作，然后现在我把那个我的 email 给你们一下。

   (hmm, this way, we have some different technology information to offer to you, and your side for me, we want to have further information of your products, and then we can exchange samples for the future cooperation, and now I can give you my email.)

5 Lisha: 好的，Thank you!

Example 8 is an excerpt from the same business meeting discussed above. Towards the end of the meeting, the Chinese speaker Lisha raises a question indicating her wish to know what to be expected from the follow-up of the discussion (8-1). She addressed the interpreter directly with an incomplete sentence with the first-person plural pronoun. The interpreter in the following turn immediately understands the implied meaning of the question and the relational value of the inclusive "we", inclusive that is of her company as well as of the Czech company. The interpreter renders the "我们" (we) into "the two companies", excluding himself from the talk to highlight the cooperative relations between the two primary participants. It is plausible to argue that the interpreter, through shifting into a "principal", makes an implicit authority claim to highlight the actual addressees and the stake-holders in this business discourse. If we look at the modes of the sentence in the interpreter's rendition, the narrative mode also shifts into a questioning mode.

From a CDA perspective, "when a speaker is posing a question in demand of information, the addressee is in the position of a provider of information" (Fairclough, 1989, p.126). Such views emphasize the asymmetric distribution of modes between interlocutors. The interpreter's shifting of the modes of the modality triggers a change in the participant relations, since "asking, be it for action or information, is generally a position of power, as too is giving information" (ibid, p.126). The interpreter shifts the mode of the sentence to explicate the intended message of the Chinese primary interlocutor, which places him in a subject position with power. From an observer's perspective, I perceive this move as a facilitation in the immediate situational business context. This is because such an intervention occurred at the moment when the talk comes to an end, and it is often vital to reassure each other there will be a follow-up process based on the previous discussion. When asked the aim of the shifts, the interpreter states that it is a conscious move, since he would like to provide a "complete rendition" to "emphasize the aim of cooperation so that my client and the Chinese company would both be happy for the productive result" (Interview 4, 15th November, 2018).

The interpreter's act is a salient "discursive practice" (Davies and Harré,

1990, p46), which means that his subjectivity or positioning is generated and constituted in the concrete use of language in a specific occasion as opposed to the static, fixed concept of the prescribed role. The interpreter's actively production of the social realities displays that the conversation is evolving with the joint action of all the participants. His mediation in the talk is largely socially and situationally determined, which is based on his understanding of the business context in a broader sense. This is a prime of example of how the interpreter breaks the norms of direct translation with his linguistic and socio-cultural expertise in a specific discourse, with their assessment of the social and situational context on a moment-by-moment basis.

The following excerpts from M2 (see Table 3.1) display a similar case. The interpreter introduces the pronoun shift based on her understanding of the social identities and social context. John is an executive of the Shanghai representative office of a U.K.-based organization that helps British companies do business in China. He came to meet Mr.Deng, a division director of the Foreign Investment Promotion Bureau in Chengdu. Wendy, a staff interpreter from the Chengdu representative office of the U.K based organization, attended the business meeting with John to assist the conversation.

M2-Example 9

1   John: Uh. and also thank you for talking through some of <u>your</u> specific industry sectors that you see as highlights and priorities.

2   Wendy: 也谢谢您刚才提到的一些主要的，就是<u>四川成都</u>的一些主要的产业。

(And also thank you for mentioning some of the major, <u>Si Chuan Chengdu's</u> major industries.)

3   Mr.Deng: 嗯嗯。

(hmm hmm.)

4   John: As **I** said before, <u>I</u> have been here many times. Um, and**I** can see the rapid development, one of the things that strike me is that so far, **I** think British business representation here has, has developed quite

slowly, and **we** need to see how we can accelerate that in the next three or four years

5   Wendy: 对，因为就像他刚才说的，他来过成都很多次了，也看到了成都在快速发展，但是有一个事实是他也觉得是让他比较震惊的是问题是，英国的产业在成都的状态，这个增长还是比较缓慢，所以说他还是希望..就是接下来我们会就是更多的促进英国企业在成都的发展…

(As he said just now, **he** has been to Chengdu many times and has seen the rapid development of Chengdu. However, one fact **he** feels quite astonished is about the development of British business, which is quite slow. Therefore, **he** hopes that **we** can accelerate the development of British businesses in Chengdu.)

6   Mr.Deng: 这个我补充一句，就是中国我们现在叫 developing country，啊我们英国呢，我们已经是 developed country，所以呢..

(This I would like to add that we China is still called developing countries, and we U.K is already a developed country, therefore…)

7   Wendy and John: hahaha…

8   Mr.Deng: 但是我们要需要加强这种沟通，确实是。

(But we need to strengthen this type of communication, indeed.)

9   Wendy: But we need to strengthen our communication, indeed.

M2-Example 10

1   John: Hmm…two more things, one is you mentioned before about becoming like Singapore, the green, smart, livable city. I think that **you** have great potential....the environment, and, it is very much a livable city already. So around smart city technology, green..uh..energy usage technology, Britain has quite a lot of sophisticated uh, solutions in this area, and I think, whether that's through university or business or more the large-scale working… the city, uh…we could develop some, some opportunities then.

2   Wendy: 呃刚刚您也提到就是新加坡花园城市，然后**成都**是一个，也正在打造一个宜居公园城市，那么**成都**肯定是有一些..嗯先天的基础的..在，所以说，那么在打造这个智慧城市，或者是说，这个..宜居城市当中，那么**英国**有很多这个…案例，或者这些比较好的解决的方案可以提供。不管是通过大学或者业界，我们都可以发现一些机会。

(Just now you have also mentioned Singapore, the garden city. And **Chengdu** is also constructing a livable garden city, and **Chengdu** has already a good foundation in this sense, therefore, for the construction of a smart city or livable city, the U.K. also has a lot of cases or good solutions to offer. Be it from university or industries, **we** can identify some opportunities.)

3   Mr. Deng: Yes.

Example 9 and example 10 are excerpts of the conversation, which include the sequences that occurred after the presentation of the industries development of Chengdu delivered by the Chinese side. John, in his utterance, highlights his vision for cooperation and the common ground between the industries in the U.K. and Chengdu. In urn 9-1 and turn 10-1, John initiates the talk with the second personal pronoun "you", which is rendered by Wendy into "四川成都" (Sichuan Chengdu) or "成都" (Chengdu) in the next turn. The interpreter's move is highly motivated by her identification of the social context, and the social positions of the interlocutors in this conversation. In the course of multi-party business interpreting, confusion of the actual addressee may emerge when the personal pronoun "you" is used. It seems that if Wendy interprets "you" as "你们"，an indefinite pronoun, it may cut off her connection with "industry in Chengdu" and her social group identity of a Chengdunese. As an in-house interpreter from the Chengdu branch of the U.K. organization, Wendy not only acts as a linguistic service-supplier of the U.K. company but alsoa representative of the Chengdu office, being in charge of liaison and event planning with the Chengdu government institutes. Her multi-layered

182

identity has decided the subtleness and nuanced relations involved in this interaction.

Apparently, Wendy is aware of her affiliation to the U.K. company, while also being conscious of her responsibility to promote the talk and to make Chengdu Government institute happy in this talk, since Chengdu Government is a player who holds power in this conversation, with its local social and economic resources that are essential for the potential partnership. In other words, Wendy's positioning in this talk is influenced by the conflicts of interest between the Chengdu governmental institute and the British company she works for. Therefore, she, on one side, conveys her client's intention, and tries to adjust her positioning on the other side so that the receiving side will resonate with her emotionally. It can be seen that her intervention aims for positive communicative effect in this business context. Wendy later explains her motives of the shifts:

> "Shifting the second personal pronoun to the third personal pronoun, or specific city name fits in the context of such occasion. As I represent Chengdu office, it may confuse the Chinese interlocutors if I translate it as 'you' (你) or 'your industry(你们的产业)'" (Interview 1, 25th September, 2018)

Wendy's remarks confirm my assumption of her motivation behind the intervention. The shifts of pronouns indicate that the interpreter not only functions as linguistic facilitator, but also a liaison officer who attends to the interpersonal relations in the business talk. Wendy is apparently fully aware of the positive effect which may be generated by the appropriate use of pronouns in the business discourse. Although she is employed by the British organization, she is still influenced by her identification with the social group. Distancing herself from the British client, she avoids the potential confusion and communicative inadequacy that may leave the Chinese interlocutors confused, wondering whether the second person pronoun "you" refers to the speaker, Chengdu Foreign Investment Bureau or the Chengdu Government as a whole.

As I mentioned above, shifting the personal pronoun to a concrete city name also produces an emphatic effect among the interlocutors. Based on her understanding of the situational context and the interpersonal relations of the

183

business encounter, Wendy assumes the role of an "author" and "principal" by shifting to the third personal pronoun and producing a different rendition "Sichuan Chengdu" (四川成都). Her intervening moves make her client's compliment more concrete and explicit to the Chinese primary interlocutors since it specifies the social context and the location where the interaction occurs.

In the following turn 9-5, John begins to use the first pronoun "I" (我) to express his views on the development of British businesses in Chengdu, which is also partially the aim of the meeting. Instead of animating the primary speaker's utterances, Wendy again in the next turn (9-6) opts for the third personal pronoun "he", and shifts back to "we", following John's personal perspective in the end of her rendition to explicate the UK agency's will to accelerate the British businesses. Similar shifts occur in the latter part of the rendition in turn 10-2 when the hope for cooperation is conveyed.

The interpreter shifts back and forth between the personal pronouns based on her assessment of the context of the conversation and the addressing and addressed party in the business encounter. On Bot's (2005, p.242) account:

> The indicator of person is particularly interesting, as it refers directly to the issue of 'who is talking', which indicates that in the interpreted business encounter, the interpreter sometimes may want to indicate that the words they speak do not come from them.

In this sequence, the interpreter opts for the third personal pronoun to distance herself from the her client John. Such shift indicates that it is John's concern about the slow development of British businesses in Chengdu. Here Wendy aligns herself more with the Chinese primary interlocutor to make it more straightforward that the "subjective view belongs to the primary speaker" (Bot, 2005, p.242). In other words, it is the attitude of the British client's instead her own stance. However, when it comes to the wish for the acceleration of development, she shifts back to the first personal plural used by John. Such a shift which reflects the interpreter's understandings of her responsibility and social position as a member of the U.K. organization. In the post assignment interview, the interpreter (Interview 1,

25thSeptember, 2018) said she was aware of these shifts,

> "I want to emphasize that the concern is actually expressed by my boss. However, part of my responsibility in the organization is also to promote the cooperation between my organization and the government agencies or companies in Chengdu for the development of the British businesses, therefore I feel obliged to use first plural person pronoun, which can best represent our agency's attitude."

As stated by Wadensjö (1998), "to interact means to continuously evaluate other's and one's own relation to the focused discourse" (p.92). Likely, the interpreter opts for different social footings with the consideration of her social positioning in relation to the primary interlocutors within the business context. The shifts of social positioning in line with the context of the discourse present the multi-layered social and cultural identities of the interpreter, which is particularly interesting as it situates the interpreter in a position with power in the business discourse. I argue it is form of power as the data clearly reveals that the interpreter breaks the order of the discourse of the interpreted business negotiation, where she is expected by the client and the rest of the negotiating primary interlocutors to only directly and completely interpret what they said. The performance of the interpreter is not "within an order of discourse", nor is it in line with the "specific discursive practices through which text and talk are produced and consumed or interpreted" (Fairclough, 1998, p.145) within a business context. Instead, the interpreter constantly assesses primary interlocutor's relations, and shifts her own subject position according to the need of the specific moments in the discourse. Such shifts are introduced to explicate the good will of cooperation for both sides, and to avoid potential confusion with the toning down of conflicts of interests.

Fairclough (1989) argues that power is never absolute, and languages have always been the carrier of the power struggle in a discourse. Therefore, the interpreter's shifting back and forth in her subject positions can be viewed as a manifestation of the power dynamics in the business negotiation. The interpreter seems to have an "implicit authority" to break the order of the discourse to not only

185

speak for her client but also actively engages herself in the business interaction. Such case is more evident in the examples presented in the following section.

5.3 Mediation through Using Reported Speech

In the data studied, I have discovered that interpreters also violate the norm of direct translation and change pronouns and the structure of the sentence by using reported speech ("he said" or "she said"). In other words, a simple sentence is shifted into a complex sentence with a main clause and a subordination in such shifts. From a grammatical perspective, "the main clause is more informationally prominent than subordinate clauses, with the content of subordinate clauses backgrounded" (Fairclough, 1989, p.132). Of course, Fairclough's discussion of this discrepancy is based on a monolingual context. The investigation of such cases in a bilingual discursive practice is plausibly more interesting since the communication proceeds through a third-party facilitation in a specific socio-cultural context, where the changes of pronoun and sentence types definitely involve more multi-layered dynamics of subject positions and interpersonal relations.

In this category, cases show that the interpreter mediates the conversation by rendering the personal pronoun used by the primary speaker into a reported speech or a different rendition. The interpreter shifts from the speaker's "I" to the interpreter's "I", highlighting not only the source of information but also the interpreter's presence in the discourse. By doing so, the interpreter's subject position also shifts in the interactive business discourse "from talking as the speaker to talking about the speaker" (Zhan, 2012, p.206). The interpreter renders the primary speaker's utterance to the addressee from a personal angle, another way to indicate that "the subjective view belongs to the primary speaker" (Bot, 2005, p.242).

The reasons behind these shifts are multifold and are related to the specific discursive moments. With the CDA's primary goal to unveil the links between language use and the power relations in social practice, I intend to explore the examples of how the power of the interpreter manifests itself in the discourse

through the shifts of pronouns and sentence types, the reasons behind these changes as well as their influence on the power dynamics of the business discourse.

5.3.1 Emphasizing the Primary Speaker's Identity or Comments

In the transcripts of the recorded business meetings, I discovered that interpreters, in various contexts of business talks, change the mode of the sentence by shifting the personal pronouns to reported speech, which potentially aims to "mark the distinction between the currently speaking self and the meaning other is particularly stressed" (Wadensjö, 1998, p.247). The interpreter takes the initiative to clarify the identity of the primary speaker or emphasize that the rendition produced actually conveys the views or expertise of the primary speaker. Interpreters, on such occasions, mediate the dialogue through "relaying by replaying" (p.247), a move that coordinates the interaction by introducing changes in the personal pronouns used by the primary interlocutors.

As proposed by Jorgenson and Philips (2002), "the texts can never be understood or analysed in isolation – they can only be understood in relation to webs of other texts and in relation to the social context (p.70). Owing to this, I will look at both contributing factors of the interpreter's intervention and their influence on the participant relations, to explore how the power of the interpreter takes shape or is shaped in the discourse.

Example 11 and example 12 illustrate the occasion in the business talk where the interpreter feels necessary to emphasize the identity of the primary speaker to the addressee by changing the personal pronoun in the original utterance.

M4-Example 11

1   Mr. Long: 我最后多问一句，啊因为我们这边也没有过，题外话，一旦确定的话，这个供货周期大概在好久呢？就以我们 2 乘以 1.7 串联这么一个体量的话？

(**I** want to ask a last question, because we haven't had it before, it is an unrelated question, once it is confirmed, what is the lead

187

time? Regarding our volume of 2*1.7.)

2   Wang: **The director wants to know** once you guys sign the contract. So what

about.. how long is the lead time before the signing of the contract?

And the and when when they received the system?

3   Mike: I think in this case, we quoted about sixteen months,

4   Wang: sixteen months?

5   Wang: 十六个月。

（sixteen months）

Example 11 occurred towards the end of the Q&A session of the technical meeting
(M2) discussed in the previous section. The conversation concerns a question raised
by the Chinese speaker about the lead time of the goods once the deal is made. The
interpreter shifts to reported speech and explicitly mentions the Chinese
interlocutor's title of "the director" (turn 11-1), while conveying the message to his
client. The interpreter later explained the motive behind,

> "I am aware of this shift, and I just want to stress to the American client this
> question is raised by the decision-maker of this deal, so that they will be more
> careful and tactful when answering the question" (Interview 2, 15th October
> 2018).

The interpreter takes the move based on the mutual understanding of "who holds
power for the decision", as well as the priority and relevance of content in the
preceding talk. It reflects the interpreter's implicit authority in the discourse, which
allows him to select and emphasize the information he believes is of great
importance to the immediate situational context of the business negotiation. The
interpreter assesses the situational context that the decision maker's question at this
point might be very vital for the conclusion of the deal, a contract his client aspires
to.

Evidently, the interpreter's mediation displays the power he holds in the
interaction, which shapes the power relations in this buyer-and-seller discourse.
Although he promotes and foregrounds the Chinese interlocutor's position in the

conversation, his American clients also benefit from his intervention. They can understand that the question is raised by someone who holds a say to the contract to assume a more tactful attitude to provide a more appropriate answer. This is evident in the American client's answer when he mentioned "quoted" (11-5), which makes his response sound more reliable to the buyer. Such diction indicates that the answer provided is not resulted from his subjective perspective, but is based on the concrete facts. In this sequence of the conversation, the interpreter's shift of subject position in relation to the primary interlocutors exerts a positive influence to the reliability of his client's role; or it at least facilitates the client to navigate the scene with subtle inter-personal relations, which is a clear manifestation of the power the interpreter holds in bilingual business discourse.

Similar cases also occurred in Example 12 from the same business encounter in turn 12-7 and 12-8 when Mr.Long bluntly interrupted the introduction of the installation process of the equipment.

M3-Example 12

1　　Mike: Ok, I will start with the first one. We have a project overview, documents that Ross has, and we will walk you through everything that we do, when we get a new order for an accelerator system.

2　　Wang: 我们有一个总体的一个，嗯..场地的相关方面的一些要求，一个手册。啊一旦我们，嗯从客户那拿到订单之后呢，我们就会先给客户有一个这方面的土建方面的一些要求的交底。

　　　　(We have a general manual for the requirements of the factory. Once we have the order from the client, we will provide the client with a guide regarding the aspect of the floor plan.)

3　　Mike: So it talks about first design production…you can read this（gives the interpreter a document.）

　　　　Transfer to sight Interpreting

4　　Wang: 他说是有很多个步骤，哈比如说先是设计啊生产，然后预测,是前期测试，然后工厂接货测试啊包装发货，然后这然后在现场安装

部分呢有人员和各个组件的到达，这是第一个，然后是…What is beamline access?

(He said that there were lot of steps, for example, to design and produce, and pretest and testing, and factory would receive the product to test and then package, and ship, and for the installation part, there would be arrival of staff members and parts. This is the first, and…What is beamline access?)

5　Mike: An established beamline access is how you align the system.

6　Wang: 然后是对整个系统来进行校正，然后是开箱…嗯开箱，然后准备，然后呢放置嗯加速器罐和支架，然后 assemble，然后组装各种支架和铆钉器，然后组装 injector，就是什么喷射口。注入系统和 D 能传输束流线，然后反应了，然后对重装设备进行精细调整，然后组装高能束流线，然后加各种电缆线缆，然后有那个加速器的测试，然后有调试，然后…..

(And then align the whole system, and open the box and prepare and the install accelerator tank and axis, and then assemble axis and parts, and assemble injector, the injector. Inject into system and D-power beamline, and the reaction, and align the equipment, and assemble the high energy beam and a variety of…)

7　Mr.Long: 我打断一下，我明白刚才这个两位代表什么意思了。整体的就是大家签订以后，会针对我们的选择这个信号啊，厂家会给出一个主线，整个工艺的接口的一个指导方案。是吧？反推我们这个，是这个意思吗？

（Can **I** interrupt, **I** understand what the two representatives mean. Generally, our people sign the contract, as to the choice of the signal, factory will give us a main line, the guide plan for the whole system, right?）

8　Wang: **He wants to make sure**, **Mr. Director wants to make sure** that once you receive the order from them, and you will provide this kind of manual based on the system that they order?

9   Mike: Yes, absolutely yes,

10   Wang: 对对对。

      (Yes yes.)

In turn 12-1 and 12-3, Mike introduces the contents of the guidance manual for the installation of the equipment the Chinese clients intend to purchase from his company. Regarding the complexity of the content, Mike passes an introductory document to Wang and expects him to do sight translation to provide insight into the process. In turn 4, Wang shifts into the reported speech "he said" to quote Mike's utterance in the previous turn and the highly technical content of the document. The Chinese primary speaker understands the gist of the content halfway through Wang's interpreting and interrupts the interpreter's rendition in turn 7, to confirm his understandings.

In the next turn, Wang again shifts to the reported speech ("He wants to make sure, Mr. Director wants to make sure") to explain the reason for the interruption and highlights the title of the interlocutor who interrupted the conversation earlier. Generally speaking, interrupting one's speech is considered an impolite behavior in a business conversation. However, it seems that there are exceptions at specific moments of a business negotiation. "I guess the priority for the Chinese client is to make sure his interpretation of the process is correct, therefore he chipped in" (Interview 2, 15th October 2018), explained the interpreter. "I changed the personal pronoun because I feel it is necessary to report the situation to the American side" (Interview 2, 15th October 2018). The interpreter's account shows that he intervenes in the talk to smooth the dialogue and highlight the information source. Also, by doing so, the interpreter draws a line between "the currently speaking self" and "the meaning others particularly stressed" (Wadensjö, 1998, p.247), which separates himself from the speaker to emphasize that it is the primary speaker that has interrupted his rendition. The departure of the interpreter's performance from the professional norms of direct interpreting is evidently a prime example of how the interpreter exercises control on the information flow to avoid

any confusion or tensions in the business encounter.

In addition to highlighting the essential position of the speaker in critical moments of the business dialogue, the interpreter shifts to reported speech and changes of sentence structure to emphasize on the commending remarks and the will of cooperation of the primary interlocutors. Such changes potentially enhance the affinity and friendliness between negotiating parties. Example 13 and Example 14 present cases in which the interpreter shifts to reported speech to emphasize whom the comments or expertise belong to. The two excerpts occur in Meeting No.2, in which the British delegate John, accompanied by in-house interpreter Wendy, is discussing with the Chinese primary speaker the potential opportunities for China-UK cooperation.

M2-Example 13

1   John: So, the British Chamber and YZ have been here for twenty years developing, I think only now we're starting. I can see that the bigger opportunities for British business here in Chengdu.

2   Wendy: 实际上 YZ 和英商会在成都市已经超过 20 年，但是<u>我们</u>现在，才开始能够把这个，英国的产业，英国的投资，做大。

(Actually, YZ and British Chamber have been in Chengdu for twenty years, but **we** are just starting to make the British industries and British investment in a larger scale.)

3   John: So, when I look through this and I see all of your uh, priorities, I can see a great synergy and complementarity with the British key strength.

4   Wendy: <u>他说</u>看了这个这个介绍以后，他就觉得有很多，可以就是和英国的产业可以互相互补的地方

(He said after the introduction, he feels there are a lot of aspects that have great complementarity with the British industries.)

5   Mr. Deng: 嗯嗯 (对着英方点头)。

(hmm huh) (Nodding to the British side).

6   John: As you are moving to that developed economy phase.

7   Wendy: 成都其实也在朝这个发展，发达经济去去发展

       (He believes Chengdu is also developing toward a developed phase.)

8   Mr. Deng: 没错!

       (Absolutely right!)

In this excerpt, John makes some comments based on the Chinese primary speaker's introduction of the industry overview in Chengdu. As can be observed from the transcripts, Wendy follows John's personal angle in turn 13-2 to animate John's utterance ("we are just starting to make the British industries and British investment in larger scale"). However, in the following turn when John makes some remarks about his thoughts on the development of British industries, Wendy shifts into the reported speech "he said" and "he feels". A similar change also occurs in turn 13-7, where Wendy uses "he believes" in her rendition. The interpreter uses the reported speech to report to the Chinese primary speaker that it is John's feelings and the commending remarks, separating herself from the British primary speaker. The interpreter's mediation here is partly related to her social position as an in-house interpreter in this context: she functions as a liaison person who deals with the relations between her organization and the Chinese Investment Promotion Bureau. Therefore the interpreter's performance is largely subjected to her institutional responsibility. Emphasizing John's stance in her rendition, Wendy successfully promotes the goodwill of cooperation of her agency.

       In the interview, the interpreter clarifies that the footing shifts are introduced to emphasize her British boss's stance. She explains, "This is just to clarify that it is John's attitude and personal feelings, instead of mine, which is more important for the intended cooperation" (Interview 1, 25th September 2018). Wendy adopts the subject position of a "reporter" and a "promoter" when she opts for the reported speech and highlights to whom the stance and attitude belong. The shifts of her social-positioning occurs because she believes that her British boss's utterance carries more weight than hers in the business encounter with the Chinese government, where the will of cooperation is cherished by both sides. Such case is

an evident example of the interpreter's power in the discursive practice because she actually assigns the utterance to John, a manifestation of implicit authority to speak for another. As an observer, I would argue that the effects of such change can be very positive since the atmosphere becomes very pleasant when Mr.Deng is nodding and smiling to John. And a strongly affirmative tone is also identified in Deng's reply of "Absolutely right!" in turn 13-8. A similarly case can also be observed in Example 14:

M2-Example 14

1   John: And the other aspect is that many of the U.K. business strengths in the services sector, in areas, you mentioned software or creative industries or leisure or educational or healthcare, or and particularly you said in a financial professional service.

2   Wendy: 对，他说同时呢，英国的很多优势产业，它的强项呢就是在这个服务领域。

        (**He said** at the same time, the U.K's advantageous industries, its strength lies in the service sectors.)

3   Mr.Deng: 嗯。

        (Hmm huh.)

4   Wendy: 呃刚才有提到这个其实，软件也是，然后教育，包括这个消费领域，零售这些包括这个创意产业，金融产业其实都是这个英国的优势产业。可能这种产业它不会要求一个什么特别大规模的这种投资。

        (As mentioned just now, software is also, and education, including the consumption, retail, creative industry, and financial industry. All of them are the strength of the British industry.)

5   John: And even if **we're** manufacturing, we tend to be a part of it and product, not the end product. So we provide the expertise or the IP or the software or the operating processes and management services rather than the end product. So we need much more mature business

environment to to develop…

6   Wendy: 他说就制造业而言呢，也不是全产业链，他说我们可能是制造业其中的一部分，比如说**我们**提供的一些 IP 方面的一些这个软件方面，或者说是这个生产流程工艺流程这一方面的专长

(He said in terms of the manufacturing industry, it is also not a whole industry. **He said** we might be part of the industry; for example, we provide expertise for IP, software, or the operating process. Therefore we need a more mature business environment.)

In this excerpt, John is introducing the features and strengths of some British industries. Wendy again opts for reported speech to denote it is the comments of the British primary speaker (turn 14-2). In turn 14-6, Wendy shifts to "direct reported speech" (Tannen, 1989, p.98) and renders John's remarks into "He said we might be part of the industry". When asked about the reason behind the shift, Wendy explained:

> "The utterance of John is some professional views of the British industries based on his expertise. I just do not want to confuse the Chinese speaker, because part of my job responsibility is also to familiarize them with the situation of the U.K. business, using 'I' might make them feel it is my take on the industry out of my survey" (Interview 1, 25th September 2018).

To highlight John's expertise and comments, the interpreter mediates the talk by introducing the direct reported speech, changing her role from talking as the speaker to talking about the speaker. Apparently, the interpreter's presence here is based on her understanding of the aim of the institutional talk and her interpretation of the institutional hierarchy.

5.3.2 Avoiding Confusion or Misunderstanding

In this category, interpreters shift their subject positions through changes of the personal pronouns used by primary interlocutors. Their intervention aims to avoid potential misunderstanding or confusion in the interaction. The data shows that

interpreters, at specific moments of the conversation, introduce the reported speech and change the forms of sentences with the aim to mark the distinction of the interpreter's "I" and the speaker's "I". Their decisions are resulted from the need to "take initiatives and speak on their own behalf" (Wadensjö, 1998, p.248) and to coordinate the business interaction. The hypothesis is testified by the interpreter's remarks in the interviews, which also sheds light on the contributing factors that give rise to such moves.

Example 15 is an excerpt from the tourism networking event (M6) between Mark, the executive of an Italian Travel Agency, and Tim, the managing director of the Chinese Travel Agency.

M6-Example 15

1   Mark: I want to ask, um, if possible, um, what type of business um, **he's** doing？if it is FIT or groups？

2   Chang: what do you mean by FIT？

3   Mark：FIT, for individual travelers or only for groups.

4   Chang: 嗯哼，**那他想问您**的就是您的这个业务的, 业务的种类是什么？是这种个人游呢还是团队为主？

    (Hmm huh, he wants to ask you that your business, what is the business category? Is it individual or package group traveling?)

5   Tim: 团队为主。

    (Mainly are groups.)

6   Chang: 团队哈？

    (Groups?)

7   Tim: 嗯。

    (Hmm huh.)

8   Chang: Mainly about the groups.

Mark initiates the conversation with the question directed to the interpreter concerning the type of tourist groups (turn 15-1), which contains an abbreviation

"FIT" that puzzles the interpreter, Chang. After clarifying the meaning of the acronym, Chang converts the utterance into the reported speech "he wants to ask you" (turn 15-4). Such a shift makes the interpreter the ultimate source of information, and her subject position shifts to a reporter, who talks about Italian primary interlocutor. At the same time, the shift of this footing also helps her explain to the client the reason behind the singular linguistic exchange between her and the Italian primary speaker in turn15-2 and turn 15-3.

In the follow-up interview, the interpreter explains that she just do not want the Chinese client feel confused because "my client was excluded in the previous sequence of interaction when I was clarifying the meaning of the question" (Interview 5, 23rd November 2018). Evidently, the interpreter is well aware of how information flows in the interaction. She coordinates the talk by highlighting the source of the utterance. The interpreter takes the initiative to shift from "talking on behalf of the primary speaker" to "talking about the primary speaker". The interpreter makes such a shift to specify the addresser who poses the question, in order to avoid any misunderstanding in the conversation due to her exchange of turns with the Italian primary speaker.

By reporting the situation to the Chinese client, the interpreter breaks the norms of direct translation and successfully re-engages the Chinese client into the interaction, thus avoiding any potential confusion potentially caused by the indirectness of the discursive practice.

Example 16 is a similar example where the interpreter introduces reported speech to avoid misunderstanding. The only difference is that the shift of subject position is delivered since the interpreter does not want to become a scapegoat of the client, which happens in the discursive practice of interpreting from time to time.

M2-Example 16

1 John: Um, so we did a lot of research into the Made in China 2025 plan and try

to align by the 47 subset subsectors we analyse, align China's potential

needs and U.K.'s specific strength to create a map where we could, focus

our attention with our made-in-China 2025 plan.

2   Wendy: 那么我们做了很多关于 2025 中国制造，呃..中国…制造 2025 的..呃
调研，那么我们也尽量就去去去把这个英国的优势产业的这个长
处和中国制造业的一些特点相结合。

(So <u>we</u> did a lot of research about the Made in China 2025, and <u>we</u> try
to align the strengths of the British industries with the Chinese
industries.)

3   John: Um, and in some areas of the aerospace. Obviously, Britain has a big
supply chain. So we do a lot of the manufacturing for airbus in the U.K..
And I think that is developing quite rapidly. So that's definitely one sector
we are looking for further collaboration.

4   Wendy: 那么还有一个就是..这个航空制造业，大家都知道英国呢，它在这
一块也是.制造发动机这一块儿是非常强的，它的发展也很快。这
方面我们也想要进一步合作。

(And also in the sector of Aerospace manufacturing, everyone knows
that Britain also has strength in this sector and also develops very
rapidly. <u>We</u> also would like to have further cooperation in this aspect.)

5   John: And some of the businesses are already doing very well, **I am not sure**
any of their presences here in Chengdu, but I think this is an aspect,
that's something that we can work on.

6   Wendy: 呃…他说他也不知道就是在成都有没有这个和英国航空制造的合
作…

(uh...**he said he doesn't know** if Chengdu has Aerospace
manufacturing or not…)

7   Mr.Deng: 嗯啊这个我倒是补充一下。航空制造我了解的并不是那么全面啊，
但是成都我们有一个成飞，成都飞机制造所。

(I should add that, for this point, I don't know much about the
Aerospace industry, but we in Chengdu has the Chengdu Aircraft
Industrial Group.)

8   Wendy: 成飞…..对对对。我们也可以合作。

　　　　　(Yes yes, CDAI, we can cooperate also.)

This excerpt begins with John's introduction of his organization's work regarding the Made in China 2025 plan. In the first few turns of this sequence, the interpreter follows the personal perspective adopted by her client, aligning herself with him to introduce the potential opportunities for the cooperation between the U.K and Chengdu in a variety of business sectors. Interestingly, when John expresses his lack of knowledge related to the aerospace sector in Chengdu (turn 16-5), Wendy shifts to reported speech and recapitulates the sentence as a complex one "he said he doesn't know" in her rendition. Such change is not un-motivated. As Tannen (1989) argues, the "reporting person" (p.109) is not responsible for the reported content, which means that the sole responsibility for this information lies with the quoted party. The interpreter, therefore reports the utterance of the primary speaker instead of following the personal perspective used by him.

　　　As an observer, I could tell from Wendy's facial expression that she was not very comfortable with John's remarks. And I assume that she may be concerned of her being held responsible for the lack of knowledge if she interprets it as "I am not sure" following John's perspective. The potential consequence is that the direct translation of John's utterance might downplay the credibility of Wendy's professional expertise considering her responsibility to proactively promote the industrial cooperation between Chengdu and the U.K. In such context, Wendy is supposed to show her professionality by presenting a comprehensive understanding of the operation of British business in various sectors of Chengdu industry. As can be seen in the sequence, Wendy opts for the reported speech，separating herself from the primary speaker, and also highlights that it is her British client's lack of knowledge. Wendy seemingly provides a very understandable excuse for the lack of knowledge, because John naturally has more in-depths expertise regarding the landscape of British industry as opposed to the Chinese one. Immediately, the Chinese primary speaker's reaction also shows that he is reminded by the interpreter the need to provide some source of information (turn 16-7) and responded "I should

add that", which furthers the triad dialogue.

> "A lot of reason behind the shift, I think I just want to emphasize that John lacks the knowledge in this sector, or I was trying to seek feedback from the Chinese primary speaker for him and request for more information" (Interview 1, 25th September 2018).

On the interpreter's account, she introduces the shifts of footing to avoid the potential misunderstanding. She actively engages with the primary interlocutors and successfully co-constructs the dialogue with them. While removing the possibility of being the scapegoat of her client, Wendy also tactfully extracts more information for her client to open up more opportunities for cooperation in various industries. Even though Wendy disrupts the professional norms, her mediating move is much in line with the goal of the conversation, and is socially appropriate in the situational context.

Example 17 shows that, in a lengthy Q&A session in a business encounter, the interpreter may also sometimes change the personal pronoun and restructure the sentence while rendering the utterances of the primary interlocutor. Mr.Li, an engineer of the Chinese side, who is the potential operator of the equipment, is making a query on some technical issues relating to the facility his company intends to purchase from the American manufacturer.

M3-Example 17

1   Mr.Li: 问一下，就是…在我这个束流这个过程当中，有哪些地方是剂量比较高的？有可能会泄露一些剂量的？

(The question is… in the process of my beam, where is the place for the higher dose? Where is the location for the leakage？)

2   Wang: So, along the whole system, in which parts are possibly the leakage points？ Where some part of the dose, beam dose, may leak？

3   Mr.Li: Radiation.

4   Mike: The rest of the system does not produce any radiation. It's only going to be on the external section.

5   Wang: 他说，整个系统本身它是不会产生核辐射的。就是在在外，外面有可能会有辐射。

    (**He said** the whole system itself won't produce radiation. In the outside, the outside part may have radiation)

6   Mr.Li: 中子那边就不说嘛…就是在加速器前面，这部分。

    (Neutron part is not concerned, it is about the front of the accelerator, this part.)

7   Wang: 你说这边这部分？

    (You mean this part?)

8   Mr.Li: 对，磁铁的部分，会不会有一些…

    (yeah, the part with the magnet, will there be..)

9   Wang: 辐射的泄露是吧？

    (Radiation?)

10 Mr.Li: 对。

    (Yes.)

11 Wang: **He wonders** whether in the magnets, there will be some radiation leakage? In the magnets?

12 Mr.Li: 比如说我们就是打打氘的时候，加速粒子是氘的时候。

    (for example when we inject deuterium, the accelerate ion is deuterium.）

13 Wang: When the accelerate ion is the deuterium.

14 Mike: So…because there's two, two magnets, there's a low energy magnet and a high energy magnet.

15 Wang: 那还有两，两种磁体嘛，一个高能的一个低低能的嘛…

    (There are two kinds of magnets, one high energy and one low energy.)

16 Mr.Li: 高能的。

    (high energy beam.)

17 Wang: **He wants to know** the high energy magnet

18 Mike: So by the time you get to the high energy magnet, the majority of your

201

current will be delivered on target. And any stray beam will be a very small amount of current. So it will not be significant. uh, radiation source.

19   Wang: 绝大部分的那个束流都是打到了那个靶上，在这个过程中呢，会有极其微小的嗯..泄露，但是达不到嗯…所谓的这种辐辐射什么遗漏的这个程度。

(The majority of the beam hits the target, in this process, there will be very small amount of leak, but not to the degree of radiation source leakage.)

20   Mr.Li: 就是我们放加速器的这个实验室就普通的墙就可以了？不用专门来考虑…

(So our lab for the accelerator, the ordinary wall is ok? No consideration of dedicated...)

21   Wang: **He means**… for the room when they place the accelerator, only ordinary walls will be okay? For, for the purpose of radiation protection?

22   Mike: Yea, that's all we have done.

23   Wang: No need to increase the thickness of the wall？

24   Mike: Um, correct. Most, almost all the radiation will be on the neutron line…the accelerator.

25   Wang: 对对，一般来说所有的辐射都是发生在中子这一块。

(yes, yes, normally most of the radiation occurs in the neutron part.)

As can be observed in the scripts, personal pronoun shifts occur several times in this lengthy sequence relating to the technical issue of radiation leakage. The Chinese speaker Mr.Li initiates the turn with a question concerning the location of the potential leakage. However, since he doesn't mention the technical word "radiation", the interpreter in his rendition also misses on this word. Mr.Li, with his professional expertise, monitors the interpreter's rendition in turn 17-3, adding the term "radiation" he expected to hear in the interpreter's rendition. It is interesting to see

202

that the primary interlocutor has more power than the interpreter in this scenario, which results from their knowledge of the industry and the company's technology, which goes beyond the interpreter's knowledge obtained in the briefing and preparation stage. Such cases also show that the power relations in BNI are always a dynamic and relational category, and the power differential is always changing with the evolving of the discourse moments.

In 17-4, the American primary speaker immediately responds to the question as he understands the English word mentioned by the Chinese side. In the next turn, the interpreter shifts to a reported speech to report to the Chinese primary speaker the American side's comments. It seems that the answer does not satisfy the Chinese user. In turn 19-6, Mr.Li explicates his concern again, pointing at the picture of the equipment, where the interpreter takes off his "interpreting hat" and initiates a singular language communication to confirm the meaning of his question (turn 17-7, 17-8, 17-9, 17-10). After a few single language exchanges, the interpreter again shifts to reported speech "he wonders" (turn 17-11) to report meaning of Mr.Li's question to Mike accurately.

The interpreter opts for the reported speech potentially because the single language exchange between him and Mr.Li excludes his client Mike from the ongoing talk. To avoid any confusion or misunderstanding in the interaction, the interpreter mediates the talk by introducing the reported speech, shifting his positioning from talking as the speaker to talking about the speaker. The interpreter thus separates himself from the Chinese primary interlocutor and indicates that the question is actually from Mr.Li instead of himself. By doing so, it seems that the interpreter also tries to hide his intervening moves in talk as he realizes the singular language exchange could be perceived to be "obtrusive behavior" (Wadensjö, 1998, p.248) in an interpreted business encounter, where the interpreter is expected to, mostly, animate the utterances of the primary interlocutors instead of engaging with the talk proactively or even voicing his own stance.

In the following turn, the interpreter continuously adopts the reported speech "He wants to know" (turn17-17) and "he means" (turn 17-21) to report the situation

to the other primary speakers, marking the distinction of the currently speaking self and the positioning of the primary speaker. Such a shift is potentially adopted to avoid the possible complexity or confusion created by the interpreter's following primary interlocutors' direct speech. Besides, it could be observed in the transcripts that the utterances of the primary speakers are either an incomplete sentence (turn19-16) or segmented sentences (turn 17-20), which might bring about misunderstandings in a bi-lingual discourse which features indirectness of communication. Besides, the reported speech adopted by the interpreter makes the identity of the speaker more prominent for the receiver of the information with the clear indication of the source of the information. By reporting to the primary speaker, the interpreter attempts to gate-keep the talk and avoids miscommunication caused by the complexities and indirectness of the interpreted-mediated discourse.

5.4 Discussion

In this Chapter, the data analysis examines the interpreter's mediating role and how the power of the interpreter shapes, and is shaped in the discursive practice of interpreted business encounters, particularly at the grammatical level. The data shows that interpreters take the initiative to coordinate the interpreted business encounters through shifts in footing and social positioning.

Combining Participation Framework theory (Goffman 1981) and the CDA perspective (Fairclough 1989), the analysis focuses on different types of personal pronoun changes introduced by interpreters, reflecting how interpreters situate themselves in this specific social context. The close examination of the data reveals that the production and consumption of the utterances or texts are mediated by the interpreter in such buyer-and-seller discourse. The interpreter has the capacity to break the order of discourse or norms of the professional interpreter, which, I would strongly argue is a manifestation of power deriving from their bilingual and bicultural expertise. The carrier of their mediation is language, which is particularly interesting with the aim of CDA to investigate the "often opaque relationships of causality and determination between (a) discursive practices, events and texts and (b)

broader social and cultural structures, relations and processes" (Fairclough 1993, p.135). The data analysis sheds light on "how such practices, events and texts arise out of and are ideologically shaped by relations of power and struggles over power" (ibid., p.135).

The results of the data analysis suggest that while arguing for the power of the interpreter in this discourse, we should also be aware that power is a highly relational category. The power relations among the interpreter, the client and the primary speaker are always dynamic and changing. The interpreter is obviously not the only party who holds power in the interaction, as their exercising of agency is largely subject to the dynamic negotiating relations between the buyer and the seller who owns more institutional and decision-making power in this discourse.

Based on the follow-up interview with the interpreters, the current research highlights the interpreter's motivation and awareness of these shifts and its influence to the power relations in the discourse. In business dialogue interpreting settings, the interaction is often charged with socio-cultural factors and institutional factors. The interpreter, be it freelance or in-house, works with the aim to facilitate the talk. It is noticeable that the interpreter's agency is influenced by the employment relationship, where they are expected to satisfy the need of the person who hires them.

However, there are also examples that illustrate the interpreter's positioning and allegiance are not always just to the client's side. Interpreters are found to align with the primary interlocutors at specific discursive moments to smooth the talk and promote the goodwill of cooperation. Whomever the interpreter aligns themselves to, the goal of such shift is always to facilitate the communication where both parties expect to "make mutually acceptable decisions on substantive matters" (Firth, 1995, p.6-7), which is in line with the intrinsic nature of the business talk in this study.

A significant proportion of personal pronoun shifts occur between first personal singular and first personal plural, first personal and third personal, as well as second and third personal pronouns. Such shifts reflect interpreters' perceptions of their positions in relation to the other participants. The institutional business

context and the interpreter's responsibility in the encounter grant the interpreter flexibility and a professional identity. On one side, they are expected by the primary interlocutors, the client in particular, to act for the benefit of the team they represent or work for; on the other side, they also flexibly adjust their positioning in relation to the primary speaker when it is necessary. As Goffman (1959, p.166) points out, the "social distance between team members may sharply increase or decrease" in a changing negotiating line. Such comment is echoed by Karanasiou (2016, p.206), indicating that "distance between team members and the interpreter can also change" along with the changes of the negotiating context in a business conversation. The interpreter's awareness of social positioning within the business context influences their approaches to communication, which brings about changes in power relations in the discursive practice.

Reported speech is also introduced by the interpreter. The examination of the data shows the aim of the interpreter's mediation is to emphasize the speaker's occupation in the institution, highlight the speaker's comments, as well as avoid the misunderstanding or confusion that might be brought about by the complexity and indirectness of the interpreter-mediated talk. In all the examples discussed, the interpreter separates him/herself from the speaker and opts for the role of a "reporter", establishing the interpreter's "self-presence" to talk about the speaker. As Jorgensen and Philips (2002, p.63) states:

> The research focus of CDA is accordingly both the discursive practices which construct representations of the world, social subjects and social relations, including power relations, and the role that these discursive practices play in furthering the interests of particular social groups.

A CDA perspective is adopted in this research because the interpreted business negotiation has an evident "linguistic-discursive character" (p.61), with the transfer of language playing a central role in the process. The discursive practices that involve text production and consumption against the social and cultural context sketch a concrete picture of how the interpreter's power is enacted. As the research results show, interpreters in BNI do not always act in strict accordance with the

professional norms and rules of direct translation. They hold power to break the order of discourse, the assumed ideal norms of translating whatever the primary speaker says. Taking on a coordinating role, they facilitate their clients to secure the deal or a favorable position. Departures from the complete and direct interpreting norms occur at different frequencies in interpreters' renditions. The interpreter often introduces personal pronoun shifts based on their assessment of the situational context and inter-personal relations with regards to the buyer-seller relation matrix.

CHAPTER 6   A CDA Insight into Interpreter's Mediation
by Turn-Taking Management

In this chapter, the study examines how the interpreter mediates the triadic interaction from the perspective of the interactional convention, a textual feature which is considered a "higher-level of organizational features which have relational value" (Fairclough, 1989, p.134) in CDA analysis. I intend to look at the situational context which motivates the interpreters to manage the interactional order. I will explore how and why interpreters in this study use their bilingual and bicultural resources to control the primary interlocutors' contribution through turn management and how this has influenced the interpersonal and power relations in the discourse.

6.1 The Interactional Convention from a CDA Perspective

Based on my definition of power in the discourse, I have featured the "interpreter's power" in business discourse as the right and capacity to put constraints on primary interlocutors. The turn-taking system in conversations, according to Fairclough (1989), be it formal or informal, "depends on (and is a part of) power relationships between participants" (p.134).

Ideally, turn-taking order in a conversation between equals should be on a turn-by-turn basis, where interlocutors in a conversation "would have equal rights at each point" of the conversation to "to select others, 'select themselves', or continue" (p.134). However, Fairclough (1989) also argues that the possibility of absolute equality in turn-taking order is extremely limited, as the actual occurrence of such social interaction "in our class-divided and power-driven society is extremely limited" (p.135). He exemplifies his views with the teacher-pupil and doctor-medical-students discourse, where the students and pupils are "are essentially limited to giving relevant answers to the teacher's questions" and the "the criteria for relevance are also the teacher's" (Fairclough, 1989, p.135). Such discursive practices occur in a specific social discourse where the "order of discourse" in an educational setting is abided by the interlocutors. Teachers hold the power to pose questions, issue instructions, or make evaluations because they obviously hold more

power in an educational setting, where the turn-taking systems are actually shaped by the power differentials in the interaction.

Fairclough (1989, p.135) specifics the power exercised in managing the turn-taking order in conversation into four categories:

-interruption

-enforcing explicitness

-controlling topic

-formulation

All these are **devices** employed by the more powerful participants in the discourse to control or limit the contributions of the less powerful ones to ensure the relevance of the topic and eliminate any ambiguity in the interaction.

Of course, the CDA study conducted by Fairclough (1989) is based on the monolingual dialogues, which makes the interpreted business interaction even more interesting since the turn-taking system is obviously more complex in a cross-linguistic and cross-cultural discourse. The proceeding of the interaction in such a context is based on the interpreters' conveying of other's messages, which also involves more stakeholders. It is therefore worthwhile to review the norms of the interpreting practice and to closely examine how the power relations shape and are shaped by the actual interactional conventions.

6.2 The Turn-Taking Norms in Interpreted Business Encounters

Before I go into the data analysis, it is of utmost significance to lay out the conventional distribution of interaction or the convention of the discourse. Understanding how the discourse is distributed and the norms of the order would be helpful for us to identify the interpreter's agency and the changes and disruptions they bring to such discourse. An interpreted business encounter between two primary speakers (Party A and B) with the assistance of an interpreter is always expected to be in the following format:

A: Utterance 1(in the majority (A's) language)

IN: Utterance 1' (=translation of U1 in B's language)

B: Utterance 2 (in B's language)

IN: Utterance 2' (=translation of U2 in A's language)

A: Utterance 3 (in A's language)

IN: Utterance 3' (=translation of U3 in B's language)

Ect.

The above format is similar to Knapp-Potthoff and Knapp's (1985) normal format of [language] mediator's discourse structure (p.457), which implies that the interpreter is expected to take every second turn immediately at the end of each primary speaker, to convey the message of the speaker A to speaker B. Such schema is similar to the Conversation Analysis concept of "adjacent pair", which was first developed by Schegloff and Sacks (1973, p.295). However, Goffman (1981) explains the concept of "adjacent pairs" as the basic units of interaction, which is defined as "one utterance temporarily following another" (p.6). He examines how adjacent pairs are linked together to form up chains; and proposes that dyadic interaction does not necessarily follow the dialogic format where two interlocutors take turns regularly. Such remarks are echoed by Wadensjö (1993), who puts forward that relaying others' utterances is just one of the activities that interpreters perform; another being the coordination of the flow of talk between participants, focusing on the mediation of organization of the talk, which she defines as "explicit coordination" (p.108). She argues that the interpreter "has a unique mandate precisely when it comes to listening and speaking" (Wadensjö, 1998, p.152), which refers to the active participation of interpreters in e.g., asking other participants to stop to let them translate or to clarify or repeat details that are relevant for translation. In other words, the interpreter functions as a "co-producer of the interaction achievements" (Gavioli, 2015, p.170), who proactively engages with the primary speakers to ensure the renditions produced is context-relevant and related to the common ground of understanding.

Roy (2000, p.36) proposes that turn-taking in interpreted interaction has "unique and complex features that actively involve the interpreter in organizing, managing, constraining, and directing the flow of talk". The data recorded shows

that interpreters in the business triad do not always strictly follow the above-stated turn-taking order. They all deviate from the expected schema at different frequency due to various reasons. They initiate the turn, hold the turn, delay the turn or ignore the turn, based on their assessments of the situation. On Baraldi's (2012) account, interpreters are "mediators who actively distribute opportunities to participate, by giving voice to participants' stories and (re-) authoring the current story as a story of cooperation" (p.298).

When an interpreter is involved in the situational context of a business dialogue, he/she potentially "has the possibility to understand everything said" (Wadensjö, 1995, p.2) with the scarce source of "bilingualism and biculturalism". As the only person who understands the flow of the conversation thoroughly, the interpreter therefore has "a unique possibility to overview and coordinate interaction" (ibid., p.2). From a CDA perspective, the interpreters' distributing and managing the turn order of the interaction manifests the power they hold in a cross-cultural business interaction. They not only convey the messages of primary interlocutor but also hold the power to put constraints on others by interrupting the conversation, enforcing explicitness, or self-selecting the turn. In the following chapter, excerpts from the data demonstrate how the interpreter plays the role of an active third party by exercising power to flexibly control the turns in the interpreted business discourse to ensure the mutual understanding of the primary speakers. They actively engage in the business interaction by interrupting a turn, maintaining a turn，terminating a turn, which obviously departs from the norms of the turn-taking system mentioned in the beginning of the chapter.

Like the two preceding chapters, the analysis framework follows Fairclough's (1989) three-dimensional model of description, interpretation and explanation. Drawing upon the categories proposed by Fairclough (1989), I decide to explore the manifestation of the interpreter's power in the business encounters by examining:

1) how they interrupt the turn;

2) how they terminate or omit the turn;

3) how they mediate the overlapped turns.

The above category is adopted based on the close reading of the data, and I also discovered that such forms of mediation occur most frequently in the discourse. Like Fairclough (1989) proposes, I intend to examine how the mediation in turn-taking system is related to "power relationships between participants" (p.134), the situational context, and the nature of the interpreted business context. I will explore the scenes whereby interpreters take advantage of the linguistic and cultural expertise they hold to disrupt the assumed norms and order of discourse in such context, and most importantly, the factors and elements that motivate their acts.

6.3 Mediation through Interrupting the Turn

In this category, interpreters intervene in the business talk and disrupt the order of discourse by interrupting the turn to request clarification or explanation of certain concepts. The interpreter disrupts the regular turn-taking order by redirecting the stipulated interpreter's turn back to the prior primary speaker A instead of the second primary speaker B for clarification or explanation:

> A: Utterance 1(in A's language)
>
> IN: Utterance 2 (in A's language)   to A
>
> A: Utterance 3 (in A's language)
>
> IN: Utterance ..' (may be translation of both U1 and U3 or just U3 only in
>   B's language)
>
> Etc.

The interpreter initiates a stretch of single language interaction to discuss with the primary speakers what has been mentioned or to demand clarification of information provided by the primary interlocutors. Such intervention is vital for the smooth proceeding of business talk since even minor ambiguity or ambivalence in a business context may create problems, which may lead to misunderstandings related to the will of cooperation or the details concerning the contract. There will be repercussions such as financial loss if the intentions of both sides are not accurately conveyed. Interpreters hold the right as well as the responsibility to request clarification. Such sequence is referred by Davidson (2002) as the "collaborative

model" (p.1284), where the interpreter conducts interactive communication in single language with the primary speaker to clarify what has just been mentioned or an unclear concept to ensure that the talk is on the right track. From a CDA perspective, the coordinating act of the interpreter is also a manifestation of power as "those with power may respond by *enforcing explicitness* – for instance, forcing participants to make their meaning unambiguous" (Fairclough, 1989, p.136) by asking questions in a situational context.

The data in this study reveals that all the interpreters opt for the interruption of the turn at different frequency to:1) request for explanation or clarification of information; 2) to avoid any potential ambiguity or ambivalence in the talk. The post-assignment interview also provides evidence that the interpreter, in most cases, interrupts the turn to avoid mistranslation or misunderstanding in the course of the business negotiation, so that both parties share a common ground of understanding in the discussion for cooperation or opportunities to buy.

Example 1 is an excerpt from M6, a business talk between Mark, the Italian Travel Agency manager and Tim, a managing director of a Chinese travel agency.

Example 1 (M6)

1   Mark: I want to ask, um, if possible, um, what type of business um, he's doing? If it is FIT or groups？

2   Chang: <u>what do you mean by FIT？</u>

3   Mark: FIT, for individuals or only for groups

4   Chang: 嗯哼，那他想问您的就是您的这个业务的, 业务的种类是什么？是这种个人游呢还是团队为主？

(Hmm huh, he wants to ask you that your business, what is the business category? Is it individual or package group traveling？)

5   Tim: 团队为主。

(Mainly are groups.)

6   Chang: 团队哈？

(Groups?)

7   Tim: 嗯。

        (Hmm huh.)

8   Chang: Mainly about the groups.

Example 1 is a prime example of how the interpreter regulates the interaction by engaging with the primary speakers. Mark initiates the conversation by posing a question regarding the Chinese travel agency's business model. In turn 1-2, instead of relaying Mark's question to the Chinese delegate in the next stipulated turn, Chang takes off her interpreting hat to seek for an explanation of the abbreviation "FIT" by raising a question of "what do you mean by FIT？". Such mediation selects Mark as the speaker of the next turn, where he explains the term. Chang then in the following turn (1-5), relays the question raised by Mark to Tim. Interestingly, the interpreter in turn 1-6 again deviates from the normative turn exchange order, confirming with Tim the answer he provides before her rendition in turn 1-8.

The interpreter flexibly regulates the turn-taking order based on her understanding of the goal of the communication and the context of the conversation, with the two primary speakers sitting on the desk seek for the common ground of their business scope. The turn-taking order is very different from the formula for interpreted conversation and norms of interpreting described in the preceding section, stating that the interpreter is supposed to take the turn only to render the primary speaker's utterance. In other words, the interpreters cannot self-select. Their taking of turns is constrained by the primary speakers who dominate the discourse, and are supposed to only interpret the primary interlocutors' utterances in the previous turn.

However, the turn-taking system in this sequence disrupts the "ideal norms". The interpreter not only self-selects in turns (1-2, 1-6), but also poses questions to the primary interlocutors to seek explanation (1-2). She tries to avoid ambiguity by forcing the speaker to clarify the meaning. According to my definition of power in discourse, the interpreter's behaviour in this sequence is clearly a manifestation of power, since she constrains the turn-taking order in the discourse as

well as the content produced by primary speakers. In the post-assignment interview, the interpreter explains, "I do not understand the meaning of the abbreviation FIT, and I believe it is an essential piece of information the primary speaker seeks for. And I feel obliged to pose the question" (Interview 5, 23 Nov 2018). By seeking an explanation, the interpreter succeeds in providing "culturally and contextually relevant information" (Baraldi and Gavioli, 2012, p.6), ensuring the conversation proceeds on the right track. The interpreter's intervening move in this sequence is conducive to the primary speaker's active interpretation of the issues they concern about, which facilitates the mutual understanding of the business talk.

As the talk goes on, a very similar example occurs. The Italian manager starts to promote a tourist destination, Paestum, in southern Italy, which is not a popular tourist destination for Chinese tourists. Therefore, the Chinese primary speaker, Tim, initiates a series of questions regarding the details of the arrangement in South Italy. Example 2 is an excerpt of queries made by Tim.

Example 2 (M6)

1   Tim: 还有一个问题就是，当地这个接待，旅客的吃住行，他如果全部
          安排接待这种可以的话…

          (Another question is, the local reception, tourists' food, accommodation

          and transportation if it is possible for him to arrange all…)

2   Chang: Um huh, Can you arrange the local reception? Such as the traveling,

          eating, and accommodation.

3   Mark: Yes.

4   Chang: In Paestum?

5   Mark: Yes, and we have also China guide, transportation, if you need services,

          I can direct you even to local suppliers professionals.

6   Chang: 嗯，是的。还有这种当地的交通啊导游啊什么都可以去安排这种
          专业的人去接待。

          (Hmm, the local transportation, tourist guide, and other things, we can

          all arrange professional people to sort it out.)

In this sequence, Tim initiates the turn with a question of the local reception. In the next turn, Chang interprets his question, followed by Mark's answer of "yes" in turn 3-3. It can be observed that in turn 3-4, instead of rendering the confirmative answer of the Italian primary speaker to Tim as expected in the norms of interpreting, Chang interrupts the turn by posing a question of "Paestum? " to clarify with Mark if it is the place he is promoting. In the next turn, Mark provides a more concrete answer, adding some new information regarding the "tourist guide" and "professional people" to further promote the tourist destination. Chang then starts interpreting in turn 2-6 to render all the information provided by Mark.

As can be observed, the interpreter regulates the turn to clarify with the Italian primary speaker based on her understanding of the business talk's aim. Hired by the Chinese client, she is well aware that the specific goal of the Chinese client, which is to explore with the Italian travel agency the possible tourist destination for the Chinese tourists. However, the Chinese client did not specify the location and he only mentions "local reception" (当地接待) in his question. The interpreter understands that it refers to the specific tourist destination the Italian speaker is promoting. This is because the context of the whole discussion before actually centers around the place name, Paestum. The interpreter, therefore, raises the question to clarify with the Italian speaker if he is specifically referring to Paestum. Interestingly, the Italian primary speaker not only confirms the location he is talking about but also provides a more detailed answer (turn3-5) compared with the answer of "Yes" in turn 3-3.

In this sequence, the interpreter's act obviously violates the conventional norms in interactional order, and it seems that she does have the privilege to select the speaker (2-4) based on the situational context. In other words, the primary speaker's taking turns is subjected to the interpreter's assessment of the situation. Besides, the content produced by the primary speakers is also somehow constrained by the interpreter as the criteria for relevance is decided by the interpreter! We can easily tell from the sequence that the interpreter's interrupting of the turn actually ensures the interaction is based on common ground of understanding. Meanwhile,

216

the interpreter also elicits more relevant information for her Chinese client through selecting Mark as the next speaker. She actually creates a turn, an opportunity for Mark to further promote his product. It can be argued that the interpreter, rather than being a neutral conveyor of messages, is an active participant "who can potentially influence the direction and outcome of the event" (Roy and Metzger, 2014, p.161). In the interview session, the interpreter explains that she is well aware of the turn interruption.,

> "Although the conversation has been focused on the tourist destination Paestum, the previous turns occurred are about the safety issues of south Italy. As Paestum is not explicitly mentioned in this sequence, I feel it is necessary to raise it up to make sure the primary speakers are on the same page" (Interview 5, 23 Nov 2018).

Obviously, the interpreter assesses the situation based on her understanding of the context. She decides to interrupt the turns to guarantee that no misunderstanding occurs in the interaction. Her co-producing the rendition with the primary speakers is central to the result and effect of the business talk, as it provides more relevant information for her clients to weigh the product promoted by the Italian manager.

The sequence in Example 3 displays a similar example of how the interpreter manages the turn-taking system to ensure the shared understanding of the primary speakers within business discourse. In the technical exchange of the representatives of the Chinese company (Mr.Li) and the American facility supplier (Mike), the interpreter (Wang) coordinates the talk by interrupting the turns a couple of times to ensure the rendition provided is accurate and contextually relevant.

Example 3 (M3)

1   Mr.Li: 问一下，就是…在我这个束流这个过程当中，有哪些地方是剂量比较高的？有可能会泄露一些剂量的？

> (The question is… in the process of my beam, where is the place for the higher dose? What's the whereabouts for the leakage dose?)

2   Wang: So along the whole system in which parts are possibly the leakage points？Where some some part of the dose, beam dose, may leak？

3   Mr.Li: Radiation.

4   Mike: The rest of the system does not produce any radiation. It's only going to be on the external section.

5   Wang: 他说嗯整个系统本身它是不会产生核辐射的。就是在在外，外面有可能会有辐射。

     (He said the whole system itself won't produce radiation. In the outside, outside part may have radiation)

6   Mr.Li: 中子那边就不说嘛…就是在加速器前面，这部分。

     (Neutron part is not concerned, it is about the front of the accelerator, this part.)

7   Wang: 你说这边这部分？

     (You mean this part?)

8   Mr.Li: 对，磁铁的部分，会不会有一些…

     (yeah, the part with the magnet, will there be..)

9   Wang: 辐射的泄露是吧？

     (Radiation?)

10   Mr.Li: 对。

     (Yes.)

11   Wang: He wonders whether is in the magnets was there will be some radiation leakage? In the magnets?

The Chinese primary speaker Mr.Li initiates the turn with a question regarding the location of the leakage dose. Interestingly, with his command of the English technical terms, Mr.Li monitors the interpreter's rendition in turn3-3 while emphasizing his concern of "radiation" in turn 3-4. The American client Mike responds to his question in the next turn, which seems insufficient regarding the specific information the Chinese side requests to know.

In turn 3-6, Mr.Li explicates his question by pointing at the diagram of the equipment. Instead of relaying the question to Mike in the next stipulated turn (3-7), the interpreter raises a question "you mean this part" to Mr.Li while also pointing at

the diagram, seeking for the clarification of the question. Mr.Li in the next turn (3-8) confirms it is the "magnet part" he is talking about, followed by the interpreter's second request for clarification of the question "radiation?" (3-9). The single language side exchange between the interpreter and the Chinese speaker occurred here is referred by Davidson (2002) as the "collaborative model" (p.1284) in interpreted discourse. Such a model refers to the interpreter's initiating a stretch of single language interaction with the aim to discuss with the primary speakers what has been mentioned, or to clarify the information that is central in the talk. Such an intervention constructs the shared understanding of the primary speakers within the discourse.

It seems that the interpreter's presence has been made prominent in the same language side exchange between him and the primary speaker as he selects the primary speaker to take turns. The power-relationship experiences subtle changes since the interpreter intervenes in the turn-taking system from turn 7-7. In the sequence prior to turn 7-7, Mr.Li, the Chinese buyer of the equipment seems to be firmly in control of the turn-taking order and the interpreter's contribution in the conversation. He not only monitors the interpreter's rendition but also interrupts the interpreter to supplement the word "radiation" (3-3) he expects the interpreter to say, which might be quite embarrassing and stressful for the interpreter considering that Mr.Li didn't explicate it in his utterance, and that it seems as if the interpreter fails conveys his message. In turn 3-6, Mr.Li also baldly interrupts the interpreter's rendition of his America client's utterance, and shifts the topic to the issues he concerns by stating "it is about the front of the accelerator, this part" (3-6). In the next turn (3-7), instead of rendering Mr.Li's concern to his client, the interpreter intervenes and poses the question "you mean this part?" to Mr. Li with the potential aim to guarantee that he correctly understands the Chinese interlocutor's question.

From an observer's perspective, such intervening moves can elicit more precise information so that the American client's answer can be more relevant. The interpreter's mediation to a large extent prevents the Chinese speaker's potential unsatisfactory feedback to the client's answer in the following turns, a situation

occurs frequently at the beginning of the conversation. In addition, the interpreter's intervention also disentangles the misunderstanding, which is caused in the exchange of turns when less irrelevant information is interpreted in turn-by-turn fashion. Such mediation imposes a positive effect in a business context in which the topic discussed is related to concrete technical details of the company, an institution that the interpreter is not affliated with. It can be seen that in this situational context, such discursive norm is apparently not maintained with the interpreter's use of linguistic resources he holds. Instead of compliantly occupying a position in which they render whatever the primary interlocutor says, the interpreter intervenes in the conversation and asks for clarification of the primary speaker's concern. The interpreter's agency is exercised, on one side, with their language expertise and understanding of the orientation of the talk. On the other side, they intervene to ensure thatthe client provides the most relevant answer to eliminate the Chinese primary speaker's technical concern. The interpreters obviously take on the subject position more than a linguistic transmitter, and they strive to manage the interactional order and avoid the misunderstandings of the critical message within the specific social context of the business negotiation.

In this process, language plays a vital role in the interpreter's exercise of agency. In Fairclough's (1989) discussion of the police-witness or teacher-pupil discourses, the social positions of the witness and the pupil are compliantly occupied, because "the social relationships which determine them are sustained by the use of language" (p.19), such as the reduced questions posed by the policeman, the lack of acknowledgement of the witness' answer, and the reduced question posed by the teacher. The use of language on such occasions is considered the manifestation of power in a specific discourse. In the discursive practice I am exploring, power also manifests itself through participants' language use. More interestingly, "the dominant conventions are resisted or contested" (p.20) when the interpreter intervenes in the dialogue as a substantial and active participant. In such a context, "language use can contribute to changing social relationships" (p.20) when the interpreter co-creates and co-produces the texts with the primary

interlocutors. The interpreter takes the subject position of a substantial participant in such context and acts as an ally of his client or the spokesperson of the primary interlocutors in the business talk. He assists the participant by monitoring the information flow, and the development of the business talk. The interpreter in the interview also states that he is fully aware of the mediation,

> "I have to interrupt to confirm with the Chinese primary speaker about his concern, as it is related to the performance of the equipment, which is essential to their decision in purchasing the instruments in this business talk" (Interview 2, 15 Oct 2018).

Obviously, the interpreter is fully aware of the technical context and the business goals of the talk. He co-produces the renditions with the Chinese primary speaker by selecting the interlocutor and putting constraints on the relevance of texts produced by the speaker. Example 4 is a similar example of the interpreter interrupting the turn for clarification.

Example 4 (M5)

1   Frank: So as an example, um, usually the acoustic materials or whatever, has to be very thick. But if you use a nanofiber layer, with just special acoustic properties, the thickness of the, of the acoustic panels can be much, much lower. For if you don't have space, it's a good, good solution.

2   Lee: 通常情况下那些声学运用的材料，他没有用纳米材料之前，传统那些隔音板，它可能会厚度很大，但是现在运用到纳米科技，我们的纳米材料之后，它的厚度会大大的缩小。所以如果空间不够，是一个号的解决方案。

(Normally, those acoustic materials application, without the use of nanomaterials, the acoustic panels will be very thick. But with the application of the nano technology, our nanomaterials, the thickness will be greatly reduced. So if you don't have enough space, it is a good solution.)

3　　　　Lisha: 哦…它就它就有那种就是怎么说呢，就是，那它用于隔音板上面是用什么，用它的什么特性？

　　　　　　　(Oh...it has, it has, how to say, that is, when it is used in acoustic panels, what is used? What kind of property is used?)

4　　　　　Lee: 啊，用纳米材料的什么特性吗？

　　　　　　　(Ah, what property of the nanomaterial is used?)

5　　　　Lisha: 隔音板上用它的什么特性？减震对吧？

　　　　　　　(What is the property used in the acoustic panel, shock absorption?)

6　　　　　Lee: When it is applied to the, to the acoustic. Um, so what kind of properties can we use? Shock absorption?

In this sequence, Frank introduces the strength of the nanomaterials produced by his institute in the first turn, which is then translated accordingly by the interpreter Lee to the Chinese primary speaker Lisha. In turn 4-3, Lisha raises a question to further explore the "特性" ("property") used in the acoustic panel with a repetitive sentence, which reflects that she is also not entirely certain of how to put together the question. Besides, Lisha also uses the pronoun "它" ("it") a couple of times without pointing out what it represents. Instead of interpreting the question, the interpreter opts to clarify with Lisha what "it" refers to by raising the question of "用纳米材料的什么特性吗？"("what property of the nanomaterial?"). In the following turn, Lisha explicates her question by pointing out "what is property used in the acoustic panel", and she also specifies her question by adding "减震吗" ("shock absorption?"). Based on his exchange with the Chinese primary speaker in a single language in the previous turns, Lee finally renders the question to his client Frank (turn 4-6). The sequence can be represented as follows: A's rendition—IN's translation—B's rendition—IN's assessment and question—B's rendition—IN's translation.

It is observable that the interpreter, instead of rendering on a turn-by-turn basis, actively engages with the Chinese primary speaker. Such a move is based on the interpreter's perception of the question, which he considers not straightforward

enough. After detecting the ambiguity in the first question, the interpreter flexibly manages the turn and requests for clarification before finally translating it to his client Frank. As discussed in previous examples, Lee's intervening behaviour in this sequence exhibits that he is able to assess the relevance of the question in the primary speaker's utterance. He also self-selects as the next speaker for clarification and then re-allocates the floor back to Frank. Instead of interpreting in a conduit mode, the interpreter takes the initiative to gate-keep the answers or questions raised by the primary speaker, eliminating the communicative inadequacy that might lead to misunderstanding, to ensure the smooth progress of the business talks.

Example 5 displays a similar case in which the interpreter self-selects as the next speaker for clarification to provide the primary speaker and his client the common ground for mutual understanding.

Example 5 (M4)

1   Frank: Some some solution, solution. Okay, so you provide some solutions to solve their environmental problems of air pollution？So you already use some technologies for filtration. We both already use some technologies.

2   Lee: 你们现在就是有一些技术帮助来，啊就是过滤净化你们客户的空气污染问题，提供解决方案，对吧？我们都用了一些技术。

      (You already have some technologies to filter and purify your client's air pollution problems, right? We both use some technologies.)

3   Miss Wu: 对。

      (Yes.)

4   Lee: <u>就是您刚才说的那个光触媒对吧？</u>

      (Is it actually the photo-catalytic technology you mentioned just now?)

5   Miss Wu: 对对对，我们也是从外面引进的。

      (Yes yes, we have also imported it.)

6   Lee: Yeah, the photo-catalytic technologies. Yeah, we mainly use um, um, the photo-catalytic technology imported from Japan.

This sequence occurs after the Chinese primary interlocutor Miss Wu's briefing of her company's business scope and the technology for clients to solve some environmental problems. Frank initiates the turn to confirm with Miss Wu if her company provides clients with the solution by offering some advanced materials or technology ("you provide some solutions to solve their problems with air pollution？"). In the following turn (5-2), Lee translates his question to Miss Wu and get an affirmative answer "yes" ("是的") in turn 5-3. Instead of rendering it to Frank, Lee claims the next turn to initiate a conversation with Miss Wu ("Is it actually the photo-catalytic technology you mentioned just now?") based on his knowledge of the context. Obviously, Lee interrupts the turn in an attempt to confirm with Miss Wu the specific technology she uses. In turn 5-5, Miss Wu immediately provides the affirmative answer with more specific information "对对对，我们也是从外面引进的。"("Yes yes, we have also imported it").

Based on his interactive exchange with Miss Wu, the interpreter, Lee, then translates the answer to Frank and redistribute the turn back to him. We can see that Frank initiates the turn to confirm if Miss Wu and his company both specialize in advanced material or technology for environmental protection, which can serve as a foundation for further talk. It seems that the interpreter's self-selecting of the turns and his interaction with the Chinese speaker has deepened the Czech client's understanding of the Chinese company's business scope. In the interview, Lee states that he decided to intervene in the talk to guarantee the mutual understanding between the two primary speakers,

> "I am aware of the turn interruption here, as I feel it would be good to clarify the technology to the Chinese primary speaker so that my client Frank will be fully aware of the technology the Chinese company uses or needs" (Interview 4, 15 Nov 2018).

It is apparent that the interpreter actually interrupts the turn for a motivated interactional conduct. He states that he wants to ensure the rendition provided is contextually relevant for the smooth proceeding of the business negotiation. The interpreter's conscious behaviour displays that his subject position grants him the

capacity to control the development of the conversation by distributing the turns and requesting for explicitness. In an interpreted business interaction, such interruption and intermittent absence of the primary speaker would be considered breaching the norms of a professional interpreter. Nevertheless, it is noticeable that primary interlocutors on both sides find no problem with the interpreter's interrupting of the conventional interactional order. Instead, they accept it as a natural constitute of the conversation, and they cooperate with the interpreter without any disagreement.

I would argue that this has supported the CDA argument that the properties of discourse are socially and situationally determined. Imagine some similar intervention of communicative order occur in a monolingual context, where there is no linguistic barrier among the participants. A similar form of interruption would totally exclude the Czech speaker in the conversation, which can be very impolite and embarrassing. On such occasions, the absence of any interlocutor would be considered as a real problem that might not be very constructive to the development of conversation. However, in the context of interpreted business dialogue, it seems such intervention is on the positive side at the specific moment of the discourse, which is much related to the social position the interpreter is located, the interpreter's linguistic capacity, and their awareness of the information flow.

6.4 Mediation through Omitting or Terminating the Turn

In this category, interpreters omit or end the turn at a different frequency when the information conveyed is transparent, repetitive, or existing knowledge mentioned in the talk. As shown in most cases, interpreters tend to omit the feedback or terminate the turn by giving feedback directly to the prior primary speaker in the context of business conversation. Such tendency is supported by Wadensjö (1998), who states that the "feedback of the primary speakers is delayed and often non-existent" (p.263). The analysis of transcripts in my study reveals that the feedback is often omitted. In some cases, the interpreter also self-selects to provide the answer to the primary speaker because the information is so transparent or repetitive, and the rendition back and forth for feedback is time-consuming or redundant. Based on my

characterization of power in the discourse, the interpreter's intervention of the turn-taking mechanism can be considered a manifestation of their agencies, as they are capable to put constraints on the primary speakers' interactional order in the business negotiation.

Example 6 is a prime example of how the interpreter manages the turn by providing affirmative feedback to the Chinese client with the discursive strategy of omission of turns in the closing part of the sequence.

Example 6 (M7)

1   Adam: In Lucerne, we have also this hotel, which is exactly by the lake.

2   Chang: 在这个琉森的话我们有这家酒店，就在湖边。

      (In Lucerne, the hotel is by the lake.)

3   Tim: 就在湖边？

     (By the lake?)

4   Chang: 对的，是在湖边的一个酒店。

      (Yes, it is a hotel by the lake.)

5   Adam: But of course it depends all on the price.

2   Chang: 但是还是跟这个价格是相关的。

      (Of course, it depends on the price.）

7   Adam: And this one is very beautiful, it is exactly by the lake, it is very romantic which fits to the theme that we are talking about today.

8   Chang: 那这个呢就是很浪漫也是在湖边的，就跟我们今天谈的这个浪漫旅行是有一定的关系了。这家酒店的话。

     (This one, it is very romantic, it is by the lake, which is related to our today's theme of romantic tour, this is the exact hotel we are talking about.)

9   Tim: 嗯。

     (Hmm.)

Example 6 is an excerpt from Meeting No.7, a match-making business event after

an official forum where each of the business talk session should not exceed 40 minutes, as the Chinese company representative in the business booth is schedule to meet different foreign companies. The Swiss hospitality group representative, Adam, is proactively promoting his product to the Chinese Travel agency manager Tim. In the previous sequence, Tim and Adam discussed Tim's questioning over the location of Adam's hotel. In this sequence, Adam initiates the turn by highlighting the hotel is by the lake in Lucerne, an arguably most popular destination for Chinese tourists. In the following turn, Chang translates Adam's promotion of the hotel "在这个琉森的话我们有这家酒店，就在湖边" ("In Lucerne, the hotel is by the lake"), followed by Tim's question of "就在湖边？" ("By the lake?") in turn 6-3. Instead of translating it to Adam, Chang provides the affirmative answer to Tim in the next turn (6-4). The interpreter steps in and functions as the "principal", who is responsible for producing the content in the course of the communication.

It can be observed that the interpreter decides to provide the answer directly, potentially because the information is so clear in the previous lines, which is considered a piece of known information by the interpreter to explain directly to her client,

> "I felt that it is not necessary to ask the Swiss primary speaker again as it is something just mentioned and I am pretty sure of the answer to this question. And also it is more efficient time-wise, as it is a conversation with the time constraint." (Interview 5, 23 Nov, 2018).

Based on the interpreter's account, she functions as an active participant to facilitate her client's understanding instead of working in a "conduit" mode. Providing the information that is known or clearly understood, the interpreter enables the conversation to move efficiently to the next agenda. In this sequence, the interpreter obviously considers herself as more than a linguistic helper. She takes up the role of a collaborative team member to manage the turn by self-selecting and selecting the speaker. It can be observed that the interpreter flexibly distributes the turn according to the relevance of the information to the topic, to the orientation of the talk, or her client's need. This is much in line with Fairclough's (1989) argument that

"Language varies according to the social identities of people in interactions, their socially defined purposes, social setting, and so on" (p.21). I would also argue that the interpreter emerges as a substantive participant with more power in this short sequence with the firm control of the development of the dialogue and her client's contribution. Besides, she sets the criterion for the relevance of information while intervening in the interactional order. Verbally, she omits the turn which she should translate to Adam (6-3) as she considers it a piece of known information. Non-verbally, my presence in the meeting enables me to observe that she is also in control through some postures. I noticed that the Chinese primary speaker actually gives feedback with a nod when he heard the answer provided by the interpreter (6-4), signaling that he understands the message. Then the interpreter turns towards the Swiss primary speaker, tactfully giving him with an eye contact, which serves as a visual cue signaling him to continue the talk. Adam takes the cue immediately as he is so eager to talk and promote the product. In turn 6-5 and 6-7, Adam continues to provide information of the hotels regarding the price and the style, which are translated by Chang accordingly. Interestingly, it can be observed that in turn 6-9, the back-channeling of Tim's "hmm" is again left un-translated by the interpreter. This type of intervention is frequently found in the data. Although the primary speakers depend on the interpreter for communication, they may also commnicate with each other by reading the non-verbal postures or the behavior of back-channeling. Such cases explain why "the feedback activity between the primary parties is delayed and often no-existent" (Wadensjö, 1998, p.236) in an interpreted encounter. It seems that the interpreter omits the turn because she discovers the "hmm" with the nodding posture can be self-explanatory.

Besides, since the Swiss speaker is so eager to talk, the interpreter decides to omit the turn so that the communication may continue. The non-verbal signs, though not a focus in this study, are also a significant manifestation of the interpreter's agency in the discourse. It shows that "spoken texts-talk is interwoven with gestures, facial expression, movement, posture to such an extent that it cannot be properly understood without reference to these 'extras'" (Fairclough, 1989, p.27).

The interpreter's agency manifests itself when the interpreter makes the decisions to accept the floor or distribute turn based on the visual cues. Meanwhile, she also uses body language, such as eye contact, to ensure the communication is conveyed in a coherent and smooth fashion. Of course, the nuances of the non-verbal intervention of the interpreter could be an interesting direction of research for future exploration if video-recordings of the business conference are accessible. As the discussion continues for a few lines, a similar example occurs.

Example 7 (M7)

1   Tim: 哦，知道知道。像这个酒店一般这个价格是团队的一个运价，还是 FIT 价格？

(Ok, I know. For the hotel like this, normally, the price is for the Group or FIT?)

2   Chang: Is this price for FIT or the group？

3   Adam: No no no, this is for the group per person.

4   Chang: 啊，就是那个团队每人每天的价格。

(Ah, it is for the groups per person per day.)

5   Tim:团队每人每天，对吧？

(Per person per day for the group, right?)

6   Chang: 嗯。

(Hmmm.)

7   Tim: ok.

8   Adam: Minimum 20 persons.

9   Tim: 最多是 20 个人？

(Maximum 20 person?)

10   Chang: 最少是二十个。

(Minimum 20 person.)

11   Tim: 每一间的价格…

(The price for every room…)

12   Chang: 对嗯。

(Yes, that's right)

In this sequence, the Chinese client Tim raises a question in turn 7-1 about the price of a hotel Adam introduces in the brochure presented. In turn 7-5, Tim again tries to confirm the information with a question while jotting down the rendition provided by Chang in the previous turn (turn 7-4). The interpreter, again, feeds back with a "hmm" without interpreting the utterance to Adam. Tim then gives feedback with the English "Ok", nodding at the same time. This makes it very transparent to Adam that Tim already understands, to move on with his introduction. In turn 7-8, Adam continues to define the number of the tourists in a "group", and Tim immediately takes the next stipulated turn of the interpreter as he seemingly understands the utterance, leaving no space for Chang to interpret. However, Tim's statement of "最多是 20 个人？"（"Maximum 20 person"）is an incorrect rendition in turn 7-9. Chang therefore claims the next turn to clarify with Tim to avoid any misunderstanding. Interestingly, Tim is taking notes in the whole process, and he murmurs in turn 7-11"每一间的价格…"（"the price for every room…"）. This leaves Adam completely excluded from the conversation. To break the pause, Chang, on one side, provides Tim with the feedback of "嗯对"（"hmm that's right"）to terminate the turn; on the other side, Chang turns to Adam and smiles at him, signaling that he can move on with the talk.

In this sequence, it is identifiable that the interpreter has "a strategic and potentially powerful position" with her presence as "a resource for attaining the shared understanding and for suppressing and counteracting instance of miscommunication" (Wadensjö, 1998, p.237). As the only one who masters both languages in this dialogue, the interpreter is able to control the turn development in the interaction. She assesses the situational context and makes the decision for selective translation of the feedback of the primary speaker. Moreover, she also claims the floor to correct the misunderstanding of her client, thus saving both parties time from recieving incorrect information. In other words, the "dominant conventions are resisted or contested" within the interpreted business context when the interpreter's possession of linguistic resource "contribute to changing social relationships" (Fairclough, 1989, p.20). The interpreter's subject position shifts to a

"principal", or even an "organizer", which is no more secondary to the primary speaker. It is noticeable that the interpreter holds power to give affirmative feedback to her Chinese client, to correct the misinformation, and to select the next speaker in the conversation.

As Wadensjö (1998) argues, "Primary parties are dependent on the interpreter's involvement in interaction to be able to contribute in their own right to a certain communicative atmosphere" (p.284). In this sequence, it is apparent that the interpreter flexibly controls the turn to facilitate the mutual understanding between her client and the Swiss primary speaker. Such an occasion also proves that the strict adherence to the ideal "turn-to-turn" mode, or detached interpreting style might not always be the best way to facilitate the interpreted communication, especially in a business talk with the time constraint, and a clear profit goal or the opportunity to buy. A similar case is presented in the sequence in Example 8, which occurs in the beginning part of Meeting No.8.

Example 8 (M8)

1   Linda: Hi, this is my Wechat.

2   Chang: 这个是我的那个微信。

         (This is my Wechat)

3   Linda: You can scan it, I have this Wechat.

4   Chang: 可以扫一下我的微信。

         （you can scan my Wechat.）

5   Chang: 这个是欧洲 spa 协会的。

         (This one is from the Europe Spa Association.)

6   Tim: 欧洲 Spa 协会。

         （Europe Spa Association.）

7   Chang: 嗯。

         (Hmm.)

In this sequence, Linda, the director of the Europe Spa Association, comes to Tim's booth to talk. Interestingly, Linda initiates the turn in a very localized fashion to

show her Wechat[5] account to the Chinese primary interlocutor. This is potentially because Chinese businesses currently rely heavily on Wechat, a social media app, to keep contact with their business partners. Chang takes the stipulated turn to translate Linda's utterance in the next turn. Then Linda requests the Chinese primary speaker in turn 8-3 to scan the QR code of the Wechat account, which is followed by Chang's rendition in the next turn. After checking Linda's Wechat on Tim's phone, Chang initiates turn 8-5 and self-selects as the next speaker and speaks in a lower voice pitch to her client Tim that "这个是欧洲spa协会的 (This one is from the Europe Spa Association). Hearing the introduction, Tim starts to take notes on a pad again, while repeating Chang's statements in the next turn. Instead of translating Tim's utterance to Linda, Chang again gives the feedback of "hmm" to Tim to confirm that his understanding is correct. Meanwhile, she turns her head to Linda as if signaling that the information is recorded or understood, so that Linda can proceed with the talk.

It is apparent that Chang, in this sequence, tactfully facilitates the talk by flexibly organizing the turns. Apart from taking the stipulated interpreter's turn, she also initiates a turn and self-selects in case her client does not understand the English Wechat account name. Besides, Chang also quickly terminates the turn with a back-channeling "hmm" to Tim and gives an eye contact to Linda so that Linda will not feel being left out of the interaction. Similar to the previous examples, the interpreter controls and organizes the conversation based on her assessment of the situational context in the discursive practice. In this sequence, Chang tactfully shifts her subject position and stands with her client to translate the utterance of the foreign primary speaker to assist her client's thorough understanding of the situation, thus generating common ground of understanding for both parties.

Example 9 reveals how the interpreter coordinates a highly technical business talk by flexibly managing the turn-taking order in the interpreted dyadic interaction.

Example 9 (M3)

1   Mr.Li: 就是我们放加速器的这个实验室就普通的墙就可以了？不用专门来

---

[5]Wechat is a popular social media app in China for people's daily communication or for business use.

考虑…

(Speaking of our lab to accommodate the accelerator, the ordinary wall is ok? No specific consideration is needed..)

2　Wang: He means… for the room when they place the accelerator, only ordinary walls will be okay? For, for the purpose of radiation protection?

3　Mike: Yea, that's all we have done.

4　Wang: No need to increase the thickness of the wall？

5　Mike: Um, correct. Most most, almost all the radiation will be on the neutron line…for the accelerator.

6　Wang: 对对，一般来说所有的辐射都是发生在中子这一块。

(Yes yes, normally most of the radiation occurs in the neutron part.)

7　Mr.Li: 这点我们是肯定的。

(We are clear about this.)

8　Wang: 对，在加速器这边，你不需要建筑特别的厚度。

(Yes, for the accelerator, you do not need to construct a wall with special thickness.)

9　Mr.Li: 就不用考虑。普通的墙体就可以..

(We do not need to consider about it, the wall with ordinary thickness will do..)

10　Wang: 对。我刚刚给他说了。

(Yes, I asked him about that already.)

Example 9 is an excerpt from Meeting No.3. In this sequence, the American accelerator company explains the technical know-how of the accelerator to the Chinese buyer who intends to procure the facility. Mr.Li, the engineer from the Chinese company, initiates the turn to ask if it is necessary to give special consideration of the wall in the lab that accommodates the accelerator. Wang, hired by the American company, takes the stipulated second turn to translate the question. In the next turn (turn 9-3), Mike provides the answer of "Yea, that's all we have done". Instead of translating Mike's response to Mr.Li immediately, Wang self-

233

selects as the next speaker to request confirmation of the response (turn 9-4), a turn-management style I have already discussed in the last category. Wang interrupts the turn to request clarification, possibly because it is an issue that is central to the decision of the procurement. After communicating with Mike in a single language, Wang finally provides the rendition to confirm that there is no need for special consideration of the wall ("Yes yes, most of the radiation occurs in the neutron part."). Obviously, the Chinese engineer Mr.Li is still concerned about the issue. In the next turn, he reiterates that they understand the location of the radiation by saying "这点我们是肯定的" ("We are clear about this")，which implies that a more affirmative answer is requested. As the buyer of the equipment, the Chinese side is obviously in a position with more power to elicit information and answers that they consider vital from the seller.

It can be observed that Mr.Li's concern is also potentially because that he couldn't understand the single language exchange between Wang and Mike (turn 9-4 and turn 9-5), in which Wang already predicts the Chinese primary speaker's concern. Wang thus proactively confirms with the American client if there is the need "to increase the thickness of the wall". In turn 9-8, instead of interpreting the statement of "we are clear about this" to his client, the interpreter self-selects and claims the turn to reassure the Chinese primary speaker that there is no need to "construct a wall with special thickness" ("普通墙体就可以"). Interestingly, in the following turn, the Chinese speaker repeats Wang's rendition "就不用考虑。普通的墙体就可以.." ("We do not need to consider about it, the wall with ordinary thickness will do") as if requesting confirmation from him. Wang again self-selects as the next speaker, and he omits the repetitive remarks of the Chinese speaker and terminates the turn. The interpreter then feedbacks to the Chinese primary speaker in a reassuring tone, explaining that he has already rendered their answer to the American client.

This sequence reveals that the interpreter is able to shape the turn-taking system of a highly technical interpreted conversation in the business context. The interpreter intervenes in the interactional order by managing the flow of information.

He also aligns with his American client to reassure the Chinese primary speaker. It can be observed that the interpreter self-selects and omits turns frequently based on his assessment of the importance and relevance of the message. When he claims turn 9-4, he intends to enforce clarification and explicitness with his client for the clarification of the technical issue. In the latter turns of the sequence, he also shifts to the subject position of a counselor of the Chinese primary speaker and a spokesman of his client (9-8, 9-10), reassuring the Chinese primary speaker while terminating the turn. When asked if he is aware of the turn-taking order deviating from the stipulated order, the interpreter states that he was aware of it. While interrupting the turn for the first time to make sure that he fully understood his clients' answer, he decides not to retranslate the Chinese primary speaker's utterance back to his client simply because:

> "It is a piece of known-information, it will be inefficient to translate back and forth the information that is already transparent and I am sure of. As long as it is mutually understood by the speakers and the talk is on the right track, I will make some adjustments to the turn-taking order; otherwise I will be like a robot. Besides, I am certain of the answer to the biggest concern of the Chinese interlocutor." (Interview 2, 15 Oct 2018).

Apparently, the interpreter is fully aware his role as an active participant or an organizer in the interpreted business talk, and he takes up the role of a "principal" in the interaction who not only translates the primary interlocutor's utterance but also assesses the situational context to express view on his own. I would also argue that the interpreter exercises the control in this discourse because he is "expected by the client to act for the team's interest, to exhibit positive bias" (Karanasiou, 2016, p.205) in a business context, for the best potential development of the negotiation on behalf of his client. He is well aware of the Chinese primary speaker's concern, and he is also certain of the answer based on the clarification of his client in the precious turn; thus he decides to claim the turn to respond to the Chinese side at this seemingly "crisis point", a very reassuring move which is also in support of his client in this interaction. In other words, the interpreter does hold the power to put

constraints on primary speakers or his client's contribution to speak for his employer. He also assists his employer to counsel or reassure the party on the other side of the negotiating table when the context requires. The criterion of the assessment for such intervening act are set by interpreters, as they are the one who has the most thorough understanding of the flow of information with the linguistic and cultural expertise, and they hold the power in the interaction to omit or terminate the turn. Besides, I would also emphasize that this interpreted business talk is lengthy (up to 3 hours), and it contains a non-breaking meeting agenda with an array of issues for discussion. The interpreter's turn management is also conducive to the efficiency of business interaction and the mutual understanding between the primary interlocutors, as both parties expect to arrive on an agreement in such a talk involving multiple business topics for discussions.

Example 10 displays a similar case of how the interpreter coordinates the business talk by allocating the turn as an active co-participant in the dyadic interaction.

Example 10 (M5)

1   Frank: Uh, well, I have one more question. Are you interested in, like, hmm, the final solution or do you want to also participate in a research, Ah, to be like your, your product?

2   Lee: 我现在有个问题啊，就是您现在只是想找到一个最终的解决办法呢还是说您现在想和我们一起来做一个研发，最终我们研发出来这个清理的技术之后呢，能作为我们的产品，您对这个有兴趣吗？

(I now have a question. Are you only looking for the final solution, or do you want to do research together for the cleaning technology and to have the product finally? Are you interested in that?)

3   Miss Wu: 有兴趣，我现在在找那个研发的单位一起合作，但是我找了几家都不行就。

(Yes, I am interested. I am looking for a research partner to cooperate with, but I failed.)

4   Lee: Yes, we are interested in looking for a research partners to develop this new technology to clean walls.

5   Frank: Okay, to clean walls, to, to clean or spray?

6   Lee: To clean and spray.

7   Frank: So that's two different, two different things.

8   Lee: 就是您有兴趣，刚才提到的是在那个它的外墙，您您有兴趣那个技术，是指的是，只仅仅去擦干净那个外墙吗？

         (You are interested in, what mentioned just now about the walls, Are you interested in only cleaning the wall?)

9   Miss Wu: 不是。

         (No.)

10   Lee: 还是说还要连带的喷漆一起？

         (Or do you mean to spray also?）

11   Miss Wu: 对对，就是这个意思

         (Yes, yes, that is what I mean.)

12   Lee: Together, not only clean.

13   Frank: Yeah, but that could be could be two different technologies.

14   Lee: Yeah. Um, but we are seeking for both.

The sequence in Example 10 is an excerpt from Meeting No.5, which is also quite a technical business meeting regarding the advanced material to clean the buildings and air-treatment. After a few lines of discussion on the technology the Chinese company is looking for, Frank initiates the sequence with a question concerning the potential approach for cooperation. He wonders whether the Chinese side is interested in "final solution" or "participating in a research". Lee takes the stipulated second turn to render his client's question to Miss Wu, followed by her answer that she is interested in both and she is also looking for research partners for the technology in turn 10-3.

In the next turn, Lee translates Wu's answer to Frank and explicates in his rendition that the Chinese primary speaker is looking for research partners to

develop this new technology to clean walls. Then, Frank again raises the question of "to clean or spray?" which is immediately answered by Lee in the next turn ("to clean and spray"). Apparently, the interpreter self-selects as the next speaker to provide feedback to his client. "I am pretty sure of the answer as it was mentioned already in the discussion a while ago. As it is something known in the context, I decide to provide the answer to my client" (Interview 4, 15 Nov 2018). The interpreter apparently decides to gate-keep the conversation and assist the client for a more thorough understanding of the situation. However, it seems Adam is still having concernwith the feedback of the interpreter. In turn 10-7, he emphasizes that "it is two different things", Lee immediately understands that the client insists on confirming with the Chinese speaker the answer to the question. He takes the next turn (turn10-8) to initiate a question towards the Chinese speaker. Instead of directly translating Frank's utterance in the previous turn, Lee's subject position shifts to a "principal" and he raises a question based on the context ("You are interested in, what mentioned just now about the walls, Are you interested in only cleaning the wall?"). In turn 10-9, as expected by Lee, Miss Wu provides a negative answer "No" which proves that Lee's understanding is correct. However, Lee continues the single language communication with Miss Wu in the next turn to extract more information, which is followed by Miss Wu's affirmative answer "对对，就是这个意思" ("Yes yes, that is what I mean"). Then Lee renders the Chinese primary speaker's feedback to his client Frank. When Frank repeatedly mentions "it is two different technologies" in the next turn (turn 10-13), Lee terminates the turn by providing the feedback "seeking for both" to him.

It can be observed that the interpreter in this sequence continuously manages the turn-taking based on his assessment of the situational context. He strives to assist his client's understanding of the technology the Chinese primary speaker is looking for. Such an attempt is a prime example of the interpreter being "morally and emotionally active in the interactions" (Karansiou, 2016, p.205). Professionally, the interpreter is supposed to follow normative turn-taking order; however, as the business talk evolves, there are times when the interpreter feel obliged to engage

with the interlocutor or to stand with his client, assuming the role of a "co-participant" or a "team member", to provide feedback or information based on the existing knowledge of the ongoing talk. The disrupting of the order of discourse is apparently a product of the specific social and situational context of the business discourse, where the interpreter actually holds power to control and distribute the turns with a context-sensitive approach. Such intervention is in line with the interest and stance of the client who hires him from time to time, and it also positively facilitates the mutual-understanding of the two negotiating parties.

6.5 Mediation in the Overlapped Turns

The data analysis in this category reveals how the interpreter distributes the turn when overlaps occur in the interpreted business interaction on various occasions. As mentioned by Wadensjö (1998), the overlapped turns are sometimes regarded as "a means of displaying positive involvement" (p.172), which frequently occur in BNI. After all, the nature of communication is "an exercise in control, an attempt to assert one's own position and to persuade the other to accept it" (Widdowson, 2007, p.67). Such features are particularly prominent in the profit-oriented business talk. Overlaps occur naturally in the ongoing business negotiation, as both sides strive to promote the strength of their business presence or clarify concerns of the party at the other side of negotiating table.

In every business meeting recorded, I have discovered that there are stretches of talk where overlapped turns occur:

1) both primary interlocutors would speak to the interpreter at the same time;

2) one of the primary speaker and the interpreter would talk at the same time.

When such circumstances occur, even the most talented interpreter will not be able to function well, as it is not possible for them to fully translate both parties' utterance at the same time in two languages. Nor could the interpreter accurately translate the utterances of the primary speaker as the overlapped talk cannot be

heard clearly. Therefore, the interpreter may decide to manage the interactional order by showing disapproval of the current turn-taking order, or to select the next speaker in order to end the disorder in turn-taking and let the interaction flow. Such behaviour is very similar to "topic controlling" (Fairclough, 1989, p.135-136), where he argues that "the topic or topics of an interaction may be determined and controlled by the more powerful participant" (p.136). In fact, interpreters may not be able to control the topic being discussed, but they can decide the order of the speaker's contribution based on the relevance of the content. They can disallow contributions they consider less relevant or critical in order to prioritize the contribution of other primary speakers in the interaction. Interestingly, while deciding on the order of turn and selecting the speaker, interpreters also set the criterion of content relevance based on their assessment of the situational context at a specific discursive moment. As Roy (2000, p.85) describes, the possible choices of the interpreter to deal with the overlapping talk as follows:

1. An interpreter can stop one (or both) speakers and allow the other speaker to continue. If an interpreter stops both speakers, then either the interpreter indicates who speaks next or one of the primary speakers decides who talks next.

2. An interpreter can momentarily ignore one speaker's overlapping talk, hold the segment of talk in memory, continue interpreting the other speaker, and then produce the "held" talk immediately following the end of a speaker's turn. Decisions about holding talk in one's memory lie within the interpreter's ability to do so and the interpreter's judgment regarding the importance or impact of the talk to be held in memory.

3. An interpreter can ignore overlapping talk completely.

4. An interpreter can momentarily ignore overlapping talk and upon finishing the interpretation of one speaker, offer the next turn to the other speaker, or indicate in some way that a turn was attempted.

The interpreter makes choices to claim the turn for rendition and reallocate the turn or ignore the turn so that the primary speakers do not talk simultaneously. All the

possible options mentioned above actually turn the interpreter into a "traffic cop" (Roy, 2000, p.92), who mediates the communication and negotiates verbally or non-verbally with the primary speakers so that the utterances could be heard and translated clearly and the conversation could proceed smoothly. The data analysed in this study reveals that interpreters make decisions for mediation based on their assessment of the situation, such as the importance of the message, the relationships of the speakers, as well as the employment relationship.

Besides, the choices interpreters make to mediate the interpreted business talk fit in the categorization described by Roy except for the first category. This means that interpreters usually choose not to stop the primary speaker verbally but flexibly adjust the turns. The following section illustrates the most prominent examples of interpreters' mediation when there are overlapped turns within the business context.

Example 11 shows how the interpreter mediates the overlapped talking considering the importance and relevance of the message. The violation of norms of interpreting is salient.

Example 11(M7)

1　　Adam: We have, we have many many Chinese groups in Switzerland from China. And we are also working with ***, Just, just show you one thing you see, I am working with *** and I am working with C-trip, ok so it has data connectivity to my reservation system, and we have so many so many Chinese groups in Switzerland

2　　Chang: 嗯哼，就是接接待过很多中国旅行团了，然后像这像这些，然后还有这个，还有携程，都是他们的这个合作伙伴。 (指向册子)

(hmm huh, they have received a lot of Chinese tourist groups. And companies like this and this and C-trip are all their partners for cooperation.) (Pointing at the brochure)

3　　Tim: 这个是属于 FIT 了。属于自由行的。

(This is in the category of FTI, the individual traveler's trip.)

4   Chang: FIT 就是自由行…

（FIT means for individual travelers.）

5   Adam: We have also groups.

6   Chang: 但是他们还是有这种团队游。

(But they have also the package tour.)

7   Tim: 团队游，那个携程…

(Package tour, the C-trip...)

8   Adam: this is our group rates, and this is the lady that is responsible for

our group department. (Pointing at the brochure)

9   Chang: 嗯，这个就是负责团队的那个负责人，这位女士。

(This is the person in charge of the package tour, this lady.)

Example 11 is an excerpt from Meeting No.7, where Adam and Tim are exchanging some specific information regarding the arrangement of the Chinese tourists in Switzerland. Adam seems to be very keen to introduce his tourist products, which leads to three overlapped turns in this interpreted business talk. Chang, the interpreter, is assigned by the translation company to Tim. She flexibly makes adjustments to the turn-taking mechanism to ensure that the message is getting across smoothly between the primary speakers.

Adam initiates the turn to introduce the partners his company cooperates with and their capacity to host Chinese tourists. The first overlap occurs in turn 11-4 and 11-5 between the interpreter and Adam. In turn 11-3, Tim looks at the brochure provided by Adam and checking the type of traveling and the partners Adam works with and says "this belongs to the category of FIT". In turn 11-4, the interpreter tries to provide affirmative feedback to her client to confirm that the messages he receives and the information he notes down are correct. Meanwhile, Adam starts to talk at the same time because he hears the English abbreviation "FTI" which he understands. He thus quickly adds up "we have also groups" in an attempt to impress the Chinese speaker. The interpreter quickly cedes the floor to let Adam speak and starts interpreting in the next turn (11-6) to let her client get more

information. Tim nods, which is a sign that he understands the message. In the following turn, he murmurs "Package tour, the –Ctrip," in a lower voice pitch, as if not talking to anyone but only reading the brochure and taking notes. Adam also starts to talk simultaneously (tun 11-8) to introduce the staff who is in charge of the group traveling. The interpreter ignores Tim's utterance and translates Adam's message to him. This is in line with the third choice of the interpreter described by Roy (2000) when there is an overlapped talk. The interpreter makes the decision to select the utterance to produce the rendition, a choice based on desired effect of situational context. She takes charge of the track of the conversation and tries to smooth the interaction while intervening in the interactional order. In the post-assignment interview, the interpreter explained that she assessed the situation and decided to ignore Tim's turn, as she considered the information provided by Adam was more relevant to the talk and more important:

> "The Chinese client is literally talking to himself while making note. Therefore, I believe it is appropriate and necessary to translate Adam's utterances to provide more information to my client" (Interview 5, 23 Nov 2018).

It can be observed that the interpreter decides to intervene in the conversation based on her assessment of the importance of the message and her client's need for more information regarding the Swiss company's product. Above all, the main goal for the primary speakers attending the meeting is to collect more information for future cooperation. The first two instances of overlapped talk end very quickly, and it seems that the interpreter does not need to intervene heavily. As the discussion goes on, other stretches of overlaps occur, where the interpreter's solution fits in the second choice of the interpreter stated by Roy (2000).

Example 12 (M7)

1   Adam：This one is in Lucerne. It is exactly by the lake. (pointing at the

         brochure)

2   Tim: 这个很好…

        (This is good)

3   Adam: And this one is around 10 minutes away to this center.

4   Chang: 然后这个，这个也是在湖边，然后这家
的话, 它是…

(And this, this one is by the lake. And this one, it is..)

5   Adam: See, here Lucerne, 7 Kilometers.

6   Chang: 嗯，它是离中心..

(Hmm, it is away from the center…)

7   Chang: How many minutes you mentioned?

8   Adam: 10 minutes

9   Chang: 哦，它离中心就十分钟的样子, 7 公里。

(Oh, it is 10 minutes from the center.)

In this sequence, there are three stretches of overlapped turns. The first overlap occurs in the second turn, where the Chinese primary speaker claims the stipulated interpreter's turn to comment "这个很好" ("This is good") on what is introduced by Adam. This is because Tim can see the picture Adam was pointing at in the brochure. However, as Tim is nodding while speaking, Adam seemingly understands that Tim is quite happy with his product. Adam then takes an extra step to promote the product by claiming the third turn, which overlaps with the Chinese primary speaker.

Till this point, the interpreter Chang decides to intervene in as the stipulated turn has been delayed twice and the two primary speakers are talking simultaneously. Therefore, Chang claims the fourth turn (12-4) in this sequence even before Adam finishes his introduction, signaling her disapproval of the current turn-taking order. It can be observed that in the fourth turn, Chang ignores her Chinese client's response of "this is good", which overlaps with Adam's utterance in the third turn (12-3); instead, she starts with the translation of Adam's utterance "this one is by the lake" in turn 12-1, pointing at the brochure. While Chang continues to translate Adam's utterance concerning the location of the second hotel

244

in turn 12-3 while pointing at the brochure ("this one, it is…"), Adam again starts talking at the same time ("See, here Lucerne, 7 Kilometers") in turn 12-5, as he could see the interpreter pointing at the picture of the second hotel. By doing so, Adam might also want to emphasize the hotel's adjacency to the town center. The interpreter has to relinquish the floor to let Adam finish; she then quickly reclaims the floor (turn12-6) to continue with the translation of the utterance concerning the location of the second hotel, momentarily ignoring Adam's utterance about the distance ("7 kilometers"). However, the overlapped talk has apparently disturbed the interpreter's short-term memory. Thus, she holds the floor and offers a turn (turn 12-7) to Adam, requesting him to reiterate the information of the hotel's location ("How many minutes you mentioned?"). With Adam's clarification, Chang finally provides the accurate rendition of the location in turn 12-9, where she is also able to add the segment of "7 kilometers" (turn 12-5) held in her memory

In the interview (Interview 5, 23 Nov 2018), the interpreter explains that she is fully aware of the turn adjustment she made in the interaction. She ignores her Chinese client's response only because both parties are talking simultaneously. When she claims back the turn, she decides to start with Adam's introduction simply because the topic is initiated by Adam. On the interpreter, Chang's (Interview 5, 23 Nov 2018) account, she believes it is necessary to quickly translate the information provided by Adam in the beginning of the turn even with the picture in sight. Besides, she also opts to ignore the response, because the nodding posture of Tim shows that he agrees with Adam's message. She thus focuses on the utterances of Adam in the following turns. For the overlaps in the fourth and fifth turn, the interpreter understands that Adam is trying to provide as much information as possible to her Chinese client, "It is a piece of quite relevant information" (Interview 5, 23 Nov 2018), she explains. It can be observed that the interpreter renders detailed information "7 kilometers", a segment she holds momentarily in her memory in her final rendition.

Apparently, the interpreter in this sequence tactfully copes with the overlapped talk, considering the relevance of the information and the aim of the talk.

She ignores her client's talk since she believes that the posture conveys the message of agreement already. She also cedes the floor to let the Swiss primary speaker convey more information while momentarily holding "the talk" in her memory. When she starts interpreting, she offers a turn to the Swiss primary speaker for reiteration to guarantee that the information provided is accurate. She then produces the "held talk" in her rendition in the final turn.

As a practicing interpreter as well as a researcher who closely observes the sequences of the meeting, I was amazed by the "traffic cop" (Roy, 2000, p.92) role of the interpreter. The interpreter's decisions in this sequence reveal the possible choices that can be made and power can be exercised by the interpreter in BNI. Interpreters can take control of the turn-taking system, which has become complex with interlocutors' intentions to promote their products and persuade others. Arguably, the interpreter is a substantive participant who holds power in this business talk. The interpreter breaks the assumed ideal order of the discourse in which she is supposed to take any stipulated turn and to interpret whatever said by her client and the primary speaker. She also organizes the turn-taking order of this business interaction. The interpreter puts constraints not only on the primary interlocutor's taking of turns, but also the flow of information. Moreover, she also sets the criterion to prioritize specific content in the conversation based on her understanding of the situational context!

The following excerpt from Meeting No.2 is an extremely interesting one. It illustrates how the interpreter takes charge of the situation in a business negotiation when the British client attempts to engage me, the researcher, into the talk (I used to be his interpreter). Meanwhile, both primary speakers compete for the floor with the interpreter to express their views.

Example 13 (M2)

1   John: Uh, I'd like learn more about Tianfu Area and see, uh... because one of

the things Britain, we decided this year, we're going to analyse many of

the the zones around China, because for many British business, very

complicated, very difficult to understand. So we'd like to work with...you, and see if we can help make it very clear to, to UK businesses, what the opportunities might be, what sectors, what priorities, uh, to… demystify.

2   Wendy: 对，他说他也想……

(Yeah, he said he also want to…)

3   John: What's demystify in Chinese? hahaha (turning to me,)

4   Wendy: 哈哈，也想了解一些关于那个，天府新区的一些情况。因为，全国很多地方都在做这个自贸区，但是….嗯，就是…怎么样去帮这些外国人去知道这些，这个..区别在哪里，这个自贸区和自贸区之间的区别在哪里，他们有的时候….

(Haha, also want to learn more about the condition of Tianfu New Area. Because nationwide, a lot of places are doing the project of Free Trade Zone. But actually, how to help these foreigners to understand what the differences are, what is the disparity among the FTA. They sometimes, sometimes…)

5   Mr. Deng: 都不一样的….嗯

(They are all different…hmm)

6   John: 他们他们没有想法，这个这个东西是什么意思，so to make it much more simple…

(They do not have an idea, this thing, what does it mean. So to make it much simple…)

7   Wendy: 他们不知道怎么去选择.

(They do not know how to choose.)

8   Mr. Deng: 嗯。

(Hmm.)

9   Wendy: 那么所以说我们现在也，正在做的一个项目，就是让他们更，

呃就是简明扼要去了解，就是每个区之间的一些特点，有什么机会啊，这方面也想和你们合作。

(Therefore we are currently also doing a project, to enable them, uhh, to enable them to have a brief and clear understanding of the features of different zones, and the potential opportunities of different sectors. We want to cooperate with you in this aspect also.)

10   Mr.Deng: 行！

(It can be done!)

In this sequence, the turns evolve in a very complicated way. John initiates the topic to express his concern regarding the British businesses' puzzlement over the Free Trade Zones in China. The first overlap occurs when the interpreter tries to take the second stipulated turn for translation. John suddenly starts to talk simultaneously and he turns to me, who sits distantly to observe the meeting. He takes such a move probably because I used to interpret for him quite regularly, and he knows the word "demystify" is difficult to find its equivalent in Chinese (John can speak Chinese on a basic communication level). It is an embarrassing situation as I cannot talk as an observer. Everyone in the room turns towards me. I therefore smile to John, and turn to Wendy with eye contact, signaling that it is improper for me to talk. Wendy waves to John while shaking her head to show a sign of disapproval. After two-second silence, John laughs at the embarrassing moment. While laughing at the same time, Wendy immediately resumes the talk and claims the next turn (13-4) to continue interpreting John's lengthy statement. Here, the second overlap occurs, an extreme one as both Mr. Deng and John are competing for the floor to speak, which means that three people are talking at the same time.

Besides, John also tries to talk in Chinese, which is not his comfort language. Then, Mr.Deng jumps in the talk because he wants to express his agreement with John regarding the Free trade Zones (13-4). John competes for the floor to emphasize British businesses' confusion, a comment that Wendy is about to interpret. Realizing the overlapping of turns, Wendy ignores the utterances of both primary speakers. She reclaims the floor to translate John's utterance of the first turn,

which is potentially because both utterances introduce no new information. She decides to prioritize her client's question based on her assessment of the relevance of information at the discursive moment.

In the interview, Wendy explains the motivation behind her decision to take control:

"I am aware of the overlapped talk here, they are just keen to express their views, and I have to complete the translation of the message of John in the initial turn because the important message of cooperation has not been delivered yet" (Interview1, 25 Sep 2018).

The interpreter is well aware of her client's goal in this talk, which motivates her to regulate the turns. She is convinced that it is of foremost importance get her client's message across to the Chinese speaker (John desires to cooperate with Mr.Deng to help British business learn more about FTZ). Therefore, Wendy repetitively claims turns (13-4,13-7) and ignores the overlapped talk to help her client achieve his goal. From the feedback of Mr. Deng "行" ("It can be done") in the last turn of the sequence, we could see that John's intention has been well-received by the Chinese side.

In this sequence, the interpreter apparently emerges as a substantive participant with power who is able to constrains the primary speakers' turn-taking order. She is firmly in control of the conversation's evolution, especially when the turn-taking order seems to be chaotic enough to involve the researcher in the process. I would argue that Wendy's identity as an in-house interpreter gives her more responsibilities in this conversation. As an event organizer, Wendy also holds the institutional commitment of building relationships with the Chinese side and promoting the British business presence in Chengdu. Her subject position in this discourse is similar to that of a bi-lingual public relation officer, who assists not only in a linguistic aspect, but also in the interpersonal relations aspect. Such subject position means that Wendy needs to influence the business talk positively and carefully cope with any situation that might lead to communicative inadequacy or confusion. She is also well aware of the positioning and aim of her client John.

She, at times, stands with her client to reiterate his concern and emphasize on his proposal. Besides, she also considers the relevance of the information provided by negotiating parties while coping with the overlapped talk. Particularly efforts are made by the interpreter to take care of her client's goal or the intended result of the business negotiation.

The following example displays how the interpreter facilitates the conversation when it is disturbed by the host of the meeting and the parallelled talk of the primary speakers at the same time.

Example 14 (M3)

1　　Mr.Li: 我理解就是磁控产生那个氢离子负离子吗？磁控的方式, 但是它怎么是怎么产生大额度的那个氢负离子。

(My understanding is magnetic control will generate the negative hydrogen ions？The way of the magnetic control? How does it generate a large amount of the negative hydrogen ions?）

2　　Tony (NEC Chinese staff): 你是指负值还是负极？

(Do you mean neagative value or negative electorde?）

3　　Host:你告诉他，这点我来沟通

(You tell him, I will communicate on this point.)

(Primary speakers started a side talk in a lower voice pitch for 4 seconds.)

4　　Wang: Based on my understanding, the ions are generated by the magnetic control, so how has the system generated the large volume of..

5　　Wang: 氢负离子是吧? 负氢离子?

(Hydrogen negative ions, right? Negative hydrogen ions?)

6　　Mr.Li: 对。

(Yes.)

7　　Wang: Negative hydrogen ions?

8　　Mike: So, you produce the negative hydrogen ions by introducing the hydrogen to cold, low energy electrons. And by controlling the

250

minute magnetic field, you can control what energy electrons are at
the extractor of the source.

9   Wang: 通过改变这个磁场呢，你可以就决定在提取器这边，是用的是，
什么样的这个电极。

(By changing the magnetic field, you can decide in the end of the
extractor, what kind of electrode will be used.)

In the initial turn of the sequence, the Chinese primary speaker Li raises a technical question concerning the generation of the negative hydrogen ion, a question that is highly technical. The overlapped talk occurs in the second and third turn of the sequence where Tony, a Chinese staff of the American company, and the host are talking simultaneously. Tony initiates a question to clarify "negative value or negative electrode" (turn 14-2). The host gives a directive to the interpreter to tell his American client that he will take care of the matter (turn 14-3). The host apparently emerges as a more powerful participant in this sequence. He not only interrupts the discussion between the two parties, but also adopts the imperative mode in his utterance ("you tell him"), a declarative sentence which is seemingly equal to a directive. As Fairclough (1989) argues, the use of imperative mode implies that "the speaker/writer is in the position of asking something of the addressee (action on the latter's part), while the addressee is (ideally) a compliant actor" (p.126).

However, the interpreter's reaction in the next turn (14-4) displays a prime example of how "dominant conventions are resisted or contested" (p.20) using linguistic resources in discursive practice under a specific situational context. The interpreter hesitates for few seconds before he starts to talk again. However, he decides not to comply with the directive of the host and he ignores the overlapped talk and holds the turn of the Chinese staff from the American company. He chooses to claim the turn 14-4 to render the question initiated by the Chinese speaker at the beginning of the sequence, which is a salient manifestation of his ability to constrain primary speakers' contribution in a business negotiation. In the interview, the

251

interpreter explains:

> "The situation is quite difficult to cope with as they respectively request me
> to do two different things at the same time, but I think the question is
> directed to my client. Therefore, I decide to translate it to my client firstly"
> (Interview 3, 20thOct 2018).

It is a difficult situation as even a most experienced interpreter will not be able to function properly and fulfill the two requests at the same time. Based on Wang's explanation, I believe that he actually stands with his client when taking control of the turn-taking order. He claims the next turn while interlocutors are talking in a lower voice pitch in Chinese, a language his American clients cannot understand. To engage with his clients and avoid the feeling of being left out of the conversation, he decides to render the question of the Chinese primary speaker to his client Mike, the technical head of the American company.

Under such circumstances, instead of telling the Chinese primary speaker that the host will take care of the explanation, the interpreter prioritizes the Chinese speaker's question for the reason that "Chinese primary speaker's question is vital, because they are making a decision whether to buy nor not. And my client wants the deal." (Interview 3, 20th Oct 2018). The interpreter's explanation of his decision reveals that he assesses the seller-buyer relationship and importance of the information. The interpreter actually realizes that the Chinese primary speaker certainly holds more power in this interaction because they can decide on the purchase of the facility, a deal his American client desire for. Therefore, the interpreter flexibly copes with the overlapped talk and translates the Chinese primary speaker's question firstly, which also offers his American clients the opportunity to better explain or even promote their product. Although the interpreter is not a member of the company and he lacks the institutional power to make any commercial decisions, it is salient that he holds power to control the interactive order and the contribution of the primary speakers.

I would argue that in this sequence, the power relations are unequal between the interpreters and the primary speaker because the turn-taking rights are

unequal: the interpreter is one who closes off the overlapped talk as well as the side discussions of both sides. He moves on to self-select in turn 14-4, ignoring the overlapped turns; the interpreter also resists the host's request (14-3) based on the evaluation of the information relevance. He selects the content to interpreter in 14-4 and decides to prioritize the Chinese seller's question to reengage his client into the talk. From the perspective of the interpreter's professional survival, the interpreter potentially makes the move to "satisfy the targets and expectation of the person who hires him" (Karansiou, 2016, p.204), so that he can receive assignments from the client again. The examination of the sequence clearly shows that when dealing with the overlapped talk, the interpreter does hold the power to balance the subtle power relations between the primary speakers as the seller and buyer in an interpreted business talk.

While we notice the disruption of interactional conventions in this sequence of interpreted business talk, it is also interesting to see that the primary interlocutors engaged in the conversation naturally accept the interpreter's intervention. Besides, such intervention also ensures the Chinese speaker's question is properly answered and the talk develops smoothly. From a CDA perspective, this is a prime example of how "dominant conventions are resisted or contested" (Fariclough, 1989, p.20) with the interpreter's possession of linguistic resources. Although overlapping talk seems a dilemma for interpreters, their interventions concerning the situational context contribute to the change of social relationships. The interpreter takes control and considers if the talk is simply a message signaling agreement, merely a back-channeling response, or an attempt to actually claim the turn. As the first person who can "begin to comprehend the import of overlapping" (Roy, 1999, p.92), the interpreter is able to constrain the contribution order of the primary interlocutors who compete for floors.

Being the only party who has a good command of both languages, the interpreter is positioned to take action and cope with the seemingly chaotic discursive moments. The distribution of turns depends mainly on the interpreter's assessment of the situational context. The data examined in this study demonstrates

that in business encounters, interpreters regulate the turn by put constraints on primary speakers' contributions. They consider the situational factors including what has been mentioned, who initiates it, the relevance of the topic, and the importance of the information. Their intervening acts show evidence that interpreters within the business context do not always follow the assumed order of the discourse. Conversely, their control of turns and contributions reshapes the interactional convention, and their subject positions exceed that of a translating machine or linguistic service provider. In business discourse, the interpreter plays the role of a team member, a spokesperson, an officer who is in charge of the external relations in a business context. They may also influence the power-relations in the interaction because they, at times, decide to intervene in based on their evaluation of the buyer-seller relationship between the primary speakers.

6.6 Discussion

This chapter examines how the interpreter mediates the interpreted business talk by managing the turn-taking mechanism. On Roy's (1999) account, "Turn-taking in interpreting has unique and complex features that actively involve the interpreter in organizing, managing, constraining, and directing the flow of talk" (p.36). The analysis of the data reveals findings similar to what Roy states. Instead of being a neutral conveyor of messages, the interpreter is discovered to play the role of "an active participant who can potentially influence the direction and outcome of the event" (Roy and Metzger, 2014, p.161). The interpreter in this study acts as a "traffic cop", who holds the power to control primary interlocutors' contribution by interrupting the turn, terminating the turn, ignoring the turn. They also cede the floor, offer the floor or even reclaim the floor when overlapping talk occurs. By self-selecting as the next speaker, the interpreter requests clarification of what has been mentioned, or the explanation of a specific concept that is central to the ongoing business talk. By terminating the turn and providing the message which is the known information discussed before, the interpreter takes the role of a team mate to facilitate the talk and provide information or feedback to their client. When

confronted with the dilemma of overlapping, the interpreter makes swift decisions to cede or maintain the floor and to ignore or offer the turn as a way to select the next speaker.

All the cases examined demonstrate that turn-taking mechanisms in business talk have unique and complex features that involve the interpreter's active participation in the talk to organize, manage, constrain, and direct the flow of talk. The interpreter intervenes to fulfill the expectations of their clients and help the clients attain their goal in the profit-driven business talk. We will return to this in more details in chapter 8, the discussion over the findings of this study.

CHAPTER 7   Reflections on Semi-structured Interviews of the Interpreters

The preceding chapters presented the manifestation of the interpreter's power in the ten naturally occurring business meetings. I have quoted several interview remarks of the interpreters while examining the power they hold in the context of business negotiation interpreting. In this chapter, I will make a summary of the semi-structured interviews with the interpreters who facilitated the business meetings recorded, which demonstrates more systematically how the interpreters identify the "self" in the discursive practice of business interpreting. The post-assignment interview is designed with qualitative questions to explore the interpreter's perceptions of business settings and the interpreter's role performance, and their understanding or awareness of the power held by them in the interpreted business encounters.

7.1 Participants

The table (table 7.1) below contains the detailed information of the six interviewees who participated in this study. For ethical reasons, the interviewees' real names have been substituted with random names to protect their privacy.

Table 7.1   List of Interviewees

No	Name	Years ` of experience	Meeting	Employ Status
1	Wendy	10 years	M1 and M2	In-house interpreter and Event Manager
2	Wang	11years	M3	Freelance
3	Chang	4 years	M6, M7 and M8	In-house interpreter in translation company
4	Lee	2 years	M4 and M5	Freelance

5	Fion	3 years	M9	Freelance
6	Cindy	2 years	M10	Freelance

7.2 Interview Data Collection

All the interviews were recorded on my mobile device. Before the interview, I briefed every interviewee that all the data collected would be used for research purposes with the reassurance of the privacy and confidentiality of their personal data. They also had the freedom to delete any part of the answers they provided as transcripts of the interview were reviewed by them before being used for analytical purposes. The table (table 7.2) below provides the details of the location and time of the interview.

Table 7.2   List of Interviews

No	Time	Interpreter	Meeting	Location
1	25/09/2018	Wendy	M1 and M2	Chengdu
2	15/10/2018	Wang	M3	Chengdu
3	20/10/2018	Wang	M3	Chengdu
4	15/11/2018	Lee	M4 and M5	Chengdu
5	23/11/2018	Chang	M6 and M7	Chengdu
6	30/11/2018	Chang	M8	Via Phone

7	25/06/2019	Fion	M9		Chengdu
8	25/07/2019	Cindy	M10		Via Phone

All the interviews were conducted in Chinese, the native language of both the interviewer and interviewees. The analysis of the data is also based on the original transcribed interviews considering "language itself can be a medium of obfuscation as well as revelation" (Sullivan, 2010, p.14). It is more objective to work on the original text because "language and cultural nuances that were inevitably missing in the translated texts" (Karanasiou, 2017, p.80). I, as the researcher who has first-hand access to the scenario, translated the transcripts of the data.

7.3 Interpreters' Perceptions of Their Roles

This section presents a brief description of interpreters' overall perceptions regarding the expected role of the interpreter, their roles in the business meetings, as well as whether they consider themselves taking an active role in the talk, comparing business settings with other settings. Questions related to these topics were asked before the detailed discussion of the transcripts of the business meetings (See the table of Interview Schedule). It will be useful to look at this overview of interpreters' perceptions before we step into the analysis of the interview data thematically.

7.3.1 *Wendy*

Having worked for a consecutive ten years in YZ China office as an event manager and in-house interpreter, Wendy has extensive experience in business interpreting. As she stated, "Half of the time in my career life, I have been engaged with interpreted business conferences" (Interview 1, 25th September 2018). Wendy believes that the interpreter plays an essential role in business meetings and is central to the smooth proceedings of the interaction. She mentions that the interpreter holds the responsibility to convey the messages of the primary speakers

accurately. Wendy also points out that a professional interpreter should play a role beyond a language service provider, "A good professional interpreter can facilitate the business talk for the completion of the deal" (Interview 1, 25th September 2018). Based on her experience in business settings, she also mentioned that the interpreter should sometimes be "tactful" to tone down some impolite assertions or comments from the primary speakers. Wendy states that although this is not unique in business settings. It is more important in business scenarios as making a deal is at the centre of business dialogue, and "the interpreter can take the intervening moves or co-participation as a value-added service for the client" (Interview 1, 25th September 2018) in the interpreted business negotiation.

Wendy stresses her position in the recorded business encounters. She mentions that as the Event Manager, she fully represents the agency while interpreting for her boss on-the-side. Generally speaking, she believes that it is ideal for an interpreter to engage in the talk in such a business scenario actively. To Wendy, the interpreter's role definitely exceeds the traditional role of a "conduit".

7.3.2 *Wang*

Wang owns a translation company and has been working as a freelance interpreter for more than 11 years. Wang believes that the priority of the interpreter in the business domain is to convey the messages of the client and primary interlocutors accurately. He believes that the interpreter plays the role of a "messenger" and "facilitator" (Interview 2, 15th October 2018). He highlights the facilitating role an interpreter is supposed to play in a business scenario. He believes that the interpreter on such assignments carries an "implied responsibility" (暗含的责任) to facilitate the client, especially the one who hires us" (Interview 2, 15th October 2018). Wang believes that the interpreter holds the responsibility to express the wills of cooperation to facilitate the completion the deal in a business context. When asked how he defines the term of implied responsibility, Wang explains that he describes it as implied because he would never explicate such responsibility or the social position of an interpreter. However, most of the clients who hire him (especially

Chinese clients) will always make statements such as "you will stand with me and help me, ok?". Wang also points out that even if the client does not explicate such intentions, he could also sense the client's expectations based on his experience and align with the client while interpreting.

When asked if he thinks he has actively engaged with the client in Meeting No.3, Wang's answer is affirmative. He explains that his engagement with the client is mostly because he finds that "both sides are very willing to deliver the deal"; sometimes, his mediation also occurs when he "has an interest in what is being talked about" (Interview 3, 20ᵗʰ October 2018). He would give advice or help promote the project under such circumstances because he believes such intervention is in line with the aim of the meeting. Interestingly, Wang insists that his role is neutral and that the interpreter has no power in the interpreting process, and he insists that "the clients hold the decision right after all" (15ᵗʰ Oct, 2018). In his view, power represents something absolute, being related to the decision-making right in business interpreting. Wang also continuously emphasizes that his intervention in the talk is mainly because of his intention to "create a more casual atmosphere for the meeting" (Interview 1, 15ᵗʰ October 2018).

7.3.3 *Chang*

Chang was trained in the U.K. as a Conference Interpreting graduate. She has a good understanding of the ethics and expected role of the interpreter in conference interpreting, which is related to the neutrality and invisibility of the interpreter. Nevertheless, Chang states that business interpreting is very different from conference interpreting because of the aim within the context. She mentions that business interpreting is unique as it is more practical, and the interaction requires the real-time and effective feedback:

> "The primary interlocutors on both sides want to listen to the key messages related to their interest, the most concerning details related to the cooperation. I think it is essential to translate the most critical information; otherwise both sides will get worried for not getting what they want to hear" (Interview5,

Chang points out that sometimes for the time economizing effect, she selectively translates by summarizing the critical points conveyed by clients for quicker and more efficient communication. She calls acts like this the "repertoire" of an interpreter as she believes the interpreter is at times the one who controls the information flow in the interpreted business encounter.

Chang also emphasizes on the changing role of the interpreter in a business encounter. She believes that interpreters should be aware of the social context of the talk and employ their interpersonal skills in the meeting. She believes the interpreter's role is multifaceted, as she herself promotes the products or the view of the client or the primary interlocutors to facilitate the talk. She also mentions that the real scenario of interpreting is quite different from what was taught in class. The primary interlocutors have taken her as a substantive participant in the business talk who is constantly being consulted of her views or her assessment of the situation in the business dialogue. Although the interpreter tries to remain detached, all the above-mentioned factors make it impossible for her to retain the codes of invisibility and neutrality.

7.3.4 *Lee*

Lee believes that the role of an interpreter is like a "bridge" both linguistically and culturally. At the beginning of the interview, Lee insisted that he played a neutral role in the business encounter and did not align with any of the primary speakers in the business meeting. However, in the latter part of the interview, while we were examining the transcripts of the meeting together, Lee identified the discrepancy between the assumed role and the actual role he played. Lee covertly expresses his endorsement of the interpreter's intervention to explaining his disrupting of the professional norms. He believes it is justifiable when the act or strategies adopted are consistent with the message of the speaker, which will not influence the meeting outcome.

Lee highlights the interactive and dialogic nature of business interpreting. He believes that the business setting is very different from other settings given the

sensitive nature of the topics discussed, which are always related to the prices, business scopes, and the concrete information about the products. Lee mentions that the information is very sensitive and is central to the deal. He therefore feels "obliged to seek clarification". He also believes that the interpreter holds the responsibility "to assess the situation and intervene when needed with the aim to facilitate the talk" (Interview 4, 15th November 2018), therefore it is also important for him to gauge the purpose of the speaker. Lee mentions he feels that his Czech client actually considers him as a teammate instead of the language service provider; he thus serves as a link between the two primary interlocutors. He explains the situational context of the scenario as follows:

> "As an interlocutor who participates in a business talk in a foreign country whose language he could not speak at all, he actually relies on me to communicate. I feel that the client considers me a consultant. And he constantly speaks to me in the meeting" (Interview 4, 15th November 2018).

Lee mentions the readiness of jargons in the business meetings. He points out that the interpreter in business interpreting should have a good command of the terminology related to the business projects and the product details. The readiness in terminology is also a decisive factor for the efficiency of the business encounter.

7.3.5 *Fion*

Fion holds an M.A. in Conference Interpreting. She has worked as a freelance interpreter for three years. Fion believes that the interpreter should work in a conduit-model and interpret whatever the client says. She believes that she plays a role that is limited to a "linguistic supporter" or "linguistic agent" (Interview 7, 25th June 2019) in the course of BNI. Though she also mentions the interactive nature of business interpreting, she endorses the codes of invisibility and neutrality. Fion holds that the interpreter should play a neutral role in business interpreting and should not intervene in or get involved with the interests of the primary speakers on both sides. She states that the interpreter's only responsibility is to completely and accurately render the primary speakers' utterances.

Fion does also mention the difference between English and Chinese forms of expression. She stresses the difficulties in producing renditions equivalent to the source language. She also admits that it is unavoidable to edit what the speaker says when interpreting though she does not consider it a form of intervention.

7.3.6 *Cindy*

Cindy holds an M.A. in Conference Interpreting. She states that working in a business setting is very different from doing interpreting exercises in the classroom. She holds that the interpreter has the dual task of "conveying the message" and "controlling the scenario" (Interview 8, 25th July 2019). She mentions that the interpreter's role is essential as they are the only individual who is bilingual and understands the utterances of the primary speakers as well as the cultural intricacies. She stresses the communicative and interactive nature of business dialogue interpreting in compared to that of conference interpreting, mostly uni-directional.

When asked whether she believes she has been actively involved in the business talk, Cindy mentions that she has definitely engaged with the primary interlocutors. She believes that the interpreter should be able to accurately assess the situational context in business interpreting so that he/she will be able to check the direction of the talk and flow of information. Cindy mentions that she always tries to intervene in the interaction to avoid a situation where there could be a mismatch between questions asked and answers provided. Cindy also mentions that her active participation in the talk is also partly related to her extroverted personality. She believes it is not against the professional ethics as long as the aim of the intervention conforms to the speaker's intention in the deal-making process.

7.4 Thematic Discussions on the Interpreter's Power

This section systematically analyses the interpreters' perceptions of the intervention and their awareness of their power in business negotiation interpreting. I will summarize the interview data thematically and the themes are listed based on the close examination of the interviews data collected during the interviews, where I

was discussing with the interviewees the strategies and decisions they adopted in the business encounters.

7.4.1 Rendition: Intervening or not?

As stated in the literature review, the interpreter's role is typically depicted as transparent, invisible, passive, neutral, and detached. According to NRPSI (National Register of Public Service Interpreters, United Kingdom) Code of Conduct (2016, p.5):

> Interpreters will interpret truly and faithfully what is said, without anything being added, omitted or changed […] not enter into the discussion, give advice or express opinions or reactions to any of the parties… [They] will act in an impartial and professional manner.

AUSTI (Australian Institute of Interpreters and Translators) gives a similar description of the interpreter's role. The interpreter should "maintain professional detachment, impartiality, objectivity and confidentiality" and "Interpreters and translators are not responsible for what the parties communicate, only for complete and accurate transfer of the message" (AUSTI Code of Conduct, 2012, p.5).

According to these professional norms, the interpreters "should do no more than make a faithful and accurate language switch and are not entitled to intervene in the communication process" (Ren and Mason, 2014, p.117). Ideally, they translate everything said by the primary interlocutors completely and should not make people feel their presence. The previous analysis chapters of the transcripts reveal that the interpreter, at times, breaks the professional norms of interpreting by controlling or reformulating the contribution of the primary speakers in the discursive practice of BNI. All six interpreters are found selectively translating the utterances of the primary interlocutors in the business meetings recorded. The following section presents a summary of the discussion with the interpreters on the reasons behind the selective translation in the business meetings. It reflects how interpreters navigate the discursive practice based on their understandings of the interpersonal relations and the social or situational context of the scene.

All six interpreters were well aware of the professional norms of complete message transfer. Five of them explicitly commented that they were conscious that they disrupted the professional norms of invisibility and neutrality, and they decided to intervene in the dialogue. Fion, the only one who insisted that she followed the conduit-model, also realized that she did unconsciously edit the primary speaker's rendition while reading the meeting transcripts (Chapter 6, M9-Example 10).

As described by the interviewees, there are various reasons behind the selection of information on their part, including the efficiency of communication, the relevance of information, and the emphasis of the message. Four of the interpreters including Wendy, Wang, Chang, and Cindy explicitly mentioned the necessity to select information when interpreting. They believe that selection of information in business interpreting is central in the intervening strategies they have adopted, as it enhances the efficiency of the meeting. As Wendy stated:

> *"I believe <u>it is justifiable</u> in the business meetings to select the key points and the major information expressed by the primary speakers, because most of the business meetings are lengthy and the primary speakers are always <u>keen to know the intention of the other side</u>. I donnot think it is necessary to always translate every element or every word of the primary speakers, especially in the meeting I interpreted a few days ago. Because one, it is not time-economizing….most of the time, the session has time constraints, and we want to try to cover all the topics we plan to discuss with them; second, it might be verbose or superfluous sometimes, as both sides know each other's institutional role and background quite well. Therefore, I sometimes translate the major message… and try to guarantee that I have conveyed the intention of my client appropriately"* (Wendy, 25thSep, 2018)

Wendy overtly emphasizes the importance of conveying the intention of the primary speakers, and she believes that elements such as the known information are not must-translate parts of the speech. She also claims that she follows her assessment of appropriateness in the setting, and the institution or client she works for. As an in-house interpreter with an institutional identity, Wendy seems to be convinced that

she holds the right to reformulate her boss' utterances for the benefit of the agency, as long as it aligns with the communicative goal of her client. Her comments imply that interpreters sometimes are able to frame what topics are to be discussed in the business talk, which will help them navigate the scene.

Wang holds similar views. He states that he is well aware that he did not follow the traditional norms of the conduit model. Wang believes the conveying the intention and message of the client outweighs the forms of the utterances:

> *"I am not 100% in agreement with the conduit model and I also believe professional norms should not be regarded as absolute principles. I don't want to sound like a robot in my interpreting…Although I endorse that our priority is that we should translate accurately, I also believe that language is the tool for communication; communication relies on the meaning and messages instead of the equivalence of the sentences or words"* (Interview 2, Wang, 15th Oct 2018).

In the statement, we can see that Wang actually makes it clear that the interpreter may violate the conduit model and take initiative to intervene or to co-participate the communicative practice. He also comments that the interpreter should have a good assessment of the situational context in order to best produce renditions that are in line with the intention of the client or the primary speakers.

> *"Besides, in the type of business meeting you recorded a couple of days ago, I think, as an interpreter I should be very sensitive to what the client and the primary speaker want the other side to know at different moments of the interaction… so that I can accurately convey the meaning and intention of the client. Sometimes you need to explicate the unspoken intention for your client. That is how I performed, even if it requires me to edit the utterances at a certain point. After all, the aim of the business meeting is to communicate and to get the deal done, and the adopted strategies that are aligned with this goal should not be considered a breach of the professional norms"* (Wang, Interview2, 15th Oct 2018).

Both Wang and Wendy emphasize the interpreter's agency in the business meeting.

They state that the interpreter needs to harness their bilingual ability, and assess the intention of the clients or the situational context of the discourse. On Van Dijk's (1997) account, "meaning is associated much with the mind of the language users" (p.9). As the only individual who understands both languages, the interpreter holds the power to decode the meaning or the intention of the primary speakers. To convey it clearly, the interpreter needs to be mindful of the atmosphere by assessing the situational context, because the contextual "meaning" is also "associated with interactions, social groups and societal structures" (Van Dijk, 1997, p.9). Owing to this, there might be different interpretation of the meaning, be it explication or implication, if the situational context of the interaction has been taken into consideration by the interpreter.

Chang also emphasizes that it is impossible to always render the primary speakers' utterances with absolute semantic completeness or equivalence in business interpreting considering the practical nature of the business talk. Chang also adds that the interpreter should consider the <u>relevance of the information</u> when interpreting.

> *"I think the business interpreting I did a few days ago is a very practical form of interpreting. I need try to select the most relevant key massages when we interpret because the client and the primary speaker are talking about something concrete related to the business cooperation. Normally, they will be very keen to hear the response of each other; they want substantive information, that's why I prejudged the <u>relevance of the information</u> and make sure I <u>prioritize the information</u> they are keen to hear. I believe that the ultimate goal for them to engage in all these discussions is to make the deal or to propose the ways of cooperation"* (Chang, Interview 5, 23rd Nov 2018).

Chang constantly emphasizes the importance of effective conveying of the substantive information to the business parties. She prioritizes the relevance and the significance of the information in the business discourse. On Chang's account, the setting of the business talk actually influences her performance as she works under

pressure imposed by primary interlocutors. Although they desire to understand each other with the aim of profit-gaining, they cannot communicate autonomously. Therefore, to facilitate the efficient communication, Chang actually screens the information and she definitely holds the decision-making right to choose the information to translate to the client or the customer. It can be seen that Chang is fully aware of the importance of her intervention in the talk.

7.4.2 Discussion

Based on the interviewees' statements, it can be argued that there is an apparent contradiction between the prescribed role and the practicing role of the interpreter. We could clearly see that the participants in this study are all aware of the professional norms and codes of conduct related to the prescribed role of the interpreter through their training or university education. However, they realized the norms of "complete and accurate transfer of the message" (AUSTI Code of Conduct, 2012, p.5) is not always practical to follow.

The "nature of the scenario" is something most of the interviewees emphasize. The discourse of business interpreting is highly dynamic, and it involves concrete and substantive content that requires the interpreter to approach it with sensitivity and interpersonal skills. They realized that the concrete business scenario required them to play a role beyond the conduit-like model, which is more active and participatory. The reason is largely related to the nature of the discourse in which they operate.

Most interviewees also mentioned the word "intention" when they talked about their motivation for intervening in the discourse. It is evident that the interpreters consider semantic equivalence or completeness secondary to the efficient conveying of the primary interlocutor's intention. Such tendency is due to the practical nature of the business conference — all the discussions are related to the practical arrangements of the cooperation; the primary interlocutors aspire to understand their business partners' will of cooperation or comments on their proposed way of doing business. According to the interviewees, such a view has

largely motivated interpreters to reformulate the primary interlocutors' utterances and select the information. They consider the efficiency of the meeting and the significance and relevance of information when they decide to intervene in the interaction. Such projection of the interpreter's role reveals that the interpreter overtly disrupts the assumed order of discourse in the discursive practice of BNI, where they are required to be invisible and neutral according to the professional codes.

In such a context, the interpreter has, through the vehicle of language, the sole producing right to control or edit the contributions of the primary speakers based on the situational context to navigate the scene. All the interviewees claimed at different points in the interviews that they had become the coordinator with a participatory subject position in the business encounters, though their views do not coincide. They were all aware of their shifting subject positions and their control the information flow for the communication efficiency.

7.4.3 Position: Neural or not?

This section examines the interpreter's view of their neutrality in the business meeting. Whether interpreters think they play a neutral role in the discourse and why is a much-discussed topic in the interview. The questions asked (see the table of Interview Schedule) are related to the following aspects: 1) the interpreter's alignment with the primary speakers or the client; 2) the interpreters advocating for the client's interest in particular.

The discussion of the questions revolved around the boundaries of the role the interpreter performs and the visibility or invisibility of the interpreter in the discourse. The results showed divided views among the interviewees. Four of the interpreters overtly stated that they are aware of their alignments with the primary speakers or the clients, while two interpreters favor the detached, neutral, and invisible role. However, they also discovered themselves unconsciously loosening this rule in the discourse in our discussion of the transcripts.

The interviewees who endorsed the visible or non-neutral role considered

themselves exceeding the prescribed role of the interpreter in BNI. They also explicitly pointed out that they unavoidably stand with the client who hired them and were motivated to advocate for their client for different reasons. On Cindy's account:

"In the training and the interpreting course, the norms of neutrality and the transparency of the interpreter have always been reinforced. However, I found that the practicing scene is so different from doing interpreting exercises in the classroom. You carry more responsibilities, and you have to advocate for the client who hires you. For example, in the meeting I engaged in a few days ago, my client—the Chinese side is in a more passive position as they do not get to choose whom they meet and all the foreign companies keep coming to our desk. You cannot predict what the discussion will focus on. I will certainly advocate for my client when it is needed, and I try to emphasize my client's need and the information which I know my client wants most in such case" (Cindy, Interview 8, 25th July 2019)

Cindy's statement reveals that although she understands the norms of neutrality, she still takes on the role of a substantive participant in the talk who stands with the client and advocates for the client's need or interest in the business discourse. This is because that she discovered the norms taught in university are not always applicable to the actual working scenario. She points out the influence of the client's position and the atmosphere of the setting on her performance, which makes it quite difficult for her to always remain detached from the conversation. She adjusts the content according to the client's need and tries to promote the company image. She also explicitly states that she considers it part of her responsibility to stand with the client and help him/her to make the deal happen. Wang also voiced a similar argument in the interview:

"I do not think there is anything called neutrality in business interpreting. My client in the meeting actually told me before the meeting that they would like to have a more relaxed atmosphere. The result of the meeting is critical for them and might increase their sales volume dramatically. Therefore

everything I did, including the change of pronouns, the intervention of the turn-taking order as well as the prioritizing of information are all done much in line with the my client's aim. I work like an adaptor to adjust the social distance and the social atmosphere during the whole process to help my client to achieve their goal. According to my experience, business interpreting assignments always come with the implicated message of 'helping your client to make the deal'" (Wang, Interview 3, 20th Oct, 2018).

As an experienced freelance interpreter who also owns a company, Wang states that alignment with the clients is an "implied rule" in the discourse of business interpreting. He mentions that the briefing from the client who hires him actually influences his performance psychologically or professionally in the meeting. The client overtly expresses the importance of the meeting and their request on the interpreter's side, which situates Wang in a social position closely linked with the team. Therefore, Wang approaches the assignment with a holistic approach, adjusting the social-distance and atmosphere concerning the client's aim in the interaction. Wang's case is a useful indicator that the client's attitude and the employment relation also disrupt the interpreter's neutral stance in business discourse.

Two of the interpreters also mention that they do not have a particular inclination to align with the client. However, they feel obliged to align with either side in the business discourse for different reasons. On Chang's account:

"I always put myself in the primary interlocutors' shoe, be it my client or the primary speakers on the other side. I find it helpful for me to understand them better and express their view more clearly. I advocate for both from time to time with the aim to facilitate their understanding. I will also step in sometimes if I am interested in what they are discussing. I think it is good for creating a positive social atmosphere" (Chang, Interview 5, 23rdNovember, 2018)

Wendy also states:

"I always feel obliged to stand with my client as I work as an in-house

interpreter and I need to represent the interest of my agency or the UK companies we want to promote. But I also feel that I have a natural alignment with my client in Chengdu since I am from Chengdu and I am in charge of the business relations of our member companies with their Chengdu counterparts. I want to advocate for Chengdu while also translating for the U.K side" (Wendy, Interview 1, 25th September, 2018)

Apparently, Chang and Wendy are well aware of their shifts of subject positions in the context of business negotiation interpreting. Chang believes that she has the responsibility to stand with the primary interlocutors in the business discourse. She believes being emphatic to stand with the primary interlocutors a way to positively influence the communication.

Wendy's perception shows an example of cultural alignment — the interpreter sometimes identifies more closely with whom shares more common ground in culture and the ethnic groups they belong to. As a member of the UK company, Wendy feels that her institutional identity gives her much flexibility in the discourse, as she is well expected by her client to be an active agent to advocate for the company. Such occasion is in line with Goffman's (1959) statement of "team mates are often persons who agree informally to guide their efforts in a certain want as means of self-protection" (p.89). However, Wendy's identification with the cultural group she belongs to place her in a position to "exhibit positive bias towards the members of their group" (Tejfel, 1978, p.131). This positive bias influences her position and stance in the discourse.

Other interviewees support the professional norms of neutrality and invisibility in the business discourse, but they also state that they may relax the standard at times or unconsciously break the norms, which is a covert description of the departure from neutrality.

"My philosophy is that the interpreter should not support the interest of anyone in the business talk. I tried to step out of anything related to the interest and just serve as the linguistic provider. I leave the primary speaker or the client to deal with it. But I will adjust their dictions if I find it might be

considered too abrupt or not appropriate and might lead to a problem in the target language, such as the change of personal pronouns...uh...I sometimes tend not to follow the first personal pronoun used by the foreign speaker to avoid the confusion." (Lee, Interview 4,15[th]Nov, 2018)

Lee's comments reveal the complexity of the interpreter's role. Even though he tries not to engage with the client and believes himself to be neutral and situates himself as someone who should not express any opinions in the discourse of business interpreting, he still finds it inevitable to make some adjustment to his stance in relation to the client or the primary speakers, which is closely related to his cultural identification in the discourse (See Chapter 4, M4-Example 7).

7.4.4 Discussion

In this section, the thematic discussion has revealed the interpreters' perceptions and awareness of their departure from a neutral position in the discursive practice. The interview results show when and why the interpreters adopt a participatory position and adjust their alignments to their client or primary speakers. The interview data also resonates with what I discovered in the previous three analysis chapters concerning the interpreter's alignment with the clients and their non-neutral subject position in BNI.

Most interpreters overtly state that they take the initiative to adjust their stance in relation to their clients or the primary interlocutors. Some of them even use metaphors like "a bridge" to explicate their perceptions of their roles in the discourse. The employer's request or preference expressed in the briefing stage serves as a prominent reason for the interpreter to make moves to engage in the talk. The interpreter feels the employment relationship with the client actually implies that they need to satisfy their employer's expectations or requirements. Such feeling is described by Angelelli (2001) as "professional survival" (p.23). Although interpreters are aware of the professional norms they should abide by, they consider the client's requirements central in the assignment, for they wish to be employed again in the future. Wang and Wendy provided the most explicit descriptions

regarding the notion of professional survival. This is potentially because of their dual identity as an external relations manager and the owner of an interpreting company. The experience in managing client relations while interpreting provided them with opportunities to have a more holistic view of the roles an interpreter might need to play in actual business interpreting discourse. The interpreter might be influenced indirectly by the client's expectations and the implied rules and actively and positively intervene in the business discourse.

The interview data shows that group identification is another factor that influences the subject position of the interpreters. The interpreter may identify professionally with the company they represent or identify culturally with the social and cultural groups they belong to in the discourse. Tajfel (1978) argues that if "people identify with a group", they usually "act in the group's interest" (p.131).

As I argued before, business negotiation interpreting is a dynamic discursive practice with its social and situational contexts. The neutrality of the interpreters may inevitably be influenced by their own cultural background and social beliefs. This is especially true when the interpreter tends to act for the agency or ethnic groups' interest they belong to, or even shows personal interest to the content discussed. Since the interpreted communicative events "do not evolve in a vacuum" (Panagiota, 2016, p.203), the interpreter's identification with the agency or cultural groups will influence and endow them more responsibility. They may engage not only professionally but also emotionally in the discourse. On the other hand, the client's sharing of sensitive and confidential information or their negotiating aim with the interpreter has also made the interpreter part of the team. The interpreter will declare loyalty to the company and align him/herself with the interest of the "group" or company he/she works for.

The atmosphere has been another factor reiterated by most interviewees, which may disrupt the interpreter's impartial stance in business interpreting discourse. The atmosphere is closely related to the situational context of the discourse. As Van Dijk (1997) describes, discourse can be defined as "social actions accomplished by language users when they communicate with each other in social

situations and within society and culture at large" (p.14). Such definition implies that the conveying of meaning in the interaction should have "appropriateness conditions" (Van Dijk, 1997, p.14), which is not only related to the expression on the linguistic level, but also the situational context. The business encounter is a discourse with situational context, which is highly dynamic. The topics for discussion are not as predictable as other forms of interpreting and can be improvised out of the turns of exchanging of views, and could be anything that pertains to the business cooperation. Therefore, the interpreter, as the only person who is bilingual and bicultural to be able to understand the nuance of the interaction, will naturally shoulder the responsibility to balance the atmosphere. They need to gauge the situational context and the social distance to ensure the appropriateness of information transfer at the specific moment of the discourse.

7.4.5 Powerful or Not?

As power is the central notion in my study from a CDA perspective, it was often touched upon in the interviews. In this section, I will present the interpreters' perceptions of power in the business discourse. The results show that the interviewees hold different views of the power they have in the interaction.

All six interpreters claimed at some point in the interview that they are aware that being the only one who is bilingual and bicultural in the discourse practice gives them a unique position. Some among them stated explicitly that the power of the interpreter derives from their bilingual and bicultural expertise; while some regard it as a capacity that comes with the client's trust and expectations or the specific social and situational context of the business encounters.

Cindy explicitly states that she believes that the interpreter does hold power in business negotiation:

> *"I do think that interpreter has power in business talk. It is to a certain extent... because the interpreter can speak both languages. The clients on both sides rely solely on the interpreter to express their intentions and views...which attach more responsibilities to the interpreter. They will be able to take control of the conversation flow or information flow, so that the*

275

talk can proceed smoothly. It is entirely not like practicing interpreting in the

classroom" (Cindy, Interview 8, 25th July 2019)

Cindy considers herself the only person whom the client can depend on in the dynamics of BNI. She explains that the client's or the primary speaker's reliance on her is due to the fact that the interpreter possesses the scarce source of bilingualism and cultural awareness. Cindy compares business interpreting with the practice in the interpreting classroom where the scene is not dynamic or fluctuating. She emphasizes that the interpreter is bound to shoulder more responsibility in a socially-situated context, and the responsibility also gives the interpreter more power to regulate the conversation.

Chang has a similar view regarding the power of the interpreter. She believes that the interpreter's power is related to their agency, which can be defined as the subject position and action taken consciously to filter information and control the conversation flow in the context of business interpreting discourse.

"I do think I hold <u>some form of power</u> to control the <u>conversation flow and to</u>

<u>select the information.</u> I think it is vital for communication at some specific

moments. For example, when the client from time to time turns to me to make

some comments by repeating other's words, I will evaluate if it is necessary to

convey it or emphasize it to the other party according to its relevance and

context of the conversation moment…because according to my

experience…the clients in business conversation are keen to hear the most

relevant utterances which are closely related to the concrete content… "

(Chang, Interview 6, 30th November, 2019)

Wang and Wendy did not explicitly declare that the interpreter has power, as they perceived power as a dominant force in the decision-making process of the negotiation. However, they did emphasize the interpreter's ability and justifiable right to coordinate the dialogic process or influence the interactional order. On Wang's account:

"I think the power of the interpreter is <u>not decision-making power</u>, but the

capacity to adjust the pace of the interaction, such as the turn-taking order…I

sometimes tend to take the floor more quickly and cut short the utterance of the speakers when I find their utterances are too long to remember. By doing so, I have more leeway to produce the appropriate rendition. I do also think…the interpreter in business negotiation has the right and mandate to adjust the atmosphere according to the expectations of the client. The power, if there is any, comes along with the multifaceted role of the interpreter and the context of business negotiation interpreting, it is the power in the interaction sense…" (Wang, Interview 3, 20thOctober, 2018)

Wang considers the power a capacity to adjust the interactional structures in the business talk. Although Wang pointed out in the early stage of the interview that he wasn't aware that the interpreter would have power in the business negotiation, he admitted that the interpreter does hold some form of power in the later part of the interview. The interpreter's power manifests itself when the interpreter imposes influence on the social distance and the pace of the talk through different strategies. This is especially true when the interpreter intervenes frequently to manage the turn-taking order through shifts of personal pronouns. In the interview, Wang frequently relates his intervening approach to the expectations of the client and the unpredictability of the business talk. To Wang, the interpreter's power is endowed by the client who hires him. Being considered an ally or member of the team, the interpreter is well aware of his client's intention and aim in the briefing stage of the meeting. Thus they are somehow empowered to act in the interest of the client to facilitate the deal-making process. Wendy's comments resonate with Wang's:

"I think the interpreter is not powerful enough to dominate the talk or make any tangible decision for the deal. However, a professional interpreter might be eligible… in a certain conversational moment to adopt the interpersonal skills and gauge the situation to best serve the speaker's interest and help the speaker realize the goal. For example, the interpreter will sift the inappropriate expression to avoid some embarrassing moments. For me, I would consider it a special mandate or eligibility of my position in such a business context…" (Wendy, Interview 1, 25th September 2018)

Wendy views power as the eligibility that comes with the responsibility of her subject position in the business discourse. As an in-house interpreter, Wendy always views herself as a team member. She explains that the interpreter is situated in a position that is very demanding. They are required to understand all the nuances of the conversation. On the one hand, the interpreter needs to guarantee the conveying of the messages; on the other hand, they should also be able to assess the atmosphere and avoid any embarrassing or volatile scene. Obviously, Wendy defines power from the perspective of interpersonal relationships and the specific type of communication within business context.

Lee and Fion, the remaining two informants, claimed that they did not think they hold power in the business negotiation. They believed that it is not justifiable for an interpreter to influence the client's decision-making process. They held that the interpreter should not be involved in the "tug of interest" in the business communicative activity. However, while examining the transcripts of the recorded meetings, they discovered that they actually disrupted the professional norms and the assumed order of the discourse although they are largely unconscious of their interventions. They implicitly expressed that their interventions are related to the changing landscape of the face-to-face business interaction. They also point out that it is out of their instincts to intervene:

> *"I try not to engage with the client or the speakers, and I try to only translate what is said by the client. However, the face-to-face business negotiation i<u>s</u> <u>highly interactive with complicated and sensitive content</u>, like the one I did is highly technical. I have to step in sometimes to clarify or to explain to ensure that I have correctly conveyed the client's intended message…It is just unavoidable, and <u>only an interpreter can do it</u>…"* (Lee, 15thNov, 2019).

Lee tried to abide by the professional norms and avoid overriding the prescribed role. However, while reviewing the meeting transcript with me during the interview, Lee found that he sometimes intervened in the interaction during the course of the business meeting. Lee explains that "it is unavoidable". He claimed that the moves were made based on the need of the specific moments of the meeting, and the

interpreter is the only who could coordinate the talk. Such remarks reveal that Lee is aware of the disruption of the norms and considers it justified, though as a supporter of conduit model, he does not relate it to the concept of power directly. The discrepancy between Lee's idealized and actual subject position in the interaction has shown the demanding nature of the business interpreting and the complexity of the role of interpreter in such context.

Fion, another supporter of the conduit-model at the beginning of the interview, also identified her intervening role in the business context while reading the transcripts of the business meeting. With the full endorsement of the professional norms, Fion found that she nevertheless coordinated the talk by filtering information and aligning herself with the client or even advocating for the client in the interaction.

> *"I think I unconsciously adapted the message of the Chinese speaker to a more concise version and it is also culturally understandable for my foreign client....You know, Chinese is highly repetitive and the delivery of the speaker is verbose sometimes and business meeting praises efficiency...I think, hmm...explicating or summarizing information might...facilitate their understanding in the sense that I could understand both languages and cultures...but it is most likely an unconscious act"* (Fion, 25th June, 2019)

Fion's comments actually contradict the attitude expressed at the beginning of the interview, where she identified with the professional norms of the invisible and detached role of the interpreter, and claimed that an interpreter should not intervene in any form and should "only completely and accurately translate what the primary speakers said" (Fion, Interview 7, 25th June 2019). Fion's statement above actually provides verbal evidence of her engagement with the primary speakers and selection of information in the course of BNI. Her remarks also confirm the interpreter's bilingual and bicultural position in the meeting. Such ability enables her to adapt to the situational context of the discourse although she is unaware of the intervention she conducted.

7.4.6 Discussion

The interview results in this section reveal interviewees' understanding of factors that influence their agency in the discourse of BNI. Four of them overtly claim that they are aware of their power in the discourse, while two of them realized their intervening role as the interview revolves.

All the interviewees associated the notion of power with bilingual and bicultural competence, which they refer to as a significant contributor to their active interventions in social discourse. This is much in line with the interpretation of the interpreter's power in preceding analysis chapters from a CDA perspective, which considers the base of power the interpreter's "privileged access to scarce social resources, such as money, status, fame, knowledge, information, culture, or indeed various forms of public discourse and communication" (Van Dijk, 2015, p.469). All the informants' comments resonate with the notion of "privileged access to resources". They highlight that the interpreter's subject position as the only bilingual and bicultural individual when they explain and justify their intervening acts of selectively translating, managing the interactional order, or adjusting the pace and atmosphere in the interactive social discourse. All the interviewees are aware that these interventions are disruptive to the "order of discourse" in interpreted business encounters, although their views do not coincide. Their comments demonstrably show that the "scarce resource" of bilinguality and biculturalism actually endows the interpreter a social position which is no longer constrained by the conventions or the norms of the business interpreting discourse. The interpreter's intervention is a prime example of CDA's tenet of "power relations are discursive" (Fairclough and Wodak, 1997, p.275). The cultural and language expertise enable the interpreter to exercise their agency to coordinate the interaction. They adopt various strategies "to negotiate, coordinate, check, and balance power relations" (Mason and Ren, 2014, p.115) in the business talk.

According to most informants, the social and situational context of business interpreting is also a contributor to their power exercised in the discourse. They claim that the demanding nature of business meetings, such as the intensity and

sensitivity of the information, the highly fluctuating and interactive scene with interwoven personal interest, also made it unavoidable for them to intervene in the discourse. As Fairclough (1989) argues, "orders of discourse are ideologically shaped by power relations in social institutions and in society as a whole" (p.17), and the process of interaction is "constrained by the specific nature of the social practice" (Fairclough, 1992, p.80). As a discursive practice, business negotiation interpreting can be "constitutive in both conventional and creative ways" through "reproducing the society (social identities, social relationships, system of knowledge and belief)" (Fairclough, 1992, p.65). Owing to this, the interpreter's subject position in relation to the client or the primary speaker has been reshaped by the social and situational context or properties of the discursive practice of interpreted business talk, as well as the interpreter's identification of the "self". They adopt a participatory approach to coordinate or even intervene in the talk as team member or advocate of the client. It can be argued that the discourse of business interpreting is constitutive of the new type of social relationships between the interpreter and the primary speakers.

The discursive changes in the interactive activity disrupt the conventional and normative order of discourse where the interpreter is detached, invisible, and neutral in the social activity of interpreting. Such discursive change unveils that the interpreter is a substantive participant in the discourse with the power endowed by their bilingual and bicultural ability to exert influence on the social relationships and social distance of the primary interlocutors. We will come back to the discussion of the interpreter's perceptions in Chapter 8.

CHAPTER 8   Findings and Contributions

This study was conducted based on the proposed hypothesis (Chapter 1.2) that the interpreter has power in business dialogue interpreting. The observation is supported by the studies on the active and coordinating role of the interpreter in business meetings (Gentile 1996, Garzone and Rudvin 2003, Ren 2007, Karanasiou 2017). The study complements and furthers this scholarship by introducing the concept of power from a Critical Discourse Analysis (often abbreviated as CDA) perspective. Data collected for this research shows that in possession of the scarce resource of bilingual and bicultural capacity, the interpreter has the ability to control the contributions from primary speakers and to intervene in the interactional conventions of interpreted business dialogues. In other words, interpreters provide linguistic facilitation for primary speakers in the business meeting. However (and in line with existing literature), they also override the professional principles to "take up more roles by persuading, negotiating, accepting and rejecting positions" (Karanasiou, 2017, p.194). Interpreters assume a substantive position in the business encounter, disrupting the prescribed idealized image of the interpreter being invisible or totally neutral within the activity of interpreting.

This chapter revisits the conceptual framework of the study for a higher-level analysis of the theoretical foundations and the findings of my study; I also clarify the contribution of this study to the existing field of scholarship.

8.1 Power and Agency

In my discussion of the performance of the interpreter role, power and agency are two inter-related concepts. Power is a loaded term – one that is big, broad, and societal. It is central to the parameters of this study. From a CDA perspective, power is defined as a privilege wherein one controls the acts or contributions of the other participants in discourse by drawing from social and cultural resources that are unavailable to others in a discourse (Chapter 1.2 and Chapter 2.3). It is considered a product derived from the interpreter's bilingual and bicultural expertise of the

interpreter, which then manifests as the interpreter's interventions in the talk. The power of interpreters represents their capacity to exhibit ownership and accountability when they take individual decisions and actions. This influence disrupts the neutral and invisible professional role they are supposed to inhabit. Interpreters have power because they can access linguistic and cultural background knowledge within the dialogue; this knowledge is unavailable to other participants interacting in a specific context. The bilingual and bi-cultural resources of the interpreters enable them to not only convey the message of the primary speakers, but also to make moves of an interactional or interpersonal nature.

As mentioned in Chapter 2, the concept of agency has a philosophical origin that can be traced back to Hume and Aristotle. It denotes the capacity of an individual to take independent action and to act on one's own will (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, 2015). In this study, agency refers to the subjectivity of the interpreter and the ability to make independent decisions to act within the larger activity of interpreting. With the exercise of agency, the interpreter can explicitly initiate and execute specific actions based on an evaluation of the specific social context in which they are situated. Unlike power, agency is neither oppressive nor dominating. In the context of business dialogue interpreting, agency manifests itself in the social positioning of the interpreter within the discourse. Positioning allows the interpreter to make decisions independently and then takes action based on their evaluation of the specific situational context of BNI. It can be understood as the active interpreter engagement within the business talk through various means. This overlaps with the definition of power, since both concepts refer to the proactive involvement of the interpreter within the interaction rather than the neutral and invisible role prescribed in professional codes. The research therefore understands the interpreter's agency not as the capacity to initiate and execute an action, but also as a pathway for influencing the contributions of the primary speakers, for adjusting their own social positioning as relates to the others, and for managing the interactional order.

Although agency and power both represent the interpreter's ability to pro-

actively engage with an interactive, bi-lingual, and bi-cultural discourse, the notion of power highlights the linguistic and cultural resources the interpreter has in such a setting. These resources allow the interpreter to assume and adjust their social positioning to control and gate-keep the talk. In a bilingual context, the primary interlocutors cannot conduct the interaction autonomously. Interpreters thus assume a coordinating responsibility based on their understanding and assessment of the social and situational context. Multiple examples in this study show that interpreters sometimes assume an authoritative tone to selectively translate the message or regulate the interactional order, which gives them a substantive social position within the interaction. To gain a more comprehensive insight into the power of the interpreter, I decided to draw on the CDA framework. The next section highlights the theoretical contributions made by this study by adopting CDA as a theoretical framework for Interpreting Studies and successfully incorporating it into Interpreting theories, which also underscores and amplifies my argument about the power of the interpreter.

8.2 The Integration of CDA into Interpreting Studies

CDA is typically employed for the analysis of political arguments. Although political discourse appears unrelated to the linguistic nature of Interpreting Studies, my study found that the framework can be effectively applied to analyse the power of interpreters. In the following section, I elaborate on why CDA theories and the method detailed by Fairclough (1989) were preferred over other CDA approaches to discourse studies on the interpreter's role. I also address how CDA was combined with other theories with its origins in politics. I also illustrate my proposal for an amended theoretical and methodological framework of Fairclough's (1989) CDA, which is replicable for Interpreting Studies.

As discussed in the literature review (Chapter 2) and the methodology chapter (Chapter 3), Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is a theory that owes much to Foucault (Fairclough 1992; Jorgensen and Phillips 2002). Foucault's (1980) seminal and genealogical work titled *Truth and Power* proposes a theory of power

and knowledge. To Foucault (1980), power is not oppressive but productive, and that power should be considered as a "productive network" (p.119) made up of discourse, knowledge, social bodies, and subjectivity. His study focuses on a notion of power that he asserts, which creates subjects and agents who are central in discourse. Foucault's (1980) definition of power connects it closely with the concept of discourse. Power is considered a product originating from and developing in social practices in different scenarios. Foucault believes that power does not belong to any particular agents, political body, or social interest groups. Instead, Foucault proposes that it is distributed across all social practices, which provides a starting point for the development of CDA theory. While highlighting the elements of power and ideology, CDA aims to shed light on social relations, including power relations and social identities in discourse. The relation between power, language and discourse is central to CDA studies. It also aims to explicate the assumed knowledge about the constitution of the social world.

The use of Fairclough's (1989) CDA theory is primarily a result of my interest in the notion of the interpreter's power and its manifestation in naturally-occurring, interpreter-involved business dialogues. As a field of academic study, CDA has been increasingly applied and adapted to new areas of academic studies, including Translation and Interpreting Studies. Bayani (2012) proposes that Fairclough's (1989) CDA framework can be combined with the notions of SFL by Holliday (1985) for Translation Studies. Bayani attempts to combine the CDA framework to explore the relationship between language and ideology involved in the translation process. And more specifically, CDA can be used to uncover the underlying ideological assumptions in the texts (both source text and target text), which are normally inconspicuous to the readers. Consequently, he examines how translators' ideologies are imposed in their translations. Gu and Tipton (2020) frame China's political press conference as part of the "autopoietic system" (Luhhman, 1990, p.39), and adapt Fairclough's CDA framework to examine the ideological nature of the institutional discursive event, which demonstrates the interpreter's ideological alignment with Beijing's discourse.

My adaptation is in line with the above scholarship, and I adopt the CDA framework mainly because it can be used to analyse relationships between concrete language use and wider social cultural structures. However, the creativity and novelty of my study in the adaptation of CDA framework lies in its application to the business scenario, which, to the best of my knowledge, is scarce in CDA studies. This also explains my combination of CDA with the sociological theories of Goffman (1981), which enables a more balanced and comprehensive view regarding the triad interaction within business scenarios. The interpreting activity in such a context is highly dynamic and is subject to the factors such as immediate situational context, institutional culture, and interpersonal relations. Based on the rationale for the choice of this framework (as outlined in the Literature review chapter), CDA is used to uncover the interpreter's power in business discourse and the influence of the situational and social context on the interpreter's subject positioning. CDA is considered useful here as the concept of power is central to its theoretical foundation. It offers a lens to look at the dynamics of the subject positions of the interpreter. These positions are highly dependent on the social and situational context; they cannot be defined in a fixed and taken-for-granted fashion as prescribed in the professional codes for interpreters. CDA also allowed me to examine the interpreter-led disruption of the order of discourse and how the interpreter's power is enacted discursively through their interventions in business encounters in different situational contexts.

Secondly, I have incorporated Fairclough's CDA theory into Interpreting Studies because his framework is different from other CDA approaches in its scope of the notion of discourse. Fairclough confines the definition of discourse to a semiotic system that includes language and images. Other approaches (e.g., Laclau and Mouffe 1985) consider all social practice, discursive or non-discursive, as discourse. This means there is no practical tool for text analysis. Although heavily applied in political or mass media studies, Fairclough's CDA theory focuses on the linguistic dimension of social and cultural phenomena. Such focus provides a good theoretical foundation to support its application in Interpreting Studies. Fairclough's

approach is also text-oriented with its emphasis on the significance of a systematic analysis of the text produced in a spoken or written context (Fairclough, 1992). Consisting of description, interpretation, and explanation, Fairclough's (1989) three-dimensional model (Chapters 3.2 and 4.1) supports the empirical study of the interpreter's power in the specific discourses by allowing for transcripts' analysis at different dimensions and levels (the vocabulary, the grammar, and the text structure).

The phase of explanation in his three-dimensional model, in particular, provides a useful tool for me to go beyond the analysis of the linguistic level or the description of the discursive practice. The sense of "critical" enables me to explore how discourse is shaped by the web of relations and power differentials, as well as the influence of the discourse to the "social identities, social relations and systems of knowledge and belief, neither of which (*sic*) is normally apparent to discourse participants" (Fairclough 1992, p.12). Arguably, the CDA perspective operationalised the interpretation of the interpreter's subject position in business discourse, which demonstrates how the interpreter's power is discursively enacted within the context.

The CDA tool reveals that the interpreter's access to linguistic and cultural resources within the encounter is central to the nature of the power of the interpreter. It is intrinsically discursive and interactional, as well as subject to the situational business settings. The "critical" sense of CDA means that it helps reveal the interpreter's subject positions in relation to the primary speakers in the interaction, and the agency exercised by the interpreter within the discursive practice to maintain the social activity (including power dynamics in the buy-and-sell social relations of the primary speakers). It explicates the dialogic relations or interactional conventions presumed to exist between the interpreter and the primary speakers.

Benefitting from authentic data collected during business meetings that occurred in the Chinese interpreting market, I was able to conduct a critical examination of the interpreter's engagement by analysing transcripts of interpreters' renditions and primary speakers' utterances. Through the CDA lens, we can see that the interpreter holds a substantive social position with awareness of their intervention (as opposed to the traditionally prescribed secondary or invisible role in

the business encounter). Such awareness and positioning fully support the argument about the interpreter's power.

My research is unique in successfully incorporating CDA into Interpreting Studies. This not only increases the interdisciplinarity of the research, but also enables me to consider the interpreter's agency within the wider context of social, cultural, and situational discourse. Although the function of CDA is to provide strong support for the examination of the social discursive practice of business dialogue interpreting, the monolingual trend of CDA means that it needs to be adapted. To the best of my knowledge, the existing cluster of theories and methodologies for CDA (Chapter 2.3) does not provide a feasible framework that can be applied as a tool for the empirical study of the interpreting process. Such a tool is instrumental for the analysis of interpreters' renditions in comparison to the utterances of primary speakers. Because CDA aims to explore relations between language use and social practice, textual analysis of the discourse might not be sufficient for analysis of the social practice in a broader sense. Social and cultural theories are thus necessary for the study of power relations in such specific cross-cultural social and situational contexts.

I therefore adapted Fairclough's framework by combining it with additional methodologies from the fields of Sociology and Interpreting Studies (Chapter 3.2). Goffman's (1981) Participation Framework and Wadensjö's (1998) typologies were adopted to adjust to the bilingual, interactional, and dialogic features of the research context. Goffman's (1981) Participation Framework highlights the dialogic relationship between the participants. The definition of the speaker's role as a "principal", an "author", and an "animator" (p.144) sheds light on the analysis of the interpreter's social positioning and shifts of footing in the interpreted business encounter. It also echoes the CDA notion of subject position, highlighting the interactional and dialogic features of the positioning assumed by the speaker in a conversation. This is central to my exploration of the interpreter's power in the dynamics of the business interaction.

Exploring the position of the interpreter is "in contrast to the way in which

the use of 'role' serves to highlight static, formal and ritualistic" (Davis and Harré, 1990, p.43). The combination of a CDA perspective with Goffman's sociological theory enabled me to examine the granular data of this research from an interactive and dialogic perspective. This helped me gain a more in-depth picture of how the subject position of the interpreter changes constantly in different discourse moments of the interaction. It also offered a lens for examining how the power of the interpreter is also discursively enacted through intervention in business encounters.

The adapted CDA conceptual framework also incorporates Wadensjö's (1998) typology, which serves as a complement from the angle of Interpreting Studies. Wadensjö's (1998) classification of the interpreter's renditions was used to examine how the interpreter selectively interprets the contribution of the primary speakers by filtering or altering the content. It served as an auxiliary tool that allowed me to examine the nuances of the interpreter's intervention and gate-keeping acts in the discursive practice of business dialogue interpreting. The results show that the active engagement from the interpreter in the business encounter influences the topic development, the negotiating atmosphere, and the dynamics of buy-and-sell relations in the interaction.

In short, the adapted conceptual framework and methodology used in this research is a valuable addition to the field of Interpreting Studies. It broadens the scope of CDA study with the merit of interdisciplinarity. The integration of CDA into interpreting is a new area within Interpreting Studies that has not yet been systematically researched, especially for business negotiation interpreting (BNI), an under-researched and uncharted territory where the empirical data is difficult to access. The adapted methodology tool incorporates interpreting and social theories with the theoretical notions of CDA as a foundation. This facilitates the examination of authentic data from naturally-occurring interpreter-assisted business meetings. The conceptual framework provides a broader angle for study of the role of the interpreter, enabling examination of the interpreter's agency within the social, cultural, and situational contexts of a broader sense. Discussion of the interpreter's actual role in business negotiation interpreting (as related to power and agency)

within the social and cultural context of the discourse generates valuable insights. It calls for professional and trainee interpreters to be aware of the significance of their substantive social position and the discursive strategies they adopt in discourse. Since the existence of the interpreter's power is a major finding of this research, the next chapter revisits the discussion of a CDA perspective on power in the discursive practice of BNI.

8.3 The Power Landscape in Business Negotiation Interpreting

As an auxiliary tool, CDA generates a comprehensive picture of power from examining the data. As stated above, CDA is used to explicate the hidden power relations and ideologies behind all of the above-mentioned alterations in the interpreter's renditions; it considers discourse as "a place where relations of power are actually exercised and enacted" (Fairclough, 1989, p.43). I find the interpreter's intervention is consistent with my definition of agency and power from the CDA perspective; interpreters are deeply involved in a decision-making process that considers what and how to translate, whom the message is conveyed to, and at what point of the interaction to translate – all of which are based on their assessment of the appropriateness of speakers' contributions at specific phases and moments of the interaction.

Such assessment may exert influence on interpreters' relations with the other interlocutors as well as the buy-and-sell relations within the business context. CDA analysis of the interpreter's engagement in the interpreted business encounter generates interesting insight and answers for the research questions of this study (Chapters 4, 5, and 6). More interestingly, analysis of the interviews regarding interpreters' motivations and awareness of their intervening moves presents the perceived roles of interpreters' perceptions of agency in the discourse (Chapter 7). Data analysed in the study shows that the power of the interpreter manifests itself mainly in the three general scenarios:

1) when the interpreter has the semantic autonomy to make decisions for the totality of the message conveyed;

2) when the interpreter endorses their client's aim and champions the interpersonal relationship between the primary speakers in the business dialogue interpreting;

3) when the interpreter endeavors to eliminate communicative inadequacies, or misunderstandings and assess the atmosphere and orientation of the business talk.

All of the three scenarios display ample evidence of the interpreter's exercise of power, which takes many forms including: their alterations of the utterances of the primary speakers with explanatory additions or substitutions (Chapter 4); their adoption of the footings of an "author " or a "principal" to respond, promote, and persuade on behalf of their client or the primary speaker (Chapter 5); and their management of the turn-taking order and the orientation of the talk by demanding clarification and adjusting the occasionally chaotic order of overlapping talks (Chapter 6).

It is worth mentioning that although I am making an argument for the power of the interpreter in BNI, power is not an absolute concept. Instead, it is a relational category within this system of discourse. A CDA perspective asserts that social power is defined as control; groups have power if they can control the actions of other groups. But this doesn't mean that in the discourse of business negotiating, the interpreter is the only one who has power. Nor does it mean that the interpreter's agency can be exercised in an absolute manner of control. The interpreter's power is neither oppressive nor absolute. My data shows that in such discursive practice, the power of the interpreter is still constrained by various factors. First and foremost of these is the intrinsic nature of a business negotiation. As discussed in the introductory chapter of this thesis, negotiation is defined as a specific type of interaction occurring in a dialogic discourse. The activity involves various elements such as floor access, topic selection, and the understanding of messages. Participants in the talk are aware of each other's goals, resources, and the potential decision-making power held by both sides.

The interpreter-assisted business negotiation is not exempt from these

interactional elements. On the contrary, it is further complicated by the cross-linguistic and cross-cultural features along with the positioning of the interpreter. In addition to conveying the messages of both interlocutors, interpreters also need to be aware of the various goals and interests of all parties to the talk (and those of their client's in particular). Interpreters need to coordinate the interaction based on the basic characteristics and principles underlying the selling-buying discourse. They may need to smooth the talk when there are conflicts of interests, for example, or to assess the appropriateness of the contribution of the speakers at the specific phases and moments of the negotiation. In short, the goal of assisting primary speakers (particularly their client or the speaker with whom they share the same cultural background) to establish and strengthen cooperative relations in business often determines the position that interpreters assume as well as the renditions they produce in the discourse. The power they hold most often exists in the interactional aspects of the discourse, such as access to floor, the order of interactions, and requests for clarification. The primary negotiating parties hold more say when the content of the talk is related to the decision-making of the deals or substantive business matters.

Moreover, some examples also showcase that the primary speakers do hold more power with their "holding of resources" at variant moments of the business discourse, i.e., when the business talk is highly involved with the professional expertise or jargon, the primary speaker does hold the right to monitor the interpreter's rendition or even correct them. The primary speaker's social positioning in the talk as the dominant speaker surfaces in such circumstances. This shows that although the primary speakers' command of English is not up to the level of the interpreter's, they may sometimes have more power in the discourse. This power derives from their holding of industry specific knowledge, which is also part institutional culture.

The second factor is the employment relationship. One element influencing the interpreter's performance is client expectations. Multiple examples in the data show that the interpreter's mediation in the talk is influenced by who their employer

is. Interpreters are expected to act in the interest of the client, assuming the "implicit responsibility" of safeguarding clients' interests. In-house interpreters who work for an institution also need to consider the operational aims or institutional norms. The performance of their roles may, at times, be subject to the operational aims of the institutions and the decision-making power of the primary interlocutors on both sides. This is especially true for in-house interpreters who not only perform the duty of interpreting, but also be in charge of the external relations. Their actions in the discourse are also charged with institutional factors. This means they must consider the operational norms of their agency as well as the profile of the primary speaker on the other side of the negotiating table. This social position adopted by the interpreter is particularly interesting as their position is attached to specific expectations from other participants in the discursive practice. Social relations between interpreter and the client are shaped and determined by this specific setting for business negotiation.

The third factor is interpersonal relations and social structures pre-existing in the discourse. From a CDA perspective, the subject position is an entirely social category that is discursively enacted, and it is highly dependent on both broader social discourse and the immediate situational context. The data of this study shows that the subject position of the interpreter in the discourse of business negotiation interpreting is highly subject to the multi-layered interpersonal relations between the negotiating parties. I describe these relations as "multi-layered" because even though most of the business meetings aim for mutually beneficial agreements or decisions, it does not change the frequently occurrence of bargaining on goals, interests, and resources. All these elements symbolise the negotiation of power and promotion of images for the company. The data shows that whether or not interpreters are aware of an "implicit responsibility" to promote the interpersonal relations, interpreters in such discourse are always motivated to make use of their cultural and social expertise to maintain a pleasant mood for conversation and champion this relationship that is vital to the "selling and buying" (Rehberin, 1995, p.82) pattern of social action. Interpreters may therefore stand with either the client

or the primary speaker on the other side at concrete moments in the discourse to avoid communicative inadequacy or misunderstanding.

Aside from their client, interpreters also align with or speak for the primary interlocutors when the situational context requires. This is especially true when the need for clarification or explication arises. Their intervention is arguably related to their professional integrity, ensuring that the messages are conveyed clearly, and the communication is conducted in a largely balanced and friendly manner. This is much in line with the relation-building aim of the meeting. Conversation in this particular context is considered, above all, to be "a form of social interaction the products of which are also social, such as interpersonal relations" (Davis and Harré, 1990, p.43). This implies that a subtle balancing of power among participants who are involved in the interaction. The data illustrates how the interpreter emerges as an active participant who holds a substantive social position in the business encounter. Their agency is bound to be shaped and constrained by a web of interpersonal relations among buying or selling parties as well as the social and cultural factors involved in the discourse. Within such a discursive context, shifts in the social positioning of the interpreter become salient from a CDA perspective. The interpreter is ascribed various social positions where they are not simply a linguistic service provider, but an ally or a spokesperson for their client.

The interpreter's cultural alignment with Chinese interlocutors, be it their client or not, is a distinctive finding in this respect. In my research, all of the participating interpreters are native Chinese speakers, who are either hired by either a Chinese party or a non-Chinese party. However, interpreters all align themselves with the person who shares a common cultural background with them. This is especially true in terms of the use of personal pronouns, which is representative of social group identification and the social positioning of the interpreter. The findings suggest that the behaviour of interpreters in this discourse is influenced by cultural identity.

A CDA perspective asserts that discourse contributes to the construction of social identities, social relations, and the system of knowledge and meaning

(Jorgensen and Phillips, 2002). Discourse structures are closely related to the social relations between different actors and their mindsets. Viewed through this lens, the social positioning of the interpreter within the setting of business negotiation interpreting is particularly attached to the client expectations and the professional function of a linguistic service provider.

Besides, the cultural identities of the interpreter and their awareness of group identification also exert influence on their subject positions. The subject positions people assume in a discourse speak to their identity. Identity itself is intrinsically social and cultural. It is obvious that the identity or social position assumed by the interpreter upon alignment with the Chinese speaker, whether a client or not, is a highly relational one. In other words, the national identity of the Chinese interpreter is something that contrasts with the foreign nationalities in the discourse. This means that while interpreters are aware of their professional identity (prescribed as totally neutral), they unavoidably bring their own social and cultural identities into the discursive practice, because it is almost impossible to conduct the activity of interpreting in a vacuum. In other words, the subject position of the interpreter is never a fixed notion, it shifts with different social or cultural elements coming into play at the specific moment of the discourse. In short, the agency and power of the interpreter is socially-anchored and is bound by both context and culture.

The analysis shows that the interpreter clearly holds a substantive position in business talks. This position also endows them power within the dynamics of the discursive practice. Their intervention in the discourse is heavily invested in their language competence and their assessment of the social and cultural context of business discourse. This context can be identified on both a micro- and a macro-level of the discursive practice. The power of the interpreter manifests in their initiative to take actions that might influence the progress of the dialogue, which is characteristic of power in an interactional sense. Their mediation shapes the order of the discourse and disrupts the assumed interactional convention of a business interpreting activity. Instead of being a passive machine-like language transmitter, the interpreter is actively involved in the interaction with their assessment of the

immediate situational context, and the broader social and cultural background of the interlocutor.

As Van Dijk (2015) argues, CDA combines "micro-level (agency, interactional) and macro-level (structural, institutional, organizational)" analysis (p.468) of discursive practice. In the setting of this study, the interpreter's agency is exercised at the micro-level through language competence within the verbal interactions and communication in the discourse. This is evident in their joint production of content with the primary speakers, their interruption of the talk for clarification or explanation, and their alignment with clients (or with non-client speakers at times) to strengthen, promote, or tone down their views. At a macro-level, the interpreter's mediation is always conducted based on the immediate situational context and the overall aim of the business talk. Their positioning in the talk exerts influence on the interpersonal relations, and the power plays within the discourse. On Ren's (2010) account, interpreters are able to partially and momentarily re-adjust the power imbalance in the discourse. Their influence on the buyer and seller relations in business discourse is a good example, especially when conflicts of interest or misunderstandings emerge. For instance, interpreters (especially in-house interpreters) can align themselves with the client who hires them or speak for the primary speakers when necessary.

It is noticeable from the data that in most cases, interpreters identify with the interests of the client or institution they serve. They engage in the talk to promote the products, persuade the primary speaker, or strengthen the views of their clients. Evidence also shows that interpreters sometimes adjust their subject positioning to speak for or defend the non-client speakers – especially when there is a potential for misunderstanding or the need to explicate the interlocutor's ideas. The interpreter's alteration of the interactional order or the utterances of the parties involved inevitably induces subtle changes to the interests of the seller or buyer along with power relations at critical or sensitive negotiating moments. More interestingly, the interpreter's cultural identification comes into play in the development of the business dialogue. This shows that the subject position of the interpreter is, in a

296

sense, related with the political use of CDA in the notion of group formation (Jorgensen and Phillips, 2002). The concept of "the other" (Jorgensen and Phillips, 2002, p.44) is noticeable in discursive group formations, where interpreters exclude themselves from the cultural identity of foreign speakers, and align themselves with Chinese speakers, regardless of the social concept of "client". A multitude of such examples can be found in the analysis conducted in Chapters 4 and 5.

The power of the interpreter can therefore be identified in different dimensions and moments of the discursive practice of business dialogue interpreting. Interpreters' positioning and autonomy in editing the utterances of the actual roles they take on can hardly be restricted to a one-size-fits-all version of definition as stated in professional codes of conduct. This study systematically deconstructs the idealized image of an interpreter tasked with making participants unaware of their presence. With discussions of the power of the interpreter in the discursive practice of business negotiation, neutral and impartial codes are problematized. Qualitative data shows that the interpreter's access to privileged resources such as professional language skills, cultural awareness, and prior background knowledge regarding the the aims and intentions of their clients situates them in a participatory social position that clearly influences the development and interpersonal relations of the talk. The interpreter thus is not merely visible, but also assumes a substantive position in the discourse, exercising agency to co-construct the interactive process with other primary interlocutors. They intervening in the interaction to edit the content and manage the interaction order of the communicative event. From a CDA perspective, all of these behaviours can be described as power. Investigation of the interpreter's awareness of their agency and power within the discourse also strengthens these findings, as summarized in the next section.

8.4 Interpreters' Perceptions of Their Roles

This study included an investigation into interpreters' perceptions of their roles. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with the aim of gathering in-depth qualitative data from interpreters to further explore the manifestation of their agency

and mediation (identified in the analyses of the three preceding chapters). Interviews begin with the interpreters' understandings of the professional codes of conduct as well as their understanding of stances and subject positions that a professional interpreter is supposed to take. Interpreters were questioned about their motivations, reasons, and awareness of the noticeable interventions that I identified from a close reading of the transcripts. Examining the underlying factors that contributed to the interpreter's mediation allows researchers to systematically understand the interpreter's actual role and the actual role of the interpreter and the potential power they hold in business settings. This section thus revisits the interview results and explores interpreters' perception of power in business negotiation settings.

All participating interpreters had a good understanding of the professional Codes of Conduct issued by organizations such as AIIC (Association Internationale des Interprètes de Conférence), AUSIT (Australian Institute of Interpreters and Translators), or NRPSI (National Register of Public Service Interpreting). They are aware that the interpreter is expected to play an impartial and neutral role. This is especially true for interpreters who are educated to a graduate level, as the doctrines prescribing the interpreter's role as invisible and neutral are taught in the training courses; graduate students are always taught that the mandate of an interpreter is to interpret whatever the primary speaker says completely and accurately without any alterations.

The findings of this study demonstrate that although all interpreters are aware of roles prescribed in their training. Their self-perceived roles are not always consistent with the doctrines proposed in the professional codes of conduct. They display good awareness of the particular nature of the business setting (Chapter 7.3). Interpreters understand that business negotiating aims for profit or the forging of cooperative partnerships; the interaction is conducted not only on a linguistic level, but also on an interpersonal level where smooth communication is essential despite potential challenges of disagreement over the terms of business. At different stages

of the interview, all of them acknowledge or admit that their roles exceed the prescribed invisible and neutral notion of the profession through the agency and mediation they exercised in business discourse.

Interpreters who explicitly support the notion of power and a mediating role of the interpreter in the business talk believe that a professional interpreter should play a role beyond a language service provider (Chapter 7.3). They emphasize that client expectations always serve as a motivation for their acts of mediation in a business scenario. It seems that they are not hired for linguistic reasons only, they are also retained for the interactional function they show in the scenario, namely, the ability to cope with changing dynamics in real time through interpersonal skills and assessment of the situation. This helps the client achieve their goals in the negotiation, be it forging a business relationship or making deals. They even describe their agency as "an implied responsibility" (Interview 3, Wang, 15th Oct, 2018) or "an additional service" (Interview 1, Wendy, 25th Sep 2018), referring to the interpreter's mediating activities of persuasion, promoting, explaining or consulting. Even interpreters who insisted at the beginning of the interview that they had assumed a neutral and invisible persona (such as Cindy and Lee) discovered, after looking at the transcripts, that their actual roles showed similar patterns – and that the motivation behind their behaviours was largely related to client needs.

Interpreters are also aware of the significance of their presence in the interpreted business encounter and their influence on the orientation or development of the talk. They are well aware of their position which is located between the client and the primary speaker. Their shifting of subject positions, consciously or unconsciously, among "principal", "author" and "speaker" (as described in the participation framework by Goffman's 1981) reveals that the interpreter plays a substantive participating role in the interaction to influence or exercise control over the social or interpersonal relations in the discourse. Interpreters consider the situational context, the relevance of information, or the efficiency of the talk when they decide to selectively interpret the utterances or manage the flow of information.

This is much in line with the claim of Van Dijk (1997), who considers

discursive practice as "a social action accomplished by language users when they communicate with each other in social situations and within society and culture at large" (p.14). Interpreters are involved in the business scenarios to assist the client in accomplishing a goal. Their mediation and agency reveal "the significance of language in the production, maintenance, and change of social relations" (Fairclough, 1989, p.1). Their perceptions of both their own positioning and the context in a relational sense influence their renditions. They adopt an authoritative tone at times, bringing changes to the order of interactions by adapting utterances. This attests to the power held by the interpreter in business interactions.

All interpreters in this study emphasize the particular nature of the business negotiation setting, which is intrinsically profit-oriented. They believe that the nature of the business talk leads to their exercise of agency in the process. This corresponds with Fairclough's (1992) claims that "the process of interaction is constrained by the specific nature of the social practice" (p.80). Bilingual and cross-cultural elements in the business negotiation also further complicate the scenario. As Chaney and Martin (2004) write, cross-cultural negotiation is the "discussions of common and conflicting interests between persons of different cultural backgrounds who work to reach an agreement of mutual benefit" (p.196). Interpreters in this study repeatedly mention that the factors contributing to their interventions are related to the interwoven personal interests and the competitive nature of the business scenario.

This is why interpreters tend to use the metaphor of "a bridge" to describe their role in the scenario. They are aware that the development of the business dialogue is not only related to the use of language, but also subject to interpersonal and cultural elements. They consciously make use of their linguistic expertise and cultural awareness to avoid cultural or interpersonal awkwardness and to remove communicative inadequacies, especially at critical moments of the discussion. They also display an awareness the ability to speak for their client in ways that would be more appreciated or well-received by the speakers on the other side of the negotiating table (Chapter 4.3). Such awareness motivates them to shift their stances

back and forth using different personal pronouns for the purpose of avoiding any abruptness or confusions in the interaction (Chapter 5.2), and to adjust the pace or orientation of the business talk through the management of the order of interactions within the discourse (Chapters 6.3 and 6.4). The motivation for the above actions expressed by interpreters deconstructs the conduit-model of the prescribed role of the interpreter. It proves that the interpreter's exercise of agency does indeed influence the interpersonal relations within the discourse. At times, the interpreter's autonomy and authoritativeness are also visible in their flexibly adaptation of intervening strategies.

It is also worth mentioning that interpreters participating in the interviews mention the concepts of a "client" and the "other side" (Chapter 7). This is especially true for those who explicitly support the notion of power. Interpreters clearly state that they feel an obligation to satisfy the goals and expectations of the person who hired them in order to get good feedback or potentially be rehired. Some of them even refer to an implied rule of standing with the client. This is particularly evident in interpreters' explanations of their motivation for filtering or adding information, or for aligning with the clients when responding and explaining. Following Angelelli (2001) proposal of the concept of "professional survival", interpreters believe that it is their responsibility to satisfy the needs of the client and support them in achieving their goal.

However, this does not mean interpreters leave the non-client speakers in an unfavorable or unattended position within the business scenario. As the only bilingual and bicultural individual in the process interaction, interpreters uphold their sense of professional integrity to ensure that both sides have a good understanding of the messages and intentions being conveyed. They are well aware that their assigned task requires facilitating communication between both parties, and that they need to conform to professional ethics as the person located in the middle of this business interaction. Such awareness is manifested in their moves to sometimes align with the non-client speaker sometimes for explanation and clarification. When a misunderstanding or sensitive issue emerges, they may try to

ensure smooth proceedings by intervening with their cultural and social expertise. The interpreter's agency in the business scenario is not exercised counter to professional integrity, but with the aim of facilitating the comprehension of intent.

Interview data indicates that interpreters are generally aware of the discrepancy between the roles they are prescribed with in professional codes of conduct and their perception of how their role should actually be performed in BNI. Their description or perception of their roles is relative to the situational context and the employment relations. Moreover, they show a good understanding of their social position in business interpreting scenarios. They also justify their intervention strategies with their assessment of the social and situational context for the discursive practice.

Overall, interpreters are conscious of the agency they exercise in the interactive discourse. Some among them explicitly refer to it as a form of power that derives from the client and primary speaker's need to rely on them for communication. Their power can be manifested at different points in the interaction. Interpreters agree that aside from linguistic skills, their interpersonal skills and capacity to handle the situation are highly significant for their ability to navigate the scenario and ensure the smooth proceedings. Some refer to such ability as a special mandate or eligibility endorsed by their position, enabling them to intervene in the interactional order or the orientation of talks. Even interpreters who initially insisted on the need for neutrality endorse the notion that the task of conveying meaning in the interaction produces "appropriateness conditions" for intervention (Van Dijk, 1997, p.14). They discovered their own participatory role in the interaction at different stages of the interview, all of which is inconsistent with their assumed performance of a conduit-like role.

The qualitative data from the interview clearly echoes a CDA perspective that "the situational, institutional and social settings shape and affect discourses" (Wodak, 2001, p.66). The interpreter's awareness of their own power and perceptions of their intervening strategies both confirm my argument for power based on the CDA lens, which describes the linguistic communicative activity as a

social practice that is both socially shaped and socially shaping. The interpreters' awareness of their social positioning as well as the socio-cultural context of the setting attests to my assumption of their power within the discourse. The role perceptions of the interpreter demonstrably influence the social positioning, the intervening strategies, and inter-personal skills they employ in their performance. The power of the interpreter is enacted discursively with their particular autonomy and privilege in addition to the influence of their subject position on power relations among the primary speakers, which derives from the linguistic and cultural resources they hold in the discourse.

CHAPTER 9   Conclusions

This research explores the actual role of the interpreter within the intrinsically dynamic and interactive interpreted business negotiation. Findings from research shed light on the complexity of the role of the interpreter within the business setting. One of the contributions of this study is the analysis of the interpreter's power through the lens of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). I adapt the politically rooted conceptual framework of CDA by integrating it with Interpreting theory and Sociological theory, which serves as a valuable addition for broadening the scope of both CDA and Interpreting Studies. The highly interactive, dynamic, interpreter-mediated scenario of business negotiation is conceptualized as a discursive practice. The methodology entails the three-dimensional analytical model Fairclough's (1989), combined with Goffman's (1981) participation framework and Wadensjö's (1998) typology of interpreter's renditions (Chapter 3.2). The adapted methodology reveals how interpreters' power is enacted discursively through a web of social relations and the interactional structures in the discourse of cross-language business dialogue interpreting. The adapted CDA conceptual framework is a demonstrably powerful tool for identifying and making sense of the interpreter's power within the interaction. It is also replicable for similar studies of differing language and cultural contexts to test some of the findings of this research, notably the importance of the employment relationship and the interpreter's alignment with those whose cultural background they share, applies to other language pairs as well.

As discussed in preceding chapters, I investigated two dimensions of interpreting in a business context from a CDA perspective. The first dimension is related to the researcher's understanding of the interpreter's power, which is based on a close reading of the data; the second dimension is interpreters' perceptions of their own agency in the business discourse. The findings suggest that dialogue interpreting in business settings is often charged with situational and social factors that are related to the nuances of interpersonal and social relations. Analysis of collected data shows that the negotiating parties participate in the business

interaction for the purpose of reaching an agreement. Most of the time, agreement is beneficial for both parties while also involving some conflicting interests between them. For business meetings with a single interpreter, the interpreter is often hired by one party to facilitate the communication for both sides. The interpreter is not only located in the midst of the common and conflicting interests of clients and primary speakers, but also subject to an employment relationship. From a CDA perspective, such a social position implies a multi-layered inter-personal relation network in the discourse. Here the interpreter is a substantial participant in the dynamic play of interest or power relations rather than a mere language transmitter. Under such circumstances, limitations on role-performance and the professionalism of the interpreter are bound to be challenged. More often than not, the interpreter breaks away from norms to adapt to the situational context. Interestingly, the research data shows that interpreters (especially the ones who are more experienced in business interpreting) are aware of the discrepancy between the prescribed roles and the actual roles they play in business discourse. To some extent, this awareness guides them in their decision-making process and selection of strategies when exercising agency.

9.1 Implications and Recommendations

Based on the detailed analysis conducted in this study, the findings related to the manifestation of the interpreters' power and their awareness of it completely deconstruct the idealized image of the interpreter working in the business domain. Granular data sourced from the business meetings in the Chinese market is valuable and it provides important references for practitioners and professional organizations who design the codes of conducts for the interpreting industry. While offering perspectives on the interpreter's power in an under-researched area of the business domain, this research is an important reminder for both industry and academia that interpreting is a service activity in nature.

Understanding the goal of the client in the interaction is an essential part of the interpreter's responsibility. Aside from providing a linguistic service,

interpreters should also be aware of their position in this subtle interplay of the personal relations within the business interaction. They should be aware that the resources held by them are not only related to their bilingual ability, but also to their bicultural expertise. Such resources entail the interpreter's awareness of the institutional aim in the talk, or the discrepant stances of the parties involved. The interpreter's consciousness of all these factors derives from the social resources they hold, such as the background information obtained in the briefings stage, their awareness of the ideological, and cognitive differences of the two parties involved. All this enables them to identify and discern the potential differentiation in the primary speaker's understanding of certain notions and concepts involved in the talk. Such capability is useful in the adoption of intervening discursive strategies in order to navigate the scene and to satisfy the needs of the specific situational context.

Interpreters also need to be aware of the changes of power dynamics in the discourse. They need to be aware that they may not be the only one who is bilingual in the context, and the bi-culturalism also derives from the background knowledge, company profiles, or the institutional culture, where the primary speakers may have more comprehensive understanding based on long-term professional industrial expertise (i.e, the primary speaker sometimes monitors the interpreter's rendition). In a word, the notion of power in the discourse is only a relational category, which is subject to multiple factors. The engagement of the interpreter in the business interaction, though an indisputable fact, is not always something to be celebrated or overwhelmingly positive. Therefore, the acknowledgement of such a possibility may provide the interpreter with a more balanced approach when exercising their agency within the business context.

Organisations that design the professional codes of conduct should take into consideration the fact that the interpreter actually occupies a substantive position in the discursive practice of business negotiation interpreting (BNI). The doctrine of invisibility, impartiality and neutrality should no longer be regarded as a silver bullet principle for interpreters to abide by in the complicated dynamics of this discursive activity. Interpreters should be aware that their impartiality and potential

intervention in the interpreting scenario, especially in business negotiation-type settings, is inevitable. It is not possible for interpreters to always maintain the principle of impartiality in the process of interaction. However, as discussed above, they should also be aware that the power they hold in the discourse might not always be something to be celebrated or overwhelmingly positive, therefore it is important to be at alert while intervening in the interaction.

Moreover, the proactive interpreter involvement in the interaction (such as by managing access to the floor, filtering information, or controlling the topic) should not be seen as a violation of the professional codes. In addition to the social and situational factors that give rise to these interactional aspects in discourse, the intrinsically relational nature of business dialogue interpreting needs to be explicated in the training process. An introduction to how the interpreter's agency can be manifested or exercised should be incorporated into codes of conduct, providing guidance for interpreters who operate in business settings. Promoting the interpreter's awareness of their power in BNI can help them make the most of their social position, which is potentially conducive for the smooth development of the interaction.

It would be helpful if an explanation of the interpreter's agency and the complexity of the BNI could be integrated into the pedagogies of interpreting as a discipline, especially in teaching sessions that introduce the ethics and code of conduct for the profession. Educating trainee interpreters on the relational nature of business dialogue interpreting and the situational or social context involved will help them gain a comprehensive understanding of the subject positions they may assume in future assignments. This is particularly useful and efficient for the outcome of training, because most trainee interpreters start their career with business dialogue interpreting assignments rather than simultaneous interpreting. Simulations of business dialogue interpreting with regards to either the data or findings from this research will enable students to gain a well-rounded understanding of the actual roles performed by an interpreter in such settings. In turn, the cultivation of such awareness may assist the trainee interpreter to provide

quality services, becoming more responsive to both client requirements and the situational context in different discursive moments when navigating the business scenario.

The study shows that interpreters do hold the right and autonomy to intervene in BNI. Their mediating moves are based on different variables in the discourse including their assessment of the situational context, the goals or needs of the client or primary speaker, and the orientation of the business talk. I consider pronounced interpreter mediation in the interaction as a manifestation of power; it not only disrupts the assumed order of discourse and the prescribed image of an interpreter, but also induces changes to the power relations in the business dialogue. The interpreter's self-perception of interventions conjures up a refreshed image of an interpreter who holds the power to influence interpersonal relations in a business setting, creating an order for discourse of which participants are often unaware. Their voices in the interview present the challenges they encounter, the expectations for role-performance (clients' and interpreters'), and necessary interpreting skill-sets in the discursive practice.

As a researcher and a practicing interpreter, I strongly advocate for the amendment of the interpreting codes of conduct, especially for BNI. The complexity of the positioning of the interpreter should be explicated in training stages through case studies or simulations that allow trainees to become aware of the actual role or substantial position held by interpreters in an interaction. It should also be clarified that business dialogue interpreting is largely a relational activity: the essential characteristic of this activity is an orientation toward service. Interpreters should be aware of the complex web of interpersonal relations in discourse, and recognize that their mediation of business negotiations is not necessarily a deviation from or disruption of professional norms. Social and situational contexts must be taken into consideration when examining the performance of the interpreter in this discursive practice. Interpreters need to be aware of their autonomy and power to adopt strategies that can assist understanding or ensure smooth communication. They sure be conscious that they

may need to assume a substantive role in an interpreting assignment with the aim of providing language assistance that caters to both the situation and client goals.

9.2 Limitations and Further Research

This research is certainly not exempt from limits and shortcomings, and identifying them provides significant insight into potential avenues and topics for future research. Limitation on this study is primarily caused by the empirical and qualitative nature of the research. All research data was collected in the Chinese interpreting market where, since I was a practicing interpreter in China for more than 7 years, business negotiations are more accessible to me compared to markets in the United Kingdom and Europe at large. However, this leaves less leeway for the choice of language combination. The language pair in this research is restricted to Chinese and English as most of the practitioners in China are native Chinese speakers who speak English as a second language, providing English-to-Chinese services or vice versa. The fact that all interpreters are native Chinese speakers is a limitation in its own right as native English speakers may show different displays of cultural alignment. Although I successfully gained access to ten business meetings that yielded ample data pertaining to the research questions, the sample size is still limited considering the large volume of on-going business conferences on a daily basis in China. But the confidential nature of the business conference has always been a barrier that impedes interpreting research in this field, giving rise to its surprisingly under-researched status. Interview data on the perceived role of the interpreter provides evidence for the interpreter exercise of power, deepening our understanding of the actual role of the interpreter in business discourse. However, client perceptions regarding their acceptance of interpreter agency are also a good potential resource for exploring interpreter's role performance in the business domain. It is a pity I had no access to the client end, as I might have been perceived as intruding or probing if I approached them in the specific setting of the scenario. This also could be a very good avenue for further research.

For future research directions, the adapted CDA model can be applied to

interpreting studies in various cultural and social contexts. Studies can replicate the theoretical and methodological framework of this research, looking into the interpreter's power in assignments for a variety of situational contexts. Researchers can also tz whose cultural background they share, for instance, or if such interpreter perceptions of power are consistent with Chinese-speaking ones. This could potentially present a comprehensive and multi-layered picture of the nature of the profession in a cross-language and trans-cultural context.

Other avenues for further research could involve investigation of individual differences in factors prompting the interpreter's exercise of agency. Differences such as age group or gender could yield more nuanced insights into the agency of the interpreter. If video-recording access to business meetings is possible in the future, it would also be interesting to study the non-verbal moves of participants as well as the non-verbal strategies adopted by the interpreter in their mediation. After all, non-verbal features area fundamental part of the discourse system in everyday conversation. There is already substantial research in this area, especially for public service settings (see Vargas-Urpi 2013, Davitti 2012, Miletich 2015). Non-verbal activities in interpreter-mediated business dialogue represent as yet uncharted territory within Interpreting Studies that could reveal how the interpreter and other participants co-construct the meaning and participatory framework of the dialogue.

Bibliography

Angelelli, C. (2001). *Deconstructing the invisible interpreter: A critical study of the interpersonal role of the interpreter in a cross-cultural/linguistic communicative event. Ph.D. thesis, Stanford University.*

Angelelli, C. (2004). *Revisiting the Interpreter's Role: a study of conference, court, and medical interpreters in Canada, Mexico, and the United States,* 1st ed. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Angelelli, C. (2014). Introduction: The social turn in translation and interpreting studies. Angelelli. C., (eds): *The Sociological Turn in Translation and Interpreting Studies.* pp.1-6.

Baker, M. (2006). *Translation and Conflict: A Narrative Account*. London and New York: Routledge.

Bakhtin, M. (1986). *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*. Emerson, C. and Holquist, M. (eds.) V．W．McGee, V.W. (trans.) 1st ed. Austin：University of Texas Press.

Baraldi, C. and Gavioli, L. (2012). *Coordinating Participation in Dialogue Interpreting,* 1st ed. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Baraldi, C. (2012). Interpreting as dialogic mediation: the relevance of expansions. In: Baraldi, C. and Gavioli, L. (eds.) *Coordinating Participation in Dialogue Interpreting.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co, pp.297-326.

Bayani, Z. (2016). Applying critical discourse analysis in translation of political speeches and interviews. *International Journal of Modern Language Teaching and Learning.* **1**(2), 54-58. [online] *Available from:* <www. ijmltl.com> [Accessed 5 Nov 2020].

Berger, R. (2013). Now I see it, now I don't: researcher's position and reflexivity in qualitative research. *Qualitative Research* 0(0): 1-16.

Bernstein, B. and Inghilleri, M. (2003). Habitus, Field and Discourse: Interpreting as a Socially Situated Activity. *Target* 15 (2): 243–268.

Billig, M. (2003). Critical Discourse Analysis and the Rhetoric of Critique. In: Gilbert Weiss and Ruth Wodak (eds.). *Critical Discourse Analysis--Theory and*

Interdisciplinarity. London: Palgrave Macmillan, pp.35-46.

Blinstrubaité, A. (2000). Interaction in liaison interpreting, Perspectives, **8** (2), 125-133. [online] Available from: Taylor and Francis Online. <www.tandfonline.com> [Accessed 10 January 2018].

Blommaert, J. and Bucean, C. (2000). Critical Discourse Analysis. *Annual Review of Anthropology*. **29** (1): 447–466.

Bochner, S., (1981). The Social Psychology of Language Mediation. In: Stephen Bochner (eds.) *The Mediating Person: Bridges between Cultures*. Cambridge (MA): Schenkman Publishing Company, pp.3-36.

Bourdieu, P. (1990).*The Logic of Practice*, trans. Richard Nice, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1993). *The Field of Cultural Production: Essays on Art and Literature*, New York: Columbia University Press.

Bot, H. (2005). Dialogue interpreting as a specific case of reported speech. *Interpreting*. **7** (2), 237–261. Available from: Wiley Online Library < onlinelibrary.wiley.com>[Accessed 7 January 2019].

Bot, H. (2005). Dialogue interpreting in mental health. New York: Rodopi.

Chouliaraki, L. and Fairclough, N. (1999). *Discourse in late modernity: Rethinking Critical Discourse Analysis*. 1st ed. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press

Dannerer, M. (2001). Negotiation in Business Meetings. In Weigand, E. and Dascal, M. (eds), *Negotiation and Power in Dialogic Interaction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company. pp. 91-106.

Davidson, B. (2001). Questions in cross-linguistic medical encounters: the role of the hospital interpreter. *Anthropological Quarterly.***74** (4): 170–178. [online] Available from: Wiley Online Library. < http s://online library. Wiley.com> [Accessed 5 January 2019].

Davidson, B. (2002). A model for the construction of conversational common ground in interpreted discourse. *Journal of Pragmatics*, **34** (9): 1273-1300. [online] Available from: Wiley Online Library. <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com> [Accessed 5 Feb 2019].

Davies, B. and Harré, R. (1990). Positioning: The Discursive Production of Selves.

Journal for the Theory of Social Behavior. **20** (1): 43-63. Available from: Wiley Online Library < onlinelibrary.wiley.com> [Accessed 7 January 2019].

Davitti, E. (2012). *Dialogue Interpreting as Intercultural Mediation Integrating Talk and Gaze in the Analysis of Mediated Parent-Teacher Meetings.* Ph.D. thesis, The University of Manchester.

De Jongh, E.M. (1991). Cultural proficiency and nonverbal communication in court interpreting. *Confluencia. 7* (1): 99-106. Taylor and Francis Online. <www.tandfonline.com> [Accessed 14 June 2021].

Diriker, E. (2004). De-/Re-Contextualising Simultaneous Interpreting: Interpreters in the Ivory Tower?.Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

-----. Simultaneous Conference Interpreting in the Turkish Electronic and Printed Media: 1988-2003. *The Interpreters' Newsletter,* 12 (2003): 231-243. Taylor and Francis Online. <www.tandfonline.com> [Accessed 20 June 2021].

Dubus, N. (2009). Professional/paraprofessional team approach in groupwork with Cambodian refugee women, *Groupwork*, **19** (2): 46-62.

Fairclough, N. (1989). Language and Power, New York: Longman Inc.

Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and Social Change.* 1st ed. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Fairclough, N. (1993). Critical discourse analysis and the marketization of public discourse: The Universities. *Discourse and Society*, **4** (2): 133–68. [online] Available from: John Benjamins Publish Company. <https://benjamins.com/> [Accessed 20 February 2019].

Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical dicourse analysis: the critical study of language,* New York: Longman Publishing.

Fairclough, N. and Wodak, R. (1997). Critical Discourse Analysis. In: T. A. Van Dijk (eds.), *Discourse as Social Interaction: Discourse Studies 2 (A Multidisciplinary Introduction)*, London: Sage, pp. 258-284.

Fairclough, N. (2000). *New Labour, New Language?* 1st ed. London: Routledge.

Fairclough, N. (2001a). Language and Power, 2nd ed. Longman/Pearson: London.

Fairclough, N. (2001b). Critical Discourse Analysis as a method in social scientific

research. In: Wodak, R & Meyer, M. (eds.), pp. 121–138.

Firth, A. (1995). Introduction and overview, In*: Firth, A. (eds.), *The Discourse of Negotiation: Studies of Language in the Workplace*. Oxford: Pergamon, pp. 3–39. [online] Available from: John Benjamins Publish Company. <https://benjamins.com/> [Accessed 20 February 2019].

Foucault, M. (1971). *L 'ordre du Discourse.* 1st ed. Paris: Gallimard.

Foucault, M. (1972). *The Archaeology of Knowledge.* 1st ed. London: Tavistock Publications.

Foucault, M., (1977). *Discipline and Punish: the birth of the prison.* 1st ed. Sheridan, A. (trans). New York: Pantheon Books.

Foucault, M. (1980) Truth and power, In: C. Gordon (eds.) *Power/Knowledge. Selected Interviews and other Writings 1972–1977*. Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Foucault, M. (1981). *History of Sexuality,* vol. 1. Hanoondswonh: Penguin Books.

Foucault, M. (1982). *The subject and power*. Mterword to Dreyfus and Rabinow.

Foucault, M. (1982, 1984). The order of discourse. In M. Shapiro (ed.), *Language and Politics,* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Foucault, M. (1998). *The History of Sexuality: The Will to Knowledge*. 1ST ed. London: Penguin.

Garzone, G. and Rudvin, M. (2003). *Domain Specific English and Language Mediation in professional and institutional Settings.* 6th edition. Milano: Arcipelago.

Gavioli, L. and Maxwell, N. (2007). Interpreting Intervention in Mediated Business Talk. In: Bowles, H. and Seedhouse, O. (eds.) *Conversation Analysis and Language for Specific Purposes.* Switzerland: Peter Lang AG, pp.141-181.

Gentile, A., Ozolins, U. and Vasilakakos, M. (1996). *Liason Interpreting: A Handbook*. 1st ed. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press.

Goffman, E. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life,* 1s ed. London, UK: Penguin.

Goffman, E. (1981). *Forms of Talk.*1st ed. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania

Press.

Gosjean, F. (1982). *Life with Two Languages.* 1st ed. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1982

Gu, C. (2019a) *Interpreters caught up in an ideological tug-of-war? A CDA and Bakhtinian analysis of interpreters' ideological positioning and alignment at government press conferences. Translation and Interpreting Studies*, 14 (1): 1 - 20. [online] Available from: Taylor and Francis Online. <www.tandfonline.com> [Accessed 14 January 2019].

Gu, C. (2019b). Mediating 'face' in triadic political communication: a CDA analysis of press conference interpreters' discursive (re)construction of Chinese government's image (1998–2017). *Critical Discourse Studies,* **16** (2): 201-221. [online] Available from: Taylor and Francis Online. <www.tandfonline.com> [Accessed 14 January 2019].

Gu, C. and Tipton, R. (2021). (Re-)voicing Beijing's discourse through self-referentiality: a corpus-based CDA analysis of government interpreters' discursive mediation at China's political press conferences (1998–2017), Perspectives, 28:3, 406-423.

Guillemin M and Gillam L (2004) Ethics, reflexivity and 'ethically important moments' inresearch. *Qualitative Inquiry* 10: 261–280.[online] Available from: Taylor and Francis Online. <www.tandfonline.com> [Accessed 20May 2021].

Halliday, M. A. K. (2004). An introduction to functional grammar (3rd ed.). London: Arnold.

Haque, M. (1). A Critique of Critical Discourse Analysis. *Dhaka University Journal of Linguistics*, *1*(1), 183-198.[online] Available from: < https://www.banglajol. info/index.php/DUJL/article/view/3346> [Accessed 18 June 2021].

Hlavac, J. (2017) Brokers, dual-role mediators and professional interpreters: a discourse-based examination of mediated speech and the roles that linguistic mediators enact, *The Translato*r, **23** (2): 197-216. [online] Available from: Taylor and Francis Online. <www.tandfonline.com> [Accessed 20 January 2018].

Hsieh, E. (2006). Understanding Medical Interpreters: Reconceptualizing Bilingual Health Communication. *Health Communication*. **20** (2): 177-186. [online] Available from: Taylor and Francis Online. <www.tandfonline.com> [Accessed 14 January 2019].

Inghilleri, M. (2003). Habitus, Field and Discourse: Interpreting as a socially situated activity. *Target,* **15** (2): 243-268.

Inghilleri, M. (2005). Mediating Zones of Uncertainty: Interpreter Agency, the Interpreting Habitus and Political Asylum Adjudication. *The Translator,* **11** (1): 69–85.

Inghilleri, M. (2006). "Macro Social Theory, Linguistic Ethnography and Interpreting Research". In: Hertog, E. and Veer, B.V., (eds.), *Taking Stock: Research and Methodology in Community Interpreting*, *LinguisticaAntverpiensia*5: pp.57–68.

Inghilleri, M. (2009) ."Ethics". *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies, 2nd ed*. Baker, M. and Saldanha, G (eds.), London and New York: Routledge.

-----. (2010). "'You Don't Make War Without Knowing Why': The Decision to Interpret in Iraq". *The Translator: Studies in Intercultural Communication* (Special Issue: Translation and Violent Conflict) **16**(2): 175-196. [online] Availablefrom:Taylor&Francis<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13556509.1999.10799039> [Accessed 21 May 2021].

Jorgense, M. and Phillps, L. (2002). *Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method.* 1st ed. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Kadric, M. and Pöchhacker, F. (2014) "The Hospital Cleaner as Healthcare Interpreter: A Case Study". *The Translator,* **5** (2): 161-178. [online] Available from:Taylor&Francis<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13556509.1999.10799039> [Accessed 21 May 2021].

Karanasiou, P.P. (2016). Public service interpreting and business negotiation interpreting: friends or foes?. In: Munyangeyo,T. Webb, G. and Gómez, M. (eds.). *Challenges and Opportunities in Public Service Interpreting,* London: Palgrave Macmillan, pp.191-211.

Karanasiou, P.P. (2017). *Fulfilling the interpreting mandate in Business Negotiation Meetings. The perspectives of interpreters and clients.* Ph.D Thesis, Heriot-Watt University.

Khalifa, A.W. (2014). Rethinking Agents and Agency in Translation Studies. In: Khalifa, A.W. (eds.), assisted by Voellmer, E. Translators Have Their Say? Translation and the Power of Agency. Selected Papers of the CETRA Research Summer School 2013. Satz: Guntram Titus Tockner, pp.9-19.

Knapp-Potthoff, A. & Knapp, K. (1986). Interweaving two discourses: The difficult task of the non-professional interpreter. In: House, J. and Blum-Kulka, S. (eds.) Interlingual and intercultural communication. Tübingen: Gunter Narr, pp.151–168.

Knapp-Potthoff, A. & Knapp, K. (1987). Te man (or woman) in the middle: Discoursal aspects of non-professional interpreting. In: Knapp, K. and Enninger, W. (eds.) *Analyzing intercultural communication*. Te Hague: Mouton, pp.181–211.

Kohler, M. (2016). Interpreting as intercultural mediation: a critical moment in an overseas midwife training programme, *Perspectives,* **24** (3): 431-443.

Krouglov, A. (1999). Police interpreting: politeness and sociocultural context. *The Translator,* **5**(2). 285–302. [online] Available from: Researchgate. <https://www.researchgate.net/> [Accessed 20 January 2018].

Laclau, E. and Mouffe, C. (1985) *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy. Towards a Radical Democratic Politics*. 1st ed. London: Verso.

Laclau, E. (1993b) 'Power and representation', In: Poster, M. (eds.), *Politics, Theory and Contemporary Culture*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Lefevere, A. (1992). *Translation, rewriting and the manipulation of literary fame*. 1st ed. London/New York: Routledge.

Lerner, G.H. (2004). *Conversation Analysis: Studies from the first generation*. 1st ed. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Levinson, S. (1983). *Pragmatics.* 1st ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Liambo, Y. and Triyono, S. (2018). Ideology in Translating News Headline: A

Critical Discourse Analysis Point of View. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research,* **165:** 241-245. [online] Available from: AtlantisPress<https://www.atlantis-press.com/proceedings/iccsr-18/25904610/> [Accessed 20 May 2020].

Luhmann, N. (1990). Political theory and the welfare state. Berlin: de Gruyter

Makaroa, V. (1998). The Interpreter as Intercultural Mediator. Ph.D. thesis, University of Warwick Publication Service & WRAP.

Mason, I. (2009) 'Role, Positioning and Discourse in Face-to-Face Interpreting. In: R. de Pedro Ricoy, I.A. Perez & C.W.A. Wilson (eds.) *Interpreting and Translation in Public Service Settings: Police, practice pedagogy*, Manchester: St. Jerome, pp.52-73.

Mason, I. and Ren, W. (2014). Power in face-to-face interpreting events. In: Angelelli, C. (eds.) *The Sociological Turn in Translation and Interpreting Studies,* Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, pp.115-134.

Merlini, R. and Favaron, R. (2003). Community Interpreting: re-conciliation through power management. *The Interpreters' Newsletter*, 12: 205-229. [online] John Benjamins Publish Company. <https://benjamins.com/>[Accessed 15 January 2019].

Merlini, R. and Favaron, R. (2005). Examining the "voice of interpreting" in speech pathology. *Interpreting,* **7** (2), 263-302. [online] Available from: John Benjamins Publish Company.<https://benjamins.com/>[Accessed 20 January 2019].

Merlini, R. and Favaron, R. (2009). Seeking asylum and seeking identity in a mediated encounter: The projection of selves through discursive practice. *Interpreting,* **11** (1), 57-92. [online] John Benjamins Publish Company.<https://benjamins.com/>[Accessed 14 January 2019].

Metzger, M. (1999). *Sign language interpreting: Deconstructing the myth of neutrality,* 1st ed. Washington: Gallaudet University Press.

Metzger, M. (2014). Replies and Response Cries. *The Translator*, **5** (2): 327-332. [online] Available from: John Benjamins Publish Company. < https://benjamins

com/> [Accessed 20 February 2018].

Miletich, M. (2015). Accounting for nonverbal communication in interpreter-mediated events in healthcare settings. *Translation and Translanguaging in Multilingual Contexts,* **1** (2), 162–181. [online] Available from: John Benjamins Publish Company. <https://benjamins.com/> [Accessed 20 May 2020].

Milton, J. and Bandia, P (eds) (2009). *Agents of Translation*. 1st ed. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Müller, F. (1989). Translation in Bilingual Conversation: Pragmatic Aspects of Translatory Interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, **13**: 713–739. [online] Available from: India Document <https://fdocuments.in/document/>[Accessed 20 April 2019].

Munday, J (2013) 'The Role of Archival and Manuscript Research in the Investigation of Translator Decision-Making', *Target*, **25** (1): 125-139. [online] Available from: John Benjamins Publish Company. < https:// benjamins.com/> [Accessed 21June 2021].

Munday, J. (2014) 'Using Primary Sources to Produce a Microhistory of Translation and Translators: Theoretical and Methodological Concerns', *The Translator*, **20** (1):64-80. [online] Available from: John Benjamins Publish Company. <https://benjamins.com/>[Accessed 23June 2021].

Napier, J. (2002). *Sign Language Interpreting-Linguistic Coping Strategies*. 1st ed. Coleford: Douglas McLean.

Pöchhacker, F. (2000). The Community Interpreter's Task: Self-Perception and Provider Views, in Roberts. R.P., Carr, S.E., Abraham, D. and Dufour, A. (eds.) *The Critical Link 2: Interpreters in the Community*. Amsterdamand /Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Pöchhacker, F. (2012). Interpreting participation Conceptual analysis and illustration of the interpreter's role in interaction. In: Baraldi, C. and Gavioli, L. (eds.) *Coordinating Participation in Dialogue Interpreting*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co, pp. 45-69.

Pöchhacker, F. (2016). *Introducing Interpreting Studies.* 1st ed. London: Routledge.

Põlajeva, T. (2017). Business negotiations: communication in the bargaining process, *Journal of Business Economics and Management*, **18** (3): 554-559.

Ra, S. and Napier, J. (2013). Community interpreting: Asian language interpreters' perspectives. *The International Journal for Translation & Interpreting.* 5 (2): 45-61. [online] Available from: John Benjamins e-Platform. <http://www.jbe-platform.com> [Accessed 10 March 2020].

Rehbein, J. (1995). International Sales Talk. In: Ehlich, K. and Wagner, V. (eds.) *The Discourse of Business Negotiation*. Berlin: De Guyer, pp.67–102.

Ren, W. (2010). *A Study of Liaison Interpreter's Subjective Consciousness,* 1st ed. Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.

Roy, C. (1996). An interactional sociolinguistic analysis of turn-taking in an interpreted event. *Interpreting.* **1** (1): 39-67. [online] Available from: John Benjamins e-Platform. <http://www.jbe-platform.com> [Accessed 10 February 2019].

Roy, C. (1999). Interpreting As a Discourse Process (Oxford Studies in Sociolinguistics). 1st ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Roy, C. (2000). *Interpreting as a discourse process*. 2nd ed. New York; Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Roy, C. and Metzger, M. (2014). Researching signed language interpreting through a sociolinguistic approach. *Translation and Interpreting.* **6** (1): 158-176 . [online] Available from: Researchgate. <https://www.researchgate.net/> [Accessed 15 Sep 2018]

Ruth,B. (2011). Critical discourse analysis and its critics. *Pragmatics*, **21** (4): 493–525. [online] Available from: Researchgate. <https://www.researchgate.net/> [Accessed 15 June 2021]

Sacks, H. and Schegloff, E. (1973) Opening up closings, *Semiotica*, **8** (4): 289–327. [online] Available from: John Benjamins Publish Company.<https://benjamins.com/>[Accessed 20 February 2019].

Setton, R. (2011). "Interpreting Chinese, Interpreting China" In Setton. R (eds.): Interpreting Chinese, Interpreting China. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. pp.1-10.

Simmel, G. (1921). Sociology of the Senses: Visual interaction, In: R.E. Park & E.W. Burgess (eds.) *Introduction to the Science of Sociology,* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (2015). [online] Available from SEP platform <https://www.plato.stanford.edu/entries/agency/AgeIntAct> [Accessed 10 November 2020].

Sullivan, P. (2010). The self–self relationship in qualitative psychology, *Qualitative Methods in Psychology Bulletin*, 9: 12–16. Available from: Google Books. <http:// books.google.com> [Accessed 15 January 2020].

Tajfel, H. (1978). Differentiation between social groups: studies in the social psychology of intergroup relations. 1st ed. New York: Academic.

Takimoto, M. (2006) Interpreters' role perceptions in business dialogue interpreting situations. Monash University Linguistics Papers, **5**(1): 47-57. [online] Available from: Google Books. <https://books.google.com.hk/ > [Accessed 10 June 2018].

Tannen, D. (1989). Talking voices, repetition, dialogue and imagery in conversational discourse, 1st ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tipton, R. and Furmanek, O. (2016) *Dialogue Interpreting: A Guide to Interpreting in Public Services and the Community*, 1st ed. London: Routledge.

Torikai, K. (1998). Mis-interpretations that have changed history (歴史をかえた誤訳, in Japanese), 1st ed. Tokyo: Shichosha Publishing.

Torikai, K. (2009). *Voices of the invisible presence: Diplomatic interpreters in post-World War II Japan*, 1st ed. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Vargas-Urpi, M. (2013). Coping with nonverbal communication in public service interpreting with Chinese immigrants. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research*, **42** (4): 340-360. Available from: John Benjamins e-Platform. <http://www.jbe-platform.com> [Accessed 10 June 2020].

Wadensjö, C. (1993). The double role of a dialogue interpreter. *Perspectives,* **1**(1),

105-121.

Wadensjö, C. (1995). Dialogue interpreting and the distribution of responsibility. *Hermes, Journal of Linguistics,* 14,111-129.

Wadensjö, C. (1998). Interpreting as Interaction. 1ˢᵗ ed. London and New York: Longman and Routledge.

Wagner, J. (1995). What Makes a Discourse a Negotiation. In: Ehlich, K. and Wagner, V. (eds.) *The Discourse of Business Negotiation*. Berlin: De Guyer, pp.9–36.

Walshaw, M. (2005). Getting political and unravelling layers of gendered mathematical identifications. *Cambridge Journal of Education, Special Issue, Provocations to/in Mathematics Education*, *35*(1): 19-34. [online] Available from: John Benjamins e-Platform. <http://www.jbe-platform.com> [Accessed 29 April 2021].

Walshaw, M. (2006a). The classroom as a space for the production of subjectivities. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies, 41*(1): 69-84.

Walshaw, M. (2006b). Girls' workplace destinations in a changed social landscape: Girls andtheir mothers talk. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 27* (5): 555-567.[online] Available from: John Benjamins e-Platform. <http://www.jbe-platform.com> [Accessed 29 April 2021].

Walshaw, M. (2007). *Working with Foucault in education.*1ˢᵗ ed.Rotterdam: Sense Publications.

Wang, B.H. and Mu, L. (2011).Interpreter training and research in mainland China: Recent developments. In: Setton, R. (eds.) *Interpreting Chinese, Interpreting China*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp.157-174.

Weigand, E. and Dascal, M. (2001). *Negotiation and Power in Dialogic Interaction.* 1ˢᵗ ed. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Widdowson, H.G. (2007). *Discourse Analysis.* 1ˢᵗ ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Willig, C. (2012). *Qualitative Interpretation and Analysis in Psychology*, 1ˢᵗ ed. England: McGraw-Hill Education.

Wodak, R. (1989). *Language, Power and Ideology.* 1st ed. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Wodak, R. (1995). Power, discourse, and style of female leadership in school committee meetings, In: D. Corson (eds.), *Discourse and Power in Educational Organizations.* New Jersey: Hampton Press, Inc, pp. 31-54.

Wodak, R. (1996). *Disorders of Discourse.* 1st edition. London: Longman.

Wodak, R. (2001). What CDA is about? In: Wodak, R. and Meyer, M. (eds.) *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis.* London: Sage, pp. 5-31.

Wodak, R. (2002). Aspects of Critical Discourse Analysis (An elaborated version of chapter). In: Wodak, R. and Meyer, M. (eds.) *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis,.* London: Sage.

Wodak, R. and Meyer, M. (2001). *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis.* 1st edition. London: Sage.

Zartman , W. and Rubin, J.Z. (2000) *Power and Negotiation,* 1st ed. Ann Arbor : University of Michigan Press.

Zhan, C. (2012). Mediation through personal pronoun shifts in dialogue interpreting of political meetings. *Interpreting,* **14** (2): 192-216. [online] Available from: John Benjamins e-Platform. <http://www.jbe-platform.com> [Accessed 29 December 2018].

Zhan, C. (2014). Professional Interpreter Training in Mainland China: Evolution and Current Trends. *International Journal of Interpreter Education*, **6** (1): 35-41. Available from: John Benjamins e-Platform. <http://www.jbe-platform.com> [Accessed 10 December 2019].

Zhan, C. and Zeng, L. (2017). Chinese medical interpreters' visibility through text ownership: An empirical study on interpreted dialogues at a hospital in Guangzhou. *Interpreting,* **19**(1): 97-117. [online] Available from: John Benjamins e-Platform. <http://www.jbe-platform.com> [Accessed15 December 2018].

Van Dijk, T. A. (2001). Critical Discourse Analysis, In: Tannen, D./ Schiffrin,

D./Hamilton, H. (eds.) Handbook of Discourse Analysis. Oxford: Blackwell.pp.466-485.

Van Dijk, T.A. (1986). *Racism in the Press.*1st ed. London: Arnold.

Van Dijk, T.A. (1987). *Communicating Racism: Ethnic Prejudice in Thought and Talk.* 1st ed. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Van Dijk, T.A. (1990). Social cognition and discourse, In: H. Giles and W.P. Robinson (eds.) *Handbook of Language and Social Psychology.* Chichester: John Wiley and Sons, pp. 163–86.

Van Dijk, T.A. (1984). *Prejudice in Discourse: An Analysis of Ethnic Prejudice on Cognition and Conversation.*1st ed. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1991). *Racism and the Press.* 1st ed. London: Routledge.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1993). Principles of Critical Discourse Analysis. *Discourse & Society*, **4** (2), 249–283. [online] Available from: John Benjamins e-Platform. <http://www.jbe-platform.com> [Accessed 29January 2020].

Valero-Garcés, C. and Martin, A. (2008). *Crossing Boarders in Community Interpreting*. 1st ed. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Vargas-Urpi, M. (2013). Coping with Nonverbal Communication in Public Service Interpreting with Chinese Immigrants. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research.* **42** (4): 340-360. [online] Available from: John Benjamins e-Platform. <http://www. jbe-platform.com> [Accessed 29January 2020].

SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

| **Introduction** |
| 1. My background |
| 2. My research (without introduction of the research question and hypothesis) |
| 3. Aim of Interview(for research purpose and will be recorded) |
| 4. Data Privacy |
| |
| **General Question** |
| **Demographic Question** |
| 1. How long have you been doing interpreting? |
| 2. Have you a degree or qualification of the Translation or Interpreting? |
| 3. How did you get connected with the clients? |
| -**Question related to the research** |
| 1. How do you see the role of interpreter? |
| 2. How do you see the business context? |
| 3. What do you think is the important quality an interpreter should have in business interpreting scene? |
| 4. Did you participate in the talk actively? |
| |

<u>Thematic Questions</u> while examining the Transcripts	
Rendition: Intervening or not?	-Why did you omit, add or summarize the information? -Are you aware of the change in the rendition? -What is the influence of the context to the strategy adopted? -What is the use of this intervention?
The Neutral and Non-Neutral Positioning	-What is your stance in the business talk? -Why did you change the personal pronouns of the primary interlocutors? -Are you aware of the adjustment? -Why did you align yourself with the client? -Is the employment relationship an influencing factor to your stance?
The Power of Interpreter	-Do you think you hold power in the interpreted business encounter and Why? -How will you describe the power? -What is the influence of this power?

Closing Question

-How do you judge your performance?

-How do you see the power now?

Thank you…

OBSERVATION SHEET

Interpreter:	Age:	Gender:	Years of Experience:
Assignment No.	Time:	Date:	Place:

Participants:
-English-Speaking Client:
-Chinese-Speaking Client:
-Other Participants:

Situation(Topic):

Briefing:
-With the English-Speaking Client:
-With the Chinese-Speaking Client:

OBSERVATION ON THE INTERACTION

Shifts of Footing

Speaker	Interpreter

Turn-Taking Management

Speaker 1	Speaker 2	Interpreter

Divergent Rendition			
Categories	Speaker 1	Speaker 2	Interpreter
Additions			
Omissions			
Substitutions			
Added Notes			