

Negotiating territories of knowledge: on interpreting talk in guided tours

LAURA GAVIOLI

University of Modena and Reggio Emilia (Italy)

Abstract

The problem of interpreting what is “behind the turns”, not explicitly said by participants in their utterances, has presented a dilemma in studies of dialogue interpreting, leading to controversies about how far interpreters should engage in dealing with implicit issues they get to know, but which are not made clear by the interlocutors. In this paper, I analyse data where a guide and an interpreter present a group of tourists with locations where the history and tradition of local products are exhibited. In my data interpreters expand the guides’ presentation in their rendition, adding quite a lot of information they know about, but which has not been explicitly mentioned by the guide. I suggest that the notion of epistemics, developed in conversation analysis, may help explain the dynamics regulating the distribution of responsibilities of guides and interpreters in dealing with relevant contents and I conclude that rights and obligations to explicate what is behind the guides’ talk can largely be seen as a product of the interaction.

Introduction

The function of interpreting in dialogic settings like doctor-patient consultations, police or asylum seeking interviews, or talk shows, has been widely debated in interpreting studies’ literature for the last twenty years. In particular, research focus has undergone a shift of interest from studies on cognitive processes and memory (Gile 1995) to analyses in pragmatics and interaction (Wadensjö 1998;

Davidson 2000, 2002; Bolden 2000; Mason 2006; Baraldi/Gavioli 2012a and see also Pöchhacker/Shlesinger 2002: part 7), which have given increasingly more importance to the study of context and its relationships with language choices. The variability of meaning in relation to context has, however, posed problems in dialogue interpreting studies. Attributing meaning on the basis of contextual circumstances, while inevitable on the one hand, may present the dilemma of interpreting and rendering what is implicit and not overtly uttered, what remains “behind the turns”; so how far interpreters should interpret what has not been said explicitly by the interlocutors has been considered as a delicate and possibly risky issue.

In this contribution, I analyse naturally occurring interactions in tourist-commercial settings, where a group of tourists are conducted by a guide and an interpreter to visit locations where the history and the tradition of local products are shown. I focus in particular on the interpreters’ rendition of the guide’s presentation and I analyse the interaction involving the guide and the interpreter. Interpreters in my data are quite active: they participate in talk expanding the guide’s description much beyond what is “said in the turns”. The way they do so, however, is regulated in the interaction, having partly to do with the participants’ roles, but being largely negotiated as a matter of access to information that guides and interpreters have and their rights and obligations to deal with it, in their talk with the tourists. I suggest that such negotiation accounts for the responsibilities interpreters may take in collaborating with the guides in the achievement of effective bilingual presentations.

1. Talk *in* and *behind* the turns

Studies in Conversation Analysis (especially Heritage 2012, 2013a and 2013b) have recently revisited an interest in how the contextual background is brought into talk and made relevant in the interaction. Heritage notes that, in talk, “we achieve cognitive economies [...] by relying on words and sentences to evoke the contextual specification that recipients will use in understanding what we mean by what we say” (2013a: 552). In order to explain this “evoking” mechanism, Heritage reports an experiment by Garfinkel whereby speakers were asked to comment a short bit of their conversation by explaining what “was behind” it, what remained unspoken but still referred to in talk. Garfinkel’s example is interesting for my purposes here, for a series of reasons I shall explain below. For the sake of clarity, let me report the example. This is a short bit of conversation between husband and wife:

Husband:	Dana succeeded in putting a penny in a parking meter today without being picked up.
Wife:	Did you take him to the record store?

And this is the speakers’ explanation of what is “behind” this couple of turns, the knowledge of context which makes their understanding of each other likely:

This afternoon as I was bringing Dana, our four-year-old son, home from the nursery school, he succeeded in reaching high enough to put a penny in a parking meter when we parked in a meter zone, whereas before he had always had to be picked up to reach that high. Since he put a penny in a meter that means you stopped while he was with you. I know that you stopped at the record store either on the way to get him or on the way back. Was it on the way back, so that he was with you or did you stop there on the way to get him and somewhere else on the way back? (Heritage 2013a: 552).

What is interesting in this example is that it illustrates quite evidently that a lot of what is talked about is referred to, evoked in the utterances and in their sequential relations but not “lexicalized” or spoken out in the turns.

Interpreting studies have long dwelt on the necessity of rendering “faithfully” what was said and the indexical characteristics of talk that are shown in Garfinkel’s example have posed a number of problems regarding their interpretation and rendition (see e.g. Hale 2007: 6-7). Wadensjö (1998) has distinguished between talk “as text” and talk “as activity” and has highlighted that, while in treating talk as text, interpreters focus on the rendition of the content of single turns as if they were “short speeches”, by treating talk as activity, interpreters consider the general communicative functions that are achieved through the turn-sequence. Wadensjö (1998) has made clear that treating talk as text is not enough for rendering interaction effectively, since turns’ “texts” may not fully account for their purposes and functions in relation to each other and to the goals of the interaction.

An account of the limit highlighted by Wadensjö (1998, and see also Davidson 2002) comes from a study by Mason (2006) about the notion of “underdeterminacy”. Mason’s notion is not far from what is illustrated in Garfinkel’s example above. He shows that utterances are evocative of context that is assumed to be shared by interlocutors. When participants at talk involve an interpreter, what is assumed as shared context between the interpreter and one interlocutor may not likewise be assumed in talk involving the other interlocutor. In these cases, effective rendition of utterances requires interpreters to “interpret” such contextual assumptions and make them explicit in the other language. In this respect, a lack of explicitation may not only be insufficient in providing sensible rendition, but also misleading.

In dialogue interpreting, the problem of rendering “what is behind talk” is interesting because it is directly related to what needs to be “brought back in talk”, that is the problem of speaking the unspoken out, by interpreting and attributing it a meaning and a function. This requires reflexive actions involving “communication on communication”, where the sense and goals of the interaction are made explicit to the interlocutors. In dialogue interpreting these types of actions have been called (by Wadensjö 1998 who first introduced the issue, but see also Baraldi/Gavioli 2012b) “coordination”. In Wadensjö’s view, coordination is related to “talk as activity” and is what makes the sense and function of turns at talk clear, largely referring to “what is behind” them.

While coordination is crucial to make sense of what is said, speaking the unspoken out, it also poses a problem of participants’ rights and obligations: if interpreters manipulate renditions in order to account for interactional

sense-making, to what extent can explicitation of communicative functions be the achievement of interpreters' activity and to what extent does it require participation of and negotiation with the other interlocutors? A number of naturally occurring data-based studies of interpreter-mediated interactions have now accounted for interactional dynamics related to the function of mediation in diverse settings (see e.g. Davidson 2000; Bolden 2000; Keselman *et al.* 2010; Pasquandrea 2011; Traverso 2012; Baraldi 2012; Zorzi 2012; Straniero Sergio 2012; Davitti 2013; Gavioli 2015). To the best of my knowledge, however, not much has been written, about the interpreters' rights or obligations to deal with informational content, e.g. expanding it – the bulk of the discussion being in terms of codes of conduct (see among others Angelelli 2007; Hale 2007; Tebble 2012). In Conversation Analysis, the notion of “epistemics” has been used to refer to socially distributed rights of access to knowledge (by e.g. Heritage 2008; Heritage/Raymond 2005). These give participants “authority” to perform particular activities in talk (e.g. answer questions, Heritage 2012). In the next section of this paper, I shall deal with this notion and its potential interest for interactions mediated by interpreters. I suggest that while expanded renditions are used to quite a large extent in my data to make the sense of the presentations effective for the tourists, they are not the sole initiative of interpreters. In fact, guides and interpreters deal with information for the tourists in different ways, which are based on a negotiation of their rights and obligations in dealing with it.

2. Territories of knowledge: the notion of epistemics

A common activity in conversation is that of telling each other about issues which are new, unknown or in some way informative for our interlocutors. In interaction, participants negotiate the “informativeness” and the novelty of the issues dealt with as well as who can knowledgeable speak about them. Research on epistemics in conversation analysis concerns the knowledge claims that participants at talk “register, assert, and defend in interaction” (Heritage 2013a: 555).

Heritage (2013a) distinguishes between two aspects of epistemics in talk. The first has to do with the actual negotiation of what is known and unknown to participants in conversation. Conversation is an interactional construction and, in their contributions, interlocutors project future actions and react to previous actions. In so doing, they display their understanding of each other's contributions and their right to contribute accordingly. These rights include the legitimacy of providing unknown or partially known information and there are mechanisms by which participants show whether possibly unknown information is in fact unknown and informative for their interlocutors. Some such mechanisms are those concerning pre-announcements, as in “did you hear the terrible news” – “no, what?” (Terasaki 2004: 184) or “oh” replies to statements, where “oh” means “I didn't know” (Heritage 1984).

The second aspect of epistemics has to do with what Heritage (2013a: 556) calls the “relative epistemic position” of participants in reference to some information or state of affairs that is dealt with in the interaction. This is the “display

of authority” participants have on particular matters of knowledge. For example, speakers who are more knowledgeable about a piece of news or information may use techniques to show this and similarly participants who are less knowledgeable about matters they are dealing with may use devices to downplay their claims, for instance by asking for confirmation from those they attribute more knowledge to. This second aspect is related to how utterances are understood, for instance in distinguishing between claims and requests. Heritage (2013a) shows that utterances with a declarative form like “your line has been busy” or “you’re married” are normally taken up as requests or invitations to provide more information when those who proffer them know less about the matter than those they are addressing.

In relation to interlocutors’ epistemic positions and their impact on action projection and understanding, Heritage (2012, 2013a, 2013b) further distinguishes between epistemic *status* and epistemic *stance*. Epistemic status involves participants’ rights to possess and express knowledge, in talk, in relation to each other. When asking questions, for instance, speakers in turn show their lack of knowledge about the matter and they attribute this knowledge to the person being asked. So status has to do with knowing or not knowing and the right to express such (non)knowledge in the interaction. Epistemic stance instead has to do with the ways in which (non)knowledge is actually expressed and the choice of the ways to express it may project different types of reaction from the interlocutor. For instance, in expressing their status of non-knowledge about their interlocutor’s marital position, requesters may use a question like “Are you married?” or a declarative like “you’re married”. Status is that of not-knowing in both cases, but stance is modulated in a way that the first form expresses higher ignorance than the second and projects a “yes” or “no” reply, while the second invites a confirmation.

In interpreter-mediated interaction, the issue of attribution and acknowledgment of rights to express knowledge is a rather complex and important one. Interpreters possess knowledge acquired from participants in talk during preliminary briefings, during the encounter or from their experience in participating in other similar events; such access to knowledge gives them the possibility to interpret contents which are not fully explicated and render them explicitly. So, the necessity of interpreting and rendering what is behind the turns accounts for the interpreters’ access to information. Interpreters, however, have access to and deal with information another participant is supposed to be more knowledgeable about; it may thus be interesting to see how different epistemic participants’ statuses are expressed and managed in interpreted talk.

In my presentations of local products, interpreters render guides’ presentations by clarifying issues and explaining their relevance for the history and tradition of the local productions. In their rendition activity, they add quite a lot of information, thus showing expert knowledge of the issues dealt with. Still, negotiation is such as to account for the fact that additional information is “authorised” by the guide, who on the one hand, is acknowledged as the “epistemic authority”, but on the other legitimises the interpreter to deal with particular contents, recognising the latter’s expertise in doing so. As a result, information

delivery as well as the responsibilities in delivering it can be looked at as products of the interaction.

3. The data

The data analysed in this paper consist of nine talks, each of about 45 minutes. Six were recorded at five different productions of Traditional Balsamic Vinegar, three were recorded at two different historic car collections (Comastri 2010). The settings are small businesses, often family-run activities, located in the countryside. They are organised as small museums with guided tours that lead tourists to appreciate the history and tradition of Balsamic Vinegar production and of car manufacturing respectively, since the two are commercially important activities in the area where the recording took place. Each tour is conducted by a guide (who may be the owner of the production or the collection) and an interpreter. The guides speak Italian (though they may occasionally switch to English) and the interpreters render what the guides say into English. The interpreters involved in the recordings are three women aged between 25 and 30, all professional, native Italian interpreters, with at least one year of working experience. The interactions are normally opened with greetings, welcoming and introduction of the participants to each other, then a presentation of the exhibited objects follows with an explanation of their significance for the history and tradition of the production. There may be questions from the tourists and these are normally concentrated in the last part of the tour or in the conclusion. Data were only audio-recorded, meaning that posture, gaze and gestures are not documented. Transcriptions follow conventions commonly used in Conversation Analysis (Jefferson 1978; Psathas/Anderson 1990; and see also Niemants 2012) and punctuation is used to approximate intonation. A literal English translation is provided in italics below each Italian turn. All personal details have been altered to protect anonymity.

4. On knowledge display in interpreted guided tours

In presentations of local productions, guides introduce the tourists to the products on display by explaining their significance in the local history and tradition. Interpreters render these presentations for the tourists and in so-doing they add a lot that remains unsaid by the guides. For instance, they explain the meaning of technical terms or characteristics, they provide examples to illustrate how processes take place, they clarify differences between apparently similar types of products. These expansions are launched by the interpreters and accepted and legitimised in the guides' talk. In what follows, I will show two types of sequences which I consider indicative of the work guides and interpreters do to manage and distribute the delivery of their presentations.

4.1. Interpreters' expansions and guides' acknowledgments

Possibly the most frequent mechanism to accomplish presentations in my data is that the guide provides a description of a product or a production process and the interpreter expands the presentation, adding details or explanations to what the guide said. Interpreters' expansions in my data are of different types and length; they may, however, be distinguished into two main types: (1) short clarifications of the meaning of technical items, frequently introduced by "which" and the verb 'be', in a subordinate or parenthetical clause ("which is ..."); (2) clarifications or explanations of production processes, for instance by giving examples or clarifying differences. While the first seems to involve rather short expansions given in the form of terminological definitions, the second appears to involve more expertise in the production dynamics. Some examples follow below.

The first three extracts are from the first category. Extracts 1 and 2 provide, respectively, a short clarification of the word "must", which is used here to refer to the grape juice, the main vinegar ingredient, and about a car's speed, first expressed in miles and then in kilometres per hour. Extract 3 is a bit more elaborate and the "brand" that is mentioned by the guide is described in more detail by the interpreter, explaining the meaning of the brand and of the letters branded on the barrels. All clarifications are given in subordinate clauses introduced by "which" and the verb 'be':

(1)

Guide: *l'uva viene pigiata come per fare il vino poi il mosto che scende viene cotto*
grapes are crushed as for making wine then the must running down gets cooked

Int: the grapes are crushed as for making wine, and then the juice, **which is called must**, is cooked

(2)

Guide: *pensate che però per allora i centosessanta orari era una velocità stratosferica, era fuori dai coppi, era una cosa straordinaria insomma*
think however that for those times a hundred-sixty per hour was stratospheric speed, it was out of mind, in brief it was extraordinary

Int: in those time one hundred miles, **which are one hundred and sixty kilometres per hour** were really really extraordinary

(3)

Guide: *l'altro controllo che fa questo ente lo fa nelle acetaie, controllando tutte le botti e facendo un marchio alle botti e ogni botte ha un numero uno diverso dall'altro, sono tanti numeri per ogni botte c'è un numero diverso dall'altro. questo per tutti i produttori di aceto balsamico*
the other control that this institution does is inside the productions, by controlling all the barrels and branding the barrels and all the barrels have different numbers, there are as many numbers as the barrels each has a different one. this for all producers of balsamic vinegar

Int: the other control that the consortium makes, is coming, is going to every producer and applying that marking ABTM **which stands for traditional balsamic vinegar of modena**. A stands for aceto **which is vinegar**, they also apply a number to every single barrel. so again everything, everything is under control

These interpreters' expansions uncover information that the guides seem to take for granted, like familiarity with the word "must", units of measure, or the meaning of the writing on the brand, which may be clear to Italian speakers, but not to speakers of other languages.

Extracts 4 and 5 below show examples of the second category. These expansions are longer and more elaborate than the previous ones, adding more information. In extract 4, the interpreter explains how quality control on traditional balsamic vinegar takes place. Not only does she repeat the information given by the guide that quality committees establish how many bottles can be produced, but she also explains why limiting the quantity of bottles guarantees vinegar quality:

(4)

Guide: ecco, loro in base a questi dati, eh, stabiliscono la quantità di bottiglie che ogni anno ogni acetaia può produrre
right, they on the basis of these data, eh, establish the quantity of bottles which every year, every vinegar production can produce

Int: and so, according to the content the consortium knows how much eh (.) each barrel can contain, **and from that datum they also know how much vinegar the producer can produce every year, so if, so that, i mean, for example if they produce more vinegar they might understand that something's not so good, something's wrong at some point, so that's why they control the barrels and the content of the barrels (among every barrel)**

In extract 5, the interpreter clarifies that the guide's statement about the balsamic vinegar of Modena is to be intended in relation to a distinction between so called "balsamic vinegar" and "traditional balsamic vinegar", where the latter is the pure, precious one, made out of grape juice only:

(5)

Guide: perché l'aceto balsamico di modena è semplicemente una miscela di mosto cotto o concentrato, aceto di vino, e caramello di zucchero aggiunto
because the balsamic vinegar of modena is simply a mixture of cooked or concentrated must, wine vinegar, and added sugar caramel

Int: cause the balsamic vinegar, **so the normally industrially produced or produced in a quicker way** is just cooked must and with addition of or concentrated must with addition of wine vinegar and sugar caramel and so on. **whereas in the traditional balsamic vinegar only cooked must, nothing else at all**

So interpreters' expansions explain what is "behind" the guide's turns, how the guides' words may be interpreted in order to appreciate the product descriptions.

Expanded renditions can be reacted to by the guides in two ways. The first is what may be called 'silent acceptance' of the interpreter's contribution: in this case the guides simply continue their explanation in Italian for the tourists. The second is that the guide acknowledges the interpreter's contribution before going on. Guides' acknowledgments normally take one of two forms: "esatto" ("precisely") or "perfetto" ("perfect"), other possible variants being "okay", "ecco" ("that's it") or "come hai detto" ("as you said"). While both guides' reactions show an acceptance of interpreters' expanded deliveries, the function of the

guides' acknowledgments seems interesting to me, first, because they highlight that guides may be aware that the interpreters have provided more information; second, because by acknowledging the interpreters' addition of information, the guides claim both their right to evaluate its relevance and appropriateness, and the expertise of the interpreter who knows what of "the unsaid" may need to be said to make the explanation effective.

While it is not easy to say whether guides *always* realise when interpreters add details in their renditions, it is interesting to note that in almost all cases where we have guides' acknowledgments, those occur after the interpreters' expansions and not when the interpreters' renditions are close repetitions of the guides' talk. We have, moreover, no occurrences of acknowledgments when interpreters add short definitions of the type "which is ,..". All acknowledgments in my data occur following expansions which provide more than a gloss or a specification: extracts 4 and 5 above for instance are both acknowledged respectively with "okay" and "esatto" immediately after the interpreter's renditions (data not shown).

I thus draw a tentative conclusion from what has been discussed in this section. First, expansions, both minimal and more elaborate, are performed by interpreters and accepted by the guides as part of the information provided by the interpreters. Second, guides have, however, the possibility to display that they can understand when "extra" information is provided by the interpreters and acknowledge it as part of what is relevant to say in presentations. When they do so, not only do the guides acknowledge and legitimise the work of the interpreters, but they also claim their rights and obligations to support it as correct and appropriate. In other words they "authorise" the interpreters to use their knowledge as "experts" in delivering information to tourists in English. This expansion-acknowledgement mechanism then accounts for one way in which responsibilities about information presentation (and the access to knowledge that is involved) are regulated in interpreter-mediated presentations in guided tours.

4.2. Interpreters' requests

Interpreters in my data have worked with the guides for a while and they know about the recounting and a number of details. Above, we have seen that they use some of their knowledge to expand the guides' explanations in rendition for international tourists and that this work is accepted and acknowledged by the guides. Another way in which interpreters introduce extra information is by making short interruptions in their renditions and asking the guide a question about something that has not been said and may instead be relevant to mention. These questions have the same form as requests for repetition: they may ask for details, e.g. "quanto cuoce?" [how long does it cook?], or for confirmation, e.g. "cinque?" [five?]. Unlike requests for repetition, however, these questions ask about details which have not been mentioned in previous talk by the guide and raise them as potentially relevant issues to tell the tourists about. Guides normally confirm or slightly correct the detail asked about and the interpreters go on in their rendition including the 'new' detail in it.

Let us look at two examples. In extract 6, the interpreter's request "quella è una botte madre?" [is that a mother barrel?] refers to the way very old barrels are called: while the guide says that the barrel in question is one of the oldest they have, he does not mention that this barrel is a "mother barrel". The interpreter's question then makes this detail relevant and is responded to by the guide with confirmation:

(6)

Guide: ad esempio, queste sono una serie di botti di origine siciliana, perché i miei genitori prendevano il vino in sicilia e dopo le botti sono rimaste qua nell'acetaia. invece l'ultima là è una delle botti più vecchie di della famiglia
for instance, these are a series of barrels of Sicilian origin, because my parents took wine from Sicily and then the barrels have remained here in the vinegar production. Instead the last one there is one of the oldest barrels of my family

Int: you see these barrels here, in this long longer shape, and these barrels come from sicily because (.) his family used to buy eh the wine from sicily, they were marsala wine barrels, and then drank the wine and kept the barrels for the vinegar=whereas the: (.) **quella è una botte madre?**
is that a mother barrel?

Guide: sì, sì. è una botte madre
yes, yes. it's a mother barrel

Int: and, the big barrel there is called the mother barrel and it's one of the oldest barrel of the family

In extract 7, the request "cinque?" [five?] refers to the number of barrels that are needed to produce vinegar for a family. While the guide mentions that family batteries are normally small, he does not specify what "small" means. The interpreter's question, here too, makes this detail relevant and is responded to by the guide with a confirmation and a correction ("almeno" – [at least]), which makes the suggested detail very relevant, highlighting that the minimum number of barrels in a battery is not that small:

(7)

Guide: la batteria non è altro che un set di barili che serve, praticamente una piccola famiglia, che serve per produrre circa un litro di aceto balsamico tradizionale all'anno
the battery is nothing else than a set of barrels which serves, in practice a small family, which can produce about a litre of balsamic vinegar each year

Int: so a battery is a set of usually (.) **cinque?**
five?

Guide: almeno cinque
at least five

Int: of at least five barrels which every year produce only one litre of traditional balsamic vinegar

These sequences seem interesting for at least four reasons. First, similarly to the sequences seen in section 4.1, they show that some information that is not in the guides' utterances may be identified by the interpreters as relevant in their rendition for the tourists. In extract 6, for example, the interpreter's question refers to a detail that may be interesting to know, i.e. those very old barrels are

called “mother barrels” and, in extract 7, the specification of the number of the barrels in a small battery is relevant to give a sense of how small is small. Second, the extracts show that interpreters have access to details which are potentially relevant and useful to make the explanations informative and effective for the tourists and this gives them authority to propose them. Third, the form of these questions is interesting. Although they are constructed as requests for repetition (a quite common type of interpreter question in the data), since they do not refer to information provided by the guides in previous turns, they are taken up as suggestions to introduce new details. Finally, the guides’ uptake is notable too. In basically all cases, guides’ responses are very quick, confirming answers acknowledging the detail as relevant in the presentation and supporting its inclusion in the interpreter’s rendition. In this dynamics, interpreters’ questions are taken up as expert suggestions and a “go ahead” to the interpreter to include new items in their renditions is immediately given. These sequences may thus provide another device by which guides and interpreters distribute their access to knowledge and their rights and obligations to deal with it.

5. Conclusion: from ethics to the distribution of responsibilities

The analysis discussed here is rather preliminary for both the quantity of the data involved and the study of the mechanisms outlined. A more accurate exploration of the acknowledgment forms used by the guides (e.g. “esatto” and “okay”) and of the interpreters’ requests (polar, declarative, etc.) may reveal more about the types of actions that are projected and responded to and may also tell more about the interplay between epistemic status and stance which was discussed by Heritage (2013a, 2013b) and has not been fully explored here. More work may also be needed to examine the type of interpreter-provided information that is treated as “extra” in talk. This may in fact give clearer suggestions about what the participants consider as part of the interpreters’ or the guides’ territories of knowledge.

For the time being, however, some points are worth highlighting. First, in rendering guides’ presentations, interpreters use their knowledge and expertise to: a. clarify and explain “what is behind” items mentioned by the guides; b. propose the guides items that have been “left behind” and that may be included in the rendition of the presentation. Both bring back to the talk something that has been taken for granted or just mentioned and not fully explained by the guide. In both cases, interpreters use their knowledge and expertise to introduce some extra information into the talk that may make the guide’s presentation appreciated by the tourists.

Interpreters in my data, then, do deal with knowledge which is their knowledge, but also ‘the guides’ knowledge. Access to knowledge and responsibility to deal with it are however distributed between guides and interpreters in different ways. Guides show they can understand not only that interpreters are adding information, but also the type of added information and they acknowledge the interpreters’ doing so as appropriate and legitimate. Interpreters suggest items that were left behind in guides’ explanations and they propose to include these

items in their renditions. They thus show their expertise in potentially collaborating with the guides. Guides accept this expert collaboration and confirm the relevance of the details suggested by the interpreters. Interpreters then show they may have rights and obligations to deal with information that was potentially behind the guides' words and the guides' show their rights and obligations to confirm the relevance and correctness of the interpreters' suggestions. Responsibilities are thus allocated partly on the basis of the participants' roles, but largely on the basis of a local construction of effective presentations in two languages. While exploration with different research methods (e.g. interviews) may provide interesting details about the interpreters' perception of their role (e.g. whether they 'feel' involved in providing an effective presentation of the products), it is interesting to observe that rights and obligations to participate in a specific 'role' are constructed in the interaction.

In conclusion, the interactional dynamics of interpreter-mediated interaction show ways in which participants get access to knowledge that is "behind" what is said and negotiate rights and obligations to deal with it. In talk mediated by interpreters, this may be an interesting research issue because in negotiating access to knowledge and dealing with it, participants construct their responsibilities in talk, not only on the basis of their roles (as guides and interpreters), but also on the basis of the expertise they negotiate as locally relevant.

References

- Angelelli C. (2007) "Validating professional standards and codes: challenges and opportunities", *INTERPRETING: International Journal of Research and Practice in Interpreting* 8/2, 175-193.
- Baraldi C. (2012) "Interpreting as dialogic mediation: the relevance of expansions", in C. Baraldi / L. Gavioli (eds.) *Coordinating Participation in Dialogue Interpreting*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 297-326.
- Baraldi C. / Gavioli L. (eds.) (2012a) *Coordinating Participation in Dialogue Interpreting*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins.
- Baraldi C. / Gavioli L. (2012b) "Understanding coordination in interpreter-mediated interaction", in C. Baraldi / L. Gavioli (eds.) *Coordinating Participation in Dialogue Interpreting*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 1-21.
- Bolden G. (2000) "Toward understanding practices of medical interpreting: interpreters' involvement in history taking", *Discourse Studies* 2/4, 387-419.
- Comastri F. (2010) *Dialogue Interpreting as Mediation: Interactional Orientations in two Different Work Settings*, unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Modena and Reggio Emilia.
- Davidson B. (2000) "The interpreter as institutional gatekeeper: the social-linguistic role of interpreters in Spanish-English medical discourse", *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 4/3, 379-405.
- Davidson B. (2002) "A model for the construction of conversational common ground in interpreted discourse", *Journal of Pragmatics* 34, 1273-1300.

- Davitti E. (2013) "Dialogue interpreting as intercultural mediation: interpreter's use of upgrading moves in parent-teacher meetings", *Interpreting* 15/2, 168-199.
- Gavioli L. (2015) "On the distribution of responsibilities in treating critical issues in interpreter-mediated medical consultations: the case of 'le spieghi(amo)'"', *Journal of Pragmatics*, 76, 169-180.
- Gile D. (1995) *Basic Concepts and Models for Interpreter and Translator Training*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins.
- Hale S. (2007) *Community Interpreting*, Basingstoke, Palgrave.
- Heritage J. (1984) "A Change of state token and aspects of its sequential placement", in J. M. Atkinson / J. Heritage (eds.) *Structures of Social Action*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 299-345.
- Heritage J. (2008) "Conversation analysis as social theory", in B. Turner (ed.), *The New Blackwell Companion to Social Theory*, Blackwell, Oxford, 300-320.
- Heritage J. (2012) "Epistemics in action: action formation and territories of knowledge", *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 45, 1-29.
- Heritage J. (2013a) "Action formation and its epistemic (and other) backgrounds", *Discourse Studies* 15, 547-574.
- Heritage J. (2013b) "Epistemics in conversation", in J. Sidnell / T. Stivers (eds.) *Handbook of Conversation Analysis*, Boston, Wiley-Blackwell, 370-394.
- Heritage J. / Raymond G. (2005) "The terms of agreement: indexing epistemic authority and subordination in assessment sequences", *Social Psychology Quarterly* 68,15-38.
- Jefferson G. (1978) "Explanation of transcript notation", in J. Schenkein (ed.) *Studies in the Organization of Conversational Interaction*, New York, Academic Press, xii-xvi.
- Keselman O. / Cederborg A.C. / Linell P. (2010) "'That is not necessary for you to know!' Negotiation of participation status of unaccompanied children in interpreter-mediated asylum hearings", *Interpreting* 12/1, 83-104.
- Mason I. (2006) "On mutual accessibility of contextual assumptions in dialogue interpreting", *Journal of Pragmatics* 38, 359-373.
- Niemants N. (2012). "The transcription of interpreting data", *Interpreting* 14/2, 165-191.
- Pasquandrea S. (2011) "Managing multiple actions through multimodality: doctors' involvement in interpreter-mediated interactions", *Language in Society* 40, 455-481.
- Pöchhacker F. / Shlesinger M. (2002) *The Interpreting Studies Reader*, London, Routledge.
- Psathas G. / Anderson T. (1990) "The practices of transcription in conversation analysis", *Semiotica* 78 1/2, 75-99.
- Straniero Sergio F. (2012) "'You are not too funny': challenging the role of the interpreter on Italian talkshows", in C. Baraldi / L. Gavioli (eds.) *Coordinating Participation in Dialogue Interpreting*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 71-98.
- Tebble H. (2012) "Interpreting or interfering?," in C. Baraldi / L. Gavioli (eds.) *Coordinating Participation in Dialogue Interpreting*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 23-44.

- Terasaki A.K. (2004) "Pre-announcement sequences in conversation", in G. Lerner (ed.) *Conversation Analysis: Studies from the First Generation*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 171-224.
- Traverso V. (2012) "Ad-hoc interpreting in multilingual work meetings: who translates for whom?", in C. Baraldi / L. Gavioli (eds.) *Coordinating Participation in Dialogue Interpreting*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 149-176.
- Wadensjö C. (1998) *Interpreting as Interaction*, London, Longman.
- Zorzi D. (2012) "Mediating assessments in healthcare settings", in C. Baraldi / L. Gavioli (eds.) *Coordinating Participation in Dialogue Interpreting*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 229-250.