

A Discourse-Oriented Approach to Interpreter's Non-Rendition Behaviour: A Case Study of An Interpreted Parent-Teacher Talk

Burak ÖZSÖZ¹ , Marmara University, Department of English Language and Literature,
burak.ozsoz@marmara.edu.tr

Recommended citation: Özsöz, B. (2023). A Discourse-Oriented Approach to Interpreter's Non-Rendition Behaviour: A Case Study of An Interpreted Parent-Teacher Talk. *Journal of Language Research (JLR)*, 7(1), 80-94.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.51726/jlr.1370174>

Abstract: This article explores the types and functions of dialogue interpreter's non-rendition behaviour in a corpus of transcriptions of a recorded parent-teacher meeting. Following the distinction between justified and unjustified renditions, it seeks to contribute to the discussion of the interpreter's use of non-renditions in a relatively under-searched mediated communicative environment. Non-renditions, interpreter-generated original utterances that do not have corresponding counterparts in the preceding source utterance, are considered a part of "talk as activity". Thus, as a theoretical framework, the study adopts a dialogic view to discuss interactional non-renditions as a discourse practice. The analysis of extracts drawn from a naturally occurring parent-teacher encounter revealed that the interpreter's non-renditions are substantially self-prompted when they ask for clarification or confirmation. There are instances of talk that lead to the exclusion of the interpreter from the ongoing dialogue in monolingual sequences. The study also provides significant data on the use of reactive tokens as a listener's response.

Keywords: *Discourse analysis, Dialogic, Interpreting, Non-renditions, Educational Setting*

INTRODUCTION

This study aims to contribute to the discussion of dialogue interpreter's non-rendition behaviour as a discourse practice in interpreter-mediated parent-teacher talk. Non-rendition, an analytical concept first suggested by Wadensjö (1998), can be defined as interpreters' responses that have no corresponding counterpart as translation in the original utterance. Despite several previous studies on non-renditions in various interpreter-mediated interactions, such as medical, courtroom, and sign language interpreting settings (Cirillo, 2012; Cheung, 2017; Metzger, 1999), the interpreters' use of non-renditions in parent-teacher talk is not well-researched.

Previously labeled as interpreters' "interventions" (Todorova, 2014, p. 229) and "interruptions" (Hale, 2004, p. 201), non-renditions have been evaluated as interpreter-induced utterances against an idealized practice. Wadensjö's (1998) term "nonrendition", however, tries to understand the interpreters' work "as they do their job" (Roy, 2001, p. 31), with a focus on the dynamics of interaction as it unfolds. What is problematic with this neutral term is that it is referred to as "interpreters initiative" (Wadensjö, 1998, p. 108), implying that the production of non-renditions is only at the interpreters' discretion. You will find in this study that there can be rare cases in which non-renditions are initiated in monolingual sequences by one of the primary participants other than the interpreter. In such sequences of talk, the interpreter can entirely be excluded from the participatory framework.

¹ ORCID ID: [0000-0002-5706-3403](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5706-3403)

Submitted: 02.10.2023

Accepted: 28.11.2023



In multilingual encounters, the interpreters' task is not to be reduced to simply rendering the original utterances produced by one of the parties to the interaction. As ratified participants, interpreters perform a range of other actions to manage the discourse flow of the exchange. To comprehend all aspects of interaction and the interactional constraints on interpreters' actions, the study adopts Wadensjö's (1998) "dialogic view", in which all interlocutors are actively involved in the co-construction of meaning. The interpreters' non-rendition behaviour can be adequately examined in this joint activity, through the dialogue of the participants.

In observing how interpreters' and other interlocutors' non-renditions actively contribute to the dialogue, analysts resort to the recordings of naturally occurring interpreter-mediated settings. Designed as a case study, the exchanges discussed in this paper are excerpts from a parent-teacher meeting, recorded in a private middle school in Istanbul, Türkiye. To fully grasp the complex nature of an interpreter-mediated setting in parent-teacher talk, a detailed description of the key structural features of similar monolingual events can be useful. The following section is devoted to this purpose.

MONOLINGUAL PARENT-TEACHER TALK

The encounter analyzed in this study represents instances of a semi-formal educational institution, which takes place between two interlocutors who come from different cultural and linguistic backgrounds. The fact that the interaction occurs in the presence of an interpreter adds an extra layer of complexity. Discourse and conversation analysts who adopt a micro-analytical approach to the study of authentic data obtained from interpreter-mediated settings can facilitate their work by examining first the structural complexity of unmediated communication in similar environments. An overview of the defining features of monolingual parent-teacher interviews can support us in this regard.

Despite the parties having different expectations about the meeting, the overall purpose is generally to inform the parents of the student's academic performance as well as the problems they face in school. Hanhan (1998, p. 116) suggests that a parent-teacher meeting is the only occasion where parents and teachers can engage in face-to-face interaction in an institutionalized manner. Pillet-Shore (2001, p.15) asserts that the meeting is an intersection point of two social institutions- the school and the family. Therefore, the talk being inherently institutional, the interlocutors can be expected to play certain roles in the coordination and the structural organization of the interaction. However sequentially organized, it is also worth noting that the contribution of each party is not pre-negotiated and the talk is dynamically shaped and reshaped between the teacher and the parent.

In the absence of the individual who is assessed, teachers mostly report on the student's progress, share opinions and concerns, and offer solutions on their part to guide parents about how they can help their children. Parents bring the interview their knowledge about the child to show their willingness to establish a close relationship with the institutional party. That is not to say that interviews are not sensitive in nature. For instance, while addressing a problematic behaviour of the child at school, the shared goal between the teacher and the parent may disappear, although both parties tend to avoid directly confronting each other (Davitti, 2012, p. 46). When such instances of talk occur, the parent may initiate independent sequences to question the teacher's competence and the effectiveness of the school system to deal with problematic situations. Frustrating exchanges that result in disagreements do not generally last for too long, though. Parents refrain from contradicting teachers for fear that the bond between the teacher and the child might be damaged.

These issues provide an opportunity to recognize problems for which interpreters need to be prepared. The following part deals with how the flow of discourse and the interactional organization of talk is managed by the interpreter.



DISCOURSE MANAGEMENT IN DIALOGUE INTERPRETING

“Discourse management” in interpreting studies is an overarching term coined to define the activities taken by the interpreter in the organization of multi-party and multi-lingual encounters. The definition indicates that it is not used only to refer to the interpreters’ actions to render the original utterances of one of the primary participants but to refer to the interpreters’ responsibility for managing the discourse flow of the interaction.

Wadensjö (1998) is the first to model discourse management in interpreting, in which he offers a twofold typology in terms of interpreters’ involvement- “renditions” and “coordinating moves”. While the former is related to the production of a target text, the latter is viewed as the interpreters’ explicit and implicit actions to coordinate the encounter. Explicit coordinating moves are of particular importance for this study and are either text-oriented or interaction-oriented. The interpreter’s utterances that do not directly relate to other participants’ immediately preceding utterances -non-renditions- are designed to coordinate the interaction and are regarded as the interpreter’s explicit coordinating moves. Roy (2000) and Davidson (2000) are two other researchers who sought to describe the term discourse management in terms of the interpreter’s role performance and responsibility in interaction. Dimitrova’s (1997) study differs from others in that it addresses how the involvement of other participants influences the translator’s actions. Davitti (2013), who studied the video recordings of parent-teacher encounters from a multimodal perspective, demonstrated how interpreters perform coordinating moves not just verbally but also via nonverbal resources, such as gaze behaviour.

It can thus be suggested that explicit coordination does not necessarily address only the interpreter’s renditions and may include non-renditions, such as “requests for clarification, requests for time to translate, comments on translations, requests to observe the turn-taking order, and invitations to start or continue talking” (Wadensjö, 1998, pp. 108–110). In the next section, non-renditions will be discussed in detail.

NON-RENDITIONS AS A DISCOURSE PRACTICE IN MEDIATED ENCOUNTERS

In an interpreting activity, there are two main types of utterances generated by the interpreters -renditions and non-renditions. Unlike renditions of the other participants’ original utterances, non-renditions are interpreter-generated original utterances. In other words, non-renditions are the autonomous utterances of the interpreters. They are the interpreters’ interactional moves to coordinate the ongoing interaction. Non-renditions, according to Wadensjö’s (1998) distinction, are a part of “talk as activity” rather than “talk as text”. Vargas-Urpi (2019) offers a different classification of non-renditions as “justified” and “unjustified”, and “reactive tokens”. Justified non-renditions, for the most part, are the interpreter’s coordination strategies and are defined in four types: pauses, clarification, confirmation, and retrieval (Vargas-Urpi, 2019, p. 478). Temporary interruptions may occur during the conversation when the interpreter asks for a pause as a non-rendition behaviour before beginning to render the talk. The interpreter may also ask for clarification when comprehension is not achieved or may produce a non-rendition when seeking to check whether the information is heard. When the interpreter realises that there is an information gap, he/she may ask to retrieve it from the source utterance producer. Unjustified non-renditions, however, are classified into three categories: instructions, advice, or warnings, interpreter-generated responses like answers, and extra information. The interpreter may warn the primary parties or give instructions and advice about how they should verbally and nonverbally behave during the conversation. The interpreter may tend to provide an answer on behalf of any of the participants or may supply information not found in the original utterance. Reactive tokens, as Varga-Urpi suggests (2019, p. 486), refer to interactional non-renditions where the interpreter acknowledges that the information in the original utterance is received before providing the rendition. However, he does not focus in this study on reactive tokens and only provides a short definition in a footnote.



Cheung (2017) addresses the non-renditions with a different typological analysis. He categorizes non-renditions as either self-initiated or other-prompted. "When non-renditions are self-initiated, the interpreter may become an active conversation initiator, but when non-renditions are other-prompted, the interpreter may be a passive conversation respondent" (Cheung, 2017, p. 179). This means that not all non-renditions are initiated by the interpreter but prompted by some other participants other than the interpreter.

This study seeks to examine the types of interpreter-generated and, if any, other-prompted non-renditions in a mediated parent-teacher interview to question what purposes they may serve in interpreted discourse. Before the analysis of non-renditions used by the participants in a mediated dialogue, the analytical perspective and corpus of the study will be elaborated on below.

METHOD

Laypeople, even interpreters may tend to think that the interpreter's task is to repeat in concise form the source utterances and thus perform a verbatim rendition of the original utterances voiced by primary parties to the interaction. This "conduit model of communication" (Reddy, 1979) has been abandoned in today's interpreting studies because the interpreter's renditions, despite relating in some way to the original utterance, are considered as the new versions of the original. That is to say, "interpreters do not function as mere transporters of other people's words" (Jacobsen, 2008, p. 239). In mediated encounters, interpreters are both hearers and speakers. As hearers, interpreters enter into a negotiation of meaning with other participants to clarify meaning or check comprehension. As speakers, they not only produce reformulations of prior original utterances but perform other coordinating functions. They play an active role in the communication process, which will be discussed in this study in terms of the interpreter's non-rendition behaviour within the framework of the "dialogic discourse-based interactionist paradigm", an analytical approach to interpreting supplied by Wadensjö (1998). What is particularly emphasized in this paradigm is the interdependence of each party in a three-way exchange, where the contributions of the interpreter, whether translational or conversational, are shaped by other agents in the co-construction of meaning. To refer to Mason's (2015) words on Wadensjö's interactional approach to mediated encounters, "each participant's moves affect the others", in a constant process of negotiation of meaning" (p. 113).

Research that adopts the interactionist approach mostly relies on data gathered from naturalistic interpreting situations. The corpus of the study is based on a 15-minute video recording of a mediated parent-teacher encounter at a private school in Istanbul. Ethics being a crucial part of responsible research, an ethical clearance was obtained from the ethics committee at an institute within a public university. The procedure began after a comprehensive report providing a detailed explanation of the data and methodology was submitted to the committee for evaluation. The researcher's commitment to present the results obtained truthfully and accurately was clearly indicated in the report. Before the interview, each participant was asked to sign a typical consent form to give their permission to be part of the study, which was also submitted to the committee along with the video recording of the interaction to ensure transparency and integrity. Providing brief information about the participants, the institutional party is an English teacher of African origin, who studied Business Administration in his home country Nigeria, and has been teaching young learners in Türkiye for nearly 5 years. The other primary party, the mother of a 4th-grade primary school student, has a limited command of English at an elementary level. The interpreter who also teaches English at the same school for a year is an in-house interpreter and a translation and interpreting department graduate. The seating arrangement was not pre-negotiated.

The recording was converted into a text document using a word processor and basic transcription conventions developed for the written representations of Turkish spoken discourse (see Appendix). The selected conventions account for the interactional aspects of oral communication, such as non-verbal vocalizations and prosodic features that may affect the quality of the verbal component. Only the initials of the participants' names were used in the transcription to protect their privacy. The



extracts chosen involve sequences of talk where a non-rendition was used by one of the participants. The utterances in Turkish were translated back into English through faithful rendition.

FINDINGS

Interpreter's Non-rendition Behaviour

The following extracts, drawing on Varga-Urpi's taxonomy (2019), present instances of the interpreter's non-rendition behaviour, without disregarding other participants' use of non-renditions. Some extracts analysed will also look at instances of non-renditions that cannot be studied in this triadic classification. Not all reactive tokens will be examined in separate sequences of talk because they do not in themselves claim the floor in conversational use to disrupt the primary speaker's turn and are mostly embedded in instances of talk where justified and unjustified non-renditions are used.

Justified Non-renditions

Justified non-renditions are mostly related to the interpreters' conversation management problems to ensure the accuracy of the output when they want to confirm or clarify information in the original utterance.

Abbreviations: GY- The Parent / SO- The English Teacher / DE- The Interpreter

Extract 1.

GY13- ayakta geziyor {falan} %demek ki% acaba İngilizce dersinde mi geziyor {sadece}(?)

he stands around and stuff I mean I wonder if in English lessons he walks around only

yoksa acaba## kontrol mü kuramıyor {sınıf üzerinde} (?) hakimiyet eksikliği mi var (?)

or is it that he fails to control the class is there a lack of control

diğer öğretmenlerden böyle bi(r) şey almadık biraz önce de görüştüm {sınıf öğretmeniyle}

we did not hear such a thing from other teachers a little while ago I talked to the class teacher

evde de çok söz dinlemeyen bir çocuk d(eğ)il (!) # derste mi ee öğretmenine mi <yapıyo(r)

when at home he is not a disobedient child is it in the class uhh he does that to his teacher

DE14- <S...> teacherda mı

bir eksiklik görüyorsunuz (?)

with the teacher do you see something wrong

GY14- %yani% belki sınıf yönetimi ile ilgili bir sıkıntısı olabilir

well may be he may have a problem with classroom management

By successively asking 3 rhetorical questions that do not expect an answer from the interpreter (GY13), the parent implies that the problem may not be with the child but with the institution or the institutional party, as she does not want to make a direct statement that accuses the teacher of the child's negative behaviour in the class. The interpreter interferes to clarify the parent's utterances to ensure whether it is the teacher's teaching skills that are being questioned (DE14). This request for clarification is the interpreter's using her voice (Metzger, 1999) as an active co-participant.



Extract 2.

GY15- bilmiyorum # biz de bi(r) şekilde uyarırız {evet ama} # tek şu an sizden duyuyorum

I do not know we also in a way warn him yes but I only hear this from you

sınıf öğretmeni öyle bi(r)şey söylemedi

class teacher did not mention such a thing

DE15- yes uhhm so S... [looking down at the notebook] ## she says that uhhm she met with the classroom teacher annd she never heard that %there is a problem% # annd she kind of questions your control your classroom management skills #

SO6- ohh (!)

The interpreter initiates a sequence that does not involve translation of the previous talk uttered by the parent (DE15). The word “yes”, often used in talk-in-interaction as a token of acknowledgment when it is someone else’s turn to speak, is used by the interpreter to signify that comprehension has been successfully achieved and that she is ready to render the preceding original utterance. She then uses a gap filler that signals a pause in the speech. The gap filler is followed by a transition word. Mentioning the teacher’s name, the interpreter seeks to attract the teacher’s attention with his name mentioned. That the interpreter averts her gaze from the institutional party supports the fact that these interpreter-generated non-renditions are visibly designed to ask for a pause to interpret.

Extract 3.

DE27- uhhs so S... # she says that may %be% you can change M... A...’s %seating position% # that would help

SO13- yeah # I do <that

DE28- <she> (.) yeah (?) ohh (!) you already <did that (?)

SO14- <yea yea> yea

DE29- okay # it did not <help (?)

SO15- <yeah> yeah it did not help

DE30- okay (!) [disappointed]

The monolingual sequences above specify two different types of justified non-renditions-confirmation and retrieval. The interpreter renders the parent’s utterances suggesting that the teacher might change the student seating arrangement to maximize their engagement (DE27). A dyadic sequence is initiated when the teacher interferes without hesitation to state that he tried that already (SO13). The interpreter repeats the teacher’s utterance to confirm understanding (DE28). The interpreter then poses a question to retrieve some part of the information that he believes to be missing (DE29). The teacher’s quick response causes an overlapping talk (SO15). This dyadic interaction leads to the temporary exclusion of the parent from the engagement framework.

Extract 4.

SO16- I think uhm first (...) uhm you uhm I am thinking should be the solution to the problem is # I think I will need %her% help to talk to the child and this uhm

DE31- you want her to warn M... (?)



SO17- # %yes% like to talk to uhm the child since she is the mother she knows how to get across to the child # that is one # and two uhhhm I am also looking at the fact that if we can get this child in a one on one uhm state of teaching like have him in a private class

DE32- you want to teach %private% to M... (?)

SO18- %yeah% (!) if # we can get a private uhm (.)

DE33- private lessons (?)

The teacher expresses opinions on how to solve the child's inappropriate behaviour in the classroom (SO16). The interpreter, due to a lack of clarity in the source utterance, interferes to request clarification (DE31). In Tebble's terms (2012), this is a 'side clarification sequence'. Another interpreter-prompted side sequence occurs (DE32) to clarify the teacher's contribution to the child's progress out of the classroom. A momentary pause by the teacher causes the interpreter to initiate another side sequence to repair the teacher's speech (DE33).

Unjustified Non-renditions

Unjustified non-renditions include moments of interaction where the interpreter often violates the principle of neutrality, though it is unlikely that there is a golden standard. In such instances of talk, the interpreter cannot afford to abstain from interfering interactional orientation of the conversation.

Extract 5.

GY3- ya aslında biliyorum {birazcık} lisede biz ee İngilizceyi gördük ## böyle çat pat

well in fact I know a little back in high school uhm we learnt English very little

biliyorum belki bi(r) ee A1 mi oluyo(r) (?)

I know may be like it is A1 level

DE4- <hıhı

GY4- <öyle> olabilir {ama} çok eee anlıyorum %ama% pek konuşamıyorum(!)

it may be so but I understand much but cannot really speak it

DE5- hıhı

GY5- arada siz böyle yardımcı olursanız

from time to time if you could help

DE6- isminiz neydi (?)

your name again

GY6- e G ...

DE6- G ... # okay sooo ahhh miss G... can speak some English # she learned in high school

SO3- okay

The parent expresses that she has a basic knowledge of English and utters in a questioning manner that she may have achieved an elementary level of English which she believes to correspond



to A1 level (GY3). The interpreter uses a 'minimal response' (Gavioli, 2012) which only signifies her active attention to what is being uttered, without confirming it (DE4). This minimal response can be considered a non-rendition, which does not disrupt the parent's turn to speak. The interpreter addresses the parent directly and asks her name (DE6), which the parent had already mentioned when the parties engaged in small talk at the beginning of the speech event. The additional information requested on this question is the interpreter's initiative that does not correspond to a preceding utterance produced by one of the primary participants.

Extract 6.

GY7- biz şimdi okul başlayalı {benim gözlemlediğim} bilmiyorum hani %tabiyki ben%
we now since the beginning of school as I see it I do not know of course I am
 # İngilizce öğretmeni değilim e bu konuda uzman değilim %ama% biraz az çok tabi başka
not an English teacher I am not an expert on this but of course in other
 okullara giden ee arkadaşları var # biraz bakıyoruz birbirimize de # konuşuyoruz # yani okul
schools he has friends we look at each other talk to each other I mean school
 açılalı bi(r) ay oldu ama hiç konuşmuyo(r) (!) # [clears throat] evde bi(r)şey söylemiyo(r)
opened a month ago but he does not speak when at home he says nothing
 # hiç İngilizce gelmiyo(r) eve # eee biz böyle işte İngilizce çizgi filmler açıyoruz şarkılar
he brings home no English uhm we are like English cartoons we watch songs
 açıyoruz #
we play

DE7- hıhı

GY8- %babası% biliyo(r) {İngilizce} on(un)la falan da böyle pratik şansı var ama # hiç
his father knows English with him also he has a chance of practice but does not
 konuşmuyo(r) başka arkadaşları var {başka okullarda} bayaa [nods head from side to side]
speak at all other friends he has in other schools quite a lot of
 ## sohbet falan %ediyo(r)larmış # öyle diyo(r)lar # acaba ders saati %mi % yeterli d(eğ)il
words they exchange or so they say I wonder if the course hours are not enough
 ee okulun İngilizce sisteminde mi sıkıntı var # biz biraz açıkçası endişeliyiz
or the school's English system is problematic we are obviously a little concerned

DE8- ah miss G ... is actually worried # because ah [turns to the mother] what is (.) um
 oğlunuzun ismi neydi acaba (?)
what was your son's name

GY9- M... A...



DE9- %M...A...% [gazing at the teacher] ahh M... A... does not speak English at home and she is really worried about this # ahhh %because% they have some other friends who goes to other schools and *they can speak English* (!) and she says it has been a month # and she wants to see some progress # %she wants% # her son to speak English aaand she says that may be there is a problem with the lessons # the hours of the lessons # %may be% there is some %problems% with the system # we have in our school # what do you want to say (?)

SO4- ummm it is okay I # I really liked the uh %to% (...) uh decided to uh (...) the approach uh the school umm you should uhh know that the school has um curriculum which the teachers umm had to follow and uuuh to (.) concerning the uuh *child* he is uuh a little of uuuh %naughty% in the class # o<key (?)

DE10- <hıhı

SO5- heee (...) he really sits to take the lessons # hee goes about uhh playing in the class {during the lesson} # and uh this is actually uhh problem # so uhh the first thing we have to do is to find a way to (.) like control him ensure that he %takes% his lesson which is uhh very uh important to me *and uh* (...) to take a step {by informing the psychology teacher} *I mean there is* <uh problem that (.)

GY10- <bayaa bi(r)şey söy>ledi # <ne dedi {acaba } (?) [laughter]

a lot of things he said I wonder what he said

DE11- <merak etmeyin

no worries

The parent expresses concern that the child has not yet made sufficient progress in English, even though the school has been open for quite a long period (GY7-8). After a long stretch of talk by the parent, the interpreter begins to render her utterances (DE8). When the interpreter pauses to ask the parent the child's name, she fails to alternate between two languages, which ends in a 'self-initiated self-repair' (Schegloff et al., 1977). Because of the length of the teacher's response (SO4-5), the parent requests a translation to find out what was said (GY10). Unlike those generated by the interpreter, this is a parent-generated non-rendition that interferes with the orientation of the conversational interaction. The parent's non-rendition behaviour causes the interpreter to generate another unjustified non-rendition, where the interpreter in a sense warns the parent how to act (DE11).

Extract 7.

DE16- she *says that* maybe there is problem with the way you teach # because %the other teachers% (.) they say that everything is great # and there is no problem # but when you say your child is naughty [gazing at the mother] she is really concerned (!) and she is concerned about your teaching skills # your teaching ways so what do you want me to say (?)

SO7- uhhm soo uhm the child is not (...) in the class there are other students in the same class and other students (.) %they% appropriately (.) when they (.) I have full reports for them %but% for her child # uhm she uhm (.) he does not really sit to take his <lessons

DE17- <is it only> M... A... # {who is naughty in the class} (?)

SO8- yeah # and a couple of his friends # the boy has some friends and uhm when there is uhm disturbance during the lesson he is usually among <those who (.)



- DE18- <but there is> a group <and M... A...>
- SO9- <there is a group>
- DE19- is in this <group>
- SO10- <yes there is a group <and>
- DE20- <okay>
- SO11- when you have uhm disturbance (...) during the lesson you always find him there # so uhm that is a problem %to me% # probably uhm uhm other teachers (.) they # they speak Turkish <and they are> able to uhm control uhm the child using the language %but% I am not
- DE21- <%aa% okay> so you say the problem *is the language barrier* because you do not speak <Turkish>
- SO12- <may be> may be # may be

Rather than acting as the voice of the other interlocutors, the interpreter enters the conversation with her own voice and asks the teacher how she should respond (DE16). In interpreting activities, there may be situations in which the interpreters need to refer to themselves in the third person in an attempt to make sure that their interpretation is correct and understood by all parties to the interaction. However, this interpreter-initiated unjustified rendition cannot be considered one of the interpreter's tools to ensure that the intended message is understood.

The teacher says that she keeps reports on the classroom behaviour and progress of other children in the class (SO7). The interpreter interferes to request additional information not provided in the teacher's original utterance (DE17). This unjustified rendition is followed by a justified rendition (DE21) when the interpreter needs clarification on the subject.

Extract 8.

- DE34- bireysel bi(r) şekilde çalışırlarsa ee daha iyi gelişeceğini *ve sizin* evde daha hızlı
if they work individually uhm he would better develop and at home you could much faster
 sonuç alabileceğinizi söylüyo
get results he says
- GY21- o zaman ee # bi(r) süreci beklemek gereki(e)cek her(h)alde # bi(r) de öyle deneyelim #
well then for a period we will have to wait I suppose let us try it then this way
 %biz de% bi(r) görüşelim #
let us also discuss it
- DE35- hıhı # sormak istediğiniz bi(r) soru var mı (?) başka bi(r) problem (?)
uh-uhh do you have other questions you want to ask another problem
- GY22- ee şu an yok ee ama süreç içinde baktığımızda hani %bu ders%de de şey olursa sıkıntı
at the moment none but in the process you know should a problem in this lesson
 olursa (.) olduğu zaman onun üzerinden konuşuruz diye düşünüyorum



arises when it arises we can talk over it I believe

The interpreter's decision not to render the parent's response (GY21) may indicate that she tends not to pursue the talk. Instead, she interjects into the conversation (DE35) to find out if there are any other questions the parent would like to ask. The interpreter's non-rendition behaviour is intended to manipulate the parent's verbal behaviour and thus can be regarded as an unjustified rendition.

Reactive Tokens

Reactive tokens refer to non-renditions where the interpreter acknowledges that the information contained in the original statement is received. They can be used to evaluate the contributions of non-primary speakers when another party in interaction holds the floor.

Extract 9.

GY16- bizim koleje gönder#{me} sebebimiz yabancı dil *yabancı dile çok önem veriyoruz* #

our purpose to send him to college is foreign language we care about it a lot

dil öğrensin istiyoruz # bir d(eğ)il iki dil öğrensin istiyoruz # ona göre zaten buraya geldik

we want him to learn language not one but two languages it is why we have come here

DE22- hıhı

GY17- ## o yüzden yabancı dilden beklentimiz çok # en çok %bu %# yabancı dili

for that reason we expect much from the foreign language the most this foreign language

sorguluyoruz {bu durumda}

we question in that case

DE23- hıhı

GY18- eee benim için diğer dersleri başka bir okulda da alabilir # ana dilini de öğrenebilir

uhhm for me he can learn other lessons in other schools he can also learn his mother tongue

%ama% ## dediğim gibi koleje gönderme sebebimiz tamamen yabancı dil

but as I said our purpose for sending him to college is completely foreign language

DE24- anlıyorum

I see

GY19- bi(r) de bize hani hep söylendi %çok% # yoğun yabancı dil (.) İngilizce var

also we were always told very much there is intensive foreign language English

şu var bu var # (...) etkilerini de görmek istiyoruz {tabi} evdeki yansımalarını (...) istiyoruz

there is this and that its effects we want to see of course its reflections at home we want

DE25- anlıyo<rum [nodding the head]

I see



GY20- <hiç> anlatmıyo(r)

he is not talking at all

DE26- anladım

I got it

During the parent's extended turn as the primary speaker (GY16-20), the interpreter produces two consecutive non-lexical vocal behaviour (DE22-23). They are 'listener responses' Oreström (1983) indicating that the message has been successfully received and understood. The interpreter's short lexical phrases (DE24-25) "anlıyorum" (I see) are reactive expressions typically produced in one or two words. Widely known as backchannels (Tolins & Fox Tree, 2014) in communication, such utterances inform the speaker of the listener's comprehension. The interpreter's final reactive token (DE26), however, differs from the previous ones in that it signals the listener's readiness to move out of the topic being talked about.

Extract 10.

GY1- mer(h)aba hocam

hello teacher

DE1- mer(h)abaaa

hello

GY2- hello

SO1- yeah # hi ## you (a)re welcome

GY3- me (.) my name is G ...

DE2- <benim adım G ...

my name is

SO2- okay # <and # my name> is S ...

DE3- ben de S ...

and I am S...

GY3- ah # tamam

okay

The sequence begins with the parent greeting both the interpreter and the teacher separately in their own language (GY1- SO1). In both exchanges, a greeting-greeting sequence occurs and neither subconversation is rendered into the target language. However, the interpreter translates the parent's following utterance in which she continues to introduce herself (DE2), despite the reciprocity being displayed by the teacher through the articulation of a reactive token- "okay" (SO2). The parent's reactive expression (GY3) "tamam" (okay) indicates that she shows a neutral stance, rather than active involvement.



DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Through the analysis of 10 individual extracts drawn from the video recordings of a mediated parent-teacher encounter in Turkish and English, the paper mainly focuses on occasions which do not involve translations of the previous talk. The study follows Vargas-Urpi's (2019) triadic classification of non-renditions, where the interpreter does not provide a rendition of the original utterance. While justified non-renditions cover the interpreter's challenges in conversation management and coordinating strategies, unjustified non-renditions cover the interpreter's interventions in interactional orientation. Reactive tokens, however, are interactional non-renditions that refer to the listener's responses signifying that the speaker's message has been received and understood. In another study by Cheung (2017), non-renditions were categorized as either self-initiated or other-prompted to distinguish non-renditions initiated by the interpreter from those prompted by other participants.

In this study, the conveyed utterance is not originally voiced by the other primary participants when the interpreter generates a non-rendition. She uses her own voice and acts as a *co-conversant* to initiate a conversation. The interpreter-initiated non-renditions, the most frequently encountered type in the study, has led to dyadic exchanges in which one of the interlocutors is temporarily excluded from the exchange. In such instances of talk, the interpreter's impartiality can be undermined, which is compatible with Cheung's (2017) findings. The study, unlike previous ones, also revealed that the interpreter's perceived role can be questioned in other-prompted non-renditions. During the teacher's extended turn, for instance, the parent's request for translation manipulates interpreter's verbal behaviour. Unlike Vargas-Urpi's (2019) evaluations of unjustified non-renditions, it is not the interpreter warning the other conversants but one of the parties to the interaction giving a warning to the interpreter on how to behave on the verbal dimension.

As a rare and unexpected result, situations where the interpreter is completely left out of the exchange are also encountered in the study. These are monolingual exchanges that lead to the exclusion of the interpreter from the participation framework but not from the engagement framework. The parent greeting the teacher in the target language may illustrate such instances of talk, where the interpreter is not involved. One other rare exchange is when the interpreter asks the parent to wait for her rendition, which indicates her will to be recognized as a ratified participant who also coordinates the interaction. In this exchange, unlike other intentional interferences by the interpreter, she enters the conversation with her own voice. It is also revealed that reactive tokens, which were only treated superficially in Vargas-Urpi's (2019) study, reflect the active involvement of all parties in the interaction and that they can be embedded in speech exchange situations where either justified or unjustified non-renditions occur. Future studies on non-renditions that adopt a dialogic discourse-based analytic approach should focus more on the behaviour of other primary parties and their interactional consequences rather than those of the interpreter.

REFERENCES

- Cheung, A. K. F. (2017). Non-Renditions in Court Interpreting. A Corpus-Based Study, *Babel*, 63 (2), 174-199.
- Cirillo, L. (2012). Managing affective communication in triadic exchanges: Interpreters' zero-renditions and non-renditions in doctor-patient talk. In C. J. Kellett Bidoli (Ed.), *Interpreting across genres: Multiple research perspectives*. EUT Edizioni Università di Trieste, 102–124.
- 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.
- Davitti, E. (2012). Dialogue Interpreting as Intercultural Mediation. Integrating Talk and Gaze in the Analysis of Mediated Parent-Teacher Meetings, Manchester: University of Manchester (Unpublished PhD Dissertation).



- Davitti, E. (2013). Dialogue Interpreting As Intercultural Mediation: Interpreters' Use of Upgrading Moves in Parent-Teacher Meetings, *Interpreting*, 15 (2), 168-199.
- Englund Dimitrova, B. (1997). Degree of interpreter responsibility in the interaction process in community interpreting. In S. E. Carr, R. Roberts, A. Dufour & D. Steyn (Eds), *The Critical Link: Interpreters in the Community*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 147-164.
- Gavioli L. (2012). Minimal responses in interpreter-mediated medical talk. In: Baraldi C. & Gavioli L. (Eds), *Coordinating Participation in Dialogue Interpreting*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 201-228.
- Hale, S. (2004). *The Discourse of Court Interpreting: Discourse Practices of The Law, The Witness, And The Interpreter*. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Hanhan, S. F. (1998). Parent-Teacher Communication: Who's talking? . In M.L. Fuller & G. Olsen (Eds), *Home-School Relations*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 106-126.
- Jacobsen, B. (2008). Interactional Pragmatics and Court Interpreting: An Analysis of Face, *Interpreting, Special Issue: Doing justice to court interpreting*, 10 (1), 128-158.
- Mason, I. (2015). Discourse analytical approaches. In F. Pöchhacker (Ed.), *Routledge Encyclopedia Of Interpreting Studies*. London and New York: Routledge, 111-116.
- Metzger, M. (1999). *Sign Language Interpreting: Deconstructing The Myth of Neutrality*. Washington, DC: Gallaudet University Press.
- Orestrom, B. (1983). *Turn-taking in English Conversation*. (Lund Studies in English 66.) Lund: Gleerup.
- Pillet-Shore, D. (2001). Doing Pretty Well: How Teachers Manage The Interactional Environment of Unfavorable Student Evaluation in Parent-Teacher Conferences, California: University of California (Unpublished MA Dissertation).
- Reddy, M. (1979). The Conduit Metaphor: A case of frame conflict in our language about language. In A. Ortony (Ed.) (1993), *Metaphor and Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 164-201.
- Roy, C. (2000). *Interpreting As a Discourse Process*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Schegloff, E., Jefferson, G. & Sacks, H. (1977). The Preference for Self-correction in The Organization of Repair in Conversation, *Language*, 53, 361-82.
- Tebble, H. (2012). Interpreting or Interfering? . In Claudio & L. Gavioli (Eds.), *Coordinating Participation in Dialogue Interpreting*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 23-44.
- Todorova, M. (2014). Interpreting conflict: Memories of an interpreter. In K. Kaindl, and K. Spitzl (Eds), *Transfiction: Research into the realities of translation fiction*. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 221-231.
- Tolins, J., & Fox Tree, J. E. (2014). Addressee Backchannels Steer Narrative Development, *J. Pragmatics*, 70, 152-164.
- Vargas-Urpi, M. (2019). When Non-renditions Are Not The Exception. A Corpus-based Study of Court Interpreting, *Babel*. 65 (4), 478-500.
- Wadensjö, C. (1998). *Interpreting As Interaction*. New York: Longman.



APPENDIX**Transcription Conventions.**

“**aaa/ooo**” vowel length indicating exclamative construction

“-” indicating the speaker’s turn

“#” pauses

“(.)” unfulfilled sentences

“(...)” incomprehensible sentence fragments

“**eee**” hesitation

“{.....}” post-rhematic structures

“[.....]” extra-linguistic features

“< >” overlapping talk

“% %” stressed syllables or words

“_____” pronounced with emphasis on underlined words or parts of words

“*.....*” pronounced more quickly

