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Abstract

Police interviews have traditionally placed strong emphasis on interviewing suspects, and devote much less attention to interviewing victims and witnesses of crime, who may possess information critical to solving the crime. In the last two decades, cognitive interviewing has emerged from the field of psychology as a superior paradigm for interviewing victims and witnesses, enabling police interviewers to move away from the practice of indiscriminately using the same traditional interviewing techniques for suspects when interviewing cooperative victims and witnesses, who may be vulnerable, traumatised and subsequently unfit to be subjected to the same style of interviewing as suspects.

This thesis examines the application of cognitive interviewing involving non-English speaking victims and witnesses to understand how the paradigm works (or otherwise) and to what extent it works when interlingual mediation by a language interpreter is employed. To date, there have been no known studies on whether this protocol retains the same level of efficacy confirmed in literature in monolingual settings mostly emanating from Anglophone countries.

This study conducted a series of laboratory experiments using a pair of monolingual English cognitive interviews that incorporated features of cognitive interviewing, adopted into bilingual interviews across eight different languages (all paired with English). Through qualitative and descriptive statistical analysis of the data generated by eight participant interpreters, the researcher ascertained whether the interpreted versions of the interviews retained the same cognitive interviewing features and verbal strategies intended by the original English monolingual design, and how much the bilingual versions resembled or deviated from the monolingual version as a benchmark.
Data analysis of this study established that the common ground between the interviewer’s and interpreter’s knowledge schema was low. Unless the interpreter had prior knowledge and understanding of the cognitive interviewing protocol through previous training or briefing by the police, some verbal strategies and features were changed or completely missing in the bilingual versions. Furthermore, the desired uninterrupted free-form narratives afforded by the interviewee as a result of the successful application of the protocol conflicted fundamentally with the cognitive requirements and linguistic operations of the interpreting process. The truncated version of the interviewee’s narration due to the process of interpreting, therefore, presents risks to disrupt the interviewee’s intensive recall effort.

This research has implications for Anglophone police using cognitive interviewing with victims and witnesses who do not speak English, yet possess critical information to solve crimes. This is particularly in the light of the constant frustration experienced by police and victims/witnesses who are unable to communicate with each other due to a lack of appropriately skilled interpreters. This research highlights a possible need to adjust the application of the cognitive interviewing protocol in bilingual settings when interlingual mediation is employed. The researcher argues strongly that specialised training on the cognitive interviewing protocol should be developed and made available to interpreters who might be engaged by police for such interviews, with an aim to develop the interpreters’ knowledge schema and foster cognitive common ground between interpreters and the police. Interdisciplinary research in the future is recommended to follow up on this pioneering study.
## List of Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1PP</td>
<td>First Pair Part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2PP</td>
<td>Second Pair Part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>Australian Bureau of Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASL</td>
<td>American Sign Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Conversation Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAT</td>
<td>Communication Accommodation Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG</td>
<td>(Conversational) Common Ground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI</td>
<td>Cognitive Interviewing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM</td>
<td>Conversation Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP</td>
<td>Change Perspective (CI strategy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>Context Reinstatement (CI strategy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQV</td>
<td>English Equivalent (in word count interpreted from LOTE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERISP</td>
<td>Electronic Recording of Interviews with Suspected Persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTV1</td>
<td>Interview 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTV2</td>
<td>Interview 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOTE</td>
<td>Language Other than English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRT</td>
<td>Migration Review Tribunal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAATI</td>
<td>National Accreditation Authority for Translators and Interpreters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>New South Wales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td>Report Everything (CI strategy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>Reverse Order (CI strategy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RRT</td>
<td>Refugee Review Tribunal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL</td>
<td>Source Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCU</td>
<td>Turn Construction Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TL</td>
<td>Target Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRP</td>
<td>Transition Relevance Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
List of Diagrams

Diagram 1. The PEACE model. Source: Schollum, 2005, p. 43.................................60
Diagram 2. Interpreting strategy continuum (Lai & Mulayim, 2013)..........................87
Diagram 3. Subcategories of legal interpreting..........................................................104
Diagram 4. Triadic interpreting setup (Heydon & Lai, 2013).................................110
Diagram 5. Mutual accommodation and adjustments in interpreted communication..167
Diagram 6. Monolingual talk versus bilingual talk. ................................................235
Diagram 7. Manifestation of different kinds of pause by PI-Eng.................................269
Diagram 8. Conversational CG in interpreter-assisted police cognitive interviews.....303
List of Tables

Table 1 Coding for Interviews and Languages in Research Data ........................................ 128
Table 2 Basic Information about Participant Interpreters .................................................. 131
Table 3 Turns 8 to 20 in INTV1 ....................................................................................... 168
Table 4 Segmentation of Turn 8 in INTV1 ........................................................................ 171
Table 5 Segmentation of Turns 8 to 13 in INTV1 .......................................................... 174
Table 6 Segmentation of PI-Eng’s Turn 15 in INTV1 ...................................................... 176
Table 7 Segmentation of EW-LOTE’s Turn 20 in INTV1 ............................................... 177
Table 8 Segmentation and Turn Length of PI-Eng’s Turn Samples ................................ 183
Table 9 Segmentation and Turn Length of EW-LOTE’s Turn Samples .......................... 185
Table 10 Average Segment Length for PI-Eng Derived from the Three Chosen Sample Turns ..................................................................................................................................................... 190
Table 11 Average Segment Length for EW-LOTE Derived from the Three Chosen Sample Turns ..................................................................................................................................................... 191
Table 12 Interpreter’s Eye Gaze Patterns when PI-Eng Speaks ........................................ 197
Table 13 Interpreter’s Eye Gaze Patterns when EW-LOTE Speaks ................................ 201
Table 14 Comparison of Interpreters’ Eye Gaze Patterns .................................................. 205
Table 15 Turns with Intentional Pauses Inserted .............................................................. 207
Table 16 Effect of Intentional Pause Recreated by PI-Eng .................................................. 212
Table 17 Back-translation into English of INTV1 Turn 21 ............................................... 220
Table 18 Back-translation into English of INTV2 Turn 45 .................................................. 221
Table 19 Back-translation into English of INTV1 Partial Turn 23 .................................... 222
Table 20 PI-Eng’s Instructions to ‘Focus in’ on Someone or Something .......................... 223
Table 21 Back-translation into English of INTV1 Partial Turn 43 .................................... 224
Table 22 Back-translation into English of INTV1 Turn 67 and INTV2 Turn 82 .............. 226
Table 23 Back-translation into English of INTV1 Turns 33 and 39, and INTV2 Turn 102 .......................................................... 227
Table 24 Napier’s Cooperative Principle for Interpreted Communication ..................... 247
Table 25 Napier’s Cooperative Principle Modified for Spoken Languages .................... 249
Table 26 Prunč’s ‘Model of Translation Culture’ for Interlingual Cooperation and Accommodation ..................................................................................................................................................... 255
Table 27 Omission Rates because of Interruption Proper Undertaken by Interpreters in INTV1 ..................................................................................................................................................... 292
List of Publications

Book Chapters


Co-authored Books


**Publications in Refereed Journals**


**Reports**

Chapter 1: Introduction

In 2007, a young girl nicknamed ‘Pumpkin’ was abandoned at Melbourne’s Southern Cross train station by a man who was later identified as her father. At that time, police were unable to establish the girl’s nationality due to a language barrier. Interpreters were employed to try to speak to the girl; however, they were unable to communicate with her (Hoare, 2007). One year later, police officers in the United States (US) responded to a ‘wanted person’ call. They found a group of people, none of whom spoke English, holding a Chinese newspaper and pointing to a photograph of a man. An interpreter was employed, who determined that the group was detaining a man they said was wanted for killing his wife in New Zealand (Broughton, 2008). He was Pumpkin’s father.

In the same year, Dr Mohamed Haneef was detained and interviewed by an Australian Joint Counter Terrorism Team officer and federal police agent for car bomb plots at Glasgow International Airport. The 27-year-old registrar at Queensland’s Gold Coast Hospital was suspected of collaborating with his cousin, who was a member a terrorist group, Tablighi Jamaat, and had died due to injuries sustained in the incident (McDougall, 2007). The interview transcripts reflect highly institutionally driven question-and-answer interactional norms, interspersed with interruptions to Haneef’s answers, and shifting and latching onto topics of the interviewer’s interest—activities found to ‘create power distance’, ‘assert dominance over the suspect’ and be ‘demeaning and oppressive’ (Yoong, 2010, p. 710). Haneef’s case triggered a judicial enquiry in 2008, headed by former New South Wales (NSW) Supreme Court justice, John Clarke SC, which highlighted the series of failures in handling the case. Later in 2010, Haneef returned to Australia and sought damages for loss of income and
reputation, as well as for suffering caused by emotional stress. He was awarded an undisclosed sum of compensation by the Australian government.

Then, in December 2013, Australian journalist Peter Greste—among nine Al Jazeera journalists—was arrested in Egypt and accused of ‘airing false news’. His trial started in March 2014 and, three months later, he was sentenced to seven years in jail. He was denied access to an interpreter in court in all except one of the half a dozen court appearances (Cooper, 2014; Harrison, 2014). He was eventually deported in February 2015 after spending 400 days in an Egyptian jail.

These are all real stories that have occurred in the ever-globalised world, where language barriers for ‘Pumpkin’ and Greste affected their journey to justice. For Greste, lack of access to interpreting in a courtroom in a foreign land rendered his presence merely physical, denying him the right to be treated as a fully meaningful participating being. For Pumpkin, although an interpreter was sought, someone who spoke the wrong language was just as futile as none at all. For Haneef, who was fully capable of communicating in English, his case demonstrates how law enforcement interviews with civilians can easily become an oppressive institutional encounter that affects the person and society. People moving across national borders or living in another country may have the misfortune of encountering the law, or being involved in a criminal case as a suspect, victim or eyewitness. When police are involved or legal proceedings are instituted, language barriers instantly present challenges that require the provision of interlingual interpreting in order for these matters to be resolved. Greste’s plight highlights how lack of access to an interpreter is a travesty of justice and denial of basic human rights, while Pumpkin was unable to communicate with the interpreter the police provided. When a group of citizens in Atlanta, US, helped law enforcement capture a fugitive by making a citizen’s arrest of a man they believed to be Pumpkin’s father, they
could only communicate with police by pointing to a photograph in a foreign-language newspaper. Without the aid of an interpreter, the police would not have gained a clear picture of what was being communicated and why.

A more recent event on 15 December 2014—in which lone gunman, Man Haron Monis, held 17 people hostage in a café in Sydney—highlighted the fact that, in a random criminal act, victims can be of any age and any cultural or language background. When NSW and federal law enforcement authorities investigate such a criminal act, skilful interviewing techniques need to be employed. This is particularly important when they need to speak to witnesses or victims who experienced an extremely traumatic episode, in order to gather important information to piece together the sequence of events. In traditional interviews, which were designed mainly to interview suspects, the use of standardised checklists on these sorts of interviewees ‘may lead an interviewer to ask inappropriate questions or ask questions inappropriately’ (Alpert, Rojek, & Noble, 2012, p. 2). To gain help in solving crimes in multicultural and multilingual societies such as Australia, and increasingly many other countries, police may have to employ the services of professional interpreters to facilitate communication when there are language barriers, whether they are interviewing suspects or people who have been indirectly involved in a crime or critical incident. It is from this viewpoint that the researcher began delving into the under-researched area of police interviews assisted by interpreters, and particularly interviews with victims and witnesses.

1.1 Rationale of the Research

1.1.1 Growing cultural and linguistic heterogeneity of society. Contemporary civic life in a multi-ethnic and multilingual society, such as Australia, inevitably involves the frequent intersection of law, law enforcement and language. Lack of access to language services for those who have low English proficiency in Australia restricts
their proper functioning in society and prevents their full participation in civic life. Anyone unable to speak English or with insufficient English in Australia is regarded a vulnerable person in a legal sense, in the same manner as those who have physical or mental disabilities (Bartels, 2011; Moston, 2013, p. 11). This vulnerability requires government, legal institutions and support services to ensure that appropriate processes and language services are implemented to facilitate communication that may otherwise not occur (Wakefield, Kebbell, Moston, & Westera, 2014, p. 2).

The current researcher is based in the state of Victoria in Australia—a country of migration that offers government-funded translating and interpreting services to residents not proficient in English, when accessing public services. As such, it is worth providing a snapshot of the multicultural and multilingual population composition of the country and the state of Victoria to set the backdrop of this research. According to the most recent population count of the Australian Bureau of Statistics (2016), Australia has roughly 24 million residents, of which over one-quarter (28%) were born overseas (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2014). Almost one in five (19%) of Australia’s population speaks a language other than English (LOTE) at home (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2012), and close to half of its longer-standing migrants (49%) and 67% of recent arrivals speak a language other than English at home (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2012). One should also remember, when discussing linguistic diversity, Australia’s indigenous people and deaf or hearing impaired people also have their specific language needs. There are more than 200 Aboriginal languages (AIATSIS & FATSIL, 2005) spoken by 548,370 people who identified themselves as being of Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander origin (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2011). 61,800 (11%) of them spoke Australian indigenous languages at home (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2011), with the percentage increasing to 42% in many remote areas.
of Australia, and almost one in five (19%) indigenous people report that they do not speak English well or at all (National Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Legal Services, 2011, p. 11). In relation to deaf or hearing impaired Australians, the total number is difficult to ascertain, ranging from 20,000 (Hearforyou, n.d) to just over 30,000 (Hyde & Power, 1991) based on available sources. According to 2006 Census (ASLIA, 2011, p.12), 5,500 people nationwide nominated Auslan as the language they spoke at home.

Looking specifically at the state of Victoria, where the researcher is based, almost half (46.8%) of its 5.4 million population were born overseas or have at least one parent born overseas (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2012; Office of Multicultural Affairs and Citizenship, 2012, p. 6), with over 1.2 million (23%) speaking a LOTE at home (Profile.id, n.d.). This highly diverse population composition manifests in Victorians’ self-reported English proficiency, with more than 200,000 people stating that they have low English proficiency (Profile.id, n.d.). The above statistics give the general context in which government-funded language services are provided.

1.1.2 Access to legal interpreting becoming a more prominent issue.

Continuing with the focus on Australia and putting language services in context, Australia’s highly multi-ethnic population composition is reflected in the over 200 languages serviced by Australia’s federal Department of Human Services (Register as an interpreter or translator, n.d.). It is also evidenced by the fact that the government is the largest purchaser of translating and interpreting services in Australia (Fierravanti-Wells, 2015). In the case of Victoria, in the area of justice and policing, the state government is responsible for 80% of language services purchased, among which its justice portfolio consumes the second-highest quantity (Department of Justice, 2012, p. 4). As the third most populous state in Australia with 4.3 million residents (Queensland
Government, 2011), the state government spent AUD5.8 million on interpreter-related services in the 2008 to 2009 financial year (Palaszczuk, 2009), with the number growing exponentially to AUD9.68 million for 2010 to 2011 (Queensland Department of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander and Multicultural Affairs, 2014, p. 5).

Dixon and Travis (2007) examined 262 police interviews conducted in Australia, in which only five were found to have an interpreter present. However, the researchers were of the view that more cases might have benefited from having an interpreter present—particularly considering the statistics outlined in Section 1.1.1. Dixon and Travis (2007) gave the example of a suspect who did not understand the term ‘free will’ and another one who did not understand the term ‘promise’. They correctly observed that people of non-English-speaking backgrounds may be competent in everyday English conversation; however, they may not be able to understand more complex or unusual words, which may be crucial in police interviews. Earlier statistics by Carroll (1995, as cited in Gibbons, 2003, p. 234) reported a reasonable usage rate of interpreters at Australian tribunals of around 25%. According to Gibbons (2003), this is a more realistic level of interpreting need, as opposed to the estimated actual usage rate of interpreters by NSW police of around 3%, which he extrapolated from available data.

There are no official statistics available in Australia to ascertain how many police interviews are conducted annually with the assistance of interpreters. However, one must assume these numbers are significant, considering the available ABS population and English proficiency data. The Victorian Department of Justice (2012) recognised that:

The actual number of Victorians who need an interpreter when accessing services is likely to be greater than the Census data suggest. This is because Census data are based on self-reported ability to speak English, and people who
may consider their English skills to be adequate for day-to-day interactions may find these skills inadequate in complex medical or legal settings. (p. 14)

The most recent data of the 2014 to 2015 financial year from Australia’s nationwide Migration Review Tribunal (MRT) and Refugee Review Tribunal (RRT) indicate that interpreters were required for 59% of MRT hearings and 90% of RRT hearings. This equates to over 8,450 hearings with approximately 92 languages and dialects in this financial year (Migration Review Tribunal and Refugee Review Tribunal, 2015, p. 20). These statistics confirm the ever-increasing need for interpreting services in the legal domain.

The need for Aboriginal language interpreters in the justice sector should not be overlooked. According to National Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Legal Services (2011, p. 14), there is a massive unmet need for highly trained interpreters in indigenous languages, with the current situations bearing high hidden costs associated with adjourning and reconvening hearings, as well as increasing risks of litigation arising from miscarriages of justice.

1.1.3 Police interpreting—A relatively under-researched area. Professor Jane Goodman-Delahunty—a specialist in legal psychology at Charles Sturt University asserts that:

[P]olice who rely on interpreters to communicate with suspects during interviews have concerns about the accuracy of the translation, the potential interference with their rapport-building strategies, the loss of control they experience when questions and answers are mediated by interpreters, and the potential for bias when the suspect and interpreter share a common culture that differs from that of the interviewer. ("Research into police interviews", 2014)
This view is no different to the concerns long voiced by judges and lawyers when they have to use interpreters. A significant amount of literature has been generated in field interpreting studies over the last few decades on the possible effects of interlingual language mediation in the courtroom. However, fewer researchers and scholars have directed their attention to policing and its intersection with language. This resulted in the current researcher’s determination to contribute to this area, as someone who has been an interpreting and translating practitioner and educator.

The legal and law enforcement systems are an essential aspect of contemporary society, governing the way members of society live and interact with each other in a fair and orderly manner. These systems are inherently complex and challenging social institutions for ordinary citizens to deal with, even in monocultural and monolingual settings. For immigrants to Australia who do not speak English well, or do not speak the language at all, the barrier can sometimes be insurmountable.

Police interviews are believed to be one of the most common law enforcement activities (McGurk, Carr, & McGurk, 1993) and one of the most important (Milne & Bull, 2006). In the US, real and documentary evidence of crimes comprises about 20% of all evidence presented in courts of law, while testimonial evidence accounts for the remaining 80% (Yeschke, 2003, p. 47). Shepherd (2007) asserted that ‘most information an investigator obtains would be “soft fact”: utterances and assertions within accounts given by witnesses (including victims, eyewitnesses) and suspects’ (p. 3). This was supported by Moston (2013), who contended that ‘in fact, the majority of cases are solved through evidence obtained in interviews with witnesses, or interrogations of suspects’ (p. 11). Based on a review of empirical findings, Horvath and Meesig (1996) argued that the majority of criminal cases do not involve using any physical evidence—even when physical evidence is available, it is not always used. The same authors
consequently argued that textbooks on criminal investigation perpetuate myths about the importance of physical evidence by over-emphasising the role of forensic evidence, relative to its actual use (Heydon & Lai, 2013; Horvath & Meesig, 1998). The importance of interviews are not just in evidence in court; interviews are crucial in avoiding contested trials by getting confessions and then guilty pleas. Therefore literature on evidence presented in court tends to underestimate the role of interviewing, failing to highlight that most cases are decided ‘upstream’ (Cotterill, 2002, p. 111).

Police interviews can be regarded an ‘upstream’ activity in the criminal investigation process because they take place early in the timeline. When cases move onto the court system where hearings are conducted and evidence presented, the earlier ‘upstream’ activities exert their critical effect on the case in question. The ‘testimonial evidence’ (Yeschke, 2003, p. 47) or ‘soft facts’ (Shepherd, 2007, p. 3) produced by police for a case can include witness statements, video or audio recorded interviews, and telephone or mobile telephone intercepts/recordings or transcripts of these recordings. In recent decades, the reliance on evidence emanating from police interviews and investigations has attracted significant interest from academics in the criminology and linguistics fields. In the police field, the body of research has focused overwhelmingly on monolingual contexts with native speaker suspects or witnesses (Gibbons, 2004). In the field of interpreting studies, most available literature has concentrated primarily on the courtroom setting (Hale, 2007, pp. 79, 90), with the subfield of police interpreting receiving scant attention, if any (Böser, 2013, p. 114; Wakefield, Kebbell, Moston, & Westera, 2014, p. 4).

The scarcity of research in police interpreting is mainly due to ‘the extreme difficulty in securing authentic data for interpreter-mediated police interviews’ (Böser, 2013, p. 117)—a view supported by Mason (2000, p. 226) and Hale (2007, p. 79), with
the latter noting that the lack of access to authentic data is a main impediment to research. Although interviews with suspects these days are videorecorded in, for example, Australia and the UK, supposedly there would be an abundance of recordings for research. On the contrary, access to them are becoming notoriously restricted by privacy and ethics concerns. More than ever, interpreting is needed to assist communication with members of the community in frontline law enforcement, police investigative interviews, community legal services, hearings in courts and tribunals, and many other judicial procedures. The lack of academic enquiry into interpreter-assisted police interviews can be said to ‘clash with the reality of today’s multicultural and multilingual societies, in which interpretation is increasingly needed to bridge linguistic and cultural barriers’ (Hertog, 2003, as cited in Gallai, 2013). It is worth noting that the absence of any existing literature addressing the nexus between cognitive interviewing and interpreting practice, it has necessarily resulted in the specific research design chosen for this study.

1.1.4 Cognitive interviewing with victims and witnesses. Traditionally, police interviewing has focused significant, if not exclusive, attention on interviewing suspects, as attested by Goodman-Delahunty’s quotation in Section 1.1.3. This is despite of the fact that when investigative interviewing was introduced in English and Walse, there was a push to place more importance to witness interviewing than suspect interviewing. Interviewing victims and witnesses of crime has been relegated to a secondary or even tertiary concern, with little methodological underpinning or specialised training for this area of police interviewing, which may be the ‘best predictor of solving crimes’ (Fisher & Geiselman, 2010, p. 321; Kebbell & Milne, 1998; Kebbell & Wagstaff, 1997; Shawyer, Milne & Bull, 2013, p. 32). Thus, when interviewing victims and witnesses, police typically employ the same strategies as those used on suspects. This may leave
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interviewees feeling disempowered because they become question answerers, dominated by the interviewer’s control of the interview, who frequently uses formulaic questions from a checklist, coupled with a high number of short-answer questions, interspersed with leading questions (Fisher & Geiselman, 2010). This is done without considering the interviewee’s completely different emotional state to a suspect (such as vulnerability or trauma due to the crime incident) and different stakes in seeing the investigated crime reach a successful conclusion (that is, having the crime solved and perpetrators charged and punished, as opposed to a suspect’s focus on denying any connection with the event). As a result, cognitive interviewing (CI) (Fisher & Geiselman, 1992) was developed about two decades ago, based on psychological principles, to address the shortcomings of applying the same interviewing techniques to suspects, victims and witnesses.

Over the years, CI has proven to elicit 25 to 40% more correct statements than traditional interviews in more than 100 laboratory tests (Fisher & Geiselman, 2010, p. 325). However, to the researcher’s knowledge, this protocol has never been tested in settings where CI is conducted with non–English speaking interviewees, with language mediation performed by interpreters. Although Fisher and Geiselman (2010) mentioned accommodative measures in CI such as allowing interviewees who are not proficient in English (as the language in which the interview was conducted) to write out or tape record their answers first in their preferred language, ultimately the interviewee still answers police questioning in English (or the language of the police interviewer). This does not seem to consider people with no or lower English proficiency, or people who have functional everyday English, yet may have difficulty expressing themselves effectively in this language when in an unfamiliar discourse setting and affected by the crime event they have experienced.
1.1.5 Summary. Based on the four reasons outlined in Sections 1.1.1 to 1.1.4, this study acknowledged contemporary society’s higher cultural and linguistic heterogeneity at a macro level. This study also acknowledged the importance of police investigative interviewing in the criminal justice system, and identified police interpreting as an under-researched area in the field of legal interpreting. This led to the decision to focus on interpreting services provided for victims and witnesses questioned during police interviews using the CI protocol.

A French proverb states that once a question has been properly asked, the answer is not far away (McLean, 1995, p. 121). McLean (1995) highlighted the importance of asking questions during investigative interviewing by saying that ‘since a question and a reply form an indivisible whole, the only true way to make sense of an account is to have access to the way in which it is elicited’ (p. 121). It is clear that police officers’ competence in investigative interviewing is critical in criminal investigation. However, even the most skilful police officers have to depend on language interpreting when they are unable to communicate with interviewees who do not understand or have problems expressing themselves in the language the police officer uses. By narrowing this line of enquiry to CI interviews with victims and witnesses, this research seeks to fill this identified knowledge gap.

1.2 Research Aims

Given the proven efficacy of CI in monolingual settings in the police interviewing literature (see Section 1.1.4), the aim of this research was to explore what happens when the interviewing police officer and interviewed victims or witnesses do not share the same language. In the context of this study, this language was English, and the interview conducted using the CI protocol had to be assisted by an interpreter.
According to Fisher and Geiselman (2010) who developed the protocol in 1992, the characteristics of CI include strategies such as:

(a) explicitly instructing the witness about his/her role in the interview and by previewing the general tone of the interview (‘You saw what happened, not I, so I expect you to tell me what happened, and without waiting for me to ask questions. I won’t be asking you many questions, so you’ll be doing most of the talking. I’m interested to know what happened to you, so I’m here mainly to listen to you’);

(b) asking open-ended questions; and

(c) not interrupting witnesses during their narrative responses. (p. 324)

The above strategies are implemented by police officers using verbal instructions with specific wording. In situations where interpreting is needed for such interviews, this research sought to determine whether interpreting can successfully transfer these instructions to facilitate CI in bilingual settings.

Further, when these strategies work properly, the interviewee’s conscious effort to search their memory storage is supposed to yield ‘free-flowing narration’ (Fisher & Geiselman, 2010, p. 325), ‘free-form narratives’ (Heydon & Lai, 2013) and ‘free narrative account[s]’ (Snow & Powell, 2007, p. 7). Any interruption during this process by the interviewer is against the protocol. Instead, the interviewer should note any leads emerging from the interviewee’s utterances, and pursue these later with subsequent questions. When an interpreter is involved in this interviewing process, applying the same principle to avoid disrupting the interviewee’s narration appears to conflict fundamentally with the cognitive requirements and linguistic operations of the interpreting process (Heydon & Lai, 2013). Interpreters render long narrations in a truncated manner—segment by segment—for the interviewing officer because the
narration in its entirety will exceed the interpreter’s cognitive capacity to manage in one go. Thus, this raises the question of whether the truncated narration on the interviewee’s behalf interferes with the CI principles, and which risk factors, if any, arise when this occurs.

Ultimately, the aim of this study was to investigate how interlingual language mediation affects CI conducted in English with a non–English speaking interviewee, and what actions can be taken to manage this so that these interviews can mirror monolingual interviews as closely as possible.

1.3 Research Questions

This research sought to explore what occurs when police conduct CI in English with non–English speaking interviewees, and subsequently use interlingual language mediation performed by interpreters. The specific research questions were as follows:

1. How do the features of CI manifest in questioning and answering in a bilingual setting assisted by language interpreting?
2. How do the manifestations of the interpreter-assisted bilingual CI interview relate to interpreting practice?
3. Given what is observed in the data, what are the effects of a bilingual setting on CI interviewing strategies?
4. How do the effects of bilingual settings translate to broader CI practice?

And, what can be done differently to achieve CI efficacy in bilingual settings?

This research used the monolingual English paradigm as the baseline of investigation, since the research is aimed at applying to English-speaking societies such as Australia, where interpreting is provided to non-English speakers so they can function as equal participants in the community. As a result, all analysis was done from this perspective in order to understand and identify what happens when language
mediation is employed in CI in English-speaking police interviewing settings, and how much language mediation impacts—adversely or otherwise—on the functions of CI in linguistic and non-linguistic terms. The working hypothesis was that the non–English speaking interviewee would react the same way as their English-speaking counterpart in a monolingual CI interview conducted in English. For example, according to CI protocol, it is preferred that questions are asked using neutral wording, such as ‘what is the length of his hair?’, rather than ‘how long is his hair?’—the latter of which is considered less neutral and more leading. Thus, this research reports on whether the interpreter’s linguistic operation results in such a category shift—that is, from noun form to adjective form, assuming that asking ‘how long is his hair?’ is also less neutral and more leading in the other language, although in reality this needs to be empirically proven. This point is discussed by the researcher in the limitations of this research (see Sections 4.3 and 8.3) and suggestions for future research (Section 8.4).

Interpreting has been referred to as an ‘exercise in diminishment’ (Cheng Kai Nam, Gary v. HKSAR, as cited in Leung, 2008, p. 201) in the sense that it is unable to recreate the ‘colour, subtlety and texture’ (Cheng Kai Nam, Gary v. HKSAR, as cited in Leung, 2008, p. 201) of the original utterances. Thus, from a different angle, this study also aimed to ascertain whether interpreting diminishes what CI is designed to achieve in an English-speaking police interview context, with non–English speaking interviewees. If so, this study sought to explore to what extent interpreting diminishes CI’s intent, and conclude whether any action can be taken—either by the police interviewer or interpreter—to minimise this diminishment.

1.4 Research Approach
This research was empirical in nature and conducted in laboratory settings. As the research instrument, the researcher converted two English monolingual police cognitive interviews—one with an eyewitness and the other with a victim of crime, written by Fisher and Geiselman (1992, pp. 159–184)—into bilingual scripts in eight different languages. Fisher and Geiselman are clinical psychologists who developed the CI protocol, and the two interviews used for this research were written in a manner that incorporated all the relevant CI strategies.

In these two English monolingual scripts, the researcher replaced the interviewee segments with translations of eight different languages. Care was taken to ensure the expressions in these eight languages sounded natural and appropriate in the situation. One professional interpreter was recruited for each language version to facilitate communication between the police interviewer and foreign–language speaking interviewee role, played by recruited native speakers. The performance of the eight language versions was video recorded for data analysis.

This study did not seek to investigate interpreting as a socially situated speech act under the dialogic paradigm (Bot & Wadensjö, 2004, p. 357) in this particular setting, since the linguistic interaction between the police officer and interviewee was completely scripted and acted by role players. Rather, the methodology of the experiment sought to use identical instruments across eight languages, reducing the key variables to the language versions (with an identical content) and the participant interpreters. This allowed the researcher to focus on analysing the participant interpreters’ linguistic output in both English (for utterances by the interviewee) and the LOTE (for utterances by the interviewer), based on the scripts.

The data analysis covered both qualitative assessment and descriptive statistics, using the workings of monolingual CI as a benchmark to examine whether the
interpretation retained all linguistic strategies used by the interviewer, and how the interpreters handled the interviewees’ free-form narratives. In particular, this study analysed interpreters’ turn-taking patterns, handling of turn lengths, eye gaze and treatment of interviewers’ specialised language. This project sought to answer the research questions, thereby seeking illumination, understanding and extrapolation (Hoepfl, 1997) of police CI interviews assisted by interpreters.

1.5 Significance of Research

Police interviewing is recognised as an important element in crime investigation. Accounts elicited from interviewing victims and witnesses are considered ‘best’ for solving crimes (Fisher & Geiselman, 2010, p. 321; Kebbell & Milne, 1998; Kebbell & Wagstaff, 1997). As stated in Section 1.1.4, as far as the researcher is aware, no previous research has been conducted on CI in bilingual settings to test whether interviewers’ questioning strategies are retained after interlingual language mediation provided by interpreters, and how interviewees’ free-form narratives are handled by interpreters. Monolingual CI has achieved its claimed efficacy in the literature via more than 100 laboratory tests undertaken in Australia, Germany, the United Kingdom (UK) and the US (Fisher & Geiselman, 2010, p. 324). However, this research pioneers exploration of the function of CI paradigms in bilingual settings, which have become and will continue to be a feature of many police jurisdictions around the world. The findings of this research will help police and interpreting professions become aware of the linguistic and non-linguistic issues involved in bilingual CI. This study will recommend strategies to manage the constraints of language mediation, thereby enabling the best possible interview outcomes to solve crimes when victims and witnesses do not speak English and need the assistance of an interpreter.

1.6 Structure of the Thesis
This thesis comprises eight chapters. Chapter 1 has introduced the context of this study and provided an overview of the research background, rationale, aims, questions, hypothesis, approach and significance. Chapter 2 explains CI in the context of police interviews, offering a detailed account of the characteristics of police interviews from the perspective of conversation analysis, institutional discourse analysis, and power asymmetry. This chapter establishes why police interviews are important in contemporary civic life, before moving on to describe the two dominant paradigms of police investigative interviewing adopted around the world. CI is used under one of these paradigms to elicit detailed accounts of crime from cooperative interviewees, including victims, witnesses and suspects. This chapter also discusses detailed CI protocol and reports on its efficacy.

Chapter 3 examines situations in which police interviewers and interviewees speak a different language, thereby requiring interpreters to breach the language barrier. It explains the legal underpinning of providing access to interpreters in criminal investigations and trials, which enables the research to situate legal and police interpreting in the domain of public service interpreting. Given the central role interpreting plays in this thesis, this chapter also gives a detailed account of the definition of interpreting in the professional sense, as opposed to ad hoc interpreting undertaken by someone who is bilingual. This chapter also explains the various modes of interpreting, which are critical for the data analysis and discussions presented in later chapters. The end of this chapter introduces Australia’s national accreditation system for professional interpreters and the interpreting profession, given that this country provides and funds public service interpreting for its residents.

Chapter 4 outlines the research methodology by explaining the design of the research instrument, the participants in the research study, and how data were collected.
and analysed. This chapter also includes brief explanations of the theoretical frameworks used for later data analysis and discussion. Chapter 5 presents the qualitative analysis and descriptive statistics in the findings of the research, covering interpreting issues for both CI questioning and answering. Due to interdisciplinary nature of the study, it necessitates the following two chapters to delineate the analytic focuses in Chapter 6 on interpreting and Chapter 7 on CI using interpreters, with chapter 6 using various theoretical frameworks to analyse how the findings relate specifically to interpreting practice in the context of the study, and Chapter 7 presenting the broader implications of the study in relation to CI. Finally, Chapter 8 summarises the research findings and implications, before closing by confirming the contributions and limitations of the research, and suggesting avenues for further research.

1.7 Summary

Due to the difficulty of accessing authentic police interviewing data and the lack of research on interpreter-assisted police CI, this project’s experimental design of mock police interviews in laboratory settings serves to begin such an enquiry. In doing so, this study sought to uncover knowledge for police and interpreters in the important area of interviewing cooperative interviewees—including victims, witnesses and suspects—who do not speak the same language as the interviewing police officer.
Chapter 2: Police Interviewing and Where CI Sits

CI was developed more than two decades ago when police realised that the techniques used to interview crime suspects failed to yield quality information when employed with crime witnesses and victims. In most countries, the criminal justice process broadly involves three main stages: investigative (police), adjudicative (courts) and correctional (prisons and other correctional programs). Police interviews are regarded an ‘upstream event’ (Cotterill, 2002, p. 111) in the criminal justice system, as opposed to court proceedings, which happen later when cases progress through the system. Police interviews are an important part of officers’ daily duties. However, police training in conducting interviews is still lacking in Australia, as Heydon (interviewed in Carrick, 2007) remarked:

[T]here were examples of officers really bullying the suspects, really trying to force them to agree to a statement. And this is a technique which is very counterproductive when used by an interviewer, because it’s very weak evidence.

Psychologist Steve Moston (interviewed in Carrick, 2007) similarly stated that, while police around Australia receive interview training at the Police Academies, they receive little training beyond that. Chan (1997) observed that police interviewing skills are not systematically taught—instead, they are learnt on the job by observing senior colleagues, including both good and bad habits. These observations relate more to police training in interviewing suspects; therefore, one can safely assume that there is even less training specifically for interviewing victims and witnesses. Fisher and Geiselman (2010, p. 312-322) observed the widespread practice of interviewing victims and witnesses with the same method used for suspects. They regarded this practice as unproductive in eliciting quality information to solve crimes, which led to the genesis of their CI techniques.
Parallel to the development of CI for interviewing victims and witnesses, there has been great development in interviewing suspects. This is mainly due to a number of serious miscarriages of justices in the UK, which led to a complete rethink of the traditional highly oppressive and coercive interviewing practice, which employed any technique to elicit a confession. Replacing these ‘outdated and counterproductive methods’ (Silvester, 2010) is the new ‘investigative interviewing’ paradigm, in which police no longer interrogate, but interview with an open mind. That is, the job of an interviewer is not to attain a confession, but to gather evidence. Currently in the UK, every police officer receives extensive training, both at the Police Academy and once they start their policing duties. There is also comprehensive ongoing training for police officers who are identified as showing potential as interviewers (Carrick, 2007).

This chapter explains in detail the broader context of investigative interviewing, which encompasses interviewing suspects, victims and witnesses. This chapter then moves on to detail the specific strategies developed for CI, specifically for victims and witnesses, which can also extend to cooperative suspects (Bull & Cherryman, 1995).

2.1 Police Interviews

The purpose of police interviews in the criminal justice system is to obtain evidence in order to find out what happened (Yarmey, 2001, p. 63). As explained in Section 1.1, most evidence presented in the court of law is ‘testimonial evidence’ (Yeschke, 2003, p. 47) or ‘soft facts’ (Shepherd, 2007, p. 3), rather than documentary or real evidence (such as threatening emails or DNA). The absence of such physical evidence obliges police to ‘interview witnesses in order to build a picture of what happened and to gather other evidentiary information that can be tested for its validity’ (Yarmey, 2001, p. 63). Further, through skilful questioning, alternative hypotheses can be eliminated and facts gathered (Yarmey, 2001, p. 63). Precisely because of the court’s
reliance on such evidence produced by police in criminal cases, it is critical that police interviews be conducted properly when eliciting facts from victims, witnesses and suspects in a neutral and objective manner. In Australia, if police evidence presented to the court is deemed to have been obtained through coercive or deceptive methods, it should be ruled inadmissible (Australian Law Reform Commission, 2006)

2.1.1 Examination of terms. There has been a tendency in the field of criminal justice to delineate some of the most frequently used terms in order to clarify their corresponding meaning and practice. Blair (2005) examined the seven interrogation manuals available in print in the US, and found that six of them similarly distinguished between ‘interviews’ and ‘interrogations’. An ‘interview’ refers to ‘a non-accusatory dialogue … to develop information that is relevant to a case’ (Blair, 2005, p. 44), whereas an ‘interrogation’ refers to ‘an accusatory monologue, dominated by the interrogator … to get the truth from an individual suspected of committing a crime’ (Blair, 2005, p. 44). The seventh manual used the terms ‘accusatory interrogation’ and ‘non-accusatory interrogation’ to refer to ‘interview’ and ‘interrogation’, respectively.

2.1.1.1 Interview. Hodgson (1987) referred to an interview as ‘a conversation with a purpose’ (p. 2). American forensic linguist, Roger Shuy (1998, pp. 13–14), discussed the following different forms of interviews:

- information interview—a journalistic interview to learn facts not known by the interviewer
- elicitation interview—common in some psychological or linguistic research, where the answer is known by the questioner, but the purpose is to observe how the subject responds
assessments interview—often seen in areas such as employment, education and psychology, where questions are asked not primarily to gain content information, but as the basis for the next course of action

• persuasion interview—used for activities such as market surveys, which give the appearance of objective neutrality, but slant the questions in ways that have persuasion as the goal.

These interviews in different settings coincide with Memon and Bull’s (1999) view on the variety of purposes that interviewing serves, which can be ‘forensic, clinical, social and organisational’ (p. iii).

2.1.1.2 Interrogation. As Shuy (1998, p. 12) highlights, in the US in recent years, when testifying in court, many law enforcement officers state that they do not ‘interrogate’—rather, they ‘interview’ subjects, in that ‘interrogation’ seems to conjure up unfavourable images such as browbeating and rubber-hose wielding. Gudjonsson (1992) regards that the term ‘interrogation’ has fallen out of favour, because some ‘interrogation tactics’ could induce false confessions. Similarly, Meyer and Morgan (as cited in Schollum, 2005) state that ‘while the objective of an interview is to gain information, the objective of an interrogation is to gain a confession’ (p. 11). Shuy (1998) also contends that ‘interviewers make use of less of their power than do interrogators’ (p. 12), where:


2.1.1.3 Investigative interview. In the early 1990s, Shepherd (1991) advocates using the term ‘investigative interview’ to describe police questioning of victims,
witnesses and suspects (Gudjonsson, 1992; Ord, Shaw, & Green, 2004) for the purpose of obtaining maximum quality of information. Milne and Bull (2006) identify two key aims underpinning any investigation: (i) to determine what happened, or whether anything did happen and (ii) to discover which participants were involved in which activities. As such, ethical investigative interviewing is central to any police investigation, and is the means to achieving justice in society (Milne, Shaw, & Bull 2007). Eades and Shepherd (2000, as cited in Schollum, 2005) recommend the term ‘forensic investigator’ (p. 13) for police officers involved in investigating crime.

Similarly, the training notes from the Foundation Course of the UK Metropolitan Police Service (2001, as cited in Schollum, 2005) state that a police officer’s responsibility is to ‘initiate an investigation that will provide the best prospect of apprehending the offender’; thus, they are the ‘investigator’ (p. 13). In a 1999 model proposed by Sir David Phillips (Chief Constable of Kent, 1993 to 2003, and Chairman of the Association of Chief Police Officers, October 2001 to March 2003), one of the professional criteria defining the forensic investigator states that:

[t]he forensic investigator must be prepared to gather and to record honestly all emergent evidence irrespective of its status, whether pointing to the suspect’s innocence (i.e. is disconformatory), to his or her guilt, or which is ambiguous. (Eades & Shepherdrd, 2000, p. 113)

One can argue that this development of terminology preference reflects the paradigm shift in police interviewing: ‘in the UK and in Belgium we are not so interested in a confession … we are searching for the truth and only … the truth’ (Dirk Rombouts, Antwerp Local Police Commissioner, personal communication, June 8, 2010). This thesis notes the differences in these terms and uses them where appropriate.
2.1.2 Interviewing subjects in police investigations. In order to gather the most accurate, complete and detailed information to solve crimes, police investigators need access to the source of the information, which is often a person—such as a witness, victim, suspect, complainant, first officer at the scene of a crime, emergency service worker, informant or expert (Milne & Powell, 2010). These people become subjects of police interviews due to their connection to the crime under investigation.

Coulthard and Johnson (2007) assert that police interviews are ‘goal-focused events, the primary aim of which is the collection and synthesis of evidence into a written statement for use in any subsequent court hearing’ (p. 80). Similarly, Gibbons (2003) identifies the two main purposes of police questioning as ‘elicitation of information’ and ‘confirmation of a particular version of events’ (p. 95). Particularly when a suspect is in custody, the accuracy of the record of the interview can assume tremendous importance (Coulthard, 1996, p. 166). In an ideal world, and in linguistic philosopher John L. Austin’s (1962) nomenclature, the court is presented with a ‘locutionary’ record. This is a verbatim record of what was said in a custodial interview. The court makes its own decisions about the meaning of the utterances in this record (the illocutionary forces) and what to do based on these utterances (the perlocutionary forces) (Austin, 1962). However, in the real world, research has established that the interview record may not really be verbatim, or ‘verballing’ may have occurred (putting words in the suspect’s mouth to fabricate a confession or admission) (Dixon, 2006; Moston, 2013, p. 4).

While criminal justice in Australia is principally the responsibility of states and territories (Dixon, 2006, p. 325; Moston, 2013, p. 3), it can be observed that audio/video recording of formal police interviews with suspects is standard practice across the country. Transcripts of these interviews are tendered to court for trial purposes, with the
possibility of requesting the actual audio or video recordings. Dixon (interviewed in Carrick, 2007) remarked that it is:

[a]n under-recognised achievement of Australian police that the use of audio-visual recording as a standard part of the investigation of crime is much more advanced in this country than anywhere else in the world. From the criminal justice system’s perspective, the introduction of video recording was a great success. The challenges to police evidence of confessions has really fallen away, guilty pleas have gone up, time spent in trials on disputes over evidence of confessions has declined.

While the method of documenting police interviews with suspects has improved with the help of technology, interviewing crime victims and witnesses still follows the old method, whereby the interviewing officer produces a typed statement in lieu of the actual interview conducted. Only when the person is vulnerable (such as child witnesses or victims of sexual crimes) will their interviews be audio/video recorded. For this reason, retired West Yorkshire Detective Superintendent Maxwell McLean (as cited in Yarmey, 2006, p. 64) questions whether witness accounts obtained and witness statements produced by police are really the witness’s own words. He cautions that the quality of police interviews should not be taken for granted.

2.1.3 Characteristics of police interviews. Haworth (2006) confirms that ‘relatively little research has been undertaken on police interview discourse. Yet police interviews have an extremely significant practical function with far-reaching consequences’ (p. 740). When civilians in their own country come into contact with police and are interviewed, either as a suspect, victim or witness, even native speakers of the local language may find such encounter challenging. This is because of factors such as the nature of the unusual discourse, unfamiliarity with the institutional formality
imbedded in the language, and being stressed and/or traumatised. This is exacerbated when the interviewee is not proficient in the local language or does not speak the language at all.

Given the central role police interviews play in any police investigations, including their implications for downstream criminal trials and the importance of trial outcomes for the maintenance of a fair and just society, it is worth detailing the characteristics of police interviews and examining them from linguistic, sociolinguistic and institutional discourse perspectives. A full awareness and appreciation of police discourse is critical to understanding police interviews in a monolingual setting, and understanding whether this can be extended to police interviews in bilingual settings. The following description applies to interviewing crime suspects, as well as crime victims and witnesses.

2.1.3.1 Police interviewing as an institutional discourse. To understand what institutional discourse is, it is helpful to return to the basics and reflect on what ‘talk’ is, and how it is performed and organised in various social settings. ‘Talk’ can be seen as the ‘verbal instantiation of language’ (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008, p. 12). According to Jones (1996) and Burns (1998), the three functions of speaking can be referred to as talk as interaction, talk as transaction and talk as performance. From a sociolinguistic perspective, these functions can be performed in private, public or institutional settings. These functions of talk are not mutually exclusive. A police officer speaking to a group of community members on how to improve neighbourhood safety can be a performance because it is public. Meanwhile, the question-and-answer session at the end can be viewed as transactional because information is imparted from the police officer to the audience. This talk is also fundamentally interactional (with the audience, to a certain level) in order to establish rapport (with the audience) and gain community cooperation.
Philosopher and linguist Paul Grice (1975) observes certain underlying cooperative principles in monolingual talks among interlocutors, which ensures that they generally communicate in logical and rational ways in order to exchange pragmatic meaning through the construction of meaningful conversation (for more, see Section 4.2.3).

The organisation of talk has been the subject of sociologists’ research since the 1960s. Harvey Sacks became interested in naturally occurring ‘ordinary conversation’, and his work became known as conversation analysis (CA). However, the origin of CA can be traced back to earlier American sociologists, Erving Goffman and Harold Garfinkel (Schegloff, 2003). The former advocates that ‘conversational interaction represents an institutional order sui generis in which interactional rights and obligations are linked not only to personal face and identity but also to macrosocial institutions’ (Heritage, 2005, p. 103). The latter stresses that ‘interactional rules and practices are ceaselessly drawn on by the participants in constructing shared and specific understandings of where they are within a social interaction’ (Heritage, 2005, p. 104).

After Sack’s death in 1975, his associates, Emanuel Schegloff and Gail Jefferson, undertook subsequent research and promulgated the CA paradigm, which offers a mechanism to uncover the ‘often tacit reasoning procedures and sociolinguistic competencies underlying the production and interpretation of talk in organised sequences of interaction’ (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008, p. 12). It is worth noting that Sacks’s work, from the beginning, ‘investigated interaction that is institutional in character’ (Heritage, 2005, p. 103), since the data he examined were telephone calls made to a suicide prevention centre in San Francisco. By using such data, he explored aspects such as turn taking, adjacency pairs and storytelling. The term ‘ordinary conversation’ denotes ‘forms of interaction that are not confined to specialised settings or to the execution of particular tasks’ (Heritage, 2005, p. 104). This paradigm was later
expanded to include institutional talk, which ‘focuses on more restricted environments in which the goals of the participants are more limited and institution specific’ (Heritage, 2005, p. 104). Talks in settings such as ‘courts, education, police, social services, medicine, business meetings, and mass media have all been major areas of institutional talk research during the past twenty years’ (Heritage, 2005, pp. 106–107).

According to Drew and Heritage (1992, p. 19) and Levinson (1992), (monolingual) police discourse can be regarded a type of institutional discourse. According to Levinson (1992) and Drew and Heritage (1992), institutional interaction has the following three main features:

1. it normally involves the participants in specific goal orientations that are tied to their institution-relevant identities, such as doctor and patient, and teacher and pupil;
2. it involves special constraints on what will be treated as allowable contributions to the relevant business; and
3. it is associated with inferential frameworks and procedures that are particular to specific institutional contexts.

Drew and Heritage (1992) further refer to these particular features of institutional interaction as ‘fingerprints’ (pp. 95–96). The manifestation of these fingerprints normally involves a reduction in the range of interactional practices deployed by the participants, and a specialisation and re-specification of the practices that remain (Drew & Heritage, 1992, pp. 95–96). Based on these three features, monolingual police interviews are identified as having the following objectives:

1. to involve an interviewing police officer and interviewee (suspect, victim or eyewitness) with the goal of obtaining information about a particular event under police enquiry; as observed by Gibbons (2003), the two main purposes
of police questioning are ‘elicitation of information’ and ‘confirmation of a particular version of events’ (p. 95);

2. to be an interaction between an interviewing police officer and interviewee that is oriented to information collecting—any deviation from the relevant business will be returned to the important topics of discussion;

3. to be compliant with police interviewing procedures, such as administering a police caution, or seeking confirmation of a statement given by an interviewee. The answers given by the interviewee is construed from the perspective of the police investigation, rather than a genuine interest in wanting to know what the person did at a particular time (for example, an interviewee’s answer of their whereabouts is inferred by the interviewing police officer as being an alibi).

To understand police interviews as a type of institutional discourse, it may also be helpful to understand the notion of ‘genre’, which is defined by Coulthard and Johnson (2007) as ‘conventional, repeated and distinctive features of text that arise from its communicative purpose’ (p. 55). From this perspective, Coulthard and Johnson (2007) regard police discourse as a ‘subgenre’ (p. 40) of legal language. According to Rock (2007, pp. 9–11), this subgenre bears the following characteristics:

- A reputation for being difficult: this is particularly the case for those who ‘enter legal domains infrequently’ (Rock, 2007, p. 9). It also results from police discourse having to ‘simultaneously address two audiences’ (Rock, 2007, p. 9)—one legal specialist and one lay. This has led to two schools of thought: one supporting the ‘easification’ (Bhatia, 1983, p. 218) of the legal language to achieve universality and accessibility under one single language for the two audiences; the other advocating for the recognition and
maintenance of both specialist and lay language, and encouraging ‘translation to the monolingual public’ (Tiersma, 1999, p. 200) by creating ‘two different genres’ (Bhatia, 1983, p. 218).

- Multifunctionality: for example, this is manifested in courtroom cross-examinations, where ‘people appropriate texts for their own ends’ (Barton & Hamilton, 2000, p. 12), and in the administration of rights by police where face-work, self-presentation and persuasion are also functioning (Rock, 2007, p. 10).

- Performativity: this idea originates from Austin’s (1962) ‘performative utterances’, which refers to the capacity for legal language/texts to ‘do something’ (Rock, 2007, p. 10). For example, the administration of oath/affirmation to defendants and witnesses in the courtroom, or the presentation of rights by police at the officially sanctioned time through official wording (or a close approximation) manifests that performativity.

- Political potential: legal language influences and is influenced by structures of power and equality. It is capable of classifying and empowering individuals in society, and, correspondingly, of systematically reproducing inequality and creating disadvantage.

- A particular relationship with literacies: written legal texts have a special status of formalising relationships between law and society (Goody, 1986, p. 142), thereby bringing fixity (Barton, 1994, p. 43) and receiving particular forms of attention. A defining feature of most written legal texts is that readers cannot question them (Goody, 1986, p. 139) and the texts are autonomous (Tiersma, 2001, p. 433). For example, the police caution is designed to be self-contained, yet ‘autonomy is scrambled by the
institutional requirement that officers explain the caution’ (Rock, 2007, p. 11).

- A capacity for difference: for example, during a police caution, the legal text can be produced in varying ways due to the influence of technology, training, interactions with the person being cautioned, interactions with other police officers, and previous exposure to cautioning (Rock, 2007, p. 11).

Further, because police interviews consist of lay, police and legislative language, they can also be regarded a hybrid genre (Johnson, 2006, p. 669), and ‘the norms that govern [police] interviews are related to the genres that they contain: interrogation and storytelling’ (Coulthard & Johnson, 2007, p. 64). Thus, Gibbons (2003, p. 130) urges that knowledge of genre is critical to understanding both the construction and comprehension of discourse. Without such a ‘knowledge schema’ (Gibbons, 2007, p. 72), it is difficult to appreciate police interviews as an institutional discourse.

Heydon (2005) uses a framework containing the stages of opening, information gathering and closing to analyse police interviews with victims, witnesses and suspects. The opening and closing stages manifest highly formulaic language, such as the introduction of the interviewing officer’s role. This language represents the police as an institution, explains the institutional goal of the interview and the interviewee’s rights in the process of the interview, recaps the interview, and explains how the institution will use the information obtained. The preference to use formulaic language by police arises from legislative requirements and concerns about admissibility in judicial processes, particularly when interviewing suspects. In contrast, in the information-gathering stage, the aim is to allow the interviewee to provide narrations as much as possible in their own words, although still subject to the confines of the subject area that the interviewer wants to explore.
As Johnson (2006) observes, due to the hybridity of police discourse—being partially legal language—it is also helpful to consider O’Barr’s (1982) contention about the content (what is said) and form (how it is said) of legal discourse. O’Barr refers particularly to language used in court, and asserts that form conveys information about the context or situation in which speech occurs, and communicates information about the relationship between the speaker and intended audience. In a courtroom setting, this audience may be the judge and jury, while, in a police interviewing setting, this may be an invisible ‘future audience’ (Cotterill, 2002, p. 124). This audience could be any one of a range of members of the judicial system when the investigation moves downstream. O’Barr (1982) highlights that ‘what is not commonly known is much about how important form really is’ (p. 1). For example, in the CI protocol, it is preferable to ask ‘What is the length of his hair?’, rather than ‘How long is his hair?’. One could argue that the pragmatic meaning of the two questions is the same. However, it is regarded more leading and less neutral in cognitive psychology to use the adjective form ‘how long’ in the question, rather than the noun form ‘what is the length’. Apart from deliberate lexical choices, speakers in a communicative event use various means—such as prosody, silence and gesticulation—to convey their intention, tone, attitude and so forth. These extra-linguistic features are an integral part of communication, and constitute what O’Barr refers to as ‘form’. As such, they should attain equal attention during analyses of police discourse.

2.1.3.2 ‘Produced for a third party’. [part of Section 2.1.3.2 is loosely based on the researcher’s contribution to Mulayim et al., 2015, pp. 33-34.] As mentioned in the previous section, police interviews may be undertaken for an invisible ‘future audience’ (Cotterill, 2002, p. 124. In this sense, they are similar to news interviews produced for an audience (Greatbatch, 1988; Heritage, 1985), rather than for the news interviewer as
a participant in the communication. Therefore, police interviews or news interviews are different to other institutional discourses taking place in contexts such as health, education, business and social welfare, where the communication is produced for the participants alone (such as doctor–patient, teacher–parent, buyer–seller and officer–client). The interactions between these parties are not subject to the scrutiny of a future third party.

One can argue that one of the most distinguishing characteristics of police interviews is that they are knowingly produced for a third party (Greatbatch, 1988; Heritage, 1985) as ‘a future audience’ ( Cotterill, 2002, p. 124), and are ‘produced to be overheard’ (Heydon, 2005, p. 39). The ‘overhearing audiences’ (Rock, 2012, p. 323)—which include magistrates, judges, juries, prosecutors and barristers—will critically analyse (often with a magnifier), review and interpret (intralingually) what is said, meant and intended by the parties, and identify probable different (intralingual) interpretations of those utterances. The existence of a future audience invariably affects how police interviewers conduct their interviews and the questioning tactics they employ (Haworth, 2006; Johnson, 2006; Stokoe & Edwards, 2008). Police interviewers are used to pitching their discourse for the purpose of future trials, while the interviewee is normally unaware of the evidential role of police interviews, and could even make statements incriminating themselves, if they are interviewed as a suspect (Haworth, 2006; Nakane, 2014, p. 9).

From a sociolinguistics perspective, one of the typical constructions of a normal conversation between two people is that one person produces the first round object (the question), followed by the other person’s second round object (the answer). Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1974) refer to this construction as ‘adjacency pairs’, with questions being the first pair part (1PP) and answers being the second pair part (2PP).
Additionally, a third round object is often produced by the first person who asks the question, to indicate news receipts (e.g., ‘oh’), add newsmarks (e.g., ‘did she?’) or give assessments (e.g., ‘good’) (Heritage, 1985, p. 98). In an ideal setting, during a police questioning sequence, the interviewing police officer normally produces the first round objects, followed by the interviewee’s second round objects. As is the case with television interviews, police interviewers do not customarily produce third round objects, as occurs in other dialogues, such as daily conversation. The use of third round objects is considered to demonstrate the questioning officer’s identification of his/her role (in the conversation) with the ‘news recipient’ (in this case, relevant members of the judicial system). This is regarded inappropriate and is used sparingly, unless the police interviewer intends to achieve something else, such as establishing rapport with the interviewee. In general, the police interviewer attempts to maintain neutral role alignment by avoiding responses that constitute positive or negative assessments of the news received from the interviewee. This consideration and behaviour ties back to the nature of police interviews being produced for someone else’s consumption, as explained above.

An essential part of interviewing is ‘translating’ (intralingually) information elicited into legal categories (Dixon, 1997). Stokoe and Edwards (2008) examine the interactional and institutional nature of what may seem to be ‘silly’ questions asked during police–suspect interactions, and the attempt of ‘legalisation’ is what is behind the ‘silly questions’ (Dixon & Travis, 2007). For example:

1. P: Did Melvin give you permission to throw the hammer at his front door?
   S: NO!!

2. P: Um, may sound a bit silly but do you know whose window it is?
   S: Yes! (smiling). (Stokoe & Edwards, 2008, p. 90)
Stokoe and Edwards (2008) observe that these questions are designed to elicit suspects’ ‘intentions and knowledge, or “the state of mind” with regard to the actions they have already admitted carrying out’ (p.107) for the sake of the record—an overhearing third-party future audience. The criminal intent—\textit{mens rea} or ‘guilty mind’—is pursued by the police interviewer. Stokoe and Edwards (2008) find that suspects often align with the course of action constructed by the interviewer’s questions, including the interviewer’s formulation of ostensibly nothing more than what the suspect has just stated. They termed this as demonstrating the ‘interactional shape of affiliation’ (p. 108). However, Stokoe and Edwards caution that asking these seemingly ‘silly’ questions may later compromise the institution when seeking to lay criminal charges or providing relevant evidence because such questions may be regarded as coercing self-incriminating testimony.

\textbf{2.1.3.3 Power asymmetry.} Shon (2008) states that police are the principal agents of social control and most visible representatives of the criminal justice system. Police power is regarded ‘a mechanism for the distribution of situationally justified force by society’ (Bittner, 1970, p. 39). The paradox is that the recipients of coercive power are the ones who bestow that right in the first place (Muir, 1977). Settle (1990) highlights that, in order to maintain order in society, individuals have given the police force the right to coerce citizens. This form of institutionally defined social control causes power asymmetry in investigative interviews conducted by police, manifesting explicitly in the uneven distribution of power between the participants. A power imbalance can also exist with other institutions, where the discourse takes place between members of the institution (such as judges, police officers, doctors and teachers) and their clients (such as the accused, suspects, patients and students). In all these cases, the power comes
from societal institutions, cultural norms for role assignments, and deference towards those roles (Walker, 1987, p. 59).

Thornborrow (2002) describes power as something that is constantly negotiated and constructed during interactions between participants, which is reflected in the paradigm propounded by Drew and Heritage (1992) and outlined in Section 2.1.3.1. Thornborrow (2002) states her position on power as follows:

[I] … see it as a contextually sensitive phenomenon, as a set of resources and actions which are available to speakers and which can be used more or less successfully depending on who the speakers are and what kind of speech situation they are in. From this perspective, power is accomplished in discourse both on a structural level, through the turn and type of space speakers are given or can get access to, and, on an interactional level, through what they can effectively accomplish in that space. (p. 8)

Harris (1989) also contends that: ‘language itself is central to the actual exercise of power and control, particularly in institutional work contexts, and not merely a transparent and neutral medium’ (p. 131). The power imbalance inherent in police interviews as a type of institutional discourse is summarised well in the following:

[I]n police interviews with suspects the role of each participant is clearly defined and restrained. Yet these roles are very unequal, especially in terms of the distribution of power and control. In addition to the asymmetric dynamic created by the ascribed roles of questioner and responder, the police have a considerable degree of direct power over the interviewee, controlling the setting in which the interview takes place and having the capability to make vital decisions about the interviewee’s liberty and future based on the outcome … (Haworth, 2006, p. 740)
Participants in police interviews have been found to comply strongly with ‘a structure where the first pair parts are allocated to the police interviewer and the second pair parts are allocated to suspects’ (Heydon, 2005, p. 99). This finding is consistent with Greatbatch’s (1988) observation of news interviews, where there exists a pre-allocation of turn types, as well as a predominant allotment of questions to interviewers and answers to interviewees. Further, it is noted that any deviations from this pattern during a police interview are ‘characteristically repaired’ (Heydon, 2005, p. 100). Apart from the ‘orientation to a question-answer structure which constrains the distribution of turn types of speakers’ (Heydon, 2005, p. 110) in police interviews, there is also restriction on the introduction or maintenance of topics by participants, which will ‘necessarily restrict participants’ access to the floor in order to provide new information voluntarily’ ( Heydon, 2005, p. 100).

Gibbons (2007) states that ‘an important manifestation of power relations is language behaviour. The manner in which power and authority are exercised through language is a significant issue in the study of language and the law’ (p. 75). His observation of courtroom discourse—which police discourse resembles to a certain extent—is that:

> [a]t the exchange level, normally only the lawyer asks questions and only the witness answers the questions—an asymmetrical pattern … At the level of question structure, coercive grammatical forms are strongly over-represented when compared to everyday conversation. (p. 115)

Such observations are similar to Harris’s (1984) in that her analysis of questions states that magistrates’ courts are used as a means of control, and the majority of questions require a minimal response. She contends that ‘the asking of questions becomes a powerful means of controlling the discourse’ (Harris, 1984, p. 14).
The imbalance of power manifests not only in police authority to manage the entire interview process, but also in the language used (Mulayim et al., 2015, p. 29). Given that language is often used as a tool to exert authority in all kinds of power relationships, it is natural for us to question: what happens in ‘unequal encounters where the non-powerful people have cultural and linguistic backgrounds different from those of the powerful people?’ (Fairclough, 1989, p. 47). On this subject, Laster (1990) offers the following observation:

[T]he linguistic tricks employed by police in an interview are probably not dissimilar from those employed in courtroom cross-examination. But because police interviews are conducted in private, there is no ‘umpire’ to ensure that the questioner remains within accepted procedural parameters, and there is the implicit and sometimes explicit possibility of coercion of various sorts to enlist the cooperation of the non-English speaker. (p. 25)

Much of the literature on interviewing methods used in police training in the UK emphasises the need for interviewers to pass control of the interview to the interviewee (Fisher, Milne, & Bull, 2011). This is considered a crucial step in eliciting the all-important free narrative and ensuring that the interviewee has the opportunity to contribute as much detail as possible, even if the relevant question has not been asked. Yet, this instruction runs counter to what is known generally about applying turn-taking rules in conversation, as established by Sacks et al. (1974)—and specifically what is known about the structure of an interview (Drew & Heritage, 1992; Heydon, 2005). In relation to turn-taking rules and Sacks et al., we can identify topic management strategies that are available to participants in a conversation:

- stepwise topic transitions—a gradual disengagement from the old topic to the new one (Jefferson, 1984; Sacks, 1992)
disjunctive topic shift—an abrupt jump from one topic to another (Heydon & Lai, 2013; Jefferson, 1984).

In terms of interview structure, we can identify the specific turn types that are available to participants: 1PP initiations (police questions) and 2PP responses (interviewee answers). By applying these observations about interaction to the advice about empowering interviewees to take control of the interview, it is immediately apparent that interviewees are heavily constrained in the interactional resources they have available to change the topic and introduce new information. As long as the police interviewer is allocated the initiating 1PP turns and the interviewee is allocated the responding 2PP turns, the only way for the interviewee to change the topic and introduce new information is to use stepwise topic transitions. In this manner, they move gradually from the topic of the police question towards the new topic via a response to the police question (Heydon & Lai, 2013). Unfortunately, prior research indicates that police interviewers are somewhat prone to interrupting interviewees as soon as the answer to their question has been provided (Clarke & Milne, 2001), or to ignoring the interviewee’s new information when it is supplied using this stepwise strategy (Heydon, 2005).

Harris (1984, p. 5) quotes the following courtroom exchange to highlight the power imbalance in a British magistrate’s court:

Judge: I’m putting it to you again—are you going to make an offer—
uh—uh—to discharge this debt…

Defendant: Would you in my position…

Judge: I’m not here to answer questions—you answer my question.

Similarly, Haworth (2006) examine the balance of power and control in an English police interview with high-profile murder suspect Dr Harold Shipman. In 2000,
Shipman was convicted of murdering 15 of his patients, and, in the later Shipman Inquiry, was found to be likely responsible for a total of 250 cases of murder over 27 years of medical practice. In the question types Haworth examined, she identified whether they were:

1. information seeking
2. confirmation seeking
3. explanation seeking
4. accusatory.

Additionally, she examines topic control, question–answer sequence and institutional status. She finds that the asymmetrical default position of control lies with the police questioner, with Shipman left in the position of attempting to resist such control (Haworth, 2006, p. 754). A good example occurred during the interview, when Shipman was asked the following question, which essentially accused him of forging the will of his then deceased patient, thus implicating him in murder:

**Police officer:** can I put it directly to you doctor that you forged … you have produced … the letters and this will on your typewriter in the hope of benefitting from Mrs Grundy’s estate.

**Dr Shipman:** is that a question or a statement? (Haworth, 2006, pp. 750–751)

Haworth (2006) regards the response from Shipman as a ‘strong challenge to P[olice]’s role as questioner’ (p. 751). Data analysis led Haworth (2006) to caution police interviewers that ‘ultimately control of interaction is achieved on a turn-by-turn basis through the use of discursive strategies and techniques’ (p. 755). She notes that police actually gained the most information when Shipman took discursive control; thus, it is ‘just as important to know when to relinquish power and control in this context as it is to maintain it’ (Haworth, 2006, p. 755).
Walker (1987) highlights the linguistic base of power, in which ‘a question is a powerful thing’. This is corroborated by Goody’s (1986) remark that ‘the most general thing we can say about a question is that it compels, requires, may even demand a response. It is this fact which leads to questions often carrying a strong command message’ (p. 23). In legal and police settings, we can go so far as to say that a question must be paired not only by a response, but by a response that addresses the question (Walker, 1987, p. 59). It becomes ‘an order that the respondent’s knowledge be displayed in an appropriate form’ (Walker, 1987, pp. 59–60), which Walker (1987) terms the ‘epistemic command function of the question’ (p. 59).

### 2.1.3.4 Turn taking

[Part of Section 2.1.3.4 is loosely based on the researcher’s contribution to Mulayim et al., 2015, pp. 34-36.] Under the CA tradition, everyday talk is characterised by exchanges of ‘turns’ produced by the interlocutors based on ‘a common set of socially shared and structured procedures’ (Heritage, 2005, p. 105). However, considering the central role turns plays in CA, it is curious that Sacks—and later Schegloff and Jefferson, as well as all the scholars after them—did not explicitly define what a ‘turn’ is. Thus, this study sought dictionary definitions as a starting point. The Merriam-Webster dictionary defines a ‘turn’ as a period of participation—as in a ‘turn of wrestling’. The Oxford Dictionary defines a turn as an opportunity or obligation to do something, which comes successively to each of a number of people. Similarly, the Collins Dictionary defines a ‘turn’ as the right or opportunity to do something in an agreed order or succession. More precisely, according to the British Council’s (n.d.) English-teaching website, in the context of human speech, a turn is the time when a speaker is talking. A turn in talking can be anything from silence (such as an answer to a police question); one word (such as ‘pardon?’ or ‘sure!’); to a sentence, paragraph or complete speech (before anyone else is able to talk). The content in a turn—from
silence to a whole speech—is referred to as a ‘turn construction unit’ (TCU) by Sacks et al. (1974).

Apart from TCUs to constitute the content of talking in one or multiple turns, without a socially accepted turn-taking system governing all participants, talking would be chaotic and ineffective. Imagine asking a group of enthusiastic schoolchildren who is their favourite pop star. The teacher is unlikely to attain the full range of answers without implementing rules, such as having the children raise their hands and letting one person speak at a time. Sacks et al. (1974) add that we also need a turn-allocation mechanism to deal with the regulation and negotiation of orderly turn taking at the end of each TCU, before the next unit. These end points in a turn complete the unit and allow the change of speaker, and are referred to by Sacks et al. (1974) as a ‘transition relevance place’ (TRP).

Sacks et al. (1974, pp. 700–701) further provide the following observations about the social organisation of turn taking in naturally occurring conversations:

- turn order is not fixed, but varies
- turn size is not fixed, but varies
- length of conversation is not specified in advance
- relative distribution of turns is not specified in advance
- turn-allocation techniques are obviously used; a current speaker may select a next speaker (as when he or she addresses a question to another party) or parties may self-select in starting to talk.

From a forensic linguistics perspective, ‘conversations’ in police interview settings manifest completely different organisational norms to the above, as observed by Coulthard and Johnson (2007), in that ‘order and distribution of turns and the degree’ (p. 32) are different. Police interviews share with other institutional interviews a basic turn-
taking system consisting of sequences of questions and answers (Greatbatch, 1988; Heritage, 1985; Levinson, 1992; Peräkylä & Silverman, 1991). They also have a turn pre-allocation system, whereby questions are allocated to interviewers and responses to interviewees (Frankel, 1990; Peräkylä & Silverman, 1991). For ‘conversations’ in other contexts (such as between couples, friends or work colleagues), there tends to be equal distribution of turns in the question-and-answer sequences per participant, although the proportion of talk time occupied by the participants is different, depending on who intends to achieve what goals during the conversation. In police interviews, although interviewees can ask questions, they are usually confined to clarifying questions asked of them in the first place. Whether these questions are answered or ignored depends on the interviewing officer’s judgement of their relevance to the interview. After the opening formalities (the recording preamble and police caution), the interviewing officer moves on to the information-collecting stage, with the aim of eliciting as much information as possible in relation to the investigation. This is normally achieved by posing a series of open-ended questions, and the interviewee is encouraged to provide as detailed an answer as possible (Mulayim et al., 2015, pp. 34–36). The turn-taking features of this part of the interview manifest differently to those in normal social conversations, as Sacks et al. (1974) propose above. These differences can be as follows:

- turn order is relatively fixed, with questions often allocated to the interviewing officer and answers often allocated to the interviewee
- turn size is relatively fixed, with shorter turns for the interviewing officer and longer turns for the interviewees
- length of conversation, although not specified in advance, is predominantly determined by the interviewing officer in terms of when it can be terminated or when a follow-up interview is to be scheduled
• relative distribution of turns is specified by default of the setting—that is, questions are always allocated to the interviewing officer and answers are always allocated to the interviewee

• turn-allocation techniques are not used by all participants in the interview, in the sense that, if the current speaker is the interviewing officer, she or he has full access to selecting the next speaker; however, the interviewee has limited access to self-select in starting to talk.

However, it must be highlighted that the above features of police interviews are by no means absolute. Rather, they represent more of an ideal of what police interviewers aim to achieve in their investigative interviews, and deviation from these patterns may see police officers using strategies to steer the pattern back to the preferred turn-taking procedures (Mulayim et al., 2015, p. 36)

2.1.3.5 Highly prescriptive opening and closing. The opening and closing segments of the police interview are used to inform the interviewee of their rights and obligations. They are identified to orient to ‘adhering to legislative requirements’ (Heydon, 2005, p. 73). If these parts of the interview are not done properly, it weakens the legitimacy of the interview as evidence in court (Heydon, 2005, p. 73).

A closer look at these prescriptive opening and ending statements in police interviews reveals that they are not written or constructed by individual officers. The following is an example of what Victoria Police use at the beginning of a formal recorded police interview:

[I] must inform you that you are not obliged to say or do anything, but anything you say or do may be given in evidence. Do you understand that? I must also inform you of the following rights: You may communicate with or attempt to communicate with a friend or a relative to inform that person of your
whereabouts. You may communicate with or attempt to communicate with a legal practitioner.

If you are not a permanent resident or an Australian citizen, you may communicate or attempt to communicate with the consular office of which you are a citizen.

If you are under seventeen years of age, you may communicate or attempt to communicate with a parent or guardian, or an independent third person, and have that person present during the interview.

Do you understand these rights?

Do you wish to exercise any of these rights before the interview proceeds?

[For children] Tell me in your own words what this means? (VITS, n.d.)

The conversational role the police interviewer occupies in these utterances is like a sounding box—or, in Goffman’s (1981) term, an ‘animator’. These utterances by the police interviewer are aligned to the institution they represent. The police institution bears the authorship and takes responsibility for the consequences of these utterances—referred to by Goffman (1981) as the ‘principalship’.

**2.1.3.6 Formulaic language.** [Parts of Section 2.1.3.6 are loosely based on the researcher’s contribution to Mulayim et al., 2015, pp. 27-29.] Often, the language used in the police interviewing process—particularly at the beginning and end of an interview, including lexical items and grammatical structures—is dictated by legislation and police regulations (Heydon, 2005, p. 4). For example, the police caution administered in Australia (similar to the Miranda rights in the US) preceding an official interview with a suspect in a criminal matter can progress as follows:

PO: Before I do this I **must** inform you

That you are **not obliged** to say or do anything
But anything you say or do **may be given** in evidence

Do you understand that? [emphasis added]. (Heydon, 2005, p. 5)

These utterances not only sound formulaic (in order to satisfy regulations), but also exert institutional power via the words in bold. The opening sequence of the interview establishes that police are in control of the ‘conversation’, i.e. it is on their terms. Additionally, asking ‘Do you understand that?’ or questions such as ‘Do you agree?’ also intends to establish a pattern of compliance. Gibbons (1990, pp. 234–235) analyses a corpus of second-language speakers in police interviews, and provided the following summary to highlight the issues caused by the complex language used by police interviewers.

1. **The accumulation of phrase and constituents, and the length.** For example:

   PO: As I have already explained to you / I am making enquiries **in relation to** the death of RZ / **in the early hours** / **of** the morning / **of** the fourth of February, 1985, / **in the vicinity** / **of** the Mob of Cows Hotel, / Pyrmont Bridge Road, / Glebe Point Park.

   There are as nine constituents in this sentence (separated by the forward slashes) and six prepositional phrases (bold). In addition, the use of police jargon such as ‘in relation to’ (instead of simply ‘about’) and ‘in the vicinity of’ (instead of ‘near’) adds to the complexity. Utterances this long and complicated are difficult to understand, even for a native speaker.

2. **The intricacy of grammatical relations between clauses.** For example: ‘PO: I want you to understand that you are not obliged to say anything unless you wish, but whatever you say will be recorded … and may be used in evidence’. This sentence contains two indirect speech forms—‘I want you to understand that you’ and ‘but whatever you’.
3. Grammatical metaphor and abstract language. For example: ‘PO: prior to the commencement of this interview’ and ‘PO: Do you agree that I also told you at the conclusion of the interview you would be given the opportunity of reading through the interview’. ‘Commencement’ in the first example and ‘conclusion’ in the second example are noun constructions used to replace simple verbs, such as ‘begin’ and ‘finish’. The passive voice in the second example (‘given the opportunity’) permits omission of the agent ‘I’ (will give you the opportunity to…), which makes the sentences sound more complex than necessary, particularly to a second-language speaker.

4. Low frequency words, expressions and grammatical structures. There are no examples of this issue in Gibbons’ (1990) paper. However, this category can easily be found in the ‘copspeak’ in television shows, where the simple words ‘men’ and ‘women’ are turned into ‘male persons’ and ‘female persons’. A suspect is ‘conveyed’ instead of ‘taken’ to the police station for questioning. Instead of asking a person why he ‘took’ the items from the shop without paying, the person has ‘removed’ the items from the shop. Worse still, a simple construction of ‘the guy got shot and he was dead’ (Gibbons, 2007, p. 86) can become ‘he was hit by a projectile from a high powered weapon, numerous times until his bodily functions ceased’ (Gibbons, 2007, p. 86).

5. Semantically difficult grammatical relations, such as those in the passive voice, and expressions such as ‘unless’. For example:

PO: Do you agree that I also told you at the conclusion of the interview you would be given the opportunity of reading through the interview [emphasis added; same example as Item 3]

PO: I want you to understand that you are not obliged to say anything unless you wish [emphasis added; same example as in Item 2]
These features of police talk may be foreign to most members of the public—even those who speak the same language. These issues understandably present substantial challenges to community members who do not speak the mainstream language, or are not native speakers of this language.

2.1.3.7 Primary versus secondary reality. [Section 2.1.3.7 is loosely based on the researcher’s contribution to Mulayim et al., 2015, pp. 30-31.] As in the courtroom setting, the process of police investigation and questioning has two layers of reality (Gibbons, 2007, pp. 78–79): (i) the primary reality, relating to the physical environment and context, and (ii) the secondary reality, relating to the matter under investigation. For example, the following conversation features a conversation between a police officer and a shopkeeper, who goes to a police station to report a robbery that has just occurred at his shop:

PO: I hope you are feeling better now. After all, it is pretty frightening to be in the situation, particularly when the guy had a gun.

(Primary reality in police station)

Now, I would like you to think back to when the robber entered the shop and yelled at you. What can you tell me about what happened?

(Secondary reality framing to prompt the eyewitness for information)

S/W: Well, it was about 11 o’clock and I was about to shut the shop. This guy came in the store and walked around the aisles for a few rounds. I thought he was trying to find something. So I yelled at him, ‘Do you need help?’

(Secondary reality recounting the robbery)

PO: How far away was he from where you stood?

(Secondary reality framing for further information)

S/W: (looks around) Not sure. About from here to where that window is.
(secondary reality using physical environment from primary reality)(Mulayim et al., 2015, p. 31)

Gibbons’s (2007) following schema demonstrates alternating realities of a police interview, starting from the preamble of recording and formal police caution (see Section 2.1.3.5), moving to the actual interviewing stage, and ending with the closing statement. Gibbons (2007) defines the opening and closing stages of police interviews as ‘primary reality framing’ (p. 142), and the information-gathering stage as ‘secondary reality framing’ (p. 142).

**Primary reality framing**

(Place) (date) Time of interview

Persons present

Interviewee’s name (address) (date of birth)

Cautions

Right to silence

Recording

(Interpreter present / (not) needed)

**Secondary reality core**

Orientation

Subject of interview

(Date and time of incident)

Questioning

Question–answer

(Introduction of evidence from secondary reality)

(Invitation to give further evidence)

**Primary reality framing**
Recording issues

Cautions

Un-coerced interview

(Invitation to sign)

(Further actions)

Closure (Time) (Gibbons, 2007, p. 142)

This description indicates the interwoven realities commonplace in police interviews, particularly when the crime incident is the topic of the talk and has necessarily already occurred. Thus, by default, it involves the secondary reality. This hybrid and dynamic nature of the police interview was also recognised by Coulthard and Johnson (2007) and Nakane (2014, p. 12).

2.1.3.8 Specific lexical choices. [Section 2.1.3.8 is loosely based on the researcher’s contribution to Mulayim et. Al, 2015, pp. 32-33.] Police discourse is regarded as a ‘legal sub-genre’ (Coulthard & Johnson, 2007, p. 40) and may be challenging even to lay native speakers. Undoubtedly, it is even more difficult for non-native speakers from different cultural and linguistic backgrounds. At the lexical level, words are chosen carefully as part of the questioning strategy used by police, and, later, if contested in court, by the legal counsels on both sides (Mulayim et al., 2015, p. 32).

Danet (1980) discusses the construction of an alternative version of the same reality through different word choices, which is often played out in a court of law by opposing parties in an adversarial legal system. To illustrate this point, Danet gives the example of a high-profile US abortion case, in which an unborn child was referred to as a ‘foetus’ by the defendant, whereas the prosecution used terms such as ‘loved one’, ‘baby boy’, ‘the deceased’ and ‘victim’. Understanding such deliberate lexical choices and being able to discern the different negative, neutral and positive connotations that
each lexical item intends to evoke are paramount to analysing the discourse. For example, the terms ‘terrorist’, ‘guerrilla’ and ‘freedom fighter’ (Gibbons, 2007, p. 118) can all be used to describe the same person, from different viewpoints (Mulayim et al., 2015, pp. 32–33).

Another widely referenced experiment was undertaken by Loftus and Palmer (1974), which asked questions to research subjects who had viewed slides of a car accident. Questions include: ‘About how fast were the cars going when they smashed/collided/bumped/hit/contacted each other?’. The results indicate that those who were asked the ‘smash’ question reported the highest speeds, followed by ‘collided’, ‘bumped’, ‘hit’ and ‘contacted’ in descending order. When the research subjects were asked if they saw any broken glass in the slides (there was none), those in the ‘smashed’ group were more likely to indicate that they had seen broken glass. Thus, Loftus and Palmer caution that great care should be taken in lexical choices, particularly in terms of creating leading questions, which may distort eyewitness testimony accounts and have a confabulating effect, since the witness account could be distorted by cues provided in the question.

2.1.4 Importance of police interviews. Police cannot be everywhere at all times to prevent crimes occurring; thus, society largely depends on police investigations through communicating with suspects, victims, witnesses, fellow professionals and the public for information leading to the arrest and conviction of guilty people. Police interviews are regarded ‘goal-focused events, the primary aim of which is the collection and synthesis of evidence into a written statement for use in any subsequent court hearing’ (Coulthard & Johnson, 2007, p. 80) and considered ‘perhaps one of the most important quasi-judicial contexts in which interpreting occurs’ (Berk-Seligson, 2012, p. 423). As forensic linguist Kate Haworth (2006) rightly states: ‘the police interview is
not only a means of evidence gathering, but also becomes a piece of evidence in itself submitted to the court at trial’ (p. 741). She further observes that ‘police interviews are communicative processes, but they are also products because they form evidence which is used and scrutinised in the trial’ (Haworth, 2006, p. 741). James Stewart (as cited in Geiselman & Fisher, 1985), Director of the US National Institute of Justice, highlights the significance of police interviews in eliciting crucial information: ‘Information is the lifeblood of criminal investigation and it is the ability of investigators to obtain useful and accurate information from witnesses and victims of crime that is crucial to effective law enforcement’ (p. 1).

Police interviews are believed to be one of the most common law enforcement activities (McGurk et al., 1993) and one of the most important (Milne & Bull, 2006). The ability to interview is regarded one of the most important tools employed by an investigator (Milne & Bull 2006). Haworth (2006) asserts that:

[t]he police interview [should be viewed] not as an event which occurs in isolation, but as an intrinsic part of a much wider process. (p. 741)

In a study conducted by McGurk et al. (1993) on 46 police officers from four locations (Exeter, London, Manchester and Lincoln) in the UK in 1992 who received training on investigative interviewing, the officers say that interviewing witnesses and suspects is in the top four most frequently conducted tasks in their daily policing activities. Their three most important investigative duties are: taking statements, interviewing witnesses and interviewing suspects. Horvath and Meesig (1998) argue that textbooks on criminal investigation perpetuate myths by over-emphasising the role of forensic evidence relative to its actual use, when the majority of criminal cases do not use any physical evidence. Even when physical evidence is available, it is not always used (Heydon & Lai, 2013; Horvath & Meesig, 1996). This view was echoed by
Shepherd (2007), who asserts that ‘most information an investigator obtains would be “soft fact”: utterances and assertions within accounts given by witnesses (incl. victims, eyewitnesses) and suspects’ (p. 3). Yeschke (2003, p. 47) refers to statistics in the US that indicated that real and documentary evidence of crimes constitutes about 20% of all evidence presented in courts of law, in contrast to testimonial evidence, which accounts for the remaining 80%. Under such circumstances, much of the evidence of crime is gathered through investigative interviews conducted by police and other professionals, such as social workers, psychologists and psychiatrists (Yarmey, 2001, p. 61). During a custodial suspect interview, there may be a lack of physical evidence, such as fingerprints, DNA or circumstantial evidence (see Section 1.1). Thus, interviewing suspects is of critical importance because it may provide the inculpatory or incriminating evidence that can lead to a guilty plea (Vrij, 1998, as cited in Yarmey, 2001, p. 79), thus saving police the time to collect real evidence and present it at a contested trial. Further, such interviews may lead to the revelation of information about accomplices, whereabouts of stolen property, or clearance of other unsolved cases (Vrij, 1998, as cited in Yarmey, 2001, p. 79).

Much emphasis has traditionally been rightly placed on interviewing suspects. However, in the last two decades, there have been increased calls for greater attention to be devoted to interviews with victims and witnesses, as their testimony is considered ‘the best predictor of solving crimes’ (Fisher & Geiselman, 2010, p. 321; Kebbell & Milne, 1998; Kebbell & Wagstaff, 1997). However, victims and witnesses of crimes may not have had an optimal view of the crime, or the most thorough memory, and may not possess sufficient verbal skills to relay their memories of the event. In addition, they may be deeply traumatised by the event, so that they have an inhibited memory or restricted verbal ability to express their experience. All the police can control is ‘how
they interview victims and witnesses’ (Fisher & Geiselman, 2010, p. 321) in order to skilfully obtain the best possible quality and quantity of information.

Inappropriate interviewing tactics, among other factors, have contributed to false confessions, leading to wrongful convictions and miscarriages of justice (Carrabine, Cox, Lee, Plummer, & South, 2013, p. 260; Gudjonsson, 2003, pp. 445–457). The dire consequences of poor interviewing should be avoided at all costs, as aptly stated by Milne and Bull (1999):

[S]ociety cannot afford investigative interviewing to be poor. This affects people’s perceptions of the criminal justice system. The guilty get away, the innocent convicted, justice for children and vulnerable adults is inadequate. Poor interviewing is of no value to anyone; it is a waste of time, resources and money. No one wins. People will not come forward if they have no confidence in the quality of investigators’ interviewing techniques. (p. 191)

As is stated by Haworth (2006),

[p]olice interviews have an extremely significant practical function with far-reaching consequences. They may well constitute one of the most important conversations of an interviewee’s [as a suspect] life. They therefore represent a particularly interesting and important area of linguistic study. (p. 740)

Commenting on the importance of ethical interviewing practice to police officers, Shepherd (1991) acknowledges the nature of language as being no less lethal than the weapon an officer carries:

[t]he service has to come to terms with the necessity to train officers continuously to fulfil the high-risk role of carrying a firearm. But language is also a loaded weapon. Unethical interviewing by a police officer is akin to using that loaded gun … language will always be a loaded weapon. The only
difference between the firearms and interviewing context is that, in the latter, every officer is armed. (p. 57)

Managing conversation in interviews with witnesses conducted by police is believed to be one of the core skills of policing. While outsiders, such as the public, assume that police are expert interviewers, the reality may be different. Shepherd (2007) notes that ‘conversation occupies so much of our lives that we never stop to think: we just do it. Investigative interviewers have to think and act differently. They have to reflect on conversation: their own and others’ (p. 69). He further states that since interviewing constitutes the ‘conversational core of policing’ (Shepherd, 1986, p. 294), ‘career development implies an explicit program of training aimed at ensuring the officer is ready, willing and able to fulfil the range of purposeful conversation’ (Shepherd, 1991, p. 57).

Until the early 1990s, British police officers were observed to have ‘received remarkably little training in techniques of questioning suspects’ (Moston & Engelberg, 1993, p. 223). In that era, it was believed that ‘interviewing skills could not be taught, but only learnt through experience’ (Moston & Engelberg, 1993, p. 223). Although interviewing skills were developed by experience, particularly in that era, it should be noted that they also accumulate through formal training and, more often, informal learning such as through police magazines. The idea of a good interview in those days was simply one in which a suspect confessed; thus, by implication, a good interviewer was someone able to elicit many confessions (Moston & Engelberg, 1993, p. 223). A confession is defined as ‘a written or oral statement or even a nod of the head by an accused, which is an admission of guilt or an admission of the fact that tends to prove his or her guilt’ (Yarmey, 2001, p. 62). However, if a confession is obtained by an oppressive questioning approach that contains threats (such as a jail term) or
inducement of benefit (such as leniency of punishment), such evidence may be ruled by the court as inadmissible because it may not be voluntarily given (Yarmey, 2001, p. 62). Before tape recording was introduced in British police interview rooms in 1989 as was required by the *Police and Criminal Evidence Act* (PACE) in 1984, contemporaneous note-taking was required under PACE. With the availability of tape recordings, British psychologists started working with the UK Home Office to undertake large-scale surveys of interview data and identify improvements that could be addressed with research-based training materials (Central Planning and Training Unit, 1993).

Australia’s state of NSW formally established a similar protocol—the Electronic Recording of Interviews with Suspected Persons (ERISP)—through a statutory law (Dixon, 2006, p. 326) in 1995, although NSW and Australian Federal Police were developing and using electronic recording long before it was mandated by the *Evidence Act 1995* (NSW) (Dixon & Travis, 2007). In this sense Australia was and is ahead of everywhere else in the world in the use of video recording, except possibly New Zealand. After 1995, this protocol was followed by all states and territories in the country. It was hailed a success in reducing the challenges encountered by police in obtaining evidence of confessions, increasing guilty pleas, and saving trial time because of decreased disputes over evidence of confessions (Carrick, 2007). One should always exercise caution, though, when viewing confession from the prism of solving crimes. On the one hand it saves the court system enormous costs in pursuing the accused; on the other hand, however, only when measures such as PACE in English and Wales, and ERISP in Australia are in place as a safeguard and ethical interviewing practice is enforced by police can confessions be regarded as desirable in criminal justice systems.
2.2 Conducting Police Interviews

Unlike private conversations between two private people, which have mainly social functions and little information exchange, police interviewing—as a type of institutional interaction—has clearly defined organisational aims and is undertaken by the institution’s members to precisely achieve those aims. Shepherd (1988) observes that interviewers must be able to monitor and adjust their conversational styles as a function of the emotion of the situation and the changing perceptions of the interpersonal relationship in order to achieve the institutional objectives. Yarmey (2001, p. 64) similarly states that the questioning officer must take care to control for contextual or situational factors that may influence the validity of the account elicited from the interviewee.

Police forces around the world have realised that the lifeblood of solving criminal cases is reliable information elicited from suspects, witnesses and victims. The old-fashioned thinking that interviewing skills cannot be taught, but can only develop through experience, has been discredited. It has been replaced by a growing consensus that police investigative interviewing is an acquired skill that must be nurtured and developed through training (Baldwin, 1993; Bull & Milne, 2004; Clarke & Milne, 2001; Heydon & Lai, 2013; Moston et al., 1992; Pearse & Gudjonsson, 1996). When trying to elicit from an interviewee an account of the event under investigation, one quickly realises that human memory is unlike a video recorder; thus, the elusive information is often incomplete, sometimes inconsistent or (worse still) fallible. Not only does the interviewee’s physiological functioning of memory play a part in the interviewing outcomes, but the interview itself, as a social situation, also has many factors involved. These factors can be the physical setting of the interview room, the personal and psychological state of each participant in the interview, the interviewee’s own
comprehension of the interviewer’s instructions and questions, verbal and nonverbal communications, and general interviewer behaviour in eliciting and responding to witness statements (Yarmey, 2001, p. 64). This explains why police interviewing can no longer be a task that police officers merely undertake or learn in an ad hoc manner. Structures or models coupled with training were developed in response to the realisation that police interviewing is a complex matter. The following two sections introduce the two most commonly adopted paradigms of police interviewing around the world, by describing and contrasting their methodologies and highlighting their differences.

2.2.1 Major models of police interviewing—The PEACE model. [Section 2.2.1 is loosely based on the researcher’s contribution to Mulayim et al., 2015, pp. 38-39.] This interviewing framework was designed for interviews in any situation, with any type of interviewee. Its inception in the UK in the 1990s arose from a series of serious miscarriages of justice and the final quashing of convictions, such as the cases of the Birmingham Six (1974), Guildford Four (1975) and Maguire Seven (1976) (Gudjonsson, 1992a, 2003; Schollum, 2005, p. 23). Gone are the days when police could begin an interview presuming that the suspect was guilty, and could pitch questions that were intimidating, inflexible, wooden and biased towards gaining incriminating answers (Mulayim et al., 2015, p. 39). The aim of the PEACE model is to elicit the interviewee’s full account of the crime under investigation. The mnemonic stands for:

- P planning and preparation
- E engage and explain
- A account
- C closure
- E evaluation (Shollum, 2005, p. 43).

This interviewing model is a structure covering the before-, during- and after-interview stages. Arguably, the main interviewing stage—as illustrated in the middle stage (Account) of Diagram 1—is where investigative interviewing is predominantly implemented (Shawyer et al., 2013, p. 27). According to the UK Home Office Circular 22/1992, police officers should adhere to the following principles when conducting investigative interviewing (Williamson, 2006):

- The role of the investigative interview is to obtain accurate and reliable accounts from victims, witnesses and suspects in order to discover the truth about matters under police investigation.
- Investigative interviewing should be approached with an open mind. Information obtained from the person who is being interviewed should always be tested against what the interviewing officer already knows or what can reasonably be established.
- When questioning anyone a police officer must act fairly in the circumstances of each individual case.
• The police interviewer is not bound to accept the first answer given. Questioning is not unfair merely because it is persistent.

• Even when the right of silence is exercised by a suspect, the police still have a right to put questions.

• When conducting an interview, police officers are free to ask questions in order to establish the truth, except for interviews with child victims of sexual or violent abuse which are to be used in criminal proceedings. They are not constrained by the rules applied to lawyers in court.

• Vulnerable people, whether victims, witnesses or suspects, must always be treated with particular consideration at all times. (p. 154)

Under this framework, CI and conversation management (CM) are delineated for interviewers to use with interviewees who have different cooperative attitudes (Gudjonsson, 2012, p. 471). CI was developed by US psychologists Fisher and Geiselman (1992) as a set of memory-facilitating processes based on psychological principles, and is more commonly used with victims and witnesses, as well as cooperative suspects. CM was developed by UK psychologist Eric Shepherd (Mortimer & Shepherd, 1999) for situations in which cooperation from the suspect is insufficient for CI to work effectively (Gudjonsson, 2012, p. 471).

The PEACE model has its ethos firmly centred on fairness and openness, and does not advocate practices such as trickery and deception to obtain a confession (Shawyer et al., 2013, p. 27). It is arguably the best-practice police interviewing model because it encourages the interviewer to keep an open mind and seek truth (Shawyer et al., 2013, p. 27). Hence, it has proven effective in eliciting free-form narratives in monolingual police interview settings, and is widely adopted in England, Wales, countries in continental Europe, Mauritius, New Zealand and Australia (Heydon & Lai,
According to Moston (as cited in Carrick, 2007), since the introduction of the PEACE model in England and Wales in 1992, every police officer in the UK has received extensive training in interviewing, both at the Police Academies and once they start their policing duties. There is also comprehensive ongoing training for police officers who are identified as showing potential as interviewers. It is worth noting, though, that Clarke and Milne’s 2001 evaluation of PEACE implementation almost ten years since its introduction is relatively pessimistic. They examined almost 150 samples of PEACE interviews with suspects by six forces across England, and report of lowly rated basic communication skills (e.g. listening) by the officers and 10% of instances where PACE may have been breached (Clarke & Milne, 2001).

In Australia, police forces of states such as Queensland, Western Australia and Victoria adopt the PEACE framework to varying degrees to conduct investigative interviews. The Queensland Police department has almost entirely incorporated the model into its training manual (Schollum, 2005, p. 44), while Victoria Police use the model primarily for interviews with vulnerable witnesses, and have been expanding this training to all detectives (Silvester, 2010).

2.2.2 Major models of police interviewing—Reid technique. [Section 2.2.2 is loosely based on the researcher’s contribution to Mulayim et al., 2015, pp. 41–43.] In contrast to the PEACE model, the other major interviewing paradigm used mainly in the US and Canada is commonly referred to as the Reid technique. The development of the interviewing and interrogation process in the US started as early as in the 1940s and 1950s. Law professor Fred E Inbau from Northwestern University, and his student John Reid—later the founder of John E Reid & Associates—published the first edition of *Criminal Interrogation and Confessions* in 1962. The interviewing techniques promulgated in the book came to be known as the Reid technique. In the ensuing years,
a number of editions were published with further updates and refined techniques. The latest (fifth) edition came out in 2013.

Contrary to the central tenet of the PEACE model (to discover the truth), the strategies recommended in the Reid technique aim to develop police interviewers’ skills to persuade a suspect to confess. Such strategies cover both the interview and interrogation processes. Interviews are delineated to exclusively refer to non-accusatory initial talks with a suspect, with a view to gathering information. When criminality is reasonably established, an interrogation follows, with approaches that are accusatory and involve active persuasion. The controversial aspect of the Reid technique lies in its acceptance of deceiving suspects and presenting false evidence, even though this is recognised as risky (Blair, 2005, p. 46). However, it may not be totally fair to attribute the disapproval of those who believe in and practice the PEACE model to Inbau, Reid and their subsequent collaborators, because US courts are the ones that raise no objections to evidence obtained through such practices (Mulayim et al., 2015, p. 43).

The interview process designed by Reid has three stages (Schollum, 2005, p. 78):

1. Factual analysis of information relative to a crime scene, the victim and possible subjects in order to help determine the direction an investigation should take and offer insights to the possible offender.
2. Interviewing possible subjects using a highly structured interview format that is non-accusatory and designed to provide the investigator with verbal and nonverbal behaviour symptoms that support probable truthfulness or deception.
3. Accusatory interrogation, which is used if the investigator believes that the subject has not told the truth during the non-accusatory interview.
Reid contended that, when an investigator ‘believes’ that the suspect has not told the
truth during the non-accusatory interviewing stage and is ‘reasonably certain’ of the
person’s guilt, interrogation can occur in a controlled environment to seek the truth.
Reid (as cited in Schollum, 2005, p. 78) divides the interrogation process into the
following nine steps:

- Step 1: direct positive confrontation by advising the suspect that the
  investigation clearly indicates his/her association of the crime.
- Step 2: develop ‘themes’ that psychologically justify or excuse the suspect’s
  crime.
- Step 3: actively discourage the suspect from offering denials or explanations
  for incriminating evidence.
- Step 4: not allow the suspect to offer any factual or emotional objections.
- Step 5: ensure the suspect’s attention to the theme and does not withdraw.
- Step 6: respond to the suspect’s passive mood by showing sympathy and
  understanding, and urges the suspect to cooperate.
- Step 7: present an alternative question concerning some aspect of the crime;
  accepting either scenario results in an admission of guilt.
- Step 8: develop the oral confession using questions and answers in order to
  corroborate the confession.
- Step 9: convert the oral confession into a court admissible document in
  which the suspect acknowledges culpability, including details only the guilty
  person would know.

Before administering these steps, ‘Miranda warnings’ (equivalent to the police
caution in Australia) must be administered to a custodial suspect and a waiver must be
obtained (Buckley, 2006). Kassin and McNall (1991) summarise the two main approaches used by the Reid technique:

1. maximisation—including intimidation, presentation of false evidence, and exaggeration of the seriousness of the crime and charges
2. minimisation—including downplaying the seriousness of the crime, offering face-saving excuses, and implying leniency.

Gudjonsson (1992a, 1992b, 1999) and Kassin (1997; Kassin, Drizin, Grisso, Gudjonsson, Leo, & Redlich, 2010) criticise the Reid technique methods of being highly oppressive and exerting psychological stress and uncertainty, which may lead to false confessions. Moreover, various studies have found that a lot of accurate information can be elicited in interviews with suspects or witnesses by using less confrontational methods (Gudjonsson & Pearse, 2011; Milne & Bull, 1999; Shepherd, 1988). However, employing artifice, trickery and deception during interrogation still enjoys support from the US public, is referred to in US literature, and is supported by the courts (Mulayim et al., 2015, pp. 41–43).

Much literature has established that all suspects—not only people with lower English proficiency—are vulnerable to making false confessions when subjected to legally permissible interrogation methods that are designed to break the will of those who find themselves in a custodial interrogation (González, Vásquez, & Mikkelson, 2012, p. 464). Gudjonsson (2003) reports a consistent 60% confession rate for more than 25 years in England from suspects in custodial interviews. In Kebbell, Hurren, and Robert’s (2005) view, confessions offer two main advantages to the criminal justice system: (i) they significantly increase the likelihood of defendants being convicted and (ii) they often mean that victims and witnesses do not have to give evidence in court. Thus, they can save court time and reduce the burden on victims and witnesses. In
addition, if an early guilty plea is entered, this plea can be used to mitigate the sentence. From this perspective, there is no doubt that securing a confession is an institutionally desirable outcome. However, the balance between ethical investigative interviewing practices and the extent of the exertion of the more controversial methods employed by the Reid technique has been a centre of contention because eliciting false confessions facilitates miscarriages of justice.

2.3 The Interviewee

When the main investigative interviewing strategies of the PEACE model (explained in Section 2.2.1) are implemented during the ‘Account’ stage of the process, two approaches are delineated for working with interviewees of different cooperative attitudes to maximise the quantity and quality of information elicited. Victims and witnesses normally have a stake in seeing the perpetrator eventually charged and punished for the crime, and subsequently have a generally cooperative attitude in the investigative interview, although they sometimes ‘observe the crime under suboptimal viewing conditions, have poor memories and verbal skills, and are traumatised by their experiences’ (Fisher & Geiselman, 2010, p. 321). The PEACE model also adopts CI techniques on cooperative suspects, except when the suspect resists cooperation, which hampers the satisfactory application of CI, and the CM protocol is employed instead.

However, it is important to note that not all victims and witnesses are cooperative, and not all suspects are uncooperative. Witnesses may be reluctant to be involved in the investigation of crimes for reasons such as:

- adverse perceptions of the police or criminal justice process
- fear of an alleged perpetrator
- concern about the response from the community where they live
- worries about their identity being released
uncertainty about the process. (College of Policing, 2014)

Further, there are hostile witnesses who are opposed to the investigative process on the basis of various factors, such as their lifestyle, close relationship with the alleged perpetrator or intention to appear in court as a defence witness (College of Policing, 2014).

2.3.1 Cooperative interviewee—CI. The development of the CI protocol in the US from the mid-1980s by two clinical psychologists paralleled the rise of the investigative interviewing paradigm. The full introduction of the PEACE police interviewing model in the early 1990s in England and Wales resulted from a series of serious miscarriages of justice due to questionable police interviewing practice. CI eventually forged a strong presence in the PEACE model, which has been adopted by a number of police jurisdictions in the world and is regarded best practice (see Section 2.2.1). Both CI and PEACE have generated much research and scholarly investigation to affirm their efficacy and superiority over other paradigms.

American psychologists Ron Fisher and Ed Geiselman developed the CI techniques based on empirical research and principles from cognitive and social psychology (Fisher & Castano, 2008). The CI protocol has mainly been adopted in Anglophone countries, with growing uptake in the last two decades by non-Anglophone police forces, such as in Belgium (Dirk Rombouts, Antwerp Local Police Commissioner, personal communication, June 8, 2010), Sweden and other Nordic countries (Fahsing & Rachlew, 2013; Fisher & Geiselman, 2010).

When police conduct criminal investigations, information elicited from victims and witnesses to the crime event are the ‘best predictor of solving crimes’ (Fisher & Geiselman, 2010, p. 321; Kebbell & Milne, 1998; Kebbell & Wagstaff, 1997). However, victims and witnesses may not have had a perfect view of the event under investigation,
may have been deeply shocked by the event and unable to recall much detail, may not be good speakers, or may have disabilities or cognitive impairment that makes them unable to fully relay their experience. These are some of the many factors over which police have no control. The only factor police can control is how they conduct the interviews—or, more precisely, how effectively they conduct the interviews to make the best of information acquired under non-ideal conditions. In response to this situation, the CI protocol is a means of improving the completeness and accuracy of victim or eyewitness accounts.

After observing hundreds of hours of police interviews recorded on tape, Fisher and Geiselman (2010, p. 322) found that officers frequently interrupted, asked too many short-answer questions, and sequenced their questions inappropriately (Yarmey, 2001, p. 58). They remarked on the discouraging fact that ‘police often receive only minimal, and sometimes no, formal training to interview cooperative witnesses’ (Fisher & Geiselman, 2010, p. 321) and ‘to the degree that police do receive training on interviewing, it seems to be more on interrogating suspects (to elicit confessions) rather than on interviewing witnesses and victims’ (Fisher & Geiselman, 2010, p. 321). The consequence of this lack of training is that police conduct their interviews with cooperative victims and witnesses ‘based on their intuitions’ (Fisher & Geiselman, 2010, p. 321), using the same prototypical template for interviewing suspects. For example, the interview typically opens with questions to collect demographic information (such as the witness’s name, address and telephone number), followed by a perfunctory open-ended question, such as ‘what happened?’. Within seconds of the witness beginning their reply, the interviewer interrupts with a barrage of short-answer questions, such as ‘how old was the robber?’ or ‘did he have a gun?’. This continues until the interviewer exhausts the list she or he thinks is relevant to the crime. To conclude the interview, the
interviewer normally adds ‘is there anything else?’, which usually does not receive a comprehensive response (Fisher & Geiselman, 2010, p. 322). Fisher and Geiselman (2010) summarise the negatives of this practice as follows:

(a) the interviewer does most of the talking (in the form of asking questions), and the witness merely ‘helps out’ by answering the questions;

(b) the questions are very specific, often in the form of True/False or forced choice (e.g. Was he Black or White?);

(c) witnesses are discouraged from providing information unrelated to the specific question;

(d) the sequence of the interview is determined by the interviewer, often adhering to a pre-determined written checklist of questions;

(e) the interview opens with a set of formal questions (e.g. witness’s name, contact information) to allow the interviewer to fill out his/her crime report;

(f) the interviewer frequently interrupts the witness to ask follow-up questions; and

(g) the interviewer often asks leading or suggestive questions to confirm his/her hypothesis about the crime. (p. 322)

This kind of questioning practice leads to extremely undesirable consequences, enticing the interviewee to:

(a) withhold information;

(b) not provide any unsolicited information;

(c) give abbreviated answers; and

(d) volunteer answers they are unsure of.

Furthermore, they disrupt the natural process of searching through memory, thereby making memory retrieval inefficient. (Fisher & Geiselman, 2010, p. 322)
Milne and Bull (1999) make similar observations and reported that untrained interviewers frequently interrupt a free recall after an average of 7.5 seconds, with the result that:

[A]fter being interrupted several times, the interviewee will soon expect this to occur throughout the remainder of the interview. Accordingly, the interviewee will tailor his or her responses by shortening these to fit the time constraints apparently set by the interviewer. Shorter responses are typically less detailed. Moreover, following an interrupted response the interviewee is less likely to make a concerted effort to retrieve in a detailed manner and will instead retrieve in a less focused way, thereby eliciting more superficial responses. (p. 3)

Consequently, Fisher and Geiselman (2010, pp. 322–324) approach their recommended protocol for interviewing victims and witnesses from the following three aspects.

2.3.1.1 Cognition. Apart from the central question about the interviewee’s capacity to retrieve information about the crime under investigation, Fisher and Geiselman (2010) also highlight the limited human cognitive capacity—in both the interviewer and interviewee—to perform multiple tasks at the same time. Therefore, they made recommendations for each of the following factors:

- Context reinstatement: The contention is that memory retrieval is most efficient when the context of the original event is recreated at the time of recall. Thus, witnesses are instructed to mentally recreate their physiological, cognitive and emotional states that existed at the time of the original event. Interviewers should allow and encourage victims to describe their emotions while narrating the factual portion of their testimony, and reassure them that this is not a waste of the interviewer’s time.
• Limited mental resources: Cognitive theories contend that humans have a finite mental capacity to perform multiple tasks. Thus, interviewees may have less ability to understand questions or instructions from the interviewer. Interviewers should minimise overloading interviewees by refraining from asking questions while they are searching their memory, and generally ask more open-ended questions.

• Witness-compatible questioning: The contention is that each victim’s mental record of an event is unique—some may have better recollection of the perpetrator’s face, while others may focus more on the weapon. Therefore, the interviewer should not blindly ask all victims the same set of questions in the same order. Instead, they should tailor the questions. Interviewers should be mindful of the current mental image the interviewee has developed and ask compatible questions relating to that image, waiting to ask other questions relating to other event details until later, when the interviewee moves on to the next relevant mental image. Fisher and Geiselman (2010) regarded witness-compatible questioning to be the most difficult aspect of the CI protocol to learn, as it requires the interviewer to defer to the victim and be aware of the victim’s changing thoughts during the course of the interview.

• Multiple retrieval: The contention is that, the more often people search through their memory about an event, the more new details they can recall. Thus, interviewers can ask interviewees to describe the critical event several times during the interview, as well as reminding the victim that they will continue to think about the crime even after the interview, possibly recalling
new details. Therefore, it is important to establish follow-ups with the interviewee via post-interview contact.

- Accuracy of responding: The contention is that witnesses will recall more accurately if they communicate only the recollections that they are certain about, and refrain from guessing. Therefore, interviewers should explicitly instruct witnesses not to guess and to feel comfortable stating that they do not know the answer when it is the case. The use of open-ended questions is the overriding principle to facilitate CI, along with sparing use of closed questions.

- Minimising constructive recall: Constructive recall refers to a witness’s memories incorporating information from other sources—such as speaking to other witnesses or watching media reports. Interviewers should be mindful of avoiding leaking information to the witness either non-verbally (such as showing increased interest in specific witness statements) or verbally (such as asking leading or suggestive questions).

2.3.1.2 Social dynamics. Interviewers and interviewees do not function in a vacuum. Instead, they form a dynamic social unit in which they interact with consideration and respect for each other’s role. Thus, Fisher and Geiselman (2010) recommend the following strategies to facilitate the development of a positive relationship:

- Develop rapport and personal concern: The contention is that victims must invest mental effort and undergo emotional distress to provide details of personal experiences to a complete stranger. Therefore, interviewers should take time at the outset of the interview to develop meaningful, personal rapport with the interviewee.
• Active witness participation: The contention is that the witness has more knowledge about the crime details than does the interviewer, so they should be the one who does most of the mental work during the interview. This has the benefit of promoting a sense of their self-efficacy and control over the interview process. Thus, interviewers should:
  - explicitly instruct the interviewee about his or her role in the interview—for example, by saying: ‘You saw what happened, not I, so I expect you to tell me what happened, and without waiting for me to ask questions. I won’t be asking you many questions, so you’ll be doing most of the talking. I’m interested to know what happened to you, so I’m here mainly to listen to you’
  - ask open-ended questions
  - not interrupt witness during their narrative responses.

• Unburden the victim: The contention is that witnesses and victims may have the counter-factual thinking that they were partially responsible for the crime—the former because they did not intervene and the latter because they placed themselves in the position. Interviewers should manage such feelings of inadequacy whenever they arise, and assure the interviewee that only the crime perpetrator’s behaviour is in question.

2.3.1.3 Communication. Effectively communicating the interviewer’s institutional duties and the interviewee’s knowledge about the crime to each other is the key to successful investigation. Fisher and Geiselman (2010) remind interviewers of the following points.

• Promote extensive, detailed responses: The contention is that most people rarely need to describe events with the level of detail that is required in a
police interview. Thus, they may not know how to do this or what is considered relevant from the police investigative perspective. Therefore, interviewers should explicitly convey this request by instructing the interviewee to report everything they think about—whether it is trivial, out of chronological order, or even contradicts something they said earlier.

- Enable nonverbal output: The contention is that some events may be easier to describe by means other than talking. For example, it may be easier to draw a sketch to show the location of an object in a room, or to enact an action witnessed by the interviewee. Thus, interviewers should keep in mind these alternative output formats, rather than sticking dogmatically to verbal rendering.

For easier reference of the above strategies in the later sections, Schollum (2005) present a more concise version of the CI in terms of the four main techniques:

1. Report Everything (RE): the witness is asked to report everything remembered about the incident and all surrounding circumstances (no matter how fragmentary and regardless of apparent importance)
2. Reverse Order (RO): the witness is asked to recall events in a variety of chronological sequences (e.g. beginning to end, reverse order, toward or backwards from particular points)
3. Change Perspective (CP): the witness is asked to consider the event from a different perspective (e.g. from the point of view of someone else present at the scene)
4. Context Reinstatement (CR): the witness is asked to focus his or her mind on the context surrounding the incident (e.g. features of the physical environment, his or her thoughts and feelings at the time, and so on). (p. 58)
While the interviewee is attempting RE and CR, the CI protocol encourages them to close their eyes and imagine they are back at the scene of the crime, and to virtually ‘relive’ the event in a cognitive state (Shepherd, 2007, p. 224; Vredeveldt, 2011; Vredeveldt, Baddeley, & Hitch, 2013; Vredeveldt, Hitch, & Baddeley, 2011). RO is a reverse memory retrieval technique (Green, 2011) that involves the interviewee attempting to form forwards and backwards loops to cover the events before and after the incident. Overall, Shepherd (2007) finds that the RO and CP options are used much less frequently by police officers than RE and CR.

According to Alpert et al. (2012, p. 4), CI is best suited to being used on witnesses involved in a traumatic event in order to obtain trustworthy and accurate accounts of the event. They gave examples of events such as sex crimes, violent crimes, crimes against children, crimes involving special victims, or even police officers involved in ‘use of force’ incidents. All detectives in Western Australia, Queensland and New Zealand are obligated to receive training for CI (Alpert et al., 2012), while ‘a more piece-meal approach has been adopted by other Australian, American and Canadian police services and oversight bodies’ (Alpert et al., 2012, p. 4). On a global scale, Fisher and Geiselman (2010) comment that countries such as Australia, Sweden and the UK do a better job in training police officers to interview cooperative witnesses than other parts of the world, where it is largely seen as a ‘secondary, or more likely, tertiary, skill for effective police work’ (p. 321).

### 2.3.1.4 Enhanced cognitive interview

Over time, the CI has been modified to encompass the entire interview, and is now referred to as the ‘enhanced cognitive interview’. As seen in the following, the stages of enhanced CI have comprehensively included Fisher and Geiselman’s ideas about cognition, social dynamics and communication discussed earlier in this section:
Phase 1  Greet and personalise the interview/Establish rapport
Phase 2  Explain the aims of the interview
Phase 3  Initiate a free report
- context reinstatement
- open-ended questions
- pauses
- non-verbal behaviour
Phase 4  Questioning
Phase 5  Varied and extensive retrieval
Phase 6  Summary
Phase 7  Closure. (Milne & Bull, 1999, p. 40)

The uptake of the CI protocol has been relatively recent and limited in Australia (Heydon, 2012). According to Nakane (2014, p. 15), it was in the late 1990s that state and federal police services in Australia started to implement the protocol as a norm. Stacey and Mullan (1997) report on members of the NSW Police Force being taught cognitive interview techniques in 1997 at the Police Academy. Buckley (2009) asserts that Victoria Police introduced the CI methodology in 2000, although the actual application of the protocol has not been comprehensive, which seems to be consistent with Heydon’s (2012) remarks on CI training being implemented only for ‘specialist investigators dealing with child and vulnerable witnesses in Victoria and Queensland’ (p. 105).

2.3.2 Uncooperative interviewee—CM. Under the PEACE police interviewing model, when the interviewee is uncooperative (mostly suspects), the CI is unable to achieve its expected efficacy. Thus, British psychologist Eric Shepherd developed a different set of CM strategies to require free recall from the interviewee, followed by
probing and challenges where appropriate (Green, 2011). When implementing CM, the interviewer must be more aware of the verbal and nonverbal behaviours of the interviewee, and be clear about the aim of CM as a framework provided to the interviewer for the effective management of conversations with a reluctant participant. The five stages of CM are as follows:

1. contact: establishing rapport and establishing the aims
2. content: eliciting facts using appropriate questioning techniques
3. conduct: the way in which the content is covered
4. credibility: the way in which the interviewer is perceived
5. control: directing the overall flow of the interview (Walkley, 1987).

When implementing CM, interviewers must be more aware of the verbal and nonverbal behaviours of themselves, the interviewee and possible third parties (Milne & Bull, 1999), and must be able to manage different levels of interviewee resistance (Schollum, 2005, p. 67).

2.4 CI and its Efficacy

CI is interviewee centred and designed to elicit free-form narratives from the interviewee with predominantly open-ended questions, supplemented by probing questions to exploit leads from the narratives. This method allows interviewees more control to organise and mine their memories, and to report their recollections in a sequence that makes the most sense to them, rather than to the interviewer (Alpert et al., 2012). This set of strategies has been around for more than two decades and has been adopted by the PEACE police interviewing model for interviewing cooperative interviewees. The CI has been proven to elicit 25 to 40% more correct statements than traditional interviews in more than 100 laboratory tests conducted mainly in Australia, England, Germany and the US (Fisher & Geiselman, 2010, p. 324). Two field studies
were conducted—one in England and one in the US—comparing police officers who received CI training and a control group who did not. The results were consistent with the previous laboratory tests, whereby the CI-trained officers elicited significantly more information from interviewees (Fisher & Geiselman, 2010, p. 324).

2.5 Summary

CI has become the backbone of the investigative interviewing paradigm, which is the central tenet of the best-practice PEACE police interviewing model adopted initially by English and Welsh police forces from the early 1990s, and later by many other police forces around the world.

This chapter began by introducing the paradigm shift from traditional interrogation to the more ethical and fair investigative interviewing mindset, followed by a detailed account of the characteristics of police interviewing as an institutional discourse, and its implications when it is not undertaken properly and fairly.

This chapter then introduced the two major police interviewing models: the PEACE framework and Reid technique. PEACE is widely adopted in England and Wales, countries in continental Europe, Mauritius, New Zealand and Australia (Heydon & Lai, 2013). The Reid technique is used mainly in the US and Canada, where coercive, suggestive and misleading interviews are allowed to be admitted as evidence in court. This chapter devoted significant space to explaining CI, covering both its historical development and methodological underpinnings. This forms an important basis for the next chapters to examine police interviewing with the CI protocol in bilingual settings.
Chapter 3: When the Police Interviewer and the Interviewee Speak Different Languages

[If] language differentiates the animal from the human, then denying the utterances of others the status of language-that-can-be-translated is to reduce them to the condition of animals. (Cronin, 2006, p. 67)

Like many other countries that have systematic immigration and humanitarian intake programs, Australia is becoming increasingly culturally and linguistically heterogeneous. Consequently, language barriers may arise when a police officer is conducting an investigative interview with a victim, witness or suspect. Although there are no official statistics to confirm how many police interviews are conducted in Australia each year with the assistance of interpreters, various data quoted in Section 1.1 and summarised below indicate a significant number:

1. Over a quarter (28.1%) of Australia’s residents were born overseas, and close to one in five (19.3%) of them speak a LOTE at home (see Section 1.1.1);

2. Eighty per cent of language services in Victoria are purchased by the state government, and within this, the second-highest amount is spent in the justice context (see Section 1.1.2);

3. The Victorian Department of Justice recognised that the actual number of Victorians needing interpreting services would be higher than what the Census suggests, because Census data are based on self-reported ability to speak English (see Section 1.1.2);

4. Australia-wide, 59% and 90% of the hearings conducted at the MRT and RRT, respectively, need interpreting services (see Section 1.1.2).
In an egalitarian society such as Australia, equal access to social services overrides expectation of English language proficiency (Pöchhacker, 2004, p. 14). This value underpins the provision of a publicly funded interpreting service to citizens who are not proficient in English and subsequently experience difficulties accessing government services. This includes the justice system, when people encounter police or have matters dealt with in court. Under this premise, Chapter 3 starts with the legality aspect of interpreting service provision from more broadly the criminal justice context (Section 3.1.1) to the more specific police contexts (Section 3.1.2). This is followed by an explanation of the important concept of linguistic presence for those in criminal proceedings but do not speak the language of the law (Section 3.2). The rest of the chapter will then focus on interpreting, in particularly police interpreting (Section 3.3), where the definition and modes of interpreting, and the role of interpreter are explained (Section 3.4) in that the readership of this thesis is set for those who are familiar with interpreting as well as those who are not, e.g. police and legal practitioners.

3.1 Rights to Interpreters in Legal Contexts

It can be said that Australia has come of age in terms of the awareness and practice of providing publicly funded interpreters in legal proceedings (Bartels, 2011; McMillan, 2009). Judicial officers, police, public prosecution, legal aid and social work services accept that adequate provision of interpreting is non-negotiable from the perspective of human rights, social justice, and respect for multiculturalism and multilingualism, although cases have been brought to light where police struggle on without an interpreter (Dixon & Travis, 2007). Gibbons (1995) documented a police case in Australia involving a Lebanese immigrant, who appeared immature in the non-interpreted encounters, yet dignified and mature in the interpreted encounters. This led Gibbons (1995) to remark that:
The failure to use an interpreter was self-defeating for the police, because they denied themselves substantial and important information … It was also unjust to the suspect, because he was unable to adequately communicate either his version of the events or his status as a mature adult. (p.237)

When someone is affected by a crime and interviewed by police, Fisher and Geiselman (2010) state that ‘forcing victims to describe events in their non-preferred language further increases the victim’s frustration’ (p. 326). For those who are involved in a crime and are not proficient in English, the coerciveness of custodial interrogation is significantly worsened in the absence of an interpreter or when provided a substandard interpreting service (González et al., 2012, p. 464). Thus, this section explores fundamental civil rights to access interpreters in criminal proceedings, specifically in police interview contexts.

3.1.1 Using interpreters in criminal proceedings.

3.1.1.1 Legal frameworks. [Section 3.1.1.1 is loosely based on the researcher’s contribution to Mulayim et al., 2015, pp. XXXIV—XXXVI.] The rights to liberty, security and a fair trial are fundamental human rights protected by the European Convention on Human Rights, and the right to interpretation is sanctioned in relevant parts of this legislation. For anyone arrested or charged with a criminal offence, Articles 5 and 6 of the convention, respectively, cover the right of the individual to ‘be informed promptly, in a language which he understands [emphasis added]’ of either ‘the reasons for his arrest and of any charge against him’ or ‘the nature and cause of the accusation against him’. Article 6 even states that the person charged with a criminal offence has the right to ‘have the free assistance of an interpreter [emphasis added] if he cannot understand or speak the language used in the court’.
Similarly, the United Nations’ International Covenant—Civil and Political Rights, Article 14 (3) states:

In the determination of any criminal charge against him, everyone shall be entitled to the following minimum guarantees, in full equality:

(a) To be informed promptly and in detail in a language which he understands [emphasis added] of the nature and cause of the charge against him …

(f) To have the free assistance of an interpreter [emphasis added] if he cannot understand or speak the language used in court. (United Nations, 1966)

These United Nations recommendations have been enshrined in treaty and implemented by law enforcement differently in different national jurisdictions. The English and Welsh police forces are obliged to provide interpreting services for deaf people and people who do not understand English. This is required under the Police and Criminal Evidence (PACE) Act 1984, Section 13, Code C: Detention, Treatment and Questioning of Persons (Home Office, 2013; Home Office, 2014). Embedded in this section is the preference for using interpreters from the National Register of Public Service Interpreters, whenever possible.

13.2 … a person must not be interviewed in the absence of a person capable of interpreting if:

(a) they have difficulty understanding English;

(b) the interviewer cannot speak the person’s own language;

(c) the person wants an interpreter present.

13.4 In the case of a person making a statement to a police officer or other police staff other than in English:

(a) the interpreter shall record the statement in the language it is made;

(b) the person shall be invited to sign it;
13.5 If a person appears to be deaf or there is doubt about their hearing or speaking ability, they must not be interviewed in the absence of an interpreter unless they agree in writing to being interviewed without one. (Home Office, 2014)

The PACE Act also seeks to encompass all other possibilities arising in the context of police interviewing when an interpreter must be used, including communicating with the parent or guardian of a juvenile (under Section 13.6), with the detainee’s solicitor (under Section 13.9) and with a custody officer (under Section 13.10). It is worth noting that Section 13.8 makes special mention of the nature of an interpreting service, highlighting, in Pöchhacker’s (2004) term, the ‘egalitarian state’ and commitment to the ‘welfare of all their citizens and residents’ (p. 14):

13.8 All reasonable attempts should be made to make the detainee understand that interpreters will be provided at public expense. (Home Office, 2014)

In the US, the provision of interpreting services in federal jurisdiction is well regulated under the Court Interpreters Act (United States Code, Public Law Title 8 (1978), Title 7 [1988]), and 16 states in the US clearly mandate the right to an interpreter (Gibbons, 2003). However, ‘current state, county, and municipal practice are still unclear. Constitutional provision for the right to an interpreter exists in two states only: California and New Mexico’ (Benmaman, 1992, p. 446).

In Australia, the right to have an independent qualified interpreter has been legislated at both federal and state levels. The Commonwealth Crimes Act 1914, Section 23N, states that any interview conducted under its jurisdiction cannot commence until an interpreter is present: ‘the official must, before starting to question the person, arrange for the presence of an interpreter and defer the questioning or investigation until
the interpreter is present’ (Laster & Taylor, 1994, p. 137). The *Crimes Act 1958 (Victoria)*, Section 464D, stipulates the following right to an interpreter in the state criminal jurisdiction:

(1) If a person in custody does not have a knowledge of the English language that is sufficient to enable the person to understand the questioning, an investigating official must, before any questioning or investigation under section 464A(2) commences, arrange for the presence of a competent interpreter and defer the questioning or investigation until the interpreter is present.

(Australasian Legal Information Institute, n.d.)

Moreover, the state of Victoria guarantees the right to an interpreter in criminal trials in its *Charter of Human Rights and Responsibilities Act 2006* under Section 25 (2) (a) and (i). In the state of NSW, the *Evidence Act 1995 (NSW)*, Section 30, gives statutory recognition to the right of a witness to give evidence through an interpreter:

[A] witness may give evidence about a fact through an interpreter unless the witness can understand and speak the English language sufficiently to enable the witness to understand, and to make an adequate reply to, questions that may be put about the fact.

However, it is worth noting that these two states fund interpreting services only for criminal proceedings, not civil ones. In Queensland, a court does have power in criminal cases to order that the state provides an interpreter, pursuant to s131A of the *Evidence Act 1977 (Qld)*, if the court is satisfied that it is in the interests of justice.

3.1.1.2 Importance of legal interpreting. [Parts of Section 3.1.1.2 are based on the researcher’s contribution to Lai & Mulayim (2013).] Thus far, Chapter 3 has outlined the ideological and legislative underpinnings for the government removing language barriers so all people can be equal participants in legal processes. Regardless
of whether a person is involved in the upstream (police investigation) or downstream (court proceedings) stages of the criminal justice system as a victim, witness or suspect, interpreting services should be provided throughout the legal process if the person is not proficient in English. In the Common Law tradition, the language used in the courtroom is regarded ‘archaic, formal, impersonal and wordy or redundant’ (Tiersma, 2008, p. xx). Less flattering descriptions—such as ‘dysfunctional’, ‘distorted’, ‘absurd’ and ‘pathological communication’ (Bogoch & Danet, 1984; Caesar-Wolf, 1984)—have also been used to describe courtroom language. If an English-speaking layperson feels this way, the challenge for a non-native English speaker will be many times greater.

Existing literature on legal interpreting largely concentrates on the courtroom setting (Hale, 2007, p. 90) due to the comparative accessibility of court trials and transcripts to closed-door interpreter-assisted police interviews. O’Barr (1982) states that, in courtroom discourse, ‘how something is said may be more important than what is actually said’ (p. 1). In light of this, Hale (2007) asserts that interpretation accuracy in the courtroom involves more than simply relaying the content of the utterance; it also involves ‘how’ the utterance is expressed (pp. 90–97). A simple example below demonstrates how the same meaning can be expressed differently, revealing completely different speaker attitudes and states of mind:

1. Could I have your full name, please?
2. Tell me your full name, will you?

Although both utterances serve to request the same information, it would be concerning if they are interpreted into another language in an identical way, thus losing the level of politeness or forcefulness deliberately built in. The critical role played by interpreters in a bilingual courtroom in an adversarial system cannot be overemphasised. After all, ‘the jury assumes that the witness heard the same questions as they did, and
they [will] view the answer through that prism’ (Mikkelson, 1998, p. 33). From the perspective of the main courtroom players, the interpreter’s role is restricted to providing a straightforward, unedited rendition of questions and answers across two languages—much the same as a ‘pane of glass, through which light passes without alteration or distortion’ (Schweda Nicholson, 1994, p. 82). However, interpreting across languages is often much more complicated. It is of utmost importance to express meaning, as well as convey the speaker’s intention, tone, attitude and so forth. These so-called ‘extra-linguistic’ features are an integral part of communication between two conversing parties in any setting. In a high-stakes courtroom trial, interpreting only the content of an utterance, and not how the utterance is made, places witnesses at risk of being judged based on the interpreter’s speech style, rather than the witnesses’ own (Hale, 2007, pp. 94–97), hampering the task of the jurors to assess the witness’s credibility by way of hearing what and how the witness says something or answers questions.

González, Vásquez, and Mikkelson (1991) similarly note that, in the courtroom environment, ‘the form and style of the message are regarded as equally important elements of meaning’ and the interpreter must ‘mediate between these two extremes: the verbatim requirement of the legal record and the need to convey a meaningful message in the target language’ (pp. 16–17). Interpreting can be represented as a continuum (see Diagram 2), with ‘form based’ on the one end and ‘meaning based’ on the other as the two extremes of strategies an interpreter can adopt. Interpreting in various contexts invariably falls at a point on this continuum. For example, interpreting between a welfare worker and non–English speaking client will probably fall towards the meaning-based end of the continuum, denoting a higher level of free translation or sense-for-sense translation. In contrast, legal interpreting will probably be situated
somewhere nearer the form-based end, where a higher level of literal or word-for-word strategy is adopted to preserve the pragmatic aspects of the utterances. González et al. (1991) suggested the following for interpreters in a courtroom setting:

> [c]onceptual units … must be conserved, not word-by-word, but concept-by-concept. To be true to the global Source Language message, paralinguistic elements such as hesitations, false starts, hedges, and repetitions must be conserved in a verbatim style and inserted in the corresponding points of the Target Language message. (p. 17)


Studies are limited on interpreters’ intuitive choice of interpreting strategies. Psycholinguists Fabbro and Gran’s (1994, p. 304) research on student and professional simultaneous interpreters shows that student interpreters tend to adopt word-for-word translation, whereas professional interpreters adopt a more meaning-based interpreting strategy. Dam’s (1998, 2000) empirical studies on consecutive interpreting and simultaneous interpreting highlight that form-based interpreting (the word-for-word or literal approach) predominates over the meaning-based approach, and that the form-based strategy is usually associated with a less difficult source message, while the meaning-based approach is linked to more difficult text. The ‘more difficult text’ in Dam’s (2000) study includes more specialised terms and numbers, longer sentences and clauses, and higher rates of speech. This design of research instrument conforms with
the general literature of interpreting, in which names, numbers, enumerations, fast speech, strong foreign or regional accents, poor speech logic, poor sound and so forth are often characterised as sources of interpreting difficulties or problem triggers (Gile, 1995, pp. 172–174; Gile, 2009, p. 176; Seleskovitch, 1975 [in French]). These issues increase the interpreter’s required cognitive processing capacity and result in deteriorated interpreting performance. Drawing from the outcome of these studies, it appears that, when faced with source text difficulties:

[the interpreters would therefore be less able to base their target text on source text form, even if they wished to do so, but would have to rely primarily on source text meaning. In other words, interpreters may tend to reformulate, rather than to reproduce. (Dam, 2000, p. 52)]

The above literature shows the nature of the challenges interpreters face when dealing with legal discourse. They are required to transfer form and meaning in an instant for all participants in the legal setting. Yet research indicates that this is not straightforward or easy. Berk-Seligson (1990) contrasts the different levels of expectation of interpreters to produce renditions closer to or further from the form-based end in Diagram 2, in different contexts:

[In a conference interpreting situation, the tension [to produce utterances verbatim] is less obvious [than in court interpreting], since professional ethics on the whole require the interpreter to render the speaker’s intended meaning (as identified by the interpreter) in as eloquent a form as the speaker would probably have wished to achieve, rather than to reproduce the often imperfect form of the original. For the interpreter to do ‘somewhat better than the original’ (Herbert, 1952, p. 62) is accepted practice in the conference setting. (p. 38)]
As highlighted by M. Morris (1995) when commenting on court interpreting, simply conveying the gist of what is being stated in the courtroom is:

[a]n insufficient criterion for most purposes … It seems obvious that a single misrepresentation of crucial testimony might sway a jury despite otherwise unexceptionable interpreting throughout a trial. Meaning does not ‘average out’ over hours and days of discourse; a single gross error can be fatal to the cause of justice. (p. 108)

When interpreting in the legal context, interpreters are rarely commended for the successful conclusion of legal cases, but are often publicised for mishaps due to difficulties or problem triggers (as discussed above) or apparent linguistic insufficiency or behavioural impropriety on the interpreter’s behalf. For example, in October 2011, a NSW district court had to abort a people smuggling jury trial because the interpreter was alleged to have interpreted ‘did you stop anyone moving?’ as ‘did you push anyone?’ (G. Jacobsen, 2011). In April 2012, a judge in a London crown court had to order a retrial, costing the taxpayer £25,000, because it was discovered that the Romanian defendant giving evidence said that the claimant had ‘beaten them’, but the interpreter had stated that they were ‘bitten’ (‘The collapses at Snaresbrook’, 2012). In the latter case, it was confirmed that the interpreter made the mistake, but did not disclose it, whereas it is unknown what occurred in the process of interpreting the former case. Regardless, it is a costly exercise to abort a trial and run a retrial, not to mention the effects on all parties involved in the case who have to undergo the process again. This indicates the critical role language interpreting plays in the justice system.

3.1.2 Using interpreters in police contexts.

3.1.2.1 Legal frameworks. In terms of police operations in Australia, using interpreters has become standard as it is mandated in the ‘Standing Orders’ of various
police forces in the country (Hale, 2007, p. 69; Ozolins, 2009, p. 23). In addition, police ‘have come to the understanding that it is in their interests to employ the services of an interpreter’ (Hale, 2007, p. 69) in order to protect the admissibility in court of the evidence they obtained from interviewees. Interpreters are engaged in investigative interviews to facilitate communication between police officers and witnesses, victims and suspects who do not share the same language, or are unable to ‘communicate orally with reasonable fluency in the language’—as stated in the *Australian Commonwealth Crimes Act 1914*, Section 23N. Most police interpreting assignments in Australia occur in a face-to-face context, the products of which often form key pieces of evidence in criminal proceedings. The interview may be recorded in one of two ways:

1. in a written narrative format, composed by the interviewing police officer through a series of investigative questions and answers
2. recorded on audio/video format in the interviewing room at a police station, which is later transcribed and used in courts of law (most frequently used when interviewing a suspect).

Laster and Taylor (1994) argue that ‘the right to have an interpreter during police questioning is probably more significant than the right to an interpreter in court proceedings’ (p. 136). Laster (1990) asserts that in police interviewing:

[T]he linguistic tricks … are probably not dissimilar from those employed in cross-examination. Here, however, the exchange is conducted in private. There is no ‘umpire’ to ensure that the questioner remains within accepted procedural parameters, and there is the implicit and sometimes explicit possibility of coercion of various sorts to enlist the cooperation of the non-English speaker. (p. 25)
This is similar to Berk-Seligson’s (2004) observation of courtroom and police questioning in the US being of a coercive nature, with police settings even more so because, in a courtroom, the judge can moderate the behaviour of the interrogator (Rycroft, 2011, p. 215). In courtroom settings, there are players such as judges, lawyers and other support people to ensure unbiased and fair proceedings for the person on trial. The absence of an ‘umpire’ in a police interviewing setting—as described by Laster (1990) above—makes the right to an interpreter even more significant when the person involved has a language barrier. Without access to an interpreting service in a police interview, the interviewee may not understand the police officer’s utterances, which may cause them to incriminate themselves, hamper the investigation, or threaten the admissibility of the evidence obtained from the interview (Heydon & Lai, 2013). González (2003, as cited in González et al., 2012, p. 463) discussed the same issue of the heightened asymmetrical power relationship in a police interview. González highlighted that there is no judge present to monitor the interaction, with the suspect and interrogating officers the only people in the room. Coercive questioning techniques—such as asking leading or compound questions—have been shown to confuse the witness and reduce the reliability of the evidence given. However, such techniques are not controlled in police interviews, behind closed doors (González et al., 2012, pp. 463–464). Thus, Berk-Seligson (2002a) advocates that the same standards of interpretation provided in the courtroom should be provided for custodial interrogation due to its implications for legal outcomes and its uniquely coercive nature, as evidenced by high percentages of criminal cases resolved due to confession evidence in various countries. For example, Zimbardo (1967, as cited in Conti, 1999, p. 15) estimates the rate in the US to be over 80%, Gudjonsson (2003) reports a consistent 60% confession rate in
England (see Section 2.2.2) and Jacob (2004, as cited in Beune et al., 2011, p. 950) refers to approximately 70% in the Netherlands (see Section 2.1.4).

In Australia, understanding the importance of engaging interpreters and the practice of using them has been a gradual progression in recent decades. Generally, in recent decades, the public services provided by the government have moved towards a mindset of respecting multiculturalism and multilingualism, and consider engaging interpreter service essential to facilitate communication with their clients—budget permitting. Thus, providing language services to Australia’s multi-ethnic population has been accepted as the norm. In response to this, the focus of attention must be directed to the study and microanalysis of interpreting quality and outcomes in specific interpreting settings, such as police interviewing, to ensure that the pursuit of meaningful justice is not lost in translation.

Despite the identified importance of using interpreters, in a study of NSW police officers, Gibbons (2003, as cited in Bartels, 2011) finds that the officers:

[w]ere reluctant to call an interpreter for a number of reasons, including budgetary considerations, concerns the interpreter would serve as an advocate for the suspect and practical issues. In particular, interpreter availability can be a challenge, especially in rural or remote areas, or in relation to those belonging to less common language groups. (p. 3)

These findings are similar to those in Chan’s (1997) earlier study of NSW police, which reported the police officers’ failure to engage interpreters for similar reasons. These reports highlight the entrenched practice of paying insufficient attention by the police to the rights of citizens to communicate effectively when they need to deal with law enforcement.
At the state level in the US, the use of competent impartial interpreters does not seem to be as clearly mandated as in the UK and Australia. Berk-Seligson (2000) discusses the practice of bilingual police officers, other employees of the police department, and suspects’ or detainees’ relatives and friends acting as police interpreters in the US. She also wrote about documented cases in the US in which the use of bilingual police officers and unqualified interpreters led to confessions that were later proven to have resulted from lack of access to impartial and competent interpreters (Berk-Seligson, 2009). This prompted her to recommend the discontinuation of using bilingual police officers and the provision of professional interpreters in police interviews (Berk-Seligson, 2009, p. 215). González et al. (2012) report on ‘the increased tendency for law enforcement agencies to use officers who possess only minimal proficiency in the language in which they interrogate or interpret during custodial interrogations’ (p. 471), which constitutes ‘the most significant barrier to equal access in the criminal justice system’ (p. 471) for citizens with lower English proficiency. A 2004 report compiled by a US county found that 84% of law enforcement agencies in the US do not have a standard policy or procedure to engage professional interpreters (González et al., 2012, p. 471). According to Eades (2003), the practice of using so-called ‘putative law enforcement interpreters’ (González et al., 2012, p. 473) is based on the misconception that interpreters from ‘outside’ will compromise interrogation work by helping out their own people from the same cultural or linguistic background. González et al. (2012) strongly voice their opposition to this practice, questioning most police officers’ levels of foreign-language proficiency (in most cases, Spanish). Even if a police officer is competently bilingual, interpreting research has established that being bilingual is different to being able to interpret. Most importantly, a publicly funded professional interpreter provides an impartial language service to the police officer and
interviewee, which avoids exacerbating the already asymmetrical power relationship between the two parties. As Berk-Seligson (2002b) correctly states, the use of putative law enforcement interpreters to provide impartial interpretation, while fulfilling the adversarial role of the interrogator (with the ultimate goal of getting the suspect to confess to the crime), has proven impossible. This practice increases the risk of coerced and false confession, leading to possible wrongful convictions. González et al. (2012) further state that using putative law enforcement interpreters:

[v]iolates fundamental ethical considerations with respect to the role of the interpreter as mandated by federal, state, and professional standards … This unsound policy ignores professional guidelines for legal interpreting which safeguard the rights of the users of interpreting service and legal standards. (p. 477)

Although the under-provision of interpreting services across every spectrum of the public service is still a significant issue in the US, some leadership has come from the federal level in an attempt to rectify the situation. For example, the US Executive Order 13166—‘Improving Access to Services for Persons with Limited English Proficiency’ (2000)—dictates that ‘the Federal Government [should] provide … and fund … an array of services that can be made accessible to otherwise eligible persons who are not proficient in the English language’ (US Department of Justice, 2012). In 2003, Haviland (2003) served as an expert witness in a US court for a murder case from 1986 and developed the notion of ‘handicap’ (p. 769) to refer to the inferior position of non-English speakers in the US criminal justice system:

[O]regon law treats non-English speakers (along with those whose hearing or speech is impaired) as ‘disabled persons’. The accommodation for this particular disability is the appointment of an interpreter. To Haviland, this approach to
language rights reflects belief that English is not only a standard language, but
‘is also somehow in the repertoire of skills of a “standard person”, one who is
socially and, perhaps, morally whole or “normal”’. Once again there is a
powerful negative implication: those who do not speak English are not only

One might argue that, in places such as Australia, Britain and other Western
countries, police procedures mandate the offer of contacting a lawyer before the
interview begins. Although no statistics are available in Australia on the take-up rates of
this offer, anecdotal evidence suggests that suspects with language barriers are unlikely
to accept the offer (also see Section 3.2 on the US statistics of the 80 to 90% waiver of
the Miranda rights for suspects in custody). This occurs because there is simply no
funding for or organisation of it, and the suspects worry that they are unable to afford a
lawyer. Suspects who find themselves in such situations are most likely unaware of the
implications of not having a legal representative present during the interview to
safeguard their legal rights. Not understanding what is said or not able to express
oneself fully inevitably results in a power asymmetry. In this situation, an independent
and publicly funded professional interpreter often becomes the only ‘lifeline’ for a
suspect or witness who has difficulty comprehending the high-stakes event due to
language barriers. And when there is no lawyer or support person present, the pressure
on the interpreter to go beyond just linguistic service is often considerable. Pym (2004)
asserts that translators (broadly including oral interpreters for cross-cultural
communication) may be mistrusted not only because their work is somewhat opaque to
the person allocating trust, but also because the work is often purported to be in the
name of another person (who may or may not be the person allocating trust). The
tension can be seen here between the person allocating trust (the main participants in a
Police interviews are often conducted long before a case goes to trial. When answering questions from the investigating police officers, interviewees might make statements that incriminate themselves in the case under investigation. The possibility of doing this may be even higher if they have difficulty communicating in a language that is not their mother tongue. Berk-Seligson (2009, p. 2) argues that understanding the language of those who command the language of the institution, and the ability to express oneself fully in the interaction, is central to the due process of justice. For people whose proficiency is low in the language of the institution, ‘access to an interpreter during police questioning is probably more significant than the right to an interpreter in court proceedings’ (Laster & Taylor, 1994, p. 136).

During police interviews, suspects or witnesses are often more vulnerable to issues from poor communication when they have limited or no opportunities to seek advice or assistance from other people, including lawyers, counsellors, advocates, family and friends. Lack of interpreting services or poor interpreting at the police station may come back ‘to haunt [suspects and/or witnesses] at subsequent stages of the judicial process’ (Berk-Seligson, 2009, p. 215). Providing interpreting services is vital for police interviewing, as poor communication may affect the effectiveness of investigations and
risk injustice for the people involved (Gibbons, 2001). In countries such as Australia and the UK, police will arrange a professional interpreter for suspects or witnesses who are judged to lack sufficient English language skills to be interviewed. Unlike in the US, where bilingual police officers can still conduct interviews in Spanish and act as interpreters (Berk-Seligson, 2009), in Australia and the UK, even if a police officer or legal representative of a suspect is bilingual and able to interpret, a publicly funded independent interpreter must be provided for reasons of objectivity and impartiality.

A criminal case more than two decades ago in Melbourne involving a number of Japanese nationals highlighted the importance of language services—particularly adequate and competent police interpreting when the lives of the accused are at stake. On 17 June 1992, a group of Japanese nationals were arrested at Melbourne Airport and charged with importing heroin for commercial purposes. They were initially interviewed by customs officers and subsequently by the Australian Federal Police, with the assistance of interpreters. On 28 May 1994, a jury at the County Court in Melbourne found them guilty of the charges and imposed custodial terms ranging from 15 to 25 years. The defendants appealed to the Court of Appeal of the Supreme Court of Victoria, but only one was granted a retrial, which again returned a guilty verdict. Subsequent appeals for leave to appeal to the Court of Appeal of the Supreme Court of Victoria in 1997 and High Court of Australia in 1999 were denied. The members of the group lodged an application (CCPR/C/88/d/1154/2003) with the United Nations Human Rights Committee in 2002 claiming violations of their rights under Articles 2, 9, 14 and 26 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. Among other issues, the members of the group alleged that several interpreting errors had led to their wrongful conviction and imprisonment. They claimed that interpreters:
1. wrongly or very inaccurately interpreted the investigator’s questions and defendant’s answers
2. failed to interpret questions asked by the investigator
3. arbitrarily asked their own questions of the defendants
4. provided answers that the defendants simply did not give
5. provided erroneous explanations to the investigator about the social meaning of Japanese terms
6. provided answers in English that in some cases were grammatically and syntactically deficient, and in others were unintelligible English utterances
7. conducted long exchanges in Japanese with the applicants, in which the investigator did not participate, and then summarised—often inaccurately—what had transpired
8. were unable to translate key legal terms (Covenant on Civil and Political Rights [CCPR], 2003, para. 2.6).

This group of people all served decade-long jail sentences and were deported back to Japan during the first half of the 2000s, although their supporters say that ‘a failure to provide competent interpreters during police interviews and during the court case was weighted [sic] the case against them’ (Green, 2002). When they took the case to the UN Human Rights Committee, the committee ruled it inadmissible because they did not raise the problems during trial (CCPR/C/88/d/1154/2003, para 4.6) or on appeal (CCPR/C/88/d/1154/2003, para. 6.2). However, this does not negate the possibility of significantly flawed interpreting they claim they received in the first place. As a matter of fact, Nakane (2007b, p. 107) analysed the audio and video recordings and transcriptions of the case and confirms issues such as omissions in interpreted caution due to police officers’ arbitrary segmentation, interpreting errors due to formulaic and
ritualistic nature of caution, and doubtful interpreter competence. Nanake (2005) reports that these five convicted drug traffickers are still ‘[c]laiming their innocence with support from Attorneys-at-law and various support groups and individuals in Japan and Australia. Interpreting problems are the main factors presented to clear the guilty verdicts’ (p. 110). Nakane (2009) further looks into the same data set and explores the interpreters’ participation role (Goffman, 1981) and management of the interview discourse. She has identified instances where the interpreters’ role shifts from a default animator’s role (as appropriate for an interpreter) to an author's role, where the interpreter edits and/or modifies the source utterances. Nakane (2009) finds these instances ‘[p]roblematic, and possibly unethical, when initiating a repair of their [the interpreters] own accord to elicit coherent or preferred responses from the suspect’ (p. 14). Langdon and Wilson (2005), in a follow-up examination of serious criminal cases since 1985 in Australia, also report on Chika Honda’s case (one of the five convicted drug traffickers), and state that ‘[A]n analysis by Japanese linguist of the transcripts of interview revealed at least 20 crucial translation errors that gave both the police and jury a completely erroneous picture of how in fact the tourists had answered police questions’ (p. 192), pointing to the unfortunate possibility of interlingual problems experienced by these people.

This is a classic case that demonstrates how interpreting during the police investigation stage has critical implications for people’s welfare in their pursuit of natural justice. In Canada, Berger (1995) examines the accuracy of interpreting in the context of deaf people and allegations of sexual abuse. He finds that over 50 deaf people were subjected to interpreting that contained critical inaccuracies during legal investigations and subsequent trials, resulting in criminal charges being dropped, mistrials and false acquittals.
3.2 The Concept of Linguistic Presence

Legal presence is one of the major tenets of a fair trial, and the concept can be traced back to the law case *Lewis v. United States* 1892, which established that a defendant has a right to be present at all stages of the proceedings (Mikkelsen, 2014). González et al. (1991, pp. 49–50, 155) further identify the notion of ‘linguistic presence’, in addition to a defendant’s physical presence in the courtroom. This referred to the case *Arizona v. Natividad* (1974) (JUSTIA US Law, n.d.), where the full bench of Arizona Supreme Court held that:

> [T]he inability of a defendant to understand the proceedings would be not only fundamentally unfair but particularly inappropriate in a state where a significant minority of the population is burdened with the handicap of being unable to effectively communicate in our national language. A defendant's inability to spontaneously understand testimony being given would undoubtedly limit his attorney's effectiveness, especially on cross-examination. It would be as though a defendant were forced to observe the proceedings from a soundproof booth or seated out of hearing at the rear of the courtroom, being able to observe but not comprehend the criminal processes whereby the state had put his freedom in jeopardy. Such a trial comes close to being an invective against an insensible object, possibly infringing upon the accused's basic "right to be present in the courtroom at every stage of his trial." (Lewis v. United States, 146 U.S. 370 (1892); Negron v. New York, 434 F.2d 386 (2d Cir. 1970)). (JUSTIA, US Law, n.d.)

González et al. (2012) also highlight the importance of the very idea of linguistic presence when the Miranda warning (similar to Australia’s police caution) is administered to people with limited English proficiency:
Notification of the Miranda rights prior to substantive police questioning was established with the specific intent to protect vulnerable individuals from the coercion inherent in custodial interrogation by ensuring that all suspects have a full understanding of their constitutional right against self-incrimination and the right to legal counsel—which cannot be superseded by police power … Only when the suspect is linguistically present during his own interrogation and is truly cognizant of his rights can evidence obtained from the custodial interrogation be considered voluntary. (p. 448)

González et al. (2012) point out that citizens with limited English proficiency in US communities are compromised in their understanding of the ‘implicit assumptions’ (p. 454) in the Miranda rights. This leaves them to fall back on their own ‘cultural schemas and belief systems regarding obedience to police authority to guide their decision-making regarding their Miranda deliberation and their behaviour throughout the entire interrogation’ (González et al., 2012, p. 454). This observation aligns with the strong correlation between non-comprehension of the Miranda rights and high percentages of its waiver. According to Berk-Seligson (2009), 80 to 90% of suspects waive their Miranda rights during custodial interrogation. Similarly, Ferguson, Jimenez, and Jackson (2010) report on ‘vulnerable groups’ whose characteristics lead to their waiver of their rights under the Miranda warning—including people of limited English proficiency, diminished cognitive and language skills, excessive compliance, suggestibility, and short-term focused decision making. They found that these people have a false belief that suspects have a duty to respond to police questioning. As high as 98% of their experimental group thought they would be punished if they did not answer police questioning (also see González et al., 2012, p. 467).
This concept of ‘linguistic presence’ serves as the basis for the provision of a qualified and competent interpreting service in spoken and sign languages during criminal proceedings. Examining the situation in Australia, the case Gradidge v. Grace Bros Pty Ltd (1988) (Roberts-Smith, 2009, p. 17) in the NSW Compensation Court saw the deaf plaintiff taking the case to the NSW Court of Appeal, where the Australian Sign Language (Auslan) interpreter was instructed by the judge to stop interpreting when a legal argument arose between the counsels. The interpreter refused to stop, and maintained that her job was to interpret everything that occurred in the court. The judge adjourned the case and sought an opinion from the Court of Appeal on his ruling. The Court of Appeal held that the judge ‘had erred in directing the interpreter to desist. The appellant was a party and entitled to know what was happening. Unless excluded from the court, she was entitled to have the proceedings interpreted for her’ (Roberts-Smith, 2009, p. 17).
3.3 Situating Police Interpreting in the Broader Field of Legal Interpreter

The area of law enforcement is a dimension of contemporary civic life under the broader context of law that governs the way people live and interact with each other. The legal and law enforcement systems are complex and challenging social institutions for ordinary citizens to deal with, even in a monocultural and monolingual setting. For immigrants to Australia who do not speak English well or at all, the barrier can sometimes be insurmountable. Consequently, a publicly funded interpreting service is offered in the legal context by ‘egalitarian states’ (Pöchhacker, 2004, p. 14), such as Australia. For the purpose of this thesis and later discussions, it may be helpful to clearly situate police interpreting in the realm of legal interpreting.

According to Benmaman (1997, as cited in Berk-Seligson, 2000), the term ‘legal interpreting’ has been used interchangeably with ‘court interpreting’ and ‘judiciary interpreting’ (p. 180). Cotterill (2002) uses the term ‘judiciary interpreter’ (p. 124) to refer to interpreters working in the legal domain. In contrast, Colin and Morris (1996) use the single term ‘court interpreter’ (p. xii) to encompass those who perform interpreting in the courts and other legal settings. Benmaman (1997) distinguishes between these terms, explaining that court interpreting (synonymous with ‘judiciary interpreting’) ‘is but one form of legal interpreting which shares many common characteristics with other types of legal interpreting’ (p. 181). In Australia, interpreters working in the broader context of law are referred to as ‘legal interpreters’. Retired Western Australia Supreme Court judge Len Roberts-Smith (2009) used ‘forensic interpreters’ to refer to interpreters working in the court. Hale (2007, pp. 64–98) stated that legal interpreters may be involved in police investigations and interviews, lawyer-client conferences, tribunal hearings, and court hearings and trials. Diagram 3
summarises the various subcategories of legal interpreting identified by the above scholars.


Hale (2007) remarks that:

[T]hese domains share the underlying legal system they serve, legal concepts and some of their discourses. However each domain differs in terms of the relationship between interlocutors, the goal of the interaction, the privacy and the formality of the event, the roles of the participants, the role of language, and as a consequence, the implications for interpreters. (p. 65)

Similar to Hale’s observation, Coulthard and Johnson (2007) state that police discourse is a subgenre of legal discourse:

[T]he legal community shares some ways of speaking at the level of register … but we might want to differentiate between different ‘communities of practice’ such as lawyers, judges and police officers who each use language in quite
different ways and for different communicative purposes, thereby generating different genres of talk and writing. (p. 40)

Similar to Coulthard and Johnson’s (2007) categorisation of legal discourse genres, police interpreting can be regarded a subcategory of legal interpreting. However, in Australia, legal interpreting is provided under the same umbrella as community interpreting (Hale, 2007) in the sense that there is no specialised training or certification system for legal interpreters or police interpreters.

3.4 What is Interpreting?

For the purpose of this thesis and the analyses of the experiments presented in the later sections, it is necessary to define what interpreting is and how it is undertaken. Interpreting can be dated as far back as when human communication needed to expand beyond the bounds of a clan that shared the same language. The earliest documentation of the need for interpreter service can be found in legendary accounts (such as the Tower of Babel) and historical accounts (such as the conquests of Alexander the Great) (Cokely, 1992). Many metaphors have been used to describe interpreters and what they do, including:

- ‘a phonograph … a transmission belt … a bilingual transmitter’ in the legal realm (Morris, 1999, p. 8)
- a ‘cipher’, ‘medium of communication’ or ‘language machine’ (Roberts-Smith, 2009, p. 14)
- a ‘black box’ (Westermeyer, 1990, p. 747)

Morris (1999) offers a less flattering analogy of interpreters working in court settings as ‘a piece of gum on the bottom of a shoe—ignored for all practical purposes, but almost impossible to remove’ (p. 7)—commonly referred to as the ‘gum syndrome’.

Interpreters are viewed by some as unwelcome intruders, and users may have varied expectations of interpreters’ ability to assist their communication or, more fundamentally, whether to use them at all (Fowler, 1997). Considering that interpreting unavoidably makes communication twice as long, it is unsurprising that ‘although interpreters are essential in bilingual cases, they are not particularly liked by anyone in the courtroom. They are always seen as a necessary evil that is tolerated rather than welcomed’ (Hale & Gibbons, 1999, p. 207). Although many users of interpreters appreciate the facilitation of communication that may otherwise not occur, others are ambivalent about what might get lost in translation, unjustifiably added in translation, or leaked after translation.

3.4.1 Definition of interpreting. [Parts of Section 3.4.1 are based on the researcher’s contribution of Mulayim et al. (2015), p. 1.] Interpreting is about communicating what is said in one language to another. Gerver (1971, as cited in Pöchhacker, 2007) defined interpreting as ‘a fairly complex form of human information processing involving the reception, storage, transformation and transmission of verbal information [emphasis added]’ (p. 16). This highlights its nature of performing multiple cognitive tasks, sometimes concurrently (receiving incoming messages and holding them in the short-term memory) and sometimes sequentially (reproducing output utterances after comprehending the input). Interpreting has the distinguishing characteristic of a ‘first and final rendition in another language … produced on the basis
of a one-time presentation of an utterance in a source language’ (Pöchhacker, 2004, p. 11). Distinguishing the competence of an interpreter from a bilingual person is their ability to instantly comprehend contextualised meaning in one language and express the totality of that message in another language. Here, the emphasis is on ‘instantly’, which refers to the immediacy of the action, and ‘contextualised’, which refers to changes in meaning depending on the context or setting in which utterances are made. This means instant decision making on behalf of the interpreter in order to achieve smooth communication between the conversing parties (Mulayim et al., 2015, p. 1).

In the theoretical field, there is no agreement as to whether translation is an overarching term encompassing both the written (translation proper) and oral (interpreting) transfer of meaning between two languages, or whether they should be clearly delineated based on their different forms of activities. In any case, unlike written translation, ‘interpreting must be performed in real time; in other words, the message must be delivered immediately to listeners who are present (physically or through video and audio connections) at the time of communication’ (Mikkelson, 1999). By default, interpreting always involves a pair of languages. In the Australian context, this is normally the combination of English and another language. As far as this thesis is concerned, unless otherwise specified, the term ‘interpreter’ always refers to an individual who possesses a high level of bilingual and bicultural competencies and who facilitates oral communication in professional contexts between people who do not share the same language.

The term ‘community interpreting’ has entered common usage in recent years to describe the type of interpreting that enables members of a community to access public services when they do not speak the dominant language of the community (Mikkelson, 1996). Australia began to use the term ‘community interpreting’ in the 1970s (Chesher
1997, as cited in Hale, 2007, p. 30), although Gentile et al. (1996) opt for the term ‘liaison interpreting’ (p. 17), which was first coined by Henri Van Hoof (1962, as cited in Pöchhacker, 2004, p. 14) as a form of interpreting mainly in commercial negotiations. Different terms have been used in other parts of the world, such as ‘cultural interpreting’ in Canada, ‘contact interpreting’ in Scandinavia, and ‘public service interpreting’ in the UK (Mikkelson, 1996; Roberts, 1997). Regardless of how this type of interpreting is referred to, it is characterised by ‘dialogic communication between a lay person and a professional’ (Nakane, 2014, p. 17; Niska, 1990; S. Russell, 2002; Wadensjö, 1998). It is also worth noting that this form of language service provided ‘to enable communication between “heterolingual” segments of a multi-ethnic society emerged only more recently in the context of egalitarian states committed to the “welfare” of all their citizens and residents’ (Pöchhacker, 2004, p. 14)—and Australia is one such state. In these states, interpreting services are free to those with language barriers who wish to access public services. These governments essentially regard “equal access” to be the overriding expectations of linguistic proficiency’, thereby making the ‘intra-social dimensions’ of interpreting more prominent (Pöchhacker, 2004, p. 16) than other forms of interpreting in contexts such as business, diplomacy or international conferences, which is often undertaken with parties from different societies and makes the interpreting activity distinctly ‘inter-social’ (Pöchhacker, 2004, p. 13).

3.4.2 Modes of interpreting. There are two modes of interpreting from the perspective of ‘the temporal relation between target-speech production and source-speech reception’ (Pöchhacker, 2012, p. 46): (i) simultaneous interpreting and (ii) consecutive interpreting (Danks, Shreve, Fountain, & McBeath, 1997; Gile, 2009; D. Russell, 2002). According to Humphrey and Alcorn (1995), simultaneous interpreting is defined as the process of interpreting into the target language (TL) at the same time as
the source language (SL) is delivered. Consecutive interpreting is the process of interpreting after the speaker completes one or more ideas in the SL, and pauses while the interpreter transmits that information (D. Russell, 2002, p. 7). Simultaneous interpreting is often used in sign language interpreting or at international conferences, where spoken-language interpreters (normally in pairs working in the same combination of languages) interpret a speech delivered on a podium via audio equipment to an audience wearing earphones so they can instantly understand the speech in their own language. This form of interpreting is also known as ‘conference interpreting’. A variation of simultaneous interpreting is sometimes seen in settings such as a courtroom or tribunal, where no equipment is involved, but the interpreter renders the interpretation in a lowered voice to the person seated next to him or her, who needs to understand what is being said at the bench or by the judge. This form of simultaneous interpreting is known as ‘whisper interpreting’ or ‘chuchotage’ in French.

The consecutive mode of interpreting is more frequently seen in the field of ‘community interpreting’ (Gentile, Ozolins, & Vasilakakos, 1996, pp. 17, 65) in a physical or notional triangular setup (see Diagram 4) rendered for either dialogues between two or more participants, or monologues between a speaker and audience. The dialogue setting is widely found in public service contexts, such as when a teacher, doctor, legal aid lawyer, social worker or police officer talks to a LOTE speaker, predominantly in a private setting. Interpreters usually render orally what the professional has just said into the language the client speaks when the professional pauses after uttering a few sentences, and vice versa when the LOTE-speaking client talks. These professional-interpreter-client and client-interpreter-professional sequences continue until the conversation or ‘dialogue’ between the professional and client is completed. Only one person talks at any given time, while the other participants listen,
and there is always one party who does not understand what the others are saying. The term ‘consecutive interpreting’ reflects the timing of interpreting output being consecutive to the interlocutors’ utterances, rather than simultaneous. From a sociolinguistics perspective, the interactive nature of this form of community interpreting in the consecutive mode is also commonly referred to as ‘dialogue interpreting’.


As seen in Diagram 4, when hampered by language barriers, the communication between the two primary interlocutors becomes ‘indirect’ in the sense that it must be ‘routed’ (Heydon & Lai, 2013) through the interpreter for communication to occur. This triadic communication flow is slower than the un-interpreted monolingual setting, where the message is given and received without interlingual intervention performed by the interpreter.

Apart from being used in dialogue settings, consecutive interpreting is also used for monologue settings, where an audience listens to a public address delivered in an SL that is interpreted by an interpreter of a particular TL. The interpreter is either standing next to the speaker or, if there are many TLs, interpreters of various languages sit with groups of people of the same TL. A speaker may divide the speech (monologue) into
segments to allow interpretation, so that the audience does not sit through the whole speech without understanding what is said. Internationally, there is no set convention on how long a segment should be for speeches to be interpreted consecutively. The alternating pattern of talk-and-interpret is normally determined between the speaker and interpreter through mutual agreement and adjustment. A rule of thumb is a few minutes per segment, and interpreters often take notes to enhance their recall when rendering the interpretation.

In the field of interpreting studies, consecutive interpreting is also referred to as ‘sequential interpreting’ (Böser, 2013, pp. 120, 131; Wadensjö, 1998). If the turns of talk by the primary speaker are truncated into smaller segments, it is referred to as ‘short consecutive’ mode (Böser, 2013, pp. 120, 131; Wadensjö, 1998), ‘semi-consecutive’ mode (De Groot, 1997; Mason, 2005, p. 48) or ‘discontinuous’ mode (De Groot, 1997; Mason, 2005, p. 48). However, if the primary speaker does not offer pauses in a turn to facilitate interpretation, it is called ‘long consecutive’ or ‘consecutive proper’ mode, for which the interpreter ‘wait[s] until the speaker completely finishes his or her turn of speech to start his or her rendition’ (Mason, 2005, p. 49). As opposed the above notion of distinguishing ‘long’ or ‘short’ consecutive mode in the light of whether intra-turn pauses are offered by the primary speaker for the purpose of interpreting, Böser (2013) refers to long or short consecutive mode by gauging the time durations for which the primary speakers talk. For example, Böser (2013) refers to her experiment data in terms such as ‘during the six interviews the police officer never produces a turn of more than 10 seconds’ duration’ (p. 125), ‘the free recall starts with a witness turn 22 seconds in duration’ (p. 126) and ‘[the witness] again embarks on a long turn of 24 seconds’ (p. 127). As the speed of talking differs from one person to the next, with factors such as a speaker’s cognitive state also playing a part on the speed, time duration seems to be a
less objective measure to use when referring to these different subcategories of consecutive mode of interpreting—long consecutive or consecutive proper versus short consecutive, semi-consecutive or discontinuous. For example, when recalling something from a fuzzy memory, one’s speed of talking is likely to be slower, strewn with pauses and characterised by disfluencies. In contrast, if one is describing something from a vivid memory, the speed of talking is more likely to be normal or even faster due to a clear memory of the event or due to excitement. Thus, although the time duration may be long, there may be minimal information to be interpreted; therefore, calling this ‘long consecutive’—as opposed to the more generally accepted definition—may cause confusion. Conversely, shorter durations of time may contain high amounts of information; therefore, calling this ‘short consecutive’ is also likely to be confusing.

It is also important to mention a cross-modal form of interpreting seen in various community interpreting settings. Interpreters may be given a written document during an interpreting assignment, and asked to provide an instant oral translation of the content in the document. For example, this document might be (in legal settings) an intervention order handed down by the magistrate, bail conditions set out by a bail justice, or a statement just typed by the interviewing police officer based on what the witness just stated. This form of mixed-mode interlingual operation from written text to oral re-expression in another language is referred to as ‘sight translation’.

3.4.3 Interpreter as language mediator. Wadensjö (1998) is among the pioneers who first analysed the coordinating role that interpreters play in an interpreted encounter, and referred to such acts as interpreting ‘in’ and ‘as’ interaction. On the one hand, interpreters perform interaction-oriented oral translation according to the contextual information that can be derived from the encounter. On the other hand, interpreters manage the turn-taking system either by rendering the translation or through
other means, such as asking for clarification or repetition of utterances, or requesting
speakers to stop so they can translate orally. These two types of activities are referred to

3.4.3.1 Interpreter’s interactional and coordinating role. CA scholars (see
Sections 2.1.3.1 and 2.1.3.4) have highlighted the basic regularity of the turn-taking
system in talk as interaction, and pointed out that ‘participants in talk shape their actions
and react to others’ actions in ways that allow them to make sense of their own and
others’ actions’ (Baraldi & Gavioli, 2012, p. 5). This theory conforms to Luhmann’s
(1984 [in German], as cited in Baraldi & Gavioli, 2012) social systems theory, which
states that ‘reference of each action to a previous action is what makes of interaction a
communicative system’ (p. 5) and refers to this self-reference mechanism as ‘basic
coordination’. Luhmann’s idea of basic coordination corresponds to Wadensjö’s
interpreting ‘in’ interaction—or ‘implicit coordination’. Conversely, Wadensjö’s
interpreting ‘as’ interaction—or ‘explicit coordination’—corresponds to Luhmann’s
(1984 [in German], as cited in Baraldi & Gavioli, 2012) categorisation of actions that
‘coordinate the achievement of basic coordination’ (p. 5), in which he referred to them
as a ‘form of reflexivity—that is, as actions which promote communication about the
communication process’ (p. 5). The idea of language ‘mediation’ does not originate
from interpreting studies; rather, it derives from other professional contexts such as the
legal and political fields in which the ‘mediator’ of conflicts needs to coordinate the
parties by dealing with their opposing preferences, working on the their relationships
and helping them to find their solutions to their problems (Baraldi & Gavioli, 2012, pp.
11-12). In the interpreting field, ‘the word “mediating” has been increasingly used … to
refer to the complexity of activity of the interpreter as a medium of meanings and forms’
and Cronin (2006) even extended the interpreter role beyond linguistic bounds to mediators of cultural forms, regarding the act of interpreting as intrinsically enabling different cultural perspectives to contact one another. The current researcher agrees that there is often a fundamental misfit between the institutions that provide services (such as health or social care) and the clients who receive these services. Institutional cultural forms are often well established, whereas new cultural forms—involving working with the clients from non-mainstream linguistic and cultural groups (the ‘other’) —are not known or accepted by institutions. However, the researcher does not agree with Baker (2006) and Cronin’s (2006) position because it lacks qualification. In some institutional encounters—such as medical and social care contexts—linguistic and cultural cooperation and collaboration between the service provider and service receiver are conducive to positive outcomes of the encounter. These institutions allow or even welcome professional interpreters to offer cultural mediation because, in these circumstances, interpreters essentially create ‘the conditions for cross-cultural adaptation and enhance the participants’ presentation of their cultural identities’ (Baraldi & Gavioli, 2012, p. 13). However, in contexts such as courtroom discourse or police investigative interviews, the act of cultural mediation may enter territory which the legal fraternity and law enforcement agencies regard as their sole prerogative, thereby leading to perennial suspicion of and aversion to interpreters’ meddling. The current study limits references to and discussion of mediation to the linguistic domain, rather than the broader conception that includes managing cultural interaction—although the researcher accepts that language is embedded in culture, and vice versa. Applying this limited scope is due to the design of this research project which used scripted police interviews, removing the possibility for spontaneous responses among the police interviewer, the interpreter and the interviewee. The artificiality of the
interactional dynamics renders the study unfit to be analysed in aspects other than the interpreters’ linguistic performance (see Sections 1.2 and 1.4).

3.4.3.2 Linguistic mediation in the legal domain. Through quantitative and qualitative research, some scholars from the interpreting discipline have indicated the reality that the interpreter’s role in a communicative event is more complex—and thus more prominent or ‘visible’ (Angelelli, 2004; Merlino & Favaron, 2003; Morris, 1999; Niska, 1990)—than is perceived by their users, or the interpreters themselves. This visibility is not necessarily accepted or appreciated in full. A clear example is the legal profession, which requires interpreters’ service to undertake some of its work, but wishes interpreters to be as unintrusive and innocuous as Google Translate. There has long been awareness of tension between the legal profession and interpreters working in legal settings (particularly in the courtroom) regarding how the judiciary believes language interpretation should be provided, and how interpreters conceive the language conversion they perform to facilitate the operation of a bilingual courtroom. The judiciary is not shy about voicing their suspicion that interpreters may usurp the judicial function of ‘interpreting’ the law, and their aversion to such usurping. Berk-Seligson (1990) discusses observing judicial animosity towards interpreters and referred to an Australian civil case, Gradidge v. Grace Brothers, which used sign-language interpreters:

[t]he silent nature of the sign-language interpreting activities which were taking place in Gradidge proves conclusively that it is not the acoustic element of interpreting which disturbs judicial figures, but the mere fact that something is occurring in the courtroom which is beyond judicial control, and indeed, is likely to be beyond the understanding of other participants in the judicial process. (p. 41)
Being able to remain in control is critical for judicial officers in the courtroom. Morris (1995) states that lawyers:

[p]ride themselves on their ability to manipulate language to express themselves with precision; if they are not understood by those who rely on interpreters to participate in the proceedings or by interpreters themselves, the fault clearly lies with the latter, not with the lawyers (p. 31).

Trust is regarded a key mechanism for reducing social complexity (Luhmann, 1989 [in German], as cited in Pym, 2004, p. 9). Thus, Pym (2004) suggested that translators (including interpreters) may face high levels of mistrust because their work is somewhat opaque to the person allocating trust, and because of the nature of their work, which is often purported to be in the name of another person.

In summary, the judiciary’s mistrust of interpreters seems to have contributed to the usual admonition of court interpreters by judges or lawyers to ‘not interpret, just translate everything literally’ (Mikkelson, 1999; Morris, 1995, pp. 25–26). On closer examination, this state of affairs stems from misunderstanding and miscommunication of the term ‘interpreting’. It may be helpful at this point to introduce Jakobson’s (1959) delineation of the three types of translation (broadly including both the written and oral forms):

1. intralingual translation or rewording: an interpretation of verbal signs via other signs of that same language—for example, explaining that to ‘jaywalk’ is to cross the street illegally or recklessly (using the English language to explain an English term)

2. interlingual translation or translation proper: an interpretation of verbal signs via signs from another language—for example, explaining that ‘bon voyage’ in French is translated as ‘have a good trip’ in English
3. intersemiotic translation or transmutation: an interpretation of verbal signs via signs from nonverbal sign systems—for example, instead of telling people that smoking is prohibited in a venue, displaying a round sign with an image of a cigarette in the middle and a diagonal line across that image.

It is apparent that the judiciary’s notion of ‘interpreting’ the law is a type of intralingual linguistic operation—that is, in the same language. Therefore, they are within their right to request the interpreting to be rendered as closely as possible to the original utterances to ensure it is not ‘deduced, induced, inferred, extrapolated or hypothesized by the interpreter’ (Mulayim & Lai, 2016, forthcoming). This allows the judiciary to do what they are trained to do—‘interpreting’ the law based on the interpreted accounts they receive. However, what interpreters actually do is a type of interlingual linguistic operation—transferring what is said across different languages. To do this meaningfully and competently, interpreters cannot directly replace one word in one language with the corresponding word in another language (if there even is a corresponding word). However, it appears that this is what interpreting scholars think that lawyers mean, which has caused an outcry in the interpreting literature about how inappropriate and uninformed it is to demand interpreters to ‘translate everything literally’ (Mikkelson, 1999; Morris, 1995, pp. 25–26). To counter the ‘unreasonable demand’, the interpreting profession and academia have asserted forcefully that ‘there is nothing in the literature on translation theory, or even in statutes and rules of court governing interpreting [in the US], that requires a literal or word-for-word translation’ (Mikkelson, 1999). All researchers in the field of translating and interpreting agree that language conversion performed in professional contexts—such as in a courtroom, police interviewing room or doctor’s officer (as opposed to a private setting where code-switching or informal interpreting occurs)—is a complex cognitive activity that cannot
be constrained to using a word-for-word linguistic transformation. This is because the outcome would be unintelligible and would defeat the purpose of communication where such language mediation is required.

A landmark case in Australia, *Giao v. Queen (1960)* establishes the interpreter’s role as an impartial facilitator of communication, as Justice Fullagar (as cited in Morris, 1993) states:

> [W]hat is in truth and in substance taking place is a single conversation between A and B—and none the less because a means of communication has to be used which would be unnecessary if they had a common language … C is not in any real sense a party to the conversation. He contributes nothing of his own that is material. He is merely the mouthpiece alternately of A and B. (p. 3)

This case involved a patrol officer who interviewed the suspect via an interpreter. His evidence given in court about the interview was challenged as hearsay. However, the High Court holds that the evidence was admissible because ‘the process was analogous to talking through a machine which interpreted from one language to another’ (Roberts-Smith, 2009, p. 14). This comment is often misunderstood and criticised by interpreting scholars as a lack of appreciation by the judge of how interlingual interpreting works. As a matter of fact, when the High Court likened an interpreter to a ‘language machine’, they were not referring to the linguistic, cultural or social aspects of interpreting, but to the jurisprudential theory of the interpreter’s role as a matter of legal admissibility (Roberts-Smith, 2009, p. 14). This misunderstanding seems to continue to be perpetuated in interpreting academia, and intensifies the mistrust between interpreters and the legal profession, who are supposed to work collaboratively in the courtroom and beyond in order to place the person receiving the legal and interpreting services in a position no less disadvantageous than someone who speaks the same language as the
lawyer. One must conclude that the polysemy of the word ‘interpreting’—referring to intralingual and interlingual operations—seems to be the cause of the communication breakdown between the legal and interpreting professions, and the consequent grief demonstrated in their relevant literatures.

A fuller understanding of the interpreter’s internal cognitive processes and external linguistic output by the police interviewer and broader legal profession—including lawyers and judges—will be beneficial in forming reasonable expectations regarding bilingual communication facilitated by interpreters. It will also help achieve the best possible communicative outcomes that are ultimately fair and just for all involved. As Roy (2000) contends, in an interpreted triadic communicative event, ‘all parties involved are jointly responsible, to differing degrees, for its communicative success or failure’ (p. 63).

3.4.4 Interpreters working in Australian context. Interpreters working in Australian courts and police systems must be accredited by the National Accreditation Authority for Translators and Interpreters (NAATI), except in cases where accredited interpreters cannot be found. NAATI was established in 1977 and is jointly owned by the state and territory governments of Australia. Accreditation can be obtained by one of the following five methods:

- completing a training program in a NAATI-approved course
- sitting an accreditation exam conducted by NAATI
- completing a NAATI-recognised training course overseas
- having membership of a recognised international translating and/or interpreting professional association
- providing evidence of advanced standing in translating or interpreting

(National Accreditation Authority for Translators and Interpreters, n.d.-a)
According to NAATI’s 2015 *Accreditation by Testing—Information Booklet*, the examiners’ panels cover 61 languages. In the case of interpreter accreditation, NAATI offers the following four categories from the lowest to the highest:

- paraprofessional interpreter (candidates are tested only in the dialogue interpreting mode)
- professional interpreter (candidates are tested in the dialogue, monologue and sight translation modes)
- conference interpreter (only available through three university training courses)
- senior conference interpreter (only by recommendation).

In the case of court or police interpreting assignments, those accredited as professional interpreters or higher will be sourced first. If no interpreter with these qualifications is available, paraprofessional interpreters may be called. In some new and emerging languages spoken by newly settled ethnic communities, there may be few paraprofessional interpreters or professional interpreters. For languages for which NAATI does not have testing panels, at best, people with NAATI recognition may be found. NAATI recognition is achieved by presenting evidence of the person’s English proficiency and two referee reports, as well as completing a short NAATI training course in interpreting (National Accreditation Authority for Translators and Interpreters, n.d.-b).

The NAATI accreditation system adopts a generalist approach that does not test specialised domains or specify the specialisation in the accreditation awarded. Thus, there is no mechanism to verify whether an interpreter has minimal competency to work in the broader legal context—particularly the police context. When interpreters work in the broader context of law (such as lawyer–client conference or tribunal hearings), they
may be referred to as ‘legal interpreters’. If they are called to interpret in court hearings or trials, they may be referred to as ‘court interpreters’. When they are requested for police assignments involving law enforcement operations or interviews, they may be labelled ‘police interpreters’ (see Section 3.3 and Diagram 3). Unfortunately, these labels do not denote any systematic training or mentorship the interpreter has received; rather, they merely reflect the incidental context in which the interpreter’s service is used. One can specialise in one or any combination of these legal-related areas by choice through selective acceptance of interpreting assignments, thereby self-justifying the label attached to the particular area. Any specialisation in the current system is largely a process of self-guided learning, involving trial and error, observation and self-reflection, instead of any structured learning delivered and guided by institutional instructors or professionals. A novice interpreter who has just passed a one-off NAATI interpreter exam without any training, or just graduated from a generalist training course without in-depth specialist training, is just as much a ‘police interpreter’ as someone who has consciously chosen to specialise in the area through accumulating years of experience. The inherent danger of these labels is the misconception of service users and the general public about the level of competence the interpreter possesses, leading to the possibility of unrealistic expectations of their interpreting skills and ability.

The lack of specialisation in the interpreter accreditation system in Australia, coupled with the attachment of arbitrary labels of ‘police interpreter’ or ‘legal interpreter’ and so forth, also means there is a lack of assessment criteria for interpreting performance in this field. Unless there are other people present during the interpreted event who are competent in both languages and aware of the workings of interpreting, it is difficult to gauge the interpreter’s performance in a meaningful way. An interpreter may appear extremely confident and fluent, but not convey what was said by the
primary speakers. The worse case is when the interpreter knowingly or unknowingly change how something is said, although the information content may be the same. This is especially problematic in legal and police contexts because how something is said is just as important as what is said (González et al., 1991, pp. 16–17; Hale, 2007, pp. 90–97; O’Barr, 1982, p. 1; also see Section 3.1.1.2). This is why interpreters working in court or police interview contexts are often called as witnesses to appear in hearings to justify or be questioned why they render certain utterances or texts one way rather than another.

3.5 Summary

Following the previous chapter, which introduced in detail the major monolingual police interviewing frameworks and investigative interviewing protocols, this chapter moved on to discuss bilingual police interview settings. These settings were introduced by outlining the legal underpinnings of access to free interpreting services for criminal proceedings in various jurisdictions, followed by more specific discussion of the use of interpreters in the critically important police investigative interviews, which are the initial activity in the whole criminal justice procedure. The aim of this chapter was to lay the foundation for presenting the empirical research and findings, and to provide the context for the data analysis and discussions in the following chapters.
Chapter 4: Research Methodology

Laster (1990) observes that police interviews are conducted in private, with no ‘umpire’ (p. 25) to analyse the interviewer’s questioning conduct. Despite that electronic recording was introduced in the 1990’s in Australian police jurisdictions, it has not improved access to interviewing data due to privacy and ethics issues. The private nature of the interviews conducted by police makes it difficult to access the authentic data (recordings and statements) from these interviews, although not completely impossible (Moston, 2013, p. 7). It is unsurprising that, in the existing body of literature on legal interpreting, the majority concentrates on courtroom settings (Hale, 2007, p. 90; Nakane, 2014, p. 222) due to the comparatively easier access to court trials and transcripts, and court proceedings being open and accessible to the general public in the countries where the literature is generated. Gallai (2013) concurs with Laster’s observation by remarking that:

[w]ithin the subfield of legal or forensic interpreting, literature on bilingual courtroom interactions is plentiful, while it is much less in police interviewing and pre-trial stages. This mainly reflects the widespread difficulty in accessing authentic data in such a sensitive environment. (p. 60)

As stated in Section 1.4, this study uses an empirical approach in laboratory settings for the purpose of illuminating, understanding and extrapolating (Hoepfl, 1997) cognitive interviews conducted by English-speaking police interviewers with non–English speaking interviewees, assisted by interpreters. CI has been developed and primarily adopted in Anglophone countries. Therefore, it is understandable that most studies and available literature focus on monolingual English CI interviews. In this sense, this research study is pioneering and exploratory, and aims to answer the following research questions:
1. How do the features of CI manifest in the questioning and answering processes in a bilingual setting assisted by language interpreting?

2. How do the manifestations of interpreter-assisted bilingual CI interviews relate to interpreting practice?

3. Given what is observed in the data, what are the effects of a bilingual setting on CI interviewing strategies?

4. How do the effects of bilingual settings translate to broader CI practice? And, what could be done differently to achieve CI efficacy in bilingual settings?

4.1 Research Setup

Two CI scripts written originally in English (of an English-speaking police officer interviewing an English-speaking interviewee) were adapted into eight languages (an English-speaking police officer interviewing a non–English speaking interviewee). The scope of the research is limited to comparing the interpreted interviewing outcomes to the monolingual versions in order to understand and identify what occurs when interlingual language mediation is employed in CI in an English-speaking legal environment, and how much the workings of CI, linguistically or otherwise, differ from the monolingual English version due to language mediation. Due to the design of the research instrument, it is beyond the scope of this study to investigate the sociocultural or sociolinguistic aspects of police interaction with the interviewee via the interpreter. In addition, this research does not seek to explore whether or how the interviewees responded to the CI questioning strategies featured in the interview scripts, or the interviewees’ interactions with the interviewer and interpreter.

This research project received approval from the Design and Social Context College Human Ethics Advisory Network (CHEAN) at RMIT University, where the
researcher is based, and it was reported to the University Human Research Ethics Committee for noting. The project is classified as Low Risk by the committee under the Register Number CHEAN B-2000383-08/10. The approval period was due originally on 31 December 2011, with approved extension till 31 December 2012.

4.1.1 Research instrument. American clinical psychologists Fisher and Geiselman (1992, pp. 159–184) present two sample cognitive interviews in their publication *Memory-enhancing Techniques for Investigative Interviewing—The Cognitive Interview* (see Appendices 1.1 and 1.2). These sample interviews are written by drawing on much of their real-life experience in their field studies, although they omitted some features of formal police interviews (such as the police caution) and less essential exchanges between the police interviewer and witness (such as reading back the statement). The main target readership of their publication is investigators in various contexts (such as law enforcement officers and insurance investigators). Thus, these sample interviews are written to demonstrate the recommended CI techniques, and to showcase mistakes when these techniques were incorrectly applied or not applied at all. Of the four CI memory-jogging principles by Fisher and Geiselman—explained in detail in Section 2.3.1, only the least utilised Reverse Order (RO) is not featured in these sample interview scripts. In addition to the questions posed by the police interviewer and the answers from the eyewitness, Fisher and Geiselman annotated in the margins of each page of the scripts in the publication, commenting on the relevant principles, what should and should not be done at particular times, what should and should not be said, and so forth.

The first script (INTV1) features a total of 132 turns of an interview between a police officer and bystander in a jewellery store, who witnessed a robbery in the shop (see Appendix 2.1). This eyewitness is relatively calm, has good verbal skills and is in
many ways an ‘ideal’ eyewitness (Fisher & Geiselman, 1992, p. 159). The second script (INTV2) is shorter, with 106 turns, featuring a drive-by shooting with mistaken identity that resulted in a woman suffering from gunshot wounds when waiting to cross the street (see Appendix 2.2). The victim in this script represents a more ‘typical’ eyewitness (Fisher & Geiselman, 1992, p. 159), who is highly anxious and has poor verbal skills.

These two monolingual English scripts are selected for the current study because of their relatively full coverage of all the characteristics of CI, as detailed in Section 2.3.1. This made them an ideal instrument to investigate whether the questioning techniques in these principles remain intact when interpreting is required between the interviewer and LOTE-speaking interviewee, and how the interpreter deals with answers elicited from the interviewee. This necessitated the conversion of the two scripts into bilingual interviews in order for the experiment to be undertaken. Eight professional translators in eight different languages were commissioned to adapt the turns spoken by the witness in INTV1 and victim in INTV2 into their respective languages. They are all experienced practitioners/teachers regularly engaged by the program the current researcher coordinates to teach interpreting and to produce interpreting materials for national accreditation exams recognised by NAATI. The way the adaptation was done by these commissioned translators is similar to how accreditation exam materials are produced by the program the current researcher coordinates. For the purpose of exam equity across various languages the program runs, the usual practice is that the program centrally produces exam dialogues in English based on real-life interpreting scenarios and discourse. These English monolingual dialogues are then contracted out to the translation practitioners who are also interpreters themselves to adapt the LOTE turns (following the English as a guide) into
their individual LOTE languages. They are all familiar with the requirements of this task, i.e. keeping to the story line and the meaning components in the utterances (written in English) for the LOTE turns, while making sure that the LOTE they convert to is natural and appropriate, rather than foreign-sounding translatese. During the process of adapting the LOTE turns, if there are any meaning components which the translator deems difficult to be expressed idiomatically or in a similar form in the LOTE (e.g. LOTE parent’s line: ‘…I don’t expect my son to pass the exam with flying colours…’ may be changed to ‘…I don’t expect my son to pass the exam with high marks…’ in LOTE), or the concept is inappropriate or does not exist in the LOTE culture (e.g. LOTE patient’s line: ‘Well, I had ham and cheese sandwich for lunch’ may be changed to ‘Well, I had a bowl of soup noodle for lunch’ in LOTE), the translator can always suggest alternatives in the LOTE, and the corresponding parts in the original English monolingual script will be noted and the English back translation for the alternative LOTE utterances will be insert as replacement. In this light the translators employed for this study to convert the LOTE turns from English adopt a more pragmatic than literal approach, which was recommended by the current researcher. None of the translators in this study raised any issues regarding the conversion of the witness turns from English into their respective LOTE. Bear in mind also that the LOTE turns in the research instrument are mainly eyewitness/victim account of the crime being investigated. Therefore the utterances produced by the eyewitness/victim are descriptions of what they see and feel, which are fairly universal across linguistic boundaries.

The eight languages used are Arabic, Cantonese, Greek, Indonesian, Italian, Mandarin, Spanish and Turkish. Table 1 below presents the codes used to refer to the data for INTV1 and INTV2 in the eight languages.
Table 1

_Coding for Interviews and Languages in Research Data_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Interview 1</th>
<th>Interview 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Arabic</td>
<td>INTV1-Arb</td>
<td>INTV2-Arb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Cantonese</td>
<td>INTV1-Can</td>
<td>INTV2-Can</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Greek</td>
<td>INTV1-Grk</td>
<td>INTV2-Grk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Indonesian</td>
<td>INTV1-Ind</td>
<td>INTV2-Ind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Italian</td>
<td>INTV1-Ita</td>
<td>INTV2-Ita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Mandarin</td>
<td>INTV1-Man</td>
<td>INTV2-Man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Spanish</td>
<td>INTV1-Spa</td>
<td>INTV2-Spa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Turkish</td>
<td>INTV1-Tur</td>
<td>INTV2-Tur</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The rationale for choosing these eight specific languages is based on 2011 Australian census data. Apart from English, which is spoken solely by 80.7% of Australia’s entire population, Mandarin ranks the second-highest language spoken at home by 1.7% of Australians, followed by Italian (1.5%), Arabic (1.4%), Cantonese (1.3%), Greek (1.3%), Vietnamese (1.2%) and Spanish (0.6%) (ABS, 2011). This research encompasses the top eight languages spoken in Australian households, with the exception of Vietnamese, due to the unavailability of a suitable translator and interpreter when the research was conducted. In addition, Indonesian and Turkish were added to the study, reflecting the significant need for these two languages in the Melbourne area where the researcher is based. It is worth noting that, although Cantonese is a Chinese dialect, given its prominence in communities of Chinese people around the world, including Australia—as evidenced by its fifth place in the ranking of languages spoken at home—it was selected for inclusion in this research.

After the scripts were converted into bilingual interviews in the eight languages, role players for the English-speaking police interviewer and LOTE-speaking interviewee were recruited as actors for the mock interviews. Eight professional interpreters in the respective languages were also recruited to interpret these mock police interviews to generate data for the purpose of analysis for this research.
The fact that this research instrument (the mock bilingual police interview scripts) contains the most frequently applied three CI principles in the interviewer questions and long free-form narratives given by the interviewee ideally made it a ‘condensed version of reality’. Otherwise one has to collect a large number of real-life police interviews assisted by interpreters in order to come across suitable data containing a wide range of LOTE languages as well as featuring the application of CI principles. Further, since INTV1 and INTV2 in the eight bilingual versions all include exactly the same conversations, this standardises the research tool across the languages, thereby allowing the research to focus on the intended target—the interpreting performance—without introducing more variables to complicate the investigation.

4.1.2 Research participants. All participants were recruited through the researcher’s contacts in the discipline of translating and interpreting at the university the researcher is affiliated. The same native English–speaking interviewer role player is used throughout both scripts in all eight languages to reduce performance variation to the minimum. Seven practising professional translators—all holding NAATI professional translator accreditation, in Arabic, Chinese (for Cantonese and Mandarin), Greek, Indonesian, Italian, Spanish and Turkish—were recruited to translate the interviewee’s turns into their LOTE. They were also asked to role-play the LOTE-speaking interviewee, given their familiarity with the script. The Chinese translator role played the Mandarin version, and another native Cantonese speaker was recruited to role-play the Cantonese version of the interviews, after the person was given the opportunity to become familiar with the English/Chinese script. The English- and LOTE-speaking role players all had access to the two scripts before the recording sessions, so they could read through and familiarise themselves with the story lines. They were not required to memorise the lines, but only read out from the printed scripts
in front of them. They were instructed to read at normal speaking tempo with natural prosodic features in a manner appropriate to their designated role. Role players were all briefed before the start of each recording session and informed that they should follow the scripted turns and only start their turn after the previous turn was completed by their counterpart. This instruction was necessary to maintain consistency of the research instrument across all languages tested.

For the convenience of referring to the ‘English-speaking interviewer role player’ and ‘LOTE-speaking eyewitness interviewee role player’ in data discussion, they will be coded as ‘PI-Eng’ (meaning police interviewer speaking English) and ‘EW-LOTE’ (meaning eyewitness speaking LOTE). Where the discussion refers to the eyewitness in a particular language, the LOTE will be replaced by the short form of the language in the same manner as in Table 1—such as ‘EW-Arb’ or ‘EW-Tur’.

Eight currently practising professional interpreters—all holding NAATI professional interpreter accreditation in one of the eight designated languages—were recruited to undertake the interpreting assignments for the mock police interviews. They were all briefed just before the recording sessions, so that they knew that the two mock police interviews they were interpreting (in two separate sessions to avoid fatigue) were acted out by role players. However, they did not know what the two police interviews were about. This is to simulate real-life interpreting assignments, in which interpreters generally only know that they are attending a police assignment or police interview, and are unaware of the content or circumstances.

Table 2 lists the basic demographic information of the participant interpreters, which was needed for the research discussions in the next chapter.
### Table 2

**Basic Information about Participant Interpreters**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Years of practice</th>
<th>Accreditation obtained via</th>
<th>1st language v. 2nd language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>University training</td>
<td>Arabic; English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>University training</td>
<td>Cantonese; English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Vocational training</td>
<td>English; Greek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>University training</td>
<td>Indonesian; English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>University training</td>
<td>Italian; English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Vocational training</td>
<td>Mandarin; English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>University training</td>
<td>Spanish; English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>University training</td>
<td>Turkish; English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average: 7.6

#### 4.1.3 Research location

All mock interviews took place at the RMIT University Melbourne city campus, where the researcher is based. An appropriate room was used for each filming session. The room setting was kept simple, with tables and chairs arranged in a triadic configuration. The interpreter was briefed to sit in the middle between the English interviewer and LOTE interviewee role players. In each filming session, the researcher set up the digital video camera on a tripod in the corner of the room, ensured the three actors were in the frame, tested the recording was working properly, and then briefed the actors. The briefing covered the logistical aspects. For example, once the camera rolled, they would be in the room by themselves until they finished the whole script. The English interviewer role player was made the person ‘in charge’ of the session, including pausing the camera if anyone needed a break, and resuming recording. In the unlikely event of a technical issue or emergency, the English interviewer role player would ring the researcher’s office extension number to inform her of the problem.

#### 4.1.4 Data collection and analysis

On average, INTV1 took one hour to finish recording, whereas INTV2, being shorter, took around 30 to 40 minutes to finish.
16 mock police interviews (two scripts × eight languages) took one year to complete, with the first interview recorded in December 2011 and the last in December 2012. All recordings are saved in MP4 digital video file format for data analysis.

The same interpreter attended on two separate occasions to complete the two mock interviews because, most importantly, this avoided interpreter fatigue and enabled the interpreters to perform as consistently as possible at their normal level of competence. Additionally, the two scripts are unrelated to each other; therefore, completing them in two separate sessions resembles more real-life practice.

The researcher is the sole person who has watched the videos systematically. The researcher first watched INTV1-Man to identify points of interest because the researcher’s language combination is English–Mandarin. The researcher then watched the other seven INTV1-LOTE versions. The researcher then moved on to watch INTV2-Man, repeating the same process for the remaining seven INTV2-LOTE versions. For any points of interest identified in any language in INTV1 or INTV2, the researcher reviewed all languages to observe the same points in order to ascertain whether these were language-specific phenomena or otherwise. These observations form the basis of the researcher’s data analysis and discussion.

When analysing the data across all the eight language versions, the word count for each segment the interpreter uttered is an important aspect the researcher investigated. For segments spoken by the PI-Eng and interpreted into the TL by the interpreter, the word count is the number of English words in the segment up to where the PI-Eng paused, and these are the English utterances originally written by Fisher and Geiselman (1992, pp. 159-184). For segments spoken by the EW-LOTE, the word count for each segment goes by the original Fisher and Geiselman’s (1992, pp. 159-184) English version before translation, rather than the actual English words uttered by the
This methodology is common in setting multilingual translating and interpreting assessments in Australia, when equity across languages in assessment tools is important (NAATI Examiners’ Manual, 2008, Section 2 Test Setting, p. 2-3). NAATI uses English word counts (from reference translation of its LOTE materials) to manage all its LOTE testing materials in order to ensure maximum reliability and equity across 61 languages it tests (NAATI Examiners’ Manual, 2008, Section 2 Test Setting, p. 5). So in relation to all the LOTE turns in this study, regardless of their respective word counts in LOTE, they all contain the same content and meaning components in each LOTE turn (because the LOTE was created based on the original English monolingual scripts, much like the methodology used to create NAATI exam materials), therefore equitable across all eight languages.

No interpreters will interpret the same LOTE segments into English exactly the same, nor would their renditions be the same as the original English monolingual scripts. What can be sure is that their renditions are all very similar to that of each other’s, because their LOTEs all reflect the same source English they are created from. As a result, if the researcher were to go by the interpreters’ actual word counts uttered in English, the comparison across the eight languages would be less meaningful, because higher word counts do not necessarily mean more meaning elements being covered. Under this principle, all representations of word count from LOTE into English in this study are provided in ‘EQV’, i.e. English equivalent (number of words), to denote the methodology adopted. For example, in INTV1 turn 8 in the Turkish version, the EW-Tur said in Turkish: ‘Better. That was really frightening, especially when they started yelling and I saw the gun’, counting as 15 words EQV. The Turkish interpreter rendered this segment from Turkish into English as: ‘Slightly better now. It was very bad at the time … particularly when I came across the gun, the weapon, and when the yelling and
screaming going on’, yielding 27 words. The EW-Tur then finished the turn by saying in Turkish: ‘I’ve never seen a gun before, except on TV, and it really shook me up’, counting as 15 words EQV. The Turkish interpreter rendered this segment from Turkish into English as: ‘I have never come across a weapon before in real life, apart from television series. And that really shaking me up quite a lot’, yielding 24 words. Instead of using \(27 + 24 = 51\) as word count, the first 27 words uttered by the Turkish interpreter completely accounted for the meaning in the 15 words from the original monolingual English script; thus, the word count for this segment was recorded as 15. The same applied to the second segment, as well as the rest of the interpreted versions by other interpreters from the LOTE into English. Here the application of Skopos Theory (Reise & Vermeer, 1984, 2014) is called for to check the interpretation for error categorisation of additions, omissions or distortions. Skopos is a Greek word meaning purpose. When examining the participating interpreters’ renditions in this study, if the utterances produced are deemed to have achieved the purpose of communication in the contexts of INTV1 and INTV2 (such are the examples provided above from the Turkish interpreter), no errors should be allocated to the corresponding utterances.

**4.1.5 Transcription.** As the LOTE sections in INTV1 and INTV2 are produced based on the English monolingual police interviews from Fisher and Geiselman (1992, pp. 159–184), the interpreters’ rendition of these sections into English could be checked against the original scripts and points of interest identified. Two separate Microsoft Excel spreadsheets were set up, containing all the turns in INTV1 and INTV2 by language. A transcriber was recruited to transcribe all the participant interpreters’ renditions of EW-LOTE’s turns into English in all 16 recordings, and recorded them in the two spreadsheets.
A separate research assistant was employed to type up English back-translations of the LOTE renditions of the PI-Eng’s questions in the spreadsheets. Not all turns rendered into the LOTEs were back-translated into English because some turns were straightforward and did not contain any points of interest. Only the turns the researcher identified as being of interest were chosen to be back-translated. With the exception of the Spanish version, all back-translations from the LOTEs into English were done by a separate independent NAATI-accredited interpreter for each language. Due to the difficulty obtaining an available Spanish interpreter when the back-translation was commissioned at the start of 2015, the original Spanish translator who did the conversion of INTV1-Spa and INTV2-Spa in early 2012 was asked to undertake the back-translation work. This Spanish translator was also a NAATI-accredited Spanish interpreter. The researcher considered there to be low risk of compromising the back-translation due to the translator’s knowledge of the original INTV1 and INTV2, as three years had lapsed since she last did the translation. During this time, she was not asked to read anything about the scripts or watch the recorded Spanish version of the experiment.

The research assistant made separate appointments with each interpreter. The interpreters watched INTV1 and INTV2 on a PC in the appropriate language version, while the research assistant had the spreadsheets open on a laptop. The research assistant paused at the various turns that the researcher had chosen for the interpreter to provide their back-translation to English of the LOTE rendered by their colleague in the video. The research assistant then typed the English back-translation into the spreadsheets. If the interpreter needed to watch the segment again to ensure they could accurately back-translate, the research assist would rewind the video.

The transcription and back-translation was done in a broad sense, which represents ‘at least the fundamental features of spoken discourse, but does not seek to
represent all the features and discriminations which are possible. A narrow transcription
tries to represent more features and discriminations’ (Du Bois, Cumming, Schuetze-
Coburn, & Paolino, 1992, p. 13). In the view of Du Bois et al. (1992), broad
transcriptions tend to capture the features of discourse, such as words uttered, speakers
and turns, speech overlap and pauses, whereas narrow transcriptions capture more
nuanced discourse information, such as the duration of pause, terminal pitch direction,
extended marked quality and ambient noise. As explained in Section 4.1, due to using
the two fixed scripts across the eight languages in the study, thereby creating an
artificial experiment, the researcher does not seek to investigate the sociocultural or
sociolinguistic dynamics between the PI-Eng and EW-LOTE in these mock interviews.
In other words, the way CA traditionally aims to demonstrate ‘how participants both
produce and respond to evolving social contexts, using conversational, rather than
contextual data, as the source for the claims it wishes to make’ (Paltridge, 2006, p. 108)
did not apply in this study. Rather, the researcher focused primarily on whether the
linguistic output of the participant interpreters retain the intended CI strategies used by
PI-Eng, and how the participant interpreters dealt with the EW-LOTE’s (scripted)
answers in response to the CI strategies. The researcher decided that broad transcription
would be sufficient to serve these purposes.

4.2 Frameworks for Data Analysis

As explained in Section 1.1 (Rationale of the Research) and Section 1.5
(Significance of Research), the available literature in police interviewing and its
employment of CI has overwhelmingly focused on monolingual settings in
predominantly Anglophone countries. Thus, the current research on bilingual police
interview settings is pioneering and serves as an exploratory study to unveil how
interlingual language mediation plays out in the CI implemented in police contexts,
where the language barriers between the interviewer and interviewee are bridged by the interpreter. The data analysis of this research uses the workings of English monolingual CI as a benchmark to examine whether the LOTE rendition of CI questioning retained all the CI verbal strategies, and English rendition of LOTE answering presents anything different from the monolingual English version which warrants attention.

In relation to the questioning side, the researcher focuses on whether the components of the CI protocol remains intact in the TLs after interpreting. The four CI elements are normally summarised as follows (see Section 2.3.1):

1. Report Everything (RE)
2. Reverse Order (RO)
3. Change Perspective (CP)
4. Context Reinstatement (CR)

According to Shepherd (2007; also see Section 2.3.1.3), RO is a less used strategy in CI. Although Fisher and Geiselman (1992) did not explain why they left out RO in the two scripts they wrote, it should be pointed out that these techniques ‘[c]an be used singly or together to produce better recall’ (Schollum, 2015, p. 58). The current research, therefore, only features the other three CI elements through the interviewing officer’s questioning and conversational strategies, limiting the subsequent analysis to covering only the three CI elements. The back-translation of the LOTE renditions (back into English) of the interviewing officer’s utterances where the elements featured were important points of interest for the researcher. In addition to ascertaining whether such segments was successfully transferred into the TLs, in cases where they are not, it was then necessary to discover which issues prevented the linguistic transfer, and whether the phenomenon was language specific or generic to the interpreting process.
In relation to the EW-LOTE’s answers, the researcher was able to compare the English renditions by the participant interpreters against Fisher and Geiselman’s (1992, pp. 159–184) original monolingual English scripts from which the LOTE segments were developed. This part of the analysis focuses on how the interpreters dealt with the EW-LOTE’s long narratives as a response to PI-Eng’s CI strategies. In particular, this analysis explores in depth the system of turn taking between the interpreter and EW-LOTE, and the manifestation (or otherwise) of cooperation and accommodation between them.

In the following Sections 4.2.1 to 4.2.6, the researcher outlines the relevant theoretical frameworks the researcher uses to analyse and discuss the research data in Chapters 6 and 7.

**4.2.1 Institutional discourse and structure.** Although the research instrument—the two police CI interviews—is artificially written, authors Fisher and Geiselman incorporated their real-life experience from watching hundreds of hours of recorded police interviews (Yarmey, 2001. p. 58). Therefore, it can be safely claimed that these interviews resemble real-life police interviews to a high degree.

Section 2.1.3 introduced the concept of the ‘fingerprint’ of institutional discourse by Drew and Heritage (1992, pp. 95–96), with the three defining characteristics summarised by Levinson (1992):

1. being goal or task oriented
2. having constraints on what is considered legitimate contributions to the goal or task
3. producing particular kinds of inferences in the way the speakers interpret, or orient to, utterances.
Heritage (2004) further dissects these characteristics into the following six areas—a useful framework to analyse features of institutional discourse as a particular genre of ‘talk in action’. The current researcher uses this framework to analyse the research instrument in order to highlight the characteristics of the two police CI interviews used in the study.

1. **Turn-taking organisation.** The order and actions individuals perform in daily conversation are rarely pre-determined, whereas special turn-taking organisation is a feature of institutional interaction, and ‘the departures from the order of speakership … can be explicitly sanctioned’ (Heritage, 2004, p. 226). The two CI interviews tested in this study demonstrated this feature—an orderly question-and-answer sequence, with questions always allocated to the police officer and answers always allocated to the interviewee.

2. **Overall structural organisation of the interaction.** This refers to the ‘overall “map” of the interaction in terms of its typical “phases” or “sections”’ (Heritage, 2004, p. 227)—an opening, an initiation of the issue under enquiry, a disposal of institutional duties, and then a closure. Institutional interactions normally manifest a high degree of being ‘task-focused’ (Heritage, 2004, p. 227). Both of the CI interviews open with an introduction by the police officer explaining who he was and the purpose of the interaction—investigating the jewellery store robbery the victim witnessed for the first CI interview, and investigating a drive-by shooting of mistaken identity for the second CI interview. The interviews close with the police officer giving the interviewee his business card (only in the first interview) and reminding the victims to contact him if they think of any further information (in both interviews).

3. **Sequence organisation.** This is the central aspect of CA, in which the turn sequences are analysed to see ‘how particular courses of action are initiated and
progressed and … how particular action opportunities are opened up and activated, or withheld from and occluded’ (Heritage, 2004, p. 230). The entire PEACE interviewing framework manifests a disciplined sequence organisation in police interviewing discourse, allowing the questioning policing officer to move during the investigative interview from Planning and Preparation -> Engage and Explain -> Account -> Closure -> Evaluation. The CI techniques used in the Account stage are developed using cognitive principles from psychology to elicit as much retained memory as possible from a cooperative interviewee for crime investigation purposes. For example, in INTV1 at turn 15, the police officer instructs the victim to ‘report everything’ (see Section 2.3.1.3 about CI principle 1: RE):

[i]t is important to keep in mind that you have all the information. I am trying to find out what happened from you, so I expect you to do most of the talking.

Don’t wait for me to ask questions. Whenever something comes to mind, tell me, even if it seems trivial or contradicts something you said earlier. Don’t omit anything. If you don’t know a specific fact, that’s OK, just say that you don’t know. Don’t make up something, though, just to give me an answer. (Fisher & Geiselman, 1992, p. 161; also refer Appendix 2.1, turn 15)

To further facilitate successful retrieval of information from the victim’s memory, in the same turn, the police officer seeks to help the victim to ‘recreate’ the original ‘context’ in which the crime occurred (see Section 2.3.1.3 about CI principle 4: RC): ‘Before we start, I’d like you to tell me a little bit about where you were in the store and what you were thinking about just before the robbery took place’. The victim started describing:

[I] wanted to buy a watch for my husband’s birthday. In the past few years, I bought a few pieces of jewellery in the store. They’re very reasonable, and they
have good-quality merchandise. I must have been standing towards the back of
the store when they started yelling. (Fisher & Geiselman, 1992, p. 161; also refer
Appendix 2.1, turn 16)

The police officer then follows with a request: ‘If you can, try to draw a simple sketch
of the store. Indicate where you were standing, and where the robbers and cashier were.
What were the lighting conditions in the store?’. After the sketch is drawn by the victim,
the police officer asks yet another question to further recreate the context of the crime:
‘What were the lighting conditions in the store?’. This is followed by an open-ended
question in order to elicit a free-form narrative:

[T]ry to put yourself back in the same location as when you first noticed the
robbers and tell me in your own words everything you remember about what
happened, until the end of the robbery. Try to be as detailed as possible. (Fisher
& Geiselman, 1992, p. 162; also refer Appendix 2.1, turn 19)

After the police officer exhausts the leads he wishes to explore from the free-form
narrative and the follow-up questions, the CP strategy (see Section 2.3.1.3 about CI
principle 3: CP) is employed for a different kind of memory retrieval:

[I]’d like you to try to put yourself into the role of the leader and think about
what happened from his perspective. That is, try to imagine what he was
thinking about and how he must have thought about the robbery. I realise that is
a difficult task to do, so try to concentrate. Don’t make up anything. Tell me
only those things you actually saw, but take the robber’s perspective. (Fisher &
Geiselman, 1992, p. 172; also refer Appendix 2.1, turn 113)

This rather unusual instruction asks a victim of crime to assume the role of someone
else and re-tell the story that was just told, except from another person’s perspective.
This epitomises how the interviewer ensures that ‘particular action opportunities are
opened up and activated’ (Heritage, 2004, p. 230). As a result of this strategy, Fisher and Geiselman (1992) annotate on the side that:

[a] few new pieces of information come to light here: the presence of a bag for carrying the money, pieces of jewellery taken in addition to the watch, a frontal view of the robber in charge of his gun, and a truck as the get-away vehicle.

Each of these sources will be probed to extract additional information similar to the way the images were probed earlier. (p. 172)

RO (see Section 2.3.1.3 about CI principle 2: RO) is the only principle not featured in INTV1 or INTV2. RO is used to ask the interviewing subject to tell their story in reverse chronological order, moving backwards through the events from the latest to earliest in temporal order to avoid triggering the generic story of ‘what normally happens’ in those circumstances.

Although the research instrument of this study consists of interviews artificially written by Fisher and Geiselman (1992) to demonstrate how the strategies work, they can be viewed as a microcosm of many real-life CI’s at work and are capable of demonstrating high levels of sequence organisation. It should be kept in mind, however, these are not authentic police interviews.

**4. Turn design.** This involves examining the institutionality of the interaction (Heritage, 2004, p. 231), which can be done by considering: (i) the action that the talk is designed to perform and (ii) the means that are selected to perform the action (Drew & Heritage, 1992). In some sense, the former is similar to Austin’s (1962) illocutionary act, while the latter is similar to Austin’s locutionary act.

In INTV2, the mistaken-identity drive-by shooting victim is in an agitated state, lying in a hospital bed. In turn 2, she vents her frustration when the police officer visits her:
[W]here were the police yesterday? Why do you let such crazy people roam the street? I was minding my own business, and then, out of nowhere, somebody shoots me. For no reason. I wasn’t bothering anyone. I could have been killed out there. What is this city coming to? Now, here I am in the hospital. I have to go to work tomorrow to pick up my pay check and I can’t even move. I don’t think I’m going to be much help. I really didn’t see much. It all happened so fast.

(Fisher & Geiselman, 1992, p. 175; also refer Appendix 2.2, turn 2)

To achieve the overall institutional goal of obtaining information from the victim for crime investigation, the following turns uttered by the police officer employ wording designed specifically to enquire about the victim’s health after the ordeal, with a deliberate intention to show empathy. This wording is not employed because the police officer necessarily wishes to display empathy towards this stranger, but because he has a job to do and, without this design, it would be difficult to achieve the aim. The police officer’s Turn 3 states: ‘How are you feeling now? Are you in pain?’, followed by his turn 5: ‘Can I do anything to help you?’. This leads to his turn 7, which validates the victim’s feelings and shares his personal experience:

[I]t really is unfair . There are some crazy people out there, and innocent people often wind up suffering because of them. My wife was hit by a car once. The car went through a red light and hit my wife as she was crossing the street. She wasn’t doing anything, just crossing the street, and she wound up with a broken leg. (Fisher & Geiselman, 1992, p. 175; also refer Appendix 2.2, turn 7)

According to Fisher and Geiselman’s (1992) annotation, the design of these three turns is a result of:
[s]ensing that the E/W [eyewitness/victim] is highly anxious and must vent her feelings, the INT [police interviewer] allows her more liberty at the outset to talk about these feelings before starting to collect facts relevant to the crime. (p. 176)

5. **Lexical choice.** This is another source that reveals the institutionality of the interaction through using lexical items chosen from different registers to reflect different levels of formality (such as choosing ‘police’ over the more colloquial term ‘cop’) and through the demonstration of footing (for example, saying ‘we thought we’d invite you in for a chat’ when there is only one institutional speaker to indicate this person’s alignment with the institution) (Heritage, 2004, pp. 235–236).

The two CI interviews used as the research instrument both feature one police officer interviewing the witness/victim of crime. In turn 11 in INTV1, after the victim comments on how the whole neighbourhood is changing, the police officer says:

>[T]hat’s what we would like to do, to make this a safe area again. If you can give us enough information, that would help us in trying to catch them and take them off the streets. In order to catch these people, I need you to give me as many details as possible, so don’t leave anything out. The more details you can give me, the easier it will be for us to find them and prosecute them [emphasis added].

(Fisher & Geiselman, 1992, p. 160; also refer Appendix 2.1, turn 11)

The same alignment of the questioning officer with the police institution he represents is clear in the second interview (mistaken-identity victim of drive-by shooting). In Turn 15, the questioning officer says: ‘It must have been very scary. [Insert name], we would like to try to catch the person who shot you so we can make the streets safer for innocent people like you [emphasis added]’.
6. Interactional asymmetry. This refers to the imbalances that occur during institutional interactions, as categorised into the following four types of interaction (Heritage, 2004, pp. 236–240).

(a). Asymmetry of participation. This is demonstrated through the direct relationship between institutional roles and tasks, and discursive rights and obligations, so that the institutional speaker is the one who determines:

1. when a topic is satisfactorily concluded
2. what the next topic will be
3. through the design of their questions, how that next topic will be shaped

(Drew & Heritage, 1992).

In INTV1 and INTV2, the police interviewer occupies the more powerful role, representing the institution. Analysing these two interviews based on aspects one to five above shows that the interactions in all cases demonstrate an asymmetrical distribution of power. In INTV1 turn 115, the police interviewer says:

[S]o far, you’ve given me lots of details about the robbers and what happened [indicating a topic is satisfactorily concluded]. I’d like you now to describe the robbers in more general terms, like height and weight or body build [dictating next topic]. Also, if you have any general impression about them, or if they reminded you of anyone, tell me [further specifying the next topic]. Let’s start with the man who held the gun to you, Roberto [shaping the next topic by dictating the victim to start with this particular robber instead of the other one].

(Fisher & Geiselman, 1992, p. 172; also refer Appendix 2.1, turn 115)

In INTV2 turn 52, after the chronology of the drive-by shooting event is given by the victim through exchanges of many turns (controlled by the police interviewer), the interviewer begins to probe the vision of the car in which the perpetrator was sitting:
[W]ait before you start to describe the car [indicating next topic]. Take your time and think about the image of the car first. Just concentrate on the image of the car for a few seconds [shaping next topic]. Don’t say anything for a while.

(Fisher & Geiselman, 1992, p. 180; also refer Appendix 2.2, turn 52)

It is worth noting that the more powerful participant in the interaction can not only determine the conclusion of the previous topic, initiate a new topic, and shape the new topic, but can also demand silence from the less powerful participant, until such a time she or he deems appropriate to receive the answer. Thus, the same turn 52 ends: ‘[after a long pause] Now, just tell me where on the car you are focusing’.

(b). *Asymmetry of interactional and institutional ‘knowhow’*. This manifests at the level of familiarity/understanding of the organisational goals, routines and procedures—in other words, the parties of the encounter bring unequal experience and reasoning to the interaction. In the two CI interviews used as the research instrument, the police interviewer clearly demonstrates his more superior understanding of the institutional goal (crime investigation) and organisational routines (opening and closing formalities in police interviewing procedures). In both interviews, the victims sound like ordinary law-abiding citizens who do not have much experience dealing with crimes or talking with members of the police. The following exchange is an example from the first interview (refer Appendix 2.1):

52 LOTE: I don’t know a lot about guns. It was black. I don’t know what else to tell you.

53 Police: Here are sketches of two different types of guns. Did the gun look more like this one or this one?

54 LOTE: It looked more like this one.
55 Police: Look at my gun, since it’s the same type. How did the robber’s
gun compare to mine?

56 LOTE: This part was longer. And the handle had a different shape. I’m
afraid I can’t describe it very well.

57 Police: That’s OK. If you can, try to draw a picture of what the handle
looked like.

58 LOTE: [draws picture of gun handle].

In INTV1 turn 13, the police interviewer says:

From what you told me on the phone yesterday, it sounded like you got a pretty
good look at the robbers and that you remember a lot about what happened. So, I
expect that it will take a while for us to go through the interview. Where’s a
good place to talk so that we won’t be distracted? [emphasis added] (Fisher &
Geiselman, 1992, p. 161; also refer Appendix 2.1, turn 13)

In turn 127, towards the end of the interview, he says:

you’ve given me a lot of information and I’d like to make sure that I have it
all written down correctly. Let me go over my notes with you as a final
check. Try to think about the robbery as I am reading my notes to you. If, at
any time, I say something that seems incorrect, or if you think of something
new that you haven’t told me, make sure you stop me immediately to tell me
[emphasis added]. (Fisher & Geiselman, 1992, p. 173; also refer Appendix 2.1,
turn 127)

Finally, in turn 128, he says: ‘I’m going to need some information about you for our
official records. It’s just something that is required by the police department whenever
we take a statement. [Insert name], what is your full name?’ (Fisher & Geiselman, 1992,
p. 174; also refer Appendix 2.1, turn 128). The contrast between the interviewee and
police officer highlights the asymmetric institutional knowledge and total dominance of the police officer during the interaction in the three aspects discussed under item (a).

(c). Epistemological caution and asymmetries of knowledge. Due to the epistemological superiority of expert knowledge of the institutional speaker, sometimes manifesting in the degree of cautiousness in his or her diagnosis/evaluation of the evidence presented, the lay participant of the encounter is the party with unequal subject matter knowledge. To some extent this is true: the epistemic authority of the police officer only extends to institutional procedures and experience in crime investigation, previous cases (similar or dissimilar), crime levels in the area and so forth. In other words, the researcher is of the view that the institutional participant has a macro-level expert knowledge. At the micro level, such ‘expert knowledge’ lies with the victim who experienced the crime and retains the memory of the episode (to some extent). This is evidenced in the police officer’s turn 15 in INTV1:

[I]t is important to keep in mind **that you have all the information. I am trying to find out what happened from you**, so I expect you to do most of the talking. Don’t wait for me to ask questions. Whenever something comes to mind, tell me, even if it seems trivial or contradicts something you said earlier. Don’t omit anything [emphasis added]. (Fisher & Geiselman, 1992, p. 161; also refer Appendix 2.1, turn 15)

This is also evidenced in turn 24 in INTV2, where the police officer says to the victim:

[J]ust do the best you can. **Anything you can tell me will be valuable**, so just relax and take your time. We’re not in any rush. I understand that you’re upset now. That’s only natural after a crime like this. If you want to take a break at any time, because you’re feeling anxious, just tell me and we’ll stop [emphasis added]. (Fisher & Geiselman, 1992, p. 177; also refer Appendix 2.2, turn 24)
This is no different to a doctor–patient encounter where the subject matter knowledge of possible illnesses lies with the doctor at the macro level. However, the doctor needs to elicit the micro-level knowledge from the patient in order to carry out his or her institutional duties to treat the patient appropriately.

(d). Rights of access to knowledge. This is demonstrated by the fact that, sometimes, knowledge by itself may not be enough: the institutional speaker normally has the right of access to knowledge, and the power to decide whether imparting this knowledge to the lay participants is appropriate, based on institutional mandate. During interviewing, in many professional contexts, the institutional participant often holds the key to accessing certain knowledge possessed by the institution (echoing the power and epistemological imbalances between an institution and individual discussed in points [a] to [c] above). For example, in a doctor–patient encounter, the doctor may decide to reveal a new drug trial and administer this drug to the patient. This may not happen to every patient with a similar condition, as the doctor may make a professional judgement about the suitability of the patient from various perspectives. In the context of police interviewing, the ‘strategic use of evidence’ technique is employed to strategically disclose the evidence police possess when interviewing a suspect in order to detect deception (Granhang, Strömwall, & Hartwig, 2007; Hartwig, Granhang, Strömwall, & Kronkvist, 2006; Hartwig, Granhang, Strömwall, & Vrij, 2005). In addition, when questioning the suspect, the interviewing officer may decide to withhold the information the institution already possesses—such as the person’s whereabouts at a particular time according to other witnesses or CCTV footage—and let the suspect volunteer his or her own version of his or her movements during that time.

Summary. Atkinson and Drew (1979) analyse the turn-taking system in courtroom interactions as a subgenre of legal discourse, and observed that participants
all follow distinctive ways of turn taking, showing clear orientation to a specific institutional identity and the tasks and constraints associated with it (Heritage & Greatbatch, 1991). The above analysis of INTV1 and INTV2—as another subgenre of legal discourse (Coulthard & Johnson, 2007)—using Heritage’s (2004) six-part framework clearly supports Atkinson and Drew’s (1979) findings. Again, the researcher acknowledges the artificiality of the instrument used for this research, but believes the two interview scripts reflect, to a high degree, real-life police CI interpreting, thereby justifying the application of this structure analysis to illustrate the important characteristics of this discourse.

4.2.2 TCU and TRP. The analysis of how the participant interpreters handled and coordinated turn taking in the triadic setup (see Diagram 4 in Section 3.4.2) required the theoretical underpinning of the workings of TCU and TRP in CA in order to explain storytelling in conversation. The application of storytelling in this research was primarily evidenced in the LOTE interviewee’s free-form narratives of the crime witnessed, elicited by the English interviewer’s RE strategy under the CI protocol. The overall ‘talk as interaction’ between the interviewer and interviewee is treated as conversation under the CA framework. However, it must be acknowledged that the primary participants to the talk—the police interviewer and LOTE interviewee—do not have equal rights in the interaction, as discussed in Section 4.2.1 on institutional discourse and structure.

Section 2.1.3 (turn taking) introduced Sacks et al.’s (1974) idea of TCU and TRP to account for the two most important elements in CA. TCU is defined as ‘the smallest interactionally relevant complete linguistic unit, in a given context, that is constructed with syntactic and prosodic resources within their semantic, pragmatic, activity-type-specific, and sequential conversational context’ (Selting, 2000, p. 477). In
contrast, TRP is a ‘turn-allocation component which deals with the regulation and
negotiation of turn allocation, at the end of each TCU, for the next such unit’ (Selting,
2000, p. 478). In real life conversational interactions, TRPs make turn transition
relevant, but not necessary—it depends on whether the conversational participant(s)
makes use of such opportunity to take over the floor and start a turn.

There has been confusion and debates about what a TCU is, as a basic unit of
talk, since it was first introduced by Sacks et al. (1974). The debates relevant to this
research relate to the analysis of ‘big packages’ or ‘large projects’, such as stories told
in conversation (Selting, 2000, p. 481), as opposed to Sacks et al.’s (1974, as cited in
Selting, 2000) original view basing TCUs on ‘linguistic units—in particular, syntactic
constructions such as sentences, clauses, phrases, and lexical constructions’ (p. 479). In
these ‘large projects’ in conversation, there are issues relating to whether to regard the
whole story as a TCU—since it is meant to be given in its entirety—or to treat each
traditional TCU (the syntactically and prosodically complete linguistic constructions) in
the story as independent TCUs. Although Selting (2000) eventually developed a
modified version of Sacks et al.’s (1974) original model to accommodate storytelling in
conversation, the current research opted for the former conception by treating the whole
story as a TCU.

Regardless of the model, Sacks (1992, p. 226) discusses storytelling as an
activity in which the story preface and ratification are designed to secure permission for
a ‘multi-sentence utterance’ (Selting, 2000, p. 486). In relation to this research, the story
preface (Turn 15 in the first interview) is actually afforded by the receiver of the story
(the English interviewer), which may not be the case in other institutional or private
settings, where it normally may be ‘proposed’ by the storyteller, and the ratification
supposedly given by the receiver of the story. In this research, this is considered a given,
in that the English interviewer invited the story in the first place. It can be construed that
the power asymmetry (see Section 2.1.3.3 about power asymmetry) in this police
interview setting is such that the story preface (Turn 15 in INTV1) and tacit ratification
are both from the receiver of the story (Turn 20 in INTV2)—the English interviewer—
rather than the storyteller.

In the conception adopted for this study, the researcher treats TCUs as ‘possibly
complete turns that end in a TRP, and other kinds of units below the TCU’ (Selting,
2000, p. 485). Thus, in relation to the story told by the LOTE interviewee in Turn 20,
the researcher treats the entire story as ‘a projected single TCU which is organised
internally into smaller units of other kinds’ (Selting, 2000, p. 485). These smaller units
are ‘story-internal and thus TCU-internal’ (Selting, 2000, p. 485) and are ‘constituted in
order to formulate the story incrementally as a whole in an orderly and recipient-
designed way’ (Selting, 2000, p. 485). Thus, when the researcher analysed them, these
units in turn were regarded production units below the TCU.

This study contends that this framework for data analysis has the advantage of
reserving TCUs for those units that are immediately relevant to the operation of the
rules of turn taking. This is because the research instrument is pre-scripted and naturally
occurring TRPs in real-life conversations may not be completely present in the
instrument; thus, this was not the angle of investigation.

4.2.3 Cooperative theory. In monolingual ‘talk in action’, Grice’s (1975)
cooperative principle has generally been accepted to explain the way people
communicate logically and rationally in order to exchange pragmatic meaning through
the construction of meaningful conversation. Grice (1975) asserts that interlocutors
abide by the cooperative principle in conversation to ‘make … conversational
contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose
or direction of the talk-exchange in which you are engaged’ (p. 5). To determine what is meant in conversation, Grice (as cited in Davis & Leo, 2012) posits that participants:

[m]ake conversational implicatures, in which they fill in, amplify, or revise the literal meaning of statements to arrive at the intended or implied meaning. These implicatures are intended to preserve the assumption that the cooperative principle is indeed being followed by the speaker. (pp. 355–356)

Grice also argues that the inclination towards conversational cooperation will never be lost because it has been learnt during a person’s childhood. The current researcher would add that further and deeper socialisation of all members of society, when growing up, reinforces such cooperative behaviour in talks.

The four maxims of Grice’s (1975) cooperative principle in conversation can be summarised as follows:

1. Maxim 1: Quantity
   - Make your contribution as informative as required (do not say too much or too little).
   - Make the strongest statement you can.

2. Maxim 2: Quality
   - Do not say what you believe to be false.
   - Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.

3. Maxim 3: Relation
   - Be relevant (stay on topic).

4. Maxim 4: Manner
   - Avoid obscurity of expression.
   - Avoid ambiguity.
   - Be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity).
• Be orderly.

According to Grice (as cited in Napier, 2007), adherence to these maxims ‘ensures successful exchange of information between conversational participants, and influences turn taking’ (p. 409). However, Grice’s theory focuses on conversational content, and not necessarily on the relationship between interactants (Tannen, 2005, p. 20). As a result, in addition to Gricean cooperation, successful communication relies on the interactants to ‘draw on their frames, work together to negotiate footing shifts through the use of cues’ (Napier, 2007, p. 409)—such as pausing, nodding and using eye contact—to facilitate the interpreter-assisted discourse, which is the type of discourse features investigated in this study.

However, Napier (2007) maintains that the Gricean principle should still be followed during interpreter-assisted talks:

[i]f the interaction is mediated by an interpreter, it can be assumed that if present in such conversations, interpreters must also adhere to the cooperative principle. In making interpretation choices in each language direction, the interpreter must also conform to the maxims of quantity, relevance, manner and quality to ensure the successful outcome of the interpreted event. (p. 411)

Thus, the current research seeks to investigate further the interpreter’s role in institutional discourse, such as police interviews, in relation to the Gricean sense of cooperation, and any other forms of collaborative effort, in order to achieve the aim of the communicative event. This will be thoroughly explored in Sections 6.1.3.1 and 6.1.3.3 where intralingual versus interlingual cooperation are dissected and contrasted.

4.2.4 Communication accommodation theory. Howard Giles’s (1977, 1980) communication accommodation theory (CAT) accounts for the way people adjust their communication depending on the counterpart in the communicative event in order to be
perceived as being part of the in-group or otherwise. Giles (1973) is credited for theorising the process of changing and meshing one’s style of speaking with others during face-to-face interaction for the purpose of seeking approval—known as ‘speech accommodation theory’ (SAT). SAT was later developed to become CAT (Giles, Mulac, Bradac, & Johnson, 1987), which includes a wider range of accommodative behaviours with diverse levels of linguistic, prosodic, and nonverbal features, such as accent features (pronunciation), intonation, speech rate, pauses, utterance length, smiling and gaze (Giles et al., 1987). These so-called ‘non-content’ (Putman & Street, 1984, p. 98) elements of speech are all strategies available for speakers to enact their accommodative inclination.

Giles (1973) began by observing communication (in monolingual settings), noting that people change their speech styles to become more like those with whom they are interacting—known as speech convergence—and adapt their speech to how they believe others in the situation may best receive it—known as accommodation (Giles & Smith, 1979). Giles, Coupland, and Coupland (1991, p. 7) refer to individuals’ ‘convergence’ behaviours when communicating with others in order to show or win approval, communicate effectively, and socially identify with a listener (Putman & Street, 1984, p. 97). In contrast, if speakers want to disassociate or show disfavour, they adopt ‘divergent’ speech behaviours to increase dissimilarities (Putman & Street, 1984, p. 97). Jaffe and Feldstein (1970) find that, in monolingual settings, participants in adult conversations tend to match certain timing parameters of their speech (such as pauses between vocalisations during a speaker’s turn)—a phenomenon termed ‘vocal congruence’. In contrast to this tendency for pauses within turns, they also reported that the length of a particular speaker’s turn is a stable individual characteristic that does not
vary dramatically, as do other non-content elements that can manifest accommodative convergence.

The current research uses Giles’s (1973) CAT developed for monolingual communication to examine how accommodation is achieved in the PI-Eng, EW-LOTE and interpreter triad, with specific attention to how the pause patterns and segment lengths are managed in bilingual communication. This aspect will be thoroughly explored in Sections 6.1.3.2 and 6.1.3.3 where intralingual versus interlingual accommodation are dissected and contrasted.

4.2.5 Effort model. Interestingly, cognitive psychology has not only been applied in police strategic interviewing, such as CI, but has also been used by interpreting researchers to analyse interpreting performance. However, the scholarly interest has primarily focused on simultaneous interpreting (as opposed to consecutive interpreting) and how the functions of human short-term memory manage such complicated tasks (Gerver, 1976; Gile, 1995, 1999; Moser, 1978; Paradis, 1994). Short-term memory is also known as working memory, which is ‘a set of mechanisms or processes involved in the control, regulation and active maintenance of task-relevant information in the service of complex cognition’ (Gile, 2009, p. 167).

Gile (2009) posits that working memory ‘requires processing capacity’ and ‘has a small storage capacity’ (p. 167). He devised an ‘effort model’ to account for the cognitive tasks interpreters have to perform in the sequence of listening (in SL) -> comprehending -> re-expressing (in TT). He argues that human beings have finite cognitive capacity (mental effort) to spare on the mental tasks they perform—such as interpreting—at any given time. His model is widely accepted in interpreting research to represent the mental gymnastics interpreters have to perform. Although Gile’s effort model was developed initially for simultaneous interpreting, he later devised one
specifically for consecutive interpreting, in which he divided the interpreter’s mental process is into two phases:

- Phase 1—listening and note taking (concurrently): In this phase, the total cognitive load = Listening and Analysis (L) + Note Taking (N) + Short-term Memory Operations (M) + Coordination (C).

- Phase 2—target-speech production: In this phase, the total cognitive load = Remembering (Rem) + Note Reading (Read) + Production (P) + Coordination (C).

The widely referenced ‘tightrope hypothesis’ is also credited to Gile (2009, p. 182), whereby he uses the analogy of an acrobat falling of a tightrope for interpreters’ deteriorated performance when they work close to cognitive saturation. This deteriorated performance occurs in response to ‘problem triggers’ in the SL or work environment, such as numbers, enumerations, fast speeches, strong foreign or regional accents, poor speech logic or poor sound (Gile, 2009, p.171). According to Gile, a tightrope situation may develop during the interpreting process for one of two reasons. First, it may occur because the interpreter is using nearly all his or her total mental processing capacity. Second, it may occur because one particular task (such as L, N or M in the equations above) requires high effort-specific processing, or the interpreter has suboptimal allocation of cognitive capacity for the tasks in the equations above.

Later chapters of this thesis use Gile’s (2009) effort model for consecutive interpreting to examine the participant interpreters’ performance in relation to their cognitive load when dealing with longer answers supplied by the EW-LOTE in response to the PI-Eng’s questions. The strategy of switching to the semi-consecutive interpreting mode adopted by the participant interpreters and accommodated by the primary speakers is also analysed in light of the effort model. Semi-consecutive
interpreting entails shorter turn lengths (M in Phase 1 above) compared to the ‘consecutive proper’ mode, thereby allowing interpreters to dispense with note taking (N in Phase 1) while listening. The reduced demand for M and N allows greater cognitive capacity to be used for L and C in the equation, thereby moving the interpreter away from a tightrope situation, and enabling him or her to perform better.

4.2.6 Model of translation culture. The ‘model of translation culture’ is credited to Prunč (1997, 2000), and he uses ‘translation’ as a generic term to include interpreting as well. Prunč (2000, as cited in Martinsen & Dubslaff, 2010) defines ‘translation culture’ as the ‘historically developed subsystem of a culture relating to the field of translation’ (p. 128). This subsystem consists of ‘a socially established and variable set of norms, conventions, expectations and values underlying the behaviour of all the interactants who participate, actually or potentially, in translation processes conducted within this culture’ (Prunč, 2000, as cited in Martinsen & Dubslaff, 2010, p. 128). The advantage of this model is that Prunč considered ‘all agents involved in the translation process’ (Pym, 2004 p. 23). Prunč’s conception of a ‘translation culture’ (‘Translationskultur’ in German) is ‘more dynamic’ and ‘something that is constantly evolving’ (Pym, 2004, p. 23). In comparison, the more traditional definition of ‘translation culture’—such as the Göttingen group’s ‘Übersetzungskultur’ in German (Frank, 1989)—describes the cultural norms governing translations within a target system, thereby referring more restrictively to the macro level of practice and value system (such as how a society expects younger people to talk to older people, and how they view filial piety).

Due to the ‘social embeddedness’ (Corsellis, 2008, p. viii) nature of translational activities, Prunč (2000, as cited in Martinsen & Dubslaff, 2010, p. 128) asserts that, in a
democratic Western society, a model of translation culture has to be derived from democratic principles. As such, he presents three principles, or maxims:

1. Cooperativeness: At the most basic level, cooperativeness implies the functional division of labour. Thus, the translators’ role in translational interactions can be described as that of a linguistic and cultural expert. Further, cooperativeness means ‘mutual respect for the legitimate interests of all participants in the production and reception of the translation’ (Prunč, 2000, as cited in Martinsen & Dubslaff, 2010 p. 128) and ‘the willingness to negotiate viable conflict-settling conventions to ensure the balancing of competing interests’ (Prunč, 2000, as cited in Pöllabauer, 2006, p. 153).

2. Loyalty: Loyalty is an ethical maxim for translational interaction that can be derived from the principle of cooperativeness (Prunč, 1997, as cited in Martinsen & Dubslaff, 2010 p. 128). ‘Loyalty is constituted by the interactants’ mutual commitment not to act against the other partners’ interests and to resolve conflicting communicative goals by way of consensus’ (Prunč, 2000, as cited in Martinsen & Dubslaff, 2010 p. 128).


Prunč’s model is used in Section 6.1.3.3 to analyse the cooperativeness demonstrated among the interpreter and primary speakers—particularly in accommodating the interpreter’s requirement of segmented TCUs in order to facilitate his or her best possible performance. This type of ‘cooperation’ is different to the Gricean cooperation because it relates to the utility arising from the ‘functional division of labour’ (Prunč, 2000, as cited in Martinsen & Dubslaff, 2010, p. 128) among participants in the communicative event (INTV1 and INTV2). The second maxim on
loyalty is used to further account for the attitudinal cooperativeness featured in this research setup—police interviewing a cooperative eyewitness (INTV1) and victim of crime (INTV2). It also considers the participants’ mutual commitment to share other participants’ (of the communicative event) interests, with the shared goal of generating the maximum benefit from the communication—gathering crime information to bring the perpetrator to justice. This maxim can supplement the use of Giles’s accommodation theory (see Section 4.2.4) to explain the behavioural and interactional adjustment by all participants in the communicative event investigated in this study. Finally, the maxim of transparency can be said to align with some sections of the legal interpreting literature, particularly court interpreting, which advocates the ‘pane of glass’ (Schweda Nicholson, 1994, p. 82) minimalist interpreting model—which is like light passing through glass without alteration or distortion. With high-stakes police interviewing where interpreting is called for, police interviewers have to rely on the transparency of the interlingual operation undertaken by the interpreter in order to be in control of the interview and achieve institutional goals. This is supported by forensic psychologist Shepherd (2007), who states clearly what investigative interviewers do not want interpreters to do:

- not speak on the interviewee’s behalf;
- not engage in side conversations with the suspect;
- check if the interpreter is in any doubt as to what is being said by the interviewer or the interviewee, and let the interviewer know about this doubt; and
- not compress or alter whatever is said by you or the suspect.

4.3 Limitations of the Research Design

The researcher acknowledges a number of limitations inherent in this study:
1. Artificiality of the research instrument: The two police cognitive interviews in eight language versions were conducted as mock interviews in laboratory settings. The PI-Eng and EW-LOTE role players had to follow the set scripts, without the scope to deviate from the lines already decided in the scripts to respond spontaneously to the dynamics unfolding in front of them.

2. Restricted generalisability: Although INTV1 and INTV2 are each identical across the eight languages test, only one interpreter is employed to perform in each of the eight language versions tested. Thus, the phenomena observed and discussed in any particular language version cannot be generalised to the language concerned. Further, any phenomena observed in a number of languages and then analysed cannot be generalised to describe police CI in any bilingual settings.

3. Reliance on the working hypothesis: The working hypothesis outlined in Section 1.3 explains that the researcher used the monolingual English interactions in INTV1 and INTV2 as a baseline to investigate how much the eight LOTE versions differed from these English ones, linguistically and interactionally. This working hypothesis relies on the assumption that the interviewees in these eight languages had the same, or very similar, cognitive functioning in relation to recalling information, linguistic preferences (in terms of grammatical categories and lexical items) and behavioural reactions when subject to CI questioning—aspects which need to be further investigated by future studies.

Given that there have been no known previous studies examining interpreter-assisted CI, the researcher argues that this study is exploratory in nature and should serve as a
starting point to encourage further potential studies. As a result, the researcher offers the following counter arguments in response to the limitations above:

1. Artificiality of the research instrument: While the artificiality of the research is a limitation of this study, it can also be regarded a strength of this exploratory study because all variables were excluded, leaving the participant interpreters as the only variable tested on two fixed scripts that were consistent across the eight language versions.

2. Restricted generalisability: The researcher does not claim that any definite phenomena in interpreter-assisted CI can be generalised from this study, in either a generic nature or any language-specific settings. To do so would be statistically unsupportable. Rather, the researcher seeks to identify patterns of linguistic and interactional points of interest, as a starting point—albeit using a restrictive research instrument and limited data—in order to further understandings of interpreter-assisted CI, which has rarely been researched.

3. Reliance on the working hypothesis: Given the exploratory nature of this study, the working hypothesis is needed to restrict the scope of the study so that it is practicable and achievable within the researcher’s PhD study timeframe. As the researcher acknowledges, each of the three areas in relation to the LOTE-speaking interviewee—cognitive functioning, linguistic preference and behavioural reactions in any language and culture—warrant a separate study regarding interpreter-assisted CI.

4.4 Summary

This chapter has explained the research setup, encompassing the instrument used and the study participants. The two sample CI police interviews—INTV1 and INTV2, containing most features of CI from Fisher and Geiselman’s (1992) publication—are
adapted into eight different languages. Instead of English-speaking witnesses and victims, this study uses LOTE-speaking witnesses and victims, who require the service of an interpreter. Eight participant interpreters (one each) in Arabic, Cantonese, Greek, Indonesian, Italian, Mandarin, Spanish and Turkish were recruited to interpret the two interviews acted by the same English role player across the eight language versions, and eight native speakers of the eight chosen languages. These mock CI police interviews were video recorded for data analysis.

This chapter also presents a synopsis of the theoretical frameworks that were used for data analysis later in Chapters 6 and 7. The limitations of the research design are outlined to justify the scope of the study.
Chapter 5: Research Findings

After viewing INTV1 and INTV2 in the eight languages (totalling 16 recordings) and listening to the English back-translation of the LOTE renditions of selected questions posed by the interviewing police officer, the researcher was able to form a comprehensive appreciation of the bilingual police interviews. These interviews employed the CI protocol in a laboratory setting and with certain elements of interactive institutional discourse removed due to the artificiality of the research instrument (as opposed to real-life police interviews). However, this enabled the researcher to concentrate on the interpreters’ management of both the interviewing officer’s CI questioning strategies and the LOTE interviewee’s free-form narratives elicited by the officer’s strategies. Due to the absence of existing literature addressing the nexus of CI and interpreting practice, this research does not intend to be overly ambitious in analysing large amount of data collected in the experiments conducted. A limited number of long turns of close to or more than 100 words featured in the research instrument are the primary target for in-depth data analysis.

This chapter presents the findings of the data analysis in order to address Research Question 1 (see Section 1.3):

How do the features of the CI manifest in questioning and answering in a bilingual setting assisted by language interpreting?

The following chapter, Chapter 6, will analyse in detail how each finding relates to interpreting practice in order to address Research Question 2. Finally, Chapter 7 will outline the effects of each finding on CI to address Research Question 3, and discuss how the effects translate to broader CI practice to address Research Question 4.
5.1 **Two Independent Turn-taking Dyads**

The findings reported in this section focus on the data derived from close observation of Turns 8 to 20 in INTV1 (see Table 3 below). INTV1 is the longer of the two interviews in the experiment, yielding 132 turns, as opposed to 106 turns in INTV2. As explained in Section 4.1.1, the eyewitness in INTV1 is relatively calm and has good verbal skills, compared to the eyewitness in INTV2, who is distressed after suffering a gunshot wound, and has poorer verbal skills. The PI-Eng in INTV2 must adjust the interviewing strategies to relax the EW-LOTE, resulting in the more stepwise implementation of the CI strategies and higher number of smaller turns in the verbal exchanges. This is annotated by Fisher and Geiselman (1992) after turn 8:

>[s]ensing that the E/W [eyewitness] is highly anxious and must vent her feelings, the INT [interviewer] allows her more liberty at the outset to talk about these feelings before starting to collect facts relevant to the crime. (p. 176)

After turn 24, Fisher and Geiselman (1992) again note:

>[w]ith a more composed E/W [eyewitness], the INT [interviewer] might make suggestions here to promote more intense concentration, e.g. ‘everything is stored in your mind, so I expect you to concentrate’. With the present E/W, who is highly anxious, the INT skips those instructions so as not to create any additional, unnecessary anxiety. (p. 177)

This particular section—turns 8 to 20—of the INTV1 data is chosen for analysis because these turns come at the beginning of the interview, where the PI-Eng establishes how he is going to conduct the interview (in a way conducive to rapport building), featuring exchanges between the PI-Eng and EW-LOTE with a combination of various turn lengths. It culminates in the PI-Eng’s turn 15 for a length of 159 words, where the RE and CR instructions of the CI protocol are given, and in the EW-LOTE’s
turn 20 for a length of 258 words, where a detailed account is given in response to RE requested by the PI-Eng in turn 19.

The exchanges before turn 8 in INTV1 are of less significance in terms of data analysis because these are shorter turns containing 4, 1, 5, 1, 32, 1 and 12 words, covering the commencement of the interview ‘niceties’ in order to conform to socially acceptable norms, as well as confirming the participants’ identities. None of the eight interpreters needed to signal any need for the primary speakers to segment their TCUs, including the longest, turn 5, in this sequence: ‘I am Detective Joe Bloggs from Victoria Police. We spoke briefly on the phone yesterday about the jewellery store robbery and I’d like to get a more thorough description of what happened’, which yields 32 words.

The PI-Eng and EW-LOTE role players could access the scripts of INTV1 and INTV2, and were instructed to speak naturally, so there was no need for them to memorise the lines. A positive aspect of these simulated interviews is to allow the participant interpreters to still exhibit high degree of observable natural interactional behaviours with the two role players, although the role players were acting. This relates particularly to the mutual accommodation and adjustments in the three sets of interactions illustrated in Diagram 5 below: between the PI-Eng and interpreter, between the interpreter and EW-LOTE, and between the PI-Eng and EW-LOTE as interactions (1), (2) and (3), respectively. The researcher uses the terms ‘accommodation’ and ‘adjustment’ in the lay definitions, as opposed to Giles’s (1973) CAT, which will be explored in Section 5.1.3. According to the Oxford Dictionary, accommodation is defined as ‘the process of adapting or adjusting to someone or something’, while an adjustment is ‘a small alteration or movement made to achieve a desired fit, appearance, or result’. In this sense, the terms ‘accommodation’ and ‘adjustment’ are regarded as synonymous. However, the researcher distinguishes them
by restricting ‘accommodation’ to mean acknowledging the pursuit of the greater good, and the mental process of adapting and adjusting in order to achieve this greater good, whereas ‘adjustments’ are the observable deeds resulting from ‘accommodation’. The pursuit of the greater good in this situation is the best communication possible in this interpreter-assisted interview, which otherwise could not occur due to language barriers. The observable deeds are actions, such as:

- the PI-Eng or EW-LOTE repeating a segment upon the interpreter’s request (under interaction [1] or [2] in Diagram 5)
- the PI-Eng or EW-LOTE rephrasing utterances or giving further explanation when the interpreter expressed that she or he did not understand the utterances (interaction [1] or [2] in Diagram 5)
- the PI-Eng or EW-LOTE adjusting their talking speed, volume or pausing patterns for the interpreting to be undertaken as smoothly as possible (interaction [1] or [2] in Diagram 5)
- the PI-Eng and EW-LOTE maintaining eye contact to foster rapport and a sense of direct communication (under interaction [3] in Diagram 5).

Diagram 5. Mutual accommodation and adjustments in interpreted communication.
5.1.1 Self-segmentation by PI-Eng. Turns 8 to 20 in INTV1 are reproduced in Table 3 below for ease of discussion (turn 7 is also provided in the table to give context to turn 8). In turn 15, the utterances where the PI-Eng implements RE are highlighted in blue in Table 3, and the utterances where CR is implemented are highlighted in green.

Table 3

**Turns 8 to 20 in INTV1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turn no.</th>
<th>Primary speaker</th>
<th>TCU</th>
<th>Word count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>PI-Eng</td>
<td>You sounded upset on the phone yesterday. How are you feeling now?</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>EW-LOTE</td>
<td>Better. That was really frightening, especially when they started yelling and I saw the gun. I've never seen a gun before, except on TV, and it really shook me up.</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>PI-Eng</td>
<td>That’s a natural response. After all, the robber did have a gun and it was a dangerous situation. I remember being in a similar situation many years ago, before I become a police officer. I was shopping in a store and there was a hold-up. I remember being frightened when it happened.</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>EW-LOTE</td>
<td>The whole neighbourhood is changing. It’s gotten to the point where I’m afraid to go out at night. There’s so much crime. I’d like to see all of these guys behind bars where they belong, so we can walk in the street again in safety.</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>PI-Eng</td>
<td>That’s what we would like to do, to make this a safe area again. If you can give us enough information, that would help us in trying to catch them and take them off the streets. In order to catch these people, I need you to give me as many details as possible, so don’t leave anything out. The more details you can give me, the easier it will be for us to find them and prosecute them.</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>EW-LOTE</td>
<td>OK, where would you like to start?</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>PI-Eng</td>
<td>From what you told me on the phone yesterday, it sounded like you got a pretty good look at the robbers and that you remember a lot about what happened. So I expect that it will take a while for us to go through the interview. Where’s a good place to talk so that we won’t be distracted?</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>EW-LOTE</td>
<td>OK!</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>PI-Eng</td>
<td>Are those your children? I’ve got three kids at home, two girls and a boy. [Name], it is important to keep in mind that you have all the information. I am trying to find out what happened from you, so I expect you to do most of the talking. Don’t wait for me to ask questions. Whenever something comes to mind, tell me, even if it seems trivial or contradicts something you said earlier. Don’t omit anything. If you don’t know a specific fact, that’s OK, just say that you don’t know. Don’t make up something, though, just to give me an answer. I realise that this is a difficult task, to remember all of the details of the crime. So try to concentrate as much as possible. Before</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Green


we start, I’d like you to tell me a little bit about where you were in the store and what you were thinking about just before the robbery took place.

16 EW-LOTE I wanted to buy a watch for my husband’s birthday. In the past few years, I bought a few pieces of jewellery in the store. They’re very reasonable, and they have good-quality merchandise. I must have been standing towards the back of the store when they started yelling.

17 PI-Eng If you can, try to draw a simple sketch of the store. Indicate where you were standing, and where the robbers and cashier were. What were the lighting conditions in the store?

18 EW-LOTE It was pretty bright. It’s a jewellery store and they want everything to sparkle, I guess.

19 PI-Eng Jane, try to put yourself back in the same location as when you first noticed the robbers and tell me in your own words everything you remember about what happened, until the end of the robbery. Try to be as detailed as possible.

20 EW-LOTE Well, I didn’t notice anything unusual at first, just some people in the store looking at the jewellery. Then, all of a sudden, I heard yelling. At first, I thought someone was sick or hurt, but then I saw these two men yelling at the owner, something about putting money into a bag. One of the men turned around and yelled to the customers, ‘DOWN ON THE FLOOR’. I really got scared then because he had a gun. I don’t know anything about guns, but it was really big, much bigger than toy guns I’ve seen. I fell to the floor, and was scared because the man with the gun looked crazy. He seemed very nervous; he kept on looking around at his partner and told him to hurry up and ‘Let’s get outta here’. I didn’t get a very good view of the other man, who took the money. I mainly concentrated on the man pointing the gun at us. After a while, the man in the front yelled to the man pointing the gun at us, ‘Let’s go’ or something like that, and then they both ran out of the store. By that time, I was really shaking. I guess the owner of the store called the police. They came in a few minutes. One of the police officers asked me a few questions about what happened and then took my name and telephone. He said he’d get back to me in a while. And then I went home and called my husband about what happened.

From this point onward and for ease of discussion, unless required in the specific point of discussion (and thus pointed out), the utterances by the EW-LOTE will be presented using the original English utterances written by Fisher and Geiselman (1992) from which the LOTE utterances are derived, rather than the actual English utterances rendered by the participant interpreters. This is because the nature of interpreting is based on meaning, rather than literal word-for-word translation, which makes it impossible to yield eight identical renditions of the same meaning components. Rather, there may be eight slightly different versions of the English rendition, which
have the same meaning and achieves the purpose of communication according to Skopos Theory (Reise & Vermeer, 1984, 2014). For the analysis, using the actual utterances produced by the participant interpreters from LOTE into English may unnecessarily blur the focus and baseline of the intended analysis. Thus, as explained in Section 4.1.4 Data collection and analysis, segment and turn lengths from LOTE into English in this study are all represented by word counts in English equivalent (EQV) based on the original Fisher and Geiselman (1992) scripts as long as the meaning components were accounted for in the interpreter’s rendition, rather than the actual utterances produced by the interpreters.

As shown in Table 3 above, turns 8 to 13 in the earlier piece of the INTV1 move from turn lengths of 30, 52, 45, 78, seven and 58 words, before the extremely long turn 15 from the PI-Eng of 159 words. In turn 8, the EW-LOTE answers the PI-Eng’s enquiry about how s/he felt after witnessing the jewellery store robbery, yielding 30 words and representing the earliest turn in INTV1. Five of the eight interpreters (63%) rendered this turn in a segmented manner, as illustrated in Table 4 below. The word counts represented in the table uses the methodology explained above, therefore reflecting Fisher and Geiselman’s (1992) original version in order to make the comparison over segmentation across the tested languages meaningful. For example, in INTV1 turn 8 in the Turkish version, the EW-Tur said in Turkish: ‘Better. That was really frightening, especially when they started yelling and I saw the gun’, counting as 15 words EQV. The Turkish interpreter rendered this segment from Turkish into English as: ‘Slightly better now. It was very bad at the time … particularly when I came across the gun, the weapon, and when the yelling and screaming going on’, yielding 27 words. The EW-Tur then finished the turn by saying in Turkish: ‘I’ve never seen a gun before, except on TV, and it really shook me up’, counting as 15 words EQV. The
Turkish interpreter rendered this segment from Turkish into English as: ‘I have never come across a weapon before in real life, apart from television series. And that really shaking me up quite a lot’, yielding 24 words. Instead of using \(27 + 24 = 51\) as word count, the first 27 words uttered by the Turkish interpreter completely accounted for the meaning in the 15 words from the original monolingual English script; thus, the word count for this segment was recorded as 15. The same applied to the second segment, as well as the rest of the interpreted versions by other interpreters from the LOTE into English.

Table 4

**Segmentation of Turn 8 in INTV1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turn no.</th>
<th>Primary speaker</th>
<th>TCU</th>
<th>Arb</th>
<th>Can</th>
<th>Grk</th>
<th>Ind</th>
<th>Ita</th>
<th>Man</th>
<th>Spa</th>
<th>Tur</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>EW-LOTE</td>
<td>Better. That was really frightening, especially when they started yelling and I saw the gun. I’ve never seen a gun before, except on TV, and it really shook me up. (30 words)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15++</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Word count 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30

++ Segment repeated because of interpreter’s intervention (to request segmented turns).

It is interesting to note that none of these five interpreters (in Arabic, Cantonese, Indonesian, Mandarin and Turkish) asked the EW-LOTE for a pause (so they could interpret) by either verbalising or gesticulating (for example, by holding the palm up vertically to signal a stop). These five interpreters simply took advantage of the natural inter-utterance pauses and essentially forcibly took over the floor to start interpreting. Since the PI-Eng and EW-LOTE role players had all been instructed to completely finish every turn in the scripts, they waited for the interpreter to finish the rendering,
and then resumed the floor and continued with the remaining utterances of the same turn. In this research setup and in turn 8, both the EW-LOTE and PI-Eng knew the EW-LOTE had not finished the turn; thus, the PI-Eng did not take over the floor prematurely—as may happen in real life. In other words, the interpreter’s treatment of the pause between utterances as a potential TRP may also be accepted by the police interviewer as one. Thus, in real life, the police interviewer may start producing the next turn based on the message received from this unfinished turn. This may cause momentary overlapped talk as the LOTE interviewee thinks the floor will be returned to him or her to finish the next segment of the turn. The researcher acknowledges that this possibility was removed in this experiment due to the research design. Sections 6.1.1 and 6.1.2 explore the implications of premature interruptions by interpreters to avoid possible cognitive saturation, leading to possible loss of information on the part of the EW-LOTE.

It appears that turn 8—as the first substantial turn in terms of its length and content of the TCU in the early stages of INTV1—serves as a precursor to the primary speakers’ tacit acquiescence to facilitating semi-consecutive interpreting mode. This manifests in the primary speakers’ self-regulated segmentation in most of the remaining INTV1 when the turns are longer, by way of stopping their own talk and create a longer pause than the normal silence gaps between utterances within a TCU. Such longer intra-turn pauses provided by the primary speakers serve as a cue for the interpreter to take over the floor. There are a distinctly small number of occasions thereafter when the interpreter had to resort to explicitly requesting the primary speaker to pause, when the primary speaker showed no sign of pausing, or the interpreter felt they needed to pause and render to avoid risking degrading their performance. Otherwise, throughout INTV1 from turn 8 onwards, segmentation by the primary speaker was achieved by either the
primary speakers’ self-segmentation within a TCU or the interpreter taking over the floor using intra-turn pauses without voicing this need to the primary speaker who held the floor.

The Mandarin interpreter is the only person who took an early intervention measure to explicitly request the EW-Man to segment the TCUs. As early as turn 8, when the EW-Man was 24 words into the 30-word turn, the interpreter requested that the EW-Man segment the TCUs from then on, and explained the same to the PI-Eng. The EW-Man agreed and essentially re-rendered the TCU, and autonomously decided to pause after a couple of utterances, which happened to be precisely half the TCU at 15 words. The other four interpreters who rendered turn 8 in a segmented manner all simply took over the floor using the natural intra-turn pauses.

It is observed that, by the PI-Eng’s turn 13 (58 words), all except the Spanish interpreter had clearly established their pattern of rendering in the semi-consecutive mode—short consecutive (see definitions in Section 3.4.2)—as illustrated in Table 5. It should be noted, though, that segmentation is an organic process. For example, turn 12 only has 7 words, and therefore no interpreter needed to offer or ask for segmentation. Furthermore, although turn 13 has 58 words, the utterances are presented in a logical sequence, no interpreter appeared to need to intervene for segmented talk. Except for the Mandarin interpreter, who explicitly voiced a request for segmented TCUs in turn 8, the other six interpreters (excluding the Spanish interpreter) secured a semi-consecutive mode without needing to verbalise it. This indicates some kind of accommodation and adjustment tacitly achieved by the PI-Eng, interpreter and EW-LOTE. With these segmented TCUs, it is interesting to note the different patterns the segmentation revealed. As observed in Table 5, three of the eight interpreters interpreted turn 8 in one go, with another two sets of exactly the same segmentation patterns: Arabic and
Indonesian (5 > 10 > 15), and Mandarin and Turkish (15 > 15). Turn 9 manifests a strikingly similar segmentation pattern with the majority of languages featuring 18 > 34 split for the turn. The same occurs for the remaining turns 10 to 13, with each turn having at least two languages that manifested the same segmentation pattern: Greek and Mandarin in Turn 10 (18 > 27); Cantonese, Mandarin and Turkish in Turn 11 (36 > 42); and Cantonese, Indonesian and Mandarin in turn 13 (30 > 28).

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turn no.</th>
<th>Primary speaker</th>
<th>Word count in TCU</th>
<th>Arb</th>
<th>Can</th>
<th>Grk</th>
<th>Ind</th>
<th>Ita</th>
<th>Man</th>
<th>Spa</th>
<th>Tur</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>EW-LOTE</td>
<td>30 words</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15++</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(EQV)</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>PI-Eng</td>
<td>52 words</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>EW-LOTE</td>
<td>45 words</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(EQV)</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>PI-Eng</td>
<td>78 words</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>EW-LOTE</td>
<td>7 words</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(EVQ)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>PI-Eng</td>
<td>58 words</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** The PI-Eng role player did not read out the remainder of the turn, resulting in missing data for this segment of 42 words in the Indonesian version.
++ The segment was repeated because of the interpreter’s intervention (to request segmented turns).

In turn 15, the PI-Eng starts to implement the RE strategy (blue text in Table 3), followed by CR (green text in Table 3), which yields 159 words in the turn. It is observed that a kind of self-regulated speech pattern was adopted by the PI-Eng in this
TCU. This is often seen in real life, governed by interaction (1) in Diagram 5, due to the primary speaker accommodating the interpreter’s need for manageable segment lengths in a turn, thus adjusting their speech to segmented TCU. Table 6 presents the segmentation pattern manifested in each language version. It is posited that the PI-Eng’s segmentation pattern of the TCU was dependent on the interactional dynamics with the respective interpreter (such as whether the interpreter took advantage of the natural intra-turn pauses to start interpreting, as tacitly accepted by the PI-Eng). It is also posited that this pattern was dependent on the PI-Eng’s evaluation thus far of the interpreter’s coping capacity of segment length. One would expect to see a more monotonous segmentation pattern across all eight languages if the PI-Eng’s speech self-regulation was a pure reflection of intrinsic determination, and independent of the interaction with the interpreter.
Table 6

**Segmentation of PI-Eng’s Turn 15 in INTV1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turn no.</th>
<th>Primary speaker</th>
<th>TCU</th>
<th>Word count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>PI-Eng</td>
<td></td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Are those your children? I’ve got three kids at home, two girls and a boy. [Name], it is important to keep in mind that you have all the information. I am trying to find out what happened from you, so I expect you to do most of the talking. Don’t wait for me to ask questions. Whenever something comes to mind, tell me, even if it seems trivial or contradicts something you said earlier. Don’t omit anything. If you don’t know a specific fact, that’s OK, just say that you don’t know. Don’t make up something, though, just to give me an answer. I realise that this is a difficult task, to remember all of the details of the crime. So try to concentrate as much as possible. Before we start, I’d like you to tell me a little bit about where you were in the store and what you were thinking about just before the robbery took place.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOTE version</th>
<th>Arb</th>
<th>Can</th>
<th>Grk</th>
<th>Ind</th>
<th>Ita</th>
<th>Man</th>
<th>Spa</th>
<th>Tur</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Segment length</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>88 ++</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Turn length | 159 | 159 | 159 | 159 | 159 | 159 | 159 | 159 |
| No. of segments | 5   | 6   | 4   | 6   | 6   | 2   | 2   | 6   |
| Average segment length | 32  | 27  | 40  | 27  | 27  | 27  | --- | 27  |

++ Segment repeated because of interpreter’s intervention (to request segmented turns).

Note: All average segment lengths presented in this thesis use the closest next available whole number. For example, when the average segment length for the Arabic version was $159 \div 5 = 31.8$, the researcher recorded 32.

The Arabic interpreter coped until turn 15. Up to this point, the highest turn lengths are turns 11 (78 words) and 13 (58 words), both uttered by the PI-Eng. At turn 11, the Arabic interpreter started interpreting when the PI-Eng was 53 words into the turn, and interpreted the remaining 25 in another segment. She interpreted turn 13 in one go, without imposing segmentation to the PI-Eng. The English back-translation from her Arabic rendition of these two turns revealed no omission of information. Upon reaching the PI-Eng’s turn 15, after the opening small talk of 15 words asking about the
EW-Arb’s children, the PI-Eng started his CI instructions on RE (blue text in Table 3). Eighty-eight words into the turn, when it appeared that the PI-Eng had more to say, the Arabic interpreter realised it had gone beyond the length pattern she had dealt with so far (maximum 58 words in turn 13) and beyond her cognitive capacity to cope. Thus, she interrupted the PI-Eng and expressed the need for him to segment longer TCUs in order for her to interpret, which the PI-Eng acknowledged and followed. The PI-Eng repeated the content of the 88 words (with slight changes to condense it, as can be observed in real life), and the Arabic interpreter rendered without omission. For the next segment in this turn, she resisted interrupting again, waiting until the 56 words were all uttered, and gave her rendition in one go without any omission. All other seven interpreters, when dealing with turn 15, used a combination of taking over the floor in the naturally occurring intra-turn pauses, or accepting the longer pauses offered by the PI-Eng as a signal of ceding the floor.

5.1.2 Invocation of self-segmentation by EW-LOTE. In response to turn 15 in which the PI-Eng implements RE and ended the TCU by giving instructions on CR, turn 20 is where the main free-flow narrative is given by the EW-LOTE in return, yielding a turn length of 258 words in English equivalent (EQV). Table 7 presents the segmentation pattern for each language version.

Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turn no.</th>
<th>Primary speaker</th>
<th>TCU</th>
<th>Word count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>EW-LOTE</td>
<td>Well, I didn’t notice anything unusual at first, just some people in the store looking at the jewellery. Then, all of a sudden, I heard yelling. At first, I thought someone was sick or hurt, but then I saw these two men yelling at the owner, something about putting money into a bag. One of the men tuned around and yelled to the customers, ‘DOWN ON THE FLOOR’. I really got scared then because he had a gun. I don’t know anything about guns, but it was really big, much bigger than toy guns I’ve seen. I fell to the floor, and was scared because the man with the gun looked crazy. He seemed very nervous; he kept on looking around</td>
<td>258 (EQV)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
at his partner and told him to hurry up and ‘Let’s get outta here’. I didn’t get a very good view of the other man, who took the money. I mainly concentrated on the man pointing the gun at us. After a while, the man in the front yelled to the man pointing the gun at us, ‘Let’s go’ or something like that, and then they both ran out of the store. By that time, I was really shaking. I guess the owner of the store called the police. They came in a few minutes. One of the police officers asked me a few questions about what happened and then took my name and telephone. He said he’d get back to me in a while. And then I went home and called my husband about what happened.

The data in Table 5 already show the EW-LOTE’s accommodation in turns 8 and 10 to facilitate semi-consecutive mode for the interpreters, although these two turns are comparatively much shorter. Nonetheless, it is observed that the interpreters took a
number of different approaches to the extremely long turn 20 to ensure that the EW-LOTE understood the need to pause every few utterances in order to facilitate their semi-consecutive interpreting. First, the Arabic and Greek interpreters raised their hand with the palm facing towards the EW-LOTE as an explicit gesture to signal that a pause was needed at 26 and 35 words EQV into the turn (see Table 7 and their first segment marked with ‘/’ after the number). Second, the Spanish interpreter verbalised (for the first time in INTV1) his need for the EW-Spa to pause so he could interpret. Third, the Turkish interpreter had a momentary overlapped talk at the end of the sixth segment into the turn, when the EW-Tur moved into the next utterance. As soon as the EW-Tur realised the overlap, he paused for the Turkish interpreter to render the 16-word EQV segment, and the Turkish interpreter asked the EW-Tur to repeat the next utterance, which was four words. The interpreter rendered the utterance, and then the EW-Tur returned to the autonomous self-segmentation that was in place before this episode.

For the Arabic and Greek versions, once the LOTE speaker accepted the interpreter’s explicit signalling of the need for pauses, self-segmentation for the rest of the turn was secured without further action needed from the interpreters. Again, the manifestation of the invocation of the EW-LOTE’s self-regulated speech was the slightly longer than natural intra-turn pauses in the TCU to create a possible entry point for the interpreter to take the floor. Except in the Spanish version, in the remaining five language versions in which the interpreters were not observed to take any explicit actions, all five EW-LOTE speakers continued the mutual accommodation and adjustment observable in the earlier shorter Turns 8 and 10. They did this by either segmenting their turn autonomously or allowing the interpreter to take advantage of their intra-turn, i.e. inter-utterance, pauses. Whenever the EW-LOTE gave a longer pause because of self-segmentation, marking the boundary of the segment in the TCU,
all seven interpreters are observed to accept this implicit offer of semi-consecutive mode by assuming the floor to interpret. The Spanish interpreter is the only person who chose to ignore a couple of the EW-Spa’s longer pauses as implicit offers for semi-consecutive interpreting, until the segment had reached 136 words EQV, when he voiced a request for the EW-Spa to pause. The same occurred in the second segment, resulting in an accumulation of 123 words EQV before the end of the turn.

When the Mandarin interpreter is in the sixth segment of this same turn 20, with the EW-Man’s self-regulated pauses available to her to enable satisfactory performance, she intervened by holding her hand up at the end of the 49-word EQV segment, signalling the need for the EW-Man to pause. The unannounced but explicit request was accepted, she was afforded the floor to interpret, and the semi-consecutive mode continued without further intervention needed for the rest of the turn or the rest of the INTV1.

5.2 Mechanism of Self-segmentation

5.2.1 Lengths of segmented turns. The researcher is interested in determining the range of lengths for the segmented turns that were mutually accepted (through explicit and implicit means between the primary speakers and interpreter) in police investigative interviews of a cooperative nature, such as this study, using the CI regime. The range of segment lengths an interpreter is able to handle is dependent on how they manage their cognitive load, with an aim to avoid cognitive saturation or Gile’s (2009) so-called ‘tightrope situation’ (p. 182). It should be noted that the working principle of interpreting in settings like this is to interrupt as often as necessary, and yet as seldom as possible. The researcher’s curiosity about segment lengths stems from the researcher’s experience in teaching interpreting, where students and novice interpreters are observed to be less sensitive to turn lengths and segment lengths—at times letting a segment go
for too long before taking measures to signal their impending cognitive saturation to the primary speakers, thereby affecting the accuracy of their interpreting performance. Thus, the researcher is interested in determining how segment and turn lengths are distributed in the research data, generated by the participant interpreters who have an average of 7.6 years of professional practice (see Table 2 in Section 4.1.2), in contrast with the researcher’s observation of student or novice interpreters.

Referring to Table 6 in Section 5.1.1, which shows the PI-Eng’s turn 15 from INTV1, at a micro level, the range of average segment lengths in different language versions varies from 27 (Cantonese, Indonesian, Italian and Mandarin versions) to 40 (Greek version). The mean average length is 32, from the Arabic version. The researcher does not take into account the Spanish version because of the two drastically different segment lengths interpreted by the Spanish interpreter, which would render the average length meaningless. As discussed in Section 5.1.1, the Arabic interpreter only realised the segment was going to be long after the PI-Eng spoke for 88 words and did not finish. The interpreter was able to render this long segment without omission, yet voiced a request to the PI-Eng for segmented turns. In response to the PI-Eng repeating the segment in an abridged manner, the interpreter took care from then onwards to more closely monitor segment lengths, and seized longer pauses afforded by the primary speakers to render her interpreting in semi-consecutive mode. It is interesting to note that, for the rest of the segment lengths in INTV1, the longest segment length the Arabic interpreter performed was exactly 56 words EQV in turn 92 uttered by the EW-Arb—the same as the segment immediately after her first intervention in turn 15.

Tables 5 (in Section 5.1), 6 and 7 (in Section 5.1.1) indicate that the Spanish interpreter:
1. did not take active measures to secure semi-consecutive interpreting mode for himself (manifested in most turns being interpreted without segmentation)

2. did not use the longer pauses afforded by primary speakers (same manifestation as above)

3. did not seek to address apparent cognitive overload caused by extremely long segments (manifested in no requests for repetition, even if the turn or segment was extremely long).

While the Arabic interpreter has practised for 10 years (see Table 2 in Section 4.1.2) and is a highly experienced legal interpreter, the Spanish interpreter has the fewest years of experience of the eight interpreters. This probably explains his less assertive way of managing impending ‘tightrope situation[s]’ (Gile, 2009, p. 182) and the reservation in situations where his cognitive load was clearly exceeded. Another perspective to understand the level of intervention effected by the interpreters is the power relationship between the interpreter and the primary speakers, mainly the English speaking professional. The more experienced an interpreter is, the more empowered s/he will be inclined to initiate necessary intervention measures in the communicative event so as to achieve the best interpreting outcome.

To understand further how the participant interpreters interacted with the primary speakers and the functions of the turn segmentation mechanism in the research data—in addition to the PI-Eng’s turn 15 in INTV1 discussed thus far—the researcher further focuses on turn 23 (157 words) in INTV1 and turn 24 (134 words) in INTV2, both produced by the PI-Eng. In addition, in relation to the EW-LOTE’s turns, the researcher chooses three representative samples of turns 20 (258 words EQV) and 114 (175 words EQV) from INTV1, and turn 33 (96 words EQV) from INTV2. These turns are picked because they are extremely long turns of more than 100 words, which match
the current researcher’s interest. The only exception is turn 33 from INTV2, which has
the highest EW-LOTE EQV word count in INTV2, but 4 words shy of 100 words. It is
worth noting that when interpreters interpret for the primary speakers, they do not know
how long the turn is going to be. They simply continue to manage the segmentation by
interrupting/segmenting/entering the floor as often as necessary, and as seldom as
possible.

Tables 8 and 9 below present segmentation of the three sampled turns produced
by the PI-Eng and EW-LOTE, respectively—two from INTV1 and one from INTV2 in
both cases. Following this, the average segment lengths derived will be discussed.

Table 8

 Segmentation and Turn Length of PI-Eng’s Turn Samples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turn no.</th>
<th>Primary speaker</th>
<th>TCU</th>
<th>Word count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 from INTV1 PI-Eng</td>
<td>Are those your children? I’ve got three kids at home, two girls and a boy. Jane, it is important to keep in mind that you have all the information. I am trying to find out what happened from you, so I expect you to do most of the talking. Don’t wait for me to ask questions. Whenever something comes to mind, tell me, even if it seems trivial or contradicts something you said earlier. Don’t omit anything. If you don’t know a specific fact, that’s OK, just say that you don’t know. Don’t make up something, though, just to give me an answer. I realise that this is a difficult task, to remember all of the details of the crime. So try to concentrate as much as possible. Before we start, I’d like you to tell me a little bit about where you were in the store and what you were thinking about just before the robbery took place.</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>Blue text: RE Green text: CR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment length</th>
<th>Arb</th>
<th>Can</th>
<th>Grk</th>
<th>Ind</th>
<th>Ita</th>
<th>Man</th>
<th>Spa</th>
<th>Tur</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88++</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turn length</th>
<th>159</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of segments</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average segment length</td>
<td>&lt;32&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turn</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>TCU</th>
<th>Word count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turn</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>TCU</th>
<th>Word count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
I’d like to go back to the image you mentioned before and ask you to describe the robbers again, but this time in more detail. I realise this is going to be difficult and take lots of concentration. But remember, the more details you can give me, the more likely we are to catch these people. Let’s go back to the man with the gun turned around and yelled at you, DOWN ON THE FLOOR. Try to focus in on just this one robber, the one who was yelling at you. You may find it easier to concentrate if you close your eyes. Try to develop a mental picture as thoroughly as possible, when the man first turns around. Don’t say anything yet. Just develop the image as clearly as you can. Concentrate on his face and head. [pause] Now, try to describe his head and face in as much detail as you can. Don’t leave anything out.

That’s OK; just do the best you can. Anything you can tell me will be valuable, so just relax and take your time. We’re not in any rush. I understand that you’re upset now. That’s only natural after a crime like this. If you want to take a break at any time because you’re feeling anxious, just tell me and we’ll stop.

[Name], when you think about today’s events, many thoughts may come to your mind. Say whatever comes to mind, whether you consider it trivial, or out of order, or even if it disagrees with something you said earlier. Just tell me whatever comes to your mind without holding anything back. Try to think back to before the shooting took place. Can you remember where you were and what you were thinking about?
Table 9

Segmentation and Turn Length of EW-LOTE’s Turn Samples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turn no. from INTV1</th>
<th>Primary speaker</th>
<th>TCU</th>
<th>Word count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>EW-LOTE</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>(EQV)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Well, I didn’t notice anything unusual at first, just some people in the store looking at the jewellery. Then, all of a sudden, I heard yelling. At first, I thought someone was sick or hurt, but then I saw these two men yelling at the owner, something about putting money into a bag. One of the men tuned around and yelled to the customers, ‘DOWN ON THE FLOOR’. I really got scared then because he had a gun. I don’t know anything about guns, but it was really big, much bigger than toy guns I’ve seen. I fell to the floor, and was scared because the man with the gun looked crazy. He seemed very nervous; he kept on looking around at his partner and told him to hurry up and ‘Let’s get outta here’. I didn’t get a very good view of the other man, who took the money. I mainly concentrated on the man pointing the gun at us. After a while, the man in the front yelled to the man pointing the gun at us, ‘Let’s go’ or something like that, and then they both ran out of the store. By that time, I was really shaking. I guess the owner of the store called the police. They came in a few minutes. One of the police officers asked me a few questions about what happened and then took my name and telephone. He said he’d get back to me in a while. And then I went home and called my husband about what happened.
### Segment length (EQV)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turn no.</th>
<th>Primary speaker</th>
<th>TCU</th>
<th>Word count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>114 from INTV1</td>
<td>EW-LOTE</td>
<td>OK. Well, after we came into the store, I took out my gun and started to yell at the owner to give me the money. I put an empty bag on the counter and told him to fill it. I told Roberto to watch the other customers in the store to make sure none of them interfered. The owner was very scared and he just put the money on the counter, not in the bag. So I put it into the bag. There were a few watches or pieces of jewellery also on the counter, so I took them too, since they were so convenient. I think I dropped one of the pieces, but I was in too much of a rush to stop to pick it up. As soon as I had all of the money, I yelled to Roberto, ‘Get in the truck’. Roberto left first. Then I backed out of the door, waving my gun and yelling to the customers, ‘Don’t anybody try to be a hero’. And then I ran out.</td>
<td>175 (EQV)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOTE version</th>
<th>Arb</th>
<th>Can</th>
<th>Grk</th>
<th>Ind</th>
<th>Ita</th>
<th>Man</th>
<th>Spa</th>
<th>Tur</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

### Turn length (EQV)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of segments</th>
<th>Average segment length (EQV)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>&lt;26&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Segment length: 26/**, 8, 35/**, 18, 53, 18, 135/**, 18, 27, 10, 18, 8, 43, 35, 123, 17, 15, 8, 15, 9, 16, 25, 18, 28, 9, 28, 18, 38, 18, 15, 39, 18, 16, 15, 43, 39, 28, 15, 15, 23, 10, 23, 49/**, 16^^, 11, 11, 26, 18, 42, 32, 41, 32, 7, **, 16, 30, 19, 23, 16, 4, 12, 15, 42, 13, 19, 11, 10, 15, 32, 26, 11, 23, 23, 17, 20, 9, 6, 22, 7, 9, 16, 7, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 22, 22. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment length (EQV)</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>175</th>
<th>25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turn length (EQV)</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of segments</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average segment</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>&lt;18&gt;</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turn no.</th>
<th>Primary speaker</th>
<th>TCU</th>
<th>Word count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33 from INTV2</td>
<td>EW- LOTE</td>
<td>I told you, I don’t remember very much. I was just standing by the light. A car drove up and somebody shot me. I still can’t figure out why. The policeman said that they might have been aiming at the man standing next to me. Just my luck. They want to shoot somebody else and they shoot me instead. That’s the story of my life. I have the worst luck. My car breaks down every three months. My husband just lost his job. I just got out of the hospital. I don’t know what to do.</td>
<td>96 (EQV)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOTE version</th>
<th>Arb</th>
<th>Can</th>
<th>Grk</th>
<th>Ind</th>
<th>Ita</th>
<th>Man</th>
<th>Spa</th>
<th>Tur</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
From what can be observed in Table 8, there are erratic segmentation decisions in each of the three PI-Eng’s turn samples (such as in turn 15 of INTV1, Arb and Spa; turn 23 of INTV1, Spa; and turn 24 in INTV2, Arb, Man and Spa). This results in large gaps in the average segment length (shown in the last row in each sub-table) for each of these turns. As a result, the mean segment length in each occasion is rendered less meaningful. The same applies to the three EW-LOTE’s turn samples in Table 9. Thus, instead of looking at the mean segment lengths, the researcher calculated the average segment lengths for the PI-Eng (Table 10) and EW-LOTE (Table 11) using their respective three chosen sample turns. In Tables 10 and 11 below, the researcher discarded the Spanish interpreter’s data for all three sampled turns due to the interpreter’s less intrusive discourse management approach consistent throughout the INTV1 and INTV2. Such strategies, although might be advantageous for the primary speakers’ floor holding, led to high omission rates (provided in the tables under the
Spanish column). The implications and discussions of these aspects will be presented in Section 7.1. The other seven interpreters occasionally opted for such approach, resulting in sporadic low segment numbers and high segment lengths, e.g. in PI-Eng turn 24 for INTV2-Arb and INTV2-Man (refer Table 10) and for EW-LOTE turn 33 for INTV2-Arb, INTV2-Man and INTV2-Tur (refer Table 11). However these interpreters did not manifest a consistent pattern of the same strategy for the rest of their performances, so the researcher feels justified in not excluding their data.

As can be seen in Table 10, the average number of segments for each turn is arrived at by adding up all segments in each turn and divide by the number of languages, e.g. for turn 15 in INTV1, $5+6+4+6+6+6+6 = 39$ divide by 7 languages (excluding Spanish), therefore 5.6 segments. Standard deviations presented in the table show a divergent nature of the data in turn 24 of INTV2, in particular, by the two greyed segment numbers from the Arabic and Mandarin data, and therefore the researcher decided to exclude these two sets of data for turn 24 in INTV2. Using the total number of words in the language versions, i.e. $159 \times 7 + 157 \times 7 + 134 \times 5$, divided by the total number of segments from the three sample turns ($39 + 70 + 41$), an average segment length of 19.2 words is thus arrived at.
Table 10

Average Segment Length for PI-Eng Derived from the Three Chosen Sample Turns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turn no.</th>
<th>Arb</th>
<th>Can</th>
<th>Grk</th>
<th>Ind</th>
<th>Ita</th>
<th>Man</th>
<th>Spa</th>
<th>Tur</th>
<th>All languages</th>
<th>All languages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 from INTV1 (159 words)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.6 (total 39 segments, excl. Spa)</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 from INTV1 (157 words)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.0 (total 70 segments, excl. Spa)</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 from INTV2 (134 words)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.4 (total 45 segments, excl. Spa; or 41 segments, excl. Arb, Man &amp; Spa)</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average segment length for the three turns
= (159 words x 7 languages + 157 words x 7 languages + 134 words x 5 languages) / (39+70+41 segments) = 19.2

Table 11 below uses the same methodologies to derive the average segment length for the chosen three sample turns for the EW-LOTE. The Spanish interpreter’s data are again all excluded due to the non-interventionist approach adopted by the interpreter, thus high omission rates. The Greek data in Turn 20 in INTV1 only go for seven segments and miss the remaining 97 words (see Tables 7 and 9), and therefore it is unable to be included in the data calculation. Again, the average number of segments for each turn is arrived at by adding up all segments in each turn and divide by the number of languages, e.g. for turn 20 in INTV1, 10+20+21+7+9+14 = 81 divide by 7 languages (excluding Greek and Spanish). Standard deviations presented in this part of the Table 11 again show a high degree of data divergence in turn 33 of INTV2 indicated, in particular, by the three greyed segment numbers from the Arabic, Mandarin and
Turkish data. The researcher excluded these outliers, and used the total number of words in the rest of the language versions, i.e. 258 words x 6 languages (turn 20 of INTV1) + 175 words x 7 languages (turn 114 of INTV1) + 96 words x 4 languages (turn 33 of INTV2) divided by the total number of segments from the 3 sample turns (81 + 84 + 30), yielding an average segment length of 16.2 words EQV.

Table 11

Average Segment Length for EW-LOTE Derived from the Three Chosen Sample Turns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turn no. from INTV1</th>
<th>No. of segments</th>
<th>Average no. of segments for each turn</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 from INTV1</td>
<td>10 20 21 7 9 14</td>
<td>13.5 (total 81 segments, excl. Grk &amp; Spa)</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114 from INTV1</td>
<td>7 17 10 20 10 10</td>
<td>12.0 (total 84 segments, excl. Spa)</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 from INTV2</td>
<td>1 10 9 8 3 2 2</td>
<td>5.0 (total 35 segments, excl. Spa; or 30 segments, excl. Arb, Man, Spa &amp; Tur)</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average segment length for the three turns
= (258 words x 6 languages + 175 words x 7 languages + 96 words x 4 languages) / (81+84+30 segments) = 16.2

The average turn lengths from the sampled turns performed by the participating interpreters point to longer segment lengths from PI-Eng than EW-LOTE, based on which the following two points could be posited:
1. In relation to the primary speakers: When the primary speakers self-segmented their talk within a turn, the PI-Eng tended to speak longer than the EW-LOTE, whereas the EW-LOTE might be more inclined towards segmenting their talk at shorter lengths or more accepting of the intervention measures undertaken by interpreters to allow them to start interpreting when segments are not as long.

2. In relation to the interpreter: The interpreters were more comfortable with the PI-Eng speaking longer before they started interpreting. In contrast, they either used the generous self-segmentation by the EW-LOTE or were proactive in securing shorter segments in order to perform satisfactorily when interpreting from LOTE into English.

There may be significant implications of this finding in bilingual CI settings, which the current researcher will explore in Section 7.2.

5.2.2 Absence of note taking. Another important observation by the researcher is that the participant interpreters very rarely took notes, or took none at all. This highlights that, due to the segmentation within the turns uttered by the primary speakers, the interpreters were comfortable relying almost solely on their short-term memory for satisfactory performance. Any information input over such levels facilitated by the primary speakers would require the interpreters to implement other strategies to counter the possibility of information overload. For example, the interpreters may have to start note taking in order to help retain the incoming information. Only the Mandarin, Spanish and Turkish interpreters were observed to have a notepad and pen to take occasional notes when addresses, names or numbers were mentioned. The other interpreters did not use notepads or pens at all.
In professional interpreter training, specialised note taking is often taught as a technique to aid interpreting performance. This is distinct from other types of note taking, such as shorthand by secretaries or journalists, note taking for the hearing impaired, or stenography in the courtroom, all of which are undertaken in monolingual settings and with different methodologies.

5.2.3 **Eye gaze in segmented turns.** Eye gaze is considered one of the nonverbal signals of turn exchange (Tannen, 2012, p. 149). Studies of monolingual communication have shown that eye gaze direction is an important signalling device to show attention and distribute turns at talk (Lang, 1978; Mason, 2012; Stiefelhagen & Zhu, 2002; Vertegaal, van der Veer, & Vons, 2000; Vertegaal, Slagter, van der Veer, & Nijholt, 2001). As far as the current researcher can ascertain, no more than a handful of studies have been done on eye gaze in the field of interpreting studies. Each of them looks at different aspect of eye gaze. For example, Lang’s (1978) descriptive study looks at the gaze, posture and gesture in a Papua New Guinea court (refer p. 259); Mason’s (2012, pp. 260-261) study uses a TV program on immigration services to analyse interpreter mediated immigration hearings on immigration officers’ and interpreters’ gaze patterns in relation to when they are talking and listening, lengths of the gaze, and the accompanying facial expressions during their gaze. Lastly, psychotherapist Bot’s 2005 descriptive study reports of six therapeutic meetings each between a Dutch-speaking psychotherapist and a migrant patient communicating through an interpreter. Bot is also interested in how turn or segment transfers were effected with the aid of gesture and eye gaze. She presents a few snippets of utterances and the detail coding representations done by her colleague Wijnen (2001) of the gesture and eye gaze by all three participants to the talk (Bot, 2005, pp. 132-140). Wijnen’s (2001) unpublished masters thesis is written in Dutch, and therefore the
current researcher could only rely on Bot’s brief descriptions of Wijnen’s coding system to understand it. The system appears to cover much more details such as direct gaze, continuous gaze, hand gesture, gaze-gesture change, head nods, looking downwards etc. and to whom these are directed to. And the coding appears to cover not only the segment/turn boundaries but also the whole utterances immediately before the boundaries, which should require funding and sustained work in order to collect the data to such extent. The methodology Bot (2005) and Wijnen (2001) adopt in relation to eye gaze appears to have a broader scope covering all talk participants and how their interactional role is realised through eye gaze as one of the resources. However for the purpose of the current research, the researcher regards it overly complicated to be used in the analysis intended.

The design of the research instrument in the current study requires the role players to finish their turns in the scripts before the next turn could start, regardless of how many segments the turn is delivered in. This removes the possibility of the floor being ceded to the other primary speaker in the talk, as might happen in real life. However, the participant interpreters, without knowledge of the content and length of the turns, still displayed their usual personal eye gaze patterns as in real-life assignments, which is of great value to observe and analyse.

The interpreter’s eye gazing behaviour is an indispensable component in the invocation and maintenance of the semi-consecutive interpreting mode. By using the same sampled data in Tables 8 and 9, the researcher append the interpreters’ eye gaze directions at the end of each segment and present them in the following Tables 12 and 13. The attempt here is to establish in segmented talk, particularly when there are numerous segments, whether the interpreter’s eye gazing direction exhibits any particular pattern at floor-changing points, i.e. when they finish rendering the current
segment and the next segment is forthcoming from one of the primary speakers (the interpreter will not be able to predict with precision who is assuming the floor). From the data collected, the interpreter’s eye gaze during rendering is normally parked at the person receiving the interpretation. And when the rendering is done, whether the interpreter exhibits autonomous eye gaze direction in anticipation of the next floor taker, and if so, how does the pattern manifests itself, is the focus of the enquiry. It is worth keeping in mind, though, the findings can not be regarded as totally representative of ‘real’ practice, given that PI-Eng and EW-LOTE are role players who know when a turn is or is not complete. The coding system the researcher uses is as follows:

- **L**= the interpreter is still looking at EW-LOTE with no intention to direct the gaze back to PI-Eng, i.e. it is as if the interpreter perceives the segment s/he just rendered was at a Transition Relevance Place (TRP), and therefore s/he is expecting/waiting for EW-LOTE to utter.

- **E**= the interpreter autonomously directs the gaze back to PI-Eng, i.e. signalling the interpreter’s anticipation of further utterances from PI-Eng.

- **E***= there is a bit of delay in the interpreter’s change of gaze direction, in that it is not as instant and clearly observable as E (where the interpreter clearly shows that s/he feels there should be more utterances forthcoming from the PI-Eng), but it is also not the case that the interpreter senses the segment s/he just rendered was at a TRP, therefore showing no intention to change his/her gaze direction from EW-LOTE to PI-Eng. In other words, the interpreter might have sensed a TRP, but not completely sure, therefore gazing at the EW-LOTE a fraction longer, and then starts the head-turning, which coincides with the uttering of the next segment by the PI-Eng.
• N= the interpreter foregoes the decision on whether the segment just rendered was at a TRP, so kept a neutral eye gaze and wait for the next utterance to come and then direct his/her eye gaze.

In Tables 12 and 13, at the end of each sampled turn, the researcher presents the sums of the interpreter’s eye gaze pattern in each language version. For each eye gaze direction, the researcher specifies the interpreter’s autonomous eye gaze behaviour, as well as the behaviour prompted by the corresponding primary speaker. For example in Table 12 below, for turn 15 from INTV1, in line E* + E for the Arabic version, the interpreter had two occasions where she parked her eye gaze at the EW-LOTE when she finished interpreting the segment from English into Arabic for the EW-Arb, and directed her eye gaze back to the PI-Eng only when the PI-Eng started talking. There is one occasion where she autonomously directed her eye gaze back at the PI-Eng once she finished interpreting for the EW-Arb. The aggregate percentages for each category of eye gaze in the last three lines were derived using the total number of segments in each sampled turn. For example, for turn 15 from INTV1, in line L* + L, the sums for L* and L over eight languages were zero and 10. The total number of segments in this sample over eight languages was $5 + 6 + 4 + 6 + 6 + 6 + 2 + 6 = 41$, except five turns that were not performed by the role players, hence the missing data for the first segment in the Grk, Ind, Ita, Spa and Tuk versions. Therefore, the percentages of eye gaze L* + L were $0/36 = 0\%$ and $10/36 = 28\%$, recorded as L* (0%) + L (28%) in the table. At the end of the three listed sample turns in Table 14, the researcher also aggregates the total number of segments in the three chosen turns to determine the aggregate eye gaze patterns in these samples.
**Table 12**

*Interpreter’s Eye Gaze Patterns when PI-Eng Speaks*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turn no.</th>
<th>Primary speaker</th>
<th>TCU Word count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 from INTV1</td>
<td>PI-Eng</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Are those your children? I’ve got three kids at home, two girls and a boy. [Name], it is important to keep in mind that you have all the information. I am trying to find out what happened from you, so I expect you to do most of the talking. Don’t wait for me to ask questions. Whenever something comes to mind, tell me, even if it seems trivial or contradicts something you said earlier. Don’t omit anything. If you don’t know a specific fact, that’s OK, just say that you don’t know. Don’t make up something, though, just to give me an answer. I realise that this is a difficult task, to remember all of the details of the crime. So try to concentrate as much as possible. Before we start, I’d like you to tell me a little bit about where you were in the store and what you were thinking about just before the robbery took place.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOTE versions</th>
<th>Arb</th>
<th>Can</th>
<th>Grk</th>
<th>Ind</th>
<th>Ita</th>
<th>Man</th>
<th>Spa</th>
<th>Tur</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Segment length</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>E*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>E*</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>E*</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>E*</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>E*</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Turn length | 159 | 159 | 159 | 159 | 159 | 159 | 159 | 159 | 159 | 159 | 159 | 159 | 159 | 159 |
|-------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| No. of segments (41 – 5 = 36) | 5   | 6   | 4   | 6   | 6   | 6   | 2   | 6   |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Average segment length | 32  | 27  | 40  | 27  | 27  | 27  | --- | 27  |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| L* (0%)+L (28%) | 0* + 2 | 0* + 2 | 0* + 0 | 0* + 1 | 0* + 2 | 0* + 1 | 0* + 0 | 0* + 2 |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| N (19%) | 0   | 0   | 0   | 1   | 0   | 3   | 1   | 2   |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| E* (28%) + E (25%) | 2* + 1 | 2* + 2 | 2* + 1 | 0* + 3 | 2* + 1 | 2* + 1 | 2* + 0 | 0* + 0 | 0* + 1 |     |     |     |     |     |     |
I’d like to go back to the image you mentioned before and ask you to describe the robbers again, but this time in more detail. I realise this is going to be difficult and take lots of concentration. But remember, the more details you can give me, the more likely we are to catch these people. Let’s go back to when the man with the gun turned around and yelled at you, DOWN ON THE FLOOR. Try to focus in on just this one robber, the one who was yelling at you. You may find it easier to concentrate if you close your eyes. Try to develop a mental picture as thoroughly as possible, when the man first turns around. Don’t say anything yet. Just develop the image as clearly as you can. Concentrate on his face and head. [pause] Now, try to describe his head and face in as much detail as you can. Don’t leave anything out.
That’s OK; just do the best you can. Anything you can tell me will be valuable, so just relax and take your time. We’re not in any rush. I understand that you’re upset now. That’s only natural after a crime like this. If you want to take a break at any time because you’re feeling anxious, just tell me and we’ll stop.

[Name], when you think about today’s events, many thoughts may come to your mind. Say whatever comes to mind, whether you consider it trivial, or out of order, or even if it disagrees with something you said earlier. Just tell me whatever comes to your mind without holding anything back. Try to think back to before the shooting took place. Can you remember where you were and what you were thinking about?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOTE versions</th>
<th>Arb</th>
<th>Can</th>
<th>Grk</th>
<th>Ind</th>
<th>Ita</th>
<th>Man</th>
<th>Spa</th>
<th>Tur</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Segment length</td>
<td>62 E*</td>
<td>8 E*</td>
<td>8 E</td>
<td>8 E*</td>
<td>8 E*</td>
<td>6 E*</td>
<td>62 N</td>
<td>8 N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72 N</td>
<td>15 E*</td>
<td>20 E</td>
<td>15 E*</td>
<td>20 E*</td>
<td>2 E</td>
<td>72 L</td>
<td>20 E*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E*</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L* (0%) + L (28%)</td>
<td>0* + 0</td>
<td>0* + 4</td>
<td>0* + 3</td>
<td>0* + 1</td>
<td>0* + 1</td>
<td>0* + 0</td>
<td>0* + 1</td>
<td>0* + 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N (6%)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E* (30%) + E (36%)</td>
<td>1* + 0</td>
<td>3* + 6</td>
<td>0* + 4</td>
<td>5* + 3</td>
<td>2* + 3</td>
<td>1* + 1</td>
<td>0* + 0</td>
<td>2* + 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The above statistics indicate that, when the PI-Eng spoke at length, on half of
the occasions when the interpreter finished interpreting the segments, s/he directed the
eye gaze back to the PI-Eng. For the other half of the occasions, the interpreters’ eye
gaze was roughly split evenly between the EW-LOTE and neutral eye contact—not
looking at either the PI-Eng or EW-LOTE. Due to the setup of the experiment, the EW-
LOTE knew not to take over the floor when the whole turn was not yet finished. Thus, it
is worth keeping in mind that there are a number of incentives in real life for the EW-
LOTE to construe these segment boundaries as TRPs and start talking, although they
were not meant by the PI-Eng to be TRPs. These incentives lay in the 24% of the
segment boundaries when the interpreters maintained neutral eye contact, and the 26%
of the occasions when the interpreters actively gazed at the EW-LOTE, serving as a cue
for the EW-LOTE to produce a turn, even though that point of the discourse was not
intended by the PI-Eng as a TRP. Rather, it was only a partial turn segmented to enable
interpreting to occur.
Table 13

*Interpreter’s Eye Gaze Patterns when EW-LOTE Speaks*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turn no.</th>
<th>Primary speaker</th>
<th>TCU</th>
<th>Word count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 from INTV1</td>
<td>EW-LOTE</td>
<td>Well, I didn’t notice anything unusual at first, just some people in the store looking at the jewellery. Then, all of a sudden, I heard yelling. At first, I thought someone was sick or hurt, but then I saw these two men yelling at the owner, something about putting money into a bag. One of the men turned around and yelled to the customers, ‘DOWN ON THE FLOOR’. I really got scared then because he had a gun. I don’t know anything about guns, but it was really big, much bigger than toy guns I’ve seen. I fell to the floor, and was scared because the man with the gun looked crazy. He seemed very nervous; he kept on looking around at his partner and told him to hurry up and ‘Let’s get outta here’. I didn’t get a very good view of the other man, who took the money. I mainly concentrated on the man pointing the gun at us. After a while, the man in the front yelled to the man pointing the gun at us, ‘Let’s go’ or something like that, and then they both ran out of the store. By that time, I was really shaking. I guess the owner of the store called the police. They came in a few minutes. One of the police officers asked me a few questions about what happened and then took my name and telephone. He said he’d get back to me in a while. And then I went home and called my husband about what happened.</td>
<td>258 (EQV)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOTE versions</th>
<th>Arb</th>
<th>Can</th>
<th>Grk</th>
<th>Ind</th>
<th>Ita</th>
<th>Man</th>
<th>Spa</th>
<th>Tur</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Segment length (EQV)</td>
<td>26 L</td>
<td>8 L*</td>
<td>35 L</td>
<td>18 L</td>
<td>53 E</td>
<td>18 L</td>
<td>135 L</td>
<td>18 L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 L</td>
<td>10 L*</td>
<td>18 L</td>
<td>8 E</td>
<td>43 L</td>
<td>35 N</td>
<td>123 N</td>
<td>17 L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 L</td>
<td>8 E</td>
<td>15 L*</td>
<td>9 L*</td>
<td>16 L*</td>
<td>25 E</td>
<td>18 N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 L</td>
<td>9 E</td>
<td>28 L*</td>
<td>18 E</td>
<td>38 L</td>
<td>18 N</td>
<td>15 L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 L</td>
<td>18 L</td>
<td>16 L</td>
<td>15 E</td>
<td>43 E</td>
<td>39 E</td>
<td>28 L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 N</td>
<td>15 E</td>
<td>23 L</td>
<td>10 E</td>
<td>23 N</td>
<td>49 N</td>
<td>16 L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 N</td>
<td>11 L*</td>
<td>26 L</td>
<td>18 E</td>
<td>42 E</td>
<td>32 N</td>
<td>4 N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 L</td>
<td>7 L</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>16 N</td>
<td>30 E</td>
<td>19 N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 N</td>
<td>16 L</td>
<td>4 L</td>
<td>12 E</td>
<td>15 N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 L</td>
<td>13 L*</td>
<td>19 E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11 L*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 L*</td>
<td>15 L*</td>
<td>32 L*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 L*</td>
<td>11 L</td>
<td>23 N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Turn length (EQV)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>258</th>
<th>258</th>
<th>161**</th>
<th>258</th>
<th>258</th>
<th>258</th>
<th>258</th>
<th>258</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23 E</td>
<td>17 E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 L*</td>
<td>6 E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 L*</td>
<td>9 E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 L*</td>
<td>7 E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 L</td>
<td>10 N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 L</td>
<td>6 E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 L</td>
<td>10 N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 L</td>
<td>10 E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## No. of segments (≈90)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>10</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26 E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Average segment length (EQV)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>26</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>37</th>
<th>29</th>
<th>129</th>
<th>19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L* (18%) + L (34%)</td>
<td>0* + 7</td>
<td>9* + 7</td>
<td>2* + 5</td>
<td>2* + 3</td>
<td>1* + 2</td>
<td>0* + 1</td>
<td>0* + 1</td>
<td>2* + 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N (21%)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E* (0%) + E (27%)</td>
<td>0* + 0</td>
<td>0* + 4</td>
<td>0* + 0</td>
<td>0* + 13</td>
<td>0* + 3</td>
<td>0* + 4</td>
<td>0* + 0</td>
<td>0* + 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OK. Well, after we came into the store, I took out my gun and started to yell at the owner to give me the money. I put an empty bag on the counter and told him to fill it. I told Roberto to watch the other customers in the store to make sure none of them interfered. The owner was very scared and he just put the money on the counter, not in the bag. So I put it into the bag. There were a few watches or pieces of jewellery also on the counter, so I took them too, since they were so convenient. I think I dropped one of the pieces, but I was in too much of a rush to stop to pick it up. As soon as I had all of the money, I yelled to Roberto, ‘Get in the truck’. Roberto left first. Then I backed out of the door, waving my gun and yelling to the customers, ‘Don’t anybody try to be a hero’. And then I ran out.
I told you, I don’t remember very much. I was just standing by the light. A car drove up and somebody shot me. I still can’t figure out why. The policeman said that they might have been aiming at the man standing next to me. Just my luck. They want to shoot somebody else and they shoot me instead. That’s the story of my life. I have the worst luck. My car breaks down every three months. My husband just lost his job. I just got out of the hospital. I don’t know what to do.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total no. of segments for turns 20, 114 from INTV1 &amp; turn 33 from INTV2</th>
<th>90 + 85 + 36 = 201</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total L* + L</td>
<td>38/201 + 54/201 = 19%* + 27% = 46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total N</td>
<td>48/201 = 24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total E* + E</td>
<td>0/201 + 61/201 = 0%* + 30% = 30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14

**Comparison of Interpreters’ Eye Gaze Patterns**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PI-Eng (Table 12)</th>
<th>EW-LOTE (Table 13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total L* + L</td>
<td>0%* + 26% = 26%</td>
<td>19%* + 27% = 46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total N</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total E* + E</td>
<td>23%* + 27% = 50%</td>
<td>0%* + 30% = 30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The statistics in Table 13 show a very similar pattern of eye gaze behaviour among the interpreters when the EW-LOTE was speaking at length. For easy reference, the aggregate percentages from Tables 12 and 13 are presented side by side in Table 14. This table shows that, when the participant interpreters interpreted long narratives for the EW-LOTE (column ‘EW-LOTE’ in Table 14), 46% of the interpreters’ eye contact was directed back to the EW-LOTE (row ‘Total L* + L’ under column ‘EW-LOTE’), whereas when they interpreted long questions for the PI-Eng (refer column ‘PI-Eng’), 50% of their eye contact (i.e. four percentage points more) was directed to the PI-Eng (row ‘Total E* + E’ under column ‘PI-Eng’). Moreover, they have exactly the same percentage (24%) of neutral eye gaze interpreting for PI-Eng and EW-LOTE (row ‘Total N’ under both columns). Again, due to the setup of the experiment, the PI-Eng knew not to take over the floor when the whole turn was not yet finished. However, it must be pointed out that, in real life, it would be tempting for the PI-Eng to take over the floor prematurely when the EW-LOTE’s narrative was continuing, in 24% of the neutral eye gaze and 30% of the gaze actively directed towards the PI-Eng.
5.3 Intentional Pauses by Interviewer

When implementing the CR component of the CI, police interviewers often insert pauses with specific wording before and after the pause to instruct the interviewee to mentally focus on the sights, sounds and smells present at the scene of the event under enquiry (Geiselman & Fisher, 2014). The period of silence in conversation (the pause) has been the subject of much research. Bruneau (as cited in Maslamani, 2011, p. 95) divides silence into three categories:

1. psycholinguistic silences, such as pauses applied by participants to gain more time while conversing by slowing their speech, or to give listeners more time to process what they hear so that they understand better
2. interactive silences, such as pauses that are mutually shared by participants of dyadic or small groups until someone takes the floor
3. social-cultural silences, which are related to religious practices in some religions (Kalman, 2008).

Nakane (2007a) summarises four functions of silence in conversation: cognitive, discursive, social and affective. This section is focused on Bruneau’s first category of psycholinguistic silence, which allows listeners more time to process what they have heard, thereby serving Nakane’s (2007a) cognitive function.

There are eight and three instances in INTV1 and INTV2, respectively, where intentional pauses are scripted for the PI-Eng to act. Table 15 lists the utterances before and after the pauses (bold added) to provide some context and the specific wording around the pauses. It is worth pointing out that, without exception, there are always words to the effect of asking the interviewee to concentrate or focus on a specific point of interest and form a mental picture of that image. After the pause, the PI-Eng would
ask the EW-LOTE to recall the information in as much detail as possible to the best of their ability.

Table 15

*Turns with Intentional Pauses Inserted*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turn</th>
<th>INTV1</th>
<th>INTV2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Turn 23:</td>
<td>Turn 62:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[...] Try to focus in on just this one robber, the one who was yelling</td>
<td>Try to visualise the front of the car. [pause] Now try to describe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>at you. You may find it easier to concentrate if you close your</td>
<td>whatever you see.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>eyes. Try to develop a mental picture as thoroughly as possible,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>when the man first turns around. Don’t say anything yet. Just</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>develop the image as clearly as you can. Concentrate on his face and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>head. [pause] Now, try to describe his head and face in as much</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>detail as you can. Don’t leave anything out.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Turn 35:</td>
<td>Turn 78:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>You mentioned that he had puffy cheeks. Concentrate on his cheeks</td>
<td>Think for a while about what he looked like when you saw him. You</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>again. [pause] Now, try to describe his face.</td>
<td>said that he yelled something and then you looked up. You see his</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>face and chest. Try to focus in on that picture. Take your time and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>develop that image. [pause] Tell me whatever you can.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Turn 43:</td>
<td>Turn 88:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[...] I’d like you to think now about when he yelled that order to</td>
<td>[...] Try to see the car in your mind as it is turning. Don’t say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>you. Concentrate on his voice only and the sounds of those words.</td>
<td>anything; just try to imagine the car from this view. [pause] Now,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[pauses to develop auditory image] Try to describe the sound of his</td>
<td>try to tell me any detail you can about the left side of the car as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>voice. [...]</td>
<td>it is turning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Turn 49:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Try to think about the position you were in and what your thoughts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>were after you fell to the floor and saw the man with the gun.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[pause] Can you describe that to me?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Turn 59:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Let’s go back to that picture of the man holding the gun. Try to get</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>it clear in your mind again. [pause] Now, try to focus on how he</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>was holding the gun.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Turn 73:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Try to concentrate on your image of the pants, looking up at him</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>from the floor. [pause] Tell me everything you can about his pants.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remember, tell me every detail you can think of.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Turn 85:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Try to concentrate on his neck and the underside of his chin. Just</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>focus in on this</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
area, from the top of his shirt to his chin. [pause] Try to describe in detail what you see.

8 Turn 91:
Try to concentrate on his right arm as he was holding the gun. Just focus in on his arm. [pause] Tell me whatever you can about his right arm.

5.3.1 Disappearance of interviewer’s intentional pauses. In a total of 11 intentional pauses identified in the two scripts (eight in INTV1 and three in INTV2), it is observed that 95% were regarded by the interpreters as TRPs, and the floor was taken over by the interpreters to start rendering the immediately-preceding utterances. For the remaining 5% of occasions, although the interpreters did not regard them as TRPs and start interpreting, the pauses were not reproduced. As a result, all of the intentional pauses in INTV1 and INTV2 are completely removed in the bilingual versions in this study. Without knowledge of these pauses in the police interviewer’s 1PP under the CI protocol for CR purposes, these slightly longer pauses (unlike the shorter ones between utterances where the speaker had no intention of ceding the floor) appear exactly the same to the interpreters as the pauses attached to the end of those self-segmented partial turns. Thus, the interpreters responded in exactly the same way as they did when the self-segmenting pauses were afforded—they started interpreting. Without knowledge of the CI protocol and CR principle implemented at these junctures (see text in Table 15), the interpreters would find it difficult to discern these intentionally inserted pauses, let alone somehow preserve or recreate them in the LOTE version. It is only because of the scripts held by the role players that the EW-LOTE knew not to respond to the unfinished 1PP, and the PI-Eng knew to resume talking to complete the unfinished utterances in the script after the pause. It is likely that, in real-life bilingual police interviews, if the same premature floor taking by the interpreter occurred, a small period of chaos may follow the interpreter finishing his or her rendition. The EW-LOTE may
start his or her 2PP, responding to the PI-Eng’s (unfinished) 1PP. If the PI-Eng decides to complete the (unfinished) instructions, instead of abandoning them to allow the interviewee to commence the 2PP, overlapped talk may occur (the PI-Eng’s unfinished 1PP and the EW-LOTE’s 2PP uttered at the same time). If this occurs, the interpreter has to manage the overlapped talk by determining who eventually gets the floor, and may ask the person to repeat what was said during the overlapping period, and then render it into the TL. Normal interaction can then resume.

These intentional pauses and the specific CR purpose they serve via the instructions given by the interviewing police officer in a monolingual setting is completely disrupted and eliminated in interpreted bilingual settings when the interpreter (prematurely) regards pauses as possible TRPs or the end of a self-segmented turn, and takes over the floor. When this happens, it works to the interpreter’s advantage because this segment or partial turn will be shorter than is originally intended by the PI-Eng, thereby giving the interpreter a smaller information load. However, this reveals that, in bilingual CI settings, it is highly likely that the intentional pauses formulated for CR will be non-existent.

The above finding is further corroborated in an interpreting exam in which the researcher was involved as the program coordinator of the Advanced Diploma of Interpreting at RMIT University, in Semester 1 of 2012. A group of interpreting students of a particular language were one semester into their two-semester interpreter training. At the end of their first semester, they had to sit an exam that included two scripted dialogues in two different topic areas in the public service domain, produced to NAATI exam specifications. The two dialogue topics could include a mixture of topics, such as social welfare and health, education and immigration, police and medicine, and legal and business topics. Five of the students completed a police dialogue (see
Appendix 3.1) written to simulate a CI interview. This included two pauses inserted strategically in the police interviewer’s 1PP at turns 7 and 13. The interpreting exam format involves the students sitting in a soundproof interpreting booth before a computer screen to interpret two pre-recorded bilingual dialogues in video format, played on the screen. The turn lengths in these dialogues could not exceed 60 words, and the total length of the entire dialogue was approximately 400 words. When each turn (of a few utterances) was completed by the role player on the screen, there was a chime at the end of the turn, signalling to the student to start rendering into the other language (while the video was paused by the exam operator). Turns 7 and 13 are reproduced below:

7. Police Officer: Uhm…take yourself back to this point—lying on the floor. Try to develop a mental picture of this guy as thoroughly as possible. You may find it easier to concentrate closing your eyes. Do not say anything just now (pause for a few seconds). Right, describe him in as much detail as you can. Don’t leave anything out. (53 words)

13. Police Officer: Now, let’s move down to his neck and the underside of his chin. Just focus in on this area, from the top of his shirt to his chin. (pause a few seconds). Try to describe in detail what you see. (36 words)

Due to these intentional pauses were inserted part ways through the turns and before the end of the turn when the signalling chime was given, the student was inhibited from taking over the floor. Instead, the student had to finish listening to the whole turn—the utterances before and after the intentionally inserted pauses—hear the signalling chime, and then start interpreting. Although they might have noted these pauses to be slightly longer than the normal ones between utterances (which are not meant for TRPs), none of the five students who were assigned the police interview dialogue reproduced the inserted pauses in their renditions. This experiment on a small
number of students indicates interpreters’ possible insensitivity to slightly longer pauses (than normal millisecond pauses occurring in between utterances) and inclination to omit them in their rendition. Without informing the students of the significance of these intentional pauses, it appears that interpreting students treat them no differently to intra-turn pauses.

In Interview 2 (see Appendix 1.2) at turn 50 (see Appendix 2.1), the interviewing police officer states:

[t]ry to look straight ahead at the wall in front of you. Try to think about when the car pulled up in front of you and the man yelled. Just try to picture that image in your mind. **Don’t say anything yet** [emphasis added].

This is the end of the turn. In monolingual interviews, an instruction such as this would normally generate a stretch of silence, and the interviewee would then either start autonomously or be prompted by the interviewer to start rendering the answer to this question. However, in a bilingual interview, when (and if) the italicised utterance is rendered by the interpreter, a compliant interviewee would likely follow the instruction and refrain from speaking. In this research, because the acting followed the script, the answer to the question in turn 51 was offered immediately by the LOTE role player. However, in real life, without the police officer’s verbal or gestural prompting, this may create confusion as to when the interviewee should start the verbal answer.

**5.3.2 Before or after—that is the question.** Within the confines of the scripted utterances in each turn in INTV1 and INTV2, the role players of the PI-Eng and EW-LOTE were at liberty to ‘act out’ their roles. Following the scripts, the PI-Eng dutifully inserted the pauses at the places listed in Table 15 in his acting. As reported above, almost without exception (95%), these pauses were not distinguishable to the interpreters from other types of pauses:
1. the usual intra-turn pauses

2. the longer pauses offered by the PI-Eng as a signal of an end of a segment within a turn

3. the pause for end of turn (a TRP).

Thus, the interpreters took over the floor and started interpreting. For the remaining 5% where the interpreters decided to wait out these pauses, none of the pauses were reproduced in their renditions—indicating that they were unaware of the special purpose of the pauses. It was discovered that when the PI-Eng’s intentional pauses resulted in ceding the floor to the interpreter, he ad-libbed a pause at the start of the next segmented.

A total of 12 instances of the 88 such occasions in INTV1 and INTV2 were found to have the pauses recreated at the start of the next utterance by the PI-Eng. The excerpt in Table 16 documents one example from INTV1 at Turn 23 where the PI-Eng inserted a new pause in the Arabic, Cantonese and Indonesian versions of the data after the respective interpreter had finished rendering the first part of the turn, and the reactions from the interpreters.

Table 16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turn no.</th>
<th>Utterances by PI-Eng</th>
<th>Interpreter’s reactions (in INVT1-Arb, INTV1-Can and INTV-Ind)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1st part</td>
<td>… Try to develop a mental picture as thoroughly as possible, when the man first turns around. Don’t say anything yet. Just develop the image as clearly as you can. Concentrate on his face and head [pause].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The pause is regarded by the interpreter as a segment boundary, and interpretation is rendered as soon as the interpreter detects the pause. <strong>EW-LOTE does not detect the intentional pause.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>2nd part</td>
<td>[longer pause inserted by the interviewer role player] Now, try to describe his head and face in as much detail as you can. Don’t leave anything out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[longer silence because there is nothing forthcoming from the interviewer; interpreter maintain neutral eye gaze; interviewee feels the silence] When the sentence is finally uttered, the interpreter renders the utterance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In essence, the improvised action taken by the PI-Eng inadvertently provides a possible solution to the finding reported above—the disappearance of the important
intentional pauses inserted by the PI-Eng for the purpose of CR under the CI protocol to
generate a momentary silence for the EW-LOTE’s mental concentration. The founders
of CI, Fisher and Geiselman (1992), regard this momentary silence for CR as important,
as evidenced in pages 166 to 167 of their monolingual scripts from which INTV1 is
adapted (also see turn 51 in Appendix 2.1), as reproduced below. Where the double
asterisks were inserted, the authors specifically annotated ‘ERROR: No pause between
imaging and describing’ (Fisher & Geiselman, 1992, p. 167):

51 I’d like you now to concentrate on the gun the man was holding. Again, 
close your eyes and try to focus on the gun. Take your time, close your eyes, and 
develop the image of the gun. ** Now try to describe the gun in as much details 
as you can. (Fisher & Geiselman, 1992, p. 167)

However, it must be pointed out that the disappearance of these pauses in the
bilingual version of CI is due to the nature of interpreting, rather than a fault attributable
to the interpreter. Without prior knowledge of CI principles, the interpreter does not
have an appreciation of the purpose of these intentional pauses—as evidenced by the
5% of instances where the interpreters did not take over the floor, but did not reproduce
the pauses in the LOTE versions either. As a result, unless a strategy is developed to
recreate the pause in the LOTE version of the utterance, the EW-LOTE will not note the
existence of the pause. As it turned out (unplanned in the script), by simply recreating
such a pause at the start of the next segment (and perhaps lengthening it slightly to
highlight it), as long as the PI-Eng still holds the floor, the PI-Eng ensures the pause
could be clearly felt by the EW-LOTE. However, this leads to the issue of how the PI-
Eng maintains control of the floor without ceding it prematurely to the EW-LOTE when
the previous utterances have been interpreted and the next segment is yet to be uttered.
The interviewee, and perhaps the interpreter, may regard it as a TRP upon hearing the
interpretation of the utterances up to the point of the pause. When the PI-Eng creating the silent stretch for the pause at the start of the next segment indicates his or her intention to hold the floor (for example, by holding up a palm and moving it slightly up and down as a turn-holding device), the interpreter and EW-LOTE will receive the message of request for temporary silence. This silence will continue until the PI-Eng utters something or gestures for the EW-LOTE to start talking, and the interpreter can transfer the segment into LOTE, thereby completing the 1PP, and the interviewee can start the requested 2PP.

5.4 Interpreting Mode Switching

As explained in Section 3.4.2, from the perspective of timing the interpreting output, there are two modes of interpreting internationally accepted in the field of interpreting studies:

1. simultaneous interpreting—denoting the near synchronicity of the output in the TL in relation to the input of the SL

2. consecutive interpreting—rendering the source message in the TL when the SL speaker pauses.

In most community interpreting contexts (see Section 3.4.1 Definition of interpreting), consecutive interpreting is the mode most widely used. It is also the mode employed in police interpreting settings, and thus the mode adopted in this research. As explained in Section 3.4.2, simultaneous interpreting—otherwise known as conference interpreting—must have specialised equipment to facilitate it, such as a soundproof interpreter’s booth with the speech fed into the interpreter’s headphone, and a transmitter system sending the interpreter’s rendering to the audience wearing headphones. Verbal interaction between the speaker and audience in this setting is possible with the interpreter situated in a sound-proof booth. If the speaker and the
audience put on their headphones, they only hear the TL they understand, as rendered by the interpreter, without hearing the foreign SL they do not understand. A variant form of simultaneous interpreting—whisper interpreting, known as ‘chuchotage’ in French—is normally done without equipment, or with equipment only for the interpreter to receive the feed of the speech, but without the receiver devices for the audience. The audience is normally only one or two people sitting next to the interpreter. This form of interpreting is only suited for monologue or speech-type SL rendering into the TL for the interpretation user, such as the accused or witness sitting in the public gallery hearing the judge’s directions or arguments of the legal representative from the opposing sides. It is normally unidirectional from the SL (for example, of the court) into the TL (of the LOTE-speaking client). The interpretation user gets interference from the ambiance because the SL and TL are heard at the same time, although the SL in the foreign language does not make sense. When the LOTE-speaking client is asked to talk (such as to give evidence in the courtroom or be cross-examined), interpreting is done in the consecutive mode. The interpreter physically stands next to the person, so that all the audience in the courtroom can hear and understand what the LOTE speaker says, and the LOTE speaker understands what is asked of him or her.

When interpreting is employed in police interviewing to bridge the communication gap due to language barriers between the interviewing officer and interviewee, the consecutive mode of interpreting is normally adopted (Nakane, 2014; S. Russell, 2002). The characteristic of police interviewing is such that it is ‘conducted in private’ (Laster, 1990, p. 25), normally, in Australia, with two police officers (one being the main interviewer and the other the observer) talking to the interviewee without an immediate audience (as opposed to a courtroom setting).
Interpreters usually use only one mode of interpreting in an assignment, whether consecutive or simultaneous. However, there are situations where mode switching is necessary. For example, in international business negotiations, the interpreter may have to undertake consecutive interpreting when the chief delegate from each side of the business negotiation addresses the whole meeting contingent, and then switch to *chuchotage* when the negotiation stage begins. In a courtroom setting, as explained above, the interpreter may have to undertake *chuchotage* by whispering to the LOTE-speaking client or ‘most often defendants, who are playing a passive role in court proceedings such as arraignments, hearings, or trials’ (National Association of Judiciary Interpreters and Translators [NAJIT], 2006, p. 1). This enables the defendant ‘to be truly present and take an active part in her [or his] defense’ (NAJIT, 2006, p. 1). The interpreter must then be prepared to rapidly switch to consecutive interpreting whenever the LOTE-speaking client is directly engaged in the procedure (NAJIT, 2006, p. 1).

Given the interactional and private nature of police interviews (although they are meant for others’ consumption at a later date—see Section 2.1.3.2), interpreting is always undertaken in consecutive/semi-consecutive mode, as adopted by the participant interpreters in this study. The Cantonese interpreter is observed to change the consecutive interpreting mode to simultaneous mode at turn 23 in INTV1 (refer Table 9 and Appendix 2.1) in the utterances before and after the strategic pause was inserted by the PI-Eng. At turn 36 in INTV1, the Indonesian interpreter interpreted the answer to the turn 35 question posed by the PI-Eng (see the corresponding text in Table 9) by saying: ‘There was nothing outstanding. No scars or any noticeable marks on his face’. Thus, the second part of the turn was rendered in simultaneous mode (when the EW-Ind was speaking at a slower pace because she was searching her memory at the same time).
In a triadic interpreting setup, where the space is normally confined (such as a police interview room, office or medical consultation room) and the conversation is highly interactional, it is not suitable for the simultaneous mode or *chuchotage* to be used. This is because this mode creates two sound sources that are audible at the same time in the same small physical space (such as a police interviewer talking in English with the interpreter rendering into the LOTE at the same time). The two speakers interfere with each other, thereby creating confusion and an non-ideal sound quality for the interviewee, and vice versa.

However, in these two identified occasions where the Cantonese and Indonesian interpreters opted for simultaneous interpreting, the primary speakers’ utterances were quite short and spoken by the role players in a softer voice and at a slower pace to mimic real-life discourse behaviour of this nature at these particular junctures: in the case of the Cantonese version, PI-Eng gently requested the interviewee not to speak for a while in order to allow memory retrieval; and in the Indonesian version, EW-Ind was thinking and searching her memory, while speaking slowly at the same time in answering the question posed by PI-Eng. There was no significant overall negative effect of having overlapped speaking from the primary speaker’s utterances and the interpreter’s rendition. The other participant was able to hear the interpreter without any problem.

The researcher also notes that these two interpreters have the shortest average segment length (see Tables 6 and 7), meaning that they started very early in the piece to signal implicitly their preference to undertake semi-consecutive interpreting, and secured tacit agreement from the primary speakers (none requested the primary speakers segment their turns). Hence, these interpreters used semi-consecutive mode almost from the beginning of both interviews. The shorter average segment length manifests in the
two interpreters skilfully using both intra-turn pauses (which were not meant by the primary speakers to offer the floor) and longer pauses at the end of the primary speakers’ self-segmentation (which were meant to offer the floor).

5.5 CI Specialised Terminology and Concept

In the field of translating and interpreting, it is accepted that cross-lingual code switching is not simply a matter of word-for-word swapping from one language to another. The consensus is that it is the transfer of meaning and sense behind the superficial construction of lexis and syntax (Mulayim et al., 2015, p. 4; Munday, 2012, p. 31). Gibbons (2007) contends that, as opposed to written discourse, ‘the spoken words can only survive in memory, but memory works on the basis of meaning not wording’ (p. 23). This reflects, in most cases, how interpreters normally perform their work—they seek to achieve the pragmatic aims of the interaction, rather than adhering to a literal (and, in extreme cases, nonsensical) word-swapping exercise. This approach has justifiably been the cornerstone of translating and interpreting training.

As explained in Section 3.4.3, the pursuit of meaning transfer as the primary aim of interpreters, alongside the need in legal circumstances to know exactly what has been said, have long caused tension between the legal profession and interpreters working in legal settings. The expectations of the legal fraternity lead to the usual admonition of court interpreters by judges or lawyers to ‘not interpret, just translate everything literally’ (Mikkelson, 1999; Morris, 1995, pp. 25–26). In contrast, the needs of interpreters mean that interpreting scholars have strongly contested the ‘word-by-word’ conception of interpreting, and called for a ‘concept-by-concept’ approach (González et al., 1991, p. 17). Although Mulayim el al. (2015) do not dispute the sense-to-sense approach in interpreting, they caution that, on limited occasions, such as during cross-examination in court hearings or in police interviews:
Regardless of whether it makes sense or not, the court may decide it is necessary to know the exact words used by the speaker rather than the intended meaning, so it is afforded the opportunity to determine what the intended meaning is. (p. 4)

The findings reported in this section highlight this ongoing tension.

5.5.1 ‘Are there any other views that you had of the robbers?’ This question is posed by the PI-Eng in INTV1 at turn 21 as a follow-up question after turn 20 (see Table 3 for Turns 8 to 20), in which the EW-LOTE gives a long free-form narrative about the jewellery store robbery s/he witnessed. The term ‘view’ here appears to be a problem trigger. Two of the eight interpreters had to intervene in order to clarify the meaning. The Mandarin interpreter did not understand what this question meant and asked for clarification, to which the PI-Eng explained: ‘from any other angles or … did you at any other times see them from the back, or the front, or…?’. This helped the interpreter render it into Mandarin as ‘Did you see the robber from any other angles?’. The Greek interpreter asked the PI-Eng: ‘view as in eye sight?’, to which the PI-Eng gave a positive answer, which enabled the interpretation to be undertaken accurately. The Italian and Turkish interpreters did not query the polysemy of the word, and rendered the question as:

- ‘Are there any other opinion [as in personal opinion] you can give us about the robbery?’ (back-translation into English from Italian)
- ‘Have you seen from any other or a different angle, or do you have your own views [as in personal view] about the robbers?’ (Turkish).

The Italian version was incorrect, and the Turkish version was more complicated than necessary. The other six versions (apart from Italian and Turkish) essentially conveyed
the intended meaning; however, none was able to reproduce the exact wording. The back-translation of all versions is presented Table 17 below.

Table 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Back-translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>Is there <em>any other appearance</em> [as in anything particular in their physical appearances] you noticed in these robbers?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td>Did you look at the robbers’ appearance <em>from another angle</em>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek*</td>
<td>Did you <em>see anything else</em> from the perpetrators?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>What can you see the robbers <em>from different position</em> [as in the viewer’s different location]?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>Are there <em>any other opinion</em> [as in personal opinion] you can give us about the robbery?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandarin*</td>
<td>[asked for clarification before interpreting] Did you see the robbers <em>from any other angle</em>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Did you <em>see anything else</em> of the robbers?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>Have you seen from any other or <em>a different angle</em>, or do you have your <em>own views</em> [as in personal view] about the robbers?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Denotes that the interpreter needed clarification of the meaning of ‘view’.  
N.B. Back-translation provided in Tables 17 to 23 is to facilitate understanding of particular lexical items, and for the ease of discussion and analysis. Therefore, it is presented as close to the LOTE rendition as possible, but at the same time in grammatical or near grammatical English, considering some languages—such as Cantonese, Indonesian and Mandarin—do not have tense. However, appropriate tense was added (as much as possible) to the respective back-translation in order to avoid confusion for English readers of this thesis.

As can be seen in the above table, in the context of the PI-Eng’s question, the term ‘view’ does not have an exact lexical equivalent in most of the eight languages. The expressions in the LOTE versions are either a superordinate item of ‘to see anything else’, or words to this effect (Arabic, Greek and Spanish) or a hyponym of ‘to see from a different angle’, or words to this effect (Cantonese, Indonesian, Mandarin and Turkish).

5.5.2 ‘What is the best view you had of the car?’ Similarly, in INTV2 turn 45, the PI-Eng asks: ‘What is the best view you had of the car?’. This is an attempt to aid
the drive-by shooting victim to remember and describe the car in which the perpetrator was sitting. Table 18 shows the back-translation in English for the eight language versions.

Table 18

Back-translation into English of INTV2 Turn 45

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Back-translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>What is the best scene [as in eye sight] or the best time you had a glance of the car?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td>The angle you saw the car, which is the clearest angle you saw the car?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>Tell me the best eyesight you had of the car. (Translator’s note: ‘eyesight’ unnatural in Greek)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>You could see the car, how good is it [as in seeing the car]?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>What is the best image you had of the car?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td>Then you saw the car, the clearest part you saw, is what?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>What is the best perspective that you had of the car?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>Can you describe the best look of this car, what did you see?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this context, the meaning of the word ‘view’ is clear. Therefore, there is no misinterpretation, and none of the interpreters needed clarification. However, again, this lexical item is unable to be transferred as is. The way it is expressed in each language involved the element ‘to see’ (as in eyesight), and the best image one can see.

5.5.3 ‘Try to develop a mental picture as thoroughly as possible’. This seemingly innocuous term in English is used and understood by most laypeople. Thus, it is surprising to find that the transfer of the term was not straightforward. In Table 19, all eight back-translations display that—in all languages except Spanish—the concept needs to be separated into two components: (i) in your head, mind or memory and (ii) to construct a picture, image or view (as in eyesight) of the robber. It is also interesting to
note that, in the Cantonese and Indonesian versions, the ‘face’ of the robber was singled out in the interpreted version, instead of the whole image of the robber.

Table 19

*Back-translation into English of INTV1 Partial Turn 23*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Back-translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>Try <em>in your mind</em> to <em>form</em> as much as you can <em>a picture</em> about this man.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td>Try to, <em>in your head</em>, <em>recall</em> that <em>person’s situation</em>, <em>the person’s face</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>Try to <em>concentrate an image</em> in your <em>memory</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>Try to <em>imagine the robber’s face</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>Try to <em>figure the man</em> who slowly turned towards you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td><em>In your mind, form a picture</em> of that time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Try to <em>make a mental image</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>Now, <em>develop this kind of view in your head</em>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The researcher is able to confirm for the Mandarin version (as this is the researcher’s language combination) that a literal translation into Mandarin of the term ‘mental’ ‘picture’ is possible: ‘心理’ ‘圖像’ (back-translation into English: 心理 = psychological + 圖像 = image). However, most Mandarin-speaking laypeople would probably be unsure about the meaning of such a term, as it is rarely used in everyday language. Rather, it is primarily only used in psychology as a direct translation (or it can be simplified to 心像—a short form of the compound term, using the first character from 心理, meaning ‘heart’, and the last character for 圖像, meaning ‘image’). This also explains the way the Mandarin interpreter opted for meaning-based translation, rather than a literal approach, which may cause confusion.

**5.5.4 ‘Focus in’ on someone or something.** In INTV1 and INTV2, there are four and one occasions, respectively, where the PI-Eng asks the EW-LOTE to ‘focus in’
on a specific area of the target being described by the EW-LOTE in order to elicit further detailed description. Table 22 lists the turns in which the expression features are listed.

Table 20

**PI-Eng’s Instructions to ‘Focus in’ on Someone or Something**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>INTV1</th>
<th>INTV2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Turn 23: …Try to focus in on just this one robber, the one who was yelling at you…</td>
<td>Turn 78: …You see his face and chest. Try to focus in on that picture. Take your time and develop that image. [pause] Tell me whatever you can.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Turn 27: …Keep that image in mind. Try to focus in around his eyes. Tell me whatever you can about his eyes, eyebrows, or the upper part of his face.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Turn 85: …Just focus in on this area, from the top of his shirt to his chin. [pause] Try to describe in detail what you see.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Turn 91: Try to concentrate on his right arm as he was holding the gun. Just focus in on his arm. [pause] Tell me whatever you can about his right arm.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All interpreters rendered the term on all five occasions (100%) as ‘focus on someone or something’—that is, to concentrate on someone or something. As the Mandarin and Cantonese interpreters in INTV1 turn 91 stated literally: ‘just focus/concentrate your attention/mental energy on his right arm’ (the idiomatic manner of expression in the languages—there must be an object for the word ‘focus’ or ‘concentrate’).

The original intention of this instruction is for the interviewee—after recalling in the mind the requested image as a whole—to cognitively bring a specific area of interest closer, with a resulting narrower field and enlarged partial image in the mind in the hope of eliciting further details about the particular area of interest. A camera ‘focusing in’ on
a particular object to get a close-up is a good analogy for what the instruction intends to achieve. Interpreting this instruction as a request to the EW-LOTE to ‘focus on’ someone or something means something different—it means to focus or concentrate one’s attention or mental energy on someone or something. Of course, this rendition does not completely nullify the intended meaning in these circumstances; however, it does take a different slant of meaning.

5.5.5 ‘Concentrate on the sound of his voice’. When a police interviewer instructs the interviewee to recall a past event, not only is a visual image being requested, but sometimes also an auditory image. This type of request is featured in INTV1 by the PI-Eng in turn 43. Table 21 presents this request and the eight LOTE versions rendered by the interpreters.

Table 21

Back-translation into English of INTV1 Partial Turn 43

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Back-translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>Concentrate on his sound, what did his sound sound like?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td>We now try to recall his voice, and the sentences he said.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>I want you to concentrate on his voice and the tone of his voice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Translator’s note: Greek has different words for ‘voice’ and the ‘tone of voice’ for sound.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>Please concentrate on what the voice is like and the sounds are like.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>Concentrate on his voice and the sound of his words.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td>Concentrate on his voice, and the voice of his words.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Translator’s note: in Mandarin, ‘voice’ and ‘sound’ are the same word.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Focus on the sound of his voice, how was his voice?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>Let’s just concentrate on that, what kind of voice did he make and what did he say?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Translator’s note: in Turkish, ‘voice’ and ‘sound’ are the same word. By adding ‘tone’ to ‘voice’, voice and sound can be distinguished.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As can be seen, some languages, such as English, have different lexical items for ‘voice’ (produced by human) and ‘sound’ (vibrations that travel through the air—something one hears), while others, such as Arabic, Cantonese, Chinese and Turkish, use one word that encompasses both concepts. The way to distinguish one from another in these languages is by the context or modifier in front. The lack of equivalence results in a circumlocutory expression used by the Cantonese interpreter, referring to the ‘sentences he said’ for the ‘sound’ of the robber’s voice, and the Mandarin interpreter’s use of the same word in both places, which sounds somewhat odd and repetitive. The Turkish rendition is similar to the Cantonese version. As suggested by the Turkish translator, by saying ‘the tone of his voice’ or, in the case of Chinese and Cantonese, by stating it more idiomatically as ‘the tone of what he speaks’, this issue of lack of equivalence can be resolved. However, as can be seen in the data, this alternative is not necessarily easy to develop quickly and without prior knowledge of this particular way of asking an important CI question.

5.5.6 Negative phrasing. CI advocates that interviewers should avoid using negative phrasing, as it suggests a negative response, which is often received from the interviewee (Fisher & Geiselman, 1992; Milne, 2004; Milne & Bull, 1999, p. 24). Table 22 presents INTV1 turn 67 and INTV2 turn 82, which feature such an error in CI questioning by the PI-Eng. This table also presents the resulting interpreted versions.
Table 22

Back-translation into English of INTV1 Turn 67 and INTV2 Turn 82

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>INTV1 Turn 67</th>
<th>Back-translation</th>
<th>Unchanged</th>
<th>Changed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>You don’t know what brand they [the sneakers the robber wore] were, do you?</td>
<td>Do you know its brand?</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td>Do you notice the brand?</td>
<td>Do you remember what brand they were?</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>The brand, did you know?</td>
<td>Did you notice the brand?</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>You don’t know what brand were them?</td>
<td>Do you notice the brand?</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>You don’t know their brand, do you know?</td>
<td>Did you notice the brand?</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td>I wonder what brand, do you know?</td>
<td>Can’t you remember if he had a beard?</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Researcher’s note: although this rendition has changed from the original utterance, it reflects the negative construction. Therefore, it is categorised as ‘unchanged’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>INTV2 Turn 82</th>
<th>Back-translation</th>
<th>Unchanged</th>
<th>Changed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>You don’t remember if he had a beard?</td>
<td>Can’t you remember if he had a beard?</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td>You don’t remember if he had a beard or not?</td>
<td>You don’t remember if he had a beard or not?</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>Do you remember if he had a beard?</td>
<td>Don’t you remember if he had a beard?</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>You don’t remember if he had a beard?</td>
<td>you don’t remember if he had a beard?</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>You don’t remember if he had a beard?</td>
<td>Do you remember or not if he had a beard?</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td>Did you remember or not if he had a beard?</td>
<td>Did he have a beard?</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Did he have a beard?</td>
<td>Did he have a beard?</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>Did he have a beard or anything, are you able to remember?</td>
<td>Did he have a beard or anything, are you able to remember?</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen in the above table, in the first instance of turn 67 in INTV1, six of eight interpreters change the negative phrasing into positive, whereas, in the second example, half of the interpreters change the sentence construction from negative to positive. Thus, in a total of 16 occasions (eight languages with two examples), in only six occasions (approximately 38%), the original negative phrasing is rendered into the TL in negative phrasing as well. The remaining occasions are all inadvertently changed.
by the interpreters to the opposite, indicating the likelihood of a preference for a more natural expression in most language versions. In other words, when the PI-Eng use the less preferred negative wording, it was likely (62%) that the interpreter would unknowingly reverse it in the TL version. This may be the only finding in this study that the interpreter’s action actually helps the CI interviewer.

Another similar example, yet not completely the same, was found in INTV1 turn 29, where the PI-Eng asked the EW-LOTE: ‘Was he [the robber] wearing glasses or not?’. Four of the eight interpreted versions (50%) dropped the ‘or not’ and simply rendered it as ‘Was he wearing glasses?’, again indicating the more preferred and/or natural expression in the TL.

5.5.7 Neutral wording in questions. Other specialised questioning strategies that are promoted under the CI protocol include using neutrally worded questions in order to avoid leading/misleading the interviewee (Fisher & Geiselman, 1992; Milne, 2004; Milne & Bull, 1999, p. 26). Table 23 shows INTV1 turn 67 and INTV2 turn 82 in which the PI-Eng employed this strategy, and presents the resulting interpreted versions.

Table 23

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Back-translation</th>
<th>Unchanged</th>
<th>Changed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>Can you describe how much was the length of his hair?</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td>Can you describe how long is his hair?</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>Can you tell me the length of his hair</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>The length, how long?</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>Can you describe the length of his hair</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td>Can you describe the length of his hair</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Can you describe the length of hair, how long did he have?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As can be seen in the table above, in the case of the correct neutral wording used in the question ‘Can you describe the length of his hair?’, five interpreted versions retain this preferred neutral wording, and three (almost 40%) change it to the less preferred expression of ‘how long’ (is the hair). In the other two examples, the less preferred, more leading questions are asked to the EW-LOTE: ‘How dark was his skin?’ and ‘Do you know about how heavy he was?’. In the former example, only the Greek interpreter changed the question to a completely closed-question format: ‘So was he brunette?’. In the case of the latter example, more than half of the interpreters (five

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Back-translation</th>
<th>Unchanged</th>
<th>Changed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>How much was his skin dark?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td>How deep was his skin colour?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>So was he brunette?</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>His skin, how dark?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>How dark was his skin?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td>How dark was his skin?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>How dark was his, his complexion?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>You said … about the leather [as for animal skin] … skin [self repair, as for human skin] was bit dark, how dark was it?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
versus three) changed the question to various renditions of similar meaning, but
different forms. Thus, in a total of 16 (eight languages with two sample turns) occasions,
on six occasions, the renditions change the question to a different format (38%). In
other words, in close to 60% of chances, the less preferred question is translated into the
TL.

Additionally, in investigative interviewing, question types, e.g. information-
seeking (Wh-questions) vs. confirmation-seeking (yes-no polar questions), are a critical
aspect in relation to the manifestation of levels of coerciveness and implications for
speculation on the part of the interviewee (Griffiths & Milne, 2006; Gudjonsson, 2003,
2012; Haworth, 2006; Lamb, Mershkowitz, Orbach, & Esplin, 2008). The interlingual
transfer of the three questions discussed in Table 23, all of which information seeking,
encounter little problem from English into all the LOTEs. In each of the cases there is
one rendition where the question type was changed from linguistic point of view:

- ‘Can you describe the length of his hair?’ becomes ‘The length, how long?’
  rendered by the Indonesian interpreter.

- ‘How dark was his skin?’ becomes ‘So was he brunette?’ rendered by the Greek
  interpreter.

- ‘Do you know about how heavy he was?’ becomes ‘How was, was he fat?’ rendered
  by the Spanish interpreter.

In the first instance the change does not alter the information-seeking nature of
the original question, whereas the latter two instances the questions are changed from
information-seeking to confirmation-seeking.

5.5.8 Instructions on CP. The CI protocol believes that asking the interviewee
to repeat the same memory search strategy is unlikely to yield new information (Milne,
2004; Milne & Bull, 1999). Therefore, additional search strategies are employed, such
as CP (putting oneself in another person’s position and describing things from that person’s perspective) and RO (describing events using reverse temporal order from the most recent to the earliest). Arguably, these two strategies under CI are less straightforward than RE and CR. This probably explains why Gudjonsson (1992) reported the CP technique to be problematic when CI was first introduced. However, Milne and Bull (1999, p. 37) argued that, if the strategy is properly administered, there should be no reason the information elicited is unreliable. The CP strategy is featured in INTV1 turn 113. The PI-Eng stated:

[Name], I’d like you to try to put yourself into the role of the leader [of the two robbers] and think about what happened from his perspective. That is, try to imagine what he was thinking about and how he must have thought about the robbery. I realise that is a difficult task to do, so try to concentrate. Don’t make up anything. Tell me only those things you actually saw, but take the robber’s perspective. (Fisher & Geiselman, 1992, p. 172)

Undoubtedly, when receiving instructions such as this for the first time, a layperson may consider this an unusual request. This is why it is important for the police interviewer to remind the interviewee that this is not an ‘invitation to fabricate an answer’ (Fisher & Geiselman, 1992, p. 111), and to state explicitly that the interviewee should only report the details of the event that they actually witnessed (Milne, 2004; Milne & Bull, 1999).

Of the eight participant interpreters, the Indonesian and Mandarin interpreters needed to ask for clarification at the same point at the end of the segment: ‘[Name], I’d like you to try to put yourself into the role of the leader [of the two robbers] and think about what happened from his perspective’. The PI-Eng explained: ‘I want her [EW-LOTE] to become the leader, pretend she’s the leader, and look at what happened as if
she was him [the leader of the robbers]’. After this explanation, both were able to render correctly. The other six interpreters were able to render correctly without clarification.

5.6 Summary

This chapter has presented the research findings from the experiments conducted using two bilingual CI scripts that incorporate all the CI features and techniques. The role players of the English-speaking police interviewer and LOTE-speaking interviewee acted out the scripts in eight language versions, each employing a currently practising professional interpreter to perform interpreting. These interpreters had no knowledge of the interviewing content (as in real-life practice in Australia) and no former training in CI (which is not available for interpreters in Australia). This exploratory study aims to identify areas where the bilingual versions of CI deviated from the monolingual English version from which they are adapted, particularly regarding how the PI-Eng’s CI instructions are conveyed into the LOTEs, and how the EW-LOTE’s free-form narratives are managed by the interpreters.

This chapter first reported on the interlingual cooperation and accommodation between the interpreter and two primary speakers observed in the data. This manifested in the primary speakers’ acquiescence to the interpreter’s preference and, sometimes, the imposition of semi-consecutive interpreting mode by either. This allowed them to take over the floor to interpret using the normal intra-turn pauses, or create longer pauses to signal the offer of floor at the end of each self-paced segmentation within a longer turn.

The chapter then examined segmentation in three chosen long turns uttered by the PI-Eng and EW-LOTE in each of INTV1 and INTV2. It is found that the participant interpreters were more comfortable dealing with longer segments from English into LOTE than the other direction, averaging 19.2 words, as opposed to 16.2 words. When
examining the interpreters’ eye gaze patterns in these chosen long turn samples spoken by the PI-Eng and EW-LOTE, the interpreters were slightly more likely (50% versus 46%) to shift their gaze back to the PI-Eng when they finished interpreting a segment to the EW-LOTE. This was done to signal the return of the floor to the PI-Eng in the unfinished turn. In contrast, when the EW-LOTE spoke in long turns, on average, the interpreters demonstrated slightly higher inclination to keep gazing at the PI-Eng (30% versus 26% kept gazing at the EW-LOTE when interpreting for the PI-Eng).

The police interviewer inserting longer pauses just before a major memory recall is an important strategy to allow the interviewee to focus his or her attention for the purpose of higher quality recall. The nature of interpreting—particularly semi-consecutive interpreting—is such that pauses afforded by primary speakers are enthusiastically assumed by interpreters to be a signal of the end of a self-paced segment. As high as 95% of the deliberately extended pauses inserted by the PI-Eng are regarded indiscriminately as inter-segment pauses, resulting in their disappearance in the interpreted CI. The remaining 5%, although not assumed by the interpreters to be inter-segment pauses, are completely absent in the interpreted versions. This result in 100% disappearance of these strategic pauses inserted by the PI-Eng.

Although the semi-consecutive mode of interpreting is preferred and adopted by all participant interpreters (except the Spanish interpreter, who opted for exceptionally long segments), the Cantonese and Indonesian interpreters are found to render certain short utterances using the simultaneous mode. This switching of interpreting mode highlights the possibility of adopting the simultaneous interpreting mode in certain circumstances in the CI.

Lastly, this chapter reports on a number of lexical items—such as ‘view’, ‘mental picture’, and ‘sound’ versus ‘voice’—that are frequently used in the PI-Eng’s
CI questions, highlighting the debate about interlingual translatability and formal equivalence. It is found that the less preferred negative phrasing in CI is more likely (68%) to be inadvertently corrected by interpreters. However, using the recommended neutral wording has a 40% risk of being interpreted into the less preferred and more leading wording. In the cases of the PI-Eng using the more leading and less preferred questioning format—such as ‘how heavy’ and ‘how dark’ the person of interest was—more likely than not (close to 60%), the question is translated into the TL unchanged.

Based on the findings reported in this chapter, the next chapter uses selected theories and practice to analyse the data and discuss the implications for interpreting practice in the CI context.
Chapter 6: Implications of Research Findings for Interpreting Practice

Chapter 5 reports on the findings of this study, while this chapter will move on to detail how each finding relates to interpreting practice in order to address Research Question 2 (see Section 1.3):

How do the manifestations of the interpreter-assisted bilingual CI interviews relate to interpreting practice?

When analysing the data in the discussions in this chapter, wherever appropriate, the researcher draws on the theoretical frameworks introduced in Section 4.2.

6.1 Invocation of Semi-consecutive Interpreting Mode

6.1.1 Two independent turn-taking dyads. The turn-taking pattern between the PI-Eng and EW-LOTE, as the primary speakers in the bilingual CI setting, becomes somewhat complicated and indirect, compared to a monolingual communicative event. This is displayed in Diagram 5 in Section 5.1.1 as interaction (3) at the bottom of the triangle in the triadic setup. Diagram 6 below unpacks the ‘routed’ (Heydon & Lai, 2013; also see Section 3.4.2) communication using a different visual representation to illustrate how this interpreter-assisted communication adds two independent turn-taking dyads to the main communicative event.
Diagram 6. Monolingual talk versus bilingual talk.

Line (1) in Diagram 6 represents unmediated talk between the speakers using the same language—interaction (3) in Diagram 5—with questions and answers between the primary speakers manifesting as direct lineal interactions. In the context of this research, line (1) represents the monolingual CI, from which the research tool was derived. In relation to the research data featuring bilingual CI, the questions by the PI-Eng and answers from the EW-LOTE reported in Section 5.1.1 became segmented, as illustrated by lines (2) and (2*) in Diagram 6. Along the timeline indicated at the top of Diagram 6, the PI-Eng’s Q1 was rendered in the sequence of: Q1.1 (Eng) > Q1.1* (LOTE) > Q1.2 (Eng) > Q1.2* (LOTE) > Q1.3 (Eng) > Q1.3* (LOTE). Note that, because of the segmented manner and insertion of the LOTE segments produced by the interpreter, completing this sequence of turn taking between the PI-Eng and interpreter takes longer than the unmediated Q1 in line (1). This turn-taking dyad between the PI-Eng and interpreter corresponds to interaction (1) on the left side of the triangle in Diagram 5. Similarly, once the EW-LOTE received Q1 (= Q1.1 + Q1.2 + Q1.3) rendered by the interpreter as Q1.1* + Q1.2* + Q1.3*, the answer A1 is rendered in the sequence of: A1.1 (LOTE) > A1.1* (Eng) > A1.2 (LOTE) > A1.2* (Eng) > A1.3 (LOTE) > A1.3*
This turn-taking dyad between the EW-LOTE and interpreter corresponds to interaction (2) on the right side of the triangle in Diagram 5.

Line (2) and (2*) in Diagram 6 above provide a visualisation of semi-consecutive interpreting. It should be appropriate to acknowledge that semi-consecutive interpreting is not exclusive to police interpreting, and, as a matter of fact, it is probably the most prevalent mode of interpreting used by community interpreters in both dialogic and monologic communicative events. However little investigation, if at all, has been carried out to understand how the segmentation mechanism works—either autonomously done by the primary speakers or as a result of interpreters’ request. The only work the researcher is aware of is Dutch psychotherapist Bot’s 2005 publication Dialogue Interpreting in Mental Health, in which she analyses six therapeutic meetings each between a Dutch-speaking psychotherapist and a migrant patient communicating through an interpreter. However the angle Bot took focuses more on analysing the various levels of interactional role taken by all the three participants of the talk in relation to their turn-by-turn management, and the accuracy of the interpreters’ renditions in relation to their contribution to subsequent communication problems—precisely the two areas that the current research explicitly does not pursue (refer Section 4.1).

Roy (2000) observes that ‘turns taken by the interpreter were shown to be a mixture of the interpreter’s decisions as well as the primary speakers’ tacit agreement to accept those decisions’ (p. 63). Baraldi and Gavioli (2012) contend that ‘coordination is a fundamental characteristic of interaction in general and of interpreter-assisted interaction in particular’ (p. 1). These scholars’ observations are consistent with the finding reported in Section 5.1.1 in the sense that the interpreters demonstrated at least
four ways of invoking a semi-consecutive interpreting mode that needed to be facilitated by the primary speakers:

1. explicitly asking the primary speaker/s to segment their turns (implemented by the Mandarin interpreter in the EW-Man’s turn 8 and the Arabic interpreter in the PI-Eng’s turn 15; see Tables 4 and 6)

2. explicitly asking the primary speaker to repeat a segment in a turn to signal the limitation of their cognitive capacity (implemented by the Turkish interpreter in the EW-Tur’s turn 20; see Table 7)

3. explicitly using nonverbal means (such as holding up the palm towards the primary speaker) to signal the request for a pause (implemented by the Arabic, Greek and Spanish interpreters in the EW-LOTEs’ turn 20; see Table 7)

4. using the natural intra-turn pauses between utterances by the primary speakers to enter the unfinished turn and start interpreting, and by so doing to signal the limitation of the interpreter’s cognitive capacity or their preference for smaller segments (implemented by all interpreters).

It is worth pointing out that for methods 1 and 2 analysed above, the interpreter must switch footing from what Goffman (1981) defines as ‘animator’ to ‘author’ and ‘principal’ in order to achieve them. The norm for interpreters in Australian contexts of using first person when interpreting corresponds to the role of a sounding box, i.e. the animator, who do not hold the authorship of the utterances s/he produces, whereas the author, according to Goffman (1981), is the individual who composes the utterances, and the principal is the individual who are socially responsible for what is said. A note should be added here about option four as a variant form of an interpreter’s intervention measure. The Turkish interpreter in turn 20 (see Table 7) is observed to start
interpreting at the end of Segment 6 (16 words) when the EW-Tur moved on to the next utterance, resulting in momentary overlapped talk. The mechanism by which the Turkish interpreter assumed the floor is option four—anticipating an intra-turn pause coming up at the end of the segment. As shown in the Turkish data, in real life, interpreters can be caught in this misalignment of intra-turn pauses, when they might catch the tail end of the very short pause, yet not quickly enough in the very short pause before the primary speaker has moved on to the next utterance (particularly when the previous utterances are not unduly long). The resulting effect of the momentary overlapping talk is that one of the producers of the overlapped talk has to cede the floor (in this case, the EW-Tur), so the other person continues the talk (in this case, the Turkish interpreter). The decision by the EW-Tur to cede the floor and for the Turkish interpreter to accept it reinforces the facilitation of the semi-consecutive interpreting that was already occurring prior to this episode of overlapped talk. In addition, the decision seems to indicate the notion of ‘achieving the greater good’, as the researcher contended in paragraph four under Section 5.1.

In reference to interpreter-mediated talk, Roy (2000) states that:

[I]nterpreters are an integral part of the exchange process. Speakers cannot know possible transition moments in other languages, nor can they know what pauses are or how turns end. They participate only in their own language. Thus, two turn-taking systems are operating independently of each other while yet another system, a discourse exchange system, is controlled by an interpreter. (p. 99)

Roy’s assertion concurs with Diagram 6 in the sense that the two primary speakers are no longer able to ask a question and receive an answer directly from each other, as depicted by the blue-arrow interaction illustrated in line (1). Instead, only the Q1.1* + Q1.2* + Q1.3* sequence produced by the interpreter is meaningful to the EW-LOTE
(represented by the blue elbow arrow Q) and only the A1.1* + A1.2* + A1.3* sequence produced by the interpreter is meaningful to the PI-Eng (represented by the blue elbow arrow A). This makes these two sequences independent of each other, thereby rendering the interaction indirect, and necessarily taking a longer time.

By viewing Diagram 6 above in conjunction with Diagram 4 in Section 3.4.2, it can be said that the interpreter depicted in Diagram 4 at the top of the triangle is a pivot responsible for routing the communication between the two speakers, who do not share the same language. Note that the two dotted arrows passing through the interpreter in Diagram 4 have no intersections, as opposed to monolingual communication at the bottom of the triangle, represented by a bidirectional arrow with solid line denoting direct interaction (as is line [1] in Diagram 6).

6.1.2 Interpreter-initiated interruptions. Section 3.4.2 gives a definition of the mode of consecutive interpreting, based on international literature in the interpreting field. This mode of interpreting is called ‘consecutive’ or, less frequently, ‘sequential’ interpreting (Böser, 2013, pp. 120, 131) because the interpreted utterances are only produced when the primary speaker stops talking—as opposed to simultaneous interpreting, which is produced at (almost) the same time as the primary speaker is talking. When a turn is segmented by the primary speaker and interpreted segment by segment in a turn, the interpreting is referred to as ‘semi-consecutive’, ‘discontinuous’ or ‘short consecutive’ interpreting (De Groot, 1997; Mason, 2005, p. 48). Most scholars view this notion of segmented turns from the perspective of TCU—or, in Mason’s (2008) term, ‘linguistic elements … [including] content words … as well as extralinguistic features, such as speech disfluencies, and pragmatic markers’ (p. 19). Only Böser (2013) examines segmentation in turns by measuring each segment’s length of time (in the total time length of the whole turn). Given that each primary speaker’s
talking speed invariably differs, this methodology seems less able to indicate how much linguistic content is covered in a segment, unless transcripts are presented. Regardless, it is clear that segmentation in a complete turn—either by content or time—is the key concept here.

No previous scholars have explicitly defined the agency of segmentation in the primary speakers. Upon further inspection of the literature on this topic, it appears that there is tacit assumption among scholars that the terms ‘semi-consecutive’, ‘discontinuous’ or ‘short consecutive’ interpreting only refer to talks where speakers exercise agency to self-regulate the segments in their turns. This is presumably either voluntarily or as a result of the prompting by the interpreter—either explicitly or implicitly via the four options noted in Section 6.1.1. However, if the interpreter verbalises a request for segmented turns (as in option one); requests repetition of a segment (option two); or uses nonverbal means, such as hand gestures, to signal the need for the primary speaker to pause (option three), scholars seem to categorise these acts as ‘interruption’. Only option four is not explicitly regarded as ‘interruption’. In option four, interpreters take advantage of the natural intra-turn pauses between utterances and make an ‘uninvited’ entry to the unfinished turn, thereby signalling their possible limited cognitive capacity and preference for smaller segments. By using the term ‘interruption’, a negative connotation is attached to such courses of action taken by interpreters. The invocation of semi-consecutive interpreting mode is not necessarily accepted or preferred by scholars, and is certainly not well regarded if achieved by using the first three options. Even though there is virtually no literature exploring the detailed workings of option four, the fact that it results in semi-consecutive interpreting renders the end product undesirable for some due to the truncating of a supposedly intact TCU.
Along similar lines to the above analysis, Bot’s (2005) observation of the turn-taking patterns and characteristics of interpreter-assisted medical interviews is relevant:

1. [Interpreter-mediated talk] is not like monolingual three-party talk, as the interpreter’s role is different from that of the other two participants.
2. There is unequal access to the talk in the sense that there is always one person [in the three-cornered situation] who does not understand what the other people are saying.
3. The turn follows a specific pattern and the interpreter generally has every second turn.
4. The interpreter’s turns are not independent ones but linked to those of the primary speakers.
5. The interpreter’s needs and interests concerning turn taking are different from those of the primary speakers. For example the interpreter benefits from shorter turns from the primary speakers in terms of their interpreting performance, whereas this may not be the primary speakers’ main concern.

(p. 112)

Bot’s (2005) fifth point is of particular relevance to the current discussion. Interpreters benefit from shorter turns because they entail less incoming information and lower possibility of information overload. However, it is the primary speakers’ decision whether they accept such constraints to modify the way they talk—by either formulating shorter turns or autonomously segmenting their talk within a turn. If the primary speakers disregard these constraints, the communication outcome is more likely to suffer because the interpreter will be less able to perform at satisfactory levels due to possible information overload when longer turns are uttered. The next section explains the cooperation and accommodation afforded in the triadic interpreter-assisted
communication, if the primary speakers consent—either explicitly or implicitly—to a modified way of talking.

6.1.3 **Intralingual versus interlingual cooperation and accommodation.**

During interpreted discourse in real-life public service contexts, whether in dialogue or monologue settings (see the definitions in Section 3.4.2), the segmentation in the primary speakers’ turns can be self-imposed or interpreter-imposed, as discussed in Section 5.1.1. Primary speakers’ self-imposed pauses in a turn (to facilitate semi-consecutive interpreting) can be completely autonomous without prompting (due to previous experience engaging in interpreter-mediated talk, for example). It can also be a result of interpreter-imposed interruptions proper—options one to three analysed in Section 6.1.1. Regardless of whether it is interpreter-initiated ‘interruptions proper’ or interpreter-imposed entry to unfinished turns, interpreters usually only have to do so a small number of times, or implement a combination of the four options, for the primary speakers to quickly ‘get the message’ and start self-segmenting their turns without further prompts from the interpreter. Further, as undertaken by the Mandarin interpreter in Turn 8, where she interrupted the EW-Man at 24 words into the 30-word turn to ask if EW-Man could pause every now and then, from then on, so she could provide the interpretation for the PI-Eng, and she explained this verbal exchange between herself and the EW-Man to the PI-Eng (see Table 4). Proper interpreting protocol requires interpreters to inform the other primary speaker who does not understand these ‘side talks’, so that everyone knows what is happening. For the rest of INTV1-Man, the Mandarin interpreter did not need to undertake any intervention measures with the PI-Eng, and needed to remind the EW-Man only once more (by holding her hand up at Turn 20 in INTV1—see segment six in Table 7), thereby securing the conditions suitable to perform her work in the semi-consecutive mode.
Primary speakers explicitly (in response to the interpreter’s verbalised request) or implicitly (ceding the floor when the interpreter takes over without invitation in a turn) agreeing to facilitate the semi-consecutive mode for the interpreter in a bilingual setting can be seen as a kind of cooperation and accommodation (in layman’s terms) between the interpreter and primary speakers to achieve successful communication. The researcher adds that, in monolingual communication, ‘cooperation’ and ‘accommodation’ have been theorised by Grice (1975) (see Section 4.2.3) and Giles (1973, 1977, 1980) (see Section 4.2.4) respectively, who highlight specific phenomena in communication that have been described, established and generally accepted. Conversational ‘cooperation’ indicates logical and rational ways people exchange pragmatic meaning in conversation. Communication ‘accommodation’ indicates the linguistic and non-linguistic adjustments people make when talking with others in order to be perceived as a member of the in-group. The following analysis seeks to investigate the cooperation and accommodation—as opposed to Grice’s ‘cooperation’ and Giles’s ‘accommodation’—between the interpreter and primary speakers in the bilingual setting against monolingual settings. However, where appropriate, the researcher also comments on the applicability of the established ‘cooperation’ and ‘accommodation’ theories to the study.

6.1.3.1 Cooperation. As introduced in Section 4.2.3, Grice (1975) contends that, in monolingual communication, interlocutors orient to ‘make … conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk-exchange’ (p. 5). By following a set of what Grice (1975) calls ‘cooperative principles’, people innately determine conversational implicatures and successfully exchange information, thereby achieving the aim of the communicative
event. In terms of interpreter-assisted communication, Napier (2007) states that the
Gricean principle should still be adhered to between the primary speakers:

[i]f the interaction is mediated by an interpreter, it can be assumed that if present
in such conversations, interpreters must also adhere to the cooperative principle.
In making interpretation choices in each language direction, the interpreter must
also conform to the maxims of quantity, relevance, manner and quality [if and
where manifested in the original utterances] to ensure the successful outcome
of the interpreted event. (p. 411)

The researcher agrees with Napier’s view; however, the second part of the
statement is unclear—hence the insertion of the researcher’s clarification in square
brackets. In other words, interpreters should faithfully transfer the conversational
‘cooperation’ manifested in the primary speakers’ utterances. However, because the
interpreter is not undertaking a conversation with either primary speaker, there is no
such ‘cooperation’ to talk about between the interpreter and each of the primary
speakers. It can be said that the interpreter is the conveyor of ‘cooperation’ for the
primary speakers. At this point, it is important to remember that Gricean ‘cooperation’
relates to conversational content, rather than the relationship between participants
(Tannen, 2005, p. 20). However, this study is interested in the attitudinal cooperation
between the PI-Eng and EW-LOTE, manifested in their interactional linguistic
behaviours between each other, and between them and the participant interpreter.

In the research instrument INTV1 and INTV2, there are a number of places in
which attitudinal willingness to cooperate was demonstrated between the PI-Eng and
EW-LOTE to achieve the shared aim of the interaction—eliciting certain pieces of
information for the investigation of the case at hand. For example, in INTV1, the
following exchange show a clear sign of co-constructing the image of the second robber
witnessed by the EW-LOTE, with the PI-Eng using himself as a reference in the primary reality to help the EW-LOTE’s recollection of the second robber’s height from the secondary reality:

119   Police: OK, let’s go to the other robber. Try to describe him.
120   LOTE: He was a bit older, maybe around 30. He seemed more refined.
121   Police: About how tall was he compared to me? Was he taller, shorter, or about the same height?
122   LOTE: Just about your height, maybe 2, 3 cm shorter.
123   Police: I’m 175 cm. So how tall would you say he was?
124   LOTE: About 170 cm or so.

A similar example from INVT2 shows a similar kind of co-construction of the description of the perpetrator’s car (from a secondary reality, using props in primary reality), again manifesting cooperation between both primary speakers in order to achieve more precision in the meaning of the topic under discussion:

55   LOTE: Well, it was blue. It looked pretty new, maybe two or three years old. I don’t know what kind of car it was. I just know my own car is a Toyota. That’s it.
56   Police: You said it looked new. What about it made it look new?
57   LOTE: It was pretty shiny and didn’t have any scratches in it.
58   Police: You said it was blue. Can you tell me what shade of blue it was?
Here are some patches of blue [takes out book of colour patches]. Which of these matches closest with the colour of the car?
59   LOTE: This one here.
60   Police: Was it exactly like this patch or a little different?
61   LOTE: It was a little darker, I think, and maybe a bit greener.
However, when interviewing an attitudinally unwilling person—such as convicted British serial killer Dr Harold Shipman—there is a completely different dynamic, as indicated in the following exchange (previously quoted in Section 2.1.3.3 Power asymmetry):

Police officer: can I put it directly to you doctor that you forged … you have produced … the letters and this will on your typewriter in the hope of benefitting from Mrs Grundy’s estate.

Dr Shipman: is that a question or a statement? (Haworth, 2006, pp. 750–751)

After establishing the overarching cooperative spirit between the primary speakers, the researcher then turns attention to their interaction with the interpreter. To achieve success in interpreted communication, Napier (2007) queried who should take control (the interpreter or primary speakers), whether one person should be in control, and whether it should be a process of negotiation or a process of cooperation.

Wadensjö’s (2004) comments seem to provide an answer:

[A] general feature of institutional encounters is that a professional party normally is in charge of them. That is, the representative of the institution is by definition in control of how topics are selected, of how much and how often clients/patients/suspects etc. normally are expected to talk, and how their contributions will be evaluated … In interpreter-mediated institutional interaction, the person in charge occasionally may have to lose some of this control. The interpreter—willingly or unwillingly—ends up taking a certain responsibility for the substance and the progression of talk. (p. 107)

Wadensjö’s (1998) views are consistent with her earlier observation of interpreted discourse as a communicative pas de trois, where the interpreter functions as a coordinator of talk, while cooperating with the primary speakers to co-construct
meaning in dialogic settings. This view is similar to that held by Pöchhacker (2004), who asserts that the primary speakers’ intentions and expectations in the communicative interaction will sometimes conflict. This forces the interpreter to take action as a ‘mediator’—not as a broker or conciliator in a negotiation, but as an ‘agent regulating the evolution of understanding’ (Pöchhacker, 2004, p. 59).

In a similar way, Napier (2007) asserted that it is widely accepted that interpreters cooperate with primary speakers to negotiate meaning in communication; thus, future academic enquiries should shift from considering whether it occurs to how the cooperation occurs in different contexts’ (p. 412). She gives the example of sign language interpreters’ use of visual feedback (such as head nods or facial expressions) from the deaf clients sitting in an audience (who are unable to sign directly back to the deaf interpreter, as in private three-cornered communication) in order to monitor audience comprehension of the interpretation. She also provides a case study of a team of two Auslan interpreters interpreting for a deaf speaker to a hearing audience, in which pausing, nodding, eye contact and hand waving were used by all three parties to monitor and coordinate the progression of the talk in Auslan, and the smooth delivery of English by the interpreters. Napier (2007) contends that ‘the key to a cooperative principle of interpretation is the establishment of communicative cues’ (p. 427). She proposed six ‘linguistic, communicative and attitudinal maxims’ (Napier, 2007, p. 427) for successful interpretation and to adhere to a cooperative principle of interpreting (in the context of sign language interpreting) as listed in Table 24 below.

Table 24

*Napier’s Cooperative Principle for Interpreted Communication*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maxim</th>
<th>Linguistic</th>
<th>Communicative</th>
<th>Attitudinal</th>
<th>Explanatory notes for the maxim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Trust</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>Mutual belief that the other parties will do their best to achieve the best outcome of the communication at hand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Preparation</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>Briefing meeting to establish frames for how the interpretation would occur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Negotiation</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>A process of proposing and explicitly agreeing on various cues that can be used to segment the talk to ensure a smooth delivery into the TL.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Eye contact</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eye contact creates feedback to the speaker, which enables the speaker to control the pacing of the talk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Turn taking</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>Maxims four and six facilitate orderly turn taking between the interpreter and speakers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Visual cues</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>Visual cues such as ‘hold’ gesture, thumbs up and nodding serve as indicators for the speaker to pace and segment the talk.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Napier did not indicate which of the three categories each maxim corresponds to, nor explain what each maxim entails (although they are relatively self-explanatory).

Thus, the current researcher proposes the above allocation (see the ticks in Table 24) to reflect the relevance each maxim bears to the three proposed categories, and provides explanatory notes to the maxims deducted from Napier’s case study. These maxims seem to be Napier’s answer to her own call to address how cooperation works in interpreter-assisted communication, instead of whether cooperation exists. There is no reason that these maxims cannot be applied to spoken languages, with slight modifications to reflect the differences between sign languages (as visual languages for non-hearing users) and spoken languages. Table 25 below describes how each maxim...
works generally for spoken languages and, more specifically, for the data in the current study, and suggests modifications to maxims four and six (in bold).

Table 25

*Napier’s Cooperative Principle Modified for Spoken Languages*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maxim</th>
<th>Explanatory notes for the maxim</th>
<th>How the maxim works in this study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Trust</td>
<td>Mutual belief that the other parties will do their best to achieve the best outcome of the communication at hand.</td>
<td>This maxim is in place because the scenarios involve a witness and victim of crime who are willingly providing information to police in order to solve the crime in which they are involved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Preparation</td>
<td>Briefing meeting to establish frames for how the interpretation would occur.</td>
<td>In current practice of community interpreting in Australia, there are usually no briefing meetings held by the professional for the benefit of the interpreter. Preparation—particularly in relation to the topic of the interpreting assignment—can only be ongoing (through accumulation of experience and self-reflection) and broad (through learning about a broad range of relevant topics). However, it possible at the start of an interpreting assignment for the interpreter to quickly exchange a few words with the institutional speaker to understand what the assignment is about and agree on the protocol of interpreting, thereby establishing the frames for the participants. This study emulated real-life assignments; hence, no information was provided to the participant interpreters other than that it was a police interview. Thus, this maxim cannot be said to be fully functional.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Negotiation</td>
<td>A process of proposing and explicitly agreeing on various cues that can be used to segment the talk to ensure smooth delivery into the TL.</td>
<td>Same as maxim two. This study emulated most real-life interpreting assignments, hence offering no chance of a pre-assignment briefing meeting. The negotiation of cues happens during the process of interpreting, and comprises explicit and implicit approaches adopted by the individual participant interpreters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Eye contact</td>
<td>Eye contact creates feedback to the speaker, which enables the speaker to control the pacing of the talk.</td>
<td>This maxim is the equivalent of using hearing in spoken languages to monitor the pace of communication. For example, when the primary speaker pauses, the interpreter may regard it as the boundary of the turn—the completion of TCU—and start interpreting. Additionally, eye gaze direction at the boundary of TUCs in spoken languages also serves as a means to regulate turn-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Orderly turn taking is crucial to successful interpreter-assisted communication. If the primary speaker talks for too long without ceding the floor to the interpreter so the interpretation can be rendered, it compromises the interpreting quality because errors such as omission may occur. If there is overlapped talk when the interpreter starts interpreting, while the primary speaker is still talking, one of the sides has to cede the floor for the other to address the overlap before orderly talk resumes.

Visual cues such as ‘hold’ gesture, thumbs up and nodding serve as indicators for the speaker to pace and segment the talk. In addition to all visual cues, spoken languages can use the prosodic features of utterances to decide whether they are the boundary of TCUs so decisions can be made, such as whether to take over the floor.

**6.1.3.2 Accommodation.** As introduced in Section 4.2.4, in monolingual settings, Giles (1977, 1980) observes that interlocutors adjust their linguistic, prosodic and nonverbal features (such as accent, intonation, speech rate, pauses, utterance length, smiling and gaze) to align with the other participants to the talk. This is undertaken in order to gain approval from the other participants—or be perceived as part of the ‘in-group’. This is referred to as ‘communication accommodation theory’ (Giles et al., 1987). In interpreter-assisted communication, where language barriers exist between interlocutors, it is unlikely that features such as accent, intonation or speech rate will be perceivable to the interlocutors who speak different languages. However, the researcher is able to observe other accommodative phenomena between the PI-Eng and EW-LOTE, and between the interpreter and the PI-Eng and EW-LOTE.

In this study—which features communication that has to be ‘routed’ (Heydon & Lai, 2013) through the interpreter—accommodative behaviours similar to Giles’s (1973) observation of intralingual convergence could be observed on two fronts in the interlingual situations. First, this occurs between primary speakers who did not
understand each other’s utterances—interaction (3) at the bottom of the triangle in Diagram 5. When one of the primary speakers self-regulate the turns and segments—either because of an overt request by the interpreter or through the interpreter’s autonomous floor taking using natural intra-turn pauses between utterances—the other primary speaker often notes their counterpart’s speech pattern and adopts the same self-regulation in their own TCUs. The point of difference here is that monolingual CAT observes convergent inclination of speakers’ pausal frequency and length of the pause (Jaffe & Feldstein, 1970), whereas the interpreter-assisted communication in this study manifests both primary speakers’ adoption of pausal speech pattern (segmented TUCs). It is also observed that, when either primary speaker exercised agency to self-segment, the pauses produced were always longer than the natural intra-turn ones not meant for this purpose.

Second, intralingual convergence occurs between individual primary speakers and the interpreter—interactions (1) and (2) in Diagram 5. Although the interpreter is not an equal participant in the communicative event—because the interpreter does not have agency in constructing the content of the communication—a different kind of accommodative behaviour on non-content elements of speech was observed between the PI-Eng and interpreter. For example, the PI-Eng adjusts his speech rate so that the utterances are understandable to the interpreter, inserted longer pauses to signal temporary ceding of floor for interpreting to occur, and produced utterances of manageable length to avoid interpreter’s cognitive overload. All these are also observed between the EW-LOTE and the interpreter. Sitting at the top of the triangle in Diagram 5, the interpreter can be described as the pivot of the communication—without them, the accommodative behaviour described under the previous point between the primary speakers (who do not understand each other) need not occur. In other words, the
manifestation of accommodation is premised on the individual speakers’
accommodative inclination of the interpreter—this part of accommodation has not been
accounted for by scholars following Giles’s CAT, although some intercultural or code-
switching scenarios have been explored (none mediated by interpreters). For example,
Giles et al. (1991, p. 12) report on Francophone customers in Montreal using fluent
English to ask for a French-speaking shop assistant, thereby showing convergence in
code, but attitudinally pointing to dissociation. White (1989) examines American–
Japanese interaction using English as medium, where Americans show convergence
behaviour by using significantly more backchannels when talking to Japanese, whereas
Japanese asymmetrically maintain the same backchannel pattern as when they
communicate with their own people. Booth-Butterfield and Jordan (1989) investigate
intra- and intercultural encounters of groups of African American and white American
female students. They find that African American students are more expressive among
themselves than were white American students, but become less expressive when
interacting with white Americans. Conversely, white Americans became more
communicatively expressive during inter-racial encounters, thereby indicating
convergence to outgroup norms.

It is worth remembering that ‘convergence on some features of language does
not mean that speakers will converge all available variables and levels’ (Giles et al.,
1991, p. 11). In terms of the finding reported under Section 5.1.1, in this study—which
features interpreter-assisted communication—the researcher can confirm that both
primary speakers’ adhered to pausal speech patterns for the greater good of the
communication. However, these patterns are premised on accommodative inclination of
a different kind to monolingual accommodative behaviours, found separately between
the interpreter and individual primary speaker.
6.1.3.3 Interlingual cooperation and accommodation. After examining intralingual ‘cooperation’ (Grice, 1975) and ‘accommodation’ (Giles, 1977, 1980; Giles et al., 1987) and analysing the applicable and non-applicable aspects of these theories for interlingual interpreter-assisted communication, this study now moves on to apply Prunč’s (1997, 2000) ‘model of translation culture’ to account for the findings reported in Section 5.1.

As introduced in Section 4.2.6, Prunč’s (1997, 2000) model treats interpreting as a socially situated activity that reflects a ‘variable set of norms, conventions, expectations and values underlying the behaviour of all the interactants’ (Prunč, 2000, p. 59; as translated and cited by Martinsen & Dubslaff, 2010, p. 128) in the communicative event. The current research is not the first to use Prunč’s model to explain the interlingual operations in the legal contexts. In reporting on interpreting undertaken in the less aggressive courtrooms of Denmark, Martinsen and Dubslaff (2010) observed that ‘institutional power exercised in a cooperative way more or less throughout the trial’ (p. 127). They contend that this observation can be adequately explained by ‘applying a model of a translation culture which is based on democratic principles in accordance with the value systems of Western democratic societies’ (Martinsen & Dubslaff, 2010, p. 127). Their colleague at Aarhus University, another interpreting researcher, Jacobsen (2008), explains that Danish courtrooms are less aggressive and adversarial than those in other countries because:

- ‘defendants are not obliged to answer questions and cannot be punished for giving false evidence’ (p. 129)
- lawyers must only ask questions ‘that will elicit clear and truthful responses’ (p. 129)
• ‘the prosecution must protect the interests of the accused’ in criminal cases
to satisfy the standard of ‘beyond reasonable doubt’ (Jacobsen, 2002, p. 39).

This essentially lays the foundation of what Martinsen and Dubslaff (2010) refer to as
the ‘cooperative’ spirit of Danish courts.

The researcher similarly finds the model applicable to explain the findings
reported in Section 5.1—the cooperation and accommodation of the primary speakers
shown to the interpreter to facilitate semi-consecutive interpreting. These observations
in the data also reflect the researcher’s experience in the industry. Once one of the
primary speakers self-regulates their utterances and renders their turns in a segmented
manner, the other primary speaker often observes and applies the same pattern of talk. It
may take a few self-segmented turns to mutually determine between the primary
speakers and interpreter what segment size is within a suitable range for the interpreter.
Different interpreters may have different cognitive capacities, and different average
segmented sizes to suit. For example, in Tables 6 and 7, showcasing how the
segmentation of turn 15 (159 words uttered by the PI-Eng) and turn 20 (258 words
equivalent in English uttered by the EW-LOTE) in INTV1, it can be seen that the
Cantonese and Indonesian interpreters prefer shorter segment lengths, both securing the
highest numbers of segments in these two turns. This was accepted tacitly by the
primary speakers, who cooperated to enable the mediated communication to occur
effectively. Applying Prunč’s (2000) ‘model of translation culture’, the data reported in
Section 5.1 can be mapped against the model’s three principles (or maxims), as
elaborated in the following table.
Table 26

Prunč’s ‘Model of Translation Culture’ for Interlingual Cooperation and Accommodation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maxim</th>
<th>Explanatory notes for the maxim</th>
<th>How the maxim works in this study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>Cooperativeness</strong> Functional division of labour: interpreters’ role covers linguistic and cultural expert (Prunč, 2000, as cited in Martinsen &amp; Dubslaff, 2010, p. 128).</td>
<td>PI-Eng and EW-LOTE were unable to communicate due to language barriers. The interpreter’s role in providing linguistic and cultural expertise complies with this maxim.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mutual respect for the legitimate interests of all participants in the production and reception of the translation (Prunč, 2000, as cited in Martinsen &amp; Dubslaff, 2010, p. 128).</td>
<td>The setting in this study manifests mutual respect for the interpreter’s legitimate interest to produce interpretation for PI-Eng and EW-LOTE, and for PI-Eng’s and EW-LOTE’s legitimate interest to receive interpretation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The willingness to negotiate viable conflict-settling conventions to ensure the balance of competing interests (Prunč, 2000, cited in Pöllabauer 2006, p. 153).</td>
<td>The conventions for PI-Eng and EW-LOTE are to produce unhindered TCUs. However, this contradicts the operations of the interpreter, which may compromise the interpreting quality due to cognitive saturation. The observed implicit or explicit negotiation of semi-consecutive interpreting mode is complies with this part of the maxim.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>Loyalty</strong> An ethical maxim derived from the principle of cooperativeness (Prunč, 1997, as cited in Martinsen &amp; Dubslaff, 2010, p. 128). ‘Loyalty is constituted by the interactants’ mutual commitment not to act against the other partners’ interests and to resolve conflicting communicative goals by way of consensus’ (Prunč, 2000, as cited in Martinsen &amp; Dubslaff, 2010, p. 128).</td>
<td>PI-Eng’s and EW-LOTE invest their trust in the interpreter to say everything they say in SL into TL for them. The Interpreter, therefore, returns their loyalty to such trust placed on them. And the conflicting communication needs for PI-Eng and EW-LOTE to speak unhindered, but unworkable for the interpreter to render if without segmentation, are resolved by the facilitation of the semi-consecutive interpreting mode.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><strong>Transparency</strong> The psychological barrier against the partners’ fear of deception (Prunč, 2000, as cited in Martinsen &amp; Dubslaff, 2012, p. 128).</td>
<td>The other side of the fear of deception between PI-Eng and EW-LOTE is their vulnerability arising from mutual incomprehensibility. In facilitating semi-consecutive interpreting, PI-Eng and EW-LOTE receive interpreting that is less likely to counter a ‘tightrope situation’ (Gile, 2009, p. 182), thereby</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.2 Mechanism of Segmentation

Section 5.2 reports that the average segment length for the PI-Eng’s three sample turns is 19.2 words, whereas it was 16.2 words for the EW-LOTE’s sample turns. Most interpreters are observed to take either no notes or very few notes. When the interpreters were rendering these sample turns, roughly 50% of their eye contact was directed to the person they were interpreting for, while the other 50% was directed at the other primary speaker or was a neutral eye gaze—not looking at either primary speaker.

6.2.1 Lengths of segmented turns. The average segment lengths reported in Section 5.2.1 for the selected turns uttered by PI-Eng’ 1PP (19.2) and EW-LOTE’s 2PP (16.2) seem to be very close to Mason’s (2008) study. Her data are derived from 200 hours of interpreting at a US Federal District Court by 12 certified English–Spanish interpreters (more see Section 7.2), where she found that ‘interpreters wait, on average, until turn length reaches 21.75 words to make an interruption’ (p. 45). The researcher posits that the difference between the average lengths for 1PP and 2PP in this study may be attributed to the fact that all except one participant interpreter had English as their second language (see Table 2). Hence, when rendering from the LOTE into English, the participant interpreters encountered heavier cognitive load in formulating their renditions into their second language, as evidenced in smaller segments with lower word counts.

At the university with which the researcher is affiliated, the interpreting training programs at both postgraduate and vocational levels are all NAATI approved (see Section 3.4.4). This means that, at the end of the training, NAATI-format interpreting
exams are administered by the programs to measure students’ performance against NAATI-required levels. Students who can demonstrate competency in the summative assessment at the required levels are recommended by the program to NAATI for the appropriate interpreting accreditation. Thus, it is understandable that the students and curricula focus heavily on NAATI’s format of interpreting exam, encompassing dialogue, monologue and sight translation in their respective NAATI specifications (National Accreditation Authority for Translators and Interpreters, 2008).

The dialogue component in the exam resembles the institutional discourses for which interpreters are employed in real life. Therefore, the dialogue component is most pertinent to this research. In NAATI’s dialogue exam format, students are trained to interpret bilingual dialogues in public service contexts, with an overall length of around 400 words, evenly distributed between English and LOTE. At least half of the turns in the dialogue must be between 40 to 60 words. The dialogue is tested in a simulated environment at the researcher’s university, using role players to act out the conversation in a pre-recorded digital video format. Students are expected to be able to manage turn lengths up to 60 words (as required by the NAATI dialogue exam). The fact that the exam is a pre-recorded video played turn-by-turn by a technician excludes the option for students to ask the primary speakers to segment their longer turns during the dialogue. In other words, it is not possible to implement the semi-consecutive interpreting mode to students, as opposed to real life. The only course of action available to students is to gesture or voice a request to the technician sitting close by to have a complete turn replayed, which is similar to requesting repetition of a complete turn in real life. In a 400-word scripted dialogue, students can have one repeat of any turn of their choice, without penalty. Any further repeats will result in mark deductions, indicating possible insufficiency of their short-term memory to cope with the discourse.
In this exam format, a chime is inserted at the end of each turn, signalling the completion of the TCU and for the student to start interpreting the turn. By default of the exam format, the word count of the turn is a maximum 60 words. Thus, students are not required to monitor how much incoming information is building in their short-term memory against their cognitive processing capacity, nor do they need to subsequently discern a point to undertake an intervention measure—such as via one of the four options described in Section 6.1.1. In other words, throughout their training, students can experience the development of a ‘tightrope situation’ (Gile, 2009, p. 182) according to their individual cognitive capacity. However, due to the limitation of the dialogue exam format (and thus the focus of training), they may not be as well versed to monitor, assess and act to resolve this situation developing against their own cognitive capacity due to the unavailability of the semi-consecutive interpreting mode in the exam.

This shortcoming often manifests in other simulated practice settings, where students are placed with students from other disciplines (such as social work, criminal justice and physiotherapy) who are studying to become future professionals and will likely work with interpreters in their future job contexts. In these practice sessions, vignettes are pre-distributed to all participants, but the simulated conversation between the social worker, prison officer or physiotherapist and LOTE client (both sides are role played by students) is not scripted per se, and is impromptu and ad-lib. Thus, the interpreting students can experience the tension between turn lengths and their own cognitive processing capacity. Some students are observed to wait for too long and realise too late that they are unable to render a longer turn satisfactorily, while others are seen to experiment implementing one of the four options mentioned in Section 6.1.1. Students who are more assertive tend to choose options one to two (which are considered more ‘interrupting’—see more in Section 6.1.2).
In this light, the segment lengths derived from the participant interpreters presented in Section 5.2.1 can be viewed from two angles. First, in high-stakes interviews, such as those featured in this study, the interpreter requires higher allocation of cognitive capacity—or ‘effort’ in Gile’s (2009) term—to remember the nuances in the primary speakers’ utterances. Therefore, the segment lengths they can manage will be compromised (shorter) to avoid Gile’s (2009) ‘tightrope situation’ (p. 182). Second, these average turn lengths can be significant indicators of the participant interpreters’ average short-term memory capacity, which can serve as a benchmark for interpreting students and novice interpreters to note and monitor their interpreting process. The second aspect should be added to interpreting pedagogy for trainers to build exercises around the range of segment lengths to accustom students to the progression of cognitive saturation, and more precisely gauge where and when the ‘tightrope situation’ (Gile, 2009, p. 182) will arise. As Froili (2001) states, ‘successful intervention depends on the interpreter’s ability to choose the right moment to grab the floor, in other words, timing’ (p. 136). Interpreting students should also be taught the four options available to interpreters to facilitate for themselves the semi-consecutive interpreting mode.

6.2.2 Absence of note taking. As reported in Section 5.2.2, there is a general absence of note taking by the participant interpreters. This highlights the possibility that limiting segment lengths through interlingual cooperation and accommodation to a level that the interpreter is capable of handling with satisfactory performance appears to remove the need for interpreters to take copious notes. This may eventually be an advantage to the communicative event because note taking is a more difficult set of skills to develop over a longer period, mainly because of the mental capacity note taking must occupy while listening to the source message. Note taking for consecutive interpreting is an acquired skill and highly personalised process that only becomes
proficient after vast amounts of practice and accumulation of interpreting experience (Gillies, 2005). It is different to the shorthand used by professions such as secretaries or journalists, which is a system to quickly write down the surface structure of spoken texts for later transcription. Other systems (such as note taking for the hearing impaired and court stenography) share the same feature, with an aim to recreate what was said word-for-word in the same language. In contrast, notes taken for consecutive interpreting focus on the meaning of spoken text, rather than the form of the words used. They normally manifest as a combination of symbols, words and abbreviations in the SL, TL or a combination of both. In fact, the language in which notes are taken is often immaterial, as many will be related to concepts, rather than specific lexical items in the spoken text (Turner, 2007).

In Gile’s (2009) effort model for consecutive interpreting (see Section 4.2.5), if notes (N) are taken well, the interpreter is ‘free to perform the three Efforts and allocate processing capacity to each at his/her own pace’ (p. 176) in the second phase. However, this is a large ‘if’ because if note-taking skills have not been practised to a level that is almost automatic to the interpreter, they may require too much processing capacity in the Phase 1 effort model equation. This will tip the balance of the interpreter’s total available mental capacity and manifest in deteriorated interpreting performance in Phase 2. Gillies (2005) note-taking training has the following advice:

[I]t is not until you have practiced [note taking] by noting dozens and dozens of different speeches that it will come so naturally that you don’t have to think about it. And this is what is required if you are to free up intellectual resources for listening to the original. Note-taking is a mechanical activity, therefore it can be made automatic, internalised. (p. 8)
Turner (2007) likens the automatic skills required in note taking as ‘muscle memory’, which is often associated with the gradual acquisition of physical skills by athletes and musicians through intensive and repetitive practice.

The fact that all participant interpreters in this study were rarely observed taking notes, and used other strategies to secure the invocation of semi-consecutive interpreting mode, highlight their possible aversion to performing consecutive (proper) interpreting—or, stated another way, their preference over semi-consecutive mode. This phenomenon seems to be consistent with Mason’s (2008) observation that note taking ‘does not seem to have been fully embraced by the court-interpreting profession. The main complaint of court interpreters is that note taking takes too much processing effort and time from the task at hand’ (p. 61).

Overall, it is unsurprising that De Groot (1997, p. 27) acknowledges the difficulties associated with the consecutive (proper) interpreting mode, and that the Achilles’ heel of consecutive interpreting is cognitive load. Additionally, former head of the United Nations interpreting service in New York, Monique Corvington (as cited in Baigorri-Jalón, 2004) refers to consecutive interpreting as ‘the stuff that makes you a good interpreter’ (p. 130), while Henderson (1974) remarks that ‘[consecutive] interpreting is seen by many professionals as the acid test of the truly competent interpreter. It is certainly no easier than simultaneous: many would claim that it is considerably harder’.

6.2.3 Eye gazing. Eye gaze in human interaction is considered to communicate affiliation or threat (Argyle & Cook, 1976). With eye gaze and other nonverbal signals, participants of a communicative event position themselves and others within that exchange (Mason, 2012, p. 178). Lang (1978) studied gaze in interpreter-assisted dialogues in a Papua New Guinea local court, and found that interpreters occasionally
missed nonverbal cues of other participants’ turn-taking intentions due to gaze aversion employed to create the impression of neutrality or detachment. American Sign Language (ASL) researchers (e.g. Baker & Padden, 1978; Metzger, 1998; Metzger, Fleetwood, & Collins, 2004; Padden, 1976) analysed ASL users and ASL interpreters, and found them employing eye gaze as an interactional strategy for gaining attention and holding the floor—a strategy not dissimilar to spoken languages.

In the context of interpreter-assisted communication, eye gaze aversion may be construed as a means of signalling neutrality or detachment on behalf of the interpreter. Although this behaviour is observable in all language versions in the research data, the researcher’s exploration of the issue presented in Tables 14 and 15, as well as the summary of these two tables in Table 16, focuses specifically on interpreters’ eye gaze directions at segment boundaries. This gaze may be affected by a number of factors:

- the context (if the interpreter regards it a possible TRP, the eye gaze may be directed to the next primary speaker in anticipation of the next turn.)
- how the current segment is secured (if the interpreter achieves it by overt interruption or taking advantage of intra-turn pauses, the interpreter should return the floor to the primary speaker being interrupted, therefore the eye gaze will be directed to this person.)
- an indeterminate state (because the primary speaker is self-segmenting and it is difficult to discern whether the current segment is meant for a TRP; thus, the interpreter employs a neutral eye gaze for the primary speakers to determine who is going to assume floor.)

In the sampled long turns spoken by the PI-Eng and EW-LOTE, the interpreters were slightly more likely to direct their eye gaze (50%) back to the PI-Eng at the end of a segment (in a long turn) when the PI-Eng was speaking, than to the EW-LOTE (46%)
when the EW-LOTE was speaking. Interestingly, they were also slightly more likely to
direct their eye gaze (30%) to the PI-Eng at the end of a segment when interpreting for
the EW-LOTE, as opposed to gazing at the EW-LOTE (26%) when they finished
interpreting a segment for the PI-Eng. Further, at about one-quarter of the segment
boundaries (24%), the interpreters refrained from directing their eye contact to any
primary speaker, regardless of whether they were interpreting for the PI-Eng or EW-
LOTE.

Mason’s (2012) study uses a German television documentary on immigration
services to analyse interpreter-assisted immigration hearings featured in the
documentary about five asylum seekers. Mason (2012, pp. 190–191) finds that, when
the interpreters were listening to the immigration officers talk and interpreting the
LOTE utterances into German for the officers, they predominantly displayed the
aversion pattern of eye gaze. They use short and rapid gazes (of up to one second)
directed to the immigration officers, mostly at the beginning or end of a turn to monitor
the talk and floor taking. In contrast, when the interpreters were listening to the asylum
seekers talk and interpreting the German utterances into LOTE for the asylum seekers,
they display a high level of eye gaze engagement with the asylum seekers (Mason, 2012,
p. 191). As explained in the previous paragraph, the current study concentrated on
interpreters’ eye gaze patterns at segment boundaries within primary speakers’ long
turns. This study’s findings seem to contradict Mason’s (2012) because the participant
interpreters seemed to display higher inclination to gaze at the PI-Eng, rather than the
EW-LOTE, regardless of the person for whom they were interpreting.

Mason (2012) also finds that the asylum seekers’ accounts of their experiences
in their country of origin could involve long turns of talk, and that interpreters ‘prefer to
break these up in order to interpret piecemeal’ (p. 192). This is consistent with the data
reported in the current study, whereby all interpreters opted for the semi-consecutive mode for long turns uttered by the EW-LOTE (as well as those by the PI-Eng).

Moreover, Mason (2012) observes that, after the interpreters finished rendering a segment of the LOTE into German for the immigration officer:

> [i]t is significant that … the mere turn of INT’s [the interpreter’s] head from right [where the immigration officer sat] back to left [where the asylum seeker sat], accompanied by gaze at AS [asylum seeker], is sufficient in itself to incite AS to continue with his/her account without any verbal prompting. (p. 192)

He finds that ‘at no point in the data does there appear to be any hesitation or awkward silence at a transition point indicating uncertainty about next speaker’ (Mason, 2012, p. 192). It is extremely significant that Mason’s findings and the data in this study confirm the function of the interpreter’s eye gaze in coordinating talk—particularly in relation to the long narratives elicited from implementing the PI-Eng’s CI techniques featured in this study. As depicted in Diagram 4, the interpreter in the research data always occupies the top position of the triangle between PI-Eng and EW-LOTE, who are situated at the other two corners of the triangle. When interpreting EW-LOTE’s unfinished 2PP, head turning accompanied with eye gaze towards the EW-LOTE is very important, in that it signals returning the floor to the EW-LOTE so she or he can continue the unfinished longer turn. The role players in this experiment were instructed not to start their scripted turn before the other primary speaker had completed the previous turn; thus, the EW-LOTE continued with the next segment of the 2PP, regardless of whether the interpreter displayed gaze aversion or gaze engagement. However, in real life, with a lack of head turning and particularly eye engagement from the interpreter to signal returning of the floor, there is a risk that a less confident interviewee may cede the floor to the police interviewer, or remain silent to wait for
further instructions to continue—in essence, rendering their 2PP incomplete. Similarly, a less experienced or more aggressive police interviewer might assume the floor following the rendering of a segment (of an unfinished 2PP) by the interpreter, and hurriedly ask a new question, thereby losing the opportunity to obtain a full account of the narrative intended by the interviewee.

Regarding the interpreter’s eye gaze behaviour in an interpreter-assisted CI, one may argue that, during semi-consecutive interpreting where the speakers self-segment the turns, because interpreters are not omniscient, it is impossible for them to discern a segment in a turn (to direct eye gaze back to the same speaker to enable continuation of the unfinished turn) or at the end of a long turn (to direct eye gaze to the opposite speaker for the next turn, or remain neutral for the speakers to self-select). The researcher argues that it would make a difference when the interpreter has knowledge of the CI protocol and understands how questions are formulated using those CI strategies. This knowledge would give them insight that a longer narrative is meant for specific types of questions; thus, they should take care in expecting more segments from 2PPs. This knowledge would also sensitise them to the structure of the narratives to help them discern whether a segment is a complete turn or more likely to be part of a turn. For example, in Turn 19 of INTV1, the PI-Eng asked:

[Name], try to put yourself back in the same location as **when you first noticed the robbers** and tell me in your own words everything you remember about what happened, **until the end of the robbery**. Try to be as detailed as possible [emphasis added]. (Fisher & Geiselman, 1992, p. 162)

Thus, in turn 20, the EW-LOTE replied: ‘Well, I didn’t notice anything unusual at first, just some people in the store looking at the jewellery’ (Fisher & Geiselman, 1992, p. 162). Regardless of how segmentation works in each language version, in the first
couple of segments (of various lengths), the overwhelming majority of participant interpreters directed their eye gaze (accompanied by head turning) back to the EW-LOTE. This is because these segments do not sound as though they encompass the end of the robbery; thus, it is likely that more segments are forthcoming and the floor should be handed back to the EW-LOTE.

When the interpreter initiates an interruption or uses the natural intra-turn pauses to start rendering (employing option one or three reported in Section 6.1.1), it is clear to them that they are intervening and the floor should be returned to the speaker who was interrupted. Face turning and eye gaze are important to signal this returning of the floor in this type of situation, as discussed above.

6.3 Intentional Pauses by Interviewer

To examine the function of ‘pause’ in everyday talk and institutional talk, it is necessary to have an overall understanding of what ‘talk’ comprises and the role each element plays, as well as how ‘talk’ is organised, how participants accomplish orderly (or disorderly) turn taking, and which systematic resources are used to accomplish this (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008, p. 40). In Davidson’s (2002) analysis of conversational process in both same-language and interpreted discourses, he correctly states that ‘to understand what is being said, then, an interpreter must understand first why it is being said’ (p. 1276). For the intentional pauses inserted by the PI-Eng discussed above, it is more likely that interpreters must first understand why something is not said. Micro-level momentary silences have always attracted interest from researchers, as ‘silence manifests itself in various ways’ (Nakane, 2012, p. 158). The role of silence in communication in linguistics is viewed not simply as an absence of noise, but as a part of communication as important as speech (Nanake, 2012, p. 158; Sacks et al., 1974; Tannen & Saville-Troike, 1985). From a conversation-analytical perspective, Sacks et al.
(1974) distinguish silence in a single turn as a ‘pause’, silence that occurs at a TRP where speaker change is relevant as a ‘gap’ (p. 715), and silence at a TRP where no one claims the floor (resulting in the non-talk space lasting longer than a gap) as a ‘lapse’ (p. 715).

For the purpose of this discussion, the researcher only examined the intra-turn silence defined by Sacks et al. (1974) in the previous paragraph as a ‘pause’. According to Field (2004), pauses in talk serve many functions, including:

1. marking syntactic boundaries
2. allowing the speaker time to forward-plan
3. providing semantic focus (a pause after an important word)
4. marking a word or phrase rhetorically (a pause before it)
5. indicating the speaker’s willingness to hand over the speech turn to an interlocutor.

The pauses discussed in this section serve functions one, three and four. However, it is evident that, without knowledge of the strategic use of these pauses, interpreters tend to consider function five is intended by the PI-Eng. In inserting such a pause at the start of the next segment and thereby holding the floor, it is evident from the data that both the interpreter and LOTE interviewee felt the existence of the pause and appeared slightly apprehensive about the momentary silence. This reaction can be explained by people’s inclination to avoid conversational silence that might last beyond an acceptable duration. The aversion to silence in talk is observed by Shepherd (2007, p. 183), who comments that police interviewers who are inexperienced, unaware, anxious or any combination of these often find silence intolerable—two to three seconds are sensed to be an eternity.

As opposed to Sacks et al. (1974), who categorise silences in talk according to their conversational functions, Walker (1985) quantifies the length of the non-talk space
and treats silence between 1.0 to 1.5 seconds as ‘in-turn pauses’, while those longer than 1.5 seconds were ‘switching pauses’. According to Jefferson (1989), a standard maximum silence in Anglophone convention is around 1.0 to 1.2 seconds. Trudgill (2000) asserts that:

in a conversation between two English speakers who are not close friends, a silence of longer than four seconds is not allowed (which means that people become embarrassed if nothing is said after that time—they feel obliged to say something, even if it is only a remark about the weather). (p. 109)

Roy (2000) contends that silence in talk ‘creates opportunities for talking and taking a turn’ (p. 74). These ‘opportunities’ created by silence are regarded by Nakane (2014) as possible to ‘become relevant for primary speakers to take a turn’ (p. 166). In the context of interpreting, as dissected in the finding reported in Section 5.3.1, the silence created by the pauses in the data could manifest at least four different functions. The researcher argues that whenever silence at appropriate junctures (approaching the interpreter’s self-perceived optimal segment length in the semi-consecutive interpreting mode) avails the opportunity for the interpreter to enter the talk, the interpreter will often seize the opportunity and start interpreting without discerning the nature of the pause.

Diagram 7 below presents a visualisation of the various lengths of silence for the various types of pauses, and the time lapse when the interpreter starts rendering. The primary speaker has an intended end point of the silence in type (1) pause (illustrated by a solid border at the end of the pause in Diagram 7), so as to continue on to the next utterance, but it is ‘hijacked’ prematurely by the interpreter, corresponding to option four in Section 6.1.1. In contrast, types (2) and (3) pauses are open-ended (illustrated by dotted borders in Diagram 7) and meant for the interpreter to take over the floor. Similar to the type (1) pause, the type (4) pause has an intended end point of silence. However,
as indicated by the finding in Section 5.3.1, the interpreter cannot discern the type (4) pause because the chronological manifestation of the pause is identical to types (2) and (3), so there is no reason for the interpreter to regard it as anything other than the end of a segment or end of a turn. Roy (2000) contends that silence in talk leads to a finely tuned coordination by the interpreter when they are undertaking their task of mediation, seemingly suggesting the interpreter’s agency in deploying strategies at points of silence to control primary speakers’ talk in interaction. In contrast, the researcher regards interpreters’ handling of silence created by primary speakers’ pauses as a method of self-preservation—achieving their best possible performance by taking advantage of the pauses available, regardless of their different underlying functions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time line (by second) from the start of a pause by a primary speaker</th>
<th>0.00&quot;</th>
<th>0.50&quot;</th>
<th>1.00&quot;</th>
<th>1.01&quot;</th>
<th>1.50&quot;</th>
<th>2.00&quot;</th>
<th>2.01&quot;</th>
<th>2.50&quot;</th>
<th>3.00&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) usual intra-turn pause (&lt; 1.5&quot;)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interpreter may start rendering at 1.00&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) longer pause to signal end of a segment within a turn (1.50&quot;—2.00&quot;)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interpreter may start rendering at 1.50&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) longer pause to signal end of turn, i.e. TRP (1.50&quot;—2.00&quot;)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interpreter may start rendering at 1.50&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) intentional pauses inserted for CR (&gt; 2.0&quot;)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interpreter starts rendering at 1.50&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Nakane (2014) investigates different types of silence in police–suspect interviews assisted by interpreters, and she asserts that:*

> [i]n some discursive contexts, especially when the suspect had given a dispreferred response, lack of reaction [silence] from the police interviewer may have been used to put pressure on the suspect to give a preferred type of response. (Nakane, 2014, p. 203)
Further, she finds that interpreters may be more tolerant of the police interviewer’s silence by maintaining the same silence. In addition, interpreters are more inclined to produce a repair sequence of the police interviewer’s 1PP when the suspect’s 2PP is a stretch of silence, in the hope of prompting an answer from the suspect. Thus, Nakane (2014) suggests that:

[t]he negotiation of power and resistance between the police officer and the suspect may rely substantially on the decisions that interpreters make in and around silences, even when those silences are as short as 1.5 seconds. It also appears to be the case, however, that the ambiguous nature of silence which can communicate meaning without using language opens up freer turntaking opportunities to all three parties in mediated police interviews. (p. 205)

The current researcher agrees with Nakane’s (2014) characterisation of the ‘ambiguous nature of silence’ in police interviews. From the analysis in this section thus far—particularly the visual representation of the PI-Eng’s four different kinds of silence in Diagram 7—it should be highlighted that, due to the nature of interpreting (to avoid cognitive saturation, with pauses created by silence a good opportunity to interpret), interpreters are prone to taking over the floor before reaching the end of the silence. They do this to gain a clearer appreciation of the purpose of the different natures of the pause. In situations (1) to (3) in Diagram 7, the interpreter’s premature floor-taking before they get to the end of the pause may have less effect since the outcome of the such action is further reinforcement of the semi-consecutive interpreting mode, which may already be in place. Only situation (4) (discussed in Nakane’s [2014] above quotation) creates new issues that need solutions, as the missing silence in the interpreted version undermines the purpose of CR under CI. This is further explored in the next section.
6.4 Interpreting Mode Switching

Section 5.4 reports that the Cantonese and Indonesian interpreters were observed switching from the semi-consecutive to simultaneous interpreting mode. Although the places where they decided to change their mode of interpreting are different, the places both featured the slowing down of the talking speeds by the primary speakers as well as the softening of the primary speakers’ voice volumes.

6.4.1 Mode switching. After it is identified that the Cantonese and Indonesian interpreters were switching modes, unstructured interviews were undertaken with these interpreters. These interviews reveal that both interpreters had simultaneous interpreting experience, and made spontaneous decisions to change the interpreting mode. The Cantonese interpreter stated that, during the particular segments in INTV1 turn 23: ‘the police interviewer slowed down, making it ideal for me to go simultaneous because those were all short sentences’. The Indonesian interpreter stated: ‘the [Indonesian] role player was talking while thinking; she was kind of slow, so I was able to almost render them at the same time as she was talking’. These statements reveal that, in certain situations, interpreting mode switch may be an alternative and innovative way of facilitating communication. The researcher is particularly interested in the Cantonese interpreter’s approach around the police interpreter’s intentionally inserted pauses. According to Wadensjö (1998):

[T]here are no absolute and unambiguous criteria for defining a mode of interpreting which would be ‘good’ across the board. Different activity-types with different goal structures, as well as the different concerns, needs, desires and commitments of primary parties, imply various demands on the interpreters. (p. 287)
The sequence of the Cantonese interpreter’s rendering of turn 23 in INTV1 below uses a similar visualisation as Diagram 6 Monolingual talk versus bilingual talk in Section 6.1.1, where the utterances flow chronologically from 1.1 (PI-Eng) > 1.1* (Interpreter) > 1.2 (PI-Eng) > 1.2* (Interpreter) > ….1.8 (PI-Eng) > 1.8* (Interpreter) > 1.9 (PI-Eng) > 1.9* (Interpreter). All utterances are interpreted consecutively, except sequences 1.6* and 1.7*.

INTV1 turn 23:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PI-Eng</th>
<th>1.1</th>
<th>1.2</th>
<th>1.3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[...] Try to develop a mental picture as thoroughly as possible.//</td>
<td>when the man first turns around. //</td>
<td>Just develop the image as clearly as you can. //</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intp Cant</td>
<td>1.1*</td>
<td>1.2*</td>
<td>1.3*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xxxx xx x xxxx xx xx x xx (in Cantonese consecutively)</td>
<td>xxx xx x xxxx xx x xx xx (in Cantonese consecutively)</td>
<td>xxx xx x xx xx x xx (in Cantonese consecutively)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PI-Eng</th>
<th>1.4</th>
<th>1.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t say anything yet. //</td>
<td>Just develop the image as clearly as you can. //</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intp Cant</td>
<td>1.4*</td>
<td>1.5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xxx xx x xxx xx x xxx (in Cantonese consecutively)</td>
<td>xxx xx x xx xxx xx x xx x xxx (in Cantonese consecutively)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PI-Eng</th>
<th>1.6</th>
<th>1.7</th>
<th>1.8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concentrate on his face and head. [original pause] //</td>
<td>[pause inserted by PI-Eng] Now, try to describe his head and…</td>
<td>…face in as much detail as you can.//</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intp Cant</td>
<td>1.6*</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.8*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Xxxx xx x xx x xxx xxx xxx xxx [pause] (in Cantonese simultaneously)</td>
<td>xxx xxx x x xxx xxx xxx (in Cantonese simultaneously)</td>
<td>xxx x x xx xxxxxx xxxxxx xxxxx</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PI-Eng</th>
<th>1.7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[silence ……………………..] xxx xxx x xxxxx xx xx (in Cantonese simultaneously)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intp Cant</td>
<td>1.7*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The fact that the Cantonese interpreter changed her interpreting mode at 1.6* somehow serendipitously preserved the presence of the intentional pauses in the rendition the interviewee received. If the PI-Eng had stretched the pause slightly longer in its original location (at the end of the utterance ‘Concentrate on his face and head [original pause]’) than the one originally intended in the monolingual version (which should already be longer than the normal intra-turn pauses), it would have been felt even more distinctly by the EW-Can. This is because, when the Cantonese interpreter finished the simultaneously interpreted segment, it already consumed some of the pause because absolute simultaneity of source utterance and target utterance is impossible. There is a lag time from the source utterances because interpreters must hear what the speaker says, and thus cannot speak it ahead of or at the same moment as the speaker. Coincidentally the Cantonese data were among the identified instances where the PI-Eng is found to have inserted a new pause in front of the immediately following utterance at 1.7, as is reported in Section 5.3.1, thus recreating the effect of the momentary silence perceivable by EW-Can and the interpreter. Alternatively, as suggested in Section 5.3.3, an explicit verbal instruction by the interviewer should be able to address the issue of the disappearance of pauses—for example, ‘don’t say anything yet’, ‘don’t say anything in the next few seconds’ or ‘concentrate on … for a few seconds and let me know when you are ready’.
6.4.2 Simultaneous versus consecutive interpreting. The international literature has established that, when comparing accuracy rates between simultaneous interpreting and consecutive interpreting, the latter generally achieves higher accuracy (Longley, 1968, p. 10; Van Hoof, 1962, as cited in Gile, 2001; Weber, 1989, p. 162). Barnwell (1989) contends that simultaneous interpreting offers little time for the interpreter to reflect on the linguistic choices needed for precise rendering. Similarly, Bruton (1985) argues that, for interpretation to be successful, reformulating and retransmitting of concepts from SL into the TL is essential, alluding to the inherent limitations of simultaneous interpreting in achieving optimum syntactical and lexical choices into the TL. The current researcher would also point out that in certain simultaneous interpreting settings, where the interpreter are seated in an interpreting booth away from primary speakers, they will be unable to check or clarify meaning by way of carrying out mini-conversations with the primary speakers (such as in a dialogue interpreting setting). In the case of whisper interpreting, i.e. chuchotage, it will most likely be for the benefit of a particular audience member (e.g. a suspect) in a public address (e.g. a judge addressing the jury), which the interpreter will be unable to interrupt the speaker to check or clarify meaning either.

Gile’s (2009) effort model for consecutive interpreting (see Section 4.2.5) dissects interpreters’ cognitive tasks performed simultaneously in the listening and note-taking stage (Phase 1) and rendering stage (Phase 2). As such, international literature converges on the view that consecutive interpreting, working from memory and notes, allows interpreters to break down the interpreting process and identify the skills required to cope successfully (Barnwell, 1989; Bruton, 1985; Mikkelson, 1998; D. Russell, 2003). According to D. Russell (2002):
[a] very high standard of accuracy prevails in consecutive interpretation. It allows for the conveyance of the content the source language message, as well as critical information conveyed in the structural elements of that message that are not contained in the words: pauses, tones of voice, stress, etc. Many interpreters regard consecutive as the most difficult mode of interpreting [emphasis added] because it is so challenging to retain all these aspects of the source language message, particularly when a question or answer is very lengthy or is not entirely coherent. (p. 52)

In an empirical study, D. Russell (2003) used two teams of two professional ASL interpreters to interpret two mock trials in simultaneous mode and consecutive mode. In each trial, three courtroom discourses are included: expert witness testimony, the entering of direct evidence with a deaf witness, and cross-examination of the deaf witness. The two trials that were interpreted simultaneously achieved 87% and 83% accuracy rates, as opposed to 98% and 95% accuracy for the two trials interpreted consecutively. When comparing the error rates across the three types of courtroom discourses, consecutive interpreting scored fewer errors across the board. Thus, D. Russell (2003, 2005) was able to reach a definitive conclusion that ‘the consecutive mode demonstrated a greater degree of accuracy than did simultaneous interpretation’ (D. Russell, 2005, p. 151). However, the current researcher must point out that it is unclear whether D. Russell’s (2003) study employed the semi-consecutive or consecutive-proper mode, which may affect accuracy. In addition, with sign language interpreting, minimal note taking is involved in consecutive interpreting (both semi-consecutive and consecutive proper) due to its nature of being a visual language, meaning the interpreter normally directs their eye contact at the deaf person, particularly
when signing. Therefore, sign language interpreters must rely completely on their short-
term memory, without notes.

Before D. Russell’s (2003) empirical study, interpreting scholars—such as
Seleskovitch (1978), Weber (1984) and Cokely (1992)—had long advocated that, when
a high degree of accuracy is required, the mode of interpreting should always give
preference to consecutive interpreting over simultaneous. This is because the interpreter
is able to hear the entire utterance(s) before rendering, thereby having the benefit of
‘thought-wholeness’ (Mikkelson, 2010), and the interpreter has more time to organise
the TL better to avoid awkward constructions or false cognates. Berk-Seligson (2012)
concurs and (referring particularly to courtroom settings) states that:

[c]onsecutive interpreting is considered by skilled interpreters to be more
difficult than simultaneous, in that it requires a great deal more reliance upon
memory, and since it is done out loud, for everyone to hear, any interpreting
errors can potentially be noticed by bilingual people who are present. (p. 422)

Having observed 187 cases in New York’s small claims courts involving non-English
speaking litigants, Angermeyer (2006) concludes that:

[W]hen interpreters translate simultaneously, they are often unable to produce
close renditions of all that has been said, and as a consequence, relevant
information may be left untranslated for the non-English-speaking litigant. This
is far less likely to occur with consecutive interpreting. (p. 271)

In contrast, Gile (2009) calls for caution and further scrutiny to the claims that
consecutive interpreting is more accurate and faithful than simultaneous interpreting. In
his empirical study using 20 practising interpreters to interpret the same English speech
into French—half using the consecutive mode and half using the simultaneous mode—
consecutive interpreting was found to be superior in incomplete sentences, while
simultaneous interpreting was superior in digressions and unimportant modifiers. Importantly, the simultaneous mode is found to be clearly better than the consecutive mode in overall accuracy. However, Gile does point out the limitations of the construct of his study, in which only small segments—rather than whole speeches—of the interpreters’ performance were chosen and assessed in isolation using transcripts, rather than voice recording. Thus, the results are not immediately generalisable to the debate about which mode of interpreting yields better performance in terms of accuracy. However, they do indicate a further need for investigation of the role of intercultural and linguistic factors in terms of problem triggers for interpreters, and whether certain language combinations are more accurate using consecutive interpreting, or vice versa.

In the context of publicly funded interpreting services in Australia, apart from courtroom settings where simultaneous interpreting or chuchotage is required, the overwhelming majority of interpreting uses the consecutive mode. The NAATI accreditation system for Paraprofessional and Professional Interpreter levels do not test the simultaneous interpreting mode; thus, the NAATI-approved training courses around the country do not train in this mode, with the exception of three universities which has conference interpreting training in about a handful of languages, e.g. French, Japanese, Mandarin, Spanish and Russian (National Accreditation Authority for Translators and Interpreters, n.d.-c). However the two categories of accredited interpreters, i.e. Paraprofessional and Professional, comprise the overwhelming majority of practicing interpreters working in the legal and police contexts.

It is worth mentioning that the issue of consecutive vs simultaneous mode of interpreting has attracted increasing attention in the legal interpreting field. Australian interpreting professor Sandra Hale (2017; Hale, Martschuk, Ozolins, Stern, 2017) has recently completed a study funded by the Australian Research Council Linkage
Program, involving 447 mock jurors for a simulated drug trial using English-Spanish interpreters. The two modes of interpreting were tested on randomly allocated jurors, and the study outcomes point to similar information recall by jurors between the two modes, while the consecutive mode was associated with significantly more favourable perception of the accused. The two modes did not lead to difference in the verdict. Obviously interpreting simultaneously has the advantage of time saving for service users involved, provided it is done at levels commensurate to consecutive interpreting in terms of accuracy. In the light of the different juror perceptions when receiving interpreting from a consecutive interpreter in sight within the courtroom and a simultaneous interpreter via equipment out of sight in a booth, the same question may be explored for police interpreting scenarios to inform what form of interpreting may be most suitable.

6.5 CI Specialised Terminology and Concepts

It has long been argued by translating and interpreting scholars that interlingual translating and interpreting is never a simplistic word-for-word code-switching operation. Diagram 2 illustrates that such interlingual operation is a matter of finding a balance between the absolute literal (word-for-word) approach and the other end of the spectrum—the sense-for-sense approach (otherwise known as ‘free translation’). This notion corresponds to translation theorist Juliane House’s (as cited in Munday, 2012) contention that ‘the “overt-cover” translation distinction is a cline rather than a pair of binary opposites. A text can be more, or less, covert/overt’ (p. 143). In House’s terminology, overt translation corresponds to literal translation, whereby readers are immediately able to discern a text to have been translated from a foreign text. In contrast, covert translation reads naturally in the target text. The implication of this is that the originality of the source text is compromised linguistically and/or culturally for
the sake of high readability in the target text. Interpreting pedagogy in the field of community interpreting for public services has always focused on being meaning based—tipping towards the free translation end of the continuum (see Diagram 2). This is because, in most contexts, public services have institutional duties to discharge and goals to achieve to fulfil the delivery of service. This has largely fostered the cooperative nature of most of their encounters with their clients, which is conducive to allowing more leeway for the interpreter to locate their interpreting strategy on the continuum (see Diagram 2) from the perspective that, as long as communication is achieved, transferring meaning is much more important than transferring words. In other words, what someone says weighs more than how someone says it—an approach leaning more towards the free translation end of Diagram 2.

However, interpreting and translating activities do not occur in a vacuum. In certain situations, transferring meaning is sufficient to achieve the aim of the communicative event, whereas in other situations, the stakeholders involved prefer or must know exactly how something is said. The perennial tension between the legal fraternity and interpreting profession is an example (see Section 3.4.3). In some police encounters (such as interviews with reluctant witnesses or uncooperative suspects) and courtroom discourses (such as cross-examination that is adversarial, or when the audience of the courtroom—such as the judge and jury—need to assess a person’s credibility), how something is said is as critical as what is said. Thus, it is inappropriate for the interpreter to exercise freedom of interpreting strategy without due consideration of the constraint of the event for which they are interpreting.

This indicates the need to rethink interpreting pedagogy to separate court and police interpreting, so that student interpreters are aware that they may have to understand the questioning strategy of the English speaker in these circumstances, and
use a more literal approach in their interpreting, as demonstrated in the findings in Section 5.5. For example, it is likely (62%) that interpreters will change the PI-Eng’s negative phrasing to positive in order achieve a more natural sounding rendition in the TL (see Section 5.5.6). It can be posited that, had the PI-Eng used the preferred positive phrasing, the interpreters would not have changed such expressions to the negative. The interpreters’ snap decision to render negative phrasing in the positive seems to be the only occasion where interpreters’ meaning-based approach yields desirable results from the CI perspective. In terms of the PI-Eng’s use of neutral wording as is desired by CI, there is almost a 40% risk that interpreters may change it to the less preferred, more leading form of questioning (‘how long is the hair?’ rather than ‘what is the length of the hair?’). In contrast, when the PI-Eng uses the less preferred questioning form (such as ‘how dark’ or ‘how heavy’), there is almost 60% chance that this form of questioning will be retained in the interpreted version.

Dogmatically opting for formal equivalence (Nida & Taber, 1964) can be an elusive pursuit because, for some lexical items, there is no correspondence in the TL. For example, the seemingly innocuous term ‘view’ used by the PI-Eng (as in ‘Are there any other views that you had of the robbers?’ or ‘What is the best view you had of the car?’), most languages tested in this study can only express the concept using their respective LOTE terms for ‘angle’. Considering the polysemy of the word ‘view’, where there is a likelihood of 25% (two of eight occasions in this study) that the word was rendered incorrectly as the ‘viewpoint’ of the robber, there may be a case for CI training to consider replacing the word ‘view’ with ‘angle’ to avoid confusion. In contrast, for more finely lexicalised concepts, such as ‘voice’ and ‘sound’ in English, there may not be equivalence in the TL, such as Arabic, Cantonese, Mandarin and Turkish. Without prior training or specific briefing, the data in Table 21 demonstrate
that the interpreter may find no ideal way to immediately translate difficult words. Similarly, the non-specialised term ‘mental picture’ was translated differently in most TLs (see Table 19), which changed the concept by saying ‘in one’s mind’ and ‘to construct a picture’. Again, formal equivalence would render the TL incomprehensible. Lastly, to ‘focus in’ on something in the data was interpreted 100% of the time as to ‘focus on’ something, which has a different meaning. Again, the researcher contends that only interpreters who receive CI training can address this misunderstanding.

6.6 Summary

Following Chapter 5, which reported the findings of the study, this chapter moved on to analyse how the findings relate to interpreting practice in order to address Research Question 2 in Section 1.3. In Section 6.1.1, the current researcher summarised four possible strategies that interpreters may employ when they need to manage the incoming information and attempt to invoke the semi-consecutive interpreting mode to facilitate satisfactory performance. Relevant literature on monolingual and bilingual police and courtroom discourses is then presented to illustrate the general attitude of interpreting users’ and interpreting academics’ aversion to interruptions initiated by interpreters, even though there may be legitimate reasons for the interpreter to take this course of action—such as asking for clarification or repetition. The intralingual and interlingual cooperation and accommodation frameworks are then discussed to compare and contrast monolingual and interpreter-facilitated bilingual communication. The cooperative and accommodative manifestations of the interactants in the current study—PI-Eng, EW-LOTE and the interpreter—are accounted for by Prunč’s (1997, 2000) ‘model of translation culture’.

In response to the invocation of the semi-consecutive interpreting mode, the researcher found the average segment lengths for the PI-Eng and EW-LOTE were 20
words (refer Table 10) and 17 words (refer Table 11) respectively. These word counts were much lower than 60 words which NAATI tests interpreter candidates for and NAATI-approved interpreter training provides for. It points to participant interpreters’ preference of shorter segments and reliance on memory, as opposed to longer segments that require note taking.

This chapter also explored the use and importance of the interpreter’s eye gaze during interpreting. In CI, where the interviewee’s long narratives as 2PP are the ultimate desirable response, any factors that inhibit these long narratives should be identified and eliminated as much as possible. The current researcher argues that the interpreter’s eye gaze at the PI-Eng (30%) when the interpreter finished rendering the current segment (i.e. a partial turn by EW-LOTE) from LOTE into English may inadvertently encourage the PI-Eng to regard such points as TRPs, thus taking over the floor from EW-LOTE. This may result in cutting short the long narratives originally were forthcoming from the EW-LOTE. The same may be argued about the interpreter’s neutral gaze (24%), i.e. not looking at PI-Eng or EW-LOTE, when the interpreter completed rendering a segment, i.e. a partial turn, by the EW-LOTE. Combining the two yields 54% of the risk that the PI-Eng may take over the floor and EW-LOTE may cede the floor prematurely.

The investigation of PI-Eng’s pauses revealed that as high as 95% of these pauses inserted strategically by the PI-Eng just before the EW-LOTE’s major recall were regarded indiscriminately by the participant interpreters as inter-segment pauses, resulting in their taking over the floor to start interpreting and, therefore, the disappearance of the pauses in the interpreted CI. This chapter discussed the nature of different kind of pauses in monolingual and bilingual discourses, and analysed why
these pauses are difficult for interpreters to discern when such pauses feature in the PI-Eng’s 1PP.

In relation to the instances where two participant interpreters switched their interpreting mode from semi-consecutive to simultaneous at places where they saw fit indicate the possibility of considering different modes of interpreting in CI. Although available literature and scholarly views seem to favour consecutive interpreting over the simultaneous mode when evaluating accuracy and completeness in the output utterances, it point to the need for further research and possible future consideration to expand the exclusive application of consecutive interpreting in CI.

Lastly, in response to the mixed interpreting outcomes from the research data where there is a 62% possibility that the participant interpreters may inadvertently reverse the less preferred negative phrasing used by PI-Eng to CI-preferred positive format, and almost a 40% risk that the interpreters may change the more neutral form of questioning to a more leading one, the researcher drew on the meaning-based and form-based interpreting approaches and call for the rethinking of best practice court and police interpreting, where discourse in these settings are high-stakes and how those involved in such settings say something is just as important as what they say.
Chapter 7: Implications of Research Findings for CI and Broader Context of CI

Following the previous chapter, which detailed how each finding relates to interpreting practice, this chapter analyses how the findings relate to CI in order to address Research Question 3 (see Section 1.3):

Given what is observed in the data, what are the effects of a bilingual setting on CI interviewing strategies?

Where appropriate, this chapter also comments on the effects of the findings in broader CI practice, and makes considered suggestions to address Research Question 4:

How do the effects of bilingual settings translate to broader CI practice? And, what could be done differently to achieve CI efficacy in bilingual settings?

After addressing all four research questions by the end of this chapter, Chapter 8 will present the concluding remarks of the entire project.

7.1 Invocation of Semi-consecutive Interpreting Mode

Section 5.1 presented the study findings regarding the invocation of self-segmentation of TCUs by the primary speakers in the study interviews. This self-segmentation was achieved via one of the four options discussed in Section 6.1.1:

1. by explicitly asking the primary speaker(s) to segment their turns;
2. by explicitly asking the primary speaker to repeat a segment within a turn to signal the limitation of their cognitive capacity;
3. by explicitly using non-verbal means, e.g, holding up the palm toward the primary speaker, to signal the request for a pause;
4. by using the natural intra-turn pauses between utterances by the primary speakers to make an entry to the unfinished turn and start interpreting, and
by so doing to signal the limitation of the interpreter’s cognitive capacity or their preference for smaller segments.

Regardless of the legitimacy of the interpreter ‘interrupting’ the primary speakers via options one to three (because they foresee a ‘tightrope situation’ of cognitive saturation due to information overload) (Gile, 2009, p. 182), ‘interruptions’ in CI—and other interpreting contexts, such as in courtrooms or therapeutic consultations—are viewed negatively. This may explain why only the Arabic and Mandarin interpreters in Turn 15 acted to ‘interrupt’ the PI-Eng in order to secure the conditions for semi-consecutive interpreting. The majority of participant interpreters secured these conditions via option four, which is a tacit way of signalling their need for manageable segment length. Turn 20 by the EW-LOTE saw more interpreters take action to reiterate their preference of the semi-consecutive interpreting mode. The Arabic and Greek interpreters did so by using a hand gesture at the first available opportunity, and the Mandarin interpreter did the same later in the turn. The Turkish interpreter created an overlapped episode to secure the floor, and requested repetition of the utterances that she did not hear clearly due to the overlapped talk. In all cases, implicit acquiesce and continued acceptance of the interpreter’s need for segmented talk were secured from the primary speakers, which the researcher attributes to the revised interlingual cooperation and accommodation principles discussed in Section 6.1.3.

There is clear aversion to all forms of ‘interruption’ during institutional talk. First, in monolingual CI settings, Milne and Bull (1999) warned interviewers about frequent ‘interruptions’ to interviewees (see the same quotation in Section 2.3.1):

[A]fter being interrupted several times, the interviewee will soon expect this to occur throughout the remainder of the interview. Accordingly, the interviewee will tailor his or her responses by shortening these to fit the time constraints
apparently set by the interviewer. Shorter responses are typically less detailed.

Moreover, following an interrupted response the interviewee is less likely to make a concerted effort to retrieve in a detailed manner and will instead retrieve in a less focused way, thereby eliciting more superficial responses. (p. 3)

It would be worth finding out if similar effects on the interviewee, such as ‘shorter responses’ or ‘less likely to make a concerted effort to retrieve in a detailed manner’ from Milne and Bull’s (1999) statement above, would similarly manifest as a result of the interpreter’s ‘interruptions’ to the interviewee when they need the interviewee to repeat or clarify something, or simply to express a need or preference for segmented turns. According to practitioner Rycroft’s (2011) personal experience interpreting for Romanian speakers in the UK criminal justice system, non-English speakers are least able to speak through interpreters. In contrast, legal practitioners are more likely to have experience communicating through interpreters, and are better at segmenting their speech to enable the interpreter’s smooth delivery, with less overlapped talk or ‘torrent of words’ (Rycroft, 2011, p. 216). Although Rycroft’s (2011) comments are purely based on her own personal experience, she claimed that ‘once interrupted, NES [non-English speakers] tend to forget what they are saying’ (p. 216).

Further, in a courtroom situation when interpreters interrupt attorneys, González et al. (2012) contended that:

[i]nterrupting an attorney who is carefully formulating a question to elicit specific testimony, or a witness who is trying to give a precise and complete answer to a question, is disruptive and adds another complication that would not be present if the speakers all understand the same language. Witnesses may find it intimidating to be interrupted in the middle of testimony and may say less than they otherwise would. (p. 888)
In addition, the fragmentation in interpreter-assisted communication caused by interpreters ‘cutting in to take a turn before his/her memory capacity is overloaded’ (Nakane, 2014, p. 17) is acknowledged as one of the distinctive characteristics of this type of interaction (Roy, 2000; Wadensjö, 1998). Wadensjö (1998) posited that, in storytelling, primary interlocutors might lose the thread or reach premature conclusions in response to interpreter interruptions. She also contended that fragmented discourse due to being semi-consecutively interpreted has the potential to affect the behaviour of primary interlocutors, who might take the opportunity, while they are being interpreted, for structuring interaction and use pauses to reflect upon how to act next (S. Russell, 2002, p. 124). Similarly, Jefferson (1978) contends that story telling is locally occasioned and sequentially implicative, and they can be co-constructed and collaboratively concluded; Nakane (2014), therefore, argues that ‘the interpreting process inhibits collaborative co-construction if the rendition in short turns fragments the discourse’ (p. 215). This is a proposition commonly held by the legal fraternity, which has always doubted interpreting as an exercise of diminishment (Leung, 2008). Wadensjö (1998) further described such fragmented discourse as one of the ‘trouble sources’ (p. 235) inherent in interpreter-assisted communication. Jacobsen (2012) concurred with Wadensjö, although her observation was based on courtroom interpreting:

[O]n the one hand, information may be lost because the interruption causes a primary participant to lose a train of thought. On the other hand, an interruption may provide a primary participant with the opportunity to gather his/her thoughts. Presumably, the consequences will also depend on how many times a primary participant is interrupted and how frequently. (p. 237)
Similarly, Nakane (2014) asserted that one of the potential issues with police interviews assisted by interpreters is that ‘if the interpreter intends to render the interviewee’s account in two stages and the interviewing professional asks the next question before the second stage is rendered, the interviewee’s account may be cut short’ (p. 19).

In the field of psychotherapy, Nijenhuis (2001, as cited in Bot & Wadensjö, 2004) described asylum seeker patients who, when giving an account of their ‘traumatised memories’ (p. 363), tended to follow a ‘fixed format, a standardised version of what happened … [and] repeat the same lines … use the same words … [and] the story tends to come out as an uninterrupted stream of words’ (p. 363). In such settings, therapists prefer not to interrupt for fear of patient withdrawal (Bot & Wadensjö, 2004). Thus, Bot and Wadensjö (2004) asserted that an interpreter interrupting the narrative ‘carries the risk of discouraging the patient to continue his or her story’ (p. 363). Psychotherapists prefer to allow patients to continue their narratives, ‘knowing that this will necessarily lead to a summarised translation’ (Bot & Wadensjö, 2004). It may be that, in a therapeutic context, a summary interpretation of the patient’s narrative is an acceptable compromise. However, in the bilingual CI context, the researcher does not think this is a feasible proposition because it completely defeats the purpose of trying to elicit the finer details from the interviewee. This dilemma was also noted by S. Russell (2002, p. 124) and Rycroft (2011, p. 216). On the one hand, if the interpreter stops the LOTE-speaking client in a police interview in order to avoid a ‘tightrope situation’ (Gile, 2009, p. 182), it may allow more time for the person to consider the answer. On the other hand, if the interpreter allows the LOTE-speaking client to finish speaking, the interpreter runs the risk that ‘some of what is being said will be lost in interpretation’ (Rycroft, 2011, p. 216).
In 2014, the US Federal Bureau of Investigations’ High-Value Detainee Interrogation Group funded a study on the effects of interpreters in intelligence interview settings. Psychology researchers Ewens et al. (2014) indicated that ‘the introduction of an interpreter disrupts the flow of conversation and it is likely that those speaking through an interpreter will provide fewer details than interviewees speaking in their first language’ (p. 2). They cited computer scientists Bailey and Konstan’s (2006) empirical study on human–computer interaction experience to examine the effect of interrupting information workers when they were engrossed in their primary task to ask them to perform a peripheral task. Bailey and Konstan (2006) concluded that interruptions to information workers cause annoyance and anxiety. In the words of Ewens et al. (2014), ‘research has shown that interruptions lead to annoyance and anxiety (Bailey & Konstan, 2006), and interviewees who are annoyed may volunteer less information (Bull, 2010; Fisher, 2010)’ (p. 2). The current researcher is unconvinced of this statement since the first part of the statement does not seem to bear causal relationship to the latter. First, the cited study done by Bailey and Konstan (2006) has little resemblance to any interpreted event, including interpreter-assisted investigative interviewing which was the focal point of Ewens et al.’s (2014) study; it seems, therefore, illogical to conclude that the social, linguistic and pragmatic impacts, if any, of interruptions arising from the operational needs of the interpreter in an interpreted event would lead to similar findings as Bailey and Konstan’s (2006) study. Second, if and when interviewees feel annoyed for any reason, they may indeed volunteer less information, as suggested by Bull (2010) and Fisher (2010). However, Bull’s and Fisher’s studies examined monolingual interviews, which have no relevance to using language interpretation. Linking two unrelated studies from two unrelated
fields to create a causality between an interviewee’s inclination to speak and the interpreting activity leads to the seemingly flawed logic that:

1. using interpreters in interviews creates interruptions (which is true)
2. interruption leads to annoyance and anxiety among interviewees (which is unsupported because the research quoted is irrelevant)
3. annoyed and anxious interviewees volunteer less information (which is true)
4. using interpreters leads to less information retrieval from the interviewee than not using them (which is doubtful).

This logic is unable to account for scenarios in which the interviewer and interviewee do not share a common language—although in Ewens et al.’s (2014) study, all non-English-speaking research subjects had basic levels of English and were assigned in groups to be interviewed speaking English or through an interpreter. Ewens et al.’s position about the disruption of the flow of conversation in interpreter-assisted interviews is undisputable. This is the inconvenient reality about interpreted discourse, in which interpreters are likened to the gum stuck to the bottom of the shoe—everybody would rather ignore them, but it is practically impossible to do so (Morris, 1999, p. 7). It may also be true that fewer details are offered by people speaking through an interpreter than by people speaking in their first language. However, the researcher has reservations about the logic presented by the authors and cases cited, which lends little weight to this claim. Ultimately, it is a difficult position to maintain as is seemingly suggested by Ewens et al. (2014) that using an interpreter in intelligence interview settings would get less information than not using one because it creates annoyance factor. While it is difficult to ascertain if those five out of twelve interpreters used in the study were professional interpreters or otherwise, since Ewens et al. (2014) only stated that they ‘had previous interpreting experience’ (p. 6), even if they were untrained bilinguals, it
defies logic that they would result in less information extracted from the ‘high value
detainees’ who were the reason for their study. If the detainees do not speak English at
all or speak very little of it, it is unlikely that not employing some sort of language
mediation will get better outcomes.

González et al. (2012) quoted a survey of federally certified court interpreters in
the US, whereby:

- only 3% of the interpreters stated that they would interrupt an attorney or
  witness at ‘every interpreting event’
- 16% of interpreters stated that they did so ‘often’
- 49% of interpreters stated that they did so ‘sometimes’
- 24% of interpreters stated that they did so ‘rarely’
- 9% of interpreters stated that they ‘never’ did so.

Combining those who interrupted every time (3%), often interrupted (16%) and
sometimes interrupted (49%), almost seven of 10 interpreters (68%) used interruption as
a strategy in the courtroom to cope with the discourse, although their reasons for
interrupting did not appear to have been probed. One would posit that one of their
reasons, if not the primary reason, must be the anticipation of an impending ‘tightrope
situation’ (Gile, 2009, p. 182) on their cognitive capacity, which would manifest in their
need to interrupt the primary speaker’s talk. In addition, they may have a ‘tightrope
situation’ already occurring, resulting in their need to ask for repetition or clarification
of the utterances just heard.

In contrast, Mason’s (2008) study of 200 hours of twelve US court interpreters
indicated that those who chose to interrupt had a higher error rate as a consequence.
Thus, she cautioned against using interruption as a strategy. However, her finding does
not seem to be corroborated by the current study. The following Table 25 presents the
seven occasions (in bold) from the turns analysed in Section 5.1.1, where the participant interpreters undertook ‘interruptions proper’—voicing their preference to receive segmented TCUs (represented by ‘++’), raising a hand to stop an ongoing TCU (represented by ‘/’), or requesting a repetition of utterances (represented by ‘{‘). The omission rate for each of these occasion is recorded at the end of the corresponding cell box. As can be seen in the Table 25, the Mandarin interpreter missed 8% of the segment when she used a hand gesture to interrupt the EW-Man for her to interpret, and the Greek interpreter changed 9% of the meaning in the segment using the same technique. Apart from these two occasions, all other four occasions recorded a 0% omission rate. The only remaining case with the Spanish interpreter should be treated as an anomaly, as he consistently refrained from interrupting at all in both INTV1 and INTV2.

The way the omission rates are calculated is by comparing the interpreters’ renditions of the selected sample turns against the original English scripts, where the word counts of the missing contents in each turn are aggregated and the percentage of this aggregated number against the word count of the whole turn is recorded as the omission rate. When working on PI-Eng’s English into LOTE omission rates, the English back translation of the LOTE renditions are used to compare against the original English scripts.

Table 27

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turn no.</th>
<th>Primary speaker</th>
<th>Word count in TCU</th>
<th>Arb</th>
<th>Can</th>
<th>Grk</th>
<th>Ind</th>
<th>Ita</th>
<th>Man</th>
<th>Spa</th>
<th>Tur</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>EW-LOTE (EQV)</td>
<td>30 words</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15++</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(0%)
In turn 20, the Spanish interpreter is observed to forego a couple of the EW-Spa’s longer pauses as implicit offers for semi-consecutive interpreting, until the segment accumulated to 135 words EQV long, when he held up his palm, gesturing to the EW-Spa for a pause. The same happened in the second segment, resulting in an accumulation of 123 words EQV until the end of the turn. Without requesting a repetition for either of the segments, the rendition of the two segments has an average...
omission rate of 41% for turn 20, or 51% and 31% for the two segments individually. These high omission rates by the Spanish interpreter show that inaction on the interpreter’s behalf is a highly risky strategy when dealing with lengthy turns or segments. Missing a high percentage of information in CI—regardless of the PI-Eng’s instructions or the EW-LOTE’s free-form narratives—is undoubtedly undesirable.

In contrast, the omission rates for the other interpreters for turn 20 ranged from 0% to no more than 13%. Referring back to Table 7 (in Section 5.1.2), the Italian interpreter produced the longest average turn length among the remaining seven interpreters, and was the only one yielding an average turn length of 37 words—the only one with more than 30 words. The omission rate of turn 20 by the Italian interpreter is 13%. This seems to indicate a dilemma faced by interpreters—facilitating the interviewee’s free-form narrative at the interpreter’s peril. In the monolingual CI literature reported in this section, scholars have warned against interviewers frequently interrupting interviewee’s free narratives for fear of interviewee withdrawal. Additionally, the interpreting literature discussed in this section asserted that fragmented discourse is likely to influence primary speakers’ behaviour. Although more evidence is needed to support these claims, from the perspective of interpreting performance, if interpreters refrain from securing segmented turns to facilitate semi-consecutive interpreting, the longer the interviewee’s narrative continues in a turn (which is desirable from CI’s perspective) and the longer the interpreter refrains from beginning the semi-consecutive mode, the more likely the interpretation will become a summary and lose the fine details (which is undesirable for CI).

Thus, the interpreter faces a dilemma when dealing with long turns uttered by primary speakers. Given the importance of relaying the precise instructions from the PI-Eng to the EW-LOTE for CI to work properly, and for the EW-LOTE’s sought-after
free-form narrative to be faithfully rendered into English, this study presents the opposite position to Mason (2008). This study argues that non-interruption on the interpreter’s behalf at these important junctures in CI—when turns are necessarily growing longer—entails a high risk of losing information.

7.2 Mechanism of Self-segmentation

Müller (2001) asserts that ‘brevity of turn is of practical translatory interest to the DI [dialogue interpreter]’ (p. 263). Similarly, Bot (2005) observes that ‘the interpreter benefits from shorter turns from the primary speakers in terms of their interpreting performance, whereas this may not be the primary speakers’ main concern’ (p. 112). This fundamental clash of interest in interpreted communication with one person inclined to talk as they wish and the other favouring a ‘piecemeal’ (Mason, 2012, p. 192) style of reception and rendering, in Nakane’s (2014) view, can ‘cause awkwardness in interaction and prevent primary speakers from giving narratives’ (p. 17).

Mason’s (2008) book Courtroom Interpreting reports her regression analysis on the relationship between turn length and interpreter-induced errors when adding, omitting or changing stylistic/linguistic devices, including politeness markers, forms of address, active to passive voice, passive to active voice, focus change, verb change, lexical change, speech disfluencies, use of hedges such as ‘well’, discourse markers and general statements. Although her data are derived from 200 hours of courtroom proceedings in the US Federal District Court, involving 12 certified English–Spanish interpreters, the analysis may offer valuable insights of such institutional discourse which bears certain similarity to police discourse in interviewing settings. As opposed to the researcher’s treatment of turn length in this thesis to mean the English word count in a turn, Mason (2008) defines turn length as the ‘number of linguistic elements, not just words, in a turn of talk. These linguistic elements include content words, such as
nouns and verbs, as well as extralinguistic features, such as speech disfluencies, and pragmatic markers’ (p. 19). Mason’s (2008, p. 34) analysis shows that at least one event (an addition, omission or change of stylistic/linguistic devices) is expected whenever the length of a courtroom utterance is seven words or greater. Of 100 linguistic variables tested, 38 errors could be attributed to longer turn lengths (Mason, 2008, p. 35).

In contrast, González et al. (2012) contend that:

[a] competent interpreter is able to process and interpret 40 to 60 words of question-and-answer testimony without having to interrupt the speaker, which they say the Federal Court Interpreter Certification Program regards this ability as a minimal performance standard in CI [Consecutive Interpreting]. (p. 877)

This range is similar to the required level of competence in Australia’s national interpreter accreditation system—a maximum 60 words in a turn of dialogue for Professional Interpreter and 35 words for Paraprofessional Interpreter (NAATI, 2008; see Section 5.2.2). However, there does not seem to be any empirical study or theoretical underpinning to support this particular set of numbers adopted by the American and Australian systems. González et al. (2012) further quote two examples of how certain courts recognise interpreters’ need for manageably sized segments in a turn of talk in order to undertake a successful job in rendering everything stated in the courtroom:

1. Section vii.8 of Administrative Order No. 85-002, Superior Court in Maricopa County, 1985 has it that:

   Interpreting in the consecutive mode, the interpreter may need to interrupt the discourse of the witness periodically to interpret or to review his notes. These interruptions should only create a pause during the witness’ testimony
and will note delete or stop parts of that testimony. The interpreter may
arrange a system of signals with the witness before taking the stand, so as to
facilitate this practice. (González et al., 2012, p. 887)

for San Diego Municipal Court states that ‘when it is obvious that an answer
is too long and complex for the interpreter to render it fully in the TL, “the
interpreter must interrupt the witness and break up his narrative into
segments not greater than the interpreter’s recall will allow for accurate
translation. The essence or gist of a statement is not enough” (p.7)’.
(González et al., 2012, p. 888)

However, González et al. (2012) also report these provisions being ‘abused’ (p.
888) when interpreters interrupted—for example, by using hand gestures at every turn
in order to compensate for their memory deficiency. They further caution that not all
courts are amenable to interpreters interrupting witnesses, and highlight the general
principle of examining attorneys’ prerogative to control witnesses’ responses to
questions. Therefore, it is best for attorneys and judges to remind witnesses at the outset
to segment their utterances in their testimony for the benefit of the interpreter. In a
courtroom setting, the current researcher concurs that this may be the best option
available to the interpreter, if there is opportunity to have a quick conference before
court appearance with the party for whom the interpreter is booked (the
barrister/solicitor for the accused or the public prosecutor and their witnesses), so the
interpreter can request segmented turns to facilitate the semi-consecutive interpreting
mode. This will ideally eliminate the interpreter’s need to employ any of the four
options discussed in Section 6.1.1 to signal their possible cognitive saturation and will
be conducive to their satisfactory performance. It must particularly be noted that the
interpreter should make clear that the request for segmented turns is also applicable to
the lawyers and judge, if and when they address the LOTE-speaking suspect or witness.
At times, lawyers’ and judges’ turns can be syntactically convoluted, semantically
complex, strategically unintelligible, and duly or unduly long. Thus, it is equally
important that the lawyers and judge segment their long turns to facilitate semi-
consecutive interpreting. Furthermore, when the suspect or witness is not being
addressed by the lawyers or judge, or not giving testimony on the witness stand or in the
dock, the principle of linguistic presence (see Section 3.2) necessitates that the
interpreter undertake whisper interpreting (*chuchotage*—see Section 3.4.2) of what is
being said in the courtroom to the LOTE person so she or he understands what is
occurring. The current researcher acknowledges that in real-life interpreting, the
negotiation of the control of segmentation (explicitly through requests prior to the talk
or during the talk, or implicitly by measures of intervention during the talk on the part
of the interpreter) and the agency of such segmentation (offered by the primary speakers
or imposed by the interpreter) is less clear-cut and may be a combination of all. The
researcher’s position above to pursue consensus of primary speakers’ autonomously
segmented talk is in response to the aversion to interpreter intervention and interruption
to achieve this aim during talk held by interpreting academia and legal practitioners.

In Mason’s (2008) data, semi-consecutive interpreting mode yields significantly
lower omissions of stylistic/linguistic devices than did the consecutive interpreting
mode, in which interruption was used to manage cognitive overload. For every 100
interruptions undertaken by interpreters, they make 86 omissions (Mason, 2008, p. 46)
of politeness markers, forms of address, speech disfluencies, hedges and discourse
markers (Mason, 2008, p. 34). In contrast, for every 100 semi-consecutive events, there
are 33 fewer omissions. Further, using another measure, Mason (2008, p. 52) finds that
omissions significantly decreased by 1.2 words in semi-consecutive interpreting, and
significantly increased by 0.86 words with interruption in consecutive interpreting. Thus,
Mason (2008) concludes that semi-consecutive interpreting is ‘better at reducing errors,
particularly overall omissions, because this mode of interpreting best addresses the issue
of cognitive overload’ (p. 53). However, Mason (2008) also comments on the limited
practicality of securing the semi-consecutive mode for interpreters in the courtroom:

[S]emi-consecutive interpreting depends on others for its execution. The
interpreter may benefit from the technique, but is not the initiator. Thus, the
interpreter does not have direct control of the use of semi-consecutive
interpreting and must depend on others who may not be inclined to, or interested
in, self-segmenting their output. (p. 53)

Mason (2008) states that power is the cause of the seeming lack of agency by judges
and lawyers to facilitate semi-consecutive mode for court interpreters, as well as the
reluctance of interpreters to voice their preference for this mode of interpreting: ‘[T]he
courtroom is still a conservative, hierarchical, and patriarchal institution … that serves
best the efforts of those who have control over courtroom proceedings, rather than
considering the legitimate needs of interpreters’ (p. 53). She states that, given that
lawyers are not particularly enthusiastic about consistently self-segmenting their output
to help interpreters counter diminished performance due to higher turn lengths, the best
solution may be to ‘create awareness in the legal profession about the potential benefits
of semi-consecutive interpreting’ (p. 57). The current researcher again concurs that this
would be a good starting point to improve courtroom interpreting quality.

However, in the context of this research, particularly in view of applying the CI
protocol with cooperative interviewees, it must be highlighted that what the researcher
termed interlingual ‘cooperation’ and ‘accommodation’ in Section 6.1.3 between the
interpreter and primary speakers is clearly at display. This is in addition to the overarching ‘cooperation proper’ between the primary speakers who are unable to communicate due to language barriers. The researcher adds that such interlingual cooperation and accommodation is not unusual in interpreter-assisted communication in other public service settings, such as teacher–parent, doctor–patient, and welfare worker–client encounters. This is because most of these encounters are fundamentally egalitarian (Pöchhacker, 2004) and supposedly cooperative. In a less cooperative police encounter with reluctant witnesses or suspects, one may posit that it may not be as easy to secure the same level of cooperation and accommodation from the interviewee. However, in such circumstances, the interviewee may not wish to say much in the first place, so it may not be a concern from the interpreting perspective. The example given in Section 2.1.3.3 illustrates this point: Dr Shipman was asked the following question, essentially accusing him of forging the will of his then diseased patient, and thus implicating murder:

Police officer: can I put it directly to you doctor that you forged … you have produced … the letters and this will on your typewriter in the hope of benefitting from Mrs Grundy’s estate.

Dr Shipman: is that a question or a statement? (Haworth, 2006, pp. 750–751)

It is always a good practice for the police to brief the interpreter before a CI session, and for the interpreter to raise the issue of using semi-consecutive interpreting as a preferred mode to achieve the best communication outcomes. Then, at the start of the interview, the police officer can explain this to the interviewee to ensure that both primary speakers are clear about the need for self-segmentation if they need to speak in long turns.
7.3 Intentional Pauses during Interviews

According to Geiselman and Fisher (2014), as the interviewee completes the main narrative of the target event as a result of the invitation of an open-ended question, the interviewer should listen attentively and take cursory notes. The interviewer should then follow up with probing questions, addressing each independent scene noted from the narrative, starting from the most promising scene from the narrative (Fisher & Geiselman, 1992). This is because elements in the memory are associated with other elements, so recalling one detail is likely to trigger recollection of others. As the interview progresses, fatigue may set in for both the interviewer and interviewee, thereby affecting their inability to concentrate. Thus, it is important for the interviewer to use the following strategies when asking probing questions in order to enhance productivity (Geiselman & Fisher, 2014):

- refraining from asking questions while the interviewee is searching their memory to avoid contributing to the cognitive load of the interviewee
- asking fewer, but more open-ended questions—for example, rather than ‘Did the robber have long or short hair?’, ask ‘Describe the robber’s hair’ (all the questions listed in Table 17 from INTV1 and INTV2 feature this strategy)
- allowing time for the interviewee to search their memory adequately and formulate an answer, by pausing after each of the interviewee’s answers (for perhaps three to four seconds) and strategically using longer pauses
- not talking over the witness or appearing to want to ask a question while the interviewee is still answering a previous question.

The third bullet point related to pauses is most pertinent to the discussion in this section in two ways:
1. the strategic nature of these pauses (enhancing interviewee’s concentration and thus the productivity of the interview)

2. making the pauses longer than usual in order to exert their usefulness (allowing time for the interviewee to search their memory, formulate an answer, and lessen their cognitive load).

The study data have 100% disappearance of pauses—95% by the floor being ceded to the interpreter, and 5% because of the non-reproduction of the pauses in the LOTE version, even though the interpreter did not take over the floor to start interpreting. In addition, the 2012 interpreting exam (reported in Section 5.3.1) has 100% disappearance of pauses among five students. This highlights that this important strategy in the monolingual version of CI does not operate in bilingual settings due to the nature of interpreting. This indicates a possible need for some kind of adjustment or intervention if these strategically important pauses are to be maintained in the bilingual version of CI. The interviewing police officer may have to be trained to insert these pauses at the start of the next utterance (such as the 12 examples in the data), or interpreters may have to be trained to reproduce the pause.

Clark (1992, 1996) relates to conversation as a form of social collaboration. Under his ‘action tradition’ (Clark, 1992, pp. xi–xiii) in the study of same-language discourse, equal emphasis is placed on speech production and speech reception, whereby all participants in a conversation work towards ‘achieving common goals by constructing, as best as they can, a reciprocally held common store of information, the conversational “common ground”’ (Davidson, 2002, p. 1273). Davidson (2002) extends Clark’s conversational common ground (CG) to interpreted discourse, and contends that interpreting does not involve one conversational CG between two primary speakers, but two separate sets of CG—between the interpreter and each of the primary speakers.
Clark (1992) further categorises CG into types. For example, one type is ‘personal CG’, which refers to mutually shared personal experience between the current interlocutor, e.g. two friends discussing a trip they took together last year. Another example is ‘communal CG’, which refers to knowledge shared due to common community membership, such as two police officers having a conversation in which their institutional knowledge about the police force forms the basis of their communal CG, or two university classmates studying the same subject and discussing an assignment. Their joint experience of studying the same subject with the same lecturer is their communal CG. For interpreter-assisted police CI, Davidson’s (2002) conceptualisation of two separate sets of conversational CG, incorporating Clark’s (1992) ‘personal GC’ and ‘communal GC’ can be illustrated in Diagram 8 below (using Diagram 4 from Section 3.4.2 as a template).

![Diagram 8. Conversational CG in interpreter-assisted police cognitive interviews.](image)

If a police interview is a repeat or follow-up interview using the same interpreter, there may be a certain (low) level of personal CG in the interaction. The researcher argues that the two sets of conversational CG—personal and communal CG—on either side of the triangle in Diagram 8 between the interpreter and two primary speakers begin from a very low base. When examining the interpreting performance during
interpreter-assisted communication in public service settings, it is important to impose realistic expectations on the publicly funded interpreter. This is important because the interpreter’s participation in the interaction between the primary speakers is superimposed, with low or no personal or communal CG. This is also why, in Davidson’s (2002) ‘complex action model of interpreting discourse’ (p. 1283), he accounts for interpreters’ need to undertake mini-exchanges with both primary speakers to make sense of their utterances before the interpretation can be undertaken. He asserts that ‘[a]ny working model of interpreted discourse must take into account the fact that participants in the discourse are not passive recipients of meaningful utterances, but rather agents actively involved in the co-construction of these meanings’ (Davidson, 2002, p. 1284). This conception is very useful in countering the aversion to all forms of ‘interruption’ initiated by and involving the interpreter. These mini-exchanges are regarded as interruptions by some interpreting scholars and many interpreter users (see discussions in Section 5.1.3). It is the researcher’s view that justified interruptions, such as these mini-exchanges, to build conversational CG should be accepted as one of the characteristics of meaningful interpreted discourse. By ‘justified’, the researcher means that these interruptions are needed to enable the interpreter to facilitate clear communication. This includes the interruptions described under options one to three in Section 6.1.1, and interruptions that seek to clarify the interpreter’s understanding—as opposed to the strategy described by González et al. (2012) that is ‘abused’ (p. 888) by interpreters to compensate for their lack of skills, such as insufficient memory (see Section 6.2.1).

However, in relation to this section about the disappearance of pauses in the interpreted version of questions asked to the EW-LOTE, the researcher argues that the more relevant element is the communal CG between the PI-Eng and interpreter—the
The particular conversational strategies in CI, and the utterances produced by the PI-Eng in the interview, share low communal CG with the interpreter. Although pauses contain no lexical items—and can narrowly be described as having no conversational content—the researcher argues they are an extremely significant component in the PI-Eng’s utterances, when the RE and RC strategies are implemented. From this perspective, pauses can be regarded a silent yet integral part of discourse. The researcher further argues that, unless the interpreter is briefed on the interview’s purpose, and, most importantly, afforded information about the questioning strategies to be applied in the interview, there is substantial risk of the interviewer’s intentional strategies being compromised. A clear example is the interpreter’s omission of pauses indicated in this study finding, which resulted from low communal CG in the interaction between the interpreter and PI-Eng. This view is corroborated by Nakane (2014), who maintains that:

[the interpreter’s] understanding of the reasons why questions are constructed and sequenced in certain ways [may affect the process of interpreter-mediated interviews]. The interpreter’s alignment or lack of it with the police interviewer’s institutional orientation, whether intentional or unintentional, may affect the course of investigative interviews and consequently the outcome of the case. (p. 9)

As the results indicated, in contrast to the pauses at the end of an utterance in monolingual settings (to allow time for the interviewee to develop a mental image for the interviewer’s further probing), in bilingual settings, an alternative way to recreate this pausal effect is to insert the pause at the start of the next utterance. Another option may be having the police interviewer verbalise an instruction of momentary silence, such as: ‘don’t say anything yet’, ‘don’t say anything in the next few seconds’ or
‘concentrate on … for a few seconds and let me know when you are ready’. This can be accompanied by floor-holding measures, so that the interviewee gains the benefit of momentary silence to gather their thoughts and does not begin talking straight away. This can be followed by a clear instruction for the interviewee to start talking, such as ‘now, tell me everything you remember about…’. This strategy was featured in INTV1 at turn 23, illustrated in Table 17:

[D]on’t say anything yet. Just develop the image as clearly as you can.

Concentrate on his face and head. [pause] Now, try to describe his head and face in as much detail as you can. Don’t leave anything out. [emphasis added] (Fisher & Geiselman, 1992, p. 164)

However, in the above statement, the phrase ‘don’t say anything yet’ should be added just before the pause. This would ensure that, upon receiving the interpreted version, the instruction would be clear to the EW-LOTE to not to say anything for a while, since it is the instruction of the last interpreted utterance. This solution requires police interviewers’ CI training to acknowledge the high possibility of intentional pauses disappearing in bilingual versions. To accommodate the operational sequence of interpreting, the sequence of utterances and the intentional longer pauses (to allow the interviewee time to retrieve memory) are recommended to be arranged and inserted by PI-Eng as follows:

Don’t say anything yet. Just develop the image as clearly as you can.

Concentrate on his face and head. Don’t say anything yet. [pause; and interpreter most likely will assume floor to interpret] // [After the interpreter finishes rendering of the previous chunk, insert a new pause here] Now, try to describe his head and face in as much detail as you can. Don’t leave anything out. [emphasis added]
7.4 Interpreting Mode Switching

The simultaneity provided by interpreters through the simultaneous interpreting mode or *chuchotage* in a bilingual interview setting—as opposed to consecutive interpreting, where primary speakers pause talking for their utterances to be interpreted into the TL—is attractive to some police or law enforcement agencies. Hence, organisations providing simultaneous interpreting solutions and equipment such as Simultanex (http://simultanex.com) seem appealing. However, the researcher calls for caution and scrutiny for what this supplier proposes. The video featured on the website shows two people speaking different languages having a conversation with each other sitting face-to-face, each wearing a headphone which supposedly receives simultaneous interpretation from an interpreter sitting nearby. The satisfying expressions on the two interlocutors in the promotional video are somewhat deceiving. Because their headphones need to be of exceptional quality in order to block all outside sound sources, including ones from the other interlocutor sitting directly opposite, otherwise there would be noise interference. Additionally, for simultaneous interpreting to work properly in this setting (or any other setting), the interpreter must have clear sight of the interlocutors to access their facial expressions, body language and so forth. Thus, the spot the interpreter sits in the Simultanex video—facing away from the interlocutors—appears to have been developed by someone who knows little about simultaneous interpreting. This may function if using a far corner with clear views of both interlocutors in the same room (provided the earphones are completely soundproof), or if the interpreter is placed in the next room with a one-way mirror.

The video goes so far as to suggest the applicability of this equipment to enable off-site interpreting via telephone. This configuration is no different to conventional
telephone interpreting, whether or not via the proposed equipment in the video. The larger issue is whether telephone interpreting is acceptable in particular types of interviews, and whether it meets the admissibility tests of evidence tendered in court. The researcher strongly believes that, if police and law enforcement wish to use simultaneous interpreting for important interviews, a sound understanding of how interpreting—specifically simultaneous interpreting—functions is critical. For example, if they opt for a system such as Simultanex or its equivalent (e.g. that tour guides or museum curators use to provide spoken commentary when leading a group of customers), care should be taken so the interpreter can see clearly the interlocutors no matter they are placed in the same interviewing space as the interlocutors or in a separate room with one-way window adjacent to the interview room. The simultaneous interpreting equipment is a mature technology, so it is the knowhow on how to design the setting in order for simultaneous interpreting to work properly and effectively in police interviewing that is the key.

As analysed in Section 6.4.2 (simultaneous versus consecutive interpreting), both modes of interpreting have positive and negatives. As such, simultaneous interpreting should not be regarded a panacea for all interpreting settings, as is stated by certain sections of the interpreting fraternity and other professions who use interpreting services. There should be no pressure to push police interpreting to exclusively use one mode, while excluding all others. As shown by the data analysed in Section 5.4, simultaneous interpreting may be applicable in places where pauses are to be inserted for strategic purposes, or when the interviewee slows down to search their memory, while continuing to speak at a slower pace.

If it is regarded undesirable for interpreters to switch between different interpreting modes during different parts of the interview, the researcher recommends
that the police interviewer verbalise instructions for momentary silence and hold the
floor, thereby creating a desirable pause to enable the interviewee to prepare an answer
or search their memory for specific information.

7.5 CI Specialised Terminology and Concepts

7.5.1 Lack of equivalence of lexical items in CI questioning. Certain
important lexical items—such as ‘view’ (as in eyesight), ‘mental picture’, and ‘sound’
versus ‘voice’—are often used in CI questioning, and (it can be safely assumed) in
general police investigations. The researcher does not argue that there will be dire
consequences when these words cannot be precisely transferred into TL. As in much
interlingual linguistic operation, different linguistic codes have always found ways to
deal effectively with such issues. As is established in Section 1.3 (research questions),
the researcher’s baseline of investigation was to identify any deviations to the original
English monolingual scripts, as an exploratory study. So the interpreting data collected
for these lexical items may warrant more attention than others in the context of CI,
requiring solutions to be determined from the police interviewer, interpreter or both.

In regard to the phrase ‘focusing in’ on an area of interest—such as a camera
lens ‘focusing in’ on a particular part of an image for a more detailed and enlarged view,
the translation of this phrase in the research data, without exception, became to ‘focus
on’ an image. Whether such change of meaning has any influencing effect on the
interviewee was beyond the scope of the study; thus, it is not discussed in detail.
However, the 100% mistranslation rate manifested in this study for this expression
suggests that there may be a need to create more explicit wording to be used by the PI-
Eng to explicate the sense intended by such expression.

7.5.2 Negative phrasing and neutral wording in CI questioning. As can be
seen in Table 22, when the PI-Eng used negative sentence construction (which CI
dislikes), the interpreter was more likely to change it to the opposite (70% versus 30% who retained the negative phrasing). This may highlight that negative phrasing is less ideal and more cumbersome to express in the LOTE from the interpreters’ perspective. Therefore, a clear meaning-based approach is favoured over achieving formal equivalence. If the PI-Eng uses the correct phrasing strategy, it is safe to assume that no interpreter would change it to negative phrasing. This indicates the sole agency of the police interviewer to use the correct phrasing.

Similarly, in relation to using neutral wording when eliciting certain descriptions of people or events in order to avoid influencing the response (see Table 23), if the PI-Eng uses the less preferred, more leading wording, there was a likelihood of 70% that the interpreter would render it as was. This again highlights the agency of the police interviewer choosing the correct word form. When the PI-Eng indeed used neutral wording, it was found that there was a risk of close to 40% that the interpreter would change it to the less preferred wording, pointing to the need for interpreter training in order to address it. The research argues that the only way to eliminate this 40% risk is to make interpreters aware of the intentional neutral wording adopted by the PI-Eng, and the need to retain formal equivalence (Nida & Taber, 1969), rather than a meaning-based approach. This could be achieved by specific interpreter training or at least police briefing before a CI interview is conducted. The importance of involving the interpreter in the planning process of the interview has been acknowledged and spelt out in paragraph 2.189 of the UK Ministry of Justice’s (2011, p. 58) Guidance on Interviewing Victims and Witnesses.

It is essential to choose wording carefully in police questioning due to the possibility of memory contamination caused by the fallibility of human memory. Loftus and Palmer’s (1974) experiment is frequently cited, in which viewers of the same video
tape were asked the same questions, phrased differently. For example, ‘about how fast were the cars going when they smashed/collided/bumped/hit/contacted each other?’.

Those who were asked the question with the word ‘smash’ reported higher estimates of the speed on average than those who were asked the question with the word ‘hit’. Those who were asked the question with the word ‘contact’ yielded the lowest estimates.

Further, one week later, the participants asked about cars ‘smashing’ into each other were more than twice as likely to report seeing broken glass when asked about the accident, even though there was no scene with broken glass. In circumstances such as these, it is essential to preserve the specific words carefully selected by the interviewer to maintain a neutral position. Thus, the roughly 40% of interpreters who changed the neutral wording must be managed by raising interpreter’s awareness of this important strategy, and the need to maintain this wording with correspondence in the TL in order to avoid inserting misleading cues in the question.

7.5.3 Unusual CI instructions, such as CP. Applying the conversational CG theoretical framework (Clark, 1992, 1996; Davidson, 2002) discussed in Section 6.3, certain instructions in CI—such as the more unusual CP—highlight the lack of communal CG. This is likely to become the interpreter’s ‘problem trigger’ (Gile, 1995, pp. 172–174; Gile, 2009, p. 176; Seleskovitch, 1975 [in French]), thus conducive to the undesired interruption initiated by the interpreter (see Section 5.1.3) for further clarification of the meaning before the interpreter was able to render. To address the issue of lack of conversation CG between the interpreter and the PI-Eng, providing interpreter training on CI will help them to acquire the desired knowledge schema in order to overcome it.

7.6 Summary
This chapter has used the research findings reported in Chapter 5 and discussed their effects on CI interviewing strategies, responding to research question 3, and, where appropriate, commented on such effects in the broader application of CI and made suggestions to future CI practice, responding to research questions 4.

In contrast to Mason’s (2008) findings on twelve US Federal Court interpreters—in which interruptions by interpreters were found to lead to omissions of extra-linguistic elements, such as politeness markers, hedges and discourse markers—this study found that explicit interruption, either verbally or by gesture, results in lower omission rates. Without a knowledge schema of CI or communal CG, the participant interpreters were unaware of the strategic purposes of the pauses deliberately inserted by PI-Eng when implementing CR and RE strategies, resulting in 95% disappearance of the pauses in their interpreted versions. Thus, the researcher proposes the relocation of these pauses by the PI-Eng from the end of the utterance to the start of the next one, or to verbalise the request to the EW-LOTE to remain silent for a moment to allow their memory to clear regarding the target of recall before they start their narrative.

Whether bilingual CI is suitable to be done exclusively by simultaneous interpreting warrants further investigation. The constraints are the small physical interviewing space normally encountered in police interviewing and the issue of voice interference if no simultaneous interpreting equipment is utilised. If equipment can be organised, the choice of suitable equipment, the interpreter’s seating arrangement in the same room or in an adjacent room with one-way window must be thought out. In addition, there is a continuing debate in the interpreting field regarding the accuracy rates of the two modes of interpreting.
The next chapter—the final chapter of this thesis—summarises the main points of the discussions, and offers a final analysis of the implications of the study findings. It will also outline the limitations of the study, and suggest further research for the future.
Chapter 8: Conclusion

This exploratory research seeks to investigate how CI protocol retains or loses its features when interlingual language mediation by a language interpreter is needed between an English-speaking interviewer and foreign-language speaking interviewee in a police investigative interviewing context. The CI protocol is a set of techniques based on empirical research and principles from cognitive and social psychology (Fisher & Castano, 2008), deployed by trained police interviewers when interviewing cooperative victims, witnesses and suspects to elicit specific information to solve crimes. CI draws on the fundamental tenets of rapport building with the interviewee and active listening with minimal interruptions. This protocol is developed by American psychologists Fisher and Geiselman (1992) and has been mainly adopted by police forces in Anglophone countries.

Thus far, the available literature has largely focused on CI conducted monolingually in English, with a minority which started to look into its workings monolingually in LOTEs. Thus, this research is pioneering in understanding how CI works in an Anglophone country when interviewing subjects are unable to communicate effectively in English. In a multicultural and multilingual country such as Australia, with over one-quarter (28.1%) of the population born overseas (ABS, 2014) and roughly one in five (19.3%) speaking a LOTE at home (ABS, 2012), this research has particular significance to members of this community. For people who are not proficient in English or do not speak English at all, when they are involved in a criminal event and assisting police with their enquiries, they are regarded as vulnerable (Bartels, 2011; Moston, 2013, p. 11) in a legal sense. This research is designed to pursue this line of enquiry to contribute to the knowledge gap.
8.1 Main Research Findings

Using two scripted CI interviews originally written monolingually in English by American psychologists Fisher and Geiselman (1992, pp. 159–184), this research adapted the interviews into eight languages which represent the linguistic demography of Australia and Melbourne in particular. The two scripts feature a police interviewer questioning a non–English speaking witness to a crime (INTV1) and a victim of crime (INTV2), with the assistance of an interpreter. This exploratory research used native speakers of English and eight LOTE languages as role players, and employed professional interpreters to provide interpreting as in real-life police interviews when there are language barriers. A total of 16 sessions (INTV1 and INTV2 by eight languages each) were video recorded to form the data for this study, allowing the researcher to analyse the linguistic and non-linguistic aspects of them. The aim is not to study the translatability of particular CI verbal strategies in the eight languages, although any such findings are noted and analysed. Rather, the main purpose is to gain an overall understanding of how cross-lingual language mediation occurs in these encounters between police interviewers and witnesses/victims, and whether police interviewers and/or interpreters need to be aware of any particular issues under CI and to adjust any aspects of their operation in order for the interpreter-assisted CI interviews to work as closely as possible to ones conducted monolingually in English. This is because CI literature has confirmed its capacity to elicit 25 to 40% more correct statements than traditional interviews (Fisher & Geiselman, 2010, p. 325). In response to the four research questions posed in Section 1.3, this study offers the following answers.

8.1.1 Question 1: How do the features of CI manifest in questioning and answering in a bilingual setting assisted by language interpreting? The participant
interpreters all opted for semi-consecutive interpreting (see Section 5.1), relying mainly on their short-term memory and using minimal note taking (see Section 5.2.2). The invocation of the semi-consecutive interpreting mode in the data was achieved by one or a combination of the four options available to interpreters (see Section 6.1.1):

1. explicitly asking the primary speakers to segment their turns
2. explicitly asking the primary speakers to repeat a segment in a turn to signal the limitation of the interpreter's cognitive capacity
3. explicitly using nonverbal means (such as holding up the palm towards the primary speakers) to signal the request for a pause
4. using the natural intra-turn pauses between utterances by the primary speakers to enter an unfinished turn and start interpreting.

Under the semi-consecutive interpreting mode employed by all participant interpreters in the data, the interpreters seemed more comfortable dealing with longer segments from English into the LOTE than the other direction. They averaged 19.2 words from English into the LOTE (for turns of questioning, or 1PP), as opposed to 16.2 words from the LOTE into English (for turns of answering, or 2PP) (see Section 5.2.1).

When interpreting segments consecutively within a longer turn, around half of the time, the participant interpreters are found to direct their gaze back at the primary speaker who was talking. For the remaining half of the occasions, they approximately equally gazed at the other primary speaker receiving the interpretation or had a neutral gaze direction, i.e. not looking at either primary speaker (see Section 5.2.3).

On a small number of occasions in the police interviewer’s questioning turns, simultaneous interpreting was used spontaneously by the interpreter, instead of the semi-consecutive mode that predominated the data (see Section 5.4). The data also displayed that 95% of the strategic pauses inserted by the police interviewer (to
facilitate the interviewee’s better recall) were eliminated due to the nature of interpreting (see Section 5.3.1).

Wording such as ‘view’ (as in eyesight) in CI questioning appears to create confusion and lead to errors in interpreting due to its polysemic meaning—as in someone’s ‘point of view’ (see Sections 5.5.1 and 5.5.2). In addition, not every language distinguished ‘sound’ transmitted via the vibration of air as opposed to the ‘voice’ produced by a human being. Using the two lexical items in conjunction in CI questioning may create problems in some languages (see Section 5.5.5). Translatability of the non-technical term ‘mental picture’ from English into other languages also proved difficult, with most languages having to express the idea by breaking it into two components: in the ‘head/mind/memory’ + construct a ‘picture/image/view’ (as in eyesight) (see Section 5.5.3). Asking the interviewee to ‘focus in’ on something being recalled yields 100% mistranslation, as it was construed by all interpreters as asking the interviewee to ‘focus on’ something (see Section 5.5.4).

On a positive note, when the police interviewer used negative phrasing disliked by CI, e.g. ‘You don’t know what brand they [the sneakers the robber wore] were, do you?’, there is a 70% possibility that it would be inadvertently corrected by the interpreter (see Section 5.5.6). However, the use of the recommended neutral wording, e.g. ‘Can you describe the length of his hair?’, has a 40% risk of being interpreted into the less preferred and more leading wording, e.g. ‘How long is his hair?’ (see Section 5.5.7).

8.1.2 Question 2: How do the manifestations of the interpreter-assisted bilingual CI interviews relate to interpreting practice? To an extent, interpreting can be regarded as talk as performance (Burns, 1998; Jones, 1996). The invocation of the semi-consecutive interpreting mode in CI indicates interpreters’ pursuit of self-
preservation in a cognitively demanding context, particularly when dealing with longer
turns, denser information or unusual CI instructions by the interviewer—all of which
can be regarded ‘problem triggers’ (Gile, 1995, pp. 172–174; Gile, 2009, p. 176;
Seleskovitch, 1975 [in French]). There is a fundamental conflict of the primary speakers’
wish to speak unhindered and interpreters’ constant urge to take over the floor to render
in order to prevent the ‘tightrope situation’ (Gile, 2009, p. 182). Four options are
categorised by the researcher that are available to interpreters to enable premature floor
taking before the conclusion of a turn (see Section 6.1.1 and point no. 1 in this Section
8.1.1). However, in the interpreting literature, these methods have been considered
‘interruptions’, therefore being regarded as undesirable. The only exception is option
four, which has not been explicitly discussed in a negative light in the interpreting
literature.

In contrast, the primary speakers in this study accepted and accommodated the
participant interpreters’ preference of the semi-consecutive interpreting mode, as is
often observed in real life, by a mixture of the following two mechanisms:

- acquiescing to ceding the floor prematurely to the interpreter at certain intra-
turn pauses (when the interpreter starts interpreting) before reaching the end
of their turn;

- implementing self-regulated segmentation of their turns so utterances are
given in manageable chunks for the interpreter to handle (see Section 6.1).

By applying Napier’s (2007) cooperative principles for interpreted communication (see
Section 6.1.3 and Tables 24 and 25) and Prunč’s (2000) ‘model of translation culture’,
the researcher explains interlingual cooperation and accommodation, and offers a point
of departure from ‘cooperation’ and ‘accommodation’ in monolingual settings
established by Grice (1975) and Giles (1977, 1980) (see Section 6.1.3 and Table 26).
In this study, the average segment lengths handled by the participant interpreters were 19.2 words from English into the LOTE, and 16.2 words from the LOTE into English (see Section 5.2.1). These numbers seem very close to Mason’s (2008) data derived from 200 hours of interpreting at a US Federal District Court by 12 certified English–Spanish interpreters, where she finds that ‘interpreters wait, on average, until turn length reaches 21.75 words to make an interruption’ (p. 45). This phenomenon may be attributed to the fact that all except one participant interpreter had English as their second language. Therefore, when rendering from the LOTE into English, the heavier cognitive load in formulating their renditions required a smaller segment (see Section 6.2.1). However, these figures are approximately one-third and slightly less than one-third of the length that trained interpreters in Australia are expected to handle (60 words) (see Section 6.2.1). It may be construed that the training for interpreters is generic in order to cover all public service domains, such as education, health, social welfare, immigration and legal. In most circumstances when interpreting is provided in order for the LOTE-speaking client to obtain public services, a meaning-based approach is sufficient to achieve communication purposes at hand. However, as analysed in this thesis and , in court and police interpreting settings, due to the high-stakes nature of the encounter, merely transferring the meaning is insufficient—interpreters must also transfer how utterances are expressed. To render primary speakers’ utterances with all their nuances requires higher cognitive load allocation, which compromises the segment length that interpreters are able to process (see Section 6.2.1).

The general absence of note taking in the data conforms to what the researcher has observed in the industry. As note taking for interpreting is a difficult set of skills to acquire and consumes much of interpreters’ cognitive capacity, if applying Gile’s (2009) effort model, it is understandable that the participant interpreters opted for shorter
segments without much note taking in order to keep their cognitive load within manageable levels (see Section 6.2.2).

In relation to eye gaze, studies have shown that eye gaze direction is an important signalling device to show attention and to coordinate turn distribution at talk (Lang, 1978; Mason, 2012; Stiefelhagen & Zhu, 2002; Vertegaal, van der Veer, & Vons, 2000; Vertegaal, Slagter, van der Veer, & Nijholt, 2001). It is challenging for interpreters to discern whether the segment they have just rendered is part of a turn, but not yet at the turn boundary. If it is the case, their eye gaze should be directed back to the same speaker as a cue for continuing the unfinished turn. In contrast, if the segment they just rendered is the end of a long turn, their eye gaze should be directed to the opposite speaker as a cue to start the next turn, or remain neutral for the speakers to self-select (see Section 6.2.3). There may be a risk of prematurely ending the LOTE speaker’s free-form narrative if the interpreter’s eye gaze is directed at the police interviewer at the end of rendering of a segment, thereby offering a cue for the police interviewer to take over the floor, therefore cutting short the turn the LOTE speaker originally intended to talk.

A few instances of interpreting mode switch by two participant interpreters from consecutive to simultaneous point to the need for further investigation into the application of simultaneous interpreting, either exclusively or mixed with the dominantly adopted semi-consecutive mode. However, the specific requirements for equipment and venue setup for simultaneous interpreting, as well as possible compromise on accuracy based on the available literature, are factors for the police to evaluate its pros and cons.

8.1.3 Question 3: Given what is observed in the data, what are the effects of a bilingual setting on CI interviewing strategies? One of the most prominent
characteristics of the English-speaking interviewer and LOTE-speaking interviewee’s discourse in the data is the truncated manner in which they uttered the longer turns in order to facilitate semi-consecutive interpreting for the participant interpreters. The segmented talk is achieved, sometimes, through the interpreters’ employment of one of the four options available to them (see Section 8.1.1 and further details in Section 6.1.1), and at other times, by the primary speakers (see Section 8.1.2 and details in Section 6.1.1). The data show that, without such interventions—as featured in the Spanish version—the omission rates in the interpretation from English into Spanish is 49% and from Spanish into English was 41% (see Table 27 in Section 7.1). In contrast, interruptions initiated by the other language versions yielded omission rates from 0% to no more than 13% (see Table 27 in Section 7.1). These numbers highlights the interpreter’s finite cognitive capacity to handle incoming messages—without intervention strategies either by the interpreters or the primary speakers to make each segment of utterances manageable for the interpreter to render into the other languages, the interviewing police officer risks receiving incomplete messages or messages containing errors (see Section 7.2). Having said that, there are also concerns that fragmented discourse arising from the need of interpreting process will inhibit collaborative story co-construction between the interviewing officer and the interviewee (Nakane, 2014, p. 215). And if the primary speakers are interrupted, they might lose the thread of their talk or change their behaviour to restructure the interaction (Wadensjö, 1998; S. Russell, 2002, p. 124)—a scenario not preferred by the police.

In view of the fact that free-form narratives from the LOTE-speaking interviewee being the key outcome that CI pursues, the interpreter bears partial responsibility to ensure holding of the floor by the LOTE-speaking interviewee. This could be realised by interpreters possessing the knowledge schema about CI, which
would lead to the formation of a communal Common Ground (CG) with the police interviewer. The interpreter’s knowledge schema of CI would better equip them to anticipate longer narratives after specific types of questions asked by the police interviewer; therefore, they would take care in expecting more segments from the answer elicited. This knowledge would also sensitise the interpreter when structuring narratives to help them discern whether a segment is a complete turn or is more likely to be part of a turn (see Section 6.2.3). The police interviewer—also benefitting from the shared communal CG—would become vigilant and not take over the floor prematurely when the interpreter has finished rendering a segment, yet the interviewee’s narrative is not finished.

From the research data, 95% of the strategic pauses inserted by the police interviewer in certain questions when implementing the Context Reinstatement and Report Everything strategies are missing in the interpreted version. As found in this study, there are two ways to address this issue in interpreter-assisted interviews. First, these pauses can be relocated to the start of the next utterance(s). Second, the interviewer can verbalise an instruction to ask the interviewee to remain silent for a moment, so that the requested target of recall can develop in their mind before they start talking (see Sections 6.3 and 7.3).

The interlingual issues pertaining to polysemy (‘view’) and translatability (‘mental picture’ and ‘sound’ versus ‘voice’) identified in the findings may require rethinking the terms used in English, and revising them to facilitate easier interlingual transfer and avoidance of mistranslation (see Section 7.5.1). In relation to the recommended use of neutral wording by the police interviewer when asking about, for example, the perpetrator’s ‘length of hair’ or ‘height’ and ‘weight’, again it requires the interpreter to have knowledge about such wording preference. Otherwise, as the
research data show, there is nearly a 40% chance that they will be rendered in the less preferred constructions of ‘how long is the hair?’ and ‘how heavy/tall is the perpetrator?’ (see Section 7.5.2).

8.1.4 Question 4: How do the effects of bilingual settings translate to broader CI practice? What could be done differently to achieve CI efficacy in bilingual settings? The answers provided thus far for Research Questions 1 to 3 point to the need for interpreters to acquire knowledge in CI in order to form a communal CG with the police interviewer. Without an appreciation of what the police interviewer intends to achieve under CI and the strategies accompanying it, the interpreter may thwart the interviewer’s efforts. Similarly, without appreciating how interpreting processes work and the issues about interpreters’ finite cognitive capacity (and the need for interpreters to receive incoming messages in manageable segment lengths), the interviewing police officer risks prematurely taking over the floor from interviewees who have not finished a long narrative that was truncated by interpreting.

This highlights the need to make training available to interpreters who may be engaged in CI conducted by police. This training should encompass the basic tenets of CI, including its relevant strategies and specialised terminology. It would also be helpful for police officers to receive training on how to communicate through language interpreters—particularly the functions and limitations of interpreting—to achieve communication outcomes that are as close as possible to those in monolingual settings. The study results also point to the potential benefit of a pre-assignment briefing to be conducted by the interviewing police with the interpreter, in which the purpose and objectives of the interview is explained and the protocol of turn segmentation, turn-taking and talk management is communicated to reach a consensus.
In order to facilitate semi-consecutive interpreting—the mode this study confirms that most interpreters opted for—the interpreter should briefly explain how semi-consecutive interpreting works and request the interviewing offer to segment the turns. When meeting the interviewee, it will also be helpful if the interpreter is afforded the opportunity to do the same with the interviewee, i.e. explain how semi-consecutive interpreting works and request for segmented turns.

8.2 Contribution and Recommendations

This research is pioneering in the sense that it has examined the CI protocol and identified the differences and issues that may exist when the interviewing officer and interviewee need to communicate through a language interpreter because they do not speak the same language. In a globalised world where linguistic heterogeneity is ever more prevalent in a growing number of societies, investigating crimes and dealing with major events effectively and efficiently increasingly requires the service of language interpreters. This research contributes to the under-researched area of police CI conducted in bilingual settings due to a language barrier between the interviewing police officer and interviewee. The findings of this study summarised in Section 8.1 do, to some extent, render interpreter-assisted police cognitive interviews an ‘exercise in diminishment’ (Cheng Kai Nam, Gary v. HKSAR, as cited in Leung, 2008, p. 201) with the inability of interpreting to recreate the exact ‘colour, subtlety and texture’ (Leung, 2008, p. 201) of the original utterances in such encounters. In this context the findings and the ways to address the issues are a major contribution to policing in modern societies where multiple languages and cultures converge.

The research is premised on the proven efficacy of CI in the literature as being able to elicit 25 to 40% more correct statements than traditional interviews (Fisher & Geiselman, 2010, p. 325). Therefore the more ‘colour, subtlety and texture’ (Leung,
2008, p. 201) the bilingual versions in the study lose through the process of interpreting, the less CI efficacy they were able to achieve, comparing to their English monolingual counterparts. Other legal institutional discourses emanating from courtrooms, tribunals, or other types of police counters such as traditional ways of interviewing (Fisher & Geiselman, 2010, pp. 321-322) have, in comparison, attracted much more research into interpreter-assisted settings since a few decades ago. Although CI with witnesses/victims as an institutional discourse shares certain similarities with these other legal discourses, its strategies implemented through the interplay of linguistic and cognitive means warrant special attention when it is conducted with the assistance of language interpreters in bilingual settings. Without looking into how interpreting impacts on the LOTE-speaking interviewer’s long narratives and the English-speaking police interviewer’s CI specific verbal strategies, police CI work when faced with language barriers will possibly be compromised. In this way this exploratory research has made the initial and definitive step to encourage further investigation.

In the field of interpreting studies, this research has contributed to operationalising the interlingual cooperation and accommodation among the primary speakers and the interpreter in an attitudinally cooperative interviewing setting, where the witness/victim helps the investigating officer to solve a crime. The researcher pioneers the application of Prunč’s (1997, 2000) model of translation culture in explaining and analysing the cooperation and accommodation afforded by the primary speakers in their interaction with the interpreter. Such interlingual cooperation and accommodation is by no means unique to police CI. Other settings in public services where the English-speaking professional and the LOTE-speaking service recipient work collaboratively to achieve the objective of the service encounter feature similar dynamics in their interaction. In this sense this research also contributed to the broader
public service interpreting studies in that it enhances the understanding of the dynamics of the interpreter-assisted communication in their respective service contexts.

In the light of the findings of this research, recommendations are made to modify certain CI strategies when it is applied in bilingual settings where language mediation is employed. It argues that specialised training on the CI protocol be developed and made available for interpreters who might be engaged in police CI, with the aim of developing interpreters’ knowledge schema and fostering communal CG between the interpreter and police. On the other hand, it is also recommended that police interviewers should receive training on the workings of interpreting for the same reason to foster communal CG. Furthermore, it would be beneficial for the interpreters to be involved by the police in their CI preparation stage, and be provided with a briefing before the interview takes place.

8.3 Limitations of Research

As explained in Section 1.1.3, authentic police interview data are extremely difficult to obtain. As a result, this research employed laboratory experiments to circumnavigate this difficulty. This research design necessarily created a number of limitations, as outlined in Section 4.3 and discussed below.

8.3.1 Artificiality of the research instrument. The two police cognitive interviews, incorporating most CI features, were from Fisher and Geiselman’s (1992) publication, written monolingually in English. The researcher adopted these interviews into eight language versions and conducted mock interviews in laboratory settings, using role players for the police interviewer and LOTE-speaking interviewee. The role players had to follow the scripts without the freedom to deviate from the lines or to respond spontaneously. Unlike in reality, where premature floor changing may occur based on the interaction dynamics between the primary speakers, the role players were
instructed to finish each scripted turn, regardless of how fragmented the participant interpreter rendered them. Due to this design, this study was unsuitable to investigate the sociocultural or sociolinguistic aspects of police interaction with the interviewee via the interpreter, nor was it able to explore whether or how the interviewees’ responded to the CI questioning strategies featured in the interview scripts, or the interviewees’ interactions with the interviewer and interpreter. In other words, ‘how participants both produce and respond to evolving social contexts, using conversational, rather than contextual data’ (Paltridge, 2006, p. 108) based on the Conversational Analysis tradition did not apply in this study.

While the artificiality of the linguistic and behavioural interactions between the primary speakers in the research was a limitation of this study, this artificiality also confined the participant interpreters to be the only variable tested on two fixed scripts consistent across the eight language versions.

**8.3.2 Restricted generalisability.** The research only used one interpreter in each language version across eight languages; hence, it was unable to ascertain whether the differences in the outcomes of each language version were due to differences in the personality, style or competency of the interpreter, or to differences in the language itself. Thus, generalising the findings of this study without acknowledging this limitation of the research design would be statistically unsupportable. However, given the scarcity of literature and research in this area, this study situates itself as exploratory and as a starting point to generate future lines of enquiry and further studies.

Further, as per Section 4.3, the researcher acknowledges that the data analysis of this study relies on the working hypothesis outlined in Section 1.3, which uses the monolingual interactions in Fisher and Geiselmans’ (1992) two scripts in English as a baseline to investigate how far the eight English-LOTE versions differed from these
monolingual English ones, linguistically and interactionally. This working hypothesis relied on the assumption that the interviewees in these eight languages had the same, or very similar, cognitive functioning in relation to recalling information, linguistic preferences in terms of grammatical categories and lexical items, and behavioural reactions when being subjected to CI questioning. All these assumptions need to be further investigated by separate future studies.

8.4 Future Research

This research serves as a starting point to explore what occurs during interpreter-assisted police CI, linguistically and interactionally. First and foremost, replicating the same experiment by including more interpreters and expanding to more languages will strengthen the data set and provide more reliable and generalizable findings. As identified in the limitations of the research design in Section 8.3, much future research should follow in order to investigate the effect on LOTE-speaking interviewees when they recall critical information in a truncated manner due to the processes of interpreting, and if so, how much would it inhibit their cognitive functioning in information recall. In addition, future research should also look into whether this truncated pattern of talk in interaction may affect interviewees’ behaviour, and if so, how much and in what way do they restructure the interaction.

For interviewees from different linguistic and cultural backgrounds questioned by English-speaking interviewers in CI, further investigation is necessary on the LOTE speakers’ cognitive and linguistic responses to understand if they are the same or similar to those of Anglophone interviewees who can communicate directly with the interviewing officer. For example, whether asking a LOTE-speaking interviewee ‘how long is his hair?’ in LOTE is also less desirable than ‘what is the length of his hair?’ (as is the case in CI conducted monolingually in English), or ‘how fast was the car
travelling?’ is also more leading in LOTE than ‘what was the speed the car was travelling?’ Or it may be the case that the two do not make cognitive differences in a LOTE language environment at all. It is, therefore, important to further this line of investigation so as to ascertain language- and/or culture-specific issues, if any, in CI, and see if there are strategies to effectively counter such issues. Furthermore, given the proven efficacy of CI in monolingual Anglophone settings, it seems a natural progression to expand CI into other monolingual LOTE settings to test how it works. The more is understood about CI conducted monolingually in other LOTEs, the more it would aid the development of CI conducted in bilingual settings assisted by interpreters involving the LOTEs.

Finally, it is important to determine whether bilingual CI is appropriate to be exclusively done by using simultaneous interpreting. The practicality issues to be considered include the small physical interviewing space and the issue of voice interference if done without simultaneous interpreting equipment. Therefore the choosing of suitable equipment and the interpreter’s seating arrangement (in the same room or in an adjacent room with one-way window) must also be determined. Furthermore, there are continuing debates in the interpreting field about the accuracy rates of the two modes of interpreting, which need to be taken into account when evaluating which mode of interpreting serves CI better.

Much of the above identified areas point to the need for further interdisciplinary collaboration between police interviewing and interlingual interpreting research. It is the researcher’s hope that this pioneering study serves as a catalyst to stimulate future inquiries into cognitive interviewing assisted by interpreters, hence leading to sound evidence-based recommendations to law enforcement agencies. In a world that is growing more interconnected and its crime fighting and truth finding becomes more
complex due to linguistic diversity, this line of inquiry should continue to be actively explored.
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Appendix 1.1: Original Text for INTV1

Original text for INTV1 from Fisher and Geiselman’s (1992) Memory-enhancing Techniques for Investigative Interviewing—The Cognitive Interview (pp. 157-175).

INTerview ONE: BYStANDER EYEWITNESS TO A JEWELRY STORE ROBERy

Background: Two days before the interview, the E/W, June Wilson, was browsing through the Midtown Diamond Exchange when two armed men entered and demanded of the other the contents of the register. The E/W was in the rear of the store and, although frightened, she did...
not panic. The E/W has good verbal skills, and at the time of the interview, she is relatively calm.

**Interview**

**INT:** Are you Jane Wilson? I am Detective Jeremy Zuckerman from the Metropolitan Police Department. We spoke briefly on the phone yesterday about the jewelry store robbery and I'd like to get a more thorough description of what happened.

**E/W:** Come in.

**INT:** You sounded upset on the phone yesterday. How are you feeling now?

**E/W:** Better. That was really frightening, especially when they started yelling and I saw the gun. I've never seen a gun before, except on t.v., and it really shook me up.

**INT:** That's a normal response. After all, the robber did have a gun and it was a dangerous situation. I remember being in a similar situation many years ago, before I became a police officer. I was shopping in a store and there was a hold-up. I remember being frightened when it happened.

**E/W:** The whole neighborhood is changing. It's gotten to the point where I'm afraid to go out at night. There's so much crime. I'd like to see all of these guys behind bars where they belong, so we can walk in the streets again in safety.

**INT:** That's what we would like to do, to make this a safe area again. If you can give us enough information that would help us in trying to catch them and take them off the streets.

In order to catch these people, I need you to give me as many details as possible, so don't leave anything out. The more details you can give me, the easier it will be for us to find them and prosecute them.

**Comments**

- **Show concern**
- **Validate E/W's feelings**
- **Convey understanding and similar feelings**
- **Identify E/W's concern and indicate how cooperation is in E/W's interest**
- **Explain need for detailed response**

**Sample Interviews with Analysis**

**E/W:** OK, where would you like to start?

**INT:** From what you told me on the phone yesterday, it sounded like you got a pretty good look at the robbers and that you remember a lot about what happened. So, I expect that it will take a while for us to go through the interview.

**E/W:** Where's a good place to talk so that we won't be distracted?

**INT:** Let's go into the living room. I'll shut off the t.v.

**INT:** (referring to photograph) Are those your children? I've got three kids at home, two girls and a boy. Jane, it's important to keep in mind that you have all of the information. I am trying to find out what happened from you, so I expect you to do most of the talking. Don't wait for me to ask questions. Whenever something comes to mind, tell me, even if it seems trivial or contradicts something you said earlier. Don't omit anything.

If you don't know a specific fact, that's OK. Just say that you don't know. Don't make up something, though, just to give me an answer. I realize that this is a difficult task, to remember all of the details of the crime. So try to concentrate as much as possible.

Before we start, I'd like you to tell me a little bit about where you were in the store and what you were thinking about just before the robbery took place.

**E/W:** I wanted to buy a watch for my husband's birthday. In the past few years, I bought a few pieces of jewelry in the store. They're very reasonable, and they have good-quality merchandise. I must have been standing toward the back of the store when they started yelling.

**E/W:** Establish the expectation that E/W will recall much and that the session will take time for thorough recall

**E/W:** Minimize distractions

**E/W:** Establish rapport

**E/W:** Personalize the interview

**E/W:** Establish rapport

**E/W:** Promote concentration

**E/W:** Recreate original context

**E/W:** Avoid fabrication
INT: If you can, try to draw a simple sketch of the store. Indicate where you were standing, and where the robbers and the cashier were. 

(E/W draws sketch)

INT: What were the lighting conditions in the store?

E/W: It was pretty bright. It's a jewelry store and they want everything to sparkle, I guess.

INT: Now, try to put yourself back in the same location as when you first noticed the robbers and tell me in your own words everything you can remember about what happened, until the end of the robbery. Try to be as detailed as possible.

E/W: Well, I didn't notice anything unusual at first, just some people in the store looking at the jewelry. Then, all of a sudden, I heard yelling. At first I thought someone was sick or hurt, but then I saw these two men yelling at the owner, something about putting money into a bag. One of the men turned around and yelled to the customers, DOWN ON THE FLOOR. I really got scared then because he had a gun. I don't know anything about guns, but it was really big, much bigger than they look at first. I fell to the floor, and was scared because the man with the gun looked crazy. He seemed very nervous, he kept on looking around at his partner and told him to hurry up and "let's get outta here." I didn't get a very good view of the other man, who took the money. I mainly concentrated on the man pointing the gun at us. After a while, the man in the front yelled to the man pointing the gun at us, "let's go" or something like that, and then they both ran out of the store. By that time, I was already shaking. I guess the owner of the store called the police. They came in a few minutes. One of the police officers asked me a few questions about what happened and then took my name and telephone.

Sketch of scene to understand E/W's perspective

Recreate context

Request open-ended narration

Request detailed description

The INT takes only brief notes here, to remind himself of the E/W's views of the event for later probing:

- 2 robbers (R) yell at owner: "get into bag"
- R1 yells at customer: "DOWN ON FLOOR" (Note: change in voice)
- E/W scared, R1 big gun
- E/W falls to floor, scared
- R1: gray, nervous

R2 to R1: "let's go"
R2 runs out

E/W speaks to husband

INT: Are there any other views that you had of the robbers?

E/W: No, those were the only times I saw them.

[Before continuing the interview, the INT plans his probing strategy for the next phase. The E/W has four views of R1, (a) initially, when he is yelling at the owner, (b) while he turns around and yells at the customers, (c) after the E/W falls to the floor, and (d) when R1 and R2 run out of the store. Images (b) and (c) are close, frontal views and will provide the best views of R1's face. Because the E/W focused on the weapon in image (b), she may also provide additional information about R1's hands while holding the weapon. View (c), from the floor, may provide extra information about R1's clothes and pants. View (d) may provide information about the backs of the robbers and also how (nervous) and a clear voice image of his saying DOWN ON THE FLOOR. The E/W has only two, probably undistorted, views of R2. (a) initially, when he is yelling at the owner, and (d) when R1 and R2 are running out of the store. She also heard him speak to R1 ("let's go").

The INT plans to probe about R1 first, as he is the better viewed, and will start with the images that contain the best information of R1's face, clothing, and the weapon. Those images are in views (b) and (c). After exhausting those frontal views of his contents, he will proceed to view (d) and probe about R1's back and how they ran. Finally, he will activate image (a) to elicit any new information not contained in the other images. R2 will be probed second, starting with frontal information from image (a), yelling at the owner, and proceeding to image (d), running out of the store. Voice information will also be probed by focusing on the E/W's image of R2 saying "let's go." Any new information that may arise during the remainder of the interview will be incorporated to be compatible with the E/W's mental representation.]

INT: I'd like to go back to the images you mentioned before and ask you to describe the robbers again, but this time in more detail. I realize this is going to be difficult and take lots of concentration. But remember, the more details you can give me, the more likely we are to catch these people.

Request more detailed description

Encourage focused retrieval

Convey need for detail
Let's go back to when the man with the gun turned around and yelled at you, DOWNT ON THE FLOOR.

Try to focus in on just this one robber, the one who was yelling at you. You may find it easier to concentrate if you close your eyes. (INT closes his eyes) Try to develop a mental picture as thoroughly as possible, when the man first turned around. Don't say anything yet. Just develop the image as clearly as you can.

(Few seconds pause allowing E/W to develop the image) Concentrate on his face and head. (Pause) Now, try to describe his head and face in as much detail as you can. Don't leave anything out.

E/W: He had an oval-shaped face, with puffy cheeks. Dark complexion. He had a high forehead. He had dark hair, either brown or black; it was combed almost straight back with a slight part on the left side. There was something strange about his mouth, like it was crooked....

INT: (silent pause)

E/W: ...Maybe it was his mustache. It wasn't even; it seemed like it was thicker on the left side than the right.... That's about all I can remember.

INT: Keep that image in mind. Try to focus in around his eyes. Tell me whatever you can about his eyes, eyebrows, or the upper part of his face.

E/W: They seemed strange... real big pupils, like when people look crazy. I don't remember the color of his eyes. Probably dark, but I'm not sure. He had some wrinkles around his eyes. Also, he was perspiring. You could see the light bouncing off the sweat on his forehead.

INT: Was he wearing glasses or not?

E/W: No.

INT: Let's go back to his hair again. You mentioned that it was dark and combed straight back. What else can you tell me about his hair?

E/W: It was straight, maybe a bit wavy, but definitely not curly.

INT: Can you describe the length of his hair?

E/W: It covered a little bit of his ears, so it wasn't real short. But it wasn't very long.

INT: You mentioned that he had puffy cheeks. Concentrate on his checks again... (pause)...

Now, try to describe his face.

E/W: There was nothing outstanding. No scars or any noticeable marks on his face.

INT: Was he clean-shaven or did he have facial hair?

E/W: He was clean-shaven.

INT: How dark was his skin?

E/W: He was somewhat dark, like he'd been out in the sun, but not very dark.

INT: Overall, what was the most distinctive feature of his face?

E/W: I guess his eyes, that he had this really crazy look, with large pupils.

INT: Let's take a different approach now. You seemed to indicate before that the man yelled...
at you, DOWN ON THE FLOOR. I'd like you to think now about when he yelled that order to you. Concentrate on his voice only and the sounds of those words. (pause to develop auditory image) Try to describe the sound of his voice. Tell me everything you can about the sound of his voice or anything else related to the way he spoke.

E/W: It was surprisingly high-pitched, like he was nervous. I think he also had a slight accent, but I'm not sure what kind. It didn't sound like regular English, ... like he learned English only a few years ago.

E/W: Can you remember what about his speech made it seem not like regular English?

INT: I'm not positive, but now that I think about it, he said "down on floor," without the word "the."

E/W: Let's switch again to another image. After he yelled at you to get down on the floor, you fell to the floor. What were your thoughts at the time?

E/W: I was scared because he had that gun and he seemed crazy.

INT: Try to think about the position you were in and what your thoughts were after you fell to the floor and saw the man with the gun. (pause) Can you describe that to me?

E/W: I was lying on the floor, looking up at the robber. I remember that the floor was very hard; it was also cold. I guess I was scared at first, but then when I realized that all they wanted was to take the money, I relaxed a bit. But the sight of the gun still scared me.

INT: I'd like you now to concentrate on the gun the man was holding. Again, close your eyes and try to focus on the gun. Take your time, close your eyes, and develop the image of the gun. Now try to describe the gun in as much detail as you can.

E/W: I don't know a lot about guns. It was black.

INT: Here are sketches of two different types of guns. (shows sketches of typical revolver and automatic) Did the gun look more like this one (points to automatic) or this one (points to revolver)?

E/W: It looked more like this one (automatic).

INT: Look at my gun, since it's the same type. (shows E/W his gun) How does the robber's gun compare to mine?

E/W: This part (points to barrel) was longer. And the handle had a different shape. I'm afraid I can't describe it very well.

INT: That's OK. If you can, try to draw a picture of what the handle looked like.

E/W: (draws picture of gun handle)

INT: Let's go back to that picture of the man holding the gun. Try to get it clear in your mind again. (pauses for her to create image) Now, try to focus on how he was holding the gun.

E/W: He was holding the gun in his right hand, like this (demonstrates). I remember his hand because I concentrated on the gun. He had very long finger-nails. His hands looked pretty big, like he was very strong. And he had a scar on the outside of his thumb.

INT: Show me on your hand where the scar was.

E/W: (points to where scar was)

INT: When you were lying on the floor and looking at him, did you see his shoes?

E/W: Yes

INT: What kind were they?

E/W: They were running shoes.
INT: You don't know what brand they were, do you?
E/W: No.
INT: What color were they?
E/W: Gray.
INT: Now, let's go to his pants. Did you notice them?
E/W: Yes.
INT: Try to concentrate on your image of the pants, looking up at him from the floor. (pauses to allow E/W to develop image) Tell me everything you can about his pants. Remember, tell me every detail you can think of.
E/W: They were blue jeans, . . . dark blue, not the faded ones. They looked kind of old, since the pocket was torn over here (points to front-left pocket). He had a brown leather belt with a large buckle, like a cowboy belt.
INT: In what way was it like a cowboy belt?
E/W: I think there was an engraving of a horse on the belt.
INT: OK, let's go to the shirt now. What color was it?
E/W: White.
INT: Was it short-sleeved?
E/W: Yes.
INT: Were there any markings on it?
E/W: No.
INT: Did you see his face when you were lying on the floor?
E/W: Yes.
INT: Try to concentrate on his neck and the under side of his chin. Just focus in on this area, from the top of his shirt to his chin. (pauses to allow E/W to develop image) Tell me every detail you can think of.
E/W: ...His shirt was open at the neck. I noticed that he had a thin, gold chain around his neck. I couldn't see if there was a pendant or not, because the bottom of the chain was inside his shirt. . . . He had some chest hair that you could see at the top of his shirt. He had pretty hairy arms too, especially around his shoulders.
INT: Did you notice his face when you were lying on the floor?
E/W: I was focusing on the gun most of the time, so I didn't look very carefully. I think I took a quick glance at him when he said something to us, but I don't remember much.
INT: You just mentioned that he had pretty hairy forearms. When did you notice his arms?
E/W: When he was holding the gun. I was looking at his right arm, since he held the gun in his right hand.
INT: Try to concentrate on his right arm as he was holding the gun. Just focus in on his arm. (pauses to allow E/W to develop image) Tell me whatever you can about his right arm.
E/W: As I said, it was pretty hairy. He was pretty muscular, like he worked out with weights. He had large biceps too. And he had some kind of a mark on his upper arm. It could have been a tattoo or a birthmark. I'm not sure, but there was some kind of unusual mark there.
INT: Can you describe this mark in any more detail?
E/W: No, I just noticed it briefly, and I didn't get a very clear look. But there was something there, about here (points to her arm) on his arm.
[The INT continues to probe images (d) and (a) for additional information about the two robbers in the same fashion as just described. Images (a) and (d) are probed with less intensity, as they contain only limited information (image d, while running out the store) or were not carefully observed (image a, when the E/W did not fairly realize what was happening). The interview continues by pricking for information that the E/W may have conveyed to her husband when she spoke with him on the phone after the robbery.]

INT: Jane, you mentioned earlier that, after the robbery, you spoke to your husband about what happened. Did you talk about it in much detail or just about your general reactions to being in a robbery?
E/W: My husband is the curious type, so he wanted me to give him a complete description of what happened. I guess he was playing amateur detective and wanted to find out who committed the crime.

INT: How well were you able to describe what happened when you spoke to your husband?
E/W: Well, it was right after the robbery, so it was easier to remember some of the details then. In fact, I told my husband the name of one of the robbers—the other robber called him—but now I can't remember what it was. I should have written it down.

INT: Let's go back to when you were speaking to your husband. Where were you at the time?
E/W: I was home. I was speaking on the telephone in the kitchen.

INT: Try to think back to when you spoke to your husband on the phone and to reconstruct the conversation.
E/W: I told him what happened. Naturally, he asked me if I was OK, and then he asked me whether I had spoken to the police. I said, "No," but told him that I thought I remembered what the men looked like and I remem-

Sample Interview with Analysis

bared one of their names. But I can't remember his name now.

INT: Try to think back to the moment in the conversation with your husband when you thought of the robber's name. Take your time, and think back to how you remembered his name.

E/W: Let's see, I remember that my husband makes jokes about it, because we have a nephew with a similar name, Robbie, but that wasn't exactly the name. It was a foreign name, a little longer than Robbie... Roberto. That's it, the man called him "Roberto."

INT: Which guy was Roberto, the one who held the gun to you or the guy at the front of the store?
E/W: The guy who held the gun to us.

INT: Is there anything else you can remember when you spoke to your husband that is not clear now?
E/W: No, just the name.

[The INT is now ready to start probing some of the non-image codes.]

INT: Was one of the robbers the leader or did the two seem to be working together as equals?
E/W: The man who stayed at the cashier and got the money seemed to be in charge. He gave Roberto orders about what to do next. The man in charge also seemed to be more intelligent.

INT: What about him made him appear more intelligent?
E/W: I'm not sure. I think he spoke more distinctly than Roberto, or he spoke without an accent. He was also dressed better. He was wearing regular pants, not jeans. And he was more clean-cut. He had glasses too. You know how sometimes wearing glasses makes people think you're smarter.
INT: Jane, I’d like you to try to put yourself into the role of the leader and think about what happened from his perspective. That is, try to imagine what he was thinking about and how he must have thought about the robbery. I realize that is a difficult task to do, so try to concentrate. Don’t make up anything. Tell me only those things you actually saw, but take the robber’s perspective.

E/W: OK. Well, when we came into the store I took out my gun and started to yell at the owner to give me the money. I put an empty bag on the counter and told him to fill it. I took the money on the counter, not in the bag. So I put it into the bag. There were a few watches or pieces of jewelry also on the counter, but I took them too, since they were so convenient. I think I dropped one of the pieces, but I was in too much of a hurry to stop and pick it up. As soon as I had the money, I yelled to Roberto, “Get in the truck.” Roberto left first. Then I backed out of the door, waving my gun and yelling at the customers, “Don’t anybody try to be a hero.” And then I ran out.

[A few new pieces of information come to light here: the presence of a bag for carrying the money, pieces of jewelry taken in addition to the watch, a frontal view of the robber in charge of his gun, and it turned out the getaway vehicle. Each of these sources will be probed to extract additional information, similar to the way the images were probed earlier.]

INT: So far, you’ve given me lots of details about the robbers and what happened. I’d like you now to describe the robbers in more general terms, like height and weight or body build. Also, if you have any general impression about varied retrieval (change perspective)

Warning against fabrication

INT: About how old was he?

E/W: I guess in his mid-twenties.

INT: [Continues to probe for other general traits before probing about his]

E/W: He was a bit older, maybe around 30. He seemed more refined.

INT: About how tall was he compared to me? Relative judgment; provide standard shorter

E/W: Just about your height, maybe an inch shorter.

INT: I’m 5-foot-11. So how tall would you say he was?

E/W: About 5-foot-10 or so.

INT: Did you have any general impressions of him? Did he look like anyone you know?

E/W: Not really. He looked a little like the cartoon character, Bart Simpson, because he had a short, hunched back, but other than that, there was nothing unusual.

INT: Jane, you’ve given me a lot of information and I’d like to make sure that I have it all written down correctly. Let me go over my notes with you as a final check. Try to think about the robbery as I am reading my notes to you. If, at any time, I say something that seems incorrect, or if you think of something new, tell me so I can correct it.

Sample Interviews with Analysis

Follow-up direct question

Loading of information retrieval

Review to check accuracy of notes and encourage additional retrieval

POLICE COGNITIVE INTERVIEWS
that you haven’t told me, make sure you stop me immediately to tell me.

[INT: reads his notes slowly]  

INT: I’m going to seed some information about you for our official records. It’s just something that is required by the police department whenever we take a statement. Jane, what is your full name?

E/W: Jane Ellen Wilson.

INT: And your address?

E/W: 222 Alpine Road.

INT: Jane, you’ve been very helpful in the investigation. Thank you for your time. I hope this hasn’t been too much of an ordeal for you. You will probably find that in the next few days you will continue to think about what happened during the robbery. That’s natural. When you do, you’ll also probably think of some new information that we haven’t covered today. Write down the information and give me a call. Here’s my card. Thank you again for being so cooperative.

(A few days after the interview, the INT telephones the E/W to follow up the formal interview to inquire about her health and to ask whether she has thought of any new information.)

INTERVIEW TWO: VICTIM OF SHOOTING

Background: The victim, Carla Thompson, is a 45-year-old woman who was shot in the leg while standing in front of a store. Apparently, the shot was fired from a passing car and was intended to hit another person standing near the victim. The interview takes place in the hospital, where the victim is being treated. Ms. Thompson has poor verbal skills and is still highly anxious one day after the shooting.

The reader will note that the following interview does not generate nearly as much information as did the first. That is mainly due to factors outside of the INT’s control. The event occurred very quickly with little opportunity to observe the criminal. More important, the E/W is not nearly as calm and does not have as good verbal skills to describe the event as did the first E/W. However, these factors are outside of the whatever the natural limits might be.

INT: Carla, I am Detective Mark Blake from the County Sheriff’s Office. My partner, Bob Locker, spoke with you yesterday about the shooting, and I would like to talk to you today to get some more information.

E/W: Where were the police yesterday? Why do you let such crazy people roam the streets? I was minding my own business, and then, out of nowhere, somebody shoots me. For no reason. I wasn’t bothering anyone. I could have been killed out there. What is this city coming to? Now, here I am in the hospital. I have to go to work tomorrow to pick up my paycheck and I can’t even move. I don’t think I’m going to be much help. I really didn’t see much. It all happened so fast.

INT: How are you feeling now? Are you in pain?

E/W: I can hardly move my leg. And every time I go to sit up it hurts even more.

INT: Can I do anything to help you?

E/W: No, there’s nothing you can do. If that idiot hadn’t shot me, I wouldn’t be here now.

INT: It really is unfair. There are some crazy people out there, and innocent people often wind up suffering because of them. My wife was hit by a car once. The car went through a red light and hit my wife as she was crossing the street. She wasn’t doing anything, just crossing the street, and she wound up with a broken leg.

E/W: I knew I shouldn’t have gone outside last night. My sister, Alisha, keeps on telling me
Appendix 1.2: Original Text for INTV2

Original text for INTV1 from Fisher and Geiselman’s (1992) Memory-
enhancing Techniques for Investigative Interviewing—The Cognitive Interview (pp. 174–184).
that it's not safe outside at night and that I shouldn't go out, especially at night. But you have to go buy food. You can't sit at home all the time. Maybe I should have listened to my sister. I'd be safe at home now instead of being scared out of my wits. Who knows, this is a crazy world nowadays.

[Sensing that the E/W is highly anxious and must vent her feelings, the INT allows her more liberty at the outset to talk about these feelings before starting to collect facts relevant to the crime.]

INT: Carla, I can understand your feelings of frustration. You can't blame yourself, however, for going shopping.

E/W: What am I supposed to do, stay home all day? I don't understand it. I was just standing there and before I knew it, I have a bullet in my leg and I'm in the hospital. Is that fair? I work hard. I don't bother anyone. And then this crazy idiot shoots me.

INT: That really is unfair.

E/W: I don't even own a gun, because I'm afraid of them. My cousin keeps a gun in the house, and I don't feel safe there. I'm always afraid it's going to go off.

INT: You're right. Guns can be dangerous.

E/W: I keep hearing the sound of the gun, and every time I hear it, I become frightened. I can't remember anything other than the sound of the gun and the pain in my leg.

INT: It must have been very scary.

Carla, we would like you to try to catch the person who shot you so we can make the streets safer for innocent people like you. I'd like to ask you some questions about what happened earlier today. Do you feel up to answering some questions?

Sample Interviews with Analysis

E/W: Officer, I don't remember much about what happened. The other police officer spoke to me earlier and I told him everything I knew. I'm not going to be able to tell you anything new.

INT: That's fine. Don't worry about what you told the first officer. Just tell me as much as you can about what happened.

[Because the E/W has given many signs of fear and seems unable to concentrate intensely at the beginning of the interview, the INT begins to relax the E/W.]

INT: First, I need to get some background information. We have to do this in all police investigations, so please bear with me for a few minutes.

Carla, what is your full name?

E/W: Carla Maye Thompson

INT: And what is your address?

E/W: 7600 Hillside Avenue

INT: Good. Now I'd like to try to go back to what happened yesterday to see what you can remember.

INT: That's OK, just do the best you can. Anything you can tell me will be valuable, so just relax and take your time. We're not in any hurry. I understand that you're upset now. That's only natural after a crime like this. If you want to take a break at any time, because you're feeling anxious, just tell me and we'll stop.

E/W: I really don't think I'll be able to remember much.

INT: Anxiety is normal after a crime. E/W to control anxiety.

[With a more composed E/W, the INT might make suggestions here to promote more intense concentration, e.g., "everything is stored in your mind, so I expect you to concentrate." With the present E/W, who is highly anxious, the INT skips those instructions so as not to create any additional, unnecessary anxiety. Instead, he opts for the alternative approach, to encourage her to relax, but to try to be as informative as possible.]
possible. Later in the interview, after the E/W is more relaxed, the INT may encourage her to concentrate with greater intensity.

INT: Carla, when you think about today's events, many thoughts may come to your mind. Say whatever comes to mind, whether you consider it trivial, or out of order, or even if it disagrees with something you said earlier. Just tell me whatever comes to your mind without holding anything back.

Try to think back to before the shooting took place. Can you remember where you were and what you were thinking about?

E/W: I was just standing in front of the supermarket. I don't remember thinking about anything in particular.

[The E/W seems unlikely to generate a detailed description of the context from a general request. Therefore, the INT changes strategy to recreating the context by asking questions about specific dimensions.]

INT: Where were you going at the time?

E/W: I was just coming home. I was standing by the stop-light waiting for it to change to green.

INT: Were there any other people near you?

E/W: Just one other person. He was also waiting to cross the street.

INT: Can you remember the traffic conditions at the time?

E/W: It was around noon, before rush hour, so traffic was pretty light.

INT: OK, Carla, now what I'd like you to do is to tell me in your own words what happened from the time the shooting occurred until you couldn't see the car any more.

E/W: I told you, I don't remember very much. I was just standing by the light. A car drove up and someone shot me. I still can't figure out why. The policeman said that they might have been aiming at the man standing next to me. Just my luck. They went to shoot somebody else and they shot me instead. That's the story of my life. I have the worst luck. My car breaks down every three months. My husband just lost his job. I just got out of the hospital. I don't know what to do.

[To prevent the E/W from rambling on about irrelevant personal matters, the INT interrupts here, although without being critical, to steer her back on target. Also, since the E/W did not reveal much in her mental images.]

INT: That does sound discouraging. Let's go back to what you said about the shooting.

Where did you see the man who shot you?

E/W: I heard him yell something and I turned to look at him.

INT: Where was the car at that time?

E/W: Just before the intersection. The car slowed down and the man yelled something.

INT: And then...

E/W: I heard the shots. I think there were two shots.

INT: What happened after the two shots?

E/W: I fell down and was in terrible pain. I didn't know what was going on at first, because there was no warning.

INT: Did you see the car after the shots?

E/W: Yes, it made a left turn at the corner and went up Cook's Lane. It was going pretty fast at the time and I was very surprised, so I didn't get a very good look at the car.
INT: What is the best view you had of the car?
E/W: Probably when the man yelled, just before he shot.

[The E/W plans to probe the two relevant images, first of the car as it approached the E/W and then when the car left and turned at the intersection. He will probe the first image for details about the front and the right side of the car, the shooter, the gun, and other people in the car. He will probe the second image for details about the rear and the left side of the car, the driver, and any other passengers who might have been viewed from the left side.]

INT: OK, Carla. I'd like you to concentrate on this image of the car. It may be easier to concentrate if you close your eyes.
E/W: I don't want to close my eyes. I get real scared.
INT: That's scary sometimes. In that case, try to look straight ahead at the wall in front of you.
Try to think about when the car pulled up in front of you and the man yelled. Just try to picture that image in your mind. Don't say anything yet.

(The E/W responds immediately)
E/W: It was a new car. I don't know much about cars.
INT: Wait before you start to describe the car. Take your time and think about the image of the car first. Just concentrate on the image of the car for a few seconds. Don't say anything for a while.

[Wait for the E/W to concentrate on the image]
Now, just tell me where on the car you are focusing.

Isolate and probe best image first
Close eyes
Look at blank field as alternative to closing eyes
Recreate specific context
Encourage developing image before description
Request the E/W to develop image thoroughly before describing
Discourage immediate image development

Sample Interview with Analysis

E/W: The side.
INT: OK, now try to describe the side of the car in as much detail as possible. Don't leave out anything. Tell me every detail you can about the side of the car, even if it seems unimportant.
E/W: Well, it was blue. It looked pretty new, maybe two or three years old. I don't know what kind of car it was. I just know my own car is a Dodge. That's it.
INT: You said it looked new. What about it made it look new?
E/W: 1: was pretty shiny and didn't have any scratches in it.
INT: You said it was blue. Can you tell me what shade of blue it was? If so, are there some patches of blue (takes out book of color patches). Which of these matches closest with the color of the car?
E/W: This one here (points to color patch).
INT: Was it exactly like this patch or a little different?
E/W: It was a little darker, I think, and maybe a bit greener.
INT: Try to visualize the front of the car. (pauses to encourage developing images) Now try to describe whatever you see.
E/W: I just saw it quickly. It was kind of square-shaped. And there was a design, like an emblem, in the front.
INT: Can you draw a picture of the design?
E/W: I'm not very good at drawing.
INT: That's OK, just draw it as well as you can.
E/W: (draws simple sketch of design)
INT: OK, now try to think about the front windshield and describe it to me. Was it tinted or clear? Were there any markings, like stickers, or a crack on it?

Explicit request for detail
Framed question
Convert subjective to objective
Recognition easier than recall; use non-verbal response format
Relative judgment better than absolute
Use non-verbal format
ERROR: no pause to develop image
ERROR: complex question (multiple questions)
E/W: It was clear, I think.
INT: Did you see a license plate in the front of the car?
E/W: No.
INT: Did you see the license plate in the rear of the car?
E/W: No, it was going too fast.
INT: Carla, try now to focus in on the man who shot you. Where was he sitting in the car?
E/W: In the front seat, on the passenger's side.
INT: And which part of him did you see?
E/W: Only the very top, his chest and a little of his face.
INT: Think for a while about what he looked like when you saw him. You said that he yelled something and then you looked up. You see his face and chest. Try to focus in on that picture. Take time and develop that image. (pauses to develop image) Tell me whatever you can.
E/W: I didn't really see much of him, because it was dark inside the car. All I could see is that he was wearing a light-colored shirt or jacket. That's all.
INT: You mentioned that you also saw his face. What can you remember about his face? Was he white or black?
E/W: He was white. That's about all I can tell you. It was dark and it happened so quickly.
INT: You don't remember if he had a beard?
E/W: No.
INT: What kind of gun was he holding, a revolver or an automatic?
E/W: I don't know.
E/W: I just got a glimpse of the driver, but I couldn't see anyone else in the car.
[The INT probes this image for any information about the driver in the same way as earlier images were probed. Following this, he probes for information in the concept codes. Because the E/W recalls having heard the assailant’s voice, failure to probe for voice information is an error here.]  

INT: Carla, let’s go back to the man who was holding the gun. I realize that you didn’t get a good look at him, but did you get any overall impressions of him? About how old was he?  
E/W: I didn’t really see him well enough to say, but I'd guess early twenties.  
INT: Do you know about how heavy he was?  
E/W: No, I didn’t see him very well, and he was sitting in the car.  
INT: What about the driver, can you describe him at all?  
E/W: No, I barely saw him.  
INT: OK, Carla, thanks for your help. If you remember anything else, please call me.

Chapter 13
TRAINING PROGRAM
TO LEARN COGNITIVE INTERVIEWING

We conclude this manual with a set of suggestions about learning to use the Cognitive Interview. We have included this section because simply to memorize its principles. Being able to answer questions on a written test or being able to conduct the interview in a controlled classroom environment is not enough. In order for the Cognitive Interview to be of value in a real-world investigation, the INT must be able to perform the various techniques properly when the situation arises. This means applying the techniques automatically, without having to think consciously during the interview about what to do next.

Like any other skilled act, learning requires extensive practice. And just as one would not expect to learn to ride a bicycle or shoot a basketball without hours of practice, one should not expect to learn to conduct the Cognitive Interview without extensive practice. This book should serve as a guide for practicing, not as a substitute for practicing.

Our experience with American and Israeli investigators has been similar to that reported by George (1991) in training British police. That is, after having heard a brief lecture about the use of a particular interviewing technique, investigators often felt that they understood the logic of the procedure, and therefore, they did not have to practice. When required to conduct an actual interview, however, many realized that, although they understood the technique, they could not implement it as easily as they expected. Only after repeated practice did they both understand and have the ability to use the techniques skillfully.

According to George (1991), much of the success of the Cognitive Interview comes from the practice exercises in the training program. Many of the techniques comprising the Cognitive Interview—especially those concerned with the dynamics of interviewing (Chapter 3)—are also taught in Conversation Management. Nevertheless, training in the Cog-
Appendix 2.1: INTV1 Turn Numbering and Word Count for Each Turn

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turn no.</th>
<th>Interlocutor</th>
<th>TCU</th>
<th>Word count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Police:</td>
<td>Are you [Name]?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>LOTE:</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Police:</td>
<td>Can I call you [Name]?</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>LOTE:</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Police:</td>
<td>I am Detective Joe Bloggs from Victorian Police. We spoke briefly on the phone yesterday about the jewellery store robbery and I’d like to get a more thorough description of what happened.</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>LOTE:</td>
<td>Alright!</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Police:</td>
<td>You sounded upset on the phone yesterday. How are you feeling now?</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>LOTE:</td>
<td>Better. That was really frightening, especially when they started yelling and I saw the gun. I’ve never seen a gun before, except on TV, and it really shook me up.</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Police:</td>
<td>That’s a natural response. After all, the robber did have a gun and it was a dangerous situation. I remember being in a similar situation many years ago, before I become a police officer. I was shopping in a store and there was a hold-up. I remember being frightened when it happened.</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>LOTE:</td>
<td>The whole neighbourhood is changing. It’s gotten to the point where I’m afraid to go out at night. There’s so much crime. I’d like to see all of these guys behind bars where they belong, so we can walk in the street again in safety.</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Police: That’s what we would like to do, to make this a safe area again. If you can give us enough information, that would help us in trying to catch them and take them off the streets. In order to catch these people, I need you to give me as many details as possible, so don’t leave anything out. The more details you can give me, the easier it will be for us to find them and prosecute them.

LOTÉ: OK, where would you like to start?

Police: From what you told me on the phone yesterday, it sounded like you got a pretty good look at the robbers and that you remember a lot about what happened. So I expect that it will take a while for us to go through the interview. Where’s a good place to talk so that we won’t be distracted?

LOTÉ: OK!

Police: Are those your children? I’ve got three kids at home, two girls and a boy. [Name], it is important to keep in mind that you have all the information. I am trying to find out what happened from you, so I expect you to do most of the talking. Don’t wait for me to ask questions. Whenever something comes to mind, tell me, even if it seems trivial or contradicts something you said earlier. Don’t omit anything. If you don’t know a specific fact, that’s OK, just say that you don’t know. Don’t make up something, though, just to give me an answer. I realise that this is a difficult task, to remember all of the details of the crime. So try to concentrate as much as possible. Before we start, I’d like you to tell me a little bit about where you were in the store and what you were thinking about just before the robbery took place.

LOTÉ: I wanted to buy a watch for my husband’s birthday. In the past few years, I bought a few pieces of jewellery in the store. They’re very reasonable, and they have good-quality merchandise. I must have been standing towards the back of the store when they started yelling.
17 Police: If you can, try to draw a simple sketch of the store. Indicate where you were standing, and where the robbers and cashier were. What were the lighting conditions in the store?

18 LOTE: It was pretty bright. It’s a jewellery store and they want everything to sparkle, I guess.

19 Police: [Name], try to put yourself back in the same location as when you first noticed the robbers and tell me in your own words everything you remember about what happened, until the end of the robbery. Try to be as detailed as possible.

20 LOTE: Well, I didn’t notice anything unusual at first, just some people in the store looking at the jewellery. Then, all of a sudden, I heard yelling. At first I thought someone was sick or hurt, but then I saw these two men yelling at the owner, something about putting money into a bag. One of the men turned around and yelled to the customers, ‘DOWN ON THE FLOOR’. I really got scared then because he had a gun. I don’t know anything about guns, but it was really big, much bigger than toy guns I’ve seen. I fell to the floor, and was scared because the man with the gun looked crazy. He seemed very nervous; he kept on looking around at his partner and told him to hurry up and ‘Let’s get outta here’. I didn’t get a very good view of the other man, who took the money. I mainly concentrated on the man pointing the gun at us. After a while, the man in the front yelled to the man pointing the gun at us, ‘Let’s go’ or something like that, and then they both ran out of the store. By that time, I was really shaking. I guess the owner of the store called the police. They came in a few minutes. One of the police officers asked me a few questions about what happened and then took my name and telephone. He said he’d get back to me in a while. And then I went home and called my husband about what happened.
Police: Are there any other views that you had of the robbers?

LOTE: No, those were the only times I saw them.

Police: I’d like to go back to the image you mentioned before and ask you to describe the robbers again, but this time in more detail. I realise this is going to be difficult and take lots of concentration. But remember, the more details you can give me, the more likely we are to catch these people. Let’s go back to the man with the gun turned around and yelled at you, DOWN ON THE FLOOR. Try to focus in on just this one robber, the one who was yelling at you. You may find it easier to concentrate if you close your eyes. Try to develop a mental picture as thoroughly as possible, when the man first turns around. Don’t say anything yet. Just develop the image as clearly as you can. Concentrate on his face and head. [pause] Now, try to describe his head and face in as much detail as you can. Don’t leave anything out.

LOTE: He had an oval-shaped face, with puffy cheeks. Dark complexion. He had a high forehead. He had dark hair, either brown or black; it was combed almost straight back, with a slight part on the left side. There was something about his mouth, like it was crooked.

Police: [silent pause]

LOTE: … Maybe it was his moustache. It wasn’t even; it seemed like it was thicker on the left side than the right… That’s about all I can remember.

Police: Keep that image in mind. Try to focus in around his eyes.

Tell me whatever you can about his eyes, eyebrows, or the upper part of in his face.
They seemed strange… real big pupils, like when people look crazy. I don’t remember the colour of his eyes. Probably dark, but I’m not sure. He had some wrinkles around his eyes. Also, he was perspiring. You could see the light bouncing off the sweat on his forehead.

Was he wearing glasses or not?

No.

Let’s go back to his hair again. You mentioned that it was dark and combed straight back. What else can you tell me about his hair?

It was straight, maybe a bit wavy, but definitely not curly.

Can you describe the length of his hair?

It covered a little bit of his ears, so it wasn’t real short.

But it wasn’t very long.

You mentioned that he had puffy cheeks. Concentrate on his cheeks again… [pause] … Now, try to describe his face.

There was nothing outstanding. No scars or any noticeable marks on his face.

Was he clean-shaven or did he have facial hair?

He was clean-shaven.

How dark was his skin?

He was somewhat dark, like he’d been out in the sun, but not very dark.

Overall, what was the most distinctive feature of his face?
LOTE: I guess his eyes, that he had this really crazy look, with large pupils.

Police: Let’s take a different approach now. You seemed to indicate before that the man yelled at you, DOWN ON THE FLOOR. I’d like you to think now about when he yelled that order to you. Concentrate on his voice only and the sounds of those words. [pauses to develop auditory image] Try to describe the sound of his voice. Tell me everything you can about the sound of his voice or anything else related to the way he spoke.

LOTE: It was surprisingly high-pitched, like he was nervous. Although my English is not good, I think he also had a slight accent, but I’m not sure what kind. It didn’t sound like regular English… like he learnt English only a few years ago.

Police: Can you remember what about his speech made it seemed not like regular English?

LOTE: I’m not positive, but now that I think about it, he said ‘down on floor’, without the word ‘the’.

Police: Let’s switch again to another image. After he yelled at you to get down on the floor, you fell to the floor. What were your thoughts at the time?

LOTE: I was scared because he had that gun and he seemed crazy.

Police: Try to think about the position you were in and what your thoughts were after you fell to the floor and saw the man with the gun. [pause] Can you describe that to me?
I was lying on the floor, looking up at the robber. I remember that the floor was very hard; it was also cold. I guess I was scared at first, but then when I realised that all they wanted was to take the money, I relaxed a bit. But the sight of the gun still scared me.

I’d like you now to concentrate on the gun the man was holding. Again, close your eyes and try to focus on the gun. Take your time, close your eyes, and develop the image of the gun. Now try to describe the gun in as much details as you can.

I don’t know a lot about guns. It was black. I don’t know what else to tell you.

Here are sketches of two different types of guns. Did the gun look more like this one or this one?

It looked more like this one.

This part was longer. And the handle had a different shape. I’m afraid I can’t describe it very well.

That’s OK. If you can, try to draw a picture of what the handle looked like.

[draws picture of gun handle]

Let’s go back to that picture of the man holding the gun. Try to get it clear in your mind again. [pause] Now, try to focus on how he was holding the gun.

He was holding the gun in his right hand, like this. I remember his hand because I concentrated on the gun. He had very long fingernails. His
hands looked pretty big, like he was very strong. And he had a scar on the outside of his thumb.

61 Police: Show me on your hand where the scar was. 9

62 LOTE: [points to where scar was]

63 Police: When you were lying on the floor and looking at him, did you see his shoes? 16

64 LOTE: Yes. 1

65 Police: What kind were they? 4

66 LOTE: They were running shoes. 4

67 Police: You don’t know what brand they were, do you? 9

68 LOTE: No. 1

69 Police: What colour were they? 4

70 LOTE: Grey. 1

71 Police: Now, let’s go to his pants. Did you notice them? 10

72 LOTE: Yes. 1

73 Police: Try to concentrate on your image of the pants, looking up at him from the floor. [pause] Tell me everything you can about his pants. Remember, tell me every detail you can think of. 33

74 LOTE: They were blue jeans... dark blue, not the faded ones.

They looked kind of old since the pocket was torn over here. He had a brown leather belt with a large buckle, like a cowboy belt.

75 Police: In what way was it like a cowboy belt? 9

76 LOTE: I think there was an engraving of a horse on the belt. 12

77 Police: OK, let’s go to the shirt now. What colour was it? 11
LOTÉ: White.

Police: Was it short-sleeved?

 LOTÉ: Yes.

Police: Were there any markings on it?

 LOTÉ: Yes.

Police: Did you see his face when you were lying on the floor?

 LOTÉ: Yes.

Police: Try to concentrate on his neck and the underside of his chin. Just focus in on this area, from the top of his shirt to his chin. [pause] Try to describe in detail what you see.

 LOTÉ: His shirt was open at the neck. I noticed that he had a thin, gold chain around his neck. I couldn’t see if there was a pendant or not, because the bottom of the chain was inside his shirt… He had some chest hairs that you could see at the top of his shirt. He had pretty hairy arms too, especially around his forearms.

Police: Did you notice his face when you were lying on the floor?

 LOTÉ: I was focusing on the gun most of the time, so I didn’t look very carefully. I think I took a quick glance at him when he said something to us, but I don’t remember much.

Police: You just mentioned that he had pretty hairy forearms. When did you notice his arms?

 LOTÉ: When he was holding the gun. I was looking at his right arm, since he held the gun in his right hand.
POLICE COGNITIVE INTERVIEWS

91 Police: Try to concentrate on his right arm as he was holding the gun. Just focus in on his arm. [pause] Tell me whatever you can about his right arm.

92 LOTE: As I said, it was pretty hairy. He was pretty muscular, like he worked out with weights. He had large biceps too. And he had some kind of a mark on his upper arm. It could have been a tattoo or a birth mark. I’m not sure, but there was some kind of unusual mark there.

93 Police: Can you describe this mark in any more detail?

94 LOTE: No, I just noticed it briefly, and I didn’t get a very clear look. But there was something there, about here on his arm.

95 Police: [Name], you mentioned earlier that, after the robbery, you spoke to your husband about what happened. Did you talk about it in much detail or just about your general reactions to being in a robbery?

96 LOTE: My husband is the curious type, so he wanted me to give him a complete description of what happened. I guess he was playing amateur detective and wanted to find out who committed the crime.

97 Police: How well were you able to describe what happened when you spoke to your husband?

98 LOTE: Well, it was right after the robbery, so it was easier to remember some of the details then. In fact, I told my husband the name of one of the robbers—the other robber called him, but now I can’t remember what it was. I should have written it down.

99 Police: Let’s go back to when you were speaking to your husband. Where were you at the time?
LOTÉ: I was home. I was speaking on the telephone in the kitchen.

Police: Try to think back to when you spoke to your husband on the phone and to reconstruct the conversation.

LOTÉ: I told him what happened. Naturally, he asked me if I was OK, and then he asked me whether I had spoken to the police. I said, ‘No’, but told him I thought I remembered what the men looked like and I remembered one of their names. But I can’t remember his name now.

Police: Try to think back to the moment in the conversation with your husband when you thought of the robber’s name. Take your time, and think back to how you remembered his name.

LOTÉ: Let’s see, I remember that my husband made a joke about it, because we have a nephew with a similar name, Robbie, but that wasn’t exactly the name. It was a foreign name, a little longer than Robbie… Roberto. That’s it, the man called him ‘Roberto’.

Police: Which guy was Roberto, the one who held the gun to you or the guy at the front of the store?

LOTÉ: The guy who held the gun to us.

Police: Is there anything else you can remember when you spoke to your husband that is not clear now?

LOTÉ: No, just the name.

Police: Was one of the robbers the leader or did the two seem to be working together as equals?
The man who stayed at the cashier and got the money seemed to be in charge. He gave Roberto orders about what to do next. The man in charge also seemed to be more intelligent.

Police: What about him made him appear more intelligent?

LOTE: I’m not sure. I think he spoke more distinctly than Roberto, or he spoke without an accent. He was also dressed better. He was wearing regular pants, not jeans. And he was more clean-cut. He had glasses too. You know how sometimes wearing glasses makes people think you’re smarter.

Police: [Name], I’d like you to try to put yourself into the role of the leader and think about what happened from his perspective. That is, try to imagine what he was thinking about and how he must have thought about the robbery. I realise that is a difficult task to do, so try to concentrate. Don’t make up anything. Tell me only those things you actually saw, but take the robber’s perspective.

LOTE: OK. Well, after we came into the store, I took out my gun and started to yell at the owner to give me the money. I put an empty bag on the counter and told him to fill it. I told Roberto to watch the other customers in the store to make sure none of them interfered. The owner was very scared and he just put the money on the counter, not in the bag. So I put it into the bag. There were a few watches or pieces of jewellery also on the counter, so I took them too, since they were so convenient. I think I dropped one of the pieces, but I was in too much of a rush to stop to pick it up. As soon as I had all of the money, I yelled to Roberto, ‘Get in the truck’. Roberto left first. Then I backed out of the door, waving my gun and yelling to the customers, ‘Don’t anybody try to be a hero’. And then I ran out.

Police: So far, you’ve given me lots of details about the robbers and what happened. I’d like you now to describe the robbers in more general terms, like
height and weight or body build. Also, if you have any general impression about them, or if they reminded you of anyone, tell me. Let’s start with the man who held the gun to you, Roberto.

LOTÉ: He was short, about 165 cm and kind of barrel-chested. He looked like a boxer, maybe because he had a flat nose and I think he hadn’t shaved in a while. He wasn’t exactly the kind of guy you’d expect to find in art gallery.

Police: About how old was he?

LOTÉ: I guess in his mid-twenties.

Police: OK, let’s go to the other robber. Try to describe him.

LOTÉ: He was a bit older, maybe around 30. He seemed more refined.

Police: About how tall was he compared to me? Was he taller, shorter, or about the same height?

LOTÉ: Just about your height, maybe 2, 3 cm shorter.

Police: I’m 175 cm. So how tall would you say he was?

LOTÉ: About 170 cm or so.

Police: Did you have any general impression of him? Did he look like anyone you know?

LOTÉ: Not really; he looked a little like the cartoon character, Bart Simpson, because his hair stood up funny, but other than that, there was nothing unusual.

Police: [Name], you’ve given me a lot of information and I’d like to make sure that I have it all written down correctly. Let me go over my notes with you as a final check. Try to think about the robbery as I am reading my notes to you. If, at
any time, I say something that seems incorrect, or if you think of something new that
you haven’t told me, make sure you stop me immediately to tell me.

[police reads his notes slowly]

128 Police: I’m going to need some information about you for our
official records. It’s just something that is required by the police department whenever
we take a statement. [Name], what is your full name?

129 LOTE: [Full Name].

130 Police: And your address?

131 LOTE: 222 Alpine Road.

132 Police: [Name], you’ve been very helpful in the investigation.

Thank you for your time. I hope this hasn’t been too much of an ordeal for you. You
will probably find that in the next few days, you will continue to think about what
happened during the robbery. That’s natural. When you do, you’ll also probably think
of some new information that we haven’t covered today. Write down the information
and give me a call. Here’s my card. Thank you again for being so cooperative.
Appendix 2.2: INTV2 Turn Numbering and Word Count for Each Turn

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turn no.</th>
<th>Interlocutor</th>
<th>TCU</th>
<th>Word count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Police:</td>
<td>[Name], I am Detective Kevin McCaul from the County Sheriff’s Office. My partner, Bob Locker, spoke with you yesterday about the shooting, and I would like to talk to you today to get some more information.</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>LOTE:</td>
<td>Where were the police yesterday? Why do you let such crazy people roam the street? I was minding my own business, and then, out of nowhere, somebody shoots me. For no reason. I wasn’t bothering anyone. I could have been killed out there. What is this city coming to? Now, here I am in the hospital. I have to go to work tomorrow to pick up my pay check and I can’t even move. I don’t think I’m going to be much help. I really didn’t see much. It all happened so fast.</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Police:</td>
<td>How are you feeling now? Are you in pain?</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>LOTE:</td>
<td>I can hardly move my leg. And every time I go to sit up it hurts even more.</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Police:</td>
<td>Can I do anything to help you?</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>LOTE:</td>
<td>No, there’s nothing you can do. If that idiot hadn’t shot me, I wouldn’t be here now.</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Police:</td>
<td>It really is unfair. There are some crazy people out there, and innocent people often wind up suffering because of them. My wife was hit by a car once. The car went through a red light and hit my wife as she was crossing the street. She wasn’t doing anything, just crossing the street, and she wound up with a broken leg.</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>LOTE:</td>
<td>I knew I shouldn’t have gone outside last night. My sister, Alisha, keeps on telling me that it’s not safe outside at night and that I shouldn’t go out,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
especially at night. But you have to go buy food. You can’t sit home all the time. Maybe I should have listened to my sister. I’d be safe at home now instead of being scared out of my wits. Who knows, this is a crazy world nowadays.

Police: [Name], I can understand your feelings of frustration. You can’t blame yourself, however, for going shopping.

LOTÉ: What am I supposed to do, stay home all day? I don’t understand it. I was just standing there and before I know it, I have a bullet in my leg and I’m in the hospital. Is that fair? I work hard. I don’t bother anyone. And then this crazy idiot shoots me.

Police: That really is unfair.

LOTÉ: I don’t even own a gun because I’m afraid of them. My cousin’s farm keeps a gun in the house, and I don’t feel safe there. I’m always afraid it’s going to blow off.

Police: You’re right. Guns can be dangerous.

LOTÉ: I keep hearing the sound of the gun in my mind, and every time I hear it, I become frightened. I can’t remember anything other than the sound of the gun and the pain in my leg.

Police: It must have been very scary. [Name], we would like to try to catch the person who shot you so we can make the streets safer for innocent people like you. I’d like to ask you some questions about what happened earlier today. Do you feel up to answering some questions?

LOTÉ: Officer, I don’t remember much about what happened. The other police officer spoke to me earlier and I told him everything I knew. I’m not going to be able to tell you anything new.
That’s fine. Don’t worry about what you told the first officer. Just tell me as much as you can about what happened.

First, I need to get some background information. We have to do this in all police investigations, so please bear with me for a few minutes.

[Name], what is your full name?

LOTÉ: [Name].

And what is your address?

LOTÉ: 5 High Street, Dandenog.

Good. Now I’d like to try to go back to what happened yesterday to see what you can remember.

I really don’t think I’ll be able to remember much.

That’s OK; just do the best you can. Anything you can tell me will be valuable, so just relax and take your time. We’re not in any rush. I understand that you’re upset now. That’s only natural after a crime like this. If you want to take a break at any time, because you’re feeling anxious, just tell me and we’ll stop.

[Name], when you think about today’s events, many thoughts may come to your mind. Say whatever comes to mind, whether you consider it trivial, or out of order, or even if it disagrees with something you said earlier. Just tell me whatever comes to your mind without holding anything back. Try to think back to before the shooting took place. Can you remember where you were and what you were thinking about?

I was just standing in front of a supermarket. I don’t remember thinking about anything in particular.
Where were you going at the time?
I was just coming home. I was standing by the stoplight waiting for it to change to green.
Were there any other people near you?
Just one other person. He was also waiting to cross the street.
Can you remember the traffic conditions at the time?
It was around noon, before rush hour, so traffic was pretty light.
OK, [name], now what I’d like you to do is to tell me in your own words what happened from the time the shooting occurred until you couldn’t see the car any more.
I told you, I don’t remember very much. I was just standing by the light. A car drove up and somebody shot me. I still can’t figure out why. The policeman said that they might have been aiming at the man standing next to me. Just my luck. They want to shoot somebody else and they shoot me instead. That’s the story of my life. I have the worst luck. My car breaks down every three months. My husband just lost his job. I just got out of the hospital. I don’t know what to do.
That does sound discouraging. Let’s go back to what you said about the shooting. Where did you see the man who shot you?
I heard him yell something and I turned to look at him.
Where was the car at that time?
LOTE: Just before the intersection. The car slowed down and the man yelled something.

Police: And then...

LOTE: I heard the shots. I think there were two shots.

Police: What happened after the two shots?

LOTE: I fell down and was in terrible pain. I didn’t know what was going on at first, because there was no warning.

Police: Did you see the car after the shots?

LOTE: Yes, it made a left turn at the corner and went up Cook Street. It was going pretty fast at the time and I was very surprised, so I didn’t get a very good look at the car.

Police: What is the best view you had of the car?

LOTE: Probably when the man yelled, just before he shot.

Police: OK, [Name], I’d like you to concentrate on this image of the car. It may be easier to concentrate if you close your eyes.

LOTE: I don’t want to close my eyes. I get real scared.

Police: That is scary sometimes. In this case, try to look straight ahead at the wall in front of you. Try to think about when the car pulled up in front of you and the man yelled. Just try to picture that image in your mind. Don’t say anything yet.

LOTE: It was a new car: I don’t know much about.

Police: Wait before you start to describe the car. Take your time and think about the image of the car first. Just concentrate on the image of the car for a few seconds. Don’t say anything for a while.
Now, just tell me where on the car you are focusing.

53 LOTE: The side.

54 Police: OK, now try to describe the side of the car in as much detail as possible. Don’t leave out anything. Tell me every detail you can about the side of the car, even if it seems unimportant.

55 LOTE: Well, it was blue. It looked pretty new, maybe two or three years old. I don’t know what kind of car it was. I just know my own car is a Toyota. That’s it.

56 Police: You said it looked new. What about it made it look new?

57 LOTE: It was pretty shiny and didn’t have any scratches in it.

58 Police: You said it was blue. Can you tell me what shade of blue it was? Here are some patches of blue [takes out book of colour patches]. Which of these matches closest with the colour of the car?

59 LOTE: This one here.

60 Police: Was it exactly like this patch or a little different?

61 LOTE: It was a little darker, I think, and maybe a bit greener.

62 Police: Try to visualise the front of the car. [pause] Now try to describe whatever you see.

63 LOTE: I just saw it quickly. It was kind of square-shaped. And there was a design, like an emblem, in the front.

64 Police: Can you draw a picture of the design?

65 LOTE: I’m not very good at drawing.
66  Police:  That’s OK; just draw it as well as you can.  

67  LOTE:  [drawing]  

68  Police:  OK, now try to think about the front windshield and describe it to me. Was it tinted or clear? Were there any markings, like stickers, or a crack on it?  

69  LOTE:  It was clear, I think.  

70  Police:  Did you see a licence plate in the front of the car?  

71  LOTE:  No.  

72  Police:  Did you see the licence plate in the rear of the car?  

73  LOTE:  No, it was going too fast.  

74  Police:  Mei, try now to focus in on the man who shot you. Where was he sitting in the car?  

75  LOTE:  In the front seat, on the passenger’s side.  

76  Police:  And which part of him did you see?  

77  LOTE:  Only the very top, his chest and a little of his face.  

78  Police:  Think for a while about what he looked like when you saw him. You said that he yelled something and then you looked up. You see his face and chest. Try to focus in on that picture. Take your time and develop that image.  

[pause] Tell me whatever you can.  

79  LOTE:  I didn’t really see much of him, because it was dark inside the car. All I could see is that he was wearing a light-coloured shirt or jacket. That’s all.  

80  Police:  You mentioned that you also saw his face. What can you remember about his face? Was he white or black?
LOTIE: He was white. That’s about all I can tell you. It was dark and it happened so quickly.

Police: You don’t remember if he had a beard?

LOTIE: No.

Police: What kind of gun was he holding, a revolver or an automatic?

LOTIE: I don’t know.

Police: You said that, after the shots were fired, the car made a left turn on to Cook’s Lane Street. What were you thinking about at the time?

LOTIE: I was scared, and my leg hurt. I looked at the car because I was mad and I wanted to know who shot me.

Police: Try to think about that moment, when you see the car turning and you are trying to see who shot you. Try to see the car in your mind as it is turning. Don’t say anything; just try to imagine the car from this view. [pause] Now, try to tell me any detail you can about the left side of the car as it is turning.

LOTIE: It was a small car, with a square shape.

Police: Mm-hm. What else?

LOTIE: It had two round lights in the back.

Police: [silent pause]

LOTIE: …and something shiny on the back, maybe the name of the car. I didn’t see it that well because it was too far away.

Police: Try to draw a sketch of what the back of the car looked like. First draw the general shape of the back and then try to fit in any details you can
remember. Try to be as complete as possible, including lights, where the licence plate is
located and anything else you can remember.

LOTÉ: [draws sketch of car]

Police: Let me show you a book that has pictures of different cars.
Go through this book and tell me if you see a picture that looks like the car you saw.

LOTÉ: [examines book of car pictures]

Police: When the car made the left turn on to Cook’s Lane, did you see the driver or anyone else in the car?

LOTÉ: I just got a glimpse of the driver, but I couldn’t see anyone else in the car.

Police: [Name], let’s go back to the man who was holding the gun. I realise that you didn’t get a good look at him, but did you get any overall impressions of him? About how old was he?

LOTÉ: I didn’t really see him well enough to say, but I’d guess early twenties.

Police: Do you know about how heavy he was?

LOTÉ: No, I didn’t see him very well, and he was sitting in the car.

Police: What about the driver, can you describe him at all?

LOTÉ: No, I barely saw him.

Police: OK, [Name], thanks for your help. If you remember anything else, please call me.
Appendix 3.1: English–Turkish Police Interview Exam Script

Administered in Semester 1, 2012, during the end-of-semester interpreting exam at RMIT University, Melbourne, Australia.

Briefing: A police officer is interviewing Mrs X as a witness about a jewellery store robbery. Mrs X was in the store when the incident occurred.

1. Police Officer: Thanks very much for coming in our office for this interview. I hope you have somehow recovered from the shock. (21 words)


[English] The neighbourhood has changed. It’s gotten to the point where I’m afraid to go out at night. There’s so much crime. I’d like to see all of these guys behind bars where they belong, so we can walk in the street again in safety. (44 words)

3. Police Office: I understand. In order to catch these people, I need you to tell me everything about the robber. Remember the more details you can give me, the easier it will be for us to find the person and prosecute them. (40 words)

4. Mrs X: [Turkish] Peki elimden geleni yapmaya calisirim.

[English] OK, I’ll try my best. (5 words)

5. Police Officer: Can you tell me where you were in the jewellery store and what you were doing just before the robbery took place? (22 words)

I was at the back of the store trying to choose a watch for my husband as a birthday present. All of a sudden, I heard someone shouted in English, ‘Everybody on the floor!’ I turned around and saw this guy waving a gun. My legs went like jelly. And I fell to the floor like everyone else. (58 words)

7. Police Officer: Uhm… Take yourself back to this point—lying on the floor. Try to develop a mental picture of this guy as thoroughly as possible. You may find it easier to concentrate closing your eyes. Do not say anything just now [pause for a few seconds]. Right, describe him in as much detail as you can. Don’t leave anything out. (53 words)

8. Mrs X: [Turkish] Oval bir yüz şekli vardı ve yanakları dolgundu. Sakalı vardı ve yüzü sanki günəşten yandı gibi esmerceydi. Saçları hafif dalgıla ve arkaya doğru taramıştı. İnsanlara bakışı sanki deli gibiydi ve göz bebekleri çok büyük. [English] He has an oval-shaped face, with puffy cheeks. He has a beard, and his complexion is somewhat dark, like he’s been out in the sun. His hair is all combed back, with a bit of a wave. The way he gazes at people is like he’s a crazy person, with huge pupils. (52 words)

9. Police Officer: Can you describe the length of his hair? (8 words)

10. Mrs X: [Turkish] Omuzlarının biraz üstündeydi. [English] Just above his shoulders. (4 words)

11. Police Officer: Keep his image in mind. Try to focus in around his eyes. Tell me whatever you can about his eyes, eyebrows, or the upper part of in his face. (29 words)

[English] I don’t remember the colour of his eyes. Probably dark, but I’m not sure. He had some wrinkles around his eyes. Also, he was perspiring. You could see the light bouncing off the sweat on his forehead. (37 words)

13. Police Officer: Now, let’s move down to his neck and the underside of his chin. Just focus in on this area, from the top of his shirt to his chin. [pause a few seconds] Try to describe in detail what you see. (36 words)


[English] His shirt was open at the neck. I noticed that he had a thin, gold chain around his neck. I couldn’t see if there was a pendant or not because the bottom of the chain was inside his shirt… He also wore an ear ring on one of the ears… eh, his right ear. A simple gold circle without any complex design. (60 words)

15. Police Officer: Uhm… shall we take a break here? (7 words)

[end of dialogue]

Total word count in English: 418 words

Word count for English Segments: 216

Equivalent English Word Count for LOTE Segments: 202