Introduction

This doctoral thesis is being written at a time when the media are one of the most researched areas of human activity within a wide range of fields of study - not only in Communication and Media Studies (MS) but also Law, Anthropology, Sociology, Political Science, Linguistics, etc. This is not surprising bearing in mind that, in this globalised world, the media are the first way to get information and, at the same time, to exert influence on society. Throughout their extensive development in the 20th and 21st centuries, the media have become prevalent in our daily lives, and this is particularly so in Western societies.

Furthermore, within a changing media landscape with the rise of the internet and the development of information and communication technologies (ICTs) such as tablets and smartphones, radio (which is the focus of this thesis) and television still play a crucial role in the production of information and entertainment, as well as in the collective construction of reality and opinions.

Within this context, translation and interpreting (T/I) have gained importance as a common practice within the media, since there has been an increasing interest in overcoming national, cultural and language barriers, particularly in the last fifty years and, in the case of interpreting, thanks to the growing importance given to talk in production formats (interviews, talk-shows, documentaries, etc.; cf. Heritage and Clayman 2010, Hutchby 2006). However, whereas translation for the media has been widely researched, media interpreting (MI) research emerged at the end of the 20th century out of individual and scattered studies (cf. Kurz 1982, Skuncke 1983, Mayer 1994, Straniero Sergio 1999 and Wadensjö 2000) and has thus not led to a solid body of research so as to consider radio interpreting a discipline - or sub-discipline - of its own. Although MI has been consolidated as a discipline within interpreting studies (IS) (cf. Katan and Straniero Sergio 2003, Straniero Sergio 2003, Pöchhacker 2007 and Jiménez Serrano 2011), thus reflecting the growing academic attention in the field, research still largely focuses on TV (cf. also Falbo 2011), ignoring the input that radio interpreting could provide. The prevalence of broadcast of interpreter-mediated events on radio in
comparison to TV is not reflected in research literature. Dialogue Interpreting (DI) specifically has limited its scope to TV, or made at most a passing reference to radio.

Outside the field of T/I Studies, interpreting has not gathered scholarly attention from Media, Radio or Communication Studies either (see chapters II and III). Therefore, in 2015, it can be stated that radio dialogue interpreting is still a largely unexplored field. DI on radio is no less practised than simultaneous interpreting (SI) on TV, for example. This research intends to fill this gap in interpreting research. Indeed, interpreter-mediated live radio events are a common practice in mass media institutions, particularly at a national and public/state-owned level (e.g. BBC, Radio France, Arte, RNE; see details in chapter IV). The absence of radio interpreting research in media and journalism studies, as well as in IS, has had an influence in training and broadcasting practices, where no specific training programmes exist (even in MI) and there are cases when radio interviews are still interpreted by non-professional interpreters or by hosts themselves (e.g. Jääskeläinen 2003; see also chapter V.2). Furthermore, difficulties in gathering data before the internet era might have been a barrier for this kind of studies, although recording technologies have been widespread since the 1970s; now, thanks to podcasting and much easier access to radio programmes, the situation is more advantageous.

Aims and Objectives

The overarching aim of my research is to ascertain the ways in which the radio setting affects the interpreter-mediated event and interaction, following the hypothesis that the context (broad and local; Cicourel 1992) explains and exerts influence on most of the interactions, relations and utterances of the interlocutors (both the primary interlocutors and the interpreter) during an interpreter-mediated event.

The main objectives are, therefore, to uncover and explain how interpreter-mediated live interviews work in radio broadcasting, from organisational, interactional and discursive points of view.

The initial premise is that there are specific features and patterns of broadcast talk-in-interaction when they take place in interpreter-mediated radio settings which have been explored neither in IS, MS nor Conversation Analysis (CA) as yet. Consequently, I also
aim at revealing modifications and adjustments to the broadcast talk practices and organisation of broadcast events, as well as how the interpreter's interaction is influenced by this institutional context in comparison with other contexts.

Given the relevance for both academic and professional bodies and individuals leading comprehensive and critical research in this area, I expect to contribute to the advancement of knowledge as regards the specific features of the radio context, and the specific skills they demand for professional practice, as well as to shed light on the organisational, interactional and discursive complexities of the communicative event when interpreting is involved.

**Data and Methodology**

The methodology I use in order to fulfil my aims and objectives involves a mixed model which is applied to five interpreter-mediated interviews broadcast on Radio 3's *El Séptimo Vicio (ESV)* (from the Spanish State Broadcasting Company, RNE). This model includes a descriptive framework of types of interpreter-mediated interviews, to which CA is applied, in order to shed light on the organisation of such events, as well as specific interactional phenomena and patterns arising in this particular type of interpreter-mediated event. AV recordings of one of the broadcasts and a semi-structured interview (SSI) with the host of *ESV* are used as corroboration for the CA, thus triangulating my data so as to strengthen the robustness of the evidence found and my ensuing claims.

This methodology takes an interdisciplinary approach, since it involves dealing with interpreter-mediated events in the highly specific context of radio broadcasting and a data collection process which requires the participation of people coming from different academic and professional domains, i.e. T/I, documentary filmmaking and radio broadcasting.

As far as the choice of my data is concerned, I have already pointed out the lack of DI, MS and CA research on radio broadcasting talk, let alone on themed or specialised radio stations such as Radio 3. Furthermore, scholarly research - as well as publications by the media institution, RTVE, itself - on Radio 3 focuses on the critical description and analysis of the institution's history, its place in the Spanish radio landscape and, at most,
a discourse and institutionally based description of its programmes (see chapter IV on
data description). Therefore, a study of Radio 3's talk-in-interaction - via one of its
landmark programmes, *ESV* - is required if we want to provide a detailed account of
how interpreter-mediated interactions work in this kind of broadcast institution.

**Outline of Chapters**

To achieve the aims and objectives of the study and to reflect its comprehensive and
interdisciplinary approach, the thesis is structured as follows: chapters I, II and III
include critical literature reviews of the key areas of my research, i.e. DI, MI and CA,
respectively. Each of the chapters aims to outline key developments in the field that this
research can build on and, at the same time, discuss gaps in current methodologies that I
intend to fill in my own model of analysis.

After a thorough description of my data and the methodological model in chapter IV,
the analysis is performed in chapter V. It is divided into four sections:

1. A descriptive analysis of the data interviews, via individual tables including details
   of the participants, production arrangements, category and broad pattern of
   interaction for each broadcast interview.

2. The information provided in the tables is then matched with an overall analysis of
   Radio 3 and *ESV* as the institutional frameworks in which the interviews take place.

3. The CA model of analysis - as developed in chapter IV - is applied in its entirety to
   interviews 1 and 2 and partially (due to issues of scope and length of this research)
   to interviews 3-5.

4. The descriptive analysis in (1) and (2) and the CA analysis in (3) are corroborated
   via the analysis of visuals (filming) of one of the interviews (see Table 5 in chapter
   V, page 146), as a way of unveiling organisational and interactional aspects which
   would not be accessible through the sole use of the interviews as they were
   broadcast on Radio 3, and a semi-structured interview with the *ESV* director\(^1\) and
   host (Javier Tolentino).

---
\(^1\) The notion of “director” refers here to a hybrid of producer and director of contents. The *ESV* podcast
website states that the programme is “presentado y dirigido por Javier Tolentino”, which translates as
“*hosted and directed by Javier Tolentino*”. 
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Drawing on CA literature and qualitative research approaches (cf. Silverman 2004), attention is paid to the frequency of particular interactional features, but also to individual or exceptional cases, which provide evidence of the specificity of the communicative event.

Chapter VI includes the findings and concluding remarks of the thesis, focusing on the “unique fingerprint” (Heritage and Greatbatch, 1991:95-96; Heritage and Clayman, 2010:18) of practices and interactions analysed in my data. Within the limits of what can be possibly generalised from the analysis of a specific (and to a certain extent always limited) set of data, avenues for future research will be sketched, and implications for public engagement in the form of guidelines, training and knowledge exchange activities which help to consolidate the study and practice of radio interpreting as a discipline in its own right will be discussed. Likewise, I sketch out future training and practice possibilities emerging from a deeper and critical knowledge of this media interpreting context.
Chapter I. Theory and Methods in Dialogue Interpreting Research

This chapter aims at critically reviewing the most prominent theories and research methods which have been applied in Dialogue Interpreting (DI) up to now, therefore contributing to the conceptualisation of this research field.

The first stage in this chapter is a critical overview of DI research within the framework of Translation and Interpreting (T/I) studies, starting with a discussion on the conceptualisation of DI (I.1). Then, I will provide a review of the evolution of Interpreting Studies (IS) and its main contributions to DI (I.2), with an eye to framing my research within a specific methodological trend along the lines of sociolinguistics and communication studies, namely conversation analysis (CA) and interactional pragmatics (I.3 and I.4).

There are two essential aspects at the centre of my research: (1) the interlocutors’ (mainly the interpreters’) comprehension of and adaptation to the communicative setting and (2) the way in which the aforementioned comprehension and adaptation unfold interactionally during the exchange (as evident in the situational arrangements and the subsequent participation frameworks). I am therefore looking at DI literature with a focus on its strengths and weaknesses in addressing both aspects so as to identify gaps where my methodology and analysis can offer a significant contribution to DI studies and, consequently, IS.

I.1 Dialogue Interpreting or Liaison Interpreting?

Literature on the interpreter-mediated face-to-face interaction, which is the focus of my study, has provided different nomenclatures: liaison interpreting, dialogue interpreting and bilateral interpreting. The literature on the field also shows that these terms are not complete synonyms, although their use may depend on which aspects of the communicative exchange are to be highlighted. It can be observed that the term ‘liaison interpreting’ (LI) is used mostly in community or public service interpreting settings, as well as in business settings (Gentile et al. 1996, Erasmus 1999, Phelan 2001, Corsellis 2008), in order to reflect a focus on the interpreter as the link between interlocutors speaking different languages. With the use of LI, this focus is placed on the role of the interpreter (cf. Gentile et al. 1996) rather than on the interaction taking place in face-to-
face conversation, for which the term DI (Wadensjö 1992, 1998; Mason 1999, 2000, 2001, 2006; Grant 1999, Pöchhacker 2012) is more encompassing when it comes to dealing with an activity which takes place in a wide range of settings, such as the ones mentioned above (including legal and medical settings), but also diplomatic and media settings, among others. Wadensjö (1998:50), for example, points out that her use of DI “has indeed been to stress the defining primacy of the setting (the communicative exchange) in which the interpreting under investigation takes place”. The interactional nature underlying the term DI also allows for the inclusion of interpreter-mediated events occurring in remote settings (i.e. telephone, video calls) (Wadensjö 1999, Mikkelson 2003 and Kelly 2008). The use of DI to which I adhere, therefore, aims at focusing on the features of interpreter-mediated dialogic interaction, which, as Mason (2001:iii) argues, “are shared by all the seemingly disparate event-types mentioned above”. These shared features include, according to Mason (2001:ii-iii), full participation, shifts of ‘footing’ (Wadensjö 1998), power dynamics and competing discourses involving negotiations of “socio-textual practices” (Hatim and Mason, 1997:18). When Mason explains how these features occur in different settings and events he essentially calls for exploring areas of common concern and interest (2001:vi). His main contribution here lies in the encouragement to investigate under-explored settings - such as interpreter-mediated radio interviews - which may reveal interactional features specific to that setting which could also be worth looking at where they manifest in other settings.

1.2 Evolution and State-of-the-Art in Dialogue Interpreting Research within Interpreting Studies

Before focusing on DI research, a historical contextualisation of DI within the larger field of IS is necessary. Research on interpreting initially focused on the process (Pöchhacker, 2005:683) and has traditionally taken simultaneous conference interpreting as its starting point (Baker, 1997:111), at least up to the mid 90s (Mason, 2001:i). Coincidentally, the growing research interest in DI from this period onwards follows an increasing acknowledgement of the relevance of sociolinguistics and the prominence of context in this type of interaction. Moving away from process-oriented studies and methods, as well as from the field of Conference Interpreting (CI),
international conferences in key settings for the study of DI started being organised, such as *The Critical Link – Interpreters in the Community* in 1995 (Mason, 2001:i) and *Languages and the Media* in 1996. These conferences are still held every three years and two years, respectively. At the same time, as Mason (2001:i) acknowledges, a number of key publications “endeavouring to stake out the discipline and determine appropriate methods for its systematic study” were beginning to appear. Mason (2001:i) highlights Gentile *et al.* (1996), Carr *et al.* (1997), Wadensjö (1998), Mason (1999) and Roy (2000); in addition to the latter, the following publications reviewed in this chapter are also worth noting along these lines: Berk-Seligson (1990), Wadensjö (1992), Baker (1997), Hatim and Mason (1997), and Mason (2000).

In line with this historical overview of interpreting research, Pöchhacker (2005) argues that the concept of process has been used in interpreting literature in a very limited way, which led to a long-claimed need to broaden it and insert it in a wider socio-communicative framework. Research on sociolinguistics, communication and the theory of action - as epitomised by the works of Schütz (1964), Schegloff (1972, 1992), Goffman (1981), Reiss and Vermeer (1984) - was highlighted by Pöchhacker (2005) as the driving force of this change in IS and clearly influenced the theoretical and methodological development of DI.

Up until the 1990s, when a paradigm shift to sociolinguistic approaches occurred, interpreting had been viewed as “an essentially linguistic process” (Pöchhacker, 2005:684), a situation which prevailed until the turn of the century with few exceptions, most notably Anderson (1976), who modelled interpreting as, fundamentally, a three-party interaction.

From the dawn of the 20th century until the mid-seventies, the conceptualisation of language as a system (Saussure, among others) or code prevailed. It was taken up by the so-called Leipzig School of translation studies (e.g. Kade and Cartellieri 1971) which provided an account of interpreting as a process of a “chain of linguistic signs” in terms of equivalence relations and syntactic correspondence (Pöchhacker, 2005:683). Contemporarily, this model or paradigm could also be found in psycholinguistics, where authors such as Treisman (1965) and Goldman-Eisler (1972) were investigating interpreting “primarily as a process of converting a linguistic input into a linguistic
output” (Pöchhacker, 2005:683). A similar trend was maintained by the profession, particularly since it took a more formalised shape in the form of CI from the 1950s onwards. Professional interpreters, many of whom divided their time between interpreting, teaching and academia, started researching their own profession. A widely referenced author from this period is Glémet, a leading conference interpreter and teacher at the Geneva School. Glémet (1958:106) stated that interpreters transfer speeches “with the same faithfulness as sound-amplification”.

However, the information storage, retrieval, analysis and delivery processes carried out by humans proved far more complex than a simple automatic task, and the human action gained focus, although still understood as a ‘human information processor’ (Pöchhacker, 2005:684), as we can observe in the approaches followed then by psychologists, psycholinguists and neurolinguists, who dared open the interpreter’s ‘black box’. Gerver (1975:119), by describing interpreting as “a form of complex human information processing involving the perception, storage, retrieval, transformation, and transmission of verbal information”, contributed to a large extent to the consolidation of this view amongst the interpreting research community until the nineties, and clearly within the training field and amongst professionals (both interpreters and other stakeholders working with them) to this day. Therefore, this ‘cognitive or psychological approach’ has exerted a great influence in research and training up until today. A clear example of this is the work and research of the so-called Paris School, whose most quoted author is Seleskovich, a pioneer professional and interpreter trainer. Seleskovich’s main interest lay in the mental process leading from the speaker’s utterance to the interpreter’s rendition (Pöchhacker, 2005:684). She and her colleagues, such as Lederer, shared psychologists’ keen interest in cognitive structures and processing operations, such as short-term memory, knowledge acquisition and use, stress and tiredness (Seleskovich, 1962, 1975/2002, 1976; Seleskovich and Lederer, 1984) without leaving aside organisational and technical aspects in CI, such as technical working conditions, topic preparation, language correctness and register (Seleskovich, 19682). These works, alongside the training programmes developed at

2 For an English version, see Seleskovich (1978).
their schools, namely the Paris School or École du sens (via the ESIT\(^3\)) greatly contributed to the development of interpreting research, training and the profession. Concepts related to the cognitive process of interpreting, such as *analysis, memory, delivery*, and even the notion of *quality* in interpreting - widely criticised and problematised nowadays - are still used in training. However, the Paris School was later criticised by numerous scholars and researchers (cf. Wadensjö 1998, Baker 1997, Pöchhacker 2005, de Manuel Jerez 2010), a criticism which, in essence and for the purposes of my research, classifies the Paris School as an approach which theoretically and methodologically does not cover the whole communicative spectrum involved in interpreter-mediated face-to-face interaction.

### I.2.1 Functionalist Approaches to Dialogue Interpreting

Functionalist theories played a relevant role in widening and diversifying research avenues in IS, helping the field to go beyond the structuralist approaches in linguistics and to contest and move away from formal equivalence (cf. Nida 1964), still quite dominant in research and practice in the 1960s and 70s. Functionalism’s developments in T/I research and theory contributed to the establishment of a closer link with the professional reality, and its training methods are still used nowadays.

Amongst the main contributions to functionalist theories in T/I, we can find the *skopos* theory, developed by Reiss and Vermeer (1984) and the theory of translatorial action (Holz-Mänttäri (1984).\(^4\) Since a review of these approaches - as well as cognitive approaches- in IS lies beyond the scope of this study,\(^5\) this section focuses on their contribution to DI.

In Pöchhacker (1995) and Nord (1997), we can find communicative approaches on which DI studies eventually drew (cf. Pöchhacker 2005) and which are in accordance with CA approaches, as dealt with in chapter III.

Nord’s functionalist conceptualisation of human interaction can serve as a starting point: “an intentional change of a state of affairs affecting two or more people or

---


agents” (Nord, 1997:16). Furthermore, Nord is aware that the participation framework may affect or be affected by the interaction and its agents. Following this general theorisation, Nord suggests that “the theory of action\textsuperscript{6} can become a theory of interaction” (1997:16). Nord goes on to state that an interaction is referred to as ‘communicative’ when it is carried out through signs produced intentionally by the agents taking part in the event, i.e. ‘sender’ and ‘receiver’, now seen as dynamic, interactive ‘agents’. Communicative interactions take place under time and space constraints, which, according to Nord (1997:16), involve:

… cultural and historical dimensions that condition the agents’ verbal and non-verbal behaviour, their knowledge and expectations of each other, their appraisal of the situation and the standpoint from which they look at each other and at the world.

Essentially, this is the starting point for the analysis of any interpreter-mediated interaction, the agents' talk-in-interaction being the fundamental analytical source. I argue in this chapter that time-space constraints and interactional processes interact and overlap with each other, bringing about interactional phenomena and features which characterise different interpreter-mediated events.

Pöchhacker uses the functionalist theory of translational action as the foundation for conceptual models and empirical analyses of interactional, situational and textual features of interpreting in general (Pöchhacker 2005),\textsuperscript{7} simultaneous conference interpreting (Pöchhacker, 1994a, 1994b, 1995) and DI (2005:690-693). In these works, he tries to bring together interpreter-mediated events and interactions (mainly in the field of CI) and the functionalist paradigm (notably drawing upon the skopos theory).

Pöchhacker considers that the skopos in IS is the assignment and it is within its framework that the interpreting of a particular speech or utterance takes place (1995:37). At this point, the concept of ‘hypertext’ is of particular relevance for Pöchhacker. He speaks of the ‘hypertext’ in interpreter-mediated events when the translator/interpreter’s focus of attention is not a particular text which is produced at a particular time within the assignment, but the “level of the overall communicative event” (Pöchhacker, 2005:690), i.e. a conference, a judicial proceeding, a TV interview,


\textsuperscript{7} Pöchhacker (2007) also uses a functionalist approach to MI (see chapter II).
Pöchhacker developed the concept of hypertext in interpreting within the field of CI - Pöchhacker's main focus in his doctoral thesis (1994a) - whereby hypertexts consist of not only particular speeches and contributions, but also visual and acoustic non-verbal information, handouts, slides, notes, gestures, the body language of speakers, and so on. Furthermore, the conference subject, the origin of the event, the type of audience and speakers attending the event, as well as their roles, perceptions, intentions and interests (based on different levels of contextual knowledge and competence), i.e. the situation (Pöchhacker, 1995:37) are part of this ‘hypertext’ from which individual ‘source texts’ cannot be separated and which the interpreter should consider holistically, as they are all “significant forces driving the process of interaction over and above a particular ‘input text’” (Pöchhacker, 2005:690).

It is at this point that Pöchhacker (2005:690) suggests that the notion of ‘hypertext’ may be of no less relevance in DI:

Judicial proceedings, a therapy session, an asylum hearing, a live TV interview - all of these communicative events involve institutional constraints and functional concerns at the hypertext level that shape the interpreter’s task and actions.

Nevertheless, Pöchhacker acknowledged that, in spite of all the positive contributions offered by the skopos theory in IS, it entails limitations, which arise when applying it to cultural transfer (1995:40), as well as the fact that target text-oriented paradigm scholars carried out little empirical research under this approach and remained largely at a conceptual and didactic level (2004:78). Furthermore, during the course of the interaction, the interpreter faces permanent dilemmas with regards to the relevant/decisive factors informing his/her decision-making when it comes to interpreting and interacting with the other interlocutors. An example of this kind of dilemma is the “culture in question”, that is, determining the origin and scope of cultural conventions (Pöchhacker, 1995:40) governing the interaction, particularly when the assignment is not straightforward and, even more evidently, when there is not a fully shared

---

8 An issue to which the author came back in the specific field of MI (cf. Pöchhacker 2007).
diacultural\textsuperscript{9} background. One further interesting dilemma that Pöchhacker uses to highlight an important limitation of the skopos theory is the determination of factors and criteria to achieve ‘intratextual coherence’ (1995:39).

Furthermore, functionalism and the theory of skopos have a fundamental methodological limitation when applied to DI: they position the different agents, functions and elements of the interaction in a rather static and unidirectional way. In line with Pöchhacker (2005:687), the challenge of specifying what the communicative situation is becomes immense, particularly when human beings are at the core of it. He also acknowledges that the ‘situation’ does not exist as anything ‘objective’. Hence, the crucial need for modelling the communicative situation and event according to the aspects and phenomena that the researcher aims to explore in a particular interpreter-mediated event (Pöchhacker, 2004:84-85).

The reviewed literature suggests that functionalist approaches - including the skopos theory - are limited when applied to DI. Nevertheless, I would argue in agreement with Pöchhacker (2004:78) that the functionalist paradigm served as a catalyst for the emergence of a new paradigm of interpreting research in the 1990s: drawing on interactionist approaches, DI began to be studied as dialogic discourse-based interaction (the DI paradigm) (Pöchhacker, 2004:79), which, in addition to being intentional, is intercultural and interpersonal. A series of seminal works (reviewed in the section below) helped to consolidate the status of the DI paradigm (cf. Baker 1997, Mason 1999, 2000, 2001; Metzger 1999a, Roy 1996, 2000; Wadensjö 1992, 1998, 2008).

\textit{I.2.2 Interaction-Oriented Approaches to DI}

Throughout the literature discussed above, it is evidenced that interpreter-mediated interactions consist of and are built on multiple dynamic relations that, as the interaction unfolds, configure the communicative behaviour of participants.

Acknowledging that the interpreter-mediated communicative event is much wider and complex than a cognitive process had enormous consequences for IS. To a large extent,

\footnote{Pöchhacker takes the concept of \textit{diaculture} from Vermeer (1983) and defines it as follows: “a group culture defined by the shared professional background, common technical expertise and, of course, a history of interaction as members” (Pöchhacker 1995: 49). Therefore, rather than being a barrier, the common cultural background, or \textit{diaculture}, greatly contributes to the success of communication between the conference participants.}
research developments in linguistics and sociolinguistics during the 1970s and 80s, providing insights into the notion of ‘text’ as a ‘communicative event’ (cf. Goffman 1967, 1971, 1981; Gumperz and Hymes 1972, Grice 1975, Gulliver 1979, Bakhtin 1981, 1984, 1986; Beaugrande and Dressler 1981, and Reiss and Vermeer 1984), contributed to bringing about this change in IS research directions. In the field of CI, the influence of these new currents materialised in the adoption of the notion of ‘discourse’ “as the more encompassing label, inspiring many to look beyond linguistic structures for insights into the communicative process” (Pöchhacker, 2005:685). The notion of ‘role’ in the socially situated practice that is interpreting (Inghilleri 2003) became key in sociological and interactional studies of DI: the studies carried out by Angelelli (2001, 2004), Inghilleri (2003) and Roy (1996, 2000), contributed with approaches and methodologies for the analysis of interpreter-mediated encounters which evidenced the interpreter’s visibility and participation in the exchange. Pym (1999) and Angelelli (2001) explored the perceptions of the role of the interpreter in face-to-face encounters in legal and medical settings, respectively, from different angles: Pym (1999), by focusing on users' expectations, and Angelelli (2001) by using survey methods and interpreted interactions; they problematised the notion of ‘role’ and its consequences for the analysis, and possibly the assessment, of the interpreter's performance beyond the conventional and pervasive conduit model.

For the interest of my research, these new theories, models and methods opened new research paths in the study of interpreter-mediated face-to-face interaction. An illustration of how the outdated monological conduit model and static notions of ‘text’ could arguably be left aside in DI studies is offered by Wadensjö (1998:40):

> When interpreting in everyday life is thought about in terms of possible ‘losses of information’, this reflects an idea of ‘information’ as belonging to words, of ‘facts’ and ‘emotions’ as properties of speech. Accordingly, the work of interpreters would consist solely of a production of ‘texts’, possessing the same information, facts and emotions as the original ‘text’/utterances. This represents a monological preconception of language.

Adhering to Bakhtin’s interactionistic model, as well as Goodwin and Duranti’s (1992)

---

10 In Holquist (1981).

11 Cited in Pöchhacker (2005), and Wadensjö (1998).
conceptualisation of meanings conveyed by language use as “co-constructed between speaker and hearer(s) in interaction” (Wadensjö, 1998:41), Wadensjö (1998:43) proposes a dialogical model when approaching DI:

A dialogical point of view, in contrast, implies that an utterance is seen as a link in a chain of utterances, as a thread in a net of intertwined communicative behaviour. Meanings conveyed are seen as resulting from joint efforts between the people involved. Hence, the meanings of an original utterance will depend on how it is reacted to by people present in it (the other interlocutors(s) and the interpreter), on preceding and following sequences of talk, on non-verbal communicative behaviour and extra linguistic features defined by and defining the speech situation.

Furthermore, this dialogical model acknowledges that meanings of an utterance depend on “participants’ mutual expectations, physical circumstances and artefacts, and on whether the utterance is part of a focused event or distended by those present at it” (Wadensjö, 1998:43), thus introducing a dynamic notion of context in DI studies (following Duranti and Goodwin 1992).

The methodological implications of such an approach are of significant relevance for the systematic study of interpreter-mediated interaction. In this regard, CA is the analytical model which, arguably, is most appropriately linked to this dialogical approach (see sections I.2.2 and I.3 and chapter II). Moreover, the dialogical view of how talk is produced ties in with the concept of talk-in-interaction, which is the focus of CA (see chapter III). Nevertheless, it cannot be ignored that Discourse Analysis (DA) and Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) have also been used in the analysis of interpreted-mediated interaction (cf. Baker 1997, Hatim and Mason 1997, Roy 2000), contributing with far-reaching insights into DI which consolidated and enlarged this field of research.

Pöchhacker also developed an ‘interactant model of the interpreting situation’ (2005:689\textsuperscript{12}) in which he shows awareness of the fact that the human agents (such as speakers/listeners and the interpreter) do not establish themselves in space and time in a static way, and the interlocutors’ judgements and perceptions on the situation and the ongoing interaction (including the interpreter in this process of triadic

\textsuperscript{12} Pöchhacker put forward this model for the first time in 1992, focusing on IS. The model was updated to suit different modes of interpreting, including DI, in 2004 and 2005, which is the version I refer to in this research.
interaction) are shaped by what they know about “the interacting parties, their roles, goals, attitudes, previous contacts, etc.” (Pöchhacker, 2005:688).

Pöchhacker’s ‘interactant model of the interpreting situation’ seeks to show the multiple dynamic relationships which make up the communicative situation “as it ‘exists’ for a given interactant and shapes his or her communicative behaviour” (2005:688). He acknowledges that there are “multiple emotional and cognitive interrelations that keep changing as the interaction proceeds” (Pöchhacker, 2005:688). The implication of this dynamism for the conceptualisation of the above mentioned concept of ‘role’ is crucial, since it is then understood as a “fundamentally relational construct” (Pöchhacker, 2005:688) which cannot be specified nor determined per se. Acknowledging this inherent dynamism in interpreter-mediated interaction makes it a complex process and allows for going a step further in the development of a broader theoretical framework for DI.

Pöchhacker (2005:687) foregrounds his ‘interactant model of the interpreting situation’, drawing on the subjectivity of human action and thus acknowledging that the situation is a matter of perspective. This perspective entails assessment and orientation (emotional attitude), which are shaped by the person’s horizon (cognitive background). Although the author accepts the difficulties in reconciling discourse processes, interactional phenomena and cognitive processing operations (Pöchhacker, 2005:692-693), he finds ground for integrating sociolinguistic and cognitive paradigms (cf. Linell 1997) in a way that interpreting could be understood as a socio-cognitive process, with its methodological implications:

The (inter)action-theoretical account of translational activity foregrounded in this paper should therefore lead us to conclude that the influential idea of interpreting as a ‘process’ applies - and ought to be applied by the researcher - at many interdependent levels of analysis: interpreting as a process involving a multitude of cognitive (sub)processes takes place within a process of situated interaction as part of a particular social practice.

Once in the interaction, what is ‘visible’ in each participant is not that socio-cultural cognitive background - which can be said to make up his/her identity - but the role (Pöchhacker, 2005:688). It could be argued that in Pöchhacker’s model, the role is the interactant manifestation of horizon and perspective. However, he points out that, similarly, the role cannot be specified per se, but “vis-à-vis other persons and, crucially,
their expectations” (2005:688). Following this cognitive dynamic chain, expectations are in turn shaped by the cognitive-cultural background and perspective of the ‘other(s)’ in the interaction (Pöchhacker, 2005:688).

Although Pöchhacker's account of DI draws on an interaction model that tries to integrate different paradigms, emphasising the need for including cognitive and social aspects in any interaction-oriented model, the methodological implementation of such an endeavour remains in the realm of the desirable and possible in his work (cf. Pöchhacker 2005).

Without leaving aside Pöchhacker’s ‘socio-cognitive’ considerations, I shall look at works such as Hatim and Mason (1990, 1997), Mason (1999, 2000, 2001), Roy (1996, 2000) and Wadensjö (1992, 1998), in order to find theoretical and methodological answers within the DI field which are able to provide - or eventually in this research work, assemble - a framework for the systematic account of actual interpreter-mediated interaction occurring in radio interviews.

In this respect, Wadensjö (1992, 1998) offered a critical contribution to DI Studies along the interactional lines which I have been referring to above. She moves away from the cognitive and emotional processes and places focus on central aspects of social interactions as well as contextual circumstances of interpreter-mediated interactions (Wadensjö, 1998:150):

> It goes without saying that how interpreters cope with their job is dependent on their command of the working languages, their knowledge about subject matters, their cognitive competence, their form of the day, their experience and training; but it also depends on their co-actors' interactive styles, expectations and goals.

‘Expectations’ - as interpreter-mediated interactions may show - include the primary interlocutors’ respective views of the interpreter’s role (Wadensjö, 1998:150), whether they coincide or differ; whether they are supplementary or competing.

To this, Wadensjö (1998:150) adds a crucial point in the modelling of ‘context’ for the analysis of interpreter-mediated interactions:

> It is evident that interpreter-mediated interaction is also structured in part by the kind of situation in which it takes place. […] Examples will show differences in the organisation of talk which partly can be explained by the impact of institutional schemata and by the primary parties' goals and expectations connected to these.
Wadensjö (1992, 1998) criticises and moves away from structuralist, cognitive (focused on formal equivalence, invisibility and process-centred aspects of T/I) and purely functionalist approaches. By considering texts primarily as actions and focal events, and assuming that interactions take place in a field of action, she argues that:

Interpreters on duty understand themselves not only to be translating between two languages, but also to be performing on other's behalf various activities, such as persuading, agreeing, lying, questioning, claiming, explaining, comforting, accusing, denying, coordinating interaction, and so forth. This links more to a dialogical view of language and mind. (Wadensjö, 1998:42)

With this view, Wadensjö set out to study the interpreter's performance and role within the interaction (1992:2), following a dialogical view of language in order to come up with a functional description of the role of the dialogue interpreter (1992:5-6). As she argues throughout her work *Interpreting as Interaction* (Wadensjö 1998), a preconception of language use as monological has resulted in rather normative thinking when it comes to interpreting in face-to-face interaction. In her view:

[…] applying the dialogic, interactionistic perspective when reconsidering studies carried out, I would argue that what constitutes ‘normality’ in interpreter-mediated interaction is not something once and for all given, but a task for empirical research to determine by exploring real-life encounters. (Wadensjö, 1998:80)

This is what Wadensjö sets out to explore, also offering a methodological and analytical framework (1998:81-102) which is coherent with this dialogic, interactionistic view. 13

Drawing heavily on Goffman’s 14 theories and advances in the fields of sociolinguistics and social psychology, Wadensjö analyses the reality of DI, specifically in medical, legal and police contexts. Her approach is that the person who carries out the translation/interpreting job is an actor who depends on a whole series of relationships which are established in different contexts (Wadensjö, 1992:4). Therefore, DI is a communicative activity or, rather, a “communicative interaction” (Wadensjö, 1992:4) in which the interpreter is not merely an individual who fulfils a particular role or function in an isolated way; instead, this role is defined socially and culturally. Through her analysis, Wadensjö (1992) shows how it is the group of people taking part in the

---


interaction as well as its context that most strongly contribute to the shaping of this role.15

Wadensjö (1992:30) argues that, although it is true that the interpreter is influenced by the primary interlocutors' actions and expectations, as well as the context, he/she is also a third party in the interaction who may exert influence on them.

Wadensjö (1995) also draws on an interactionistic, non-normative, dialogical approach in order to analyse the distribution of responsibility in face-to-face interpreting. Throughout her analysis of an interpreter-mediated police interview in Sweden (Wadensjö, 1995:111), she shows how different aspects of meaning (propositional, interactional and situational), are continuously negotiated in and by talk, therefore carrying a shared responsibility for the substance and for the progression of talk (1995:121-122).

Metzger (1999a) also proposes an interactionistic approach for the study of DI in her revision of Goffman’s *Forms of Talk* (1981), which she applies in Metzger (1999b) with the aim to deconstruct the myth of neutrality. Metzger (1999a) discusses Goffman’s seminal work in sociolinguistics to make clear the distinction between DI and CI, drawing on the three main themes of this work: ritualisation, participation status and embedding. Metzger shows how the use of these three features of talk as analytical tools has provided a foundation for researchers to (1) “begin to examine the ritualised interactive features of interpreted encounters” (1999a:328), (2) “demonstrate that the interpreter’s status is not nearly so neutral and uninvolved as was once thought to be the case” (1999a:328) and the use of specific embedding techniques by dialogue interpreters. The implications of Goffman’s work for DI are also methodological: according to Metzger (1999a:329), Goffman builds a case that “both supports and extends the basic units of interaction, namely adjacency pairs”. This consideration is in line with CA, where adjacency pairs (Schegloff and Sacks 1973, Sacks 1992, Traverso 2004) are considered the basic two-part units of talk that “provide evidence of the sequential nature of interactive discourse” (Metzger, 1999a:329). The interactionistic approach that Metzger suggests, drawing on Goffman, is strengthened with the

15 As Goffman (1982:49) argues: “Again we are forced to see that the individual is not the natural unit for our consideration but rather the team and its members”.
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incorporation of the notion of *move* as the basic unit of interaction in DI research, training and practice (1999a:330), and the use of Goffman’s taxonomy of speaker roles (cf. Wadenström 1992). Acknowledging Goffman’s (1981) attempt to characterise the dynamic and ever-changing relationships between interactants and the discourse itself was, therefore, critical to widen the scope of research into DI.

Thanks to these advances in DI literature from the 1990s onwards, drawing on theories and methods from contextual linguistics, sociolinguistics, pragmatics and discourse and conversation studies, the field was then framed along the lines of a communicative interaction in which the different participants adopt and perceive roles, functions and expectations, and they interact accordingly, given the constraints and possibilities within the participation framework and their co-actors in the interaction.

In this respect, Mason (2000:218-220) highlights four main advances in DI research, which, in his view, can be accepted to date as basic methodological principles: the first principle would be the untenability of the “conduit model of communication”, even though most of those who have to rely on interpreters and/or interpreting services still adhere to this model and their notion of interlinguistic communication is still based on the information transfer between sender and receiver, following a codification-decodification process. On the other hand, the field of linguistics has long accepted “the need for a pragmatic dimension to account for the relation between language, its context of use and the multiple meanings which can be exchanged beyond the literal, propositional sense of the words” (Mason, 2000:218).

The second principle is, therefore, the central role of pragmatics. Beyond language-based issues, there are highly relevant contextual, referential and inferential components which are crucial in the communicative interaction, and which neither the interpreter - practising *in situ* - nor the researcher should ignore. As Mason argues, the restrictive, yet “pervasive”, conduit model cannot explain the interpreter’s behaviour, because there is a participation framework, as well as the interpreter’s sociolinguistic competence,

---

16 Reddy (1979) used the term ‘conduit metaphor’ to describe the traditionally assumed notions related to linguistic communication. As Mason (1999:150) argues, interpreters themselves would suffer this wrong assumption of translation/interpreting as a mechanical operation in their daily practice.

17 See also: Chernov 2004.
which shape the decision of what is “appropriate within the social situation of an interview” (Mason, 1999:150).

Thirdly, the ‘participation framework’ (taken from Goffman 1981) is the central axis of study and not the participants in an individualised, isolated way. Thanks to the adoption of this perspective, a series of phenomena which are essential to DI can be distinguished, such as permanent changes of footing, the interpreter’s coordination tasks, or the safeguarding of different interests, although it largely remains to be evidenced in media settings, something which I will undertake for the case of live radio interviews through my research.

Fourthly, there was a crucial move away from the prevalence of prescriptivism in DI studies towards more descriptive and critical approaches, since DI became generally accepted as an extremely complex form of social interaction.

Contrary to the ‘channel-based three-way’ or ‘gap-bridging’ view of DI, which has been criticised and proved to be inaccurate and methodologically constraining for the analysis of a triad which is unstable, unpredictable, and variable, the conceptualisation of DI as a ‘three-way exchange’ -‘triadic exchange’ (Mason 2001) or ‘communicative pas de trois’ (Wadensjö 1998) - crucially involves that interpreting “cannot be studied just as a series of oral texts, in complete isolation from paralinguistic and other contextual features” (Mason, 2001:ii).

Thanks to a growing number of studies taking this triadic perspective, a series of major features in DI started to be recognised (Mason, 2001:i-ii) and its analysis received growing attention in later works, as is the case in this research.

I.3 General Features of Interpreter-Mediated Triadic Social Interactions

The aim of this section is to explore the features of DI as a basic type of “triadic exchange” (Mason 2001), drawing on dialogical, interactionistic theories and approaches, as suggested by the reviewed literature in the field discussed above. DI is conceptualised along primarily interactional lines (cf. Mason 2001), where DI is considered to be a triadic interaction: the actors or interlocutors in the exchange are seen as a triad, whereby they are all situated at the same participative and communicative level, that is, the interpreter is a full participant in the interaction, whether it is through
language transfer, coordination or explanation (Mason, 2001:ii). Within this triad, Mason (2001) talks about potential changes of *footing*, power relations, permanent negotiation, etc. Indeed, Mason previously argued that “it is the interpersonal dimension which is the prime determiner of the range of concerns which dialogue interpreters experience in their day-to-day work” (1999:148).

While performing these tasks, the relationship which is established with the primary interlocutors is essentially characterised by what Goffman (1981:128) calls *footing*, or positioning during the interaction. Goffman defines footing as “the alignment that people take up to each other in face-to-face interaction” (1981:67). In a later passage devoted to radio talk, he adds that this alignment may refer to a particular utterance, whether involving a production format, as in the case of a speaker, or solely a participation status, as in the case of a hearer (Goffman, 1981:227). Although Goffman uses concepts such as alignment, set, stance, posture or projected self to develop his notion of ‘footing’, he acknowledges that changes of footing are constant, being a persistent feature of natural talk (1981:128). When Wadensjö took up Goffman’s concept (cf. 1998:164-165/189-190) for her study of interpreting as interaction, she showed how this alignment changes throughout the interaction, not only from the side of the interpreter, but from the side of the primary interlocutors with regards to each other and the interpreter. There can be multiple reasons for this: loss of confidence, safeguarding of particular interests or *face*, solidarity with the perceived weakest side of the interaction, search for institutional protection, and so on.

What research shows is that the primary interlocutors often exert great influence in determining the interpreter's footing, and the latter’s shifts are motivated rather than random (Mason, 1999:157). Moreover, Mason (2009) analysed footing (amongst a series of linguistic and paralinguistic moves, including gate-keeping, manipulation of responses, contextualisation cues, in-group identity, gaze and lexical choice) to evidence how it could be a signal of “reflexive and interactive positioning and the take-up of these by other participants” (2009:71). Throughout the problematisation of *role* and *positioning*, using these analytical categories applied to data from interpreter-mediated encounters (televised immigration interviews), Mason comprehensively manages to

---

suggest that positioning provides a useful alternative to the rather static notion of “role”.

Moreover, he concludes:

Positions evolve as an exchange develops and are the subject of joint negotiation among all involved. In some ways, then, positioning is similar to footing. The latter, though, may be treated as a choice of an individual speaker (like, say, code-switching in conversation), whereas, in the treatment of positioning here, I have sought to stress its interactive nature: positionings are either accepted and adopted by other participants or rejected and replaced. (Mason, 2009:71).

One more essential feature of this triadic exchange is the distribution of power between the participants - the interpreter being in a position which could be defined as privileged. 19

Linguistic competence, cultural/intercultural knowledge, coordination skills, the acceptance of roles, etc., are all related aspects to the interpreter’s interaction and his/her ability to manage them is affected by power dynamics (understood as the interactional unfolding of the distribution of power throughout the exchange). Mason (2000:221), argues that the effects and interplay of power differentials deserve thorough investigation. The institutional setting where DI takes place (i.e. police, legal, medical, media, etc.) may accentuate these phenomena, and, although Mason acknowledges that there is scope “for much research to be done from an interactional pragmatic and semiotic perspective” (2000:222), he observes that “in virtually the whole range of community interpreting encounters, there is a wide gap in status and power between the parties involved” (2000:221). Moreover, he argues that the dynamics of the exchange in terms of power and distance “are of primordial importance in seeking to understand what is going on linguistically. For that reason, such issues cannot be set aside in any analysis of interpreter performance” (Mason, 2001:ii).

Power differentials in face-to-face interactions can derive from multiple factors: the institution (understood both in terms of discoursal space and participation framework) and position of the interlocutor(s) representing it; the reason(s) for the encounter; social status, the value of knowledge within the interaction, convergence of interests, and situational arrangements, amongst others.

The communicative dynamics in interpreter-mediated face-to-face interaction highlight

19 Anderson (1976:218) argues in this respect: “The interpreter, as the sole bilingual in an exchange, enjoys the advantage of power inherent in all positions which control scarce resources".
the distribution of power among the interlocutors in the exchange: every utterance needs
to go through the interpreter as a filter (or gatekeeper\textsuperscript{20}) in order for understanding and
coordination between primary interlocutors to be possible. This position within the
triad confers a degree of power on the interpreter, and it is only via the analysis of the
talk-in-interaction that it can be observed how he/she exerts this power.

One aspect of power relations which has been addressed in DI research is their
asymmetry during the exchange: Roy (1996, 2000) shows how the interpreter is not
immune to power asymmetries and plays a very important role, most notably
establishing turns at talk; Brennan (1999), Cambridge (1999) and Tebble (1999), among
others, show how power asymmetries are manifested in the interpreter using different
language registers in order to accentuate or minimise power imbalances; power
dynamics can also be behind the emphasis on or ignoring of cultural and technical
references which might bring the interlocutors closer or distance them (cf. Cambridge
interlocutors' awareness of the wide range of actions that power relations entail, they
will accept or limit the power which is acquired by the interpreter, according to their
expectations and interests. Power-related strategies used by the interpreter within the
interaction may, therefore, have a direct effect on the overall communicative event.

Nevertheless, as pointed out by Mason (2000:222),\textsuperscript{21} we lack “fine-grained” analyses of
the effects of these decisions and shifts related to power, but this lack seems to apply
not only to community interpreting encounters - the field referred to by Mason - but also
notably to live interpreter-mediated interviews in the media.

Closely related to power issues are the notions of face and politeness, as documented in
several studies, particularly in the fields of sociology and sociolinguistics, on which DI
scholars have largely drawn (Goffman 1959, 1961, 1971; Knapp et al. 1987, and Brown
and Levinson 1978, 1987, among others). Face is defined as “the public self-image that
every member wants to claim for himself [sic]” (Brown and Levinson, 1978:66). The

\textsuperscript{20} See, for example, Mason (1999:159; 2000:219) and Davidson (2000).

\textsuperscript{21} Cf. also Mason (1999:159), where he notes that there is "undoubtedly scope for a much more far-
reaching investigation of the negotiation of face in interpreted encounters in relation to the variables
of power and distance."
interpreter may adopt different strategies in order to avoid being threatened with regards to their role, or ‘filtering out’ utterances which might be seen as showing one of the primary interlocutors in a bad light or which might aim at protecting themselves and/or some of the primary interlocutors from ridicule (Cambridge, 1999:203). There seems to be evidence in previous research, as Mason (1999) shows, that interpreters are “keenly aware of threats to face” (1999:159), with the following politeness strategies (Brown and Levinson 1987) being the most commonly adopted: downtoning or hedging (Tebble, 1999:186-188) and conventional apologies (Brennan, 1999:242).

Another notion closely linked to power is that of distance, which is established as a result of power distribution and power relations within the exchange, hence, ”exerting a determining influence on who says what, when and how” (Mason, 2001:i). Before questioning if it is necessary and/or appropriate - ethically and professionally - to reduce or emphasise power asymmetries between the primary interlocutors, descriptive and critical research should start by noting this phenomenon throughout interpreted mediated events and then analyse the strategies used by the interpreter in context - in my case, radio.

Lastly, there is negotiation of “socio-textual practices” (Hatim and Mason, 1997:15), which is accentuated when the triadic exchange takes place at the intersection of competing discourses (Mason, 2001:ii). Mason (1999:158) poses several questions: “What happens, in cross-cultural contexts, to the discoursal value of lexical selections?”, and how do interpreters negotiate appropriate discourses and genres?

The eventually added cultural value of the primary interlocutors’ utterances and the attitude towards them taken by the interpreter are of relevance for the course of the interaction. Pöchhacker discusses this in the case of simultaneous interpreting (SI) in TV interpreting (2007), but how it is managed interactionally and negotiated in DI in live radio interviews largely remains to be studied, as the previous interactional features discussed above.

---

22 Eco (2003:Introduction) defines negotiation as the essential feature of translation (understood in general terms, thus implying interpreting). Therefore, Eco places the translator as negotiator between different sides:

Negotiation is a process by virtue of which, in order to get something, each party renounces something else, and at the end everybody feels satisfied since one cannot have everything. […] A translator is the negotiator between those parties, whose explicit assent is not mandatory.
When extrapolating the issue of negotiation of socio-textual practices (i.e. of texts, discourses and genres\textsuperscript{23}) to interpreter-mediated interaction in media settings, another issue comes to light, which requires specific attention in the following chapter and subsequent analysis: negotiation in the media goes beyond ‘socio-textual’ practices and also involves the negotiation of context (broader and local) and of socio-cultural practices (such as the way the interpreter-mediated event will be broadcast). These are issues that may not be made explicit in the interpreter-mediated broadcast interaction, since they tend to be negotiated off-air (before and/or during the broadcast interview) but which have an impact on it at different levels (technical, interactional and socio-textual).

Last but not least, all these interactional phenomena - footing, power, face, distance, competing interests and discourse, and the way they are negotiated and managed - have their linguistic manifestation throughout the interaction. This idea is summed up by Tebble (1999) in her exploration of the interpersonal metafunction taking place in interpreted medical consultations:

 Speakers’ power is shown in their lexicogrammar by their choice of modal verbs and modal adjuncts, polarity, […] evaluative lexis, intensification, numeration, and logico-semantics. The solidarity of speakers is shown in the lexicogrammar by their choice of person, vocation (naming of people), specialized or technical lexis, slang and taboo lexis […]. At the phonological level of language, intonation conveys the speech function in the exchange, the loudness, change in pitch and voice quality convey the power of the speaker […]. The ways in which the physician and patient negotiate their meanings, express their attitudes, judgements and appreciation, and build up a level of solidarity are all linguistic strategies […]. (Tebble, 1999:186-187)

Tebble’s remark proves crucial for the study of DI and is in line with CA theory: it is in the talk-in-interaction that researchers can best study what is going on in the exchange, without ignoring the relevance of knowing the circumstances (broad and local, institutional and conversational) in which the exchange takes place.

From a methodological point of view, these analyses can be enriched by video-recordings of the exchanges. An illustrative example is found in Bot (2005). Bot uses videotaped interpreter-mediated psychotherapy sessions to analyse changes in interpreters’ use of reported verbs and personal pronouns to show that the addition of a

\textsuperscript{23} See Hatim and Mason (1997:16).
reporting verb not only serves to indicate who is speaking, but also plays a role in the organisation of turn-transfer.

The outcomes of the study of the interactional features discussed above can greatly enrich the knowledge and account of DI exchanges. As illustrative examples of this, it is worth noting the works on the distribution of responsibility (cf. Wadensjö 1995), trust (cf. Tipton 2010, Martínez-Gómez Gómez 2011), politeness (cf. Mason and Stewart 2001), cooperation (cf. Pym 2000) and paralinguistic moves (cf. Davitti 2013) in DI encounters.

The reviewed DI literature suggests, as Mason (1999, 2000, 2001, 2009) has repeatedly claimed, that the impact of strategies and moves related to power, footing, face and distance according to the participants’ context in the unfolding of the interaction, is central to the study of any type of interpreter-mediated triadic interaction.

The dynamic nature of interactional moves concerning footing, power, face, distance, gate-keeping, manipulation of responses, contextualisation cues, in-group identity, gaze and lexical choice (Mason 2009) have crucial methodological implications, since they cannot be conceptualised as static and independent categories/features. Nevertheless, efforts must be made to develop robust methodological frameworks and tools for the systematic analysis of their influence in the interpreter-mediated encounter. As Mason (2000:224) argues, “studies are needed of the take-up by primary parties of interpreter selections and how this influences the unfolding of the exchange”. This is a key issue that I aim to address systematically in my study of live radio interviews.

Indeed, the reviewed literature on DI in this section suggests that further research on DI which aims at being comprehensive, engaging and critical has to be able to show to what extent interpreters and other agents within the interpreter-mediated encounter are aware of these interactional features and how they manage them in the course of the interaction.

Most recent literature on DI research emphasises the gaps still to be filled along these lines:

24 Further features related to the position of the interpreter, such as coordination and negotiation (Wadensjö 1998) are also included in this group.
The positions adopted and accepted by participants [...] may exert considerable influence on the likely development of the exchange. Yet, the impact of participants’ choices remains under-investigated. Indeed, large-scale empirical investigations of actual participant behaviour in interpreter-mediated face-to-face exchanges are still relatively few (e.g. Berk-Seligson 1990, Wadensjö 1998) and much work remains to be done, both in the ethnography and in the linguistics and pragmatics of such communicative events. (Mason, 2009:71)

In chapter II, I will show how this claim is all the more fitting in the specific case of DI in media (radio) settings.

I.4 ‘Context’ in the Study of Interpreter-Mediated Triadic Social Interactions

Drawing on my initial hypothesis on the influence of context on the interaction, as backed up by DI literature (cf. Wadensjö 1998, Mason 2000, 2001, 2006), I will discuss approaches to ‘context’ which can theoretically contribute to my methodology and analysis.

Formally, the questions I aim to answer in this section are: what is context in interpreter-mediated interactions? What is it made up of? How should it be conceptualised for the systematic study of interpreter-mediated, triadic interactions?

Context can be defined as all the information surrounding the communicative event, that is to say, the participation framework(s) (Goffman 1981) in which the interlocutors interact. This ‘participation framework’ does not only involve the physical space where the interpreter-mediated face-to-face interaction takes place (i.e. a police station, a hospital, a TV/radio studio), but also its origin and aims, clients' and/or participants' expectations and interests, previously shared background and information, space-time conditions and constraints during the encounter (such as the scheduled time and duration of the interview), etc.

Mason and Stewart (2001:54) argue that it is essential to understand the ‘participation framework’ in order to study DI and its interactional features. The main argument put forward by the authors is that the immediacy of the event and the physical presence of all participants “exert a determining influence on the way meanings are exchanged and negotiated” (Mason and Stewart, 2001:51). In this respect, the authors offer a substantial methodological contribution:

25 A further section will be devoted to ‘context’ in CA in Chapter III, looking at converging theoretical issues and concerns.
No study of interpreted exchanges can afford to overlook these factors. Moreover, as the incidental examples [...] demonstrate, they are closely involved in the negotiation of face and other pragmatic variables. Thus, the approach we propose to adopt is one which, rather than comparing the propositional meaning of utterances and their interpretation, seeks to describe the behaviour of all parties in terms of the set of factors governing the exchange. (Mason and Stewart, 2001:54)

In this passage, a key concept for my study can be found: “the set of factors governing the exchange”. This is how the participation framework becomes crucially relevant in the study of DI. The pragmatic variables that Mason and Stewart allude to (i.e. politeness and face-work) are governed by contextual elements. However elusive, wide, complex and changing they may be, exploring them and how they evolve within the exchange is crucial in understanding this type of interpreter-mediated interaction.

Hatim and Mason (1997:43) argue that context is even more determining in DI: “For whereas context is, we are suggesting, the key domain in liaison interpreting, it may, by the same token, become the main source of problems.” In the same line of reasoning, they argue that “contextual information [...] almost causally determines the way both structure and texture appear in texts”. The notions of immediacy and physical presence referred to above (Mason and Stewart, 2001:51) are at the core of this major influence of context in DI.

Closely related to this notion of context is that of ‘hypertext’ (Pöchhacker, 2005:690), introduced earlier in this chapter (see I.2.1, above). The author argues that the hypertext involves institutional constraints and functional concerns that shape the interpreter's tasks and actions - and, I would also argue, their position. Nonetheless, Pöchhacker (2005:693) emphasises that the context, or ‘hypertext’, is subjected to the participants' cognitive representation, opening the door to viewing interpreting as a socio-cognitive process, where the situated interaction and mental operations could be reconciled in a coherent conceptual framework. This is the point at which Pöchhacker, acknowledging the analytical and methodological contributions of Linell (1997), Linell et al. (1992) and Wadensjö (1992, 1998) among others, aims to offer an integrated common ground for conceptualising interpreting in its different modalities where “interpreting is construed first and foremost as a situated process of social interaction” (Pöchhacker, 2005:692).
Wadensjö (1992, 1998) also offers an extensive insight into interpreter-mediated
encounters as ‘situated systems of activity’ (Goffman 1981) which is crucial for her
conceptualisation of context. Drawing on Bakhtin’s dialogical organisation of
language,26 but also on Voloshinov (1986[1929]) and Goffman (1959, 1981), Wadensjö
(1998) deals with the situational context in which interpreter-mediated interaction
develops, and how functions of talk and the dynamics of interpreter-mediated
encounters are dependent on a multitude of circumstances that she calls “global aspects
of interaction” (Wadensjö, 1998:154), which she defines as the ones that have a global
presence in the situation, and which cover:

... the interpreter and other interlocutors, their respective background knowledge, linguistic
competence, overall aims and wish to communicate […], socio-cultural conventions associated
with the type of situation (in institutional terms) in which the interpreting occurs, and on
participants' respective understanding of what it means to speak via an interpreter. […] The
presence and the use of artefacts […], when focused upon in interaction and used in certain
ways, help establishing the transformation […]. Thus, they are in a way globally present. If we
take abstract objects, such as fear and embarrassment, when these dominate in an encounter, then
they can also be said to have a global presence in the situation.

Wadensjö, like Pöchhacker, goes beyond the strictly physical context surrounding the
interaction and frames it in a complex socio-cultural environment, rather than only in
the time-space conditions of the event. In a more pragmatic and specific way, Wadensjö
(1999:247-264) investigates the ways in which social interaction in two different
interpreting situations - telephone interpreting and on-site interpreting - is influenced by
the setting. She shows significant differences between the two types of interpreter-
mediated encounters, mainly with regards to coordination and synchronisation of talk, a
study which sheds light on interactional phenomena and methodological issues that are
of relevance to further research, such as this work, as discussed in my methodology (IV.
2) and analysis (V).

Tebble (1999) also offers an illuminating approach with regards to the analysis and
consideration of context as an essential vector for the configuration of discourse in
interpreter-mediated face-to-face interviews, namely, medical consultations. In Tebble’s
theoretical framework and analysis (1999:181), which she describes as “an eclectic
approach within linguistics but [which] draws particularly upon systemic functional

linguistics”, the context and structure of the type of event are the main factors triggering the discourse model in the interaction.

Drawing on Halliday and Hasan (1989), Tebble (1999) shows how the close relationship between the context and the discourse that unfolds can be demonstrated by delineating the three contextual variables: field (subject matter), tenor (roles and relationships of participants), and mode (the role that language plays in the configuration of the event) (Halliday and Hasan 1989). The production of discourse during the interaction is, according to Tebble, a result of the action - namely, ‘talk’ - of the three participants in the interpreter-mediated interaction, within those three contextual variables.

Exploring further the role and influence of context in DI, an insightful approach is offered by Mason (2006), who examines evidence of participant moves, particularly the interpreter's, to show inferencing at work and the evolving, intra-interactional nature of context (2006:359), adopting Relevance Theory but also drawing on some insights from CA.

In his article, Mason (2006:363) is aware of the “evanescence of context” and a generally common unavailability for analysis - other than via the analyst’s intuition. This potential methodological flaw was recognised by the developers of CA (e.g. Sacks 1963; c.f. Mason 2006:363), and CA scholars tried to offer a methodological answer to the question of how we can know the contextual aspects and elements affecting the interaction. If the analyst aims to be critical, he/she will try to track the relevance of context with regards to the interaction, or the ‘contextual effect’ (Sperber and Wilson, 1986/1995:41). Nevertheless, although the analyst may not intend to ignore contextual factors, he/she is sometimes forced to manage without them or, as Mason (2006:361) aptly puts it:

… accounts of the contextual environment of instances of interpreter-mediated communication need to include mapping from utterance meanings and linguistic meanings to actually received meanings, crucially dependent upon mutual accessibility of contextual assumptions.

Tebble (1999:181) sums up this approach by defining it as a ‘comprehensive theory of language in use’, and its eclectic character is manifested in the insights from other relevant disciplines, including discourse analysis, pragmatics, sociolinguistics, conversation analysis and ethnomethodology, social psychology and communication studies. Although the scope and length of the article does not allow her to further develop these methodological considerations, it is worth noting that a complex and integrating methodological approach is in place.
This methodological concern can be followed by others of crucial relevance for the analysis of face-to-face interpreter-mediated interactions: how to determine the previous knowledge and background that is shared by the interpreter and the primary interlocutors? How to establish causal links between contextual elements and the *field, mode* and *tenor* along which the interaction unfolds? Particularly in my case, radio broadcasting, how can the analyst get to know, for example, the preparation for an interview that is carried out - either independently or jointly - by the radio station, the producer (or production team), the presenter, the interpreter and the interviewee?

Mason (2006:364) is aware of these issues and suggests a study on the influence of contextual assumptions on DI and offers two complementary procedural solutions, drawing on CA scholarship.28 Firstly:

… there is the evidence available within interaction itself in the form of responses: how do participants take up each other’s meanings? Such evidence (if not the interpretation of it) can at least be said to be independent of the analyst and to rely on actual rather than imagined contexts.

Secondly, taking on the proposal made by Cicourel (1992):

… the inclusion of (objectively verifiable) ethnographic information to provide a ‘framing’ context (which may complement or even override the local context in accounting for particular participant moves).

With regards to the first solution proposed by Mason (2006:364), my analysis chapter will show that, in many occasions, contextual factors influencing the interaction can only be known by accessing the radio broadcast interviews (via audio and/or video-recording, and their transcription).

As far as the second proposed solution is concerned, precisely due to the indeterminate and volatile nature of context, it will be methodologically necessary to distinguish, as Cicourel (1992) does, between a ‘broad’, or general participation framework, and a ‘local’ context, that is, the most immediate to the interaction.

The methodological implication that Mason (2006:366) considers, drawing on Davies and Harré (1990), is of interest for my research:

A way forward in analysing the pragmatics of dialogue interpreting might lie in using the evidence of actual responses (and responses to responses) to trace the communication of meanings beyond what is said. In order to do this we need to incorporate into our notion of

28 Lynch (2000) and Sacks (1963), among others.
context, in addition to a ‘broad’, framing context of situational and ethnographic information, a
‘narrow’, local element whereby user assumptions are negotiated and re-negotiated continuously
in interaction.

These two arguments and their methodological implications constitute a key reminder
for accomplishing a comprehensive, systematic and detailed study of the social
situation and the participation framework of interpreter-mediated talk-in-interaction,
which is the focus of my doctoral research on live interpreter-mediated radio interviews.
Chapter II. Media Interpreting: Evolution and State-of-the-Art

In this chapter I will deal with the main developments and contributions in the field of media interpreting (MI) research with regards to issues, approaches and methodologies which are relevant to my subsequent study of DI in live radio interviews.

The production of scholarly literature in the field of MI is fairly recent, although a slower start is noticeable: the first works on the field appeared in the 1980s and 90s - with only a handful of works in the 80s (Kurz 1982, Skuncke 1983, Daly 1985 and Luyken 1988) which limited their scope to documenting and discussing the emergence of this field of practice with a certain degree of specialisation - and it only gained momentum in the 21st century (cf. Jiménez Serrano 2011).

Literature and research on MI is not a sub-field within Media Studies (MS) or Multilingualism. Moreover, if we go a level down in the type of MI and its interactional framework, i.e. media dialogue interpreting and, more specifically, on the radio, literature is scarce. As this review will show, most of the publications on MI have limited their scope to TV interpreting and SI, and when it comes to radio, they provide, at most, a passing reference, acknowledging that it exists but without providing further details. Only Wadensjö (2000) has focused on the analysis of a specific radio interview.

Nevertheless, as Jiménez Serrano (2011:116) acknowledges, since the beginning of the 21st century, there has been an ‘explosion’ of TV interpreting research, with analyses on particular fields:

29 Cf. Kelly-Holmes (2012), a paper devoted to multilingualism in the media where there is no reference to interpreting or interpreter-mediated events.
Cf. also Podkalicka (2007), a doctoral thesis devoted to the study of language policy, multilingualism and multiculturalism within the Australian Special Broadcasting Service (SBS), which provides radio, TV and online programmes in as many as 68 languages, “delivering reportage of local, national and international news, and coverage of cultural, arts, music and sporting events within specific language communities across Australia” (Podkalicka, 2007:155) and yet no study - nor reference - to interpreter-mediated events is made.


... such as legal discourse (Amato 2002), or sports (Straniero Sergio 2003); on specific TV channels (Darwish 2009) or programmes (Niemants 2007); and even [...] comparisons between different TV channel approaches (Shibahara 2003; Tsuruta 2008). On a more detailed scale, only regarding linguistic aspects, we find studies on proper names (Hanaoka 2002), compensatory strategies (Al-Khanji et al. 2000), rhetoric (Kwak 2007; Neuberger 2010), coherence (Dal Fovo 2011) or prosody (Moritz 2010).

For the purposes of his study on ‘backstage conditions’ and interpreters’ performance in live television interpreting, Jiménez Serrano considers that certain specific constraints imposed by this “special interpreting modality” (2011:116) have yet to be analysed. This argument can also be applied to the study of the interpreter-mediated interaction in live radio interviews.

A subsequent question, which is central for the justification of my research, is why such scarce scholarly attention has been paid to radio interpreting and live radio interviews, although it is a communicative setting which generates a large number of interpreter-mediated events, compared to other media platforms (see chapter IV). This review of the current literature will highlight how not all advances in TV interpreting can be applied to radio, as the differences between the two media are more significant than current literature shows. My analysis will corroborate this.

II.1 Media Interpreting: Advances in Theory and Research

Following Mason (1999, 2000, 2001, 2009), Wadensjö (1998) and Grant (1999) - as reviewed in chapter I - I will cover research on interpreter-mediated social interactions in the media which, from a theoretical and methodological point of view, draws on sociolinguistic, communicative and dialogic approaches, and which can substantiate my research questions and subsequent analysis (see Introduction and chapter IV, respectively).


This structure is intended to cover the methodological stages of my research, as well finding a continuity with the advances in DI research discussed in chapter I. Likewise, this review will allow me to find gaps and unresolved issues in DI on the radio, thus offering a space for contribution through my research.

II.1.1 The Impact of the ‘Broad Context’ on Interpreter-Mediated Media Interactions

Like Conference Interpreting and Public Service Interpreting (PSI), MI is a field of ‘situated practice’ (Linell 1997, Angelelli 2004) or ‘situated system of activity’ (Wadensjö 1998, following Goffman 1981) in its own right. This involves specific discoursal and interactional features which, first and foremost, are intrinsically linked to the elements of the setting(s) in which it takes place: the medium (TV, radio, online media platform, etc.), the programme and the production/broadcast conditions under which the interpreter-mediated interaction occurs - which can be included under the encompassing term of ‘broad context’ (Cicourel 1992). Research in MI has rarely put the determining impact of this broad context at the centre of the research and we can find only a few cases where broad contextual features are considered primary determining factors of the exchange (Wadensjö 1998, Mason and Stewart 2001) and put at the forefront of the research: Jiménez Serrano (2011), Gieve and Norton (2007), Castillo and Comte (2011, 2012) and Katan and Straniero Sergio (2003). Although these studies do not use their analysis of the conditions and policies in interpreter-mediated media events as the basis for exploring actual interpreter-mediated interactions (in the way Straniero Sergio 1999 and Wadensjö 2008a, 2008b do; see section II.1.4 in this chapter), their coverage and account of the media setting is detailed and comprehensive, suggesting methodological and analytical pathways which are still unexplored in MI.

In this section, therefore, I aim to look at how those studies have approached interpreter-mediated media events, putting the broad context surrounding the exchange at the centre of their analysis. One of the expected outcomes of this review is to legitimise the claim that we can also talk about specific sub-fields within MI, e.g. the live radio interview,
Jiménez Serrano (2011) analyses the backstage conditions of interpreting assignments as a factor affecting quality according to two salient variables: visibility and exposure. His approach is interpreter-centred, and although the variables he looks at are of a different nature than those I will analyse, his study offers a comprehensive way of studying live TV interpreting with implications for measuring quality and stress that had not been taken into account in previous studies (cf. Kurz and Pöchhacker 1995, Strolz 1997, Kurz 2001). The prominence given by Jiménez Serrano (2011:120) to the ‘backstage conditions’ - a term that he borrows from theatre - cover “all the elements constraining the interpreter's work, which mostly belong to the world behind the TV camera”. They may include the way the interpreter's ‘visibility’, understood in terms of the interpreter's location during the event, the subsequent interpreting modality and the final broadcast (e.g. sound quality, volume, camera) is approached. Jiménez Serrano’s study (2011) of backstage conditions as a major factor to measure stress (exposure) and quality recommends considering these factors as part of the specific broad context of this field (MI) for the analysis of the actual interaction.

On a more comprehensive level of analysis of the broad context surrounding interlingual exchanges in the media, Gieve and Norton (2007) study how British television deals with linguistic difference in encounters with ‘Others’. By looking at a small corpus of televised travel, documentary and lifestyle programmes filmed outside the UK and broadcast between 2003 and 2005 on British television, Gieve and Norton (2007) aim at unveiling the strategies for dealing with linguistic difference on broadcast television (including interpreter-mediated and non-interpreter-mediated encounters) and the subsequent emerging attitudes towards linguistic difference in multilingual talk-in-interaction on TV.

As a starting point for their research, Gieve and Norton (2007:188-189) pose the basic question of what is going on when foreign voices appear on TV:

> How can we explain the fact that, in a programme dedicated to demonstrating the Otherness of Japanese culture,\(^{32}\) language has become transparent? Of course, we know that there must have been an interpreter present, that they couldn't have made the programme without one or

\(^{32}\) Japanese culture is only used as an example for their overall argument in this extract.
many linguistic intermediaries setting up interviews, negotiating, translating and interpreting. Why did the producers go to the trouble of erasing all evidence of linguistic difference when they must have gone to enormous trouble to deal with it themselves? The evidence of linguistic difference has not been hidden from us, so why has it been made to appear as if communication across linguistic difference is not difficult, problematic, or even of interest?

The answers to these questions, Gieve and Norton (2007:189) argue, might be obvious: preventing the audience from enduring delays and the awkwardness of communication across different languages, thus not turning the audience's attention to aspects which the programme makers do not consider to be the focus of the programme; or simply saving precious air time. Nonetheless, the authors set out to explore more complex and multi-layered answers, e.g. how the trend to minimise linguistic difference is ideological, and the effects this might have on audiences.

The first part of Gieve and Norton’s (2007) analysis is descriptive: first they create a model to represent the relationship between the broadcast protagonists - hosts, narrators, journalists, British people travelling abroad, whom Gieve and Norton (2007:192) define as the monolingual English native or near-native speakers, who are representative of the target audience - and the Others - i.e. the foreign language (FL) speakers, “those with whom the protagonists may not be able to communicate” (Give and Norton, 2007:192).

There are two crucial analytical aspects that Gieve and Norton (2007:192) draw from this model: first, there are different types of ‘mediation’ to solve (potential) linguistic difference, which may serve to

1. erase linguistic difference by ignoring its existence;
2. background linguistic difference;
3. ‘thematize’ linguistic difference (foreground the procedure of talk between speakers of different languages, making it the topic or content rather than the vehicle); or
4. present linguistic difference as an ordinary, everyday interactive accomplishment, unthematized, as in common subtitling and dubbing practices.

Each type may entail different problems regarding production issues, but also notably the way linguistic difference is shown to the audience. The problem that gathers most attention for the authors is that of how to judge whether or not an encounter includes genuine interaction or only pseudo-interaction, and hence everything in the communication between the programme and the audience is to a certain extent ‘contrived’ (Gieve and Norton, 2007:193). How to distinguish between ‘authentic’
interactions between protagonists and FL speakers and pseudo-interactions becomes nuclear in their quest. In order to tackle this issue, Gieve and Norton (2007:193) proceed to the second analytical aspect in their model: establishing when linguistic mediation may occur in TV production - i.e. prior to filming, during filming and post-filming - and how

1. Pre-filming interventions may anticipate problems likely to arise from linguistic difference and preclude them, by avoidance or mediation strategies.

2. Mediation during filming may also be, and usually is, required to allow the protagonist to interact with FL speakers, but interpreters are not always made available.

3. Post-filming mediation may allow the audience different degrees of direct access to the voices of FL speakers without them having been mediated by a protagonist.

With these categories, Gieve and Norton’s triangular model (cf. 2007:192-193) can be used to represent the interaction as it happened and show whether protagonists “demonstrate a primary orientation to the audience or to those with whom they are in presence of and interacting with”. A further contribution of this model is “how the production as a whole articulates and mediates the relationship between the protagonist, audience and the FL speaker as broadcast, through pre-, during- and post-filming strategies”. In the second stage of their descriptive analysis, Gieve and Norton (2007:194-206) identify strategies for the representation of linguistic difference, which I summarise as follows:

1. Omission of encounters across linguistic difference

2. Overheard FL talk

3. Protagonist-Other talk in English

4. Non-verbal engagement

5. ‘Getting by’ across linguistic difference

6. Mediated interaction across linguistic difference

7. Protagonist-Other talk in an FL

8. Pseudo-interaction

The way communication is accomplished and, ultimately, broadcast in each of these strategies is at the centre of Gieve and Norton’s analysis (2007:194-206), and it allows
them to identify certain elements used for accomplishing that communication, which they summarise in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-filming strategies</th>
<th>During-filming strategies</th>
<th>Post-filming strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Selecting English speakers as informants</td>
<td>Intermittent report / narration / explanation by protagonist</td>
<td>Voice-over interpretation and dubbing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoiding interaction with non-English speakers</td>
<td>Non-verbal communication</td>
<td>Subtitling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing interpreters</td>
<td>Pseudo-interaction</td>
<td>Narration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selecting a presenter competent in the FL</td>
<td>Use of an Interpreter, on-or off-screen</td>
<td>Editing out real-time interpreter participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consecutive translation by protagonist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Foreigner talk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lingua franca talk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What this table shows is a comprehensive approach to multilingual encounters in the media (using British TV data) and although it has some shortcomings (cf. footnote 5) which require further development, it may prove to be more useful than previous attempts to frame interpreter-mediated media encounters for subsequent interactional analysis (cf. Gottlieb, 2005:7).

Finally, Gieve and Norton draw interesting conclusions for the analysis of interpreter-mediated media interviews: first, they make a critical assessment of how British television does not do well in broadcast representations of interlingual encounters (2007:208). Moreover, when linguistic difference cannot be avoided, they find a “reluctance” (2007:190) to engage with it positively and protagonists who settle for minimalist attempts at communication (as seen in Table 1).

Secondly, the models and strategies to deal with linguistic difference - which ultimately are part and parcel of TV production - are political and ideological. Gieve and Norton

---

33 The table excludes news reports and political interviews (Gieve and Norton, 2007:206). Although the categorisation does not draw on exhaustive quantitative analysis, the authors mark the most commonly found strategies in bold.
(2007:208) conclude that:

It is less easy to justify avoiding representations of linguistic difference or adopting strategies to minimize the implications of linguistic difference. Equally unsatisfactory are representations of Others as unreachable, irredeemably different, marked by linguistic difference before all else, such that is is impossible to have meaningful interaction with them, and all attempts at interaction are evidence of its very impossibility, hence a cause only of humour or frustration.

The ‘reluctance’ to engage with the Others mentioned above, plus the ideological trend to put FL speakers in a potentially weaker position (Gieve and Norton, 2007:209) may explain an even smaller presence of interpreter-mediated events (live or pre-recorded) on British TV, as well as the preference for English-speaking informants/interviewees when interacting with the Others, at least in the mainstream, peak-time TV programmes used in their data.

Although not following this model, this is precisely what Castillo and Comte (2011) set out to explore in the documentary *The Behind the Scenes Journey of TV Interpreting*, offering audiovisual evidence of the creation and production mechanisms in a multilingual television programme which requires interpreters. Moving away from the notion of ‘ideal approaches’ (Gieve and Norton, 2007:208) to the organisation and broadcast of interpreter-mediated exchanges in TV and the media in general, Castillo and Comte (2011) and Castillo (2012) show that there is a collaborative character of media production which cannot be ignored when it comes to interpreter-mediated events. Moreover, as Castillo (2012:85) argues following his data analysis

> Media stakeholders’ views and approaches to interpreting sometimes collide or need to be negotiated, and it is the level of language and interpreting awareness, experience and collaborativeness of the production team that ultimately shape the way interpreting is performed and broadcast.

As opposed to Gieve and Norton (2007:208), who suggest an ‘ideal approach’ which recognises that linguistic difference does exist, in predictable as well as unpredictable contexts, Castillo and Comte (2011) and Castillo (2012) argue that the ‘ideal approach’ does not a priori guarantee a successful interpreter-mediated exchange. Nonetheless, the works discussed above provide evidence leading to a common argument: when there is language awareness from the organising institutions as well as a will to not hide linguistic difference, they employ comprehensive, integrating production mechanisms -
including the provision of interpreters from the beginning of the production - to satisfy the interlingual and intercultural needs of the broadcast.

In line with Gieve and Norton (2007), we find Katan and Straniero Sergio (2003) who, following a qualitative analysis of 50 hours of Italian interpreter-mediated (DI mode) talk show material (cf. also Straniero Sergio 1999), claim that the way interpreter-mediated interactions are broadcast on television reflect how foreign voices are represented and how they can interact with target audiences. The overriding norm of the ‘comfort factor’, understood as “the degree to which the TV audience is entertained” (Katan and Straniero Sergio, 2003:131; cf. also Katan and Straniero Sergio 2001), leads to broadcasters and hosts controlling the interpreting process before, during and after the interpreted event. Since the interpreter is considered an integral part of the comfort factor, his/her expected role in the event is that of a highly (media) professional and visible performer, who is able to embody the values of two main ideologies - consumer capitalism and popular culture - and match the expectations of both broadcasters and viewers.

Katan and Straniero Sergio (2003:135/137) consider here a multilayered gatekeeping process, with the first layer being of an organisational nature - which ties in with Gieve and Norton’s (2007) analysis:

The broadcaster gatekeepers decide not only what to translate but also, importantly, how an event is to be translated.

Once a situation involving a foreign language (e.g. an interview) has been selected by the programmers, regardless of the fact that the participants directly involved might have the interlinguistic competence to dialogue by themselves, there is always some form of linguistic mediation offered on the screen. […]

The gatekeeping decision to use an interpreter, whether simultaneous, consecutive or dialogue during social interaction on screen (or only in audio) is only one of the ways in which interlanguage transfer is managed.

Katan and Straniero Sergio also acknowledge the possibility of subtitling, ‘overvoicing’ and ‘interpretation’ by the journalists and presenters themselves, which are strategies

---

34 By ‘process’ they do not refer to the cognitive action of interlingual transfer (Katan and Straniero Sergio, 2003:143), but the social interaction which it involves.

35 Cf. the studies by Jääskeläinen (2003) and Chiaro (2002) on this topic: their main focus lies in questioning the status of that ‘interpretation’ as such.
covered by Gieve and Norton (2007). The crucial contribution that Katan and Straniero Sergio (2003:137) make in this respect and which methodologically and analytically can not be overlooked in my study, particularly when looking at differences between radio and television, is:

The decision to use one modality rather than another [...] will be directed by broadcaster and programme controllers according to: programme strategies, general channel broadcasting policies, the TV genre (talk show, live media event, pre-recorded interview etc), the target audience, and the particular effect that the programme director wishes to achieve.

Secondly, there is gatekeeping at the level of the interaction, that is, how the broadcasters control the interpreting process by gatekeeping both the verbal and non-verbal behaviour of the interpreter and how they shape the identity of the interpreter (Katan and Straniero Sergio, 2003:137). Likewise, the interpreter will also function as a gatekeeper (cf. Wadensjö 1998), but he/she is selected and briefed (overtly and/or covertly) to satisfy the values inherent in the ‘dominant submerged ideologies’ (Katan and Straniero Sergio, 2003:135). Drawing on their data analysis, Katan and Straniero Sergio (2003:140) point out that Italian interpreters are aware of these gatekeeping constraints and, moreover, constraints are explicitly given to the interpreters by the institution regarding ‘language decency’, register and even censorship. The corpus shows cases of those three gatekeeping strategies (Katan and Straniero, 2003:140-141).

The third level of institutional gatekeeping takes place in programmes that do not go out live - with or without the interpreter’s input - and where the control during the editing stage may be extensive. Katan and Straniero Sergio (2003:142-143) analyse the different ways in which this can be done in TV (cf. also Gieve and Norton 2007, Castillo and Comte 2011) to suit the broadcasters’ interests. However, since the main focus of my research lies in live interviews, post-editing lies beyond the scope of my review.

Katan and Straniero Sergio reach the conclusion that the submerged ideologies in the organisation of interpreter-mediated events in TV production have a crucial effect not only on the way the interaction unfolds, but most notably on how the interpreter’s traditional habitus (Bourdieu, 1990:78) changes: first, the traditional interpreter’s beliefs about invisibility, the supremacy of the text and equivalence are challenged. The
interpreter is being judged, “no longer on source text/target text criteria, but in terms of, as Marx suggests, ‘Commodity Fetishism’” (Katan and Straniero Sergio, 2003:132). Hence, Katan and Straniero Sergio’s argument goes, short-term profit and the ability to maintain or increase audience share is becoming the pre-eminent value guiding MI performance, at least in the case of TV shows. Secondly, and most importantly

TV interpreters are being encouraged, through the natural selection process, to enter the media habitus. Broadcasters expect interpreters not just to have the relevant linguistic skills but also to be good performers and to participate in the non-verbal interactions (Straniero Sergio 1999). The ‘deadly click’ power of popular culture is obliging or encouraging interpreters (depending on their own comfort factor) to take on roles which traditionally have not been part of their profession.

Whether language transfer is considered part of the TV show (as in the Italian TV corpus presented by Katan and Straniero Sergio 2003) or avoided in broadcast television (as Gieve and Norton suggest in the case of British TV), what both studies show is that the inclusion, organisation and broadcast of interpreter-mediated media events follow pragmatic, financial and time-space constraints, but also, most notably, political and ideological ones which determine the interaction. How this operates in radio is yet to be explored.

Comparing and integrating views of the studies discussed above reinforces the argument put forward by Katan and Straniero Sergio (2001:234), who suggest potential differences between particular contexts of television and national culture. This ties in with Mason’s (2001, 2006) encouragement to explore DI across different interpreting contexts. Research which addresses such concerns is highly likely to reveal different approaches to interpreting and, hence, interactional dynamics and features.

II.1.2 Interpreter-Mediated Media Events: Interviews

In this sub-section I will concentrate on studies that place their focus on the particular type of event which is at the centre of my research: interviews.

Alexieva (1999), drawing on a previous paper in which she offered a general overview of interpreter-mediated events (Alexieva 1997), offers an account of different interpreter-mediated TV events according to the parameters which differentiate TV interpreting from other interpreting fields (Alexieva, 1999:332). These contextual parameters can be split into four groups: (1) the participants parameter, where a
distinction is made between the “on-screen” and the “off-screen” casts, with the interpreter acting as mediator in two communicative channels; (2) the specificity of the TV product as a polysemiotic text; (3) the communicative goals of the two casts of primary participants and the strategies employed to attain these goals in a situation highly marked from a kinaesthetic and proxemic point of view, which often leads to shifts in the interpreter's output, and (4) the factors determining the choice of the optimum mode of interpreting (Alexieva, 1999:329). These four parameters make up Alexieva's analytical framework and she looks at them with two major aims: (1) to distinguish the types of TV live interpreting, i.e. the “monologue type” and “the dialogue type” (1999:333), which mainly occurs in interviews and panel discussions and typically involves DI; (2) to explore how these parameters affect the interpreter's performance and decisions. Alexieva's research is not interactionally driven, but rather event type driven and interpreter-centred with a problem-solving approach (Alexieva, 2001:113).

Drawing on TV interviews and other types of interpreter mediated interactions on Bulgarian TV, Alexieva (1999, 2001) observes the following phenomena:

- Participants' actions on different levels of communication. Alexieva (1997:171-174; cf. 1999, 2001) points out the following two levels or channels of communication, consisting of two sets of primary participants: on the one hand, the “on-screen” level, that is to say, where the primary interlocutors interact with each other, i.e. the interviewer and the interviewee(s) alternatively perform the roles of speaker and addressee (Alexieva, 2001:114). On the other hand, the “off-screen” level, which consists of, firstly, the initiator - the TV channel via its programme managers, who are responsible for the invitation of the interviewee(s) - and secondly, the audience as main recipient of the broadcast event, that is, the final addressees of the performance of all the other

---

36 This is a generalisation of how interviewees, or guests, are invited to take part in TV/radio programmes. In my data description and analysis, I will elucidate specific circumstances triggering each interview.

37 Following CA, I will apply changes in the terminology for these categories, as well as the verbs used to describe the interaction, thus preferring 'to interact' over 'to perform', the latter being relegated to its 'staging, theatricalising' meaning.
participants (Alexieva, 2001:114). The interpreter ‘mediates’ between these two communicative channels (Alexieva, 1999:334): “(i) between Speaker and Addressee of the on-screen cast […] ; and (ii) between the latter and the Initiator (the TV channel), on the one hand, and, on the other, the TV viewers”, an “imaginary audience” (Strolz, 1997:194) with whom the interpreter has no interaction. According to Alexieva (1999:135/348), it is in the ‘mediation’ between these two channels where power, distance, status and intertextuality are framed and negotiated.

− The dominant role of the interviewer, not only as coordinator but also as controller of the event (Alexieva, 1999:336):

[…] the Interviewer, certainly without violating the principle of politeness, reclaims her/his role of Controller, that is, the role assigned to her/him by the discourse structure of the interview as the person who asks the questions and thus runs the whole show.

This control unavoidably exerts an influence on the interpreter’s interaction, both at the pragmatic and discourse level. In her data, Alexieva (2001:115-117) finds recurrent instances where the interviewer manifests this control of the interpreter-mediated interaction by (i) giving cohesion to the interview as a whole, (ii) pre-planning the interview and (iii) showing communicative goals which may be shared or conflicting with the other participants in the interaction. This view reinforces the arguments given by Straniero Sergio (1999) on the close relationship between the presenter/interviewer and the interpreter. Likewise, this conceptualisation of the presenter/interviewer ties in with those offered by Wilby and Conroy (1994), Scannell (1991) and Hutchby (1996, 2006), among others, when they describe radio interviews. Therefore, this feature deserves particular attention when looking at the interpreter-mediated social interactions on the radio.

− Implications of the polysemiotic nature of the TV text for interpreter-mediated TV events. In TV, there are a wide range of verbal and non-verbal means of expression, amongst which language and image are always present (Alexieva, 1999:338). The implications of this polysemiotic nature when it comes to the interpreter’s interactions, in terms of translation strategies, intertextual coherence
and degree of involvement, among others, are diverse and complex (Alexieva, 1999:343): in the case of TV broadcasting, image - the visual support, or pictorial code - may be of help for the interpreter, as he/she shares it with the audience and, therefore, they are closely linked as common receivers of this visual output. This dimension is quite particular in TV and cannot be applied in the same way in the radio context. Nevertheless, it may be of interest to take it into account, since participants communicate between different levels of multimodality and multimediality in radio (Kress and Van Leeuwen, 2001:67).

- Aims of the event and negotiation. Even if the expectations of the different participants in the TV event (both on-screen and off-screen) may vary to a certain degree, Alexieva (1999:348) argues that their aims are not so different and, furthermore, she has not found cases in her data in which they are either fully shared or totally antagonistic. Participants' aims may vary, but they are hardly ever in opposition, as the nature of the event involves a shared aim which has an “imprint on the discourse structure, and most of all, on the exchange of turns in the discussion” (Alexieva, 1999:348): everything that is being said (ostensibly to one another) is actually addressed to the TV audiences. For Alexieva (1999, 2001), the primary participant and the interpreter share a major goal: to reach and impress the audience, no matter the way each participant sets out to achieve it. Ultimately, it will be the audience that may withdraw from the event if it is not interesting, appealing or impressive.

As far as negotiation is concerned, it has already been shown how it is constantly present in face-to-face interaction: of meaning, of roles, of power relations, etc. (see chapter I). In this regard, Alexieva’s (1999) contribution to the study of interpreter-mediated TV interviews lies in revealing that negotiation is framed

38 Kress and Van Leeuwen (2001:67) apply multimodality and multi/monomediality to radio in the following terms:

… multimodality and multimediality are not quite the same thing. Radio […] is multimodal in its affordances, because it involves speech, music and other sounds; but it is monomedial, since it can only be heard, and not seen, smelled, touched or tasted. Everyday face to face interaction, on the other hand is both multimodal (it uses speech, non-verbal communication and so on) and multimedial (it addresses the eye and the ear and potentially also touch, smell and taste). […] All this speaks for the relative independence of mode and medium.

within a common trend of cooperation and good disposition in the exchange, even if conflict over topics or ideas being expressed arises (Alexieva, 1999:350). However, the prevalence of politeness and good will may produce ambiguous utterances and inferences (propositional and relational) (Alexieva, 2001:121-124), particularly when the participants wish to hide a less cooperative attitude. This may entail certain interactional and discursive complexities for the interpreter, which can be manifested in face protection moves, shifts of footing, repair strategies, etc.

- The factors determining the choice of the optimum mode of interpreting. Alexieva (2001:121) argues that it is the setting which ultimately determines the mode of interpreting:

  The dialogue form of the interview suggest that the best option in this case is conference interpreting (CI), which lends a more natural rhythm to the interaction. However, the shortage of time TV programmers always complain of, recommends simultaneous interpreting (SI) as less time consuming. But there are other factors which work against the choice of SI, and these are: (1) The effect the mode of interpreting has on the Trust/Distrust parameter, and (2) the time the two primary interlocutors have for making decisions about their next move, for which CI creates more favourable conditions.

Arguable as this reasoning may be, Alexieva (2001) opens a space for exploring the circumstances surrounding the choice of the mode of interpreting.

In spite of certain gaps in Alexieva’s work (1999, 2001), which relate to the lack of illustrative examples from her data, or the failure to apply any dialogically based methodology (i.e. CA or even CDA), the typology of events, the parameters for the analysis of this interaction and the subsequent finding of specific features were pioneering in the field of MI. Furthermore, Alexieva’s focus may lie on TV interpreting, but it is important to highlight that she admits potential differences with other media, notably radio, particularly when it comes to the ‘polysemiotic type of text’ (1999:338). By outlining the specific features of TV live interview interpreting which suggests the requirement of specific professional skills and knowledge - which can be acquired through specialised training - Alexieva (1999, 2001) is indirectly

---

II.1.3 The Study of Media-Specific Constraints Influencing the Interpreter’s Role and Performance

In this sub-section, I will review studies focusing on how media environments and settings specifically shape the interpreter's role (Katan and Straniero Sergio 2001, 2003; Kurz and Bros-Brann 1996, Mack 2002, Straniero Sergio 2012) and performance (Kurz and Pöchhacker 1995, Viaggio 2001). The aim of this section is to critically review research literature focusing on the study of features and constraints which make interpreting in the media a specific socially situated interaction. This will help to explore the hypothesised specificity of interpreter-mediated live radio interviews.

Katan and Straniero Sergio (2003) explore the submerged ideologies and subsequent production practices when it comes to organising and broadcasting interpreter-mediated TV events (cf. previous discussion in section II.1.2). Their analysis suggests that the ideologies of consumer capitalism and popular culture in entertainment TV shows mould the interpreter’s identity, belief system and role around the mediated event (Katan and Straniero Sergio, 2003:135). They find evidence of this ‘moulding’ in the following interpreting/interpreter-related interactional features:

- The interpreting modality is chosen according to broadcasting requirements and arrangements (usually by programme directors and producers), such as perceived audience interests and profile (Katan and Straniero Sergio, 2003:141) and technical arrangements.

- The presenter’s control on the interpreter’s interaction as the most salient form of institutional gatekeeping (cf. Alexieva 1999, 2001). In this regard, Katan and Straniero Sergio (2003:142) note:

  It may well be that the presenter actually takes the interpreter’s turn, either anticipating or overlapping the official interpreter’s translation. Alternatively the presenter may reformulate, integrate, distort or comment on the interpreter’s words. In each case, the presenter is in competition with the interpreter. This rivalry can generate tension and conflict particularly when the presenter, replacing the interpreter, insists on his or her own personal version. This particular behaviour is part of the more general requirement to make the translated text more interesting, entertaining or newsworthy.
The role of the interpreter is, then, not only confined to strict interlingual transfer, which affects his/her status and identity. Thus, interactionally-oriented research (cf. Straniero Sergio 1999, as discussed in section II.1.4.) can shed light on how: 

Interlingual transfer is not only the interpreter’s habitus, but may well be co-managed by the talkshow host (or journalist). The results may be a more creative interpretation where meaning is cooperatively negotiated through two mediators. (Katan and Straniero Sergio, 2003:143)

Particularly illustrative of how the interpreter’s status and identity are challenged by the programme's submerged ideology and shaped via the presenter is the case of consecutive/dialogue interpreting in TV talk shows, where “the TV host’s institutional identity de facto also encompasses translation and interaction (e.g. turn-taking, interrupting and topic agenda setting)” (Katan and Straniero Sergio, 2003:144), hence taking over some of the interpreter's habitus, even though he/she does not have the status of interpreter.

Having acknowledged that the interpreter’s role, status and identity are challenged and shaped by the media institution as Katan and Straniero Sergio (2003) do, it is then possible to establish categories of communicative and discoursal features of the particular media environment - as produced by the media institution - and put mechanisms in place to analyse how they determine the interpreter-mediated interaction.

Katan and Straniero Sergio (2001) embark on a deeper critical analysis of interpreter-mediated communication and interaction in TV entertainment through an ‘ethical lens’. Although ethics are not at the core of my research, it is relevant to view the analytical approach and issues dealt with by Katan and Straniero Sergio (2001) as a tool which can go beyond the study of interpreter-mediated events in the media and, therefore, cannot be overlooked when studying radio interpreting.

The aim of Katan and Straniero Sergio (2001) is to investigate the evolving - yet unresolved - ethics in TV entertainment and talk show interpreting. They study the constraints influencing the interpreter’s performance in TV talk shows, which subsequently determine the media interpreter’s role, and the ethics surrounding it. Their standpoint is that there are intrinsic factors within the media entertainment industry that are challenging the traditional role of the TV interpreter, that of an ‘invisible black box’,
understood as an unreserved loyalty to the source text and a clear-cut role definition (Katan and Straniero Sergio, 2001:213).

Following a brief review of talk shows within the entertainment industry, drawing on CDA (e.g. Fairclough 1992, Livingstone and Lunt 1994) and sociolinguistics (e.g. Goffman 1981 and Linell 1998), the authors offer a critical framework for analysis. Their main consideration is that the entertainment function prevails over the information function (Katan and Straniero Sergio, 2001:214). Talk shows are also described as “a mixture of genres imported from other fields such as the interview, discussion/debate, romance, testimony, confession, drama and story-telling” (Katan and Straniero Sergio, 2001:215), which occurs via a transformation process described in terms of ‘interdiscursivity’ (Fairclough 1992). Within this mixture, the talk-in-interaction in TV talk shows, although institutionalised and simulated, resembles that of ordinary conversation, that is, being ‘non task-related’ (Goffman 1981, Linell 1981) and with no clear intention to discuss a specific topic (Katan and Straniero Sergio, 2001:215). The interactional complexity of this type of programmes is increased by the emphasis on display, shock and confrontation (Richardson and Meinhoff, 1999:131-132), their polythematic character (Charaudau and Ghiglione, 1997:135) and their different types (e.g. personality-type, issue-type, elite, vox pop, celebrity, daytime, current affairs, consumer affairs, etc.).41


These three factors are very much in line with the discourse analysis model followed by Hatim and Mason (1990), which takes into account the pragmatic, the semiotic and the communicative dimensions of text and talk. Hence, within the theoretical field, there are links that could be drawn between professional skills and the pragmatic dimension, the comfort factor and the communicative dimension, and the cultural context and the semiotic dimension.

Heavily influenced by these three factors, the interpreter carries out certain actions within the media interactional framework which are not so frequent in other interpreter-mediated situations and, most importantly, are medium-specific: explications when facing ambiguity or lack of clarity,\footnote{Which usually entails “repair and story-telling”, referred to by Straniero Sergio (1999:316; see section II.1.4, this chapter).} which are highly motivated by the ideology of popular culture and by ‘emotainment’ as the prevailing function (Katan and Straniero Sergio, 2001:219); a greater involvement in the management of meanings and discourse via ‘contextualization cues’ (Gumperz 1992) for the benefit of the viewers as a recurrent feature (Katan and Straniero Sergio, 2001:220). Following their study, Katan and Straniero Sergio (2001:220) argue that “it is clear from our corpus that the talkshow interpreter is much more involved in creating topic coherence than would be expected or tolerated in other interpreting situations”.

With further analysis of the interpreters’ ‘perceptual positions’ (Katan and Straniero Sergio, 2001:220), and an account of the talk show interpreters’ increased interactional flexibility to levels that are “almost inconceivable (and ethically unacceptable) for other dialogue interpreters”, the authors claim that linguistic features such as embellishing and enriching the message to project a positive image, and to protect the interpreter’s personal and public ‘face’ are brought to the fore in the setting of TV talk shows (Katan and Straniero Sergio, 2001:224).

With interactional evidence provided through illustrative examples from their data, Katan and Straniero Sergio (2001:232-234) suggest that it is necessary to re-think the media interpreter's role and ethical framework, that is to open the range of actions that the interpreter “may” and/or “must” deal with in TV talk shows. In this sense, Katan and Straniero Sergio point out that in real practice, at least in the Italian context of their study, the media interpreter’s status has tended towards a role that can be conceptualised as “multivariate mediator” (2001:232). Under this umbrella, the interpreter’s role “requires a profound sense of limits, an ability to oscillate between distance and involvement by adopting a third perceptual position in order to co-manage the talk event and packaging of actions” (Katan and Straniero Sergio, 2001:232).

Having this complex role, the ethical norms usually applied to conference and public
service interpreters are not fully applicable in the MI context, namely on TV talk shows, where ethical barriers also exist, but are determined by comfort, respect for capacity and culture (Katan and Straniero Sergio, 2001:232). This multifaceted role thus forges a new model of interpreting ethics (Katan and Straniero Sergio, 2001:234), which they propose to be based on “the three ‘C’ factors (comfort, capacity and culture)”: (1) interpreters (as the primary participants) need to work within their “comfort zones”; (2) interpreters need certain professional skills, which include public communication skills and making themselves respected as fully-ferged professional participants; and (3), the interpreters’ behaviour should be coherent with the particular media context of television and the culture of its broadcasting scope.

Beyond their ethical claims, Katan and Straniero Sergio (2001) offer structural and methodological contributions which are key to my study of interpreter-mediated radio interviews, since they include a theoretical and methodological framework which is aimed at uncovering specific interactional aspects of interpreter-mediated media events which had not been researched in radio settings before this thesis (see chapters IV and V).

Kurz and Bros-Brann (1996) also look at the specific constraints of the medium (TV) for live interpreting: constraints on the interpreting mode, on the broadcast output of the interpreting and, ultimately, on the interpreter's skills and profile. Although their analysis and conclusions exhibit a certain degree of judgment and prescriptivism, it is still relevant to review Kurz and Bros-Brann’s study in terms of the specificities they claim for this interpreting environment.

In this regard, I review Kurz and Bros-Brann’s (1996) study on live interpreting for TV, with special focus on the influence of the non-visible context (off-stage) on the primary participants and the interpreter.

In contrast to other fields of interpreting - particularly conference interpreting - where

---

43 Particularly illustrative of this prescriptive approach is the inclusion of a document produced by Bros-Brann in 1991 and sent to the AIIC, entitled *Ce qu’il faut savoir lorsqu’on utilise l’interprétation simultanée à la télévision*, as an annex to their study (Kurz and Bros-Brann, 1996:214-216).

44 Although Kurz and Bros-Brann’s study focuses on television and SI, they acknowledge that there is a long tradition of interpreting practice in radio (1996:207). However, it must be noted that they do not reference any study on the field, nor justify why radio is left out in their study.
participants and audience can react to each other's utterances via non-verbal communication or even direct questions, in TV and radio broadcasting communication with the audience is unidirectional (Kurz and Bros-Brann, 1996:214):

Le téléspectateur ou l’auditeur ne peut pas indiquer verbalement ou de quelque autre manière qu’il ne comprend pas l’information. L’interprète doit donc s’efforcer de coordonner son message avec les images émises, pouvant occasionnellement faire un commentaire pour lever toute ambiguïté… […] L’interprétation reste sa responsabilité primordiale, mais lorsque c’est nécessaire, il doit aider les récepteurs à saisir le contexte de la communication.45

Conceptualising interpreter-mediated media interaction in these terms contributes to developing a framework for the analysis of interactional features such as contextualisation cues and footing shifts by the interpreter for the purposes of reaching his/her perceived or ‘imaginary’ audience (Strolz, 1997:194).

The off-screen communicative level mentioned above (i.e. the audience and the TV initiators), is a significant constraint for Kurz and Bros-Brann (1996). They argue that, since the audience is not made aware of the production mechanisms and arrangements to provide simultaneous interpreting in a TV broadcast, they have expectations that are media-infused: “Le public, ayant certaines attentes, exige aussi d'un interprète la perfection sans avoir une idée des difficultés auxquelles celui-ci doit faire face”46 (Kurz and Bros-Brann, 1996:211). Furthermore, Kurz and Bros-Brann argue that interpreters face highly demanding and critical expectations from TV producers and audiences alike (1996:208), essentially because their performance is “consumed” by the audience as any other broadcasting product offered by mass media (Kurz and Bros-Brann, 1996:211).

One may wonder what Kurz and Bros-Brann (1996:211) mean by “perfection”. What they argue is that interpreter’s perfection is something very close to what the presenter as the media professional does. This also involves a demand for the highest quality from the interpreter with regards to a series of parameters, as is shown in an empirical study based on interviews with the audience and TV representatives (e.g. Kurz and

45 The TV viewer or the listener cannot indicate verbally or otherwise that he [sic] does not understand the information. Therefore, the interpreter must make an effort to coordinate his message with the images being broadcast, being able to occasionally make comments in order to remove any ambiguity… […] Although interpreting remains his primary responsibility, whenever necessary, he must help the receivers to grasp the communicative context (my translation).

46 The audience, having certain expectations, also demands perfection from the interpreter without having any idea of the difficulties that he [sic] must face (my translation).
Kurz and Bros-Brann’s analysis is paralleled by Viaggio (2001:28), who studies the constraints involved in SI for television and other media. He points out that

The media interpreter is called upon a) to bridge a potentially much wider cultural and psychological disparity between the producer of the original speech act and the addressees of the new one, and b) consciously to adapt his own speech act so that it will be immediately intelligible and acceptable to a heterogeneous mass of addressees (often more so than the one originally intended, and certainly incommensurably more so than the audience targeted at a conference).

In their study, Kurz and Bros-Brann consider further ‘difficulties’ in live TV interpreting (1996:212-213) which are medium-specific: the media interpreter should make an effort to be fast and avoid long décalages (gaps), particularly in SI, but also when consecutive interpreting and DI are the mode of interpreting; the interpreter should master the use of the microphone, so that his/her output is not too distant from TV presenters and broadcasters; the interpreter also faces intense psychological and physiological stress (Kurz and Bros-Brann, 1996:212; cf. also Jiménez Serrano 2011, Kurz 2002, Viaggio 2001). What makes these requirements specific to TV (or mass media) interpreting is the fact that the interpreter is aware that he/she could be listened to and/or watched by thousands, even millions, of people; these requirements lead the authors, following Laine (1985:212), to claim that the interpreter must adapt the delivery and style to those of the media professionals, as reflected in grammar structures, voice, intonation, etc. Although their claims regarding the specificity of these requirements may hold true for other interpreting contexts, Kurz and Bros-Brann maintain that the additional public exposure - based on audience figures (1996:213) and audience reception surveys (cf. Kurz 1994) - emphasises the weight of the above mentioned skills in TV interpreting. Hence, Kurz and Bros-Brann (1996:213) acknowledge the need for establishing a new interpreter profile for the media, which is closer to a ‘hybrid’ (Laine, 1985:212) between a good interpreter and a good communicator, to the point of suggesting a new job.

Although stress management is a feature which has received scholarly attention in the field of MI (cf. Kurz 1982, 1997, 2002, Viaggio 2001, Jiménez Serrano 2011), the aims and methodology under which it is studied fall out of the scope of my research, where this feature will only be presented as a phenomenon which may lead to distinctive interactional features in radio settings.

In the illustrative case of Austrian television (Kurz and Bros-Brann, 1996:213), they might be interpreting for around two million people.
profile, that of the ‘interprète-journaliste’ (interpreter-journalist) (Kurz and Bros-Brann, 1996:214).

However, there are certain methodological flaws in both Kurz and Bros-Brann (1996) and Viaggio (2001) which I will avoid in my study: audience interaction and expectations within a given medium and programme need to be studied also via actual interpreter-mediated interactions, by looking at the primary interlocutors’ covert and overt allusions to the audience in their uptakes during the broadcast exchange, as well as at how the interpreter-mediated interaction is organised and broadcast (i.e. situational and technical arrangements). Also, in Kurz and Bros-Brann (1996) (cf. also Chiaro 2002, Jääskeläinen 2003), there is a variable which has not been looked into and which is to be taken into consideration for further research: most of the interpreters I have approached during the realisation of my thesis acknowledge that the fact that the audience may understand English (in the media and elsewhere) produces more stress to those who interpret into or out of English the English-broadcast institution official language than when the interpreting combination involves languages that are not widely spoken by the target audience (e.g. Farsi, Chinese, etc.). This is a common underestimation in IS, which could be tackled by carrying out language-specific research on the issues discussed in this chapter, something that also falls outside the scope of my research.

Mack (2002) takes the example of television to explore new perspectives and challenges for interpreting. Mack (2002:203) claims the need to “improve our understanding of [television] working mechanisms” via the analysis of large collections of recordings of ‘impromptu oral translations’ on Italian television (cf. Straniero Sergio 1999). The aim of Mack’s study is to sketch “a general background for the systematic analysis of characteristics and typologies of orally translated television discourse in Italy” (2002:204), highlighting some of its crucial aspects. The main contributions of Mack (2002) to my research are of a methodological nature: first, the study is based on the analysis of broadcast data; second, it attempts to find ‘systematic’ ways to sketch out the specificity of the interaction in a particular medium of mass communication.

Mack’s study starts off with three theses on the specificity of TV interpreting, compared to other interpreting settings - notably conference interpreting (2002:204):

− television interpreting is indeed substantially different from interpreting in traditional conference settings and ordinary face-to-face communication;
− most of the specific differences between traditional interpreting and television interpreting have not yet been sufficiently investigated;
− the norms of behaviour internalised by professional conference interpreters are not always adequate to television communication, and can even lead to conflicts about the perception of interpretation quality.

Then, Mack (2002:205) singles out the salient peculiarities of media discourse when interpreting is involved:

a. the typically asymmetrical and one-way character of television communication: there is a growing number of recipient subgroups - the television audience [off-screen participants] - who cannot actively participate in the communication process but have the power of (remote) control, accompanied by a shrinking number of producers of messages, the on-screen participants, and an even smaller number of senders distributing the ‘raw material’ (pictures and contents);

b. the industrial character of message production for mass communication, involving enormous personal and technical resources and economic interests, which makes it difficult to identify and clearly distinguish between animator, author and principal of a message.

Mack draws on Hymes’s analysis of communicative events (1974:45-65) - the SPEAKING model - to systematise the salient characteristics of television interpreting (in both consecutive and simultaneous mode): situation (the physical setting), participants (on-screen and off-screen), ends, act sequences, key (as guiding and orienting the interaction), instrumentalities, norms, and genres (e.g. “infotainment”), planned or unplanned media events, and entertainment (Mack, 2002:206-211).

Although Mack (2002) does not offer illustrative data examples in the analysis of each category, the specific aspects of television interpreting highlighted in it point to the potential success in singling out specificities of radio interpreting, with a model that includes detailed interactional occurrences and trends.

---

50 Cf. also Katan and Straniero Sergio (2003).

51 The general discussion for each category is based on the corpus being drawn up under the initiative of Straniero Sergio (cf. 1999) and which later on would become CorIT (cf. Falbo 2012).
In his conclusions, Mack (2002:212) offers a “deliberately provocative statement” issuing from his analysis of interpreters’ performances on Italian TV:

[referring to Italian television] Some of its interpreters still live on the other side of the (media) moon, where the faithful transmission of meaning, even at the expense of form, for a co-operative audience is the supreme goal of interpreting, while others use their power as mediators in a far from impartial way.

It can be argued that the polarisation of interpreters’ performances that Mack suggests, drawing on his data analysis, may be largely due to the fact that there has not been a systematic analysis in research, capable of having an impact and application in practice and training; hence, as Mack states, we can see the consequences in these types of interpreter-mediated events, at least on Italian television.

Beyond the potential considerations on performance, quality, role and ethics - which Mack (2002:212) suggests to further explore - it is first crucial to gain a better understanding of interpreter-mediated interactions so that conclusions and any subsequent guidelines, for example regarding ethics and quality standards, can be comprehensively drawn.

The literature reviewed in this section focuses on the analysis of specific media constraints directly affecting the interpreter, whether in his/her role, identity, the quality of his/her performance or the professional conditions and standards of his/her job. Although my approach is interactionally-oriented, the more interpreter-oriented studies discussed in this section offer issues for exploration and analysis which, if set against the backdrop of the social interaction, will contribute to configuring a methodology for the analysis of interpreter-mediated live radio interviews.

II.1.4 The Analysis of Interpreter-Mediated Interactions in Media Interviews

In this sub-section I will review studies which draw on interactional and dialogical approaches to focus on the analysis of interpreter-mediated interaction in media interviews.

Straniero Sergio (1999) offers one of the first analyses of DI in the media, namely in the context of the televised talk show. Drawing on CA and taking data from a large corpus
of Italian talk shows\textsuperscript{52} (1999:303-304), the author explores how the interpreter's role and
identity are interactionally constructed by participants influenced by this particular
context. He starts by examining some basic conversational aspects that are present in
the social interaction which takes place in television: the television speech context, the
distinction between on-screen and off-screen participants, the function of the presenter,
the use of language and the goal of communication. He uses methods and concepts
developed not only within CA, but also in DA and ethnomethodology, and he finds
common theoretical lines in these disciplines which view language “as an action and as
an instrument of social interaction” (1999:303). Furthermore, he conceptualises context
not only as a constraint on the production of talk, but also as a product of the use of
language, thus acknowledging that ‘context’ has a dynamic character that no analysis of
social interaction should omit. In Straniero Sergio's words: “the analyst must therefore
recognise the mutual role played by language, context and participant cooperation in
shaping speech events” (1999:304).

In his analysis, Straniero Sergio covers the following issues: (a) how the interpreter and
the host change their footings (Goffman 1981) in order to provide a coherent framework
for their speech activities; (b) how the interpreter manages his/her face wants (Brown
and Levinson 1987); (c) how the interpreter contributes to the successful outcome of the
interaction in terms of topic introduction and management, meaning negotiation and
turn-taking coordination (Straniero Sergio, 1999:304).

In his approach to talk show interpreting, he considers first “the televisual
space” (Straniero Sergio, 1999:306),\textsuperscript{53} which is made up of two discourse levels: on the
one hand, the relation between the speakers and the overhearing audience, “the plan of
reporting action”; on the other hand, the relation between the speakers themselves, “the
plan of reported interaction”. In television talk shows or interviews, “the participants
talk among themselves and at the same time talk to the audience” (Straniero Sergio,
1999:306). As is shown in his study, this has important implications for the interaction,
since in this speech context, the interpreter is not the only participant to speak through

\textsuperscript{52} The data analysed in Straniero Sergio's case study consists of a transcript of a talk show where
Straniero Sergio himself acted as interpreter in 1986, and is part of a wider corpus of more than 200
episodes, from more than 40 different Italian talk shows, involving 6 language s and 30 interpreters.

\textsuperscript{53} Straniero Sergio draws on Bondi Paganelli (1990).
the words of others. At the interface between on-screen and off-screen participants, it is
the presenter who has a dual identity and behaves like a member of the audience by
expressing its concerns and expectations in order to make the audience present in the

Secondly, a distinctive feature of the talk show, particularly in multiparty settings, is that
topics continuously shift, and there is not necessarily a logical development of the
content (Straniero Sergio, 1999:307). This unpredictability shows that what counts is
the development of the situation (Straniero Sergio, 1999:307). Hence, as part of the
dynamic notion of context in the interaction “disproportionate emphasis is placed on the
relational level and phatic communication to the detriment of the referential
level” (Straniero Sergio, 1999:307; cf. Mack 2002:209). This means that, in this type of
interactional frameworks, what is more important is that the event ‘carries on’ and
progresses; the ‘how’ takes precedence over the ‘what’. In Straniero Sergio’s view
(1999:306), this involves specific interpreting skills, which are different from those
required in conference interpreting and even other forms of DI. In this sense, it is not
uncommon that broadcasting institutions and audiences expect from the interpreters not
only language skills, but public communication skills, to the point of nearly equating
them with presenters and broadcasters (Straniero Sergio, 1999:308; cf. Kurz and Bros-
Brann 1996).

In talk show interpreting, as a form of interpreter-mediated talk-in-interaction, the
presence of the interpreter is also a contextual resource which the presenter or other
participants may utilise as a form of pre-text to develop and manipulate or, as Straniero
Sergio (1999:308) puts it, to ‘mediatize’. A distinctive feature of this type of media
interaction is observed at the level of register (Straniero Sergio, 1999:308): an
interpreter who expresses something in unmarked language may find his/her utterance
reformulated by the presenter in a more ‘television-friendly’ way.

For his case study, Straniero Sergio (1999) analyses three interactional parameters:
‘footing and interactional identity’,\(^\text{54}\) ‘repair and story-telling’ and ‘turn-taking and
agenda policing’.

\(^\text{54}\) I.e. face.
The analysis of both the verbal and non-verbal (notably prosodic and proxemic) interaction, together with the camera movements as an intrinsic part of the televisual space, shows that footing and face occur specifically in this type of TV talk show. Indeed, this type of analysis allows Straniero Sergio (1999:311) to disentangle the causes of the unfolding and shifting interactional positioning during the exchanges:

The structure of role relationships is embedded not only in the language but also in the spatial organisation of interaction. Spatial positioning and alignments are influenced by and reflect communicative roles enacted in public institutional scenes. [...] Coded spatial arrangement, together with the personality and status of the presenter, are important pragmatic elements in the televised text.

Shifts in the interpreter’s footing can then be observed in terms of the roles that the interpreter assumes in the course of the interaction, whether it is the presenter’s or the interviewee’s. As Straniero Sergio (1999:311) notes, the interpreter footing is generally closer to the presenter, who - as coordinator and regulator of the event - generally expects the interpreter to “stage” his [sic] translation for the benefit of the overhearing audience.

As far as interpreter's face is concerned, Straniero Sergio (1999:312) points out that it is constantly “threatened” during the interaction, most notably by the presenter, in the form of challenging his/her work or questioning translation decisions. These face-threatening acts trigger face-saving and counter-face-threatening acts by the interpreter, subsequent change of footing and, ultimately, an active involvement of the interpreter in the event. In the particular case of TV talk shows, Straniero Sergio (1999:312) argues that “provoking and teasing are part of the narrative structure of the talk show, with the interpreter being both the subject and the object of narration” - which thus offers potential research avenues along the lines of narrative theory and narrative semiotics (cf. Propp 1975, Lyotard 1979 and Greimas 1985). As an illustrative example, Straniero Sergio (1999:315) looks at the presenter’s introduction of the guests at the beginning of the show: the presenter refers to the interpreter as “our interpreter”, followed by the first name and surname; to the eyes and ears of the audience, the interpreter apparently belongs to the talk show cast, irrespective of the procedure followed to hire him/her.

The second interactional parameter under analysis by Straniero Sergio is ‘repair and story telling’ (1999:315-319), which is shared by the presenter and the interpreter.
Interpreted utterances are not limited to the interpreter’s action; they constitute an interactional space, a (meta)discoursal activity, open to all participants (Straniero Sergio, 1999:315-316), not only with regards to content, but also when it comes to managing and negotiating the way the message gets across to the audience (either prior to the broadcast or during the talk show itself): making it more interesting, embellishing it, polishing it, leaving out hedges, self-corrections, hesitations and false starts (Straniero Sergio, 1999:316). Taking into account that interactional features (e.g. controversy and disagreement) are often fictionalised on television and participants argue for the sake of arguing ‘on the stage’, the way repair and story-telling occur within the interpreter-mediated interaction is clearly different from interpreting in other settings, such as the police station or the courtroom (Straniero Sergio, 1999:316). Repair and story-telling in interpreter-mediated media interactions of this type is closely linked to the above referred notion of ‘message mediatization’, or embellishment for audience entertainment purposes.

The third interactional parameter under study by Straniero Sergio (1999) is ‘turn-taking and agenda policing’, that is coordination tasks and the unfolding topics during the talk show interview. Drawing on CA theory, Straniero Sergio implies that the selection of topics and turn-taking organisation are more flexible on television talk shows than in other institutional settings where a more rigid question/answer format may be in place (1999:319). This is because talk shows aim to replicate natural, spontaneous conversation, even if they take place in a form of institutionalised setting (cf. Heritage and Clayman 2010 and III.3).

Finally, the analysis and results obtained in Straniero Sergio’s study (1999:323-324) offer conclusions and suggestions for further research which are directly relevant to my analysis of interpreter-mediated radio interviews:

- A comprehensive study of interpreter-mediated interaction in the media - as in any other social interaction - requires a detailed description of the type of media institution and programme, its setting and other circumstances of the broadcast (e.g. time constraints, technical arrangements) under which the interpreter-mediated interaction takes place. This is key to understanding and explaining how interactional and discoursal features such as spontaneity, controversy, repair,
storytelling, interviewing, etc. occur in that specific interpreter-mediated interaction.

- The role of the interpreter is dependent on that of the presenter, as the latter forces him/her to share the role of ‘animator’ (Straniero Sergio, 1999:323) of the event, as well as to share coordination tasks. Furthermore, the presenter as host exerts interactional control over the guests; this involves regulating access to speaking time and modes as well as constructing participants’ identities, thus having a greater influence in the interaction as well as in shaping the image of the participants in the minds of viewers. Addressing the presenter’s *ethos* within the programme under study is therefore a key aspect to consider in the analysis of the unfolding interpreter-mediated interaction.

- The analysis of footing and face shows that the relation in which the interpreter is cast “is not that of the man in the middle, the neutral link, who doesn’t side with either party, but that of an assistant, someone who collaborates with the presenter” (Straniero Sergio, 1999:315).

- A study of this kind which places focus on the interaction may contribute to elaborating specific ‘interpreting profiles’ which - in the case of media, and particularly TV (talk shows) - have particular features and parameters that must be taken into account, such as communicative style, interactional skills, teamwork organisation, reaction time, turn-taking, meaning negotiation and cooperation, language use and register, all of them highly influenced by the TV setting.

- In order to provide a more comprehensive and accurate analysis, research has to shift from cognitive to sociolinguistic approaches based on empirical observation of situations and behaviours for a more accurate description of what interpreters do in the media and their (perceived) role in the specific context of TV interpreting. This, in turn, may help to improve interpreter training programmes.

Straniero Sergio’s interactional analysis and conclusions on the participation, role and profile of the interpreter on TV talk shows shed light on the categories for the study of interpreter-mediated live interviews and hence, a similar interactionally-oriented
analysis can be applied to the radio context, using actual broadcast data.

The contribution of Straniero Sergio (1999) to media DI research is clearly noticed in his later works - most notably in Straniero Sergio (2011) and Straniero Sergio and Falbo (2012b) - where he looks further into the specificity of television interpreting (Straniero Sergio 2012), offering an account of the specific features of DI in TV talk shows, such as the primacy of ‘participation control’ (notably by the host) over ‘participation coordination’ (2012:71). Drawing on CA and politeness theory, Straniero Sergio (2012) points out repairing actions, as well as other conversational moves (formulations, competitive interruptions, anticipatory completions) as evidence of that ‘control’, which is exerted in accordance with the entertaining function of talk shows (Straniero Sergio, 2012:94).

Methodologically, it is also worth remarking how in Straniero Sergio’s later works on interpreter-mediated media interactions (i.e. 2007 and 2012) CA gains importance as part of his methodology (with respect to DA and ethnomethodology, co-present with CA in Straniero Sergio 1999), in order to enable an understanding of the interactional features of the interpreter-mediated events under analysis.

Wadensjö (2000, 2008a, 2008b) also provides key research on interpreter-mediated media interactions which follows interactionistic approaches, in this case to show different features of media (news) interviews. Given the similar methodologies and analysis carried out in Wadensjö 2000, 2008a and 2008b, I place particular focus on Wadensjö (2000), where she uses radio broadcasting data: Wadensjö (2000) explores the interpreter’s performance in an interpreter-mediated political interview with Russian politician Boris Yeltsin, broadcast live on Swedish radio. The aim of Wadensjö’s analysis of this unique interview live on air (2000:235) is (1) “to shed light on social processes typically at work in this kind of social event” (2000:233) and (2) “to demonstrate what kind of knowledge one may generate when applying an interactionistic approach to research on (dialogue) interpreting” (2000:234). It must be pointed out that the backbone of Wadensjö’s (2000) study is not the potential medium-driven genuineness or specificity of the radio interview but the nature of the assignment, the communicative genre (i.e. ‘news interview talk’) and the journalists’ way of conducting broadcast talk ‘for absent overhearers’ (cf. Bell 1984, 1997; Heritage, 1985.
and Hutchby 1995; see III.2.1.3). As Wadensjö claims, drawing on her analysis, these were the aspects which first and foremost affected the interpreter’s performance (2000:233); this performance, in turn, had an impact on how Yeltsin was presented to the Swedish audience.

In order to fulfil her aims and validate her claims, Wadensjö approaches them from three angles (2000:237): firstly, an extensive open-ended interview with the interpreter; secondly, a transcription of the whole radio interview; thirdly, a CA exploration of how the interview was organised at sequential, turn-by-turn level. What each methodological tool allowed Wadensjö to do is as follows. Firstly, she presented the interpreter’s recollections of the radio events and comments on his own performance. This ran parallel with Wadensjö’s own investigation of the context in which the interview occurred and the particular circumstances in which it was broadcast (Wadensjö, 2000:235-236). This quest allowed Wadensjö to analyse and explain features of the broadcast interaction taking into account what happened off air (cf. Korolija 1999). Secondly, the transcription offered the possibility to quantify the interpreter's speaking times with respect to Yeltsin and the journalists, as well as to trace linguistic features, following a talk-as-text model (Wadensjö, 2000:242-243, drawing on Berk-Seligson 1990), comparing Yeltsin’s and the journalists’s originals with the interpreter’s renditions. Thirdly, CA allowed Wadensjö to find out how the presentation of Yeltsin was interactively accomplished, with the interpreter’s management of both linguistic transfer and coordination tasks contributing to this.

This methodology admittedly has its own shortcomings: the retrospective interview is only carried out with the interpreter; even if the information that the interpreter provided is highly valuable (Wadensjö, 2000:240) it is still a one-sided view of the event and it raises the question of how much understanding the analyst could gain from interviewing the journalists and the interviewee; furthermore, Wadensjö (2000:238) remarks that “quite some time had passed” between the broadcast interview and the retrospective interview. Furthermore, Wadensjö only had access to the radio interview as it was broadcast; as she acknowledges in her ‘first impressions’ of the radio interview (2000:237); as an analyst, her position was quite similar to that of the listener. However, visual access to a radio interview could provide a richer insight into how the
link between the off-air and the on-air levels of communication is achieved by the active participants, i.e. the production crew (c.f. Interview 5 of my data in chapter V). This links to a further shortcoming in Wadensjö’s (2000) methodological approach: medium-specific features are not reflected in her research premises, while the communicative genre (Baker 1997) is part of them. Nevertheless, with this first scholarly exploration devoted exclusively to a radio interview, the door is open to analyses of the specificity of the medium and its influence on the different aspects of the interpreter-mediated interaction, including the situational arrangements, production constraints and the broadcast interaction itself.

In sum, Wadensjö (2000) shows how the interpreter in news interview talk on radio contributes to the co-construction of the interviewee’s presentation of him-/herself to the presenters/journalists and the overhearing audience and, in contrast to other institutional settings where DI takes place (cf. Englund Dimitrova 1997, Wadensjö 1998, Straniero Sergio 1999, Roy 2000), in the radio interview “the interpreter seems to be concerned not only about the understanding of those interacting, but also about the comprehension of the overhearing audience” (Wadensjö, 2000:249), while not being able to get feedback from that audience (cf. Alexieva 2001).

Wadensjö (2000) puts forward an analysis which opens the doors to an investigation of possible interactional trends based on the specificity of radio live interviewing (along the categories suggested by Mack 2002 and Straniero Sergio 1999, and using CA methodology supported by other methods). In this regard, Wadensjö’s (2000) contribution to the field is two-fold: first, methodological, with an interactionistic approach which, in addition, uses several angles to look at the interaction; second, analytical, since that methodology allows for a more complex, comprehensive and detailed insight into this type of interpreter-mediated interaction where claims can be made about how aspects and features of interpreter-mediated live radio interviews can be genuinely radiophonic.

In this section, I have offered a review of different insights into the specificity of interpreter-mediated interactions in media interviews, with a view to finding a methodological and analytical shared ground for exploring interpreter-mediated live radio interviews. Whereas authors such as Straniero Sergio (1999, 2011 and 2012) offer

II.2 Overall Contributions of Media Interpreting Literature to the Study of Interpreter-Mediated Live Radio Interviews

The critical review of academic literature on MI in this chapter aims to provide my research with a solid theoretical MI framework, as well as helping to develop a critical approach to my field of study. The contributions of MI literature to my study can be summarised as follows:

− The social interaction is determined by its context of production, in this case the media. MI research has approached the impact of the broad factors governing the exchange for different purposes (e.g. policies and approaches to MI, context-based features and constraints, interactional analysis, quality and ethics). The common ground I have found across studies focusing on the broader media context when interpreting is involved (see sections II.1.1 and II.1.2) is the critical effort to provide an account of the media institutions, programmes and/or events in which interpreter-mediated exchanges occur. This broad context is essentially characterised by the co-existence of two levels of discourse and communication, the on-screen level and the off-screen level, and the relational interaction (implicit or explicit) between the on-screen participants and the off-screen participants, i.e. the audience as the primary addressee of the communicative event, the producer/s, the broadcasting institution and, in varying degrees of involvement, the external event organisers - e.g. a film festival which manages the time and arrangements for its guest(s) to be interviewed. Framing the analysis under the primacy of this overarching relationship has proven to help to elucidate the great number of interactional processes and features which are conditioned by the individual requirements of the two levels.
- The specificity of the media context entails that the initiators’ aims of the communicative event, as well as their expectations and those of the audience, are highly specific too; they greatly differ from other interpreter-mediated social interactions (as noted, for example, in Kurz and Pöchhacker 1995, Wadensjö 2000, Katan and Straniero Sergio 2001, 2003, Straniero Sergio 2003, 2011). In the case of the media, the literature places emphasis on context-induced interactional situations which lead the participants’ interactions to give prominence to the so-called relational level over the referential level (cf. Straniero Sergio 1999, Mack 2002). This is mainly due to the information plus entertainment - or infotainment- (Katan and Straniero Sergio 2001, Mack 2002) character which is intrinsic to the TV programmes discussed in this chapter. Infotainment also involves subsequent expectations from the media institution (most notably and visibly the programme’s host) and the audience; the aims, the infotainment character and style and the submerged ideologies of the media institution/programme play a key role in determining what is considered the “comfort factor” during the interaction (cf. Katan and Straniero Sergio 2001, 2003). This factor, as subjective and elusive as it may appear conceptually, is essential to every broadcast production, affecting not only the interaction, but also the situational arrangements and final broadcast output.

- The interpreter-mediated social interaction which takes places in the media context is highly specific, as is shown in different aspects and issues regarding communication, discourse processes, participants' relations and, in a dynamic way, the context itself:

  * Face: the media interpreter is highly visible, in terms of the interactional involvement - particularly in the case of DI or consecutive interpreting and public exposure; however, the interpreter (like the host and the interviewee/s) is remotely connected to the audience for which the interaction is organised and broadcast. This involves a ‘footing’ - in Goffman’s terms (1981:128) - which places the interpreter quite close to the presenter, very often from the start of the event. However, as it occurs with

the interactional re-contextualisation of the event, ‘positioning’ (Mason, 2009:53) and face are dynamically altered in the course of the social interaction. The public face of the interpreter can be addressed, challenged or interpellated - overtly or covertly - in order to make the interaction progress according to the media institution’s discoursal, propositional and interactional lines and interests. This may even lead the interpreter to become the focus of attention, usually for infotainment purposes. Analytically, what may prove highly revealing is the interactional uptake of the interpreter to different face threatening acts; that is, his/her ‘face saving’ devices and how they are driven by the ‘comfort factor’ and ‘media public exposure’.

- Taking part in a mass media event may provide the interpreter with a status and space which can also be continuously threatened. The interpreting space is not reserved only for the interpreter and can be frequently accessed by the other participants in the event (mainly the presenter/host, but also other members of the media crew) or at least they attempt to access it - with varying degrees of success. Nevertheless, the space provided by the media context to the interpreter, as shown in the literature, offers a great deal of flexibility for the interpreter’s decision-making and actions. This discussion opens the possibility to adopt Mason’s (2009) appeal in DI studies to consider ‘positioning’ over ‘role’ when analysing interpreter-mediated exchanges/events in the media. This shift might answer many of the questions addressed by authors which have placed emphasis on role - and consequently ‘profile’ or ‘prototype’ - as a more static category (e.g. Kurz and Pöchhacker 1995, Kurz and Bros-Brann 1996, Viaggio 2001, Chiaro 2002, Katan and Straniero Sergio 2001, 2003, Jiménez Serrano 2011).

Understanding the interpreter's interaction in terms of ‘positioning’ when analysing data including interpreter-mediated broadcast interactions offers a dynamic approach, in contrast to fairly static, pre-determined, institutionally oriented notions of ‘role’.
• Negotiation of meaning, situational arrangements, roles, tasks, positioning and power relations takes place in very different participation frameworks (cf. Gieve and Norton 2007), with the most general distinction being the on-the-record and off-the-record levels of communication, including prior to and during the event. As a specific feature of MI, when that negotiation takes place on-air, data shows that interpreters tend to use interactional mechanisms which are based on cooperation and politeness (cf. Alexieva 1999, Katan and Straniero Sergio 2003), given the nature of the media event, as discussed in the section devoted to the ‘broad context’ (II.1.1). However, there is still a lot of research to be carried out with regards to how negotiation occurs off-air.

• High communicative goals and expectations. The “comfort factor”, understood as an intrinsic, context-induced element of media interviews, requires certain communicative skills from the interpreter which are expected by the initiators and the audience alike (cf. Kurz and Pöchhacker 1995, Kurz 2001). Interactionally, this does not only affect the interpreter, but also, the host: repair, reformulation and story-telling by the host - occupying at times the space that is supposed to be reserved for the interpreter - are frequently observed when the host considers that a particular utterance is not well fitted for or not conveyed properly in the framework of the communicative event. Hence, the goals and expectations of the host - and, subsequently, the interpreter - in terms of a successful broadcast are interactionally expressed following the ‘comfort factor’, as perceived and created within the particular media programme they are interacting in.

- Methodologically, a link between the literature discussed in chapters I and II can be drawn in order to consider the contributions to the methods and models I put in place for the study of interpreter-mediated live radio interviews. In this respect, approaching this socially situated interaction involves (i) a study and description of the reasons, the strategies, the conventions and/or policies surrounding broadcast interpreter-mediated events (cf. Gieve and Norton 2007, Jiménez Serrano 2011); (ii)
the configuration of a representative corpus, including exceptional cases (cf. Straniero Sergio 1999, 2011, Wadensjö 2000); (iii) the configuration of a subsequent typology of interpreter-mediated interviews based on that corpus (cf. Alexieva 2001); and (iv) an analytic model for the systematic study of the interaction included in that corpus (cf. Wadensjö 2000, 2008a, 2008b, Mack 2002, Straniero Sergio, 1999, 2012). Taking a holistic view which encompasses the research literature discussed in this chapter, it can be argued that the study of interpreter-mediated live radio interviews requires interactionistic approaches that fulfil the overarching aim of gaining a deeper understanding of what happens and why it happens the way it does in these types of encounters. A mixed method approach (cf. Straniero Sergio 1999 and Wadensjö 2000, Katan and Straniero Sergio 2001) acknowledges that tackling interpreter-mediated interactions from different angles is not only desirable, but required. The expected outcomes of research of this type are not so much aimed at tangible results, but at offering common interactional trends, open findings and a multi-layered discussion which, nonetheless, allows for the formulation of strong and cohesive claims.

- There is a significant body of research literature pointing at the high level of pressure and stress (cf. Kurz and Bros-Brann 1996, Viaggio 2001, Kurz 2002, Jiménez Serrano 2011) mainly due to the public exposure to mass audiences. Although stress measurement during the live broadcast interaction falls out of the scope of my research, it is a category that cannot be overlooked, as existing research suggests.

- All these specific aspects of MI have tended to lead to an agreement amongst scholars (and practitioners) on the interpreter’s specific communicative skills when working in or for the media and, hence, the need for establishing - or at least opening up a discussion to sketch out - a media interpreter’s profile, whose features would include:

  • The media interpreter as a hybrid (cf. Laine 1985, Kurz and Bros-Brann 1996) between an interpreter (in the traditional-conventional sense seen in conference interpreting56 and also within PSI57) and a host/
This involves a certain level of teamwork - particularly with the host/journalist - reaction time, turn-taking, meaning negotiation and cooperation, language use and register (cf. Straniero Sergio 1999).

The media interpreter, being aware of the two levels of communication (on-stage/off-stage) on which the interaction takes place, implements strategies to create his/her space, identity and his/her own decision-making processes to interact in the event. This, in turn, shows the interpreter’s perception and constructed identity of the other participants and vice versa, having an impact on the interaction, which - the interpreter is well aware - occurs first and foremost for the the audience, within the format and style of the particular programme/event.

Whether the specificity of the media context is explored in terms of the need for a specific job profile (the media interpreter), a call for an ethics of MI, evidencing increased stress levels or requiring appropriate quality criteria, all these analyses and discussions within the field of MI point to a clear manifestation of specific and genuine pragmatic, communicative and semiotic dimensions (Hatim and Mason 1990) in interpreter-mediated events. Given the sub-fields and settings in MI which are yet to be explored, such as live radio interviews, I consider that at this point in research on the field, primacy should be given to the understanding of the social interaction, including the broad context, the local context and the sequential development of the interpreter-mediated talk-in-interaction. Wadensjö (2000:251), following her study of one interpreter-mediated live radio interview, concludes: “the interpreter took responsibility for helping the interlocutors to make their conversation appear as a planned, goal oriented, joint and coherent activity”. Although Wadensjö’s conclusion needs to be corroborated via the analysis of a larger corpus of radio interviews, if this were the case, it would be part and parcel of such further research to evidence the ways in which interpreters on radio take - or shirk - that responsibility and whether there are genuinely radiophonic ways of doing it. This is a challenge which I take up in this thesis.

With different terminology, but similar description, Katan and Straniero Sergio (2001:231) use the above mentioned concept “multivariated mediator”.

---

58 With different terminology, but similar description, Katan and Straniero Sergio (2001:231) use the above mentioned concept “multivariated mediator”.
Having carried out this literature review on MI, a further critical discussion is required to answer the question asked in the introduction to this chapter: “Why has such scarce scholarly attention been paid to radio interpreting and live radio interviews while, nonetheless, it is a communicative setting which generates a large number of interpreter-mediated events, compared to other media platforms[?]”. Indeed, radio interpreting is still a largely unexplored field into which research is almost non-existent. The focus heavily lies on television and IS, while the vast and prolific development of Radio Studies (RS) within the field of Media Studies (cf. Chignell 2009 and Sterling 2009) is ignored. Different reasons could be pointed out for this research gap: firstly, an argument for not having enough data, which would be indicative of a marginal number of interpreter-mediated events in radio. Secondly, and subsequent to the first reason, an apparent difficulty in gathering or recording data. Thirdly, a suggested - or rather presupposed - similar interaction to that taking place in TV (cf. Kurz and Bros-Brann 1996, Alexieva 1999, 2001) or other interpreting settings. Fourthly, a lack of attention and interest by scholars, both from MS and IS. While the fourth reason holds true according to the mentioned lack of literature on the field, the first three reasons lack empirical support and can be refuted (see chapter VI).

Finally, this literature review has contributed to point out issues that research still has not dealt with in the field of radio interpreting and, therefore, are to be addressed in my study as part of my research objectives:

- Firstly, there are two basic studies which are yet to be carried out on radio: (i) the circumstances bringing about interpreter-mediated radio interviews and (ii) production issues (i.e. interpreter provision, situational and technical arrangements, broadcast output), and their impact on the broadcast interaction. Such studies would also reveal trends and conventions (along the lines of Gieve and Norton 2007 and Castillo 2012 with regards to TV production), as well as underlying attitudes towards foreign language transfer and representation (cf. Gieve and Norton 2007) and submerged ideologies in the organisation of interpreter-mediated events (cf. Katan and Straniero Sergio 2003).

59 A thorough study of the provision of interpreters in radio programmes would provide more accurate data on the prevalence of the journalist as interpreter (cf. Chiaro 2002, Jääskeläinen 2003) or the diplomat service interpreter (cf. Wadensjö, 2000, 2008b), for example.
More specifically, there is no study to date attempting to document and categorise interpreter-mediated events across different programmes or genres (e.g. news interviews, talk shows, specialised programmes’ interviews, etc.), broadcasting times (e.g. prime-time/mainstream, late-night/small audiences), media institutions (e.g. public, private radio institutions), or languages. Indeed, the question of where to find larger amounts of interpreter-mediated ‘air time’ is as yet unresolved.

The coverage of interpreter-mediated events outside the radio broadcasting premises where the programme/show takes place, that is, the broadcast of ‘cross-media’ events (Davidson 2010) has not been addressed yet, even if some studies have pointed to their specificity when interpreting is involved (cf. Straniero Sergio 2003, Jiménez Serrano 2011).

The manifestation of media features such as the comfort factor (Straniero Sergio 1999, Katan and Straniero Sergio 2003) and public exposure (Kurz 2002, Katan and Straniero Sergio 2003, Jiménez Serrano 2011) and how they are managed interactionally in radio interpreting merit researching. Furthermore, the specificity of radio communication and production points at the potential existence of specific interactional features in this type of social interaction, as Wadensjö (2000) pointed out in the first investigative approach to interpreter-mediated radio interviews.

The different attempts in the literature to sketch a profile of the media interpreter do not endeavour to elucidate a ‘sociology’ of the media interpreter: that is, conventions for the provision of interpreters, professional conditions and standards. Moreau (1998) addresses these issues, but only for the particular case of ARTE and from a corporate point of view. Such a sociology, together with the suggested need for framing the profile of the media interpreter, might point at a job profile which is not only a ‘hybrid’ with regards to the skills, but also the status, that is, a mid-way between a conference interpreter and a public service

---

60 This could also be applied to TV, with the exception of the CorIt corpus and its related studies (cf. Dal Fovo 2011, Falbo 2012).
interpreter (particularly in the case of interpreters in public service broadcasting institutions).

- The specificity of radio interpreting could also be shown via comparative studies with TV. For example, in contrast to the polysemiotic nature of the televisual text (cf. Alexieva 1999), radio does not offer this visual support to the listener and, therefore, the level of multimodality available to the interpreter and the listeners differs considerably between radio and TV. In this sense, it can be stated that the spoken word in radio broadcasting is *liberated* from the image on the screen, as well as being the backbone for creating content, feelings, mental images, etc., with the potential support of other non-verbal codes, such as music or ambient sound, which may entail other types of strategies when it comes to dealing with these simultaneous sound codes.

There is, therefore, a strong case for arguing that the specificity of radio broadcasting with regards to the way an interpreter-mediated interaction is conceptualised, arranged and how it unfolds is, overall, unexplored. This gap in IS makes it impossible to extrapolate issues of quality and ethics (e.g. Kurz and Pöchhacker 1995, Kurz 2002 and Katan and Straniero Sergio 2001) to radio interpreting, as well as other claims made for TV interpreting, as discussed in this chapter. Such tasks depend heavily on research which, first and foremost, documents interpreter-mediated radio events and carries out subsequent interactional analyses, as I endeavour in this thesis.
Chapter III. Conversation Analysis: Theory, Methods and Practices

This section focuses on CA as a model for the study of social interaction, with a view to exploring its theoretical, methodological and analytical contributions to my study of interpreter-mediated live radio interviews. First, I will review the foundations of CA, its key theories, concepts and the methodological implications for the study of social interaction and - more precisely - the talk-in-interaction which unfolds. Secondly, I will focus on specific CA research-based studies in the field of media - or broadcast talk. Thus, I aim to find a solid background where CA can serve as the core methodology for my research, providing analytical tools that contribute to widening the knowledge and understanding of interpreter-mediated live radio interviews.

Although an extensive review of CA, its origins, developments, discussions generated with other approaches and applications within the social sciences falls outside the scope of this research, it is nevertheless relevant to highlight CA’s enormous contribution to the study of a vast range of human activities in sociology, linguistics, social psychology and anthropology, including Interpreting and Media Studies. By putting CA into perspective within these fields and across its nearly fifty years of scholarly existence, I will map out the key concepts and tools that CA offers to my research.

III.1 CA’s Theoretical and Methodological Contributions to the Study of Talk

First of all, I will undertake a brief discussion around an encompassing definition of CA. The aim is to offer a first basic point of departure for the conceptualisation of CA in the framework of my study. CA is the “systematic analysis of the talk produced in everyday situations of human interaction: talk-in-interaction” (Hutchby and Wooffitt, 2008:11). In this brief and apparently simple definition, ‘talk’ is identified as “the primordial locus for sociality” (Schegloff 1987) and is conceptualised as a “highly organized, socially ordered phenomenon” (Hutchby and Wooffitt, 2008:11, drawing on Sacks 1992). What does this definition involve? What does does it mean in CA to ‘systematically analyse talk’? And, most crucially, what for?

First of all, CA involves a view of talk which is much more complex than the attempt to exchange information or convey messages between two or more speaker-hearers. As Hutchby and Wooffitt (2008:1) argue, participants in conversation are seen “as mutually
orienting to, and collaborating in order to achieve, orderly and meaningful communication”. Thus, Hutchby and Wooffitt (2008:1) point out, the aim of CA is:

...to reveal the organized reasoning procedures which inform the production of naturally occurring talk. The way in which utterances are designed is informed by procedures, methods and resources, which are tied to the contexts in which they are produced and are available to participants.

Therefore, analytically speaking, CA aims at explicating these reasoning procedures, as well as the interactional phenomena attached to them.

CA is a data-driven theory, methodology, and mentality (Schenkein 1978). When approaching research in the fields which use CA as the analytical method and framework, it can be observed that, like other prominent methods in social research such as ethnography (cf. Garfinkel 1967, Gumperz and Hymes 1972, Hymes 1974, 1996), speech act theory (cf. Searle 1969), relevance theory (cf. Sperber and Wilson 1986/1995), narrative theory (cf. Bruner 1991, Somers 1994), DA (cf. Sinclair and Coulthard 1975, Brown and Yule 1982, Stubbs 1983, Coulthard 1992, Sinclair 1992), and CDA (cf. Fairclough 1992, 1995a, 1995b, 2001, Van Dijk 2001), CA has been able to offer a unique interface between disciplines, practices and research, and it has been flexible enough to be combined with other methodologies (e.g. Mason 2006, see chapter I; Wadensjö 2000, see chapter II), as well as making a significant effort to bridge that gap between the ‘real world’ of social interactions and academic social sciences.\footnote{61}

I will deal with CA’s approach to talk and interaction, focusing on how key issues and concepts in CA have the research-based support to configure a robust - yet flexible - theoretical framework: (1) talk as a complex yet organised activity in sequences of interaction; (2) intersubjectivity as the quest for establishing how participants work with similar understandings of what each of them is saying and means as their talk unfolds (Schegloff 1992c); (3) context as the broad and local circumstances in which utterances are produced and to which talk is seen as inextricably tied (Hutchby and Wooffitt 2008:12).

In the paragraphs that follow, I will expand on these three concepts that are key to CA, focusing on aspects that will be at the core of my methodological approach.

\footnote{61 See Hutchby and Wooffitt (2008:182-237) for a detailed review of the practical implications and critical engagements of the conversation analytic approach in those disciplines.}
First, the notion of talk-in-interaction, which is a much more complex system than it superficially looks and which can yet be examined, with identifiable conversational patterns and devices. Theoretically, the philosophical-anthropological view of ordinariness in social interactions by Sacks (1984) shared assumptions with Goffman’s theatrality in interaction (1959). Nevertheless, there is a crucial difference between Goffman's presentation of ‘self’ in everyday life and Sacks's notion of humans ‘being ordinary’: Goffman’s aim was to document the ritual procedures which inform the orderly conduct of everyday life by arguing that “while in the presence of others, the individual typically infuses his [sic] activity with signs which dramatically highlight and portray confirmatory facts that might otherwise remain unapparent or obscure” and for that activity to be significant to others, “he [sic] must mobilize his activity so that it will express during the interaction what he wishes to convey” (Goffman, 1959:40); for Sacks however, people present themselves in ordinary conversation doing “being ordinary” (Sacks, 1984:429).

This brief discussion on how CA research resulted in a different view of talk-in-interaction leads me to recapitulate on three key points - drawing on Sacks (1992) - that heavily inform my CA’s theoretical approach: (1) utterances may be viewed as objects which speakers use to accomplish particular tasks in their interactions with others, revealing deeper strategies than their apparent, straightforward face value; (2) talk can be seen as methodic, in the sense that conversational moves can be methodic answers to given problems within the interactional and sequential contexts in which it is produced; (3) talk-in-interaction can be treated as an object of analysis in its own right, rather than “simply as a window through which we can view other social processes or broader sociological variables” (Hutchby and Wooffitt, 2008:19).

The second concept informing the theoretical and methodological foundations of CA is intersubjectivity: how do we share a common understanding of the world and of one another's actions in the world? How is mutual understanding accomplished and represented in talk? CA research devoted a great deal of work to showing devices, strategies and patterns used by participants to maintain mutual orientation to common topics and fields of reference in talk-in-interaction. A clear example of this is repair, an area where CA has generated a large amount of work (Jefferson 1972, 1987; Schegloff,
1979, 1987a, 1992c; Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks, 1977, Zahn 1984 and Geluykens 1987, to name but a few) and which is crucial for interpreter-mediated encounters, such as the ones I will analyse.\textsuperscript{62} For example, Schegloff (1992c) argues that repair can be seen as central to the management of intersubjectivity, one of the outcomes being interpersonal alignment during the interaction.

The third concept where CA provides a relevant theoretical contribution to social research is the prominent place given to \textit{context}, in the sense that talk is related to contextual and sociological variables (Hutchby and Wooffitt, 2008:5).

Although not necessarily subscribing solely to CA, Goodwin and Duranti (1992:1-42) provide an extensive review dealing with how, since the 1960s, there has been a large amount of research devoted to the relationship between language and context. Following Goodwin and Duranti (1992), a review of CA’s approach to context should not overlook, but attempt to find supplementing and compatible views from other disciplines (i.e. ethnography, ethnomethodology, anthropology, sociology, sociolinguistics, social psychology, philosophy and the philosophy of language, discourse studies, pragmatics and semiotics). In other words, although the approach to context in this section is CA-centred, the awareness of alternative perspectives helps to foster critical dialogue between different traditions (Goodwin and Duranti, 1992:13) and to recognise that notions such as \textit{talk}, \textit{social interaction} and \textit{context} can be approached from different fields of human knowledge. The different ways to approaching the context of interpreter-mediated live radio interviews in my research are intended to serve as an illustrative example of this integrative approach.

One of the main issues in the analysis of context is describing not only the physical context (or environment) which is relevant to what participants are doing but also describing “the socio-historical knowledge that a participant employs to act within the environment of the moment” (Goodwin and Duranti, 1992:5). As Gumperz (1992:44) shows, context is infused with a “dynamic mutability which is complicated further by the ability of participants to rapidly invoke within the talk of the moment alternative contextual frames”. There are relevant phenomena here which authors from different

\textsuperscript{62} The influence of CA based research on repair in DI studies is dealt with in chapter I.
perspectives (cf. Bateson 1972, Gumperz 1982, 1992, McDermott 1976) have observed based on research on context: human beings have the capacity to dynamically reshape the context that provides organisation for their actions within the interaction itself. Thus, in social interactions, participants are situated within multiple contexts which are capable of rapid and dynamic change as the events in which they are engaged unfold (Goodwin and Duranti, 1992:5). This view provides scope for a richer and deeper analysis than a static view of context, as it has been acknowledged in DI studies which heavily draw on the approaches to context reviewed in this section (see 1.4).

There are basically two interrelated approaches that CA research has provided, both being of interest for my own study. Firstly, there is most of the early work in CA focused on ordinary conversation, that is, forms of interaction which are not confined to specialised settings nor related to specific tasks (Heritage and Clayman, 2010:15); second, there was the emergence - from the late 1970s onwards - of studies of institutional talk, in which the goals and agendas of the participants are more institution-specific, often with more restrictions on the nature of interactional contributions, as talk is mostly part of the institutional framework and, therefore activity-specific (Drew and Heritage 1992). While a common arena for the approach to context between these two CA research traditions can be found in Heritage and Atkinson (1984:6), in the sense that there is an acceptance that the production of talk is both context-shaped and context-renewing, significant differences can be found with regards to the importance given to the researcher's knowledge of the broad and local context (Cicourel 1992). Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (1974), for example, focus on the sequential organisation of talk, and by looking at that organisation (e.g. the organisation of turn-taking) contextual elements in conversation can be detected. It could be argued that this is a ‘bottom-up’ approach, as explained by Sacks (1984a:27):

> When we start out with a piece of data, the question of what we are going to end up with, what kind of findings it will give, should not be a consideration. We sit down with a piece of data, make a bunch of observations, and see where they will go. […] I mean not merely that if we pick any data we will find something. And how interesting what we may come up with will be something we cannot in the first instance say.

CA analysts such as Sacks made a strong point that analysis should not be constrained by prior theoretical assumptions on those patterns of social organisation or participants’
attributes - such as status, role, etc. - and therefore looking at the participants’ interaction would be the first step to finding instances of the “situated social order” (Montgomery, 1986:51).

Cicourel’s criticism and contribution to CA lies in the support for an approach to context which becomes an intrinsic part of the analysis. As Duranti and Goodwin (1992:292) point out, Cicourel’s (1992) model of the relationship between language and context is one in which the participants have simultaneous access to several levels of analysis (before the analysts), such as the local organisation of turn-taking, lexical choices and semantic networks, as well as what Cicourel calls the “broad context” of the institutional settings where the interaction takes place, or “an institutionalized framing of activities” (1992:294). Cicourel’s (1992) distinction between two senses of context, “narrow” and “broad”, and their inclusion for the analysis of everyday talk involves important contributions for CA, as it allows for an integration of different layers of information about the participants, their institutional roles, their previous exchanges and their shared knowledge, as well as ethnographic fieldwork which helps situate the ongoing talk within its larger institutional work (cf. Cicourel, 1992:299-300). Thus, if the researcher is able to supplement and share extratextual information, a reexamination of the sequential analysis of that very same talk (cf. Cicourel, 1992:300-307) will show that the local context - understood in CA terms as the information that the participants themselves make available in the talk - is largely enriched, since it “incorporates structural and processual aspects of social organisation and reasoning during social interaction” (Cicourel, 1992:308-309).

To sum up, an integrative view of context which acknowledges its complexities in social interactions as a “socially constituted, interactively sustained, time-bound phenomenon” (Goodwin and Duranti, 1992:6) is one that fits into the type of event under exploration in my study, thus calling for CA to be performed together with supplementary methods to shed light on the specific context of radio interpreting and, in turn, to enrich the analysis of the whole interaction.

The methodological implications of the conversational analytic approach with regards to the three key concepts reviewed above (i.e. talk-in-interaction, intersubjectivity and context) are crucial for the study of any given social interaction. Schegloff and Sacks
(1973:290) summarise at an early stage in CA how it seeks to uncover that ‘orderly’ character of talk from the perspective of how the participants display for one another their understanding of ‘what is going on’ (Hutchby and Wooffitt, 2008:13).

When it comes to the actual analysis, Heritage and Atkinson (1984:11) phrase the implementation of CA in the following way:

In sum, in examining talk the analyst is immediately confronted with an organization which is implemented on a turn-by-turn basis, and through which a context of publicly displayed and continuously updated intersubjective understandings is systematically sustained. It is through this turn-by-turn character of talk that the participants display their understandings of the state of the talk for one another, and because these understandings are publicly produced, they are available for analytic treatment by social scientists. Analysts may thus proceed to study with some assurance the factual exhibits of understandings that are displayed and ratified at the conversational surface.

Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (1974) provided the methodological tools to approach talk as a much more complex and yet highly systematised interaction. CA set out to evidence how people talk in different conversational settings, how they relate to the context where they interact and, above all, to elucidate how people use talk and other non-verbal elements to interact by focusing on a close analysis of its sequential organisation. In fact, one of the main contributions of CA to the field of sociolinguistics is the relevance given to how talk is related to contextual and sociological variables (cf. Mason 2006 in the case of DI). However, as a way of procedure, instead of assuming that such a relationship exists, CA demands that the relevance of sociolinguistic variables for the participants themselves must be demonstrated on the basis of the data. As Hutchby and Wooffitt (2008:5) argue, this does not mean that variables such as gender, class or authority are irrelevant; what is required is for the analyst “to pay close attention to empirical phenomena and to begin from the assumption that participants are active, knowledgeable agents, rather than simply the bearers of extrinsic, constraining structures”. This brings us to a central concept in CA: intersubjectivity, or how members negotiate or achieve a common context and understanding for each other’s actions (Schegloff and Sacks 1973, Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks 1977, Sacks 1992, Schegloff 1992c).

---

63 This argument constituted the main response of CA to criticism made by CDA scholars (cf. Fairclough 1995a).
CA was heavily influenced by the groundwork of two social scientists who “dissented from the view that details of everyday life are an inherently disorderly and unresearchable mess” (Heritage and Clayman, 2010:8): Erving Goffman and Harold Garfinkel. Their claims on social interaction and its study were in line with Sacks's criticism of standard methodologies in both linguistics and sociology of the time (cf. Sacks 1972): they were critical of prominent linguists like Chomsky, who claimed that ordinary talk could not be the object of study for linguistics, since it is too disordered (Chomsky, 1965); Sacks, in his quest to make sociology a naturalistic, observational science (Hutchby and Wooffitt, 2008:21), also criticised the prevailing procedure of using invented examples of language for their formal properties (also in Weinreich 1963 and Chomsky 1965) without paying any attention to how language is actually used in interaction; Sacks also criticised the Chicago School’s ethnographic work (e.g. Whyte 1943, Park 1952, Becker 1953, Hughes 1970; referenced in Hutchby and Wooffitt, 2008:22) for relying very heavily on information gained through interviews with certain trusted members of the group or setting, called “informants” (Sacks, 1992, Vol. 1:27).

CA’s sociological affinities with Goffman’s explorations of the interaction order (Goffman 1983) lie in Goffman’s research-based ability to establish that social interaction is a form of social organisation in its own right. Like CA analysts, Goffman (1983) rejected the view that the interaction order is a colourless, odourless, frictionless substrate through which social processes operate, and asserted instead that the interaction order is an autonomous site of authentic social processes that inform social action and interaction. Goffman’s main interest when analysing this interaction order was to explain complex sets of interactional phenomena, rights and obligations of people when presenting their ‘self’ in social interactions, such as ‘face’ (Goffman 1959, 1963, 1967, 1981), ‘footing’ (Goffman 1979, 1981), and rituals as a way of ‘syntax’ for interaction (Goffman 1967). Although Goffman did not develop a systematic approach to the analysis of interaction - this being the main criticism made by CA scholars (cf. Sacks 1975, Duranti and Goodwin 1992, Traverso 2005, Hutchby and Wooffitt 2008, Heritage and Clayman 2010) - he inspired its conceptualisation and offered ‘frames’ for the study of talk within social institutions (cf. Goffman’s 1981 study of radio talk) and their interactional phenomena (cf. Metzger 1999a, see chapter I). The common
platform of Goffman and CA lies in the syntax of interaction, as “the place where face, self, and identity are expressed, and where they are also ratified or undermined by the conduct of others” (Heritage and Clayman, 2010:9). While documenting ritual procedures which inform the orderly conduct of everyday life, Goffman also assumed “that the proper study of interaction is not the individual and his [sic] psychology, but rather the syntactical relations among the acts of different persons mutually present to one another” (Goffman, 1967:2). This assumption helped to develop Sacks’s central notion of intersubjectivity.

Garfinkel’s groundwork for CA’s intersubjectivity is provided by his programme of ethnomethodology: like Goffman, although with a different agenda in mind, Garfinkel (1967) proposed that everyday interaction constitutes a legitimate domain of sociological study. In opposition to the predominant functionalist paradigm of that time, especially associated with Parsons (1937), Garfinkel proposed that participants’ common sense knowledge should become a topic of study, rather than simply a resource to explain the causes for the internalisation of societal norms and values, or its deviation and transgression, as sociological functionalism predicated (see Heritage 1984, Atkinson and Heritage, 1984:17-20, Hutchby and Wooffitt, 2008:26-28 for detailed discussions). Thus, the aim of sociology, from Garfinkel’s perspective, should be to describe the methods that people use for accounting for their own actions and those of others (Hutchby and Wooffitt, 2008:27). These would be the shared methods of practical reasoning, or ‘ethno-methods’ which are the subject of Garfinkel’s ethnomethodological inquiry.

Drawing on philosophical views such as Durkheim’s aphorism, Garfinkel (2002) argued that human action and human institutions - including Goffman’s view on the interaction order - rest on the primordial fact that individuals are able to make shared sense of their circumstances and act on that shared sense. This approach did not only have a large influence on Sacks’s CA (cf. Garfinkel and Sacks 1970, Sacks 1984b) and CA as a whole, but it also was of significance for DI studies (cf. Wadensjö, 1998:84; Mason 2006): Garfinkel’s argument that coordinated and meaningful actions, 64 “According to Durkheim’s aphorism, ‘the objective reality of social facts is sociology’s fundamental principle’. Sociology’s fundamental principle? There’s the rub” (Garfinkel, 2002:65).
“regardless of whether they involve cooperation or conflict, are impossible without these shared understandings” (Heritage and Clayman, 2010:9) is at the core of triadic multilingual interactions.

Although the scope and findings of Garfinkel’s experiments were limited, they offered significant theoretical insights into the nature of intersubjectivity, one of CA’s central concepts:

[A] concern for the nature, production and recognition of reasonable, realistic and analysable actions is not the monopoly of philosophers and professional sociologists. Members of society are concerned as a matter of course and necessarily with these matters both as features and for the socially managed production of their everyday affairs. (Garfinkel, 1967:75)

Sacks shared a great deal of Garfinkel’s claims, particularly those related to criticising conventional research methods in sociology, such as survey research and quantitative analysis (see Garfinkel and Sacks 1970), but he still advocated a move away from the ethnomethodological stand, considering that in ethnomethodology, the researcher’s account would not only be post hoc, but also a reconstructed version of what happened in the setting (Hutchby and Wooffitt, 2008:29).

Sacks proposed solutions to what he considered methodological pitfalls of ethnomethodology, always pointed in the direction of data-driven research, arguing for an element of ‘unmotivated looking’ when initially approaching a piece of data for CA (Sacks, 1984a:27; see III.1.1). In the following extract, Sacks (1992, Vol. 1:27) reconciles Goffman’s and Garfinkel’s claims of also using naturally-occurring talk, a claim which will prove as valid when approaching interpreter-mediated live radio broadcast interviews:

The difference between [ethnography] and what I’m trying to do is, I’m trying to develop a sociology where the reader has as much information as the author, and can reproduce the analysis. […] You can re-do the observations. Here, I’m showing my materials and others can analyse them as well, and it’s much more concrete than the Chicago stuff tended to be.

The operation of Garfinkel’s ethnomethods was epitomised as “the documentary method of interpretation” (Garfinkel, 1967:78), which forms the basis for “temporally updated shared understandings of actions and events among the participants” (Heritage and Clayman, 2010:11) when employed in a temporally dynamic context, as well as functioning as a resource for the production of actions. Sacks and later CA scholars
took Garfinkel’s research on board, thus bringing to CA epistemology the assumption that shared methods of reasoning are publicly available on the surface of social life because the results of their application are inscribed in social action and interaction (Heritage and Clayman, 2010:11).

As Heritage and Clayman (2010) claim, it was in the integration of three themes related to the sequential organisation of interaction - i.e. turns at talk are (1) context-shaped, (2) context-renewing,65 and (3) building blocks of intersubjectivity - that CA fused Goffman and Garfinkel’s separate ideas “into a single, powerful research program that crystallized into a clear set of empirical working practices” (Heritage and Clayman, 2010:15).

These three themes set the fundamental methodological path of CA research in the following years, and they can still be considered one of the main areas where CA research has developed, particularly since the 1980s: institutional talk, including media talk.

III.1.1 The Collection and Presentation of Data

I will now proceed to review the analytical tools and procedures which shape the CA analytical framework: data collection and presentation and finding interactional phenomena, devices, features and patterns.

The requirement for conversational data via recordings (audio and/or filmed) and transcriptions is one of the key methodological tools for CA. Although using recorded, naturally occurring data seems an obvious procedure in any research which aims at dealing with talk-in-interaction which has not been produced in the first place for the purposes of social scientific analysis, there are a few aspects in how CA approaches data collection and presentation which are of relevance for my research.

First of all, if the aim of a given research is to get to know how a specific social interaction (i.e. interpreter-mediated interviews) works in a specific setting (i.e. live radio broadcasting) and, in turn, how the participants appraise that setting for the purpose of their talk, and how they display for one another “their orientation to the
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65 Goffman and Garfinkel’s contributions to CA with regards to the perspective on context will be reviewed in the section devoted to context (this chapter).
relevance of contexts” (Hutchby and Wooffitt, 2008:139), the use of raw data which is not produced under the aegis of any specific research project (Hutchby and Wooffitt, 2008:14), is essential. As Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (1974:729) argue by giving the example of the unfolding of turn-taking in interaction:

… while understandings of other turns’ talk are displayed to coparticipants, they are available as well to professional analysts who are thereby afforded a proof criterion (and a search procedure) for the analysis of what a turn’s talk is occupied with. Since it is the parties’ understandings of prior turns’ talk that is relevant to their construction of next turns, it is their understandings that are wanted for analysis. The display of those understandings in the talk of subsequent turns affords […] a proof procedure for the professional analysis of prior turns - resources intrinsic to the data themselves.

From a methodological point of view, there are relevant implications of this approach to turn-taking when it comes to dealing with raw data and the devices and procedures to be used in the analysis: first, the use of the next-turn proof procedure, as a basic tool used in CA to ensure that analyses explicate the orderly properties of talk as oriented to accomplishments of participants, rather than being based on the assumptions of the analyst (Hutchby and Wooffitt, 2008:13).

Secondly, there is a methodological implication which is directly linked to those ‘analyst assumptions’ and this is what Sacks (1984a: 26-27) called an initial ‘unmotivated looking’:

It is not that I attack any piece of data I happen to have according to some problems I bring to it. When we start out with a piece of data, the question of what we are going to end up with, what kind of findings it will give, should not be a consideration. We sit down with a piece of data, make a bunch of observations, and see where they will go.

Treating some actual conversation in an unmotivated way, that is, giving some consideration to whatever can be found in any particular conversation we happen to have our hands on, subjecting it to investigation in any direction that can be produced from it, can have strong payoffs. […]

Thus there can be some real gains in trying to fit what we can hope to do to anything that happens to come up. I mean not merely that if we pick any data we will find something, but that if we pick any data, without bringing any problems to it, we will find something. And how interesting what we may come up with will be is something we cannot in the first instance say.

Third, the tape/video recording, or digital podcasting (as is now the case with most mass media interactions) facilitates the step from that first ‘unmotivated’ look to formal description and analysis. As Heritage and Atkinson (1984:4) point out, the availability
of recorded data enables repeated and detailed examination of particular events in interaction and hence greatly enhances the range and precision of the observations that can be made, as well as providing those who approach that data (whether the audio/video recording or its transcription) with direct access to the data about which analytic claims are being made, “thereby making them available for public scrutiny” (1984:4).

Fourth, this data-driven approach, when combined with the conversational analytic method and mentality (Schenkein 1978), enables the production of systematic analytic accounts, as Hutchby and Wooffitt (2008:104) illustrate in the following three-stage model:

- First, identify a potential object of analytic interest – a conversational device or a sequence-type.
- Second, produce a formal description of an empirical example, concentrating in particular on the sequential environment, in order to try and define what the device or sequence-type is doing.
- Third, return to the data collection to refine the description until it becomes a generalized account.

With these methodological considerations in mind, conversational analytic tools - such as transcriptions, and procedures such as the next-turn procedure, single case and extended sequence analyses, sound wave software, gaze and non-verbal analysis, and so on, can be applied to show innumerable conversational empirical phenomena, allowing their analysis and, possibly, finding patterns in conversation while being able to find exceptions to those patterns, which is not necessarily incompatible with evidencing orderly and interactionally intended actions.

In this respect, CA research has provided detailed accounts of a wide range of conversational features, patterns, devices and settings, thus making an important contribution to social science research. For the purposes of my research, CA constitutes a vital contribution in terms of elucidating the organisation of turn-taking and finding patterns and systems of turns at talk, including overlapping talk, with analytical tools such as adjacency pairs (Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson 1974), turn constructional units and turn transition places (Jefferson 1984).

Studies on conversational turn-taking systems (e.g. Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson 1974) and orderliness of overlapping talk (e.g. Jefferson 1984 and Schegloff 2000) have
shown that talk-in-interaction and speakers’ manner of orienting to talk and the context in which it unfolds is a matter of “fine-grained attention” where “pervasive orderliness” (Jefferson, 1984:11) can be found.

Within the framework of the analysis of turns at talk, it can be evidenced that conversational devices, such as repair strategies, continuers, receipt tokens, prosodic devices etc., are used by speakers not only systematically, but, most importantly, interactionally and contextually motivated and oriented.

The adaptation and application of these models to broadcast interviews will be dealt with in section III.2.1.3, below. Nevertheless, it is key to point out that the models and categories proposed by Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (1974) and, most notably for the purposes of my study, Jefferson (1984), are suitable for my data and, therefore, for searching for specific phenomena and patterns that configure interpreter-mediated live radio interview turn-taking systems.

CA has also contributed to the knowledge on other conversational features which unfold in conversation via the participants orientation to their context and to interaction, such as storytelling, neutrality, scepticism, conduct, rhetoric, grammar and inferential aspects, in mundane conversation and in a vast array of institutional settings. In this respect, it must be emphasised that CA studies on the above conversational patterns, features and settings have focused largely on monolingual talk-in-interaction. While acknowledging the use and application of CA in DI research (see chapter I and III.2.2) the specific application of CA to interpreter-mediated interactions in radio settings is a methodological innovation of this thesis.

III.1.2 Transcription in CA: Contributions to Analysis and Conventions

Transcriptions are given a core place in CA, both as a tool and as a procedure for analysis. The aim of transcriptions, including transcription symbols (see Appendix 4), is to provide the researcher and the reader with a description of the relevant features to the analysis of talk-in-interaction (Psathas, 1995:70), following precision, fidelity and readability constraints (Traverso, 2005:23). Thus, transcriptions aim to provide an empirically reliable approximation to the interpretive assemblies that participants in talk are working with (Mazeland, 2006:153). Although there is not a unified transcription
system, CA analysts have usually drawn on Jefferson’s system (cf. Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson 1974, and Jefferson 2004). Bearing in mind that there are innumerable phenomena in talk which could be transcribed to varying levels of detail, no transcription system exists which can claim to be able “to capture all the possible features of talk that may be observable” (Hutchby and Wooffit, 2008:71). As Kendon (1982:478; quoted in Hutchby and Wooffitt, 2008:71-72) puts it:

It is a mistake to think that there can be a truly neutral transcription system, which, if only we had it, we could then use to produce transcriptions suitable for any kind of investigation... Transcriptions, thus, embody hypotheses.

Transcriptions are, therefore, a tool for analysis: a “selective process reflecting theoretical goals and definitions” (Ochs, 1979:44). It is important to stress, in line with Hutchby and Wooffitt (2008:69), that transcripts are not thought of as data, but a tool for analysis. The actual data in my study consists of audio-recordings, podcasts and video-recordings of naturally occurring interactions in radio broadcasting. The transcripts I present in the analysis chapter and the annexes are a representation and a tool for analysis.

Transcription systems may be adapted for the purposes of the analysis (see chapter IV; cf. also Niemants 2012 in the specific case of interpreting research) and, therefore, a particular transcription system embodies in its format and in the phenomena it marks out the analytic concerns which conversation analysts bring to the data (Hutchby and Wooffitt, 2008:72). For example, transcriptions may mark out, on the one hand, dynamics of turn-taking, that is, details of the beginnings and endings of turns, including precise details of overlap, gaps, pauses and audible breathing, and, on the other hand, characteristics of speech delivery, such as stress, enunciation, intonation and pitch. In DI, for example, Mason (1999) reduces the amount of symbols (most notably regarding pronunciation features) used in most conventional CA transcripts, in favour of a more readable transcript which is still able to show the precision, fidelity and “relative delicacy” (Mason, 1999:no page number) needed for the analysis.

Secondly, a more simple transcription system is required for the semi-structured interviews, where the focus of the analysis lies not so much on interactional aspects but on the verbal content of the interview. In this case, the transcription system features the
words that were spoken, and some non-verbal actions such as laughter, in a standard orthography which makes the text look like a script for a play (Hutchby and Wooffitt, 2008:80). The aim here is to offer a simple representation of what is said during the interview, avoiding a large number of symbols referring to non-verbal communication or additional information (such as speed of talk, volume, tone or other prosodic features) which are not relevant for the type of analysis to be performed.

III.2 Practices and Implications. CA and Institutional Talk: Broadcast and Radio Talk-In-Interaction

The aim of this section is to show how CA research-based theoretical approaches (discussed in III.1 in this chapter) have particular methodological implications for demonstrating the key role of talk (with its own social processes, governed by its own regularities) in institutional settings (Hutchby and Wooffitt, 2008:19) which are at the core of my study: radio and, specifically, multilingual (interpreter-mediated) broadcast talk. In this section, therefore, I will offer a review of analyses, findings and advances in research using CA in monolingual and multilingual media interaction with a two-fold purpose: (1) to see how existing CA research can inform my methodology and analysis, and (2) to discuss how findings in these fields can help map out the specificity, appropriateness and relevance of CA methods in my study.

CA studies of ‘institutional talk’ began to emerge in the late 1970s with Atkinson and Drew’s (1979) study of courtroom interaction, which set out a path in CA that moved the focus from ordinary conversation, as the “primordial form of talk-in-interaction” whose organisation “is not subject to functionally specific or context-specific restrictions or specialized practices or conventionalized arrangements” (Schegloff, 1999:407), to institutional talk where organisational “speech-exchange systems” (Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson, 1974:729-731) emerge in ‘institutional settings’.66 There was a growing conviction amongst conversational analysts that there are more restricted environments in which the goals of participants are more limited and institution-specific, and there are often restrictions on the nature of interactional contributions.

---

66 For a detailed distinction between ‘ordinary conversation’ and ‘institutional talk’, as well as the difference between ‘institutional setting’ where a speech event takes place and the ‘speech-exchange system’ by which it is organised, see Schegloff (1999:405-415).
Within the sub-field of institutional CA, talk is therefore understood in terms of
institution-specific and activity-specific inferential frameworks (Drew and Heritage

This involves a distinctive CA approach to interaction compared with ‘ordinary
conversation’: interaction remains the focus of research but is examined in terms of how
specific practices of talk are, “embody or connect with specific identities and
institutional tasks” (Heritage and Clayman, 2010:17). In this sense, organised forms of
talk-in-interaction can be found in institutional settings such as courts of law,
classrooms, religious ceremonies, talks at scholarly, scientific, arts and culture meetings,
medical encounters, police investigations, broadcast talk and so on. Over time, CA-
based research spread into studies of talk-in-interaction in an ever-widening range of
social institutions and contexts.

While maintaining the analytical core of CA, some studies of institutional talk added a
comparative approach, in order to delineate differences between institutional talk and
ordinary conversation (cf. Drew and Heritage 1992), or how some conversational
practices in ordinary conversation are managed differently in particular institutional
contexts (cf. Schegloff 1991, 1992b). What institutional CA research has shown is that
each institution, each particular speech-exchange system creates a “unique fingerprint”
of practices (Heritage and Greatbatch, 1991:95-96; Heritage and Clayman, 2010:18),
which is shown in a number of “dimensions of distinctiveness”, first systematised by
Drew and Heritage (1992) and later further developed by Heritage (2004, 2005) as
follows:

1. Turn-taking organisation
2. Overall structural organisation of the interaction
3. Sequence organisation
4. Turn design
5. Lexical or word choice
6. Epistemological and other forms of asymmetry

With the assumption of the existence of a ‘unique fingerprint’ and its evidencing via
systematic analysis of the ‘dimensions of distinctiveness’, CA could offer a model for the exploration of institutional talk and the specificities of different conversational settings and events.

The adaptation and further applicability of Drew and Heritage’s (1992) analytical categories - as further developed by Heritage (2004) - to my data will be discussed in chapter IV. But first, in this section I will look at how broadcast settings have that fingerprint in talk-in-interaction, by discussing research in the field following CA models for analysis.

**III.2.1 CA and the Study of Broadcast Talk-In-Interaction**

Broadcast talk-in-interaction is a kind of institutional talk with a relatively short existence (its origins can only be traced to the first mass broadcasting devices and institutions - first radio and later television - in the 21st century). Due to the fast technological development in the last 50-60 years, mass media have spread and diversified into a wide range of media institutions, platforms and devices (radio, television - analogue and digital -, the internet, mobile phones, etc.), formats (news interviews, multi-party debates, advice-giving shows, audience participation programmes, etc.), different ways of reaching audiences (live or prerecorded broadcasting, digital TV and radio platforms, podcasting, websites such as YouTube, blogging, etc.), and also different possibilities of audience engagement (i.e. phone-ins, mail, e-mail and social networks). Overall, there is a complex and diverse broadcasting landscape which should be understood and looked into according to different media and their ‘broadcasting cultures’ (cf. Curran and Morley 2006), also bearing in mind synchronic aspects, not only with regards to institutions, programmes or formats, but, most notably, with regards to technological developments and their influence on how audiences’ relation with different media has evolved and may have had an impact on the production, organisation and broadcasting of talk-in-interaction.

These assumptions are in line with Bourdieu’s (1996) concerns about the superficial and decadent trend of mass media leading to “cultural fast food”, both from the side of the institutions (he uses the example of French media) and from the audience as consumers. Bourdieu criticises what can be considered the mainstream and dominant media, but
claims that there are independent, free and avant-garde media which attempt to resist the mainstream processes and dynamics. I would argue that my data from Radio 3 runs explicitly against that “cultural fast food” and the guests on ESV are not brought in for being what Bourdieu defines as “fast-thinkers” (Bourdieu, 1996:30). Javier Tolentino, ESV host, makes continuous references in his programmes to the avant-garde, underground, intellectually challenging and counter-mainstream character of his programme and of Radio 3 (see sections IV.1 and V.2). In this sense, the history and media conventions of the media institution where my data comes from (Radio 3) need to be made relevant in my study, since they can explicate the fundamental reasons why live interpreter-mediated interviews of 15 minutes to 2 hours are frequent on Radio 3, but not on contemporary mainstream TV or radio.

Curran and Morley (2006) and Bourdieu (1996) raise conceptual issues to which CA can offer methodological answers. CA has contributed to the study of broadcast talk by providing insights into the very nature of mass communication, by analysing how broadcasters use talk as their means of communicating with audiences and vice versa. During a period of less than 40 years of research work, CA on broadcast talk has put forward and tried to answer two major questions (Hutchby, 2006:11):

1. What are the ways in which mass communication is accomplished as a public form of discourse; and 2. How do broadcasters design their talk so as to relate to their audiences in specific, inclusive and cooperative ways?

Hutchby (2006) reviews the relationship between CA and the study of broadcasting, focusing on media talk. Drawing on previous CA-based research on broadcast talk, he offered a key contribution to the study of broadcast talk with a monographic work which integrates theoretical approaches, methods and case studies covering a whole range of talk-based media genres (i.e. audience participation television shows, confrontation talk shows, talk radio phone-ins, advice-giving radio shows, news interviews and televised debates). Hutchby (2006) not only describes the communicative imperatives of talk in radio and television, but also offers illustrations of how the analysis of media talk can be carried out in practical terms. With this approach, CA is brought to the forefront of the methodological and analytical agenda, with a particular emphasis on how CA can overcome the criticism made by CDA (see previous
section, and also Hutchby, 2006:31-35), notably by Fairclough (1995a), with regards to the relationship between talk and higher levels of society and culture, such as power, ideology and cultural values.

Drawing on the facts that any aspect of broadcasting involves the use of spoken or signed language and that television and radio talk-in-interaction is “key to the nature of the relationship between the media, public opinion and public knowledge” (Hutchby, 2006:4), the main aim of the study of broadcast talk “was, and remains today, to reveal the frameworks and dynamics of that interactional medium” (2006:11).

Each of the case studies in Hutchby (2006) serves to show “how we can find, in the small details of talk, interesting phenomena that cast light on the work that broadcasters do, consciously or tacitly, to produce effective communication in the particular contexts of radio and television” (2006:4). Further on, Hutchby argues that that work is not only carried out by the broadcaster in talk-in-interaction, but also, crucially, by the guests and/or audience members interacting with them.

Heritage and Clayman (2010) also devote a whole chapter of their work on talk-in-interaction and social institutions to broadcast talk, focusing on news and political communication.

For the purposes of my study, works such as Hutchby (2006) and Heritage and Clayman (2010) make a compelling case for the study of broadcast talk as a significant contribution to media and cultural studies, demonstrating why media conversations need to be prioritised for examination, since they are “involved in - and crucially, partly constitutive of - an everyday awareness of the social realities around us” (Allan, 2006:x).

III.2.1.1 Key Concepts in the CA Study of Broadcast Talk

There are a series of key analytical concepts in CA-based studies of broadcast talk which require discussion in this section, since they have been used to frame models and categories for analysis of broadcast talk-in-interaction: the communicative ethos, the public broadcasting arena, and broadcast framing.

---

The communicative ethos of broadcasting: Hutchby (2006) takes this term from Scannell (1988, 1989:152) to refer to the distinctive approach to communicative procedures and policies of a broadcasting institution, station or broadcaster. This ‘distinctive’ communicative ethos tends to instil a sense of familiarity and, hence, inclusiveness and sociability in the audience (Hutchby, 2006:12). With this concept, which does not involve a ‘natural’ practice or way of talking but a performance (Hutchby, 2006:12) - and which can be linked to Goffman’s concept of theatricality in interaction (1959) - we can develop a critical description of what a particular broadcaster is working to produce, aware of the fact that it is not a ‘naturally-occurring’ practice or way of talking but a performance, by virtue of which aspects of everyday casual conversation are imported into the broadcaster’s discourse and modified according to the distinctive institutional contexts of broadcasting (Hutchby, 2006:12). Scannell (1988, 1989, 1996) and Scannell and Cardiff (1991) use the term for their conceptualisation of broadcasting based on the evolution of radio broadcasting from a rather patronising medium which talked at the masses in its origins but gradually evolved towards a more democratic, personal and conversational relationship with the audience, thus acknowledging also the usually ‘ordinary’ spaces where the medium was listened to. The communicative ethos does not only change in time, but at any time “it will vary across different areas of programme output […] and within particular areas: the talk produced around classical music is different to that produced around pop music” (Scannell, 1996:20). Broadcasters work to produce their distinctive ethos. A key question here is, as Heritage (1985) points out, that of how broadcast talk-in-interaction is designed (from the initial production stages) for recipiency by an absent audience: an audience of ‘overhearers’, or ‘distributed recipients’, which takes us to the public arena of broadcasting.68

---

68 During the broadcast talk-in-interaction, the audience can be characterised as being addressed in various ways (cf. Bell 1984, Hatim and Mason, 1997:52-53). Hutchby (2006:172) suggests that ‘distributed recipients’ is a more appropriate term than ‘overhearers’ or ‘overhearing audience’ for the purpose of CA analysis, since that concept characterises the audience as being addressed in various ways by broadcast talk. Nevertheless, whether in Goffman's sense (1976, 1981) - 'overhearers' - or in Hutchby's (2006) - 'distributed recipients' - both terms can be used indistinctly when referring to the audience that, in broadcast talk, is separated from the broadcaster in space and, maybe also, in time (Hutchby, 2006:171).
- The public *arena* (its creation and representation): also referred to as the public *space* or *sphere*, the *arena* reflects the overall participation framework created by the participants in the broadcast (most notably, the institution in charge of the production and the host) where the interaction takes place. These ‘arenas’ are understood as modes of human interaction with their own conditions of access and modes of conduct (Clayman, 2004:29). In broadcast talk, examples of public arenas of interaction are radio talk shows, audience participation TV debates and news interviews (whether on TV or radio). For CA and the analysis of broadcast talk, it is crucial - as Clayman (2004:31) argues - to approach these public *arenas* not as constituted by specific media, but “by specific modes of interaction conveyed through radio and television”.

The acknowledgement of this public *arena* in CA allows the analyst to explore how the speakers in a broadcast event show an orientation to it via their ways of constructing topics as themes in the public domain (Hutchby, 2006:31), as well as via turn design and sequence organisation. It is in that public arena that the *communicative ethos* of the broadcaster is manifested and where participants’ interaction is *framed*, usually via the host mediating and guiding action.

- *Framing* the broadcast talk-in-interaction: framing is a key concept in sociology and the study of interactions drawn from Goffman (1974). Furthermore, it is a concept which is increasingly used nowadays in studies of broadcast talk (cf. Livingston and Lunt 1994, Tolson 2001, Hutchby 2006), as well as T/I studies (cf. Baker 2006, 2007, Zhao 2014, Fernández-Ocampo and Wolf 2014). Hence, how *framing* is conceptualised in CA research is of key relevance to my study. Framing refers to the ‘situated interactional constitution’ (Hutchby, 2006:52) of the participants’ positions and roles during the interaction, which provide different participation spaces for them during the broadcast interaction. In radio broadcasting, the host, with the assistance of the sound technician and with sound being the only resource, gains a more relevant role than in TV when it comes to framing the talk-in-interaction to the audience, in terms of framing the physical setting and non-verbal communication. However, *framing* the broadcast talk-in-interaction involves a complex mixture of tasks and actions (some of them may actually take place before the broadcast). Throughout
Hutchby's case studies (2006), the following framing strategies can be listed when referring to broadcasting: via the structure of the show, the selection of topics, the categorising of the guests, and the use of language in reactions to and the orientation to turn-taking. Framing the interaction does not necessarily entail that the host and the institution will achieve their communicative and broadcasting purposes, since the guests and the audience might not wish to engage in the participation framework(s). However, on a much finer scale, what can be demonstrated using CA (cf. Hutchby 2006, 1999, 1996a, 1996b) is that the organisation of talk-in-interaction is bound up with the public arena that is created - or framed - by the broadcasting institution.

My model for analysis will include a thorough exploration of the media institution's communicative ethos and the show's public arena and framing strategies in the specific event of the interpreter-mediated radio interview.

III.2.1.2 The Broadcast Interview as the Basic Type of Broadcast Talk-In-Interaction

I will now focus on how CA has approached the broadcast interview, which is the type of institutional conversation which is under analysis in my research, with a particular focus on radio interviews.

Interviewing has long been one of the basic journalistic tools for gathering information, providing debate and criticism and engaging with the audience via a dynamic, unscripted interaction. As Heritage and Clayman (2010:215) argue, nowadays, this form of talk-in-interaction is an increasingly prevalent alternative to the traditional narrative of news and/or opinion presentation. Therefore, interviewing as a form of unfolding broadcast talk-in-interaction is central to the practice of contemporary journalism and broadcasting.

Within Media and Journalism Studies, the broadcast interview has been conceptualised as “a conversation with an aim” (McLeish, 1988:31) where the interviewer tends to interact - in different degrees according to the aims of the interview and the style of the programme - using an “informed naivety” (McLeish, 1988:31). Planning and previous chats with the guest(s) are considered key to the communicative success of the live interview event (Boyd 1997, Harcup 2004). In broadcast radio studies, there is a general agreement (cf. Franklin et al., 2005:119-121) that the interviewer/host
establishes, prior to and during the interview, the speakers’ roles and the ‘norms’ for the unfolding of the dialogue or interaction (Wilby and Conroy, 1994:62). Subsequently, it has been acknowledged that “the interview is by definition an asymmetrical exchange where power is to the interviewer and not the interviewee” (Macaulay, 1996:491). This theoretical framework heavily supports my exploration of off-air interaction and the host’s approach to interpreter-mediated interviews as a key methodological procedure to fulfil my research aims.

In this regard, CA supplements MS with a bottom-up analytical approach (Heritage 1984) and has shown that broadcast interviewing is a complex and dynamic type of talk-in-interaction which can easily escape the apparent, pre-established notion of question-answer sequences (Heritage and Clayman 2010), even if the turn-taking system tends to preallocate particular types of turns to speakers with specific institutional identities (Greatbatch, 1988:404).

The activity of interviewing is central to the production and unfolding of different “broadcast media output” (i.e. news and current affairs, advertising, documentary, drama and entertainment) (Hutchby, 2006:2). Whether it is in televised audience debates, confrontational TV talk shows, open-line radio talk shows, advice-giving broadcasts, news interviews, or political panel discussions - i.e. types and events where a certain degree of interviewing is involved as the main strategy to generate talk-in-interaction for the audience - there are a series of common aspects to them (Hutchby, 2006:1-3): firstly, there is a large proportion of unscripted talk, or “fresh talk” (Goffman 1981), where even if there may have been some planning and preparation prior to the broadcast, the talk as it unfolds in real time is not scripted. Secondly, these types and events involve live talk, that is either talk that is broadcast live or else the broadcast preserves “a sense of liveness in its very editing” (Hutchby, 2006:2); in both cases, and crucially for what concerns my study, focus is placed here on a specific type of media talk: communicative interaction ‘live on air’ (Hutchby, 2006:2). Thirdly, a common feature is that broadcast talk does not only involve professional broadcasters; rather, they interact with speakers from outside the broadcasting profession, thus bringing in different sociological categories (i.e. experts, lay persons, public figures, institutional representatives) to produce talk in what can be considered a complex and dynamic cross
between ‘public’ and ‘private’, ‘lay’ and ‘professional’ (Hutchby, 2006:2), (e.g. Interview 3 in my data).

III.2.1.3 CA in Broadcast Talk-In-Interaction: Categories and Patterns

In section III.1 of this chapter, it was argued that there are ways of looking at the sequential organisation of talk which allow the analyst to find different phenomena and patterns in talk-in-interaction. CA literature in broadcast talk has studied the following categories and patterns, placing an emphasis on how specific and illustrative of this type of communication they are:

- The organisation of talk in a public broadcasting arena (cf. Hutchby, 2006:39-51, Heritage and Clayman, 2010:215-216), with the subsequent sequential contexts (or participation frameworks) in which participants speak and the forms of talk or discursive genres that are used: through the analysis of talk-in-interaction in a specific broadcast event, “we gain a better understanding of the ongoing, situated production of the ‘public sphere’” (Hutchby, 2006:51). In this sense, Heritage and Clayman (2010:216) highlight an important institutional demand of broadcast talk-in-interaction: the presence of the broadcast audience. This involves that the interaction should be managed as “talk for overhearers”, so that audience members do not feel they are listening to a private conversation, but can feel instead that the talk is being conducted for their benefit.

- The implementation of turn-taking devices and patterns and, consequently, the co-construction of turn-exchange systems, which can reveal a wide range of features and phenomena specific to broadcast talk. Some studies of CA in broadcast talk-in-interaction have looked at turn-taking in broadcast interviews, drawing on previous CA research in mundane conversation (e.g. Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson 1974, and Jefferson 1984) in order to establish practices and patterns in the organisation of news interview interaction (cf. Greatbatch, 1988:404, Heritage and Greatbatch 1991) and its implications, such as the perception and implementation of institutionalised footings, particularly with regard to the controlling position of the interviewer via the use of formulations such as third-turn receipts of information (cf. Thornborrow 2002) and frame attunement (cf. Hutchby 1999). Following Thornborrow (1997), the main
analytical contribution of this type of research lies in elucidating how turns clearly function as position-taking contributions in an interview or debate. The methodology and findings in the studies reviewed above have only been applied to monolingual broadcast talk. Based on this research, categories of specific turn-taking strategies in interpreter-mediated live radio interviews will be proposed in this thesis. How ‘unique’ interpreter-mediated radio talk-in-interaction is or how it departs from these accounts will be dealt with in chapters V and VI.

- The interactional work of questions: Hutchby (2006:51-56) shows how questions by the host have different interactional functions. Hutchby’s CA highlights how questions are addressed to the interviewee and/or the participants in the studio but also to the audience. They can be used to focus the debate (2006:52), but also to establish the tenor or environment of the interaction (such as tension, conflict, cooperation, easing, etc.). In line with further CA-based research (cf. Heritage and Clayman, 2010:218-244, Livingston and Lunt 1994), Hutchby claims that in the design of his/her question turns, the host constructs systematically different participation spaces for different categorised speakers (2006:55). Thus, although an apparent question-answer rule of broadcast interviews may be simple and obvious (Heritage and Clayman, 2010:218), the practices and procedures underlying it are complex and often surprising. Focusing on news interviews, Heritage and Clayman (2010:220) show this by looking at how hosts or interviewers may produce elaborate question prefaces as a major source of agency “within the otherwise restrictive turn-taking framework of the news interview”; having this capacity, they claim, remains “a key resource for the exercise of vigorous journalism” (2010:220).

In addition to question prefaces, Heritage and Clayman revisit features of question design in broadcast news interviews with different interactional purposes, such as agenda setting (2010:229-231), presupposition (2010:231-232), question preferences (2010:232-234) and defensive questioning such as justification prefaces (2010:234) and “footing shifts” (2010:235-238; taken from Goffman 1979) consisting of attributing statements which may be hostile to the interviewee's position to third

---

69 See also Hutchby (2006:121-), Clayman and Heritage (2002), and Heritage, Clayman and Zimmerman (1988).
parties. Thus, Heritage and Clayman (2010) show how in fact the question-answer framework is usually departed from in news interviews, although an orientation to the normative question-answer framework may be sustained even during actions that depart from that framework. The authors emphasise the differences to accomplish these actions and how the institutional settings influence that interactional work, thus allowing for different phenomena to occur in different institutional settings. This claim makes Heritage and Clayman (2010) analytical approach not only relevant but applicable to my study.

- The construction of answers, rhetorical arguments and presentation of opinions: Hutchby (2006) also shows how the relationship which is created between host and guests (whether ‘experts’ or ‘laypersons’) is not just a question of categorising the different speakers nor their discursive genres and the interactional devices they employ, but is deeply rooted in the ways those participants are enabled to speak in response to the mediating talk of the show's host and the participation structures that are set up throughout the ongoing talk. In this sense, Hutchby (2006:56-60) offers an account of participants' interactional moves to the host's answers, ranging from rhetorical arguments and the presentation of opinions, to the generation and management of audience responses, such as applause (2006:60-64; see also Heritage and Clayman, 2010:267-268; Heritage and Greatbatch 1986). Harris (1991) and Heritage and Clayman (2010) also give an account of how answers may be constructed to act as evasion moves (e.g. conceptual preliminaries, overt and covert resistance). Their CA applied to news broadcast data (mainly TV) provide finely grained details of how those actions are manifested in broadcast settings.

- The production of confrontation: confrontation may be part of broadcast interactions (e.g. interviews, debates, phone-ins) and although sometimes it may occur unexpectedly, that is diverging from the general interactional co-operative trend of a programme and/or the guest(s) disagreeing with or diverting from the host’s ethos and his/her questions, there are instances where confrontation is an intrinsic part of the show. Furthermore, sometimes the conditions are set up so that participants are encouraged to publicly air disputes, as Hutchby (2006:65-77; cf. also Greatbatch 1992, Lunt and Stenner 2005) shows using data from audience participation TV
shows, such as Donahue, Oprah Winfrey and Jerry Springer in the US, and Kilroy, Vanessa and Trisha in the UK. The question at stake in this CA-based research which is relevant to my study is: what forms of argumentative discourse occupy this distinctive public arena (Hutchby, 2006:66)? First of all, Hutchby discusses how the public argumentation in these kinds of programmes is distinct from other public argumentation spheres in which large-scale audiences are co-present with the debaters. In fact, there is a considerable amount of scholarly work dealing with this interface of the private and public which broadcasting creates (cf. Crittenden 1971, Avery and Ellis 1979, Carbaugh 1988, Verwey 1990, Scannell and Cardiff 1991, Livingston and Lunt 1994), by which audience participation talk shows can be seen as a means to permeate the wider overhearing audience and to provide private citizens with access to the public sphere represented by broadcasting, thus fulfilling a ‘democratic function’ of which radio is a pioneer (Verwey 1990, Wood 2001).

Hutchby's (2006) analysis, therefore, aims to evidence how confrontational talk, as a form of talk, is produced to be addressed to the ‘overhearing audience’ (Scannell and Cardiff 1991) more or less overtly. Most importantly, Hutchby uses the methods of CA to look at aspects of the ‘indigenous organizational structures’ through which the show allows itself to be heard and experienced as a ‘spectacle of confrontation’, namely: (1) the framing of confrontation talk (Hutchby, 2006:67-70), via organisational, structural and interactional devices such as the structure of the show, the selection of topics, the categorisation of the guests and the use of language in reactions. The host, therefore, plays a crucial role in actively framing and promoting a confrontational discourse among participants. Framing this confrontation during the unfolding of the talk-in-interaction is much more delicate work (Hutchby, 2006:71).

Hutchby (2006) takes the notion of the creation of ‘participation frameworks’ from Goffman (1974, 1981) to show how utterances are phrased in audience participation shows (radio and television) to enable the hearers “to situate themselves as [the show’s] direct target, an indirect addressee, an overhearer, and so on” (2006:71). In the analysis, Hutchby provides a list of eight basic participation frameworks which routinely come into play in audience participation shows (2006:72).  

---

70 Hutchby (2006) uses argumentation as the discursive form of confrontation.
private and public: drawing on Heritage (1985), Hutchby shows how co-present speakers (such as an interviewer and an interviewee) produce their talk so that the audience can “unproblematically overhear it” (Hutchby, 2006:73), that is, for example, that interviewers avoid acting as the primary recipient of the interviewee's answers to their questions, leaving that role for the overhearing audience. The key aspect that is of relevance to my study here is to show how CA methods can reveal patterns of interaction of specific broadcast talk events.

The analysis of this interactional pattern, when transferring it to my research, will raise the question of how the interpreter manages confrontation in live radio broadcasting and, vice versa, how the medium institution provides or creates a space for the interpreter to interact within that ‘spectacle of confrontation’.

- Power and interaction: a line of research which has generated a considerable body of CA-based research on broadcast talk-in-interaction is power: how it is exerted via interactional devices; how power differentials may arise via the organisational structure of the broadcast event (temporally and spatially) and of talk, particularly via turn-taking. This is what Hutchby (2006:81-101) aims at analysing, drawing on data from a London-based open-line phone-in radio show whose host is famous for being argumentative, controversial and even sometimes rude to his callers (2006:81). The author also draws on previous research on issues of power in broadcast talk, such as Avery Ellis (1979), Liddicoat et al. (1994), Hutchby (1996), and Thornborrow (2001 and 2002), and focuses on two issues: (1) how callers seek to present their opinions, strengthen, legitimise or authenticate their viewpoints, given the well-known argumentativeness of the show's host and, therefore, (2) what are the ways the host has of developing an argument with callers' opinions. The analysis looks at specific structural features and devices in the talk-in-interaction which enable the host in this case study to take up a more powerful discursive position than the caller, even though the topic for discussion is usually introduced at the caller’s initiative (Hutchby, 2006:82). Amongst these features and devices, Hutchby finds witnessing and authentication devices, which tend to involve the interactional work of authenticating and legitimising speakers on the subject in question, but also to counter the scepticism of the host (2006:88); the sequential organisation of arguments and the way in which
calls on talk radio are organised, both of them create - or are geared to creating - power asymmetries, for example by simply allocating first and second positions to the caller and the host (2006:90); finally, devices to ‘turn the tables’, in a way that the caller (or guest, in the case of an interview) offers resistance to the host's challenges and contests his/her position in the turn-exchange system. Such devices may include shifting the topical focus of the host's agenda, shifting the roles of challenger and defender, or just adopting the host's strategy of (re)taking\textsuperscript{71} the initiative of the argument (Hutchby, 2006:95).

CA-based research is able to offer a solid analysis emphasising the relevance of turn-taking in interactional issues such as power asymmetries. The studies in broadcast talk discussed above demonstrate how it is not only the strength of witnessing and argumentative resources, but the position they take within a given interactional sequence. Hence, turn-taking has the potential to become an overt or covert discursive struggle during the interaction. Thus, winning the public arena of a debate in this type of broadcasting is not only a question of putting forward the ‘winning’ argument, but ‘fighting for’ the best position to win it (Hutchby, 2006:100).

This type of analysis can be extrapolated to other contexts and further institutional broadcast features can be brought in to see how they can influence emerging features of power during the broadcast talk-in-interaction. In fact, a key methodological contribution in providing a CA account of issues of power in broadcast talk-in-interaction lies in moving aside \textit{a priori} terms (Schegloff 1991), such as \textit{expecting} power asymmetries between the host and the caller, or a pre-existing authority deriving from the host's status as a professional and celebrity of sorts in radio broadcasting (Verwey 1990), or the host's control over the callers' access to the air (Moss and Higgins 1984). Such an \textit{a priori} approach would fail to demonstrate the existence of that power relationship in the interaction itself and, therefore, it would not provide empirical detail on how power can be “an accomplished feature of talk radio encounters on each individual occasion” (Hutchby, 2006:89). The proposed solution in CA is to look for instances when participants explicitly mention the power dimensions between themselves and, most importantly, instances when participants

\textsuperscript{71} My emphasis.
design their interaction in a way that can have the effect of placing them in a relationship “where discourse strategies of greater or lesser power are differentially available to each of them” (Hutchby, 2006:89). In this sense, power is viewed as an emergent feature of oriented-to-discourse practices as well as oriented to the institutional setting.

Issues of power have received a great deal of attention in DI studies (cf. Roy 1996, Wadensjö 1998, Mason 2000, Turner and Harrington 2009; see also chapter I) and parallels can be drawn in these two fields of research. However, a gap can be observed in the study of power asymmetries in interpreter-mediated events in live radio interviews, an issue not tackled by either broadcast CA or IS. Thus, my analysis and search for specific interactional patterns and phenomena in interpreter-mediated radio interviews become all the more relevant.

The audience’s ‘presence’ in the interaction: it has already been suggested in this chapter, as well as in chapter II, that participants in broadcast interactions talk among themselves but also, and primarily, to and for the audience, and literature across different fields - media, sociolinguistics, IS, etc - has provided evidence of this occurring. For this purpose, participants use interactional devices in order to establish the degree in which they are talking, interacting and addressing the audience. As Hutchby (2006:109) notes, there are ways in which both hosts and experts move into ‘audience-oriented mode’ in their talk, drawing on advice-giving talk radio shows as the primary data for his case study. This orientation to the “specifically public nature of the talk” (Hutchby, 2006:103) is not always explicit and clear, and it may involve the use of devices - namely ‘proxy questioning’, ‘answer plus auxiliary information’, generalising the relevance of advice and recommendation, shifts in personal deictics, contextualisation cues, continuers, etc - through which the audience is included in the talk, even if conceived of as an abstract category of people and possibly not overtly addressed. Therefore, through CA we can explore how active participants in the broadcast talk display an orientation to the significance of the public nature of the event.

---

The audience may experience shifts in its position throughout the talk-in-interaction, depending on how speakers situate themselves through their talk: from ‘overhearers’ (Bell 1984, Hutchby 1995) - or ‘distributed recipients’ (Hutchby, 2006:172) - to ‘co-recipients’ (Hutchby, 2006:172), thus effecting continuous and dynamic shifts in the overall event's participation framework. Ultimately, Duranti (1986), drawing on a dialogic approach to talk (cf. Bakhtin 1981 [1934], Wittgenstein 1958, Gadamer 1976 [1962], Goffman 1976), would argue that audiences act as co-authors in any kind of public talk. Following a CA approach, in broadcast talk-in-interaction, in order to see how the audience is actually conceived of and situated, there is still the need to look at the active participants' utterances and the sequential order of talk. This is, in turn, a crucial analytical step when looking at how the interpreter appraises the primary interlocutors’ utterances when interpreting in radio broadcasting. This is the line of research which is widely used in CA, as opposed to audience reception studies or statistical audience surveys, which might provide limited - in the latter case - and biased - in the former - detail and analysis of the actual broadcast talk-in-interaction. At most, as Glevarec (2007:182) aptly puts it, audience measurement techniques act as ‘déclarations’ (statements) and ‘jeux de langage’ (word trickery) for radio producers and institutions. Hence, CA research has contributed to treating talk-in-interaction as a legitimate object of study, also when looking at audience design and audience perceptions.

Throughout this section, I have outlined the main theoretical influences, underlying assumptions, concepts, analytical tools and techniques used by CA in the study of broadcast talk-in-interaction, with special focus on radio broadcasting.

III.2.1.4 Using Authentic Broadcast Data

In essentially data-driven research such as this, the aim of working with naturally-occurring broadcast data is to reflect how this type of interaction actually happens in a particular context. Furthermore, the use of broadcast data provides for rich and authentic interactional situations, allowing for CA to be performed. As Mason (1999:159-60) puts it, this approach, which already accounts for a significant body of
scholarship in interpreting research, moves “away from a narrow source-text/target text comparison towards a more procedural account ...[where] the interpreter [is seen] as a gatekeeper, coordinator and negotiator of meanings within a three-way interaction”.

Media research on monolingual interaction (i.e. in news interviews and talk shows both on TV and radio) has shown how broadcast messages are increasingly being generated in and through the production of talk-in-interaction (Hutchby, 2006:121). In this regard, Hutchby (2006:121) argues that

...this encourages us to examine news talk not just in terms of its role in the manufacture of news (Cohen and Young 1973), but also in terms of the structures of interaction in which news talk takes place, and which shape and constrain the very content of news messages (Clayman and Heritage 2002).

When looking at multilingual broadcast interactions - a widely ignored field in Media research (see III.2) - this encouragement is as appropriate, even if it is usually hard to get access to all the interaction taking place, due to broadcasting constraints and conventions.

With naturally-occurring (Hutchby and Wooffitt, 2008:1) authentic broadcast data, research brings in real life for analysis. If we think in terms of using a corpus or sample of broadcast interactional data, as Baker (2006) argues, this does not mean that the use of a particular corpus completely erases partiality and bias in the researcher's approach, in favour of total empiricism and objectivity. Nevertheless, for the purposes of a better understanding of the analysis and its outcomes, it is relevant to acknowledge the researcher's position, focus and aims with respect to the data. Working with a limited corpus of authentic interpreter-mediated broadcast data does not mean that we are dealing with live radio interpreting as a whole. As a consequence, Baker (2006) warns that we must be very careful not to make excessive generalisations. In this line of thought, Baker (2006:11-12) argues:

For example, we may select a newspaper article which ‘confirms’ our suspicions, but ignore other articles which present a different perspective. There is nothing essentially ‘wrong’ about that, but it may mean that we need to be careful in terms of any generalizations we make beyond the article itself. Additionally, we may only focus on aspects of a text which support our initial hypotheses, while disregarding those which present a more complex or contradictory picture.
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By using a corpus, we are able to place a number of restrictions on our cognitive biases. [...] With corpus analysis, there are usually a lot of results, and sometimes, because of limitations placed on researchers (such as word length restrictions of journal articles), selectivity does come into play. But at least with a corpus, we are starting (hopefully) from a position whereby the data itself has not been selected in order to confirm existing conscious (or subconscious) biases.

In this respect, CA's primary concern is not achieving ‘empirical generalizations’, frequency, range and distribution of interactional phenomena, but rather, “the discovery, description and analysis of complex interactional phenomena as socially produced phenomena in their own right” (Psathas, 1995:50).

Mason (2000:225) is also aware of the potential flaws of an analytical model involving the collection of a corpus of independently generated data, “the evidence from which is used by the investigator to generate the model”. According to Mason, the advantage of this method is that more generalisations that are not attributable to intuition can be yielded, something which tends to be truer the larger the corpus is. However, “since a corpus can never be exhaustive, it can never be claimed that it is entirely representative” (Mason, 2000:225). Thus, Mason argues, corpus-generated evidence needs to be supplemented in some principled way. One method the author suggests is the experimental one, which does not apply to my research. But there are further methods: a given analytical model presenting both the researcher's intuition and corpus-generated evidence can be supplemented with an introspective method, as “when participants are invited to comment on their own perceptions in post-performance interviews” (Mason, 2000:225-226). Although the use of this method is not exempt from subjective and inhibiting factors (Mason, 2000:226), its application may prove to make findings more consistent, especially if statistical value is added (Heritage and Clayman, 2010:281-282).

III.2.2 CA and the Study of Interpreter-Mediated Live Radio Interviews: A Critical Review

The review of CA-based research on broadcast talk in section III.2.1 critically points at the need for re-studying features of broadcast talk-in-interaction and the different patterns they can exhibit when they take place in interpreter-mediated settings, in order to find out modifications and adjustments to the broadcast talk practices and
organisation of broadcast events, as well as how the interpreter's interaction is influenced by this institutional context in comparison with other contexts.

With regards to the specificity of radio broadcast talk-in-interaction, Hutchby’s seminal works on radio talk (cf. 1991, 1992, 1995, 1996a, 1996b, 1999, 2006) have been crucial to highlighting the conversational *fingerprint* (Heritage and Clayman, 2010:18) of this medium, a fingerprint which will be observed in detail thanks to a critical description of radio as a medium, Radio 3 as the broadcasting institution, and *ESV* as the programme where the communicative ethos, arena and framing of the interpreter-mediated interaction take place (see chapter IV on data and methodology).

Furthermore, CA research on broadcast talk has contributed to sustaining the view that a broader sense of ‘context’ can be invoked (Hutchby, 2006:24), moving away from the idea of context as a static ‘container’ which participants enter into and where influence is exerted on their behaviour. Following institutional CA approaches, we need to begin from the opposite direction (Hutchby, 2006:25) and see participants (i.e. the host, the interviewee and the interpreter) as knowledgeable social agents who actively and openly demonstrate for one another (and hence also for analysts) their understanding of contexts.

A dynamic notion of context applied to broadcast settings shows how, just as the interaction order is influenced by the institutional contexts of its implementation, the workings of institutions are influenced by the interaction order (Heritage and Clayman, 2010:280). In fact, current research on broadcast talk-in-interaction shows how the very visibility of institutional activities (including the roles and identities associated with them) “arises through modifications and adjustments to the practices through which ordinary conversational interaction is managed” (Heritage and Clayman, 2010:280). This claim strengthens the validity of the application and adaptation of CA's original methods and practices, as well as the epistemological approach to talk (cf. Sacks 1984a, 1984b, 1992), based on the quest for ordinariness-yet-orderliness, which broadcast talk-in-interaction seems to accentuate.

As I have tried to show in this chapter, research literature using CA in ordinary and broadcast talk-in-interaction offers a solid basis for elaborating and applying a model
for analysis of interpreter-mediated live radio interviews, which may start with an ‘unmotivated looking’ (Sacks, 1984a:26) at my radio broadcast data, which then leads to finding phenomena and patterns by applying categories for systematic analysis. Institutional CA has proved to be a consistent approach and methodology for uncovering and explicating the phenomena and patterns arising from specific social interactions (e.g. broadcasting). Therefore, it is suitable for application to radio interviews, where the issues under research are how the interpreter integrates into the speech-exchange - or turn-taking - systems in live radio broadcasting, its public arena, communicative ethos and framings; and, vice versa, how radio institutions, broadcasters and guests orient their utterances to an additional participant in the broadcast talk-in-interaction - i.e. the interpreter - while still producing talk-in-interaction for the audience.

Thus, categories for analysis, such as broadcasting production constraints, turn-taking organisation and structure, issues of power, the influence of the medium, communicative ethos, public arena of communication and institutional discourse on the interactional dynamics (cf. Heritage 1985, 2004), can be re-examined in this unexplored broadcasting arena of interpreter-mediated live radio interviews with a methodology that deals with those categories in an structured and systematic way (see chapter IV).

Radio interpreting can be considered a type of situated talk-in-interaction in its own right, which allows for data-driven studies, therefore making CA appropriate for approaching how talk is organised and how it unfolds in those settings. Psathas (1995:50) claims that CA's primary concern does not lie in achieving ‘empirical generalizations’, frequency, range and distribution of interactional phenomena - although they may be an outcome of CA - but rather in “the discovery, description and analysis of complex interactional phenomena as socially produced phenomena in their own right”. No study of this type of broadcast event should overlook the contributions and insights that CA offers, while still being critical with its limitations and acknowledging the need for being supplemented by other methods which are compatible with CA.

For the purposes of my research, CA can be supported by supplementary methods in order to reach a comprehensive, multi-layered and substantiated analysis (cf. Goodwin
and Duranti, 1992:2, Cicourel 1992). Thus, when looking at live interpreter-mediated (DI) events, CA allows the analyst to focus on the interaction; when looking at interpreter-mediated interaction in radio settings, CA also allows a focus on the setting. It is at this intersection that CA in institutional settings is justified, as Hutchby and Wooffitt (2008:160) conclude:

*By focusing on the distinctive nature of the speech-exchange systems which are oriented to by participants in such settings, and on other aspects of the design of talk, CA demonstrates that institutional contexts are the ongoing accomplishment of the participants in their interactional conduct, rather than external constraints which cause certain forms of conduct to occur.*

Nonetheless, there are critical aspects that should not be ignored before considering integrating CA-based theoretical, methodological and analytical contributions in my research. There are gaps in CA literature on broadcast talk-in-interaction that need to be addressed.

First of all, although there is an acknowledgement of the differences and similarities between TV and radio broadcast talk-in-interaction (e.g. Hutchby 1991, 1995, 1999, Scannell 1991, 1996), as well as social, cultural and professional differences (e.g. Sterling 2009, Glevarec and Pinet 2009, Fleming 2002, Cebrián 1994, Scannell and Cardiff 1991), CA has not fully answered the question of why and how certain types of broadcast talk occur only in radio (e.g. interpreter-mediated interviews in *ESV* and the whole of Radio 3, *Cosmopolitaine* on France Inter, or *World Routes* on BBC World74). It seems evident that interviews of this length and depth are specific to radio broadcasting and not TV or other media. CA is able to detail the fine-grained features and conversational patterns of broadcast talk-in-interaction, but if we ask why this kind of conversational events do indeed take place on a particular radio station and format, the explanation may require an epistemological, sociological and ethnographic approach, as Cicourel (1992) suggests (see also Durham Peters 1999, Gieve and Norton 2007).

A second criticism I would highlight with respect to the English-speaking CA-based research is the prominence given to news interviews (covering mostly politics), studio
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74 What these programmes and their respective institutions have in common is that they have a long history of in-depth broadcast interviews in the fields of culture and arts, where interpreter-mediated interviews are part and parcel of the broadcast events.
debates, phone-in shows and audience participation programmes in the conversational study of radio talk-in-interaction. This body of research literature has largely ignored cultural programmes or events of the like of the aforementioned *World Routes* on BBC World Service and BBC3, or *Jarvis Cocker’s Sunday Service* on BBC6 Music, which are significant examples of programmes where talk-in-interaction is central to the show. Drawing on the first ‘unmotivated looking’ (following Sacks 1984a) approach, these programmes show quite different organisational, structural (in form and content) and conversational patterns with respect to most of the radio broadcast data in the discussed literature, but still have not received CA scholarly attention.

This criticism to current CA studies on broadcast talk is of particular relevance to my research, which focuses on a different kind of broadcast interview taking place within a particular media institution, Radio 3, which devotes most of its schedule to culture and arts. In this sense, the gap found in the English-speaking CA-based research, can be partially filled by an interesting line of research on cultural radio stations in France (e.g. Glevarec 1996, 1999, Glevarec and Libbrecht 1997), focusing on France Culture and France Inter, which are two public radio stations that devote a large part of their schedule to culture and arts, and where interviews and debates are an intrinsic part of their programmes (e.g. *Le Grand Entretien* on France Inter, *Les Bons Plaisirs*, on France Culture). Scholarly work highlighting the practices and specificities of these stations when it comes to approaching, organising and broadcasting talk-in-interaction can be found in the works of, for example, Chareaudeau (1984), Glevarec (1996, 1999, 2001, 2007), Glevarec and Libbrecht (1997), Traverso (2006), and Glevarec and Pinet (2009). These studies contribute to CA research on broadcast talk in the sense that they acknowledge the role of producers in the organisation of talk (Glevarec 1996, Glevarec and Libbrecht 1997), the specificity of the communicative ethos of a station such as France Culture and its impact on the production and organisation of talk-in-interaction (Glevarec 1999, 2001) and, in a wider sociological sense, how different radio stations in
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75 As an example of a multilingual broadcast episode in this programme, see: [http://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/b00j0g08](http://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/b00j0g08).
76 See: [http://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/b00ptsjd](http://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/b00ptsjd).
France, including France Culture, have established a close relationship with their audiences (Glevarec 2007, Glevarec and Pinet 2009). The following paragraph succinctly summarises Glevarec’s CA approach in his research:

L’émission de radio à France Culture est un cadre particulier qui se construit entre producteur et intervenants, avant, pendant et après l’émission. Le cadre d’interaction radiophonique inclut le contenu abordé par les parties et les modalités de son traitement, mais aussi la nature relationnelle de l’interaction au micro et les formes de l’engagement des protagonistes.79

Using CA, supported with visuals of the event, Glevarec shows how producers use the moments before going on-air to spatially construct the interaction (1999:6), as well as engaging in an interaction whereby they utter ‘formulations’ (accounts) (1999:6) to construct the interactional framework, such as “On va essayer de s’arranger comme ça”80 or “faisons comme ça, il faut tenir l’antenne”.81 Glevarec has produced a large body of research covering themes, methodologies and findings around French radio which could be well extrapolated to the study of Radio 3’s ESV, given the institutional similarities of the stations. Drawing on these analyses can prove appropriate, since the institutional contents and ethos of Radio 3 are much closer to these media institutions than to news interviews broadcasting or news radio stations.

An additional gap in CA-based research is the lack of research dealing with multilingual broadcast talk, including interpreter-mediated interactions and events, beyond T/I studies. Whereas some multilingual and intercultural concerns have arisen in a certain number of works (e.g. Traverso 2000, 2006, Tannen 2005, Fetzer and Lauerbach 2007, Busch and Pfisterer 2011) multilingual broadcast talk has not been covered by fields outside T/I studies, and when an intercultural approach is taken in broadcast CA-based research, it has only been by comparing similar broadcast programmes, events or practices across different countries, regions or cultures (cf. Traverso 2006, Fetzer and Lauerbach 2007). This gap is also found in intercultural CA works in settings other than
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79 Radio broadcasting on France Culture is a particular framework which is constructed with the cooperation of the producer and the participants before, during and after the broadcast. The radio interaction framework includes the content dealt with by the different parties and the different modalities of content treatment, but also the relational nature of the interaction on air and the ways in which the protagonists engage (my translation).

80 “We’ll try to get by like this” (my translation).

81 “Let’s do it like this, we have to stay on air” (my translation).
media (cf. Traverso 2000, Schegloff et al. 2002), where conversational situations and acts are compared across different cultures and languages, but no studies are carried out when languages and cultures enter into direct contact via talk-in-interaction.

To sum up, there are still gaps with regards to what CA research has covered up to now in broadcast talk-in-interaction. In terms of my study this is most notable in talk-in-interaction in cultural programmes and radio stations, and also in multilingual and interpreter-mediated talk and documentary fieldwork (or ethnographic work) on broadcast production conditions. Nevertheless, the studies reviewed in this chapter show that there is a rigorous and valid research path on which to build up further research which, thanks to new technologies allowing easier access to data, could even include quantitative studies permitting “conversation analytic findings to be augmented by the dimensions of frequency and association” (Heritage and Clayman, 2010:282).

While limitations of CA have been pointed out not only in this study, but also by CA scholars themselves and by other analytic traditions, such as Speech Act Theory (Searle et al. 1992), CDA (Fairclough 1995a) and Ethnography (Cicourel 1992), it can be rightly argued that there is not only one way of looking at talk-in-interaction events of the like of my data. For example, if we want to look at how Radio 3 approaches cinema via ESV, CDA could be useful in revealing the political and ideological interests behind their approach by looking at the programme's institutional messages (e.g. on its website) and by interviewing its host and director. But in order to look at how the talk around cinema is organised, how interlocutors take up the Radio 3 approach to cinema in their broadcast talk-in-interaction, a CA-based model is to be followed.

My critical review of CA studies has covered its foundations in sociolinguistics, its theoretical framework and first developments, its application to the fields that are relevant to my study (i.e. media, radio and DI), taking into account converging studies which CA has also drawn on (i.e. MS and RS) as well as its main criticism (mainly coming from CDA approaches).

Building up on this critical review, I aim to put forward a study of interpreter-mediated live radio interviews whose methodology and analysis acknowledge and put into practice the main contributions of CA as an approach which has illuminated the ground
rules of broadcast interviewing (Franklin et al., 2005:50) - most notably, the organisation and interactional devices and effects of turn-taking (cf. Greatbatch 1988, Thornborrow 2002, Hutchby 2006), the use of semi-formalised sequences and the disregard of question-answer adjacency pairs by both hosts and guests/interviewees (cf. Heritage 1985, Greatbatch 1998, Hutchby 2006, Heritage and Clayman 2010). CA offers a model for the systematic analysis of social interactions (cf. Heritage 1985, 2004) which has been applied to both broadcast talk (as referenced in this section) and DI (cf. Davidson 2000, 2002, Merlini and Favaron 2005, Mason 2006, Pasquandrea 2012, Davitti 2013; specifically in the field of media interpreting, cf. Straniero Sergio 1999, Wadensjö 2000, 2008a, 2008b, Mack 2002, see chapter II). During its development since the 1970s, it has gradually overcome its main criticisms (cf. Fairclough, 1995b:22-23) to integrate models of analysis which acknowledge that the broadcast interview is not a unitary genre, that is, that there is considerable, culturally patterned variation, not only historically but also in contemporary broadcasting, “depending upon the medium, type of programme, and particular style of interviewer” (Fairclough, 1995b:23), and therefore, CA-based analyses have become more flexible and comprehensive by being integrated in mixed methods (cf. Wadensjö 2000) which my study aims to follow.
Chapter IV. Data and Methodology

The data and methodology presented here are aimed at detailing interpreter-mediated radio interviews, with regards to their specific organisational aspects (prior to and during the broadcast) and their interactional features and patterns.

IV.1 Data Description

The data consists of six interpreter-mediated live broadcast interviews from the programme *El Séptimo Vicio* (*ESV*), broadcast on Radio 3, a station which is part of the *Spanish State Radio Group* (Radio Nacional de España, RNE), belonging to the *Spanish State Broadcasting Company* (Radiotelevisión Española, RTVE). The interviews were collected between June 2006 and March 2013 and include interpreter-mediated exchanges involving Spanish and the following languages: French (Interview 1), English (Interviews 2 and 3), Italian (Interview 4), Farsi (Interview 5) and German (Interview 6). The data is presented in the form of the actual broadcast audio programmes (either recorded from the live FM broadcast or taken from the station's podcast website), transcriptions of Interviews 1-4 for CA purposes and, in the case of Interview 5, my own AV footage offering visuals of the actual interpreter-mediated radio interaction (all of them included on a DVD, Annex 1).

The data for the purposes of corroboration (see IV.2.3) consists of the aforementioned visuals of Interview 5 and semi-structured interviews (SSI) with *ESV* director and host Javier Tolentino (JT) and the sound technicians (STs) working in one of the interviews (Interview 5), Juan Carlos Fernández and Juan Becerra.82

IV.1.2 Data Size and Representativeness

As far as data size is concerned, the six broadcast interviews amount to a total of 7 hours of broadcasting time and 1 hour (approx.) of AV footage for the filmed broadcast interview (Interview 5). Given the purposes and scope of my study, the data size is considered adequate and representative of *ESV* and Radio 3's broadcasting practice,
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82 The interpreter in Interview 5, Rima Shermohamaddi, was also interviewed. However, given the scope and space limitations of this doctoral thesis, this semi-structured interview and the transcription of the SSI with the STs have been left out of the analysis. In the case of STs, the technical information they provided in the interview coincided with that provided by JT, which would make its inclusion redundant. A case study of Interview 5 using the three semi-structured interviews against the backdrop of Communities of Practice Theory is envisaged as further research.
since the aim is to offer CA-based, qualitative findings which are illustrative of DI practices on this radio show and the radio institution broadcasting it.

It must be emphasised, nevertheless, that the interpreter-mediated live radio interviews in my data are not necessarily representative of all the interpreting situations that take place in the radio communicative landscape - neither geographically, nor culturally, nor in historic terms. Following Mason’s methodological concerns on data collection, size and representativeness (2000:226-227), large quantities of data are not always necessary and the scale and scope of the corpus compiled for analysis “will depend on the objectives of the research”. Mason (2000:226) provides research studies using authentic interpreter-mediated events (cf. Wadensjö 1998, Roy 2000, Lang 1978), as well as research based on experimental methods (cf. Berk-Seligson 1990), to argue that “a qualitative study may rely on a much lesser corpus than a quantitative study” and that “the aims of a study of simulated data cannot be the same as those of a study of authentic data occurring in a real social context”.

With these methodological concerns in mind, there are two basic reasons to focus my analysis on data taken specifically from one radio programme (ESV) belonging to one themed public radio station (Radio 3): firstly, Radio 3 is the station that most frequently broadcasts interpreter-mediated (DI) live radio interviews within the Spanish radio landscape, with ESV being one of the programmes that contributes most to this (e.g. 23 episodes with interpreter-mediated interviews during 2013, out of a total of 203 interviews on ESV that year); secondly, this type of data provides the analysis with a wide range of production and broadcasting practices which do, however, maintain a certain stylistic homogeneity and a common content-based (themed) framework (i.e. cinema), thus allowing for a deeper focus on the communicative framework (radio) and its participants during the interaction.

In this regard, a large diversity of content within the data runs the risk of introducing too many variables in the interpersonal and referential dimensions, hence the risk of losing focus from my object of analysis. This risk is avoided by the cohesiveness of the data, as explained above.
Finally, the data collecting process is complex and involves a dialectic process where continuous feedback emerges from the active research processes of listening, interviewing, transcribing, etc. Hence, the compilation of this corpus is not only based on my original hypotheses, research questions and theoretical and analytical frameworks, but most notably on listening to ESV programmes following, first, an “unmotivated looking” (Sacks, 1984a:27) approach and producing “first impressions” notes (Wadensjö, 2000:237). This dialectic, bottom-up and data-driven approach has contributed to shaping my research questions and to further developing categories for analysis by providing a dynamic and permanent space for reflection. There is a simple fact underlying the data collection process: long hours of radio listening are involved if the analyst aims to have a reference corpus that is suitable for analysis and which could provide the researcher “with the clear type of information and idiosyncrasy of this participation framework” (Baker, 2006:25). Thus, this is data-driven research whereby the interpreter-mediated live interviews found in Radio 3’s ESV have largely contributed to formulating my hypothesis and to shaping my corpus and the subsequent analysis.

IV.2 Methodology

The following section includes the methods used for my analysis of interpreter-mediated live radio interviews in Radio 3’s ESV: the systematic study of the organisation of the communicative event, CA and corroborating methods - i.e. AV recordings of the social interaction and semi-structured interviews .

My analytical model consists of a triangulated model which places CA at the centre of the analysis. There are four structural steps sustaining this model which are further developed below in subsections IV.2.1, IV.2.2 and IV.2.3, but are succinctly introduced here to provide an overall picture of the model:

1. A descriptive analysis of the data interviews, via individual tables (see table model in Appendix 1) including details of the participants, production arrangements, category and broad pattern of interaction for each interpreter-mediated live broadcast interview. The tables offer this detailed information with the aim of (1) gaining a deeper understanding of the broad context surrounding the interaction and (2) elaborating a subsequent ‘map’ of Radio3/ESV approaches to interpreter-
mediated events, which allows for structuring the CA analysis according to different ‘situational’ categories and specific organisational aspects (cf. Mack 2002 and Gieve and Norton 2007; see section II.1).

2. A critical description and analysis of the communicative and institutional ethos and public arena of broadcasting where the interpreter-mediated interviews in my data occur: Radio 3 and ESV. By looking at the origin of Radio 3 within the Spanish radio broadcasting landscape, the launch of ESV and its institutional statements (via the podcast website description and theme soundtracks), a first explanation for the presence of foreign language speakers and cultures is sought.

3. CA via systematic interactional categories (Heritage 1985, 2004; cf. Straniero Sergio 1999 and Wadensjö 2000 in the field of MI and Hutchby 1996, 1999, 2006, Glevarec 1996 and Glevarec and Libbrecht 1997 in the field of Radio Studies) of the talk-in-interaction in interviews 1-4. The CA framework of this study draws on theories and methods which have been applied in the study of DI and broadcast talk (as reviewed in chapters I, II and III), on Cicourel's (1992) call to account for the broad and local contexts of the interaction and Mason's (2004:88) argument for taking account of the full participation framework, including “production and reception formats, audience design and the footings of all participants”.

4. A corroborating analysis via the support of visuals (filming) of one of the interviews (see Table 5 in chapter V, page 146) and a SSI with ESV director and host JT.

This triangulated model, whereby 1 and 2 represent one point of the triangle, is expected to reveal multiple aspects (Denzin 1978) of a single event or sets of events, assuming that looking at an object (in this case situated communicative events) from more than one standpoint “provides researchers and theorists with more comprehensive knowledge about the object” (Miller and Fox, 2004).
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IV.2.1 Model for the Descriptive Study of Interpreter-Mediated Radio Interviews and their Communicative and Institutional Ethos and Public Arena of Broadcasting: Radio 3 and El Séptimo Vicio

My exploration of the organisational practices of the media institution (Radio 3) and programme (ESV) when it comes to interpreting and its attitudes towards the management and display of multilingual broadcast talk draws on Gieve and Norton (2007) (see chapter II). The information gathered in the individual tables is extracted from different sources: (1) the episode's information as provided on the ESV podcast website, (2) information provided by the host or other participants during the actual broadcast and (3) information provided via the SSI with ESV host JT (see transcription in Appendix 5 and filmed interview in Annex 1 DVD). The tables cover the six interpreter-mediated broadcast interviews in the data and represent distinct categories based on broad patterns of interaction (cf. table model in Appendix 1 and full tables 1-6 in Chapter V.1, pages 133-151). A descriptive analysis of each interview is provided in a table and supplemented by a subtable detailing other interviews of the same category which are not part of my data but that provide evidence of the production of this type of event in ESV.

IV.2.2 CA of Broadcast Interpreter-mediated Interviews in ESV: Structure and Categories for Analysis

The core stage of the analysis consists of looking at the actual broadcast talk-in-interaction that is produced during the interpreter-mediated event via participants' sequences where aspects of the interpreter-mediated interaction are unique or specific to this form of talk (cf. Heritage and Greatbatch 1991 and Heritage and Clayman 2010) using a CA-based model for analysis (see Appendix 2). The analytical categories in this model draw on Heritage (1985, 2004) and later adaptations by Straniero Sergio (1999) and Wadensjö (2000) in the field of MI. The structure of these categories acknowledges that broadcast radio talk is produced in a specific interactional context and that participants' talk is highly sensitive to that context (Hutchby, 2006:24). My CA-based model is applied fully to Interviews 1 and 2, and partially to Interviews 3, 4 and 5, following a transversal approach (Traverso, 2005:26-27) which focuses on specific aspects of these interviews. The scope and length of this research do not allow for a full
application of my CA model to all 5 interviews. The rationale behind this analytical strategy takes into account Interviews 1 and 2 as two case studies for the application of the analytical model as a whole and Interviews 3-5 as completing the range of categories of interviews and broad patterns of interaction found in the data. Hence, section 1 of the model, focusing on ‘broadcast production and situational arrangements prior to and during the interview’ (see Appendix 2), remains central to unveiling the unique footprint of this specific setting and institution in interpreter-mediated talk-in-interaction.

Based on the CA of interviews 1-5, a separate section which highlights and categorises prosodic features and nonverbal communication specific and recurrent in this type of interaction is provided.

IV.2.3 Corroborating Methods: Visuals and Semi-Structured Interviews

Mason's call to use introspective methods, as “when participants are invited to comment on their own perceptions in post-performance interviews” (Mason, 2000:225-226) (cf. Wadensjö, 1994, 2000, Roy 2000), is all the more fitting when a large amount of face-to-face interpreter-mediated interaction in radio broadcast events, such as the ones in this data, occurs off-the-record and, hence, is unavailable to the researcher.

Following this rationale, I supplement CA of broadcast data with a semi-structured interview with ESV’s host (see Appendix 5). Visuals of the interpreter-mediated event are also provided for one broadcast interview of my sample (see Annex 1, DVD). Both sources of data are intended to corroborate the primary conversation analysis based on the spoken interaction as it was broadcast.

The implementation of these two methods aims not only to substantiate the analysis and findings, but also to enrich this research by making the stakeholders present in the research process (cf. Mason 2000, Turner and Harrington 2009).

Supportive data from video-recordings of live radio interviews, as well as the semi-structured qualitative interviews with stakeholders will provide further first-hand information and knowledge with regards to the actual institutional and participation framework, time-space constraints, organisational aspects of the interpreter-mediated event and the broadcaster's expectations with regards to the interpreting and the
interpreter which, in turn, may inform the interpreter’s performance and interaction. Given that primary characteristics of this type of interpreter-mediated event (as a form of public radio broadcast) are the absence of visuals and the off-the-record interaction (two crucial elements in the organisation and performance of the event), visual access to the exchange and interviews with members of the broadcasting institutions become crucial as part of my methodological procedure.

IV.2.3.1 The Support of Visuals

Having access to visuals, or video-recorded evidence (Turner and Harrington, 2009:18), is essential in DI research. The benefits that can be gained relate to multiple research issues, as Mason (2000, 2007) and Turner and Harrington (2009) suggest.

Some researchers have taken up this encouragement and put it in practice with success: Davitti’s doctoral work (completed in 2012) and subsequent publication (Davitti 2013) integrate talk and gaze in the analysis of mediated parent-teacher meetings. Davitti (2012) uses a small corpus of authentic, video-recorded, mediated English-Italian interactions in pedagogical settings. She adopts an interdisciplinary approach encompassing CA and studies on non-verbal communication to explore how interactants orient to both verbal and nonverbal activities (mainly gaze) in the production and monitoring of each other’s actions, the initiation and maintenance of social encounters and in the co-construction of a meaning and participatory framework. Further examples of the use of filmed interpreter-mediated exchanges for research analysis (CA-based or other) can be found in Angelelli (2004), Bot (2005), Merlini and Favaron (2005, 2009), Pöchhacker and Shlesinger (2007), Pöchhacker (2012) and Pasquandrea (2012) in the field of healthcare interpreting, and Martínez-Gómez (2011) in the field of prison interpreting.

IV.2.3.1.1 Designing and Planning AV Filming of an Interpreter-Mediated Live Radio Interview

The support of visuals when analysing interpreter-mediated face-to-face broadcast talk on radio is key to finding evidence revolving around the physical-spatial organisation of the interactional event, as well as technical and logistic aspects both prior to and during the exchange: by showing the interpreter and the primary participants in interaction,
attention is not only focused on the propositional content but also on the form and pragmatic value of non-verbal interaction. Rapport building and complicity between the participants, eye gaze, gesture, feelings etc. are *subtleties* in the interaction which need to be made visible for the researcher, unless the researcher is physically present and does not record the interaction (see Image 1).


Furthermore, as will be shown throughout the analysis, organisational and interpersonal aspects are not only dealt with during the broadcast interaction, but most notably during the interaction off-air. Documenting what participants do and talk about while the interaction is not being broadcast can provide information (even if not representative) on these organisational and interpersonal aspects and how they influence the broadcast interaction.

The video-recordings were made with the assistance of Géraldine Comte, a qualified documentary film maker. Filming interpreter-mediated interaction is a specialised task which has usually been carried out by researchers themselves, drawing on their intuition based on their interpreting expertise, but not on a trained and experienced film
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84 BA in Audiovisual Design (University of Buenos Aires), MA in Script, Production and Direction (Paris I Panthéon-Sorbonne), MA in Anthropological Cinema and Documentary (University of Paris X).
and sound recording background. Using the techniques and methods of documentary film-making, with the expertise of a skilled professional working hand-in-hand with the researcher, may turn the data collection process, as well as the collected data itself, into a higher quality, professionally filmed AV resource. The skills and expert knowledge of someone with Comte's profile and experience for data collection and filming is a contribution to DI research which had never been put in practice before. With this interdisciplinary and collaborative research practice, we also hope to set a trend for future research methods in interpreter-mediated events.

A further methodological contribution of video-recording authentic face-to-face interpreter-mediated events, as noted by Turner and Harrington (2009:18) and Psathas (1995:45), is that transcriptions can be much more detailed thanks to both audio and visual media.

Summing up, video-recording this type of interpreter-mediated event is a methodological tool which is aimed at enriching the analysis and revealing aspects of the interaction, while minimising the chances of overlooking some of them, as well as reducing the researcher's intuitive analytical inferences which may arise from only having access to broadcast audio interviews.

It must be stressed that, overall, collecting this type of data is a complex task in face-to-face radio broadcasting: video-recording live radio broadcasting involved a series of constraints which had to be overcome in order to not only collect the data, but, most importantly, to make it viable for research, including obtaining permissions, accessing scheduled broadcasts, filming the interaction, and minimising the observer's paradox (as underlined by Mason, 2000:229), the latter being a relatively simple task, since the filmed participants acknowledged that being recorded (sound and/or video) was part of their daily practice, hence video-recording them would not have much of an impact in this particular interaction.

---

85 None of the authors reviewed above have used experts to film the interpreter-mediated events which are part of their data.

86 Cf. also Turner and Harrington (2009:19).
**IV.2.3.2 Semi-structured Interview: Designing, Preparing and Filming**

**IV.2.3.2.1 Design**

The SSI (see Appendix 3) included standardised questions as well as open-ended questions. It aimed to cover as many aspects of interpreter-mediated radio events as possible, particularly in case the informant would not comment on them in his/her answer. The interview was designed in a way that stakeholders would feel empowered (Cameron *et al.* 1992) to talk openly about their concerns, experience, knowledge and views on the interpreting activity and the interpreter in the programmes they work for.

The interview consisted of three sections, namely (1) *Background Information*, covering the stakeholder's role and position, the kind of multilingual and interpreter-mediated events they usually cover; (2) *The place of interpreting in their respective radio production*; (3) *Working with an interpreter/media stakeholders.*

The SSIs were designed to take place on a one-to-one basis (i.e. researcher - journalist/sound technician/interpreter), as the target informants were few and very specific: those involved in the actual radio programme production and broadcast, that is JT, sound technicians and, if possible, interpreters who have worked with them on *ESV*. This one-to-one approach, plus the fact that the researcher (myself) and the interviewer (Géraldine Comte) were familiar with the broadcast programme, made it possible to ask for clarification or further explanations in case the interviewee was stuck. The following is an illustrative example of this interviewing technique:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Question:</th>
<th>• How is the interpreting carried out: consecutively, simultaneously?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explanatory Question:</td>
<td>• What do you think is the reason for choosing consecutive interpreting or simultaneous interpreting?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarification / Provision of ideas [only if necessary or if previous question remains unanswered]:</td>
<td>• Common procedure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Communicative preferences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Technical constraints/considerations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflective Question:</td>
<td>• If you have worked with both, what do you think are the advantages and disadvantages of each of them?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

87 ‘Working with an interpreter’ in the case of interviews with media stakeholders, and ‘Working with media stakeholders’ in the case of interviews with interpreters.
In the case of JT a special section of the SSI was included to cover specific broadcast interviews from his programme, namely Interviews 2 and 5 of my data, one of which took place two and a half months before the SSI was carried out, the other one day before.

IV.2.3.2.2 Planning and Preparation

The filmed semi-structured interviews took place on 17th-18th June 2010, upon my official request to both Radio 3 and JT, and after obtaining full permission to film and subsequently use the SSI, as well as the ESV episode broadcast from Granada at that time (see IV.2.3.1.1) for academic research and training purposes.

The SSIs were filmed in the interviewee’s chosen location, i.e. across the city of Granada (Spain), where the Cines del Sur International Film Festival takes place every June. In 2009 and 2010, ESV covered the festival on location: JT, as director and host, travelled to Granada and the local RNE team set up the outdoors studio, as opposed to previous years, when the festival had been covered from Radio 3’s central studios in Madrid (2007, 2008, 2011, 2012) and interviews (interpreter-mediated and otherwise) had taken place via phone-line or via radio duplex (studio-to-studio connection).

The reasons for filming the SSIs were two-fold: first, of a pragmatic nature, that is, to get as much non-verbal information supporting the informants’ interview answers/comments as possible, as well as making the eventual transcriptions easier. Secondly, for broader research and public engagement purposes: a total of 13 media stakeholders were interviewed as part of my overarching research project, entitled Interpreting in the Media: Liaison Interpreting in TV/Radio settings. The interviewees were Radio 3’s ESV team that was already mentioned: director/host and sound technicians; staff involved in the Canal Sur TV Cines del Sur special programme (RTVA): the producer and executive producer, four journalists involved in the programme throughout the years and the cameraman involved in the 2010 edition; other media stakeholders from the written press (El País) and foreign media (RTL, Germany) were also interviewed.

---

88 Funded by Heriot-Watt University’s School of Management and Languages.

89 I asked for all the relevant authorisations to interview, film and eventually disseminate the findings academically, following the Heriot-Watt Research Code of Ethics. Both RTVA and RTVE gave authorisation immediately and I am very grateful to everyone in this institution who has collaborated with this research.
Before the filmed SSI with JT took place, guidelines and previous preparation were discussed with the documentary filmmaker and interviewer, Géraldine Comte, for her to understand and to be fully aware of my research aims and objectives, as well as the rationale behind my first semi-structured interview draft (on which she offered invaluable input before and during the interviews). Comte was asked to listen to my sample of ESV’s episodes in order to share the primary data and, thus, integrate it as part of her expert knowledge. Furthermore, as part of the interviewing procedure discussed above, Comte used documentary interviewing techniques, drawing on her experience, adopting the position and ethos of a naïve/curious yet professional and well-informed interviewer (cf. Barbash and Tailor 1997, Wengraf 2001).

The pre-filming contact (phone and later face-to-face) with the interviewees took place during the week previous to the interview. Our common objective was to be seen by the interviewees as both informed and interested researchers/professionals in interpreting and documentary filmmaking who, as such, were unobtrusively approaching their field of work and interaction. Thus, we aimed at creating an ‘interviewing participation framework’ which would encourage the interviewees to talk openly and in detail about the issues in question.

A short briefing of the research aims was provided to the interviewees, reminding them that while the focus would be placed on the activities of the interpreters in these settings, our aim was not to identify or analyse interpreter ‘errors’ (Mason, 1999:159-160; Turner and Harrington, 2009:18), but rather to gain a better understanding of the ways in which the organisational and interactional complexities of these events affected both interpreters’ and media stakeholders’ ability to operate effectively. Furthermore, while asking the interviewees to freely express their concerns, experience, knowledge and views, they were also reminded to bear in mind that ‘frequencies’, ‘representativeness’ and eventual ‘standardisation of practices’ were part of the researcher’s concerns and, therefore, including general practice and particular examples would be appreciated.
Concerning the way the SSIs unfolded, both in terms of content and interaction, it is relevant to note that, particularly in the case of JT, not only his willingness to take part in the research project but, most notably, his profile and experience as a communication professional were of great help. JT is used to talking in front of a microphone, conducting interviews, participating in media events; these factors made the interview run smoothly and the impression the researcher gets when analysing the filmed interview is that JT co-operated fully and used his communicative skills for the benefit of the research project.

IV.2.4 Note on transcriptions: presentation and conventions

The radio interviews in my corpus are presented as they were originally broadcast on Radio 3 and uploaded to the podcast section of the website (Annex 1, DVD). Full transcriptions of interviews 1, 2, 3 and 4 for CA purposes are included in Annex 1, DVD. Broadcast interview fragments which are considered illustrative for the analysis are inserted in the form of transcription excerpts, including back translations into English of the foreign language utterances. All of the radio interviews, except for Interview 1, can also be accessed through the Radio 3 website (see links in the data tables for each ESV episode, chapter V).

For the purposes of my analysis, I use two types of transcription systems: firstly, a CA-based transcription system (Jefferson 2004) for my primary data (ESV’s set of 5 interpreter-mediated broadcast interviews from 5 different episodes and my own filming of one of the ESV episodes included in the data).

The layout of the transcriptions is structured to allow the reader to follow the flow of the exchange, as well as easily referencing sequences and utterances throughout the exchange. Each utterance is numbered, followed by its timing (minutes and seconds) and speaker’s initials or other sound input, as in the following example taken from Interview 1:

\[(62)\]
\[
14:03-14:05
\]
\[IF: \text{Por favor, ¡de nada! [(laughs)]}\]

\[(63)\]
\[
14:04\]
LC: [[Merci.]]

(64)
14:04-14:06
JT: [(laughing) À bientôt.]

(65)
14:06-14:19
Film sound extract in Spanish.

This transcription system includes marks of the analytic concerns which I, as the conversation analyst, bring to the data (Hutchby and Wooffitt, 2008:72; see transcription symbols, Appendix 4). The transcription system I have adapted for this purpose, however, does not include all symbols developed by Jefferson, based on Ochs’s “selective process” (1979). Following Meyer’s (1998) and Niemants’s (2012) theoretical premises for the representation and interpretation of transcriptions of interpreting events as primary data, I have developed a mixed transcription system, adapted from Hutchby (1996a:117) and, most notably, the one put forward by Mason (1999) - later simplified in Mason (2009) - for the study and analysis of DI, by reducing the amount of symbols (particularly regarding pronunciation features) used in most conventional CA transcripts in favour of a more readable transcript, while still showing the precision, fidelity and delicacy (Mason, 1999:no page number) needed for the analysis. Special attention has been paid to marking turn constructional units and turn-alloca- tional techniques used by the participants, with the purpose of finding specific and recurrent patterns of turn-taking in this type of interpreter-mediated live radio interviews.

The system has been supplemented with some new symbols which I have considered necessary in order to represent conversational features which are specific to this type of interaction:

- XX: Undetermined speaker.
- ¶: Line break. Speaker turns to talk to other active participant within the same utterance.
- #Singing#: Music lyrics or film soundtrack, relevant for the talk-in-interaction. Only verbal transcription applied.

Secondly, a simpler transcription system is used for the semi-structured interviews, which features the words that were spoken and some non-verbal activities, such as
laughter, in a standard orthography which makes the text look like a script for a play (Hutchby and Wooffitt, 2008:80). The aim here is to offer a simple representation of what is said during the interview, avoiding a large number of symbols referring to non-verbal communication or additional information (such as speed of talk, volume, tone or other prosodic features) which are not relevant for the type of analysis to be performed on these semi-structured interviews.

In this section, I have presented my model for the analysis of live broadcast radio interviews, which integrates CA with analytical supporting methods, i.e. visuals and participants' views via semi-structured interviews. Given the specificity of the radio interactional context under research, unexplored phenomena are expected to be found. The sociolinguistic approach which inspires my methodological model takes into account the three dimensions which configure any given social interaction: the contextual, interpersonal and the socio-cultural dimensions.90

The following diagram shows my methodological model for analysis.

---

90 Hatim and Mason (1990) talk about the pragmatic, semiotic and communicative dimensions of translation. However, the terminology applied here, as I will show, is more suited to my analytical framework.
Figure 1. Methodological model for analysis.
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Chapter V. Analysis

V.1 Categories of Interpreter-Mediated Live Radio Interviews: Data Tables

This section includes tables with the basic details of each of the radio interviews which are part of my data. These tables are the first step in the analysis: they frame the broad context in which the interpreter-mediated interviews take place, including a categorisation based on the reasons for the interview, the situational arrangements and the broad pattern of interaction. The subtables including ‘Further interviews within this category and broad pattern of interaction’, show how the interviews chosen as part of my data are representative of Radio 3’s ESV broadcasting practices.

Table 1: Interview 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme details:</th>
<th>Radio 3 (RTVE): <em>El Séptimo Vicio (ESV)</em>. Interview with Laurent Cantet (French filmmaker).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>08/06/2006.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration of the whole episode:</td>
<td>1 hour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration of the interpreter-mediated interview:</td>
<td>14:19 (incomplete – tape recorded from FM live broadcast, introductions missing).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages:</td>
<td>Spanish and French.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title on ESV’s podcast website:</td>
<td>No podcasting at the time of the interview. <em>ESV</em> podcasts available from 24/06/2008.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Episode Metadata:</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category of interview:</td>
<td>Film release interview.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadcast participants:</td>
<td>Javier Tolentino (host) (JT).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Laurent Cantet (guest) (LC).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interpreter, female, name unknown (IF).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound management:</td>
<td>Unnamed Sound Technician (ST).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note: Samuel Alarcón is the usual sound technician for ESV in Madrid.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Broad contextual factors:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisational and situational arrangements prior to the interview.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interpreter provider:** Unspecified.

Note: the talk-in-interaction suggests that it is the filmmakers’ distributor/manager who provides a professional interpreter, not only for this programme but for all events requiring interpreting during the promotion and release of LC’s film in Spain (media interviews, premiere, Q and A, etc.). The interpreter's provision responds to the usual practices in Radio 3 and ESV (see section IV.1.1.2).

**Reasons for interview:** LC is in Madrid to promote and premiere his new film, *Vers le Sud* (premièred in Spain as *Hacia el Sur*).

*ESV* invites LC to the programme for an in-depth interview.

**Participants' location:** Radio 3 studios in Madrid.

**Broad pattern of interaction:** Face-to-face.

**Outline of participation frameworks and structure:**

1. Introductions [missing in the recording].
2. Interactional focus on the film.
4. Recontextualisation of the interview by the host and question about critics’ reaction to the film.
5. The host turns to contemporary French cinema production and the guest's views.
6. Ending the interview: thanks, film première reminder and last remarks. Film extract as a participation framework transition.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Further interviews within this category and broad pattern of interaction:</th>
<th>Date (1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; broadcast)</th>
<th>Languages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>El amor en el cine de Naomi Kawase</td>
<td>02/04/13</td>
<td>Japanese-Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abderrahmane Sissako: &quot;Avisamos a Europa hace algún tiempo&quot;</td>
<td>18/10/12</td>
<td>French-Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>España es mi segundo país, Nikita Mihalkov</td>
<td>04/12/11</td>
<td>Russian-Spanish</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2: Interview 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Programme details:</strong></th>
<th>Radio 3 (RTVE): <em>El Séptimo Vicio</em>. Interview with Peter Greenaway (Welsh filmmaker).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date:</strong></td>
<td>02/04/2010.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Duration of the whole episode:</strong></td>
<td>2 hours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Duration of the interpreter-mediated interview:</strong></td>
<td>1 hour 30 minutes (including music interludes).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Languages:</strong></td>
<td>Spanish and English.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Title on ESV's podcast website:** | 1st hour: El séptimo vicio - El cine ha muerto y todos los periodistas son unos parásitos. Encuentro en directo con Peter Greenaway – 02/04/10. [Cinema is dead and all journalists are parasites. Live interview with Peter Greenaway – 2nd April 2010.]  
2nd hour: El séptimo vicio - Después de 100 años de búsqueda, ¡¡encontrada la segunda hora de Peter Greenaway con Javier Tolentino! - 02/04/10 (uploaded 11th February 2011). [After 100 years looking for it, we found the second hour of Peter Greenaway with Javier Tolentino! - 2nd April 2010.] |
| **Category of interview:** | Coverage of film-related events from central studios.                                                                              |
### Sound management:
José Ignacio Orona (JIO)

### Broad contextual factors:

#### Organisational and situational arrangements prior to the interview.

#### Interpreter provider:
Unspecified in the broadcast. Research on the festival website (see note below) points to the festival organisers, probably on request of Radio 3 - in line with the Radio 3 and ESV’s conventions and practice (see section V.2.3).

**Note:** RS is a freelance translator and interpreter, as well as General Coordinator of Performing Arts at the Secretaría de Cultura de Morelos (Culture Department of Morelos Government, Mexico) and Professor of French Literature, Translation and Linguistics at the Universidad Internacional of Cuernavaca (Mexico). He was also taking part in Cuenca's Religious Music Week, where he gave a talk entitled "Cantar un instante fuera del tiempo", *La armonía poética de Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz*, which was part of the festival special section, *Jornadas México: Caminos de Ida y Vuelta*, organised by the Vicerrectorado de Campus de Cuenca y Extensión Universitaria (Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha). Rafael Segovia's talk took place on the 30th of March (3 days before ESV’s broadcast interview).

#### Reasons for interview:
Peter Greenaway has been invited to Cuenca's *Semana de Música Religiosa* (Religious Music Week), to showcase and premiere, his documentary film, *The Marriage*.

*ESV* devotes its Easter Friday programme to the work and career of PG, including a broadcast live interview with him.

#### Participants' location:
Host and programme collaborator: Radio 3 studios in Madrid.

Guest and Interpreter: RNE local studios in Cuenca.

#### Broad pattern of interaction:
Studio-to-Studio connection.
### Outline of participation frameworks and structure:

1. **Introduction:** JT starts off with a radio narrative-chronicle of Jesus Christ's last days, as a contemporary chronicle adaptation, using metaphors and register of contemporary journalism to recall what supposedly happened in those days. Music is played after first contextualisation of the chronicled events: In Sempiterna, Stabat Mater, by Rossini. The opera soundtrack keeps playing in the background.

2. **Music break** (flamenco music) and PG's film extracts - dialogues and soundtracks.

3. **Interpreter-mediated interview starts.** Introductions and exchange of greetings between JT, PG and RS take place.
   - **3.a.** Host introduces OC as film and psychoanalysis expert, who has studied PG's films. OC proceeds to monologic sequence (4:43 min. of duration) on that line.
   - **3.b.** Interpreter-mediated exchange with PG re-starts. During the exchange, JT reminds PG several times that this is an interview and suggests (addressing PG directly, using the second person singular) to initiate an interview, a dialogue for the sake of the listeners.

4. JT takes the floor to redirect the interaction: he reminds the audience who the guest is, thanks the sound technicians and plays music (Otis Taylor) (min.01:13:15).

5. **Interview re-starts with re-contextualisation** and along similar interactional lines as in 3.b. Interaction is increasingly heated.

6. JT turns to RS (min. 01:40:47) and initiates dyadic exchange with him; JT asks him his personal views on how the interview went for him.

7. JT suggests to bring PG back to the interaction with clarifying question. Triadic exchange takes place.

8. After several attempts to bring the interview to an end by JT, PG says goodbye and JT wraps up interview, thanking RS for his 'hard task' (implicitly: interpreting).

9. **Broadcast talk is back to studio in Madrid only:** Oriental music is played; JT recapitulates the interview commenting on how he thinks it went, asking OC how she thought it went, and overtly asks the audience for their opinions and comments on ESV's blog. JT promises to upload the interview to ESV's podcast website. Final thought on PG's arguments, and thanks to audience, sound technicians and OC.

10. **Audience-oriented mode:** JT wishes good weekend and encourages the audience to listen again the following Friday. Music plays.
Table 2.1: Interview 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Further interviews within this category and broad pattern of interaction:</th>
<th>Date (1st broadcast)</th>
<th>Languages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Ese cine italiano, como es</em></td>
<td>17/12/2013</td>
<td>Italian-Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Festival Granada - 13/06/09</em></td>
<td>13/06/2009</td>
<td>English-French-Spanish</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3: Interview 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>13/03/2013.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration of the whole episode:</td>
<td>1 hour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration of the interpreter-mediated interview:</td>
<td>15:35-57:45 (40min 10sec).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages:</td>
<td>Spanish and English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title on <em>El Séptimo Vicio</em>'s podcast website:</td>
<td>Kossakovsky quiere a Tolentino en su próxima película. [Kossakovsky wants Tolentino in his next film.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category of interview:</td>
<td>Coverage of film-related event, collaboration with event organisers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadcast participants:</td>
<td>Javier Tolentino (host) (JT).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Andrea Guzmán (guest; president of DOCMA, organiser of the film event, 3xDOC) (AG).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Andrés Duque (guest, Spanish documentary filmmaker) (AD).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Viktor Kossakovsky (guest, Russian documentary filmmaker) (VK).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interpreter, male, name unknown (IM).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victoria Esparza (programme collaborator-journalist) (VE).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 passers-by/filmgoers (1 woman, 2 men) at the Café (interviewed by VE).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound management:</td>
<td>David Velasco (DV), Santiago Francia (SF) (in semi-outdoors studio).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sound production in Radio 3 Studios (Madrid): Samuel Alarcón.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Broad contextual factors:**

**Organisational and situational arrangements prior to the interview.**
### Interpreter provider:

Unspecified.

Note: The interaction suggests that it is the organisers of the event (DOCMA, documentary filmmaking association) and the interpreter has been hired by the organisers to accompany VK to all the interpreter-mediated events organised for his stay in Madrid (Q and A, masterclass, media interviews, etc.).

### Reasons for interview:

VK is in Madrid, as special guest of *3xDOC Encuentro de Creadores* (3xDOC Meeting with Creators), organised by DOCMA. *3xDOC 2013* unites documentary filmmakers AD and VK for a retrospective screening of some of their films, followed by Q and A sessions (13th and 14th March) and a public meeting with both filmmakers (15th March) at the Cine Doré (the official film theatre venue for Filmoteca Española). On 13th March, 9 pm, VK's film, *The Belovs*, was scheduled to be screened. *El Séptimo Vicio*, in collaboration with DOCMA and Filmoteca Española, arranged to broadcast its live programme - by then scheduled for live broadcast at 4 pm - from Cine Doré's Café, interviewing the organiser, AG, and the two guest filmmakers, AD and VK.

### Participants' location:

Semi-Outdoors Studio: Café at Cine Doré.

Note: Frequent location for *ESV* broadcasts outside RTVE studios.

### Broad pattern of interaction:

Face-to-face, multi-party interview.

### Outline of participation frameworks and structure:

1. Introduction by JT: audience-oriented mode, framing where the programme takes place, what for and with whom.

2. Music is played.

3. Recontextualisation: JT mentions the previous day’s programme and introduces first guest (AG). Diadic exchange takes place about the event and the guest filmmakers.

4. JT introduces the guest filmmakers.

   4.a. AD is introduced and short diadic exchange takes place.
4.b. VK is introduced and extended interpreter-mediated exchange takes place (mins. 15:36-57:09): starts as triadic, then multi-party. The radio table talk-in-interaction is supplemented with three music interludes and two interviews with filmgoers in the café by VE.

5. Overt audience-oriented mode: good-byes (starting with VK). Individual thanks and good-byes to the interpreter, the other guest filmmaker (AD), the event organiser (AG) and ESV’s team (DV, SF and VEJ) in Filmoteca Española.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Further interviews within this category and broad pattern of interaction:</th>
<th>Date (1st broadcast)</th>
<th>Languages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entrevista a Gianfranco Rosi</td>
<td>12/12/2013</td>
<td>Italian-Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reza Karimi, en El séptimo vicio</td>
<td>07/03/2013</td>
<td>Farsi-Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Por fin, Mía Hansen Love en El séptimo vicio</td>
<td>28/09/12</td>
<td>English-Spanish</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1: Interview 3
Table 4: Interview 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>23/01/2013.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration of the whole episode:</td>
<td>1 hour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration of the interpreter-mediated interview:</td>
<td>32:30-54:27 (21min 57sec).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages:</td>
<td>Spanish and Italian.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title on <em>El Séptimo Vicio</em>’s podcast website:</td>
<td>Olmi, en directo desde Asiagio (Italia). [Olmi, live from Asiagio (Italy).]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category of interview:</td>
<td>Coverage of film festival and collaboration/monographic interviews with filmmakers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound management:</td>
<td>Eduardo Larios (EL). Note: Mentioned by JT during broadcast.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad contextual factors:</td>
<td>Organisational and situational arrangements prior to the interview.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpreter provider:</td>
<td>ESV, upon request from JT and the production team. NOTE: made explicit during the broadcast.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasons for interview:</td>
<td>Seville's European Film Festival and ESV had previously scheduled an interview with EO. Due to the impossibility of EO to be in Seville, ESV decides to carry out the interview via telephone.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Participants' location:** | JT and VG: Radio 3 studios in Madrid.  
EO: own house in Asiago (Italy). |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Broad pattern of interaction:</strong></td>
<td>Telephone connection.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Outline of participation frameworks and structure:**

1. Introduction by the host (JT). The programme is framed within the time of year, the usual film events of that time of year and a link to the previous day's programme. JT draws on those three elements to invite the audience to stay tuned to ESV and Radio 3.

   1.a. JT mentions greetings from Eduardo Larios (sound technician), as well as greetings from the programme's collaborators (Ana Morente, Gregorio Parra, Isabel Ruiz Lara) and his own.

2. Music is introduced and played.

3. Generic re-contextualization: ESV’s theme soundtrack and recorded voice-over (as declaration of intentions) “El Séptimo Vicio: cine de todo el mundo, en versión original; el cine pequeño; el cine, en Radio 3. Como siempre.” [“El Séptimo Vicio: films from all over the world, in their original version; small films, in Radio 3. As always.”]

4. JT introduces and gives the floor to Marco and Busqui, organisers of the Muestra de Cine Europeo (European Cinema Showcase) in Lanzarote (Spain). The host uses this introduction to first mention EO (min. 7:08), introduced as a key player in European cinema.

5. Cabrillas Fritas Film Radio Magazine.

6. Back to the studio in Madrid, generic re-contextualisation: ESV’s theme soundtrack and recorded voice-over (as declaration of intentions): “Hablamos de cine, sólo cine... En Radio 3.” [“We talk about cinema, only cinema... on Radio 3.”]. JT picks up on the recorded theme and provides an overview of ESV’s approach to cinema in its almost 14 years of existence.

7. VG is introduced by the host and dialogue takes place framing VG’s invitation to ESV.

   7.a. Dialogue between the JT and VG on EO’s film career and why the interview takes place over the phone and not in Seville.

   7.b. JT and VG talk about Italian films and filmmakers.

8. Music from Quentin Tarantino's film Django Unchained is played. The host tells the audience that while the music plays they will try to establish a phone connection with EO.

9. Connection with Olmi is established. Introductions. Interpreter-mediated interaction takes place.

   9.a. The host thanks and wishes good luck to EO's film in Spain.
10. Dialogue in the studio between JT and VG. Recapitulation of the fields and tenor of the interview.

10.a. JT thanks VG for ‘translation’ and invites him back to the programme to talk about cinema. Further exchange on EO's films and the recent exchange with him, including translation issues.

11. JT ends the programme and hands over to the next show on Radio 3.

Table 4.1: Interview 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Further interviews within this category and broad pattern of interaction:</th>
<th>Date (1st broadcast)</th>
<th>Languages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mi segundo país, Nikita Mikhalkov</td>
<td>04/12/2011</td>
<td>Russian-Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sevilla I - 13/11/09</td>
<td>13/11/2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sevilla II - 13/11/09</td>
<td>13/11/2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segunda hora - 15/11/08</td>
<td>15/11/2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primera hora - 15/11/08</td>
<td>15/11/2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El séptimo vicio - 14/11/08</td>
<td>14/11/2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>18/06/2010.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration of the whole episode:</td>
<td>2 hours.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration of the interpreter-mediated interview:</td>
<td>58 minutes, approx. (00:17:33-01:15:30).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages:</td>
<td>Spanish and Farsi.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title on <em>El Séptimo Vicio</em>’s podcast website:</td>
<td>Emocionante entrevista de Javier Tolentino a la primera dama del cine iraní. [Moving interview by Javier Tolentino with the first lady of Iranian cinema.]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Episode Metadata (see Episode's link):</td>
<td><a href="http://www.rtve.es/alacarta/audios/el-septimo-vicio/septimo-vicio-emocionante-entrevista-javier-tolentino-primera-dama-del-cine-iranii-18-06-10/804982/#aHR0cDovL3d3dy5ydHZILmVzL2FsYWNhcncRhlL2IudGVybym8vY29udGVudHRhdmlnLmNodG1sP2N0eD0xOTU5Jm9yZGVyPSZvcmRlckNyaXRlcmlhPURFU0MmbG9jYWxipPWVzJmFkZlNyZXJjaE9wZmFjdHJ1YXJjaE9wZW49dHJ1ZS0aXRsZUZpbHRlcj0mbW9udGhGaW5xZXR1NiZ5ZWFyRmlsdGVyPTIwMTAmdHlwZUZpbHRlcj0mPXVuZGVY">http://www.rtve.es/alacarta/audios/el-septimo-vicio/septimo-vicio-emocionante-entrevista-javier-tolentino-primera-dama-del-cine-iranii-18-06-10/804982/#aHR0cDovL3d3dy5ydHZILmVzL2FsYWNhcncRhlL2IudGVybym8vY29udGVudHRhdmlnLmNodG1sP2N0eD0xOTU5Jm9yZGVyPSZvcmRlckNyaXRlcmlhPURFU0MmbG9jYWxipPWVzJmFkZlNyZXJjaE9wZmFjdHJ1YXJjaE9wZW49dHJ1ZS0aXRsZUZpbHRlcj0mbW9udGhGaW5xZXR1NiZ5ZWFyRmlsdGVyPTIwMTAmdHlwZUZpbHRlcj0mPXVuZGVY</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note:</td>
<td>Visuals available.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category of interview:</td>
<td>Coverage of film festival, collaboration with event organisers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Interview 5
### Broadcast participants:

- Javier Tolentino (host) (JT).
- Fatemeh Motamed-Arya (Iranian actress) (FMA).
- Rima Shermohamaddi (interpreter) (RS).
- Eulalia Ramón (actress, master of ceremonies of the *Cines del Sur* Awards Ceremony, usual collaborator with *El Séptimo Vicio*) (ER).
- Rosa Vergés (filmmaker, jury member for the *Mediterráneos Awards* section of *Cines del Sur*) (RV).
- Renato Baltazar (production assistant representing award-winning Brazilian film) (RB).
- Mikel Ardanaz (filmmaker) (MA).
- Alberto Elena (Film Festival programmer) (AE).
- María Luisa Ortega (Film Festival programmer) (MLO).

### Sound management:

- Juan Carlos Fernández (JCF) and Juan Becerra (JB) (in Granada).
- Samuel Alarcón (SA) (in Madrid).

### Broad contextual factors:

**Organisational and situational arrangements prior to the interview.**

### Interpreter provider:

Granada *Cines del Sur* Film Festival.

### Reasons for interview:

Coverage of the 4th Granada *Cines del Sur* Film Festival by *ESV* on location. *ESV* sets up a semi-outdoors studio at the festival's main venue, with permission of *Cines de Sur*. The programme’s broadcasting time coincides with the festival award closing ceremony. This makes it possible to interview festival guests, programmers and other ‘friends’ of the festival, in the form of a multi-party talk.

Interpreting is required for the broadcast since FMA is invited to the programme.
| **Participants' location:** | 1) Awards ceremony coverage: Teatro Isabel la Católica de Granada (on location inside the theatre, with JT commenting and ambient/stage sound taken from the ceremony). Mins. 00:00:00-00:17:30.  
2) Talk-show: semi-outdoors studio in the foyer of the Teatro Isabel la Catolica. Mins. 00:17:30-01:58:40. |
| **Broad pattern of interaction:** | Face-to-face, multi-party interview.  
Note: there is a telephone interview with MA – mins. 00:57:30-01:01:30. |
| **Outline of participation frameworks and structure:** | 1. Partial coverage of Granada *Cines del Sur* Film Festival Award Ceremony. Introduction by the host (JT).  
1.a. Master of Ceremonies (ER) introduces FMA and invites her to the stage. While FMA reaches the stage accompanied by applause, JT provides more information about FMA's career.  
1.b. FMA's interpreter-mediated speech (consecutive interpreting) with intermittent applause. JT recapitulates FMA's career.  
1.c. Awards ceremony goes on and ESV covers it until the end, with JT's comments.  
2. *Cines del Sur* theme music is played, followed by live soundtrack music of the screened film. Meanwhile JT and guests take their positions in the semi-outdoors studio and sound technicians get technical aspects ready for live broadcast talk-show.  
3. Generic re-contextualization by JT: event location and introduction of guests (ERG, FMA) with first exchanges.  
3.a. Interpreter-mediated interaction starts after first question by JT to FMA.  
3.b. JT announces music to be played as a break.  
[off-air] Provide participation frameworks as offered by the visuals. This is where change of positions take place]  
4. Multi-party talk goes on. RB joins the table. Interpreter (RS) is heard in the background rendering what is going on on-air to the guest actress, FMA, in Farsi.  
4.a. JT thanks RB, good-byes and RB leaves the table. Music by Maria de Medeiros is played as homage to the winning Brazilian film (as explained by JT).  
5. JT recapitulates on the film that won the award and the cash prize with ER and RV. |
6. The host starts conversation via telephone with MA (in Navarra) about his film *Flores Silvestres* and Navarran film showcase taking place in Madrid the following week.

6.a. JT brings an end the talk with MA inviting the audience to watch *Flores Silvestres* and the whole showcase in Madrid.

7. AEG and MLOG are introduced by JT. Dialogue takes place on the festival and its programming.

7.a. RV and ER are brought back to the talk and dialogue goes on talking about *Cines del Sur* and its outdoors screenings, the closing ceremony, budget, screened films, retrospectives, festival organisation issues, Iranian cinema.

NOTE: while debate on the closing ceremony takes place, FMA breaks in to participate in the sequence, which is the last sequence where she actively participates in the show. No audience-oriented on-air thanks and good byes are uttered by JT to FMA and RS directly. Only through visuals we can know how this happens and the way she leaves the table. (See participation framework 12.a for last reference and recapitulation on FMA's presence and interaction in the programme and the festival).

7.b. JT says good-bye to and thanks AE and MLO.

8. Music is played abruptly (without introduction).

9. The hosts re-contextualises: location, atmosphere in Granada and festival awards.

10. The table is left with JT, ER and RV with informal radio debate on unstructured topics, for the last half hour of the programme: documentary genres, documentary and fiction, filmmaking traditions and styles across nations, cultures and history; guest's views on their own professions and future film events and festivals which will be covered by *ESV*; film festivals around Spain.

11. JT starts to wrap up the show with dialogue on *Cines del Sur* and the importance of festivals like this one for cities like Granada, film viewers and culture in general.

11.a. Talk goes off-topic (football, politics, etc.) in JT’s eyes; JT takes the floor to wrap up again: thanks to sound technicians in Madrid and Granada. Emphasis on 1st time an award ceremony was broadcast live on *ESV* and how lucky they were to start the broadcast with the Iranian actress speech in the Award Ceremony. Dialogue about FMA's presence, personality and discourse, followed by further praise for Iranian cinema.

11.b. JT finally ends the programme, recapitulating the show’s production and topics: technical difficulties, the host sharing a table with 5 women, dialogue about love and final invitation by the host to the guests to go out and have an ice cream. Audience-oriented mode to say bye: final thanks the audience for putting up with this kind of festival coverage, which JT finds essential in order to meet filmmakers and film-related persons.

12. Brazilian music is played.
### Table 5.1: Interview 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Further interviews within this category and broad pattern of interaction:</th>
<th>Date (1st broadcast)</th>
<th>Languages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reza Karimi, en El séptimo vicio</td>
<td>07/03/2013</td>
<td>Farsi-Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbas Kiarostami en Murcia (2)</td>
<td>28/02/2013</td>
<td>Farsi-Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los riesgos de hacer cine en Irán</td>
<td>28/05/2010</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Extra: interpreter-mediated events other than DI mode broadcast by ESV (as proof of other practices and approaches to broadcasting interaction involving foreign languages)

Table 6: Interview 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>20/02/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration of the whole episode:</td>
<td>1 hour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration of the interpreter-mediated interview:</td>
<td>4:25 min approx. [05:00-07:00 / 37:20-39:43]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note:</td>
<td>Pre-recorded press conference at <em>Círculo de Bellas Artes</em> earlier the same morning. Extracts of the press conference are broadcast unedited, as if live.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages:</td>
<td>Spanish and German.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title on <em>El Séptimo Vicio</em>’s podcast website:</td>
<td>Haneke en Madrid. [Haneke in Madrid.].</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of interview:</th>
<th>Press conference coverage.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Broadcast participants:</td>
<td>Ana Morente (host) (AM).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alberto Bermejo (film critic) (AB).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gregorio Parra (film critic, RTVE journalist) (pre-recorded feature) (GP).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michael Haneke (main -indirect- guest) (MH).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interpreter, male, name unknown (sitting next to MH).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Sound management:      | Samuel Alarcón (Radio 3 studios, Madrid).                                                                                  |
|                       | Pre-recorded press conference: unspecified.                                                                                   |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Broad contextual factors:</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisational and situational arrangements prior to the interview.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpreter provider:</strong></td>
<td>Unspecified. Nevertheless, from the press conference broadcast, it can be inferred that it is the organisers of the event (MH’s Golden Medal award by the Circulo de Bellas Artes –Spanish Fine Arts Circle- and the Spanish première of MH’s production) who provide the interpreter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reasons for interview:</strong></td>
<td>MH is in Madrid to première his production of Mozart’s opera <em>Cosi fan tutte</em> at the Teatro Real and to receive the Golden Medal award by the Circulo de Bellas Artes in Madrid. ESV devotes a monographic show to MH's career. Given that it is not possible to bring MH to the studio, ESV records the press conference at the Circulo de Bellas Artes in the morning and AM plays some excerpts during the programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participants' location:</strong></td>
<td>AM and AB: Radio 3 studios in Madrid. MH and interpreter: Circulo de Bellas Artes (location of pre-recorded press conference).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Broad pattern of interaction:</strong></td>
<td>Face-to-face dialogue/consecutive interpreting external to ESV.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Outline of participation frameworks and structure:**

1. AM's introduction to the programme’s topic: MH (reasons explained).

2. AM introduces guest expert (AB) and talk unfolds on MH's career and latest film *Amour*.

3. AM and AB focus on MH’s *Amour*.

4. Music extract from MH’s *Amour*.

5. GP’s prerecorded piece reviewing the career of MH. MH’s films excerpts are interplayed.

6. AM recontextualizes picking up on GP’s feature on MH (violence, Tarantino…). Interaction with guest expert takes place.

7. MH’s interpreter-mediated press conference extract.

8. AM and AB talk about MH's topics and concerns in his films.
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Film extract from MH’s <em>Funny games</em> (US remake).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>AM and AB resume talk on MH’s <em>Funny games</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Classical music is played (J. S. Bach).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>AM and AB resume talk on MH’s films.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>AM ends programme by recalling MH’s opera première in Madrid and Academy Awards nominations. AM quotes MH’s interview published recently in <em>El País</em> newspaper and thanks AB.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
V.2 Broad Contextual Aspects. The Broadcasting Communicative Ethos and Institutional Public Arenas: Radio 3 and El Séptimo Vicio

The first step in my analysis of the broadcasting communicative ethos and institutional public arenas the data in my study is extracted from is to provide an overall description of Radio 3 - the radio station where ESV is broadcast - its origins and evolution, its schedule and institutional-discursive themes throughout the 35 years of its existence, in order to frame ESV within the larger broadcasting ethos (Hutchby 2006) of Radio 3. With this in mind, I will point out the distinctive features of Radio 3 with regards to programming, style, audience design and, within its broadcasting context and culture, the radio space which Radio 3 occupies on the whole Spanish radio spectrum. Then, I will explore Radio 3’s general approach and/or policy when it comes to using interpreters in order to overcome language barriers, as well as decisions and practices within ESV itself with regards the organisation of interpreter-mediated live interviews.

Across its six radio stations, RNE’s raison d’être is to offer quality and public interest news, culture and entertainment to audiences in Spain and abroad. Radio 3 was created in July 1979, a moment in history when Spain was experiencing political and social turmoil, followed by cultural effervescence, with cultural movements such as La Movida in Madrid and underground artistic movements in several cities, which found expression in cinema, theatre, TV, magazines, newspapers and radio (most notably pirate radio stations and, within the public broadcasting sphere, Radio 3). This period, which was politically marked by the establishment of a parliamentary democracy in Spain, is to this day exerting a great influence on the station's character, programmes and audience.

According to Ximénez de Olaso (1999), Radio 3 soon became, in sociological terms, the mirror of political change in the form of a public media institution. In this line, Ximénez de Olaso adds:

---


92 La Movida Madrileña was a countercultural movement that took place mainly in Madrid during the Spanish transition after Francisco Franco’s death in 1975. For more details and analysis see, for example, Miller, Vandome and McBrewster 2010, and Gallero Díaz (1991).

93 The Website where this text appears is extracted from the book Radio 3: 20 años (1999), published by Radio 3 and the publishing company La Máscara.
In its beginnings, Radio 3 aimed at being the avant-garde in a Spain that was at boiling point, when the country was experiencing political changes whose outcomes were unpredictable. People wanted to express themselves and Radio 3 knew how to connect with this effervescence, because its audience, irrespective of its size, would play a major role in spreading it: they were the radio station’s loudspeakers on the leading opinion platforms (my translation).

With this background and its audience figures (see section V.2.2 below) in mind, it is observable how Radio 3 has established itself as one of the media reference points in culture, arts and even society and politics, through the creation of a critical, independent, underground and avant-garde broadcasting arena. Radio 3 offers a wide range of specialised - or themed - programmes, and although music makes up the largest part of its schedule, every form of art has its space in Radio 3 (Martín, n.d.).

Taking into account the number of seasons broadcast so far, the broadcasting time and audience figures, as well as Radio 3’s own public communication, some of the most significant programmes of Radio 3 have been: *El Ambigú*, presented by Diego A. Manrique;* Diario Pop*, presented by Jesús Ordovás;* El Bulevar*, presented by José María Rey;* La Barraca* (various hosts, e.g. Gloria Berrocal, Manolo Ferreras);* La ciudad invisible*, cultural magazine with different presenters, directed by Javier Díez.

Within the current Radio 3 schedule, we can find a mixture of long-standing programmes and newer additions (between 1 and 5 years). In the first group, we can find *Disco Grande*, presented by Julio Ruiz, an indie music programme which has been

94 In the beginning, Radio 3 aimed at being the avant-garde in a Spain that was at boiling point, when the country was experiencing political changes whose outcomes were unpredictable. People wanted to express themselves and Radio 3 knew how to connect with this effervescence, because its audience, irrespective of its size, would play a major role in spreading it: they were the radio station's loudspeakers on the leading opinion platforms (my translation).


broadcast for 40 years now. As the host states on the programme’s website, “una de las especialidades de la casa son las entrevistas”. Another stalwart is *Discópolis*, directed and hosted by José Miguel López. *Discópolis* has been broadcast for more than 25 years now, a programme which defines itself as a cosmopolitan journey focusing on folk music, ethnic rhythms and any music style apart from pop music. The programme also deals with festivals which share the programme's view. Interviews during festival coverage are also part of the programme and, therefore, interpreter-mediated interviews are frequent.

More recent Radio 3 programmes where talk and interviews are central and, hence, interpreter-mediated interviews are also frequent, include *Hoy empieza todo*, which started on 30th June 2008 and is currently directed and hosted by Ángel Carmona and Marta Echeverría.

Whether still on air or not, what all these Radio 3 programmes have in common is the centrality of talk via interviews. When this feature is combined with the station’s goal to include experts from their relevant fields from all over the world, we find a plausible explanation for the common presence of live interpreter-mediated interviews across Radio 3 programmes. According to RNE (RTVE 2012), in 2011, more than 300 artists and bands from Spain and abroad were interviewed in Radio 3 studios. Although Radio 3 does not provide statistics of live interpreter-mediated interviews, the previous figure provides evidence of Radio 3 being the radio station in Spain broadcasting the greatest amount of hours of live interpreter-mediated interviews (see IV.1 for more details on these figures and VI.1 for their implications for IS).

*ESV*, as one of the reference programmes in its subject and having been broadcast for more than 15 years now, is a representative example of this Radio 3 broadcasting practice and its *ethos*.

---

100 More information about the programme at: [http://blog.rtve.es/discogrande/autor.html](http://blog.rtve.es/discogrande/autor.html).

101 “Interviews are a house special” (my translation). See [http://www.rtve.es/?go=11b735a516af85c803e604f4546adce4e9885a8e53805c69ad49e29577ae993aa2a0658da481224fd2e9d62b856aaf5e3dd6e57bea805d807245da893171a1354f604601fee25f6](http://www.rtve.es/?go=11b735a516af85c803e604f4546adce4e9885a8e53805c69ad49e29577ae993aa2a0658da481224fd2e9d62b856aaf5e3dd6e57bea805d807245da893171a1354f604601fee25f6) [Last accessed 27/04/2012].


El Séptimo Vicio

*ESV* is a specialised radio programme, broadcast daily (Monday to Friday) for one hour\(^{104}\) and devoted to cinema in its different manifestations (films, filmmakers, film production, acting, film festivals) and as a form of art and culture (sociology, politics, psychology, philosophy, etc.). The programme has been directed and hosted by Javier Tolentino (JT) since its first broadcast in 1999, and it is now the longest running film programme on Spanish radio. On the website of the programme’s podcast, *ESV* is presented to the general public in the following terms:

*El Séptimo Vicio* es un espacio que Radio 3 reserva para la pasión por el cine de una audiencia que ama el cine *indi*, de autor, comprometido, fantasioso y empapado de una cierta militancia *friki*. Defiende apasionadamente el movimiento de cortometrajes de nuestro país y a partir de ahí El Séptimo Vicio intenta estar al cabo de la calle de las nuevas vanguardias cinematográficas.\(^{105}\)

As the CA of part of the data in my corpus will show (see V.3) (supplemented by my own knowledge of a considerable number of broadcast episodes of *ESV*), the talk-in-interaction on *ESV* corroborates the programme's agenda or ‘declaration of intentions’ and shows how *ESV*’s communicative *ethos* (Scannell 1988, 1991) has been created throughout its 15 years of existence, finding its referential space not only within Radio 3, but also within the fields of film criticism and dissemination.

With regards to *ESV*’s broadcasting times, there has been constant change throughout the years. During 15 years of *ESV*, although the broadcasting format and *ethos* have not changed greatly, the frequency and broadcasting times have: it started as a weekend 1 hour show (Saturdays and Sundays) in the afternoon (at 4 pm), then being rescheduled to weekday afternoons; for a number of seasons,\(^{106}\) it went back to the weekend, to a 2 hour slot at 8pm. The decisions for these changes would come from Radio 3 programming board and/or the head of programming. What is of relevance for my

\(^{104}\) Broadcasting times change every season. For instance, during the season covering September 2013 - October 2014, *ESV* was scheduled for Monday to Friday, 8pm. More information on the influence of the scheduling on the organisation of interpreter-mediated events in this section, below.


*ESV* is a space that Radio 3 devotes to the passion for cinema of an audience that loves indie, auteur, socially engaged, imaginative films; an audience that is infused with a freak militancy. *ESV* passionately supports the short-film movement in Spain and, taking off from that starting point, intends to be at the grassroots of the new cinematic avant-gardes (my translation).

\(^{106}\) As far as I have been able to find out, at least during 2009-2010 and 2010-2011.
research is the fact that even though the broadcasting times have not changed ESV’s format and communicative ethos, they may have had an influence on the way some events and interviews are prepared, produced and eventually broadcast, particularly regarding live events, such as film festival coverage, guest interviews, etc. This aspect is essential to the analysis, particularly when describing the broad context (Cicourel 1992) for each category of broadcast interview (see interpreter-mediated interview tables in section V.1, above) as part of the space-time constraints influencing the live interpreter-mediated broadcast event, not only the interaction, but also notably the organisation and production of such an event.

V.2.1.1 ESV on Podcast

Podcasting has become increasingly common in radio broadcasting since technological advances have allowed for this internet-based, converged medium and technology (Berry 2006), gaining widespread popularity particularly since 2005 (cf. Sterne et al. 2008). In the case of ESV, podcasting started in 2007, but the podcasting platform and service did not become regular, that is not all ESV episodes were uploaded until 24th June 2008. Since then, every ESV episode has been regularly uploaded to RTVE’s “a la carta” (on demand) ESV podcast website for worldwide availability. The following screenshot shows what this website looks like for users.
Each podcast episode is given a title, usually referring to the main topic, event or interviewee(s) appearing (cf. Image 2 above and Tables 2-6, pages 133-151). In addition, each episode contains its own metadata, although the level of detail provided by ESV can vary, ranging from one sentence to a whole paragraph detailing the topics, events and interviewees appearing on the episode in question.

The podcasts are uploaded as they were broadcast, which is of great relevance for the purpose of my research, since the interpreter-mediated interviews are not edited.
V.2.1.2 ESV’s public arenas of communication

Although an overall outline of ESV’s contents has already been put forward at the beginning of this section, it is pertinent to frame the public arenas of communication (Hutchby 2006) where face-to-face interpreter-mediated interviews take place within ESV. What follows is a categorisation of ESV’s interviews with non-Spanish speaking guests requiring an interpreter.

-Film release interview: the commercial release of foreign films - usually taking place in Madrid, where Radio 3’s central studios are based - is one of the main contexts for ESV’s approach to interviews with non-Spanish speaking guests. The programme takes advantage of the visit of a director, actor, actress or other member of the film crew (the latter being rare) to release and/or promote the film in Spain (see Tables 1 and 2, pages 133 and 136). These interviews usually take place in the Radio 3 studios in Madrid, although it might be the case that the film is released in a different city and the interview takes place via telephone or studio-to-studio connection.

-Coverage of film festivals and film-related events: Whether from the central studios in Madrid, via phone/studio line, moving the studio on location to the festival’s venue or at RNE’s studios in the city where the festival takes place, JT, as the programme’s director and host, takes advantage of the opportunity offered by film festivals (both in Spain and abroad) to which filmmakers, actors and actresses are invited as part of the festival’s official section, a retrospective, or similar sections. Festival guests can also be members of the jury or organisers/curators of a special event for the festival. This category of guests does not only include filmmakers, actors and actresses, but a wider range of personalities related to cinema, e.g. producers, members of the film crew, festival organisers, critics, etc.). Although filmmakers and actors are the most common guests in interpreter-mediated interviews for ESV’s special coverage of festivals, the other type of guests included above are also common and are usually Spanish-speaking guests (see Tables 2, 3, and 5, pages 136, 140 and 146) who take part in the broadcast conversation, sharing the table with the foreign language speaking guest and the interpreter.

Apart from festival coverage via interviews, ESV has covered live festival events, most notably awards ceremonies, which may include speeches and/or statements delivered in
a foreign language (e.g. award-winners' speeches). However, for these cases the event's interpreting audio feed is usually used for broadcast (see Table 6, page 151).

It can be seen that the foreign languages spoken in ESV’s interviews - as well as the foreign films and cinematographies that are covered - are driven not only by the programme's (or the director's/host's) interests and agenda, but also by the programme and agenda of film festivals and the film releases in Spain and, to a lesser extent, abroad.

-Filmmakers'/actors’ retrospectives: monographic episodes about the filmography of a particular filmmaker or actor (or even producers) are also common on ESV (cf. Tables 2 and 4, pages 136 and 143). The circumstances or agenda originating this kind of ESV episode may be very diverse: a special award or retrospective within in a film festival or other institution (e.g. Interview 6), the release of one of the filmmaker’s/actor’s films (e.g. Interview 2) or ESV’s own decision to devote a special episode to a filmmaker they particularly love (e.g. Interview 4). These different circumstances may lead to different patterns of interaction when it comes to the broadcast interview (see Tables 2 and 4, pages 136 and 143). When a live broadcast interview cannot be organised and ESV still want to produce a monographic show about a particular filmmaker or actor/actress, it may include a broadcast live or pre-recorded interview, usually from a press conference (e.g. Interview 6). The latter category of interpreter-mediated event falls outside the scope of my interactional analysis, since there is no live interaction between the guest, the interpreter and the host, but it is included both here and in section V.1 (Table 6) as evidence of this practice on ESV and, in line with Gieve and Norton (2007), it fulfils the aim of mapping out the strategies for dealing with foreign language transfer in broadcasting.

-Coverage of press conferences and masterclasses: Whether as part of a monographic episode (as in the category above) or as part of the coverage of a film festival or film-related events, ESV also deals with interpreter-mediated events which are broadcast live or pre-recorded. Examples of these events are coverage of awards' press conferences,107 press conferences with filmmakers (see Table 6, page 151) and film-related events, such

as masterclasses or round tables with filmmakers.\textsuperscript{108} These broadcast events lie beyond my interactional analysis, for the same reasons presented for the interpreter-mediated event in Table 6 (see item above).

Apart from the categories of events triggering the type of interpreter-mediated broadcast interviews under study in my research, it is worth mentioning, for contrastive purposes, that there are entire ESV episodes where there is no interpreting required at all. These episodes are usually broadcast from the central studios in Madrid. Here, the people involved in the programme are all Spanish, or Spanish speakers.\textsuperscript{109} There are also special programmes where ESV is broadcast on location, such as cinemas, cultural centres,\textsuperscript{110} or festivals and awards ceremonies devoted to Spanish films.\textsuperscript{111} Here, the norm is that the programme is entirely monolingual and therefore, no language transfer is involved.

\textit{V.2.2 Radio 3’s Audience}

In line with Bell (1997) and Hutchby (2006), the audience in my analysis - and overall research approach - is conceptualised in terms of how it is referred to during the broadcast talk-in-interaction. However, I will make a brief point about how Radio 3 has conceptualised its audiences, in order to get a first general approach of the types of audiences that Radio 3 programme hosts have in mind when they devise their shows and design their interviews.

Manrique (2009) describes Radio 3’s overall audience as specialised, intellectually curious, independent, small-scale (in mass media terms), open to discussion and debate and willing to discover new creations, events, opinions, etc. Radio 3’s references to its audience (mainly via Radio 3’s website) indicate this type of target audience which the


\textsuperscript{109} E.g. Latin-American cinematographies are covered extensively in ESV.

\textsuperscript{110} Listen, for example, to the episode ‘Inolvidable El Séptimo en Cineteca’ (05/02/2013), broadcast from the Madrid Filmhouse at the Matadero Centre for Contemporary Creations (Cineteca, Centro de Creación Contemporánea ‘Matadero’): http://www.rtve.es/alacarta/audios/el-septimo-vicio/septimo-vicio-inolvidable-septimo-cineteca-05-02-13/1683670/ [Last accessed: 04/03/2013].

\textsuperscript{111} Listen, for instance, to the episode ‘Balance de los Premios Goya’ (19/02/2013), devoted to the Spanish Film Academy Awards: http://www.rtve.es/alacarta/audios/el-septimo-vicio/septimo-vicio-balance-premios-goya-19-02-13/1694860/ [Last accessed: 04/03/2013].
radio station has been consolidating during its 35 years of history.

With regard to audience figures, I have gathered data from the EGM (Estudio General de Medios, AIMC n.d.), the body in charge of measuring audiences in Spain, which includes Radio 3 under ‘themed radio stations’.\textsuperscript{112} An overall look at historical data shows that the average daily Radio 3 audience fluctuates between 310,000 listeners (3.3% share, ranked 7 out of 18, amongst themed radio stations) for the February-November 2000 period\textsuperscript{113} and 391,000 listeners (2.4% share, 11 out of 23, amongst themed radio stations) for the October 2011-May 2012 period, according to one of the latest audience figures reports released during the realisation of this research. Adding up general radio stations and themed radio stations, Radio 3 (FM) is placed in position 18 out of 36 radio stations on the overall list, according to the 2012 Audience report, whereas in 2000, it was placed in position 12 out of 28 radio stations on the list. Taking into account the increasing fragmentation of mass media audiences nowadays (Napoli 2011), this constitutes a highly consolidated audience which is, for the time being, not very exposed to huge fluctuations in terms of audience numbers and the trend is slightly upwards, gathering momentum in spring 2012, when Radio 3 reached a record audience of 450,000 listeners - a 25.7% increase compared to 2011 (RTVE 2012). This situation is accentuated by the Radio 3 website visitor figures. According to the EGM specific figures to which RTVE (2011, 2012) had access, the Radio 3 website had 483,846 visits during November 2011, which represents a 16% increase compared to November 2010. In April 2012, that figure went up to more than 500,000 visitors, with an average duration of the visit of 64 minutes, which adds up to the continued increase in the number of social network followers of the station\textsuperscript{114} and its programmes,\textsuperscript{115} showing that the audience tends to be loyal and participative, along the lines Manrique (2009) described.

\textit{ESV} specific audience figures are not provided by the \textit{EGM}.

\textsuperscript{112} For \textit{EGM}'s audience measurement methods, see AIMC (n.d., Web).

\textsuperscript{113} This is the period from which audience data are available on the \textit{EGM} website.

\textsuperscript{114} By March 2013, Radio 3 had 171,046 followers on Facebook, a steep increase with respect to April 2011, when it had 131,000 followers, and November 2011, with 115,000 followers (RTVE 2012, 2011).

\textsuperscript{115} By August 2014, \textit{ESV} had 7416 followers on Facebook. In March 2015, this figure went up to 8315.


V.2.3 Interpreting Policies and Practices in Radio 3 and ESV

How does Radio 3 as a whole deal with language transfer and how is it integrated into the broadcast discursive and interactional arena of its programmes when interpreting in live interviews with foreign language speaking guests is required? This is one of the central questions in my research, which is specifically tackled by exploring ESV’s daily practice and production conventions. Drawing on Gieve and Norton (2007), an overall look at the practices and approach to how foreign languages are managed in live interviews on Radio 3 (as illustrated by the interviews that constitute my data) shows that, firstly, there are no official statements or documents on this matter. In spite of this lack of a priori policies or guidelines, the use and broadcast of DI on Radio 3, both in live and pre-recorded interviews, is the norm (see Tables 1-5).

Furthermore, there is no established policy or framework for selecting and hiring interpreters. Radio 3’s reasons for not having an established interpreting policy/framework are hard to determine, as the institution does not make them explicit anywhere. However, based on my study of Radio 3 interpreter-mediated interviews and of Radio 3 itself (namely via e-mail contact with the relevant Radio 3 stakeholders) as well as on my interviews with presenters and stakeholders, I can point out several reasons for this: firstly, there are budgetary and logistical reasons (see V.2.3.1, below). Radio 3 does not have a budget allocated for interpreters.

This may be linked to the second reason behind this absence of interpreting policies: the station's informal approach to the way communication and dialogue is established with the audience and guests. This may account for the occasional reliance on non-professional interpreters when there is no other external body providing a professional interpreter (e.g. Interview 4).

The reasons stated above lead to the following practice when it comes to broadcasting interpreter-mediated interviews on Radio 3 and, by extension, ESV: the interpreters and their background are very diverse; professional interpreters, non-professional interpreters, usually experts in the subject matter who also know the interviewee's career well (see Interview 4)\(^{116}\) or fellow journalists/broadcasters, to name the most common

\(^{116}\) In music programmes, roadies and band managers are often used as interpreters.
ones. In Ozolins’s (2010) categories, interpreting on Radio 3 and ESV is placed in the *ad hoc* stage with regards to interpreting provision.\(^{117}\)

**V.2.3.1 Institutional-Economic Constraints Influencing the Production and Broadcast of Live Interpreter-Mediated Interviews on ESV**

*ESV* does not escape economic factors affecting production issues, including the organisation and broadcasting of interpreter-mediated interviews and interpreter provision. As any media production, it is subject to budgetary constraints, and in the case of the interviews covered in my research data, they involve collaboration between institutions (namely Radio 3, film festivals and film distributors) and their staff, particularly those in charge of production. In this respect, as JT points out in the semi-structured interview (see Appendix 5), Radio 3 operates on low production budgets which do not allow for hiring in-house interpreters, and nowadays freelance interpreters are rarely hired for specific events, hence the occasional need to resort to *ad hoc* film experts as interpreters (see Table 4 and Interview 4) when film festivals or film distributors do not provide the interpreter for the foreign language speaking guest.\(^{118}\)

The common practice on *ESV*, as well as generally on Radio 3, is therefore that the interpreter collaborating with the programme is either part of the film festival staff (see Tables 3 and 5), part of the film distribution company or institution bringing the guest to Spain (see Tables 1 and 2) or a regular guest on *ESV* who speaks the guest’s foreign language and *helps* with the ‘translation’ (see Table 4), as it is usually referred to by JT (e.g. Interviews 4 and 5).

Although I do not have exact figures of how budgetary cuts have affected *ESV* and, most crucially, the key events involving the organisation and broadcast of interpreter-mediated interviews, JT states that increasing budgetary constraints over the last years (mainly since 2010) have reduced the opportunities for covering international film festivals on location, as well as bringing guests to the studio, therefore affecting the

---

\(^{117}\) Although Ozolins (2000) outlined a spectrum of responses to multilingual interpreting needs in Public Service Interpreting (cf. Ozolins, 2010:195) which did not envisage Public Service Media, it can still be used as a way of describing the current provision of interpreters and of explaining the way interpreter-mediated interviews are broadcast live and unedited.

\(^{118}\) JT points out (see semi-structured interview, Appendix 5) that it would be the case sometimes, during the first few years of *ESP*’s broadcast, that a freelance interpreter would be hired for an interview in the studio, but this soon became the exception rather than the norm.
number of interpreter-mediated events on the programme. Furthermore, there is another element having an impact on this issue: the increasing budgetary cuts affecting film festivals in Spain have considerably reduced the number of invited guests and, in the worst case, have even caused festivals to disappear.

Therefore, it can be claimed that the presence of foreign language-speaking guests on ESV not only depends on the programme’s agenda but also on the programme’s budget and the budget of institutions/events that invite guests who would, eventually, be approached by ESV for an interview. This issue is of high relevance for the ‘initiation’ (Alexieva 1999, see chapter II) and subsequent organisation of interpreter-mediated interviews by ESV as part of its festival coverage. Firstly, film festivals heavily depend on the budget they have allocated for bringing guests to the festival. Secondly, it is evidenced that some Spanish festivals rely on volunteer interpreters (e.g. the Seville European Film Festival, the Cordoba African Film Festival) while others budget for paid interpreters and even have a translation/interpreting team (e.g. the Granada Cines del Sur Festival, the San Sebastian International Film Festival).

An illustrative example of how budgetary constraints can affect the organisation of interpreter-mediated events, even if an interpreting team and ESV’s will to cover the festival exist, is the Granada Cines del Sur Film Festival. This festival started off with the aim of finding areas of convergence, “areas capable of establishing a culture of dialogue beyond the usual political channels” (Elena 2009[2005]:10-11), and part and parcel of that aim was to bring in filmmakers, actors and producers from the South. This enhanced the media coverage of the festival by general and specialist press, including ESV, which covered the festival in 2009, 2010 and 2011, both from the studios in Madrid and on location in Granada. However, budgetary cuts from 2012 onwards caused the festival to minimise the presence of foreign language speaking guests and this affected the coverage by ESV and other media. Since then, not a single

119 This festival uses a mixed system of professional and volunteer interpreters (personal communication, undisclosed).

interpreter-mediated interview initiated by ESV's coverage of Granada Cines del Sur Film Festival has been broadcast.

V.2.3.2 Management and Broadcast of Interpreter-Mediated Language Transfer in ESV's Interviews

ESV's management of language transfer in live interviews for each of the 'situational categories' included in the data tables above (see also V.2.1.2) follows the practices and conventions described in section V.2.3 for the whole of Radio 3: preferably face-to-face and using DI modality, with minor attempts to use SI throughout the event (e.g. Interview 5). The way interpreter-mediated interviews are broadcast on Radio 3 reflects an institutional attitude towards foreign languages and their interaction with the official language of the station (the audience target language) which is open and transparent by broadcasting the interaction as it happens live with the interpreter’s mediation - a strategy which is not covered in Gieve and Norton’s (2007) model. This attitude is not only evidenced by the amount of live interpreted-mediated interviews on ESV, but also by JT (who is very supportive of Radio 3’s communicative ethos) (see SSI Excerpt 4). According to JT’s argumentation, language transfer is crucial for ESV and it is portrayed as an intrinsic part of communication and the talk-in-interaction, not only due to the production and broadcast of multilingual exchanges, but most notably due to the station's communicative ethos and the public arena that the director/host aims to create.

With regards to the interpreting modality chosen for the actual broadcast (mostly DI), there seems to be a connection between Radio 3 socio-economic factors, production conventions and the station's communicative ethos. Using DI in the media involves a preference for listening to all the voices in the interview, no matter the language, instead of turning down the volume of foreign speakers’ interventions, or simply pre-recording the interview and editing it for broadcasting (the latter not being common practice on Radio 3 and ESV). JT made this explicit in the semi-structured interview when asked about the interpreting modality for the interaction, which is sometimes chosen explicitly, sometimes “naturally” over the course of the interaction (cf. Castillo and Comte 2010): JT wants to create a dialogue, not a standard ‘Q & A’interview; he likes to form a connection, a relationship with the guest, a dialogue which is more like an “act of love” (see Appendix 5). For this type of dialogue to take place and to make the
audience participate in it, the original language has to be heard, the interpreter has to be heard and all the interaction has to be shown, in JT’s view, neatly and cleanly to the audience, because it is part of the intercultural exchange taking place. Although JT confuses the interpreting terminology as far as modalities are concerned by saying “simultaneous” (see SSI Excerpt 3), the context tells us that he is referring to consecutive and DI. JT is has a strong opinion on this issue and considers it “chauvinistic” to edit the interview, to do simultaneous interpreting and then broadcast the interview silencing the guest's voice, or leaving it for only a few seconds at the beginning (as it is the norm on many other stations, not only in Spain, but also in France and the UK, as JT acknowledges). Hence, JT’s choice of DI for the purposes of a “natural translation” and, therefore, a natural dialogue. JT also acknowledges that, in this way, the interpreter is an interactant who is at the same level as himself and the guest, as he states in the semi-structured interview (see Appendix 5) when asked which interpreter-mediated interviews he would recall as instances where the interaction went smoothly, or even ideal:

*My ideal interpreter is the person who translated today, for example. It’s one who has, like I said before, a passion for radio, journalism, culture, for freedom of expression, for film; she loves her language, her country and her people: she has a perfect command of Spanish and of the other language. And she has translated –get this, she has done simultaneous translation of poetry, which is the hardest thing in Farsi, isn’t it? So the ideal interpreter is... just what this young Iranian woman has done. She not only did a perfect translation, she really was yet another protagonist of the interview. In other words, there were really two protagonists [...] : the interpreter and the protagonist of the interview, and both are really protagonists because together they bring a message, a fascinating discourse to listeners.*

This explanation sums up the rationale behind the way live radio interviews are broadcast, but also constitutes a first impression of how JT interacts with the guest and the interpreter in a live interpreter-mediated interview. Its features, patterns and specificity are the main focus of the next section of my analysis.

121 Personal communication (17/06/2010).
V.3 CA of Interpreter-Mediated Live Interviews on ESV

The following section consists of my CA model applied to interpreter-mediated live interviews on ESV which are part of my corpus data, following the structure and categories for analysis developed in section IV.2.2. As stated in my research aims and objectives (see Introduction) and following CA methods in broadcast and radio talk-in-interaction (see III.2), the focus is placed on how specific features, phenomena and patterns of interaction are to ESV, Radio 3 and, potentially (as it will be discussed in chapter VI), radio broadcasting.

Interview 1: Interview with Laurent Cantet (French filmmaker)

1. Broadcast production and situational arrangements prior to and during the interview: influence and impact on the overall interaction

The first category for CA analysis deals with the way the ‘Reasons for interview’ (see Tables 1-5, pages 133-147) determine the setting (or situational arrangements), including the broad pattern of interaction, and influence the field and tenor of the interpreter-mediated broadcast interaction. Given the fact that the host’s introduction to the interview is missing in my recording (see section a), below), I will look at the ‘good-byes and thanks’ as well as the turn-taking organisation which takes places in those interview sequences. By looking at these sections of the interview, I acknowledge that they are the interactional space where the broad context is manifested in the local interactional context.

a) The setting up of the participation framework: host’s introduction to the talk-show and interview

The Radio 3 studio, where Interview 1 takes place, is the most common ESV broadcast setting and, consequently, it is a frequent setting for the organisation and broadcast of live interviews (including monolingual and multilingual). Face-to-face interpreter-mediated interviews in the Radio 3 studio are, therefore, one of the most recurrent broad patterns of interaction in my study (see Table 1.1, page 135).

First of all, it is salient to mention a data collection limitation for the ESV episode from which Interview 1 is taken: the beginning of the episode and JT’s introductions are missing in my recording. Interview 1 is part of the first interviews I recorded in the
early stages of my research, before Radio 3 set up its podcasting service. This interview was tape-recorded from the ESV live broadcast on FM and then digitised into MP3 format. Therefore, the live FM broadcasting constraints led me to miss the host's introductions and first exchanges with the guest and the interpreter.

For the purposes of this section, I will compensate this gap in my analytical model by using the ‘good-byes and thanks’ sequence at the end of the interview in order to analyse how the interpreter-mediated exchange is configured interactionally and framed within this specific setting.

**Excerpt 1.1**

(55) 12:48-12:50
JT: [(hhh)] Interesante. Le deseamos suerte para esa próxima [pelicula↑.]

*Interesting. We wish you good luck for that next film.*

(56) 12:50-12:52
IF: [Bonne chance↑] pour votre [prochain film↑!]

*Good luck for your next film.*

(57) 12:52-13:09
JT: [De momento] le sugerimos a los oyentes de Radio 3 que en estos estrenos de este fin de semana no se pierdan Hacia el Sur, una película realmente: que permite ver a Charlotte Rampling en toda su belleza, como hemos dicho antes, y que no escapa de unos temas, bueno, que se traslucen y que se [dejan…] (2sec pause) [entre: entre…]

*For the moment, we suggest Radio 3's listeners don't miss Heading South among the premières of this coming weekend. It is a film that really allows seeing Charlotte Rampling in all her beauty, as we said before and which does not ignore one of the issues, well, that show and can be…*

(58) 13:09-13:39
LC: [interrupts] [Alors,] je sais que vous êtes amoureux de Charlotte Rampling, [moi aussi.] mais: elle n’est pas la seule quand même, je trouve que les, il faut rendre aussi justice à, d’une part KarenYoung qui pour moi, est une actrice américaine que je ne connaissais pas, que j’ai découvert en faisant le film et qui me semble être vraiment formidable là↑, et puis surtout à Ménothy Cesar, qui est un jeune Haïtien non professionnel que j’ai rencontré dans les rues de Port au Prince↑ et qui a un rôle très difficile et qui le joue, pour moi…, heu enfin qui est souvent à égalité avec Charlotte Rampling↓ [finalement↓.]

*Ok, I know that you are in love with Charlotte Rampling, me too, but she is not the only one there, I find that, we should do justice to, on the one hand, Karen Young, who in my view, is an American actress who I didn’t know before and who I discovered while making the film and who I think is astounding, and then, above all, Ménothy Cesar, who is a young Haitian, non-professional actor who I met in the streets of Port au Prince and who plays a very difficult role and who plays it, in my opinion..., well, he can be considered on a par with Charlotte Rampling.*

(59) 13:39-13:42
JT: [Mm↓.] Si, supongo que me habla de otras actrices que… [salen en la película!]…]
[Yes, I suppose that he is telling me about other actresses who appear in the film...]

(60) 13:42-13:56
IF: [Sí XXX] Sí, hay otras actrices. Bueno, Karen Young, que es una actriz sudamericana que realmente merece la pena↑ y, sobre todo, Cesar Ménothys que es un chico no profesional que encontró en la calle [y] que estima que está, a veces, a la altura de Charlotte Rampling↓. Realmente, por ellos también (short laugh).

[Yes XXX There are other actresses. Well, there is Karen Young, who is a Southamerican actress who is really worth it and, above all, Cesar Ménothys who is a non-professional guy who he found in the street and who he considers to be, at times, at the same high level as Charlotte Rampling. Indeed, it’s them too.]

(61) 13:51-14:03
JT: [Aha.] (4sec pause) ¡Muy bien! Pues Hacia el Sur, la película de Laurent Cantet.
¶ Eh… gracias por acercarse a este estudio y gracias a usted por la traducción.

[Very good! Well, Hacia el Sur, the film by Laurent Cantet. Ehm… thank you for coming to our studios and thanks to you for the translation.]

(62) 14:03-14:05
IF: Por favor, ¡de nada! [(laughs)]

[Not at all, please!]

(63) 14:04
LC: [[Merci.]]

/[Merci.]

(64) 14:04-14:06
JT: [(laughing) À bientôt.]

[See you soon.]

(65) 14:06-14:19
Film sound extract in Spanish.

Throughout this excerpt, it can be observed that the interactional devices that the active participants use to address the other participants in the interview - particularly the interpreter - are context-specific.

First, JT tends to switch between second and third person when addressing LC, depending on his interactional intentions: JT uses the second person when he wishes LC good luck (utterance 55), thanks (utterance 61) and says good-bye to LC as the main guest (utterance 64) in French. On the other hand, the third person is used when JT
wants to check or clarify what has been said in the previous utterance (utterance 59) or when interacting in overt audience-oriented mode (Scannell 1988, Hutchby 2006) (utterance 61).

This interactional pattern shows the host’s awareness of the triadic nature of the interview taking place primarily for an overhearing - not physically present - audience, where it is crucial that the listener can follow the exchange without being confused about who is talking when; hence the shift between second and third person for broadcast talk-in-interaction purposes.

IF's uptake follows audience-oriented patterns of interaction when rendering LC's words to JT and, covertly, to the audience: IF uses first person when LC’s utterances reflect personal opinions and a certain degree of storytelling (e.g. utterances 42 and 44, see Excerpt 1.4, page 184) when her turn follows LC's and she considers that there is no confusion for the audience if she uses the first person; however, as soon as JT shifts that participation framework by using the third person (as explained above, see utterance 59), IF renders LC's words in the third person (utterance 60) following JT's stance; thus, it can be observed that IF makes an effort to structure and deliver her utterance in a way she considers interactionally clear for the overhearing audience when it comes to reflecting the on-stage participation framework.

In Excerpt 1.1, it is also worth noting how JT, as the participant who is most responsible for bringing the studio interaction to the audience, makes an effort to frame - covertly and overtly - the interaction in a way that the overhearing audience can follow the speech-exchange system. JT ensures that the talk makes sense to the audience, propositionally, communicatively and interactionally. Utterance 59 illustrates JT's interactional effort, which in turn shows his full awareness of the interpreter-mediated interaction taking place in this specific radio setting: upon LC’s interruption of JT (utterance 58) to emphasise the great job done by all actors in his film, JT backchannels the interaction with a continuer (59) addressed to IF. By anticipating IF's rendition, JT uses this backchannelling device to keep track of the flow of the interaction in the audience’s minds. Ultimately, IF considers that JT’s utterance (59) is addressed specifically to her (although in covert audience-oriented mode) with the purpose of structuring the propositional content of the ongoing talk-in-interaction for the audience.
and, hence, she does not interpret it to LC. IF (utterance 60) directly proceeds to interpret LC's previous utterance (58), by structuring her rendition in a way that is linked to JT's invitation to interpret what was just said (“Sí, hay otras actrices.” / “Yes, there are other actresses”). It is plausible to argue that IF started her utterance in a way which makes interactional sense within the immediate host-interpreter exchange rather than keeping the structure of LC's original utterance (58) (“Alors, je sais que vous êtes amoureux de Charlotte Rampling, ...” / “Well, I know that you are in love with Charlotte Rampling, ...”). IF's decision, whereby she does not break the lineal flow of the interaction and sacrifices the original textual structure for a structure which makes more interactional sense within the sequence, is oriented to the radio communicative context.

The broadcast interaction taking place in this particular participation framework (good-byes and thanks) shows overt and covert orientation to the broadcast audience, whereby the participants, most notably the host and the interpreter, have a degree of awareness of the broadcasting environment, and they interact accordingly, by co-constructing a speech-exchange system in which audience-oriented interaction takes precedence over active participants' interaction and complete understanding. This explains why JT's utterance 61 is not interpreted at all to LC and, yet, it does not have negative effects on the unfolding interaction.

b) Turn-taking organisation (medium-motivated/oriented)

The Radio 3 studio setting contributes to a focused interpreter-mediated exchange between the host and the guest via the interpreter. The isolation provided by the studio with regards to the active participants' triadic exchange is intensified by the absence of further film experts as participants in the interaction. In turn, the manifestation of the institutional setting in this particular situational arrangement is discernible in the interactional co-construction of talk: the filmmaker's latest film, Vers le Sud, his filmography (past and future) and his local filmmaking context (France). These are the themes along which the interview develops, usually under JT's initiative, following his usual provision of a 'natural' space (see V.4) for dialogue with the interviewee and, by extension, the interpreter.

The studio isolation and IF's uptake of the radio setting via her turn-taking patterns are
aided by LC’s interactional cooperation: out of LC’s 14 utterances within the recorded exchange, 3 can be categorised as interruptions of the other participants’ turns: 2 interruptions of IF (utterances 27 and 51) and 1 interruption of JT (utterance 58). Throughout the interview, LC, IF and JT cooperate to produce talk which avoids overlapping turn-taking and, subsequently, overlapping talk and which generally follows the following consistent turn-taking pattern: host-interpreter-guest-interpreter-host. This turn structure leads to more stable participation frameworks than in Interviews 2-5 (see Table 1: ‘Broadcast Interpreter-mediated interview’s participation frameworks and structure during the interview - outline’, page 133). Hence, the interactional challenges for the interpreter with regards to turn-taking, coordinating talk and relating on-stage and off-stage levels of communication via her utterances are reduced considerably in comparison with interviews 2-5.

**b1) Interpreting modality: influence of the organisation of the setting and the ongoing interaction (participation frameworks)**

Interview 1 presents a face-to-face pattern of interaction where the interpreter (IF) uses the DI modality, following a pattern which is characterised by the avoidance of interruption and overlapping talk and shows an orientation to the radio broadcasting context. Furthermore, and in contrast with Interviews 2 and 4, the face-to-face situational arrangements in the Radio 3 studio help to integrate the DI modality into radio broadcasting.

Although there is neither off-air data nor extra information provided by JT on this particular broadcast with regards to the interpreting modality, it can be argued that IF’s common recurrence to similar interactional devices within a consistent DI pattern of interaction (as discussed above) shows an orientation to the station’s ethos and ESV public arena of communication (see V.2). IF’s consistency may be a result of her experience and/or awareness of the communicative setting and it can also be argued that organisational aspects such as the face-to-face studio arrangements, the absence of broadcasting time pressure and JT’s feeling comfortable with IF’s input to the speech-exchange system contribute to maintaining the DI modality throughout the interview.
**b2) Broadcasting the interpreter-mediated exchange: sound management**

The DI pattern of interaction consistently followed by IF during the broadcast interview, plus the face-to-face situational arrangements, have certain implications for the sound management of the interview: firstly, the fact that the speech-exchange system consists of DI-based turns (no simultaneous interpreting is involved) allows the sound technician (ST) to coordinate the volume output of all the active participants’ microphones throughout the interview. Secondly, the need for the ST’s coordination with the interpreter is not as complex as during face-to-face use of SI (e.g. Interview 5). Thirdly, the studio broadcasting simplifies broadcast output sound arrangements compared to Interviews 2-5. In sum, given the broad pattern of interaction and IF’s consistent use of the DI modality, the ST’s main technical focus is on providing the right input and output sound to the active participants in the interview.

Situational arrangements have an influence on the unfolding of Interview 1 with regards to the interview's structure and themes, but also on the interactional dynamics and subsequent participation framework(s) which are created during the exchange and which help explaining the interpreter's moves, propositionally and interactionally, including the interpreting modality and its subsequent sound management.

**c) Off-air interaction**

Not applicable for Interview 1.

**2. Participants' orientation to Public Radio Broadcast talk-in-interaction**

This category for analysis shows how the active participants in the interpreter-mediated live interview display an orientation to the public broadcasting context in general and the Radio 3 communicative *ethos* and *ESV* public *arena* in particular. The following subcategories draw on previous CA research on institutional talk and include a series of interactional devices and features which expose the specificity of this type of interpreter-mediated exchange, whether it is by way of interactional trends and patterns or with exceptions which can be considered particular to this communicative setting.

**a) Turn-taking organisation (public broadcasting motivated/oriented)**

The participation frameworks, as set up by the host, cover recurrent *fields* in *ESV* within this category of broadcast interview. The broadcast interview does not provide evidence
of IF's pre-interview contact and information exchange with the primary interlocutors; it could be her own interpreting training, skills and experience in those fields and communicative environment, her documentation process, and even the previous work relation with LC, which would place the interpreter in an advantageous position to anticipate propositional content and references.

Nonetheless, IF’s turn-taking and turn-offering patterns are designed to be smooth and straight-forward, offering clear turn transition places, marked by a slowing down at the end of the utterance and a falling tone (e.g. utterances 18 and 22) or using continuers such as “¿no?” (e.g. utterances 20 and 24). The primary interlocutors engage positively (that is, neither questioning nor distrustful) with IF's interaction. The direct effect on the broadcast talk-in-interaction is that the primary interlocutors find a space to delve deeper into the propositional and referential level within a speech-exchange system that suits the medium. The following excerpt is illustrative of this analysis:

**Excerpt 1.2**

(17)
04:46-05:13
JT: (.hhh) *Hacia el Sur*, la... bueno, se estrena esta película de Laurent Cantet el próximo viernes, *en la...* como os decíamos *antes*, presentó en España *Recursos Humanos* y *El empleo del tiempo*↑.

Señor Cantet, ¿qué ha dicho la crítica cinematográfica francesa sobre *Hacia el Sur* y comparándolo con *Recursos Humanos* y *El empleo del tiempo*↓? Sí, Sí está por encima de aquellos títulos... si ha sido mejor recibida por el público que aquellos títulos. Cuéntenos algo de esto.

//Heading South, the... well, this film by Laurent Cantet will be released next Friday. As we were telling you before, two of his films were already shown in Spain: Human Resources and Time Out.

Mr. Cantet, what did the French film critics say about Heading South, in comparison to Human Resources and Time Out? If it is better than those films, if the audience's response was better than the one to those titles... Please tell us something about this//

(18)
05:14-05:19
IF: La critique, le public, quelle est son opinion? Aussi en comparaison avec les deux... les deux films eh: précédents↓?

//The critics, the audience, what do they think? Also in comparison to the two... the two previous films.//

(19)
05:20-06:03
LC: Le film a été: en France en tous les cas bien reçu par la critique et puis je l'ai présenté aussi dans, dans un certain nombre de festivals... dans des... le film va sortir aux États Unis: dans quelques... dans quelques jours aussi... J'ai rencontré beaucoup de critiques, et ce qui me touche toujours c'est que quand on fait un film on ne pense pas beaucoup au:... au public↓; on est eh, on est dans une histoire, dans... Après il nous arrive parfois de dire: “voilà!”, de penser à ses amis,
“est-ce que est-ce que mes amis aimeront le film?” Et puis là d’un seul coup réaliser que à New York, à Madrid, à Copenhague les gens peuvent bien… comprendre le film, se l’approprier à peu près de la même manière, c’est toujours très touchant.

[The film was generally well received in France by the critics and then I presented it in, in a few festivals... where... the film is going to be released in the United States in a few, in a few days too... I have met many critics and what I find is that when we make a film we don’t think much about the public; we are immersed in a story, in... Then, what happens sometimes is that we say: “voilà!” we think of our friends, “will my friends like the film?” And then, suddenly, we realise that in New York, in Madrid, in Copenhagen, people can understand the film, they can grasp it more or less in the same way, and that is very touching.]

(20)
06:04-06:45
IF: Bueno, la crítica desde luego: en Francia ha sido... eh (.) muy bien, o sea, dentro de unos días va a salir en Estados Unidos†, va a estrenarse en Estados Unidos† y también allí ya ha hecho todas las entrevistas y muy [bien], ¿no? Pero, cuando haces una película normalmente pues no piensas mucho en el público. A lo mejor no está bien, pero no lo piensas, haces tu película, ¿no?]

[Well, the critics, obviously, in France, were... ehm very well, I mean, in a few days the film will go out in the United States, it will be released in the United States, and also there he has already done all the interviews and it went really well, you know? But when you make a film, usually you don’t think much about the public. Maybe that is not good, but you don’t think about them, you make your film, right?]

(20bis )
06:22
JT: Mm†.

(20 cont.)
IF: Y: luego† piensas en tus amigos, hablando del público, ¿no? Y lo que... ya más tarde. Y de pronto, cuando te das cuenta, por ejemplo, como ahora en Copenhague, ¿no?, o aquí en España, ¿no?; en Francia, mm, en otros sitios†..., dices: “Pero, es increíble que un público tan diferente reaccione de la misma forma ante la película”†. [Eso llega al corazón†.]

[And then you think about your friends, when it comes to the public, you know? And what... later. Then, suddenly, when you realise it, for example, like now in Copenhagen, yeah?, or here in Spain, yeah?, in France, ehm, in other places... you say: “Well, it is unbelievable that such a different audience reacts the same way when they watch the film”. That touches your heart.]

(20tris)
06:45-06:47
JT: [(laughs)] [(hhh)]

(21)
06:45-06:59
LC: [Et c’est] là qu’on se dit qu’on doit quand même toucher quelque chose d’un peu universelle, parce que parce que effectivement le le le le décodage dépasse les: frontières, les les les sexes, les les les ages aussi: [eh...]

[And it is then that we think that we have to somehow touch upon something a bit universal, because, in fact, the decoding goes beyond borders, genders, ages too, ehm...]

(22)
06:59-07:14
IF: [(hhh)] Está claro que... entonces piensas: “bueno, debo tocar algo (.) algo un poco universal”, ¿no?, porque, está claro que la descodificación: va más alla del sexo..., de la edad:, de los países:, de las ¡clases sociales!.

[Obviously then... you think that: “well, I must be touching upon something, something a bit universal, you know?, because it is clear that the decoding process goes beyond gender, age, countries and social classes!]
[Mm. As Billy Wilder said, cinema is the, the only homeland he recognises, right?]

In addition to managing the *mode*, *field* and *tenor* what is most relevant for the analysis of the specific interactional dynamics of this event is to observe how IF integrates her moves into the radio broadcasting arena and ESV’s ethos, as the sequence in Excerpt 1.2 shows. The direct effect on the broadcast interaction is not only cooperative interaction around the interview table but, most of all, the participation of the interpreter suits the medium in a way that enables the host to co-construct a “*radiophonic creation*” (see V. 4) with the interpreter and, consequently, with the guest. The broad face-to-face pattern of interaction allows for a speech-exchange system where visual contact and non-verbal communication can play a crucial role in the management of broadcast talk-in-interaction (i.e. in managing the interaction between the on-stage and off-stage levels of communication). Although visuals for this interview are not available, the analysis of the broadcast recording leads to the observation that turn-taking runs smoothly, based on participants' orientation to the overhearing radio audience: 5 utterances (27, 43, 47, 51 and 58) out of a total of 65 can be considered turn interruptions, or overlap onsets, in Jefferson’s (1984) terms. In all cases - except for utterance 58 (LC interrupts JT) - IF is the participant who is interrupted, using recognitional onsets (utterances 27, 47 and 51) and progressional onsets (utterances 43 and 51) after IF’s brief stuttering. This shows a will of the primary interlocutors to make the interaction as clear and fluid as possible to the audience. Linked to this pattern are a few deviations from the host- interpreter-guest- interpreter-host turn-taking pattern: sequences 9-10-11-12, 19-20-21-22 and 31-32-33-34 are LC-IF-LC-IF consecutive turns which constitute blocks of answers to JT’s questions; sequence
13-14 involves JT's backchannelling comment which LC ignores to continue with his answer; finally, sequence 45-46-47-48 involves JT and IF in the co-construction of a comment/question for LC, and 61-62-63-64 (see Excerpt 1.1) is a dyadic exchange between JT and IF involving the aforementioned ‘goodbye and thanks for the interpretation’. The fluid turn-taking system shows a high level of cooperation along the lines of a conventional broadcast interview (cf. Jefferson 1984, Hutchby 2006, Heritage and Clayman 2010), integrating the interpreter's turns as one more natural element of the live broadcast interaction. Furthermore, when the active participants perform interruptions or anticipations they do it in a way that minimises the listeners' disruption and accommodates to the comfort factor. An illustrative example is in sequence 57-60 (Excerpt 1.1), when LC interrupts JT (utterance 57) - arguably understanding at least names referenced in Spanish - and JT anticipates IF (utterance 58) to suggest the propositional and structural lines along which IF's interpreting could go. Both interruptions provoke the immediate silence of the interrupted participant, who gives up the turn in favour of a cleaner broadcast interaction. This pattern occurs in each of the utterances catalogued as interruptions or turn anticipations above.

The co-construction of the turn-exchange system is thus based on the active participants' awareness and integration of their interactional moves within the medium. IF's smooth yet straight-forward and fluent turn uptake following the DI modality, as well as her clear turn-transitions to the primary interlocutors, are evidence of her orientation to the radio audience and, ultimately, to this type of institutional talk-in-interaction.

**b) Sequence organisation and co-construction**

**b1) Interpreter’s management of relational and referential aspects between on-stage and off-stage: focus on selective information in on-off stage communication. Shifts between overt and covert audience-oriented mode**

There are several examples throughout Interview 1 of how JT, as host, permanently links the on-going talk in the studio with the remote audience for different purposes: first, keeping the audience's attention through re-contextualisations of the interview setting, participants and field (utterances 17, 39, 57 and 61); second, providing details of the interviewee's film and première in Spain and further related events (utterances 17,
57 and 61). These overtly audience-oriented utterances are usually inserted in larger sequences where JT shifts between on-stage and off-stage talk-in-interaction. Sequence 17-18 in Excerpt 1.2 and Excerpt 1.3 (below) illustrate these links and shifts:

**Excerpt 1.3**

(39)

09:43-10:11

JT: Mm. Bueno, vamos a dejarle, sabemos que viene de...**comer**, con lo cual no sé si a lo mejor es el mejor momento para charlar un **ratito**, para nosotros **es**: **eh**, es un placer, **Señor Cantet**, que usted esté en este estudio, que nos hable **de**, de las películas **anteriores**, como **Recursos Humanos**, como **El empleo del tiempo**, como de **L’Esquive**, como de **Hacia el Sur**, y: y ya no nos queda que preguntarle sobre **eh**...bueno, su próximo **proyecto**, si tendrá que **ver** con **Recursos Humanos** o con **El empleo del tiempo**, o se acercará más a **Hacia el Sur**↓.

[Mm. Well, we are going to leave him there, we know that he just came back from having lunch, so I don’t know if it is really the best moment to talk for a little while, it is a pleasure for us, Mr. Canter, that you are in this studio to tell us about your previous films, like Human Resources, like Time Out, like L’Esquive, like Heading South, and now we only have time to ask you, ehm well, about your next project, if it will have something to do with Human Resources or with Time Out, or if it will be rather like Heading South.]

(40)

10:11-10:13

IF: Votre **prochain projet**?

[Your next project?]

IF’s uptake of JT’s overt audience-oriented utterances when interpreting JT’s words to LC follows a common pattern: (1) the omission of propositional information addressed to the audience; (2) avoiding the repetition of the referenced films and vocatives; (3) cutting out JT’s rhetorical questioning. None of these patterns are replicated when IF interprets LC’s utterances into Spanish. Throughout these interpreting strategies, IF is showing an orientation to the medium whereby she considers that the live broadcast nature of the event, time pressure and the primacy of the ‘on-air participation framework’ allow for cutting propositional content when interpreting into the foreign language, in order to get the most out of the interview for the audience.

This pattern shows, therefore, an information selection process by the interpreter which still contributes to the smooth unfolding of the interaction and is tacitly accepted and not questioned by any of the active participants.

**b2) Interactional cooperation to produce talk during the interview**

It has already been pointed out that IF puts mechanisms in place with regards to turn-
taking and speech delivery that contribute to a constant, regular pace of the talk-in-
interaction. Below, I provide further evidence as to how these mechanisms are
interactionally devised in order to accommodate for the radio broadcast nature of the
event.

**b2i) Turn transition and completion via the use of prosodic devices**

In section 2.a) I have referenced a series of sequences where LC and IF co-
construct the answer to JT’s questions throughout several turns. Turn-taking
in these sequences shows a common pattern: the use of prosodic devices,
usually a falling tone and a light slowing down of word utterance speed (see
utterances 9-12, 19-22 and 31-34). This pattern reflects an avoidance of
overlapping talk and, therefore, produces a linear sequence of talk which
can be followed easily by the audience. Furthermore, these three sequences
are followed by JT’s fast, non-overlapping turn uptake, via a
backchannelling comment, which reflects JT’s ambition to create a dialogue
rather than a conventional question-answer based interview.

**b2ii) Turn appraisal via gentle coughing/inbreaths**

Non-verbal devices such as coughing and overt breathing for turn-taking
purposes only take place in sequence 21-22 in Interview 1. It can be argued
that the cooperative attitude of the active participants leads to the primacy of
the use of prosodic devices in turn-transition, as discussed above. A
comparison with Interviews 2, 3 and 5 suggests that the use of non-verbal
devices such as coughing and inbreathing results from the attempt to avoid
overlapping talk; however they are avoided as long as prosodic devices
work and the interlocutors cooperate in creating a smooth turn-taking
system in this public arena.

Furthermore, face-to-face situational arrangements may contribute to this
significant absence of coughing and inbreathing as turn-taking devices. The
analysis of interviews which do not correspond to the studio face-to-face
broad pattern of interaction (2 and 4) will provide insights into the extent to
which these situational arrangements determine the primacy of certain turn-taking pattern devices.

**b2iii) Speed in turn-taking**

It has already been pointed out that IF’s turn appraisal throughout the interview is fast and unhesitating, in a clear orientation to the broadcasting nature of the event. Although prosodic devices are the main interactional features helping IF to accomplish her fast turn-takings, there may be a high possibility that visual contact and other non-verbal devices (e.g. hand gestures) help anticipating when the primary interlocutors are finishing their utterances, of which sequence 23-24 may be an example.

On the other hand, there are other cases of fast turn-taking: the aforementioned cases of turn anticipation via progressional onsets (e.g. utterances 14LC, 25JT, 43JT and 47JT). JT’s anticipation (utterances 25, 43 and 47) is a paradigmatic case of JT supportively repairing IF’s interaction for the creation of the broadcast dialogue that JT aims at as host. In the referenced utterances, JT’s main interactional purpose is to maintain the smooth flow of the talk, so that the integrity of the broadcast interview as a whole is not broken or questioned by the listener. JT is supportive of IF in the sense that he does not constitute a face threat for IF’s interpreting job. Indeed, IF interactionally welcomes JT’s anticipations, as shown by her uptake (utterances 26, 44 and 48).

**b2iv) Overlapping talk**

Overall, overlapping talk rarely occurs in Interview 1. Evidence of how it is avoided (see b2i, b2ii and b2iii) shows an active orientation not only towards the talk-in-interaction between participants, but notably towards the radio broadcasting nature of the event. Yet, on the few occasions when it happens it is rapidly repaired within less than one second and avoided, primarily by IF (utterances 6, 12, 13bis, 28, 42, 44, 46, 50, 52, 60), who tends to relinquish her turn when a primary interlocutor engages in an overlap onset, but also by JT (utterances 7, 21bis, 45, 55, 57 and 61) and LC.
This is more evidence of IF’s active orientation towards the broadcasting nature of the communicative event, and JT’s acknowledgment of live language transfer in his programme.

As with previously analysed patterns of interaction, this may be helped by the studio face-to-face arrangements, but this can only be evidenced when comparing it to the broad patterns of interaction in interviews 2-5.

**b2v) Explicit turn repair or turn re-organisation**

None of the active participants make an explicit reference to the dynamics of the talk-in-interaction, neither in particular sequences nor generally at the end of the interview. This is yet more evidence of the fluid turn exchange system in Interview 1 due to the active orientation and cooperation of LC and IF with JT in the unfolding of the broadcast interview. Again, the situational arrangements may have contributed to these unchallenged turn dynamics. This hypothesis will be corroborated when I analyse Interviews 2-5.

JT’s uptake of LC and IF’s management of the radio broadcasting public arena shows a covert acceptance, which is expressed by JT’s co-operative attitude throughout the interview.

**c) Public Face**

The core of this subcategory for analysis is to explore how the interpreter (IF) deals with her public face and how the primary interlocutors approach it during the broadcast talk-in-interaction.

**c1) Turn design: Addressing the interpreter’s interaction**

IF’s turn-taking patterns are never explicitly addressed or challenged, especially by JT from his position as host - which involves communication gatekeeping and turn-coordination (cf. Hutchby 2006, Heritage and Clayman 2010). There is no evidence of JT and LC specifically addressing IF, in the form of requests or emphasis in asking the primary interlocutors. It can be observed, therefore, that IF’s interaction with the primary interlocutors via fast turn-uptakes, lack of hesitations and self-repair, as well as a broadcast-oriented use of prosody, produces a covert acceptance of her interaction by
the primary interlocutors. In turn, these interactional devices account for the primary resources which IF uses to preserve her public face.

**c2) Participation shifts:**

**c2i) Use of first and third person with face-protection purposes.**

In section 1.a), utterances where IF switches from first to third person were registered. The shifts in those sequences were not due to face-saving nor motivated by face threats. However, there is a face-saving element in IF's permanent use of first person and direct speech when rendering JT's utterances: IF makes sure that LC acknowledges that it is JT's figure that she is voicing (e.g. utterances 8, 18 and 25).

**c2ii) Non-verbal face-saving devices: backchannelling and laughing**

IF's public face is potentially threatened in the instances where she hesitates (utterances 42, 46) and JT breaks in to offer a continuer, as in the following excerpt (cf. utterances 43 and 47):

**Excerpt 1.4**

(42) 10:39-10:57
IF: Bueno, es curioso pero efectivamente volvemos a *L’Esquive* porque es un poco:, bueno, toca el mismo tema ↑. La próxima película *tendrá lu*…, o sea, transcurre en un *colegio* ↑; *inst*, no llega a ser un *instituto*, no es exactamente *lo mismo* en Francia ↑, pero vamos, más o menos ↑, y dentro del marco, el marco de una clase *donde* transcurren, (lower volume) se puede decir, donde:

[Well, it may seem curious but we actually come back to *L’Esquive* because it is a bit, well, it deals with the same topic. The next film will take pl…, I mean, it is set in a school, high sch, it is not really a high school, it’s not exactly the same in France, but more or less for this matter, and within the framework of a classroom where we could say that what is involved is…]

(43) 10:58-11:03
JT: [Las] tensiones de la sociedad…! [(coughs) (2sec pause) actuales ↓]

[The tensions of current society!]

(44) 11:01-11:08
IF: Efectivamente ↑. Y toda, [digamos,] las tensiones actuales [de la sociedad] con todo la mezcla et étnicas que hay en Francia ↓ [actualmente ↓].

[That’s it. And all, let’s say, current tensions of society with all the ethnic mix that exists in France nowadays.]

(45) 11:07-11:15
In utterance 59 (see Excerpt 1.1), JT anticipates IF’s interpretation just after LC's utterance, offering a backchannelling uptake which covertly suggests to IF how to structure her utterance. In all instances referred to above, IF shows her orientation to the public broadcasting nature of the event by neither hesitating in her turn uptake, nor offering signs of distrust, disagreement or unease. Furthermore, her uptakes suggest that she does not feel that her interpreting abilities are being threatened. Specifically in utterances 44 and 60, IF offers assertive and reassuring turn uptakes, via backchannelling devices, such as “Efectivamente” (“Precisely”, utterance 44) and “Sí, hay otras actrices” (“Yes, there are other actresses”, utterance 60), which are directly addressed to JT, but do not aim to break the interactional ‘comfort’ of the ongoing talk-in-interaction.

Short laughs are also used by IF as a public face-saving device, thus showing an interactional alignment not only with JT but also with the broadcast comfort that JT is trying to create during the interview (e.g. utterance 24).

Laughs are used by IF in a number of utterances within sequences in which
she interacts with JT without necessarily reflecting LC’s propositional or relational content, but in a face-saving, comfort factor and rapport-building way, which is geared towards the overhearing audience (e.g. utterances 28, 30, 60 and 62).

**d) Lexical choice**

There are different lexical levels at which IF shows her orientation to and engagement with the medium and ESV’s ethos and public arena of communication:

**d1) Marking self and others**

IF uses different strategies for conveying the way the primary interlocutors address each other and her, depending on the participation framework: firstly, when IF renders JT’s questions to LC, she omits vocatives from JT’s original utterances (17-18, 39-40, see excerpts 1.3 and 1.4). This omission shows that IF is not trying to replicate JT’s position as host, but to make communication with LC as effective as possible so that the audience can make the most of the event. Secondly, when IF produces the Spanish rendition of LC’s answers, as in sequence 9-10, she makes an effort to maintain LC’s references to himself and others, as elaborated by LC, following a mimetic style (Wadensjö, 1998:244). IF places herself as a ‘figure’ (Goffman, 1981:147) of the voiced person (LC), thus accomplishing two interactional aims: (1) a direct interaction with JT and (2) avoidance of audience confusion with regards to the ‘authorship’ of the utterances produced in the foreign language.

**d2) Interpreter's appraisal of the institutional setting**

**d2i) Via his/her own tenor as audience design**

IF orients herself to the institutional setting by making lexico-grammatical choices that tend to be formal, literary, journalistic and, overall, of a high register and enhanced by an active use of prosodic devices for radio talk purposes. Evidence can be found in utterances 8, 10, 12 and 15, all within a sequence where JT's question (rendered into French in utterance 8) invites a degree of storytelling, which is what IF replicates in utterances 10, 12 and 15.
Throughout the whole interaction, IF makes an effort to replicate the source language register and, if possible, to embellish it and clean it of hedges and repetitions. Sequence 49-54 is illustrative of IF’s effort to make structural changes with regards to LC’s utterance which are oriented to the public broadcasting nature of the interaction. IF departs from the monologic structure of LC’s utterance to produce a dialogic utterance which engages with JT’s radiophonic interaction. This departure involves paraphrases, explicitation and prosodic devices that engage more with the setting than with the original utterance.

Additional evidence of IF’s uptake of the institutional setting is found in IF’s lexical choice with regards to politeness when JT ends the interview and thanks her for the interpreting (see Excerpt 1.1). IF answers with a highly polite lexical choice and tone (utterance 62), thus showing an orientation to the setting, which she understands as being formal and where public face is also preserved via the lexical level.

**d2ii) When explicitly referenced by the host**

Not applicable in Interview 1.

The analysis in subcategories a-d, which places the focus on IF’s interaction, explains why her public face remains unchallenged and unthreatened, as well as building interactional trust, allowing JT and LC to engage openly and spontaneously in the radiophonic co-construction of the interview. Rather than simply concluding that this may be considered a successful interpreter-mediated interaction in radiophonic terms, I have pointed out the factors which explain why IF’s interaction does not create public face issues either for herself or for the primary interlocutors.

**e) Power**

There are different ways in which medium/setting related power differentials are shown in Interview 1. The following subcategories highlight these with an analysis of how the asymmetries of participation (Heritage, 2004:236) are created and dealt with by the active participants.
**e1) Asymmetries of participation**

JT guides the interactions of the interview through his questions (e.g. utterances 7, 17, 25, 35, 39), comments, backchannelling or invitations to develop an answer further (e.g. utterances 4, 13, 14bis, 23, 29, 43, 45, 47, 53, 59, 61). This gatekeeping activity is exerted on IF when JT considers that it is in the interest of the broadcast interaction to get the cooperation of the interpreter or her direct interaction (without the need to involve LC). This is accomplished via gentle turn-interruptions, or recognitional onsets (Jefferson 1984), even if it involves a substantial change in the structure of the interpreted utterance in comparison with the source language utterance. This is the case in sequence 41-54 where JT and IF dialogically disentangle LC's utterances (41, 49, 51) for the overhearing audience.

Another illustrative example of how IF engages with JT's interactional power is found in JT’s invitation to end the interview (see Excerpt 1.1). Acknowledging time constraints and politeness towards LC, IF applies a higher level of summarising than in the previous utterance. In this case, IF's utterance (60) is significantly shorter (14 seconds) than LC’s (utterance 58, 30 seconds). This summarising device shows an alignment and cooperation with JT and the medium in order to finish the programme on time and or, at least, to avoid delays caused by her own interaction.

**e2) Subverting the host's power**

While Interview 1 generally unfolds along co-operative interactional lines, there is one occasion where JT's interactional guiding of the interview is challenged, if gently, by LC, in sequence 57-60 (see Excerpt 1.1): JT’s reaction is to immediately resort to IF in order to not leave the audience out and keep track of the interaction, as well as to redirect the talk where he wants and not where LC suggests. In that sequence, IF cooperates with JT’s gatekeeping move rather than conforming to LC’s original utterance structure, thus showing how, when required, IF is ready to cooperate with JT for the purposes of the broadcast interaction.

**e3) The interpreter's appraisal of the primary interlocutors' power differentials: alignments**

Throughout IF's interpreting it can be observed how she positions herself in the
interaction as the ‘figure’ (Goffman 1981) of the guest, using communicative devices that aim at replicating LC's propositional content, lexical choices and prosody, as well as engaging with JT via prosodic devices such as laughing (see 2.c2 above) and turn-taking, showing a higher rapport building attitude with JT than LC. On the other hand, IF's interactional alignment with JT takes place when she considers that JT is overtly addressing the audience (as discussed in subcategories 2.b1 and 2.b2) and when JT covertly shows concern for live broadcasting issues, such as time constraints (sequence 57-64). IF seems to engage with the primary interlocutors' interests (whether interactional or propositional) in the way she considers apt for the communicative setting. This is evidence of IF's active engagement with the ongoing broadcast talk-in-interaction and her orientation to the medium.

**e4) The interpreter’s position and status**

Interview 1 shows organisational and interactional features which tell us about the interpreter’s position and status as communicative aspects which are collectively constructed before and during the live broadcast and which do not only depend on the interpreter’s agency, even if the interpreter plays a significant role in defining it through her agency. Adopting a transversal analysis of the interaction (Traverso 2004), the following are the features which define the interpreter’s position and status throughout the interview:

- The interpreter’s interaction is not hidden or made ‘invisible’ by the broadcasting institution. That is, the live DI interpreter-mediated interview is broadcast as it naturally happens in the studio, minimising sound control and editing techniques. By using the first person, IF keeps herself as a ‘figure’ representing the primary interlocutors. The main purported interactional effect is to avoid participants' authorship confusion amongst the audience. It is when ‘authorship’ is at stake that IF switches to third person and reported speech.

- Interactionally, JT deals with the interpreter-mediated broadcast production by making IF overtly present in the interaction when required, particularly, when ending the interview: JT’s thanks to IF for her
‘translation’, to which IF reacts politely with a humble answer and laugh, showing a co-constructed position of the interpreter not only as the ‘figure’ of the guest, but also as an interactional support and a broadcasting ally for JT who engages with his interviewing technique and seems at ease with ESV’s ethos and public arena of communication.

- IF’s different approaches to dealing with the rendition of each of the primary interlocutors’ utterances show interpreter shifts depending on the participation framework, thus showing shifts in the interpreter’s position according to the broadcasting needs.

This particular interpreter-mediated radio broadcast is one where the interpreter engages with the host's tenor and renders propositional content (field) uttered by both the host and the guest in covert audience-oriented mode, hence making a deliberate effort to participate along the lines - and within the constraints - of the specific radio broadcasting arena in this radio show.

The interactional evidence (via the interpreter's moves and devices) is seen in turn-taking patterns and relational moves, suggesting that this is specific to this type of interpreter-mediated event.

Footing, face and power relations unfold in a relatively stable and co-operative interaction: neither the guest nor the interpreter tends to challenge the host's moves and, hence, the interview follows the fields and tenor suggested mostly by the host. This creates a smooth dynamism in the turn-taking speech system, with a highly polite dialogue where the three active participants share a co-operative uptake of the communicative event. Even in the case of slight deviations of the interactional flow, all participants co-operate to bring it back to their desired orientation to the broadcast talk-in-interaction.

3 Broadcast talk: institutional framework and institutional discursive features

It is ESV's agenda and interest in covering independent cinema (see V.2.1) that brings LC to the studio, as detailed in Table 1: Reasons for interview. The fact that ESV, via JT, shows a preference for LC's Vers le Sud and JT's interest in the Spanish audience watching the film contributes to the creation of a cooperative and supportive talk-in-
interaction, with questions and comments geared towards exploring LC’s films and career further, rather than challenging or questioning him.

The fact that the interpreter’s interaction is perceived by the host as integrated within the medium and the programme leads to a lesser need to remind her about the institution where they are interacting. This aspect will be investigated further in the following interviews, where frequent references to Radio 3 and ESV are made by JT during the interviews.

Throughout my CA of Interview 1, I have shown how the interpreter's DI pattern of interaction takes into account the key interactional aspects of radio broadcasting and how IF sought to integrate her participation accordingly. Whether IF’s approach and skills in dealing with this radio broadcast talk-in-interaction were also based on her experience in this communicative setting remains unknown; however, there is reason to think that she has a certain degree of experience based on previous practice, in terms of her management of medium-specific features (voice, silence, turn-taking), her involvement in the co-construction of the broadcast arena, and her understanding of and interaction with ESV’s public arena and the host's ethos.
Interview 2: Interview with Peter Greenaway (Welsh filmmaker)

1. Broadcast production and situational arrangements prior to and during the interview: influence and impact on the overall interaction

Within this category of interview, ESV devotes part of or the whole programme to a specific film-related event and a triadic or multi-party talk takes place between JT (in Madrid) and the guest(s) placed at the event's location - either the local RNE studios or directly on location (see Interview 3). The interpreter's physical location may vary depending on the provider, that is, Radio 3 (see Interview 4) or the event organiser, usually being the latter, as is the case in Interview 2.

The studio-to-studio connection in Interview 2 means that the guest, Peter Greenaway (PG), is not interviewed on location or at the hotel where he is staying. PG and Rafael Segovia (RS) - the interpreter - were asked to come to the local RNE studio some time before the actual broadcast interview started.

Once the broadcast interview starts, remoteness and lack of visual contact between PG/RS (in Cuenca) and JT/OC (Olga Correas) (in Madrid) are the main broad contextual features arising from the situational arrangements for this particular broadcast interview. Distance between the broadcast participants - including the STs in each studio - is, therefore, the first and most salient constraint in the broadcast production of this particular interpreter-mediated interview (see section 1.a) below). The participants have to deal with this as they embark on a dialogue which is produced primarily for the audience. Based on the number of times JT re-contextualises the interaction and reminds the audience of the ‘distant’ dialogue with PG (utterances 54, 59, 64, 85, 135, 249), it can be argued that the distance between the active participants, accentuated by relatively long foreign language utterances for radio broadcasting (by PG, between 50 seconds and 1 minutes 10 seconds on average), increases JT’s effort to relate the on-stage interaction to the off-stage audience by reminding the foreign language speaking guest to engage in more dynamic talk.

The studio-to-studio connection, whereby two RNE studios with similar technical

---

122 This is a recurrent connection for phone interviewing in ESV’s coverage of film events (e.g. Festival Granada - 13/06/09, interviews with: Rana Sultan, Leonardo de Franceschi; see Table 2.1, page 139).
facilities are connected, contributes to a focused interpreter-mediated exchange, isolated from other external participants and contextual elements (cf. Interviews 3 and 5). The ‘Reasons for interview’ (see Table 2, page 136, and section 1.a) below) have an impact on how the fields and tenor of the interview are dealt with by the active participants. In this regard, while the first interactional challenge for the interpreter may still be to master propositional content, referential meanings and shared background between the host and the guest, it can be observed that extra work is needed to simultaneously cope with the broadcast's situational arrangements (see sections 1.a) - 1.c) below). At the same time, this complex setting has to be technically integrated into the radio broadcasting arena and ESV’s ethos.

But first, I will analyse how the situational arrangements have implications for the interpreter-mediated broadcast talk-in-interaction with regards to turn-taking, interpreting mode, sound management and off-the-record interaction.

**a) Setting up the participation framework: host's introduction to the talk-show and interview**

Interview 1 took place in April 2010; at that time ESV was broadcast on Friday evening, 10pm - 12am, a two hour format which, due to the broadcasting day and time, offered more opportunities to cover film festivals and related cultural events live than in seasons when ESV was broadcast on weekdays, as for example in 2014 (8 to 9 pm, Monday to Thursday).

The run up to the interview (minutes 00:33-18:42, sequence 2-9) evidences JT’s framing of the interview: via his “diario hablado” (“spoken diary”, utterances 2 and 4) and the use of radiophonic devices such as music (3, 5 and 6) and film extracts (8), JT brings together the different broad contexts triggering the interview with PG: Easter Friday, the Religious Music Week, PG’s presence in Cuenca and ESV’s coverage of the event. JT’s monologic narration serves the purpose of contextualising PG's visit to Cuenca and the forthcoming interview in the programme; he goes from a rather metaphorical introduction to a progressively ‘down-to-earth’ and more specific introduction. In sum, JT uses radio language features to also recreate a gloomy and dark environment, thus linking the atmosphere in Cuenca and PG’s filmmaking.
This framing, together with the participants' physical location and the constraints it exerts on the interpreter-mediated interaction, are made evident from the beginning of the actual interview, when direct contact between JT, PG and RS is first established on-air via JT's introductions:

Excerpt 2.1

(8)
10:49-18:16
Sound tracks: [Music and film tracks (in English) taken from Greenaway's films, notably The Pillow Book and The Draughtsman's Contract] [music fades out]

(9)
18:15-18:42
Sound tracks: [theme music] El Séptimo Vicio, Radio 3. [[theme music fades out]]

(10)
18:34-18:38
JT: [Peter... Greenaway, buenas noches.]

[Peter... Greenaway, good evening.]

(11)
18:39-18:40
PG: [Good evening.]

(12)
18:40-18:57
JT: Gracias por: por aceptar esta invitación invisible casi, desde este Séptimo Vicio, en la radio... en la radio pública española, que sabe de su cine, que le apasiona su estilo, su búsqueda. Es un placer, un honor para nosotros, señor Greenaway. Muchas gracias, ¿eh?

[Thank you for accepting this almost invisible invitation to this program, El Séptimo Vicio, on Spanish public radio, where we have seen your films, we love your style, your quest. It's a pleasure, an honour to have you with us, Mr. Greenaway. Thank you very much, indeed.]

(13)
19:01-19:05
PG: (hhh) It's my pleasure! I'm delighted to be invited too.

(14)
19:08
JT: Rafael Segovia.

(15)
19:11
Rafael Segovia: Hola.

[Hello.]

(16)
19:11-19:12
JT: ¡No me dejes solo…!

[Don't leave me alone...!]
The interview starts off with JT establishing direct contact with PG (utterance 10). JT thanks PG and introduces him to the programme, the station and the audience, providing PG with the broadcasting context in which the interview is going to take place, not only physically (“invitación invisible casi” - “almost invisible invitation”) but also institutionally (“en la radio pública española, que sabe de su cine, que le apasiona su estilo, su búsqueda” – “[on the] Spanish public radio, where we have seen your films, we love your style, your quest”). Then, RS is introduced by JT, who, by using his name, establishes the interpreter’s position as one more participant in the interview (he has a name and is not introduced as ‘the interpreter’) and, upon RS’s delay in his reply, JT reminds him, succinctly yet clearly, what the communicative setting is and that he is also part of it (utterance 16): “¡No me dejes solo! – “Don’t leave me alone!””). This utterance serves as an invitation to proceed to the rendering of PG's first words in English and to build a first ‘radiophonic’ rapport with the interpreter too. Judging by RS's upshot, he does not seem to be fully integrated with the communicative environment yet. The utterance that follows (18, see Excerpt 2.2 below) by JT aims at checking if PG is comfortable in this environment, which PG takes up as a more general question on his whole experience in Cuenca (utterance 20).

Within this first interpreter-mediated sequence, a first participation framework has been co-constructed for the interactional unfolding of the interview, which builds on the first eighteen minutes of the programme (see participation frameworks 1 and 2 in Table 2, page 138) and the situational arrangements.

**b) Turn-taking organisation (medium/technically-motivated/oriented)**

Utterance 16 (see Excerpt 2.1, page 194) is not only a polite invitation to render propositional content, but to engage in a dynamic talk exchange which is actively oriented to the radio interview context. The first noticeable consequence of JT's move is that RS makes an effort to quickly take up his turn and to use prosodics for a smoother turn exchange. This attitude towards turn-taking by JT sets up a smooth, dynamic and primarily inferential turn-exchange system, based on the use of voice tone
for turn transition and completion. A downward tone and/or slower pace are commonly used throughout the interview in order to facilitate next speaker’s turn-taking via the creation of turn transitional spaces (e.g. utterances 34, 35, 37, 38, 40, 41, 43, 44, 46, 61, 63, 65, 68, 72, 78 and 70). These utterances correspond to the first hour of the episode, where turn exchange is characterised by this type of turn-transition rather than by the use of recognitional and/or progressional onsets.

With regard to the latter two, two common interactional turn-anticipation devices are used in this broad pattern of interaction: inbreathing and gentle coughing preceding the verbal utterance onset. This is particularly common with the primary interlocutors after RS’s utterances (e.g. 45, 47, 112, 115, 135, 153, 213 and 226), hence evidencing that the main space for the primary interlocutors’ turn-taking are JT’s speech slowing down and downward tone, as well as moments of hesitation (e.g. utterances 73 and 140).

On the other hand, the space for RS’s turn-taking is much less conflicting and clearly straight-forward, particularly after longer utterances by PG (i.e. between 20 seconds and 2 minutes 25 seconds) which focus on the referential level of communication and not the relational level. In these sequences, RS’s turn appraisal is characterised by being generally slow (for radio broadcasting practices), starting with backchannelling devices (e.g. ‘mm’ prefaces), and a lack of reassurance in his tone (utterances 21, 31, 35, 39, 41, 44, 46, 58, 60, 63, 67, 73, 80, 83, 106, 111, 116, 120, 130, 132, 134, 140, 158, 160, 166, 189, 205, 212, 229, 223, 244, 246, 248, 275, 282, 286 and 315; that is 37 out of 146 RS utterances). The interactional effect is that, instead of providing dynamism to the interview, it slows it down. Moreover, 29 out of 37 utterances following this pattern are into Spanish, following PG’s turn, with 14 of them taking more time than PG’s original (between 3 seconds in utterance 286, and 45 seconds in utterance 67). These four features - i.e. ‘mm’ prefaces, 1-2 second pauses before the start of verbal rendition, higher turn time than preceding turn in the foreign language and unreassuring prosody - do not help to bridge the physical distance between PG and JT to the ears of the audience. And, even more relevant to my analysis, RS’s repeated turn-taking pattern creates a covert frustration in JT which becomes manifest in utterances 26, 196bis, 210/210bis and 253-266. JT’s reactions can be considered a consequence of his own perception that RS is not actively oriented to the medium.
b1) Interpreting modality: influence of the organisation of the setting and the ongoing interaction (participation frameworks)

Interview 2 is characterised by an evolving interpreting modality: it starts with a rather consistent DI modality which gradually shifts to a mixed interpreting modality pattern, based on the use of the DI modality for English into Spanish utterances, and simultaneous/whispering mode (with sound mute on most occasions) for Spanish into English utterances. Hence, the interpreting modality is maintained on-air and off-air, and evolves during the interaction as follows.

The broadcast talk-in-interaction starts with RS using DI. The reason for this lies in RS's understanding of the communicative setting, also given the absence of a particular preference for a particular interpreting mode from ESV and JT (see V.4). Excerpt 2.2, taken from the first exchanges of the interview, is illustrative of this initial pattern:

Excerpt 2.2

(18) 19:17-19:23
JT: Eh... ¿Le puede preguntar al señor Greenaway si está cómodo, si está a gusto, si está tranquilo?

[Eh... Could you please ask Mr. Greenaway if he is comfortable, at ease, relaxed?]

(19) 19:23-19:27
RS: Mmm. [4 seconds silence – muted by ST]

(20) 19:27-19:36
PG: Yes! I have only been in this city maybe for about five hours, but from what I've seen in five hours I am more than happy. [4 seconds silence – muted by ST]

(21) 19:40-19:47
RS: Sí, estoy bien; sólo he estado en la ciudad por unas cinco horas, pero por lo que he visto, estoy encantado.

[Yes, I'm fine; I have only been in the city for about five hours, but from what I have seen, I am delighted.]

Shifts in the interpreting modality start shortly after the introductions have taken place:

Excerpt 2.3

(22) 19:47-20:05
JT: Mm. Eh., Señor Greenaway, me acompaña en este, en este programa especial que está dedicado a usted, eh, Olga Correa, que es miembro de diversos espacios cinéfilos de, de Madrid y
de Canarias; espacios que ha explorado y explora en el cine desde la psiquiatría y el psicoanálisis…

¡Olga, ¡buenas noches!

[Mm. Ehm, Mr. Greenaway, in this especial programme devoted to you, I am accompanied by, ehm, Olga Correa, who is a member of several cinephile spaces in Madrid and in the Canaries; spaces that she has explored and that she keeps exploring in cinema from the point of view of psychiatry and psychoanalysis… Olga, good evening!]

(23)
20:05-20:06
OC: Hola, buenas noches.

[Hello, good evening.]

(24)
20:05-20:10
JT: ¿Por qué ese interés por el cine del señor Greenaway?

[Why this interest in Mr. Greenaway’s films?]

(25)
20:11-24:54
OG: Bueno, primero te quiero agradecer esta invitación. Ehm, yo no voy a decir que es un honor, que por supuesto lo es, ehm, si no, sobre todo, porque me parece una suerte poder compartir este rato en El Séptimo Vicio contigo y con un autor que me interesa tanto como Peter Greenaway.

[Well, first I would like to thank you for this invitation. Ehm, I am not going to say that it is an honour, which it is of course, ehm, but above all, because I think it is very fortunate to be able to share this moment on El Séptimo Vicio with you and with an author in whom I am so interested, such as Peter Greenaway.]

(26)
24:55-25:16
JT: [sighs] Gracias Olga, Olga Correas, psiquiatra, psicoanalista, miembro de varios espacios de, de cine y psicoanálisis, y estudiosa del cine de Peter Greenaway. Eh, yo no sé, Rafael, Rafael Segovia, que está en Cuenca junto con Peter Greenaway si... si ha podido pasarlle o transmitirle algunas de las palabras elaboradas por, por Olga Correas...

[Thank you, Olga, Olga Correas, a psychiatrist, a psychoanalyst, member of different film and psychoanalysis groups, and also a scholar of Peter Greenaway’s films. Ehm, I don’t know, Rafael, Rafael Segovia, who is in Cuenca next to Peter Greenaway, if... if you have been able to pass on or transmit some of the words elaborated by, by Olga Correas…]

(27)
25:17-25:20
RS: Sí, sí (1sec pause) [hecho] está.

[Yes, yes, that's done.]

(28)
25:20-25:23
JT: [Y...] ¿Y tiene, tiene algo que decir a estas palabras? O no ha dicho... [no...]

[And... do you have, do you have anything to say to these words? Or he has not said... not...]

(29)
25:23-25:25
RS: [Do] you: have anything to say about this?
RS’s uses SI whenever the communicative framework allows it (i.e. longer utterances by JT and OC, which escape the question-answer format). This evolving approach in the use of different interpreting modalities may have implications with regards to public face and participants’ perceptions of the interaction (notably by JT), which will be explored in Section 2 of this analysis. It also remains to be seen if this is a specific and common interactional trend in ESV interpreter-mediated interviews and, overall, in radio interpreting.

b2) Broadcasting the interpreter-mediated exchange: sound management

The broad pattern of interaction, the situational arrangements and RS’s choice of interpreting mode have technical implications for the sound technician (JIO) in Cuenca. Excerpt 2.2 is illustrative of how these three aspects come together at the beginning of the interview: the 4 seconds mute sound in both utterances 19 and 20 show that prior to the broadcast interview, RS and JIO had not worked out a clear idea of which interpreting modality to use and how to broadcast it. As the interview unfolds, the off-stage communication between RS and JIO, as well as its output for the active participants in Madrid and, most importantly, the live broadcast for the audience, evolve.

In Excerpt 2.2, it can be observed how JIO chooses to fade out RS's utterance (19) into English. However, acknowledging that JT is not consistent with the use of simultaneous interpreting, JIO decides against this practice over the course of the interview for RS's renditions of JT’s utterances into English (which last less than 15 seconds on average). This is due to an overarching live broadcasting convention: avoiding silence in radio. Nevertheless, JIO keeps muting RS's microphone when the sequences in Spanish are considered long and he opts for SI (see Excerpt 2.3, utterances 22-26).

On the other hand, it is noticeable how in sequences where utterances in Spanish (and the subsequent simultaneous interpretation) are elaborated in a way that their duration is uncertain, JIO opts for putting the interpreter's microphone volume down, but not entirely, in case JT finishes his turn and then the voice of the interpreter needs to be heard, in order to keep the audience aware of what is going on in the studios; with this
practice, undesired silence is also avoided. The following excerpt is illustrative of this practice during the interview:

**Excerpt 2.4**

(137)  
18:37-19:42  
JT: [(..hh)] *El Séptimo Vicio, que es en directo eh:: podéis seguir formulando preguntas…] eh la verdad es que las estamos recogiendo con muchísimo gusto, pero (.hh) pero prácticamente, bueno si, hemos podido colocar algunas, algunas preguntas, pero si queréis hacerlo en directo y conversar con con Peter Greenaway, pues nada más tenéis que marcar el novecientos ciento treinta ocho ciento treinta y ocho.  
Peter Greenaway, que no es la primera vez, ni mucho menos, que se ha metido con Bergman, o que ha declarado que el cine está muerto. Por ejemplo, es muy curioso que, que él eh, bueno, critique de alguna manera a Bergman y a la vez: a la vez fue el cineasta que le llevó a él al cine; que declare que el cine está muerto… pero él **sigue** haciendo cine!

¶

Yo no sé si, señor Greenaway, con ese panorama que usted nos está pintando de que el cine es casi cosa del pasado… (.hh) ¿cómo le apetece seguir haciendo cine? Bueno, supongo que, que desde los parámetros que nos ha dicho, ¿no?, desde las nuevas tecnologías, desde quizás desde los, los museos de arte también como nuevos espacios para el cine, ¿no?, que acaban de ser conquistados, señor Greenaway ↓.

//**El Séptimo Vicio**, which is broadcast live, ehm, you can keep asking questions, ehm the truth is that we are noting them down with great pleasure, but but, well, we have hardly been able to ask any of them, but if you want to do it live and chat with with Peter Greenaway, you just have to dial nine hundred thirty eight, hundred and thirty eight.  
Peter Greenaway, who not the first time has criticised Bergman, or who has stated that cinema is dead. For example, it is very odd that, that he, well, criticises somehow Bergman and that, at the same time, Bergman was the filmmaker who got him into filmmaking; that he states that cinema is dead… but he still makes cinema!  
I don't know, Mr. Greenaway, with this panorama that you are drawing where, where cinema is something from the past... how come you still feel like making cinema? Well, I suppose that following the parameters that you told us, right?, with new technologies, in, maybe, in art museums also as new spaces for cinema, right?, which have just been conquered, Mr. Greenaway.

(138)  
19:42-19:49  
RS: [mic volume tuned up] the technologies and the: art museums can be spaces for:: for cinema creation now[adays too…].]  

Although RS (utterance 138; see also 225) had not finished interpreting JT's utterance yet (using the SI modality), JIO turns RS's microphone up as soon as JT accomplishes his turn, in order to avoid broadcasting silence. This practice is a medium-driven choice by the ST which escapes any of the interlocutors' interests or communicative preferences, thus showing the direct influence of the broad context.

One of the main interactional implications of this approach to sound management is that JT and, ultimately, the audience can hear the interpreter's utterances and they can grasp
paralinguistic features such as the interpreter's tone, hesitations, pauses, etc., making language transfer visible and an intrinsic element of the broadcast.

There is a broadcast orientation in RS preferring SI over DI in this type of sequences: to cut irrelevant ‘foreign language noise’ for the audience, thus also saving broadcasting time, which can be used for getting more talk-in-interaction through to the audience; RS seems aware of time constraints and of how the interpreting interaction may also produce a more dynamic broadcast for the listeners.

However, using the SI modality proves technically and interactionally problematic, not only for RS but also for JIO. The ‘foreign language noise’ for the audience while JT speaks in Spanish is reduced when JIO mutes RS's utterance, yet RS struggles to master SI all the time and ends up resorting to DI for most of the interview in both directions, particularly when disagreement and conflict are involved. The following excerpt is illustrative of this recurrent interactional pattern:

**Excerpt 2.5**

(237)  
34:39-35:04  
JT: En cualquier caso, señor Greenaway, sí le quiero decir que este periodista... del siglo pasado... quiso acercarse a su cine, se ha acercado muchas veces a su cine..., quiso hablar de su cine y quiso hacerle muchas preguntas, y usted... y usted se ha limitado prácticamente a: a hacer un psicoanálisis bastante: [clicks tongue] bastante barato, señor Greenaway...

[In any case, Mr. Greenaway, I would like to say that this journalist from the past century wanted to explore your filmmaking, has explored your filmmaking on many occasions; I wanted to talk about your films and ask you a lot of questions and you have done practically nothing but play the psychoanalyst, Mr. Greenaway.]

(238)  
35:04-35:27  
RS: (hhh) Okay. Eh::, well..., this journalist of the: past century eh tried to make an interesting interview with you and you have concreted yourself to making: observations about psychoanalytical observations and: things like that which are not, which are... out of the point.

(239)  
35:27-35:44  
PG: Well, I disagree with you. I absolutely disagree with you. I think the French for a long time have argued that there's no such a thing as content any more, there's only language, and you must remember... the famous phrase offered by McLuhan, that the medium is the message ↓.

(240)  
35:45-36:04  
RS: (hhh) Bueno, yo no... eh no estoy para nada de acuerdo contigo: eh, hay que recordar que los franceses han dicho ya que no hay contenido, que lo único que hay es lenguaje y eh: hay que recordar también a McLuhan con la idea del mensaje; ¿no?

[Well, I do not agree with you at all. We have to remember that the French have said that there is no such thing as content, only language. And we have to remember McLuhan and his idea about]
the message, right?

(241)

36:04-36:21

JT: Pues sí, es verdad. Tiene usted toda la razón. En todo caso, eh: mañana vamos a acercarnos a Cuenca... a conocerle a usted, físicamente... y a ver sobre todo su última película... y esperemos que sea toda la vanguardia del siglo veintiuno que usted dice que hace.

[Yes, that's true. You are absolutely right. In any case, we will go to Cuenca tomorrow... to meet you, physically... and above all, to watch your latest film... and we hope that it has all the 21st century avant-garde that you claim you are doing.]

(242)

36:22-36-38

RS: (.hhh) Eh: okay. Eh, we'll be in Cuenca tomorrow and we hope to meet you too, and: we'll: (.hhh) we'll see if your movie is: as:: avant-garde as you: [as you are saying…]

RS’s use of SI shows difficulties in mastering it and he therefore struggles to capitalise on the potential strategic use of SI as a time-saving device. RS ended up not resorting to it. Inexperience in this type of communicative event, and even tiredness may influence his decision. In this case, the ‘safe mode’ to which RS resorts is DI.

A further example of utterances that are not followed by their respective interpretation by RS on-air are those aimed at reframing or redirecting the interview when JT considers it necessary, as in the following excerpt:

Excerpt 2.6

(135)

13:15-14:11

JT: (.hhh) Son las once y cuarto de: de la noche… las diez y cuarto si nos escucháis El: Séptimo Vicio en cualquier lugar de de: de Canarias. Recordaros que estamos hablando con, dialogando, escuchando con (.hhh) con Peter Greenaway, uno de los autores eh, bueno, importantes de este continente… eh que nos… que de… Un saludo muy grande para José Ignacio Orona, que está en esa coordinación de control y sonido de Cuenca… y por supuesto para Rafael Segovia, que está ayudándonos a: a escuchar y a precisar sobre todo: el discurso del señor Greenaway, ¿no? Y Samuel Alarcón, que nos pone músicas… yo espero que el señor Greenaway – se va a ir a cenar dentro de un ratito-, así que vamos a escuchar un poquito a James Taylor y después: y después vamos a despedirle agradeciéndole por supuesto que se haya, que se haya acercado hasta la emisora de de Cuenca ↓.

(4sec pause)

¡Otis! Otis Taylor, no James Taylor.]

[It is quarter past eleven in the evening, quarter past ten if you are listening to El Séptimo Vicio anywhere in the Canaries. I would like to remind you that we are talking with, conversing, listening to, to Peter Greenaway, one of the, ehm, important authors of this continent... ehm, who... Greetings to José Ignacio Orona, who is coordinating and monitoring sound in Cuenca and, of course, to Rafael Segovia, who is helping us to listen to, to specify above all Mr. Greenaway’s discourse, right? And also to Samuel Alarcón, who plays the music...I hope that Mr. Greenaway, who is going for dinner in a little while, so let’s listen for a little while James Taylor and then, later; later we will say bye to him, thanking him, of course, for having come to the broadcasting studios in Cuenca.

Otis! Otis Taylor, not James Taylor.]
Even if it is impossible to know from the broadcast/podcast episode if RS is rendering JT's message simultaneously or if he has decided to wait and render it consecutively off-air, both JIO in Cuenca and the ST in Madrid (Samuel Alarcón, SA) understand JT’s intention to move on to music straight away. Therefore, whether RS interprets JT’s utterance simultaneously or not, he has a free off-air space to render JT’s utterance into English while the music plays. This sequence procedure seems to be a trend in ESV’s interpreter-mediated interviews. Via this interactional technique, whereby JT uses elements of radio language, such as jingles and music, he may fulfil overt interactional purposes, such as relaxing and redirecting the talk-in-interaction (e.g. sequence 83-85) and, given the case, correcting technical aspects (such as phone connections) or giving guidelines or advice to the active participants or other production members off-air. Indirectly, the interpreter benefits from such music/sound breaks: potentially, RS has extra time to interpret what was said or to deal with interactional and relational aspects of the interview while off-air.

Although in this particular interview salient sound management issues (i.e. provoking silence or muting the active participants) occur in the first sequences of the interview (see excerpt 2), JIO eventually becomes familiar with the interpreter's patterns of interaction. The sound management becomes smoother and more consistent throughout the interview. The technical management of the talk-in-interaction by JIO responds to issues related to the exposure to the audience and the potential risk of losing the link between the audience and the on-going talk-in-interaction.

Finally, it is common practice for JT to mention and thank the sound technician, particularly when external broadcast connections are used in ESV, whether they are interpreter-mediated or not. Utterance 135 (see excerpt 2.6) is an example of this acknowledgement, which is confirmed throughout the rest of my data. Furthermore, what can be observed here is a discursive pattern which consists of placing the sound technician and the interpreter consecutively in these acknowledgements.

c) Off-air interaction
Although there is no off-air recorded evidence of Interview 2, there is a sequence in the live broadcast interview where RS brings up the previous off-air interaction between himself and PG. JT considered that the high level of tension, disagreement and absence of interactional cooperation from PG might also have influenced RS's interpreting and interaction, and he wanted to address this issue in a monolingual conversation with RS towards the end of the episode, a unique case in my data:

**Excerpt 2.7**

(251) 40:39-40:42  
PG: I think if you want respect, you have to **earn** it.

(252) 40:43-40:47  
RS: Creo que si quieres respeto... lo tienes que merecerlo.

[I think if you want respect... you have to be worth it.]

(253) 40:47-41:08  
JT: Muy bien. [.] **Exactamente.**

¶

[with louder tone] Señor Rafael Segovia, ¿le puedo preguntar a usted cosas?

[Fine. Exactly. Mr. Rafael Segovia, can I ask you some things?]

(254) 40:52  
RS: [Sí::...]

[Yes...]

(253bis) 40:52  
JT: [O... Yo ] sé que usted es un importante **hombre** de la cultura, un hombre que... al que le hemos metido en un **compromiso** al preguntarle eh: cosas al señor **Greenaway**, pero: en todo caso, mm:, ¿ha estado a gusto en la entrevista usted? ¿O se ha sentido a veces un poco: [tongue clicks] violento?

[Or... I know you are someone relevant in the cultural world, someone who...who we have left in a predicament when asking Mr. Greenaway things, but, in any case, were you comfortable during the interview? Or did you feel at times a bit violent?]

(255) 41:10-41:22  
RS: ¡Bueno! No ha sido fácil porque efectivamente siento que ha habido un: pequeño enfrentamiento... que en realidad hubiera podido pasar: de **largo**, yo creo, ¿eh?

[Well! It has not been easy because, indeed, I feel that there has been a small clash... which, in fact, could have been ignored, I think]

(256) 41:22  
JT: Sí...

[Yes...]
RS: Yo creo que no era nada, era un rasgo de... era un juego y había que tomarlo como tal.

*I think it was nothing, it was a feature of... it was a game and it had to be taken as such.*

JT: No, no, si así ha sido, ¿eh?

*Oh yes, it was like that, yes.*

RS: Sí. [[laughs]]

*Yes.*

JT: [Ha sido más...] Yo por lo menos me he divertido mucho con el señor Peter Greenaway, que de eso se trataba, que... que saliera todo su: su esencia provocadora..., y le ha salido, y además yo estoy encantado. Y además, las opiniones que él dice tampoco son muy originales sí: [si a eso vamos, ¿no?]

*It was rather... I, personally, have had a great time with Mr. Peter Greenaway, and that was the idea, that all his provocative essence came out... and it did, and I am delighted with it. Furthermore, the opinions he expressed are not very original if that was the issue, right?*

JT: [pero no,] pero, ¡vamos!, no puedo yo medirme, en ningún caso, eh: en un diálogo abierto con el señor Peter Greenaway, al que admiro su cine, su obra, y no se trataba de eso. Pero también, de las opiniones que son libres, ¿no?

*But no, but, well!, I cannot measure myself, in any case, in an open dialogue with Mr. Peter Greenaway, as I admire his cinema, his works, that was not the point. But also, opinions are free, aren't they?*

RS: Mm. Claro. Sí, [mumbles] eh, diré algo que no debería decir porque se dijo fuera del aire, pero en un momento me preguntó que si: eh: en una radio nacional en España había libertad de decirlo todo: yo dije: “Yo pienso que en realidad, hoy en día, hay libertad de decirlo todo en la radio de española”.

*Mm. Of course. Yes, I will say something that I should not maybe say because it was said off-air, but at some point he asked me if there was freedom to say everything in a Spanish national radio; I said: “I think that, actually, nowadays, there is freedom to say everything in Spanish radio”.*

JT: Sí, mm matice: hay un matiz, ¿eh?

*Yes, mm please specify; there is a nuance there*
RS: [Sí.]

[Yes.]

(263bis)
JT: Puede decir todo lo que quiera en Radio 3. Yo no sé del caso de otras emisoras...

[You can say everything you want on Radio 3. I don't know about other stations…]

(265)
42:29
RS: ¡Claro! No, no, no.

[Of course! No, no, no.]

(263tris)
JT: [Este:] este tipo de, de: entrevista... yo, eh, se lo he preguntado al señor Greenaway pero no ha querido contestar, porque ha ido por otro lado, como hemos visto en la entrevista: Si él; ha estado alguna vez en una radio en cualquier parte del mundo durante dos horas en directo hablando. A mí, si me gustaría saber eso, porque eso [...] sí da... hasta él mismo se ha sorprendido aunque no ha contestado; [ha dicho... sí... sí...]

[This, this kind of interview... I, eh, asked Mr. Greenaway but he did not want to answer, because he went along different lines, as we could see in the interview: if he has ever been on a radio station anywhere in the world for more than two hours talking live. Indeed, I would like to know that, because that...even he himself was surprised about that, although he has not replied; he has said... yes... yes]

(266)
42:49-42:58

Eh, he would really like to know if you have ever before been in a two hour long interview.

[Well, I ask him, I ask him.
[...] ]

Relational and interactional conflict between JT and PG, and also between JT and RS - although indirectly and covertly expressed - are so evident that JT decides to have this one-to-one dialogue with RS in his position as interpreter, which JT starts by acknowledging RS's background (utterance 253bis) on-stage. This is an exceptional interactional phenomenon in my data. Although monolingual sequences between one of the active participants, in this case the host, and the interpreter occur in other DI settings, the reasons for and the way this sequence unfolds is specific to radio broadcasting, as well as unique to Radio 3.

Overall, in this section I have looked at how the physical setting and situational arrangements of this particular interpreter-mediated live radio interview have an impact on the interaction when it comes to organisational aspects, such as turn-taking, the interpreting mode, sound management and working with the sound technician. The
analysis also shows how the interpreter-mediated talk technically and interactionally manages this particular medium and type of broadcast, as evidenced via introductions and the management of the off-the-record interaction.

Interview 2 is made possible thanks to the willingness of different stakeholders to devote a whole 2 hour episode of ESV to PG. RNE and Radio 3 provide the necessary technical equipment to include a broadcast interview with PG live. The broad context is favourable for the broadcast interview to take place, yet the primary interlocutors deviate from the usual tone of ESV interviews by engaging in a hostile exchange, which was not aided by the interpreting.

2. Participants' orientation to Public Radio Broadcast talk-in-interaction

a) Turn-taking organisation (public broadcasting motivated/oriented)

In Interview 2, the physical distance between active participants, plus the fact that the broadcast production is shared between the RNE studios in Madrid and Cuenca, leads to particular approaches to turn-taking by the active participants themselves. However, these do not only respond to medium-based technical, temporal and spatial constraints, but also to the public broadcasting nature of the event.

There are two salient aspects determining the general turn-taking organisation during Interview 2.

The first example is the monolingual dialogue that JT establishes with RS (see Excerpt 2.7 and section 1.c) above, especially, utterances 263 and 263bis). The interpreter-mediated triadic participation framework is momentarily suspended when JT wants to know how RS felt during the interview, what difficulties he had and, ultimately, if JT's suspicions about PG's uncooperative attitude could be confirmed by RS, who was sat next to PG in Cuenca. In this sequence, JT gains more control of turns when Radio 3’s ethos is at stake (utterances 263 and 263bis), which emphasises JT's interest in framing this interview within a very specific media institution (see more details in section 3 below).

Second, JT shows an overt awareness that the apparently unorganised, unconventional and spontaneous turn-exchange during the interview, with no clear question-answer trends, no post-editing of the interview and a total openness to immediate broadcasting,
are practices that are common to ESV and, most importantly, closely linked to Radio 3’s ethos and public arena (cf. utterances 171, 196 and 196bis, 210 and 210bis, 263 and 263bis). Thus, JT is aware that this way of proceeding in a radio programme might unsettle both the guest and the interpreter and potentially generate interactional and propositional instability in the broadcast talk-in-interaction.

Third, the physical distance between the host/expert (JT/OC) and the guest/interpreter (PG/RS) does not allow for visual, off-stage interaction between the interlocutors for turn-taking purposes (both on-air and off-air). JT-OC and PG-RS can only use non-verbal (visual) devices between themselves.

This also applies to the off-air moments of the broadcast, where verbal exchange, prosodics and other non-verbal sound-based devices are the communicative devices available between JT in Madrid and PG/RS in Cuenca. It particularly stands out that JT chose air time to openly address organisational aspects or repair the turn-exchange system:

**Excerpt 2.8**

(47)  
38:03-38:12  
JT: (.hhh) Yo quería recordarle (coughs) al señor Greenaway que esto es una entrevista; lo digo por sí: si quiere que yo le siga haciendo preguntas o: o no sé...

[I wanted to remind Mr. Greenaway that this is an interview. I say that to get an idea if he wants me to keep asking questions, or...]

(48)  
38:13-38:23  
RS: (.hhh) (1 sec pause) Ehm... (2 sec pause) he would like to remind you that this is an interview, so he would like to: to know if you want to: hear more questions?

(49)  
38:23-38:24  
PG: Go ahead!

(50)  
38:25  
RS: Adelante.

[Go ahead.]

(51)  
38:26-38:35  
JT: No, pero, pero verá, ¿eh? No, [yo no... Yo] estoy encantado y estamos orgullosos de estar escuchando una auténtica lección de, de cine del señor Greenaway...

[Ok, but only if he wants to, all right? I wouldn’t... I’m thrilled and we are proud to be listening to a real lesson on film by Mr. Greenaway...]
This excerpt does not only evidence that distance affected the broadcast interaction, but also that JT wanted this part of the interaction to take place on-air, in line with Radio 3’s public arena approach of sharing openly what is going on on stage - in this case in the studio-to-studio interaction - with the audience (see V.4).

However, there is conversational evidence in the broadcast programme that RS and PG did use off-air gaps to deal with different aspects of the communicative event as analysed in section 1.c) (see utterance 262, Excerpt 2.7). The sequence in Excerpt 2.7 is of high analytical relevance, because JT brings up on-air a de-briefing talk between him and RS, which JT overtly decides to share with the audience.
Furthermore, JT verbalises the great extent to which the absence of body language and gestures were playing a role in the guest-interpreter-host exchange, thus explaining JT's initial concern about this “invisible interview” (utterance 12), and his perceived disadvantaged position with regards to establishing a more balanced interview. Utterance 70 illustrates how the physical proximity between PG and RS allows for a faster turn uptake by PG after RS has finished his interpreting utterance, without having to resort to breathing or coughing. The same pattern is repeated in utterances 34, 37, 40, 43, 45, 56bis, 70, 72, 82, 131, 133, 153, 178, 184, 215, 222, 272 and 326; that is 19 PG utterances (out of a total of 81) can be catalogued as turn anticipations to JT favoured by the physical proximity to the interpreter. Hence, one can point to gestures and body language playing a role in anticipating RS's turn completions and, thus, PG having greater chances to take the floor before JT in Madrid, who fails to take the floor 8 times (utterances 68, 69, 81, 121, 177, 221, 271 and 235, out of a total of 112 utterances), largely as a consequence of the physical distance with RS and PG.

b) Sequence organisation and co-construction

b1) Interpreter's management of relational and referential aspects between on-stage and off-stage: focus on selective information in on-off stage communication. Shifts between overt and covert audience-oriented mode.

There are numerous examples in Interview 2 evidencing the permanent link that JT makes between the on-stage and off-stage levels of communication. Sequence 85-89 below can be considered paradigmatic for this pattern of interaction:

Excerpt 2.9

(84) 55:24-59:27 Music track

(85) 59:26-01:00:38
JT: (.hhh) Son las once de la noche, estamos en directo, en este día:: viernes de pasión, mañana ya es de resurrección, o sea que... y estamos recordando, dialogando, bueno, dialogando es un eufemismo; estamos escuchando a Peter Greenaway que es para nosotros un: un: un ¡un honor! ¡de verdad!, lo hemos dicho ...

pero todavía sería mucho más divertido si el señor Greenaway nos deja preguntarle cosas... ↓ (.hhh) Yo voy a hacer... bueno, hay que recordar que el señor Greenaway ha hecho uno de los cines que más apasiona a los oyentes de esta: de esta emisora, de este Séptimo Vicio, que nos, que además lo decimos abiertamente, que nos gusta violentamente su cine: El cocinero, el ladrón, su esposa y sobre todo The Pillow Book, en fin El vientr..., nos gusta muchísimo su cine; Michael Nyman ha estado aquí y también igual de provocador... Yo quisiera que se desatara un
poco Greenaway; yo no sé si, si, si quiere siempre sacar su discurso ortodoxo, purista, pero yo quiero que se relaje un poco, eh, va a cenar tranquilamente dentro de un ratito. Está escuchándole todo el país eh; que: que ama el cine, que le gusta el cine... Señor Greenaway, ¿puedo hacer un, puedo hacer un: un juego con usted? ¿Le puedo invitar a jugar o no?

It is eleven in the evening, we are broadcasting live, on this day, Good Friday, tomorrow is already resurrection day, so... and we are recalling, conversing, well, conversing is a euphemism; we are listening to Peter Greenaway who is for us a,a, an honour, truly! We said it before, but it would be much more fun if Mr. Greenaway would let us ask things... I am going to... well, we have to remind you that Mr Greenaway has made some of the films which the listeners of this station, of El Séptimo Vicio, are more passionate about, and we say it openly, we love his cinema; Michael Nyman, who was here and was as provocative... I would like you to relax a bit Greenaway; I don't know if, if, if you always want to get your orthodox, purist discourse out, but I want you to relax a bit, eh, you are going to have dinner quietly in a little while. All the country is listening to you, eh, the country that loves cinema, that likes cinema... Mr. Greenaway, can I play a game with you? Can I invite you to play or can’t I?

(86)
01:00:39
RS: Mm...

(87)
01:00:40-01:00:44
PG: What do, what would you like to ask? What is the question?

(88)
01:00:45-01:00:48
RS: ¿Qué te gustaría preguntar? ¿Cuál sería la pregunta?

[What would you like to ask? What would the question be?]

(89)
01:00:49
JT: ¡Muchas!

[Many!]

(90)
01:00:50
RS: Many.

RS's utterance can’t be heard, since he interprets simultaneously and JIO puts his microphone volume down. This pattern, therefore, accounts for a joint on-stage/off-stage management of communication through RS's choice of interpreting modality and JIO's agency.

Excerpt 2.9 is also illustrative of another phenomenon: whereas consecutive interpreting is performed for all utterances from English into Spanish, this is not the case into the opposite direction. Both RS and JIO understand that this part of the interaction is of no interest to the audience, hence they help to save broadcasting time by favouring the off-stage level of communication (sequence 85-86).

However, in order to explore how RS manages JT's overt addresses to the audience, I
have to look at sequences where he uses DI, as in the following excerpt:

**Excerpt 2.10**

(157)  
22:21-22:57

JT: Una, una pregunta:] eh, ehm:, él él, Peter Greenaway, que escribe, que pinta, que dirige películas, que incluso compone... compone películas, parece como... se nos aparece como un artista total, ¿no?, al estilo renacentista, ¿no? Pero, pero con la mano en el corazón, señor Greenaway... ¿cuándo... cuándo se encuentra usted mucho mejor, no..., cuando escribe... tranquilamente un texto? ... cuando pinta o hace pelis o cuando compone música?... Pero no le hago una pregunta, bueno, usted me va a acusar de que son preguntas que nunca alcanzarán el premio Pulitzer pero, pero sí nos gustaría saber en qué momento él disfruta más, haciendo qué cosa... ↓.

[A, a question, ehm, he, he, Peter Greenaway, who writes, who paints, who makes films, who composes... composes films, he is like... he appears to us as a total artist, doesn't he? Renaissance style, isn't it? However, with your hand on your heart, Mr. Greenaway... when... when do you find yourself more comfortable..., when you are writing... a text, quite relaxed... when you are painting or making films or composing music? But I am not asking you a question, well, you are going to accuse me of asking you questions that will never get the Pulitzer Prize but, but we would indeed like to know in which moment he enjoys the most, doing which thing...]

(158)  
22:57-23:19

RS: Mm. Eh:: people would think of you as some kind of Renaissance artist, eh:: embraces all kinds of art, and, but, when would you say that you are at your best? When you are writing? When you are painting? Or [when you are making films?] ↓.

This sequence shows interactional phenomena which are directly linked to the broadcast nature of the event and thus specific to this interpreter-mediated setting.

First, there is JT's swap between the second and third person when referring to PG. The use of the third person involves a covert level of communication with the audience, which is addressed and involved in two ways: first, by referring to PG using the third person, as a comment/question (see utterance 157). Second, by asking the question not as an individual, but as a group (JT, plus the audience, plus the institution), by using the first person plural. The complex structure of utterance 157 also fulfils a third purpose: involving RS in the question by emphasising the information to be interpreted, via repetitions, reformulations and reminders of the question itself.

Throughout RS's uptake of JT's utterance, we can observe that the complex strategy developed by JT to address and involve different participants has been simplified to a great extent by RS: he does not render all this complexity, probably considering that his utterance is not serving all of JT's original interests and purposes, and is not being listened to nor understood by the same participants. Thus, RS asks the question in a
straightforward manner, using the second person and not referring to the audience as JT originally did. Finally, RS chooses to omit JT's personal comment about his own question (utterance 157), which can also be a face-related omission, judging from what RS argues in utterance 262 later in the interview.

JT expects RS to translate these subtleties (“guiños”), which are an intrinsic part of JT's communicative ethos and, as he states in the semi-structured interview (see V.4), they were the core of the ‘dialectic challenge’ he was trying to establish with PG. However, RS did not make this swap between second and third person when interpreting into English for PG and he tended to use the second person to address PG, thus rendering the message void of JT's deeper intended interactional complexities. Even if RS's rendition is influenced by time restrictions and off-on stage considerations, it still shows a lack of engagement with ESV’s ethos and public arena of communication.

The next sequence, however, shows a common pattern of interaction in this type of interpreter-mediated broadcast interview, which was also seen in Interview 1:

Excerpt 2.11

(61) 40:01–41:16
PG: [(hhh)] We, you shouldn't, you shouldn't cry nostalgic tears about this. What's happening next is gonna be a thousand times more exciting than what we've seen heretofore. We are now entering an age where we can all become filmmakers. The notion of cinema is becoming an egalitarian preoccupation and not an elitist one. Practically everybody, I'm sure, who's listening to me now has a mobile phone, a laptop, and probably a camera recorder, which makes you all potential filmmakers. You don't have to have special knowledge; you don't have to have a network of complicated relationships that relate to economies and industry; you have all sorts of conduits now for free expression, and this should be seized avidly to move away from the cautious a hundred and fifteen years of so-called cinema, which we've now experienced. This is a time for celebration! You have all been enfranchised! You are all now potentially filmmakers! A situation you've never had before. So, seize the moment and do something useful with it ↓.

(62) 41:17
JT: Mm...

(63) 41:17–42:29
RS: Mm (hhh) (4sec pause) No hay que ser nostálgico: a propósito de todo esto; en realidad, eh, lo que sigue es algo realmente muy excitante. Y: lo que está sucediendo es que el cine se está volviendo: igualitario y a partir de: de ahora, cualquier persona que tenga en su posesión un ordenador y una cámara de video que pueda tomar imágenes y: eh transmitirlas al ordenador, se convierte potencialmente en un realizador de cine, eh: y esto de alguna manera nos eh: lleva a conductas de libre expresión y: que: y nos está haciendo ir mucho más adelante de estos ciento quince años de cine congelado en si mismo ↑; eh, o sea que es un momento para la celebración, no es un momento para la nostalgia. Y: debemos pensar que esto es una oportunidad, es una situación eh que hay que tomar como oportunidad y, y aprovecharla, ¿no? ↓

[Mm. One should not be nostalgic about all this; in fact, ehm, what is next is something really
exciting. And what is happening is that cinema is becoming egalitarian and from now on, anyone who has a computer and a video camera that can take pictures and transfer them to the computer, potentially becomes a filmmaker, ehm, and somehow this takes us to conduct of freedom of expression and take us so much further than the last hundred and fifteen years of frozen cinema; ehm, that is, this is a moment of celebration, not a moment of nostalgia. And we have to think that this is a chance, a situation that we have to take up as a chance and take advantage of it, isn't it?

[We should remind Radio 3 listeners that we are having a live conversation with filmmaker Peter Greenaway, who is in Cuenca to close this year's edition of the Cuenca Religious Music Week tomorrow and he is going to do that with Las bodas de Caná. Eh, tras un minucioso estudio de La ronda de noche de Rembrandt y de La última cena de Leonardo Da Vinci, Greenaway eh incide ahora sobre Las bodas de Caná, el gran cuadro que Veronese pintó para el refectorio del monasterio benedictino de San Giorgio, en Venecia.

Señor, señor Greenaway, ¿por qué... por qué Las bodas de Caná? ¿Y por qué... eh en Cuenca? Y: ¿cómo ha sido posible esto?

[We should remind Radio 3 listeners that we are having a live conversation with filmmaker Peter Greenaway, who is in Cuenca to close this year's edition of the Cuenca Religious Music Week tomorrow and he is going to do that with The Wedding at Cana. Ehm, after a meticulous study of Rembrandt's Night Watch and Leonardo Da Vinci's Last Supper, Greenaway ehm delves into The Wedding at Cana, the great painting that Veronese painted for the refectory at the Benedictine monastery of San Giorgio, in Venice.

Mr, Mr Greenaway, why The Wedding at Cana? And why Cuenca? How was this possible?]

In this sequence, JT takes the floor just after RS's interpreting to remind the audience about the programme's guest and interview subject(s), but also to reframe the participation framework and to attempt to bring the interaction back to the “diálogo directo” (“live dialogue”, utterance 64).

The audience as distributed recipient in the interview helps to explain RS's decision to selectively render the question about The Wedding at Cana and not the previous paragraph (see utterance 64). Both his tenor and lexical choice show a clear orientation to the public broadcast nature of the event.

b2) Interactional co-operation to produce talk during the interview

b2i) Turn transition and completion via the use of prosodic devices

The comfort factor (Katan and Straniero Sergio 2001; see chapter II) is clearly considered by JT in this interview. It is a feature which underlies the technical and spatial constraints of the broadcast, affecting the way the
primary interlocutors exchange turns with the interpreter, who is their primary recipient in the turn-exchange system.

Throughout Interview 2, there is an evident effort by the primary interlocutors to complete turns in a clear-cut way so that RS can take up his turn smoothly, via transitional onsets (Jefferson 1984). PG is aware of his utterances having to be interpreted into Spanish. He produces a clear downward tone and his speed tends to decrease when completing his turns, as in the following excerpts:

**Excerpt 2.12**

(30) 25:26-25:44
PG: (.hhh) Well, I suppose when you make a film, you throw it out to the world, it's entirely up to people's subjectivity to use their culture baggage for an interpretation. But The Pillow Book for me: was really, I suppose, an examination of text versus image ↓.

(31) 25:45-26:09
RS: Mm. (2sec pause) Eh:, bueno, cuando uno echa una película al público, obviamente, deja uno de tener control sobre ella... […]

[Mm. Ehm, well, when you throw a film at the audience, obviously, you don't have any more control over it... […]]

**Excerpt 2.13**

(34) 26:20-27:27
PG: I'm: very interested, I suppose, in the general in the twenty-first century obsession with the notion that we now have an information age... which is predominantly visual and not textual. Umberto Eco argues that we've had a text-dominated civilisation for eight thousand years and now it's about time these textmasters, these gatekeepers of the word... will move aside so that we can come of age and reconsider our civilisation now primarily as a visual phenomenon! This is going to interest me enormously because I have traded in the cinema, I suppose, in the culture of cinematic imagination for the last thirty years, and I'm greatly disappointed by the cinema because it is not an image-based medium, it's a text-based medium, and I think that is a great tragedy for a brand-new medium which unfortunately, I sincerely believe, has travelled a wrong route ↓.

(35) 27:28-28:22
RS: Mm. (2sec pause) (mumbles) Eh:, existe hoy en día una obsesión con la: información y, y esta idea de que estamos en la edad de la información, y: hemos entrado en una edad en que lo visual se vuelve realmente predominante. […]

---

123 They might have been accompanied by body language, as PG and RS are face-to-face in Cuenca, which would ease RS's understanding of PG's turn completion; however this level of detail is unknown, due to the lack of access to visuals for this broadcast.
RS's turn-taking in this type of sequence is systematically characterised by a strategy which has a two-fold purpose: (1) to reassure PG of his understanding of the utterance and (2) to delay his utterance in order to think about how to deliver his interpretation in Spanish. Excerpts 2.12 and 2.13 are representative of RS's systematic turn-takings from PG's previous turns, which can be observed consistently in sequences 37-39, 40-41, 43-44, 45-46, 56-58, 61-63, 66-67, 72-73, 78-80, 82-83, 104-106, 110-111, 115-116, 119-120, 131-132, 133-134, 139-140, 159-162, 165-166, 188-189, 193-195, 234-236, 239-240, 243-244, 274-275 and 313-315. They start with utterances by PG which are longer than 15 seconds and in which PG makes use of his turn to produce relatively monologic utterances. RS's *mm* turn-taking tends to fade out when the interaction becomes more dynamic (with shorter turns) and controversial (see, for example, utterances 211-233 and 283-312).

On the other hand, JT's questions and requests are uttered following a more dialogical attitude, more open-endedly and even at times repairing and completing his utterance, in an effort to simplify JT's propositional content, but also his irony and nuances transmitted via prosody (what JT specifically calls “*my dialectical duel with PG*”, see V.4).

**Excerpt 2.14**

(18) 19:17-19:23  
JT: Eh... ¿Le puede preguntar al señor Greenaway si está cómodo, si está a gusto, si está tranquilo?

*[Eh... Could you please ask Mr. Greenaway if he is comfortable, at ease, relaxed?]*

(19) 19:23-19:27  
RS: Mm †.  
*[4 seconds silence – muted by ST]*

**Excerpt 15**

(95) 01:01:01-01:01:07
Estupendo. Yo solamente le voy a pedir que cada pregunta responda casi casi con cinco palabras [y así] puedo hacerle casi cien.

[Fantastic. I am only going to ask you to answer every question with hardly five words [and like that] I can ask you nearly a hundred.]

These examples show RS's different approach to the way he interprets JT's turns, where his lack of prosodic emphasis and increased hesitations, together with the omissions of propositional content, render, generally, a simplified message to PG with regards to field, tenor and texture, which has interactional implications throughout the broadcast interview.

b2ii) Turn appraisal via gentle coughing/inbreaths

The primary interlocutors' interstitial space for turn-taking can be found in the ends of RS's utterances or, in some cases, during RS's utterances, when he makes long pauses or uses a falling tone. Public broadcasting features, most notably the ‘comfort factor’, motivate smooth turn-exchange patterns. In this respect, gentle coughing and inbreathing are the most common devices to accomplish this action, with overlapping talk and impolite or uncooperative turn-taking actions being avoided by all interlocutors. The following excerpts are illustrative of the way this systematically occurs during the interpreter-mediated broadcast interview:

Excerpt 2.16

Whatever your level of nostalgia for the notion of cinema, that strange activity that people do in the dark - and that always surprises me because man is not a nocturnal animal - all looking at one rectangle of light, so that two thirds of the world is always behind your head, and if you are watching a feature film sitting still for a hundred and twenty minutes, which is not at all a human characteristic - and we play this silly game now for a hundred and fifteen years - and we can see all over the media world how these characteristics are breaking down and creating a mixed-media interactive association with ideas about the world which is much more sophisticated, much more embracing, much more egalitarian, where the means of distribution are coming closer and closer to the makers... take for example, Youtube, which is one of the best things that have happened in the last ten years, so we can get away from these elitisms that really created a great barrier between film and its potential...
RS: Mm. (3sec pause) Si por mucho que tenga uno: una cierta nostalgia por este cine, este arte del movimiento del cine y todo esto, tenemos que darnos cuenta de que, de alguna manera, esto está cambiando y que además no es un medio natural, es una: intenta reproducir la vida y no lo logra... es un medio en el que obliga al ser humano a sentarse durante cuarenta minutos frente a una pantalla, limita el espacio a un rectángulo y, de alguna manera, esto no son características humanas. Eh..., por el contrario estamos entrando en una era donde empieza a existir la posibilidad de funcionar de manera fragmentaria eh, crean, vien, anali, recibiendo las imágenes de manera fragmentaria, gracias a los medios digitales, y: además, estos se, es algo mucho más..., que abarca algo mucho más importante y, de alguna manera, también es un medio más igualitario porque permite que los productores sean los mismos realizadores, pone los medios de producción en manos de los realizadores y eh; por ejemplo, Youtube es una de las mejores cosas que le ha sucedido a la humanidad en los últimos años y esto es lo que está realmente cambiando el panorama ↓.

[Mm. No matter the level of nostalgia one may have for this kind of cinema, this art of motion which is cinema and all this, we have to realise that, somehow, this is changing and that, furthermore, it is not a natural medium, it is, it tries to recreate life and it fails to accomplish it... it is a medium that forces the human being to sit down during forty minutes in front of a screen, limiting the space to a rectangle and, somehow, these are not human features. Ehm, on the contrary, we are coming to an era when the possibility to work in a fragmentary way has started to exist, ehm., by receiving images in a fragmentary way, thanks to digital media and, furthermore, these are, this is something much more..., it encompasses something much more important and, somehow, also a more egalitarian medium because it allows producers to be the filmmakers themselves, it puts the means of production in the hands of filmmakers and ehm, for example, Youtube is one of the best things that has happened to humanity in recent years and this is really changing the current landscape.]

(47)
38:03-38:12
JT: (.hhh) Yo quería recordarle [coughs] al señor Greenaway que esto es una entrevista; lo digo por si: si quiere que yo le siga haciendo preguntas o: o no sé...

[I wanted to remind Mr. Greenaway that this is an interview. I say that to get an idea if he wants me to keep asking questions, or I don't know...]

(48)
38:13-38:23
RS: (.hhh) (1 sec pause) Ehm... (2sec pause) he would like to remind you that this is an interview, so he would like to: to know if you want to: hear more questions?

Whereas JT (utterance 47) uses it to try and take the floor, RS (utterance 48) uses breathing as a way of taking time to think, to self-reassure and as a continuer to start his interpreting utterance.

Drawing on the data examples, the overriding conversational rule guiding the use of these interactional devices is not to compromise the smooth and dynamic progress of the broadcast event, no matter the propositional or relational lines along which the interaction may unfold. This is especially noticeable when looking at JT's turn appraisal methods during conflictive moments in the dialogue, namely when he wants to make a side comment or break in RS's utterance. JT takes advantage of RS's moments of silence or
hesitation to break into the interaction, even if he is aware that RS may not have finished his utterance yet. This is noticeable in Excerpt 16, above. Excerpts 17 and 18, below, illustrate these devices, which fall into the categories of turn recognitional and progressional onsets (Jefferson 1984) in sequences where the interaction is heated and confrontation between the primary interlocutors is brought to the forefront of the broadcast.

Excerpt 2.17

(120)
06:15-06:28
RS: Mm... (.hhh) Bueno, me estás haciendo preguntas realmente aburridas y y: y: tontas... [Y: yo quis... ] (. ) [yo quis... ]

[Mm... Well, you are asking me really boring questions and, and, and silly too... I would... I would like...]

(121)
06:24-06:28
JT: [Dígale que suspendí] [que suspendí] en la facultad... (.) [que suspendí] en la facultad de periodismo...

[Please, tell him that I failed, that I failed at the school... at the school of journalism...]

(122)
06:28-07:09
RS: [(laughs)] Yo quisiera que dejaras la nostalgia... y que: te enfocaras en este hecho de que el cine está a punto de desaparecer [...]

[I would like you to leave nostalgia behind... and that you focused on the fact that cinema is about to disappear [...]]

Excerpt 2.18

(151)
21:33-21:51
RS: Eh... y entonces, bueno, a partir de: del: del: año dos mil diez... efectivamente, eh hace diez años tal vez los chicos querían estudiar más cine... Hoy en día, están orientándose más hacia estas actividades tipo museográfico, ¿no? ↓.

[Ehm, and then, well, from the, the, the year two thousand and ten, that's right, ehm maybe ten years ago guys wanted to study rather cinema... Nowadays, they are orienting themselves more towards activities of this museographic kind, right?]

(152)
21:51
JT: No sé... (5sec pause) [Será en Gales o en, o en Reino Unido...]

[I don’t know... That will be the case in Wales or in, or in the United Kingdom...]

(153)
21:51-22:12
PG: (hhh) Maybe just to to ex... eh enlarge on that a little from [XXX – overlapping with JT - unaudible] ...in this music festival, the initiators of this are not the conventional people who set
up feature films, but the initiation here and the funding organisation has come from the big museum and painting collections of the world! [exclamation with subsequent falling tone].

JT (utterances 121 and 152), as the radio communication professional, is aware that he might be causing communicative ‘noise’ to the audience, and he tries to find the least disruptive moments to break into the conversation, not only to avoid being impolite and generating further tension between the interlocutors but, most notably, to keep in line within the public broadcasting arena which he has largely set up himself.

However, the use of inbreathing and coughing as turn-exchange devices does not always work in this physically distant setting. JT tries to use it in some instances, (e.g. utterances 69-70, 74-75, 80-82 and 149-151) where, mislead by RS downward tone, he breathes in as a way of taking the floor, unsuccessfully:

**Excerpt 2.19**

(67)
45:12-47:57

RS: Mm (5sec pause) Ok. Ehm: (2sec pause) Bueno, l::, como ustedes ya han escuchado en este programa:, eh, los orígenes de mi interés por el cine fueron mi deseo convertirme en un pintor. Y: fue a partir de esa: necesidad de: de expresión a través de la pintura que: de alguna manera llegué al cine, donde los: eh: todo es mucho más complicado, se requieren, entre otras cosas, de enormes cantidades de electricidad y de medios y de contactos y de todo esto para poder hacer cine, eh: y:; de algún modo, eh:; es un medio muy especializado y esta:: especialización justamente es la que lo condena, de alguna manera, a, a:, a su propia muerte, ¿no? (hhh – restarts with higher tone volume) De las otras seis formas de arte eh: que en realidad son formas que: todas ellas han sido creadas miles o incluso millones de años, hace millones de años, y la, la:; la pintura en este sentido pues tiene una superioridad respecto a este medio limitado por su: por su peso tecnológico. Eh:, entre otras cosas, hay, ten, conocemos ocho mil años de pintura occidental y yo quisiera utilizar justamente estas::; las nuevas tecnologías de las que disponemos para volver a crear un encuentro, un método de aproximación con la pintura. Eh:, de alguna manera esto nos lleva al tema de la, eh:; (1sec pause), digamos, de la alfabetización visual, en la que existe un:, un gran cuerpo de pintura en nuestra historia, eh, que podemos leer y que es parte de nuestra historia.

[Mm. Ok. Ehm, well, as you have already heard on this programme, ehm, the origins of my interest in cinema were my desire to become a painter. And it was starting from that need to express myself via painting that, somehow, I came to filmmaking, where ehm everything is much more complex, more things are required, among other things, enormous amounts of electricity and means and contacts and all this is required to be able to make cinema, ehm and, somehow, ehm, it is a very specialised medium and this specialisation is, precisely, what condemns it, somehow, to its own death, isn’t it? The other six forms of art ehm which actually are forms that have all been created thousands or even millions of years, millions of years ago, and painting in this regard has a superiority over this constrained medium due to the weight of technology. Ehm, among other things, there are, we know eight thousand years of Western painting and I would actually like to use these new technologies that we have today in order to produce an encounter, a method of approximation to painting. Eh, somehow, this takes us to the question of, ehm, let’s say, visual literacy, in which there is a great corpus of painting in our history, ehm, that we can read and which is part of our history.]
RS: Este importantísimo cuadro de Veronese, ehm, para mí, fue la continuación de una investigación que emprendí hace tiempo ya con otros dos cuadros que, que traté de manera semejante y, ehm, de alguna manera, eh, en este cuadro se, está, encarna de alguna manera mi interés justamente por lo visual ↓.

[This extremely important painting by Veronese, ehm, was for me the continuation of a research that I started a long time ago with other two paintings that, that I dealt with in a similar way and, ehm, somehow, ehm, in this painting, it embodies somehow my particular interest in the visual.]

RS: Estamos [encantados…]

[We are delighted…]

PG: ([sound fading in]) [XXX the film.] if I could continue a little bit more to give you a little more context... (.hhh)

RS: (heard in the background – lowered sound) ¿Si puedo continuar…?

[If I may continue…]

PG: … the: film we are presenting here -indeed it is called The Marriage and it is related to this famous icon of Christianity, which represents Christ's first miracle, painted by a great deal of painters, but certainly very much in the middle of the sixteen century, probably at its most profound by this extraordinary painting by Veronese-, but it is part of a long series: there is a series of an examination of the connections between cinema and painting -eight thousand years of painting, only a hundred and fifteen years of cinema- which is represented by what I believe to be nine important stepping stones, for example, since the Renaissance up until now, where grand ideas, both in terms of language and content, had been examined at by: -I won't call the masterpieces because that is too much of valued judgemental attitude- but certainly deeply significant images which I think all of us, even though we might not be painting students or even remotely interested in painting, have some knowledge of. We started with Rembrandt's The Nightwatch, a: very important painting north of the Alps, in Europe, four years ago, then we moved to the famous Last Supper, by Da Vinci, in Milan; now this presentation is about a third example of a great painting called indeed eh: The Marriage. We are now gonna move on, and we hope this year to consider Las Meninas, by Velazquez, which you well know is in Madrid, and also a very famous painting in Madrid, which is Picasso's Guernika. And then we move to Essura, which is in eh Chicago, a Monet in Paris, a Jackson Pollock in New York... And you may be aware of the new Vatican initiative to reclaim some, I suppose, some ascetic legitimacy for the Roman Catholic Church to engage with contemporary artists, architects, painters, filmmakers, etcetera ↑... And I have a great ambition to bring my new languages to bear on the Sixtine Chapel ↓.
sido pintado por muchos pintores diferentes, eh, pero, de alguna manera, este, el cuadro de Veronese es probablemente el más interesante y el más importante. (hhh) Eh, como dije, eh, hay una enorme diferencia entre estos ocho mil años de pintura y ciento quince años solamente de técnica cinematográfica, eh; pero de alguna manera eh, me está permitiendo recorrer el cine... estos nueve eh: puntos clave digamos de la pintura occidental ↓.

[Mm. Well, ehm, all this comes from a project that I have which consists of working on nine painting masterpieces of all time. Ehm, actually, to me, somehow; this is a, the, the, cinema, sorry, it is the manifestation of some... Ah! What i would like to film is the manifestation of this icon of Christian culture which, where the first miracle of Christ is represented and which has been painted by many different painters, ehm, but, somehow, this, Veronese's painting is probably the most interesting and most important of them all. Ehm, as I said before, there is an enormous difference between these eight thousand years of painting and only a hundred and fifteen years of cinematic technique, ehm, but somehow, it is allowing me to cover cinema... these nine key points of, let's say, Western painting.]

(74)
52:04-52:06
JT: (hhh) [Efectivamente], sí, sí, discúlpeme ↓ (volume fading out).

[Exactly, yes, yes, I beg your pardon]

(75)
52:04-52:42
RS: [Estos... Los, los puntos que: mencionó Peter son eh; bueno, serían las pinturas que va a analizar en esta serie son la Ronda de noche, de Rembrandt, la Sopa de Da Vinci, eh: la boda, Las bodas de Caná de: de: de Veronese; y - que es lo que ha hecho hasta ahora - y: a partir de ahora se: seguirían Las Meninas de Velázquez, El Guernika de Picasso, ↓]

¶ and you mentioned another one, eh, after Picasso...?

[These... The, the points that Peter mentioned are, ehm, well, the paintings that he is going to analyse in this series are The Night Watch, by Rembrandt, the Soup by Da Vinci, ehm, the wedding, The Wedding at Cana by by by Veronese and - which is that he has done up to now - and what comes next would be The Meninas by Velázquez, Guernika by Picasso, [...]]

A clear contrast with regards to the pragmatic use of deep breathing and coughing can be observed between the primary interlocutors (mainly JT) and RS. Whereas JT uses these devices to take his turn, RS (utterances 67 and 73) uses inbreathing and mumbling as a ‘time-to-think’ and ‘self-reassurance’ device throughout the interview. In fact, RS only uses a short laugh as a turn-taking device twice (utterances 162bis and 191).

b2ii) Speed in turn-taking

Physical presence is a crucial factor which contributes to producing systematic ways for taking the floor after RS's utterances. The fact that PG and RS are sat next to each other in Cuenca's RNE studio reduces the requirement for coughing or breathing in order to take up the turn or break in the interaction. Helped by physical proximity and visual communication,
PG is able to make a more efficient use of verbal anticipation than JT. Utterances 70 (Excerpt 2.19) and 153 (Excerpt 2.18) illustrate this pattern. Furthermore, PG repeatedly interacts in this way, whereas JT's coughing or breathing collides with PG's turn-anticipation. Additional instances of this pattern occur in sequences 35-37, 41-43 and 80-82.

With regards to RS's speed in taking his turn, he shows a different approach, depending on who he is taking the turn from. Although the spatial arrangements may contribute to the way this pattern occurs, the overriding reason for it lies in the public broadcast communicative arena: RS looks for more dynamism in turn-exchange sequences with JT than with PG, whereas he makes sure he takes his time to render PG's utterances to JT and the audience as clearly as he considers necessary for this medium (while overcoming evident tension and stress due to the communicative setting and/or his previous experience). The following sequence is illustrative of this pattern:

Excerpt 2.20

(282)
44:29-44:44
RS: Mm. Okay. (louder voice volume) Admiro a Buckminster Fuller, que es un agent, un arquitecto norteamericano que tiene la capacidad de: de hacer este tipo de: de prestaciones en en los medios, ¿no?

[Mm. Okay. I admire Buckminster Fuller, who is an agent, an Northamerican architect who has the capacity to put in place this kind of skills in the media, isn't it?]

(283)
44:44-44:50
JT: Mm. (.) Muy bien, pues señor Greenaway, le dejamos que vaya a cenar tranquilamente, que disfrute del día ↓.

[Mm. Very good, so Mr. Greenaway, we'll leave you to go for dinner and relax, enjoy your day.]

(284)
44:52-44:56
RS: Okay. So, have a good dinner and... [XXX heard in the background]

(285)
44:55-45:03
PG: I will! [Thank you, and it will be] good maybe to continue our arguments tomorrow. I will look out for you. Will you be wearing a red rose in your loophole?

(286)
45:03-45:14
RS: (hhh) Mm: bien, mañana continuaremos nuestra discusión... eh: espero: reconocerlo... eh ¿llevará usted una rosa roja en su: ojal?
[Mm, well, we’ll continue our debate tomorrow... ehm, I hope I can recognise you... ehm, will you be wearing a red rose in your loophole?]

(287)
45:14-45:15
JT: Roja nunca.

[Never red.]

(288)
45:15-45:18
RS: [short laugh] Never red... [no]

(289)
45:18
JT: [Blanca.]

[White.]

(290)
45:19-45:20
RS: A white rose.

The exchange in this excerpt takes place towards the end of the interview. RS understands that JT is trying to end this broadcast interview, not only judging by JT’s utterance (283), but also by how the intensity of the talk has relaxed now and JT moves off topic. RS seems to be willing to collaborate in speeding up the good-byes, not only for the institution but also for the audience.

b2iv) Overlapping talk

The radio broadcast nature of the interpreter-mediated event helps to set up a broad participation framework where overlapping talk is generally avoided. Yet, overlapping talk happens in Interview 2, shortly but frequently. An illustrative example is the sequence in Excerpt 2.19: overlapping talk due to misunderstood turn-transitions and unsuccessful turn-taking is a phenomenon that the three interlocutors avoid immediately after it occurs, unless they actively want to break in the conversation. This sequence shows three attempts to take the floor by JT (utterances 68, 69 and 74, Excerpt 2.19 above). The third attempt provokes an overlap between JT and RS which leads them to rapidly stop talking. JT realises that RS had not finish his utterance yet and politely invites RS to go on. JT tends to give up
his turn-taking and let either PG or RS continue. As director and host, JT tends not to impose himself on the other interlocutors in cases of overlapping talk. There are various explanations for this pattern: politeness towards his guests, saving his face in front of his audience and, crucial in broadcasting terms, producing an interaction which is suitable for this kind of radio broadcast. The sequence comprising utterances 139-151 (see transcript in Annex 1) takes place while clarifying the term “curator” (utterance 139), which RS first translates as “curadores” (utterance 140) and JT is neither happy with the translation nor sure that the audience will understand it in the context that RS used it. The sequence shows how JT smoothly interrupts RS's utterances while avoiding overlapping talk, by resorting to recognitional onsets.

Even if the reasons for overlapping talk are diverse (e.g. misunderstanding of turn completion, attempt to interrupt the interaction, repair, clarification, etc.) the recurrent pattern consists of the active participants making the interactional effort to immediately avoid overlapping talk. The causes for this common reaction are not only technical, motivated by space-time restrictions or plain politeness; they also, most notably, respond to the public radio broadcasting nature of the event.

**b2v) Explicit turn repair or re-organisation**

During Interview 2, JT states in different instances that he is trying to establish a dialogue with PG (utterances 64, 85, 135, 137, 329). This discursive pattern evidences JT/ESV’s dialogic approach to interviews, rather than following a more conventionally journalistic style based on questions-answer exchanges (Hutchby, 2006:122).

Within this framework, an explanation can be found as to why PG's six successive floor uptakes from RS (utterances 34, 37, 40, 43, 45) do not go down well in interactional terms with JT and ESV’s public broadcasting arena. In nearly twenty minutes of interview after the connection between
JT and PG/RS was first established (minute 18:34), JT was unable to ask or comment anything. Hence, JT's overt turn exchange system repair efforts throughout the interview in order to re-direct the interview within interactional dynamics which are more appropriate for this radio genre and which are more in line with ESV’s ethos: utterance 47 (see Excerpt 2.16), sequence 87-101 (Excerpt 2.21 below), which involves a negotiation of the interactional lines of the interview, and utterances 105 and 228.

JT's polite attempt to redirect and streamline the triadic interaction between the two studios increasingly becomes an issue in the interaction and it is made even more evident when JT, out of frustration over not being able to interact with PG, resorts to music as a way of stopping this monologic sequence (e.g. Excerpt 2.6). After the music track, JT takes the floor back and overtly tries to redirect the interview by asking PG to answer his questions in five words (utterance 95):

**Excerpt 2.21**

(87) 01:00:40-01:00:44
PG: What do, what would you like to ask? What is the question?

(88) 01:00:45-01:00:48
RS: ¿Qué te gustaría preguntar? ¿Cuál sería la pregunta?

[What would you like to ask? What would the question be?]

(89) 01:00:49
JT: ¡Muchas!

[Many!]

(90) 01:00:50
RS: Many.

(91) 01:00:51
JT: [laughs]

(92) 01:00:51-01:00:57
PG: Ok, go ahead! [.]

(93) 01:00:53-01:00:54
RS: [Adelante…].
Go ahead

(92 bis)
PG: [Be provocative and give] me the opportunity to be provocative back.

(94)
01:00:57-01:01:01
RS: Se... Se provocativo y dame oportunidad de: de serlo yo también.

[Be... Be provocative and give me the opportunity to be so too.]

(95)
01:01:01-01:01:07
JT: Estupendo. Yo solamente le voy a pedir que cada pregunta responda casi casi con cinco palabras [y así] puedo hacerle casi cien!

[Fantastic. I am only going to ask you that for each question you answer with at most five words, so that I can ask you nearly one hundred questions!]

(96)
01:01:06-01:01:17
RS: [Eh:] I would, I would ask you to answer very briefly with about five or six words [to each question so I can ask you] a lot of questions.

(97)
01:01:13-01:01:16
PG: [Ok. Let's go ahead, ok.]

(98)
01:01:18-01:01:19
JT: ¿Le parece?

[Do you agree?] 

(99)
01:01:20-01:01:21
RS: Are you:, do you agree with that?

(100)
01:01:21
PG: Sure!

(101)
01:01:21-01:01:23
RS: Ok. Sí. [Está bien]

[Ok. Yes. That's fine.]

The effect of this attempt to repair the interactional dynamics is noticeable in the sense that PG's utterances become shorter from that moment on. Furthermore, the consequences can also be seen in the relationship between JT and RS. JT knows that it is up to PG to cooperate with him, but it is only via RS that the request can be made and he expects RS's interactional and propositional support. As this is the first interactional confrontation
between JT and PG, JT opts for leaving RS aside in the request to repair and redirect the interview (utterances 47, 51 and 54, Excerpt 2.19) by addressing PG in the second person and offering RS a comfort zone to interpret in - i.e. more isolated from the audience, with RS not being overtly face threatened by being directly addressed by JT.

As the interview progresses, JT increasingly loses trust in RS when it comes to redirecting the interview. In a new attempt to do this (utterance 196, Excerpt 2.22), JT explicitly involves RS through the use of the second person when he refers to PG and by addressing RS directly in second person, thus acknowledging RS's involvement in the management of turns hand-in-hand with JT.

**Excerpt 2.22**

(196)  
28:47-29:09  
JT: Hombre, es muy atrevido por su parte - y me parece que no es muy británico - ya se que es galés, pero... enmendarle la plana a quien le ha invitado a su espacio. (.hhh) Es posible que esta Radio 3, que es la más creativa de este país, hace muchísima radio, señor Greenaway, de de de la que usted dice de Orson Welles. Pero, en este momento, le estamos entrevistando a usted... (1sec pause)

*Well, it is very bold from your side - and I think it is not very British - I know that you are Welsh, but... to rectify the person who has invited you to his show. It is possible that this Radio 3, which is the most creative station in this country, that produces a lot of radio broadcasting, Mr. Greenaway, of of of that Orson Welles's style that you are evoking. But right now, we are interviewing you...]*

(197)  
29:07  
RS: [.hhh - laughs]

(196 bis)  
JT: Traduzca, si es tan amable.

*[Translate, if you could be so kind.]*

(198)  
29:10-29:18  
RS: Okay. It is a: a little bit eh: (1sec pause) un-British from you to to:....

(199)  
29:20-29:23  
PG: Orson Wells was Irish, so be careful about your politics here.

(200)  
29:23-29:25  
RS: Yeah, ehm, and you're... you are Welsh, right? [laughs]

(201)  
29:26-29:39
PG: I'm Welsh, [yes, but we are all part of the] King... the Celtic fringe. The people that the Romans threw out of Europe.

(202) 29:32
RS: Cui...
PG: [louder voice] But I don't, I don't regard myself as British any more... I regard myself as a good European. Do you regard yourself as a good European?

(203) 29:40-29:47
RS: ¿Te... eh... Yo ya no me considero como un: británico.; me considero como un buen europeo. ¿Tú te considerarias como un buen europeo?

[Do you... ehm... I do not consider myself British anymore, I consider myself a good European. Do you consider yourself a good European?]

(204) 29:47-28:49
JT: Yo no. Yo más africano.

[Not me. I am rather African.]

(205) 29:50-29:52
RS: Mm. He is more; he is more African...

(206) 29:52-29:57
PG: Well, we all came out of Africa originally, of course, so that's no saying anything new...

(207) 29:58
RS: [Buen...]

[Well...]

(208) 29:57-30:00
JT: [Creo] que Europa está muerta, señor Greenaway. Usted lo ha dicho, además.

[I think that Europe is dead, Mr. Greenaway. Moreover, you have said that.]

(209) 30:00-30:05
RS: Sí, bueno, todos venimos de Africa originalmente, dice el señor Greenaway, ¿verdad?

(210) 30:06-30:36
JT: Sí. Sí pero yo no sé si, si:, señor Segovia, usted ha traducido mis palabras. Yo no sé si le ha traducido exactamente...

[Yes. Yes but I don't know if, if, Mr. Segovia, if you have translated my words. I don't know if you have translated exactly...]

(211) 30:12
RS: Sí si [several attempts to break in – inaudible]

(210 bis) JT: … al señor Greenaway que, eh, realmente esta emisora tiene: tiene muchísima programación en la que la vanguardia, la nueva escritura radiofónica, los nuevos métodos de expresión, se hacen y se llevan a cabo. Él no los conoce, pero pero: pero en este momento estábamos intentando entrevistándole a él. Y él tampoco ha contestado, señor Greenaway, a si
hay, a si alguna emisora del mundo le ha dedicado dos horas en directo. A eso no ha contestado él.

/... to Mr. Greenaway that, eh, actually this station has a lot of programmes where avant-garde, new radiophonic writing, new methods of expression are created and put into practice. He does not know them, but but but now we were trying to interview him. And he did not answer, Mr. Greenaway, if there is any radio station in the world that has devoted you two hours of live broadcast. He did not reply to this/

(212)
30:37-30:57
RS: Mm. Well, eh he says eh::. The Spanish radio makes lots of programmes, eh: as... as you like them: with this all new media and different original ideas and so on. But this is an int... an interview and he [ehm; the question again…]
depending on the interlocutors' perception of how the interaction unfolds according to their own agenda and, most crucially, their understanding of this setting.

c) Public Face

c1) Turn design: Addressing the interpreter's interaction

JT's utterances 16, 26, 196bis, 210 and 210bis include direct references to RS's core activity: interpreting as an ongoing and crucial task for the unfolding of the broadcast interaction. JT's utterances constitute a threat to RS's public face in two specific ways: first, they are a reminder of the medium RS is interacting in; second, they call into question the quality of his interpreting not only to PG but, most crucially, to the overhearing audience.

When RS's interaction is put centre stage by JT, it has to do with radio broadcast communication issues (i.e. avoiding excessive silence, as in utterances 16 and 196bis) or looking for reassurance in RS's rendition so that the interaction can go along the lines suggested by JT (utterances 26 and 210).

RS's uptakes and responses to these face-threatening utterances are preceded by a certain level of stress and tension, which may be explained by the fact that he is in a public broadcast with thousands of listeners. RS may not be used to this type of interpreter-mediated event, and certainly not to Radio 3. Nevertheless, RS's systematic reaction is to try to offer reassurance to JT without compromising his public face towards the audience.

The high level of politeness manifested by RS is also in line with his aim of not adding extra tension to the event, in favour of a smoother interaction. This is shown by RS's attitude towards turn-exchange, whereby he does not try to contest the primary interlocutors' turn-related actions; RS is also ready to interpret whenever he is asked to or when he considers he has been given the floor via prosodic devices. Therefore, the way face protection devices are used by RS is not only shaped by the ongoing face-to-face interaction but, to a great extent, by the way RS understands and copes with public radio broadcasting.

Throughout the sequences discussed (see Excerpts 2.1, 2.3 and 2.23), it can be observed how JT brings RS to the front of the interaction in different moments by gradually
increasing RS's public face exposure, as JT seems to be losing confidence in him. Therefore, what started with a “don't leave me alone” (utterance 16) reappears as a “I don't know, Rafael, Rafael Segovia, [...] if you have been able to pass on or transmit some of the words elaborated by, by Olga Correas” (utterance 26). In the second half of the interview, this request for reassurance also contains a certain level of distrust (utterance 210: “Yes but I don't know if, if, Mr. Segovia, if you have translated my words. I don't know if you have translated exactly...”), hence intensifying RS's public face threat. The fourth stage in JT's questioning of RS's performance occurs at the end of the interview: JT, unconvinced by RS's renditions and dubious reassurances, wants to make a final check with RS with regards to how important and how hard it was to interpret his concepts and nuances for PG. The way JT accomplishes this is by starting a monolingual sequence on-air with RS, leaving PG out of the conversation (see Excerpt 7).

RS's face-saving moves in this sequence are directed towards avoiding confrontation with JT (utterances 262, 264, 265) and focusing on the propositional content of utterances, while admitting how hard it was to keep up with this relational “game” (utterance 257), which RS considered unnecessary (utterance 255). In utterance 266, it can be observed how RS is not comfortable with this dialogue with JT, which is leaving PG aside, and he reverts to the triadic exchange as soon as he can by turning JT's comment (utterance 255) into a question for PG.

The first and most salient observation that can be made from linking the sequences discussed above is that this is an event where the interpreter is put on the same level of communication as the two primary interlocutors and his position and role are considered by the medium (via JT) as relevant as any other participant or aspect of the broadcast interaction. This is what explains the openness and directness with which JT addresses RS.

How RS manages these face threats may be related to personal experience, motivations and circumstances, but it also points to a particular way of dealing with face threats in a public broadcasting arena. What this analysis shows is that, given this particular communicative ethos and public arena, interpreters' public face threats occur more than might be expected (compared to other types of broadcasts and media institutions). CA
allows to document and analyse how the interpreter deals with this interactional feature within this specific communicative context.

**c2) Participation shifts**

**c2i) Use of first and third person with face-protection purposes**

RS's use of first and third person can show not only RS's positioning and alignment with regards to the primary interlocutors, but also his judgement of his own public face and his engagement with the interaction taking place.

Excerpt 2.16 is an example of how RS does not have any doubt in using the first person when rendering PG's utterances into Spanish (e.g. utterance 46), particularly during long monologic utterances. When it comes to rendering JT's words to PG, RS fluctuates between the first and third person, usually opting for third person (utterance 48). This inconsistent use of the first and third person can be coincidental and unproblematic at times, such as in sequence 28-29 (Excerpt 2.3), because JT also fluctuates between addressing PG in first and third person. However, there are sequences where this fluctuation points to face-saving moves which show RS's appraisal of the public broadcast setting he is interacting in. Excerpt 2.22 shows a clear, evolving use of the grammatical person when addressing PG: first, RS has to interpret a defensive-then-accusative statement by JT (utterances 196, 210 and 210bis), which picks up on PG's previous criticism, perceived as offensive by JT. RS uses an impersonal structure to transmit this potentially controversial statement (utterance 198), which includes a down-toning device: “a little bit”. Then, in utterance 200, RS uses the second person to clarify a potential misunderstanding (“Yeah, ehm, and you're... you are Welsh, right?”), and finally, given the increase in controversy and tension, he opts for using the third person (utterance 205: “He is more; he is more African...”).

**c2ii) Non-verbal face-saving devices: backchannelling and laughing**

Backchannelling is used by RS in this interview in a very systematic way, using both verbal and non-verbal devices. The backchannelling responses
by RS in utterance 27 (Excerpt 2.3), utterance 211(Excerpt 2.22) and utterances 259, 261, 262, 264 and 265 (Excerpt 2.7) are examples of the following systematic pattern: when RS's interaction is called into question and/or reassurance is sought by JT, RS reacts immediately with a clear backchannelling response that is not only addressed to JT, but to the audience as well, as his face is being threatened in a public broadcast. How the reassuring response is uttered (usually consisting of a very quick “yes”, “yes, of course”) points to a particular understanding of how undesirable it is for RS to lose public face in this live broadcast event.

*Laughs* are used by RS in noticeably face-threatening sequences. RS does not laugh because he finds some utterance humorous, but when his public face - or any of the primary interlocutors' face - is threatened, a reaction he considers appropriate, face-saving or least aggressive, in a clear drive to maintain the comfort factor and a pleasant atmosphere in this public broadcast interview. The following excerpt is a paradigmatic example of this pattern:

**Excerpt 2.23**

(119)
05:24-06:15
PG: Well I think, I think, you know, we're asking, you are asking *boring* tedious questions now about a medium that's now *finished*. You really gonna have to stop your sloppy thinking and get rid of your nostalgia and start seriously thinking about the future. The *future* lies with the laptop generation in a post-television world. *Young* people simply aren't going to the *cinema* any more... They are *hardly* even watching *television*. (breathes and brings up his tone) The *now*, the new phenomenon are ideas of multimedia and notions of interactivity. We are *all*, let me repeat, filmmakers now. Let's move on from this old-fashioned idea of a *stravinskism, corbussiers and picassos* and really enter into a *egalitarian* attitude towards the notion of cinema as a *public* and not a private medium.

(120)
06:15-06:28
RS: Mm... (.hhh) Bueno, me estás haciendo preguntas realmente aburridas y y: y:: *tontas*... [Y:: yo quis... ] (. ) [yo quis... ]

[Mm... Well, you are asking me really boring questions and and and silly [as well]... And I would like... I would lik... ]

(121)
06:24-06:28
JT: [Dígale que suspendí] [que suspendí] en la facultad… (. ) [que suspendí] en la facultad de periodismo…

[Please tell him that I failed at the school... that I failed at the school of journalism...]
06:28-07:09
RS: (laughs) Yo quisiera que dejaras la nostalgia... y que: te enfocaras en este hecho de que el cine está a punto de desaparecer [...]  
[I would like you to leave nostalgia behind... and that you focus on the fact that cinema is about to disappear [...]]

This tends to be followed by the corresponding omission of the utterance which gave way to the face-saving laugh (e.g. utterance 122). In this case, RS does not render the satirical comment by JT (utterance 121). Hence, laughing does not only serve the purpose of relaxing the interaction, but also shows RS's intention to not add this controversial comment to the interactional arena. In this sense, laughing occurs in both directions - upon both PG's and JT's utterances. On the other hand, this use of laughing overexposes RS to the audience and host, hence the probability that distrust and frustration about his performance grow. Similar instances of the use of laughing by RS can be found in utterances 126, 168, 170, 191, 196, 218, 233, 246, 248, 288, 319-320 and 324.

d) Lexical choice

d1) Marking self and others

RS uses different strategies for conveying the way the primary interlocutors address each other and himself and they are closely linked to public face-saving motivations. In section 2.c1), I have already analysed how RS deals with the primary interlocutors directly addressing him. In this subsection I will explore how RS positions himself and others throughout the interview by using person deixis, implicature and omission.

The use of person deixis as a face-saving device is quite common throughout Interview 2. Excerpt 2.8 (sequence 54-55) is an example of RS's interest in toning down direct accusations and references via person deixis: when RS renders JT's utterance regarding the listeners' interest by adding “so maybe we should give space for that…” (utterance 55), RS is offering a polite request to avoid PG being offended by a potential direct accusation.
The following excerpt evidences RS's attempts to depersonalise the subject used by JT when asking questions that RS consider controversial.

**Excerpt 2.24**

(59)
39:17-39:37
JT: La primera es que ha ardi do perfecta... el ordenador de, de mensajes, ehm: Cómo nos, cómo nos pone sobre la mesa, señor Greenaway, -dicen la mayoría de los oyentes de Radio 3-, de tal pesimismo. ¿Asistimos al funeral del cine? Entonces, ¿qué estamos haciendo? ¿Qué, cómo definiría el cine que estamos yendo a ver? Dicen algunos oyentes de Radio 3.

[The first question is that the computer has been burning perfect... with messages, ehm: How are you bringing up, Mr. Greenaway, -most of Radio 3 listeners are saying-, this pessimism? Are we attending the funeral of cinema? What are we doing, then? What, how would you define the cinema that we are watching nowadays? That's what some Radio 3 listeners are saying.]

(60)
39:38-40:01
RS: Okay. Mm. (hhh - 1 sec pause) Eh, many of the questions which are: flooding the, the computers at the radio, eh, ask if ehm: if it's not a little bit: ehm deceiving that cinema is, eh, is about to, to die, and, are these, is this the funeral [of, of movie-making?]

Toning down via person deixis, implicature and omission as a face-saving device is evident here: first, RS (utterance 60) does not place emphasis on the fact that it is the concern of most Radio 3 listeners, hence the question rendered to PG is simplified and is bound to be perceived as only the host's concern. Second, by using this structural device, emphasis is put on the object of the question and less on the subjects, who are part of the interaction, as JT wants to emphasise. Sequence 249-250 is also illustrative of this toning down by marking others and their views, thus exhibiting a pattern characterised by erasing as many personal views and accusations made by JT - on his own behalf or the audience’s - as possible.

This pattern highlights the fact that the interaction is being broadcast and that it influences RS's choices at the lexico-grammatical level. However, as JT states in the semi-structured interview (see V.4), these choices were problematic not only for the interaction, but also within this medium and institution and played against the kind of dialogue that JT was seeking to establish with PG.

**d2) Interpreter's uptake of the institutional setting**

**d2i) Via his own tenor as audience design**

RS orients himself to the institutional setting by making lexico-grammatical
choices which include: face-saving fillers such as “de alguna manera” (“somehow”), which RS says 32 times in 21 different utterances, with no direct propositional correspondence to PG's adjacent utterances; a use of tú which aligns RS with PG while distancing himself from JT/ESV/Radio3 (see 2.e3), below); a tendency to omit JT's references to Radio 3 and its audience, which reduces the broad participation framework to the active participants' interaction, while JT's intention is to include the media institution and the audience in his confrontation. These three tenor-related features point to a lack of engagement by RS with the institutional setting and the public arena of communication.

-When explicitly referenced by the host

Evidence of RS's lack of engagement with the setting and the public arena of communication can be found in the sequence where his lexical choice of interpreting “curadores” for “curators” is challenged by JT (see sequence 140-150). When RS and JT reach an agreement on the term that is used in Spain and, hence, understood by the overhearing audience (“programador”, “comisario de una exposición”, utterance 148), RS does not show any acknowledgment or rapport building with JT. This feature is later confirmed by the tenor in the JT-RS dyadic monolingual exchange (see Excerpt 2.7). Furthermore, RS's overall overt lexico-grammatical difficulties, particularly in rendering PG's words, but also in managing the primary interlocutors' interaction, is acknowledged by JT at the end of the interview (utterance 329). This is a unique case in my data, but it shows how JT is ready to bring interpreting issues to the forefront of the broadcast talk-in-interaction, in line with Radio 3's ethos and public arena.\textsuperscript{124}

\textit{e) Power}

\textit{e1) Asymmetries of participation}

In line with literature on CA and institutional talk (cf. Heritage 2004, see III.3), power differentials and the status of every active participant are all the more salient in this

\textsuperscript{124} A similar acknowledgement is made by JT to the interpreter in his interview with Naomi Kawase (02/04/2013); see Table 4.1.
turn-exchange system. The active participants use power (via interactional power-related devices) within their co-constructed position and role as the interaction unfolds. In this sense, JT, who designed the interview within a particular framework with regards to the field and tenor of the interview (see the first 18:42 minutes of the interview), does not use his apparently pre-existing powerful institutional and professional position to impose himself when taking turns, nor when overlapping talk occurs. As I already showed in sections 2.a) and 2.b), JT attempts to take the floor several times via breathing, gentle coughing or polite utterances throughout the interview, unsuccessfully. These instances are of relevance because they show that JT does not impose his role-related power to redirect the interview according to his own agenda and interests. However, JT does exert his power on the on-going interaction when he considers that it is appropriate in broadcasting terms via radiophonic devices to which neither PG nor RS have access, that is music. Music tracks (84 and 136) show how JT, with the support of the sound technician in Madrid, enforces the use of music without necessarily asking for permission or previously telling the other interlocutors. The interaction is thus reframed in a way that still matches the comfort factor of the medium and the communicative ethos of ESV.

Furthermore, it is after the music interlude that JT verbally reframes the interview and makes an effort to realign the interaction with his suggested guidelines.

Another way for JT to exert interactional pressure on PG and RS is by making the audience present in his utterance (e.g. utterances 54 and 59, see excerpts 2.8 and 2.24, respectively). It is common in radio broadcasting that the host uses the listeners to add more weight to his utterance, whether it be a request, a statement, an opinion, etc. (cf. Hutchby 1992, Tewksbury and Rittenberg 2012, Mitchell 2005). However, this power-related resource can be ‘neutralised’ if RS does not take it up and render it to PG (see utterances 55 and 60), which tends to be the case in Interview 2.

When it comes to turn-taking, PG has an added power-related resource for taking the floor, which is the physical presence of RS next to him. Having the possibility of visual contact with RS offers him higher chances of taking the floor after RS's utterances, as shown in Excerpts 20 and 21. JT considers this situation to be a powerful advantage for
PG and, hence, tries to counteract it by directly addressing RS via backchannelling (see Excerpt 2.22) and even initiating a monolingual interaction with him (see Excerpt 2.7).

**e2) Subverting the host's power**

Throughout Interview 2, there are several instances where the preconceived categories of ‘host’ and ‘guest’ (Hutchby 2006) are subverted when it comes to leading and coordinating the interview. Excerpt 2.22 shows how JT reacts to PG's opinion of his interview organisation and skills, which is a contestation of the typical power relations in a broadcast interview of this kind. Nonetheless, this subversion of ‘tacitly-given’ power is even more evident when it comes to finishing the interview (Excerpt 2.25, below): after two failed attempts by JT to politely and smoothly end the interview (utterances 283 and 294), the talk goes on and, ultimately, it is PG who - out of a final outburst of anger - does not follow either radio live interview conventions or JT's requests and he simply “signs off” (utterance 326), leaving JT to wrap up the interview (utterance 329), which he does politely and smoothly, including a thank you to RS for his “translation”, admitting the “attributed difficult role” assigned to him with the “translation task”. The way the interview with PG ends influences JT's tone in the wrap-up, which is sad, frustrated and apologetic, hoping that next time he meets PG they have a more pleasant and dynamic dialogue.

**Excerpt 2.25**

(316)
48:53-49:00
JT: (hhh) Perdone... en esta ya despedida una pregunta muy frívola, ¿no? Eh:, ¿cuál es su bebida favorita, señor Greenaway? Díganos…

[May I... in this farewell, a very frivolous question, yeah? Ehm, what is your favourite drink, Mr. Greenaway? Tell us…]  

(317)
49:01-49:04
RS: Eh (1sec pause) what is your favourite drink?

(318)
49:05-49:12
PG: Oh, yours falling back on boring journalism again. Come on! [Wise up!]...

(319)
49:09-49:10
RS: (laughs in the background)

(318bis)
PG: ...You'll be asking me my favourite colour in a minute!
RS: (short laugh in the background) Otra vez una pregunta aburrida [de: de periodista...]

[Again a boring question of a journalist...]

JT: [Totalmente aburrida, sí.]

[Absolutely boring, yes.]

RS: (short laugh-breathing) Sí, ehm es por eso que tengo una opinión tan, tan mala de los periodistas!, porque este tipo de preguntas me parecen tontas.

[Yes, ehm this is why I have such as bad opinion of journalists! Because I find this sort of questions silly.]

JT: [Hay que...]

[We should...]

PG: [I think we have to] wrap this up now; it's degenerating second by second by second in to a really total waste of time.] So I'm gonna wish you good night, now, I hope you have good dreams. [...] Okay, this is Peter Greenaway signing off; good night!

RS: [(simultaneous interpreting – inaudible because of very low microphone sound) [Creo que: que deberíamos terminar porque... y: les voy a desear buenas noches... [volume tuned up] y: buenos::] sueños a todos... y Peter Greenaway se despide... adiós.

[I think that we should finish now because... and I am going to wish you good night, I hope you all have good dreams... and Peter Greenaway signs off... bye.]

JT: Ha sido un placer esta: conversación, esta noche de Jueves Santo, ya viernes, ¿no?, prácticamente, estamos a dos minutos, con Peter Greenaway. De verdad un abrazo muy fuerte para Rafael Segovia que estuvo, que estuvo ahí en la traducción y... es verdad que muchas veces se le: transmite un papel, un papel difícil de:... pero le enviamos un fuerte abrazo y mañana le:, se lo daremos físicamente en Cuenca.
A todos vosotros, esperad un poquito, que todavía queda una sorpresa…

[It's been a pleasure this conversation, this Maundy Thursday, well already nearly Friday, isn't it? only two minutes left, with Peter Greenaway. Seriously, a very big hug to Rafael Segovia who was, who was there with the translation and... it is true that many times they are given a, a difficult role of... but we send him a big hug which we'll give him for real tomorrow in Cuenca. To all of you, wait a little bit, that we still have a surprise…]

(330)
50:23-51:35
Music: [music track played on] [When JT breaks in, music is tuned down]

e3) The interpreter's appraisal of the primary interlocutors power differentials: alignments

RS's understanding of the media institution is characterised by uncertainty (see utterances 197 and 199 as paradigmatic examples) and, at times, by pure lack of knowledge of Radio 3 and ESV (e.g. utterances 246 and 262). It is also noticeable that RS particularly tones utterances down when he has to render references made to Radio 3 by JT. RS accomplishes this in different ways: (1) by softening the host's assertiveness (sequences 228-229, 249-250); (2) by omitting “Radio 3” as the subject of the sentence and making it more general (“Spanish radio”, “radio listeners”, see utterances 55 and 60).

The following excerpt from the last quarter of the programme, when the interview is about to be wrapped up, epitomises RS's reaction to the power differentials within the media institution they are interacting in.

Excerpt 2.26

(245)
37:37-38:10
JT: Es usted una:... un gran tipo... mmm la verdad es que me gustan mucho los medios de comunicación... (.hhh) Me parece que no es correcto le ha: le hace más más más apetecible para Radio 3 y para este: periodista del siglo diecinueve... Eh: que se lo pase usted muy bien... Ha estado, prácticamente dos horas con nosotros... Ha sido una: una borrachera de ideas y de conceptos... Yo se lo agradezco muchísimo... Y que tenga usted una muy buena travesía en, en este país;... y mándenos por favor al correo que yo le diré a su agente, su proyecto para Radio 3, que será muy bienvenido en esta emisora ↓.

[You are great guy... the truth is that I like the media very much. I think that you are not correct, and that makes you more appealing for Radio 3 and for this journalist of the nineteenth century... Have a good time... You have been nearly two hours with us... It has been a brainstorm of ideas and concepts... I thank you a lot. I hope you have a great journey through this country and please send us to the email address that I will give to your agent your project for Radio 3, which will be very welcome in this station.]
RS: Mm. Eh: he says it's been a pleasure having you here, and... it's been some kind of eh:... it's a two hour long interview which has been full of ideas and full of eh: eh things and: even though he thinks that it's not eh: eh very nice of you to [loud laugh] that you haven't been very nice to him... eh eh, that he: enjoys and and, he's thankful t, for your... interview.

PG: (hhh) Okay... I don't necessarily think that journalism is the highest form of human activity, and that most journalists, probably like you, are parasites... but ehm, I do think probably... that you have a place in the world. Let's meet tomorrow!... eye-to-eye and let's continue our conversation then ↓.

This neutralising, toning down and insecure attitude by RS throughout the interview partially explains the dyadic and monolingual interaction that JT starts in utterance 253 (Excerpt 2.7). Beyond the threats to his public face previously analysed, a specific feature in this sequence is that JT wishes to share this dialogue with the audience, to make it public and not hide salient controversial issues regarding language transfer in interaction, something which pertains to Radio 3's communicative ethos (see V.2 and V. 4).

RS also shows his attitude to power asymmetries via the use of tú and usted (informal and formal use respectively) when rendering PG's use ‘you’ to address JT. Throughout the interview, RS tends to use the tú form, a choice which the listeners and JT might find surprising at first glance for the following reasons: first, the communicative setting is one where JT and PG would be expected to address each other politely (in fact, JT uses the formal usted every single time he addresses PG). Second, the use of tú does not seem to match the politeness in propositional structure and tone that RS tends to use throughout the interaction. Looking at instances where tú is used by RS when rendering PG's words, it can be argued that it is not only the informal and rather friendly notion of tú (Álvarez, 2005:28-29) that drives RS to use it, but deeper power-related issues. Tú is employed by RS in controversial and argumentative circumstances in a way that distances the interlocutors even more, contributing to an atmosphere where PG is in his own filmmaker's ‘ego bubble’, talking down to JT, diminishing his status as journalist and host. The use of tú by RS (e.g. utterances 214 and 227) thus increases power differentials between PG and JT. This use of tú also reinforces the powerful position of the guest with regards to the interpreter, who with this lexico-grammatical decision
shows an alignment to PG and distances himself even more from JT as a potentially powerful ally (see V.4).

**e4) The interpreter's position and status**

As was the case in Interview 1, Interview 2 shows organisational and interactional features which tell us about the collective construction of the interpreter's position and status, before and during the live broadcast. Since Interviews 2-5 show similarities in the interactional co-construction of the interpreter's position and status, from Interview 2 onwards, I will only look at features which are specific to the interview in question:

- From the very first call for participation in the interaction by JT (utterance 16), RS implicitly and explicitly remains external to the institutional and communicative setting. Although RS shows a certain degree of orientation to the medium, he generally remains reluctant to co-operate in the actual broadcast talk-in-interaction. This attitude has an effect on JT as host, who shows distrust and a covert lack of solidarity with RS's position and, hence, his efforts to build a rapport with the interpreter gradually decrease as the interview unfolds.

- The sequences where RS shows a lack of thorough knowledge of Radio 3 have a negative effect on JT's rapport building efforts. It can be observed how JT gradually positions RS as external to Radio 3 and highlights the fact that cultural management and literature (utterance 253bis), not interpreting, are his daily trade thus acknowledging RS's difficulties in engaging interactionally within this setting.

Although the situational arrangements for Interview 2 are different from the standard studio interview, it is produced and unfolds in line with Radio 3's and ESV's communicative ethos and public arena of communication: the interaction is broadcast as naturally and spontaneously as possible, bringing the audience as close as possible to the actual interaction on-stage. In this regard, the interview unfolds without following specific broadcasting/communicative guidelines or parameters concerning the management and broadcasting of the interpreter-mediated interaction.

The analysis throughout section 2 also highlights that this particular interpreter-
mediated radio broadcast is one where the interpreter (RS) takes JT's tenor and renders propositional content (*field*) uttered by both JT and PG with a vague idea of medium-specific constraints and requirements when it comes to managing the interaction. This led RS to use certain interactional devices (e.g. interpreting mode, turn-taking, prosody, lexico-grammar, etc.) without fully integrating them or feeling comfortable within the medium.

3. Broadcast talk: institutional framework and institutional discursive features

The fact that ESV devotes a 2 hour programme to PG's career and the première of his film in Cuenca, including a live interview with him, is highlighted by JT as unique during the broadcast interview. This uniqueness can be corroborated at least within the Spanish media framework, since no other AV media institution broadcast an interpreter-mediated live interview with PG. This is also the case for the rest of the interviews in my data.

Overall, the media institution hosting the interpreter-mediated broadcast interview influences the interaction between the primary participants at all levels of communication: technical, relational and referential. Radio 3's ethos exerts a significant influence, allowing for certain phenomena to occur, in the following ways: firstly, by being the institution that makes the interpreter-mediated event happen. Secondly, by allowing for a participation framework where the interpreter can interact with the same naturalness, visibility, time and space as the primary interlocutors. Thirdly, by JT's explicit and overt view regarding the need for the interpreter to understand the institutional setting and to feel part of it during the broadcast talk-in-interaction.
Interview 3: Interview with Viktor Kossakovsky (Russian documentary filmmaker)

1. Broadcast production and situational arrangements prior to and during the interview: influence and impact on the overall interaction

The ‘Reasons for interview’ in Interview 3 (see Table 3, page 140) are inextricably linked to ESV’s long-standing collaboration with Filmoteca Española (FE), which typically takes two forms: (1) ESV’s support of FE’s film-related events (festivals, showcases, screenings), usually by announcing and covering them in its broadcast, and (2) ESV’s coverage of this type of events by live broadcasting from FE’s premises (i.e. FE’s café). Therefore, ESV’s familiarity with the venue and organising institution does not only influence production arrangements (e.g. making the set up of the studio on this location easier for the production team), but also the broadcast interaction. Excerpt 3.1 (below), including JT’s introduction to the talk-show, illustrates how JT frames the field(s) and tenor of this ESV episode based on this long-standing relationship with FE.

**Excerpt 3.1**

(1)
00:00-01:19
Ambient sound: (Café atmosphere from Cine Doré's café, Madrid)

(2)
00:03-01:19
JT: [Buenas... Muy buenas noches... desde... desde el Cine Doré, uno de los edificios más emble, más emblemáticos, más curiosos, más lindos de: de Madrid, sede, como sabéis... de: Filmoteca Española y un lugar: que es casi casi sagrado para los cinéfilos. (.hhh) Sabéis que nada más entrar en el Cine Doré se: bueno, un café, eh; lleno de gente sospechosa () que se reúne para ver cine () de autor en versión original y: y aquí estoy en compañía de (.) de David Velasco y de Santi Francia para construir El Séptimo Vicio de esta tarde, ya que hay una señorita que se ha empeñado en que el documental tenga aquí bastante: bastante asiento, en Madrid. Tres por doc, Encuentro de creadores en Filmoteca, trece, catorce y quince de marzo. Hemos pedido unos cafés... cortado (.), tú con leche (.) y un licorcin, que: hace frío! Ha pegado una nevada estupenda en Madrid y: y la primavera se va a resistir en: en llegar. Café de Filmoteca Española. Un lujo, tú.]

[Good... Very good night, from, from Cine Doré one of the most symbolic, curious, nicest buildings in, in Madrid, headquarters, as you know, of the Spanish Filmhouse and a place which is nearly sacred for cinephiles. You know that as you enter Cine Doré, well, there is a café, full of suspicious people, who meet to watch films d’auteur in the original version and I am here today with David Velasco and Santi Francia to create this afternoon’s edition of El Séptimo Vicio, since there is a lady who has insisted on creating a space for documentaries in Madrid. Tres por doc, Meeting with filmmakers in the Filmhouse, thirteenth, fourteenth and fifteenth of March. We have asked for some coffees, a macchiato, you with milk and a little liquor, because it is cold! There has been a great snowfall in Madrid and spring is resisting to arrive. Spanish Filmhouse Café. See, a luxury.]

(3)
01:19-05:21
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JT's tenor when he frames the talk-show is less formal compared to interactions taking place in the studio or via phone connection (cf. Interviews 1, 2 and 4). Furthermore, JT makes clear to the audience that ESV feels at home when broadcasting from FE (utterances 2 and 4). By starting the programme with a description of the setting and by underlining the significance of Cine Doré and FE for ESV with the café ambient sound in the background, JT radiophonically creates the atmosphere of the show for the listeners, but also for the interlocutors and co-participants (i.e. addressees and auditors) in the broadcast on-stage. Although at this stage it was still unknown how the interview with VK would unfold, an outline of the show in terms of broad context and the relational level is provided by JT.

This talk-in-interaction is a multi-party dialogue: five people around the table, including JT, guests (AG, AD and VK), the interpreter (IM), and a journalist (VE) who interviews people at the café when required by JT. The guests and the collaborating journalist's interactions are coordinated by JT, with the technical support of sound technicians DV and SF, who are on location.

As far as production issues are concerned, this kind of setting and situational arrangements involve a more complex live broadcast, more team work and negotiation than the interpreter-mediated face-to-face studio interview with one guest (e.g. Interview 1); this is the case both prior to and during the interview. Complexity is higher with regards to issues such as managing the guests' agendas, turn-coordination tasks, sound connections, input-output sound monitoring - especially the interpreter's -
and managing the open and public physical setting (i.e. a café, where the film event staff and café staff, as well as passers-by, may be watching, thus creating a different atmosphere and interaction from the isolated studio interaction in Interview 1). In a live broadcast such as the one in Interview 3, these issues can be more exposed to the overhearing audience, particularly if JT makes them explicit when the talk-in-interaction is about to start in multi-party format (see utterances 46 and 52, Excerpt 3.2, below). Consequently, the talk-in-interaction is affected by the setting.

**Excerpt 3.2**

(46)
12:22-12:43
JT: [¿Te gusta...?] ehm, ehm, bueno, hay que decir que este Séptimo Vicio está: (.) está realizado así a pelo!, como se suele decir!, con poquitos medios, con poquitos recursos..., ¡suficientes! para hacer la radio (.hhh) y eh: con el: apoyo del equipo que tiene Docma, que es un equipazo realmente importante, y además de: con recursos audiovisuales, supongo que: al servicio de la web de Docma, que se puede visitar...

[Do you like... ehm, ehm, well, it must be said that this Séptimo Vicio is made kind of on the spot, as we say!, with few facilities, few resources, enough to make radio and with the support of the great Docma team, which is a very important team and, furthermore, with audiovisual resources on the Docma website which, I suppose, people can visit...]

(47)
12:42-12:43
AG: Por supuesto.

[Of course]

(48)
12:43-13:00
JT: (.hhh) Y también de los compañeros de: de Radio Tres, como son Daniel: Daniel Velasco, Santi Francia y como es Victoria Espanza, que dentro de un ratito* quizás†, Victoria, nos haga alguna radiografía de los personajes que habitan Filmoteca, que la verdad diría que son: curiosos↓

[And also the colleagues of Radio 3, like Daniel Daniel Velasco, Santi Francia and Victoria Espanza, who in a little while, maybe, Victoria, will provide a radiography of the characters who inhabit the Filmhouse, who, in truth I would say, are weird.]

(49)
13:00-13:02
AG: Sí: son curiosos, sí†.

[Yes, they are weird, indeed.]

(50)
13:02-13:46
JT: Los personajes que: que que deambulan por: por este lugar, tomando un cafecito... ¡un almuerzo a mediodía! que no, tiene un menú muy: muy asequible... y unas extraordinarias cañas, a esa hora de la: de la tarde↓... Estamos en un lugar que puedes hablar de cine y que te puedes acercar a una mesa y le dices: “Tú, oye..., ¿tú sabes quién es... quién es Kossakovsky...?” Esa es una pregunta que se la podríamos hacer ahora, ¿no?, por ahí , a ver quién, quién sabe en esta; en esta: en este café de la Filmoteca, Victoria, le vamos a pedir que pregunte si, si alguien sabe quién es Kossakovsky†, y si lo sabe†, que imagino que sí†, que cite una de sus películas↓.

(.hhh) ¡Estamos en El Séptimo Vicio! Vamos a hablar con Andrés Duque†. Andrés, buenas.
[buenas tardes.]

The characters who wander around this place, having a little coffee, lunch at midday, with a, a very affordable set menu and fantastic beers, at this time of the afternoon. We are in a place in which you can talk about cinema and you can come to a table and say: “Hey, you, do you know who Kossakovsky is?” This is a question that we could ask around now, isn’t it? See who knows in this Filmhouse café, Victoria, we ask her to ask around if they know who Kossakovsky is and, if they do know, which I imagine they do, to mention some of his films. We are in El Séptimo Vicio! We are going to talk with Andrés Duque. Andrés, good, good afternoon.]

(51)
13:46-13:47
AD: [(low microphone volume, fading in) Hola buenas] tardes. [¿Qué tal?]  

[Hello, good afternoon. How’re you?]  

(52)
13:47-14:02
JT: [Ahi estamos] ¡Te he pillao, Santi! ¿eh? Santi Francia↑ (hhh)
¶
Eh:: mm bueno!, yo creo que no:, que no (tongue clicks) que no pensabas tú que con: Ensayo para...iba a tener esa travesía, ¿no? Desde cuando recuerdo en Las Palmas, ¿te acuerdas?

[There we go. I got you, Santi! Yeah? Santi Francia… Eh, well, I think that you didn’t think that with Ensayo para… you were going to go through that journey, right? Since I remember in Las Palmas, do you remember?]  

Excerpt 3.2 includes the sequence where the second guest in the programme (AD) is introduced. Utterance 51 (AD) causes problems to SF with regards to sound volume adjustments. Immediately, JT considers that this might have disturbed the audience and initiates a repair strategy in covert audience-oriented mode (utterance 52), which is directly linked to what JT himself said just seconds earlier in utterance 46. 

The production complexity of this multi-party face-to-face broad pattern of interaction is further made evident in sequence 281-309, in which VK asks JT a challenging question (utterance 284bis) and JT considers bringing production issues to the conversation in his response. 

Throughout utterances 287, 290, 294, 296, 297, 299, 301, 303, 303bis and 307, JT brings up contextual elements and production issues within the broadcast production arrangements influencing the interaction - most notably his own off-stage multi-tasking during the talk. As in Excerpt 3.2, this sequence shows how JT aims to produce a broadcast interaction that is co-constructed without further editing or cuts and he makes this clear to the guest, the interpreter and the audience. Crucially, in this sequence (utterances 281-309), JT addresses VK, engaging IM by emphasising productions issues
separating them in clear turns, allowing for clear turn-transition spaces, thus also covertly addressing the audience. A pre-recorded broadcast or an interview designed to be edited before being broadcast would most likely include this explanation in private talk mode and be left out of the final broadcast.

The participation frameworks (see Table 3, pages 141 and 142) show a complex talk-in-interaction, with frequent participation shifts which are largely motivated by the physical setting, the situational arrangements and the number of participants. Furthermore, these participation shifts involve changes in the number of active participants in the talk, thus adding complexity to how the whole interaction is managed for broadcasting by two kinds of participants in the event: STs and the interpreter. How they achieve this radiophonically is the focus of the following sections of the analysis.

a) The setting up of the participation framework: host's introduction to the talk-show and interview

The first 01:19 minutes in the programme are devoted to (1) contextualising the setting, (2) describing the event which ESV is covering and (3) emphasising the relationship between ESV, FE and DOCMA (see Excerpt 3.1). The first exchange takes place between JT and AG. In that sequence, VK is highlighted as the main guest, together with AD. An introduction to VK's film career and the reasons for inviting him to this event is co-constructed between JT and AG as a prelude to the interview.

The actual broadcast interpreter-mediated talk-in-interaction starts in minute 15:33 and the introduction sequence with VK lasts until minute 22:34 (utterances 61-182). This sequence provides the interactional dynamics which set the pattern for the rest of the interview in terms of the speech-exchange system and the interview tenor.

Although this initial sequence takes up a considerable amount of time in live radio broadcasting terms (7:01 minutes) before any straight-forward question-answer sequence starts, it evidences ESV's open-ended approach towards interviews on location and with the participation of a foreign language speaking guest: ESV integrates the setting and leaves space for the special guest's input to the talk-in-interaction, on both the referential and the relational level.
b) *Turn-taking organisation (medium/technically-motivated/oriented)*

Turn-taking, as well as the rapport building that takes place between the active participants in sequence 141-150, is highly influenced by the face-to-face nature of the interaction and the café setting: these two contextual features allow for and, in fact, promote, cooperation and interactional trust during the interview, as opposed to Interview 2. The rapport is built without creating interactional conflict (even if overlapping talk takes place); yet, VK challenges the interviewer and IM takes up these challenges as naturally and spontaneously as he considers appropriate (e.g. IM’s utterances 71 and 73; 78, 84, 89, 92, 109, 130, 133, 135, 147, 152, 152bis, 155, 158 and 160). JT implicitly engages with VK’s challenges and counter-arguments (e.g. utterances 81, 86, 93, 110, 112, 132, 136, 141, 148, 148bis, 153 and 161) and, most crucially for the purposes of my analysis, JT does not show signs of disagreement (neither overtly nor covertly) with the way IM is managing the talk-in-interaction.

IM’s uptake of the setting and of the primary interlocutors’ moves is characterised by a fast and dynamic turn-uptake based on his perception of radio talk-in-interaction, as is shown by his mixing of DI and SI. This is supported by fine-tuned turn-taking to avoid silence and overlapping talk (e.g. IM’s utterances 65, 67, 69, 92, 94, 96, 101, 103, 105, 113, 118, 121, 123, 126, 128, 133, 137, 139, 158, 169, 171 and 175), that is, resorting to transitional and recognitional onsets which tend to take place within less than half a second after the previous speaker’s turn or within the last 1-3 words, except for the cases where IM opts for SI, when onsets tend to start 1-2 seconds after the primary interlocutors (usually VK) started their utterance (e.g. utterances 107, 111, 152, 160, 180 and 223). At the same time, IM’s turn-taking moves support VK’s particular engagement with JT and ESV, as illustrated in utterances 141-150.

Following JT’s terms, IM becomes an “ally” (see V.4) during the interview; hence, JT does not call into question VK’s or IM’s turn-taking strategies, which are often based on short turns, turn-recognitional onsets, overlapping talk and challenging JT’s interactional moves, and which are in clear contrast to other ESV interviews (cf. Interviews 1, 2, 4 and 5). The interview goes along interactional lines which JT does not attempt to change during the whole programme, even if he considers them
uncommon and unexpected (cf. utterances 141, 177, 192, 195, 652, 654, 688, 690 and 730).

With the support of the face-to-face broad pattern of interaction, IM uses the technical facilities available and his perception of the radio setting to produce a dynamic flow. IM's interaction, therefore, helps to create and maintain the interactional dynamics encouraged by the primary interlocutors and, consequently, gradually consolidate them throughout the interview.

b1) Interpreting modality: influence of the organisation of the setting and the ongoing interaction (participation frameworks)

Interview 3 consists of a multi-party face-to-face broad pattern of interaction where IM uses a mixed system of DI-SI, with an overall preference for DI. Each modality is used following recurrent patterns of interaction, aiming to integrate with the different local participation frameworks of the broadcast. Throughout the following excerpts, I intend to show how IM tries to find a balance between a natural and dynamic interaction around the café table and the overarching audience-oriented live broadcast which is bringing the participants together.

Pattern 1: predominance of DI in short turns (less than 15 seconds on average). This pattern is recurrent during question-and-answer sequences, with VK’s answers usually being longer than JT’s questions (see Excerpt 3.3 below) and during argumentations co-constructed in short turns (see also utterances 287-308).

Excerpt 3.3

(195) 22:57-22:58
JT: [¿Se] imagina en radio Moscú algo de esto? ¿A que no↓?
[Do you imagine something like this in radio Moscow? I bet you don’t?]

(194bis) 22:59-23:03
AD: [Lo bonito...] (1sec pause) Lo bonito [es tener eh siempre la reacción adecuada↓,] en el momento adecuado↓, [¿no?]↓
[What is nice... what is nice is to always have the right reaction, in the right moment, right?]

(196) 22:59-23:01
IM: [XXX anything like this in Moscow?]

125 Cf. the 50 seconds to 1 minutes 10 seconds average turn in Interview 2.
A notable feature in this pattern is that IM tailors the interpreting modality to radio broadcasting by minimising the turn-transition spaces, with IM's turn appraisal happening within the same second as the previous turn.

Pattern 2: predominance of semi-simultaneous interpreting in counter-argumentative sequences. As described above, Interview 3 is characterised by continuous challenges and counter-arguments by VK and JT. IM provides for extra dynamism to this part of the talk-in-interaction by starting the rendition of the primary interlocutors before they finish their utterance, using recognitional onsets. In this pattern, IM's utterances usually finish without overlapping with the primary interlocutor and with a clear-cut turn-transition cue. Sequence 232-259, which takes place just after the sequence in Excerpt 3.3, above, is illustrative of this pattern.

Pattern 3: predominance of SI when the talk-in-interaction is monolingual and VK is not directly involved in the talk. The aforementioned sequence 281-309, is illustrative of this pattern.

The analysis of the interpreter's choice of interpreting modalities points at a flexible-yet-cohesive approach, influenced by IM’s own perception of the communicative requirements for radio broadcasting. This medium-specific feature informs the approach of the interpreter, who does not interact randomly, but following systematic patterns.

b1) Broadcasting the interpreter-mediated exchange: sound management

Interview 3 evidences the complexities of multi-party interpreter-mediated radio talk-in-interaction for sound management. The main issue here is how the STs manage sound
in a way that is broadcast clearly, and with as little confusion as possible for the audience, while facilitating appropriate sound quality for the participants in the talk. In this case, SF and DV may have asked themselves a similar question as IM when he decided on the interpreting modality: when are interpreters' utterances relevant for the audience? When are microphone volumes adjusted for the production of different levels of sound depending on the languages spoken on the talk-show? Excerpt 3.2 above and sequence 607-624, illustrate SF and DV’s sound management work and how they deal with overlapping talk and other sounds.

Throughout these two sequences, it can be observed how SF and DV opt for leaving the interpreter's microphone on at every moment, due to the dynamism and short turns during the interaction. Hence, sound muting of the kind of Interview 2 is not possible here. Nevertheless, they opt for muting the whole sound of the talk-show table when the floor is given to VE and she interviews film-goers in the café (e.g. sequences 310-318, and minutes 45:41-47:42126).

A crucial feature of this multi-party talk-show when it comes to sound management is that the on-going talk does not always actively involve VK. Table V.3.1.1 includes the timings where these sequences can be found in the audio track and the transcription.

Table V.3.1.1 Monolingual Talk sequences in ESV’s interview with Viktor Kossakovsky

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Audio track minutes:</th>
<th>Duration:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 00:00-15:32</td>
<td>15:32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 22:41-22:57</td>
<td>00:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 29:22-31:12</td>
<td>00:50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 33:54-35:02</td>
<td>01:07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 45:41-47:42</td>
<td>02:01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 53:51-54:04</td>
<td>00:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. 54:20-55:23</td>
<td>01:03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. 57:05-57:43</td>
<td>00:48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

126 Minutes 45:49-47:42 were not transcribed because they are irrelevant for my analysis.
The patterns of interaction in these sequences can be grouped into the following categories: Monolingual talk with guests around the table (sequences 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 8 in Table V.3.1.1 above) and monolingual talk not involving the table, i.e. VE interviewing passers-by (sequences 3 and 5 in Table V.3.1.1).

While sequence 1 in Table V.3.1.1 above corresponds to the introduction to the show and the introduction of the event organiser (AG) and the Spanish-speaking guest (AD), sequences 2-8 take place during the interpreter-mediated interview with VK. In all of them, IM keeps rendering the on-going talk in guest-oriented mode, so that VK can follow the talk-in-interaction.

This pattern of interaction occurring under this participation framework represents 6:18 minutes out of the 59 minute show. IM's systematic interactional pattern and its sound management are illustrated in sequence 4 (utterances 379-408) in Table V.3.1.1 above.

During this sequence, VK becomes the main subject of the monolingual talk between JT and AD (utterances 379-392 and 393-406). Although the interpreting of this sequence is not necessary for the target audience, it is still crucial for VK to keep track of the broadcast interaction. This is what triggers the STs' decision to lower the volume while they consider VK and IM still part of the participation framework (379-392), or to fade it out when they consider that the participation framework does not involve VK (393-406).

A final remark must be made with regards to sound management work and its analysis: the face-to-face nature of the event and the importance of body language in this medium, particularly in this type of broad pattern of interaction, highlights the need to film this type of exchange, including the STs’ interaction with the interlocutors. This type of data and analysis is provided for Interview 5.

c) Off-air interaction

Not applicable for Interview 3.

Overall remarks on section 1

The description of the broadcast event (Table 3, page 140) and the subsequent analysis of the broadcast interaction, focusing on broadcast production and situational arrangements, and medium-specific technical features of the event show that this talk-
in-interaction integrates the dynamism of talk in a cinema café with ESV’s public broadcasting arena and the host's communicative ethos. This is intensified by the particular approach to the interview by the foreign language-speaking guest, VK, who continuously challenges the host’s questions and interactional moves and clearly shows the intention to actively participate in the co-construction of the dialogue and participation shifts. This results in conflicting interactional agendas and moves which the interpreter has to manage within that public broadcasting arena, the fast turn-uptake and the preference for short turns being one of the most salient features of the interpreter's moves, thus orienting himself to the café and radio broadcasting mixed arena where the broadcast takes place.

IM's approach in terms of the interpreting modality and the STs' support and sound management account for an interpreter-mediated interaction which does not only present unique patterns of interaction, with a mixed DI-SI system, but also produce broadcast talk interactional patterns which are unique to this type of broadcast medium and setting, thus resulting in considerable differences with monolingual radio talk-in-interaction and TV interpreting.

2. Participants’ orientation to Public Radio Broadcast talk-in-interaction

An overall transversal account of how footing, face and power relations unfold during Interview 3 points at a highly dynamic talk-in-interaction characterised by relatively short turns at talk (between 2 and 12 seconds on average, and rarely exceeding 15 seconds), where, even if there are continuous challenges to the host's agenda and questions, the fact that they were face-to-face in a rather informal setting allows for an accepted deviation from the host's original agenda and conventional broadcast interview patterns. In contrast to Interview 2, conflicting agendas of guest and host do not involve interactional clashes, impolite face threats, overt repair, unilateral overt participation shifts or conflicting power-related issues. Drawing on CA studies of broadcast talk (see III.2), in this particular interview, it can be observed how the café-radio setting, the face-to-face broad pattern of interaction and the DI modality used by IM are part and parcel of the type of interactional dynamics which are co-constructed during the broadcast.
3. Broadcast talk: institutional framework and institutional discursive features

The integration of two institutional settings, i.e. ESV and the Cine Doré’s Café, allows for a setting where JT as the host, with the collaboration of the guests and the interpreter, mixes the programme's ethos with the physical setting they are interacting in, and where even the main field of the interaction (documentary filmmaking) is linked to the broadcast setting during the broadcast talk (cf. sequence 406-437).

As the sequence illustrates, different forms of institutional talk are merged into the broadcast, influencing the textual features (field, mode and tenor) and giving way to interactional phenomena which are the result of the hybridism between these two institutional settings.

Furthermore, each active participant - including the interpreter - understands the merger of these two institutional settings in their own way, which, in the case of Interview 3, converge in one crucial aspect: producing a talk-in-interaction which takes place in a café but which is organised and broadcast for an overhearing audience. Sequence 325-338 epitomises the participants' convergent interactional approach when the conversation is about radio broadcasting itself.

The broadcast production approach also shows that ESV, by broadcasting this type of event and talk-in-interaction live, is open to integrating the guest's agendas, ethos and interactional moves into its own broadcasting arena, a key communicative feature of Radio 3 and ESV (as described in section V.2).
Interview 4: Interview with Ermanno Olmi (Italian filmmaker)

Interview 4 shares organisational parameters with Interview 2 as far as the category of interview and broad contextual factors are concerned (see Tables 4 and 2, pages 153 and 136, respectively). However, there is a key arrangement in Interview 4 which makes it different from Interview 2, i.e. the interpreter's (VG) physical location with JT in the Radio 3 studios in Madrid, and his provision by the personal choice of JT. The analysis in Interview 4, therefore, will focus on those particular aspects which add new interactional features and phenomena to those extensively covered in Interview 2, inviting a comparison of the interpreter's position and status in both interviews in a future paper (forthcoming) as a result of this thesis.

1. Broadcast production and situational arrangements prior to and during the interview: influence and impact on the overall interaction

ESV has a long-standing co-operation with Seville's European Film Festival, which has materialised in public broadcast interviews on location, usually in cinemas or lecture theatres (see Table 4.1, page 145).

On this occasion, the film festival and ESV had previously scheduled an interview with EO. However, due to technical reasons (unspecified by EO during the broadcast interview), it was impossible for him to go to Seville, so the interview took place via telephone connection, between the Radio 3 studios in Madrid and EO’s house in Asiago (Italy).

The set up involves a studio-to-remote location telephone connection, which is quite common in radio broadcasting and, by extension, in ESV (although phone interviews on ESV are more frequent in monolingual broadcast interviews). However, it must be emphasised that the talk-in-interaction in this broadcast interview takes this interactional pattern due to a previous setback: the guest could not travel to Seville where the interview was originally scheduled, causing a change to the originally planned setting.

The adaptation to the new situational conditions shows how ESV and Radio 3 are flexible and open in dealing with the communicative constraints which may arise prior to the interview, thus giving priority to the actual production and broadcast of the
interview, rather than clinging to a rigid approach based on pre-established conditions for the interview and broadcast. Interview 4, therefore, requires specific organisational and technical arrangements prior to the interview, i.e. setting up a time for the phone call and monitoring sound quality for communication and broadcasting purposes. In fact, distance and sound quality become a conversational issue during the actual broadcast interview (see Excerpt 4.6, below), where the guest asks the host and the interpreter to speak one at a time so that he can hear them well through the phone, thus suggesting some organisation in the turn-exchange system to avoid overlapping talk between the host's utterances in Spanish and the interpreter's utterances in Italian.

In this interaction, features of phone interpreter-mediated interviews (cf. Wadensjö 1999, Mikkelson 2003, Kelly 2008, Crossman et al. 2010) may be shared, but how they occur in the broad context of radio broadcasting has not been explored until now.

The studio-to-remote location telephone connection also involves the mix of two institutional settings in one broadcast event, i.e. the ESV studio and EO's house in Italy. JT intends to integrate them both and he explicitly conveys to the audience this link between two different environments via his first question after the introductory exchanges (Excerpt 4.1, below) and the concluding exchange with VG once the interview with EO is over (Excerpt 4.2).

**Excerpt 4.1**

(76) 32:29-32:35
JT: [Asiago↑ en Italia↑. (.hhh) Y: vamos a saludarle inmediatamente, eh, señor Olmi, buenas noches↓.]

[Asiago in Italy. And we are going to say hello immediately, eh, Mr. Olmi, good evening.]

(77) 32:35-32:37
VG: [Carissimo: signor Olmi buonasera.]

[Dearest Mr. Olmi, good evening.]

(78) 32:37-32:40
EO: [Buonasera.]

[Good evening.]

(79) 32:40-32:43
JT: ¿Cómo es la noche↓ en donde... en su casa↑?
[What is the night like where... at your house?]

(80)
32:43-32:51
VG: Eh, mi chiede il signor Tolentino: ¿com’è se lei si affacciasse alla sua finestra, come sarebbe la notte, dico è un po’ poetico?!

[Eh, Tolentino is asking me, what would you see if you were to look out of your window, what might the night be like, I mean, is it a bit poetic?]

(81)
32:53-32:56
EO: Se mi affacciassi alla mia finestra qui?

[If I were to look out of my window here?] 

(82)
32:56
VG: ¡Sí!

[Yes!]

(83)
32:56-32:58
EO: Questa sera?

[Tonight?]

(84)
32:58-33:04
VG: Sì, cosa vedere... ¿cosa cosa cosa si vede così lo può descrivere o forse inventare?

[Yes, what can you see... what what what do you see if you can describe it or perhaps invent it?]

(85)
33:04-33:13
EO: No, no, diciamo che la realtà è così bella, per cui non c’è nulla da va... da inventare. (laughs)

[No, no, let’s say that reality is so beautiful, so there is nothing to, well... invent.]

(86)
33:13-33:16
VG: [¡Dice] que no hay nada que inventar!, que [es... (laughs)]

[He says that there is nothing to invent, that...]

(87)
33:17-33:18
EO: [Un] villaggio di montagna†.

[A mountain village.]

(88)
33:19-33:22
VG: Es un pueblo de montaña†.

[It is a mountain village.]
[Where snow has fallen in abundance.]

(90) 33:22-33:23
VG: [Ha] caído mucha nieve↑.

[A lot of snow has fallen.]

(91) 33:23-33:30
EO: Eh: c’è la sensazione↑ di un Natale, di un presepio che continua↓.

[Eh it is the feeling of Christmas, of the nativity that goes on.]

(92) 33:31-33:35
VG: Es la sensación de un, de la Navidad, de un pesebre que, que que, que prosigue, que sigue↓.

[It is the feeling of a, a Christmas, a nativity that, that that, continues, that goes on.]

(93) 33:36-33:39
EO: Ecco! e questa: sera c’è anche una bella stellata↑.

[There you are! And this evening there is also a nice star-spangled sky.]

(94) 33:39-33:42
VG: Y hay muchas estrellas esta noche↑.

[And there are plenty of stars tonight.]

Excerpt 4.2

(342) 54:22-54:29
JT: (laughs) Ermanno Olmi, desde su: desde su casa alejada de: de la aldea de Asiago…

[Ermanno Olmi, from his, from his remote house in the hamlet of Asiago…]

(343) 54:29-54:30
VG: Asi, cerca del bosque [(laughs)]

/[Asi, near the forest.]

(344) 54:30-54:32
JT: [Cerca] del bosque, entre ardillas…

/[Near the forest, surrounded by squirrels…]

(345) 54:32-54:34
VG: [¡Sí! Cabritillos, cabras.]

/[Yes! Young goats, goats.]

(346) 54:33-55:19
JT: [Cabras… Recuerda:, recuerda mucho… algunos de vosotros recordáis esa fantástica;↓ esa
fantástica película de de Ermanno Olmi (tongue clicks) eh:, el hombre de los zuecos, el eh; no sé que me pasa hoy con el (laughs) con los títulos que se me olvidan... En fin (coughs), en cualquier caso, no ha, ha sido un auténtico placer, una auténtica pasada tener a a Ermanno Olmi con con nosotros y: cómo ha ido describiendo al comienzo de de este Séptimo Vicio eh: las, las, bueno pues lo que rodea su casa, que parecía que es efectivamente el cine que él siempre ha amado, ese cine rural, ese cine del campo, ese cine, de alguna manera, en el que ha convertido su vida al regresar al mundo rural.

[Goats... It reminds, it reminds a lot... some of you may remember that fantastic, that fantastic film by Ermanno Olmi, eh, the man with the clogs, the eh, I don't know what's going on with me today with the film titles, I'm forgetting them... Well, anyway, it has been a real pleasure, a real blast to have Ermanno Olmi with us and see how he described at the beginning of this Séptimo Vicio eh, the, well, what surrounds his house, which in fact looked like the cinema that he has always loved, that rural cinema, the cinema of the countryside cinema, that cinema, somehow, which his live has turned into, by returning to rural life.]

The host's interest in framing the interview in this dual setting, whereby the audience can picture the guest's environment, does not only respond to radiophonic purposes but also clearly to JT's interest in linking EO's home in the Alps with his filmmaking career, as it is the case in sequence 99-130 (see Excerpt 4.4, below). This sequence takes place immediately after the first introductory exchange (Excerpt 4.1): the host asks about the relevance of nature in EO's films and a dialogue linking nature, filmmaking and EO's home follows. What is salient from the interpreter's interaction is his uptake of JT's question and the emphasis VG places on what he believes is the main issue in JT's question (e.g. utterances 80, 84, Excerpt 4.1, page 259).

As was the case in Interview 3, there is evidence here of how the field and tenor of Interview 4 are influenced by the mix of the two participants' physical settings. Since the physical settings become part of the interaction, the interpreter has to deal with them, not only technically and interactionally, but also as part of the field and tenor of the interaction. In this regard, VG is in a position which equals the host's in creating images for the audience through the spoken word. When VG interprets EO's description of his surroundings, he is not only doing so for JT but, most notably, for the audience, as JT originally intended with his question.

The increased organisational and interactional complexity with regards to the face-to-face studio interaction (e.g. Interview 1) is seen in the higher number of participation frameworks (see Table 4, page 144 and 145). However, the physical presence of the interpreter near the host shows a closer collaboration between them in order to direct the interview along the lines suggested by JT, as opposed to Interview 2, which also takes
place remotely, but with the interpreter placed next to the guest.

The interpreter's provision and background is another production aspect prior to the interview which influences the broadcast interaction. In fact, the interpreter's background - a poet and expert on Italian film - is brought to the broadcast conversational arena by JT prior to the interpreter-mediated interaction (participation framework 7, see Table 4, page 144), thus providing a space for VG to take part in the programme from that interactionally framed position as guest-expert-interpreter. Therefore, before the interpreter-mediated interview starts, the audience is provided with organisational details, such as VG's background and EO's reason to be interviewed by phone, as Excerpt 4.3 illustrates:

Excerpt 4.3

(4) 19:32-20:04
JT: (.hhh) Pues vamos de cine en Radio Tres. Llevamos: trece, catorce años yendo de cine en Radio Tres! ¡No, no es un valor añadido el tema de (tongue clicks) de la experiencia, como bien sabéis… y mucho menos de, de los años que van pasando. (.hhh) Eh: lo que sí va dejando es una cierta coherencia por el tipo de cine que vamos, que vamos: defendiendo, difundiendo, apostando↑ y: bueno, pues colocando de alguna manera en todos los espacios posibles! En la radio, en las salas, en: en streaming, eh:
¶ Usted↑, ¡buenas tardes!

/[So we are all about cinema on Radio Tres. We have been all about cinema for thirteen, fourteen years on Radio Tres! It is not an added value that thing of experience, as you well know… and even less, the passing of the years. Eh, what this leaves behind is a certain coherence about the type of cinema that we, we defend, disseminate, support and, well, we try to take it to as many spaces as we can. On the radio, in the theatres, via streaming, eh…]

(5) 20:04-
VG: Buenas tardes.

/[Good evening.]

(6) 20:04-20:06
JT: Usted↑, eh, tú↑… usted cómo le↓

/[You [informal] ‘you’… Of course, I am still young. No, no.]

(7) 20:06-20:13
VG: De tú, tú… [Claro] yo soy todavía joven [(laughs)]
[No, no].

/[Use [informal] ‘you’… Of course, I am still young. No, no.]

(8) 20:07-20:18
JT: [Tú.] (1sec pause) [(laughs) No, no, pero, eh…, no, no era por eso [es] por protocolo que a

/You. No, no, but it wasn’t that, it was just out of protocol, you know, sometimes we are obliged… On Radio Tres, a bit less, because Radio Tres is something else. Well, Valentín, Valentín Gómez y Oliver, isn’t it?/ 

(9) 
20:18-20:19 
VG: Sí, sí, sí. XXX

/[Yes. Yes, yes.]

(10) 
20:19-20:20 
JT: Poeta†,

/[Poet.]

(11) 
20:20-20:21 
VG: Sí, sí†.

/[Yes, yes.]

(12) 
20:21-20:23 
JT: Buen aficionado al cine†…

/[Great lover of cinema…]

(13) 
20:23-20:39 
VG: ¡Mucho! Muchísimo. Estudié con Ros, como te he dicho antes, estudié en los años finales del sesenta y setenta el curso del Centro Experimentale con Rosellini que era el presidente y fue realmente algo extraordinario y después he conocido muchísima gente en Italia†, pero independientemente, un programa como este, si son catorce años es como un soneto…

[A lot! A lot! I studied with Ros, as I said it before, I studied at the end of the sixties and seventies, the course at the Centro Experimentale with Rosellini, who was the president and it was something extraordinary and then I met a lot of people in Italy, but irrespective of that, a [radio] show like this one, if it is fourteen years, it is like a sonnet…]

(14) 
20:39-20:40 
JT: [(laughs)]

(13bis) 
20:39-20:43 
VG: [son como] los versos de un soneto, lo cual está muy bien! [Catorce años luchando…]

/[It is like the verses of a sonnet, which is very good! Fourteen years fighting…]

(14) 
20:43-21:03 
JT: No, pero, pero… la verdad que muchas veces, los años no garantizan muchas veces, hay muchas historias por ahí que se permanecen en el calendario y que no… No pero, ¡ese es otro tema! No vamos a meternos en ese jardín. Valentín es poeta, como, como nos decía†, le hemos convencido hoy, y yo no sé si es de fácil sí o de difícil no: o…]

/[No, but, but… the truth is that often, years are not a guarantee of, there are many stories that are still in the calendar of events and they don’t… No, but that’s another issue. We won’t get into that mess. Valentín is a poet, as he was telling us, and today we convinced him, and I don’t know
if he is easy to or hard to…]

(15)
21:03-21:12
VG: [¡No!] Hoy era una obligación, un poco e ética↓, de, tratándose de, en la medida de poder ayudar, intentar hacerlo de la mejor manera posible, una personalidad como Ermanno Olmi.

[No! Today was an obligation, a bit of an ethical one, as it was… to somehow try to help, try to do it as best as I can, with such an important personality as Ermanno Olmi.]

(16)
21:12
JT: Mm↑.

(15bis)
21:12-21:17
VG: [Y,] y que: hacer todo lo que él ha hecho y sobre todo también el estreno de esta película que es muy interesante…

[And with all that he has done and, above all, with the première of this film, which is very interesting…]

(16)
21:17
JT: Mm.

(15tris)
21:17-21:35
VG: [y que] aparte de las opiniones↑, pero ya el tema en sí y sobre todo una figura de de de de persona independiente, libre, con su ideología, como es Olmi↑, pues yo creo que vale la pena↑, vale la pena↑ pues intentar a ver si comprender a ver lo que dice↑ y puede ser una entrevista, ¡no sé!, una entrevista ↓ muy… [¿no?] [And beyond different opinions, the topic in itself, and above all, such a figure, someone independent, free, with his ideology, like Olmi, so I think it is worth it, it is worth it to try it and see if it is possible to understand what he says and he can be an interview, I don’t know, an interview which is very.. yeah?] This is an organisational aspect of this broadcast episode which shows how ESV, via JT, aims to share production issues and relational aspects of the active participants with the audience, so as to integrate them and make them part of the broadcast production before ESV remotely connects with EO to start off the interview. In particular, the monolingual exchange between JT and VG (a sequence of nearly ten minutes, of which Excerpt 4.3 is a part) may influence the audience's appraisal of the whole interaction and, particularly, of the interpreter's interaction.

a) The setting up of the participation framework: host's introduction to the talk-show and interview

The ‘Reasons for interview’ and the situational arrangements for Interview 4 constitute the basis for JT's framing of the interview and how he establishes his rapports, first with VG as interpreter-guest-expert and, second with EO as the programme's main guest. JT
creates a wintry atmosphere from the beginning of the programme (see participation framework 1 in Table 4, page 144, and Excerpt 4.1, pages 258-260) and this tenor is kept all throughout the episode, including the interpreter-mediated interview, thanks equally to the co-operation of VG and EO (e.g. Excerpt 4.3, pages 262-264).

b) Turn-taking organisation (medium/technically-motivated/oriented)

Interview 4 evidences a smoother co-operation between the host and the interpreter sharing the same physical setting, as opposed to when the interpreter is next to the guest in a remote location (Interview 2), with JT in this case being able to co-ordinate turns with the interpreter, as well as interrupting the interpreter's utterances without excessive or aggressive overlap for the overhearing audience, generally by resorting to recognitional onsets (e.g. utterances 97, 99 and 127, below).

Excerpt 4.4

(95) 33:42-33:44
EO: E quindi aspetto che passi la cometa!.

[And so, I am waiting for the comet to pass.]

(96) 33:45-33:47
VG: (laughing) Y ahora está esperando que ¡pase el cometa!

[And now he is waiting for the comet to pass!]

(97) 33:47-33:49
JT: Que pase: la estrella fugaz, quizá, o no?

[For the shooting star to pass, perhaps?]

(98) 33:49-33:51
VG: (laughing) Sì, la stella fugace… (laughs)

[Yes, the shooting star…]

(99) 33:52-34:03
JT: Eh; ehm su: su lenguaje casi casi: nos recuerda a su cámara, señor Olmi, y a su, y a su… cine completamente relacionado con la naturaleza [y con el mundo rural, ¿no?]

[Eh, his language, which almost reminds us of his camera, Mr. Olmi, and his, his… cinema, which is completely related to nature and to the rural world, isn’t it?]

(100) 34:02-34:15
VG: (.hhh) Lui dice che la sua; il suo, il modo come lei ha descritto ricorda la sua camera, il modo come lei descrive la, la natura, il suo rapporto con la natura, cosa ne dice??
[He says that your, your, the way that you have described it, reminds us of your camera, the way you describe the, nature, your relation with nature, what do you say about that?]

(101)
34:16-34:27
EO: Eh, beh, diciamo che la natura ha una tale autenticità, ha un’autenticità assoluta. La natura non mente mai.

[Eh, well, let’s say that nature has such an authenticity, an absolute authenticity. Nature never lies.]

(102)
34:27-34:31
VG: La naturaleza no miente nunca, la naturaleza tiene una, una gran fuerza.

[Nature never lies, nature has a, a great force.]

(103)
34:31-34:35
EO: Per cui ha sempre cose belle da raccontare.

[And therefore there are always beautiful things to tell.]

(104)
34:35-34:39
VG: Siempre tiene cosas bonitas que, que contar, que explicar.

[He always has beautiful things to tell, to explain.]

(105)
34:39-34:50
EO: E così ogni tanto mi viene la tentazione di inquadrare un pezzo di natura e impressionarlo sulla pellicola.

[And that’s why every now and then I feel the temptation to frame a piece of nature and expose it onto film.]

(106)
34:50-34:55
VG: Y por esto a veces le, le viene esta necesidad de, de encuadrar un fragmento de naturaleza.

[And this is why he sometimes has this necessity to frame a fragment of nature and,]

(107)
34:56
EO: [Ecco.]

[That’s it.]

(106bis)
34:56-34:58
VG: [Plasmarle en la película.]

[To capture it in film.]

(108)
34:58-35:08
EO: Ecco! Un po’ come i musicisti un tempo ascoltavano i suoni della natura e componevano i loro concerti.

[That’s it. A bit like musicians used to listen to the sounds of nature and compose their concerts.]
(109) 35:08-35:19
VG: Un poco\up como antiguamente\up los músicos oían los, los sonidos de la naturaleza\up y entonces se dedicaban a componer\up sus, sus melodías, sus canciones. [(hhh)]

[A bit like when in the past, musicians listened to the, the sounds of nature and then they worked on composing their melodies, their songs.]

(110) 35:18-35:31
EO: [Ecco\down.] Peccato che adesso la natura molto spesso\up, ecco, ha i suoni soffocati o addirittura, come dire, sovrapposti dal rumore metropolitano\down.

[That’s it. It is a shame that now often nature has strangled sounds, or even, how to say it, overlapping with the metropolitan noise.]

(111) 35:31-35:45
VG: La pena (laughing) es que ahora a veces la naturaleza\up presenta los, manifiesta los sonidos a apagados\up, o incluso desbordados por la (laughing) por la, los los ruidos de\down de la m de la metrópolis\down, por los ruidos metropolitanos\down.

[The sad thing is that now sometimes nature has, manifests dull sounds, or even overshadowed by, by the noises of the metropolis, by metropolitan noises.]

(112) 35:45
JT: Le, [le asens…]

(113) 35:45-35:53
EO: [Io] son venuto a vivere in una piccola, ehm: piccolo altipiano e un piccolo villaggio alpino\down.

[I have come to live in a small, eh, a small plateau and a small Alpine village.]

(114) 35:53-36:01
VG: Es por esto que él se ha ido a vivir a una altura:… a un altipiano, ¿no? a la llanura\down, eh eh, y: a un pequeño pueblo alpino\down.]

[This is why he as gone to live in a high… in a altipiano, isn’t it? a plain, eh, eh, a small Alpine village.]

(115) 36:00-36:01
JT: [(h[hh])]

(116) 36:01-36:04
EO: [Ecco,] e qui dietro la mia casa\up…

[That’s it, and behind my house…]

(117) 36:04-36:05
VG: Detrás de mi casa\up.

[Behind my house…]

(118) 36:05-36:09
EO: Ogni tanto si affacciano dal bosco caprioli…
Now and then, goats come out of the forest…

Yes, goats, sometimes goats come out of the forest…

[Squirrels…]

[Squirrels…]

[Small hares…]

[Yes, so, a series of little animals…]

[You are…]

[I don’t live in the village, I live outside the village, near the forest.]

[He does not live in the village, he lives outside the village, very close to the forest.]

[You are very privileged, of course!]

[You are privileged!]
This results in an interview where JT can keep more control of the flow than when the interpreter is not next to him. The power relations with regards to interactional moves and access to the floor are, consequently, also highly determined by the situational arrangements of the broadcast.

b1) Interpreting modality: influence of organisation of the setting and the ongoing interaction (participation frameworks)

DI is followed by VG. His turn-taking patterns reflect a clear orientation to JT and the audience, which is influenced by his physical location: while VG tends to leave JT to finish his questions, although not letting him produce utterances longer than 10-15 seconds or which include more than two clauses, he tends to anticipate EO's turn completion and bursts into EO's turn when he considers a sentence is being finished - i.e. recognitional onsets - so that the turn-exchange system is kept short. In fact, turn transition spaces are minimised by VG and across the interview are kept within less than half a second or just a slight overlap with the last word in a clause, thus influencing the utterance length of the primary interlocutors, particularly EO. Excerpts 4.4, above, and 4.5, below, are illustrative of this pattern.

There is one particular case when EO's turn is considered long to be interpreted by VG (utterance 161, see Excerpt 4.5, below), so VG politely reminds EO that he has to translate. The sequence following that request results in a more stable and structured turn-exchange system between EO and VG, whereby utterances with a single clause, or at most two, are uttered by EO before he leaves space for VG to interpret (e.g. utterances 165-179).

Excerpt 4.5

(158) 40:15-40:25
JT: Mm↑, (.hhh) ¡Es una, también eh:, Olmi, eh: una crítica sutil… por supuesto muy poética y muy: y muy: escénica ¡a la religión! ¿no?

[This is also, Olmi, a subtle criticism... and of course a very poetic and scenic one, of religion, isn’t it?]

(159) 40:25-40:34
VG: (.hh) È una critica sottile, hm, poetica ma molto sottile a, a, alla religione?
[This is a subtle, poetic yet very subtle criticism of religion?]

(160) 40:34-41:22
EO: Eh, sì. Voglio dire che arrivato alla mia età ho capito che il cristianesimo ha una, come dire, tale potenza di proposizione, vale a dire tutto ciò che è alla base della religione cristiana, che è il perdono, ecco questo perdono è andato (laughing) perduto! E, e, e mi trovo molto a disagio quando dico che sono cristiano, o meglio che aspiro! ad essere un cristiano, e non trovo la forza a volte io stesso di perdonare↓. [Allora…]

[Oh, yes. I mean that once I reached this age, I understood that Christianity has, how to put it, such a strength to propose, meaning that everything that is the foundation of the Christian religion, which is forgiveness, this forgiveness is gone lost! And I find myself very uneasy when I say that I am a Christian, or better, that I aspire to being a Christian, and I myself don’t find the strength sometimes to forgive. Then…]

(161) 41:22-41:26
VG: [Esto, esto, dobbiamo…] È impossibile tradurre (laughing) tutto questo.

[So, so, we should. It is impossible to translate all this.]

(162) 41:26
EO: [Ah!]

(163) 41:26
VG: [Lei dice!] Lei, él nos dice que llegado a esa edad↑ que, que es es el↓ el cristianismo, y que y que entonces el problema del perdón ¿eh?

[He says (in Italian), he says (in Spanish) that having reached such an age, Christianity is, is… and then there is the problem of forgiveness, yeah?]

(164) 41:36
JT: [Mm↑.]

(163bis) 41:36-41:51
VG: [Que él] perdón↑ entonces él encuentra que le cuesta muchísimo↑ aceptar este hecho de de ser cristiano↑, porque↑…

¶
Lei capisce. Come definirebbe, come definirebbe il perdono↑, perché lei parla del perdono↓…

¶
[That forgiveness, so he finds that it is very hard to accept this fact of of being Christian, because…]

¶
You understand. How would you define, how would you define forgiveness? Because you are talking about forgiveness…]

(165) 41:52-41:54
EO: Sì, il cristianesimo↑…

[Yes, so, Christianity…]

(166) 41:54-41:55
VG: El cristianismo↑…

[Christianity…]
This is a clear contrast with Interview 2 and, although it does not come down to one single reason, it shows a higher engagement by VG with the medium than RS in Interview 2.

VG’s admitted lack of experience in radio interpreting (and interpreting in general) leads him to intuitively try SI into the foreign language without acknowledging the constraints offered by the situational arrangements, and also deviating at times from the turn-exchange system which he has actively helped to establish throughout the interview. This is particularly evident in Excerpt 4.6, below, when EO interrupts VG and JT to ask for consecutive turns to be taken so that he can understand them properly (utterance 273). After that sequence, VG quickly reverts to the DI modality, also providing clear-cut transitional spaces for both primary interlocutors, which he maintains until the end of the interview (e.g. utterances 279 and 281 in Excerpt 4.6 below).

Excerpt 4.6

(265) 48:21-48:38
JT: [(hhh)] Señor Olmi, cuando usted: estrenó cento: Centochiodi†, Cien clavos†, eh: esa escena de los: libros asesinados, eh; cla, con, de alguna manera, eh, preguntándose para qué ha servido toda la cultura [occidental…]

[Mr. Olmi, when you premièred Centochiodi, One hundred Nails, eh, that scene with the
assassinated books, eh, somehow, eh, wondering what was all Western culture for…

(266)
48:37-48:45
VG: [Quando lei] comincia all’inizio dei Centochiodi tutta questa scena dei libri, in qualche modo ce, domandandosi a cosa [servono…?]

[When you start Centochiodi with that scene of the books, somehow wondering what was…]

(267)
48:45-48:48
JT: [Una] specie de de de de homicidio [de la cultura occidentale↑…]

[A kind of of homicide of Western culture…]

(268)
48:47-48:49
VG: [Come unomicidio della cultura] occidentale↑…

[Like a homicide of Western culture…]

(269)
48:49-48:50
JT: ¡Fue bestial!

[That was brutal!]

(270)
48:50-48:51
VG: È brutale!

[It’s brutal!]

(271)
48:52-49:01
JT: Eh, eh, s seguro que que ↓ que esa pregunta “¿para qué ha servido la cultura occidentale?” es una pregunta: que se ha hecho usted↑ en al, en algún momento?

[Eh, it is sure that that question of ‘what has Western culture been for?’ is a question that you have asked yourself at some point?]

(272)
49:01-49:09
VG: Questa, questa, questa domanda di, di a che cosa è servita questa cultura occidentale lei se f’è fatta veramente? Cosa ne pensa↑?

[This, this question of what was Western culture for, did you ask it yourself truly? What do you think about it?]

(273)
49:10-49:13
EO: Non ho capito! perché vi parlate uno sopra l’altro…

[I didn’t understand because you are overlapping each other when talking…]

(274)
49:13-49:18
VG: Ah! Que no, ¡no nos entiende (laughing) porque hablamos uno encima de la↓… voz↓.]

[Ah! He doesn’t understand us because we are overlapping our… voices.]
JT: [Bueno, (laughs), digale que] a propósito Cien clavos↑ … [(hhh)]
[Well, tell him that, with regard to One Hundred Nails…]

(276)
49:21-49:26
EO: [Allora,] ecco, lasci parlar e poi mi traduca solo con la sua voce↓.
[Ok, that’s it, let him talk and then you translate for me only with your voice.]

(277)
49:27-49:30
VG: Benissimo!
¶
Que hablas tú↑, breve↑ y yo te traduzco↓.
[Very good!]
¶
You talk, briefly, and then I translate.]

(278)
49:30-49:42
JT: Perfecto. Le preguntaba es, si a partir de que usted hace Cien clavos, es a partir de preguntarse para qué nos ha servido, la cultura occidental↓, real, esa pregunta fue real↓.
[Perfect. I was asking you if it is from the moment that you made One Hundred Nails that you started wondering what has been the use of Western culture for us, if that question was real.]

(279)
49:42-49:51
VG: Lui chiede se lei fa il film Centochiodi partendo dalla domanda a cosa è servita la cultura occidentale↑ e se questa è stata la domanda iniziale che lei si è fatto↓.
[He asks if you made the film Centochiodi starting from the question of what has been the use of Western culture and if this was the starting question that you asked yourself.]

(280)
49:52-49:54
EO: No, è un’altra↓.
[No, it was another one.]

(281)
49:54-49:55
VG: Es otra.
[It is another one.]

b2) Broadcasting the interpreter-mediated exchange: sound management

The fact that Interview 4 is a studio-to-remote location telephone connection entails two crucial sound management issues for the ST: providing good quality sound for both sides of the telephone line and, subsequently, providing good quality output sound to the audience. This is of particular relevance in the case of EO's output sound, which is coming through a telephone line to both the studio and the audience. Although there is neither visual nor broadcast evidence of the ST working on EO's output sound, what is
particularly striking is the use of music in minutes 29:16-32:39, right in the middle of the programme, in order to establish the phone connection with EO off-air and proceed to the technical arrangements which will make the on-air interview possible.

c) Off-air interaction:

Not applicable for Interview 4.

Overall remarks on section 1

Interview 4 presents a dynamic talk-in-interaction, characterised by relatively short turns at talk, a pattern which is intensified by the telephone connection constraints, as well as by EO's and VG's co-operation and acknowledgement of the medium.

Furthermore, EO is also aware of the interpreter-mediated exchange taking place in this particular medium, as evidenced in utterance 273 (see Excerpt 4.6, pages 271-273) when he asks the interlocutors in the studio not to overlap their utterances. This example remarkably shows how the three active participants co-operate interactionally, putting their agendas aside when needed. JT, VG and EO show awareness of the technical conditions of the broadcast and the communicative nature of the medium.

2. Participants' orientation to Public Radio Broadcast talk-in-interaction

A general transversal CA of Interview 4 highlights a specific aspect of this particular interaction with regards to the interpreter's public position and status: The primary effect of VG being introduced as a poet and an expert on Italian film (see Excerpt 4.3, pages 262-264) is that it provides a space for VG to interact from that position, notably with the host and the audience. However, VG is never introduced as such to EO - at least not on-air - and his exchange with EO is limited to his position as interpreter, something which VG deliberately wants to stick to. This phenomenon is directly related to the interpreter's provision and how his position, role and ethos are openly framed on-air, this being a specific and common interactional feature on ESV and Radio 3.

By allowing VG the space to interact as himself and as a figure of the others (i.e. the interpreter) during the programme, language transfer and the interpreter-mediated event itself are conceptualised as an intrinsic part of this type of event on ESV and Radio 3. By openly talking with VG, JT is overtly sharing with the audience the approach
followed to provide this particular interpreter for the interview, which can be a tool for the audience to appraise VG's interaction.

The introduction of VG as guest-expert-interpreter also allows him to put a series of face saving strategies in place throughout the interview which are geared towards minimising his lack of experience as an interpreter, while still engaging with the interview. Illustrative of this approach are utterances 161 (Excerpt 4.5, page 270), 277 (Excerpt 4.6, page 272), when he explicitly asks EO and JT respectively for brevity, and 238 (Excerpt 4.7, below), when he encounters problems in the translation of *addobbi* (Italian word for *ornaments*).

**Excerpt 4.7**

(237)  
46:27-46:39  
EO: E questa parabola† racconta come, diciamo, la Chiesa, nel momento in cui rinuncia agli *addobbi*†…

*[And this parable tells how, let’s say, the Church, from the moment in which it renounces ornaments…]*

(238)  
46:39-46:46  
VG: Y esta parábola explica cómo la Iglesia, en el momento que renuncia a, a a ¶ Addobbi non è facile da tradurre…

*[And this parable explains how the Church, from the moment in which it renounces to, to ¶ Addobbi is not easy to translate…]*

(239)  
46:46  
EO: [Eh…]

(238bis)  
46:46-46:48  
VG: [Es decir las] componendas†…

*[That is to say, arrangements…]*

(240)  
46:48-46:49  
EO: Gli ornam[enti.]

*[Ornaments.]*

(241)  
46:49-46:53  
VG: [A los] sí, a los adornos, se se a las¶ eh?

*[Ah, yes, ornaments, eh, yes?]*
Later in the programme, during a monolingual, dyadic exchange between JT and VG after the interview, when they both comment on how the interview went and JT thanks VG for interpreting, VG brings back the issue of the “addobbi” (utterance 349) as a way of highlighting the difficulties he had ‘translating’ during the interview. This exchange shows how the interpreter-mediated exchange is oriented towards the public broadcast nature of the event and it is shared with the audience by interlocutors in the studio in an open and transparent way.

3. Broadcast talk: institutional framework and institutional discursive features

The participation frameworks (see Table 4, pages 144 and 145) show how most of the elements of ESV’s ethos and broadcast public arena (see section V.2.) manifest themselves, structurally and interactionally, in Interview 4.

From an institutional point of view, the theme soundtracks work as a declaration of intentions (see participation frameworks 3 and 6 in Table 4, page 144). They also serve as transitions to new participation frameworks (e.g. 5, the Cabrillas Fritas magazine) and are picked up by the host, who delves into the programme's intentions and main references (e.g. Iranian cinema, broadcasting from Radio 3 which the host carries in his heart on a cold day in Madrid, etc.).

The intimate and unpretentious yet committed atmosphere is progressively created by, first, the host alone and, secondly, by the host and the interpreter-guest-expert jointly,
and it leads up to the interview in a way that is in line with the programme's ethos and arena. In this regard, although the interpreter-guest-expert might already be familiar with ESV, establishing the structure, fields and tenor of the participation frameworks prior to the actual live interpreter-mediated interview helps him integrate into the programme and, hence, interact accordingly, i.e. by being spontaneous with the host and the guest; by accepting the invitation and position given by the host on-air in a natural and open way, particularly when it comes to transmitting the host's utterances to the guest, and when interacting in audience-oriented mode (mainly via prosodic devices and the tenor of his utterances, as in utterances 319, 321 and 323 in Excerpt 4.8, below).

Excerpt 4.8

(318)  
52:52-52:56  
EO: Ecco, sono come un nonno che guarda i nipoti↑…

[That's it, I am like a grandpa who looks at the grandchildren.]

(319)  
52:57-53:00  
VG: Soy como un abuelo que mira (laughing) a los nietos↑…

[I am like a grandpa who looks at the grandchildren.]

(320)  
53:00-53:03  
EO: E vedo che stanno crescendo ¡moltò bene!

[And I see that they are growing very well!]

(321)  
53:03-53:07  
VG: Y veo y contemplo que están creciendo ¡muy bien!

[And I see, I consider that they are growing very well!]

(322)  
53:07-53:09  
EO: Avremo grandi soddisfazioni↑…

[We will have great satisfaction!]

(323)  
53:09-53:12  
VG: [Y tenemos grandes satisfacciones↓, nos darán grandes satisfacciones↓.]

[And we will have great satisfaction, they will give us great satisfaction.]

Since JT and VG have co-constructed the position and role of the latter as a mixture of guest-interpreter-expert, they openly interact in audience-oriented mode along these
lines during their dyadic exchange. However, when it comes to the actual live interpreter-mediated interview with EO, VG focuses on language transfer following a medium-oriented approach which leads him to avoid long turns and prioritise dynamism and spontaneous orality in the interaction (as evidenced crucially in the instances when VG stops EO to interpret for the audience), while leaving interview-related co-ordinating tasks, such as producing new questions, commenting and back-channelling, to JT as the host.
Interview 5 (Corroboration): Awards Ceremony of the Granada *Cines del Sur* Film Festival. Interview with Iranian actress Fatemeh Motamed-Arya

Interview 5 shares organisational parameters with Interview 3 as far as the category of interview and broad contextual factors are concerned (see Tables 5 and 3 respectively, pages 146 and 140). The focus of the analysis of Interview 5 is on how the use of visuals (i.e. AV recording of the exchange) contributes to exploring specific interactional features and patterns of this event.

1. Broadcast production and situational arrangements prior to and during the interview: influence and impact on the overall interaction

The ‘Reasons for interview’ (see Table 5, page 147), have a direct influence on both the situational arrangements which follow, on the speech-exchange system and on the fields and tenor of the broadcast.

The episode broadcast on Friday 18th June 2010 coincided with the festival award closing ceremony. JT decided to set up the semi-outdoors studio on location, partially broadcast the award ceremony live from inside the cinema and immediately afterwards (while the closing film was being screened) to start the talk show in the studio set up in the cinema’s main hall (see images 3 and 4, page 280). He took advantage of the presence of several guests, programmers and ‘friends’ of the festival to bring them to *ESV*’s live talk-show table. Amongst the festival guests was Fatemeh Motamed-Arya (FMA), an Iranian actress who was given an honorific award by *Cines del Sur* and whom JT had interviewed the previous day for another programme, *El Árbol de las Palabras* (Radio Exterior de España). It must be emphasised that JT highlights Iranian cinema - not only in this particular episode (minutes 21:14-22:03), but also in others - as one of *ESV*’s and JT's favourite cinematographies, hence his permanent intention to take advantage of festivals and film-related events bringing Iranian filmmakers and actors to interview them in *ESV*.127 The effects of *ESV/JT*’s admiration of this particular cinematography for the broadcast interaction affect organisational aspects (proxemics and situational arrangements), the broadcast public arena created by JT and his

---

127 Cf. [http://www.rtve.es/alacarta/audios/el-septimo-vicio/septimo-vicio-cine-irani-09-07-13/1924967/](http://www.rtve.es/alacarta/audios/el-septimo-vicio/septimo-vicio-cine-irani-09-07-13/1924967/). Also, in Table 4.1 (page 145), a list of *ESV* programmes covering festivals or film-related events which involve Iranian cinema and guests is provided, which evidences *ESV/JT*’s efforts to cover this cinematography whenever possible.
institutional discourse. Moreover, this highlights the reasons for this radio event happening.

The set up of the talk is that of a multi-party talk-show characterised by the changing number of people at the table. JT, actress ER and documentary filmmaker RV are present throughout the whole talk-show. The number of active participants present at the table ranges from five at the beginning, to seven and, finally, three (see images below).

Images 3 and 4: Situational arrangements (before the broadcast talk-show) and STs' location.

Image 5: Talk-show table arrangements during first part of the programme.

Images 6, 7 and 8: JCF suggests the interpreter move over to FMA during music interlude (AV recording minutes 35:44-36:40, Annex 1).
The talk-in-interaction, as well as the situational arrangement of the different participation frameworks, is coordinated by JT as the programme's host and director, with the technical help of STs JCF and JB, who are in charge of monitoring the talk which goes on-air, as well as the input and output volume of the interlocutors' headphones and microphones (see Image 4). As far as production issues are concerned, this type of live broadcast is more complex and involves more team work and negotiation than the interpreter-mediated face-to-face studio interview with one guest only (e.g. Interview 1): it involves managing different guests' agendas, turn-coordination tasks, sound connections and sound monitoring - especially the interpreter's - and the open and public physical setting (in this case, the foyer of a theatre) where festival and theatre staff as well as passers-by may be watching the talk-show, thus creating a different atmosphere and interaction (as in Interview 3) from the isolated studio interaction (e.g. Interview 1).

The increased organisational and interactional complexity compared to the studio-only interaction (Interview 1) can be observed in the higher number of participation frameworks (see Table 5, page 148) in comparison with Interviews 1, 2 and 4 (see Tables 1, 2 and 4, pages 133, 136 and 143 respectively).

The participation frameworks show a complex talk-in-interaction, with numerous participation shifts, which are strongly motivated by the physical setting and the changing number of participants taking part in the interaction. Furthermore, the participation shifts driven by JT cause continuous changes in the number of active participants in the talk, thus adding more complexity to all the participants' actions, particularly the STs' and the interpreter's (RSI), who has to work closely with the STs in order to arrange how her renditions to FMA and vice versa are going to be managed with regards to sound input-output arrangements. Images 3 and 4 are illustrative of this: they show the moments prior to the start of the multi-party broadcast, after the coverage of the award ceremony, and JT tells RSI where to sit, while the STs check different input-output sound possibilities.

The physical setting, at the heart of the Cines del Sur festival premises, allows for the interactional fields to revolve around the broad and local festival context. It can be claimed that in events like Interviews 3 and 5, the setting of the studio influences the
fields and tenor of the talk-in-interaction to the extent that it acts as its driving thread, mainly via the host's coordination of questions and comments. The interpreter's integration as part of that environment may prove crucial both in organisational and interactional terms. In this regard, JT had previously worked with RSI, who is the usual interpreter hired by *Cines del Sur* when Iranian filmmakers or actors are invited. RSI confirmed having worked with JT several times, not only within the framework of *Cines del Sur*, moments before being on-air, when she is challenged by JT with regard to the physical position that she should take at the table (see Interview 5 AV recording minutes 09:59-10:32, Annex 1, and Image 5 above).

**a) The setting up of the participation framework: host's introduction to the talk-show and interview**

The way in which the ‘Reasons for interview’ (see Table 5, page 147) and the subsequent situational arrangements help to shape the broadcast interaction as analysed above can be seen first-hand during JT's introduction of the show and the guests (minutes 17:30-18:28). In these first exchanges, it can be observed how the interaction with FMA is going to be developed with RSI following a mixed modality of SI-DI.

**b) Turn-taking organisation (medium/technically-motivated/oriented)**

The use of SI when FMA is not directly involved in the talk influences prosody and makes active participants talk without having to pay specific attention to turn-ends for RSI's interpretation. However, when FMA decides to interact verbally, the turns have to be taken by herself and RSI more abruptly, interrupting the others at the table. FMA’s onsets tend to be recognitional and progressional, and they are generally preceded by non-verbal cues (gaze and hand gestures) directed at RSI. The implication of this move is that RSI has to replicate that onset, which she tend to do by replicating the non-verbal cues towards JT.

RSI's choice of SI-DI (analysed below) fits into the multiparty face-to-face broad pattern of interaction in the sense that it allows the Spanish speakers to have monolingual exchanges without the interference of RSI interpreting consecutively into Farsi. This choice matches IM's in Interview 3. However, there are two aspects that allow for the talk-in-interaction to not be so centred on the foreign language speaking
guest: first, the main field of the overall interaction remains Cines del Sur and FMA does not take as much protagonism as VK in Interview 3. Secondly, RSI's preference for SI over DI allows JT and the rest of the table to not depend so much on her turn-taking and therefore they have more turn-taking space than the Spanish speaking participants in Interview 3.

**b1) Interpreting modality: influence of the organisation of the setting and the ongoing interaction (participation frameworks)**

RSI opts for a mixed modality of SI-DI (with a predominance of SI) after her appraisal of the setting and, arguably, based on her previous experience in this medium. She coordinates with JT and the STs in order to accomplish this modality without hindering the talk-in-interaction. The visuals for Interview 5 evidence how RS accomplishes this mixed modality, with the technical support of JCF and JB. Images 9 and 10, below, reflect a moment in the interaction when RSI has sound problems while interpreting into Spanish (i.e. in audience-oriented mode) and she uses non-verbal communication off-stage in order to not compromise the broadcast talk in interaction. This is a recurrent pattern of interaction throughout Interview 5.

![Images 9 and 10: RSI solving sound problems with STs and JT (AV recording minutes 55:26-55:49, Annex 1).](image)

**b2) Broadcasting the interpreter-mediated exchange: sound management**

The complexities of the setting as a multi-party talk-show on location (as discussed above) have an impact on how the interpreter's interaction is managed by the STs depending on the participation framework. In the case of Interview 5, the broadcast talk does not always actively involve the foreign language-speaking guest (see participation frameworks 3 to 8, Table 5, pages 148-149) and, yet, RSI keeps rendering the on-going
talk to FMA, with the consequent implications for the STs. The visuals for Interview 5 show the focus of the STs on the transitions between the different participation frameworks which involve output volume adjustments, particularly regarding RSI and FMA. This is first shown in JB’s off-air exchange with RSI regarding sound adjustments (see Interview 5 visuals, minutes 10:39-10:51, Annex 1). Also, when RSI changes her physical position after the music interlude, upon JCF's suggestion (see images 6-8 and Interview 5 visuals, minutes 35:44-36:40, Annex 1), she encounters sound problems which have to be solved while the broadcast talk is on-air (see images 9 and 10, Interview 5 visuals, minutes 55:26-55:49, Annex 1), thus forcing non-verbal communication to play a crucial role so that the talk going on-air to the audience is not affected. This can be seen as overt non-verbal face work, whereby RSI, JT and JCF-JB work together off-air to solve a sound problem without bringing the talk-in-interaction to a halt, taking advantage of radio's communicative nature as a sound-based broadcast medium.

The change of RSI's physical position is suggested by JCF during the first music interlude (see Images 6, 7 and 8 above, corresponding to Interview 5 visuals, minutes 35:44-36:40, Annex 1). Once the active participants are back on-air, the audience does not notice this change, but the access to visuals provides information on how it is easier for JCF and JB to manage sound, while RSI also can make better use of non-verbal language by being next to FMA. A further advantage for the broadcast output is that RSI now has her own microphone and therefore the STs can lower her sound output when she interprets into Farsi. Therefore, the Spanish language output sound is cleaner to the audience, while RSI and FMA welcome this new situational arrangement (see Interview 5 visuals, minutes 36:07-36:15, Annex 1).

c) Off-air interaction

The use of visuals as a support for the broadcast episode in the analysis of Interview 5 shows the organisational complexities of a multi-party interpreter-mediated broadcast on location. The analysis of Interview 5 with the support of the visuals of the event evidences how crucial the access to visuals is, both methodologically and analytically, in order to reveal situational arrangements such as the guests' physical position at the talk-show table, the off-air interaction with the STs and JT and the relevance of non-
verbal communication. Visuals in Interview 5 provide key details about how certain situational and technical arrangements involving the interpreter are solved off-air (verbally and non-verbally) to be broadcast on-air, thus showing how these interactional features are specific to radio.

2. Participants' orientation to Public Radio Broadcast talk-in-interaction

A transversal overall analysis of how footing, face and power relations unfold during the interaction points at highly dynamic talk-in-interaction characterised by relatively short turns at talk (less than 20 seconds on average), where the fact that the participants are in a less institutional setting, face-to-face, and having built previous rapport with the foreign language speaking guest thanks to the previous day's broadcast interview for a different RNE radio show, allows for an accepted deviation from the host's original agenda, who accepts and follows the guests' challenges and suggestions with the interpreter's interactional co-operation and covertly invites the audience to enjoy the exchange, beyond the apparent language barrier (as evidenced in JT's address to the audience and the subsequent exchange with FMA and RSI, minutes 21:14-22:45).

Hence, the conflicting agendas do not involve interactional clashes or impolite face threats, overt repair and unilateral overt participation shifts, or conflicting power-related issues. All this, together with RSI's co-operative attitude and uptake of the medium's interactional arena and ethos (as corroborated with the visuals), create an interpreter interaction which runs dynamically and smoothly. Minutes 09:03-13:53 in Interview 5 visuals (see Annex 1), illustrated in images 3, 4 and 5, above, are evidence of how this collaborative rapport builds off-air before the actual broadcast.

This sequence shows how the participants' collaboration may also account for the lack of interactional conflict and tension between the broadcast participants, specifically in that multi-party talk between JT, RSI and FMA. Through the analysis of visuals it is possible to identify interactional features - prior to and during the broadcast interview - which help to avoid or reduce conflict and interactional clashes between the interpreter and the primary interlocutors.

As in the case of Interview 3, the broadcast talk-in-interaction in Interview 5 integrates the dynamism of talk in this kind of multi-party semi-outdoors setting and ESV’s arena
and host's communicative ethos. This is intensified by the particular approach to the interview by the foreign language-speaking guest, FMA, who several times challenges the host's questions and interactional moves. She clearly shows the intention to actively participate in the co-construction of the dialogue, in the same way as the other participants. This results in conflicting interactional agendas and moves, which the interpreter has to manage in the public broadcasting arena, on-stage and off-stage. One of the most salient features of RSI's moves is the fast turn-taking and the preference for SI and short turns, thus adapting to the rather informal semi-outdoors setting of the radio broadcast.

However, there is a point at which FMA gradually fades away from the interaction, becoming an overhearer in the broadcast talk-in-interaction (see participation frameworks 4-9, Table 5, pages 147-49), after which she and the interpreter leave the table. This happens smoothly in conversational terms, i.e. the broadcast interaction is not halted to let the actress and the interpreter leave; rather, they leave off-air, and without any reference to the audience about how this is happening on-stage.

3. Broadcast talk: institutional framework and institutional discursive features

Interview 5 illustrates the institutional discourse on and approach to Iranian cinema that ESV has created over the years. The fact that ESV devotes a large part of this particular programme to an interview with an Iranian actress, within the framework of the coverage of a film festival and a multi-party talk with several guests, evidences how a programme's and host's agenda have an influence on which participants are invited to ESV and the subsequent interpreter-mediated events which arise.

ESV's institutional discourse and approach to Iranian cinema may also have had an influence on the host's positive reactions to the Iranian actress's comments, her attempts to turn the tables (Hutchby, 2006:94) and occasional face threats. JT's positive uptake, although probably also in need of a deeper analysis in terms of gender relations and issues which do not fall within the scope of this research, may also be intensified by the non-threatening and polite tenor in FMA's and RSI's uptakes of JT's comments and questions.

In conclusion, highlighting this discursive aspect of ESV and how it manifests during
the broadcast interaction helps mapping out the film-related people and foreign cinematographies which find a voice and visibility in ESV, as well as how they are treated (judging from the visuals of the exchange) based on its agenda and interests, under the umbrella of an institution which allows for the production of this type of radio event.
V.4 Corroboration: Semi-Structured Interview with the Host

The aim of this section is to corroborate the CA in section V.3 with a filmed semi-structured interview (SSI) with the programme's host (JT), which included general questions on radio interpreting and specific questions on the programme devoted to PG (see Appendix 5 and Table 2). The SSI was also intended to gather information on the production, organisation and unfolding of interpreter-mediated events on ESV which I could not infer by only listening to the broadcasts themselves.

CA of the broadcast data at hand for Interview 2 has shown interactional phenomena and patterns which may appear salient upon examining the broadcast talk-in-interaction, but whose analysis can be enriched with extra information regarding the organisation prior to the interview, which can be provided by those who took part in it, e.g. JT. Here, the SSI with JT offers supportive data, providing further first-hand information concerning the broad pattern of interaction, time-space constraints and organisational aspects of the interpreter-mediated event, as well as his views as journalist and host with regards to key interactional aspects in interpreter-mediated interviews, thus contributing to a better understanding of JT's interaction as host in the interviews.

I will follow the three main analytical categories in the CA-based model for analysis (see Appendix 2), which match the three main blocks of questions covered during the SSI (see IV.2 and Appendix 3).

V.4.1 Broadcast production and organisational aspects prior to and during the interview

The first section of the analysis dealt with how the broadcast interpreter-mediated interview was organised and shaped according to production and situational arrangements prior to the interview and its impact on the following aspects: turn-taking organisation, interpreting modality and sound management.

Thanks to the SSI, it is possible to see which of these conditions and factors are of more relevance for JT in the broadcast interaction. JT for example comments on the production factors which, in his view, had an impact on Interview 2: distance and the lack of visual contact with both the guest and the interpreter.
SSI Excerpt 1

JT: The show was live, but there was another important circumstance. The interpretation was not the only obstacle, it was also that Peter Greenaway was not with me. It was a duplex connection, as we say in radio. I was at the studio in Madrid and he was in Cuenca. He could not see me with his eyes. We did not have that direct knowledge of physical presence, you see?

This account provides information that helps to map out the space-time conditions under which the broadcast live interview took place (see Table 2), thus also corroborating the turn-taking patterns analysed in V.3 for Interview 2.

- Interpreting modality

Although the CA section V.3 showed that the reason for using a particular interpreting mode was determined by the interpreter's uptake of the context, JT does not show a particular preference for one interpreting mode, but has a clear view on the interpreting mode(s) which can be better integrated in radio broadcasting.

SSI Excerpt 2

JT: Let's see: the worst of all is ehm... consecutive interpreting, isn't it? Question, question by the interpreter to the interviewee, answer by the interviewee, translation by the interpreter. This would be the most... the most painful, but sometimes there is no other solution, particularly if the interpreter is a kind of machine translator, Google, who, in this case, it would be the same as using a translation machine, isn't it?

Ehm... the most interesting is simultaneous interpreting; for me, for radio, that's the most relevant for me. And the most aberrant/awful, the one I don't get on well at all is, let's say, final translation, isn't it? A whole speech is given, one hour, half an hour, fifteen minutes, ten minutes... and then the interpreter produces the translation.

What is the fundamental value of simultaneous translation? It creates communication, it creates spontaneity. It's not: "cut, stop, go on". I does not create a mess, lack of rhythm; on the contrary, there is consecutivity... it's a natural composition!

JT's concern is not so much the modality but the interpreter's skill to communicate in this medium (a concern that has public face implications, as seen in section 2 of CA in Interviews 1 and 2). Radio 3’s ethos also allows for an open and integrative approach to

---

128 Although the SSI with JT was conducted in Spanish, the excerpts only include English back translation of the SSI transcription, given that no interactional analysis is performed on the SSI (see IV.2.4)

129 Note JT's confusion when he talks about interpreting modalities (consecutive, simultaneous, final, natural...). Throughout the SSI, it is not entirely clear when he refers to consecutive or simultaneous interpreting, as defined by the discipline. Nevertheless, his emphasis lies on the dynamism that the interpreter provides through his/her translations in this particular medium.
broadcasting, which involves enough freedom for its programmes to provide space and time for this kind of interviews to take place, not only with regards to content, but also with regards to the broadcast output.

SSI Excerpt 3

**JT:** For me, one thing I really like in natural translation is that the original language can be heard, Persian, Turkish, Arabic, Swahili, whatever... Languages are so rich! Even if you don't know a language, hearing it spoken by a famous person is almost a cultural discourse on that country, that person and that language. They have to be heard in a natural way. We can achieve this with simultaneous translation: the person starts to talk in his or her language and then, in a natural way, almost as if the listener were participating in the conversation... you see?

This excerpt evidences how the interpreting modality used by the interpreters across my data is chosen in an open and non-formalised procedure within Radio 3. Thus, the way interpreting is part of ESV (both for communication purposes and its broadcasting) is neither random, nor organised following an institutional communicative standard or guideline. ‘Convention open to the participants' input’ can be said to be predominant here. An evidence of this phenomenon is the dynamic and changing use of interpreting modes (consecutive and simultaneous) by interpreters across Interviews 1-5.

- **Broadcasting the interpreter-mediated exchange: sound management**

Sound is managed by the STs during the broadcast interview. Tables 1-5 show that in five broadcast interviews in my data, seven different STs work with JT to make the broadcast possible, largely due to the reliance on STs working at local RNE studios when interviews take place on location (e.g. Interviews 3 and 5) or via studio-to-studio connection (e.g. Interview 2). JT, as programme director and host, but also as a professional of radio broadcasting, shows his concern about the importance of sound management in these types of interpreter-mediated radio interviews.

SSI Excerpt 4

**JT:** [...] well, the truth is that different languages, hmm... Sometimes they make things difficult for us, or they put us in a difficult situation and we really need translation, and more than translation, interpretation. It's our great ally: the microphone, sound, translation and interpretation.

[...]

Well, there are really two things: first, we're talking about creative interpretation, but there is something that limits or conditions it, which is the medium, the format. Translating or interpreting
for television is not the same as for the written press, for a website, for a conference, or for the radio. Therefore, radio is... the basis is the spoken word. And there are different kinds of sound takes. I always like naturalness in interpreting and also in radio.

So I always speak, me personally, with the interpreter: first, about the technical requirements of the interpretation and then about creation in the interpretation, about being on the air live, what the interview will be like, how I want to create complicity with the interviewee, right?

Based on JT's statements in this excerpt, the argument regarding sound management being intrinsic and crucial to interpreter-mediated broadcast radio interviews gains strength, while confirming that live interpreting is a major sound management issue when it occurs in this type of radio broadcasting event.

- Turn-taking and off-air interaction

SSI Excerpt 4 also supports the analysis carried out in section 1 of the CA-based model in V.3: JT expresses his concern about the technicalities of radio as well as the dynamism he wants to create during the interaction. This view helps to explain JT's reaction when he considers that the interview is not going along the interactive lines he expects for a radio interview. Particularly in the case of Interview 2, JT's views on how radio elements and aspects of radio language were used (including the lack of previous contact and arrangements between himself, RS and PG) confirm that there was an active awareness by himself and the production team of how problematic the development of the broadcast interview was.

V.4.2 Public broadcast talk-in-interaction

In section 2 of the CA-based model, the analysis focuses on aspects related to the public radio broadcasting nature of the interpreter-mediated live interview (see Appendix 2). JT's awareness of these aspects throughout the SSI confirm and strengthen the CA in V. 3.

In SSI Excerpt 4 JT explains his notion of radio interpreting, whereby he considers that the medium allows for and even requires creativity and the mastering of the spoken word, as a basic and essential part of radio. Further on, he makes statements about interpreting in his programme which shed light on the key questions I address in my study.
SSI Excerpt 5

**JT:** Let's say that in translation... I always do live broadcasting or fake live broadcasting: the harsh noise of the recordings, you know? Today, for example, we have had two instances of programmes which show what I am talking about, isn't it? We have carried out a live broadcast; very naturally, I addressed the creator, the interpreter, telling her to act in a natural way, that she could ask whenever she needed to ask for any information, but live...

The listener is not dumb, is not a fool; he/she knows perfectly, sometimes, of the difficulties of a simultaneous interpretation which goes on live; the fact that he/she knows them from the beginning is very good! It is not cheating, nor being tedious by any means; it is just creating natural communication.

According to JT, there are three overriding aspects in ESV's interpreter-mediated interviews which corroborate previous analyses in sections V.1, V.2 and V.3: (1) the inner features and limitations of radio as a mass medium of communication, (2) the institutional and communicative ethos created by Radio 3, and (3) how it manifests on Radio 3’s ESV, through its public arena of communication created for the audience.

These three aspects come together in JT’s statement on his preference for not editing the interview, even if it is not broadcast live, and help to explain the live format of interpreter-mediated interviews on ESV.

SSI Excerpt 6

**JT:** If it had been a recording following the radio recording discourse that some people use, it would be, ehm... question in Spanish, question in Persian, answer in Persian, answer in Spanish. Questions are erased from the recording, ehm... in that language, and then it goes directly to the question in Spanish and the answer in Persian simultaneously [interpreted]: all this is made by editing first and second planes of sound. [...] This creates dynamism... as well as a shorter interview; let's say that if an interview might be fifty minutes, such as the one today, leaving the questions and all the translation aside, you could bring it down to fifteen minutes. We can say that this is much more useful for news, for news programmes, which require greater brevity and concision. But as far as specialised film programmes are concerned, I like that people, well, listen to the other person in all his/her dimensions, with all his/her language.

- **Turn-taking and sequence organisation (public broadcasting motivated/oriented)**

SSI Excerpt 4, in which JT talks about his concern with establishing a relationship with the interpreter by speaking and arranging with the interpreter certain aspects of the radio interview, corroborates why he did not feel totally comfortable interacting with the interpreter (RS) in Interview 2. JT admits that he did not have time to build up any previous rapport with RS, so he had to do it over the course of the live interview,
remotely. The conditions were not the best to interact with the interpreter along the host's preferred lines. Hence, RS's unwillingness to engage with JT's approach to the interview, as evidenced in V.3's CA, is corroborated by JT's perception of RS's interaction.

SSI Excerpt 7

**JT:** ... I have had several conflicts due to bad interpretations, due to average interpretations and due to awkward interpretations, you see? Maybe the most talked about one was the interview with British filmmaker Peter Greenaway, who... since the interpreter did not render him my questions correctly, plus the fact that Peter Greenaway's personality is very special, because he is very god-like and, well, very... very anti-journalists... his discourse is based on disagreement and counter-attack... so, well, the dialogue could have been fresh, lively, rich. We might have even agreed! Because me too, I am not a fierce advocate of the journalist guild, you know? There are bad journalists, average journalists and very good journalists; nonetheless, in the same way, there are good filmmakers, bad filmmakers and dumb filmmakers, aren't there? No trade, no activity is free from all this, right? So... neither journalism, nor filmmaking, nor the hospitality sector, right? Everyone has blunders and I may agree with that, but obviously, a bad interpretation may lead to insults, to any of the two interlocutors feeling alluded to by those insults. It created a problem for me, a big conflict, ehm... but also a challenge! You know? In essence, for the listeners [too], don't you think? Well, there were all kinds of listeners: there were listeners who aligned with Peter Greenaway's insults and there were listeners who understood the difficulties, you know? And I stick to the latter, to the ones who found that the... the biggest difficulty was not the concepts or Peter Greenaway's prejudices, or that they caught me in flagrante, because the insult was such a surprise. The main issue there, the true protagonist, was a bad interpreter.

**Question:** But, why do you say he was a bad interpreter? What was the mistake?

**JT:** The basic mistake was that he did not manage to transmit, maybe out of cowardice, my dialectical duel with Peter Greenaway. Then, of course, if Greenaway had known the things I was saying, the... the tension in the interview might have never occurred, because maybe Peter Greenaway would have understood that I also agreed with the idea of journalistic blunders with regards to filmmaking, you know? But if the interpreter does not render this, then I give the impression of being a guild journalist, yeah?

The series of statements in SSI Excerpts 5-7 corroborate the analysis made with regards to turn transition and completion via the use of the voice (prosody), whereby JT's questions and requests are uttered following a dialogical, open-ended approach, where he even rephrases and completes his own utterance at times, in an effort to increase the interpreter’s understanding of his utterances (for example, what he specifically calls ‘my dialectical duel with Peter Greenaway’, see SSI Excerpt 7). Furthermore, it
corroborates other interactional features/patterns analysed in V.3 with regards to turn-taking, such as turn uptake via gentle coughing/inbreaths, increased speed in turn-appraisal, overlapping talk, the host's explicit reference to the use of turns for the sake of the broadcast and the audience, the interpreter's management of relational and referential aspects between on-stage and off-stage, and explicit turn repair or re-organisation.

- Public Face

The SSI with JT includes statements which are closely related to how public face can be affected in the type of interpreter-mediated live broadcast interview under study here and, in turn, how the interview itself can be affected:

SSI Excerpt 8

**JT:** Some psychological pressure must be exerted on the interpreter. But more than that, the interpreter must be given some rules. You have to tell him or her: “I want the interpretation, the translation, to be like this”. It's like with the interpreter there's a spirit of complicity and also technical complicity, but pressure has to be exerted on the interviewee, always. The interviewee must always be seduced. Each interview is almost an act of love, you see? And if there is no enchantment, no seduction, there is no creation.

[...]

Furthermore, well, about mistakes in the interpretation... The biggest mistake was the one I mentioned earlier about the questions. It's when the interpreter doesn't want to create something, doesn't want to... doesn't have that complicity with you to make the interview a creation, both journalistically speaking and also in terms of translation. Then, there, you realise that it would be the worst, to stop the interview, and say: “let's not do it”.

SSI Excerpt 9

**JT:** But the biggest mistake is that the interpreter is a coward! If you are facing a coward translator or interpreter, it may all end up in a summary court, because of course, the language barrier is sometimes very important, isn't it? But on top of it, if the interpreter does not want to translate, from the beginning, what the interview director, what the interviewer wants to do, because he/she is afraid... Because you are saying to an Indian filmmaker, for example: “I don't like your film”, and then you are putting forward your arguments for not liking his film in front of him, but if the interpreter decides on his/her own that he/she does not want to translate what you are saying, out of fear or cowardice, it could all end up terribly... because what happened was that [Peter Greenaway's interpreter] did not translate me. Because me... there was an argument between Peter Greenaway and myself. [...] Then, he said, for example, that we the journalists were all frustrated, people who hate cinema, who like judging...

**Question:** That muddled you up, didn't it?
JT: No, no no. Well, I don't know if... Maybe yes! [laughs by interviewer] My impression... my impression is that I told him: “Well, not all of them; I also know filmmakers who behave disgracefully”. And then the guy, from then on, became a bit... [quoting Peter Greenaway] “The thing is that you don't know!...”. And I told him: “But, why are you using the plural? I can't understand why you are using the plural, please use...”. Then, obviously, the duel he was putting forward, was not being translated! Therefore, it might have been the case that Peter Greenaway and myself had agreed. [motorbike noise]... There are journalists who behave disgracefully, but some filmmakers too! But of course, if the translator or interpreter does not translate well for him, with this spirit, he/she is creating a problem, like..., at the end, we nearly insulted each other! [laughs] And I told him: “But what are you saying?”. And I told him: “Why do you think you are God?”. Because the thing is that there is a level where... the lack of feelings in the translation may lead to a diplomatic conflict [laughs].

JT’s rather disappointed view of how RS interpreted his questions into English in Interview 2 (see SSI excerpt 9) strengthens the significance of the different interactional features and patterns analysed in the public face section 2.c) in V.3. The orientation to the audience of this type of event is what leads JT to state that it was not so much the “concepts” (i.e. propositional content, lexical choices) that JT was concerned about, but the creation of a radiophonic interview with the interpreter as a key figure for the broadcast production (see SSI Excerpt 7).

- Power

Issues of power, dealt with in section 2 of CA in V.3, are referred to by JT when he reflects on the previous guidelines for the interpreter (see SSI Excerpt 8) and on his interview with PG (see SSI Excerpts 7 and 9).

A particularly illustrative example is when JT reflects on the duel of wits during his interview with PG and acknowledges that the filmmaker's personality and his views on journalists created a confrontation that the interpreter was neither willing nor ready to grasp and, hence, power asymmetries between JT and PG grew in interactional terms. Moreover, in JT’s view, RS became an extra obstacle to be overcome in terms of making an agreement between JT and PG possible but, most crucially, for the co-construction of a fresh interview (see SSI Excerpt 7).

- The interpreter's position and status

A further corroborating point of the SSI with JT touches upon the co-construction of the interpreter's position and status (2.e4) in the CA model.)
Question: Did you ever carry out an interview being your own interpreter?

JT: We can’t be everything in life. I mean, yes, I have had sometimes the bug of interpreting, of translation, of course! everyday. Today! I would have loved to speak Persian, to speak Farsi with this key Iranian actress. I mean, language is sometimes a barrier. But I don’t think that it is a fundamental barrier! See, languages in radio, television, in the media. It is more important that you [the journalist] know about cinema, that you know who the interviewee is and that you have a good interpreter, a good translator; this is more important than speaking Farsi... You can’t speak all languages in the world; that’s clear, right? Then, taking it from there, you have to trust and have confidence in good interpreters, in good creators of translation...

I have confidence in several [interpreters], in Spain, in their translations and their interpreting, but it is true that each time that I see a nice, lovely, pleasant translation, I feel like I would like to have that command of the language of that country, that culture, you know? But that is impossible.

Me, rather than having the bug for that, I have lots of confidence in people who take this trade of translation seriously, professionally, with passion, right?

I don’t have the bug for interpreting; I have the bug for journalism... and there you have some tools, right? I don’t think that a journalist needs to control the camera, the sound, the production...

I believe in the division of labour, I believe in the film crew at work, yeah? I think that cinema is a network of trades and journalism too, you know? And if you are focusing on a good interpretation, then you stop focusing on the value of questions; you don’t focus on the sequence, the rhythm, the speed, the enthusiasm, the communication of a good interview, you know?

Let the cobbler stick to his last, you know? I mean, the one who is obsessed with sound is going to make possible that an interview is good. The one who is obsessed with the image, the framing, is going to accomplish a [good] television, cinema interview, a good documentary...

We need to have an obsession with our specific job, for our own task. A good radio journalist, a good television journalist is the one who focuses on the interviewee, who creates an atmosphere in the studio or the set, who focus on an enthusiastic communication so that there is good communication. But, you can’t be obsessed with the framing of the camera at the same time! Or shot, or sound, or if a lorry is coming, a van... This is why we have the specialisation of trades, you know? And all this is at the service of a good journalistic job. And another tool for the good journalistic job is interpreting: it’s basic in such a globalised world in which we are living now, in which you can have someone from Mozambique speaking Portuguese, someone from South Africa speaking English, a Senegalese speaking Swahili, or a Moroccan speaking Arabic, or an Iranian speaking Farsi, right? Then, creativity in interpreting in journalism nowadays is crucial.

JT’s clear and unhesitant views about interpreters on ESV evidence the open interactional space that they are given in Interviews 1-5, in spite of - or precisely because of - the absence of written guidelines or standards of practice for interpreters on
Radio 3 - and, by extension, RTVE. JT's view places the interpreter on the creative side of the event, as a crucial part of the journalistic creation of talk-in-interaction. Generally, JT acknowledges interpreters' alignments in this specific type of event: with the host in communicative and interactional terms, but with the guest when it comes to knowing his/her culture and language.

V.4.3 Broadcast talk: institutional framework and institutional discursive features

Section 3 of CA in V.3 shows how Radio 3’s ethos has a fundamental influence on shaping the organisation of the programme and the broadcast interaction, particularly via JT's utterances, but also via the use of other radiophonic resources, such as the use of Radio 3 and ESV theme tracks. JT corroborates this point with his regular references to Radio 3 during the broadcast interviews (see section 3 of CA in V.3), showing the close discursive link between Radio 3’s ethos and ESV’s public arena of communication.

It is not strange then, that this issue becomes salient during the SSI, when JT recalls his interview with PG and reflects on how Radio 3 provided a communicative arena which surprised both PG and - more importantly for the progress of the interview - RS.

SSI Excerpt 11

JT: Peter Greenaway... I adore him. I mean, I adore his works, his cinema, his work [as a filmmaker]... Personally, I am tempted to think that he is quite conceited, smug, quite divine!, however, in essence, I have had, well, filmmakers, who I will not quote, whose importance, mistakes, divinity were similar to Greenaway's, so I was not surprised by that, you see? Something that may have surprised Greenaway, and may be the reason he began to insult me, is the freedom with which we speak on the radio network I belong to, Radio 3. But there, perhaps, the interpreter wasn’t quite on the mark, you see?

The evidence of the discursive layer of Radio 3’s ethos and how it may affect the interpreter-mediated interview is strengthened when we establish the connection between JT's comment in SSI Excerpt 11 and the actual broadcast interviews (e.g. Interview 2 utterances 262-264, Excerpt 7 in the CA of Interview 2, in which JT starts a monolingual dialogue with RS reflecting on how Radio 3 is unique in offering this kind of spaces for free and open dialogue). While RS uttered a generalisation about freedom of expression on Spanish radio as a whole, JT pointed out that he should tell PG that this was the case on Radio 3 for sure, but maybe not on other radio stations.

Although JT does not elaborate further on how Radio 3 is unique in creating this kind of
spaces for live interviews, the clarity and emphasis of this comment are in line with his constant references to Radio 3 during the broadcast interview, as well as with Radio 3’s approach to radio broadcasting (see chapter IV).

Throughout this section I have shown how the descriptive analysis (V.1 and V.2) and CA of a corpus of broadcast interviews (V.3) can be corroborated and, hence, strengthened in their validity. JT’s expertise in working with interpreters during more than 15 years of ESV, as well as his concern with the presence of foreign languages in interviews and the specificity of radio communication, Radio 3 and ESV, provide a solid basis for forming his own views on what is at stake with regards to the interpreter-mediated side of the broadcast. The SSI also evidences how the broad institutional context is not necessarily a constraint for the interaction, but a platform which makes it possible, an open field where the active participants - with the support of the institution and the production team - unfold the interaction in a joint exchange oriented to an overhearing audience.
Chapter VI. Findings and Discussion

This chapter provides an account of the findings from the four analysis sections and a further discussion relating these findings to the aims and objectives set out in the introduction to this thesis. The presentation of the findings is guided by the way in which the methodology and analysis, in chapters IV and V respectively, have served the purposes of meeting my objectives, that is: (1) a detailed account of the specificity of the organisation and production of broadcast events, specifically live interpreter-mediated interviews on Radio 3’s ESV, as an inroad to gaining knowledge about the existence and practices of interpreting on the radio; (2) a detailed account of the specific interactional features and patterns which result from the interpreter-mediated event taking place in both broad and local contexts; (3) the benefits of my model for analysis which produced original knowledge about a particular environment where interpreting happens and its potential application in further research.

The findings are set against the background of relevant academic literature discussed in chapters I, II and III with the purpose of elucidating the contributions of this research to the fields of IS and MS. The chapter also includes a section on the limitations of the study, a section where further avenues for public engagement resulting from this research are discussed and a final section with concluding remarks.

VI.1 Broadcaster's Attitudes, Production Aspects and Situational Arrangements

The study of five interviews as broadcast on Radio 3’s ESV reveal findings of a mixed quantitative-qualitative nature with regard to the production and organisation of interpreter-mediated events of this type:

- The data collection process and the subsequent creation of the descriptive tables (see V.1) documents a corpus of interpreter-mediated interviews which had gone unnoticed in IS and which suggests wider and more systematic approaches to the collection and categorisation of MI events, along the lines that I have followed in my study. Strong evidence supporting the latter claim is the amount of live interpreter-mediated broadcast hours on Radio 3, with a focus on ESV but also taking into account other Radio 3 programmes (see V.2 and RTVE 2012); this shows that Radio 3 is the radio station in Spain broadcasting the greatest amount of hours of live interpreter-mediated
interviews. Although no official figures are provided, the 23 episodes with interpreter-mediated interviews in ESV during 2013, out of a total of 203 interviews, alone provide evidence that this is the case. From a qualitative point of view, this fact does not only make Radio 3 a reference for analysing practices and rethinking previous assumptions about DI in MI and MI in general, which heavily relied on data taken from TV and ignored radio, but also a rich source of interpreter-mediated broadcast data, which is essential for testing and comparing hypotheses and claims, as well as making findings representative. To date, CorIT (Falbo 2012) and FOOTIE (Sandrelli 2012) have been the only solid and long-standing attempts to build a corpus of live interpreter-mediated broadcast events for academic research and training.130

- ESV's relatively regular broadcasting of interpreter-mediated live interviews (figure provided above) is explained by Radio 3's ethos (discussed in V.2), which makes this type of monographic interview of 15 minutes to 2 hours of duration possible, with a range of foreign languages involved (see IV.1), unique in its kind in the Spanish broadcasting landscape.

- The different stages in my analysis confirm unstandardised practices with regard to the provision of interpreters, the situational arrangements and the live broadcast output for the audience. This places interpreting on ESV at the ad hoc stage (Ozolins 2000) with regard to interpreting provision.

- Radio 3's ethos and conventional production practices leading to this ad hoc stage of interpreting provision entail a range of broad patterns of interactions and situational arrangements (see Tables 1-5), which consequently lead to a variety of interpreting modality patterns, as well as medium-specific strategies in respect of broadcasting language transfer, which I summarise in the following table:

130 Other studies using TV broadcast data, with a smaller and more specific corpus, in MI research include Ibrahim (2011), Jiménez Serrano (2011) and Bungeroth et al. (2006).
Table VI.1: *ESV* Live Interpreter-Mediated Interviews: Descriptive Framework of Practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>· Studio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Outdoors/ On Location Studio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Remote: Studio-to-studio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Remote: Studio to private home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad pattern of interaction</td>
<td>· Face-to-face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Face-to-face, multi-party interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Studio-to-studio connection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Phone connection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode of Interpreting</td>
<td>· Dialogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Mixed: Simultaneous/Dialogue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The significance of this table lies in broadening the previously documented spectrum of situational arrangements and broad patterns of interaction in MI. Attempts to describe the “backstage conditions” of TV interpreting (Jiménez Serrano 2011) and to categorise interpreter-mediated TV events and interviews (Alexieva 1999 and 2001, respectively) did not look into these aspects systematically. Table VI.1 above shows that the production arrangements under which *ESV* interpreter-mediated live interviews take place result in a wider and more complex MI landscape of interpreting practice - in organisational and interactional terms - than previously known.

- The prevalent interpreting modality in the analysed interviews is DI, with two occasions where a mixed system of DI and SI is used (Interviews 2 and 3). In both cases, the interpreting modality is chosen by the interpreters, based on their appraisal of the setting, heavily influenced by the situational arrangements and technical provisions which do not encourage the choice of SI, thus triggering interactional features and patterns of a specific nature (see below).

- The situational arrangements, technical provisions and ultimate live broadcast conditions lead to unique sound management strategies which are characterised by the constant monitoring and control of the interpreter's microphone volume and output, with the interpreter not having direct control over his/her microphone output (as opposed to SI in a conventional booth). This constant sound monitoring during the broadcast interview forces the interpreter and ST(s) to solve sound related problems via non-verbal communication, in a way that does not have a negative impact on the
broadcast talk-in-interaction and does not pose face threats to either the interpreter or the ST(s) (as shown in the analysis of Interview 5, V.3).

- The interpreter's management of public face in this specific type of situation is different from TV or Conference Interpreting, since the overhearing audience does not have visual access to what is going on on-stage.

- Contesting Gieve and Norton's generalisation regarding the negative trend in “broadcast representations of encounters across linguistic difference” (Gieve and Norton, 2007:207), Radio 3’s ESV does well when it comes to not avoiding, eliminating or obscuring the workings of cross-linguistic communication.

VI.2 Specific interactional phenomena, features and patterns

The CA of Interviews 1-5 has revealed a series of interactional phenomena, features and patterns which, although they may not all be specific to this setting, have a “unique fingerprint” (Heritage and Greatbatch, 1991:95-96; Heritage and Clayman, 2010:18) in the way they happen and the reasons why they happen, which is intrinsic to the three layers of the broad context (the medium, the institution and the programme) dealt with in the analysis.

- **Turn-taking organisation (public broadcasting motivated/oriented)**

The three layers discussed above (i.e. radio broadcasting, Radio 3 and ESV) largely contribute to shaping the way interlocutors design and/or produce turn-exchange devices. What can be observed through the CA of turn-taking and sequence organisation (V.3) is that before the rendition of propositional content across two languages in interaction (i.e. the basic task involved in ‘interpreting’), there are aspects of talk-in-interaction whose orientation to the radio broadcasting setting are as crucial for the interpreter as for any of the other active participants in the co-construction of talk for an overhearing audience.

Specifically, the live broadcast nature of the events covered in my data makes turn-taking much more relevant for the broadcast interaction than if it was edited or pre-recorded for a later broadcast. The fact that the setting and arrangements in all interviews anticipate a live broadcast gives way to turn-exchange systems with unique features and patterns in comparison with other settings reviewed in chapters I, II and III.
(i.e. in other DI and MI settings and in monolingual broadcast talk), such as: the use of non-verbal cues such as laughs, coughing and body language as devices for turn-taking, slight voice overlaps in turn-taking, as well as unstable patterns regarding the interpreting modality in use (e.g. Interviews 2-5). The following table summarises and categorises the most frequent turn-exchange patterns which primary interlocutors (host and guests) and interpreters use in order to integrate their interaction into the live radio broadcast talk, as analysed in section V.3 and following Jefferson’s (1984) model:
Table VI.2: Categorisation of Turn-Exchange Patterns in Interpreter-Mediated Live Radio Broadcast Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turn-allocation</th>
<th>Face-to-Face in Studio (Interview 1)</th>
<th>Face-to-Face Multi-Party talk (Studio on Location) (Interviews 3 and 5)</th>
<th>Phone / Studio Connection (Interpreter with FL Speaking Guest) (Interview 2)</th>
<th>Phone / Studio Connection (Interpreter with Host) (Interview 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Host</strong></td>
<td>- Clear transitional spaces via prosody</td>
<td>- Transitional / Recognitional spaces</td>
<td>- Recognitional spaces</td>
<td>- Clear transitional spaces via prosody</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FL Speaking Guest</strong></td>
<td>- Clear transitional spaces via prosody</td>
<td>- Recognitional spaces</td>
<td>- Clear transitional spaces via prosody and word speed</td>
<td>- Clear transitional spaces via prosody</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpreter</strong></td>
<td>- Clear transitional spaces with prosody and/or continuers</td>
<td>- Transitional / Recognitional spaces</td>
<td>- Transitional spaces with prosody and/or continuers - Recurrent hedges and hesitations leading to progressional onsets</td>
<td>- Clear transitional spaces to guest - Transitional / Recognitional spaces to host</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Turn-taking</strong></td>
<td>- Transitional onsets after interpreter - Progressional onsets after guest - Progressional onsets upon interpreter’s few hesitations</td>
<td>- Recognitional onsets</td>
<td>- Recognitional and progressional onsets via non-verbal devices (coughing, inbreathing) - Progressional onsets - Turn relinquishing over guests and/or interpreter’s onset</td>
<td>- Transitional / Recognitional onsets - Progressional onsets upon interpreter’s few hesitations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FL Speaking Guest</strong></td>
<td>- Transitional onsets - Recognitional onsets with minimal overlapping</td>
<td>- Recognitional onsets</td>
<td>- Recognational onsets</td>
<td>- Transitional onsets - Recognational onsets with minimal overlapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpreter</strong></td>
<td>- Transitional onsets - Turn relinquishing over host’s onset</td>
<td>- Recognitional / Progressional onsets</td>
<td>- Hesitating transitional onsets after guest - Turn relinquishing over guest’s onset</td>
<td>- Recognational onsets - Transitional onsets (particularly after requested to avoid overlap)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This table shows that interpreters resort to turn-exchange patterns which are closer to those of the host than the FL speaking guest, thus showing an adaptation to the medium. Table VI.2 also shows that face-to-face radio settings accommodate turn-exchange patterns which do not differ much between participants, whereas in non-face-to-face settings, differences are more common.

Turn-taking devices and patterns become strategic resources that are distinctive of interpreter-mediated radio interaction. Consequently, these specific turn-exchange systems also have an impact on the broadcast outputs which, for example, make post-editing strategies of the kind presented by Gieve and Norton (2007:207) for later repetitions or podcasting purposes nearly impossible. This is corroborated by the fact that the interviews included in my data, which were taken from the ESV podcast website (Interviews 2-5), are unedited as they were broadcast live.

- **Interpreter's management of relational and referential aspects between on-stage and off-stage levels of communication**

One of the unique systematic patterns of interaction found across my data via CA is the interpreter's unchallenged omission of audience-oriented propositional and relational content when rendering the host's moves to the interviewee, most frequently when DI is used. The interaction in Interview 1 is paradigmatic of this pattern, which does not go unnoticed even if the listener does not speak the foreign language, due to the considerable difference in utterance duration between the first and second utterance in the sequence. The time-saving strategy involved in these omissions shows the interpreter's active orientation to the audience and the medium, which takes precedence over the interaction on-stage with the primary interlocutors.

This strategy is replicated by the STs when interpreters opt for SI into the foreign language, i.e. they tend to lower the interpreter's microphone output sound, or even mute it, in order to improve the audience's listening experience. This strategy responds to the 'comfort factor', as conceptualised by Katan and Straniero Sergio (2001 and 2003).

- **Public face and interactional co-operation to produce talk during the interview**

The comfort factor also explains strategies in the on-stage triad for the production of
talk for the overhearing audience during the interview. The active participants show their “interactional know-how” (Heritage, 2004:238) in order to accomplish their purposes (whether particular or general) during the broadcast talk. In my data, I have found specific and systematic patterns of interaction which go along the following lines:

- An overt and active avoidance of overlapping talk, which involves strategies such as frequent use of prosodic devices in turn-completion for the interpreter's smooth turn-taking and frequent attempts (successful and unsuccessful) to take turns via gentle coughing, both of which also involve an avoidance of threats to the other interlocutors' public face.

- The host, as the communication professional in charge of the unfolding broadcast talk-in-interaction, shows overt alignment strategies towards the interpreter when needed for broadcasting purposes, such as relinquishing his own turn to let the interpreter or the interviewee talk, encouraging other people to relinquish their turn or encouraging more rapid exchange of turns, verbally and non-verbally, for example to move the interview on, to change the participation framework or just to end the interview. Crucially, repair and reorganisation strategies of the host to the interpreter tend to take place when he considers that the flow of communication - in his appraisal of the ‘comfort factor’ - is at stake for the audience (Interviews 2 and 3 are paradigmatic for the use of these patterns by JT).

- The position of the interpreter throughout the interview is largely influenced by the conditions of his/her provision and the situational arrangements. Analysis sections V.1 and V.3 show how different interactional dynamics are found between the interpreter and the primary interlocutors across the five interviews based on those two factors. Furthermore, CA provides evidence that the interpreter's experience within the medium and, to a lesser extent, his/her knowledge of the institutional setting, explain different levels of awareness, engagement and orientation to the radio broadcast event he/she is interacting in. If the interpreter showed little awareness of these communicative aspects, this did not go unnoticed by the host (as corroborated in section V.4), who then tended to show frustration and interactional distrust in him/her (Interview 2 being a paradigmatic example of this pattern).
- Power differentials surfaced quite notably because of the participants' physical position and geographical location and how they could interact with each other. When the host and the guest's agendas or interests collided, physical proximity became a powerful tool for the interaction. This phenomenon is also present in other DI fields, but the ways in which it manifested in the live public radio interviews in my data via specific turn-taking and face-saving devices had not previously been noted.

- In this respect, a relevant finding lies in the fact that media institutions such as Radio 3 offer a space for the interpreter which is open and liberating, rather than constrained in its broadcasting scope (both in terms of the interpreter's participation and the eventual broadcast of the interpreter's utterances). As stated by JT (see V.4), creativity is at the heart of Radio 3, and this aspect of its ethos is extended to the interpreter when he/she takes part in ESV's interviews.

VI.3 Limitations of the study

In spite of the findings and contributions to the field discussed in this chapter, a series of limitations of my study must be taken into account in order to avoid inappropriate extrapolation of my analysis and findings:

- Firstly, limitations regarding data size and representativeness: as described in IV.1, the broadcast data (whether filmed or not) in my study accounts for a relatively small number of interpreter-mediated Radio 3 interviews. The issue of where and when to stop gathering data arises. Baker (2006:28) argues that the more specific the context or subject matter is, the more limited the corpus can be (cf. Mason 2000). Furthermore, it must be taken into account that the selection of data is essential and its full description and justification is crucial for making the most of the analysis, while being aware that the extrapolation of the findings can best be achieved with a model for analysis which is applicable to other radio settings.

- The corpus of broadcast interviews in my study covers one radio programme from one radio station. Although the methodological and analytical advantages of this choice have already been detailed, the disadvantages cannot be ignored. First of all, there is a danger of falling into excessive generalisations to the
broader radio landscape. For example, state-owned radio stations in other countries, such as BBC Radio or Radio France, tend not to use live DI for interpreter-mediated interviews (although, like RNE, they do not have a written policy on this topic); both radio broadcasting institutions tend to take recourse to what is called “near live” or edit the interview so that the interpreter's voice is made to sound like simultaneous interpreting, or even a second interpretation of the recorded interview for the purposes of broadcasting. These types of interpreter-mediated radio broadcast interview do not fall within the scope of my research. This is why Interview 6 (see Table 6, V.1) is included as an example of other interpreter-mediated events which are also covered in ESV but which go beyond my research aims and subsequent analysis. Its inclusion is purely informative.

- The primary data consist of radio broadcast talk-in-interaction. With the exception of the use of video footage of one of the broadcast interviews, the analysis mainly relies on the broadcast interaction of Interviews 1-5.

Radio communication, as any other type of human interaction, is much more than words. The use of orally produced data which is transcribed will always raise the issue of how to integrate into the analysis the interactional work of non-verbal communication and organisational aspects, such as the situational arrangements. This is why filming interpreter-mediated radio interviews becomes crucial for widening the scope and depth of the analysis and for obtaining more solid results (cf. Turner and Harrington 2009). Having this visual support is of particular relevance in the context of radio, where communication between the audience and the medium (the off-stage and on-stage levels) is based on voice and sound (with the help of technology) and the audience does not have access to non-verbal communication taking place in the

---

131 Cf. Gieve and Norton (2007), also in chapter II.

studio. This has been tackled by accessing the visuals of that interaction, although for one out of five interviews in my data.

VI.4 Public Engagement and Further Avenues for Research

Throughout this doctoral thesis I hope to have shed light on a situated field of interpreting activity which had not been comprehensively approached before. Consequently, I aim to pave the way for further research in this field and contribute with public engagement activities related to training and knowledge exchange issuing from my methodology, analysis and findings. With regard to the latter, I propose the following training and knowledge exchange outcomes of my research.

- The creation of systematised corpus data from broadcast radio interviews for deepening research into organisational, interactional and discursive aspects, as well as considering authentic material of this kind for training purposes (cf. de Manuel Jerez 2003 and de Manuel Jerez and Sandrelli 2007), starting with live radio interviews on Radio 3 and continuing with further interpreter-mediated radio events from Radio 3, RNE and elsewhere.

- The inclusion of radio interpreting workshops and courses as part of interpreting training programmes at university level, both undergraduate and postgraduate, which constitute a basic point of departure for interpreter-training in this specific field.

- The expansion of the collaboration with ESV and Radio 3 for training courses with radio professionals (producers, presenters, journalists, sound technicians etc.) and interpreters, so as to guarantee a knowledgeable approach to interpreter-mediated events from all participants involved in their production and broadcast, with the aim of an improved listening experience for the audience. The organisation of innovative programmes and workshops along these lines has shown encouraging research-based initiatives, such as ARTE TV’s occasional training programmes133 (cf. Krone 2010, 2012), which could well be replicated in radio broadcasting.

- The creation of interpreting guidelines and policies in collaboration with broadcasters, including provision of interpreters, technical arrangements and standards, and ethical considerations. This is an issue that involves long-term collaboration between interpreters

and radio broadcasters, producers, journalists and other professionals involved in interpreter-mediated radio interviews (e.g. sound technicians and press officers), as well as researchers in the field. Therefore, in the interest of public engagement, the following draft of proposed guidelines for radio broadcasters, producers, hosts and interpreters is intended to open a discussion of the topic.

VI.4.1 Draft Proposal of Guidelines for Radio Broadcasters, Producers, Hosts and Interpreters for the Production and Broadcast of Interpreter-Mediated Live Radio Interviews

1. Organisation and arrangements prior to the broadcast

- Budgets, provision and hiring protocols

Radio stations with programmes including live interviews requiring an interpreter on a regular basis can allocate a budget for interpreting provision, and then hire either in-house or freelance interpreters. The latter are especially appropriate for stations or programmes that involve a wide range of foreign languages. A study of the potential language needs is generally recommended, involving both an exhaustive analysis of the frequency and linguistic diversity of previous years’ interpreter-mediated events and an assessment of potential future needs. When hiring freelance workers, a register of qualified and experienced interpreters in radio - and other media - settings could be created, either by broadcasting companies themselves or, preferably, by bodies external to individual radio stations or broadcasting companies.

Collaboration between partner stations within the broader broadcasting company - in the case of Radio 3, RTVE - is also an option. The company can, for example, include the radio stations as beneficiaries of the interpreting services and budget, making it possible to share in-house interpreters when required. This is particularly advisable in the context of increasing budgetary constraints in public broadcasting (see section V.2.3.1).

A proactive attitude and advance planning can make it easier to incorporate interpreting into the production from the very early stages, for example by budgeting for it early on. As research in other fields of T/I (such as Audiovisual Translation, cf. Romero-Fresco 2012) shows, when multilingualism is an intrinsic part of communication in media institutions, T/I issues should be included in the budget. For example, ARTE allocates

---

134 In the particular case of ESV, it would make sense to have this registry for freelance recruitment for languages such as English, French, Italian, Farsi, Japanese and German.
7% of its overall budget to T/I services - or the “second language version” (ARTE 2007). With an estimation of half of it being allocated for interpreting (i.e. 3.5%), for public broadcasting companies, such as RTVE, it is therefore recommended that the budget fall within that range, or to follow a proportional budget allocation drawing on the interpreting needs of the company.135

Events are also an opportunity for radio stations to collaborate. Event organisers and other institutions can share interpreting costs. In cases where event organisers cover the full cost of interpreting services, the radio station should acknowledge this either in the broadcast or on the podcast website (see details below in point 3).

Where the interpreter is hired by the event organiser, rather than the radio station, he/she should be informed about the conditions of the agreement between the two institutions. It is recommended that the responsibility for establishing said agreement and liaising with the interpreter fall on the event’s press officer and the radio programme’s producer.

If a professional and experienced interpreter is not available for a live interview, ad hoc solutions have to be found. Communication professionals (i.e. journalists and radio presenters) can rely on colleagues who speak foreign languages and are experts on the subject matter (as is the case in Interview 2). Other solutions seen in Radio 3 are using students of language and/or interpreting, or fellow journalists. Although these solutions are best avoided, if the programme’s host (as a communication professional) still believes that the interview can take place using ad hoc interpreters, the producer and/or host should make those interpreters aware of the complexities of the medium, the subject matter and the type of interview.

- Technical provisions (chair, microphones, headphones) and situational arrangements

Technical provisions for the interpreter, such as headphones, a microphone and a physical location where he/she has visual access to both the host and the guest(s) (in the

135 Although RTVE has an in-house interpreter and hires freelance interpreters for some TV programmes (cf. Castillo 2015), the company does not publish the financial allocation for T/I services. Applying the EU model to the RTVE budget for 2016 (where interpreting, including both spoken and signed languages, and translation receive an equal share, see Prensa RTVE 2015) 0.5% of the annual budget would mean a total of €1,994,435 for interpreting staff expenses and interpreting-related investments (technology, logistics, etc). However, as Javier Tolentino (SSI) confirms, Radio 3 currently has no budget at all for interpreting. This budget estimation and allocation would allow stations such as Radio 3 to cover interpreting needs, certainly with more independence and decision-making power than is currently the case.
case of face-to-face interviews), can be arranged beforehand. The interpreter should also have visual and audio access to the STs.\textsuperscript{136}

In cases where the live interview cannot take place face-to-face, provisions have to be made for an interpreter who is either with the host or with the guest at one end of the line. My research shows that physical proximity between the host and the interpreter allows for smoother turn-coordination from the host, who is in charge of the radio interview. If the interpreter is with the guest at the other end of the studio/phone line, the interview can still take place and this should not be considered an obstacle. However, it must be noted that coordination tasks and power relations can be drastically different and, therefore, an extra effort to establish communication with the interpreter prior to the interview and off-air during the live broadcast is not only advisable, but necessary in order to guarantee that all participants share a common ground for the broadcast interaction.

- Communication with Sound Technicians

STs should check if the interpreter is familiar with the usual sound arrangements for that particular radio broadcast, as well as give guidelines with regard to microphone output volume and headphone input. A sound check with the interpreter prior to the broadcast should be common practice. During the broadcast, if interpreters and/or the STs encounter sound problems, off-air time and, depending on the specific issue, non-verbal communication off-stage can be used to solve those problems, taking advantage of the communicative possibilities offered by the radio setting.

- Interpreting modality

There are different modalities which can be used in live radio interviews: Dialogue Interpreting (DI), Simultaneous Interpreting (SI) and a mixed model of DI/SI. They have different interactional and technical consequences for the broadcast event, which participants, including the interpreter, should be aware of. In the absence of established policies and technical arrangements which favour one modality over the others, it is recommended that the interpreter chooses the interpreting modality, based on his/her

\textsuperscript{136} Images 4, 9 and 10, section V.3, pages 280 and 283 respectively, are an example of good practice in terms of physical and technical arrangements for the interpreter.
judgement of the physical arrangements, as well as time constraints, such as the expected duration of the interview. The host’s/producer’s judgement, as well as the technical possibilities with regard to sound management, can be crucial for the interpreter’s decision. Following my research, a mixed model of DI/SI is recommended for live radio interviews, taking consecutive turns when interpreting into the radio station’s official language, and using SI when interpreting for the FL speaker, lowering the volume for the interpreter’s output, thus reducing the time during which the audience is exposed to FL sound input on the one hand and overlapping talk on the other hand. For this modality, fast, dynamic turn exchanges and relatively short turns (below 20 seconds on average) are recommended, particularly from the interpreter and the host, the main coordinators of the talk exchange.

SI is to be avoided in this setting, since the absence of interpreting booths in radio studios make the use of this modality a form of chuchotage, which is fairly intrusive for both the participants on-stage and the audience.

For interviews where broadcast participants do not have visual contact, DI is highly recommended across the whole interview, also avoiding long turns (over 20 seconds) which might affect the dynamism and audience comfort factor if exposed to too much FL speaking time. As my research shows, the absence of visual contact between interlocutors is highly likely to make overlapping talk between broadcast participants interacting over a studio or telephone line more unsettling and disturbing, as well as making sound management more complex for STs.

- Rapport building

Overall, given the specificity of radio stations, programmes and hosts (cf. section V.2), it is highly advisable to allow for a briefing between interpreter and host (and or producer) - including the guest and STs whenever possible - before the live broadcast. These off-air conversations allow participants to build a rapport that can be crucial once they are on-air. The interpreter can use this time to check the organisation of turns at talk, the modality of interpreting and the sound output with the host and STs. Establishing these arrangements in advance can help the live broadcast run smoothly
from the beginning of the interview. In radio settings, as in other settings, interpreters should never be expected to perform without some form of prior briefing.

2. Framing and developing the interview during the broadcast

- Interpreting modality

Participants must be aware of the interactional implications of their chosen interpreting modality. It is also worth noting that the interpreting modality can be adapted to the medium’s ethos and the framing of the interaction. For example, DI leaves interlocutors the choice between using the first or third person. Hosts can choose to make the interpreter present at all moments in the interview by addressing him/her directly as a full participant in the interview, thus making the use of the third person - or some form of reported speech - necessary both for the interpreter and for the primary interlocutors when addressing each other. Furthermore, the use of the first person does not guarantee that the interpreter is not addressed directly. In these cases, the interpreter should adopt strategies which clarify to the audience who he/she is talking on behalf of.

- Technical and interactional problems during the broadcast

When technical problems or issues of an interactional nature arise (i.e. turn system repairs, new participants in the interview) off-air time can be used to solve them. While these issues are solved, music or other sound effects can be played in order to not disturb the audience comfort and attention. Otherwise, overexposure of the interpreter in the broadcast may increase his/her stress and affect his/her concentration, attention and delivery skills.

- Interpreter’s interaction

Interpreters’ interactional engagement with the primary interlocutors, but also with the radio station/programme’s arena and ethos of broadcasting, is crucial for the smooth and successful progress of the interview. Key factors in this engagement are the use of linguistic and prosodic devices which are suited to the specific radio broadcasting station, programme and event, sharing talk coordination tasks with the host to produce the talk-in-interaction that the broadcasting institution aims for, and interacting with the FL speaking guest without affecting the communication with the audience. In this regard, as argued above, more previous contact with the interpreter will lead to more
communicative engagement and commitment to the broadcasting institution and the live interaction on-air.

3. Acknowledging the interpreter’s work

My research shows that in radio settings the interpreter appears to the audience at the same level of on-stage communication as the primary interlocutors. This means that the interpreter has the same interactional space and opportunities to influence the interaction and therefore shares the responsibility for the success of the broadcast interview. This has a series of implications with regard to the interpreter’s status which should be taken into account particularly by radio broadcasting institutions and professionals working with interpreters:

- The interpreter’s status as a communication expert and/or professional is to be recognised by broadcasting institutions. This is of particular relevance as a basic step towards raising standards of quality and to establish protocols for hiring interpreters.

- Radio broadcasting institutions should put as much effort as possible into making the interpreter feel that he/she is integrated into the broadcasting production and not just an isolated service provider. This is especially relevant when interpreters are not familiar with the broadcasting institution and programme, e.g. if they accompany the FL speaking guest and are not given enough time to become familiar with the radio institution/programme.

- The way the interpreter is credited and/or quoted during the live interview should be arranged with him/her beforehand, taking into account issues of confidentiality, privacy and intellectual property. At the moment, there is no policy, either by public service media or by any governmental organisation - at a national or international level - that establishes the status of what is said by an interpreter in a media event. Therefore, the suggested guideline above aims at starting protocols of public communication which consider potential ethical and legal aspects and also make the interpreters accountable for their interaction in the media.

- With the interpreter’s permission and also depending on his/her contractual terms, it is recommended that radio broadcasters inform the audience about which institutions or companies have enabled the presence of the interpreter in the interview. This
encourages accountability not only by the interpreter but also by the hiring institutions/companies. Particularly in public service broadcasting companies, such as Radio 3, it contributes to greater transparency for the listeners. This information could be provided either live during the broadcast or on the podcast website.

The benefits of the above guidelines, which should serve as a platform for future discussion and improvement with all stakeholders, will be felt not only in the quality of the live broadcast interaction, but also in terms of the radio interpreter’s status and, ultimately, in making this type of events happen. Guidelines along the lines of those presented here also encourage broadcasters and producers to consider the audience comfort factor beyond monolingual terms, where linguistic differences and diversity would be avoided and/or hidden. Finally, the existence of these guidelines can contribute to developing further specific training for interpreters in radio settings (within the broader context of mass media settings) and selection criteria for employment.

Concerning further research on radio interpreting, I am aware that more representative and wider results can be produced by enlarging the corpus with more live interviews from different programmes and stations, as well as across countries. In this regard, further research is suggested along the following lines:

- My research has approached the radio context comprehensively, that is to say from a socio-linguistic and multimodal perspective, shedding light on production issues around the radio interpreting activity, as well as expectations, goals, etc., which had not been tackled before in this context. By showing these contextual specificities, as well as their interactional outcomes (such as turn-taking, the use of prosodic features of language, space and time constraints affecting the speed of delivery, the dynamism of the interaction, the meaning and use of silence, the use of contextual markers, face-threatening acts, power relationships and alignments, among others), this research could help to corroborate the need for interpreters with high communicative skills, quite close to the level of broadcasters.
- The assessment and eventual application of this methodology to other broadcasting cultures (i.e. BBC, Radio France, etc.) which may have different approaches to MI, as pointed out by Gieve and Norton (2007).

- The carrying out of comparative studies aiming to show different realities and approaches to interpreter-mediated radio interviews in different radio stations and countries, hence increasing the diversity of approaches and phenomena across the radio framework. The brief comparison of the analysis of Interviews 2 and 4 (see V. 3), which showed a considerable difference in the interactional dynamics in each exchange, largely due to the different physical position of the interpreter, points to the advantageousness of deeper comparative analyses of turn-taking, proxemics and power-related issues in live radio interviews and elsewhere in MI.

- With regards to ethics, I will not raise the debate on the need for a media interpreter's code of ethics or code of practice in the terms put forward by AIIC or the UK ITI (AIIC 2012, ITI 2013); however, it must be highlighted that to date none of the media institutions I have approached (RTVE, RTVA and BBC) have such a code. In general, they implicitly expect the interpreter to ‘bring’ his/her professional code of conduct. It would be interesting to find out if they apply a journalist/presenter code of ethics. This debate was raised in an event organised by the Chartered Institute of Linguists devoted to MI in London (2012), with examples of British and German talk shows, where a code of ethics for interpreters also does not exist. Although issues of ethics have been dealt with in literature on MI (i.e. television, cf. Kurz and Pöchhacker 1995, Kurz 2002 and Katan and Straniero Sergio 2001), this is an ongoing question where research and practice have yet to bridge some gaps.

VI.5 Concluding Remarks

In addition to the findings related to organisational and interactional aspects of interpreting on Radio 3's ESV, taking into account the limitations of the study while acknowledging the requirements for further research and possibilities of public engagement issuing from my study, what follows is a summary of the contributions that this thesis offers to knowledge and research:
A key point issuing from my study is the observation that Radio 3’s proactive decisions - whether coming from programmers, producers or programme hosts - to cover events involving interpreter-mediated interviews with guests coming from a wide range of cultures and languages are at the heart of the broadcasting of such events.

Overall, from an interactional point of view, CA of my data interviews shows that in this type of radio interpreting events, how the interpreter copes with the communicative setting and orients to other participants has more influence on the unfolding of the broadcast interaction than the rendition of propositional content itself which, in my data, hardly creates interactional problems or controversies. In my study, crucially, the interpreter contributes to shifts in the interactional balance - of turns, power asymmetries, alignments and so on -, depending on his/her physical position, and his/her perception, engagement and orientation to the specific radiophonic arena and ethos of Radio 3 and ESV. The model and structure of the analysis of interpreter-mediated events which I have followed have been key in unveiling aspects of interpreters’ engagement with the radio setting where they were interacting.

In this regard, the methodology that I have developed and put into practice in chapter V has informed these findings in ways that a single method (i.e. CA only, or semi-structured interviews only) could not. There are, therefore, a series of methodological gains offered by the categorisation of interpreter-mediated events via a descriptive table model and the use of visuals and semi-structured interviews which supplement CA as the core methodological tool.

First, without any intention to extrapolate my findings to a generalisation of what radio interpreting is, the recording of a broadcast radio programme and a semi-structured interview with JT, as the participant who is present throughout Interviews 1-5 and who has a complete picture of interpreter-mediated events on ESV, revealed aspects of the communicative setting and interaction which otherwise would have remained unknown in IS, such as: the negotiation of situational arrangements immediately prior to the broadcast; how the interpreter manages sound problems and communicates non-verbally with the ST(s) while on-air; the value of off-air moments
for dealing with interpreting-related issues such as physical positions, sound arrangements, communicating institutional background or building rapport; the interpreter's use of non-verbal communication and face work in on/off-stage communication; the status given to the interpreter, as shown by communication - or the lack of it - with him/her off-air, which crucially involves the interpreter's provision (prior to the interview), his/her location and position (during the interview).

Second, in addition to filming interpreter-mediated radio interviews for the purposes of gathering non-verbal interactional moves, any information and opinion provided by the participants in the interaction and by media stakeholders (i.e. broadcasters, interpreters, producers, sound technicians, etc.) enriches the analysis, consolidates hypotheses and reveals new aspects of the interaction taking place which might otherwise remain hidden to the researcher, or might only be intuitively inferred with access only to the broadcast interviews.

Third, it is nonetheless of the same relevance to note that a study of programmes with no commercial constraints, a public service vocation and more independence with regard to content creation and invitation of guests than commercial radio stations (see V.2 and V4), such as ESV, is evidence of the fact that interpreter-mediated interviews happening under these institutionally situated circumstances are highly open and creative in terms of their organisation prior to and during the broadcast. This aspect goes hand in hand with the station's/programme's openness to foreign languages and guests, resulting in more interpreter-mediated air-time than any commercial and mainstream radio station in Spain and thus challenging current research on MI, which has virtually presented TV interpreting as the standard practice of MI. The field of practice - and therefore, the needs and opportunities for research - is much wider and complex than was thought before the completion of this thesis.
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Appendix 1: Table Model for the Descriptive Analysis of Interpreter-Mediated Live Radio Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme details:</th>
<th>Radio 3 (RTVE): <em>El Séptimo Vicio</em>. Interview with …</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration of the whole episode:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration of the interpreter-mediated interview:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title on <em>El Séptimo Vicio’s</em> podcast website:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional episode metadata: details included on the podcast website.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of interview:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Broadcast participants:</td>
<td>[Name and initials for easier referencing]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Sound management: |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Broad contextual factors:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organisational and situational arrangements prior to the interview</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Interpreter provider: |

| Reasons for interview: |

| Participants' location: |

| Broad pattern of interaction: |

| Outline of participation frameworks and structure: |
Subtable Table Model:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Further interviews within this category and broad pattern of interaction:</th>
<th>Date (1st broadcast)</th>
<th>Languages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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Appendix 2: Model for Analysis of Interpreter-Mediated Live Radio Interviews

1. Broadcast production and situational arrangements prior to and during the interview: influence on the overall interaction

   a) Setting up the participation framework: host's introduction to the talk-show and interview

   b) Turn-taking organisation (medium-motivated/oriented)
      
      b1) Interpreting modality: influence of the organisation of the setting and the participation frameworks

      b2) Broadcasting the interpreter-mediated exchange: sound management

   c) Off-air interaction

2. Participants' orientation to Public Radio Broadcast talk-in-interaction

   a) Turn-taking organisation (public broadcasting motivated/oriented)

   b) Sequence organisation and co-construction

      b1) Interpreter's management of relational and referential aspects between on-stage and off-stage levels of communication

      b2) Interactional co-operation to produce talk during the interview

      b2i) Turn transition and completion via the use of prosodic devices

      b2ii) Turn appraisal via gentle coughing/inbreaths

      b2iii) Speed in turn-taking

      b2iv) Overlapping talk

      b2v) Explicit turn repair or re-organisation

   c) Public Face

      c1) Turn design: Addressing the interpreter's interaction

      c2) Participation shifts

      c2i) Use of first and third person with face-protection purposes

      c2ii) Non-verbal face-saving devices: backchannelling and laughing

   d) Lexical choice

      d1) Marking self and others

      d2) Interpreter's appraisal of the institutional setting

      d2i) Via his/her own tenor as audience design
When explicitly referenced by the host

e) Power
   e1) Asymmetries of participation
   e2) Subverting the host’s power
   e3) The interpreter’s appraisal of the primary interlocutors power differentials: alignments
   e4) The interpreter’s position and status

3. Broadcast talk: institutional framework and institutional discursive features

4. Corroboration: Semi-structured interview with the host

4.1. Broadcast production and organisational aspects prior to and during the interview- Interpreting modality: influenced by the organisation of the setting and the participation frameworks
   - Broadcasting the interpreter-mediated exchange: sound management
   - Turn-taking and off-air interaction

4.2. Public broadcast talk-in-interaction
   - Turn-taking and sequence organisation (public broadcasting motivated/oriented)
   - Public Face
   - Power
   - The interpreter’s position and status

4.3. Broadcast talk: institutional framework and institutional discursive features
Appendix 3: Semi-Structured Interview Outline

Background information:

Can you describe the programmes you have presented/broadcast which need an interpreter: topic, style, documentary, series...?

How often do you require an interpreter in your programme/interviews?

What are the most common foreign languages to be interpreted?

Is there any common procedure to hire/call/look for an interpreter?

Who is in charge of deciding how the interpreting will be delivered, and then edited to be broadcast?

Working with an interpreter:

Before any interview is carried out, what is your relation with the interpreter?

Do you usually have the chance to talk to him/her?

Do you give him/her any guidelines? Do you talk about the topic, the interviewee...?

How is the interpreting carried out: consecutively, simultaneously?

If you have worked with both, what do you think that are the advantages and disadvantages of each of them?

What do you think is the reason for choosing Consecutive Interpreting or Simultaneous Interpreting?

- Common procedure
- Communicative preferences
- Technical constraints/considerations

How is the interpreted utterance broadcast: live, edited, recorded, re-recorded by a broadcaster?
Could you elaborate on the editing process?
Could you say what is in your view the best way to manage the interpreter-mediated-event for a radio programme?

Have you ever been your 'own' interpreter in an interview? If so, how did it go?

Has the audience ever commented on any broadcast interpreter's utterance?

**The relation between the broadcaster and the interpreter:**

In general, what do you expect from an interpreter?

Does the interpreter do other tasks other than 'translating' linguistic content, i.e. arranging interviews, contacting people? There is the concept of the 'fixer'? Could you describe this role?

Are usually the interpreters that you have worked with aware of the communicative skills and constraints of the radio context/event? How do you help them to integrate into this context?

Did you ever repair or correct an interpreter because of his/her delivery? Have you ever noticed a content mistake or misunderstanding and how was it dealt with, particularly in a live programme?

How would you describe the relationship between the interpreter and the interviewee? Do you think it is as important as the relation with the broadcaster?

Was there any conflict with the interpreter because of the topic, the context or other considerations?
Appendix 4: Transcription symbols

[] Simultaneous or overlapping talk

// Talk overlapped with music or ambient sound

(laughs) Non-verbal feature

(.hhh) Inbreath

[(laughs)] Non-verbal feature overlapping with talk

(lau[ghs]) Non-verbal feature overlapping with talk partially

(1sec pause) Pause indicating time gap in seconds

(.) Short pause (less than one second)

eh: Long or lengthened sound

… Open-ended intonation (fading or ambiguous tone)

↑ Upward tone

downward tone

Under Emphasis or stress

i Exclamating or animated intonation (which might not finish as an exclamation)

! Exclamation or animated tone

¿ Questioning intonation (which might not finish as a question)

---

138 The transcription symbols used here are common to conversation analytic research, although they are adapted from a more detailed set of transcription symbols developed by Jefferson (see Jefferson 2005). In line with Mason (1999), the symbols in use are adapted to the delicacy of transcription needed for the analysis. A more detailed discussion of the use of these symbols is provided in Chapter IV on Data and Methodology.
? Questioning intonation (it does not necessarily indicate a question)

XXX Inaudible

[very…] Guess at an unclear word or utterance

XX: Undetermined speaker.

*italics* Word sharply cut off and unfinished, usually repaired by the next word

¶ Line break. Speaker turns to talk to other active participant within the same utterance.

(238) Utterance or action marking its numerical position in the overall communicative event

#Singing# Music lyrics or film soundtrack, relevant for the talk-in-interaction. Only verbal transcription applied.

*[italics]* English back-translation of talk in other languages. Transcription symbols are kept only in the original. Standard punctuation applied in the back-translation

→ Line in transcript referred to in transcription

[…] Utterance or sequence continues but not included in the excerpt because it is considered irrelevant for the ongoing analysis.

**Note:** standard punctuation symbols, such as commas, colons, semi-colons, inverted commas, etc., are used with their usual meaning when they convey non-verbal features.
Appendix 5: Transcription of Semi-Structured Interview Javier Tolentino, 17\textsuperscript{th} June 2010, Granada

Total filmed interview time: 25'18''

[Answer to first question by Geraldine Comte -unrecorded: “Could you tell me your name and position?”]

00'03''-01'18'' (tape 7-3)
Javier Tolentino:
Mi nombre es Javier Tolentino, me dedico al periodismo radiofónico básicamente, y sobre todo al periodismo cinematográfico. Eh... varios años llevamos... vamos a cumplir once años de El séptimo vicio, un lugar en Radio 3 para la difusión, la opinión, la información, el mejor cine posible, que es el cine en el que creemos. Como el cine en el que creemos, el cine posible, es un cine que viene de India, de Afganistán, de Mongolia, de Turquía, de Afganistán, de Irán, de Irak, de Mozambique, de Sudán, de Eritrea, de Senegal, de Costa de Marfil, de Sudáfrica... pues la verdad es que los idiomas, las lenguas, eh..., nos hacen a veces dificultades, o nos ponen en dificultades y necesitamos muchísimo de la traducción, y más que de la traducción, de la interpretación. Es nuestro gran aliado: el micrófono, el sonido y la traducción y la interpretación.

01'19-01'22''
Question:
¿Cuáles son los idiomas predominantes?

01'25''-02'57
Javier Tolentino:
En la radio, el idioma, fundamentalmente, por supuesto aparte del español, es el inglés y el francés. Después vendrían el italiano, el alemán... y a partir de ahí, el arco iris espectacular de los idiomas de África... y de los idiomas como el farsi, ¡por ejemplo! Daros cuenta que... que el cine iraní es una de las grandes cinematografías del mundo y que el farsi es fundamental.
Yo puedo hablar en inglés, algo en francés y en italiano, y en portugués. Pero claro, el hablar no significa traducción simultánea, y mucho menos la interpretación.
Y..., bueno, cuando un periodista tanto de radio como de televisión -no de prensa, porque sí puede valerse con la soltura que pueda tener en un idioma como el inglés o el francés-, pero, en el directo, tanto en la radio como en la televisión, ¡es un arte!, es una joya, ¿no?, el poder no solamente traducir sino interpretar y más... más que nada en el cine, que es una de las... de los medios, bueno, un idioma, una escritura bastante difícil, en el que los conceptos... hay que conocer conceptos, hay que conocer el lenguaje propio del cine, y también incluso de la belleza y del arte. Y ahí es donde, quizá ponen, se pone a prueba un buen intérprete, un buen traductor.

02'58''-03'01''
Question:
¿Cuál es la política de selección de intérpretes?

03'01''-03'03''
Javier Tolentino:
¿Cuál es la qué, perdona?

03'03''-03'05''
Question (clarification):
La política de selección.

03'08''-03'58''
Javier Tolentino:
Hoy, hoy por ejemplo hemos podido tener una prueba de lo que es una buena interpretación en la radio, ¿no?: entrevistamos a una actriz, a la mejor actriz del cine iraní y la intérprete, yo no la conocía, apenas, ¿no?, un reto, pero, sin embargo, nos hemos entendido enseguida; ¿por qué? Por que es una mujer que no solamente que traduce y que interpreta bien, sino que tiene pasión por el trabajo que hace. Entonces, la primera, la primera clave, el primer punto para elegir a un buen intérprete es que sepa uno que le apasiona el oficio de traducir y de interpretar, que le apasione su oficio. A partir de ahí va a haber
un buen guiño ya profesional: a mí me apasiona el cine, al intérprete le apasiona la traducción, ¡seguro que va a salir bien!

03'58''-04'04''
Question:
¿Eres tú quien se encarga de dar las pautas de interpretación o quienes?

04'04''-05'15'' (end of tape 7-3)
Javier Tolentino:
Bueno, digamos que hay dos cosas: primero, estábamos hablando de la interpretación creativa, pero hay una interpretación que la limita o la condiciona el medio, el soporte.
No es lo mismo traducir o interpretar para la televisión, para la prensa escrita, para una Web, para una conferencia, que hacerlo para la radio. Entonces, la radio es... la base es la palabra y, bueno, hay diferentes planos de sonido, y a mi siempre me gusta la naturalidad en la interpretación y también a la hora de hacer la radio.
Por eso siempre me pongo de acuerdo, yo, a título personal, con el intérprete; primero en la necesidad técnica de la interpretación y luego en la creación de la interpretación, en el directo, en el cómo va a ser la entrevista, en el cómo quiero los guiños hacia el entrevistado, ¿no? Es muy importante, esas dos conversaciones.
Claro, con Pedro no ha hecho falta porque ya nos conocemos de hace tiempo y él sabe de los giros, de los guiones, de la naturalidad que yo pido en la traducción y en la interpretación.

00'02''-00'08'' (Tape 7-4)
Question:
¿Cuáles son las instrucciones previas? ¿Intentas hablar antes siempre con el intérprete?

00'08''-01'55''
Javier Tolentino:
Siempre. Intento hablar antes con el intérprete porque me parece que todos... que los dos queremos la misma cosa. Eh... de todas formas, me llevo mal con los intérpretes que entienden la interpretación, la traducción como algo... como un traductor de Google, como un traductor simultáneo; no, yo no quiero ese tipo de intérprete. Yo quiero intérpretes apasionados por su trabajo, que conozcan la radio, que les guste hablar en público, que les guste establecer comunicación, que les importe el otro. Pues con estos intérpretes, ¡es fundamental hablar! Con los otros no, pero ya sé que no habrá una entrevista buena. […] Si son mecánicos, no habrá... no habrá ninguna posibilidad para hacer una buena entrevista. Entonces, eh... casi me voy. Algunas veces he suspendido entrevistas porque he visto que iba a ser imposible establecer la comunicación buena con ese intérprete. Pero en cuanto hay un guiño, cuando hay una posibilidad buena, claro que hablamos en el comienzo de todos los detalles, ¿no?
Desde cómo tiene que situarse ante el micrófono él, como intérprete, de cómo quiere que le susurres, si hay que susurrar al entrevistado; de cómo tiene que establecerse el guiño conmigo; de cómo a veces no hay que preguntar, simplemente miradas; de si va a haber preguntas con cierta complicidad con el entrevistado, como en el caso de esta, esta... de hoy, de esta mujer iraní, en el que se ha puesto a prueba no solamente la buena interpretación, sino la creación; XXX
El gran lujo de la interpretación es que sea una creación.

01'55''-02'06''
Question:
¿Me puedes hablar un poco de las modalidades de interpretación? Digo la simultánea, consecutiva... ¿cuáles son sus ventajas e inconvenientes? ¿Cuáles son sus ventajas e inconvenientes? ¿Cuál usas en tu programa...?

02'14''-04'05''
Javier Tolentino:
Vamos a ver: la peor de todas es la interpretación eh... consecutiva, ¿no? Pregunta, pregunta del intérprete al entrevistado, respuesta del entrevistado, traducción del intérprete. Ese sería lo más... lo más penoso, pero a veces no queda más remedio siempre que el intérprete sea ese modelo de traductor mecánico, Google, que, bueno, da lo mismo que utilizáramos una máquina de traducir, ¿no?, ese sería.
Eh... la más interesante es la simultánea; para mí, para la radio, es la que más me importa. Y la más aberrante, con la que peor me llevo es la traducción, digamos, final, ¿no?, en el que da todo su discurso, de una hora, de media hora, de quince minutos, de diez minutos... y va el intérprete y hace esa traducción.
¿Valor fundamental de la traducción simultánea? Que crea comunicación, crea espontaneidad. No crea: “corto, paro, sigo”. No crea descontrol, falta de ritmo, sino que hay consecución... ¿es una composición
natural! A mí, una cosa que me gusta mucho en la traducción natural es que se escuche muy bien la lengua persa, turco, árabe, swahili, la que sea, ¿no? ¡Es una riqueza el idioma! Aunque tú no sepas de un idioma, el conocerlo en una persona que es famosa es casi un discurso cultural de ese país, de esa persona y de esa lengua. Se tienen que escuchar siempre de una forma natural. Eso se consigue en la traducción simultánea: él empieza a hablar en su idioma y después, de una forma natural, como casi como si el oyente estuviese participando de esa conversación, ¿no?

04'06''-04'09''
Question:
¿La emisión es grabada o en directo?

04'10''-05'14''
Javier Tolentino:
Eh... Digamos que en la traducción... Yo siempre hago directo o falso directo: el ruido de las grabaciones pura y dura, ¿no? Hoy, por ejemplo, hemos tenido dos casos de programas de lo que estoy diciendo, ¿no? Hemos realizado una emisión en directo; con toda la naturalidad del mundo me he dirigido al creador, al intérprete, diciéndole que actuara de una forma natural, que preguntara si tenía que preguntar algo, alguna información, pero en directo...
El oyente no es torpe, no es tonto; sabe perfectamente, a veces, las dificultades de una traducción simultánea y en directo; y que las conozca desde el principio, ¡está muy bien! No es hacer trampa, ni hacer pesadez de ningún tipo, sino es crear una comunicación natural.
Y la segunda emisión que hemos hecho es lo que llamamos falso directo que, eh... bueno, es, no hay montaje, no hay grabación... eh, hay grabación porque no es una emisión en directo, pero quiero decir que se emite tal como se ha grabado, con lo cual a eso le llamamos “falso directo”.

05'16''-05'26''
Question:
Entonces, juegan con el nivel de los volúmenes, ¿cómo es eso? Si no hay edición, ¿cómo se arreglan para que el público diferencie bien cada discurso... cada persona?

05'26''-05'33''
Javier Tolentino:
¿Esto en esta parte de la entrevista o te parece ya que lo hagamos en la tercera parte? ¿O no? No lo sé, tú tendrás tu división, ¿eh?

05'33''-05'35''
Question/Clarification:
No, está bien en esta parte.

05'36''-05'44''
Javier Tolentino:
Vale. Eh... ¿La pregunta era...? ¿Cómo era la pregunta?

05'45''-05'47''
Question/Clarification:
¿Cómo es el proceso en el falso directo?

05'47''-07'06''
Javier Tolentino:
Ah, Sí, eh... No, ¡es igual que el directo! Por eso te decía que no hay diferencia, ¿no? Si hubiese sido una grabación como hay gente que utiliza el discurso de grabación radiofónico, sería, eh... pregunta en español, pregunta en persa, respuesta en persa, respuesta en español. Se elimina en la grabación las preguntas, eh... en el idioma, y se va de la pregunta en español a la respuesta en persa simultánea; todo eso, a través de un montaje y de montaje de primeros planos y segundos planos. En el primer plano sería, al comienzo, para la... para la respuesta en persa y iría a fondo para volviera a primer plano la traducción simultánea. Eso hace la agilidad, dentro de, de la... y una mayor brevedad de la entrevista; digamos que si una entrevista puede durar cincuenta minutos, como la de hoy, respetando preguntas y toda la traducción por su lado, eh... se podría reducir a quince minutos. Digamos que eso para informativos, para los programas informativos, es mucho más útil, en el que requieren mayor brevedad y mayor concisión. Pero en los programas de cine especializados, a mí me gusta que la gente, bueno, pues escuche a la otra persona en toda su dimensión, con todo su idioma.
¿Has recibido comentarios de la audiencia sobre alguna entrevista con intérpretes, sobre la interpretación?

07'14''-07'47''
Javier Tolentino:
Siempre, siempre que hay una entrevista *eh...* importante, ¿no?, no una entrevista corta o pequeña; siempre que hay una entrevista importante, siempre hay reacciones de la audiencia, de gente que está estudiando persa, en este caso, y que nos pide y nos demanda el programa; gente que agradece muchísimo que se respete, por ejemplo, el inglés y el francés; suele ocurrir esto, ¿no?, que agradece que haya esta naturalidad con el idioma pueda tranquilamente *eh...* poder seguirlo, incluso, ella misma, la conversación que sigue, en versión original, diríamos, ¿no?

07'48''-07'54''
Question:
Bueno, algo que ya dijiste un poco, pero si querés ampliar: ¿cómo sería tu intérprete ideal?

07'55''-08'48''
Javier Tolentino:
La de hoy. Mi intérprete ideal es la persona que ha traducido hoy por ejemplo, ¿no? En el que hay, como he dicho antes, una pasión por la radio, por el periodismo, por la cultura, por la libertad de expresión, por el cine; ama su idioma, su país, su pueblo; tiene un conocimiento exacto del español y del otro idioma. Y ha traducido, ¡fíjate que ha traducido simultáneamente hasta poesía!, que es lo más difícil del farsi, ¿no? Así que el ideal de intérprete es, justo, bueno lo que ha hecho esta mujercita iraní, que ha hecho una traducción no solamente perfecta, sino, bueno, era una protagonista más de la entrevista. O sea, había dos protagonistas, y lo he dicho desde el principio: “estoy rodeado de dos mujeres bellas, pero no están aquí por su belleza, sino por su inteligencia”, ¿no? La intérprete y la protagonista de la entrevista, pero las dos son protagonistas porque están llevando un mensaje, un discurso realmente rico al oyente.

08'50''-08'51''
Question/Side Comment:
¿Y Concha Ortiz?

08'52''-08'57'' (end of tape 7-4)
Javier Tolentino:
[Laughs] Eso ya la siguiente... ¡eso ya la siguiente fase! [laughs] ¿No? Arriba...

00'01''-00'05'' (tape 7-5)
Question:
¿Ejerces alguna labor de control sobre el intérprete?

00'06''-00'45''
Javier Tolentino:
Una labor psicológica hay que ejercer sobre el intérprete, ¿no? Pero más que sobre el intérprete, que al intérprete hay que darle normas, ¿no? Hay que decirle: “Yo quiero así la interpretación, la traducción...”. Casi con el intérprete es un guiño cómplice y un guiño técnico, pero la presión hay que ejercerla sobre el entrevistado siempre, siempre. Hay que intentar seducirlo siempre. Cada entrevista, casi es un acto amoroso, ¿no? Y si no hay hechizo y no hay seducción, no hay creación. ¿Me quedé corto?

00'46''-00'52''
Question:
Te ha surgido que el intérprete cometa un error significativo y que te des cuenta

00'52''-00'53''
Javier Tolentino:
[Hand gesture and gaze, as if it would have happened to him often] Pffffff...

00'53''-00'54''
Question:
¿Y qué haces en ese caso?

00'54''-02'24'' (end of tape 7-5)
Javier Tolentino:
Te hundes en la miseria. Además de que, bueno, los errores de la interpretación... El error más gordo es el
que yo señalaba antes en torno a las preguntas, ¿no? Y es que el intérprete no quiera hacer una creación, no quiera... no tenga esa complicidad contigo para hacer de esa entrevista una creación tanto periodística como desde el punto de vista de la traducción. Entonces, ahí, ya te das cuenta de que ya sería lo peor dejar la entrevista, y decir: “no la hagamos”. [...] ahí está claro cómo usar al intérprete...

Pero el error más grande es que el intérprete ¡sea un cobarde! Si te encuentras con un traductor o con un intérprete cobarde puedes, puede acabar de toda en un juzgado de guardia, porque claro, la barrera del idioma es muy importante a veces, ¿no?, pero si encima ya desde el principio no quieres traducir lo que, lo que el director de la entrevista, lo que el entrevistador quiere hacer, porque te da miedo... Porque tú estás diciéndole, por ejemplo, a un director indio: “Su película no me gusta”, y luego quieres ofrecerle tus argumentos porque no te gusta, pero si el intérprete se... se toma por su cuenta que no quiere traducir lo que tú le estás diciendo por miedo o por cobardía, aquello puede acabar como el rosario de la Aurora.

00'00"-00'26" (tape 7-6)
Javier Tolentino [continues answering the previous question]:
... porque claro, no me traducía. Porque yo, de ya..., hubo una discusión entre Peter Greenaway y yo. Si estuviera Pedro podría añadir cosas así. Entonces, él dijo, por ejemplo, que los periodistas éramos todos unos frustrados, gente que odiábamos el cine, que nos gusta el juicio...

00'27"-00'29"
Question-comment:
Te descolocó, ¿no?

00'29"-01'32"
Javier Tolentino:
No, no, no. Bueno, no sé si me... ¡a lo mejor, sí! [laughs by interviewer] Mi impresión... mi impresión es que le dije: “Bueno, no todos; yo también conozco a cineastas que son unos imprescriptibles”. Y el tío entonces, a partir de ahí, empezó a ponerse así un poco... [quoting Peter Greenaway] “Es que, ¡ustedes no saben!”. Y le dije: “Pero, ¿por qué habla en plural? No comprendo por qué habla en plural, usted hable...”. Y, claro, el duelo que él estaba haciendo, ¿no se estaba traduciendo! Con lo cual, pues probablemente hubiésemos estado de acuerdo Peter Greenaway y yo, [motorbike noise]... Hay periodistas imprescriptibles, ¡como cineastas imprescriptibles! Pero claro, si el traductor o el intérprete no le traducen bien y con este espíritu, está creando un problema, como XXX, que al final, ¡casi nos insultamos mutuamente! [laughs] Y le digo yo: “¡Pero qué está diciendo?”. Y le digo: “¡Por qué se cree usted Dios?”. Porque claro, llega a un nivel la, la... la falta de feeling en la traducción que puede crear un conflicto diplomático [laughs].

01'34"-01'36" (end of tape 7-6)
Question-comment:
Bueno, de eso tenía varias preguntas.

00'00"-00'04" (tape 7-7)
Question:
¿Has tenido algún tipo de conflicto debido a una mala interpretación?

00'05"-02'06"
Javier Tolentino:
Sí. No he tenido un conflicto; he tenido varios conflictos por interpretaciones malas, por interpretaciones regulares y por torpes interpretaciones, ¿no? Quizás la más sonada ha sido con el cineasta británico Peter Greenaway que... debido a que el intérprete no le transmitía correctamente mis preguntas, y como además la personalidad de Peter Greenaway es muy especial, porque es un hombre muy divino y, bueno, muy... muy antiperiodistas... es... tiene un discurso en contra y a la contra, pues ehm... bueno, el diálogo podía haber sido fresco, podía haber sido travieso, rico. ¡Incluso podríamos haber llegado hasta a un acuerdo! Porque yo también, yo no soy ningún defensor del gremio periodístico por sí, ¿no? Hay malos periodistas, mediocres periodistas y muy buenos periodistas; pero de la misma manera que hay buenos cineastas, malos cineastas y torpes cineastas, ¿no? Ningún oficio, ninguna actividad se libra de todo esto, ¿no?, con lo cual... Ni el periodismo, ni la realización, ni la hostelería, ¿no? Todo el mundo tiene sus torpezas y yo puedo estar de acuerdo, pero claro, una mala interpretación puede llevar al insulto, o a que alguno de los dos se pueda sentir aludido bajo el insulto. Me creó un problema, un conflicto muy grande, eh... pero ¡también un reto! ¿no?, en el fondo, de cara a los oyentes, ¿no?, y bueno, hubo oyentes de todo tipo: hubo oyentes que se aliaron con los insultos de Peter Greenaway y hubo oyentes que entendieron la dificultad, ¿no? Y me quedo con estos, me quedo con los que encontraron que la, la... la dificultad más grande no eran los conceptos y los prejuicios de Peter Greenaway, o que me pillaron a mí en in fraganti, por la sorpresa del insulto, sino lo... el protagonismo ahí, el verdadero protagonista fue un mal intérprete.
¿Por qué dice que fue mal intérprete? ¿Cuál fue el error?

El error fundamental es que no le llegó a transmitir, por cobardía quizá, mi duelo dialéctico con Peter Greenaway. Entonces, claro, si Greenaway llega a saber las cosas que yo decía, a lo mejor no hubiera habido ese, ese... esa tensión en la entrevista, porque a lo mejor podía haber entendido Peter Greenaway que yo también estaba de acuerdo en las torpezas periodísticas dentro del oficio de la cinematografía, ¿no? Pero si no le transmite eso, pues entonces queda como que yo soy un periodista gremial, ¿no?

¿Ya habías hecho conocimiento con Peter Greenaway? ¿Habías hablado antes un poco?

Peter Greenaway... yo le adoro. O sea, adoro su obra, su cine, su trabajo... A título personal me puede parecer bastante vanidoso, bastante engreído, bastante ¡divino!, pero en el fondo, en una entrevista, yo he tenido, bueno, cineastas que no voy a citar, de la... del calibre, de los errores y de las divinidades de Greenaway y a mí eso no me sorprende, ¿no? Lo que sí le puede sorprender o le pudo sorprender a Greenaway, y por eso pasó al insulto, es la libertad con la que hablamos en la emisora de radio a la que pertenezco, Radio 3. Pero, quizás, el intérprete ahí no estuvo acertado, ¿no?

Sobre la edición del programa: había momentos en los cuales en los que estaba... la traducción, digamos, hecha por el intérprete, y momentos en los que no. Me pregunto si hubo algún tipo de edición...

No, no, era en directo. La emisión era en directo pero con una salvedad importante también. No sólo la interpretación fue un obstáculo, también lo fue que Peter Greenaway no estaba conmigo. O sea, era un dúplex, que llamamos en la radio. Yo estaba en Prado del Rey, yo estaba en Madrid y él estaba en Cuenca. Era otra ciudad. A mí él no me veía visualmente. No teníamos esa... ese conocimiento directo de presencia física, ¿no?

¿Has hecho entrevistas siendo tú tu propio intérprete?

No podemos ser todo en la vida. O sea, si yo he tenido algunas veces el gusanillo de la interpretación, de la traducción, pues ¡claro!, todos los días. ¡Hoy!, me hubiese encantado haber hablado persa, haber hablado farsi con esta actriz iraní fundamental. O sea, el idioma a veces es una barrera. ¡Pero no creo que sea una barrera fundamental!, fíjate, el idioma en la radio, en la televisión, en los medios de comunicación. Es más importante que tú sepas de cine, que tú sepas quién es el entrevistado y que tengas una buena intérprete, un buen traductor, más que el que tú sepas farsi... Tú no puedes saber todos los idiomas del mundo; eso está claro, ¿no? Entonces, partiendo de eso tienes que fiarte y tener confianza en los buenos intérpretes, en los buenos creadores de la traducción... [pauses]

Yo tengo confianza en varios, en España, en la traducción y en la interpretación, pero es verdad que cada vez que yo veo una traducción bonita, linda, agradable, me gustaría tener ese dominio de la lengua de ese país, de esa cultura, ¿no?, pero eso es imposible.

Yo, más que gusanillo por eso, tengo mucha fe y mucha confianza en la gente que se toma este oficio de la traducción con seriedad, con profesionalidad, con pasión, ¿no?

No podremos ser todo en la vida. O sea, si yo he tenido algunas veces el gusanillo de la interpretación, de la traducción, pues ¡claro!, todos los días. ¡Hoy!, me hubiese encantado haber hablado persa, haber hablado farsi con esta actriz iraní fundamental. O sea, el idioma a veces es una barrera. ¡Pero no creo que sea una barrera fundamental!, fíjate, el idioma en la radio, en la televisión, en los medios de comunicación. Es más importante que tú sepas de cine, que tú sepas quién es el entrevistado y que tengas una buena intérprete, un buen traductor, más que el que tú sepas farsi... Tú no puedes saber todos los idiomas del mundo; eso está claro, ¿no? Entonces, partiendo de eso tienes que fiarte y tener confianza en los buenos intérpretes, en los buenos creadores de la traducción... [pauses]

Yo tengo confianza en varios, en España, en la traducción y en la interpretación, pero es verdad que cada vez que yo veo una traducción bonita, linda, agradable, me gustaría tener ese dominio de la lengua de ese país, de esa cultura, ¿no?, pero eso es imposible.

No, no tengo el gusanillo de la interpretación; tengo el gusanillo del periodismo... y en el que tienes varias herramientas, ¿no? No creo que un periodista tenga que manejar la cámara, tenga que manejar el sonido, tenga que manejar la producción... Creo en la división del trabajo, ¡creo en el equipo de cine de trabajo! ¿No? Creo que el cine es una red de oficios y el periodismo también lo es, ¿no? Y si tú estás fijándote en una buena interpretación, no te estás...
fijando en el valor de las preguntas; no te estás fijando en la secuencia, en el ritmo, en la velocidad, en el calor, en la comunicación de una buena entrevista, ¿no?
Cada uno... a sus zapatos, ¿no? O sea, el que está obsesionado por el sonido va a hacer que la entrevista sea buena. El que está obsesionado por la imagen, por el encuadre, va a obtener una entrevista de televisión, de cine, un buen documental...
Tenemos que tener obsesiones por un trabajo específico, por una labor nuestra. Un buen periodista de radio, un buen periodista de televisión es aquél que está pendiente del entrevistado, que crea un aroma en el estudio o en el plató y en la comunicación cálida para que se obtenga una buena comunicación. Pero ¡a la vez, no puede estar obsesionado por el encuadre de la cámara! O el plano, o por el sonido, si viene un camión, una furgoneta... Para eso está la especialización de oficios, ¿no? Y todo eso al servicio de un buen trabajo periodístico. Y una herramienta más de un buen trabajo periodístico es la interpretación; básica en un mundo tan global como éste en el que nos encontramos, en el que puedes tener, pues, a un mozambicano hablando portugués, a un sudafricano hablando inglés, a un senegalés hablando swahili, o a un marroqui hablando árabe o a un iraní hablando farsi, ¿no? Entonces, la creación en la interpretación para el periodismo de hoy es fundamental.