

**Sense-making in an interpreter-mediated lawyer-immigrant encounter: incorporating the perspectives of the participants utilizing dialogism**



**UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS**

School of Languages, Cultures and Societies  
University of Leeds, Leeds, UK

Submitted in accordance with the requirements for the degree of Doctor of  
Philosophy 2017

By

**Hassan Mizori**

Supervised by **Professor James Dickins & Dr Rebecca Tipton**

**January, 2017**

## **DECLARATION AND STATEMENT OF COPYRIGHT**

The candidate confirms that the work submitted is his own and that appropriate credit has been given where reference has been made to the work of others.

This copy has been supplied on the understanding that it is copyright material and that no quotation from the thesis may be published without proper acknowledgement.

© 2017 The University of Leeds and Hassan Mizori

The right of Hassan Mizori to be identified as Author of this work has been asserted by him in accordance with the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

## **Dedication**

*To my late father, who would have been very proud,*

*This thesis is also dedicated to my 'phenomenal' family, for their phenomenal support, understanding, love and dedication: my wife Gawla, and my children Rasi, Yasmine, Zilan, Sari and Milan.*

*Last but not least to the immigrants, those who have died at sea and to those who have managed to stay alive.*

## **Acknowledgements**

I would like to thank Professor James Dickins from the bottom of my heart for the phenomenal supervision and support he provided throughout this study, and for his patience with me, and guidance. His confidence in me has helped me enormously.

The same amount of gratitude is due to Dr Rebecca Tipton (University of Manchester) for her brilliant supervision. She helped me at critical moments in the study by asking critical questions, and helping me keep the overall picture clear. She also encouraged me to be critical of my work and to take difficult decisions alone. Both of my supervisors complemented each other in such a way that I was able to complete this study successfully.

I would like also to thank the participants of this study, whose names I cannot mention due to considerations of confidentiality. Without them, this study would not have been possible. I would like also to thank Dr Leendert Plug for his support when I needed him during the data collection period.

Special thanks go to Mrs Karen Priestley for her brilliant work and patience. A thank you is earned by my good friend, Dr Majid Abed, for his professional friendship. I would like also to thank my Italian friends Dr Marilena Di Bari and Dr Marco Brunello for being such pleasant colleagues and friends, and my Chinese friends, Steven and David, for their pleasant presence in my life during my studies.

## Abstract

Sense-making in interpreter-mediated encounters (IMEs) in a lawyers' office has not been previously investigated on the micro-level by utilizing post-IME interviews of a reflective nature. This case study addresses this shortcoming by examining an IME in the Netherlands between a Syrian immigrant and his lawyer. It addresses three questions: 1) How does the interpreter translate the lawyer's utterances? 2) Does the immigrant understand these utterances (via the translations), and what can be learned from his answers in terms of the sense-making processes? 3) How does the interpreter explain his translation decisions, and what can be learned from his answers in terms of the sense-making processes?

After analysing the transcribed IME, two semi-structured interviews were conducted: the first with the immigrant and the second with the interpreter. Wadensjö's (1998) analytical model is extremely valuable. However, it needs to be developed somewhat into order to fully understand how sense-making processes develop; her use of dialogism is accordingly extended to incorporate also situation-transcending knowledge/resources (STK/R), thereby going beyond the situated context. Her taxonomy is also extended.

The findings show that the immigrant has understood the majority of the lawyer's utterances, and that his understanding of them was not dependent solely on the translations; he has also resorted to a good extent to STK/R during the process of sense-making. However, this does not mean that STK/R helps in all cases, for not all originals were understood, even those in which STK/R played an important role. It is noticeable that these non-understood translations are mainly of a legal nature.

Further, we have observed that the interpreter understandably does not have an explanation for every translation decision. In such cases, the factors that have been found to have probably influenced the interpreter's translation decisions relate to the nature of interpreting as a profession, to the characteristics of the discourse utilized in it, and to constraints involving memory. Where the interpreter does mention an explanation, he has been found to be adopting a means of approaching communication which utilises decisions corresponding to central concepts in dialogism.

The major theoretical contribution of this thesis is that it extends the model of Wadensjö using Linell's dialogism to incorporate STK/R, in order to more adequately study sense-making. On a practical level, this gives rise to a new approach to data elicitation, which has not previously been applied to dialogue interpreting, enabling participants to re-construct their internal dialogue about meaning-making.

## Table of Contents

|   |    |
|---|----|
| DECLARATION AND STATEMENT OF COPYRIGHT .....  | 1  |
| Dedication .....  | 2  |
| Acknowledgements.....   | 3  |
| Abstract .....  | 4  |
| Table of Contents.....  | 5  |
| Transliteration system for Standard Arabic.....   | 13 |
| List of Tables .....  | 14 |
| Appendices .....  | 15 |
| List of Abbreviations .....   | 16 |
| Introduction to the study .....   | 17 |
| 0.1 Description the study .....   | 17 |
| 0.2 Background, significance of the study and assumptions.....  | 17 |
| 0.2.1 Research questions.....   | 19 |
| 0.3 Theoretical approach of the study .....   | 21 |
| 0.4 Structure of the Thesis .....   | 21 |
| Chapter one .....   | 25 |
| 1.0 Introduction .....  | 26 |
| 1.1 Middle Eastern immigration into Europe and the Netherlands.....   | 28 |
| 1.2 Asylum procedure in the Netherlands, the associated organizations and the legal status of the participating immigrant.....          | 29 |
| 1.2.1 The Organizations .....   | 29 |
| 1.2.1.1 The Aanmeldcentrum or AC (Asylum Registration Centre) .....   | 29 |
| 1.2.1.2 The Immigratie- en Naturalisatiedienst or IND (Immigration and Naturalisation Service).....                                     | 30 |
| 1.2.1.3 The Afdeling bestuursrechtspraak van de Raad van State (The Administrative Jurisdiction Division of the Council of State) ..... | 30 |
| 1.2.1.4 The Asielzoekercentrum or AZC (Asylum seeker Centre) .....  | 30 |
| 1.2.1.5 'The lawyer' .....  | 31 |
| 1.2.1.6 The Vreemdelingenpolitie or VD (Aliens' Office) .....   | 31 |
| 1.2.1.7 The Vluchtelingenwerk Nederland or VVN (Dutch Council for Refugees).....  | 31 |
| 1.2.2 The asylum procedure .....  | 32 |
| 1.2.3 Status of the participating immigrant in this study.....  | 36 |
| 1.3 The need for Interpreting during the asylum procedure.....  | 38 |
| 1.3.1 The right to have an interpreter.....   | 39 |
| 1.3.2 Interpreters needed from the beginning.....   | 40 |

|   |    |
|---|----|
| 1.3.3 Background information about the interpreter.....   | 40 |
| 1.4 Conclusion.....   | 41 |
| Chapter Two .....   | 43 |
| 2.0 Introduction .....  | 44 |
| 2.1 Definition of interpreting.....   | 45 |
| 2.2 The many names of Dialogue Interpreting .....   | 47 |
| 2.2.1 Name adopted in this study.....   | 48 |
| 2.3 Brief historical overview .....   | 49 |
| 2.4 Role and (dis)empowerment .....   | 51 |
| 2.4.1 Role.....   | 51 |
| 2.4.1.1 Addressing the interrelation between the setting where the interpreting takes place and the interests of the immigrant..... | 52 |
| 2.4.1.2 Thinking about how to help the interpreter and the institution for a role that is more engaging.....                        | 53 |
| 2.4.1.3 Addressing the perspective of the interpreters about their role.....  | 55 |
| 2.4.1.4 Addressing the perspective of the foreigner about the role of the interpreter .....   | 57 |
| 2.4.1.5 Explaining the actual 'actions' of the interpreter.....   | 58 |
| 2.4.2 (Dis)empowerment .....  | 60 |
| 2.4.2.1 Studies aimed at eliminating disempowerment .....   | 61 |
| 2.4.2.2 Studies which show the interpreter as an empowerment figure .....   | 63 |
| 2.4.2.3 Studies which explain how/why disempowerment takes place .....  | 63 |
| 2.5 Methods of data collection and methodologies .....  | 65 |
| 2.5.1 (Natural) discourse as text.....  | 65 |
| 2.5.1.1 Type of natural data: audio-recorded or video-recorded.....   | 66 |
| 2.5.2 Experimental approach.....  | 68 |
| 2.5.3 Artefact analysis .....   | 68 |
| 2.5.4 Survey research .....   | 69 |
| 2.5.5 Ethnography/participant observation .....   | 70 |
| 2.5.6 Mixed methods .....   | 70 |
| 2.5.7. Interviews .....   | 71 |
| 2.6 Contribution of this study.....   | 72 |
| 2.7 Conclusion.....   | 74 |
| Chapter Three .....   | 75 |
| 3.0 Introduction .....  | 76 |
| Part I.....   | 79 |
| 3.1.1 Central concepts.....   | 79 |

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| 3.1.2 Epistemology/ontology and interrelation with methodology adopted .....   | 81  |
| 3.1.3 Dialogism as counter-theory to monologism.....   | 83  |
| 3.1.4 Dialogism and its assumptions/principles.....  | 84  |
| 3.1.4.1 The human mind as a sense-making system.....   | 85  |
| 3.1.4.2 Other-orientation: intersubjectivity and alterity.....   | 86  |
| 3.1.4.3 Interactionism .....   | 91  |
| 3.1.4.4 Contextualism .....  | 93  |
| 3.1.4.5 Communicative constructionism.....   | 95  |
| 3.1.5 Meanings and understandings .....  | 96  |
| 3.1.5.1 Action, meaning and understanding .....  | 97  |
| 3.1.5.2 Understanding.....   | 100 |
| 3.1.5.2.1 Sense-making in situ understanding, responding and anticipation .....  | 101 |
| 3.1.5.2.2 Determination of understanding.....  | 102 |
| 3.1.6 Nature of talk.....  | 104 |
| 3.1.6.1 Implicitness .....   | 104 |
| 3.1.6.2 Vagueness .....  | 106 |
| 3.1.6.3 Partial understanding, and understandings for current purposes .....   | 107 |
| 3.1.7 Misunderstanding and miscommunication .....  | 108 |
| 3.1.7.1 Understandings that are not made public .....  | 110 |
| 3.1.8 “Situations and situation-transcending practices” .....  | 111 |
| 3.1.9 Double Dialogicality.....  | 112 |
| 3.1.10 Biographical experiences .....  | 113 |
| Part II.....   | 115 |
| 3.2 Theoretical approach of Wadensjö to dialogism .....  | 115 |
| 3.2.1 Wadensjö’s applications of dialogism: ‘talk-as-text’ and ‘talk-as-activity’ analytical tools.....  | 116 |
| 3.2.2 Understanding and miscommunication tools .....   | 117 |
| 3.2.3 Wadensjö’s analytical tool for Role .....  | 119 |
| 3.2.4 Participation framework.....   | 121 |
| 3.2.5 Taxonomy .....   | 123 |
| 3.2.5.1 Adaption of the taxonomy .....   | 124 |
| Part III.....  | 129 |
| 3.3.1 The interrelationship between “Afford[ing] material for making sense”, the degree of difficulty of this ‘material’ and the concept of role ..... | 130 |
| 3.3.1.1 Affording material .....   | 130 |
| 3.3.1.2 Understanding being resolving a task posited .....   | 130 |

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| 3.3.2 Influence of implicitness and vagueness on situated sense-making.....  | 131 |
| 3.3.3 Enabling reconstruction of internal dialogue to understand how sense-making developed.....                       | 132 |
| 3.3.4 Possible reasons for translation decisions.....  | 134 |
| 3.3.4.1 How ‘strategy’ is understood in this thesis.....   | 134 |
| 3.3.5 Interrelation between the perception of the interpreter of his role and the afforded ‘material’ on his part..... | 135 |
| 3.3.6 The immigrant: as equally empowered as the lawyer and the interpreter?.....                                      | 135 |
| 3.3.7 Influence of the nature of the profession (including the nature of its discourse) on the internal dialogue.....  | 136 |
| 3.3.7.1 Immediate nature.....  | 137 |
| 3.8 Conclusion.....  | 139 |
| Chapter Four.....  | 141 |
| 4.0 Introduction.....  | 142 |
| 4.1 The Qualitative approach of this study.....  | 144 |
| 4.1.1 Case studies.....  | 148 |
| 4.1.2 Interviews (general).....  | 151 |
| 4.1.2.1 Weak and strong points of interviews.....  | 152 |
| 4.1.2.2 Validity.....  | 153 |
| 4.1.3 The need for interviews in this study.....   | 154 |
| 4.1.3.1 Enabling the reconstruction of the internal dialogue, etc.....   | 159 |
| 4.1.3.2 Semi-structured interviews: considerations and decisions.....  | 162 |
| 4.1.3.3 Considerations and decisions regarding approaching the participants.....                                       | 165 |
| 4.2 Data Collection.....   | 167 |
| 4.2.1 Initial micro-analysis of the data of the IME.....   | 168 |
| 4.2.3. Recordings.....   | 169 |
| 4.2.3.1 Video or audio.....  | 169 |
| 4.2.4 Interview with the immigrant.....  | 172 |
| 4.2.5 Interview with the interpreter.....  | 178 |
| 4.2.6 General questions to both participants.....  | 179 |
| 4.2.7 Information from the lawyer.....   | 180 |
| 4.2.8 Transcriptions.....  | 181 |
| 4.2.9 Think-Aloud Protocol.....  | 183 |
| 4.3 Triangulation.....   | 184 |
| 4.4 Ethical Approval.....  | 186 |
| 4.5 Conclusion.....  | 186 |

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| Chapter Five.....  | 188 |
| 5.0 Introduction .....   | 189 |
| Part I .....   | 191 |
| 5.1 First research question: how did the interpreter render the originals?.....  | 191 |
| Table 5.1 .....  | 191 |
| Part II.....   | 193 |
| 5.2 Categorization of findings.....  | 193 |
| 5.2.1 Originals understood .....   | 193 |
| 5.2.2 Originals miscommunicated .....  | 194 |
| 5.2.3 Originals partly understood .....  | 194 |
| 5.2.4 Originals partly miscommunicated.....  | 194 |
| 5.3 Factors which possibly contributed to understanding and miscommunication .....   | 195 |
| 5.3.1 Term/notion/talk miscommunicated .....   | 196 |
| 5.3.2 Miscommunicated procedure.....   | 197 |
| 5.3.3 Partly/vaguely understanding the procedure .....   | 197 |
| 5.3.4 Not understanding clearly which organization does what .....   | 198 |
| 5.3.5 Term/notion understood .....   | 198 |
| 5.3.6 Not being able to say something but recognizing it when mentioned by the researcher .....  | 198 |
| 5.3.7 Understanding something the interpreter has not said.....  | 199 |
| 5.3.8. Saying ‘correct’, assuming that the interpreter said what he knew as reality .....  | 199 |
| 5.3.9 Understanding the original directly via Dutch .....  | 199 |
| 5.3.10. The immigrant says ‘correct’, assuming that the interpreter meant what he himself had gone through .....   | 200 |
| 5.3.11 Opinion towards interpreter and interpreting.....   | 200 |
| Part III.....  | 202 |
| How did the interpreter explain the decisions regarding the renditions he had produced during the IME, and what can be learned from his explanations in terms of the sense-making processes? ..... | 202 |
| 5.4 Categorization of the decisions of the interpreter: technical structure.....   | 203 |
| 5.4.1 Explanations & recollections.....  | 206 |
| 5.4.2 Renditions towards the lawyer .....  | 207 |
| 5.4.3 Presentation of findings.....  | 207 |
| 5.4.3.1 Frequency by category.....   | 207 |
| Table 5.4.3.1 .....  | 209 |
| 5.5 ‘No conscious strategy’ Group .....  | 211 |
| 5.5.1 ‘No idea why’ .....  | 211 |

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| 5.5.2 ‘Mistake’ .....  | 211 |
| 5.5.3 Uncontrollable external factors .....  | 213 |
| 5.5.3.1 Sub-category: ‘Forgetting’ .....   | 213 |
| 5.5.3.2 Sub-category: Immediacy .....  | 215 |
| 5.5.3.3 Sub-category: Being interrupted .....  | 216 |
| 5.5.3.4 Sub-category: Unconsciously .....  | 217 |
| 5.6 ‘Strategies followed’ Group .....  | 218 |
| 5.6.1 ‘Giving the intended meaning’ .....  | 218 |
| 5.6.2 Changing the pronoun .....   | 220 |
| 5.6.3 ‘Ḥaammīya’ .....   | 221 |
| 5.6.4 ‘Ixtiṣaar’ (condensing) .....  | 222 |
| 5.6.5 Free translation .....   | 224 |
| 5.6.6 Explications .....   | 225 |
| 5.6.7 ‘Dictionary translation’ .....   | 226 |
| 5.6.8 ‘Interpreting is not written translation’ .....  | 227 |
| 5.6.9 Not translating .....  | 227 |
| 5.6.10 Literacy/educational level of immigrant & simplifying .....   | 229 |
| 5.6.11 Interrupting .....  | 232 |
| 5.6.12 ‘They already know’ .....   | 235 |
| 5.6.13 Side-sequences .....  | 236 |
| 5.6.14 ‘Freedom when translating for lawyers’ .....  | 237 |
| 5.6.15 ‘Dramatick/life/emotions’ category .....  | 238 |
| 5.6.16 ‘Tāwḍīḥ’ (making clear) .....   | 239 |
| 5.6.17 ‘No half-sentences’ .....   | 240 |
| 5.6.18 ‘Language of immigrant bad’ .....   | 241 |
| 5.6.19 ‘Reorganizing the utterances’ .....   | 243 |
| 5.7 Conclusion .....   | 245 |
| Chapter Six .....  | 246 |
| 6.0 Introduction .....   | 247 |
| Part I .....   | 250 |
| 6.1 First/Main research question: How does the interpreter render the originals of the lawyer? .....   | 250 |
| Part II .....  | 250 |
| 6.2 Second research question: Does the immigrant understand these originals (via the renditions), and what can be learned from the immigrant’s answers in terms of the sense-making processes? ..... | 250 |

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| 6.2.1 Originals understood .....   | 251 |
| 6.2.1.1 The immigrant says “yes” assuming that the interpreter meant what he himself had gone through .....  | 252 |
| 6.2.1.2 ‘Understanding something the interpreter has not said’ .....   | 258 |
| 6.2.1.3 ‘Understanding the original directly via Dutch’ .....  | 262 |
| 6.2.1.4 ‘Not being able to say “something” but recognizing it when mentioned by the researcher’ .....  | 264 |
| 6.2.2 Originals miscommunicated, partly understood or partly miscommunicated .....   | 269 |
| 6.2.2.1 ‘Term/notion/talk miscommunicated’ .....   | 270 |
| 6.2.2.2 Miscommunicated procedure (not showing understanding of the information about the procedure with regard to the rendition under discussion):..... | 274 |
| 6.2.2.2.1 General.....   | 277 |
| 6.2.2.2.2 Specific case .....  | 278 |
| 6.2.2.3 Partly/vaguely understanding information on procedure .....  | 280 |
| 6.2.2.4 Not understanding clearly which organization does what .....   | 283 |
| 6.2.3 Conclusion of part II.....   | 285 |
| Part III .....   | 287 |
| 6.3 The explanations of the interpreter explaining his translation decisions .....   | 287 |
| 6.3.1 Discussion of ‘no conscious strategy’ Group .....  | 287 |
| 6.3.1.1 The immediate nature of the communicative event.....   | 287 |
| 6.3.1.2 Influence of the nature of discourse .....   | 291 |
| 6.3.1.3 Memory/recollection.....   | 295 |
| 6.3.2 Discussion of ‘strategies followed’ group.....   | 298 |
| A general introduction .....   | 299 |
| 6.3.2.1 Alterity .....   | 300 |
| 6.3.2.2 Intersubjectivity.....   | 303 |
| 6.3.2.3 The dialogic nature of the communicative event.....  | 305 |
| 6.3.2.4 Importance of context in decision-making on the part of the interpreter .....  | 307 |
| 6.3.2.5 Influence of STK/R on the strategies of the interpreter .....  | 310 |
| 6.3.2.6 Understandings for “current practical purpose” .....   | 312 |
| 6.3.3 Conclusion.....  | 314 |
| Chapter Seven.....   | 316 |
| 7.0 Introduction .....   | 317 |
| 7.1 Description of the study and the research questions .....  | 318 |
| 7.2 Brief recapitulation of the chapters .....   | 318 |
| 7.3 Questions of the study answered .....  | 320 |

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| 7.4 Key outcomes of the study .....   | 326 |
| 7.4.1 Outcomes related to the first research question .....                               | 326 |
| 7.4.2 Outcomes of the second research question .....                                      | 327 |
| 7.4.3 Outcomes of the third research question.....  | 328 |
| 7.4.4 Conclusions of the section .....  | 329 |
| 7.5 Contributions of the study.....   | 330 |
| 7.6 Limitations of the study and gateways for future research.....                        | 331 |
| 7.6.1 Study being a one-case study.....   | 331 |
| 7.6.2 Naturalness of the data .....   | 331 |
| 7.6.3 Reliability of the answers of the participants during the interviews .....          | 333 |
| 7.6.4 Not including the perspective of the lawyer on the micro-level of sense-making .... | 333 |
| 7.6.5 Time interval between the IME and both interviews rather long.....                  | 334 |
| 7.6.6 Not incorporating the visual aspects of sense-making during the recording .....     | 335 |
| 7.6.7 Limitations due to lack of time.....  | 335 |
| 7.7 Looking forward: avenues for future research and recommendations .....                | 335 |
| 7.7.1 Future research inspired by the findings of this study .....                        | 336 |
| 7.7.1.1 In the case of the immigrant.....   | 336 |
| 7.7.1.2 In the case of the interpreter .....  | 338 |
| 7.7.1.3 In the case of the lawyer.....  | 338 |
| 7.7.2 Inspired by the limitations of this study .....                                     | 339 |
| 7.8 Concluding remarks.....   | 340 |
| Bibliography.....   | 341 |
| Appendix I.....   | 353 |
| Appendix II.....  | 414 |

## Transliteration system for Standard Arabic

|                         |              |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |             |             |
|-------------------------|--------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|-------------|-------------|
| <b>Arabic Letter</b>    | ا            | ب | ت | ث | ج | ح | خ | د | ذ | ر | ز | س | ش | ص | ض | ط | ع | غ | ف | ق | ك | ل | م | ن | هـ | و           | ي           |
| <b>Trans-literation</b> | ʾ<br>or<br>ā | b | t | ṯ | j | ḥ | x | d | ḏ | r | z | s | š | ṣ | ḍ | ṭ | ḡ | g | f | q | k | l | m | n | h  | w           | y           |
|                         |              |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    | o<br>r<br>ū | o<br>r<br>ī |

## List of Tables

|               |  |
|---------------|--|
| Table 5.4.3.1 | Explanations provided by the interpreter regarding the decisions he made during the IME (section 5.4.3.1).                   |
| Table 5.1     | Interrelationship originals and renditions produced during the IME, utilizing a complemented version of Wadensjö's taxonomy. |

## Appendices

- Transcribed text of the interpreter-mediate encounter (Appendix I)
- A concise representation of the groups and categories in which the data has been placed (Appendix II)

## List of Abbreviations

|        |   |
|--------|---|
| IME    | Interpreter-mediated Encounter. In this study, this stands for a meeting which takes place between an immigrant and his lawyer. An interpreter mediates the inter-cultural communication (see section 1.2.1). |
| DI     | Dialogue Interpreting. This is the term which is used in this study to refer to the work of the interpreter. See section 2.2.1 for more information.  |
| IND    | Immigration and Naturalization Service. This organization represents the Dutch authorities during the asylum procedure (see section 1.2.1).   |
| CA     | Conversational Analysis   |
| STK/Rs | Situation-Transcending Knowledge/Resources  |
| TVcN   | Dutch Centre for Interpreters and Translators   |

## **Introduction to the study<sup>1</sup>**

### **0.1 Description the study**

This thesis investigates sense-making in an interpreter-mediated encounter (henceforth: IME), in a lawyer's office in the Netherlands, in a non-adversarial, legal setting<sup>2</sup>. The IME concerns a meeting between a Dutch-speaking lawyer and a Syrian, Arabic-speaking immigrant, with a temporary residence permit with the intention that the immigrant will obtain an asylum residence permit (see section 1.2.3). The interpreter is Iraqi and Arabic speaking. More specifically, the thesis investigates the manner in which the interpreter renders the lawyer's original utterances, and whether or not the immigrant understands these utterances via the translations.

### **0.2 Background, significance of the study and assumptions**

During his professional career as interpreter and translator in the Netherlands, the researcher used to attend meetings held by the Dutch Centre for Interpreters and Translators (henceforth: TVcN), at the time the biggest organisation that provided interpreting and translation services<sup>3</sup>. These meetings were meant to serve the purpose of annually bringing together the interpreters and translators in order to give them, and also the officials of the company, the opportunity to listen to each other's problems and concerns and also to learn from each other's work experiences. For the interpreters, the meetings were not only a welcome opportunity to talk to the officials of the company, whom they normally rarely met in person, but also to talk to other interpreters about their work and to listen to the other interpreters' professional experiences.

The majority of the interpreters were self-employed, which means that they did not often meet other interpreters with the same language combination.

---

<sup>1</sup> In this thesis, 'the researcher' and 'I' are used interchangeably. Both refer to me, Hassan Mizori, the writer of this thesis.

<sup>2</sup> This setting is referred to as *interpreting in legal setting outside the courtroom* by Bancroft et al. (2013)

<sup>3</sup> The IND also had a list of interpreters. Some of the latter used to work also for the TVcN.

TVcN had the aim of working as efficiently as possible, which meant that two interpreters who spoke the same language were rarely deployed in the same setting. This meant that above-mentioned meetings were for many interpreters a welcome opportunity to meet other professional interpreters, not only to blow off steam because of the daily tension suffered at work, but also to ask each other work-related questions. Questions like “How do you translate ...?”, “what do you do when ...?” used to be among the most frequently asked. In addition to the examples given above, one common theme that was often discussed was the expectations of the clients and the end-users of interpreting services on the one hand and the vision of interpreters, on the other.

What made many interpreters welcome these meetings was that the confidential and sensitive nature of their work makes it difficult for them to attend real-life interpreting sessions in order to see how other interpreters do their work, or even to have access to (transcribed) IMEs to learn from. This is unfortunate. If a professional is to further develop their professional skills, access to the experiences of other professionals is important, especially when expectations of interpreters and end-users do not seem to match.

The current study, although a case study, is an attempt to bring some change to this. It is believed that if researchers and the parties involved in the interpreting practice conducted similar studies, more knowledge could be generated, which would enable interpreters, and the other end-users, to better understand how sense-making develops during such IMEs. This is not the only added value or significance of this study.

This study is also meant to shed light on how sense-making develops during such IMEs, which is important. Interpreters are called upon in order to make communication possible between two parties: in this case the lawyer and the immigrant. As will be discussed in Chapter One, immigration has become a world-wide phenomenon, the EU receiving a constant flow of immigrants (Jacquemet, 2009: 525). Many of these immigrants are dependent on interpreters for communication. Enabling them to communicate is essential for their well-being and maybe even survival. Immigrants, like the one who participated in this study, often do not speak the language of the host country and the communicative skills they learned in

their home countries do not help them to effectively communicate in the host country (see e.g. Blommaert, 2001). Therefore, in this study, an important assumption is that the immigrant is not as empowered as the other participants<sup>4</sup> and is in a “more humble position” (Garber, 2000: 19). This makes the contribution of the interpreter to the encounter crucial. For, undoubtedly, end-users, such as the lawyer will want sense-making to develop during the IME in such a way that the lawyer and the immigrant understand each other. The other assumption in this thesis is that in a study with this research agenda, it is not possible to depend only on the transcribed text of the IME. This study is designed in such a way as to investigate whether or not the immigrant understand the originals of the lawyer, and also what made the interpreter take the translation decisions he took in the recorded IME. This is why an interview method was employed as part of the study.

### **0.2.1 Research questions**

According to Hale (2007), interpreter-mediated lawyer-client conferences have not been previously studied. It is also noticeable that Urpi’s (2012) *State of the art in Community Interpreting research*, for example, does not mention this type of setting. This study takes one real-life interpreter-mediated lawyer-client encounter as a case study and asks the following three research questions (the second two of which are composite, because the questions posed within them are very closely linked together):

- 1) How does the interpreter render the originals of the lawyer<sup>5</sup>?**
- 2) Does the immigrant understand these originals (via the renditions), and what can be learned from the**

---

<sup>4</sup> In the first Critical Link which was held in 1995, immigrants are even referred to as ‘lost in an alien land’ [inverted commas in original] to refer to the disempowered position of the immigrant: (Roberts, 1997).

<sup>5</sup> The ‘originals’ of the lawyer are his utterances, which are in Dutch. The translation of these utterances are called ‘renditions’.

**immigrant's answers in terms of the sense-making processes<sup>6</sup>?**

**3) How does the interpreter explain his translation decisions, and what can be learned from his answers in terms of the sense-making processes<sup>7</sup>?**

The first question is designed to investigate the manner in which the interpreter renders (i.e. translates) the originals of the lawyer, while the second one is designed to investigate whether or not the immigrant understands these originals via the renditions of the interpreter. The second question is also meant to investigate what can be learned from the answers of the immigrant in terms of sense-making. The third research question is designed to investigate the manner in which the interpreter explains the translation decisions which he made during the IME. This question is also meant to investigate what can be learned from these answers in terms of sense-making, 'sense-making' being understood in this thesis from the perspective of dialogism (see chapter Three).

As 'culture' is sometimes overused to account for communication problems in IMEs (Felberg and Skaaden, 2012), this study, while accepting the important influence of culture on communication, approaches communication from a broader perspective: it does not 'impose' on the interview a certain topic (e.g. culture). It listens to what the participants say. Furthermore, Jacobsen (2009: 155) states that research on Dialogue Interpreting (henceforth: DI) traditionally focused on the role of the interpreter as opposed to that of *interpreting*. This study will focus on interpreting as a process, and will incorporate the perspective and views of the interpreter on his work, on micro- and macro-levels. The interrelated concept of Role will be incorporated.

---

<sup>6</sup> The answers are taken during a post-IME interview with him.

<sup>7</sup> The explanations are taken during the post-IME interview.

### **0.3 Theoretical approach of the study**

The researcher takes his inspiration from the influential book of Cecilia Wadensjö *Interpreting as interaction* (1998). In this book Wadensjö succeeded in showing that the interpreter is actively involved in sense-making. Because the aims of this study are different from those of Wadensjö, the researcher needed an ethnographic tool (interviews) to find answers to the second and third questions. Two interviews were conducted, the first one with the immigrant and the second one with the interpreter. These are termed Interview I, and Interview II respectively.

*Rethinking language, Mind and World Dialogically* of Linell (2009) is another essential source of inspiration for this study. Linell's work helps the researcher to understand how sense-making takes place in interactions. The theory of dialogism, as explained in the book, has provided the analytical tools that the researcher needs to account for sense-making beyond the transcribed text of the IME. It helps the researcher to understand the data which is extracted during the two interviews referred to above.

### **0.4 Structure of the Thesis**

In addition to this Introduction, this thesis consists of seven chapters. Chapter One contextualizes the IME under investigation. It provides information on its purpose and introduces its participants. The chapter consists of three sections; the first one (1.1) briefly provides information on Immigration; the second section (1.2) discusses the asylum procedure in the Netherlands. Within it, the related institutions are introduced. This is followed by an introduction to relevant aspects of the Dutch asylum procedure. After this, the legal position of the participating immigrant is discussed. In the third section (1.3), the rights of the immigrants are discussed regarding having access to an interpreter. The section starts by discussing the importance of the work of interpreters. It then discusses the right of access to an interpreter from a human rights angle. Following this, the researcher argues that the interpreter is not only needed in the initial phase of the procedure, but throughout the procedure, and even after it.

Chapter Two is devoted to critically reviewing relevant literature. It consists of seven sections. The first one deals with how interpreting is defined while the second one discusses the many names by which the kind of interpreting investigated in this thesis is referred to and discusses why the researcher has chosen to adopt the term 'Dialogue Interpreting' (DI). The section which follows provides a brief historical overview of research into DI. Section four addresses the notions of Role and (Dis-)empowerment. In section 2.4.1 on Role, the researcher addresses the motivation of scholars to address this notion and why it is still researched. In section 2.4.2 on (Dis-)empowerment, the researcher addresses and critiques studies which have researched this topic. He also discusses the aims of these studies. In section 2.5, Methods of data collection and methodologies are discussed. Section 2.6 deals with the contribution of this study to the field.

Chapter Three introduces the theoretical underpinning of the study. It comprises three parts: Part I, II and III. In **Part I**, dialogism as explained by Per Linell (mainly 2009) is introduced, unpacked and critiqued. This Part starts by discussing three central concepts to the study (section 1.1). This is followed by a discussion as to whether dialogism is epistemology or ontology (section 1.2). In section 1.3, dialogism is contrasted to monologism. In section 1.4, dialogism with its 'assumptions/principles' is introduced and critiqued. Section 1.5 discusses Meaning and Understanding according to this theory, which are crucial concepts in this study. Section 1.6 addresses how the concept of talk is understood in dialogism. The concepts of understanding and miscommunication are introduced in section 1.7. In the following sections, the importance of STK/R and 'biographical experiences' for this study is discussed. In **Part II**, the application of Cecilia Wadensjö of dialogism, whose model inspires this study, is put under the light and critiqued. The researcher argues that STK/R need to be incorporated in the analysis of IMEs, and adapts and extends the taxonomy of Wadensjö. In **Part III**, the researcher discusses how he will utilize dialogism in this study.

Chapter Four discusses the methodology of the study. It is divided into five sections. In section 4.1, the researcher argues that this agenda requires a qualitative approach. After providing information on this approach, the discussion is narrowed down to the topic of case studies (section 4.1.1).

After discussing the case study approach, information is provided about the ethnographic tool utilized in this study, which is interviews (section 4.1.2). In section 4.1.3, the researcher discusses the interviews which are utilized in this study and provides why they fit into the aims of this study. In section 4.1.3.1, the researcher discusses the purposes for which interviews are utilized – to attempt to re-construct the internal dialogue of the involved participants. Following this (section 4.1.3.2), the researcher argues that semi-structured interviews are found to benefit this study, provides information on their structure and discusses the considerations and decisions which led to choosing them.

In section 4.2, data collection and the related topics are dealt with. In section 4.2.1, the researcher addresses the initial analysis of the recorded IME. In section 4.2.3, information is provided about the choices which had to be made with respect to the type of recording, and the reasons for choosing audio-recording. In sections 4.2.4 and 4.2.5, the researcher deals with the interviews with the immigrant and the interpreter and discusses the considerations and decisions which were taken during the interviews, and how they were conducted. In section 4.2.6, the researcher provides information on the general questions which the interviewees were asked about, and explanations for the use of the collected information. In section 4.2.7, some information is provided about the benefits of the information gained during ‘corridor-conversations’ with the lawyer. In section 4.2.8, more information is provided about the process of transcribing and the decisions which had to be taken and have been taken in this study. Section 4.3 deals with the topic of triangulation: its benefits and how it is used in this study. Section 4.4 deals with ethics and the ethical approval which was needed to conduct this study.

In chapter five, the findings of the study are presented. The data was collected by audio-recording and transcribing an IME in the Netherlands. The transcribed version of this has been placed in Appendix I. Throughout this chapter, the reader is provided with cross references between Appendix I and the data which was collected during the two post-IME interviews I and II,

with the immigrant and then with the interpreter, and presented in this chapter.

The chapter is divided into three parts. In each part, the findings related to the corresponding research question are provided. Part I provides the findings to the first research question: 1) how does the interpreter render the originals of the lawyer? Part II provides the findings to the second: 2) Does the immigrant understand these originals, and what can be learned from the immigrant's answers in terms of sense-making? Finally, Part III provides the findings to the third: How does the interpreter explain his translation decisions, and what can be learned from them in terms of sense-making? These Parts are sub-divided into sub-topics, each presenting more specific findings.

In Chapter six, the findings of the study are discussed. Chapter six consists of three parts: Part I, Part II and Part III, each discussing the findings of the related research question. Part II is sub-divided into four sections, each one dealing with one aspect related to the concepts of Understanding and Miscommunication. Within these sections, relevant topics are discussed which arose during the interview with the immigrant related to sense-making. Part III discusses the findings of the third research question, and is divided into two sections. The first one addresses those renditions for which the interpreter could not provide an explanation. The second deals with cases where interpreter was able to provide explanations for the translation decisions. Within these sections, the themes are discussed related to the main sections.

Chapter Seven addresses the conclusions of the study. It deals with what can be learned from it, the contribution of the study, what the limitations are, and recommendations for future studies.

## **Chapter one**

Setting and context of the study

## 1.0 Introduction

As indicated in the Introduction to this study, in the IME under investigation, the interlocutors have come together in the office of the lawyer to discuss the immigration case of the participating immigrant<sup>8</sup>. The immigrant had been living in the Netherlands since 2009 and had been granted a residence permit. This permit was based on the generally difficult situation in the homeland of the immigrant. He was not provided with the permit that he and the lawyer had hoped for: an asylum residence permit that is granted when the IND believes that the conditions of Geneva Convention have been met. The lawyer had lodged an appeal against this decision and won, as we come to find out during the IME under investigation in which the lawyer is preparing himself and his client for the scenario in which the IND might defend their initial decision, which is to decline the request of the asylum seeker for an asylum residence permit. The lawyer mentioned during the IME that he wanted to a) discuss the development of the legal procedure thus far, b) to revisit the backstory of the immigrant and c) to ask the immigrant questions about it. Because the IME under investigation does not take place in a vacuum as it were, but in the context of immigration, it is essential to provide information on this and other directly interrelated issues. Furthermore, as will be seen in chapters Three, Five and Six, communication during the investigated IME was heavily influenced by the knowledge which had been gained among other things during previous phases of the procedure. This knowledge is termed in dialogism (see chapter Three) Situation-Transcending Knowledge/Resources (STK/R). Therefore, I have decided to provide this concise representation of the asylum procedure, which should be beneficial for the understanding of the rest of the thesis and for understanding what is at stake for the immigrant.

This information is provided as follows. In section 1.1, light is shed on the phenomenon of immigration, from the Middle East in particular. Because

---

<sup>8</sup> In this study the term 'immigrant' will be utilized. According to Bischof et al (2012), this term encompasses not only asylum seekers but also individuals like the immigrant who is participating in this study, who has a residence permit and is seeking a more permanent asylum residence permit (p. 7).

the setting under investigation is an immigration lawyer's office in the Netherlands, the focus on immigration is narrowed down to that in the Netherlands (sections 1.2). The Dutch asylum procedure is briefly outlined (section 1.2.2), and the main related organizations and professional are introduced (sections 1.2.1-1.2.1.7). Then, information is provided about the IME under investigation and the reason why the lawyer has held this encounter: A picture is drawn of the legal position of the immigrant (section 1.2.3). In section 1.3, I address the issue of the right of the immigrant to have access to an interpreter during the asylum procedure, and the role of the interpreter in this procedure. Information is also provided about the background of the participating interpreter<sup>9</sup>.

---

<sup>9</sup> The term 'the researcher' and the personal pronoun 'I' are used interchangeably in the thesis.

## **1.1 Middle Eastern immigration into Europe and the Netherlands**

Immigration is not a recent phenomenon; it has been part of human history since earliest times (International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, [No date]). Immigration has also become a worldwide phenomenon (UNHCR, 2016a), with the European Union being no exception (Jacquemet, 2009: 525). “33% of all immigrants live in Europe” of the 191 million immigrant worldwide (Shah, 2008). The Netherlands is among the member states where immigrants seek residence opportunities (VluchtelingenWerk, 2012; 2014). They come from different countries, European and non-European (Nicolaas and Sprangers, 2006), including countries in the Middle East (BBC, 2014). Due to the turbulent political situation in the Middle East, especially since the 1990s, increasing numbers of immigrants from that part of the world have sought refuge in the EU, including the Netherlands (Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek- en Documentatiecentrum, 2011; VluchtelingenWerk, 2014). Recently, many immigrants have arrived in the Netherlands from Syria because of the civil war that has been raging there (UNHCR Syria Regional Refugee Response, 2016). In March 2016, there were 45,000 asylum seekers in Dutch asylum centres, almost half of them from Syria (Werkwijzer Vluchtelingen, 2016). Asylum-seeking is considered an ‘inviolable human right’, recognized by the United Nations (Jacquemet, 2009: 529). The immigrant who agreed to participate in this study is an asylum seeker from Syria.

When immigrants arrive in the Netherlands, they are required by law to regulate their residence. An asylum procedure has been designed for this purpose. During the IME under investigation in this study, and also during post-IME interviews I and II, with the immigrant and the interpreter respectively, reference was made to previous and future stages of the asylum procedure. Accordingly, a general understanding of the Dutch asylum procedure is required in order to contextualise this study. To this end, the following sections will deal with first the organisations and professionals involved in the asylum procedure, and then with the different stages of this procedure.

## **1.2 Asylum procedure in the Netherlands, the associated organizations and the legal status of the participating immigrant**

Information is provided below on the main parties during the different stages of the asylum procedure. The organisations and individuals which asylum seekers deal with during the asylum procedure are described immediately below. As mentioned in the introduction (section 1.0), this list is provided to help the reader get an idea about the complexity of the asylum procedure and also to help them understand the position which the immigrant is in when they apply for asylum. This information will also help the reader to better understand the discussion and the findings chapter. The most important organizations in this thesis are the IND (section 1.2.1.2) and the Lawyer (section 1.2.1.5).

### **1.2.1 The Organizations**

I will start first with the organizations which deal with asylum seekers during the procedure.

#### **1.2.1.1 The Aanmeldcentrum or AC (Asylum Registration Centre)**

This is a reception centre where asylum seekers are required to go to when they wish to apply for asylum. Such centres are administered by the Centraal Orgaan Opvang Asielzoekers or COA<sup>10</sup> (COA, 2016). The COA is “responsible for the reception, supervision and departure of asylum seekers” (ibid). The COA falls under the political responsibility of the Ministry of Security and Justice (ibid). The immigrant who participated must have gone to one of these centres on his arrival in the Netherlands.

---

<sup>10</sup> Central Agency for the Reception of Asylum Seekers.

### **1.2.1.2 The Immigratie- en Naturalisatiedienst or IND (Immigration and Naturalisation Service)**

This organization deals with all applications of asylum, family reunions, visas and other residence permits (Naturalisatiedienst, 2014). It falls under the scope of the Ministry of Security and Justice (De Rijksoverheid, 2014). In the case under investigation, reference is made to this organization throughout the IME. It is the organization the immigrant is attempting to persuade to grant him the residence permit he wants (an asylum residence permit).

### **1.2.1.3 The Afdeling bestuursrechtspraak van de Raad van State (The Administrative Jurisdiction Division of the Council of State)**

This is the “highest general administrative court in the Netherlands. It hears appeals lodged by members of the public or companies against decisions or orders given by municipal, provincial or central governments” (De Raad van State, 2016). It consists of three chambers, one of which is the Aliens’ Chamber (ibid; De Rijksoverheid, 2014; De Rechtspraak, 2016). In the case under investigation, the IND lost the appeal lodged by the immigrant at the lower court. The IND would have lodged a higher appeal if it had decided to contest the decision of the lower court. It did not, as is apparent from the transcribed text (see Appendix I).

### **1.2.1.4 The Asielzoekercentrum or AZC (Asylum seeker Centre)**

This is an organisation that is a part of the COA<sup>11</sup>, and is responsible for the accommodation of asylum seekers (COA, 2016). The participating immigrant resided in such a centre for some time before he was allocated a more permanent place in one of the Dutch towns.

---

<sup>11</sup> The COA is the Central Agency for the Reception of Asylum Seekers (see section 1.2.1.1 above).

### **1.2.1.5 ‘The lawyer’**

When asylum seekers apply for asylum, they are allocated a lawyer who assists them during their procedure (Raad voor Rechtsbijstand, 2016). The lawyer who participated in this study is an individual who works for a lawyers’ office in the Netherlands, and like other asylum lawyers is an independent professional (Immigratie- en Naturalisatiedienst, 2015: 4). He is a middle-aged Dutchman who specialises in immigration law, including asylum law. As agreed with him, no names or addresses will be used in this thesis.

### **1.2.1.6 The Vreemdelingenpolitie or VD (Aliens’ Office)**

This organization also falls under the auspices of the Ministry of Security and Justice. It conducts the first interview with the asylum seeker when they arrive in the Netherlands (Immigratie- en Naturalisatiedienst, 2015). This first interview is not the same as the ‘first hearing’, which is conducted by the IND at a later stage (ibid). The immigrant in this study must have had such an interview when he applied for asylum on his arrival in 2009.

### **1.2.1.7 The Vluchtelingenwerk Nederland or VVN (Dutch Council for Refugees)**

This is an “independent, non-governmental organization” that defends the rights of refugees to a “fair asylum procedure, and subsequently access to adequate housing, education, health care and work” (VluchtelingenWerk, 2014). This organisation engages in assisting asylum seekers from the moment they register at an Asylum Registration Centre (see section 1.2.1.1 above), where asylum seekers go when they want to submit an asylum application (Immigratie- en Naturalisatiedienst, 2013). The immigrant in this study must have dealt with this organization during the several stages of his procedure.

## 1.2.2 The asylum procedure

As mentioned in section 1.1, when an asylum seeker arrives in the Netherlands, s/he is required by law to regulate her/his residence in the country (Immigratie- en Naturalisatiedienst, 2014). The IND is responsible for handling this process. This type of organization is created by nations-states, like the Netherlands, in order to deal with these “transnational clients and their multiple languages” (Jacquemet, 2011: 479). During the process in which the application is handled, the asylum seeker is subjected by the authorities to a procedure designed to determine whether or not there is/are (a) legal ground(s) upon which the asylum seeker is entitled to a residence permit. This procedure is based on the 1951 Geneva Convention, which defines a refugee as somebody who has a “well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion [...]” (UNHCR, 2001; Maryns, 2006). This convention forms the basis upon which the authorities determine whether or not an asylum seeker satisfies the definition of a refugee. In this regard, the decision of the authorities on refugee status relies heavily on the manner in which the asylum seeker presents their reasons for seeking asylum and the other aspects of their personal histories, all from the perspective of the authorities (Bogner et al., 2010: 519). The credibility of the account, from the perspective of the IND, is very important (Jacquemet, 2011: 482).

In the Netherlands, the asylum procedure starts in one of the Asylum Registration Centres in the country (Immigratie- en Naturalisatiedienst, 2013), see the Aanmelcentrum or AC in section 1.2.1.1 above. Before the start of the hearings, the asylum seeker is given some time to rest and to prepare for the official procedure. This is called the rest-and-preparation period (Immigratie- en Naturalisatiedienst, 2015). This period lasts six days, during which the asylum seeker is given information on the procedure by the Dutch Council for Refugees and by an asylum lawyer (VluchtelingenWerk, 2014). During this period, the asylum seeker is also seen by the medical centre to find out if he or she has any mental and/or physical condition the IND must take into account (Immigratie- en Naturalisatiedienst, 2013).

After this period, the Algemene Asielprocedure or AA 'General Asylum Procedure', starts (VluchtelingenWerk, 2014; Immigratie- en Naturalisatiedienst, 2014). This procedure normally lasts eight days but can last up to 14 days in exceptional cases (Immigratie- en Naturalisatiedienst, 2014). Nearly 50% of applications in the Netherlands are determined during this procedure (ibid). The application of the asylum seeker is either accepted or rejected (ibid). If the application is rejected, then the asylum seeker is rehoused to a 'Return Location', where their return to their homeland is prepared. The asylum-seeker is entitled to lodge an appeal against the decision of the IND.

This 'General Asylum Procedure' starts with an interview which is conducted by an IND employee, during which questions are asked about the nationality, identity and travel route of the asylum seeker (Immigratie- en Naturalisatiedienst, 2014; VluchtelingenWerk, 2014), in order to establish the facts about all three matters. During this hearing, the asylum application is signed (Immigratie- en Naturalisatiedienst, 2013). During the interview, communication is mediated by an interpreter, who is provided by the State (Doornbos, 2006: 22) because asylum seekers usually do not speak the language of the host country (Maryns, 2015: 23), in this case the Netherlands<sup>12</sup>.

A day later, an assigned lawyer discusses the content of this first hearing with the asylum seeker on the basis of a hardcopy of the meeting provided to him and the immigrant. This meeting can be used, in addition, to prepare the asylum seeker for the second hearing, which takes place on the third day<sup>13</sup>. A 'detailed hearing' (in Dutch 'nader gehoor') is then held, during which the applicant is asked why they have applied for asylum in the Netherlands (Doornbos, 2006; VluchtelingenWerk, 2014). This hearing is very important as it is used by the IND to take a decision regarding the submitted asylum application. The Dutch Council for Refugees can decide to attend this

---

<sup>12</sup> In some cases they might do; for example, when they have lived in the Netherlands for a long time and their previous application(s) had been rejected.

<sup>13</sup> In some cases, the IND may decide to postpone this detailed hearing and hold it in *the Verlengde Asielprocedure or VA (Extended Asylum Application)* (Immigratie- en Naturalisatiedienst, 2014).

hearing if this is needed or if the asylum seeker or his lawyer has requested it (VluchtelingenWerk, 2014).

The day after the detailed hearing has taken place (thus day 4), the lawyer discusses the report of this hearing with his client (ibid). Corrections and/or additions can be made to the report, which is then passed on to the IND (ibid) to decide what happens next. There are three possibilities (Immigratie- en Naturalisatiedienst, 2014):

- The applicant will be granted an asylum residence permit because their application satisfies the requirements<sup>14</sup>.
- If the IND believes that more research is needed, it will refer the applicant to the other asylum procedure which is known as the Extended Asylum Procedure (Immigratie- en Naturalisatiedienst, 2013). The applicant will be provided with a copy of the content of the detailed hearing and will be rehoused in an AZC, where applicants stay during the procedure<sup>15</sup>.
- If the application does not satisfy the requirements for asylum, according to the convictions of the IND, then the applicant will receive a copy of the content of the detailed hearing together with a copy of the so-called Intention to Reject (in Dutch Voornemen tot Afwijzing) the asylum application, in which the IND explains that it intends to reject the application and presents the reasons for this. The applicant will be given the opportunity, with the assistance of their legal advisor, to make possible corrections and additions and to respond to the Intention to Reject.

When the IND receives the response of the applicant to the Intention to Reject, the IND has three options (Immigratie- en Naturalisatiedienst, 2014):

- The applicant will be nonetheless granted an asylum residence permit.
- If the IND decides that more time is needed to conduct research, then the application will be referred to the Verlengde Asielprocedure or VA

---

<sup>14</sup> The immigrant in this study had been attempting to receive this permit, having previously been denied it (see 1.2.3 below).

<sup>15</sup> During post-IME interview I, the immigrant indicated that this had happened in his case as well.

(Extended Asylum Application). The applicant is then rehoused in one of the Asylum Seeker Centres (AZC see section 1.2.1.4 above).

- The application will be rejected, which means that the applicant will be expected to leave the Netherlands. However, at this point the applicant can decide to lodge an appeal.

As indicated in the second point directly above, the IND may decide to refer the application to the Extended Asylum Procedure if it believes that more research is needed. If this decision is taken, then the asylum seeker will be moved to an AZC. During this procedure, which lasts a maximum of 6 months, the asylum-seeker will be residing in this AZC (VluchtelingenWerk, 2014).

During this procedure, the IND can grant the applicant an asylum residence permit (ibid), but can also decline the asylum application (ibid). In the latter case, the applicant will firstly receive a letter in which the IND explains its intentions. This is again called Intention to Reject (Immigratie- en Naturalisatiedienst, 2014). If the applicant is not prepared to accept this decision, they can discuss this with their lawyer. The lawyer can then refer the so-called *Zienschijde*<sup>16</sup> to the IND explaining why they do not agree with this concept decision (i.e. the Intention to Reject) of the IND (ibid). After receiving the response of the applicant, the IND can reconsider the decision it had wanted to take, and thus grant the asylum seeker an asylum residence permit. Alternatively, it can decide to adhere to the decision it had wanted to take and thus decide to reject the application of the applicant. The IND will send the applicant the official decision, together with its (i.e. the IND's) motivation for the decision. This also explains the consequences of this decision (Spijkerboer, [no date]).

If the asylum seeker rejects this decision, then s/he can go to court (Immigratie- en Naturalisatiedienst, 2015). The points which are looked at by the judge are 1) whether the IND dealt with the application in a careful manner, 2) whether the decision which has been taken conforms with Dutch laws and regulations, 3) whether the decision conforms to international

---

<sup>16</sup> The lawyer writes a letter to the IND in which they indicate that they do not agree with the negative decision the IND intends to take.

treaties. It is worth mentioning that in this case applicants are rehoused in another so-called asylum seekers' centre (AZC), where they are expected to prepare for their return to their homeland. In its decision to reject, the IND indicates the time period within which the applicant is required to have left the Netherlands. If they have not left before the end of that period, they are not entitled to reside in an asylum seekers centre, or AZC (Immigratie- en Naturalisatiedienst, 2014). The applicant is himself responsible for arranging his return to his homeland. He risks being deported if he does not do so.

Generally, according to regulations, when an asylum application has been submitted, the IND has six months to take a decision regarding the application. It can sometimes extend this time by a maximum of a six further months if more time is needed for the investigation. The IND may in exceptional cases extend the term by one year. An example is when the security situation changes significantly in the country of origin of the applicant (Doornbos, 2006: 68).

When an asylum application has been rejected by the IND and the subsequently submitted appeal is rejected by the court, the asylum seeker is entitled to lodge a higher appeal at The Administrative Jurisdiction Division of the Council of State (see section 1.2.1.3 above) (De Raad van State, 2016), which is the highest administrative judicial authority in the Netherlands. If the decision of the Administrative Jurisdiction Division of the Council of State is in accordance with that of the lower judge, then the asylum seeker can go to the European Court of Human Rights.

In the following section, the researcher will outline the status of the participating immigrant in relation to the asylum procedure explained in this section.

### **1.2.3 Status of the participating immigrant in this study<sup>17</sup>**

It can be observed in the transcribed text of the IME under investigation that the immigrant had been granted a residence permit (see Appendix I). This was also confirmed in post-IME interview I. It is also observable that this

---

<sup>17</sup> The reader is advised to read Appendix I in its entirety to understand this text.

residence permit had not been of the type the lawyer and the immigrant had hoped for, which is an asylum residence permit. This is provided when an asylum seeker has a “well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion [...]” (UNHCR, 2001; International Refugee Rights Initiative, [no date]; Gibb and Good, 2014). This was also confirmed in post-IME interview I.

According to the lawyer, as he explains during the recorded IME with the immigrant, the latter had been granted a residence permit of a temporary kind. The IND seems to consider the backstory of the immigrant not sufficient(ly) (credible) to grant him an asylum residence permit. It is also observable that the IND had not provided reasons for their decision to deny the immigrant an asylum residence permit. It is clear that the immigrant, together with the lawyer, had decided to lodge an appeal to the court to force the IND either to grant him the residence permit he had been seeking, or to provide the reasons why it had decided to deny him one. It appears that the immigrant had won the appeal he had lodged some time before the IME under study was held. The lower court had ordered the IND to reconsider its previous decision. The court had given the IND four weeks to lodge a higher appeal against its decision. During the IME, it appears, the IND had failed to do so. This means that the IND now had six weeks to take a new decision, starting from the date of the lower court session when it ordered the IND to reconsider its decision. The deadline for this was a few days after this IME. According to the lawyer, the IND now had two choices: either to grant the immigrant the resident permit he wanted, or to send him a new decision in which it must now explain the reasons why it has refused/refuses to grant the asylum residence permit.

The lawyer has convened this IME in order to prepare himself and the immigrant for the next decision of the IND. To this end, during the encounter, the lawyer performed, among other things, three communicative projects: 1) he discussed with the immigrant the legal process the latter had been involved in from the date of submission of his asylum application, 2) he revisited the backstory of the immigrant and read (parts of) it out, and 3) he asked the immigrant questions related to his backstory.

Thus far, information has been provided about immigration and the asylum procedure in the Netherlands, as well as the procedure the immigrant had been involved in since his arrival. Due to the importance of the work of the interpreter in this study, in the following section, light will be shed on the role of interpreters during the asylum procedure in the Netherlands and during the IME under investigation.

### **1.3 The need for Interpreting during the asylum procedure**

Interpreters are called in by the IND during the asylum procedure (Doornbos, 2006: 88) because asylum seekers generally do not have a good command of Dutch (Goos, 2008: 57). These interpreters are independent professionals; they are not officers of the IND, but rather they are their own bosses (ibid: 57). Interpreters are considered impartial professionals and are assumed to fulfil the function of an 'intermediary'. Their task is to enable the officer of the IND and the asylum applicant to "hold a conversation" (ibid).

Interpreters are generally thought to fulfil an important task, especially during the hearings which are held by immigration services (Jacquemet, 2011: 479; Pöllabauer, 2004a: 143). In these hearings, questions are asked by officers of the IND to draw up a picture of the problems the asylum seeker bases his asylum request on. These questions can also help determine whether the statements of the asylum seeker are credible (Goos, 2008: 88; Doornbos, 2006). When asylum seekers come into contact with the authorities, they are expected to substantiate their claim of having a well-founded fear of persecution (Pöllabauer, 2004a; Goos, 2008; VluchtelingenWerk, 2012). They are thus expected to have a story that is "plausible, coherent and non-contradictory" (Pöllabauer, 2004b: 3; Doornbos, 2006). The officials who deal with the applications show "a particular virulent version of the "ideology of mistrust" found in all institutional settings" (inverted commas in original) (Jacquemet, 2011: 480). This has been the case in most of the Western nations since the 1980s, when restrictive measures were introduced (ibid: 480).

When the IND believes that the requirements for granting asylum have been met, the asylum seeker might be granted a residence permit, as mentioned in section 1.2.2. If this happens, this is the end of the asylum procedure. The interpreter is not needed anymore, at least not for the asylum procedure. However, as we have indicated in the Introduction, in certain cases, the IND can decide to grant an applicant a residence permit not because the requirements in its view have been met, but when it believes that it cannot expect the asylum seeker to return to their homeland due to the bad security situation there (Goos, 2008: 18) that it would be very harsh to expect the asylum to return (Amnesty International, [no date]). This has happened in the case under investigation. If the asylum seeker decides he does not agree with the decision of the IND, as has happened in the case under investigation, he can decide to lodge an appeal at the court. Here too, the immigrant is entitled to have an interpreter. This study takes its point of departure from this moment: it studies the work of the interpreter at a point where the immigrant already has a residence permit that is considered to be less solid (or more temporary) than the one he has sought.

In the following section, I outline the normative environment governing the involvement of interpreters in the Dutch asylum procedure.

### **1.3.1 The right to have an interpreter**

In the Netherlands, asylum applicants and immigrants have access to an interpreter when they are confronted with governmental organisations like the Dutch IND (Goos, 2008: 88; Doornbos, 2006). The European Commission considers this to be one of their human rights (United Nations, 2016). “Properly trained, interpreters thus contribute to safeguarding human and democratic rights”, says the European Commission (European Commission, 2009). It is also claimed that interpreters “hold the key” to the asylum seeker’s future (Pöllabauer, 2004b: 143). Without their intervention, the very future of the asylum seeker is sometimes at risk (ibid: 143).

### 1.3.2 Interpreters needed from the beginning

As mentioned in section 1.3, before, sometimes also during, and sometimes also after the hearings of the IND, asylum seekers meet with the VVN<sup>18</sup> and (a) lawyer(s) at the Asylum Registration Centre or AC where the asylum application is being dealt with (VluchtelingenWerk, 2014). Depending on the practicalities involved, the VVN and/or the lawyer prepare the asylum seeker for the hearings and for mapping out the problems because of which the asylum seeker has fled their country of origin (ibid). The lawyers and the VVN (and before them the IND, during the hearings) need interpreters for communication (Garber, 2000: 19; Goos, 2008). Interpreters can be called in throughout the asylum procedure. Therefore, they do not vanish from the scene after the initial hearings with the IND, and meetings with the lawyer(s), regardless of where the asylum seekers stay (or are detained) after arrival. Later in the procedure, when lawyers receive their asylum-seeking clients in their offices, interpreters are also called in, as in the case under investigation in the study. After the asylum seeker has received her/his residence permit, s/he may similarly need a lawyer and an interpreter if they have received a non-asylum residence permit and seek a permit from the IND which is an asylum residence permit. It is this particular setting, where there is a lawyer, an immigrant with a non-asylum residence permit and an interpreter, which forms the object of this study.

### 1.3.3 Background information about the interpreter

It is useful to give information on the background of the interpreter. Before moving to the Netherlands, the interpreter, an Iraqi-born man, had studied engineering in Iraq. In the Netherlands, he followed *middelbaar beroepsonderwijs* or MBO<sup>19</sup> study. He became qualified to work as a *Contact Centre Medewerker*<sup>20</sup>. Following this, he followed several courses in

---

<sup>18</sup> Dutch Council for Refugees.

<sup>19</sup> Technical and vocational training for 16-18-year-olds (*Van Dale Groot Woordenboek Nederlands-Engels*, 1991)

<sup>20</sup> Contact centre employee

*Incasso*<sup>21</sup> to qualify to work as an *incasso worker*<sup>22</sup>. These courses were followed by a course to qualify him to work in *debiteurenbeheer*<sup>23</sup>.

Regarding interpreting-related education, he indicated he followed the *SIGV*<sup>24</sup> in the Netherlands. This was followed by several short interpreting-related courses, for example: *Tolken en Gezondheidszorg*<sup>25</sup>. Regarding his knowledge of the Syrian dialect, he indicated that he had learned it while interpreting for Syrian immigrants, from television, and from friends. He indicated that there are no institutions in the Netherlands where one can learn an Arabic dialect. Syrian Arabic is one of 5 dialects in which he interprets, including his mother tongue, Iraqi Arabic. Regarding his knowledge of the Dutch language, he said he had initially attended language courses given by volunteers. After he had learned the language to a good standard, he took and passed *the Staatsexamen*<sup>26</sup>. This was followed by the above-mentioned *SIGV* study<sup>27</sup>. Unlike in many other studies where “ad hoc, unprofessional and untrained interpreters (Hale, 2007: 235) are used, the interpreter in this study is thus an trained interpreter who has followed quite a few courses on interpreting.

## 1.4 Conclusion

This chapter shows that immigration is a highly visible phenomenon in the EU<sup>28</sup> and involves complex networks of agents: individuals who want to make a residence claim, governmental organisations that are assigned with the task of dealing with this claim, and international organisations, like the European Court for Human Rights. Each of these parties has a different position with regard to immigration. Individuals who leave their homelands and come to one of the EU member states, in this study the Netherlands,

---

<sup>21</sup> Debt collection

<sup>22</sup> Debt collector

<sup>23</sup> Credit management

<sup>24</sup> Post-graduate study: court interpreter in criminal cases.

<sup>25</sup> Interpreting and health-care.

<sup>26</sup> State exams.

<sup>27</sup> Stichting Instituut Gerechtstolken en vertalers ‘Association of Legal Interpreters and Translators.’

<sup>28</sup> The UN Refugee Agency (UNHCR) mentioned that 1,177,914 asylum applications had been made in the period between April 2011 and September 2016 (UNHCR, 2016b).

seek residence opportunities. Among these individuals, there are those who seek asylum. Governmental organisations such as the IND are tasked with handling the applications that are submitted by these asylum seekers. The IND works on achieving its tasks by following a procedure designed by the state, so that the IND decides on behalf of the government whether or not a certain asylum seeker is entitled to what they are applying for. Their task is different from that of the lawyers, who are paid by the state to defend the interests of the asylum seekers. The latter and the former need to communicate with the asylum seeker or immigrant. To achieve this communication, the lawyer and the immigrant need the assistance of an interpreter. Interpreters are needed throughout the procedure and sometimes even after it. Dutch law and also EU regulations deem their work to be important for the well-being of immigrants.

## **Chapter Two**

### Literature Review

## **2.0 Introduction**

In this chapter, I will critically review some aspects of Dialogue Interpreting (henceforth DI) with the aim of providing the reader with a concise view of this mode of interpreting, focusing on topics of central concern to this study. Section 2.1 provides information on how this mode of interpreting is defined. A number of definitions are introduced and critiqued. In section 2.2, I refer to the many names which are utilized in the field to refer to DI. I then explain why I have chosen to use DI (section 2.2.1), rather than another name. In order to understand the field of DI as it is now, one needs to understand historical developments since the 1960s and 1970s (section 2.3). In section 2.4, I address the concept of Role, a notion which has been extensively dealt with in this field of research, and (dis-)empowerment. In section 2.4.1, I introduce the reasons/motivations for researchers for (re-)addressing Role. In section 2.4.2, the focus shifts to (dis-)empowerment. The section presents an overview of some of the studies which have dealt with this concept.

The manner in which researchers working in the field of DI handle the issue of data collection is discussed in section 2.5, while in section 2.6, I introduce the contribution of this study to the field. The contribution is among other things methodological (a new approach to data elicitation) and theoretical (the model of Wadensjö is extended).

## 2.1 Definition of interpreting

In this section, the researcher will consider a number of definitions of interpreting. The aim is to show that this profession is theorized in various manners, rather than to provide an exhaustive list<sup>29</sup>. We will see that the presented definitions are not what one would expect after more than two decades of intensive DI research, i.e. since the first Critical Link conference in 1995.

Interpreting is traditionally considered a part of translation (Hale, 2007: 3; Pöchhacker, 2007: 11), with the overall area of translation being defined by Rabin (1958: 123), as “[...] a process by which a spoken or written utterance takes place in one language which is intended and presumed to convey the same meaning as a previously existing utterance in another language.” This is a monological way of theorizing<sup>30</sup>. Interpreting is theorized here in terms of ‘equivalence’ as Baker and Pérez-González (2011: 40) call it. This is not surprising as dialogical theorization of interpreting, which informs this study, started only in the 1990s. Four decades after Rabin, theorizing from a dialogical perspective, Wadensjö (1998: 41) in her extremely influential book *Interpreting as Interaction* states that “an act of translating is in practice performed by a specific ‘I’ speaking, or writing on behalf of a substantial other.” Unlike Rabin’s definition, Wadensjö’s gives a prominent role to the interpreter. Rabin’s definition burdens the translator/interpreter with a responsibility while not giving them the privilege of contributing to meaning-making; the interpreter is not even referred to. Interpreting is seen as a ‘process’ that ‘takes place’.

Other Influential IS scholars, for example Pöchhacker (2004), also refer to the challenging nature of defining DI. Pöchhacker (ibid: 154) argues that different definitions are provided depending sometimes on the aspect of DI which scholars want to foreground. He re-presents a definition of

---

<sup>29</sup> The researcher argues that these different theorizations bring with them consequences for how DI is regulated in different countries, a topic which will not be addressed further in this thesis.

<sup>30</sup> Monological and its counterpart Dialogical theorizations of language are discussed in section 3.1.3.

interpreting which was produced in the 1960s by Otto Kade<sup>31</sup>: “a form of Translation in which a first and final rendition in another language is produced on the basis of a one-time presentation of an utterance in a source language.” Here the definition relies on two criteria: one-time presentation of the utterance and time pressure. This type of definition is not supported in this study, for as we will see in chapter Five several other factors also play a role when the interpreter produces the translation, e.g. audience design, meaning in this study the immigrant and the lawyer.

Perhaps not surprisingly, sometimes the way interpreting is defined depends on the setting in which it is practised. For example, a manual used in the US (Bancroft et al., 2013: 100) defines DI as “[i]nterpreting that takes place within a community setting, typically for public and non-profit services.” This definition is used to differentiate DI from court interpreting, which takes place in an adversarial setting. Hrehovčik (2009: 160) on her part defines DI as “a special type of oral translation facilitating access to public services by mediating between service users and service providers who do not share the same language.” Unlike in the case of Otto Kader (see above), where the definition was based on circumstantial factors related to the technicality of producing the interpreting, it is not surprising that a more business-like theorization has been provided by Hrehovčik, probably because, at least in the case of the manual, it is given in the context of an organization.

The orientation in terms of which DI is defined can sometimes shift from the setting in which it is practiced to the languages which are involved. For example, the Canadian National Standards Guide for Community Interpreting Services defines community interpreting as “[b]idirectional interpreting that takes place in the course of communication among speakers of different languages” (Bancroft et al., 2013: 104). It is noticeable that even though this definition involves the type of interpreting, the emphasis is not on the setting but on the ‘different languages’. In the case of both the American ‘manual’ and Canadian ‘Guide’, it is striking that the role of the interpreter is not given any significance, apart from mentioning elsewhere in the document that he is a “person who facilitates spoken language communication”

---

<sup>31</sup> Together with Danica Seleskovitch, the German Otto Kade is considered one of the pioneers of research into interpreting. See section 2.3 below for more information.

(Healthcare Interpretation Network, 2007). Both of these definitions remind one of a monological way of thinking of language and mind and make one wonder how this could be possible in the light of the shift in interpreting theory since the start of 1990s, other than it might be reflecting a weak relationship between researchers and regulators of DI services, in that there is not always cooperation between the two parties. Al-Rubai'i (2009: 329) also provides a monological definition<sup>32</sup>, stating that interpreting is the "[...] oral transposing of SENSE of an orally delivered message in one language (source language "SL") into another (target language "TL") [...]." , with or without the help of note-taking, by a person proficient<sup>33</sup> in both languages and cultures *after the speaker has delivered a part of his speech.* 'SENSE' is theorized as something tangible and solid over which the 'speaker' has no influence, which is disputable. Further, the word 'proficient' seems to suggest that interpreters are by definition skilful; whereas, as the literature suggests (e.g. Jacquemet (2011)) sometimes less competent interpreters are used to translate.

As has been seen in this section, there is no single perspective on how DI should be defined. This is not surprising as DI is interdisciplinary and different ontological/epistemological perspectives will leave their mark on its definition. We have also seen that the definitions above mainly reflect a monological view of interpreting instead of a dialogical one. This is in a way surprising after the breakthrough of dialogism as theory into DI research spearheaded by Wadensjö (1998). This multiplicity of definitions and theorizations will also apply to the names which are used to refer to DI as well. This is the topic of the next section.

## **2.2 The many names of Dialogue Interpreting**

The literature on DI shows that there is indeed no consensus among scholars about how to name the profession. Terms which are used include: 'liaison interpreting' (e.g. Gentile and Vasilakakos (1996), Smirnov (1997),

---

<sup>32</sup> The article is on 'consecutive' interpreting. However, many aspects of the article are also true for DI interpreting.

<sup>33</sup> The requirement of language proficiency is also mentioned by Smirnov (1997).

Erasmus et al. (1999), Blinstrubaité (2000), Alexieva (2002)); 'public service interpreting' (e.g. Rogers and Corsellis (2008), Tipton (2011)); 'community interpreting' (e.g. Shackman (1984), Benmaman (1997), Carr et al. (1997), Roberts (1997: 10), Garber (2000), Hertog and Van der Veer (2006), Hale (2007), Norström et al. (2012), Napier (2013)); 'cultural interpreting' (e.g.: Mesa (2000)); 'escort interpreting' or 'ad hoc interpreting' (e.g.: Hale 2007); Dialogue Interpreting (e.g.: Wadensjö 1995, 1998; Mason and Stewart (2001)); 'consecutive interpreting' (e.g.: Al-Rubai'i (2009), Liu and Chiu (2009); and 'face-to-face interpreting' (e.g.: Mason and Ren (2012)).

It is noteworthy that these terms were largely non-existent until the 1990s: things then started to change when new settings and professional domains began to emerge for "the traditional mode-based distinction has become less effective" (Pöchhacker, 2007: 12). Wadensjö (2007: 3) believes that this multiplicity of terms is not a problem. Partly, it reflects the different theoretical and practical traditions related to the profession in different countries, as she argues. The researcher tends to agree and thinks that this is to be expected for the same reason: it is impossible to reach a consensus on a global level on a name. The researcher believes that there should somewhere be a reference list where each term is defined in a clear way, in order to avoid confusion on the part of researchers and clients. That being said, it is not unexpected that, in the long run, the number of names will be reduced, when some of these names fall out of use for practical or theoretical reasons.

In the following section, the researcher will discuss why he has chosen to utilize the term Dialogue Interpreting (DI).

### **2.2.1 Name adopted in this study**

The term DI is used because it encapsulates the manner in which sense is made in the IME under investigation according to the theoretical underpinning of this thesis. This does not mean that it is recommended for every researcher. Arguably, the theoretical stance of the researcher could be a basis on which he or she might want to choose to use a particular term. In this study, dialogism is the theory that is drawn on to interpret the collected

data (see chapter Three). As will be seen in chapter Six, this theory is found to adequately account for the manner in which the participating interpreter makes his translation decisions. This term brings to the fore the very dialogic nature of this type of interaction.

### **2.3 Brief historical overview**

In this section, a brief reflection will be provided on the development of DI research over the years. This is important in order to understand how the current dialogic interactionist paradigm has come into being. Given the shared history of DI and IS, and the fact that the latter is the overall discipline, DI research cannot be studied in isolation from research on IS in general. Reference will therefore also be made to research into other forms of interpreting, such as conference interpreting, especially because research into IS started with this in the 1960s (Pöchhacker, 2007: 15-16).

Although DI has been practiced since early history (Urpi, 2012: 58), intensive research into it began only in the 1990s (ibid: 58-9; Merlini, 2015: 102). Earlier, “[w]ith a few interesting exceptions”, research on interpreting had started in the 1960s (Pöchhacker, 2007: 201; 2015), mainly on conference interpreting. The first researchers who developed an interest in the skills of simultaneous interpreting were psychologists (Pöchhacker, 2007: 15). They conducted experiments into interpreting as a form of language processing, rather than a profession (ibid: 15). Danica Seleskovitch, a conference interpreter and a prominent conference interpreting scholar, also, however, did research on simultaneous interpreting as a professional activity (Pöchhacker, 2007: 16). Around the same period, the East German Otto Kade published a paper on note-taking in DI. These two pioneers never collaborated not only because they were on different sides of the Iron Curtain but also because they differed in their theoretical perspectives (ibid: 16). Unlike Kade, who “searched for equivalence relations between language systems” in his research, Seleskovitch theorized interpreting as a “process of making sense based on the interpreter’s knowledge of the world and the situational context of interaction” (ibid: 16). Seleskovitch proved to be influential throughout the seventies. In this environment the IT paradigm

flourished and the influence of psychology was overshadowed by that of the Paris School of Seleskovitch.

It was not until the early 1980s that other conference interpreters and scholars (e.g. Gile) challenged the Paris School of Seleskovitch, arguing for a “(self-) critical, scientifically oriented approach to research” (ibid: 16). They questioned the assumptions which were taken for granted by the Paris School, and called for a return to research that was empirical, and in many cases experimental-oriented. They argued for inter-disciplinarity in IS research (ibid: 16). Psychology came back into the picture, and the cognitive paradigm (CP paradigm) was born. Research was conducted from the perspective of interpreting as a form of cognitive processing (ibid: 17), and the linguistic features of interpreting became less prominent (ibid: 17).

In the 1980s also “the process-oriented conception of text linguistics, as developed in particular by Robert de Beaugrande (1980) based on advances in cognitive science, helped direct attention to the interpreter’s text product” (ibid: 17). This embodied a new theorization according to which interpreting was considered a ‘purposeful’ activity (ibid: 17). The goal of interpreting was seen to be the production of a target text which was functional in the target culture, i.e. to serve the target culture. This was known as the target text paradigm (TT Paradigm).

As seen above, until the 1990s, much of the research had investigated the work of the conference interpreter. In the 1990s, dialogue interpreting gained much more attention from researchers (Hale, 2007: 200; Pöchhacker, 1999: 125). According to Pöchhacker (1999) “the first international conference on ‘Interpreters in the Community’ held at Geneva Park near Toronto, Canada, in 1995, represents the most important landmark in this respect [...]” (inverted commas in original). The publication of Wadensjö’s seminal work *Interpreting as Interaction* in 1998 constituted a turning point in how DI was theorized. Wadensjö showed that the interpreter was far from being a passive entity in the IME. Since then, the question has not been whether the interpreter is actively involved, but how this involvement is manifested. Prior to Wadensjö, there was a ‘prescriptive approach’ (Rudvin, 2006: 21) towards interpreting. The interpreter was viewed as an individual who was there in

order to convey a message produced by one interlocutor to another interlocutor without the interpreter having any influence on the production of this message. This mode of theorization has been replaced by “[...] an increasing appreciation among scholars and practitioners in the field of the fact that language – and thus the interpreter’s performance – is a much more complex, interactive affair situated in a larger institution, cultural and ‘political’ framework [...]” (Rudvin, 2006: 21).

## **2.4 Role and (dis)empowerment<sup>34</sup>**

The research questions in this study (section 0.2.1) require that the renditions<sup>35</sup> are investigated and the interpreter and the immigrant are asked about some of them, that each for a different purpose, of course<sup>36</sup>. This inevitably brings with it the question of the role of the interpreter and the related concept of empowerment in the case of the immigrant. Further discussion of this interrelation will be provided in the following sections. In the section immediately below, the researcher will discuss how Role has been addressed in the DI literature.

### **2.4.1 Role**

Role has traditionally been an important topic for researchers in DI, and will probably continue to be so in the foreseeable future. The researcher argues there are many reasons for this, including the following: a) DI is interdisciplinary, which means that it is approached from diverse epistemological and ontological perspectives, b) there are many interests at stake when interpreters are called in, c) there is no authority which has the mandate to impose the maintenance of a certain role, and d) there seems to be a desire on the part of researchers to reach a consensus for a role definition on a global level, which is a very challenging matter. It is not the

---

<sup>34</sup> In DI literature, especially that on immigration, the immigrant is often theorized as a *disempowered* figure who needs to be empowered (see section 2.4.2 below). This is why this expression has been used like this.

<sup>35</sup> A rendition is a translated utterance (see Part II in chapter Three).

<sup>36</sup> Detailed information is provided on the methodology of this study in chapter Four.

aim of this thesis to further theorize on this. Rather, it will focus on Role matters relevant to this study, especially regarding to the motivation behind the desire to (re-)address this concept.

The conduit metaphor of communication<sup>37</sup> seems to have ceased to be supported by DI researchers in their characterization of the role of the interpreter, the well-known and influential work of Wadensjö (1998) having shown that the interpreter actively participates in the process of sense-making. However, as mentioned earlier, researchers have not lost their appetite for investigating the role. Throughout the nineties and the last decade and a half, there have been studies on role. In the following sections, a number of reasons/explanations will be discussed why researchers continue to (re-)address this issue<sup>38</sup>:

#### **2.4.1.1 Addressing the interrelation between the setting where the interpreting takes place and the interests of the immigrant**

The reason for re-addressing Role seems sometimes to be the setting where interpreting takes place, in combination with the interests of the foreigner which are thought to be at stake. The interrelation between Role and these interests is a subject which seems to be thought not have been sufficiently theorized, possibly due to the multiplicity of the parties involved and the ambiguity researchers feel regarding the prescribed tasks of these parties and how they perform in reality. This ambiguity seems to be one of the reasons why some researchers re-investigated Role. In a recent article, Gibb and Good (2014) seem to have felt the need to re-explore Role, by focusing on the “interplay between language and intercultural communication [assisted by interpreters] within refugee status determination procedures in the UK and France [...]” They conclude that the role of the interpreter is a

---

<sup>37</sup> In DI research, the interpreter was supposed to be like a device through which messages are exchanged between the professional and the foreigner. The interpreter was thought not to have any influence on the interaction.

<sup>38</sup> The decision to discuss which publication(s) under each topic (i.e. topics discussed in sections 2.4.1.1-2.4.1.5) is related to the topic that is being discussed and are meant to be representative, not exhaustive.

complex one (ibid: 396), referring, among other things, to the differing expectations of the institutions they work for regarding their role, and the periodic contradictions which may be found in the code of conduct of these institutions. Given the importance and complexity of this issue, further studies on the topic are expected.

#### **2.4.1.2 Thinking about how to help the interpreter and the institution for a role that is more engaging**

As mentioned above, in DI research, interpreters have been theorized since the 1990s as active participants in IMEs. Researchers have not stopped revisiting the notion of Role. There have been researchers who seem to aim to go on to the next stage of research, beyond the question whether or not the interpreter is actively involved or not.

Jiang et al. (2014), for example, attempted to help the interpreter (and also, indirectly, the professionals who call them in) to develop a mechanism according to which they can take translation decisions: Jiang and his colleagues attempted to “model a set of interdependent parameters that influence the interpreter’s decisions in an interpreting situation” (ibid: 292). The idea is that the interpreter develops a set of criteria which help him/her in different interpreting settings to take decisions. The researcher argues that it is possible that interpreters might welcome such an attempt; however, it is unclear how the proposed model will help in practice. It is also not clear how different stakeholders in the IME will respond to this and whether the model will cover different interpreters from different cultures.

Felberg and Skaaden (2012) also attempted to make a contribution regarding the issue of role. While Jian et al (2014) attempt to empower the interpreter by giving them tools, Felberg and Skaaden attempt to convince the professional to change their perspective on the role of the interpreter in those settings where ‘culture’ is used as an explanatory tool for miscommunication. They argue that in Norway ‘culture’ is too often used as an explanatory tool when communication fails, even in cases where this is not warranted. They believe it is not wise to put all the blame on culture and

thus to expect the interpreter to deal with it. The researcher argues that this is a refreshing way of looking at IMEs as it happens too often that “[...] general levels of human interaction, e.g. concentration or language proficiency [...]” (Felberg and Skaaden, 2012: 96) are not taken into consideration when IMEs are investigated<sup>39</sup>. It is unfortunate that this is the case as my data also show findings related to situational constraints which cause the interpreter take certain decisions, of a type not necessarily related to culture, but rather to concentration, remembering, etc.

Shisheng and Shuang (2012) also re-address Role. They think that researchers have not managed thus far to account for the complicated nature of intercultural interactions (ibid: 45). They argue that the researcher must leave the “what role the interpreter should take”-era and focus more on what the interpreter should do in such interaction and where he should intervene more (ibid: 45), in cases where communication will not go smoothly if cultural issues are not addressed properly. This study also reminds one of the studies above. It is striking how Shisheng and Shuang differ from that of Felberg and Skaaden (2012); Shisheng and Shuang argue for providing the interpreter with more powers regarding the treatment of ‘culture’ while Felberg and Skaaden call for the professional to take more responsibility in this regard.

These studies above have in common that they try to empower the participant in IMEs by empowering the interpreter. Addressing Role and attempting to critically address it is not new, of course. Some researchers argued in the past that there must be a more critical attitude towards role. Kaufert and Putsch (1997), for instance, question whether the end-users should want the neutral attitude they expect from the interpreter who works for the court and police to be adhered to when these interpreters work in a healthcare setting. Barsky (1993; 2005) suggested that drastic measures should be taken. He explained the difficult position of the foreigner and suggested that the interpreter be given the role of intercultural mediator, a position which was forbidden in Canada, and was not favoured in many

---

<sup>39</sup> In this thesis too, non-cultural issues have been found to influence how sense-making progresses (see chapter Four).

countries in the 1990s. For more on Barsky's contribution, see section 2.4.2.1 below.

### **2.4.1.3 Addressing the perspective of the interpreters about their role**

A number of researchers have focused on the perspective of interpreters regarding their role, presumably because this provides information which is otherwise inaccessible, and can be illuminating<sup>40</sup>. Napier (2013), for example, investigates how Asian language DI interpreters see their role, and the possible cultural conflicts they face. The findings show that they see their task as facilitators of communication, and that they think that interpreting in their language combinations is different from that between "two Western or Indo-European languages" (ibid: 45). Although such survey-based research is needed, the conclusion that the findings of the study have potential implications for the education of interpreters, as Napier does, seems to be misplaced, as the percentage of respondents was very small as Napier herself states.

Bischoff et al. (2012), aiming at examining how interpreters perceive their work "within the context of the integration of immigrants" identify four main interpreter roles, only one of which corresponds to the 'official role' (ibid: 1) of word-for-word interpreting, while the other roles are taken when necessary to facilitate communication. Bischoff et al. (2012) and Napier (2013) have in common that the responding interpreters see the importance of their role as facilitating communication. The difference is that Bischoff et al.'s respondents seem to be less vocal about the complexity of their role and seem to suggest that the prescribed role types could be accepted in certain cases, while those of Napier talk in a more assertive way about their role as facilitators of communication.

Other studies which address the perspectives of interpreters about their role include Hale (2011), which concentrates on the views of

---

<sup>40</sup> As we will see in chapter Five, this approach can provide interesting insights, as happened in this study.

interpreters on the positive sides of their work/role. This represents a new way of approaching DI practitioners. The respondents were found to be happy with their work and felt respected by the professional and foreigner alike (ibid: 234). While Hale recognizes that no claims could be made about the representativeness of these findings, the researcher shares her view that these positive perceptions are indeed welcome. DI needs to attract new practitioners and such studies could help in giving the profession a better image than it has now, especially due to the tendency of DI researcher to focus on negative issues as Hale says.

Hsieh (2006) also takes the perspectives of interpreters. Utilizing in-depth interviews, she attempts to understand the role-distance shown by interpreters during medical IMEs. She identifies four sources of conflict that interpreters are confronted with during their work. Analysing how interpreters manage these, Hsieh argues that in order to understand interpreters' actions, these need to be analysed in the light of the communicative actions of the other interlocutors. Hsieh (2006; p. 729) argues that interpreters feel forced to depart from their prescribed word-for-word role due to the interactional/communicative strategies of the professional and the foreigner, in order to accommodate to their communicative goals. The findings of my study corroborate those of Hsieh regarding the influence of the professional and foreigner on the strategies of the interpreter. Further similar research is needed. Foley (2006) takes the perspective of the interpreter from a more macro-level. He examines the concept of Client from their perspective and compares it with that of the lawyer, arguing that awareness of the difference is important for all parties. He identifies two types of interpreters in terms of their perspectives: those who rejected the notion of client and those who recognizes it but mentioned that this did not mean they favoured their client over the other party (the foreigner or the party representing the host culture). Rightfully, Foley draws the attention of the lawyer to this difference in perspectives. It needs to be stated here that issue of face must be taken into consideration when such studies are done. Face might not have been an issue in Foley (2006) as the research was done as part of a training programme. However, the researcher believes that a larger-scale study using questionnaires could provide even richer data, for face-threatening

issues would be even less significant. A further study is that of Leanza (2005), which investigates the roles of interpreters from the perspectives of interpreters, physicians and researchers.

While the researcher recognizes that it is impossible to frame all the roles different interpreters think they should be allowed to perform, it is undeniably important to elicit these perspectives from the interpreter, as they will provide policy-makers and others with valuable insights into how interpreters think about their role(s).

#### **2.4.1.4 Addressing the perspective of the foreigner about the role of the interpreter**

In professional settings, and particularly intercultural ones, where different individuals need to communicate, it is likely that the different stakeholders have different views on things. It is also likely that researchers in such cases will want to know the perspective of these stakeholders. Jacobsen (2009: 155) claims that “[...] research in community interpreting has traditionally centred on role perceptions and expectations among users of interpreting services and interpreting practitioners.” This may not be quite true, unless she means by “users of interpreting services” the institutions and individuals who belong to the host countries, not the foreigner. There are only a few studies which address the perspective of the foreigner regarding the role of the interpreter (Williams, 2005: 41) by talking to the foreigner himself. It is fairly remarkable that there is no extensive body of such research already. Among the studies which adopted this methodology are the following.

Edwards et al. (2005a) investigated the qualities of a good interpreter from the perspective of foreigners, both professional and non-professional (i.e. family and/or friends). Their conclusion is that “personal character and trust are important in people’s understandings of good interpreting [...]” (ibid: 77). In a fairly recent study, Watermeyer (2011) mentions that the voice of the patient is neglected in healthcare and that there is a lack of knowledge on what the patient’s needs and preferences are regarding the work of the interpreter (ibid: 71-72). She suggests that in healthcare situations a “flexible

approach based on patient preferences and communicative needs may be more successful in realizing communication goals and achieving patient-centred interactions” (ibid: 71).

This kind of research is needed as it can provide invaluable information on the foreigner’s needs and preferences. However, the difficulty of accessing data due to ethical and practical issues could be a reason why there is not an extensive of body of research on this. This makes my study unique, since I was able to access the point of view of the foreigner and have gathered some insightful information on this (see Part II in chapter Five).

#### **2.4.1.5 Explaining the actual ‘actions’ of the interpreter**

The actual work of the interpreter as an activity has been a central theme in interpreting research since the 1990s. The conduit metaphor seems largely to have ceased to be supported by researchers<sup>41</sup>. However, no clear-cut consensus has been reached by researchers on how this role should be manifested in reality. For this reason, researchers have retained their appetite for investigating the actual work delivered by the interpreter, even after Wadensjö (1992, 1995, and 1998) had managed to show that the interpreter is far from being a passive participant. Roy (2000), focussing on the responsibility of the interpreter for “maintaining flow and communication” (Tipton, 2011), corroborates the findings of Wadensjö and shows the engagement of the interpreter on the micro-level in various activities, contradicting the traditional view that the role of the interpreter is passive. A few years later, presumably driven by a desire to apply the same theoretical underpinnings mentioned above on asylum hearing, Pöllabauer (2004a) researched the work of the interpreter in asylum hearings, using a discourse analytical approach to investigate authentic asylum hearings (ibid: 143). The interpreter was found to often take on discrepant roles, which “may at times

---

<sup>41</sup> This seems also to be true for many end-users of interpreting (e.g. the lawyer in this study). However, as argued in the previous section, the researcher believes that there is a lack of research into the perspectives of the foreigner about the question “what is the role of the interpreter?” and expects that interesting insights can be collected. The foreigner in this study said that he thinks that “the interpreter should translate what the lawyer says.” This statement can mean different things for different foreigners.

be determined by the perceived expectations of the officers in charge.” Although the theoretical approach used, Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), is a valuable analytical tool, the researcher would argue that caution is recommended when conclusions are drawn about intentions as presented by Pöllabauer regarding the reason behind the actions of the interpreter. Enriching the findings with interviews with the interpreter could provide further illuminating data. If proven difficult to realize, well-designed questionnaires can be used in which questions could be formulated based on the findings of the CDA-based analysis.

It seems that there are also some researchers who not only assume the active involvement of interpreters, but also want to take the discussion further: how this involvement manifests itself in real-life situations in settings that interest them (i.e. the researchers). Merlini (2009), for example, maintaining the term ‘cultural mediation’ to refer to the work of the interpreter, presents findings which show the interpreter as being extremely involved in the interaction. He is seen to be active on the sense-making level even when the professional is absent. In this respect, Merlini not only corroborates the findings Wadensjö, etc., but also gives them even greater emphasis.

It is noticeable that almost 14 years after Wadensjö’s *Interpreting as Interaction*, Mason and Ren (2012) still considered it was necessary to refer to the traditional view of the role of interpreter as “[...] transparent, invisible, passive, neutral, and detached [...]” (ibid: 233), presumably partly to present a theoretical stance against which to contrast their own theoretical stance, which is that the interpreter is a “ co-constructor of the interaction and can therefore be a powerful figure” (ibid: 213). Adopting an adapted definition of Michel Foucault’s concept of power, the researchers argued for seeing the interpreter as an empowerment figure, even though they might be considered to have less power than the professional, for example. Thus, these researchers seem to be taking a new theoretical step: towards attempting to get the role of the interpreter as an empowering figure recognized by the stakeholders, which is not yet the case, as these Mason and Ren argue (ibid: 249).

Departing from the known assumptions about interpreting and viewing IMEs as communicative events and interactive processes, Li (2013) also seems to want to take DI a step forward. She argues that there is a need to deepen our knowledge of the co-constructive mechanism of these processes, hoping to provide more in-depth information on these interactive process for the benefit of “interpreters and medical professionals who work with them.” The study of Li (2013) involves “co-constructed turn-design as a generic phenomenon in interpreted spoken discourse, focusing on how the primary speaker’s (the doctor’s in particular) behaviour can influence that of the interpreter” and on the “interactional determination of actions of the interlocutor” (ibid: 147). This kind of study can help understand how actual cases of IME take place and can also be used to train interpreters, and medical staff in how to engage with the interpreter in such interactions.

In the current section (2.4.1), we saw that the concept of Role has not lost its potential for research. Different reasons have been presented why this is the case in sections (2.4.1.1-2.4.1.5). In section 2.4.2, which follows, I will discuss the interrelated concept of (dis-)empowerment. I will start to explain this interrelation firstly.

## **2.4.2 (Dis)empowerment**

Many studies on interpreting involve settings where the alien is in a foreign country and where he or she does not speak the language, or not well enough, and needs the help of (a) professional(s) in the host culture. When interpreters are called in in such cases, it seems inevitable that interpreting researchers try to investigate how the disempowered position of the immigrant is dealt with by the interpreter within the framework of their prescribed and actual roles. In the following sections (2.4.2.1 – 2.4.2.3), the researcher will discuss some of the studies which have addressed this concept.

### 2.4.2.1 Studies aimed at eliminating disempowerment

It can be argued that there have been researchers who have had in common that they wanted to serve the foreigner by attempting to eliminate their disempowerment. It has been suggested in some of these studies that this can be achieved by easing the burden on the interpreter and re-empowering the professional. For example, Felberg and Skaaden (2012) argue that professionals in health-care settings too often ascribe miscommunication to culture, and argue that it is tricky to standardly use the concept of culture as an explanatory tool for miscommunication. They warn against 'othering' the foreigner and putting the entire responsibility on the shoulders of the interpreter, thereby disempowering the foreigner. Instead they suggest that the professional should "[...] refrain from using culture as an overall explanatory tool and reframe the assignment of the problem source" (ibid: 108), which could be issues related to concentration or language proficiency, rather than culture<sup>42</sup>. The researcher argues that there is a connection issue related to the data which was used: the participating professionals' and interpreters' frame of reference were different IMEs each time. This can have consequences for the conclusions of the study. Nonetheless the study remains valuable. Further, it seems that the foreigner has not been included in the study, which would have provided more in-depth knowledge. This has, however, been done by Williams (2005), who examines interpreting services from the perspective of the foreigner. She considers refugees to be vulnerable, and proposes that all parties in the encounter be educated about how to work with interpreters.

Among the scholars who have addressed (dis)empowerment is Barsky (1993; 1994; 1996; 2005), who looked at communication breakdowns in refugee hearings. He focused on the malfunctions of interpreters during such hearings and analysed the reasons for them, considering the huge related legal consequences of such malfunctions for the immigrant. Barsky calls for the expansion of the role of the interpreter by giving him more space and tools, which he thinks are needed to relieve the disempowered position of the immigrant in the Canadian asylum system (1993: 133-4). What Barsky (1993)

---

<sup>42</sup> Some of these findings are corroborated in my study (see chapters Five and Six).

left unaddressed, however, is the immigrant and their responsibilities to make the interaction succeed. The researcher believes that an immigrant who is well-informed regarding the role of the interpreter and the legal system will reduce the burden on the interpreter. In his article published in 2005, Barsky calls for a further expansion of the role of the interpreter. He links this to exceptional cases in which the human rights of the immigrant are endangered by the 'System'. He advises that the interpreter should play a more active role in the interaction and in effect act as an activist in favour of the foreigner. He does, however, set conditions for this, arguing that not every 'translator' is suitable for this kind of interpreting and not every kind of situation is suitable for this kind of interpreting. The suggestions which are made are understandable. However, questions arise regarding the practical implications of this in respect of labelling, training and recruiting of interpreters. It is, to mention only one example, possible that the 'System' might distrust the interpreters who have taken up such tasks in the past.

Jacquemet (2011) also addresses the problems which foreigners can face as a result of the 'unexpected' nature of the narration in the asylum procedure in the Western world. Like Barsky, he warns against 'communicative breakdowns' which can take place due to the vast difference between the communicative worlds of the foreigner and those of the professional who assesses their asylum claims, especially because the latter uses a type of communication with which the foreigner is not familiar: "late-modern communication, characterized as it is by asymmetrical power, multiple communicative agents [...]" (Jacquemet, 2011: 475). In this, he seems to be agreeing with Barsky (1993; 1994; 1996 and 2005) that the foreigner is a disempowered figure.

There are also studies which deal with the issue of empowerment/disempowerment from another angle, that of seeing the interpreter as an empowering figure. These will be considered in the following sections.

#### **2.4.2.2 Studies which show the interpreter as an empowerment figure**

Although there have been many studies which have shown that the interpreter is an active participant during the IME, reaffirming the findings of Wadensjö (1998), even seasoned researchers like Mason still think that a readdressing of Role is needed. Within this framework, Mason and Ren (2012) argue that the interpreter should be seen an '*empowerment figure*' [italics in original] (ibid: 233) in IMEs. They shed light on this aspect of the role of the interpreter by analysing authentic material from encounters, using the concept of power as understood by Michel Foucault (ibid: 233). They argue that interpreters are capable of empowering the foreigner and by assisting them to "exercise their responsibility to make decisions for themselves" (ibid: 243). Such studies show us the complexity of intercultural communicative events, how much is at stake for foreigners and the fact that there is no consensus agreed on by all those interested in such research.

#### **2.4.2.3 Studies which explain how/why disempowerment takes place**

Dealing with the disempowered position of the foreigner has enjoyed attention from DI researchers. Examining the studies below, it becomes clear that all agree that the foreigner is in a communicatively unfavourable position. They all aim to shed light on this issue, presumably to alert the parties dealing with foreigners to the problem, with the aim of empowering them. However, not all researchers have the same view of what this empowerment should look like.

Some of the researchers adopt a more radical approach than others. Barsky (1993; 1994), for example, suggests drastic measures, which were revolutionary in their time. He explains the difficult position of the foreigner and suggests that the interpreter be given the role of intercultural mediator, a position which, as noted in section 2.4.1.2 above, was forbidden in Canada in that context.

Other studies which deal with how/why this disempowerment takes place are Blommaert (2001), who addresses the narrative inequality of African asylum seekers, showing that the expected narrative (by the state) does not match the narrative resources of the immigrant (ibid: 445), and Maryns (2006), who investigates the discursive processes in the asylum procedure and the possible influence of these on the future of the asylum seeker in Belgium. She shows that 'reality' is constructed during the procedure without enough attention being given to "narrative-linguistic diversity and multilingual speaker repertoires", which results in disempowering the asylum seeker (Maryns, 2006: (cover page)). Both of these studies show the disempowered position of the immigrant in the asylum seeking context. Both, arguably, aim to draw the attention of the parties to these issues. The difference between these studies and those of Barsky is that the latter seems to be more concerned with highlighting the extreme disempowered position of the immigrant, explaining how this happens and suggesting ways of dealing with it that can be embedded in the design of the asylum procedure related to removing the mismatch between the capacities of the foreigner and the expectations of the 'System'. Blommaert and Maryns, by contrast, seem to concentrate more on the system than the interpreter, as is the case with Barsky. Maryns (2006) focuses more how the 'system' works and shows the disempowered position of the foreigner within it. Like Blommaert she shows that there is a mismatch between what the system expects from the foreigner and how his narrative is structured. More specifically, Blommaert (2001) concentrates on the "inequality" of narratives between the asylum seeker and the narrative requirements of the Belgian asylum procedure, while Maryns (2006) concentrates more on how these are cast into texts as required by the Belgian authorities. Both bring to the fore the disempowering nature of these asylum procedures.

A number of scholars, such as Keselman et al. (2010), focus more on the question of how disempowerment takes place. They attempt to "shed light on the ways the asylum-seeking children might be disempowered in the context of asylum hearings, especially when unskilled interpreters are involved" (ibid: 100). Baraldi (2009) too indicates that the foreigner is disempowered by the

interpreter in a health-care setting, such that “mediation mainly supports a doctor-centred communication, preventing the empowerment of linguistic and cultural minorities” (ibid: 120). Both of these studies seem to be concerned to show how sense-making works in practice in DI settings. Theories and models are general idealizations (ibid: 100) while these scholars want to show how things happen in real-life situations. Again, the aim is to show the disempowerment presumably with the aim that the institutions concerned will deal with it.

In this section (2.4.2), I have addressed the concept of (dis-)empowerment in relation to DI research. Different aspects have been discussed in sections 2.4.2.1-2.4.2.3. In sections 2.5-2.5.7 below, the researcher will discuss the methods of data collection which have been used in DI research. The aim is to investigate the thinking behind the choices which are made.

## **2.5 Methods of data collection and methodologies**

Researchers must take many decisions when they do research. Some of these concern the interrelationship between the theoretical underpinnings of their study and the method(s) of data collection. When data is collected, careful consideration is needed to achieve a balance between what the researcher wants to achieve and the methods they need to use to achieve their aims. It is also important to refer to the limitations of the study when addressing this interrelationship. In this section, the researcher will address data collection methods found in the literature. The titles used in the following sections are inspired by the thesis of Dr Rebecca Tipton (2011).

### **2.5.1 (Natural) discourse as text**

Many researchers have utilized (natural) discourse in their studies (Mason, 2006: 362). This is to be expected as DI by its very nature involves natural language. Examples of these studies are Barsky (1993), Dimitrova (1997), Hale (1997) Wadensjö (1995; 1998), Blinstrubaité (2000), Mason and Stewart (2001), Pöllabauer (2004a), Barsky (2005), Leanza (2005), Merlini

and Favaron (2005), Apfelbaum (2007), Baumgarten et al. (2008), Eraslan Gercek (2008), Baraldi (2009), Merlini (2009), Keselman et al. (2010), Amato and Garwood (2011), Christensen (2011), Gavioli and Baraldi (2011), Jacquemet (2011), Watermeyer (2011), Mason and Ren (2012), Major and Napier (2012), Fogtmann Fosgerau (2013), Berge (2014), Gallez and Maryns (2014), Lai and Mulayim (2014), and Raymond (2014).

In the following section, the researcher will address one of the questions which need to be asked when this type of data is employed, that is, which type of natural data should be used?

### **2.5.1.1 Type of natural data: audio-recorded or video-recorded**

When natural data is utilized, there are decisions that need to be made and considerations that need to be taken, for example, do we use audio- or video-recorded data. These decisions are related to the research agenda of the researcher. To take an example, Mason and Ren (2012) cite examples “from authentic interpreting events to analyse interpreters’ power-at-work, focusing on their verbal and non-verbal behaviours, in particular, their positing and gaze.” It seems self-evident that they needed natural data – their research agenda prescribes this, as they are studying how sense is developing during the interactions. This research agenda of theirs requires not only natural data but even video-recorded data, for there is no other way to study non-verbal behaviour than through visual access to it.

However, in addition to the fact that access to natural data could be a problem for DI researchers, video recording is not always absolutely crucial, for example in cases like Fogtman Fosgerau (2013), who “explores excerpts from Danish naturalization interviews” and utilizes *excerpts from interview (authentic texts)*. Although it is true that if Fogtman Fosgerau had had access to video-recorded material the analysis would have been richer, she was able to conduct interviews with the police personnel who conducted the naturalization interviews. By incorporating their perspective into how sense

was made during these naturalization interviews, the researcher might have managed to compensate for some of the elements of sense-making. In such cases, the researcher needs to explain to the reader the limitations of the study, the decisions taken, and the implication of these decisions.

In other studies, the lack of visual data is more problematic. For example, Keselman et al. (2010) had no access to video-recorded data. In their study into how the “participation status of asylum-seeking children is interactively constructed in interpreter-mediated asylum hearings”, they utilized transcribed asylum hearings: a discourse-analytical approach was utilized to analyse 50 non-repair side-sequences. In this study, the analysis would have been richer if the perspective of at least one type of participant had been incorporated. For sense-making is much more than its transcribed aspects, as will be observed in my study too (see chapter Six). Difficulty of access to video-recorded material may have played a role in it not having been used.

Other researchers might try to get around the problem of data collection by utilizing televised material. Mason and Stewart (2001), possibly partly due to data collection considerations, utilize data presented in a televised documentary about immigration to Britain. Transcripts were used in addition to a literal translation of the original Polish. Interactional pragmatics is utilized to analyse the data. Although the researcher might have done the recording differently and taken another approach, adapting the research questions to the material available can be a good way of dealing with the problem of non-availability of video-recordings.

Having access to video recordings is also not always a total solution. Baraldi (2009), for example, uses “video-taped interpreter-mediated interactions, focussing on the mediators’ translation activity, and on its relationship with the cultural presuppositions in the medical system.” The utilization of video recordings gives the analysis an extra dimension; however, the analysis would have been further enriched if it had been possible to take the perspectives of the participants into account. Cultural presuppositions, which are a pragmatic concept, suggest that a monologic way of theorizing sense-making is adopted. It would be interesting to see how the analysis would look like if a dialogic approach was adopted to sense-making.

As has been seen in this section, there are decisions which have to be made about data collection which are related to the research agenda of the study and the theoretical underpinnings of the researcher. One of these decisions concerns which type of natural needs to be utilized, audio or video. The approach of utilizing (natural) discourse as data brings with it possibilities but also challenges. Reliability, bias, validity, etc. are issues which need to be addressed seriously when natural data is used. It is imperative that the interests of the immigrant are given precedence over those of the researcher.

### **2.5.2 Experimental approach**

Research in DI does not depend only on natural data. There are research agendas for which there could be a need to conduct an experiment, whether or not complemented with natural data. Berk-Seligson (1989) uses this method in order to simulate how interpreters act in courtroom settings with the view of investigating how certain pragmatic features displayed in interpreter performance are received by jurors. The researcher is a court interpreter and is aware of the influence of the presence of the audience and the judges. In studies with this approach to data, it would be important to refer to this lack of the influence of the audience, in the discussion.

### **2.5.3 Artefact analysis**

In DI research, artefacts are sometimes used as a unit of analysis, maybe complemented by another method. An illustrative example is the exploratory study conducted by Liu and Chiu (2009). The researchers aimed at “[...] identifying indicators that may be used to predict source material difficulty [...]” for interpreters. Texts were chosen as experimental material (ibid: 247). The researchers seem to have realized that their research would be richer if they also utilized another source of information. They incorporated “[e]xpert judgement” in the analysis. This is undoubtedly a good approach in studies with this agenda.

Although this method does not seem to enjoy much popularity, there are studies in which it has been used (e.g. Smirnov (1997), Pöchhacker (1999), Blinstrubaité (2000), Maryns and Blommaert (2001), Pöchhacker (2001), Baumgarten et al. (2008), Minhua and Yu-Hsien (2009), Jacquemet (2011), Norström et al. (2012) Bancroft et al. (2013), Gibb and Good (2014), Raymond (2014), and Li (2015)).

The researcher argues that caution has to be exercised when research is conducted which concerns sense-making when researchers decide to take this data approach. For example, Liu and Chiu's approach, mentioned above, would not be sufficient if it was used in studies which look at communication in IMEs. Research in sense-making should as far as possible incorporate the perspective of the parties involved. Artefact analysis would not provide enough information about how the sense-making process develops for an in-depth study of sense-making.

#### **2.5.4 Survey research**

Doing surveys is a popular method in DI research. In addition to reasons related to its accessibility, this type of data is arguably less intrusive than accessing natural data. In addition, the research aims play a central role in the choice of the methods of data collection. These aims can sometimes motivate the researcher to triangulate surveys to other methods, for example natural data. Example of studies which have utilized the survey-research approach are Mesa (2000), Edwards et al. (2005b), Eraslan Gercek (2008), Bontempo and Napier (2011), Christensen (2011), Hale (2011), Bischoff et al. (2012), Napier (2013), Hadziabdic et al. (2014), and Vargas-Urpi (2014).

Survey research is a valuable approach, and if used alone, could help in cases where static facts need to be researched, for example issues related to the type of education the interpreter has had. However, if the method is to be utilized for other purposes, such as analysing discourse, then it should be triangulated with another method into order to address the process of sense-making in a more robust manner.

One of the examples which can be referred to is the study conducted by Hadziabdic et al. (2014). Their aims were to “describe and document aspects of Arabic-speaking individuals’ attitudes to the use of interpreters in healthcare”, using a self-administered 51-item questionnaire. Although their approach provides much needed information, it should not be used to draw conclusions which go beyond their own exploratory nature. It is also important that studies like this one refer to their own limitations.

### **2.5.5 Ethnography/participant observation**

Ethnography/participant observation is an approach that has also been employed in DI research, presumably to examine first-hand how communication takes place in IMEs. Below are examples of studies which were conducted utilizing ethnographic methods. Undoubtedly this tool is a powerful one. However, everything of course depends on the aims of the investigation. One cannot use only participant observations and then make sweeping claims about how the sense-making processes developed. As will be seen in chapter Three, sense-making is a complex process and requires a more in-depth investigation. Without this investigation, the sense-making aspects which it was not possible to incorporate in the analysis need to be mentioned in the limitations. Ethnography/participant observation is especially valuable if combined with other investigatory tools as is done by Norström et al. (2012), who also utilized interviews and discussions with the relevant participants in addition to observations, in addition to artefacts.

Examples of studies that have used Ethnography/participant observation include: Wadensjö (1995; 1998), Keselman et al. (2010), Christensen (2011), Jacquemet (2011), Watermeyer (2011), Norström et al. (2012), Gibb and Good (2014), Gallez and Maryns (2014), and Raymond (2014).

### **2.5.6 Mixed methods**

Mixed methods approach is a popular approach within DI research. This approach is adopted in order to triangulate data, for example when the

researcher wants to investigate sense-making, for example to find out whether the foreigner understood the renditions. However, sometimes, the researcher might choose to collect data from different sources, not necessarily to triangulate, for example when the researcher to gauge the opinions of two parties for two different objectives in the same study.

Examples of studies which have used mixed methods include: Wadensjö (1995; 1998); Blinstrubaité (2000), Leanza (2005), Christensen (2011), Watermeyer (2011), Norström et al. (2012), Fogtman Fosgerau (2013), Napier (2013), Gallez and Maryns (2014), Gibb and Good (2014) and Vargas-Urpi (2014). I will now examine the most relevant of these for the current study.

In Vargas-Urpi (2014) “qualitative interviews were held with interpreters and mediators who work with Chinese people and with coordinators of PSI and intercultural mediation.” In addition, quantitative questionnaires were sent to Chinese users of public services. The researcher aimed to study the “specificities of interpreting for the Chinese community”. The data generated were analysed independently. The technique of triangulation was used for the validation of the results and “to compare and contrast the information collected from each sample of informants.” The study sheds light on “some specificities and challenges of PSI for the Chinese” with regard to issues such as “Chinese linguistic diversity, mediating between cultures and gaining users’ trust.” As can be observed the researcher aimed to incorporate the views of all parties concerned. However, if the questionnaire had been replaced by interviews, more insightful information could have been elicited. Interviews would be more powerful in eliciting information in studies like this one as the process of sense-making would be more fully reconstructable. The researcher is aware of the fact that time and resources could form an obstacle, in which case the study must report this in the limitations.

### **2.5.7. Interviews**

As we will see in chapter Four, interviews are a powerful ethnographic tool. Some DI researchers have exploited them (e.g. Leanza (2005), Williams

(2005), Bogner et al. (2010), Watermeyer (2011), Norström et al. (2012), Fogtman Fosgerau (2013), Napier (2013), Gibb and Good (2014), and Vargas-Urpi (2014)). They used this tool to extract natural data, directly from the participants.

Williams (2005: 42) utilized semi-structured, qualitative interviews with eight interpreters “who work in services for refugees and asylum seekers in London and Kent” (ibid: 42) to investigate contemporary issues regarding when interpreter are called in. She did this from the perspective of refugees and asylum seekers in the UK. This type of study should be replicated as the researcher believes that the voice of the interpreter and the foreigner is still not really heard sufficiently in DI research (especially when it comes to conducting how sense-making develops on micro-level). This is especially the case with those who speak Middle Eastern languages, and is striking in the light of the apparently unending wave of immigration from that part of the world. Bogner et al (2010: 518) employed interviews aiming to “explore the factors involved in the disclosure of sensitive personal information during Home Office interviews in the UK.” In studies like this and the preceding one, issues of bias, reliability and trustworthiness need to be given significant attention.

In this section, I discussed the methods of data collection and the methodologies used in DI research. In each section (2.5.1-2.5.7), I discussed one type and analysed its methods and methodologies. In the last section (2.5.7), I discussed interviews, arguing that they are a powerful method of investigation. In the following section, I will demonstrate my contribution to the field, showing the key role played by interviewing.

## **2.6 Contribution of this study**

This study contributes to the field on several levels, the first being the type of IME. To my knowledge, the type of IME that is studied in this thesis has not been studied previously. Regardless, the research questions that are investigated and/or the data-elicitation methods that are adopted are new. It is true that there are studies in which researchers talk to immigrants and/or

interpreters (see sections 2.4.1.3 and 2.4.1.4 for examples), however, the methodology is different. The type of data collection methods these studies utilize are different as are the aims, in that this study addresses the sense-making processes on micro-level. In addition, what strikes the researcher is that there are not many studies that deal with contexts in which the immigrant is from the Middle East. This needs to change in the light of the waves of immigrants from the Arabic-speaking world.

In addition to the type of IME under investigation, this study also contributes to the field in terms of theory; it adds another dimension to the analysis, enabling the researcher to incorporate STK/R into it (see chapter Three). This new theoretical dimension calls for enriching the data collection methods, which is thought to be another contribution: reflective interviews are used in this study to enable the participants to reflect on the process of sense-making. This approach has not been previously adopted in DI as far I am aware, at least in the way I have used them in this study. Regarding the fourth and last contribution, as indicated in the introduction to the thesis (section 0.2), there is also a need on the part of many interpreters to have access to this type of data, in order to be able to see how other interpreters work. This type of data can also be used by curriculum designers to reflect on points which they might consider including in their training programmes.

## 2.7 Conclusion

This chapter has provided the necessary background for understanding the thesis. It started by providing various definitions of DI (section 2.1), highlighting the fact that there is no single agreed-upon definition of the profession, and that there is no consensus regarding which name should be used to refer to it (section 2.2). In the light of the complexity of this profession and the many contexts in which it is practiced this is not a surprise. It is even possible that this multiplicity of names serves the interests of the profession rather than harming it. If these names are used in an informed manner, they might even help practitioners and clients alike to get a structured view of how they may orientate themselves towards the profession.

In section 2.2.1, the researcher explained why he has decided to adopt the term Dialogue Interpreting in this thesis. In the following section (2.3), the researcher provided some historical background to contextualize the present study. The concept of Role was then discussed (section 2.4.1), as a central notion in interpreting studies. Up till now, there is no consensus as to what the role of the interpreter is or should be. This should not be considered a surprise as research into interpreting is relatively new. Further, the many contexts where interpreting is practiced, bringing with them many different expectations, do not lend themselves to easy decisions. Closely related to the concept of Role is the concept of empowerment (section 2.4.2). Methodologies and methods of data collection were also addressed in this chapter (section 2.5.1). We have observed that there are numerous studies which address the phenomena under investigation (sense-making) from a dyadic perspective as it were, whereas the author believes that a three-dimensional view needs to be created if a good understanding is to be gained of the topic under investigation. Examining the literature it can be seen that there is a lack of sufficient depth in previous studies with regard to 'situation-transcending knowledge'. This study aims to address this shortcoming, by including the perspective of the relevant participants. Conversation analysis, although a valuable analytical tool, has been found to not be sufficient when it comes to addressing the research questions under investigation (see section 0.2.1).

## **Chapter Three**

Theoretical underpinnings of the study

### **3.0 Introduction**

In this chapter, which consists of three parts, the researcher discusses the theoretical framework of the study. In part I, central notions are introduced: Section 3.1.1 provides the reader with a basis for understanding how this chapter will be shaped theoretically. Three central concepts are introduced. In section 3.1.2, the relationship between the theoretical/epistemological stances of researchers and their methodological decisions will be discussed. Following that, the nature of dialogism in relation to ontology and epistemology will be discussed. In section 3.1.3, dialogism itself, which is a central theory in Wadensjö's model, and which informs central notions utilized in the overall theoretical framework of this study, will be discussed by contrasting it to its counter-theory, monologism. In sections 3.1.4.1-3.1.4.5, the relevant principles/assumptions of dialogism will be presented and discussed. Because the core of this study concerns the notions of sense-making, meaning-making and understanding, they are dealt with in an in-depth manner in section 3.1.5. In the sections 3.1.5.1 onward, an explanation is provided on how meaning and understanding are realized in interaction. The main components of meaning-making and understanding, which are actions and interactions, are dealt with (section 3.1.5.1). The discussion then moves on to understanding and its characteristics (sections 3.1.5.2-3.1.5.2.2).

In section 3.1.6, the nature of talk/interactions is discussed. In sections 3.1.6.1 and 3.1.6.2, the notions of 'implicitness' and 'vagueness' are considered because of their importance to the notions of meaning and understanding. In section 3.1.6.3, partialness of understanding and the notion of 'understanding for current purpose' are discussed. In section 3.1.7, the concept of misunderstanding is discussed and an explanation is given as to why dialogism theorizes this as 'miscommunication'. One of the most important characteristics of understandings is that not all of them are made public during interaction (see section 3.1.7.1). Sections 3.1.8-3.1.9 deal with other theoretical notions that are important in this thesis. Section 3.1.8 discusses the role of prior-knowledge (STK/R's) in conversation. This notion is important in this study when the findings are discussed. Also important is

the notion of 'double dialogicality' (section 3.1.9), because it explains how the internal dialogue is realized in interaction. This last notion is important for this study as it provides a rationale for adding another element to the methodology of Wadensjö. Section 3.1.10 tackles the notion of biographical experiences.

Part II deals with the theoretical model of Wadensjö (1998). The researcher provides an exposition of relevant tools for this study, and offers a critique. The researcher also shows how this study is different and explains what the contribution of the current study will be. This part starts with a brief discussion on how interpreting was theorized before Wadensjö published her book *Interpreting as Interaction*. Section 3.2.1 deals with the manner in which Wadensjö uses transcribed text for discourse-analytical purposes. The researcher explains his position with regard to these tools and shows how his study will be different. In section 3.2.2, the researcher discusses the understanding of Wadensjö of the notions of understanding and miscommunication. The researcher provides a critique of how she analyses miscommunication. The researcher claims that while he will need her tool for detecting 'trouble sources' when analysing the transcribed text, he will not base his analysis of the data solely on her method of Conversation Analysis (henceforth CA). The researcher argues that the perspectives of the interlocutors too are needed. In section 3.2.3, the analytical tool of Wadensjö with regard to analysing Role is presented and critiqued. Section 3.2.4 deals with the tool 'participation framework'. Its suitability for this study is explained. The researcher then discusses the taxonomy of Wadensjö and provides a critique. He argues that this taxonomy needs to be adapted in this study, and he adds a number of categories to it (see sections 3.2.5 and 3.2.5.1 respectively).

In part III, the researcher discusses how he will apply the tools he discusses in parts I and II. In sections 3.3.1-3.3.1.2, the researcher discusses how interlocutors exchange 'material' during sense-making. This is done in order to pave the way theoretically for the discussion of the third research question. In section 3.3.2, the researcher addresses the notions of implicitness and vagueness and how they influence sense-making during interactions. In

section 3.3.3, the concept of 'internal dialogue' is addressed and the need for re-constructing it when studying sense-making is argued for. Difficulties which might be encountered are discussed. In section 3.3.4, the notion of 'possible reasons' is discussed. As will be observed in chapters Five and Six, the interpreter understandably sometimes cannot provide explanations for his translation decisions. In section 3.3.5 the interrelation between the perception of the interpreter of his role and the afforded 'material' on his part is discussed. In section 3.3.6, the question of whether or not the immigrant is as equally empowered as the lawyer and the interpreter is addressed. This section and the previous ones together provide a rationale for how the discussion of the data will be shaped.

Regarding the structure of part I, it should be noted that "[d]ialogism is not one coherent school, or theory [...]" (Linell, 2003: 2), and scholars from different disciplines and research traditions have contributed to it. The approach to dialogism developed in **Rethinking Language, Mind and World Dialogically** (Linell, 2009) by the communication theorist Per Linell is my main source of inspiration. The main reason for adopting this work is because it explains well how sense-making takes place in real-life daily interactions while other scholars take a perspective that is less relevant for this study. Where necessary, however, other perspectives will also be incorporated.

The interrelation between the work of Linell and the model of Wadensjö is as follows: Wadensjö is going to be extended to better suit the purpose of this study. For this, I need the work of Linell.

I am going to set out in some detail a large number of concepts from Linell (2009), especially in Part I. Inevitably this involves a lot of description and exposition. The concepts that will be discussed are those which are directly of relevance to this study. Other concepts, notions and areas of interest will not be discussed in this thesis.

## Part I<sup>43</sup>

Before embarking on a full theoretical discussion, some core notions need to be presented because of their centrality for the study: **sense-making, motivations and assumptions**.

### 3.1.1 Central concepts

Very briefly, in Dialogism the concept of **sense-making** is theorized as consisting of a combination of the communication between the participants of a situated interaction (including the internal dialogue), the meanings attributed to the situated interaction and the 'situation transcending knowledge/resources' (henceforth STK/Rs) which interlocutors take with them to the interaction. The processes of meaning-making and understanding are part of sense-making (more on this later in this chapter).

Also very briefly, in this study, the perspectives of the interlocutors are considered to form an integral part of the process of attempting to understand how the process of sense-making developed during the encounter; it is believed that if the relevant parties are requested to reflect upon what Linell refers to as their 'actions' and 'interactions' (Linell, 2009: 13), and the interrelated ones of the other interlocutors, and to **motivate** these, the results will provide insightful information on the interrelationship between these actions and interactions and how they evolved during the overall sense-making process.

Taking as its starting point Wadensjö (1998), whose model has inspired this study, and who focuses on a detailed discourse analysis (in addition to some short interviews) using Conversation Analysis, this study enriches the analysis of the data with the above-mentioned notion of **motivation**<sup>44</sup>. This study, thus, takes Wadensjö's approach a step further. This is considered essential because, as argued by other scholars, e.g. Bernd Meyer (1998), analysing transcribed data (even if the event was attended by the researcher as was the case with Wadensjö) does not give

---

<sup>43</sup> The structure of this part is partly inspired by the structure used in Linell (2009).

<sup>44</sup> Motivation is understood in this thesis as being the explanations the interpreter provides when he is asked about the translation decisions taken during the IME. The word 'motivation' is used sometimes with the word 'explanation'. Sometimes these words are used interchangeably.

access to enough information to reconstruct how the sense-making has evolved (even if complemented with interviews similar to those conducted by Wadensjö). For as will be seen in chapter Six, the sense-making process is heavily influenced by the STK/R and the interrelated *assumptions* on the part of the interlocutors of each other as interlocutors, of the setting where the encounter takes place, of the legal position of the immigrant and of the knowledge of the immigrant.

In the following sections, I discuss the overall theoretical position taken in this study. As mentioned in the introduction (section 3.0), while there is no single, unitary understanding of dialogism, I have chosen Linell (2009) because of its comprehensive character. It brings together many understandings on how dialogism works. Lourenço et al. (2013), in their review mention that this book contributes to the “unification of an entanglement of different dialogical theories and perspectives, crafting a solid meta-theory”, “offer[ing] an integrated view upon the many strands of Dialogism, establishing itself as an essential reference to the field”. Gillespie (2010: 463) even thinks that this book serves dialogism as theory, for it “consolidates dialogism as a distinctive, synthetic, and fruitful paradigm.” Linell sounds more modest stating that his book is “a general overview of dialogical theories of human sense-making.” Valsiner, as series editor of this book, says in his introduction, that Linell’s book is important “because it leads to generalized knowledge about ways the dialogical ways of thinking are organized. From that general perspective, various constructions of usable knowledge in different contexts can be derived by the readers.”

It is clear then that taking this book as a basis for the theory brings with it opportunities but also challenges. On the one hand, Linell brings different views on dialogism together, which is helpful for researchers. On the other hand, this brings with it challenges as to how to trace the development of thinking about the different concepts and notions. Due to the fact that this thesis has to deal with relatively many concepts, which are relevant to this study, I cannot but limit the amount of different view on each concept, as it is not the primary purpose of this study to extensively critique each concept.

Rather, the aim is to critique the concepts in a way and to a degree that is warranted within the limitations of this study.

The study requires a rather detailed account of dialogism as it is its core theory, together to the model of Wadensjö (1998). I have chosen to expound only the relevant concepts due to space. Despite this, this exposition does require a significant amount of description. Where possible, the views of Linell will be contrasted with those of other scholars.

### **3.1.2 Epistemology/ontology and interrelation with methodology adopted**

This study is designed in such a way that, in addition to examining the transcribed data from a 'textual' perspective, importance is given to the individual perspectives of the interlocutors as to how the interaction unfolded and developed during the IME. This methodological decision originates from the fact that dialogism has been adopted in the study. This methodology benefits this study as follows: in addition to attempting to counteract possible and preventable bias by, where possible, triangulating the data, it helps gauge the influence of STK/Rs on meaning-making during the encounter, and understand the influence of each interlocutor on the others during the process of sense-making. In order to be able to understand dialogism well, it is found useful to understand the theoretical nature of dialogism with respect to the question of whether it is ontological and/or epistemological.

Ontology is described by Gray (2009: 17) as the "[...] study of being, that is, the nature of existence", which is about understanding "*what is*". Crotty (1998), whom Gray seems to have been influenced by and to be citing, explains the concept in a more concrete way: "Ontology is the study of being. It is concerned with 'what is', with the nature of existence, with the structure of reality as such" (Crotty, 1998: 10). The introduction of the notion of structure, presented by Crotty, is amplified in the Collins English Dictionary definition of an ontology as "the set of entities presupposed by a theory" (2016a). If we take dialogism as an example to explain how ontology can be understood, ontology in relation to dialogism seems to be "the study" of what

dialogism is as a phenomenon; and what its 'structure' looks like in reality, in contrast to monologism.

Having now introduced the notion of ontology, the researcher will go on to explain what epistemology is, as these notions together inform the theoretical perspective of a researcher into a reality under study (Crotty, 2003: 10). Epistemology, or the theory of knowledge (Landesman, 1997: 190), is the "[...] study of knowledge and justified belief," as explained by the Stanford Encyclopaedia of Philosophy (2016b); it "tries to understand *what it means to know*" (Gray, 2004: 16); it deals with the "nature of knowledge, its possibility, scope and general basis" (Hamlyn, 2005: 262), which means the nature of knowledge (i.e. what is, and can be, known) is itself scrutinised in the endeavour to interpret it. In explaining why it is necessary to identify, explain and justify the epistemological stance, Crotty (2003: 8), quotes Maynard (1994, p. 10): "Epistemology is concerned with providing a philosophical grounding for deciding what kinds of knowledge are possible and how we can ensure that they are both adequate and legitimate." It seems that Maynard (1994) believes that epistemology helps with providing a philosophical basis to help identify and justify the knowledge under investigation, based on the ontological stance which is taken by the researcher. The question which now arises is: is dialogism an epistemology or an ontology?

In dialogism, the unit of analysis is a concrete interaction that is situated "(including its constituent activities and its belonging to sociocultural practices)" (Linell, 2009: 30). Dialogism has also been "characterized as a metatheory for the human mind" (ibid: 30). These two perspectives are interrelated: "[...] the mind is realized largely in and through its situated interaction", argues Linell, and arguably, the situated interaction itself is dependent on the mind to take place and further develop. This is the reason why dialogism is neither simply an epistemology nor an ontology. It is both "[...] an epistemological approach to the study of mind and language as historical and cultural phenomena" (Marková, 1990a) and an "ontology of human mind" (Marková, 2003a: 90). It is worth noting that Marková works in the 'social' social psychology tradition (Linell, 2009: 403).

In this section, the perspective of the researcher on dialogism has been explained. He sees it both as epistemology and ontology. As ontology, dialogism helps in understanding the IME as a phenomenon; it helps us understand the “what is” which was talked about in this section. As epistemology, it helps us deal with the knowledge we gain from the recorded IME. Thus, epistemology gives us the ‘philosophical grounding’ we need to deal with dialogism.

In the following sections, dialogism will be investigated in an in-depth manner. In the section directly below, dialogism will be compared to its counter-theory, monologism, in an attempt to explain the nature of dialogism.

### **3.1.3 Dialogism as counter-theory to monologism**

In his endeavour to theorise sense-making according to the dialogical perspective, Linell (2009) contrasts dialogism to monologism. Dialogism is considered as a counter-theory of monologism (Linell, 2003), monologism being part of a ‘written language bias’ (Linell, 1982: 1). Linell seems here to provide a view that is accepted by other scholars too. For example, Lourenço et al (2013), in their review of Linell’s book, do not provide a different understanding of monologism. They agree also with Linell’s dialogical definition of meaning-making<sup>45</sup> as being “constructed in the dynamics of interaction and properly accounting its contextuality and historicity” (Lourenço et al., 2013: 424). According to Lourenço et al., in monologism, meaning-making is viewed as a “process that takes place in the encapsulated mind of the individual, not accounting for the variables mentioned before like time and context” (2013: 424). The views of Linell and Lourenço seem to converge in this respect too.

Theoretically, as can be seen, the difference between monologism and dialogism, is significant, both on ontological and epistemological levels. From

---

<sup>45</sup> For the sake of clarity, it should be noted that ‘sense-making’ is the overall concept within dialogism. Human beings seek to make sense of the world. ‘Meaning-making’ is part of sense-making: during the process of sense-making, people engage in meaning-making. During the process of meaning-making, interlocutors can understand each other or miscommunicate. Understanding or miscommunication take place during the process of meaning-making.

the ontological point view, monologism views reality, thus, as something that is created in the mind of the individual by the individual; it is born in the mind and already exists when it is expressed by the individual concerned. The world outside the mind of this individual does not have a role in the creation of this reality. Reality is viewed differently by dialogists, who theorise it as an entity that is not there prior to the process of sense-making. It develops during this process. The constituents which contribute to meaning-making during the process of sense-making are the internal dialogue in the minds of the interacting individuals (cognition or thinking) and the 'outer world', consisting of the communication in which the individuals engage during their situated interaction and the situation-transcending traditions. For a good understanding of dialogism, a good understanding is required of its assumptions (Linell, 2009) theoretical principles (Lourenço et al., 2013)<sup>46</sup>. This is the topic of the following section.

### **3.1.4 Dialogism and its assumptions/principles**

In their book review of Linell's book, Lourenço et al. (2013: 422) state that as one of the meta-theories which imply "[...] a perception of reality as built by the relation between the human being and the world that surrounds it", dialogism "[...] stands out by looking at reality as neither being something enclosed in the human mind (as centered on the ego) or something that exists exclusively on the outer world (as diluted in the context)." Here as well, Lourenço et al. agree with the theorization of Linell (2009). And as noted in the previous section, Lourenço et al. mention that in order to understand dialogism, its basic principles/assumptions must be understood. These theoretical and epistemological principles/assumptions, which together constitute dialogism according to Linell (2009: 11), concern "human action, communication and cognition" and also "language and languaging, knowledge about the world, interventions into the apprehended world, and in general: human sense-making" (Linell, 2009). When dialogism is adopted, these assumptions/principles are used for the "explanation of human action

---

<sup>46</sup> Lourenço et al (2013) do not provide a rationale for why they use the term 'theoretical principles' instead of Linell's 'assumptions'.

and language use in real mundane life” and for underpinning the empirical description of them (Linell, 2009: 11). One of the assumptions of dialogism is that the human mind is a sense-making system. This is the topic of the next section.

### 3.1.4.1 The human mind as a sense-making system

According to Linell (2009), dialogism theorizes the human mind from the perspective of ‘action’ (followed by ‘inter-action’); i.e. the mind is not viewed from the perspective of being a sort of ‘machine’ responsible for sense-making, as critics of monologism (e.g. Bakhtin and his ‘circle’<sup>47</sup>), might tend to criticise that theory for proposing. Dialogism theorizes meaning as created in the process of interaction between the individual and the other(s) and the world (Linell, 2009: 12). Sense is thus profoundly interactive and contextual in nature (Linell, 2009: 12). Thus, sense-making involves an action taking place in the mind of an individual, where the mind is one part of the sense-making system, with ‘others’ and the world being the other parts of the system. It is worth mentioning that ‘others’ do not have to be other human beings. Others can even be a thing with which the mind *interacts* within a certain *context* (Interactionism and Contextualism are other assumptions, which will be dealt with in sections 3.1.4.3 and 3.1.4.4 below).

This suggests that the proponents of dialogism (e.g. Markova, Rommetveit, Valsiner, etc.) consider the human mind as ‘social’, in the sense that it is not an autonomously working system; rather, it (i.e. the human mind) interacts with the minds of the other individual(s) present in the situated context, and with the world. The term ‘social mind’ is used to metaphorically explain how the mind is understood to function during the process of sense-making

---

<sup>47</sup> Mikhail Bakhtin is one of the most renowned representatives of dialogism and sometimes even regarded as its founder (Linell, 2009). Linell even uses the term ‘Bakhtinian dialogism.’ There are certain dialogists who are profoundly influenced by Bakhtin and who are members of this ‘circle.’ Unlike Linell, who is “occupied with talk-in-interaction as such, using many excerpts from authentic interactions to illustrate dialogical principles” (Linell, 2009), Bakhtin focuses on ‘speech’ (talk, text, discourse).

(Valsiner and Van der Veer, 2000)<sup>48</sup>. Every product of the mind is considered to be the result of an interaction between the mind of the individual and the mind of the other and the world. Meaning is seen as a joint construction between an individual's vision of the world and the vision of the other who is interacting with him/her. To permit this joint construction, characteristics of the world itself are needed (Lourenço et al., 2013: 422), these characteristics being the physical world and the knowledge which individuals have of the world. Lourenço echoes the vision of Linell here. Linell (2009, p. 12), quoting Clowes (2007, p. 94), states that “[I]nsofar as there are such things as internal mental states that can be ascribed symbolic content, they exist and have that content only because they derive it from social and prototypically public interactions.”

In this section, we have discussed the first assumption/principle of dialogism. The mind has been seen to be theorized as a sense-making system. As will be discussed later (chapter Six), this is an important concept which will help us understand the manner in which the relevant participants in this study interacted with each other. In the following section, the second and third assumption/principles will be discussed. This is important as knowing these is essential for understanding dialogism.

### **3.1.4.2 Other-orientation: intersubjectivity and alterity**

As a dialogist, Linell deals with the assumption of intersubjectivity as being part of (or related to) the notion of other-orientedness. The latter refers to the interrelation between interlocutors during the process of meaning-making: in dialogism, meaning is made collectively by interlocutors during the interaction, and interlocutors are dependent on each other during this process. Unlike monologism, which forces one to choose between subjectivism and objectivism, dialogism concentrates on the other-orientation, which presupposes a different theorization with regard to reality. Dialogism theorizes meaning-making from the perspective that the “[...] individual mind evolves in constant interaction with others” (Linell, 2009: 80). In this regard,

---

<sup>48</sup> Valsiner works in the cultural psychology tradition, which seems to be very compatible with the views of Linell. As mentioned earlier, Valsiner is the writer of the introduction of Linell (2009) in his capacity as series editor.

Dufva (2004: 140)<sup>49</sup> states that this interaction with the other enables us “[...] to see wholes instead of fragmented and separate individual realities.” She and Linell seem to have the same theoretical position on this.

Individuals taking part in an interaction do not have only complementing perspectives. There are also differences between them which come up during the interaction (we will see this in this study too, in chapter Six). “Other-orientedness has thus two sides: commonality and sharedness with others, and difference from others” (Linell, 2009: 81). ‘Commonality and sharedness with other’ refers to *intersubjectivity* while ‘difference from others’ to *alterity*.

When individuals interact, they can be understood to generally assume intersubjectivity with each other, and the other parties make an effort to achieve this intersubjectivity. However, they are also arguably aware that there is also alterity among them. Alterity implies “difference, multiplicity of meanings and opinions, open-endedness and unfinalizability”, while intersubjectivity “tends toward unity, closure, consensus and possibly and ultimately, by extension, even monologization” (Linell, 2009: 81). This goes for cross-cultural encounters too. The one under investigation for example is an encounter where the participants are meant to co-operate to achieve a mutual goal; however, the interlocutors know there is alterity between them. The interpreter is not called in without a reason. There is a point which needs to be made here, which is that Linell does not, as far as I have been able to ascertain, devote much attention to the fact that there are degrees to alterity and intersubjectivity in daily life). This is strange as it can be claimed that interlocutors vary in their tendency towards intersubjectivity or alterity depending on many variables that are found in daily life interactions. After having given this introductory information on other-orientation, intersubjectivity and alterity, in the following paragraph I will discuss the notions of intersubjectivity and alterity in more depth, and I will explain the relevance to this study.

As has been pointed out in the discussion of the first assumption/principle, the role of the ‘other’ is important in the process of sense-making, a

---

<sup>49</sup> Professor Hanneke Dufva is a Finnish dialogist. She has written several publications on dialogism and Bakhtin.

conviction which is accepted by all dialogists, as far I am aware. In dialogism, generally, intersubjectivity is a term that is used to refer to the interrelationship of communicating individuals with regard to cooperating communicatively during a social event with the aim of making sense of the world. Dialogism gives the 'other' an important role with regard to the "acquisition of knowledge" (Lourenço et al., 2013: 423) during the sense-making process. Agreeing to this, Linell considers intersubjectivity a "defining property of communication" (2009: 81). According to Clark (1996: 92-120)<sup>50</sup> in order to be able to communicate, interlocutors have to have some knowledge they share; also some common assumptions and commitments, an opinion which is also supported by Rommetveit (1974: 56)<sup>51</sup>. Otherwise, communication would be very difficult, if not impossible. Again, this reminds us of the manner in which dialogism theorizes meaning-making, namely, that the human mind does not 'produce' ideas or generate knowledge as an autonomously working machine. It needs the 'other' in the process of sense-making. The other is the "[...] most important source of information and of communication [...]" which the human mind needs, making it even logical that the mind is seen as a 'social mechanism' (Lourenço et al., 2013: 423). Marková (2000: 419)<sup>52</sup> refers to this when she describes thoughts as a social product that has come into being during the social process of meaning-making. For this social process, the 'other' is needed. And when this 'other' comes to the social event, they take with them what Clark refers to above (in order to be able to communicate, interlocutors have to have some knowledge they share; also some common assumptions and commitments). Therefore, the other is an important factor in the process of communication: "When we are in contact with the world we communicate and at the same time we elaborate thoughts. Our thoughts are a form of communication [...]" (Lourenço et al., 2013: 423). This might explain why meetings and other

---

<sup>50</sup> Clark is one of the scholars who has written on Bakhtin's life and work, for example in 1984, together with Holquist. He is a conversation and interaction analyst.

<sup>51</sup> Ragnar Rommetveit is a dialogist whom Linell has worked with and is one of the scholars whom Linell (2009) cites as a source of inspiration for his book. Rommetveit's main discipline is social psychology.

<sup>52</sup> Ivana Marková is one of the scholars who Linell (2009) thanks for her contribution to further enriching his knowledge on dialogism. Like Rommetveit, Marková's discipline is social psychology.

social events sometimes might take a longer (or a shorter) span of time than anticipated. And this explains why Intersubjectivity is so important with regard to communication. Rommetveit (1974: 56), working in 'social' social psychology (i.e. social psychology with a very strong sociological orientation) mentions that if intersubjectivity was not taken for granted at least at some level, interlocutors would find it extremely difficult to communicate or proceed with communication.

Intersubjectivity is stressed by many scholars as an important concept with regard to how meaning is made from the perspective of dialogism. For example, Schutz, a social scientist who worked in the tradition of 'social' social psychology, emphasized that the reciprocity of perspectives is important, according to Graumann and Marková et al respectively (1990: 111; 2007: 21). According to Linell (2009: 82) Schutz and Rommetveit<sup>53</sup> consider intersubjectivity to have priority over alterity. We can take this to be the case; if it were the other way round, communication would be under any circumstances very difficult. However, Schutz does mention that "socially shared knowledge is far from totally socially shared" (Linell, 2009: 82). Marková et al. (2007: 21) agrees with this stance stating that "[T]his is to be expected because people have different biographies, experiences, and knowledge, and these differences amount to distances among people." According to Linell, Rommetveit (2003) too refers to this 'differentiated knowledge', stressing that "[...] different individuals and groups have different amounts of shares, and not all shares are of the same value", and in his later work Rommetveit even seems to prefer the concept of 'co-authorship' in the process of sense-making to that of intersubjectivity (Linell, 2009: 82) to stress the importance and relevance of the different perceptions of reality of the different interlocutors.

As shown, intersubjectivity does not mean that there is a linear relationship between the parties involved in an interaction and because, in Linell's words (81), "intersubjectivity is necessarily partial", the notion of alterity is important to discuss and incorporate in studies like the current one.

---

<sup>53</sup> Rommetveit worked in in the tradition of 'social' social psychology. He was the founder of the 'dialogical approach' in psychology (Josephs, 1998).

The notion/concept of *alterity* “[...] implies that the other often comes with a perspective on things talked about that is different from oneself’s [*sic*] own” (Linell, 2009: 82). When individuals interact, in addition to the properties related to intersubjectivity mentioned here, the discourse is characterized by “strains and tensions, differences between people and traditions, boundaries between communities (and reaching across these boundaries), knowledge, norms and expectations at variance”, according to the interpretation of Linell of Marková (2003a: 103ff), with which he agrees. It is important to mention here that alterity is not theorized as a negative aspect of discourse as much as a complementary feature of it. Quoting from Holquist (1981: 314), Linell mentions that “this dialogic tension [...] permits authorial intentions to be realized”. This means that the “tensions evoke thoughts in the self” (Linell, 2009: 83). Thus, alterity can be considered an essential component of talk during interactions.

This theorization of talk arguably opens up opportunities to study the talk utilized in immigration settings. The researcher argues that it would be a mistake to put too much emphasis on intersubjectivity and thus over-associate this discourse with “[...] consensus, communion and equality [...]” (Linell, 2009: 85). The notion of alterity, which provides “[...] space for differences of perspectives and opinions, asymmetries and argumentation, competition and conflict, as well as misunderstandings and misalignments” (Linell, 2009: 85) can be very helpful to bear in mind during the analysis of immigration discourse as many of the characteristics mentioned characterize the discourse in immigration settings due to, at least in the context of this study, the difference in language and culture between the interacting individuals, and due to the challenging nature of legal language to the layman. It is important to see how interpreters address these differences.

Furthermore, when immigration lawyers hold meetings with their clients, they often want to discuss immigration-related topics with them. These topics often concern reports authored by the IND or a judicial entity. Often, these discussions are characterized by conflicting views expressed by the IND and the immigrant. Lawyers, it can be claimed, want to contrast the opinions of the IND with those of the immigrant in order to be able to defend

the interests of the latter. Lawyers seem not to experience these conflicting views as negative, and seem to be aware that a difference in views “[...] brings in a ‘surplus’ of vision, knowledge and understanding [...]” (Linell, 2009: 83) which they did not have before. The IND or the lawyer “[...] may see things from points-of-view that have so far been strange or unfamiliar [...]” to them (Linell, 2009, 83). Furthermore, “[t]he other’s discourse may function as a counterpoint, and it gives the individual opportunities for integration of others’ knowledge” (Linell, 2009, 83). One can argue that this is the reason why the lawyer in this study holds the meeting under investigation. He aims at confronting the immigrant with the opinion of the IND as can be seen throughout the transcribed encounter. He will later write to the IND or the judge giving the point of view of the immigrant (see section 1.2.3).

These immigration settings are often mediated by an interpreter. It is inevitable that misunderstanding will take place due to cultural differences and/or other reasons (see chapter Six). In an interview with Ingrid Josephs, Rommetveit states that “[...] in the most fruitful dialogues novel ideas emerge as a result of fruitful misunderstandings” (Josephs, 1998: 200). Approaching talk-in-interaction with a strong awareness of alterity can arguably help identify such misunderstandings.

The notions of alterity and intersubjectivity are studied in the context of interacting people. This brings us to the next assumption of dialogism: interactionism. This notion as well needs to be discussed in order to understand dialogism.

### **3.1.4.3 Interactionism**

In their review of Linell’s book (2009), Lourenço et al. (2013: 423) argue that the “[...] construction of meaning is dependent on the interconnection with others, looking at both communication and cognition as interactional processes of knowledge acquisition.” Linell (2009) agrees with this, and mentions as well that “[one] difference between communication and cognition is that the former, by definition, involves interaction, especially interpersonal interaction.” Thus, one of the central assumptions/principles in dialogism is

that the sense-making activity involves interaction. When we communicate and think, during the process of sense-making, we interact with others, sometimes on two levels, the communicative level and the cognitive level, and sometimes only on the cognitive level. The 'others' do not have to be by definition human beings, as mentioned earlier. They can be "[...] other persons, other systems, other dimensions of one's self, others through texts and additional types of artifacts with 'inscriptions,' etc." (Linell, 2009: 14).

It can be said that thinking (cognition), unlike communication, is not normally considered to involve interaction with the world. However, from the perspective of dialogism, this activity does involve interaction, "[...] albeit not always (i.e., not in each and every moment) with other human beings" (Linell, 2009: 14). In their aforementioned review, Lourenço et al. do not offer any different views on this.

Potter (1998: 35)<sup>54</sup> observes in relation to cognition: "[R]ather than treating cognition as prior to, and separable from, interaction, it is treated as something that is managed in, constituted in, and constructed in interaction."

The understandings of Linell and Potter seem to coincide on this matter; the former, commenting on the latter, says in this regard that "[t]hinking is indeed (largely) "managed in, constituted in, and constructed in" languaging and semiotic processes" (p. 15). However, the point that Linell does raise about the understanding of Potter in this regard is that in dialogism, unlike in discursive psychology, which Potter represents, interaction is not considered, as Linell put it, "talk and publicly observable, external behavior" (p.15) because people, as he says, "[...] simply do not disclose everything they think." The researcher takes the side of Linell (2009) in this because as we will see later on in chapter Six many aspects of interaction are kept by the interlocutor for himself. This means that in dialogism, thinking is theorized as being inseparable from the process of interaction, even if this interaction is not observable to others. It takes shape during it; it is influenced by the other during the interdependent process of communication and it influences the other during the same process.

---

<sup>54</sup> Jonathan Potter is a leading representative of discursive psychology (Linell, 2009).

In this section, we have discussed another assumption/principle of dialogism, considering the centrality of interactionism in dialogism when it comes to theorizing meaning-making (or acquiring knowledge as Lourenço et al. call it). In the following section, we will discuss yet another assumption/principle.

#### **3.1.4.4 Contextualism**

This assumption/principle is about how knowledge is ‘acquired’ and about it being ‘dependent’ on the context (Lourenço et al., 2013: 423) in which the interaction takes place. Undoubtedly, context is one of the concepts that are central in dialogism in relation to sense-making and there seems to be a consensus among dialogists on this. Linell agrees with Lourenço et al., and says that “[...] sense-making processes and situated discourse are *always* interdependent with contexts” (Linell, 2009: 16). Unlike in monologism, contexts are important; they are a “universal property of these practices [in which they are seen].” (ibid: 16). According to Linell (ibid: 16) contexts are dynamic in the theory of dialogism; in the sense that they, like situations, “dynamically change with the participants’ communicative and cognitive activities.”

Affirming Linell (2009), Lourenço et al. state that context is also a ‘resource’ which is used in the process of sense-making (2013: 423). In dialogism, reality is not only theorized from the perspective of the individual who is taking part in the process of sense-making. It also takes into account “[...] the elements that are provided by this same reality” (Lourenço et al, 2013: 423) that is being made sense of. These elements are those that are related to the situated context. In addition, I would argue that it is not only the situated context which is important, but also the general context in which an interaction takes place. In the setting of this study, context is not only situated context, that is the IME, but also the entire asylum procedure. This last will be discussed in more depth later on in this chapter.

One of the distinctions Linell (2009) makes regarding types of contexts, which are considered to be relevant for this study is the distinction between ‘*realized contexts* [italics in original]’ which refer to those which are “*actually*

*made communicatively relevant* [italics in original] by participants in situ” and ‘*contextual resources* [italics in original]’, which refer to “[...] various meaningful phenomena which are (in one way or another) accessible and could potentially be made relevant” during the interaction (Linell, 2009: 16 (italics in original)). In this study, the first type would represent the ‘material’ which is made relevant during the IME by the participants in this study, while the second would represent the ‘material’ which is there and which could be used during the interaction – for example information which involves past events related to asylum. Regarding this type, Linell argues that it “[...] come[s] to life only when actively oriented to *in situ*.” (2009: p.17). While I agree with this last statement, it needs to be made clear that not all of this type is retrievable, even if actively oriented to, during the IME. Think for example of private material regarding what the immigrant thinks of the interpreter or the lawyer, or very private information regarding previous, relevant asylum-related events which the immigrant wants to keep private.

Another scholar who saw the importance of context in relation to the analysis of discourse is the ‘interactional sociolinguist’ (Davitti, 2012), John J. Gumperz. In his (1982) work *Discourse Strategies* (1982: 131), with regard to analysing discourse, he describes contextualization as a process through which interlocutors in a conversation “*foreground* or make relevant certain aspects of background knowledge and underplay others” (Gumperz, 1982: 131). These cues are important to be aware of when interactions like the IME in this study is analysed. They can give very interesting insights as how the interlocutor understands what is being said and how he engages in meaning-making during the IME. However, in immigration settings, like the case under investigation in this study, it happens that the interpreter and the immigrant do not entirely share the same culture even if they speak Arabic. This fact needs to be put in the back of the mind when applying this notion in similar studies.

In their review, Lourenço et al. mention that although the “image that we get of reality is constructed through the relationship with others and the use of language as a semiotic mediator”, “some elements that are taken into this construction exist in fact in the outer world” (2013: 320). Agreeing with this,

Linell states that those elements meant here refer to information that individuals take with them into an interaction which belongs to traditions (2009: 54) (for more information on this, see Double Dialogicality in section 3.1.9 below). Therefore, because there are different individuals with different histories and personal biographies, for sense-making to take place, the individuals that are in the process of sense-making need to communicate with one another, the researcher argues. This brings us to the following principle/assumption of dialogism in which this will be discussed.

#### **3.1.4.5 Communicative constructionism**

This principle/assumption deals with the social nature of sense-making. Meaning-making is not a process where interlocutors have ready-made thoughts which they simply share, as mentioned earlier. Thoughts are co-constructed during the process of meaning-making. Each interlocutor has a share in the development of these thoughts. In dialogism, the cognition of each interlocutor does not simply “[...] copy, reproduce or reflect a pre-given extra-discursive reality” (Linell, 2009: 19). Adding to this, Lourenço et al (2013) mention that meaning-making is a shared activity in which individuals communicate using semiotic means, such that dialogism theorizes reality as being there “outside the individual but [...] also built through communication with others” (p. 423).

Meaning is thus actively co-constructed by individuals in their pursuit of making sense of the world. According to Linell, the “meaning of discourse and texts is (partly) accomplished in and through the active and formative sense-making which is part of the linguistic, cognitive and communicative processes themselves” (2009: 19). Arguably, it is more logical to say that these processes are constituents of the process of sense-making because Linell himself argues in his book repeatedly that sense is made of the world in relation to the interrelatedness between the human mind (cognition) and the other (whom we communicate with using semiotic means) and the world. Sense-making cannot take place if one of these interrelated processes is

missing. Therefore, these processes and sense-making can be said to be interrelated.

The principle/assumption of communicative constructionism concerns “[...] intersubjective co-construction with the help of others and artifacts” (Linell, 2009: 19). This stresses again the interdependence of the individuals in the process of sense-making. It is essential to stress here that the individuals do not engage in the process of sense-making in isolation from the outer world, which is not only the ‘other’, but also the situated context and the STK/R.

So far, central assumptions/principles of dialogism have been introduced and evaluated. In the following sections, I will discuss the notions of ‘meaning’ and ‘understanding’ (and other interrelated notions), which are central notions to this study and to the theory of dialogism. It is important to discuss them because this whole study is about sense-making in which these notions are central.

### **3.1.5 Meanings and understandings**

Wadensjö (1998: 280), whose theoretical model is inspired by dialogism, mentions that “[i]t goes without saying that interpreter-mediated interaction involves a certain lack of shared understanding.” Agreeing with this, the researcher adds that this lack could be large or small depending on the level of the immigrant in the language of the host country and the material dealt with during the IME. This lack of shared understanding is the reason why interpreters are called in. They are “by definition placed in a position of promoting the primary interlocutors’ mutual understanding” (Wadensjö, 1998: 280) in addition to solving translation problems (Roy, 2000: 31). However, it can be argued that this does not guarantee that the desired understanding takes place. Therefore, the second research question in this study is about investigating understanding on the part of the immigrant. Understanding or the lack of it are not straightforward processes, the researcher argues, but are in fact rather complex, as we have seen in the sections above, and will see in the sections below. Understanding is not a stand-alone notion that can

be addressed independently as in monologism. Dialogism addresses understanding differently. The interrelated notions too need to be addressed.

In order to bring the 'cognitive revolution' back to its 'original impulse', and away from the 'computational metaphor', Bruner (1990: 33), a dialogist who works in the cultural psychology tradition, calls for returning to the 'central concept' of human psychology which is "[...] *meaning* and the processes and transactions involved in the construction of meanings" (italics in original). Linell (2009), building on this, calls for the adoption of a new theory for the notions of meaning and understanding. Linell (2009: 221) proposes to move away from the traditional monological approach to sense-making, according to which meaning is an entity which is born in the mind of the individual and belongs entirely to them. According to this theorization, other individuals/interlocutors have no share in the production of meaning. The approach proposed by Linell is dialogism. This way of theorizing does not draw on concepts which are used in what Bruner calls 'extreme cognitive paradigm' such as 'stimuli and responses', 'overtly observable behaviour', etc." (Bruner, 1990: 2), in its pursuit of understanding meaning, as would be the case if a monological theorization were adopted. Rather, dialogism adopts a 'theory of action', as it is called by Linell, whereby meaning is theorized by looking at the actions of the participants ('agents, or persons'), who are essential in the process of meaning-making (Linell, 2009: 221). In the following section, I will expand on the interrelation between action, meaning and understanding.

### **3.1.5.1 Action, meaning and understanding**

As mentioned earlier, in dialogism, unlike in monologism, meaning does not belong to one single individual; i.e. it is not made only by one individual. It is co-constructed in a joint effort by interacting individuals. During this process, individuals act and interact (among other things with each other); and it is during these interrelated actions between individuals that meaning is co-constructed. This means that when individuals participate in a communicative event, meaning is made by an action on the part of an

individual and a response to it on the part of the other individual (Wadensjö, 1998; Linell, 2009).

The process of meaning-making involves cognition (thinking) and communication. These “involve interventions in the world, engaging with the world” (Linell, 2009: 221). Individuals intervene *in* the world (in a concrete situation) by performing an “action”. This action is a “[...] semantic-pragmatic function of language and communication”, as Linell says (p. 221). Unlike in monologism, this action is not considered as a “representation of the world” in dialogism (ibid: 221), i.e. the action is not given the status of an independent entity. Therefore, when this action has been performed, meaning has not been made yet. For meaning to come into being, another individual must react to this action. The individual has thus to engage *with* the world, that is (among other things) with another individual. It must be noted here that individuals also communicate with non-humans (artefacts) in the process of sense-making; however, in this study, the notion of communication refers only to communication between humans, unless explicitly otherwise indicated.

Thus, from the perspective of dialogism, the action of an individual is not decisive in the process of meaning-making. And generally, when ‘action’ is heard ‘*interaction*’ comes to mind (Linell, 2009: 221). In such an interaction, when individuals interact, communication is achieved by the individuals during the process in which they interact with each other. The inter-acts in which they are involved are the communicative acts that are performed during conversations. This is unlike monologism where instead of communicative acts, monologists would talk about ‘speech acts’ (Searle, 1969; Birner, 2013).

It can be concluded from the above that the process of meaning-making involves at least two individuals engaging with each other communicatively (the role of *traditions* is left out here temporarily). It is during these interactions that meaning is co-constructed. Meanings are not a phenomenon which is there, and which belongs to the individual, without the other individuals in the interaction having a share in it. Meaning is not the child of the mind of one individual. Rather, individuals contribute to creating it during ‘talk-in-interactions’. During these interactions, turn-taking is an

essential phenomenon (Linell, 2009: 221). Every basic action, with its content, performed by any individual is permeated by other-orientation<sup>55</sup> (ibid: 221/222).

The fact that meaning is made through interaction and that the one individual is dependent on the other in interaction during the process of meaning-making does not mean that agency in dialogical theory is downgraded. Dialogical theory does not “disavow the agency of the individual” (Linell, 2009: 222). It can be said that dialogism on the one hand unburdens individuals and on the other hand it burdens them with responsibility. By introducing the notion of co-construction with regard to meaning-making, dialogism relieves a single individual of being ascribed sole responsibility for the production of meaning. On the other hand, another individual is empowered by dialogism. They also take part in the co-construction of meaning. In this regard, it can be argued that researchers of talk-in-interactions are empowered. Instead of attempting to ‘read’ the mind of the individual, dialogism makes their task arguably more doable. Meaning is easier to reconstruct – by investigating the actions and interaction of the individuals involved.

Theorizing ‘actions’ from the perspective of dialogism, Linell states that they “[...] must be meant and understood” (Linell, 2009: 222). This statement, although somewhat obscure, can be interpreted to represent a basic theoretical assumption in order to account for the efforts individuals make to understand meaning. Actions *can* be understood but there are no guarantees they always are. This explains why dialogism theorizes misunderstanding. Linell (2009: 222) also states that “[m]eaning and understanding are absolutely central concepts in a dialogical approach to the world.” No reference is made to misunderstanding. However, it is believed that it is implied here. Bartlett (1932: 44), a dialogist working in the cultural psychology tradition, has a similar opinion with regard to the importance of meaning and understanding. He regards “[...] every human cognitive reaction – perceiving, imaging, remembering, thinking and reasoning – as an

---

<sup>55</sup> This notion is discussed in section 3.1.4.2 above.

*effort after meaning*” (italics in original). People want to understand. Understanding is the topic of the following section.

### 3.1.5.2 Understanding

As dialogism is about sense-making, Linell could not but address the notion of understanding in his book<sup>56</sup>. Explaining understanding, Linell states that “[i]f meaning is linked to action and interaction, the same applies to *understanding*” (italics in original). He states that “[u]nderstanding is closely linked to responding to situations and utterances” (Linell, 2009: 222), meaning that people try to make sense of/understand these situations and utterances. He follows this by saying that understanding “involves being able to cope with situations, carrying out tasks, being able to explain and account for various subject matters, etc.” It is noticeable here that the abilities referred to are articulated in a way which suggests that misunderstanding means automatically the opposite, though this arguably does not have to be the case. Miscommunication is an essential part of sense-making, the researcher argues.

This is why Linell addresses the notion of understanding in more depth later in his book. In this regard, explaining Garfinkel<sup>57</sup> (1967), Linell stresses that only partial understanding is meant and underlines that understanding is needed only for current practical purposes. Wadensjö refers to this in a clearer way: “interlocutors engage in achieving *sufficient understanding of current activity*” (1998: 200 (italics in original)). This last means that understanding is needed, which is sufficient for us “[...] so we can go on with our current doings” (Linell, 2009: 222). However, the researcher argues, there are situations imaginable where no understanding takes place or where partial understanding is not sufficient for carrying out “our current doings”. It is possible that communication in a talk-in-interaction can carry on without

---

<sup>56</sup> To reiterate a point made previously for the sake of clarity: sense-making is the general notion within which the notions of meaning, understanding and miscommunication are constituents. In sense-making, one engages with others in meaning-making. During this process, interlocutors may understand each other or miscommunicate.

<sup>57</sup> Harold Garfinkel was an American sociologist, ethnomethodologist, who worked in a number of sociological and social theories. He made a major contribution in ethnomethodology.

sufficient understanding having taken place, or even when parts of the communicative acts performed are miscommunicated. This is also noticed in this study (see chapter Six). Misunderstanding can take place on a local level (related to some communicative acts) and on a global level (related to [big chunks of] the talk-in-interaction). In the following section, the researcher will address the notion of understanding in more depth, illuminating its nature as theorized in dialogism.

### **3.1.5.2.1 Sense-making in situ understanding, responding and anticipation**

As noted earlier, unlike monologism, which theorizes meaning as a phenomenon encapsulated in the mind of the individual, dialogism perceives meaning as being the result of situated communicative actions and interactions performed by individuals (Linell, 2009: 222). The semiotic resources of the language used during such interactions do not carry meaning; they carry meaning potentials (Linell, 2009: 222). Part of these semiotic resources are words. In her endeavour to develop a theoretical model for interpreting, Wadensjö affirms the view of Linell and other dialogists such as Bakhtin with regard to this, explicitly stating that these semiotic resources carry meaning potentials rather than meaning. This means that interlocutors have a task to do when they interact.

When people enter a communicative situation, they try to make sense of it. In so doing, they influence and are influenced by the other individuals who attend such a situated interaction. During the process of sense-making, when producing an utterance, speakers “afford material for making sense” (Linell, 2009: 222); i.e. they provide clues, linguistic and/or non-linguistic, which can be taken up by the participating individuals to make sense of what was said. This material is meant to guide “the interlocutors in their efforts after meaning and interpretation.” This material carries meaning potentials, as discussed in the last paragraph. This does not mean, however, that sense-making is totally dependent for its creation on the speaker. The receiving interlocutor in turn contributes to sense-making by his “uptake and

interpretation, made manifest in his or her following utterance(s), that counts in the interaction as the communicated meaning” (Linell, 2009: 222).

It needs to be noted that the response shown by the ‘receiving’ interlocutor (the immigrant in this study) does not necessarily show understanding of the utterance voiced by the ‘providing’ interlocutor even where a consenting sign is provided. It is not unthinkable that the interlocutor has not understood a rendition despite the fact that he may give (a) verbal sign(s) which suggest(s) that he has. This has also been seen in this study (see chapter Six). This tells us that the ‘communicated meaning’ could be perceived differently between the receiving and the providing interlocutors. We need to ‘understand’ how understanding is determined, which is the topic of the following section.

### **3.1.5.2.2 Determination of understanding**

Sense-making is, as we have seen, a dialogical process. During this process, while contributing to meaning, interlocutors show how they understand each other’s utterances; they thus ‘interact’ with the ‘action’ of their interlocutor. This interaction is how they understand the ‘action’ taken by their interlocutor. Therefore, it can be said that understanding is shown during the process of meaning-making, when interlocutors try to make sense of the material which is provided by the ‘other’. Recall that this material is not meaning itself, it is rather ‘meaning potentials’, as explained above. It is not only the speaker who determines meaning: “[...] the utterance is nothing more than a selection proposal, a suggestion” (Luhmann, 1995: 139). The listener also contributes to it by responding to the utterance of the speaker: “[...] that the listener contributes to meaning is a consequence of the responsivity permeating understanding” (Linell, 2009: 223). To reinforce his point, Linell refers to the following statement by Bakhtin:

Any understanding of live speech, a live utterance, is inherently responsive, although the degree of this activity varies extremely. Any understanding is imbued with response and necessarily elicits it in one form or another: the listener becomes the speaker (Bakhtin, 1986: 68).

It is important here to make the point that due to the importance of the notion of understanding in this study, it is necessary to contextualise the discussion within this study. Sense-making is not always about understanding. Miscommunications too can take place, for as we have come to conclude, the 'material' provided by each interlocutor do not hold meanings but potentials for them. And these meaning potentials could be miscommunicated. Therefore, the interactions of the immigrant with actions of the interpreter need to be problematized. The researcher means by this that although the interpreter is seen as empowered in this study, it is inevitable that he sometimes will misunderstand 'inter-actions' (the counterpart of the 'actions') made by the immigrant. This makes it essential in studies like this one to check, where possible, whether the responses/interactions given have not led the speaker/interpreter to infer a meaning that is not based on a correct interpretation of the interactions on the part of the immigrant, which then could lead to further miscommunication(s).

With regard to the 'quality' of the response (the inter-actions) for the original speaker, responses cannot be expected to be always what the original speaker would wish. Responses might involve "[...] actively responsive understanding" which they are oriented towards (Bakhtin, 1986: 69). However, when the responses are not what speaker would wish, this can lead to situations where the speaker might find it difficult to understand whether the listener has understood the original utterance (as happened in this study; see chapter Six).

The two central notions in Bakhtin's interpretation of 'understanding in situ' are: responding and anticipation (Linell, 2009: 223): "When a listener attends to an utterance, especially if he is the addressee expected to respond in the following moment, he understands it partly by anticipating what his response might be." When the listener is 'passive' or economical in his responses (like the immigrant in this study), it becomes very difficult to reconstruct how he understood the speaker unless he is asked about this, as is the case in this study. In this study, the interpreter did not do this, but the researcher did.

### **3.1.6 Nature of talk**

In the following three sections, characteristics will be discussed which belong to the Talk. This will help us further understand how sense-making develops and understand how the very nature of talk influences meaning-making. I will start with Implicitness.

#### **3.1.6.1 Implicitness**

According to Linell (2009: 224) not everything that individuals want to say can be said explicitly. Further, unlike in monologism, in dialogism it is not claimed that utterances, which are constituents of talk, hold meaning. Rather, utterances “prompt” individuals to make meaning (ibid: 224). “Signs [constituents of utterances] are used as navigational aids when we try to make sense of the world” (Linell, 2009: 224). The utterances produced by the speaker can only be understood when the context is known (ibid: 224). This means that language can be understood as a tool that guides individuals to make meaning and to understand it. And the fact that language is incomplete indicates that meanings will be difficult to follow and the understandings will be difficult to infer, unless the utterances are put in context. The context will then serve as a guide in the jungle of possible meanings. Contexts are always relied on by interlocutors to understand utterances (ibid: 224). They help understand the situated meaning (Linell, 2009), also called contextual meaning (Wadensjö, 1998: 153). “A considerable part of meaning in interaction is therefore *inferred*, implicit rather than explicitly expressed” (Linell, 2009: 224). One theory that deals particularly with the role of inferences with regard to meaning is Relevance Theory. Although interesting, Relevance Theory will not be pursued further in this thesis, due to its highly technical nature, and its limited relevance to the type of analyses that the researcher is adopting.

Some information, needed to make sense, is not explicitly mentioned by speakers. The context in which the utterance is made is utilized by the listener to infer the meaning possibly aimed at by the speaker. According to Bakhtin (Holquist, 1981: xix) “[a] unitary language is not something that is

given [dan], but is in its very essence something that must be posited [zadan] ... ." In the context of this study this means that during talk, interlocutors do not decode the talk of the other interlocutor(s) in a mechanical manner. The interlocutor engages in a task that they need to resolve. This is because, as mentioned earlier, the words of which utterances consist of do not hold meanings that are stable and permanent. The listener/interlocutor becomes the speaker in the process of attempting to make sense of what is said; while responding to it in the process of meaning-making. By doing so, the speaker "[...] attributes sense to a word [or words an utterance consist of]" (Wadensjö, 1998: 39) in the sense that their understanding of it is shown. Thus, when the speaker uses a word, they use it the way they understand it; they populate it with their own sense of it (Wadensjö, 1998: 39). This reflects the view of Bakhtin that understanding an utterance is a "task *posited*" and that interlocutors do not decode the talk of the other interlocutor in a mechanical way as mentioned earlier in this paragraph.

It can be argued here that there are degrees of this. The degree of difficulty of the 'task' will arguably vary depending (among other things) on the attitude of the speaker regarding how they need to be understood by the listener. This last will be dealt with in more in-depth in the Part III in this chapter because of its importance to this study.

Linell (2009: 224) citing Rommetveit (1974) states:

"We assume [as interlocutors of an encounter] that we share a lot of knowledge and assumptions, which remain implicit or unquestioned in most communicative encounters. It would be unpractical, tedious and often mutually face-threatening if we were to make all our assumptions explicit; we are simply "supposed to know" a lot in advance; intersubjectivity is taken for granted."

It is interesting to see this stated by Linell because in immigration contexts, lawyers might not necessarily make these assumptions or be able to make them. Knowledge is assumed but much less because in cross-cultural meetings one of the interlocutors does not speak the language (well) and does not have (enough) legal knowledge. Further, it happens quite often, especially at the beginning of the asylum procedure that the procedure is

explained in detail because the immigrant is expected to know little about it. This tendency to explain in detail decreases after the passage of time because the immigrant is supposed to have heard the information often before. Another point that needs to be addressed is that while attempting to prepare for the legal procedure lawyers might choose to withhold some information from the immigrant before the immigrant has answered the question. This is in order to avoid influencing what the immigrant is going to say. This illustrates Linell's insight that the amount of information displayed in utterances differs in different situations (Linell, 2009: 224).

In the following section, I will address another characteristic of talk: its vagueness.

### **3.1.6.2 Vagueness**

According to Linell (2009: 226) “[i]mplicitness is also related to vagueness. There is normally a considerable amount of vagueness in normal language use.” The researcher argues that the speaker cannot be expected to be always clear. The speaker cannot anticipate everything that is not known to the other interlocutors, and which needs to be mentioned (ibid: 226). To do so would be an impossible task. Given this, it is inevitable that talk is sometimes vague. This vagueness is also not necessarily unwelcome. Suchman (1987: 27)<sup>58</sup>, taking an anthropological approach into human action and communication, mentions that “the prescriptive significance of intentions for situated actions is inherently vague.” Potter and Te Molder (2005: 29) underline in *Conversation and cognition* Suchman's point of view, stating that:

“This vagueness is not a flaw when compared with full specification; rather the vagueness is precisely what makes plans useful for their projective and reconstructive tasks – they can be applied to an indefinite number of situations in deft and locally specific ways.”

Thus, often, vagueness cannot be (entirely) anticipated. However, interlocutors generally expect that the listener might demand an explanation.

---

<sup>58</sup> Lucy Suchman is a Professor of Anthropology of Science and Technology.

For this reason, in immigration settings, immigrants are expected to indicate that they need further explanation when they do not understand something said due to lack of background information and/or the complexity of legal discourse. However, reality is sometimes more complex than this. What, for instance, if the immigrant has miscommunicated the issue under discussion and thinks he does understand the rendition? (As happened in this study) What if the immigrant assumes that the interlocutor meant something and he is wrong? This is why the researcher favours conducting interviews with the immigrant when notions of meaning and understanding are dealt with, i.e. the topic of the study is sense-making. There are other situations where vagueness can be resorted to from a strategic point of view. In immigration settings, the lawyer might try to make the immigrant release information to him without influencing the quality of that information.

Ambiguity can also be related to implicitness (Wadensjö, 1998: 223). When a word is ambiguous due to the fact that it can be interpreted in different ways, this can cause miscommunication on the utterance level. The speaker cannot be expected to be able under all circumstances to anticipate possible ambiguity. This last too justifies conducting an interview with the immigrant.

### **3.1.6.3 Partial understanding, and understandings for current purposes**

The individual participants of a situated interaction cannot fully anticipate what will be said by the 'other', and what they themselves will end up having said during this interaction. They are dependent on the other interlocutors in co-constructing meaning. Rommetveit (1974: 50-51) states that Situated understandings are partially shared, and are partial. They come into being dialogically, in a fragmentary way. This stance is shared by Wadensjö (1998). This partial and the fragmentary nature of understanding makes us work with understanding 'for current (practical) purposes' (Linell, 2009: 226) and individuals must be "content with understanding each other sufficiently well in order to proceed further in their communication or other current doings" (ibid: 39). Wittgenstein (1953: 158), who worked in the philosophy of language,

was one of the dialogists who took this stance. He linked situated understanding to “Now I know how to go on.” But what does this mean, exactly? It is as if interlocutors have a milestone to gauge these understandings and that they choose to stop understanding when the ‘current (practical) purpose’ does not require further understanding. The researcher argues that interlocutors are rather thought to do their best to understand until they understand enough for ‘current, practical purposes’ (Linell, 2009: 39). However, they can also choose not to stop engaging with further understandings on the basis that a better understanding is required of something. For example, the interlocutor can include a new dimension in the discussion and ask the speaker to respond to it.

Furthermore, unlike Linell (2009), who relates the notion of ‘understanding (enough) for current practical purposes’ to the notion of ‘difference that makes a difference’ which is used by Bateson (1972: 99)<sup>59</sup>, the researcher argues that interactants do not always interact with a practical purpose in mind. There are interactions which are less practically oriented, for example, when the listener wants a piece of information for another unrelated subject. Interactions can also progress without that understanding, being even partial, achieved. The speaker might proceed knowing, or perhaps not knowing, that his interlocutor has not understood.

In the following section, I will address one of the central notions in this study: misunderstanding/miscommunication; for as must have become clear by now this study is concerned with sense-making.

### **3.1.7 Misunderstanding and miscommunication**

Unlike monological theories of communication, which often associate misunderstandings only with the recipients of the utterance(s) (the listeners are assumed not to succeed to understand what the speaker means) (Linell, 2009: 227), in dialogism misunderstanding is theorized as miscommunication, implying that misunderstanding is a “joint” product between the interlocutors as Wadensjö says (1998, p. 228). It has repeatedly been shown in

---

<sup>59</sup> Gregory Bateson was among other things an anthropologist, social scientist and linguist.

empirical studies of misunderstandings in ‘talk-in-interaction’ that miscommunication is generated “collectively and reciprocally” (Linell, 2009: 228); Wadensjö, (1998: 198) agrees with this, which is to be expected as she has discovered the beneficiality of dialogism for interpreting studies. According to Linell (2009: 228), miscommunications are often the:

“[...] products of the intricate interaction of participants’ interpretations of various contextual affordances and of *each other’s utterances*. When parties build new utterances, they sometimes exploit different parts of the semantic-pragmatic affordances of self’s and other’s prior utterances [...].”

The researcher argues that these contextual affordances can be related to the context of the interaction, but they can also be related to knowledge that was learned in prior interactions with the same interlocutors or with other interlocutors. In immigration settings, the affordances exploited in a courtroom, for example, could be used later during an interaction with a lawyer. When the meaning learned in a previous context does not match the meaning in a situated context, miscommunications can take place (see also the discussion on Situation-transcending-resources in section 3.1.8 and of Double Dialogicality in section 3.1.9).

Linell states that “[m]iscommunication often involve [*sic*] mismatches of participants’ purposes and situation definitions; it is not just utterances in themselves that can be “misunderstood,” but rather utterances in relation to framing assumptions and expectations” (commas in original). The researcher argues that these assumptions can relate to the role of the interpreter, that of the lawyer, etc. (see *Sense-making, motivation and assumptions* in section 3.1.1. above), or simply to what has been said or not. “Hence, miscommunication is dialogically generated and accomplished, in several respects” (Linell: 228). Wadensjö<sup>60</sup> (1998) refers extensively to this. She introduces the useful analytical tool ‘trouble sources’ to account for those sources of trouble that cause miscommunication. This tool is adopted in this study. This will be discussed in Part II in this chapter.

---

<sup>60</sup> Professor Cecilia Wadensjö is key figure within the field of DI. Her seminal work *Interpreting as Interaction* has been very influential in the field.

Before we go to the next section, here a summary of what has been covered in this chapter so far. As said, this chapter is about dialogism and how it theorizes sense-making. To understand dialogism, we have considered its assumptions/principles. Then, we dealt with meanings and understandings, which are central concepts in this theory. After that, we talked about the notion of talk and how it is theorized in dialogism in relation to sense-making. In the previous section, we talked about how misunderstanding is theorized in dialogism. In the following section, another aspect of understanding will be presented.

### **3.1.7.1 Understandings that are not made public**

Expanding on the notion of understanding, Linell states that “[d]ialogical theories align with CA [Conversation Analysis<sup>61</sup>] in regarding responses as embodying interpretations of prior contributions.” Yet, he argues, the contributions overtly shown in public discourse do not comprise all aspects of the understandings (or misunderstandings) of individuals: “[p]arties to communication conceal a good deal of those understandings, which are presumably present in their ‘internal dialogues’” (Linell, 2009: 230). The researcher argues that this is understandable as the characteristics of talk (see section 3.1.6 above) cause the interlocutor not to show all their understandings. The present study adopts the position of Linell in relation to understanding. Having this fact in the back of his head, the researcher considers it an essential theoretical basis for the manner in which data needs to be collected and dealt with. Further, the researcher argues that due to the fact that “speakers often “claim” understanding without “demonstrating” it” (Linell, 2009: 230, inverted commas original), and that ‘internal dialogue’ forms a cornerstone in dialogical theory, excluding any attempt to reconstruct the meaning from the perspective of the recipient and the speaker would be a considerable impoverishment. It is not possible to claim that private understandings, i.e. ones that are not shown in discourse, could be (fully)

---

<sup>61</sup> According to Silverman (2006: 401), conversation analysis is “based on an attempt to describe people’s methods for producing orderly talk-in-interaction. It derives from the work of Harvey Sacks (1992).”

reconstructed by interviewing the involved participants. However, it is believed that under the right circumstances and given the right approach participants could be willing to disclose (some parts of) their understanding, which is generated through internal dialogue.

In the following section, I will discuss a very important aspect of dialogism, which is the how interlocutors utilize their past knowledge during the process of meaning-making. As will be shown in Part III and in the following chapters, this aspect is of great importance both during the overall sense-making process, and also in the context of the IME under investigation.

### **3.1.8 “Situations and situation-transcending practices”**

In dialogism, during situated interactions, while meaning is being constructed, the interacting individuals do not only depend on the ‘material’ (as it is called in Linell, 2009) provided during the interaction itself. They also appeal to the sociocultural resources they take with them into this interaction (Linell, 2009: 49). These resources are the “language, concepts, knowledge about the world, identities and norms, etc., which govern expectations and efforts for meaning in concrete situations” (ibid). These resources belong to ‘*traditions*’ (ibid). Traditions “[...] constitute the counterpoint of ‘situations’ (ibid). Situations refer here to the “*specific occasions or encounters, specified in terms of particular times and places and specific participants (speakers and recipients)*” (Linell, 2009: 49 (italics in original)). The term ‘situation transcending knowledge/resources’ (STK/Rs) will be used in this study to refer to the “*situation-transcending, sociocultural practices*, to which participants in situated interactions orient in producing and reproducing activity types and other routines” (italics in original) (Linell, 2009: 50). Situatedness and situation-transcendence can be illustrated by almost any actual utterance or sequence of utterances as “[...] sense-making is always situated, *and* it is dependent on situation-transcending resources” (ibid: 51).

Thus, when individuals interact, they are not entirely dependent on current social interactions in meaning-making. They also appeal to the knowledge they already have. This is important for the current study, since it means that

it is not enough to study the discourse utilized during the ‘talk-in-interaction’ as Wadensjö (1998) arguably has done in her seminal work, admittedly complemented with some short interviews.

But how is this information, that is of STK/R, acquired? When an individual acquires knowledge and skills which originate from understanding something new, this new knowledge could then be used in future situations. Something then has been “learnt” (Linell, 2009: 230). “The concept of “learning” is intrinsically related to trans-situational changes over time” (commas in original) (ibid). When information is provided to individuals in a learning situation, this information is thought (meant) to be of use for future situations, “[...] where learners get opportunities to account more extensively for their understanding [...]” (ibid: 231).

After having introduced the notion of STK/R, now is an appropriate point to explain how situated meanings and those related to STK/R relate to each other during the process of meaning-making which takes place during interactions. This is the topic of the following section.

### **3.1.9 Double Dialogicality**

In studies like the current one, it is arguably important not to blindly look at the situated interaction as if it takes place in a ‘vacuum’ (the term is Wadensjö’s (1998)). As mentioned earlier, individuals, while engaging in sense-making, do not depend only on the materials that are purely related to the situated interaction; they also resort to materials that belong to STK/R. The knowledge they have acquired from past events is used during the new interactions. During these interactions, each individual engages in two dialogues, one dialogue with the interlocutor(s), and the other in his own mind with himself during which he engages previous knowledge. Linell calls this process ‘double dialogicality’. He says that the concept refers:

“[...] in the terms of Nystrand (1992), to the combination of interactionism and social (i.e., sociohistorical) constructionism. In and through communicative and cognitive activities, there is dialogue within both situations and traditions; participants in the activities in question engage in both situated interaction and sociocultural praxis. In one sense, the situated interaction (with its

internal dialogue) and the various situation-transcending aspects [...] are features of the same comprehensive communicative project performed there-and-then [...]"

The concept of 'double dialogicality' is believed to be useful in the analysis of discourse of immigration contexts. As has been shown in chapter One, the immigration process often entails engaging in numerous meetings with different institutions, including legal institutions like lawyers' offices. During these meetings, lawyers and their clients engage in communication sessions with the aim of strengthening the legal position of the immigrant. The interlocutors engage in a discussion that addresses not only situational issues related to the context of the situated meeting, but often also related to their life in their homeland. Individuals participating in the interaction do not involve themselves in such interactions 'empty-handed'; they 'take' with them the knowledge they have acquired prior to the situated interaction. Both of these types of meanings are then dealt with in the internal dialogue during the process which is called Double Dialogicality by Linell, as briefly explained above. An example, when an immigrant meets their lawyer, is that they will have very often heard parts of the information to be discussed during earlier meetings. This means that in addition to the situated interaction, the interaction is also influenced by the STK/R.

In this section, the concept of Double Dialogicality has been briefly explained. This explains how situated meanings and those related to the STK/R relate to each other during interactions and how both influence each other during the process, giving rise to meaning between interlocutors. Part of the STK/Rs are the biographical experiences of the interlocutors. This will be discussed in the following section.

### **3.1.10 Biographical experiences**

Related to STK/R are what Linell (2009: 53) calls the *biographical experiences* of the individual: "Each person develops individual points-of-view as a result of his or her *biographical experiences*" (italics in original). This study places importance on these points of view. The points of view can reveal very interesting insights into meaning-making and understanding with

regard to one's own responsibility and that of the other. It is important to involve these points of view in the study as they are "[...] thoroughly impregnated by social and cultural interdependences [...]" (ibid). Although some of these points of view (perspectives) can be taken to be views shared by many people, they are sometimes "[...] partly unique to the individual, due to this or her specific life course" (ibid).

In this part (Part I) of the chapter, the researcher has discussed notions related to the theory of dialogism, which accounts for how meaning-making develops during interactions. Later, in Part III, the researcher will explain how we can apply these notions in this study, by integrating them into the theoretical model of Wadensjö for the purpose of finding answers to the research questions of the study. In part II, immediately below, the researcher will provide an exposition and discuss relevant aspects of the theoretical model of Wadensjö, and where relevant, will provide a critique of it. In general, there are three aspects which will be critiqued with regard to the model of Wadensjö:

**(a)** Her model suggests that she did not unpack dialogism sufficiently or utilize it as effectively as this study does, thus underplaying some notions that dialogism provides. The researcher refers here to the concept of STK/Rs. The reason for this is perhaps that her research aims did not require this.

**(b)** She seems to give CA a greater role and credit than it deserves with regard to the capabilities she attributes to it. Again, the reason for this can be attributed to her research questions and aims.

**(c)** Related to **(b)**, arguably, she does not give the participants sufficient voice compared to this study.

## Part II

### 3.2 Theoretical approach of Wadensjö to dialogism

Until the 1990's, interpreting had been conceptualized as a 'transfer' of messages from one language to another, and interpreters "as 'channels', which are temporarily hosting primary speakers' messages in their brains" – an approach which represents a "*monological* model of language and mind" (commas and italics in original) (Wadensjö, 1998). In this monological approach "[...] words and expressions are understood as entities with a fixed meaning" (Bot and Verrept, 2013: 119). This theorization finds its origin in the theoretical stance towards mind as being the source where reality originates, without the 'other' [other interlocutors] having any share in the development of that reality. The dialogical theorization of interpreting, by contrast, argues that the interpreter is an active participant in the interaction. Adopting this theorization would imply accepting that the interpreter is an essential source of meaning-making and thus a full participant in the interaction. It is, thus, not surprising that Wadensjö theorizes interpreting as an "interaction between participants in a social event." By doing so, she theorizes reality as a co-construction between the mind of the individual and the 'outer world'. This is why the unit of analysis is not interpreting or the interpreter as would be the case if a monologic theorization was adopted; it is the IME in its entirety. By adopting this approach, Wadensjö not only emphasizes the relevance of the individuals participating in the interaction in meaning-making; she also emphasizes the importance of the context in which the interaction takes place.

However, what she does not do sufficiently, is to incorporate the STK/Rs (introduced in section 3.1.8) in her theorization. This is probably as a result of the fact that her primary interest is in how meaning is made during the interaction, on a turn-by-turn level and on the level of the interaction as a whole. She aimed in her work to show that the interpreter is an active member of the encounter, which challenged earlier theorizations. The researcher argues that this also explains why other, important dialogical

notions such as intersubjectivity and alterity did not feature prominently in her work.

The fact that Wadensjö did not problematize the communicative capabilities and the interrelated knowledge of the immigrants in her study sufficiently, as this was not one of her primary research aims, is one reason why she might have chosen not to engage with the concept of alterity prominently. In this study, the notions of alterity and intersubjectivity are foregrounded because the researcher wants to problematize the communicative skills and the interrelated knowledge of the immigrant and to show their influence on sense-making during the IME, both on the part of the immigrant and that of the interpreter (see Part III below).

By adding the notion of STK/R to the dialogical model of Wadensjö, and giving more prominence to alterity and intersubjectivity, the researcher is able to deal with the research questions of the current study more comprehensively. Adopting this approach and having such research questions requires holding interviews with the participants. The more-or-less pure CA approach of Wadensjö to the data will not support the investigation of the present research questions. In the following sections, the researcher will provide an exposition and critique of Wadensjö's application of dialogism to interpreter mediation.

### **3.2.1 Wadensjö's applications of dialogism: 'talk-as-text' and 'talk-as-activity' analytical tools**

Differentiating her dialogic approach from the monological one does not mean, according to Wadensjö, that the textual approach should be totally rejected. When one analyses the talk of an IME, one starts by "freezing" the transcribed text, which is then used "as a tool for exploring, from the authentic participants' point of view, issues of semantics, phonetics, turn-taking, and so forth" (1998: 22). It is unclear to me how this can be done from "the authentic participants' point of view" without talking to them directly as done in this study. When Wadensjö has questions regarding "the socio-cultural significance of activities represented by a text, about the actors'

situated organization of talk”, talk is looked at as “activity, as consisting of a range of activities at different levels.”

The researcher shares Wadensjö’s stance here. The difference between Wadensjö’s work and this research lies in the fact that this study not only studies the (transcribed) text, but also complements it with the perspectives of the relevant individuals.

### **3.2.2 Understanding and miscommunication tools**

Wadensjö discusses the notions of understanding and miscommunication on the basis of her dialogical theorization of IME, i.e. as an interaction. She theorizes miscommunications as follows: “*Miscommunication* within a particular communicative exchange is taken as *lack of fit between the sense aimed at by one interlocutor, and what is displayed by another as the sense made of the current message* [italics in original]” (Wadensjö, 1998: 198). In this statement, it is unclear how the “sense made of the current message” can be interpretively analysed. It seems that Wadensjö relies mainly on detailed discourse analysis, principally utilizing CA, which is arguably not sufficient to account for what happens in such an interaction. She seems to want to account only for audible and/or visible discourse, as though there were a linear relationship between what is heard/said and what is meant. This sounds very similar to the monologic way of thinking and language (which she is so against). It is as if the reader of such transcribed texts (and/or hearer of such audible texts) is given a mandate to decide what the meaning of the words uttered is and how they should be understood. The linguistic features of an utterance are not always equal to the meaning normally attributed to them. For example, there is no linear relationship between ‘Yes’ or ‘Ehum’ with ‘I have understood’, etc. They could have other meanings; for example, “Carry on, I am listening”. Another example of the problem is that despite the fact that both parties may think there is mutual understanding, there are no guarantees that this is the case. The use of CA could not possibly account for all the processes of meaning-making and

understanding. It needs to be complemented with the views of the participants.

This study does not raise the questions which were asked by Wadensjö regarding whether the interpreter is an active participant in the IME. These are answered by Wadensjö brilliantly. The research questions of this study require building on her methodology: the methodological decisions taken by her are extended. More tools are needed in this study. I place more emphasis on investigating understanding or miscommunication by, where possible, involving the perspective of the participants. I seek to enable the interpreter to re-construct, as far as possible, the internal dialogue he had when interpreting in order to understand the meaning-making process which led to the rendition under investigation. This is complemented by a detailed discourse analysis based on the audio and the transcribed data (completed before the interviews). For a practical overview of how this was done, see section 4.2.1. In this process, Wadensjö's tool of 'trouble sources' was utilized.

In order to analyse miscommunication, Wadensjö introduces the notion of 'trouble sources'. These trouble sources can distort communication and cause 'miscommunication'. They are divided into two types: 'locally occurring' (Russell, 2001: 136) ('tied' to the local, 'turn-by-turn' organization of talk), and 'global'. The first type of 'trouble sources' is further divided into ones 'tied' to '*linguistic factors*' (understanding based on words spoken, in relation to linguistic, prosodic and phonetic standards in a given language) and those 'tied' to the '*local coordination* of communicative efforts (understanding based on words spoken, in relation to agency and addressivity conveyed – verbally or non-verbally – when speaking)".

The second type of trouble sources, global possible 'trouble sources', refers to the "[...] different interlocutors' respective views, beliefs and attitudes in relation to subject matter, to the encounter and to one another [...]" (Wadensjö, 1998: 202). Further, on the global level, 'trouble sources' are divided into two levels: "discrepant views of institutions" and "discrepant views of interpreters". The first is "tied [...] to participants' expectations and knowledge concerning the *institutional encounter* in which talk occurs [...]",

while the second involves “[...] assumptions and beliefs as regards *interpreter-mediated conversation*.”

In IS, decision-making on the part of the interpreter is closely related to the notion of role, which is traditionally investigated in this field (Jacobsen, 2009). The notion of role is important in this study too, as it was for Wadensjö when she developed her theoretical model to prove the active involvement of the interpreter in IME’s.

### **3.2.3 Wadensjö’s analytical tool for Role**

Wadensjö’s tool for analysing role, consists of the concepts ‘normative role’, ‘typical role’ and ‘role performance’, which she borrowed from the sociologist Erving Goffman (1961) and adapted for her aims. The ‘normative role’ is “[...] what interpreters think they do when they perform well, or at least appropriately as interpreters” (Wadensjö, 1998: 83). Consulting Goffman’s work (1961: 75), we notice that he does not use the term ‘normative role’. Rather, ‘Role’ is used. The individual who performs this role “[...] would engage in were he to act solely in terms of the normative demands upon someone in his position”, according to Goffman. Unlike Wadensjö, Goffman links this role directly to predefined demands which are to be fulfilled by someone who does the work. In Wadensjö’s definition, the interpreter seems to be given more freedom with regard to the demands connected to the role played. In the context of this study, the researcher believes that asking the interpreter about his/her ‘normative role’ would arguably help the researcher analyse the translations made from the perspective of whether or not they show ‘role distance’. And if this were the case, this would provide the researcher with a tool to attempt to find an explanation for it from the interpreter.

The notion of ‘typical role’ “[...] takes into account that the conditions for performing a certain role typically fluctuate from time to time and place to place” (Wadensjö, 1998: 83). Performers of this role “[...] develop routines [...]” to deal with those situations which are considered to be typical and “[...] *not* foreseen by shared established norms” (Wadensjö, 1998: 83 (*italics in*

original)). There are several points to be discussed here. First, it is as if Wadensjö suggests that all situations which are “[...] *not* foreseen by shared established norms” are by definition dealt with as being typical, which is disputable. When can the individual decide whether a situation is a typical one? Wadensjö does not provide a clear explanation. Secondly, it is unclear when norms are shared and when they are not. Are they by definition shared only because they are supposed to be distributed among and known by a working community? What about those situations where the individual *violates* the “shared and established norms”? Further, what are the norms that she refers to? Is she only referring, in the case of the interpreter, to the norms which are valid in the host country, in her case Sweden? Are the norms of the country where the interpreter comes from (e.g. Iraq) included? Are norms regarding, for example, professionalism and neutrality global? Rudvin (2007) advises that notions such as professionalism, and related notions such as neutrality should be problematized. The researcher believes that it is essential to incorporate the definitions belonging to the culture of the immigrant regarding these notions. It is expected that this will have an illuminating impact on the research community regarding how to define role.

Takimoto (2006: 50) defines ‘typical role’ as “[...] the typical response of an individual in a certain position [...]” Due to the lack of context in this statement, it is unclear how this role is understood by the writer. In what way does the ‘response’ have to be understood? Is this done on a local level (related to a concrete happening), or a global level (related to a work type as a whole)? Eraslan Gercek (2008) explains this role in a clearer way by breaking down Wadensjö’s statement. He argues that a role performer can be confronted with situations which “pre-established norms” may not accommodate. In this regard, reference is made to change of time and place as being variables which affect the definition of the situation. However, it is left unexplained how the reader should understand the influence of the variables on the situation which the individual finds him or herself in. No examples are given to further facilitate understanding the notions of time and place in this regard. Gercek, however, goes on to contextualize his understanding of ‘typical role’ by providing an explanation of how this kind of role can be understood in an interpreting situation: “When shared ideas

about the interpreter's role in general do not envisage what interpreters encounter in the course of interpreting, interpreters develop certain strategies to deal with those 'typical situations'. These strategies constitute the typical role of the interpreter" (2008: 11). This explanation seems to correspond to Wadensjö's understanding of 'typical role'.

The concept of 'role performance', according to Wadensjö (1998: 82) represents:

"[...] aspects of the individual's behaviour which stem neither from normative nor from typical standards, but must be explained by circumstances in the situation (e.g. other people present, light, noise, physical object) and by the performer's personal style while on duty."

Goffman (1961: 75) defines this concept in a clearer way. It represents the "[...] actual conduct of a particular individual while on duty in his position". Furthermore, unlike Wadensjö, Goffman does not link this role to "circumstance in the situation". By adding this, Wadensjö seems to alter Goffman's definition of this role, adding conditions to it, as it were.

The notion of *role others* refers to the relevant audience with whom interlocutors [the interpreter in this study] interact in the role in question (Goffman, 1961). Both the *role others* of the interpreter are termed by Goffman *role-set* (Goffman, 1961: 75). The 'role others' of the interpreter in this study are the immigrant and the lawyer. The *activity role* of the interpreter is his role as interpreter.

### 3.2.4 Participation framework

Goffman's (1981) Participation Framework analytical model which has been complemented by Wadensjö, and "[...] which serves to describe an individual's involvement, or "status of participation," in communicative interaction" (Pöchhacker, 2004: 91 (commas in original)), can be utilized in the process of studying the 'actions' and 'interactions' of interlocutors in such interactions. The aim is to investigate the involvement of the relevant participants in the social interaction under study "[...] at the micro-level of individual utterances [...]" (Pöchhacker, 2004: 91), because "[t]he choices interpreters make in interaction as speakers and listeners make a significant

difference to the progression and the substance of common discourse” (Wadensjö, 1998).

According to Wadensjö “[...] the organization of spoken interaction ultimately results from participants’ continuous evaluations and re-evaluations of speaker-hearers’ roles or *status of participation* [italics in original], at the turn-by-turn-level” (Wadensjö, 1998: 86). Wadensjö’s adoption of this view is based on her adoption of dialogism in understanding how sense is made. In this approach, “[t]he substance and the progression of interaction, and subsequently individuals’ ‘role performance’, depend on how interlocutors relate to one another at an utterance-to-utterance level, through potentially changing alignments in the ongoing flow of discourse” (Wadensjö, 1998: 86). In this study, the researcher utilized this tool mainly during the preparation phase for the two interviews.

Closely related to changing of alignment in respect of footing, which is the central notion which led to the design of the notions of ‘production format’ and ‘reception format’, is the notion of ‘code switching’. This is discussed by, among others, Bernstein (1972). While revisiting the backstory of immigrants, lawyers (depending on the reading techniques of the lawyer) switch between the role of the IND/Court and the role of the immigrant/lawyer in order to show their legal stance and contrast it to the stance of the lawyer and their client. The lawyer utilizes footing to mark the difference between the legal stance of the immigrant and himself on the one hand, and that of the IND/court on the other. By so doing, the lawyer contrasts the two stances with the aim of discussing them and, where relevant, inviting the immigrant to respond. The task of the interpreter can be regarded as a challenging one when the lawyer regularly changes footing in order to mark a change in his alignment. This might arguably form a challenge for the immigrant too, in differentiating between the discourse of the IND/court and that of the lawyer. This process of ‘changing hats’ (Goffman, 1981: 145) ‘shift of footing’ (Mason, 2001: i) on the part of the lawyer can form a challenge for the interpreter. It must be noted that the lawyer is expected to show that they are changing alignment by “[...] introducing the name or capacity in which he speaks [...]” (Goffman, 1981: 145). This issue is important to keep in mind when

dialogism is adopted as an epistemology because this adoption brings with it numerous implications (Wadensjö, 1998: 279), for example, meaning is theorized as “[...] settled in and by interaction between individuals” (Wadensjö, 1998). If the issue of changing alignment is not dealt with well by the interpreter, the immigrant might face difficulties in understanding who says what because meaning as established in the interaction is also partly dependent on how interlocutors understand each other’s ‘listenership and speakership’ (Wadensjö, 1995).

### 3.2.5 Taxonomy

The taxonomy of Wadensjö has been utilized in this study for the purpose of organizing and classifying the renditions. As in Wadensjö, the texts voiced during an IME are viewed “[...] as consisting of basically *two types of utterances*, namely *originals* (i.e. all utterances voiced by primary interlocutors) and *interpreters’ utterances* (i.e. all utterances voiced by interpreters)” (Wadensjö, 1998: 104 (italics in original)). Wadensjö mentions that she compares the originals with the interpreter’s utterances and analyses them in terms of ‘closeness’ and ‘divergence’ with the aim of finding out if she can “[...] detect potential interactional *functions* of different kinds of utterance”, rather than primarily exploring the reason for these (Wadensjö, 1998: 105 (italics in original)). Arguably, she took this approach because she was more interested in re-defining the role of the interpreter than in understanding *why* the interpreter acted the way he did.

This study is different; it enriches the analysis through taking the perspectives of the relevant interlocutors into account. By doing so, it attempts to understand the *why* which Wadensjö was not principally interested in. The researcher does not understand this *why* from a prescriptive approach, however. Rather, it is investigated from the perspective of attempting to understand *how* the interpreters’ utterances have come into being; i.e. this study attempts to understand, where possible, how the process of meaning-making evolved. The researcher seeks to enable the interpreter to re-construct the internal dialogue he had when

interpreting in order to understand the meaning-making process which led to the investigated rendition. This is not the only difference between Wadensjö's study and the current one. With regard to the current data and utilizing her taxonomy, the researcher has found renditions in his data that could not fit in any of Wadensjö's categories. For this reason, he needed to adapt Wadensjö's taxonomy.

### 3.2.5.1 Adaption of the taxonomy

In her explanation of '*close renditions*', the criteria which Wadensjö applies are style and the degree with which the 'propositional content' is present in the rendition: "[...] the propositional content found explicitly expressed in the rendition must be equally found in the preceding 'original', and the style of the two utterances should be approximately the same" (Wadensjö, 1998: 107). According to Peetz (1972: 183), propositional content is:

"an expression used by Searle to denote what is common to, for example, 'I assert that John Smith shut the door', 'I, John Smith, promise to shut the door', 'John Smith, shut the door!' 'Did John Smith shut the door?', and so on, namely the proposition 'John Smith shut the door.'"

This means that the words which are used to perform the illocutionary acts, for example 'assert', 'promise', the ordering element in 'John Smith, shut the door!', and the questioning element in 'Did John Smith shut the door?' are not taken into consideration when the closeness of the utterances are judged by Wadensjö. Or at least, this is how the matter is understood, since Wadensjö does not provide any definitions of the term 'propositional content'.

Considering that the research questions of this study require every element of the utterance to be studied, and given that Wadensjö's taxonomy does not seem to cover all the elements that an utterance contains, her taxonomy needs to be adapted for this study. Therefore, when evaluating the closeness of the 'renditions', this study will look at the 'informational content' instead of the 'propositional content', where the notion of the 'informational content' subsumes not only Wadensjö's 'propositional content' but also 'interactional'/'situated meaning' (Wadensjö, 1995). This means that in an

utterance like 'I assert that John Smith shut the door', all the linguistic elements will be evaluated, not only the 'propositional content'. This is true for the other types of 'renditions' as well. To take an example from the data of this study, every linguistic element in the following is counted as relevant in the analysis, even the 'comment clause' (Crystal, 2008) 'goed' ['good'].

Example:

1<sup>62</sup> Lawyer: goed (....) .hhhh (.) ja we zijn al la:ng bezig met jouw::  
asielprocedure.

Lawyer: good (....) .hhhh (.) yeah we have been busy with your: asylum  
procedure for a lo:ng time.

2 احنا صارنا فترة (.) عم نشغل مشغولين ب: (.) اجراءات لجوى:ك.

Interpreter: we have been working on been busy with: (.) your asylum  
proce:dure for some time.

In the following paragraphs, the categories of the taxonomy which are relevant for this study and which will be adapted will be discussed. The other categories are either irrelevant [because not relevant data was found] or will be used as they are.

Starting with 'close renditions', to be considered a close rendition, the 'informational content' "[...] found explicitly expressed in the rendition must be equally found in the preceding 'original' [...]" (Wadensjö, 1998: 107 (commas in original)). Unlike in Wadensjö where the style of the two utterances "[...] should be approximately the same", in this study the style of the two utterances need only be fairly comparable to each other. This decision is related to the notions of meaning, understanding and the will of the interpreter to facilitate understanding. For more information, see chapter Six.

---

<sup>62</sup> This number and corresponding numbers used in other excerpts/examples in this thesis represent their place in the sequence in the IME (see Appendix I).

The data has revealed certain types of ‘renditions’ that cannot be placed under one of the categories of Wadensjö’s taxonomy. The researcher has accordingly developed the following additional categories.

- **‘Reduced + substituted renditions’**

This category contains renditions where there is at least one item which is ‘reduced’ and one item which is ‘substituted’. Below example shows one case of ‘substitution’. “Uitgelegd” [*explained*] is ‘substituted’ with “قلت لها” [*said to her*]. The item “meer” is ‘reduced’.

Example:

**137** Lawyer: je hebt toen uitgelegd dat je bang was voor de politie en niet meer naar haar toe wilde komen.

Lawyer: you explained back then that you were afraid of the police and did not want to go to her any longer.

**138** المترجم: وقلت لها انو انتى خيفان من الشرطة: و ما بدك تروح لعندا.

Interpreter: and you said to her that you are afraid of the police: and you do not want to go to her.

For information with regard to the frequency with which this category occurs in the data, see table 5.1 in section 5.1 (Chapter Five).

- **‘Only substituted renditions’**

This category contains ‘renditions’ where there is at least one ‘substitution’. In the example below, “gevraagd of” [*asked if*] is ‘substituted’ with “طلبت” [*requested*]. This category is different from the ‘substituted renditions’ found in Wadensjö’s taxonomy.

Wadensjö’s category is arguably unclearly explained: “[a] ‘substituted rendition’ consists of a combination of an ‘expanded’ and a ‘reduced’ one.”

The way this is understood by the researcher is that renditions can belong to this group where two items have been changed. One item is 'reduced', meaning that it is not reflected in the rendition and another one is 'expanded', meaning that this other item has been 'expanded'.

The following is an example:

Original: John has a car, a house and a horse.

Rendition: John has a house and a white horse.

In this example, we have a 'reduction' "a car" (which is found in the original, but omitted in the rendition) and a 'expansion' "white" (which is not found in the original, but is found in the rendition).

- **'Expanded + substituted renditions'**

In addition to the above categories, there are other examples found in the data where Wadensjö's taxonomy is inadequate. In the example below, there are some 'reductions' and at least one 'substitution'

Exerpt:

10 Lawyer: en e: (.) de IND (.) heeft (.) daar op zitting ook gezegd dat ze vonden dat we >eigenlijk< = dat je helemaal geen recht had om in (.) beroep te gaan (.) omdat je geen belang had=want je hebt nu verblijfsvergunning .h dus dan kun je niet beroep e e tegen een asielbesluit.

Lawyer: and e: (.) the IND (.) said (.) there during the [court] session indeed that they are of the opinion that we >actually<that you had no right whatsoever to (.) lodge an appeal (.) because you had no interest=for you have now a residence permit .h so you cannot lodge an appeal eh eh against an asylum [residence] permit.

11 المترجم: وأنتُ (.) وأثناء الجلسة (.) دائرة الهجرة والتجنّي:س قابلت أنّو هنيّ (.) إي بيشو إي يعني من رأيين إي أنّو إنت إي ما من حقك أنّو تتقدم ب: (..) طَلب إي إي ب: إستئناف ضدّ القرار لأنّو ما من مصلحتك لأنّو أنتي حصّلت (.) على الإقامة.

Interpreter: and du (.) and during the [court] session (.) the Immigration and Naturalization Service said that they (.) e: think e: yaʕni<sup>63</sup> they are of the opinion e: that you e: have no right to lodge (...) e: e: an appeal against the decision because it is not in your interest because you [already] have (.) received the [residence] permit.

In part I of this chapter, the researcher discussed dialogism and provided a critique. In this part (Part II), the theoretical model of Wadensjö has been discussed, and a critique and adaptation have been provided. In part III, below, the researcher will pave the way theoretically for the discussion of the findings, by discussing how tools and concepts discussed in parts I and II will be used in the discussion: dialogic notions discussed in the previous parts will be dealt with in the context of how they will be used during the data analysis, alongside their integration with tools from the relevant theoretical model of Wadensjö.

---

<sup>63</sup> This is a filler probably used here by the interpreter to give himself time to think or reformulate.

### Part III

My general argument has been that we need to borrow some dialogical concepts and integrate them into the model of Wadensjö in order to be able to address the second and third research questions adequately. In preparation for this, in Part I, I discussed and critiqued dialogism, while in Part II, I discussed and critiqued the model of Wadensjö. In this Part, I will lay down theoretical foundations that will be used to interpret the data I have collected. These foundations thus benefit from the theoretical discussions of in Part I and II. I will use these theoretical foundations in chapter Six to discuss the data.

As will be seen in that chapter, I argue that: (A) there is an interrelation between how the interpreter understands his role and the degree of difficulty of the 'material' he affords to the immigrant; (B) In addition, the nature of talk in general also influences how the translation decisions of the interpreter come into being; and (C) the characteristics related to the profession of interpreting also influence how these decisions come into being.

Directly below (3.3.1-3.3.1.2), I will discuss the interrelation between the perception of the speaker (i.e. the interpreter in this study) of their role and the material they afford to the listener (the immigrant in our study). This represents argument (A) in the previous paragraph (*how the interpreter understands his role and the degree of difficulty of the 'material' he affords to the immigrant*). Then argument B (*the nature of talk in general also influences how the translation decisions of the interpreter come into being*) will be discussed in section 3.3.2. The discussion here is not entirely separate from argument (A), of course, as will be seen. Related to this discussion of argument (B), in sections 3.3.1-3.3.6, I will discuss related topics which need to be addressed. In section 3.3.5, the discussion of (A) and (B) will be brought together. Following this, in section 3.3.7 I integrate argument (C) (*the characteristics related to the profession of interpreting also influence how these decisions come into being*) into the overall discussion. It needs to be stressed that there are no clear-cut boundaries between the material in the different sections. They are designed to reflect the thread of the analysis. I will now discuss argument A.

### **3.3.1 The interrelationship between “Afford[ing] material for making sense”, the degree of difficulty of this ‘material’ and the concept of role**

In the following sections, a rationale will be provided for understanding the interrelationship between how interlocutors/speakers afford ‘material’ for making sense, how this is connected to the level of difficulty of the material they afford, and how all of this relates to the speaker’s understanding of his role.

#### **3.3.1.1 Affording material**

As mentioned in Part I, when people enter a communicative situation, they try to make sense of it. They influence and are influenced by the other interlocutors. During this process, when producing an utterance, the speaker affords material for making sense, which are meant to guide “the interlocutors in their efforts after meaning and interpretation.” The receiving interlocutor contributes to sense-making by their “uptake and interpretation, made manifest in his or her following utterance(s), that counts in the interaction as the communicated meaning” (Linell, 2009: 222). But how does this affording of material take place and what are the factors which are taken into consideration in it? This is topic of the following sections.

#### **3.3.1.2 Understanding being resolving a task posited**

As mentioned in Part I, not everything that individuals want to say can be said explicitly (Linell, 2009: 224). The fact that language is incomplete indicates that meanings may be difficult to follow and that understandings will be difficult to infer, unless the utterances are put in context. The context will then serve as a guide in the jungle of possible meanings. Contexts are always relied on by interlocutors to understand utterances (Linell, 2009: 224). They help understand the situated (Linell, 2009) contextual (Wadensjö, 1998:

153) meaning. “A considerable part of meaning in interaction is therefore *inferred*, implicit rather than explicitly expressed” (Linell, 2009: 224). This plays an important role in helping the listener by providing context for the linguistic materials he ‘gives off’ (Goffman, 1961: 13). And even when this context is made clear, the listener will need to solve a task as Bakhtin mentions (Holquist, 1981: xix).

The researcher argues in this regard that there are degrees of difficulty of the task which is posited. The degree of difficulty of the ‘task’ will vary depending (among other things) on the attitude of the speaker with respect to how they need to be understood by the listener. In this regard, the researcher argues that the degree to which the interpreter will deal with the task “posited” will depend on (i) his understanding of his role as interpreter and (ii) his perception of his professional responsibility towards the immigrant. These two factors will help us understand how the interpreter thinks he should best translate, making strategies he employs easier to understand<sup>64</sup>.

Thus far, in sections 3.3.1-3.3.1.2, the researcher has discussed argument A (*there is an interrelation between how the interpreter understands his role and the difficulty degree of the ‘material’ he affords to the immigrant*). In the following section, the researcher will discuss argument B (*the nature of talk in general also influences how the translation decisions of the interpreter come into being*). He will recapitulate the influence of the nature of talk on how meaning is made in interactions. The researcher will also explain the influence of this nature of talk on the choices made by the speaker (i.e. the interpreter) regarding affording ‘material’.

### **3.3.2 Influence of implicitness and vagueness on situated sense-making**

As previously mentioned (section 3.1.1), not everything that individuals want to say can be said explicitly (Linell, 2009: 224). Because interlocutors cannot explicitly say everything and because talk is characterized by implicitness

---

<sup>64</sup> These two factors can be partly seen as being part of one’s personality; the personality of the interpreter influences the decisions that he makes (Bontempo and Napier, 2011).

and vagueness due to its dialogic nature (see 3.1.6.1 and 3.1.6.2 above), interlocutors/speakers need to make choices with regard to what they will say. In addition, the individual participants in a situated interaction cannot fully anticipate what will be said by the other. Rommetveit (1974: 50-51) states that situated understandings are not total or complete; they are partial. They are also fragmentary in the sense they crystalize during the process of sense-making; they are dialogically constituted. Finally, they are only partially shared; not everything is said. This stance is also adopted by Wadensjö (1998). This nature of understanding makes us work with understanding “for current (practical) purposes” such that individuals must “be content with understanding each other sufficiently well in order to proceed further in their communication or other current doings” (Linell, 2009: 39).

Having revisited the manner in which the ‘material’ is dealt with during communication (sections 3.3.1 – 3.3.1.2 above)<sup>65</sup>, having presented his argument in this regard, and having referred to the organic nature of talk (which influences the process of meaning-making between interlocutors)<sup>66</sup> (this section), the researcher will now move on to a discussion of the ‘internal dialogue’<sup>67</sup>. This is needed because the process of meaning-making, during which interlocutors deal with the ‘material’, requires that the interlocutor evaluates what they will say and re-evaluate their own thinking when the other interlocutor has presented how they think. In the context of this study, when the translation decisions of the interpreter are discussed, it is for us to attempt to understand how the interpreter made these evaluations and re-evaluations in his internal dialogue.

### **3.3.3 Enabling reconstruction of internal dialogue to understand how sense-making developed**

As indicated earlier, this thesis is concerned among other things with understanding how the investigated renditions came into being<sup>68</sup>. Based on the theory of dialogism, the researcher argues that all the constituents of the

---

<sup>65</sup> Related to argument A (section 3.3.1 above).

<sup>66</sup> Related to argument B (section 3.3.1 above).

<sup>67</sup> Argument C (section 3.3.1) will be discussed in section 3.3.7 below for practical reasons.

<sup>68</sup> See the research questions in section 0.2.1.

process of co-constructing meaning are relevant for the analysis and need to be involved in it as much as possible in order to achieve a comprehensive picture of what happened when the investigated renditions were being produced, simply because each one of these components influences how meaning is constructed. In studies like this one, the researcher needs to enable the interpreter to try to re-construct the internal dialogue when a particular rendition is being investigated. In the following paragraph, the researcher will provide a recapitulation of how the process of meaning-making which takes place in the internal dialogue goes and link this to this study.

According to dialogism, communicating individuals constantly 'evaluate' and 're-evaluate' their thinking in their endeavour to make sense of what is being said, and to contribute to the discourse by providing responses. These responses represent their understanding of what is being communicated. In cross-cultural communications like the one under investigation, the interpreter is dependent not only on the lawyer, but also on the immigrant during the process of sense-making; and the researcher indeed claims that all interlocutors (including the interpreter) are responsible for meaning-making during this process, whether they are actively participating in interaction by producing an utterance, or 'just' being there: their mere presence influences the process of meaning-making (Linell, Wadensjö). As mentioned in part I, for sense-making, interlocutors need context in order to be able to make sense of what is being mentioned. In addition, STK/R is important in this process.

While this study attempts to enable the interpreter to re-construct the internal dialogue, where this is not possible it seeks to uncover 'possible reasons' for these translation decisions<sup>69</sup>. The following section deals with this topic.

---

<sup>69</sup> It needs to be made clear that in the case of the immigrant also, the researcher attempted to re-construct the internal dialogue. This was for different reasons, though (see second research question: section 0.2.1). In the case of the immigrant, the researcher attempted to understand whether or not the immigrant understands the investigated rendition. While doing this, the researcher attempted also to understand what had led to understanding or miscommunication on the part of the immigrant.

### **3.3.4 Possible reasons for translation decisions**

It is possible that the interpreter might not remember exactly how the sense-making went at the specific point asked about; he might then mention possible reasons. It can be said that these possible reasons will provide us with information about how the interpreter would act if he were confronted with similar situations in the future, or might have acted in similar situations in the past. These possible reasons are arguably related to the process of (re-)evaluation of one's own thinking: "in which case/under which circumstances would I have acted like this?" So, when the interpreter provides such information, he is trying to re-construct his own internal dialogue in search of possible reasons for a translation decision the reason for which he does not remember during the IME.

In theoretical terms, (some of) this information may represent STK/R the interpreter has access to. Thus, these possible reasons could provide insightful information regarding the interpreter's views on how he acts, or would act, when translating for different kinds of clients and immigrants.

When the researcher seeks to enable the interpreter to re-construct his internal dialogue, he will be asking him about translation decisions he made, whether these were made based on a strategy or not. Only when the interpreter explains the decision will the researcher know whether the rendition was based on a concrete strategy or not. But how is 'strategy' understood in this theory? This is the topic of the next section.

#### **3.3.4.1 How 'strategy' is understood in this thesis**

In this thesis 'strategy' is theorized from the perspective of dialogism. Strategies are understood to be co-constructed by all the interlocutors of the IME during the process of meaning-making. This means that these strategies are not something produced by the interpreter without the other interlocutors having a share in the way they were produced by the interpreter. Related to the notion of 'strategy' from this perspective is the notion of role. Arguably, the opinion of the interpreter with regard to his role as interpreter is inextricably connected to the strategies he employed in his work. In the

following paragraph, the researcher will discuss this role theoretically and from the perspective of the interpreter himself, and its interrelationship with the notion of internal dialogue and affording material for sense-making. Thus, the discussions presented in sections 3.3.1-3.3.4.1 will be synthesised to make a case for the method of data collection, analysis and interpretation adopted in this study.

### **3.3.5 Interrelation between the perception of the interpreter of his role and the afforded 'material' on his part**

In sections 3.3.1-3.3.1.2, the researcher discussed the importance of understanding the interrelationship between the notion of role from the perspective of the speaker and the 'material' they afford. In the context of this study and the related research questions, the speaker is the interpreter. Thus, when we want to understand this interrelationship, we need to talk to the interpreter. In the context of attempting to understand how the translation decision came into being, this would mean that we will be trying to understand how the interpreter perceives his role as an interpreter because this could help us understand (some aspects of) the strategies he employs (i.e. the type and amount of 'material' afforded). As argued above, the manner in which the interpreter will deal with the task 'posited', in addition to the perception of the interpreter of his role, will depend also on how he perceives his professional responsibility towards the immigrant, which is again interrelated with the notion of role. This leads us to the following section, where the researcher will discuss the notion of empowerment in relation to the immigrant, the notions of Role and empowerment being interrelated, as discussed in section 2.4.

### **3.3.6 The immigrant: as equally empowered as the lawyer and the interpreter?**

The researcher argues that the immigrant is not equally empowered as the lawyer and interpreter. Other researchers too have referred to the fact that

they are less empowered (e.g. Blommaert (2001); Maryns (2006); Williams (2005); (Barsky, 1993)). The researcher is aware that dialogism theorizes all the interlocutors of an encounter (including the immigrant) as being full participants in it, a view he shares; however the immigrant in this study cannot be considered as an equally empowered participant in the encounter as the lawyer and the interpreter with regard to understanding the material under discussion. For, unlike the other interlocutors, the immigrant does not speak Dutch very well and has enjoyed little education in his homeland (as he mentions). Furthermore, unlike the lawyer, who specializes in immigration law, the immigrant can be considered to have relatively modest knowledge of the legal procedure being referred to fairly extensively during the encounter under investigation, especially at the beginning of the encounter. Having said this, the researcher does not want to downplay the legal knowledge to which the immigrant had been exposed during the asylum procedure in the period prior to the encounter under investigation (for more information, see chapter one).

The researcher argues that the opinion of the interpreter regarding the disempowerment of the immigrant might and probably will influence how they deal with 'material' the interpreter affords to the immigrant.

In this part, until now, we have discussed arguments A and B. In the section below, the researcher will discuss argument C (*the characteristics related to the profession of interpreting also influence how these decisions come into being. In this regard*), he will shed light on characteristics related to the nature of interpreting as a profession. Arguably, like the characteristics of talk, the characteristics of the profession itself will have an influence on the interaction, both for the immigrant and the interpreter.

### **3.3.7 Influence of the nature of the profession (including the nature of its discourse) on the internal dialogue**

In the context of argument C (section 3.3.1), the researcher will, in the following sections, discuss the influence of the nature of DI as a profession on the internal dialogue of the interpreter.

### 3.3.7.1 Immediate nature

It is known that the interpreter is expected to work in the 'here and now'; interpreting happens in real-time (e.g. Mason et al, 2001). Unlike in written translating, the clients of interpreter are present right where the interpreter is. They are having a conversation with each other at a time when they do not understand each other (sufficiently), and they need to complete this communicative event successfully within a certain amount of time. This means they need the interpreter to make their communicative event possible in a manner which is satisfactory for them within the available time. This requires the interpreter to adapt to the new working space and conditions as soon as possible in order to be able to perform well. The interpreter also needs (and is perhaps expected) to match the speed with which the primary parties are communicating to avoid him hampering the interaction. This means that the process of making sense (the evaluation and re-evaluation of the afforded material, i.e. the internal dialogue) is put to the test. The interpreter generally does not have as much time as the primary parties when it comes to dealing with the materials which are being discussed. Arguably, during the time the primary parties are taking their turns, the interpreter does not have enough time (if any time at all) to revisit the translations he just made to correct and/or complement his translation. Talk is ongoing during IMEs. It is characterized by this *immediate* nature.

Unlike the translator, who works with written discourses, the interpreter is expected to be able to deal with an *unfolding nature of discourse* without too much 'disruption' on his part through requests to be given time to rethink or check his decisions. Interpreters are expected to produce translations 'smoothly'.

This immediate nature of the profession and the unfolding nature of talk during IMEs exert influence on the process of sense-making, in that they make the process of evaluating and re-evaluating the interpreter's own thinking (the internal dialogue) during interaction more challenging. This makes interpreting itself a challenging activity with regard to the process of retaining the afforded material (by the other interlocutor(s)) and the

interpreter's own thinking during the process of meaning-making. The *memory* of the interpreter is burdened by these two characteristics of this type of interpreting. In studies like this, it is important that when strategies are investigated, the influence of the nature of the profession be given the attention it deserves when the data is analysed.

To conclude this section: the lawyer renders an original and expects that the interpreter will come back to him after the interpreter has produced the translation, while the immigrant is waiting at the same time for the interpreter to render the rendition. In both cases, the interpreter comes under pressure to a) produce the translation accurately, and b) produce it without too much delay. This kind of interaction is thus generally characterized by its immediateness (as mentioned above), as the interpreter is booked for a limited period of time (generally between 45 and 60 minutes). This last factor puts pressure on the interpreter to translate the communicative acts of the primary parties as efficiently as possible. This pressure brings with it consequences for the cognition of the interpreter in terms of *memory*. This is the third factor found to be of influence, on the ability of the interpreter to produce the renditions. The interpreter is, as it were, at "the mercy" of (in this case) the two primary parties (Al-Rubai'i, 2009: 329).

To conclude this part: in section 3.3.1, I presented three arguments which form the basis upon which I believe the data needs to be analysed and discussed. These arguments (A, B and C) need to be seen as a composite unit and not as separate when the data is to be understood. Thus, to repeat, I argue that (A) there is an interrelation between how the interpreter understands his role and the degree of difficulty of the 'material' he affords to the immigrant; (B) In addition, the nature of talk in general also influences how the translation decisions of the interpreter come into being; and (C) the characteristics related to the profession of interpreting also influence how these decisions come into being.

### 3.8 Conclusion

In terms of theory, this study is inspired by dialogism and Wadensjö's model, both of which are required to address the research questions. Because his aims are different from those of Wadensjö, the researcher needed to extend her model and to borrow concepts from dialogism. Wadensjö considered the *conduit model* of communication developed by the philosopher Reddy (1979) unsuitable for accounting for what happens during IME's with regard to the role of the interpreter. She developed a "theoretical model of interpreter-mediated interaction shaped on the relevant practice" (Wadensjö, 1998). For this, she needed to explore and explain the actual role of the interpreter, and the interrelated roles of the other interlocutors. Wadensjö's main method of investigation was detailed analysis of discourse utilizing CA. She "[...] explore[d] the social order of real-life interpreter-mediated conversations" (Wadensjö, 1998: 5) and the "[...] *dynamic inter-activity* of interpreter mediated conversation" (Wadensjö, 1998: 7). She studied meaning-making realized during the investigated interaction by looking at turn-taking and at the interaction as a whole. She drew on Bakhtin to theorize how meaning comes into being during conversations. This helped her to then move on to the next step, which was to theorize in more depth the role of the interpreter during such conversations. For this second and at the same time main objective, she turned for inspiration to Erving Goffman, who worked in the conversation and interaction analysis tradition. She adapted, and adopted, his analytical tools to analyse the role of the interpreter on a turn-by-turn level and on the level of interaction as a whole.

In my study, the role of the interpreter is not problematized. The study is concerned with how sense-making takes place, more specifically how meaning-making develops, during the IME under investigation. The researcher is interested in all the relevant factors which play a role in these coming into being, whether related to the interaction under investigation or to other, previous interactions, and whether these are linguistic or extra-linguistic ones. The immigrant is also not theorized as automatically empowered. In addition to the fact that Wadensjö's detailed analysis of discourse using mainly CA has been criticized for not providing a reasonably

clear image of the content of such encounters, a stance the researcher supports, the realization of my research goals necessitates that the relevant participants are interviewed. Unlike the current researcher, Wadensjö concentrated mainly on the investigated interaction. In addition to the interaction under investigation, the current researcher is also interested in the influence of other, previous interactions and the biographical experiences of the participants. For this, the researcher has turned to the theory of dialogism from the perspective of Linell (2009) because (unlike Bakhtin, for example) Linell is concerned with how meaning-making takes place in daily life, not in novels and other written artefacts. While notions like intersubjectivity and alterity are perhaps not essential in Wadensjö's study, in my study they are.

In Part III, the researcher discussed theoretical foundations upon which the data needs to be discussed.

In this chapter, which is divided into three parts, the theoretical underpinnings of this study have been discussed. In the following chapter, I will discuss the methodology of the study.

## **Chapter Four**

### Methodology

## **4.0 Introduction**

Earlier in this thesis, the researcher argued that answering the research questions in this study requires that, in addition to analysing the IME, the perspectives of the relevant participants be taken into account – i.e. their views on how the sense-making developed during the IME. In this chapter, the researcher will provide a rationale for how this will be done.

In section 4.1, the researcher argues that this agenda requires a qualitative approach. After providing information on this approach, the discussion is narrowed down to the topic of case studies (section 4.1.1). After discussing the case study approach, information is provided about the ethnographic tool utilized in this study, which is interviews (section 4.1.2). In section 4.1.2.1, the weak and strong aspects of interviews are discussed. In section 4.1.2.2, the concept of validity is discussed. In section 4.1.3, the researcher discusses the interviews which are utilized in this study and details why they fit into the aims of this study. In section 4.1.3.1, the researcher discusses the purposes for which interviews are utilized – to attempt to enable the participants to re-construct their internal dialogue. Following this, in section 4.1.3.2, the researcher argues that semi-structured interviews benefit this study, provides information on their structure and discusses the considerations and decisions which led to choosing them.

In section 4.2, data collection and the related topics are dealt with. In section 4.2.1, the researcher addresses the initial analysis of the recorded IME. In section 4.2.3, information is provided about the choices which had to be made with respect to the type of recording, and the reasons for choosing audio-recording. In sections 4.2.4 and 4.2.5, the researcher deals with the interviews with the immigrant and the interpreter and discusses the considerations and decisions which were taken during the interviews, and how they were conducted. In section 4.2.6, the researcher provides information on the general questions which the interviewees were asked about, and explanations for the use of the collected information. In section 4.2.7, some information is provided about the benefits of the information

gained during 'corridor-conversations' with the lawyer. In section 4.2.8, more information is provided about the process of transcribing and the decisions which had to be taken and have been taken in this study. Section 4.3 deals with the topic of triangulation: its benefits and how it is used in this study. Section 4.4 deals with ethics and the ethical approval which was needed to conduct this study.

## **4.1 The Qualitative approach of this study**

This study falls under what Pöchhacker calls the 'dialogic discourse-based interactionist paradigm' (2004: 79). It utilizes only primary data: "raw" data collected for a specific goal (Hox and Boeije, 2005: 593). It deals with the IME as a 'social phenomenon' and like Wadensjö considers this interaction as "the basic unit of investigation" (1998). The researcher argues that if the questions raised by this study are to be addressed properly, then a good understanding is needed of this basic unit of investigation. This agenda requires relevant description of the participants, the setting where the interaction takes place and of the purpose for which the participants have come together, which characterizes the qualitative methodology (Taylor and Bogdan, 1998: 7). Understanding the purpose feeds into understanding how sense-making developed during the IME. In addition, dialogism requires also that STK/R is incorporated into the analysis. These research aims require again a qualitative methodology (Taylor and Bogdan, 1984: 5), which this study principally adopts.

Creswell (1994: 1-2) defines qualitative research as "an inquiry process of understanding a social or human problem, based on building a complex, holistic picture, formed with words, reporting detailed views of informants and conducted in a natural setting." Although the IME under investigation is not a 'problem' in the traditional sense of the word as for example in the case of addiction in a community, answering the second and third research questions requires, according to dialogism, this "[...] complex, holistic picture, formed with words, reporting detailed views of informants and conducted in a natural setting." These questions require that the perspectives of the participants be ascertained in interviews to determine whether the immigrant understood the originals and to understand the perspective of the interpreter regarding the translation decisions he has taken, respectively (for more information on interviews see sections 4.1.3 – 4.1.3.2 below).

Although this study is not principally a quantitative one, it does incorporate in the analysis quantitative elements found in the data, because most research has both quantitative and qualitative elements in them (Bryman, 2004). Bryman (2016: 34) mentions that “[...] quantitative and qualitative research represent different research strategies [...]. However, Bryman and Bell (2011) argue that the

“distinction is not a hard-and-fast one: studies that have the broad characteristics of one research strategy may have a characteristic of the other. Not only this, but many writers argue that the two can be combined within an overall research project [...]” (p. 28).

There is also a practical reason why these quantitative elements have not been excluded in this study. It has been noticed from the collected data that certain themes/topics are frequently mentioned by the involved participants and/or can be observed by the researcher. For example, the data tell us that the immigrant often does not fully understand the renditions when it comes to the legal process being discussed by the lawyer. It has also been noticed that the topic of educational level is often referred to, especially by the interpreter when discussing why he chose a certain translation strategy, rather than another one. These two examples have been found to be particularly valuable in the provision of insight regarding how sense was made during the IME. The frequency with which these themes/topics have been found in the data means that they should be included in the analysis.

The design of this study requires thus that naturally occurring data be analysed. It has been decided to let the data talk, in the sense that inductions will be made based on reading and considering the data. Induction-based research “looks for patterns and associations derived from observations of the world” (Snape and Spencer, 2003: 23). Taylor and Bogdan (1984: 5) as well mention that “[*q*]ualitative research is inductive”. This is thus the approach which will be adopted in this thesis. However, it should be noted that not every qualitative researcher agrees that qualitative research should be considered to generate theory. Taylor and Bogdan (1984: 125) mention that “[...] qualitative researchers have debated whether the purpose of theoretical studies should be to *develop* or *verify* social theory, or both [...]”.

In this study, the researcher takes the position that qualitative research should be considered to *verify* **and** to *develop* theory. As will be seen in chapter Four, STK/Rs have been found to have a considerable bearing on how sense-making, including meaning-making, develops. To my knowledge, no other research in interpreting studies has incorporated this knowledge into its analysis, at least in the light of the research questions in this study. There may be different reasons for this, one of which might be the difficulty of gaining this type of data; some researchers seem to prefer studies with more quantitative elements in them, possibly because it is relatively easier to collect data using quantitative methods, such as questionnaires<sup>70</sup>.

The researcher argues that there is a noticeable tendency on the part of the researchers to shed light on the role/perspective of other participants; that is other than the interpreter; and even when the perspectives of participants are taken into account, it is more the quantitative studies which are done, which do not deal with the work done by the interpreter as done in this study (see for more information, see chapter Two). Further, the research questions in this study are different in that, unlike these other studies, they require taking an in-depth look into how sense is made during the encounter.

According to Grbić and Pöllabauer (2006), if the inductive approach is chosen, “[...] certain phenomena are observed, data on these phenomena are collected and an explanatory theory is then formulated on the basis of recurrent patterns in these data.” It is unclear what Grbić means by “formulated” exactly. If it means that a theory is generated, then this does not apply to this study. What is used is, rather, the model of Wadensjö, complemented with the notion of STK/R which she does not utilize in her model sufficiently. In this sense, the exploratory nature of this study has been well served by the inductive paradigm because it provided the researcher with the mandate to let the choice of theory be based on the data collected. In this study, the data is examined to see which theory is capable of interpreting it. Dialogism has been found to provide the researcher with good analytical tools for the analysis.

---

<sup>70</sup> This not the only reason. The ontological and epistemological perspective of the researcher will also define how they do research, and of course the research questions and the general research agendas with the tradition in which they work.

Within the framework of the inductive paradigm, this study has been designed around its research questions; these have informed the entire design of the study. The researcher had clear research questions to answer. The first one required letting the data of the IME talk. The IME was audio-recorded to find an answer to the first research question about the manner in which the interpreter renders the originals of the lawyer. The answers to the second and third research questions were treated with the same exploratory mentality. Questions were prepared based on the transcribed data, related to the second and third research questions. Answers were sought during post-IME interviews I and II<sup>71</sup>. This follows the approach of Matthews and Ross (2010: 141) regarding the manner in which data should be collected: “data collection methods should be determined by the hypotheses or research questions and the aspects the research topic that are the prime focus and interest of the researcher.” In this study, the prime focus and interest have been understanding/miscommunication on the part of the immigrant and the motivation/explanation on the part of the interpreter regarding the translation decisions he took.

According to Hale (2007), interpreter-mediated lawyer-client conferences have not been studied yet. It is also noticeable that Urpi’s (2012) *State of the art in Community Interpreting research* does not mention this type of setting. Since then, however, thinking has changed. This study deals with this by studying an IME between lawyers and immigrants. This study takes one such real-life encounter as a case study. According to Susam-Sarajeva (2009: 37) the case study is often used in translation studies, including CI, especially by postgraduate students, “and yet its characteristics and requirements are rather taken for granted and not necessarily elaborated on.” This study will attempt to address this shortcoming.

---

<sup>71</sup> In this study, two interviews in total were conducted - the first, called ‘post-IME interview I with the immigrant’, and the second, called ‘post-IME interview II with the interpreter’. Sometimes the full name is used and sometimes only a part of it: e.g. interview I, interview II. The numbering refers to the sequence of holding the interviews. Interview I was conducted before interview II.

### 4.1.1 Case studies

Stake (2000: 19) mentions that case studies are useful in understanding human affairs in extending our understanding of a topic. However, the concept case study is not easy to define (Gillham, 2000: 1; Gerring, 2007: 17; Swanborn, 2010: 12). Yin (2003: 13) defines a case study as:

“[...] an empirical inquiry that

- Investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context, especially when
- The boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident.”

Yin (ibid: 5) indicates that a case study, whether single or multiple, can be “*exploratory, descriptive, or explanatory (causal)*”. This study is descriptive. It “presents a complete description of a phenomenon with its context” as Yin puts it (ibid), although the researcher argues that a complete or exhaustive description is extremely difficult, even if possible at all. This study is also exploratory as it explores a setting which has not previously been analysed (Hale; 2007). According to Matthews and Ross (2010: 128), “The subject of the case may be a person, an organisation, a situation or a country [...].”

In the context of interpreting and translation studies, Raido (2014: 90) states “[...] a case is a unit of translation or interpreting-related activity, product, person, etc. [...]. A case can be anything from a translated text or author, translator/interpreter, etc. to a whole translation institution or source/receiving system.” In this study, the subject of study is an IME which takes place between a lawyer and one of his clients. This case study is not about the legal firm where the lawyer works; nor is it about the interpreter or the immigrant who participated in this study as such; rather it is about the translation activity during the encounter and how each participant relates to this translation activity regarding sense-making. A case study can, ‘in principle’, be based on one case (Wadensjö, 1998: 99); it can also include multiple ones (Creswell, 2014: 239; Matthews and Ross, 2010: 128). If a researcher aims at exploring ‘linguistic and/or cultural variation’, then “a larger number of recorded encounters would be needed” (Wadensjö, 1998:

99). The researcher has chosen to do one case, while being aware that “[...], multiple-case studies have considerable advantages over single-case studies in terms of the rigour of the conclusions which can be derived from them” (Susam-Sarajeva, 2009: 43). However, “the researcher needs to have well-documented procedures and a well-developed qualitative database” (Creswell, 2014: 246). It was not the aim of this study to produce generalizations.

The selection of the IME in this study was not straightforward. On the one hand, the researcher was aiming at recording an IME which is ‘routinely handled’ by lawyers (Wadensjö, 1998: 98). On the other, he was dependant on the goodwill of the would-be participants.

Further to case studies research, Yin (2003: 13) points out that one utilizes a case study method because one deliberately wants to include ‘contextual conditions’ in the analysis; i.e. in studies utilizing a qualitative methodology, context is an essential part of the study. It is part (constituent) of the phenomenon under investigation. Gillham (2000: 1) on his part defines the case study in a clearer way, with emphasis on the contextual factor, as “a unit of human activity embedded in the real world; which can only be studied or understood in context; which exists in the here and now; that merges in with its context so that precise boundaries are difficult to draw.” It is not clear to the researcher whether these writers would consider STK/R to be a part of the case study. Although they might do so, their definitions do not make this clear. In this study, STK/R is considered an integral part of how sense is made and how it develops. The researcher argues that as sense-making is an inherent part of the case study, STK/R should be considered this too. For, as discussed in chapter Three, sense-making (including STK/R) is intrinsically embedded in the context in which the phenomenon to be studied is taking place. Further to this point, in this study, ‘context’ refers not only to the place and time in which the case is studied. It is also understood to be intrinsically connected to previous contexts. When sense is made during an IME, it is understood to be interrelated with sense-making processes which the participants were involved in in the past; for example during earlier meetings between the lawyer and immigrant. In the present study, the key

method of determining participants' previous knowledge is through interviews (see 4.1.2 below, also 4.2.4-4.2.5 below).

Susam-Sarajeva (2009: 39) states that case studies have “close conceptual and methodological links to ‘ethnography’, ‘participant observation’, ‘fieldwork’, ‘qualitative research’ and ‘life history’”. As main parts of the data collected in this study come from an ethnographic instrument (interviews), and as the data is analysed within the qualitative research paradigm, the case study research method is found to be suitable for this study because it provides the researcher with the possibility to, in the words of Taylor and Bogdan (1984), “render a “true to life” picture of what people say and how they act” (p. 124).

One of the characteristics attributed to case studies which is found to be appropriate to this study is their intensiveness: “[...] they examine a small number of units of analysis in considerable depth, offering extensive data to gain insight into each unit's features” (Susam-Sarajeva, 2009; Swanborn, 2010: 21). Case studies “focus on the whole unit of analysis *per se*, paying attention not to leave out any relevant detail – and certainly not those which might contradict the initial hypotheses – and also making sure that one can still see the wood through the trees” (Susam-Sarajeva, 2009). In this study, there are three interrelated small units of analysis, in addition to one overarching unit of analysis. The three small ones are related to the research questions, while the overarching unit of analysis is the IME as a whole. The large amount of data related to these units of analysis is a rich source of information for the investigation.

Further, case studies involve “naturally occurring cases, presenting qualitative analysis of ‘unstructured’ data” (Hammersley and Traianou, 2012: 1), which is collected using interviews. The research questions which are presented in this study require answers elicited from natural settings. They also require access to the originals the way they are produced, not as they should or could have been produced, keeping the data as pure and natural as possible to find out how things happen in the real world, without intervention.

Context is central to this kind of research Gillham (2000: 1). Susam-Sarajeva (2009: 39) indicates that in case study research particular focus is placed on the “context in which the case is embedded and which can be highly pertinent”. In chapter One, the context of the recorded meeting is explained; it is argued that without a good understanding of the context, the whole recorded meeting would be difficult not only to investigate but also even to understand. In addition, the collected data shows that this is not the only context which influences how sense is made during the IME (see section 6.3.2.4). The interpreter has been found to change his translation decisions according to the context in which he does his work. His understanding of his role as an interpreter is firmly connected to the context in which he is asked to perform as an interpreter. He is even found to attach importance to the type of immigrant when he produces his rendition. This is also a context which has been found to influence the process of sense-making.

Explaining Yin (2003b), Gray (2009: 248) states that the case study approach has not yet been accepted universally by researchers “as reliable, objective and legitimate”, but notes also that like most scientific inquiries, which “have to be replicated by multiple examples of the experiment”, case studies “can be based upon multiple cases of the same issue or phenomenon.” As will be explained in the chapter Seven, it is believed that this study has opened up a door to an interesting field of inquiry. It is believed that much work is to be done regarding the setting under investigation. Accumulation of cases over time will undoubtedly provide valuable information which can provide some new lines of inquiry (Gile, 1995). In the following section, the researcher will discuss interviews, which have been valuable in this study.

#### **4.1.2 Interviews (general)**

Gray (2009: 369) states that “[a]n interview is a conversation between people in which one person has the role of researcher.” Interviews are an ethnographic method which is used to collect primary data. Arksey and

Knight (1999: 32) argue that the interview is a “powerful way of helping people to make explicit things that have hitherto been implicit – to articulate their tacit perceptions, feelings and understandings.” Gray mentions that interviews are useful also where “it is likely that people may enjoy talking about their work rather than filling in questionnaires. An interview allows them an opportunity to reflect on events without having to commit themselves in writing, often because they feel the information may be confidential” (ibid: 370). There are several types on interviews: structured, semi-structured, non-directive, focused and informal conversational interviews. In this study, semi-structured interviews are utilized. For more information on this, see section 4.1.3.2 below.

Yin (2014: 110) mentions that interviews are one of the most important sources of case study evidence. Interviews are thus important in data generation. The interview method is used in this study for this task and for triangulation purposes; triangulation being “the combination of methodologies in the study of the same phenomenon” (Jick, 1979: 602), i.e. to ask questions arising from the transcribed data and to triangulate these data.

#### **4.1.2.1 Weak and strong points of interviews**

Yin (2014: 106) mentions that there are six main sources of case study<sup>72</sup> data. Each one has its own strengths and weaknesses. An interview, which is one of these sources, is “targeted – focuses directly on case study topics” and “Insightful – provides explanations as well as personal views [...]” The main weakness is danger of bias, which can occur if questions are poorly constructed. The other weaknesses that are mentioned concern “[r]esponse bias, inaccuracies due to poor recall, reflexivity - interviewee gives what interviewer wants to hear” (ibid). Regarding the weaknesses, before holding the interviews, the researcher had acquainted himself with them and prepared himself to deal with them.

The second weakness, response bias, was dealt with by recording the whole interview, and making it possible to rewind the recording at any point

---

<sup>72</sup> Case studies are discussed in section 4.1.1 above.

in the interviews. This helped in that the intervention of the researcher was reduced. Naturally, this does not mean that this weakness is fully eradicated. Regarding the weakness of reflexivity, that the interviewee tells the interviewer what he wants to hear (to please the researcher), from the very beginning of the interview, the participant in the interview was requested to only tell what he really thought. The interviewees were made fully aware that the researcher was solely interested in their true opinions. This was repeated several times during each interviews and made clear again whenever the interviewee was thought to be giving answers to please the interviewer. The researcher is aware that this does not provide guarantees.

The ways in which bias occurs according to Gray (2004: 377) are the following:

1. "Departure from the interviewing instructions.
2. Poor maintenance of rapport with the respondent.
3. Altering factual questions.
4. Rephrasing of attitude questions.
5. Careless prompting.
6. Biased probes.
7. Asking questions out of sequence.
8. Biased recording of verbatim answers."

Having acquainted himself with these points, the researcher developed preventive measures where possible to apply during the interview. For example, regarding maintaining rapport, this was addressed by showing understanding for the confidential nature of the information, showing that the researcher had taken all precautions regarding how the data would be handled, being very clear that the interviewee could withdraw at any point without any questions asked, etc.

#### **4.1.2.2 Validity**

Validity means that an "an instrument must measure what it was intended to measure. In the case of structured and semi-structured interviews, the issue

of validity can be directly addressed by attempting to ensure that the question content directly concentrates on the research objectives” (Gray, 2009: 375). Explaining Arksey and Knight (1999), Gray (2009, p. 375) mentions that validity can be strengthened by:

“[u]sing interview techniques that build rapport and trust, thus giving informants scope to express themselves, prompting informants to illustrate and expand on their initial responses, ensuring that the interview process is sufficiently long for subjects to be explored in depth and constructing interviewing schedules that contain questions drawn from the literature and from pilot work with respondents.”

Inspired by this, the researcher attempted to implement these points.

The conduct of the interview, preliminaries at the beginning of the interview, preparation of the interview, and how to build rapport with the participant, are all discussed in section 4.1.3.2 below. The interrelation between reliability and triangulation is discussed under triangulation (section 4.3 below). Other information on interviews is provided in other sections in this chapter.

### **4.1.3 The need for interviews in this study**

As discussed in chapter Three, adopting a dialogical theorization in studying sense-making requires that all its components are incorporated into the investigation. In addition, there are certain other points which needed to be taken into consideration when analysing the IME under investigation: a) the fact that this IME was not an ordinary type of conversation<sup>73</sup>, b) the education attainment<sup>74</sup> of the immigrant in combination with the fact that that the ‘material’ which were discussed during the IME are sometimes of a challenging nature, c) the often uncritical attitude on the part of the immigrant towards the renditions which can be concluded from analysing the transcription<sup>75</sup>, and d) the sometimes unclear renditions of the interpreter. Regarding the interpreter, the researcher was interested in how he understood his role regarding how he should produce renditions and

---

<sup>73</sup> As discussed in 1.2.3.

<sup>74</sup> During a ‘corridor conversation’ with the lawyer prior to conducting post-IME interview I, he indicated that he tried to keep the register understandable due to the limited education of his client.

<sup>75</sup> This was later corroborated during post-IME interview I. The transcription as well shows that the immigrant often agrees with the rendition when there is a reason to think he might not have understood it, as was found during post-IME interview I.

regarding his responsibilities towards making the immigrant understand these renditions<sup>76</sup>. All these points are important when such a text is analysed utilizing dialogism (see Part III in chapter Three).

With regard to point a) above, while the encounter under investigation is in some sense a conversation between the immigrant and his lawyer, it is not entirely this, at least not always, in that it does not always have all the classic characteristics of a standard conversation. It is a special kind of conversation where the lawyer is supposed to summarize the procedure of the immigrant thus far, and read out his backstory written in a report by the IND<sup>77</sup>. The immigrant is supposed to agree or disagree with its contents. In both cases, the immigrant and the lawyer may add and/or remove information. Within this framework, the lawyer asks question to check the correctness of the data in the report he is discussing. The corrections and additions (called 'correcties en aanvullingen') are then sent to the IND. These conversation features can be seen in the transcribed text (see Appendix I).

If we examine the transcribed text of the IME, we will see that the text from turn 1 to turn 54 is characterized by the fact that the lawyer is reading out and/or explaining how the legal procedure of the immigrant has developed since his arrival date. The interpreter is either agreeing with the lawyer or giving other minimal responses (for example turn 46). Starting from turn 55 the conversation enters a new phase where the immigrant says more (see turn 74, for example). Still, the majority of the contributions of the immigrant are minimal. He agrees with the renditions. The conversation becomes more engaging again from turn 105. This pattern repeats itself in the rest of the IME. The researcher argues that this conversation lacks the classic features of a dialogue where interlocutors engage in meaning-making more actively. That is, the immigrant does not show clearly his contribution to meaning-making in a way that is observable. Before the investigation it was regularly not clear if and to what extent he had understood the original. In addition to this, the originals of the lawyer which deal with the legal procedure are formulated in a challenging way sometimes due to changing

---

<sup>76</sup> This point relates the concepts of Alterity and Intersubjectivity, which are discussed in section 3.1.4.2.

<sup>77</sup> In chapter One (section 1.2.3), the background of this meeting has been discussed.

footing<sup>78</sup>; the original is formulated in such a way as to present the perspective of more than one party. The lawyer switches between the role of the IND/Court and that of the immigrant/lawyer in order to show their legal stance and contrast it to the stance of the lawyer and their client. The lawyer utilizes this technique to mark the difference between the legal stance of the immigrant and himself on the one hand, and that of the IND/court, on the other. By so doing, he contrasts the two stances with the aim of discussing them and, where relevant, inviting the immigrant to respond. The task of the interpreter is a challenging one when the lawyer regularly changes footing (or switches code) in order to mark a change in his alignment. This might form a challenge for the immigrant too, in differentiating between the discourse of the IND/court and that of the lawyer. This process of ‘changing hats’ (Goffman, 1981: 145) on the part of the lawyer can pose a challenge to the interpreter. Closely related to changing footing or switching code, which are conversation strategies interlocutors utilize when they make meaning, is the manner in which the other interlocutor engages with these strategies. The immigrant is found to regularly show minimal responses, as said earlier. At times, it is not clear whether or not he understood the original. When the structure of the original is challenging and/or when the lawyer is dealing with legal discourse in his original, one might wonder if and/or to what extent the immigrant understood the content of the original.

The point is that an approach to data analysis founded solely on Conversation Analysis, would not have been adequate, or even suitable, to get the research questions answered. The second research question is about whether or not the immigrant understood specific renditions. There are examples in the data where the immigrant says “correct” when the rendition is produced. Taking the transcribed text as a guide to determine whether the rendition was understood, one would say that it had been. When one talked to the immigrant to find out whether this was indeed the case, it turned out, however, in several instances that the immigrant had not understood the original (for more on this last, see section 6.2.2).

---

<sup>78</sup> This is treated in section 6.3.1.2.

In addition to this, the researcher has chosen to problematize the manner in which the interrelationship is viewed between sense-making and the concept of empowerment (see Part III in chapter Three). The immigrant is viewed as less empowered than the lawyer and the interpreter. This has methodological consequences. The researcher was aware that dialogism theorizes all the interlocutors in an encounter (including the immigrant) as being full participants in it, a view I share<sup>79</sup>; however, while he is a *full* participant, the immigrant could not be considered as an *equally empowered* participant in the encounter as the lawyer and the interpreter (in this study) with regard to understanding the material under discussion; for, unlike the other interlocutors, the immigrant does not speak the language of the host country and has enjoyed little education in his homeland as was mentioned by the lawyer during a corridor-conversation and as corroborated later by the immigrant. Furthermore, unlike the lawyer, who specializes in immigration law, the immigrant could be considered to have relatively modest knowledge of the legal procedure which is referred to rather extensively during the encounter under investigation, especially at the beginning of the encounter. Having mentioned this, the researcher does not want to downplay the legal knowledge to which the immigrant had been exposed during the asylum procedure in the period prior to this recorded IME<sup>80</sup>.

As has become clear human behaviour is “not so easily measured” (Hale and Napier, 2013: 14). It is not always possible to measure, for example, whether or not – or to what extent – the immigrant has understood the utterance by basing ourselves solely on how they respond to a translated utterance during their meeting with their lawyer. As it turns out during data collection, one linguistic response can mean different things. For example, it is observable that when the immigrant sometimes says “yes”, it is not necessarily because they have understood the utterance, but because they do this sometimes automatically when the interpreter asks with this facial expression or spoken intonation to indicate whether the immigrant has

---

<sup>79</sup> Being a full participant does not automatically mean that the participant is a ratified one (in the Bakhtinian sense). There is no evidence that the interpreter was considered a ratified participant in the meeting.

<sup>80</sup> See section 1.2.2.

understood or not. In such a case, the “yes” could mean, “carry on, I am listening.” This difficulty regarding how human behaviour is measured is one of the reasons why the researcher decided to interview both the immigrant and the interpreter. ‘Qualitative interview[s]’ (Hox and Boeije, 2005: 595) have helped the researcher to better understand the responses given by the involved participant during the recorded meeting (with the lawyer). Hale and Napier state that “human motivation is shaped by factors that are not always observable” (Hale and Napier, 2013: 14). In one of the cases discussed with the immigrant, for example, he mentioned that at the end of the IME he did not want to correct the interpreter simply because he was hungry and wanted to leave. He accepted a translation mistake although he knew it did not correspond to the truth.

In addition to the purposes mentioned above of holding interviews, these interviews had another purpose. This was to ask questions which would help the researcher understand some aspects of the complex nature of human behaviour exhibited during the meeting with the lawyer. For example, prior to post-IME interview I, the lawyer had indicated in a corridor conversation that he approached his client during the IME in a way that was not too complex with regard to the provision of information; he said that he approached him using relatively non-challenging language to ensure he would understand the material in the encounter. Such information, together with the background knowledge the researcher has due to my work as an interpreter for over a decade, prompted the researcher to investigate whether, and if so how, this fact had influenced the interaction, and particularly whether the originals exhibited a lower register<sup>81</sup>. This also motivated the researcher to draw a profile of the immigrant in which information was registered about topics such as Education<sup>82</sup>. This was carried out with the interpreter too. Although seemingly unrelated to triangulation, this is, albeit indirectly, relevant to it, since this information has helped the researcher to better understand (linguistic) responses/actions during the recorded meetings.

In the following section, the researcher will discuss how he handled the interviews with each interviewee. He will explain the interrelation between

---

<sup>81</sup> Also known as ‘communicative style’ (Hale, 1997: 39).

<sup>82</sup> This is also called biodata.

finding answers to the research question and enabling the participant to re-construct their internal dialogue during the IME<sup>83</sup>.

#### **4.1.3.1 Enabling the reconstruction of the internal dialogue, etc.**

As indicated in the previous section, very briefly, this study differentiates itself from other studies in that it seeks to investigate all aspects of communication which are theorized to contribute to sense-making according to the theory of dialogism. Adopting this approach requires conducting interviews.

When the researcher conducted interview II, he sought to enable the interpreter to re-construct the internal dialogue he had when interpreting during the IME in order to understand how the meaning-making process went which led to the investigated translation strategy or decision adopted by the interpreter. It needs to be clear that this is not meant in a neurological/neurolinguistic sense; rather the purpose was to enable the interpreter to reflect on how the investigated renditions came into being, whether he could remember, and if he could not remember, what could have led him to take the decisions that led to the production of the renditions under investigation.

The researcher asked the interpreter to describe which strategy, if any, he adopted towards a certain (part of a) rendition, i.e. what led him to provide the translation in that particular way. If he was unable to provide an explanation due to memory constraints, he was asked to reflect on *possible reasons* or explanations for the translation decision. Sometimes, there was more than one reason or explanation. The interpreter mentioned possible reasons<sup>84</sup> if he did not know the reasons anymore. In the following paragraph, the researcher will discuss the reliability of the data he has used in this study.

The researcher was well aware that there are no guarantees that this effort would succeed; i.e. one cannot guarantee that the internal dialogue can

---

<sup>83</sup> Section 3.3.3 above also deals with 'enabling the reconstructing of the internal dialogue.'

<sup>84</sup> Possible Reasons are also discussed in section 3.3.4.

be re-constructed, or that the interpreter was telling the truth. There are several factors which could distort the process of re-constructing the internal dialogue. The researcher will now discuss briefly some of these challenging factors and how they were addressed, the most important one being memory retrieval.

When the researcher started the interview with the interpreter, he was not expecting the interpreter's long term memory would be good enough to allow him to reconstruct everything, as the interview with him took place three weeks after the IME. Thus it was not surprising to the researcher that the interpreter did not always remember why he had taken a certain decision or how could re-construct how the investigated rendition came into being. The decision to interview him after three weeks was not arbitrary. The researcher had to transcribe the text and analyse it first to be able to prepare himself to hold interviews with the immigrant and then with the interpreter. The researcher tried to reduce the influence of time by playing the entire recorded IME for the interpreter before he started to ask the questions. It is also possible that the influence of time was further reduced due to the fact that the interpreter knew he would be asked questions about his work, i.e. it is possible that he might have tried to pay more attention to the details during the IME than he would normally. In addition to this, it is highly probable that he had acted as an interpreter in many similar settings in the past as this type of encounter is very common in the Netherlands. Judging from the professional life of this interpreter<sup>85</sup>, it can be said that his experience of similar encounters could have made it easier for him to retain the information during the encounter. During interview II, the interpreter was given reasonable time to remember the content of the encounter; the audio was replayed at the beginning of the interview in its entirety. When he was asked a question, he was given time to think. In addition, where needed, during the interview, the interpreter was given the transcribed text to examine. And, even if he did not remember, he was given the opportunity to mention possible reasons or explanations why he could have translated the way he did. Before discussing any further how the internal dialogue was enabled, it

---

<sup>85</sup> He mentioned he had many years of experience as an interpreter.

is necessary to discuss the concept of translation 'strategy' and how it is understood in this study, as the interpreter was requested during interview II to motivate or explain his strategies, which led to the rendition under investigation<sup>86</sup>.

It needs to be explained that the word 'strategy' is understood in this study from the perspective of dialogism. It is not used to mean that the interpreter was the sole creator of the strategy. The researcher argues that strategies come into being during the process of co-constructing of meaning<sup>87</sup>. This is why, during interview II (and actually during this whole study), the researcher was not only interested in the product (the rendition), but also in the 'internal dialogue' of the interpreter and in the influence of the other participants on this 'internal dialogue', just as he was, in addition, interested in the influence of the situated context and in the influence of the STK/R on this 'internal dialogue' of the interpreter. This is also the reason why the researcher interviewed the interpreter. The interpreter was requested to present his vision of how the decisions behind the strategies came into being, that is how meaning was co-constructed with regard to the strategy he followed. Thus, regarding the third research question<sup>88</sup>, the researcher has attempted to find out how the process of meaning-making developed from the perspective of the interpreter. The researcher argues that by requesting the interpreter to reflect on how a specific decision was made, some important elements of the 'internal dialogue' could be re-constructed. These elements would stay unaccounted for if only a discourse-analytical approach was adopted based on a transcribed text. Related to the issue of re-constructing the internal dialogue is the issue of which renditions (or elements of them) were dealt with during interview II. This was related to the outcome of interview I, for the interview with the interpreter was meant mostly to make sense of the strategies/decisions of the renditions discussed with the immigrant.

---

<sup>86</sup> See section 3.3.4 also for the discussion on the concept of strategy.

<sup>87</sup> For more information on how meaning is constructed, see section 3.1.5.

<sup>88</sup> This concerns how the interpreter explains the investigated rendition.

The type of interview utilized in this study was semi-structured. In the following section, the researcher will discuss this type from a theoretical point of view, and relate this to the decisions taken in this study.

#### **4.1.3.2 Semi-structured interviews: considerations and decisions**

There are several types of interviews, for example structured, semi-structured, unstructured and non-directive interviews. Gray (2009: 371) states that “[...] the choice of interview technique will depend in large part on the aims and objectives of your research”. This study uses semi-structured interviews. This kind of interview is non-standardized and it was because the questions for which answers were being sought were of a non-standard nature, that this type of interview was chosen. The researcher had questions to ask and issues to cover, which were not of a standard type. This kind of interview permits the order of the questions to change depending on how the interview progresses (ibid). This gave the researcher the tools to ask the questions in such a manner that the question was asked in one way or another depending on the situation at hand and the context of the question. Sometimes, questions might arise which had not been anticipated. This kind of interview “allows for probing of views and opinions where it is desirable for respondents to expand on their answers” (ibid). This last point is very important “where the objective is to explore subjective meanings that respondents ascribe to concepts or events” (ibid). Furthermore, this might allow the researcher when needed to divert from “the interview into new pathways, which while not originally considered as part of the interview, help towards meeting the researcher objectives” (ibid).

Semi-structured interviews are not like the open-ended ones (Silverman, 2006: 110). The first type is less flexible than the second type, while it is more flexible than structured interviews. In structured interviews much is predefined before the interview. In semi-structured interviews, there is such some flexibility regarding the manner in which the topics are dealt with. According to Nunan (1992: 149), semi-structured interviews have been

widely used in applied linguistics. This type of interview provides the researcher with the control which is needed. At the same time, the researcher does not have predetermined set of questions. Further, Nunan (p. 149) states that the flexible nature of this type of interview has made it an attractive method of inquiry.

Regarding the length of the interview, Seidman (2006) advises 90 minutes for each interview, with three interviews altogether. The researcher does not agree with this, arguing that the crucial point is to find a balance between the goals of the study and the interests of the respondents; key to this is to give the respondents the opportunity to make an informed judgement. In the following paragraph, information will be provided about how things went during the interviews.

Regarding preparation for the interviews, following Wengraf (2001: 9), the researcher consider being well-prepared and arriving well ahead of time advisable in order to ensure that the interviews are conducted in a stress-free and unhurried manner. Therefore, with each interview, the researcher arrived at the agreed place where the interview would take place well ahead of the agreed time. As Gray (2009: 379) suggests, some time before each interview, the relevant interviewee was contacted to ask them if they still were prepared to participate, and still remembered the date, time and place. On the day of the interview, the researcher made sure that he had everything needed ready.

With regard to the preliminaries at the start of the interview, inspired by Gray (2009: 379), the interviewee was provided with an explanation of the purpose of the interview. It is worth mentioning that this had also been done on the day of the recording of the IME and on the day they were contacted to consider participating in this study. Further, they were informed about the destination of the information. They were also told how the information would be handled, why this information would be collected and how it would be used. They were reminded that the information which would be collected by the researcher was important for the research he was conducting<sup>89</sup>.

---

<sup>89</sup> See also Ethical Review and the related topics, in the sections 4.1.3.3, 4.2.3.1 and 4.4.

In order to prepare the immigrant, before embarking upon the actual interview, the purpose of the interview was explained to him and he was given the opportunity to ask questions. Furthermore, before the interview started, the researcher rehearsed with the immigrant to ensure that he understood what the interview was about: the researcher used an example from the data to show the immigrant what the interview was about. This was also an opportunity for the researcher to reflect on his own functioning, in that the researcher tried to find out whether his approach to interviewing was adequate.

The immigrant was explicitly requested to indicate if he had understood something directly from Dutch, thus not via the interpreter, whether partly or completely. Whenever the researcher sensed that that might be the case, he checked by asking the immigrant.

Regarding building rapport with the participant, Gray (2009: 380) states rapport must be established with the respondent during interviews. He says that “[r]apport means an understanding, one established on a basis of respect and trust between the interviewer and respondent.” He further argues that “[t]o establish a rapport it is particularly important to make the respondent relaxed and to get the interview off to a good start.” Inspired by Gray, the researcher explained to the involved participant the manner in which the interview would be conducted, how much time it was expected to take, which issues would be the focus of attention, and question-areas which would be asked about. Each time, the participant was asked again if he did not mind that the interview would be recorded. The participants were ensured that participation and recording were voluntary. Further, the researcher ensured that the participants knew well what the content of the interview would be and that it would stay strictly confidential<sup>90</sup>. The participants were told that they could ask a question whenever they had one.

Following Patton (1992), it was made clear at the beginning of the interview to the participants why they would be interviewed. It was also mentioned to them why they had been chosen for the interview. They were also told that their genuine opinions were required, not opinions they thought

---

<sup>90</sup> See Ethical approval as well: section 4.4.

the researcher would like to hear. During the interview, the researcher tried not to look surprised even if there was a reason to. He tried to avoid the temptation to give hints about a possible answer. The researcher did his best not to show any sign of irritation even if there was a reason to, for example when the interviewee would talk slowly and/or in a verbose way. See Gray (2009: 382) for the checklist of the do's and don'ts of interviewing, which was used as a source of inspiration by the researcher.

So far, in this chapter, discussion has been of a fairly theoretical nature. In this section, I have discussed semi-structured interviews and argued for their suitability for this study. In the following sections, the discussion will be more practically oriented. In the following section, I will address the process of approaching the participants of this study.

#### **4.1.3.3 Considerations and decisions regarding approaching the participants**

During the process of designing the study, prior to applying for ethical approval, a decision had to be made between involving a former asylum seeker or a current asylum seeker. Here, feasibility was an important issue on two levels – that of gaining the ethical approval and that of gaining the approval of the participant himself. This was discussed with the lawyer, and parallel to that with the University of Leeds Ethics Committee<sup>91</sup>. The lawyer indicated he anticipated he would not be able to help if a meeting were required between him and a current asylum seeker. He did not think they would agree to participate. He said that the case would be easier if a former asylum seeker was required. One of the advisors on the Leeds Ethics Committee who was asked about this indicated that it would be easier to gain ethical approval if the participant already had a residence permit. After having found the participant, decisions had to be on where to hold the post-IME interview.

At the beginning, the researcher considered holding post-IME interview I with the immigrant in the office of the lawyer in order to ensure

---

<sup>91</sup> See also Ethical approval in section 4.4 below.

that the meeting took place in a neutral setting. However, the immigrant preferred to be interviewed where he lived in order not to have to travel. After consulting the immigrant, it was decided to hold the interview in a hotel in the city where he lived. Further, it was chosen to hold each interview two weeks after the recording was made in order to ensure that there was enough time to transcribe and study the recording. This time gap was considered to be reasonable because a) information was thought to be still relatively fresh in the mind of the immigrant, and b) the recording was played at the start of the interview and the immigrant was asked to listen. Furthermore, given that the immigrant had had a 'heavy' meeting with their lawyer, it would not have been appropriate to hold this interview, which would last for several hours, immediately after the meeting with the lawyer.

When the issue of paying participants arises, the interrelated topics of data quality and ethics need to be addressed (Patton, 1992: 412). Although the immigrant indicated clearly that he did not expect any kind of compensation, the researcher chose, after having consulted the lawyer, to provide him with compensation of EUR 7.50 per hour, which is the hourly minimum wage. The researcher had already taken the consent of the Ethics Committee of University of Leeds for this. Travel costs were also paid.

The meeting took between 3 and 4 hours. The immigrant had been informed that due to the nature of the questions which would be asked they would be needed for a whole afternoon, to which they agreed. At different points during post-IME interview I, the immigrant was asked if he still wished to continue. He had also been told at the beginning of the interview, and before that at the lawyer's office, that he could withdraw at any moment with no questions being asked. At the beginning of the interview, the researcher sought to ensure that the immigrant felt comfortable and at ease. The immigrant was reminded of his rights. He was reminded of the fact that their relationship with the lawyer would not be affected at all if he decided to cancel his consent to participate or chose to withdraw. He was told this also in the presence of the lawyer on the day of the recording of the IME. In the case of the interpreter, the choices were easier to make, as he agreed quickly to participate.

The process of finding interpreters for this study went as follows. The lawyer was asked if he could help with the process of approaching an interpreter to participate in the study. He mentioned that although he expected that it would be a rather difficult task to find one, he did have one in mind. This interpreter would be approached. After waiting in vain for almost two months, the researcher reviewed the situation with the lawyer. A colleague of the lawyer offered to try to help. A few weeks later, it was announced that an interpreter had agreed to participate. Both lawyers had been asked not to approach interpreters who they thought were 'good' or 'bad', etc. The researcher wanted an 'everyday interpreter'. The researcher thus aimed to find an interpreter who was not too different from most other interpreters working in the field. The interpreter was also paid a minimum fee and was interviewed at the weekend to ensure he did not lose income.

Following the discussion of how the participants were approached, this is now an appropriate point to discuss how the data collection and interrelated topics have been handled (sections 4.2-4.2.8).

## **4.2 Data Collection**

The data collection started by recording the IME in the office of the lawyer. Two small-sized dictaphones were used. The researcher left the space before the start of the IME and came back to the office of the lawyer when the IME had ended. In consultation with the lawyer, the researcher stayed in the building in order to intervene in case a technical issue arose. The dictaphones were brought back to the UK the same day, where the transcription process and the initial analysis started in preparation for the interviews with the participants. In the following section, the researcher will discuss considerations and decisions related to the initial analysis of the IME.

### 4.2.1 Initial micro-analysis of the data of the IME

After the recording was transcribed<sup>92</sup>, it was micro-analysed in order to investigate how sense-making developed during the IME and in order to find answers to the first research question about how the renditions were produced. This analysis was also utilized to prepare questions for the immigrant and the interpreter<sup>93</sup>.

The manner in which the analysis of the data was dealt with is similar to the “six phases of analysis” mentioned by Braun and Clarke (2006) in some respects. The first step taken by the researcher was to familiarise himself with the data which was recorded and transcribed. Actually, the process of transcribing contains in itself a familiarization element because decisions have to be made to reflect the digital text on paper. The second step was to start with producing initial codes, meant to be used during the interviews. The third step was to search for themes among the codes. The fourth step was to review the themes which had been identified. During the fifth step, the themes were defined and named. The ‘trouble sources’ of Wadensjö proved to be beneficial in this process (see section 3.2.2).

In the case of the interpreter, for example, as his work is not studied in this thesis in isolation from the social and linguistic environments which surround it, questions which were prepared for him during the initial analysis crystalized further during interview I with the immigrant. This means that the interview with the immigrant was not used to find answers to the second research question only. This is because all the participants contribute to sense-making<sup>94</sup> and the work of one cannot be studied in isolation from the influence of the other participants.

Having briefly outlined the initial process of the analysis, in the following section, I will address the decisions which I had to take related to collecting the data which I needed to analyse in the first place. I will start by discussing

---

<sup>92</sup> See section 4.2.8 for information on transcription.

<sup>93</sup> The interviews will be dealt with in sections 4.2.4 – 4.2.5 below.

<sup>94</sup> For more information, see the discussion of triangulation (e.g. section 4.3), dealing with the interview with the immigrant.

the decisions which had to be made related to the type of the data: video or audio.

### **4.2.3. Recordings**

Designing a study like this one requires taking many decision including what type of data needs to be collected.

#### **4.2.3.1 Video or audio**

As discussed in section 4.1, in this study naturally occurring talk has been utilized; ideally, one would wish to video-record the IME to be able to see all the features of sense-making. However, “it is often difficult to obtain permission to record ‘real-life’ interpreting situations due to the sensitivity and privacy of such interactions” (Pöllabauer, 2006b: 239), and in this case this proved impossible. The consultant of the University of Leeds Ethics Committee indicated that she was “not sure” that permission would be granted for a video-recording by the Ethics Committee and that the likelihood of receiving ethical approval would be greater if the researcher decided to audio-record the IME. The lawyer also indicated that he would cooperate if an audio-recording was required; and he anticipated that the immigrant would not co-operate if video-recordings were required. The immigrant who gave his consent to participate too demanded total anonymization of the data and indicated he would not participate if the encounters were to be video-recorded<sup>95</sup>.

The interpreter was of the same opinion. One has to recognise that this desire for anonymization is to be expected. As it might be the case in other countries, in the Netherlands, most, if not all interpreters, are self-employed and thus depend on the satisfaction of their clients for new assignments. Thus, it can be assumed that they attempt to keep their clients satisfied. This could be a reason for some not allowing a researcher to come and “evaluate”

---

<sup>95</sup> Looking back, it is believed that the intrusive nature of video-recording would have affected the naturalness of the IME; audio-recordings are ‘less threatening to people’s integrity’ (Wadensjö, p. 101).

their work, who they might think might show up possible ‘errors’ on their part. Therefore, it could be argued that interpreters – *we will never know the percentage* – including the one who participated in this study, might feel uncomfortable with being recorded, observed and/or evaluated when they do their job, especially because institutional talk, like that under investigation in this study, is already ‘controlled and agenda-bound’ (Wadensjö, 1998: 95). This could mean that even the interpreter who agreed to participate might, at least to some extent, have acted unnaturally. It must be noted here that some police interrogations are recorded in the Netherlands<sup>96</sup> and this interpreter mentioned during interview II that he worked for the police as well. However, it is not common for interpreters to be recorded when they translate for lawyers as in this study.

With the above in mind, and because the researcher was seeking data which is as natural as possible, it was anticipated that the interpreter would have to be reassured that participating would not harm his interests: that no reference would be made to his identity and that this study was not about searching for “errors”<sup>97</sup>. Nevertheless, the researcher was aware of the fact that he would at least sometimes “pay attention to the fact that they are under surveillance” (Wadensjö, 1998: 95). That is why he was asked during interview II if he could tell me to what extent his performance had been affected because of his knowing that the IME was being recorded. The interpreter responded that his performance was not affected. However, as we will see in chapter Six (e.g. section 6.3.2.3) some of the answers show that he might have wanted to save his professional face.

It is worth mentioning that because “the presence of an observer and/or the recording of the situation may influence the participants’ behaviour and they, thus, may act in an unnatural way” (Pöllabauer, 2006a: 238), the researcher was hesitant about being present. Furthermore, the lawyer did not expect the other participants to accept the idea. Also, during the process of designing the study, the researcher was aware of the danger that the recorded participants might to some extent act unnaturally because of what Labov (1972) calls the Observer’s Paradox – that is, that the presence of an

---

<sup>96</sup> I have experienced this when I worked as interpreter in the Netherlands.

<sup>97</sup> See section 4.4 below for more information on ethical issues.

observer itself affects the way a task is carried out. This is why it was decided to use the smallest, and least intrusive, recording devices available.

Some interpreting scholars tend to relativize the influence of recording devices on IMEs. Roy (2000: 48), for example, indicates that 'sociolinguistic research' has shown that participants interacting in face-to-face situations are confronted with such a demand for their attention that they forget that they are being recorded. Discussing the video-taping method, Roy mentions that similar results have been found. According to her, people at some level "forget" that they are being recorded and the interaction becomes more important, particularly if they have come together with a real will to achieve something, to communicate about something. Roy does, however, also mention that participants may initially be nervous or guard their speech and actions when videotaped. Because the 'triadic exchanges' (Mason, 2001) in this study were audio-recorded, it is believed and hoped that the participants 'forgot' more quickly that they were being recorded than if they had been video-taped. On the other hand, it must be stated here that the IME in this study, unlike those of Roy, *who knew her participants already and who arguably were less vulnerable because they were her friends and colleagues*, concerns an immigration meeting and the researcher did not know any of the participants. Only the lawyer and the immigrant knew each other. Therefore, together with the lawyer, the decision was made to approach an immigrant who already held a residence permit in order to ensure that the participants had less reason to be anxious about being recorded. Wadensjö (1998: 95) also discusses 'naturalness' with regard to recording 'naturally occurring data' (Gile, 1995). She agrees partly with the assumption that people forget quickly that they are being recorded. She argues, nevertheless, that they probably "find it difficult" now and then not to pay attention to the fact that they are being recorded. The researcher argues that the presence of a video-recorder would have made the collected data less natural and that the disadvantages probably would have outweighed the advantages.

After having discussed issues relating to the choice of type of data, in the following section I will discuss aspects related to the interview with the immigrant and how these were dealt with during the interview.

#### **4.2.4 Interview with the immigrant**

Interviewing is a challenging task. “The development of good interview questions [...] requires creativity and insight, rather than a mechanical conversion of the research questions into an interview guide [...] and depends fundamentally on your understanding of the context of the research” (Maxwell, 2013: 101). It is obvious that researchers in studies having an agenda like this one cannot go to an interview with a fixed set of questions. In semi-structured interviews, like the ones held in this study, “improvisation may be the key to success” (Gray, 2009: 382). Arksey and Knight (1999) provides some tips, of which the following were adopted: The questions were varied in order “to fit the flow of the interview”. Care was taken to make the questions sound natural by varying the phrasing of the questions. Care was taken that the questions asked were phrased and said in a neutral tone to avoid leading the participant in any particular direction.

Following Gray (2009: 383), when questions were formulated, the researcher attempted to avoid language which contained jargon or was prejudicial. The researcher also attempted to avoid ambiguous language and leading questions.

The questions did not take one definitive and static linguistic form. Rather, the form they took depended on the question, the situation at hand and the context. Examples of the ways the questions were formulated are as follows: ‘What is the lawyer telling you here?’, ‘What did/do you understand here?’, ‘What did the lawyer want you to know here?’, ‘What did he want you to understand here?’ As can be seen, the questions were about the originals.

At the beginning of the interview, the immigrant was initially requested to listen to the whole recording, in one go, without questions from the researcher, in order to give him a chance to remember the details of the meeting which might have been forgotten. The immigrant welcomed this. After this, the researcher replayed the recording and stopped where there would be a question. The immigrant was alerted whenever there was a question approaching.

After this, depending on the context at each question, the part of the audio-text which the question was about, was sometimes repeated, either by replaying or by reading it out loud from the transcription document. The choice depended partly on whether the immigrant asked for the question to be repeated or not, and whether the researcher thought this was needed. Thus, the immigrant was asked to listen to the relevant part of the audio-text and was asked the relevant question with the aim of getting the question answered. Sometimes, when needed, the researcher would replay the piece and sometimes he would (re)read, or both. This would be done if a situational constraint at that specific moment might have caused the immigrant not to have understood the text, for example, noise from outside.

Then the researcher would ask the immigrant the question that is to say what he had understood of the part which the question was about. Sometimes as in the example below, the question would be about a certain part of the text with the intention of seeing if the immigrant knew what it meant (e.g. the word *istiṭna'ya* (*exceptional*), which is a word that is generally not used in colloquial Arabic, but is rather Modern Standard Arabic (MSA). This was necessary to check if the lexical item had been understood and if not whether that had influenced the understanding of the remaining parts of the utterance. Again, sometimes the researcher would resort to replaying the audio text to give the immigrant a second chance to listen in order for the researcher to ensure that the immigrant had heard well (or remembered exactly what the question was). Also in the example below, when the researcher realised that the immigrant had not answered correctly, the researcher thought he should double-check to see if he really had not understood. The immigrant was asked not to try to please the researcher by giving an answer he thought the researcher would like to hear. The immigrant promised he would not do so. Then he told the researcher that he had understood the question the way the researcher explained it. In the second example, the researcher tried to get the information from the immigrant by asking 'who', 'when', 'where'.

When a participant like the immigrant is interviewed about a meeting (in this case with the lawyer) which took place two weeks before the interview (with

the researcher), the influence of the passage of time must be taken into consideration. It is true that the meeting with the lawyer had taken place only two weeks before the interview, and also that the material which was discussed during the meeting was largely not new, yet it must not be forgotten that this immigrant does not have a legal background. This arguably can make remembering the legal material challenging<sup>98</sup>. Therefore, one must not jump to conclusions too easily; i.e. one must not be inclined to conclude too easily that the immigrant did not understand<sup>99</sup>. Thus, when the immigrant does not succeed in re-constructing a rendition, especially one which contains legal information, this does not necessarily mean that he did not understand the rendition. The process of checking is a delicate one: one must weigh the ups and downs of every piece of information one releases during the investigation in order to avoid leading the immigrant in a certain direction or assume too early that the immigrant did not understand. One needs to remember that the information handled during the IME could have been mentioned during previous meetings with the immigrant, by the lawyer, the IND, the COA and other institutions (sections 1.2.2 and 1.2.3) although from different perspectives and for different reasons. Therefore, there is a delicate balance that needs to be continually observed during such interviews.

It is also important to mention here that during Interview I, it turned out to be unreasonable to think that a standard way of presenting the question is possible: e.g. "How do you understand this?" The researcher needed to be creative: "What is the lawyer saying here?" is another way of expressing the same thing. Nonetheless, the researcher tried as far as possible to standardize the process of asking the question under investigation, particularly regarding its formulation and the way in which the immigrant was exposed to the original and the rendition under investigation. Thus the researcher tried wherever possible to stay close to the original formulation of the rendition under investigation, i.e. how it was uttered by the interpreter. Sometimes, the researcher had to repeat a question or a rendition due to

---

<sup>98</sup> This also turned out to be the case. See section 6.2.2.

<sup>99</sup> This also turned out to be the case. See section 6.2.1.4.

concentration-related constraints. Also, the length of these renditions and originals had an influence on the exposition strategy. When a certain rendition was found to be too long by the immigrant, it was divided into parts by the researcher.

The researcher was aware of the fact that the immigrant could not possibly remember the meeting with the lawyer in its entirety, or all the renditions he wished to enquire about. The researcher did his utmost to prepare the immigrant ahead of the interview. When asked about his understanding of what was going to happen during the interview, the immigrant showed an acceptable understanding of it. The immigrant was also asked to mention whenever he needed more explanation. The researcher provided a structured approach to assisting recall on the part of the immigrant.

On the occasions when the immigrant indicated that he did not know, or did not remember whether or not he had understood the original during the IME, he was asked to reflect on this during the interview itself. The researcher asked the immigrant to try to remember if he understood during the meeting with the lawyer<sup>100</sup>. Where this was not possible, and he was not able to remember this, the immigrant was asked to answer the question based on his current listening during the interview with the researcher.

Due to the nature of this study which forced the researcher to 'listen' to the interviewee, for example the interpreter, and to try to avoid 'leading' him in any direction, it was not possible to enter the interview with a pre-defined set of questions which was to be followed strictly like a questionnaire<sup>101</sup>. Instead, a set of questions was prepared which dealt with (certain part(s) of a) translation decision(s); this set of questions resembled structurally the one used when the second research question was dealt with (see also section 4.2.1 above)<sup>102</sup>.

---

<sup>100</sup> The immigrant was told that that the researcher was aware of the challenging nature of remembering and that he should not feel embarrassed in case he did not know the answer.

<sup>101</sup> Predefined questions are characteristic for structured interviews.

<sup>102</sup> The transcribed text was analysed. When questions arose (see research questions in section 0.2.1), the researcher marked the place. During the interview with the immigrant, the annotated transcribed text was then used to ask the questions.

With regard to the quality of the explanations provided by the immigrant, it must be noted that I was relying on the cooperation and goodwill of the immigrant. It is believed that the explanations provided by the immigrant have a high credibility given that the immigrant was approached professionally and was given the right to withdraw whenever he wanted (for more information, see sections 4.1.2.1 and 4.1.3.3). In the following paragraph, the researcher will discuss a specific case in which he will consider how decisions were taken regarding which cases were to be treated during the interview and why.

Due to time limits available for interview I, during the preparation period, choices had to be made regarding which renditions would be discussed. There were 110 renditions. Questions were asked about 39 of them. The researcher chose to make a selection of renditions and originals to enquire about. Based on the micro-analysis of the transcription (section 4.2.1), where it seemed obvious that the immigrant did understand the 'original' and where there were no reasons to suspect otherwise, no questions were asked or prepared. Where it was not obvious that the immigrant understood the original, for example the rendition was not produced in a clear way or where technical terminology was used or where the legal procedure was being discussed etc., questions were formulated in order to investigate whether understanding had taken place or not. Sometimes, it was clear that the immigrant did not understand; sometimes he gave an unrelated answer or he did not respond to the rendition where he should have.

Below, is an example where understanding was not double-checked because it was thought that the immigrant probably had understood the original because of its simplicity, the fact the immigrant has just gone to court and because he showed that he understood what was said<sup>103</sup>:

Example:

**3** Lawyer: .hh we zijn e:: een aantal weken geleden bij de rechtbank geweest (.) in Den Helder<sup>104</sup>.

Lawyer: .hh we went e:: to court a number of weeks ago (.) in Den Helder.

<sup>103</sup> For a complete version of the IME, see Appendix I.

<sup>104</sup> The name of the city has been changed.

4 المترجم: قبل إي: عدة أسابي:ع (.) كنا: في محكمى في دن هيلدر.

Interpreter: several wee:ks ago e: (.) we had a court session in Den Helder.

5 اللاجئ: صح صح °.

Immigrant: °correct correct°

6 Interpreter: klopt

Interpreter: correct

Where it was not clear whether understanding had taken place, it was double- checked whether that was the case or not:

Example:

10 Lawyer: en e: (.) de IND (.) heeft (.) daar op zitting ook gezegd dat ze vonden dat we eigenlijk=dat je helemaal geen recht had om in (.) beroep te gaan (.) omdat je geen belang had=want je hebt nu verblijfsvergunning .h dus dan kun je niet in beroep e e tegen een asielbesluit.

Lawyer: and e: (.) the IND (.) said (.) there during the [court] session indeed that they were of the opinion that we actually=that you had no right whatsoever to (.) lodge an appeal (.) because you had no interest=for you have now a residence permit .h so you cannot lodge an appeal e e against an asylum decision.

11 المترجم: وأنت (.) وأثناء الجلسى (.) دائرة الهجرة والتجنّي:س قابلت أتو هنى (.) إي بيشو إي يعني من رآين إي أنت إي ما من حقك أتو تتقدم ب: (..) طلب إي إي ب: إستئناف ضد القرار لأنو ما من مصلحتك لأنو أنتى حصلت (.) على الإقامة.

Interpreter: and du (.) and during the [court] session (.) the Immigration and Naturalization Servi:ce sai:d that they (.) e: think e: yaʕni<sup>105</sup> they are of the opinion e: that you e: have no right to lodge (..) e: e: an appeal against °the decision° because it is **not** in your interest because you [already] have (.) received the [residence] permit.

The reason to double-check this example was that the phrase لانو ما من مصلحتك (*because it is not in your interest*) as rendered by the interpreter does not reflect the content of “omdat je geen belang had” (*because you have no interest*) in the original of the lawyer. Upon investigation, it turned out that the

<sup>105</sup> This is a filler probably used here by the interpreter to give himself time to think/reformulate.

immigrant had not understood it (for more information on this example, see section 6.3.1.1).

#### **4.2.5 Interview with the interpreter**

The interview with the interpreter was different to that with the immigrant and was approached differently. However, many issues mentioned in the previous sections regarding how the interview was conducted with the immigrant also apply to the interview with the interpreter.

The interpreter was also given the required freedom to answering the questions. He was requested to state if he needed more time, etc. Sometimes, the interpreter would give direct answers because he said that he remembered how the process of decision-making went. In other cases, when he did not know, the interpreter would explain how he normally acts in similar cases. In such cases, sometimes, several possible explanations/reasons were given: for instance, the interpreter would say that he might have forgotten or maybe because he was interrupted, etc. (see also section 3.3.4). Due to this fact, as discussed in chapter Five, it is difficult to categorize the findings in such a way as one would do in a purely quantitative study. Those renditions for which different possible motivations were given are put in more than one category (see the discussion in section 5.4).

As mentioned in section 4.2.3 above, it is also inevitable that the interpreter might have felt that his face was threatened at certain points while giving explanations. Although he had been given full guarantees the data would be dealt with confidentially and that no names would be mentioned, it is not unthinkable that the interpreter might have felt the need to be cautious with regard to his image as an interpreter (section 6.3.2.3). Furthermore, it is also possible that the fact that he was a freelancer might have made him feel that he should be careful when giving answers in order to avoid possible problems with his clients. On the other hand, the interpreter was quite confident. One could see this in his answers. On several occasions, he expressed views critical of the primary interlocutors (for examples in section

5.6.10). Arguably, this shows that in all probability he was sincere in giving answers.

In addition to asking the interpreter and before that the immigrant-specific questions related to specific issues found during the initial, micro-analysis of the transcribed data (section 4.2.1 above), the researcher asked also questions of a general nature. This is the topic of the following section.

#### **4.2.6 General questions to both participants**

As explained in chapter Three, sense-making is a process which does not solely depend on the situated context, on how interlocutors interact in it. Pre-IME knowledge (STK/R) plays a role during sense-making<sup>106</sup>. In the same chapter (Part III), the researcher discussed the fact that the manner in which an utterance is produced will vary depending (among other things) on the attitude of the speaker as to how they need to be understood by the listener. In this regard, the researcher argues that the degree to which the interpreter will deal with the task “posited” will depend on his understanding of his role as interpreter and on his perception of his professional responsibility towards the client (for a more comprehensive discussion, see Part III in chapter Three). The manner in which the interpreter perceives his role and his responsibility towards the immigrant will arguably help us understand how he thinks he should best translate. The strategies he employs will be arguably easier to understand, which has been the case as will be seen in the discussion chapter (chapter Six).

With this in mind, during the interviews, the researcher sought to enrich the data which was gained from the IME by attempting to add an extra dimension to it: the immigrant and the interpreter were asked to express their views on topics which cannot by definition be derived from the data recorded during the meeting or from the data collected during the interviews when asking questions about the renditions. The topics that were covered, and which are found to be relevant for this study, concerned the following:

---

<sup>106</sup> This was also corroborated during the interview. See Part II in chapter Six.

- During the interview with the immigrant, the immigrant was asked about his understanding of the role of the interpreter, and his own share of responsibility in sense-making.
- During the interview with the interpreter, the interpreter was asked about his understanding of the role and responsibility of the immigrant regarding the process of sense-making.
- The researcher also investigated the role of the lawyer from the point of view of the interpreter.

As will be seen in chapters Five and Six, the opinions of the participants are not always compatible when it comes to the understanding of each other's role and the responsibility for translating the originals of the lawyer.

#### **4.2.7 Information from the lawyer**

In addition to interviews, the researcher benefitted from another source of information, which was gained outside the venues of the interviews. This can be called 'corridor comments', and involved comments made by the participants outside the formal domains of the interpreting encounter or the interviews, typically in corridors, unasked for by the researcher. This information was found beneficial mainly in the process of taking methodological decisions and also during the analysis. For example, the lawyer mentioned that he utilizes a lower register when he discusses the legal procedure and backstory with many immigrants. He anticipated that if he utilized a higher register, many immigrants would encounter difficulties in understanding the information as legal information is challenging for many people. The researcher benefitted from this information during the micro-analysis and also while preparing the interviews. This information helped explain some of the linguistic choices made by the lawyer during the IME.

Thus far, sections 4.2.1 – 4.2.7, the researcher has discussed the approach of this study regarding collecting data. The process and decisions of coding this data have been explained in full in the findings chapter (see sections 5.2

and 5.4.)<sup>107</sup>. In the two sections below (4.2.8 and 4.2.9), the researcher will discuss transcription, the decisions that needed to be taken in respect of transcription and how he handled them, and will reflect on the Think-Aloud Protocol methodology.

#### **4.2.8 Transcriptions**

Because “interpreted situations are highly ‘evanescent’” (commas in original), they have to be recorded and transcribed for the analysis process (Pöllabauer, 2006a: 239) especially because this process can take place months after the IME has taken place. Transcripts of recordings are very important for analysing discourse (ibid: 239). Edwards (1993: 3) states that transcripts play “a central role in research on spoken discourse, distilling and freezing in time the complex events and aspects of interaction in categories of interest to the researcher.” The process of transcription requires taking some decisions. According to Wadensjö (1998: 100) features such as “variants of pronunciations, emphasis, pitch and so forth” should only be reflected in the text when they are important for the analysis where they occur, which is also done in this study. Further, she notes the process of transcribing is ‘extremely time consuming’. This study has attempted to be somewhat more ambitious by trying to reflect as many relevant features as possible within the boundaries of the time that was available. The reflection of the features was considered important because these features were found to help the researcher remember how the recorded interaction developed. The transcription system which is used is inspired by that of Gail Jefferson (1984b, 2004). In addition, the researcher has resorted to using footnotes (see Appendix I), in which he has aimed at reflecting certain verbal and pragmatic features which are extremely difficult to show using transcribing signs; for example the manner in which someone laughs; whether it seems to have an acknowledging function or not, etc.

---

<sup>107</sup> The researcher is referring here to the grouping and categorization of the data which is collected during the entire study; thus during the IME and during the two interviews. He is not referring to the initial, pre-interviews analysis and the codes related to it which were discussed in section 4.2.1 above.

The transcription was not outsourced for several reasons. Firstly, the data had to remain in the EU and because there are (to my knowledge) no professional transcribers in the Netherlands who can deal with colloquial Arabic, in an interaction where the participants came from different countries. The researcher also believes that he would be willing to try again when the first few attempts had failed to catch what was said in the recorded interaction, something which cannot always be expected from commercial agencies. In addition, the researcher could not entrust to a commercial agency important question involving choices about what to transcribe and what not. Making such choices would mean delegating power to an office or person one does not know. Bucholtz (2000: 1439) states that transcription has not received the attention it deserves in discourse studies, “despite its centrality” to its method. This study has chosen to give it the attention it deserves by giving the time it needs. The questions of ‘what is transcribed?’ and ‘how is it transcribed?’ (Bucholtz, 2000: 1439) were considered seriously during the process of decision-making on the part of the researcher.

Thus far, the researcher has talked about the process of transcription of the IME. Regarding post-IME interviews I and II, the matters are rather different. Although Patton (1992: 384) advises that a full transcription of interviews be carried out, which is also advised by Brikci and Green (2007: 19), the process can take a long time . During the transcription process of the recorded IME, with each minute taking at least one hour of labour, it became soon clear that transcribing the post-IME interviews, each one consisting of several hours, was impractical due to time limitations. In addition, it was not actually needed. The nature of the research question regarding the interviews and the nature of the data during the interviews does not require an approach like the one followed in the case of the IME, even taking into account the argument that a “detailed and careful transcript that re-creates the verbal and non-verbal material of the interview can be of great benefit to a researcher who may be studying the transcript months after the interview occurred” (Seidman, 2006: 116). Instead of producing full transcripts for the post-IME interviews, another method was developed which was nearly as effective and much less time-consuming: all the answers of the interviewed

participants were noted using Standard English script forms. Where needed, phonological aspects were also noted using Standard English script forms. This saved the researcher a lot of time and at the same time gave him access to more than 90% of the text that was uttered by the involved participant. In cases of doubt, the researcher had access to the original recording.

All in all, transcribing data, while a challenging matter, provides the transcriber with many insights into how sense-making unfolds.

In the following section, I will discuss, think-aloud protocol, which is a well-known method in translation studies used in collecting data, and mention why it is not used in this study.

#### **4.2.9 Think-Aloud Protocol**

The term ‘Think-Aloud Protocol’ is used in translation studies to refer to a “type of research data used in empirical translation process research” (Jääskeläinen, 2010: 371). The method which is used to elicit data is called ‘thinking aloud’ or ‘concurrent verbalization’ (ibid: 371). The participant “‘thinks aloud’ what goes on in her head when she translates” (inverted commas in original) (Tirkkonen-Condit, 1990: 381). Jääskeläinen states further that the participants are requested to perform a translation task and mention what crosses their mind during the task performance (ibid: 371). The transcripts which are written of the verbalizations are called think-aloud protocols (TAPs) (ibid: 371).

This data elicitation method is a valuable method in translation studies. My data elicitation method differs from this method in that the interpreter was not asked to mention what he thought at the moment he was engaged in interpreting. This would have been impossible. Think-Aloud Protocol might be usable in a simulated setting, however.

### 4.3 Triangulation

“Collecting information using a variety of sources and methods is one aspect of what is called *triangulation*” (Maxwell, 2005: 93; Taylor and Bogdan, 1998: 80). Walliman adds to this that these sources and methods are related to the same event (2006: 73). There are several types of triangulation. The triangulation type that is used in this study is what Pöllabauer calls ‘triangulation of methods’ (2006a: 236). This qualitative, empirical piece of research is conducted using different types of primary data: recordings of an IME and two post-IME interviews. As noted in section 4.1 above, the term ‘primary data’ is used in this thesis to mean (Walliman, 2006: 51): “Data that have been observed, experienced or recorded close to the event [...]” The third source of primary data is the information taken during ‘corridor-comments’ made by the lawyer (see also sections 4.1.3 and 4.2.7 above). These comments were minimal but important.

Triangulation is adopted in this study in order to strengthen the reliability of the data collected, as “for most qualitative approaches, reliability is improved, if not guaranteed, by triangulation, gathering information, for example, from multiple sources or by using multiple data gathering tools’ (Gray, 2009: 193). It needs to be mentioned that it is rather too strong a claim that triangulation can, at least in the case of this study, absolutely guarantee reliability, although it does certainly enhance it: when methods are combined, the one method will compensate the weaknesses and blind spots of the other (Flick, 2006: 37). This was the case in this study as will become clear in chapter Six.

The transcribed data collected from the recorded meeting was analysed with the aim of investigating the renditions of the interpreter. Where there was a reason to suspect that a translation might not have been understood, this was marked and questions were formulated about it (see also section 4.2.1 above). During interview I, these questions were asked. The researcher attempted to explore whether or not the originals were understood. The interpreter was also interviewed with the aim of exploring the motivation behind the translation strategies/decisions which had been used in the relevant example (if needed; for this was not always needed). The interview was designed to ask the interpreter to reflect on these strategies. The

questions directed to the interpreter during interview II aimed at exploring how decision-making regarding the strategies/decisions took shape as far as the interpreter was able – or willing – to tell. Close analysis of the recorded IME was triangulated with the information collected during the meeting with the interviewed participants. Also, the corridor comments referred to above were incorporated into the triangulation. This study also went a step further: during each interview, a biographical history of the participant was elicited of the immigrant and the interpreter. That of the interpreter contains his understanding of his duties/responsibilities as an interpreter on the one hand, and how these relate to those of the lawyer and immigrant in relation to achieving ‘shared understanding’ and ‘miscommunication’, on the other (see also 4.2.6 above). That of the immigrant contains his views on the responsibilities of the interpreter. Information about the education of the interpreter and the immigrant was also collected during the interviews. The researcher believes the above procedures have benefited this research, as “[t]his strategy reduces the risk that [the] conclusions will reflect only the systematic biases or limitations of a specific source or method, and allows [the researcher] to gain a broader and more secure understanding of the issues [they] are investigating’ (Maxwell, 2005: 93-94).

To my knowledge, the form of triangulation used in this study is an innovative one, as no studies in this field with a similar research agenda have so far been found by the researcher which have adopted “reflective/retrospective in-depth audio (...) recorded interviews” in the way used in this study. The purpose of this kind of interview is to “obtain information that [would have been] missed in an observation, or to check the accuracy of something observed” (Maxwell, 2005). Triangulation is thus one of the strengths of this study. The researcher has used different kinds of evidence (data), collected in different ways, but bearing on the same point (cf. Gillham (2000: 40).

The researcher resorted to this strategy in order to ensure that information arrived at by one method was double-checked (where needed and possible). For example, in this study it was not considered sufficient if the immigrant indicated during that the IME he had understood the rendition. In order to ensure that this was the case, especially if the researcher had doubts, the

immigrant was asked during interview I to state what he had understood. This was then checked against the original by the lawyer. This was done in the case of the immigrant. In the case of the interpreter, if there was reason to think that the translation had taken a particular form for one or a number of possible reasons, the researcher chose to ask the interpreter to reflect on this instead of providing his own interpretation only.

#### **4.4 Ethical Approval**

Due to the sensitivity of the data under investigation, special attention was given to the ethical side of collecting it. Each type of data that had to be collected required careful consideration to ensure that a) no harm was done to the wellbeing and the interests of the participant involved, and b) the chance of getting approval from the participants was not wasted. Thus, a sensitive balance had to be struck between satisfying the participants and the University of Leeds Ethics Committee on the one hand, and being able to collect enough relevant data on the other. For more information on these considerations see previous sections in this chapter (e.g. 4.2.3 above).

#### **4.5 Conclusion**

Based on the overall argument in this study, that if a relatively comprehensive picture is to be drawn about how sense-making develops in the IME under investigation, then all the theoretical constituents of sense-making as discussed in chapter Three need to be utilized, including the STK/R. The methodology of this study revolves around this. Such an agenda requires a good description of the context in which the IME takes place, and that the participants are interviewed. This invites a qualitative approach to the study in which the phenomenon under study is treated as a case study, using an ethnographic tool: interviews.

In the light of the above, important methodological decisions have been taken with respect to collecting data. As we have seen, the type of data brings with it opportunities and challenges. In this study the choice has been made to use audio recordings. This type of data collection brings with it advantages

as far as ethical considerations are considered; missing out the visual aspects of communication has been considered to be less disadvantageous than the advantages gained by having access to data which is more reliable due to the fact that the participants have one less reason to act unnaturally.

In the following chapter, I will present the data collected during the study.

## Chapter Five<sup>108</sup>

### Findings

---

<sup>108</sup> Throughout the thesis, the Arabic text has been kept in the Syrian dialect form as it was produced by the participants. The researcher has not changed it to Modern Standard Arabic as this study is concerned with studying natural talk.

## 5.0 Introduction

In this chapter, the findings of the study are presented. The chapter is divided into three parts. In each part, the findings related to the corresponding research question are presented<sup>109</sup>. In **part I**, the findings related to the first research question are presented, in table 5.1 shown below (section 5.1<sup>110</sup>). This question is about how the originals are translated. The adapted version of Wadensjö's taxonomy has been utilized in the categorization. In **part II**, the findings related to the second research question are presented (section 5.2). This research question considers whether or not the immigrant understood the originals via the renditions, and what can be learned from his answers in terms of sense-making (see section 0.2.1 for the research questions). At the beginning of this part, a brief recapitulation is provided of the approach of this study considering why the immigrant is interviewed. Following this, with regard to understanding or the lack of it on the part of the immigrant, the researcher develops four clearly defined analytical categories which exemplify how he theorizes understanding by the immigrant of the originals. The findings are then given in each relevant category. This is followed by section 5.3, where possible factors are presented which may have contributed to causing originals to be miscommunicated (5.3.1 - 5.3.4) or understood (5.3.5 - 5.3.10). In **part III** of the chapter, the researcher addresses the findings related to the third research question, about how the interpreter explains the decisions he had taken during the IME. At the beginning of this part (section 5.4), the researcher introduces the structure which he has developed for the purpose of presenting the findings: he does this by presenting the overall structure of the groups and categories comprising this structure and the reasoning behind them. Information is provided as to how the notions behind the categories and groups have been developed by the researcher and how these are interrelated.

---

<sup>109</sup> Appendix II provides an overview of the groups and categories which comprise the three parts. The reader is advised to revisit the Appendix when needed while reading the chapter(s).

<sup>110</sup> The numbering of the table is made the same as that of the section in which it is presented to make it easily locatable.

In the process of attempting to understand how the interpreter had made his translation decisions during the IME, during post-IME interview II with the interpreter, the researcher asked him to provide (an) 'explanation(s)' about certain decisions he had made during the IME; in doing this, the researcher did not expect the interpreter to always provide an explanation; this is due to expected 'recollection' constraints. Given this sensitive interrelationship between these two concepts regarding how the data should be interpreted, information is provided as to the manner in which they have been handled.

Following this, information is provided about why the researcher chose during post-IME II with the interpreter to deal with the renditions directed at the lawyer even though the research questions are designed to deal with the renditions produced for the immigrant. After this, some statistics are provided detailing the frequency with which the categories were mentioned by the interpreter (see table 5.4.3<sup>111</sup>). An explanation is given as to how these statistics are viewed methodologically in this study.

Following this, the researcher presents the findings which belong to the '**no conscious strategy**' group (section 5.5 below), which is one of two groups in this part (Part III), and which is further divided into categories (sections 5.5.1 - 5.5.3.4). In this section, those cases (renditions) are dealt with for which the interpreter did not seem to have a strategy. In some cases, he said 'no idea why' (section 5.5.1); in an another case, he said that his translation was a 'mistake' (section 5.5.2). In section 5.5.3, those cases are dealt with where 'uncontrollable external factors' seem to have had an influence on the renditions made: 'forgetting', 'immediacy', 'being interrupted' and 'unconsciously' (sections 5.5.3.1 – 5.5.3.4).

In section 5.6, we move onto the findings which belong to the '**strategies followed**' group, which is the second and last group. Those cases are dealt with where the interpreter mentioned that he made a conscious strategy/decision, or seems to have done so (sections 5.6.1 – 5.6.20). The researcher will now present the findings of the first research question.

---

<sup>111</sup> This numbering as well has been given for the sake of making the table easily locatable. It corresponds to the section in which it is placed.

## Part I

### 5.1 First research question: how did the interpreter render the originals?

During the encounter, 110 renditions were produced (see Appendix I). The table below shows by category how many renditions are represented in the data, their type, and their percentages. 86 renditions fell within the categories developed by Wadensjö. The rest (24) fell within the additional categories the researcher has developed for this study. 39 of the renditions are 'close renditions', 9 are 'expanded renditions', 24 are 'reduced renditions', 5 are 'substituted renditions', 5 are 'summarized renditions', 2 are 'two-part renditions', 2 are 'zero renditions', 12 are 'reduced + substituted renditions', 7 are 'only substituted renditions' and 5 are 'expanded + substituted renditions'. The taxonomy has been utilized here with the aim of showing how these renditions relate to the originals produced by the lawyer.

**Table 5.1**

Utilizing the taxonomy of Wadensjö

| Category               | Number of renditions | Percentage |
|------------------------|----------------------|------------|
| close renditions       | 39                   | 35.45%     |
| expanded renditions    | 9                    | 8.18%      |
| reduced renditions     | 24                   | 21.81%     |
| substituted renditions | 5                    | 4.54%      |
| summarized renditions  | 5                    | 4.54%      |
| two-part renditions    | 2                    | 1.81%      |
| zero renditions        | 2                    | 1.81%      |

Additional categories developed by the researcher

| Category                          | Number of renditions | Percentage |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------|------------|
| reduced + substituted renditions  | 12                   | 10.90%     |
| only substituted renditions       | 7                    | 6.36%      |
| expanded + substituted renditions | 5                    | 4.54%      |

The information given in this table will be used in the second and third parts of chapter Six (sections 6.2 and 6.3 below).

## **Part II**

### **Did the immigrant understand the originals via the renditions, and what can be learned from his answers in terms of the sense-making processes?**

As indicated in chapter Four, this study attempts to ascertain whether or not the immigrant understood the originals. Then, it tries to find an explanation for the findings in both of these cases, i.e. which factors have contributed to understanding as well as to miscommunication. As this study applies dialogism as an overarching theoretical framework, it is interested in the manner in which meaning was co-constructed during the encounter, with regard to the renditions under investigation. In this regard, the researcher argued in chapter Three that a pure discourse-analytical approach is insufficient to understand how the meaning-making process developed, and that understanding cannot always be judged by the transcribed and/or oral text. For this reason, the immigrant was interviewed after the IME.

## **5.2 Categorization of findings**

For analytical purposes, with regard to understanding or the lack of it on the part of the immigrant, four categories have been developed<sup>112</sup>:

### **5.2.1 Originals understood**

This category comprises the originals that the immigrant understood. It is represented by 93 originals (out of a total number of 110 originals). 63 of these originals were concluded by the researcher to have been understood by the immigrant based on a micro-analysis of the audio and transcribed texts of the encounter. 30 were concluded to have been understood based on an investigation during post-IME interview I. For analytical purposes, it

---

<sup>112</sup> The relationship between these categories and the information which is presented in table 5.1 above is as follows: the table (5.1) shows how the renditions were produced. The taxonomy has been used to categorize them according to their relationship with the originals. The categories in the present section show which of these renditions were understood, miscommunicated, partly understood or partly miscommunicated by the immigrant.

was found useful to break down the findings and to present them according to the communicative projects of the lawyer<sup>113</sup> to which they belong.

It has been found that 12 of the understood originals related to the legal process which was being discussed during the IME (first project by the lawyer), 45 were related to revisiting the backstory (second project) while the rest (36) were related to questions asked by the lawyer about the backstory (third project). It is noteworthy that in total, 18 originals related to the first project (i.e. were legal process-related), 48 related to the second project (revisiting the backstory) and 39 related to the third project (asking questions to the immigrant). This shows that 66.66% of the first type were understood, 93.75% of the second type and 92.30% of the third type. The remaining originals (5) were not directly related to the topics mentioned.

### **5.2.2 Originals miscommunicated**

This category comprises the originals which were not understood (12 in total; 6 belonging to the first communicative project and 3 to each one of the second and third projects). All of them were investigated during the interview (see turns no. 7, 10, 12, 37, 41, 44, 91, 123, 145, 255, 327 and 400 in Appendix I).

### **5.2.3 Originals partly understood**

This category comprises the originals which were understood partly, i.e. where only a part of the original was understood. The percentage which is understood is smaller than the percentage which is miscommunicated. This category is represented by one original (see turn no. 30 in Appendix I).

### **5.2.4 Originals partly miscommunicated**

This category includes originals which the immigrant partly miscommunicated. The percentage which is miscommunicated is smaller than the percentage which is understood. This category is represented by three originals (see turns no. 39, 51 and 55 in Appendix I).

---

<sup>113</sup> These communicative projects have been discussed in section 1.2.3.

### 5.3 Factors which possibly contributed to understanding and miscommunication

As discussed in chapters Three and Four (for example section 3.2.5), this study also attempts to address the *why* question Wadensjö (1998) is not primarily interested in; The study seeks to understand how ‘things’ developed the way they did during the encounter, leading to understanding or miscommunication on the part of the immigrant; i.e. it attempts to understand why the sense-making process was not successful, and what contributed to understanding when sense-making was successful. Therefore, where a rendition is miscommunicated, partly understood or partly miscommunicated, this study also attempts to understand *why* this was the case. It needs to be mentioned here that it is not a matter of obtaining watertight explanations from the immigrant for these understandings and miscommunications; sometimes, one cannot find more than *possible reasons/explanations/factors*.

With respect to miscommunication, the first four categories<sup>114</sup> below (sections 5.3.1-5.3.4) were designed to encapsulate in relation to each investigated rendition what might have led to miscommunication on the part of the immigrant when the original was miscommunicated. Admittedly, not all originals in these categories were miscommunicated. An account of the number of the understood/miscommunicated originals is given under each category. Thus, these categories categorize possible *reasons/explanations/factors* as to why the original under investigation possibly was miscommunicated. For example, the category named ‘term/notion/talk miscommunicated’ (section 5.3.1 below), was designed to cover those renditions where it turned out that the immigrant did not understand an immigration-related term/notion. Earlier, prior to the interview with the immigrant, during the micro-analysis of the transcribed text, the term/notion had been designated by the researcher as being a possible ‘local linguistic problem’. The ones that turned out during the post-IME interview

---

<sup>114</sup> As mentioned earlier, Appendix II provides a concise, diagrammed representation of the interrelationship between the groups and the categories referred to in this chapter.

with the immigrant to have been miscommunicated have been placed in this category, i.e. 'term/notion/talk miscommunicated'. To recapitulate: during the micro-analysis of the transcribed text, prior to holding the interview with the immigrant, possible 'local linguistic problems' were designated for further investigation. During the interview, in the process of investigation, if such a term was miscommunicated, it was placed in this group. At the same time, it was investigated whether or not this miscommunication caused the entire original (via the rendition) to be miscommunicated. As can be seen in the category, not all miscommunicated terms/notions/talk investigated led to miscommunicating the entire original (via the rendition).

With regard to understanding also, the data provides some interesting insights, which have provided some useful findings about how understandings took shape during the encounter under investigation. Categories 5.3.5 - 5.3.10 cover the findings with regard to the originals that were concluded to have been understood by the immigrant. As the title of each category shows, the findings share a common characteristic in relation to understanding which made me place them in one category.

In all cases, due to the fundamentally qualitative nature of this study, the number of cases represented by each category is not always exclusive. One case might be represented in more than one category. In addition, it is not possible to claim that each category includes all the cases that could be found in the collected data.

In the following, each category will be presented and an explanation will be given about how the category is to be understood.

### **5.3.1 Term/notion/talk miscommunicated**

In this category, renditions are categorized where the immigrant miscommunicated an immigration-related notion or term which was used by the lawyer (and translated by the interpreter). This category contains three examples. The original is understood in one case (turn 22 in Appendix I) and miscommunicated in two cases (turns 37 and 44). The term does not

necessarily involve strictly legal terminology, but rather immigration-related terms/notions/talk. This applies to the following category as well.

### **5.3.2 Miscommunicated procedure<sup>115</sup>**

There are five examples in the data where it can clearly be concluded that the immigrant miscommunicates the asylum procedure as being mentioned by the lawyer and translated by the interpreter (see turns 7, 10, 12, 37 and 41 in Appendix I). It is noticeable that the original is miscommunicated in all these cases.

### **5.3.3 Partly/vaguely understanding the procedure**

The procedure is partly/vaguely understood (as mentioned in the original and translated by the interpreter). This is seen in four cases (see turns 26, 30, 39, and 41 in Appendix I). With regard to understanding and miscommunication of the corresponding originals, it turns out that the original is miscommunicated in one case (turn 41), partly understood in one case (turn 30), partly miscommunicated in one case (turn 39) and understood in one case (turn 26).

In all the four cases, it turns out that the immigrant does not have a clear idea about how the procedure is designed and how it works; however, he manages to mention information related to the procedure.

In one case (turn no. 30), the way he presents this information shows that he probably resorts to his STK/R. In another case (turn no. 30), he seems to have not understood the rendition partly (i.e. more is understood than not), while in yet another case (turn no. 39) he seems not to have understood partly (this means that more is not understood), the part which was not understood being due to his lack of understanding of how the procedure works. It needs to be noted here that the immigrant showed that he did not understand the procedure. This statement is not a general one that would be valid to the immigrant with regard to the asylum procedure.

---

<sup>115</sup> Meaning that the immigrant does not show understanding of the information about the procedure with regard to the rendition under discussion.

The immigrant showed no understanding of the procedure when asked about the renditions under investigation.

#### **5.3.4 Not understanding clearly which organization does what**

This category contains four examples (see turns 10, 37, 39 and 41), of which three renditions were not understood<sup>116</sup> (turns 10, 37 and 41) and one partly miscommunicated<sup>117</sup> (turn 39). In this category, examples are included of renditions where it is noticeable that there is confusion on the part of the immigrant regarding the tasks of different organizations involved in the asylum procedure. He encounters difficulties with regard to understanding how the legal institutions involved in the asylum procedure function and what their tasks are with regard to his procedure. Perhaps partly as a result of this, the immigrant did not manage to understand the rendition.

#### **5.3.5 Term/notion understood<sup>118</sup>**

In this case, the term was understood. This category contains two examples (turns 22 and 37). One of the originals is understood (turn 22) and the other one is miscommunicated (turn 37).

#### **5.3.6 Not being able to say something<sup>119</sup> but recognizing it when mentioned by the researcher**

The immigrant is incapable of expressing the information with regard to the question of the researcher, but does recognize it when the researcher reconstructs the information the immigrant is asked about. It is possible that

---

<sup>116</sup> I.e. miscommunicated.

<sup>117</sup> This means that more was understood than not.

<sup>118</sup> As indicated in section 5.0, in this section possible factors are presented which may have contributed to causing originals to be understood.

<sup>119</sup> 'Something' refers to sense-making-related information which was talked about during post-IME interview I.

this recognition of the information is due to the STK/R; and not because he had understood the rendition. This category contains two cases (turns 30 and 41); the original is partly understood in one case and miscommunicated in the other one (turn 41).

### **5.3.7 Understanding something the interpreter has not said**

This category comprises two examples (turns 51 and 91). The immigrant understands a rendition where one of its parts does not reflect the information the immigrant says to have understood. The missing part conforms to reality according to the immigrant; something which happened in his life, not referred to in the rendition, but assumed by the immigrant as said. The first original is partly miscommunicated and the second fully miscommunicated<sup>120</sup>.

### **5.3.8. Saying ‘correct’<sup>121</sup>, assuming that the interpreter said what he knew as reality**

The immigrant agrees with a translation by saying ‘correct’ when the translation is produced during the meeting while assuming that the interpreter is saying something which corresponds to reality as he knows it. Reality refers to past facts in his life. The category is represented by one example (turn 64). The original was understood even though the rendition did not reflect the way the original was produced by the lawyer.

### **5.3.9 Understanding the original directly via Dutch**

This category is represented by one example (turn 68). The immigrant was asked about a rendition which did not correspond to the original content-wise.

---

<sup>120</sup> In this case and in the cases of the other sub-sections coming under section 5.3 the process of investigation regarding how the researcher came to the conclusions which are presented in these sections is complicated and cannot be provided in an Appendix. The process was not in the form of yes-no answers but rather in the form of an interaction.

<sup>121</sup> I am using the wording of the immigrant to show he used to respond in such cases. The immigrant was sometimes uncritical of the rendition as we will see in chapter Six.

The immigrant noted that he knew the rendition was wrong and yet agreed to it. He explained that he understood the original directly from the lawyer.

### **5.3.10. The immigrant says ‘correct’, assuming that the interpreter meant what he himself had gone through**

The immigrant agrees to a translation assuming that the interpreter meant by his rendition what the immigrant had gone through in real life; i.e. he thought it corresponded to what he had experienced previously, although the rendition in reality did not reflect the content the immigrant assumed it did. The rendition or part of it was not produced the way he assumed it was. This category is represented by seven cases (turns 93, 96, 102, 133, 163, 171, and 428 in Appendix I). All but one of the originals were understood. Thus, the interpreter would say something while the immigrant would understand it as it had happened in the past, in real life, not exactly how it was translated. The immigrant would assume that the interpreter meant or said something when it was not necessarily the case.

### **5.3.11 Opinion towards interpreter and interpreting**

This category represents how the immigrant thinks how an interpreter should translate. The immigrant thought that interpreters too often tend to ‘ixtiṣaar’<sup>122</sup> (that is to summarize/condense) the content of originals. He indicated that he was unhappy when interpreters do not translate everything. He mentioned that he thinks that interpreters should translate what the lawyer (in this case) says “in a clear way”.

At the beginning of the interview, the immigrant told the researcher that he was satisfied with the interpreter. He was given enough time and he understood the translations.

---

<sup>122</sup> I have used this word in Arabic (transliterated) in order to show the pragmatic meaning of the word which would be lost if translated: the immigrant was showing his unhappiness that interpreters summarize/condense.

Thus far, I have presented the findings related to part I and II, which covered the first and second research questions. In the following section, I will present the findings which are related to the third research question.

## Part III

### **How did the interpreter explain the decisions regarding the renditions he had produced during the IME, and what can be learned from his explanations in terms of the sense-making processes?**

In this part, the researcher will present the explanations that the interpreter gave during interview II about the translation decisions he had taken when he produced the renditions under investigation. He was requested to explain according to which strategy, if any, conscious, or unconscious, he took the decisions he did during the process of producing the renditions under investigation. In the cases where the decisions were taken unconsciously<sup>123</sup>, he was asked to reflect on possible reasons. The questions about the explanations were sometimes asked directly and sometimes indirectly, depending on context during the interview. In the latter case, the researcher would ask the interpreter to reflect on a rendition without asking him specific questions. For more information on this, see for example section 3.3.4.

The findings will be presented below according to the following principles. With each rendition which was investigated, was there a conscious strategy<sup>124</sup>? If so and if the interpreter remembered it, was it an 'online' strategy (called 'during-interpreting strategies' by Chen (2007)), or was it an 'off-line' one (called 'pre-interpreting strategies' (ibid)). The first one represents strategies an interpreter employs when a decision has to be made during an interpreting session, without having thought about it before the encounter, while the second represents the way an interpreter thinks he

---

<sup>123</sup> According to Li (2015: 172), strategies are utilized either consciously or unconsciously. Conscious strategies can become unconscious after having been successfully used many times (ibid: 172). In this study, unconscious strategies are understood as those which the interpreter had not thought about previously. He just employs them, without too much pre-thinking about them. Li (p. 172) mentions that strategies are "intentional and goal-oriented procedures for the solution or prevention of problems." Li seems to see strategies from a monological way of thinking. The researcher has a dialogic view of them, meaning that the strategies are seen as a product of all the participants of the IME.

<sup>124</sup> According to Li (2015: 170), strategies are used by interpreters "to cope with cognitive constraints, interpreting mode-specific difficulties, and language- and culture-specific constraints."

should interpret in similar settings. This last distinction is not dealt with separately due to the complexity of explaining decisions.

If there was no conscious strategy or the interpreter did not remember the strategy, he was requested to provide, where he could, possible reason(s)/explanation(s) for the decision.

## **5.4 Categorization of the decisions of the interpreter:**

### **technical structure<sup>125</sup>**

In this section, the researcher will provide an explanation for how he categorized the findings, which is in the case of strategies not an easy task (Li, 2015: 176). This is to ensure that they will be easier to understand when presented. Following this, the factual presentation of these findings will be given (see section 5.4.3).

The findings have been divided into two groups: '**No conscious strategy**' **Group** and '**strategies followed**' **Group**. These groups have been designed to reflect the reasoning above about how the decisions were explained by the interpreter: was there a conscious strategy, or not? The groups have been divided into categories. In addition to the title of each category, which is designed to reflect its content, at the beginning of each category information is provided about how to understand the content of the category. These categories are also subdivided into sub-categories when there was a good reason to do so (see e.g. section 5.5.3 below). The following provides more specific information on how to understand each group.

The name '**No conscious strategy**' **Group** is designed in such a way to reflect the overall nature of the content of the categories within the group: the interpreter mentioned specifically or indirectly that there was 'no conscious strategy' on his part when he produced the renditions under investigation (and which have been placed in the categories of this group). Thus, the researcher has placed in this group those cases (of renditions) where the

---

<sup>125</sup> It is advised that the reader takes a look at Appendix II for a concise explanation of the interrelationship between the categories and groups referred to in this chapter.

interpreter was not able to mention a strategy he had taken consciously during the encounter. Then, these cases were divided according to their nature with regard how the interpreter reflected on them. What follows is a concise explanation of the categories of the group under discussion.

**'No idea why'** is a category which includes examples of renditions or parts of them where decisions were made for which the interpreter could not mention/think of a reason. He mentioned he had 'no idea why' he had taken these translation decisions.

**'Mistake'** is a category that includes cases of renditions where the interpreter indicated that he had made a mistake with regard to decisions he had made. He discovered the 'mistake' during the post-IME interview II.

**'Uncontrollable external factors'** is a category which is sub-divided into sub-categories. For each of these, examples will be provided of renditions where the interpreter had taken certain decisions which he attributed to external factors over which he had no control. The sub-categories that belong to this category are 'Forgetting', 'Immediacy', and 'Being interrupted'. Each of these sub-categories will be explained later (sections 5.5.3-5.5.3.3).

**'Unconsciously'** is a category that includes examples of renditions the interpreter said he had made unconsciously.

Unlike the **'no conscious strategy' Group** explained in the previous paragraphs, the **'strategies followed' Group** comprises cases where the interpreter did mention a strategy. Some of these strategies are related to how the interpreter generally thinks he should do his work. They represent pre-meeting considerations (termed 'off-line' strategies) which could be also valid in other, similar settings, according to the interpreter, for example the strategy named 'Çaammiya' (see 5.6.3 below). Other strategies are 'online' ones, related to decisions he made in order to deal with situations arising during the encounter itself. These strategies could not be anticipated before the encounters; for example the strategy named 'Dictionary translation' (see 5.3.5.7 below).

For organizational and analytical purposes, the strategies have been divided into categories. The categories are: 'giving the intended meaning', 'changing the pronoun', 'ṣaammiya', 'ixtiṣaar' (to condense), 'free translation', 'explicitations', 'dictionary translation', 'interpreting is not [written] translation', 'not translating', 'literacy/educational level of immigrant & simplifying', 'interrupting', 'they already know', 'side-sequences', 'language towards the lawyer different', 'freedom when translating for lawyers', 'downplaying of drama', 'tāwḍīḥ' (*making clear*), 'no half sentences', 'language of immigrant bad', and 'reorganizing the utterance'. The researcher will explain the nature of each one of these categories: how to understand them, and what the relationship is between their names and their content, in the sections where they will be fully presented. In each category, the examples which are mentioned are either exclusive, or have been chosen as being representative of the category in the sense that the other examples in the same category are similar.

The names of these categories reflect the reason/explanation mentioned by the interpreter with regard to the strategy behind the investigated rendition. Furthermore, due to the sensitive nature of the notion of motivation in the study and in order to avoid any misinterpretation of any expression used by the interpreter regarding the motivation under investigation, this study has chosen, where possible, to use the expression used by the interpreter himself to refer to or interpret a translation decision dealt with. For example, the interpreter on several occasions used the expression "Interpreting is not [written] translation". The researcher has found that it is better to keep this expression and to translate it, and also to give a concise explanation how it is understood in Arabic if needed. In a few cases, a translation alone was found to be insufficient to reflect the full meaning<sup>126</sup>. Furthermore, keeping the wording of the interpreter as much as possible was considered to be a handy strategy for easily tracing back a phenomenon in the data when needed. In

---

<sup>126</sup> Whether a wording used by the interpreter is translated literally into English or not, it is sometimes found useful to keep these wordings in Arabic or Dutch due to the desire on the part of the researcher to retain the pragmatic meaning, especially in those cases where it was thought that a translation might diminish this pragmatic meaning.

some cases, however, the title was developed by the researcher based on analysis, rather than wording used by the interpreter.

It is with regard to the relationship between the categories and the groups, that the technical terminology of the extended *taxonomy* of Wadensjö comes in: This terminology is used to discuss the examples in each category and the motivations of the interpreter according to the theory of Wadensjö. This means that the technical terminology of Wadensjö's model is used when the originals and renditions are discussed; that is how a rendition relates to the original: is a close or expanded rendition, etc.

All in all, this methodology benefits the discussion phase of the study: the titles of the groups represent a macro-analysis of the findings. Again, the titles of the categories often represent the explanations of the interpreter (with regard to his renditions) and how he theorizes them. These titles are often his own expressions, sometimes in adapted form (this could be termed 'folk theorisation'). Staying as close as possible to the expressions of the interpreter is thought to help with ensuring that the researcher stays on the safe side in analysing the explanations of the interpreter (because the expression used by interpreter explains well how he reasons, the risk of misinterpreting them is then further reduced), and that the reader gets an impression about how the interpreter thinks, which arguably provides good insights.

In the following section, I will explain what I mean by the notion of 'Explanation' and what it encompasses in this thesis.

#### **5.4.1 Explanations & recollections**

The notion of 'explanations' as used with regard to the decisions of the interpreter is meant to encompass a) the general strategies the interpreter mentioned about how he works and how he thinks he should work; b) the decisions he took at the moment he produced the translation, in which regard, one can also think of unforeseen situational circumstances and situations whereby the immigrant acts in a way which was not expected by the

interpreter due to STK/R (see chapter Three); and c) decisions which have to be made at the turn-taking level, which the interpreter was not, and could not have been, prepared for. In cases where the interpreter (mentioned that he) remembered, the answers will henceforth be termed 'explanation(s)'. Where it was not possible for the interpreter to remember to an acceptable extent how the decision was made, possible reasons were mentioned by him. Some insights would be given by him to indicate how he thought he must have reasoned, or thought how he would act if he were put in a similar situation.

### **5.4.2 Renditions towards the lawyer**

Although this study is primarily concerned with the renditions produced for the immigrant, and not those produced for the lawyer, it is relevant to include examples of these, which I will do. This is because, according to the ontology that this study is based on (dialogism), meaning is co-constructed. This means that the manner in which the renditions in the direction of the lawyer are produced influences the manner in which he handles the interaction, whether on a turn-by-turn level or on the level of the interaction as a whole.

### **5.4.3 Presentation of findings**

In the following sections, I will present the findings taken from the data which was collected during the post-IME interview with the interpreter.

#### **5.4.3.1 Frequency by category<sup>127</sup>**

Although this is fundamentally a qualitative rather than a quantitative study, it is inevitable that it contains some quantitative elements. In table 5.4.3.1<sup>128</sup>

---

<sup>127</sup> A recap: The researcher is referring here to the categories designed for Part III, which is being discussed in this part. These categories referred to here and presented in table 5.4.3.1 below, represent explanations provided by the interpreter during post-IME interview II when he was asked to provide explanations for translation decisions he had made. These explanations are the answers to the third research question. The findings (i.e. the explanations provided) of the collected data are assigned to categories and groups. In section 5.4 above, information is provided about how these categories and groups were designed. A diagrammatic representation of the groups and categories which are referred to in this chapter is provided in Appendix II.

below, some information is provided regarding the explanations which were given by the interpreter and a tentative indication of the frequency with which he mentioned each category during post-IME interview II. In a study like this one, it is not possible to ask clear-cut, and precisely delimited questions and receive answers which can then be quantified as is the case in quantitative studies. This is why these statistics will need to be understood from the perspective of qualitative studies. The frequency of each category does not necessarily give an indication of its importance or otherwise. It only gives an indication of how often the category is mentioned by the interpreter during the meeting. It is meant to provide a tentative indication of how the interpreter theorizes his actions. Thus, the interpretation of these statistics will need to be made with caution. It also needs to be mentioned that the researcher was not primarily looking to produce statistics. These statistics should thus be interpreted from the perspective of the extent to which the corresponding phenomenon was relevant for the interpreter to refer to when motivating the decisions he made.

The statistics provided below were checked several times. The frequencies on each occasion were largely similar. Where the frequency differed somewhat, a median figure was chosen. As indicated earlier, unless the interpreter really remembers how a decision was made, in which case it is easy to categorize the explanation, it is not easy to give clear-cut numbers when the interpreter is trying to reconstruct the factors that made him take a certain decision. In such cases, one must be careful with regard to categorization, especially when several possible reasons are given or when the interpreter is not totally clear with regard to the possible reason. In such cases, careful consideration is needed when categorizing, and it is inevitable that the researcher might come to slightly different conclusions regarding categorization when the data is revisited.

---

<sup>128</sup> The numbering of the table corresponds to the number of the section in order to make it easy for locating.

**Table 5.4.3.1**

| Name of explanation                                       | Frequency |
|---|-----------|
| 'Giving the intended meaning'                             | 6         |
| 'Changing the pronoun'                                    | 2         |
| 'Çaammiya'  | 16        |
| 'Ixtiṣaar' (condensing)                                   | 2         |
| 'Free translation'  | 1         |
| 'Explications'  | 5         |
| 'Dictionary translation'                                  | 1         |
| 'Interpreting is not translation'                         | 4         |
| 'Not translating'   | 3         |
| 'Literacy/educational level of immigrant' & 'simplifying' | 3         |
| 'Interrupting'  | 3         |
| 'They already know'                                       | 3         |
| 'Side-sequences'  | 2         |
| 'Language towards the lawyer different'                   | 6         |

|  |    |
|--|----|
|  |    |
| 'Freedom when translating for lawyers' | 2  |
| 'Dramatiek'                            | 1  |
| 'tāwḏīḥ'                               | 4  |
| 'No half-sentences'                    | 5  |
| 'Language of immigrant bad'            | 5  |
| 'Reorganizing the utterance'           | 6  |
| 'Forgetting'                           | 8  |
| 'Immediacy'                            | 7  |
| 'Being interrupted'                    | 2  |
| 'Mistake'                              | 2  |
| 'No idea why'                          | 12 |
| Unconsciously                          | 1  |

In the following sections (5.5 - 5.6.19), more information will be provided about the groups and (sub-)categories introduced above. Within each of them, their nature will be explained, and examples will be provided to make the nature of the category clearer. The frequency with which they appear in the investigated data (see above table) will also be mentioned. Categories 5.5 – 5.5.3.4 below belong to the 'No conscious strategy' Group; categories 5.6 -5.6.19 belong to the 'Strategies followed' Group.

## 5.5 ‘No conscious strategy’ Group

The categories that belong to this group are the following:

### 5.5.1 ‘No idea why’

There are examples in the data where the interpreter was unable during post-IME interview II to explain the idea behind the strategies he had followed. He said that he had ‘no idea why’ why he had taken the decisions behind the renditions under investigation. In the example below, for the element “zo zullen ze **zelf** ook in problemen komen” [*this way they will get into trouble **themselves** too*] which was ‘reduced’, he had no explanation. There are 12 examples of this category (see table 5.4.3.1 above).

Example:

**373** Lawyer: .hh dat is al een belangrijk punt in je verhaal= waar de waar de IND ook op gaat **zitten** (.) van **waarom waarom** hebben die politieagenten dit gedaan, ik bedoel= ze kregen de opdracht om jou (.) **op** te pakken =want ze wisten waar je was (.) en ze laten je gewoon (.) lopen= zo zullen ze **zelf** ook in problemen komen.

Lawyer: .hh this is already an important point in your backstory= which which the IND will **scrutinize** (.) in the sense **why why** did those police agents did this, I mean=they were assigned to (.) arrest you=for they knew where you were (.) and they just let you (.) go=this way they will get into trouble **themselves** too.

**374** المترجم: يعني هاي النقطة بدها تركز عليها دائرة الهجرة والتجنيس إي الشرطة لشو عملو هوك هيك هني إي كانوا عرفانين انت وين وجايين لعندك ومسكوك<sup>129</sup> ولو كان بدون اياك كانوا أخذوك هيك ما كانوا خلّوك هيك تهرب!

Interpreter: yaʕni this point the immigration and Naturalization Service will concentrate on e: the police why did they do this they e knew where you were and they came to you and caught you (*immigrant interjects: “right”/“correct”*) and if they had wanted you they would’ve taken you just like that they wouldn’t have let you escape so easily!

### 5.5.2 ‘Mistake’

There are some cases where the interpreter thought during post-IME interview II that he had made (a) mistake(s) (see table 5.4.3.1 above). For

<sup>129</sup> The immigrant interjects: ‘correct’.

example, when asked about renditions which did not reflect the informational content correctly, and where he agreed about this with the researcher, the interpreter said it was a ‘mistake’ and attributed this to the possibility that he had misheard the original. Thus in example (1) below, the lawyer is talking about “the” family (which the immigrant had enmity with), while the interpreter says “your” family. In example (2) below, the interpreter mentioned that he knew that the rendition did not reflect the meaning of the original well [he had replaced ‘nice’ with ‘beautiful’], and that it was a ‘mistake’, but he did not have a better solution for it at that moment. He used a ‘dictionary translation’. He said that in hindsight ظريفة (*nice*) would have been better. In example (3) below, the interpreter indicates that “in hindsight”, as he said, he should have used لهذا السبب (*for this reason*) instead of the filler يعني (*yaʕni*) for the Dutch “om die rede.”

Example (1)

**400** Lawyer: waren daar <sup>130</sup> ook mensen van de familie bij?

Lawyer: Were there also people from the family with them?

**401** المترجم: كان في ناس من قرابينك او من عيلتك (.) موجودين (.) كمان؟

Interpreter: Were there also people from your relatives or your family (.) there?

Example (2):

**68** Lawyer: ‘t was een leuk meisje.

Lawyer: she was a nice girl.

**69** المترجم: كانت إي: صبيبة: حلوى؟

Interpreter: she was e: a beautiful gi:rl?

Example (3):

**26** Lawyer: en e: om die rede heb ik gezegd ja IND als jullie e::: met een andere datum (*unintelligible*) (.) dan moeten jullie wel uitlegggen (..) waarom dat niet met ingang van 2009 is.

<sup>130</sup> This word is not fully intelligible.

Lawyer: and e: for that reason I said Yes IND if you e::: [unintelligible] with another date (.) you will then need to explain (..) why not from 2009.

(....)

27 المترجم: إيه يعني (.) هو قال (غير واضح) إذا إنتو (.) إي عيّننو إي تاريخ بداية الإقامى (.) تاريخ مختلف (.) فلأزم ت تقولونه (.) توضّحوننّه السبب (.) لّشو ما: أخذتو بتاريخ الفين وتسعة=الفين وتسعة،

Interpreter: e: yaʕni (.) he said (unintelligible) if you (.) e set e the start date of the residence (permit) (.) a different date (.) then you need to to say to us (.) explain to us the reason (.) for what reason you did no:t pick two thousand and nine=two thousand and nine,

### 5.5.3 Uncontrollable external factors

This category contains sub-categories in which ‘phenomena’ are included over which the interpreter had no control. These sub-categories include cases of the influence of memory on the capacity to produce renditions; this sub-category is named ‘*forgetting*’.<sup>131</sup> The immediacy of the event (the encounter) too seems to have had an influence on the capacity of the interpreter to produce renditions; the representing category is named ‘*Immediacy*’. In other cases, the interpreter mentions that an interruption on the part of the immigrant caused him to ‘reduce’ an item unintentionally; this sub-category is named ‘*being interrupted*’. These sub-categories will be dealt with separately.

#### 5.5.3.1 Sub-category: ‘Forgetting’

Sometimes, the interpreter was unable to mention a (possible) reason or provide an explanation for a ‘reduction’ he had made. The reason which he would then give was that he must have “forgotten” to translate it. This sub-category is mentioned eight times in the data (see table 5.4.3.1 above). In the example below, the interpreter mentioned that he must have forgotten to translate “la:ng”. He was unable to find another reason for it. The interpreter did not mention what could have caused this forgetting.

<sup>131</sup> According to Li (2011), apart from the textual and contextual comprehension influencing the interpreter’s turn-design, there is another factor that is very unique to the interpreted conversation—**memory**.”

Example:

1 Lawyer: goed (....) .hhhh (.) ja we zijn al la:ng bezig met jou::  
asielprocedure.

Lawyer: good (....) .hhhh (.) yeah we have been busy with you::r asylum  
procedure for a lo:ng time.

2 المترجم: إحنا صارنا فترة (.) عم نشغل مشغولين ب: (.) إجراءات لجو:نك.

Interpreter: we have been working on been busy with: (.) your asylum  
proce:dure (.) for some time.

In other cases, the interpreter did mention a possible reason for forgetting: in one case, he attributed the forgetting to being interrupted by the immigrant in the middle of the translation (see turn 290 in Appendix I). He thought the interruption might have been the reason why he forgot to translate that part of the original, though he was unsure. There could have been other reasons, other than forgetting, he said; for instance, he might have thought that it was not necessary to translate this lexical element because the immigrant had understood directly from the lawyer, which might have been the reason why the immigrant interrupted him with “Sah”, meaning “correct”. In this regard, the interpreter complained that the immigrant too often said “Sah”.

With regard to another rendition where one element was ‘reduced’, the interpreter mentioned that he might have forgotten or he might have thought it sounded strange in colloquial Syrian (which is the mode he was translating in) and so he left it untranslated. More information on colloquial Arabic Çaammiya and its influence on translation decisions will be provided below (section 5.6.3).

In another case (see turn 351 in Appendix I), the interpreter blamed the lengthy original for the loss of part of the utterance, implying that he forgot. He also mentioned that he sometimes thinks he should ‘yextişir’ (*condense*) (for more on ‘yextişir’ (*condense*), see section 5.6.4 below). He did not think the immigrant had missed anything because the rendition was clear even though it was slightly different from the original, according to the interpreter. The sub-category is represented eight times in the data.

### 5.5.3.2 Sub-category: Immediacy

Although the interpreter did not mention the ‘immediacy’ of the event himself, the fact that interpreters often do not have time to reflect on their renditions can be assumed to have an influence on how these renditions come into being<sup>132</sup>. On several occasions, when asked about a certain translation, the interpreter indicated that this was what he was able to think of at that moment. This phenomenon is represented in the data seven times (see table 5.4.3.1 above). The following rendition is an example of a situation where the interpreter produces a translation involving a substitution which he admits was what he could think of at that moment. “omdat je geen belang had” (*because you had no interest*) was translated as *لأنو ما من مصلحتك* (*because it is not in your interest*). He mentioned that this was what he was able to think of at that moment, admitting that it should have been translated differently. It is noteworthy that when the same phrase was used by the lawyer in the following original, the interpreter was able to give a ‘close’ translation, which might be an indication that he had had enough time on this occasion to think of a closer rendition<sup>133</sup>.

Example:

**10** Lawyer: en e: (.) de IND (.) heeft (.) daar op zitting ook gezegd dat ze vonden dat we eigenlijk=dat je helemaal geen recht had om in (.) beroep te gaan (.) omdat je geen belang had=want je hebt nu verblijfsvergunning .h dus dan kun je niet in beroep e e tegen een asielbesluit.

Lawyer: and e: (.) the IND (.) said (.) there during the [court] session indeed that they were of the opinion that we actually=that you had no right whatsoever to (.) lodge an appeal (.) because you had no interest=for you have now a residence permit .h so you cannot lodge an appeal e e against an asylum decision.

**11** المترجم: وأنت (.) وأثناء الجلسة (.) دائرة الهجرة والتجنّي: س قابلت أنّو هنى (.) إي بيشو إي يعني من رأين إي أنّو إنت إي ما من حقا أنّو تتقدم ب: (..) طلب إي إي ب: إستئناف ضد القرار لأنو ما من مصلحتك لأنو أنتي حصلت (.) على الإقامة.

<sup>132</sup> Mason and Stewart also refer to the “immediacy of the event”, noting that together with physical presence of all participants, immediacy exerts a “determining influence on the way the meanings are exchanged and negotiated” (2001: 51).

<sup>133</sup> This example has been used in chapter Six.

Interpreter: and du (.) and during the [court] session (.) the Immigration and Naturalization Service said that they (.) e: think e: yaʕni<sup>134</sup> they are of the opinion e: that you e: have no right to lodge (..) e: e: an appeal against °the decision° because it is **not** in your interest because you [already] have (.) received the [residence] permit.

### 5.5.3.3 Sub-category: Being interrupted

Like monolingual encounters, interpreter-mediated ones show cases where one of the interlocutors is interrupted. In the examples below, the interpreter is interrupted by the immigrant. He is interrupted by the interjection صح [Immigrant says “correct” to show that he agrees]. The interruption does not seem to have influenced the rendition, probably because of the shortness of the original. In example (2), the adverb “flink” [heavily] is reduced. The interpreter attributes this to the fact that he was interrupted by the interjection صح (correct) on the part of the immigrant. He is not sure of this but he thinks that this is plausible because the reduced word would have occurred directly at that point if the interjection had not been produced by the immigrant.

Example (1):

**194** Lawyer: en e:m (...) ja je hebt jouw neef gebeld (.) en dit verteld.

Lawyer: And e:m (...) yeah you phoned your cousin (.) and told him this.

**195** المترجم: وأنت إتصلت بابن عمك وقلتلو.

Interpreter: And you contacted your cousin and said to him.

**196** اللاجئ: صح

Immigrant: correct

**197** هالشي

Interpreter: this

Example (2):

<sup>134</sup> This is a filler probably used here by the interpreter to give himself time to think/reformulate.

**289** Lawyer: °ok° (...) t! e: inmiddels is ter hoop veranderd in Syria (.) ook in Aleppo is is **fli**nk gevochten heb je e: enig idee waa (.) of die familie nog steeds aan de kant van de autoriteiten staat= of ze daar zijn of ze weg zijn?

Lawyer: °ok°. (...) t! e: in the meantime a lot has changed in Syria (.) in Aleppo too there there has been **fierce** fighting have you e e any idea whee (.) whether that family is still on the side of the authorities=whether they are there or have left?

**290** المترجم: يعني في الوقت اللي فات صار في كثير تغيرات في سوريا وفي حلب صار في معارك و اشتباكات<sup>135</sup> حسب معلوماتك (.) هذول لساتون واقفين مع النظام هالعيلى (.) ولا طلعو ولا لساتون موجودين،

Interpreter: yaʕni in the past period many changes have taken place in Syria and in Aleppo battles and confrontations have taken place [immigrant: correct] according to your information they are still on the side of the regime this family (.) or they have left or they are still there,

#### 5.5.3.4 Sub-category: Unconsciously

With regard to the following examples, where the rendition is expanded by the adverbial *وكمابن* (*and also*) as in example (1), and with the conjunction “Omdat” (*because*) as in example (2), the interpreter stated that this happened ‘unconsciously’. It was not a decision he was aware of. In example (2), while motivating expanding the rendition with “omdat”, the interpreter added smilingly that one does other things unconsciously as well: a word like “walla” (*By God*) is translated as “echt” (*really*), and *waraqqa* (*paper*) becomes “document”. He motivated this by saying with a smile that if one did not make these changes, the lawyer would not understand.

Example (1):

**74** Lawyer: .hhh en: je bent haar gaan opzoeken (.) op (.) op ar school?

Lawyer: .hhh and: you went to visit her (.) at (.) at her school?

**75** المترجم: وكمابن إي رحت زرتنا في مدرستا.

Interpreter: and also: e you went to visit in her school.

<sup>135</sup> Here the immigrant jumps in and says: ‘correct’.

Example (2):

176 اللاجئ: ما بتذكر والله ما بتذكر. من زمان.

Immigrant: I don't remember really I don't remember. [It was a] long time ago.

177 Interpreter: kan ik me niet herinneren =kan me niet herinneren omdat het lang geleden is.

Interpreter: I cannot remember=cannot remember because it has been a long time.

## 5.6 'Strategies followed' Group

As indicated in section 5.4 above, the findings of post-IME interview II with the interpreter have been divided up into two groups: the 'no conscious strategy' group and the 'strategies followed' group. In the previous sections, the findings were presented of the 'no conscious strategy' Group (sections 5.5 – 5.5.3.4). In this section, the researcher will present the findings for the 'strategies followed' Group<sup>136</sup>. In the sections below (5.6.1 - 5.6.19) the findings have been divided up into categories which belong to this group. These categories include explanations the interpreter gave during the post-IME interview II of strategies the interpreter indicated he had employed during the IME under investigation. It is noteworthy that the interpreter did not use the word 'strategy'. He used expressions or a derivation of them, which are used here as names of the categories. These were mentioned by him when he was asked to explain his 'decisions' regarding the translations he had made.

### 5.6.1 'Giving the intended meaning'

During the post-IME interview II, in some cases, the interpreter would admit that a rendition is not exactly what it should have been. He would then relativize this by stating that the translation made did give the 'intended

<sup>136</sup> A mentioned ealier, if the reader needs to remember how the categories and groups interrelate, they are advised to consult Appendix II for a concise depiction of the structure.

meaning’, that is the meaning intended by the lawyer. This category is represented six times in the data (see table 5.4.3.1 above). In the example below (turn 56 in Appendix I), for example, the interpreter was initially unhappy with his translation of *مشان تغطو على هالموضوع* (*in order to cover up this issue/matter*), which is a ‘substitution’ of *حتى لا تلفت الانتباه* (*so as not to draw attention*), which would have been a closer translation, and said immediately that it was a mistake. Then, after reconsidering it, he said that the rendition did give the ‘intended meaning’, meaning that he did not think it was that bad. A better translation would have been *حتى لا تلفت الانتباه* (*so as not to draw attention*), though, the interpreter added.

With regard to reducing the filler “goed” (*good*) and the adverb “trouwens” (*by the way*), the interpreter stated that the reason was that he sometimes neglected them as not being important for the sentence, in that they were not adding to or taking away from the meaning [i.e. the ‘intended meaning’ did not suffer]. In addition, he said that as the atmosphere at the lawyers office is ‘shwayya’ (‘somewhat, a little’) informal, it is not necessary to translate “literally”, i.e. word for word, like when one is translating for the police during interrogations or in similar situations<sup>137</sup>. He then added that the information that was being discussed by the lawyer had already been talked about in preceding meetings; and the meaning had thus become clear to the immigrant. He did, however, also confirm that translating those omitted elements would have been better.

Sometimes, the interpreter would mention “[it is] the same meaning”, when shown a substitution he had made. One example was when the original “explained” was rendered as “said”. Or he would say it ‘يفي بالغرض’ (*suffices for the purpose*) (see turn 248 in Appendix I). At other times, the interpreter would say that he did not know why he ‘reduced’, ‘expanded’ or ‘substituted’ a part of the utterance. He would relativize this by saying that he did not think the ‘intended meaning’ was affected (see turn 251 in Appendix I). Sometimes, the interpreter would say that leaving out particles like “Ok”, “maar” (*but*) was acceptable in colloquial Syrian or Arabic.

<sup>137</sup> This is also referred to by Li (2013: 147): “Some authors have pointed out that the interpreter’s activity (or turn-design) is affected by the “framing context” (e.g. the contexts of hospital, the consulation, etc.) [...]”

Example:

**55** Lawyer: e:m ik heb begrepen dat e: tus ik heb het verhaal zo begrepen= jouw vriendin (.) of nee jouw jouw neef had een vriendin e: een meisje leren kennen .hh waarmee e: ja die wat aanrommelde<sup>138</sup> om het zo maar te zeggen .hh (.) en (.) en op een gegeven moment heeft **jou** neef aan jou gevraagd om mee te gaan= zodat het meisje **ook** een vriendin mee zou nemen (.) en dan zou het allemaal wat minder (..) opvallen.

Lawyer: e:m I have understood that e: tog. I have understood the story in such a way=your **girlfriend** (.) or no your your cousin had a girlfriend e: had met a girl .hh with whom e: yeah he used to mess around a little bit (*chuckles*) to put it this way .hh (.) and (.) and at a given moment **your** cousin asked you to accompany [them]=so that the girl **too** would take along a [girl] friend (.) and then things would be less (..) noticeable.

**56** المترجم: يعني: (.) حسب ما هوى (.) فهم أُو ابن عمك (.) كان عندو رفيقة: (.) وعمل معا شغلًا:ت، (.) وقال لك قال لك أُو تجي معو مشان هي كمان تجيب رفيقتها معا= مشان تغطو على هالموضوع.

Interpreter: yaʕni: (.) according to how he (.) has understood your cousin had a girl:friend (.) and he did things to her (.) and he said he said to you to come with him so that she too brings her [girl] friend with her=so you cover up this thing.

### 5.6.2 Changing the pronoun

It is noticeable that the interpreter sometimes changes the first person pronoun to the third person pronoun. He states that he knows the rules with regard to using the first person pronoun; but “one is sometimes motaʕawwed [*in the habit*’ of] changing to the third person.”

Example:

**7** Lawyer: he:m<sup>139</sup> dat was (.) e: een beetje bijzondere procedu:re (.) want ik ben in beroep gegaan tegen een beslissing van de IND (.) **terwijl** je een verblijfsvergunning had.

Lawyer: he:m it was (.) e: a unusual procedu:re a little bit (.) for I lodged an appeal against a decision of the IND (.) at a **time** when you [already] had a residence permit.

<sup>138</sup> Here lawyer laughs nasally.

<sup>139</sup> This is a filler. It indicates that the lawyer is about to start his rendition.

8 المترجم: هذه الإجراءات كانت إليه استثنائية بعض الشيء لأنو هوّى (.) عمل (.) إستئناف (.) ضد (.) قرار (.) دائرة الهجرة والتجنيس في حين إنو القرار كان إقامة،

Interpreter: this procedure was e somewhat exceptional for he (.) made [sic] (.) an appeal (.) against (.) the deci:sion of (.) the immigration and naturalization bureau when the decision [already taken by the IND] was a residence permit.

### 5.6.3 'ʕaammiya'

The data shows (see table 5.4.3.1) that the interpreter frequently mentions that he uses ʕaammiya (informal/colloquial Arabic) when interpreting, because immigrants, according to him, generally would not understand the translations if Modern Standard Arabic (MSA) was used. He referred to the current immigrant as an example. He mentioned that the educational and literacy levels of many immigrants would not be sufficient for them to understand MSA.

In example (1) below, the interpreter was asked why the adverbs ook (*also*), eigenlijk (*actually*), helemaal (*totally*) were 'reduced'. He stated that these "kinds of words" cannot easily be translated into ʕaammiya. "If you do translate them literally, then you get words that are too heavy and the sentence will become too formal; that is the reason sometimes. So you do not use them. And sometimes they are forgotten or not heard. So there can be different reasons." In example (2), when requested to motivate 'substituting' "klap krijgen" (*get hit*) with ضربك (*beat you*), the interpreter argued that interpreting into ʕaammiya brings with it certain decisions that have to be made with regard the language used. He mentioned that he knew that وجهلك ضربة (*aim a blow at you*) is closer to the original; but this expression is not used in Syrian ʕaammiya. Furthermore, تافي بيل ماڤنا ضربك (*is good enough to give the meaning*). The immigrant and the lawyer were also speaking about something they both knew about.

The interpreter considered expressions like "om het maar zo te zeggen" (*to put it this way*), "op een gegeven momen" (*at a given moment*), too "heavy" – i.e. over-formal - in ʕaammiya. The interpreter thought that MSA translations of them would not be understood by the immigrant.

Example (1):

**10** Lawyer: en e: (.) de IND (.) heeft (.) daar op zitting ook gezegd dat ze vonden dat we eigenlijk=dat je helemaal geen recht had om in (.) beroep te gaan (.) omdat je geen belang had=want je hebt nu verblijfsvergunning .h dus dan kun je niet in beroep e e tegen een asielbesluit.

Lawyer: and e: (.) the IND (.) said (.) there during the [court] session indeed that they were of the opinion that we actually=that you had no right whatsoever to (.) lodge an appeal (.) because you had no interest=for you have now a residence permit .h so you cannot lodge an appeal e e against an asylum decision.

**11** المترجم: وأنتُ (.) وأثناء الجلسة (.) دائرة الهجرة والتجنّي: س قابلت أنّو هنيّ (.) إي بيشو إي يعني من رأيين إي أنّو إنت إي ما من حقاك أنّو تتقدم ب: (..) طلب إي إي ب: إستئناف ضدّ القرار لأنّو ما من مصلحتك لأنّو أنتي حصلت (.) على الإقامي.

Interpreter: and du (.) and during the [court] session (.) the Immigration and Naturalization Service said that they (.) e: think e: yaʕni<sup>140</sup> they are of the opinion e: that you e: have no right to lodge (..) e: e: an appeal against °the decision° because it is **not** in your interest because you [already] have (.) received the [residence] permit.

Example (2):

**94** Lawyer: en jij krijgt toen een klap (.) van een van de agenten.

Lawyer: and then you received a blow (.) from one of the policemen.

**95** المترجم: واحد متّون (.) من هذول الشرطة ضربك؟

Interpreter: one of them (.) of these policemen hit you?

#### 5.6.4 'Ixtiṣaar' (condensing)

The interpreter indicated twice that he sometimes 'Yextiṣir' (*condences*) the content of the original when he produces a rendition. In example (1) below, "heeft hij toen iets verteld over hoe het met je vader was" (*did he say something back then about how your father was*) is 'reduced' to ما قال لك شي عن (he didn't say something about your father). The interpreter stated that some information which is in the original might have been lost in the

<sup>140</sup> This is a filler probably used here by the interpreter to give himself time to think/reformulate.

rendition due to the length of the original. Or he might have at that point chosen to ‘yextiṣir’ [*condense*] the meaning. He then mentioned that he does, however, think that his rendition was clear. If the immigrant had heard something about his father, he would have known what was meant even though the “meaning” in the rendition is not exactly the same as in the original, according to the interpreter. In example (2) below, when asked about changing the past perfect tense in the original to the present tense in the rendition, the interpreter mentioned that the tense should have indeed been kept in the past perfect. Then he mentioned that the rendition would not have really sounded smooth in *Ṣaammiya* (*colloquial Arabic*) if he had done this. He went on to say that one sometimes chooses to ‘Yextiṣir’ (*condense*); “so you remove it”.

It is observable in these examples that the interpreter might have meant by ‘ixtiṣaar’ that he does not always stay close to the original and that where not strictly necessary he may deviate from staying close by choosing to use more colloquial language, by which he seems to mean that he wishes to “free” himself from the rules of MSA. It is noteworthy that when one learns Dutch or wants to look up something in the dictionary, one is often (if not always) dependent on material which is written in MSA. When one then ‘translates’ this MSA material into an *Ṣaammiya* version of Arabic, when interpreting such as in this case, it could be a challenge for the interpreter to find an equivalent for the MSA material in *Ṣaammiya*. This seems to have happened to this interpreter in example 2.

Example (1):

**350** Lawyer: huhum e: (.) heeft hij toen iets verteld over hoe het met je vader was, want (.) de politie zei dat ze hem vasthouden. Was dat inderdaad zo?

Lawyer: Huhum e: (.) did he say something then about how your father was, for (.) the police said that they were detaining him. Was that indeed the case?

**351** المترجم<sup>141</sup>: ما قال لك شي عن عن بيك؟<sup>142</sup> لان الشرطة قالوا لك انه ماسكينو (.) كانوا فعلا ماسكينو؟

<sup>141</sup> The interpreter start to translate while there are muddled voices.

Interpreter: didn't he say anything about your father? [*unintelligible*] for the police told you that they were holding him (.) were they really holding him?

Example (2):

**22** Lawyer: precies (.) en ik heb toen gezegd van (.) ja: .h (.) maar d (.) je hebt in tweed duizend **negen** al asiel aangevraagd= en de hoofdregel is dat een asiel (.) vergunning ingaat (.) e: vanaf het moment van asielaanvraag= dus (.) die verblijfsvergunning had moeten worden verleend met ingang .h van juni 2009.

Lawyer: Exactly (.) and I said then something like (.) ye:::ah .h (.) but (.) you applied for asylum already in two thousand and **nine**= and the main rule is that the asylum (.) [residence] permit starts (.) e: from the moment of the asylum application=thus (.) that residence permit should have been granted from .h June 2009.

**23** المترجم: لكن (.) هو قال لَوْن نعم (.) ماشي (.) بس إنت قدمت طلب اللجوء في الفين وتسعة (.) و أو القاعدة الأساسية هو أَو طلب اللجوء (.) يعني أو الإقامة الممنوحة (.) بتسري المفعول (.) من تاريخ طلب اللجوء=يعني لازم تبلش في شهر ستي (.) الفين وتسعة.

Interpreter: But (.) he said to them yes (.) okay (.) but you submitted the asylum application in two thousand and nine (.) and or the main rule is that the asylum application (.) that is or the granted residence [permit] (.) is valid (.) from the date of the asylum application=that is it must start in month six (.) two thousand and nine.

### 5.6.5 Free translation

In the example below, the interpreter stated that لَأَو ازا (.) احنة (.) ئي أخذنه (.) اللي (.) لاأَو ازا (.) احنة (.) ئي أخذنه (.) اللي (.) (if we took what we want) is a free translation of “.hh em: (.) want >op het moment< dat wij gelijk krijgen (.)” (At that moment we are shown to be in the right).

Example

**33** Lawyer: .hh em: (.) want op het moment dat wij gelijk krijgen (.) en dat je **toch** een verblijfvergunning krijgt (.) met datum ingang e: jouw asielaanvraag (.) dat betekent dat je komende **juni** (.) al asiel onbepaalde tijd kan aanvragen en ook je Nederlandse paspoort kan krijgen.

Lawyer: .hh em: (.) for the moment that we are said to be right [by the court]

<sup>142</sup> The interpreter carries on with translation while there are muddled voices.

(.) and that you nonetheless receive a residence permit (.) with a start date e: [which is] your asylum application [date] (.) this means that you coming June (.) already can apply for a permanent asylum [residence permit] and you can also get your Dutch passport.

**34** المترجم: لآتو إذا (.) إحنة (.) إي أخذنه (.) اللي بدنا إيّاه (.) و و إعترفوا بأنو (.) تاريخ الإقامى تبعك (.) هو نفس (.) تاريخ (.) طلب اللجوء (.) ففي=هالشني معناه إنو في شهر ستى الجاي، من حقك انه تقدم بطلب للحصول على إقامة مفتوحة، (.) وفينك أنو تقدم على إي (.) التيسبور= على الجنسية.

Interpreter: Because if (.) we (.) e took (.) what we want (.) and and they admitted that (.) your residence [permit] date (.) is the same as (.) the date of (.) the asylum [application] date (.) in this=this thing means that in month six which is coming you have the right to apply for an open-ended residence [permit] (.) and you can apply for a e (.) the passport=for the nationality.

### 5.6.6 Explications

There are five examples in the data (see table 5.4.3.1) where the interpreter produced ‘expansions’, the explanation for this, according to the interpreter, being a willingness to “make things clear for the immigrant”. In example (1) below, when requested to motivate expanding the rendition with the adverbial *بعد هالموضوع (after this matter)*, he indicated that he did so “in order to make things clear for the immigrant, in order to avoid questions like ‘when?’ being asked”. In other cases, the interpreter ‘substituted’ a pronoun with the noun it refers to (see example 2). He mentioned he did this to avoid that immigrant asking “who?”, “By doing this, one makes things clear.”

Example (1):

**123** Lawyer: ok (..) e:mm (..) nou uiteindelijk hebben ze jullie laten gaan met een waarschuwing en heb je ook aantal weken geen contact met haar gezocht.

Lawyer: ok (..) e:mm (..) well eventually they let you go with a warning and you too did not seek to contact her for a number of weeks.

**124** المترجم: وفي النهاية أعطوكو تحذير و و و إي إي خلوكن (.) تمشو (.) وانت لمدّة (.) عدّة أسابيع بعد هالموضوع (.) ما كان في اتصال بينك وبيننا.

Interpreter: And in the end they gave you a warning and and and e e they let you (.) go away (.) and you for (.) several weeks after this thing (.) there was no contact between you and her.

Example (2):

**39** Lawyer: nou die zijn voorbij, (.) en ik heb niks gehoord (.) dus ze zijn niet in hoger beroep (.) gegaan.

Lawyer: these have passed (.) and I have heard nothing (.) so they have not lodged an appeal (.)

**40** المترجم: الأربعة أسابيع (.) مرّوا (.) وخلصوا (.) وهو ما (سمع<sup>143</sup>) شي فمشان هيك (.) دائرة الهجرة والتجنيس ما قدمت إستئناف في المحكمة العليا.

Interpreter: The four weeks (.) have passed (.) and come to an end (.) and he has not (heard?) anything and this is why (.) the Immigration and Naturalization Services has not lodged an appeal at the High Court.

### 5.6.7 'Dictionary translation'

In the example below, the Dutch word “benieuwd” (*curious*) is substituted by متشوق (*agog/excited*). The interpreter smilingly stated that he knew that the translation is not good but “this is how it is translated in dictionaries”. He said that he did not have a better translation at that moment. This strategy has been found once.

Example:

**44** Lawyer: .hh dus ik ben heel benieuwd (.)<sup>144</sup> of het gaat gebeuren.

Lawyer: .hh thus I am very curious (.) whether it is going to happen.

**45** المترجم: فهو متشوق متشوق كتي::ر (.) شو بدو يصير.

Interpreter: so he is longing really longing (.) [to know] what is going to happen.

<sup>143</sup> Word difficult to hear.

<sup>144</sup> Interpreter interrupts here and starts producing his rendition (turn 45).

### 5.6.8 'Interpreting is not written translation'

The interpreter said on four occasions that "interpreting is not written translation". "It is not translating word for word. It is important that you 'tāwḍīḥ' (*make clear*) the idea as much as possible. Because languages and dialects are different."

### 5.6.9 Not translating

The interpreter indicated during post-IME interview II that he does not translate elements that are repeated within an original, especially when they come one after another. He integrates them together into one unit. The unit is then translated. Also, when the lawyer makes mistakes and subsequently corrects himself, the interpreter does not translate the mistakes; these parts are 'reduced'. Generally, those elements that are over-formal and make the sentence heavy are also 'reduced'.

In example (1) below, the lawyer produces an original (turn 55). The immigrant corrects one element of it (turn 57). The subsequent original in which the lawyer echoes the correct information is translated back for the immigrant without the part which contains the information echoed by the lawyer (turn 61). That part is reduced. The interpreter said he did not translate it for the immigrant because he thought the lawyer was thinking out loud while producing it and did not expect this to be translated for the immigrant (reduced part in turn 59). In example (2) below, the immigrant indicates that he agrees with the information provided in the rendition by saying "correct" (turn 84). This is not translated by the interpreter for the lawyer. The interpreter indicated that he did not remember why he did not translate, although it was possibly because the lawyer did not give him the chance to translate. The lawyer might have anticipated this answer because the immigrant was agreeing the whole time with the renditions. There could be other reasons for this, according to the interpreter. For example, one might not have enough time to translate everything and has to make choices. One chooses then to translate something with more content, especially

because this less important element had been used repeatedly by the immigrant.

Example (1):

**55** Lawyer: e:m ik heb begrepen dat e: tus ik heb het verhaal zo begrepen= jouw vriendin (.) of nee jouw jouw neef had een vriendin e: een meisje leren kennen .hh waarmee e: ja die wat aanrommelde<sup>145</sup> om het zo maar te zeggen .hh (.) en (.) en op een gegeven moment heeft **jou** neef aan jou gevraagd om mee te gaan= zodat het meisje **ook** een vriendin mee zou nemen (.) en dan zou het allemaal wat minder (..) opvallen.

Lawyer: e:m I have understood that e: tog. I have understood the story in such a way=your **girlfriend** (.) or no your your cousin had a girlfriend e: had met a girl .hh with whom e: yeah he used to mess around a little bit (*chuckles*) to put it this way .hh (.) and (.) and at a given moment **your** cousin asked you to accompany [them]=so that the girl **too** would take along a [girl] friend (.) and then things would be less (..) noticeable.

**56** المترجم: يعني: (.) حسب ما هوى (.) فهم أئو ابن عمك (.) كان عندو رفيقة: (.) وعمل معا شغلًا:ت، (.) وقال لك قال لك أئو تجي معو مشان هي كمان تجيب رفيقتها معا= مشان تغطو على هالموضوع.

Interpreter: yaʕni: (.) according to how he (.) has understood your cousin had a girl:friend (.) and he did things to her (.) and he said he said to you to come with him so that she too brings her [girl] friend with her=so you cover up this thing.

**57** اللاجئ: أختنا أختنا.

Interpreter: her sister her sister

**58** Interpreter: nee? Ze zou haar zus meenemen.

Interpreter: no? She would take her sister with her.

**59** Lawyer: haar **zus** is het, .hh **Ok** = ik heb hier een vriendin staan, een vriendin van een vriendin=maar het gaat om de zus.

Lawyer: it is her **sister**, .hh **OK** (.) I have girlfriend noted here, a girlfriend of a girlfriend=but it is a sister.

**60** [the interpreter interrupts the lawyer and addresses the immigrant: ]

**61** المترجم: هون المكتوب رفيقة رفيقتنا.

<sup>145</sup> Here lawyer laughs nasally.

Interpreter: here the text says a friend her friend.

Example (2):

82 Lawyer: precies en die hebben jouw identitetiskaart gevraagd.

Lawyer: exactly and they asked to see your identitiy card.

83 المترجم: وطلبوا منك هويتك.

Interpeter: and they asked for your ID.

84 اللاجئ: صح

Immigrant: correct

85 Lawyer: en die vroegen ook (.) wie is dat meisje die bij jou is?

Lawyer: and they asked also (.) who is that girl who is with you?

### 5.6.10 Literacy/educational level of immigrant & simplifying

The interpreter stated three times (see table 5.4.3.1 above) that he often chooses to lower the ‘register’ (or ‘communicative style’ (Hale, 1997: 39)) during the encounters where he acts as interpreter, like the one under investigation; that is he utilizes informal (colloquial) Arabic in his renditions. He said that this is necessary; otherwise, the immigrant would not understand the rendition. He mentioned that he tries at the beginning of an encounter to get an impression of the ‘literacy/educational level’ of the immigrant, without explicitly asking questions about it, by listening to the way the immigrant talks<sup>146</sup> (for more information on what is meant by educational level in the Arab world, please see 6.3.2.1). He then adapts the register accordingly. According to the interpreter, unlike at the IND, the court and other official bodies, where the interpreter has to translate “word for word”, it

<sup>146</sup> Li (2013: p. 140) refers to this by saying “in order to translate, the interpreter also needs to anticipate the level of the patient’s understanding of the **language** and **content** based on what the doctor has said.”

is permissible with lawyers to raise and lower the register. The atmosphere with lawyers is flexible and more informal, said the interpreter. He said that one can intervene, talk, add, and correct if needed “even though this is not the work of the interpreter.” The interpreter added that he thinks that it is the primary responsibility of the lawyer to ensure that the register is adapted to the level of the immigrant, but that the majority of the lawyers do not take this responsibility. “The lawyer talks and *و ما إله علاقة* (*it is not his concern*) whether the immigrant understood or not. I try, *بقدر الإمكان* (*as far as possible*), to make him understand if I see that the level is too low”, said the interpreter<sup>147</sup>.

In example (1) below, when asked about why “op een gegeven moment” (*at a given moment*) was ‘reduced’ (turn 55), he mentioned that the ‘literacy/educational level’ of the immigrant would not have allowed him to understand it. *في لحظة معينة* (*at a given moment*) would have been over-formal, according to the interpreter. This expression was considered to be MSA by the interpreter. The immigrant would have found it difficult to understand. This is the reason he chose not to translate it.

In example (2) below, when asked if he could motivate ‘reducing’ “meer” (*anymore*) (in turn 134 below), he said smilingly that it is used in Dutch but in colloquial Arabic a Modern Standard Arabic equivalent *إبعد الآن* sounds strange. When the researcher mentioned how it could have been translated [an Iraqi colloquial version was given], he said “ok but you do not use that word (that is: *بعد الآن*) in Syrian dialect. He tried to find the Syrian equivalent for it but then he gave up saying that he did not know it. When he was also asked about ‘substituting’ “uitgelegd” (*explained*) with *وقالت لك* (*she told you*) (turn 135 below), he said “[b]y the way, we simplify many things [in the discourse].” This is needed, according to the interpreter “because with all due respect the literacy/educational level of many immigrants is not sufficient to allow you to use complex words. I also noticed that the vocabulary of this immigrant was a little bit limited.” When the researcher asked whether this statement applies to this utterance only or to the meeting in general, he said,

---

<sup>147</sup> Gentile (1996: 24) too refers to this: “[...] experience shows that even where particular and well accepted expertise being sought by the client, the tendency for clients to abdicate responsibility to the interpreter is strong despite the often enunciated fear on the the part of the client of losing control over the interview.”

“in general”. “I tried to avoid complex terminology”, he said. It is believed that the interpreter here did not mean necessarily technical terms but ‘fancy’ ones – i.e. high-register words in general. He mentioned “I would have been able to translate them the way they are, but the immigrant wouldn't have understood many of them.”

The researcher also tried to investigate whether there were no other, perhaps more immediate, explanations for using these words. So he asked the interpreter whether the immediacy of the event caused him to forget and to think that “say” was used instead of “explained.” He denied this, saying that he takes notes. He said that tries to speak in everyday language to suit the level of the immigrant so that the immigrant can understand.

#### Example (1)

**55** Lawyer: e:m ik heb begrepen dat e: tus ik heb het verhaal zo begrepen= jouw vriendin (.) of nee jouw jouw neef had een vriendin e: een meisje leren kennen .hh waarmee e: ja die wat aanrommelde<sup>148</sup> om het zo maar te zeggen .hh (.) en (.) en op een gegeven moment heeft **jou** neef aan jou gevraagd om mee te gaan= zodat het meisje **ook** een vriendin mee zou nemen (.) en dan zou het allemaal wat minder (..) opvallen.

Lawyer: e:m I have understood that e: tog. I have understood the story in such a way=your **girlfriend** (.) or no your your cousin had a girlfriend e: had met a girl .hh with whom e: yeah he used to mess around a little bit (*chuckles*) to put it this way .hh (.) and (.) and at a given moment **your** cousin asked you to accompany [them]=so that the girl **too** would take along a [girl] friend (.) and then things would be less (..) noticeable.

**56** المترجم: يعني: (.) حسب ما هوى (.) فهم أئو ابن عمك (.) كان عندو رفيقة: (.) وعمل معا شغلًا: ت، (.) وقال لك قال لك أئو تجي معو مشان هي كمان تجيب رفيقتها معا= مشان تغطو على هالموضوع.

Interpreter: yaʕni: (.) according to how he (.) has understood your cousin had a girl:friend (.) and he did things to her (.) and he said he said to you to come with him so that she too brings her [girl] friend with her=so you cover up this thing.

#### Example (2)

**134** Lawyer: en toen heeft ze jou opgebeld (.) en gevraagd waarom je haar niet meer wilde zien.

<sup>148</sup> Here lawyer laughs nasally.

Lawyer: and then she phoned you up (.) and asked why you no longer wanted to see her.

135 المترجم: وبعدا هي تلفنت لك وقالت لك ليه ليه ما بدك (.) تشوفا.

Interpreter: and after that she phoned you up and said to you why why you do not want (.) to see her.

### 5.6.11 Interrupting<sup>149</sup>

It has been noticed that the interpreter sometimes interrupts the lawyer and the immigrant, and starts producing the rendition. This is represented three times in the data (see table 5.4.3.1 above). With regard to example (1) below, in turn 61, he interrupts the lawyer; when asked about this, the interpreter mentioned that he was not sure the lawyer would give him the opportunity and time to translate; therefore, he chose to translate “simultaneously”, at the expense of completeness if necessary, as he said; he said he wanted to translate as much as possible. This would be better than not translating, which could have happened if he had waited for the lawyer to give him the chance to translate, he argued. He denied that he was interrupting the lawyer. He mentioned that the other reason for translating “simultaneously” was to help the immigrant hear what the lawyer was thinking at that very moment. With regard to example (2), he stated that he ما انتبهت لهذا الشيء (*I did not notice that*) when he was asked if he was aware that he interrupted the immigrant more than the lawyer during the encounter. In example (3), in turn 164, when asked about the fact that he interrupted the immigrant and started producing the rendition, the interpreter replied that “we interpreters have learned not to leave space for silence.” The interpreter denied interrupting. He said that the immigrant had finished talking and that he started interpreting directly after that. Furthermore, the interpreter mentioned that the immigrant had answered the question of the lawyer when he started producing the rendition: “I thought the answer has come, so I thought, ok now I will translate, and if

<sup>149</sup> The interpreter interrupts the lawyer or the immigrant.

he has something else to say then he can add it after the translation! This [way of working] has advantages; firstly, it does not take long, secondly he does not start speaking about other subjects, where I will then have to interrupt. In order not to fill any possible silent moments, one should start translating directly.” When asked about when an interpreter should start translating in his opinion, the interpreter said: when he thinks that he has a complete answer to the question of the lawyer or when he notices that the immigrant is going to deviate from the subject. “When the last happens here I guide him by stopping him; or when I think he has finished.” The researcher then asked the interpreter about what he does with the information which the immigrant gives after the question of the lawyer has been answered; whether he translates that too or whether he *volstaat (is satisfied)* with the information which is sought by the lawyer. He answered that when something has been said, then it must be translated. Here he mentioned that the idea behind interrupting [*here he used the word ‘interrupting’ himself*] is that the immigrant does not mention information which is not relevant to the talk of the lawyer. In response to the question of the researcher, “So is this one of the reasons why you interrupt?”, the interpreter replied, “Yes”. Then he added that he naturally does not want to influence the answer of the immigrant, and/or make him think in a certain direction, because “when the immigrant says something I have to translate it, and in order to prevent the immigrant from saying it, I translate the relevant parts for the lawyer, and if the lawyer wants to give the immigrant more chance then let him do it.”

Note that with regard to interrupting, the interpreter said that the lawyer was reading out the report of the backstory and selecting extracts to read. So when the lawyer stops, he jumps in without interrupting. The interpreter thus does not believe that he is interrupting.

Example (1):

**59** Lawyer: haar **zus** is het, .hh **Ok** = ik heb hier een vriendin staan, een vriendin van een vriendin=maar het gaat om de zus.

|  |
|--|
| <p>Lawyer: it is her <b>sister</b>, .hh <b>OK</b> (.) I have girlfriend noted here, a girlfriend of a girlfriend=but it is a sister.</p> |
|--|

60 [the interpreter interrupts the lawyer and addresses the immigrant: ]

61 المترجم: هون المكتوب رفيقة رفيقتا.

Interpreter: here the text says a friend her friend.

Example (2):

107 Lawyer: je hebt hier verteld (.) e::: ongeveer 2000 pond (.) Kan dat?

Lawyer: you said here<sup>150</sup> (.) e::: about 2,000 pounds (.) is this possible?

108 المترجم: هون قُلت لُون (.) تقريبا ألفين (.) جنيه؟

Interpreter: here you told them (.) about two thousands (.) pounds?

109 اللاجئ: والله ممكن هيك والله ما انتذكر.

Immigrant: well something like that I really do not remember

110 المترجم<sup>151</sup>: جنيه جنيه.

Interpreter: pounds pounds.

111 112 اللاجئ: سوري سوري (.) مصاري سورية.

Interpreter: Syrian Syrian (.) Syrian money.

113 Interpreter: Lira (.) Syrische Lira.

Interpreter: Lira (.) Syrian Lira.

Example (3):

163 اللاجئ: ما كان معبّي كان فيه شوية أغراض والله شوية أغراض .. (غير واضح)<sup>152</sup>

Immigrant: it was not full there was some stuff yeah some stuff ..  
[unintelligible]

164 Interpreter: er stonden daar wat aantal spullen in het huis.

<sup>150</sup> That is in the IND report he is reading in.

<sup>151</sup> The Interpreter interjecting.

<sup>152</sup> The interpreter starts with his following rendition before immigrant has finished his original.

Interpreter: there were [*sic*] some stuff in the house.

### 5.6.12 'They already know'

The data includes examples where the interpreter attributes translation decisions to the assumption on his part that the immigrant would understand the rendition even if it did not reflect well the content of the original. The interpreter explained his decision by mentioning that the material which is being discussed by the lawyer and the immigrant is already known to them both because they have discussed it before. This category is represented three times in the data. See section 5.4.3.1 above for a discussion on how frequency is understood in this study.

In example (1) below, see turn 95, the interpreter was asked if he could motivate his decision with regard to 'substituting' "Klap krijgen" (*to get hit*) with ضربك (*beat you*). The researcher mentioned that the rendition was not as specific as the original. The interpreter responded that a close translation would be وجهلك ضربة (*he directed a blow at you*) "but it is not used in Çaammiya Syrian, one would say "ضربك", he added. Then the researcher reminded him that ضربك can mean different things, like "hitting with fists", "slapping", etc. He responded: "it [the translation] gives the intended meaning; it suffices". When asked if there were any other possible reasons, he responded "e::, because both [the immigrant and the lawyer] are talking about something they already know, they understand it and I thought the word ضربك is sufficient and the meaning is clear to both parties already".

In example (2) below (see turn 120), when asked about a reduction he had made, the interpreter indicated here too that the immigrant must have understood the utterance as the material which was being discussed was already known to him.

Example (1):

94 Lawyer: en jij krijgt toen een klap (.) van een van de agenten.

Lawyer: and then you received a blow (.) from one of the policemen.

95 المترجم: واحد مَنُون (.) من هدول الشرطة ضربك؟

Interpreter: one of them (.) of these policemen hit you?

96 اللاجئ: صح

Immigrant: correct

Example (2):

119 Lawyer: ok (...) °goed° Jah ik zie trouwens dat ik in de correcties en aanvullingen had ik dat al gecorrigeerd (.) dat het niet om de vriendin ging (.) maar om de zus.

Lawyer: Ok (...) °good° yeah by the way I see in the Corrections and Additions that I already had corrected that (.) that it was not about a girlfriend (.) but about her sister.

120 المترجم: هو (.) شايف هون (.) في التصحيحات والإضافات (.) أنو صلح هالموضوع (.) أنو مو رفيقتنا (.) وأنما اختنا.

Interpreter: He (.) sees here (.) in the Corrections and Additions (.) that he corrected this matter (.) that it's not her girlfriend (.) but her sister.

### 5.6.13 Side-sequences<sup>153</sup>

It is noticeable in the data that the interpreter resorts to side-sequences with the immigrant or the lawyer when he thinks this is needed without involving the other party. This category is represented twice in the data. In the example below (see turns 108-112), the interpreter engages with the immigrant without taking permission from the lawyer. When he gets what he wants, the interpreter relays the information to the lawyer without informing him of the nature of the interaction between him and the immigrant. The interpreter indicates that this way of working is possible with lawyers, but not in work for the IND, for example. The interpreter mentioned that he wanted to ensure the currency mentioned by the lawyer was correct, even though there was no indication in the original that the lawyer wanted to double-check the

<sup>153</sup> A side-sequence is a “monolingual sequence conducted in only one of the languages involved in the interviews” (Keselman et al., 2010). They are also called ‘sub-dialogues’ (Mason, 2001: ii).

currency. Elsewhere in the data, the interpreter acts the same way towards the lawyer. The immigrant is not involved in the side-sequence.

Example:

**107** Lawyer: je hebt hier verteld (.) e::: ongeveer 2000 pond (.) Kan dat?

Lawyer: you said here<sup>154</sup> (.) e::: about 2,000 pounds (.) is this possible?

**108** المترجم: هون قُلت لُون (.) تقريبا ألفين (.) جنيه؟

Interpreter: here you told them (.) about two thousands (.) pounds?

**109** اللاجئ: والله ممكن هيك والله ما اتذكر.

Immigrant: well something like that I really do not remember

**110** المترجم<sup>155</sup>: جنيه جنيه.

Interpreter: pounds pounds.

**111 112** اللاجئ: سوري سوري (.) مصاري سورية.

Interpreter: Syrian Syrian (.) Syrian money.

**113** Interpreter: Lira (.) Syrische Lira.

Interpreter: Lira (.) Syrian Lira.

#### 5.6.14 'Freedom when translating for lawyers'

Regarding reducing 'goed' (*good*) and 'trouwens' (*by the way*) (see turn 120 below), the interpreter indicated that the reason is either that he neglected them because they were considered not important in the utterance – they do not add to the meaning, nor does their absence affect it, as he said – or that in that context he took the free choice of just not translating them. That is to say, the atmosphere at the lawyers' office is shwayya (*somewhat*) informal; one does not have to translate literally, word for word, like one would do at

<sup>154</sup> That is in the IND report he is reading in.

<sup>155</sup> The Interpreter interjecting.

police interrogations, or in other more formal settings, said the interpreter. Furthermore, during this meeting, the backstory of the immigrant was being revisited and the material was thus not new to him, according to the interpreter. The immigrant must have understood the original, he said. He confirmed that translating the omitted elements would have been better. This category is represented two times in the data (see Table 5.4.3.1 above).

Example:

**119** Lawyer: ok (...) °goed° Jah ik zie trouwens dat ik in de correcties en aanvullingen had ik dat al gecorrigeerd (.) dat het niet om de vriendin ging (.) maar om de zus.

Lawyer: Ok (...) °good° yeah by the way I see in the Corrections and Additions that I already had corrected that (.) that it was not about a girlfriend (.) but about her sister.

**120** المترجم: هو (.) شايف هون (.) في التصحيحات والإضافات (.) أتو صلح هالموضوع (.) أتو مو رفيقتنا (.) وأنما اختنا.

Interpreter: He (.) sees here (.) in the Corrections and Additions (.) that he corrected this matter (.) that it's not her girlfriend (.) but her sister.

### 5.6.15 'Dramatiek/life/emotions' category

Although the research questions in this study do not concern renditions meant for the lawyer, it is appropriate to include examples of them in the analysis where relevant. According to dialogism, meaning is co-constructed, which means that the discourse in both directions needs to be investigated when the process of meaning-making is studied. In the example below, it is noticeable from the audio-recording that the rendition is less 'dramatic' than the original, in the sense the emotions of the original are not shown in the rendition. The interpreter did not agree totally. According to him the second part of the rendition is well translated; but the first part, which contains "go go" is not, he admitted. Re-constructing a Dutch translation if he had made one, the interpreter mentioned that it would have sounded "strange". He therefore decided to "translate the meaning". When asked if he tried to convey "روح الجملة" (*the spirit of the sentence*) as well, he said "no, that is not the work of

the interpreter. The lawyer is present and he hears and sees what happens in his presence. The lawyer hears the tone and the manner with which the immigrant talks. I translate the content, but not the manner in which the client talks. It happens while the lawyer is present. He can see it himself.” He mentioned that he knows that there are different opinions on this point: “One view is that the interpreter must act like the client and the other is that he shouldn’t. I support the second point of view. I cannot laugh and cry with everyone; interpreting is already very stressful.”

Example:

354 المترجم: قال لي روح روح (..) ما ما (.) ما تفرجيننا وشك.

Immigrant: he said go go (..) don’t don’t (.) don’t show us your face.

355 Interpreter: hij zei dat ik maar moest vluchten en mijn gezicht niet meer laten zien.

Interpreter: he said that I had to flee and not to show my face again.

### 5.6.16 ‘Tāwḍīḥ’ (making clear)

In example (1) below, see turn 361, the interpreter expanded the original by adding *عل حياتك* (*to your life*). The interpreter explained that these expansions are necessary for ‘tāwḍīḥ’ (*making clear*) purposes. In example (2) also, turn 365, the expansion is attributed to the need for ‘tāwḍīḥ’. The interpreter mentioned he expanded “authoriteiten” (*authorities*) to *او النظام السلطات* (*authorities or the regime*) to ensure that the immigrant understood what was meant by the lawyer. Generally, he said, Syrians do not use the word *السلطات* (*authorities*); rather they use *النظام* (*the regime*). By expanding the original, he wanted to ensure that he stayed close to the original and ensured that the immigrant understood it<sup>156</sup>. This category is represented four times in the data (see Table 5.4.3.1 above).

<sup>156</sup> This reminds one of what Dimitrova (1995: 153) says about DI occurring mainly in institutional discourse. It is noticed in the discourse of the lawyer in this encounter that he

Example (1):

**360** Lawyer: waar ben je het meeste bang voor, voor de autoriteiten, je vader of voor de familie (.) Hussein,

Lawyer: what are you afraid of the most, of the authorities, your father or of the Hussein (.) family,

**361** المترجم: مين أكثر (.) ناس او جهة بتخاف عل حياتك منا؟ (.) بَيِّك؟ النظام، ولا عائلة الحسين؟

Interpreter: Which (.) people or party are you afraid the most of for you life? (.) your father? the regime, or the Hussein family?

Example (2):

**364** Lawyer: waarom ben je bang voor de autoriteiten,

Lawyer: why are you afraid of the authorities,

**365** المترجم: لشو انتى خايف من السلطات، او النظام،

Interpreter: Why are afraid of the authorities, or the regime,

### 5.6.17 'No half-sentences'

In the example below, which involves reducing a false start, the interpreter mentioned it should not be a problem to leave it untranslated: "Why should it be a problem?!" Then, he said "look, I do not translate half-sentences! He [the lawyer] must provide good sentences; otherwise I will not translate. What could I do with three words!" When asked about the notion that everything should be translated, he said "the lawyer is stuttering here; am I supposed to do the same! So, I do not translate half-sentences! Sometimes, I say this to people. From my point of view, half-sentences are not translated. You must either complete your half sentence yourself or forget it. It's that simple." This category is represented five times in the data.

Example:

---

does not himself use this discourse extensively. He is even found to 'localise' this discourse during this IME. It is believed that the interpreter is referring here to the fact that he is using informal language.

321 Lawyer: °ok° (...<sup>157</sup>) heb je nog geprobeerd e e (..) na ja ja goed ik me voorstellen dat je ongerust maakt over je familie gezien wat er gebeurd is in de afgelopen (.) periode in Syria? Heb je even nog (.) een of andere manier (.) geprobeerd om contact te: ..<sup>158</sup>.

Lawyer: °ok° (...) have you tried e e (..) I can imagine that you are worried about your family given what has happened in the previous (.) period in Syria? Have you (.) one way or another (.) tried to contact ... [*interrupted*]

322 المترجم: نتصور أنّو انتى تكون قلقا:ن (..) على عيلتك في سوريا في ظل كل اللي بيحصل هونيك في سوريا= ما:: حاولت بالفترة الأخيرة انو تحاول تحصل شي خبر ..<sup>159</sup>

Interpreter: We can imagine that you could be worried (..) about your family in Syria in the light of all that is happening in Syria= have you no:t tried in the last period that is to try to get some news (*interrupted*).

### 5.6.18 ‘Language of immigrant bad’

On five occasions (see table 5.4.3.1 above), the interpreter indicated that the immigrant produced sentences that were hard to translate. In example (1) below, turn 304, the interpreter said smilingly: “how can one translate such a sentence!” when asked about ‘reducing’ لا لا ما عندي (*no no I don’t have [it]*). In example (2) below, turn 367, the rendition shows a ‘reduction’, an ‘expansion’ and two ‘substitutions’. The interpreter motivates his decisions by saying that the immigrant had a limited ability to express himself. He indicated that he translated in a way that expressed what the immigrant had actually meant. “This is ‘tāwḍīḥ’ (*making clear*)”, he said. When asked about وقتها انا كان كان مطلوب (*at the time I were were wanted*), here too, the interpreter started to smile indicating that this is another example of the poor communication skills of the immigrant. This shows again, according to the interpreter, that the task of the interpreter is not easy, and that (in this case) he is not getting “decent sentences” to translate. He indicated that he thinks that should intervene in order to make “understandable sentences”. He thinks this is part of the job of the interpreter. This brings us to the following topic, which deals with structuring the utterances of the immigrant in the process of interpreting.

<sup>157</sup> 12x the short interval (.)

<sup>158</sup> The interpreter starts with his rendition.

<sup>159</sup> The immigrant starts talking.

Example (1):

**301** Lawyer: en je en je eigen familie, je ouders,

Lawyer : and your and your own family, your parents,

**302** المترجم: وأهلك؟ (.) عيلتك؟

Interpreter : and your relatives? (.) your family?

**303** اللاجئ: لا لا ما عندي (.) في سوريا (.) ما في تلفونات في سوريا.

Immigrant: no no I don't have (.) in Syria (.) no telephones in Syria.

**304** Immigrant: die verblijven in Syria (.) en in Syria zijn er geen telefon (.) contacten.

Interpreter: they reside in Syria (.) and in Syria there are no telephone contacts.

Example (2):

**364** Lawyer: waarom ben je bang voor de autoriteiten,

Lawyer: why are you afraid of the authorities,

**365** المترجم: لشو انتى خايف من السلطات، او النظام،

Interpreter: Why are afraid of the authorities, or the regime,

**366** اللاجئ: وقتها انا كان كان مطلوب= إذا يمسوني هنى إي بيت الحسين مدعومين .. (غير واضح) بيشيلوا لحمي من جلدي.

Immigrant: back then I was was wanted=if they catch me they e the Hussein family are supported .. [unintelligible] they will skin me.

**367** Interpreter: ik e omdat ik gezocht ben, en e e familie Hussein e hebben wel invloed als ze me te pakken krijgen dan zullen ze e: e mijn mijn mijn huid uit mijn vlees vlees halen.

Interpreter: I e because I was wanted, and e e the Hussein family e does have influence if they get hold of me then they will e: e remove my my my skin from my flesh flesh.

### 5.6.19 'Reorganizing the utterances'

The interpreter has shown a desire to reorganize utterances which are *krom* (crooked/incoherent) as he called them smilingly. In example (1) below, turn 240, “ongeveer (.) iets minder dan een week” (*about (.) less than a week*), was considered strange, and needed to be put in a way that sounded logical. This tendency is also seen in the other direction, when the immigrant is talking. Example (2) below, turn 275, shows that the interpreter improves the sentence in such a way that its structure looks like that of written language. He mentioned that he thought that the linguistic capabilities of the immigrant were modest, and that if the immigrant could have, he would have expressed himself in better language. When asked to motivate condensing *يشغلون على* *المخدرات = تجار سلاح هني* ([*They*] *work in drugs=they're arms dealers*), into “arms and drug trafficking”, he said smilingly that the sentence of the immigrant was *مخربطة* [*disorganised*]: “There is no subject: *يشغلون* ([*They*] *work*), what is the subject? We do not know where the subject is. Then he [the immigrant] said *تجار سلاح* [weapons traders] and then he said *هني* [they]. So, I wanted to *ارتب* [*restructure/reorganize*] the sentence. Then I thought now how do I restructure the sentence, and I thought that “wapen (.) en drugshandel” was the best formulation in Dutch.” When the researcher asked why he worked like this and not just translated the way the original was formulated, the interpreter mentioned that the lawyer would not understand the rendition, thinking it was a bad rendition, thus thinking ill of the interpreter.

When shown how the rendition would have looked like if translated ‘literally’, he did not approve it. He mentioned he was aware that there is an opinion which says that the interpreter must stay very close to the original but it did not work according to him. When asked about where it would not work, he said in every context, but especially in asylum cases: “asylum seekers talk in a disorganized way. As an interpreter, you must understand what the immigrant means. Many of our people [asylum seekers] say something while meaning something else. Therefore, you need to know what they mean, not their words. You need then to organize the sentences into ones that are understandable.”

When asked about the possibility that he might be following this strategy to avoid the lawyer getting a negative impression about his capabilities as an interpreter, he mentioned that he sometimes does not intervene and translates exactly as delivered by the immigrant, when the “sentence is totally incomprehensible.” He also mentioned that he sometimes asks the concerned interlocutor to reformulate their sentence so that he can translate properly. The interpreter then mentioned that it is the duty of the interpreter to organize the talk as long as he knows that he understands the sentence. The fact that the immigrant is ‘Muxarbat’ [*disorganised*] does not mean that the translation has to reflect this. The immigrant would have formulated a better sentence if he had been able to do so.

Example (1):

**240** Lawyer: en e:m (..) ja: kort (..) ongeveer (..) iets minder dan een week toen jullie d’r woonden is ter een inval geweest in e de woning.

Lawyer: and e:m (..) yea:h short (..) about (..) a little less than a week when you moved there there was a raid on the house.

**241** المترجم: وَ أَقْلَ مِنْ اسْبُوعٍ بَعْدَ مَا سَكَنْتُو هُونِيكَ (..) إِي حَصَلَ فِيهِ اقْتِحَامٌ (..) لَ: الْمَسْكَنِ

Interpreter: and and less than a week after you moved there (..) e: the house (..) was raided.

Example (2):

**274** يشتغلون على المخدرات = تجار سلاح هني (..) مدعومين = زكينيون يعني.

Immigrant: they work in drugs=weapons traders they are (..) [they] are supported=[they] are rich yaʕni.

**275** Interpreter: ze zijn betrokken bij wapen (..) en drugshandel. Zij (..) zijn rijk (..) en zij krijgen ondersteuning.

Interpreter: they are involved in weapons (..) and the drugs trade. They (..) are rich (..) and they are supported

## 5.7 Conclusion

As is no doubt clear from this chapter, presenting the findings in qualitative studies like this one is not a straightforward task. Semi-structured interviews provide rich data, the nature of which requires a careful consideration of how to understand and categorize it. In this study, not unexpectedly, the interpreter and immigrant did not always come up with clear, or discrete answers. With regard to Part I, the taxonomy of Wadensjö needed to be adapted to accommodate certain renditions. For Part II, it became quickly clear that the researcher needed more than the traditional categories 'understood' and 'miscommunicated'. Therefore, a decision was taken to add two more categories, which generally covered the answers of the immigrant. With regard to the factors which possibly lead to understanding and miscommunication, it was again clear that a set of categories had to be designed to include these factors. A delicate balance had to be struck between these categories as some investigated renditions could be included under more than one category. Similarly the categorization in Part III needed a critical look with regard to design and content. Accordingly, an entire section was devoted to explaining the structure of this part. In the following chapter, these presented findings will be discussed.

## **Chapter Six**

### Discussion

## 6.0 Introduction

This chapter discusses the findings that have been presented in the previous chapter<sup>160</sup>. It is structured around the three research questions.

**Part I** discusses the findings of the first, overarching research question: *How does the interpreter render the originals of the lawyer?* **Part II** discusses the findings of the second research question: *Does the immigrant understand these originals (via the renditions), and what can be learned from the immigrant's answers in terms of the sense-making processes?* **Part III** discusses the findings related to the third research question: *How does the interpreter explain his translation decisions, and what can be learned from them in terms of the sense-making processes?*

**Part I** briefly presents the relevant issues. **Part II** comprises two sections. Section 6.2.1 deals with the originals that have been understood, while 6.2.2 deals with the ones that have been miscommunicated, partly understood or partly miscommunicated. In both sections, the general methodological argument is that without interviewing the immigrant the insights that have been gained would not have been possible, while the general theoretical argument concerns the knowledge this methodological choice generates, in which regard, the researcher argues that STK/R is important to be taken into consideration when similar studies are conducted.

In section 6.2.1, the researcher shows the influence of STK/R on the process of sense-making during the IME. He shows that the immigrant sometimes does not rely only on the 'material' rendered in the renditions. The researcher does this by introducing topics that show this. In section 6.2.1.1, the researcher discusses the incorporation by the immigrant of material in his internal dialogue not mentioned as such by the interpreter but assumed<sup>161</sup> by the immigrant. It concerns the assumption on the part of the immigrant that the interpreter meant something in his rendition, despite the fact that there are no lexical or other communicational items that justify this. In section 6.2.1.2, the researcher discusses how the immigrant seems to

---

<sup>160</sup> As suggested in the previous chapter, the reader is advised to refer to Appendix II for a brief depiction of how the groups and categories are interrelated.

<sup>161</sup> The researcher referred to the notion of Assumption in section 3.1.1.

incorporate in his internal dialogue 'materials' not afforded by the interpreter but assumed as such. These concern materials from his past; i.e. things happened in the past or belong to his past. In section 6.2.1.3, the researcher discusses how the interpreter understands an original directly via Dutch, which is part of STK/R. In section 6.2.1.4, the researcher shows that the immigrant cannot always be expected to show the STK/R dimension in communication. Sometimes, the researcher will need to take an extra step to extract the data.

In section 6.2.2, the researcher shows that while STK/R has a visible influence on the process of understanding on the part of the immigrant, as shown in the previous section, its presence (i.e. STK/R) does not provide guarantees that the immigrant will understand the original, even if he has been exposed to it extensively in the past. In section 6.2.2.1, the researcher discusses cases where although the immigrant might seem to have understood a certain original (the transcribed text shows that he provides a confirming answer), yet when probed during post-IME interview I, it turns out that he had miscommunicated it. In this case and in the cases in the following section, it turns out during the interview that the type of discourse in such cases (legal information/talk), can form an obstacle for the immigrant in his endeavours to understand the original. In section 6.2.2.2, the researcher demonstrates again the importance of taking the perspective of the immigrant. It turns out that the immigrant has failed to understand the original due to the complexity of the legal information/talk for him and that the STK/R has not helped him to understand the originals under investigation. In section 6.2.2.3, the researcher shows again that understanding legal discourse and information can be challenging, that the STK/R does not help sufficiently; parts of the originals have been understood not the whole original. In section 6.2.2.4, the researcher looks again at the influence of STK/R on sense-making and argues again that it does not guarantee understanding. In this case, the immigrant is seen to have difficulties with regard to understanding the interrelationship between the different organizations that appear in picture during the asylum procedure. Again, an analysis based on transcribed data would not have provided the insights the researcher gained during the interview.

**Part III** discusses the findings related to the third research question. It starts with a brief reminder of how the findings are structured in the findings chapter (section 6.3). The discussion is structured around the structure of the findings. Section 6.3.1, discusses the findings of the ‘No conscious strategy’ group (data related to section 5.5). This section is divided into three sections, each one focussing on the discussion of a different, but interrelated, aspect of the data that the interpreter was unable to provide a conscious explanation for (see sections 5.5.1 – 5.5.3).

Section 6.3.2 discusses the findings related of the ‘strategies followed’ group (data related to section 5.6). The discussion is divided into five sections, each addressing the findings from a different, yet interrelated, theoretical notion borrowed from dialogism. The researcher argues that the concepts discussed in chapter Three with regard to meaning-making could be used to discuss the strategies of the interpreter. Sections 6.3.2.1 and 6.3.2.2 discuss the reflection of ‘intersubjectivity’ and ‘alterity’ on the strategies of the interpreter. Section 6.3.2.3 discusses how the interpreter handles the dialogic nature of IME’s. Section 6.3.2.4 tackles the reflection of the notion of context on his strategies, while section 6.3.2.5 deals with the reflection of the notion of STK/R on the strategies of the interpreter.

In the following section, Part I will be discussed. This section answers the first research question.

## **Part I**

### **6.1 First/Main research question: How does the interpreter render the originals of the lawyer?**

The findings related to this overarching research question (see section 5.1) are used in the discussion in **Part II** and **Part III** of this chapter which deal with the second and third research questions. This part does not warrant discussion as the findings speak for themselves and have an analytical value in this study when used together with the findings of the other research questions. However, for structural reasons related to the clarity of the thesis, the researcher has decided to give it the status of a part. What follows immediately below is the discussion of the findings of the second research question.

## **Part II**

### **6.2 Second research question: Does the immigrant understand these originals (via the renditions), and what can be learned from the immigrant's answers in terms of the sense-making processes?**

In section 5.2, the researcher presented four categories which he has developed for analytical purposes regarding understanding and miscommunication on the part of the immigrant: 'originals understood', 'originals miscommunicated', 'originals partly understood' and 'originals partly miscommunicated'. The last two categories will not be discussed in separate (sub-)sections, but as part of the first two categories. In the following sections, the findings that belong to these categories will be discussed. The researcher will start with the first category: 'originals understood'.

## 6.2.1 Originals understood

Before starting the discussion in sections 6.2.1.1-6.2.2.4, the researcher will provide a concise recapitulation of the context in which the IME takes place, of the findings related to this part (Part II), and of the relevant aspects of the theory.

During the IME, the lawyer is preparing himself and the immigrant for the possibility that the IND may decide again to refuse to grant the immigrant an asylum residence permit, on the basis of his personal backstory (see section 1.2.3). To this end, during the encounter, the lawyer performed, among other things, three communicative projects: 1) he discussed with the immigrant the legal process which the latter had been involved in from the date of submission of his asylum application, 2) he revisited the backstory of the immigrant and read (parts of) it out, and 3) he asked the immigrant questions related to his backstory.

With regard to the findings related to this research question, as indicated in section 5.2.1, the analysis shows that out of the 110 'originals', 93 (that is 84.54% of the renditions) were concluded to have been understood: 12 of the understood originals belonged to the first communicative project, 45 to the second, and the rest (36) to the third. The total number of the renditions involving the first communicative project was 18, the second 48, and the third 39. This shows that 66.66% of the first type of renditions were understood, 93.75% of the second type and 92.30% of the third type. The remaining originals (5) were not directly related to the topics mentioned.

Theoretically, as indicated in chapter Three, dialogism theorizes meaning as being co-constructed by all interlocutors. Each engages in his internal dialogue with the 'material' afforded by the other interlocutor(s). The interlocutor evaluates this 'material' and re-evaluates their own thinking. This is followed by a response on their part, which represents their understanding. This process is influenced by the context in which the interaction takes place. In addition, the STK/R too influences how sense is made. This knowledge/these resources represent the knowledge the interlocutors have before they enter the encounter. In the context of this study, STK/R is the

relevant knowledge the interlocutor has gained in his life before participating the IME. A more specific and relevant example would be the knowledge the immigrant has gained about the asylum/immigration process during his prior meetings with the lawyer and the other organizations that deal with the asylum procedure, in addition to the knowledge he has with regard to his backstory. Therefore, when attempting to understand how meaning in an interaction has come into being, these three main components need to be taken into consideration in the analysis.

In the light of this, the researcher will discuss in sections 6.2.1.1 – 6.2.1.4 below how the figures presented above should be understood, and will show that sometimes the immigrant indeed does not only depend on the renditions in sense-making, but also on his previous knowledge (the STK/R). The researcher argues that in order to be able to reach these conclusions, one must involve the perspective of the immigrant himself. As will be observed in the following discussions, conclusions based on transcribed data only could sometimes be impoverishing or misleading. In section 6.2.1.1 below, the researcher will show that the interpreter sometimes **assumes** that the interpreter **meant** something when that is not necessarily the case. The assumed materials are STK/R-related.

### **6.2.1.1 The immigrant says “yes” assuming that the interpreter meant what he himself had gone through<sup>162</sup>**

As indicated in sections 1.2.3 and 6.2.1, the lawyer engaged during the encounter in three communicative projects. In this excerpt, which is part of the second one, the lawyer is revising the backstory of the immigrant. In turn 123 below, the lawyer is recounting how the backstory goes according to the report in front of him. It reads that the immigrant and his girlfriend were released by the police after they were given a warning, and that after this the immigrant did not seek to contact his girlfriend for a few weeks. In his translation (turn 124), the interpreter substituted for *\*you too did not seek to contact her\** *\*there was no contact between you and her\**. The researcher

---

<sup>162</sup> The findings discussed in this section can be found in section 5.3.10.

wanted to know if the immigrant had understood the original as produced by the lawyer via the rendition, especially because he had agreed to this divergent rendition, as the text shows in turn 133 below.

Excerpt:

**123** Lawyer: ok (..) e:mm (..) nou uiteindelijk hebben ze jullie laten gaan met een waarschuwing en heb je ook aantal weken geen contact met haar gezocht.

Lawyer: ok (..) e:mm (..) well eventually they let you go with a warning and you too did not seek to contact her for a number of weeks.

**124** المترجم: وفي النهاية أعطوكو تحذير و و و إي إي خلّوكن (.) تمشو (.) وانت لمدة (.) عدّة أسابيع بعد هالموضوع (.) ما كان في اتصال بينك وبيننا.

Interpreter: And in the end they gave you a warning and and and e e they let you (.) go away (.) and you for (.) several weeks after this thing (.) there was no contact between you and her.

**125** اللاجئ: لا (.) إي ما فهمت عليك السؤال.

Immigrant: no (.) e I didn't understand you the question.

**126** Interpreter: Ik zal het herhalen meneer heeft het niet begrepen.

Interpreter: I will repeat the gentleman did not understand it.

**127** Lawyer: ja

Lawyer: yes

**128** المترجم: بعد ما أعطوكن تحذير (.) تركوكن.

Interpreter: after they gave you a warning (.) they let you go.

**129** اللاجئ: مين أعطانا تحذير؟ (..) الشرطة يعني؟

Immigrant: who gave us a warning? (..) You mean the police?

**130** المترجم: إيه

Interpreter: yeah

Immigrant: yeah yeah<sup>164</sup>

132 المترجم: وبعدا (.) عدة اسابيع بعد هالحادثة (.) ما كان ما كان في إتصال.

Interpreter: And after that (.) a number of weeks after this incident (.) there was no there was no contact.

133 Interpreter: dat klopt.

Interpreter: that is right.

134 Lawyer: en toen heeft ze jou opgebeld (.) en gevraagd waarom je haar niet meer wilde zien.

Lawyer: and then she phoned you up (.) and asked why you no longer wanted to see her.

135 المترجم: وبعدا هي تلفنت لك وقالت لك ليه ليه ما بدك (.) تشوفا.

Interpreter: and after that she phoned you up and said to you why why you do not want (.) to see her.

136 اللاجئ: صح.

Immigrant: correct.

If we take a close look at the excerpt, we can observe that at the beginning the immigrant did not understand the entire rendition, let alone notice the substitution (see his response in turn 125 above). This could explain why he did not notice the substitution. He asked in this turn for a clarification: “no (.) e I didn’t understand you the question.” After the interpreter indicated to the lawyer that the immigrant did not understand the rendition and that he was going to repeat (turn126), the interpreter engaged in a side-sequence with the immigrant in which he explained to the immigrant step by step what the lawyer had just said (turns 128-133). If we examine these renditions, we will observe that the interpreter re-produced the substitution: he did not change

<sup>163</sup> Interpreter continues with below rendition.

<sup>164</sup> Here the interpreter carries on with the last turn.

the substitution to a close rendition<sup>165</sup>. The immigrant for his part did not intervene to correct the interpreter (by explaining that it was *he* who did not seek contact). He restricted himself to saying “correct” (turn 133).

If we keep the data of post-IME interview I with the interpreter out of the analysis for a second, we might be inclined to think that the immigrant might not have noticed the substitution, or that he might have noticed it but have thought that he knew enough ‘for the current (practical) purpose’, meaning the substitution was not a problem for him.

If we read further down the excerpt, however, we will notice that, after the side-sequence has ended, it becomes clear in the following renditions that it was *him* indeed who did not seek contact with the girlfriend (see turn no. 135 onwards). His girlfriend called him and asked him why he did not want to see her. It is possible that he might have felt here there was no need to raise any more questions, if we were to assume that he had indeed become aware of the substitution. However, the question remains why he did not react during or directly after the side-sequence, preceding this, if he had become aware of the substitution. Was it again that he thought that he knew enough for ‘current practical purposes’? Or might there have been something else? If we engage the data of post-IME interview I with the immigrant, we notice that there is another dimension to it.

During this interview with the immigrant, when requested to mention if and how he understood the rendition above, it turned out that the version the immigrant produced for the researcher corresponded with the original, rather than with the rendition, meaning that he mentioned that he was the one who did not seek contact with the girlfriend. When asked why he did not intervene when he heard the rendition, he said that he assumed that the interpreter meant that it was the immigrant who did not \*seek contact\*; this is how he understood the rendition, he indicated. While one might argue that the immigrant, during post-IME interview I, might have not managed to remember what happened during the encounter two weeks earlier and that he gave this answer only to please the researcher during interview I, it is

---

<sup>165</sup> When asked about this substitution, the interpreter mentioned to me during post-IME interview II: “this is what I thought of, that is what happened, this is the first sentence that came to my mind.”

noticeable that this is not the only case in the data where the immigrant provides a similar reason, as will be observed in the following paragraph. Therefore, while the researcher is not totally certain what had happened two weeks earlier during the IME, the fact that the immigrant provides such an explanation on several occasions might mean that he was being sincere when he was providing this explanation. Again, this was not the only case where the immigrant did not intervene, and assumed things. In the following paragraphs, this tendency on the part of the immigrant to assume things will be treated in greater depth.

Examining the text of the IME, and the findings related to the current topic (i.e. section 6.2.1.1) which are extracted from post-IME interview I with the immigrant<sup>166</sup>, it can be observed that there are seven cases of renditions<sup>167</sup>, including the above, where the immigrant agrees to the informational content of a (part of a) rendition during the IME, which content, when probed, does not correspond to the informational content of (the corresponding part of) the rendition as produced by the interpreter. During post-IME interview I with the immigrant, each time when requested to motivate why he agreed to the rendition under discussion, although the relevant informational content of the rendition does not correspond to the original (of the lawyer), the immigrant said, after understanding the point under discussion, that he assumed that the interpreter meant the version as he (the immigrant) understood it and agreed to. In the excerpt above, he said that he assumed that the interpreter had said that it was *him who did not seek contact*. Each time, he said that the version he agreed to corresponded with the truth as he knew it, to reality – ‘reality’ being related to the world as he knew it or had experienced it before entering the IME, and thus reality in the case of the above excerpt being that back then when this incident happened to him and his girlfriend, it was *he* who did not seek contact. Here, the question arises: how can the researcher explain this theoretically?

---

<sup>166</sup> The text of the IME can be found in Appendix I. The findings related to the current topic (i.e. section 6.2.1.1) extracted from interview I can be found in section 5.3.10. Again, a concise depiction on the interrelation between groups and categories presented in the findings chapter can be seen in Appendix II.

<sup>167</sup> The researcher spotted this 7 times without explicitly asking questions about it. If this phenomenon was explicitly asked about and more thoroughly investigated, one might have concluded that it happens more often, or not.

In the excerpt above, and in the other six examples referred to in this discussion (all can be found in section 5.3.10), the immigrant seems to be engaging in his 'internal dialogue' the STK/R he had before entering the IME. He seems to assume 'things' not necessarily mentioned in the rendition by the interpreter. It cannot be ruled out that this is not the only explanation; that his knowledge of Dutch might have helped him in understanding more than was said in the renditions; but this is not very likely because his knowledge of Dutch can be considered modest. During the first phase of post-IME interview I with the immigrant, at the very beginning of the interview when he was asked some general questions about his background, the immigrant mentioned that did not know much Dutch and that he had not had the chance to attend proper Dutch lessons; he had attended only a few months of these lessons. Thus, it is more probable that he was indeed making these assumptions by engaging his past knowledge. But what could be the explanation for making these assumptions?

It seems that, in this regard, the immigrant was assuming the 'intersubjectivity' of his interlocutors, probably by being less critical and that each time he thought (in the seven cases referred to) that he knew enough 'for practical purposes'. It is good to remember that understanding, according to dialogism, "involves being able to cope with situations, carrying out tasks, being able to explain and account for various subject matters, etc." (Linell, 2009). The immigrant might have thought that he knew enough to "carry out [the ] tasks" expected from him on the part of the lawyer, which are among other things answering questions with regard to his backstory<sup>168</sup>. After all understanding according to dialogism is not meant to be complete. Explaining Garfinkel (1967), Linell argues that only partial understanding is meant and stresses that understanding is needed only for "current practical purposes".

Based on this example and the other six cases found in the data (see section 5.3.10 in), the researcher argues that the development of an IME like this one seems to not only depend on the originals and the renditions and their interrelation with the situated context. The co-construction of meaning

---

<sup>168</sup> See the communicative projects of the lawyer in section 1.2.3.

seems also to be influenced by the STK/R. The data shows that the immigrant understood six of the seven originals which belong to the phenomena under discussion. It is important to note that the manner in which this immigrant dealt with the STK/R cannot be taken as example of how other immigrants would act. The researcher argues, however, that it is important to include the STK/R in the analysis in such studies. Based on the discussion on this topic (i.e. section 6.2.1.1) several interesting questions have arisen, which will be dealt with chapter Seven.

In the following section, the researcher will discuss another topic in which he will show again the influence STK/R has on sense-making during such an encounter, and will argue that the immigrant is not always solely dependent on the renditions. The section title 'Understanding something the interpreter has not said' reflects in a compact way the essence of the section, namely that the immigrant sometimes engages in his 'internal dialogue' information not mentioned in the rendition. This information also belongs to the STK/R.

### **6.2.1.2 'Understanding something the interpreter has not said',<sup>169</sup>**

In the excerpt below, after having reminded the immigrant about how the 'debate' between him and the representative of the IND in front of the judge had developed, which constituted the first communicative project of the lawyer during the IME, the lawyer is now revisiting the backstory of the immigrant, which is his second communicative project. In the first turn below (turn 51), the lawyer mentions among other things that, according to the report he is citing from, the immigrant came to the Netherlands together with his cousin because they got into trouble together, meaning they got into the same problem. Examining the rendition, it turns out that the interpreter has reduced 'together'. The immigrant says "correct", and does not say anything about the reduction.

Excerpt:

---

<sup>169</sup> The findings related to this topic can be found in section 5.3.7.

51 Lawyer: goe:d e::: ok e: nou je hebt in jouw interview e: verteld (.) dat (.) jij samen (.) met jouw neef die hier nu even niet is maar wie ik nog een gesprek ga hebben (.) dat jullie samen naar Nederland zijn vertrokken= omdat jullie samen problemen hebben gekregen in Syria.

Lawyer: goo:d e::: ok e: well you said in your e: interview<sup>170</sup> (.) that (.) you together (.) with your cousin who is not here right now but with whom I will have a conversation (.) that you together departed to the Netherlands=because you together got into troubles in Syria.

52 المترجم: انت (.) حكيت في المقابلة (.) أنّو انتى إي في وقتا غادرت إي البلد (.) مع ابن عمك أو ابن اخوك (.) الي اليوم مو معنا<sup>171</sup> ابن عمك<sup>172</sup> إي: غادرتو إلى هولندا=لأنو انتو الإثنين تعرّضتو إلى: مشاكل.

Interpreter: you (.) said in the interview (.) that you e at the time left e [your] country (.) with your cousin or your nephew (.) who is today not with us<sup>173</sup> your cousin e: you left to the Netherlands=because both of you got into: troubles.

53 اللاجئ: صحّ

Immigrant: correct

54 interpreter: klopt

Interpreter: correct

55 Lawyer: e:m ik heb begrepen dat e: tus ik heb het verhaal zo begrepen= jouw vriendin (.) of nee jouw neef had een vriendin e: een meisje leren kennen .hh waarmee e: ja die wat aanrommelde<sup>174</sup> om het zo maar te zeggen .hh (.) en (.) en op een gegeven moment heeft **jou** neef aan jou gevraagd om mee te gaan= zodat het meisje **ook** een vriendin mee zou nemen (.) en dan zou het allemaal wat minder (..) opvallen.

Lawyer: e:m I have understood that e: tog. I have understood the story in such a way=your **girlfriend** (.) or no your your cousin had a girlfriend e: had met a girl .hh with whom e: yeah he used to mess around a little bit (*chuckls*) to put it this way .hh (.) and (.) and at a given moment **your** cousin asked you to accompany [them]=so that the girl **too** would take along a [girl] friend (.) and then things would be less (..) noticeable.

<sup>170</sup> The lawyer is referring to the 'detailed hearing' held by the IND (see 1.2.2 in chapter one).

<sup>171</sup> Here the immigrant interjects: my cousin.

<sup>172</sup> Interpreter adopts in the translation what the immigrant just interjected. See last footnote.

<sup>173</sup> here immigrant interjects 'my cousin'

<sup>174</sup> Here lawyer laughs nasally.

**56** المترجم: يعني: (.) حسب ما هوى (.) فهم أُو ابن عمك (.) كان عندو رفيقة: (.) وعمل معا شغلًا: ت، (.) وقال لك قال لك أُو تجي معو مشان هي كمان تجيب رفيقتها معا= مشان تغطو على هالموضوع.

Interpreter: yaʕni: (.) according to how he (.) has understood your cousin had a girl:friend (.) and he did things to her (.) and he said he said to you to come with him so that she too brings her [girl] friend with her=so you cover up this thing.

**57** اللاجي: أختنا أختنا.

Interpreter: her sister her sister

Leaving out the findings of post-IME interview I with the immigrant for a minute, it would be very difficult if not impossible to conclude how the immigrant understood the original. Was the immigrant aware of the reduction when he said “correct” in turn 53? If so, what made him accept the rendition as it is? Could it be that he decided back then to include the reduced item in the evaluation (in his internal dialogue) even though he was aware it (i.e. the item) was not there? Or is it possible that he might have felt he knew enough for ‘current ‘practical’ purposes’ and that he did not think that the reduction was a problem. It might also be that he was not aware of the reduction.

It is also possible that, during the IME, he had felt that there was something ‘missing’, but might have felt that it was acceptable when the rendition in turn 56 was produced, where it becomes more or less clear that the immigrant and his cousin had the same problem. Probably, he just felt that the rendition in turn 51 above was acceptable ‘for current practical purposes’ and there was no need to correct, especially given that this was not the first time that he had a meeting of this kind with the lawyer. That being said, if we examine how the renditions developed afterwards, we will see that the immigrant is not always tolerant of divergent renditions.

The next rendition shows that when the interpreter produced a substituted rendition, the immigrant intervenes and corrects the interpreter: the person concerned is the sister of the girlfriend of his nephew, not her friend (turn 57). This might arguably mean that when an integral part of the rendition is not right, the immigrant does intervene to correct the interpreter. But was the reduction mentioned above (turn 52) not important and did it not

deserve to be corrected? The researcher would claim it was. Until now, the discussion has been based on the transcribed text alone.

Engaging the findings of post-IME interview I with the immigrant, it turns out that the immigrant understood the rendition under discussion (turn 51 in the excerpt above) in a way that does not reflect how the rendition was produced, but how the *original* was produced. When asked about how he understood the rendition, the immigrant reproduced a close version of the original. When the researcher drew his attention to the reduction made by the interpreter, the immigrant indicated that he had assumed during the IME (during which he had indicated that the rendition was correct; as shown in the excerpt above) that the interpreter meant by the rendition how things had happened as experienced by him in reality: i.e. the immigrant had assumed that the interpreter had produced a close rendition, not a 'reduced' one. He indicated that he understood the rendition in a way which corresponds to the 'truth', this truth being reality as he knows it as an immigrant: that he and his cousin had encountered the *one and the same* problem.

This shows us again that the STK/R had an influence on how meaning was negotiated during the IME. It seems that the immigrant was not dependent solely on the rendition, that his pre-IME knowledge (i.e. the STK/R) too had an influence. In all probability, while evaluating his thinking in his 'internal dialogue', he assumed that the interpreter had included the reduced lexical item in the rendition.

Like the case in the previous section (i.e. section 6.2.1.1), the one mentioned here could be seen as a manifestation of the influence of STK/R on how meaning was created during this IME, where the notion of intersubjectivity seems to have played a role again. The immigrant again seems to assume intersubjectivity on the part of the interpreter. He does not seem to take a critical attitude with regard to scrutinizing the rendition. As said before, it is obviously impossible to know what exactly happened back then, but it is noticeable that the immigrant has the tendency to assume intersubjectivity rather than alterity. This might be a personal trait. It is also possible that the fact that he already had a residence permit played a role in him being possibly less critical. Previous experiences with other interpreters might have also played a role, in that he had had positive experiences –

although the immigrant indicated at some point that he had noticed that not all interpreters produced close renditions, but rather reduced ones, which he did not approve of (see section 5.3.11).

We have two cases of this type in the data discussed with the immigrant. The researcher cannot claim that these are the only two cases in the wider data. However, these are the ones that appeared in the data during the post-IME interview with the immigrant. The researcher cannot and does not exclude that there could also be other cases in the wider data where the same thing happened.

In the following section, the researcher will carry on discussing the influence of STK/R on the process of meaning-making during the IME. The aim is again to show that the rendition seems not to be the only source of understanding the original for the immigrant. He seems to involve the STK/R in his internal dialogue during the process of sense-making.

### **6.2.1.3 'Understanding the original directly via Dutch'<sup>175</sup>**

In the excerpt below, the lawyer is revisiting the backstory of the immigrant, which is his second communicative project during the IME. In turn 68 below, the lawyer asks the immigrant if the girl he had a relationship with was “nice”. The interpreter makes a substituted rendition. He substitute “nice” with “beautiful” (turn 69)<sup>176</sup>. The immigrant responds with “[she] was beautiful yes” (see turn 70). Based on a purely textual analysis, it would not be possible to conclude whether or not the immigrant was aware that a divergent rendition was produced and/or whether or not he knew what the lawyer wanted to know. His response (turn 70) corresponds to the rendition and not to the original. It is also not known how the immigrant interpreted the chuckling of the lawyer (turn 71). Further, it is also not known whether or not the immigrant was aware that the Dutch rendition of the interpreter in the

---

<sup>175</sup> The findings of this topic can be found in section 5.3.9.

<sup>176</sup> During post-IME interview II with the interpreter, he stated that he did not have a better solution during the IME. In hindsight, *Ṭariffa* (cute) would have been better, according to him (see section 5.5.2).

direction of the lawyer (turn 72) corresponded to the original of the lawyer in turn 68.

Excerpt:

**68** Lawyer: 't was een leuk meisje.

Lawyer: she was a nice girl.

**69** المترجم: كانت إي: صبيبة: حلوى:؟

Interpreter: she was e: a beautiful gi:rl?

**70** اللاجئ: كابتنت حلوة نعم .

Immigrant: [She] was beautiful yes

**71** Lawyer: [chuckles] hehe

Lawyer: [chuckles]

**72** Interpreter: 't was een leuk meisje.

Interpreter: she was a nice girl.

When asked about this substitution during post-IME interview I, the immigrant mentioned that he was aware that the Dutch word “leuk” did not mean “beautiful”, but rather “nice”, but he chose not to correct the translation because he understood the original directly from the lawyer whose version of the account corresponded with ‘reality/truth’. He said he thought there was no need to correct the interpreter and that he himself used the word ‘beautiful’ because it was used by the interpreter, on whom he was relying.

It is noticeable that the interpreter translated the confirming response of the immigrant with a divergent rendition that corresponded to the original of the lawyer (turn 72). He did not produce a close translation of the response of the immigrant; rather, he substituted it with “nice”, which corresponded with the original of the lawyer. This shows that he knew that his rendition did not reflect the original of the lawyer, something the interpreter admitted during post-IME interview II, as referred to earlier.

In this example too (as in the previous sections, 6.2.1.1 and 6.2.1.2), it turns out that the immigrant does not solely depend on the rendition during the process of sense-making. At least in this one case (which is shown here), the immigrant indicated that he understood the original directly from the lawyer. Obviously, his knowledge of Dutch is part of his STK/R; however, it is obvious that we will never know how many times more (if at all) the immigrant understood the original directly from the lawyer via Dutch, whether partly or completely. He did not mention other cases and the researcher did not seek to ask on this in order to avoid asking leading questions. The researcher did request him at the beginning of the post-IME interview I to mention if he understood something directly from Dutch. He agreed while acknowledging that his knowledge of Dutch was modest (as noted in section 6.2.1.1 above).

In the following section, the researcher will discuss a case in which it can be seen that, unlike the case discussed in this section, the immigrant cannot always be expected to express STK/R. If the researcher is inattentive, he could too early conclude that the original has been miscommunicated.

#### **6.2.1.4 ‘Not being able to say “something”<sup>177</sup>’ but recognizing it when mentioned by the researcher’<sup>178</sup>**

During the IME, in turn 30 below, which is part of the first communicative project of the lawyer, the lawyer indicates that it seems that the IND has not considered the backstory of the immigrant “sufficient” for an asylum residence permit. He mentions then that the problem is that he and the immigrant do not know why the IND thinks this. The lawyer argues that the IND must motivate its original decision to not provide the immigrant with an asylum permit, which it has not done<sup>179</sup>. If this happens the lawyer will be able to counter argue (in his endeavour to help the immigrant receive the

---

<sup>177</sup> Which is STK/R related.

<sup>178</sup> The findings related to this topic can be found in section 5.3.6.

<sup>179</sup> As indicated in section 1.2.3, the IND had decided to grant the immigrant a residence permit of a general nature, not linked to his personal problems but linked to the overall bad security situation in Syria. The lawyer complains here that this decision has not been motivated by arguments on the part of the IND.

more solid, asylum residence permit). He carries on, mentioning that not having granted the immigrant such an asylum permit will have serious consequences for his residence position in the future<sup>180</sup>. The immigrant says “correct”:

Excerpt:

**30** Lawyer: want mijn standpunt e: (.) is dat bekend dus **eigenlijk** als als ss je zo een beslissing neemt (.) dat ze jouw asiilverhaal (.) e onvoldoende vonden= wat je hebt verteld .h= maar wij weten niet waar**om** en dan moeten nog op kunnen reage:ren .h = omdat het grote gevolgen heeft voor jouw e::: verblijfspositie in Nederland.

Lawyer: for my point of view e: (.) is that means thus **actually** if if ss you take such a decision (.) that they consider your backstory (.) e insufficient<sup>181</sup>= what you said .h= but we do not know **why** and we must then be enabled to res:pond to it [the decision] .h = because it has big consequences for your e::: residence position in the Netherlands.

**31** المترجم: يعني هوّى (.) وجهة نظروو (.) إنوو (.) هنىّ (.) في هالحالى (.) قرّروا بأنو قصة اللجوء تبّعك ممّا كافية (.) وفي هالحالى (.) بدّون يقولوننا لّشو (.) شو السبب مشان نقدر كمان نقدم برّد على (.) هالموضوع = لأنو هالشي ممكن يكون إله (.) عواقب (.) او تأتّي:ر (.) على (.) إقامتك في هولندا<sup>182</sup>.

Interpreter: yaʕni he (.) from his point of view (.) that (.) they (.) in that case (.) decided that your backstory isn't sufficient (.) **and in such a case** (.) they must say to us **for what** (.) **what is the reason** so that we can also submit a response (.) regarding this subject=for this thing can have (.) consequences (.) or influen:ce (.) on (.) your residence in the Netherlands [*interrupted by immigrant*].

**32** correct

We saw in the previous sections that the immigrant sometimes involves in his internal dialogue ‘material’ which was either not said as such by the interpreter but assumed as having been meant the way the immigrant has understood (see section 6.2.1.1), or ‘material’ which is physically not present in the rendition but assumed as such by the immigrant (see section 6.2.1.2), or ‘material’ which is directly taken from/via Dutch, not via the rendition

<sup>180</sup> For a full picture of this and other related topics, please refer to section 1.2.3.

<sup>181</sup> In the sense that it is not good enough for an ‘asylum residence permit’ (see 1.2.2 in chapter one).

<sup>182</sup> Immigrant interjects (see turn 32).

(section 6.2.1.3). All, coincidentally or not, coincided with the informational content of the original as produced by the lawyer. These materials coincided as well with the STK/R the immigrant had before the IME. This showed us the relevance of STK/R when analysing this kind of discourse because it provides interesting insights into how the immigrant makes sense during the sense-making process in the IME.

Having said this, this does not mean that the immigrant could always be assumed to be able to mention or show how he benefitted from the STK/R and utilized it in his internal dialogue (as he did in the previous sections). This is more problematic if this 'material' (which is related to the STK/R) is relevant in the process of judging (on the part of the researcher) whether or not understanding of a certain original has taken place: the researcher might too soon assume that the immigrant has not understood the original. For it turns out in some cases that the immigrant might have understood the original without being able to show this, especially if the informational content concerns the asylum (legal) procedure.

For example, in the case under investigation (turn 30 above), the immigrant was unable to show he understood the original. He sounded as if the informational content was somewhere in his mind, but he could not express it. With regard to the content of the original, it was as if he thought that he and his lawyer were expected to take the next action: that is to convince the IND that his backstory was plausible, while the original read that it was the IND which must mention why they thought that the backstory of the immigrant was implausible. It was as if the immigrant had not understood the original. If the original was of a general nature, in the sense that the content discussed was non-procedural, the researcher would have characterised it as not understood. However, because of the researcher's insider knowledge as an interpreter, this did not surprise him; legal/procedural originals can be challenging to deal with for some immigrants. When the researcher noticed this, he proposed to replay the relevant part of the recording, to which the immigrant agreed happily. During the second attempt, the informational content sounded more solid when mentioned by him. He sounded more confident. But still, while expressing the content above in turn 30, he did not sound very sure about who was

responsible for which task. It was as if he was seeking confirmation from the researcher. At this point he had mentioned too much content that corresponded with the original to make the researcher think that his failure to show understanding was due to the complexity of the materials rather than to him not having understood it. To ensure that the researcher could make a decisive judgement for the sake of categorization about whether or not the immigrant had understood the original, the researcher decided to tell the content in his own words and to see how the immigrant would respond. When the researcher did this, the immigrant confirmed that that was the way he had understood the information during the IME and that he was finding it difficult to express the information in the way a researcher does. The researcher thus believes that the immigrant probably had understood the original to a good extent when he agreed to this (turn 32). His inability to clearly say how he understood this original could arguably be attributed to him being not empowered<sup>183</sup>. The immigrant recognized the information and said that he indeed understood it the way it was mentioned by the researcher but was unable to tell it the way a researcher would, as he put it, meaning that he encountered difficulties in expressing the informational content.

To summarize this section, sometimes during my interview with the immigrant, as in this example, he was unable to clearly say what he had understood and I, as the researcher, was unsure whether this was because the immigrant did not understand the rendition under investigation or whether it was possibly because he encountered difficulties in expressing his thoughts with regard to it. For this reason, in this case of this example, the researcher asked targeted questions and when needed resorted to replaying the informational content in order to find out how the immigrant would react. By doing this, the researcher attempted to probe whether or not the immigrant had understood the rendition(s) under investigation.

Taking a closer look, it could be said that the immigrant was encountering difficulties in expressing the 'informational content' in the rendition because this information in these cases was not related to something of a general

---

<sup>183</sup> The immigrant had enjoyed only a few years of education, as he himself had said at the beginning of post-IME interview I.

nature, but was specifically about the asylum/immigration procedure. The fact that the immigrant understood the information expressed in the rendition when told by the researcher, is easily explainable. It is of a technical nature and arguably not everyone can be expected to understand such information easily, let alone to be able reproduce it in a clear way easily and/or independently. It could be argued then that the immigrant probably had understood the information in a general way, meaning that he experienced this kind of information as being rather vague, that is not always as clear as 'normal', everyday talk. The legal nature of the information arguably adds to 'vagueness', which is a characteristic of talk in general (section 3.1.6.2). The fact that the immigrant is not able to reproduce this kind of language clearly and independently is then not surprising. The fact that he is able to recognize it when reproduced by me could be partly attributed to the fact that in all probability he had heard this information in previous meetings with the lawyer and/or during previous meetings with organizations such as the IND, the Court, the COA, etc. (see section 1.2.2) and partly from the IME under investigation. Therefore, it is arguably fair to say that what helped him to (partly) understand this information is the fact that the information was not new to him. Therefore, it can be argued that when the discourse of such encounters is analysed, again one should not neglect the knowledge interlocutors have prior to the encounter under investigation. Arguably, in this case, the analyses would have been impoverished if the researcher had not 'dug' further; that is, if he had not intervened when the immigrant seemed to have not understood the renditions under investigation. The immigrant would not have been able to indicate that he did understand the informational content and the researcher would not have had the opportunity to find out that the immigrant was not solely dependent on the information he was given during this the IME under discussion, but that previously gained knowledge also helped him in his understanding of the (specific) renditions. It would also have not been easy, or even perhaps possible, to find out that the "correct" of the immigrant did not necessarily mean that everything had gone well with regard to understanding.

Having discussed in this section what contributed to the immigrant successfully understanding so many originals (93 out of 110), the researcher will now move on to those cases where understanding proved to be challenging. He will discuss the possible reasons for this, and show that STK/R does not provide guarantees with regard to understanding on the part of the immigrant. In the following section also, we will see the importance of taking the perspective of the immigrant into account as is done in this study.

### **6.2.2 Originals miscommunicated, partly understood or partly miscommunicated**

In this section, the researcher will discuss the findings related to those originals which were miscommunicated, partly understood or partly miscommunicated. Information will be provided on possible reasons why the immigrant found understanding some originals produced during the IME challenging<sup>184</sup>. The researcher will show that information related to STK/R does not always help the immigrant understand the originals. As in section 6.2.1, the discussions will be categorized under specific topics. These will revolve around miscommunication, etc. of the originals. With regard to the order with which the topics below are treated, the researcher has chosen to keep the same order in which these topics were discussed during post-IME interview I. The order does not reflect the relative importance of individual topics.

The first topic is about the influence of immigration-related terms/notions/talk<sup>185</sup> on sense-making during the IME. The researcher will show in the following section that this talk can reveal, if probed, that the immigrant might not have understood an original even if he gives a confirming answer to a rendition. Sometimes, a possible linguistic 'trouble source' found in the transcribed data of the IME can lead to discovering a flaw in the understanding not only of the piece of talk probed but also of several

---

<sup>184</sup> The findings which will be discussed can be found in sections 5.2.2, 5.2.3 and 5.2.4. As mentioned earlier in this thesis, for a concise depiction of how the groups and categories in the findings chapter are interrelated, please refer to Appendix II.

<sup>185</sup> Talk which is referred to here is not necessarily of a legal nature (see section 6.2.2.1 directly below). It could be just normal talk which is used in this immigration context.

originals before the one under investigation as we will now see. If the researcher had not decided to interview the immigrant, this information will not have come to light.

### **6.2.2.1 'Term/notion/talk miscommunicated'**

During the IME, in the excerpt below, which is a part of the first communicative project of the lawyer, the lawyer is discussing the legal procedure, explaining to the immigrant the benefits of getting an asylum residence permit (i.e. one that is based on his own personal backstory, unlike the one he has now which is based on the general situation of Syria); see turn 33 below. Then, he explains that the immigrant apparently has won the appeal the lawyer had lodged, because the deadline imposed by the court on the IND for lodging a higher appeal has expired (turn 39). After that, the lawyer explains to the immigrant that the IND is expected now (as ordered by the court) to take a new decision within a few days (on whether or not they will grant the immigrant the residence permit he wants); see turn 41. In turn 44, he tells the immigrant that he is very curious what this decision will be. In turn 45, the interpreter produces a substituted rendition of this last original of the lawyer: the lawyer says: “.hh thus I am very curious (.) whether it is going to happen,” while the interpreter, while interrupting the lawyer at the word “whether”, produces the following rendition: “so he is longing really longing (.) [to know] what is going to happen.” It is obvious that the lawyer is showing that he is curious about what the IND is going to do while the translation suggests more that the lawyer is feeling excited about the possible outcome of the expected decision on the part of the IND. If we examine the transcribed text without involving the perspective of the immigrant, the immigrant seems to show his appreciation to the lawyer and says that the lawyer has done everything that he could have done (turn 46). The researcher sensed a possible ‘possible trouble source’ here. It was not clear to the researcher whether or not the immigrant really understood what the lawyer had just said. In addition to the fact that the interpreter produced a substitution (“curious” is substituted with “longing”), it is noticeable that the immigrant did not provide a (verbal) response when the lawyer earlier was

talking about technical issues related to the legal procedure, while trying to make a point to the immigrant about that procedure (see turns 37 and 39). Also, the immigrant showed minimal response when the following rendition was made, which noticeably was not translated by the interpreter (see turn 43). Having noticed this during the initial analysis of the (transcribed) text (see section 4.2.1), the researcher decided to probe this during post-IME interview I. He wanted to know how the immigrant had understood the original. During this interview, it turned out that the immigrant had miscommunicated the original in which the lawyer showed that he was curious about the decision of the IND. The immigrant indicated that he thought that the related rendition meant that the lawyer was *optimistic* about his legal procedure, not *curious*. It made the immigrant think, according the immigrant, that the lawyer was eager, in the sense that he was optimistic.

Excerpt:

**33** Lawyer: .hh em: (.) want op het moment dat wij gelijk krijgen (.) en dat je **toch** een verblijfvergunning krijgt (.) met datum ingang e: jouw asielaanvraag (.) dat betekent dat je komende **juni** (.) al asiel onbepaalde tijd kan aanvragen en ook je Nederlandse paspoort kan krijgen.

Lawyer: .hh em: (.) for the moment that we are said to be right [by the court] (.) and that you nonetheless receive a residence permit (.) with a start date e: [which is] your asylum application [date] (.) this means that you coming June (.) already can apply for a permanent asylum [residence permit] and you can also get your Dutch passport.

**34** المترجم: لأنّو إذا (.) إحنة (.) إي أخذنه (.) اللي بدنا إيّاه (.) وّ و إعترفوا بأنّو (.) تاريخ الإقامة تبعك (.) هو نفس (.) تاريخ (.) طلب اللجوء (.) ففي=هالشني معناه إنّو في شهر سنّي الجاي، من حقّك انه تقدم بطلب للحصول على إقامة مفتوحة، (.) وفينك أنّو تقدم على إي (.) التّسبور= على الجنسية.

Interpreter: Because if (.) we (.) e took (.) what we want (.) and and they admitted that (.) your residence [permit] date (.) is the same as (.) the date of (.) the asylum [application] date (.) in this=this thing means that in month six which is coming you have the right to apply for an open-ended residence [permit] (.) and you can apply for a e (.) the passport=for the nationality.

**35** اللّاجئ: صح

Immigrant: correct

**36** Interpreter: klopt

Interpreter: correct

37 Lawyer: .hhh nou die beslissing van de rechtbank was op 15 oktober (.) en de IND had vier weken de tijd om daar tegen in hoger beroep te gaan.

Lawyer: .hhh well that decision of the court was on October 15 (.) and the IND had four weeks to lodge a higher appeal against it.

38 المترجم: قرار المحكمة كان صادر في 15 عشرة (.) ودائرة الهجرة والتجنيس كان الا (.) أربع أسابيع من الوقت (.) مشان تتقدم بإستئناف في المحكمة العليا.

Interpreter: the decision of the court was issued on October 15 (.) and the Immigration and Naturalization Service had (.) four weeks of time (.) in order to lodge an appeal at the Higher Court.

39 Lawyer: nou die zijn voorbij, (.) en ik heb niks gehoord (.) dus ze zijn niet in hoger beroep (.) gegaan.

Lawyer: these have passed (.) and I have heard nothing (.) so they have not lodged an appeal (.)

40 المترجم: الأربعة أسابيع (.) مرّوا (.) وخلصوا (.) وهو ما (سمع؟<sup>186</sup>) شي فمشان هيك (.) دائرة الهجرة والتجنيس ما قدمت إستئناف في المحكمة العليا.

Interpreter: The four weeks (.) have passed (.) and come to an end (.) and he has not (heard?) anything and this is why (.) the Immigration and Naturalization Services has not lodged an appeal at the High Court.

41 Lawyer: de rechtbank heeft ook gezegd dat ze binnen zes weken nieuwe besluit moeten nemen en **dat is** komende dinsdag.

Lawyer: the court said also that they have to take a new decision<sup>187</sup> within six weeks and **that is** next Tuesday.

42 المترجم: والمحكمة .. (غير واضح) خلال ست أسابيع بدون يتّخذو قرار جديد (.) وهدول بيخلصو (.) يوم الثلاثاء (.) الجاي.

Interpreter: and the court .. [unintelligible] within six weeks they need to have taken a new decision (.) and those will end (.) coming (.) Tuesday.

43 اللاجئ: الجاي .. (غير واضح)

<sup>186</sup> Word difficult to hear.

<sup>187</sup> In such case, the IND will be expected either to grant the immigrant the 'asylum residence permit' he wants or to decide they want to reject to do so, in which case they will have to send the immigrant a concept decision called Intention to Reject in which the IND explains why it does not to provide the immigrant with an 'asylum resident permit' (see 1.2.2 in chapter One).

Immigrant: the coming .. [*rest unintelligible*]

44 Lawyer: .hh dus ik ben heel benieuwd (.)<sup>188</sup> of het gaat gebeuren.

Lawyer: .hh thus I am very curious (.) whether it is going to happen.

45 المترجم: فهو متشوق متشوق كتي:ر (.) شو بدو يصير.

Interpreter: so he is longing really longing (.) [to know] what is going to happen.

46 اللاجئ: والله شكرا شكرا يعني هو عمل اللي عليه.

Immigrant: well thanks, thanks, he did what he had to do.

The case discussed above is not the only one in the findings. During post-IME interview I, It turned out that the immigrant sometimes encountered difficulties in understanding immigration-related notions/terms/talk used in the IME, when he was asked about it a few times (section 5.3.1), for example while talking about an excerpt like the one above. It is true that the category contains only 3 examples; however, there are a few points which need to be made here. Firstly, not every notion was probed during the post-IME interview with the immigrant as this was not the aim of this study, and due to practical reasons, the most important one being time constraints. Further, the data reveals that the lawyer utilized rather informal language, which might partly explain why not too many challenging legal notions were utilized. The lawyer indicated during a 'corridor conversation' with the researcher that he kept 'things' simple to prevent the immigrant from encountering difficulties in understanding. Furthermore, the interpreter also indicated during post-IME interview II with the interpreter that in this case, as in a significant number of other cases, he resorted to a lower register (using informal language) when he thought that his client (the immigrant) might face difficulty in understanding closer renditions.

Despite this, during post-IME interview I with the immigrant, the immigrant mentioned on several occasions that he generally encounters difficulties

---

<sup>188</sup> Interpreter interrupts here and starts producing his rendition (turn 45).

understanding immigration-procedure related talk. The STK/R – in this case the legal knowledge he must have been exposed to during his residence in the Netherlands since 2009 (until the date of the meeting in 2013) – seems not to always help the immigrant sufficiently to understand originals. In the excerpt above for example (turn 40), when asked if he knew what the task of the court of appeal is, he mentioned that he did not. He said he knew only ‘the court’.

Yet, arguably, if the lawyer and the immigrant had not attempted to assist the immigrant during the meaning-making process by utilizing a lower register, the latter would have encountered more difficulties with regard to understanding. The ‘material’ which was afforded by the lawyer, through the interpreter, in a lower register, have arguably empowered the immigrant in his participation in the process of meaning-making in a way that would have been less possible if the lawyer and immigrant had not done this.

Closely related to the topic of legal notions/ terms/talk (discussed in this section) is the topic of the asylum procedure. In the following section, the researcher will discuss how the challenging nature of legal knowledge related to the asylum procedure can sometimes obstruct the endeavours of the immigrant to understand the originals. As previously mentioned (sections 5.2.2 and 5.2.4), six originals (out of 18) in which the asylum procedure was being discussed were miscommunicated (while two others were partly miscommunicated).

#### **6.2.2.2 Miscommunicated procedure (not showing understanding of the information about the procedure with regard to the rendition under discussion):**

In the excerpt below, extracted from the very start of the IME under investigation, the lawyer is opening the meeting with the immigrant. He is engaging in the first communicative project. He starts by reminding the immigrant that they have been busy with the asylum procedure for a long time (turn 1). Then, he reminds him that they had attended a court session a few weeks earlier. After that, he engages in presenting some facts related to

the procedure. Prior to holding the post-IME with the immigrant, the analysis of this part of the transcribed text had shown some possible ‘trouble sources’. These were probed during post-IME interview I with the immigrant. Below, a general statement will be made at the start (see section 6.2.2.2.1). After that (see section 6.2.2.2.2), a specific example will be discussed to show how the challenging nature of legal knowledge related to the asylum procedure can sometimes obstruct the endeavours of the immigrant to understand the originals.

Excerpt:

**1** Lawyer: goed (....) .hhhh (.) ja we zijn al la:ng bezig met jou::r asielpcedure.

Lawyer: good (....) .hhhh (.) yeah we have been busy with you::r asylum procedure for a lo:ng time.

**2** المترجم: إحنا صارنا فترة (.) عم نشغل مشغولين ب: (.) إجراءات لجو:نك.

Interpreter: we have been working on been busy with: (.) your asylum procedure (.) for some time.

**3** Lawyer: .hh we zijn e:: een aantal weken geleden bij de rechtbank geweest (.) in Den Helder<sup>189</sup>.

Lawyer: .hh we went e:: to court a number of weeks ago (.) in Den Helder.

**4** المترجم: قبل إي: عدة أسابي:ع (.) كنا: في محكمى في دن هيلدر.

Interpreter: several wee:ks ago e: (.) we had a court session in Den Helder.

**5** اللاجئ: صح صح .

Immigrant: °correct correct°

**6** Interpreter: klopt

Interpreter: correct

<sup>189</sup> The name of the city has been changed.

7 Lawyer: he:m<sup>190</sup> dat was (.) e: een beetje bijzondere procedu:re (.) want ik ben in beroep gegaan tegen een beslissing van de IND (.) **terwijl** je een verblijfsvergunning had.

Lawyer: he:m it was (.) e: a unusual procedu:re a little bit (.) for I lodged an appeal against a decision of the IND (.) at a **time** when you [already] had a residence permit.

8 المترجم: هذه الإجراءات كانت إيه استثنائية بعض الشيء لأنو هوى (.) عمل (.) إستئناف (.) ضد (.) قرار: (.) دائرة الهجرة والتجنيس في حين إنو القرار كان إقامة،

Interpreter: this procedure was e somewhat exceptional for he (.) made [sic] (.) an appeal (.) against (.) the deci:sion of (.) the immigration and naturalization bureau when the decision [already taken by the IND] was a residence permit.

9 اللاجئ: صح (.) شكرا.

Interpreter: correct (.) thanks

10 Lawyer: en e: (.) de IND (.) heeft (.) daar op zitting ook gezegd dat ze vonden dat we eigenlijk=dat je helemaal geen recht had om in (.) beroep te gaan (.) omdat je geen belang had=want je hebt nu verblijfsvergunning .h dus dan kun je niet in beroep e e tegen een asielbesluit.

Lawyer: and e: (.) the IND (.) said (.) there during the [court] session indeed that they were of the opinion that we actually=that you had no right whatsoever to (.) lodge an appeal (.) because you had no interest=for you have now a residence permit .h so you cannot lodge an appeal e e against an asylum decision.

11 المترجم: وأنت (.) وأثناء الجلسي (.) دائرة الهجرة والتجنيس:س قابلت أنو هنى (.) إي بيشو إي يعني من رأيين إي أنو إنت إي ما من حقاك أنو تتقدم ب: (..) طلب إي إي ب: إستئناف ضد القرار لأنو ما من مصلحتك لأنو أنتي حصلت (.) على الإقامة.

Interpreter: and du (.) and during the [court] session (.) the Immigration and Naturalization Servi:ce sai:d that they (.) e: think e: yaʕni<sup>191</sup> they are of the opinion e: that you e: have no right to lodge (..) e: e: an appeal against °the decision° because it is **not** in your interest because you [already] have (.) received the [residence] permit.

12 Lawyer: e: en ik heb toen uitgelegd (.) **bij** de rechtbank (.) dat ik vind dat er wel **degelijk** belang is omdat jij .hh e een verblijfsvergunning heb gekregen vanwege de de algeme slechte situatie in Syria (.) op dit momen.

<sup>190</sup> This is a filler. It indicates that the lawyer is about to start his rendition.

<sup>191</sup> This is a filler probably used here by the interpreter to give himself time to think/reformulate.

Interpreter: e: and I explained then (.) **in** court (.) that I believe that there is certainly interest because you .hh e received a residence permit due to the the general bad situation in Syria (.) at this moment.

**13** المترجم: وهو إي وضّح (.) مَعْن عند المحكمة (.) إتهو (.) أنتي فعلا (.) في إلك مصلحة (.) في الإستئناف (.) لأنو إنتي حصلت على الإقامة (.) على ضوء (.) الوضع (.) إي: السيئ (.) حاليا (.) في (.) سوريا<sup>192</sup>؟

Interpreter: And he e explained (.) with [sic] them at [sic] the court (.) that (.) you do indeed (.) have an interest (.) in [lodging] an appeal (.) because you have received the residence [permit] (.) in view of the (.) bad (.) e: situation (.) at present (.) in (.) Syria?

**14** اللاجئ: صح

Immigrant: correct

#### 6.2.2.2.1 General

In one of the cases probed (seen in the excerpt directly above), a lexical item utilized by the interpreter could be understood in several ways (turn 8). During post-IME interview I with the immigrant, the original turned out to have been miscommunicated. In another case (turn 11), the translation of a part of the original was not reflected in a correct way; a substitution was produced by the interpreter. It turned out that this substitution made the immigrant miscommunicate the entire original. In another case (turn 13), it was unclear whether the immigrant had understood the original where the lawyer was explaining some issues related to the procedure. The answer of the immigrant to the researcher during post-IME interview indicated that he did not understand the originals because understanding the procedure, as explained, proved to be challenging. On several occasions during post-IME interview I, the immigrant himself indicated that he found this kind of knowledge challenging. He attributed this to not having enjoyed enough education, as he put it. The researcher will now discuss the first example referred to in this paragraph in detail.

<sup>192</sup> While producing this rendition, the interpreter sounds as if he is thinking.

#### 6.2.2.2.2 Specific case

In the excerpt above, the lawyer is engaged in revisiting the legal procedure, which is his first communicative project during the IME. In turn 7, the lawyer indicates that the legal tool he used when he went to court some time ago before the IME under investigation was not an ordinary legal tool: he went to court for the immigrant at a time when the immigrant already had a residence permit<sup>193</sup>. The lawyer knows that the IND argues in such cases that when an immigrant has been granted a residence permit (of the type this immigrant has been granted), he or she does not have an “interest” in going to court, because they already have a residence permit<sup>194</sup>. This is why the lawyer mentions here that the legal tool he utilized was a “special” one, i.e. not an ordinary one. The interpreter in turn translates the word “special” as *إستثنائية* (*exceptional*) (turn 8). The immigrant says “correct”, followed by “thank you” (turn 9). Because this lexical item *إستثنائية* is rather Modern Standard Arabic (MSA), and because the immigrant himself had mentioned earlier during post-IME interview I that he enjoyed only a few years of education, the researcher tried to find out if the immigrant had understood what the lawyer wanted to say in turn 7. The immigrant turned out to have not understood the lawyer: the original was miscommunicated. He thought that the lawyer meant that the immigrant had fled his homeland because he, the immigrant, “personally” had problems with the authorities, unlike some other asylum seekers, who, as the immigrant says that the IND sometimes argues, leave their homeland because of the “general” bad situation in their homeland, not necessarily because they themselves had encountered problems with the authorities. The immigrant understood the word *إستثنائية* in this last sense; i.e. that he that the lawyer meant that the immigrant personally had problems with the authorities. During the post-IME interview, when the researcher explained to the immigrant what the lawyer had actually said, the immigrant indicated that this was not the way he had understood the original during the IME.

---

<sup>193</sup> The reader is advised to refer to section 1.2.3 for information on the legal position of the immigrant and for an overview of what the lawyer is engaged in this excerpt.

<sup>194</sup> The lawyer expresses this information specifically expressively in turn 10 in the excerpt.

It is interesting to see that the next original (turn 10) contains the phrase “which is why”, connecting the reasoning of the previous original with the current one, while the corresponding rendition does not. This could have functioned as a ‘clue’ for the immigrant to suspect that he might have misunderstood the first rendition under investigation (turn 7). We notice here that the immigrant does not give any response, which could mean that he was unable to follow the sequence of talk at that point.

In this excerpt and in the other cases probed by the researcher (referred to among others above in section 6.2.2.2.1), the original turned out to be miscommunicated due to the complexity of the asylum procedure for the immigrant. There are sometimes ‘linguistic factors’, related to the choice of lexical items or expressions used by the interpreters, and at other times ‘global factors’, related to understanding the bigger picture with relation to the legal procedure, as explained earlier in this section.

Again, although the procedure had arguably been explained to the immigrant or talked about on several occasions prior to this IME (as has been explained in chapter one), STK/R does not seem to have helped sufficiently to understand this and other originals, unlike in sections 6.1.1 – 6.1.4 above. In addition, the point needs to be reiterated that these insights would not have been possible if the researcher had not interviewed the immigrant.

In the following section, the researcher will show that the immigrant sometimes understands the procedure partly or vaguely. It is not simply a matter of him either understanding it or miscommunicating it. We will go back to the excerpt treated in section 6.2.1 above.

### 6.2.2.3 Partly/vaguely understanding information on procedure

**33** Lawyer: .hh em: (.) want op het moment dat wij gelijk krijgen (.) en dat je **toch** een verblijfvergunning krijgt (.) met datum ingang e: jouw asielaanvraag (.) dat betekent dat je komende **juni** (.) al asiel onbepaalde tijd kan aanvragen en ook je Nederlandse paspoort kan krijgen.

Lawyer: .hh em: (.) for the moment that we are said to be right [by the court] (.) and that you nonetheless receive a residence permit (.) with a start date e: [which is] your asylum application [date] (.) this means that you coming June (.) already can apply for a permanent asylum [residence permit] and you can also get your Dutch passport.

**34** المترجم: لأنّو إذا (.) إحنة (.) إي أخذنه (.) اللي بدنا إياه (.) و و إعترفوا بأنّو (.) تاريخ الإقامة تبعك (.) هو نفس (.) تاريخ (.) طلب اللجوء (.) ففي=هالشني معناه إنّو في شهر سنّي الجاي، من حقك انه تقدم بطلب للحصول على إقامة مفتوحة، (.) وفينك أنّو تقدم على إي (.) البسبور= على الجنسية.

Interpreter: Because if (.) we (.) e took (.) what we want (.) and and they admitted that (.) your residence [permit] date (.) is the same as (.) the date of (.) the asylum [application] date (.) in this=this thing means that in month six which is coming you have the right to apply for an open-ended residence [permit] (.) and you can apply for a e (.) the passport=for the nationality.

**35** اللاجئ: صح

Immigrant: correct

**36** Interpreter: klopt

Interpreter: correct

**37** Lawyer: .hhh nou die beslissing van de rechtbank was op 15 oktober (.) en de IND had vier weken de tijd om daar tegen in hoger beroep te gaan.

Lawyer: .hhh well that decision of the court was on October 15 (.) and the IND had four weeks to lodge a higher appeal against it.

**38** المترجم: قرار المحكمى كان صادر في 15 عشرة (.) ودائرة الهجرة والتجنيس كان الا (.) اربع اسابيع من الوقت (.) مشان تتقدم بإستئناف في المحكمة العليا.

Interpreter: the decision of the court was issued on October 15 (.) and the Immigration and Naturalization Service had (.) four weeks of time (.) in order to lodge an appeal at the Higher Court.

**39** Lawyer: nou die zijn voorbij, (.) en ik heb niks gehoord (.) dus ze zijn niet in hoger beroep (.) gegaan.

Lawyer: these have passed (.) and I have heard nothing (.) so they have not lodged an appeal (.)

**40** المترجم: الأربعة أسابيع (.) مرّوا (.) وخلصوا (.) وهو ما (سمع<sup>195</sup>؟) شي فمشان هيك (.) دائرة الهجرة والتجنيس ما قدمت إستئناف في المحكمة العليا.

Interpreter: The four weeks (.) have passed (.) and come to an end (.) and he has not (heard?) anything and this is why (.) the Immigration and Naturalization Services has not lodged an appeal at the High Court.

**41** Lawyer: de rechtbank heeft ook gezegd dat ze binnen zes weken een nieuw besluit moeten nemen en **dat is** komende dinsdag.

Lawyer: the court said also that they have to take a new decision<sup>196</sup> within six weeks and **that is** next Tuesday.

**42** المترجم: والمحكمة .. (غير واضح) خلال ست أسابيع بدون يتخذو قرار جديد (.) وهدول بيخلصو (.) يوم الثلاثاء (.) الجاي.

Interpreter: and the court .. [unintelligible] within six weeks they need to have taken a new decision (.) and those will end (.) coming (.) Tuesday.

**43** اللاجئ: الجاي .. (غير واضح)

Immigrant: the coming .. [rest unintelligible]

**44** Lawyer: .hh dus ik ben heel benieuwd (.)<sup>197</sup> of het gaat gebeuren.

Lawyer: .hh thus I am very curious (.) whether it is going to happen.

<sup>195</sup> Word difficult to hear.

<sup>196</sup> In such case, the IND will be expected either to grant the immigrant the 'asylum residence permit' he wants or to decide they want to reject to do so, in which case they will have to send the immigrant a concept decision called Intention to Reject in which the IND explains why it does not to provide the immigrant with an 'asylum resident permit' (see 1.2.2 in chapter One).

<sup>197</sup> Interpreter interrupts here and starts producing his rendition (turn 45).

45 المترجم: فهو متشوق متشوق كتي::ر (.) شو بدو يصير.

Interpreter: so he is longing really longing (.) [to know] what is going to happen.

46 اللاجئ: والله شكرا شكرا يعني هو عمل اللي عليه.

Immigrant: well thanks, thanks, he did what he had to do.

It has been noticed in the data that the immigrant in some cases understands the information related to the asylum procedure in a partial way (i.e. only parts of the informational content are understood), or vaguely (he does not show clear understanding). There are four examples of this (see turns 26, 30, 39 and 41 above). In one case, the original is understood, in one partly understood, partly miscommunicated and one original was miscommunicated respectively. This means that understanding how the procedure is designed could be considered important to understanding the original. During post-IME interview I with the immigrant, it turned out also in these cases that the legal information was challenging. Thus here also the STK/R did not help the immigrant sufficiently to understand the originals. In these cases also, it would not have been possible to gain this information if the immigrant had not been interviewed.

In the following section, the researcher will discuss another topic where STK/R does not guarantee understanding of the originals, even if in this case also the immigrant must have been exposed to this information repeatedly during the procedure. Rommetveit (1974: 50-51) states that “[s]ituated understandings are partial and fragmentary, dialogically constituted and only partially shared.” Wittgenstein (1953: 158) links situated understanding to “[n]ow I know how to go on.” I argue that both seem to apply also to understandings across encounters like the ones under investigation, which take at different intervals of time. It seems that this ‘partial understanding’ stays partial sometimes even though the topic that is related to it has been discussed in earlier encounters.

#### **6.2.2.4 Not understanding clearly which organization does what**

In four cases which were probed during post-IME interview I with the immigrant (see turns 10, 37, 39, 41)<sup>198</sup>, it can be observed that the immigrant encounters difficulties in understanding which legal organization is responsible for which task during the asylum procedure (see section 1.2.1 for a list of these organizations). The researcher concluded this during the interview with the immigrant during the process of probing. In this regard, the immigrant indicated during post-IME interview I that he does not clearly understand the difference between the IND and the court regarding their tasks and responsibilities in relation to the appeal he had submitted. Of the four cases probed, in three, the originals were miscommunicated (see section 5.2.2) and in one partly miscommunicated (see section 5.2.4). It can be observed that the immigrant does not know or cannot tell (in a clear way) which organization performs the legal task under discussion, a factor which arguably contributed to miscommunicating the original in these three cases.

In the excerpt mentioned in the previous section (section 6.2.2.3 above), it becomes clear that the court had decided in favour of the immigrant (see turn 37). The court had given the IND two choices. The first was to accept the decision of the court, in which case the IND would be expected to make a new decision in the case of this immigrant; thus it would annul the previous decision. The other choice was to reject the decision of the court, in which case the IND would lodge an appeal at court of appeal. In the last case, the IND would have four weeks to act from the date of the court session.

If the IND did not lodge this appeal (as turns out to be the case since the four weeks have passed; see turn 39 above), then it would have two choices: either to grant the immigrant the more permanent type of residence which he is after (the one based on his personal problems; i.e. an asylum residence permit), or to come up with a 'decision concept', which is a concept decision in which the IND would indicate that it is planning to refuse

---

<sup>198</sup> As is the case with the majority of the cases probed during the post-IME interview with the immigrant, the analysis of the audio and the transcribed text had shown possible 'trouble sources'.

the request of the immigrant for the more permanent residence permit (an asylum permit). In such case, the immigrant would be given an opportunity to convince the IND that they should change their mind and should grant him the residence he is after (section 1.2.3). During the IME under investigation, the lawyer is preparing for this last scenario; he is double-checking the information in his report in order to base his possible response to the IND on factually correct information.

According to the lawyer, the IND seems not to have filed a higher appeal as the 4-week deadline has expired (see turn 39). This means, as the lawyer explains, that the IND now has six weeks from the date of the decision of the lower court to take a decision to either grant the residence permit wanted by the immigrant or to come up with a 'decision concept'. The deadline to take this decision was a few days after the IME under investigation was recorded (see turn 41).

Before the post-IME interview with the immigrant, the audio and the transcribed were analysed. In the excerpt above (section 6.2.2.3), due to certain linguistic choices made by the interpreter (turn no. 42), the researcher considered the rendition not clear enough and expected that it could have been problematic for the immigrant during the IME. The pronoun 'they' was not specific enough and due to the complexity of this discourse, the researcher foresaw possible miscommunication. This turned out to be the case when the immigrant was asked about it during the post-IME interview. He thought it was the lower court that had to take the new decision, not the IND. He argued that the rendition meant this. When told that it was the IND who now had to take a decision, the immigrant argued that the interpreter did not say this in the rendition. He followed this by saying that he generally confuses the IND and the court. He attributed this to having gone to school for only a few years. He said this because, while discussing this material with the researcher, he regularly made mistakes with regard to which of these organization has to undertake which tasks.

Arguably, it could be said that the immigrant should be expected to have this knowledge due to the fact that in all probability he has heard this information before during previous meetings with the lawyer, and with other institutions

that hold meetings with immigrants about their procedure. However, the fact that understanding is generally partial, as discussed in chapter Three, and as “[...] there is normally a considerable amount of vagueness in normal language use” (Linell, 2009: section 3.1.6.2), it could be argued that this kind of miscommunication should not be considered strange, especially if we considered that this is not ‘normal language’ and legal information was found generally challenging by the immigrant. But does this argument not account for understanding in situated interactions only? Is not there a need to look at the notions of partial understanding and understanding for current purposes in settings that deal with information which is dealt with across encounters, as in this case? The researcher argues there is. Understanding across encounters (like the one under investigation) too seems to be partial, and interlocutors in these settings too seem to engage in understanding for current purposes.

It might be tempting to conclude that the immigrant always encounters difficulties with regard to understanding the tasks of the different organizations. However, one could not say that the immigrant as a rule fails to differentiate between the tasks of each organization. It is not unthinkable that the immigrant’s confusion regarding this issue could be temporary. One cannot exclude that situational issues during the meeting with the researcher, and the lawyer (during the IME) could have contributed to this confusion and that under other circumstances he might be more capable of differentiating between these tasks.

### **6.2.3 Conclusion of part II**

In this (second) part of the discussion chapter, the researcher has shown that the process of sense-making during the investigated IME should be studied holistically, and in order to do this, the STK/R of the participant must be included in the analysis. To do the latter, the immigrant needs to be interviewed. This interview has provided rich insights which would not have been accessible if it had not been conducted.

The discussion has shown that the immigrant draws to a considerable extent on the knowledge he had prior to embarking on the IME (section 6.2.1). On the other hand, the discussion has shown that STK/R does not provide guarantees that originals will be understood (section 6.2.2). When it comes to immigration-related talk, the influence of the STK/R seems to be less. Further, this part has raised questions with regard the interrelationship between STK/R and the different IMEs. It argues that notions such as 'partial understanding' and 'understanding for (current) practical purposes' are not confined to one IME, but they could also be seen in relation to inter-IME communication, in the sense that the partiality of understanding and understanding for (current) practical purpose could also be present across different IMEs.

In Part III, which follows, the researcher will address the third research question: How does the interpreter explain his translation decisions, and what can be learned from them in terms of the sense-making processes?

## **Part III**

### **6.3 The explanations of the interpreter explaining his translation decisions**

In this part, the researcher will discuss the findings related to the third research question: How does the interpreter explain his translation decisions, and what can be learned from them in terms of the sense-making processes? As will be seen, the interpreter has been found to be wanting to achieve mutual understanding between the lawyer and the immigrant, and to direct his translation decisions towards this goal, thereby taking the educational level of the immigrant into account. He is also found to be aware of the influence of the nature of the encounter under investigation regarding how sense-making develops. The findings of the first group in this part will now be presented<sup>199</sup>.

#### **6.3.1 Discussion of ‘no conscious strategy’ Group**

As mentioned in the findings chapter (section 5.5), the interpreter did/could not provide an explanation for some translation decisions. As the researcher lacks the perspective of the interpreter in those cases, he followed another path in the analysis. He has based the analysis in these cases on the interrelationship between the characteristics of interpreting as a profession and the characteristics of the discourse utilized in it, on the one hand, and on the produced renditions in this IME, on the other. Sections 6.3.1.1 - 6.3.1.3 below are devoted to this discussion.

##### **6.3.1.1 The immediate nature of the communicative event**

One of the characteristics of interpreting is that it is practiced in real-time/online (Mason, 2006: 1). Although the interpreter did not refer to this fact expressly when motivating his decisions, but rather indirectly, for example

---

<sup>199</sup> For the sake of clarity of this section, this is a reminder that Appendix II provides a concise depiction of how the categories/groups in chapter Five interrelate. In addition, the reader is also advised to refer to chapter Five when needed.

when he said that 'Interpreting is not written translation' (see section 5.6.8), it would be reasonable to assume that this immediacy must have had an influence on some of his decisions during the interaction. While producing renditions, he might not have had (enough) time to reflect on/(re-)evaluate some of the afforded 'material' or to reflect on/(re-)evaluate some of the decisions he had made.

When the process of evaluation and re-evaluation in his internal dialogue is strained by external factors such as *immediacy*, this process might then develop in a way other than it would have if this strain were not present. The interpreter might, as in the excerpt below, mention that this (rendition) was what he was able to think of at the moment when produced it.

The findings of the 'no conscious strategy' group under discussion in this section show that, on several occasions, when asked about a certain (part of a) rendition (see for example turn 11 in Appendix I, also shown in the excerpt below), the interpreter indicated that this rendition was what he was able to think of at the moment when it was produced: "this is what I what was able to think of back then." Arguably, this means that at another moment, he could have thought of another rendition, and that the immediacy of the event made him produce this rendition the way he did, and that he was not satisfied with this rendition. This phenomenon is represented seven times in the data (see table 5.4.3.1). The researcher will now discuss one specific example, the understanding of which requires it to be contextualized.

As has been discussed section 1.2.3, during the IME, the lawyer is revisiting the legal procedure of the immigrant, which was the first of three communicative projects he employed during that IME. He starts the IME by outlining how the legal procedure has developed so far. At some point (turn 10 below), he starts to introduce the vision of the IND with regard to this procedure. The lawyer is telling the immigrant that the IND made it clear during the court session, in which the appeal of the immigrant against an earlier decision of the IND was being dealt with, that the immigrant had no interest in submitting an appeal because the immigrant had already been granted a residence permit. This is where the extract below begins.

Here the interpreter produces a rendition (turn 11), where he makes a substitution<sup>200</sup>. It concerns the clause “omdat je geen belang had” [*because you had no interest*], which was translated as لأنو ما من مصلحتك [*because it is not in your interest*], which in this case, at least in Arabic, could carry the pragmatic meaning that something could turn out to be bad for you. During post-IME interview I with the immigrant<sup>201</sup>, It turned out that the immigrant had not understood the rendition as meant by the lawyer/IND, but as meaning [*because it is not in your interest*] as rendered by the interpreter, carrying the negative connotation referred to. The interpreter mentioned during interview II that *this was what he was able to think of at that moment*, admitting that this element should have been translated differently. However, if we look at the transcribed text and move further than the rendition under investigation, we will see the same phrase was re-introduced by the lawyer in the following turn (turn 12 below). It is noticeable that the interpreter produces a closer rendition this time. This tells us that this might be an indication that the interpreter had enough time this time to think of a closer rendition than the one produced in turn 11, and that the substitution produced the first time was probably due to immediacy. It seems that in the time interval between his last rendition (turn 13) and the first version of it (turn 11), the interpreter found enough time to re-evaluate the afforded ‘material’, and re-evaluate his own thinking and produce a rendition he might have thought was a better reflection of the original. Possibly, the fact that he had insufficient time on the first occasion to evaluate the afforded ‘material’ in a way that reflected how the lawyer produced the original, made him make the substitution.

Excerpt:

**10** Lawyer: en e: (.) de IND (.) heeft (.) daar op zitting ook gezegd dat ze vonden dat we eigenlijk=dat je helemaal geen recht had om in (.) beroep te gaan (.) omdat je geen belang had=want je hebt nu verblijfsvergunning .h dus dan kun je niet in beroep e e tegen een asielbesluit.

<sup>200</sup> It can be seen in table 5.1 above that less than 5% of the renditions which were produced belong to this group. It is noteworthy that the findings presented in this table answer the first research question.

<sup>201</sup> Conducted a week earlier than the interview with the interpreter.

Lawyer: and e: (.) the IND (.) said (.) there during the [court] session indeed that they were of the opinion that we actually=that you had no right whatsoever to (.) lodge an appeal (.) because you had no interest=for you have now a residence permit .h so you cannot lodge an appeal e e against an asylum decision.

**11** المترجم: وأنتُ (.) وأثناء الجلسة (.) دائرة الهجرة والتجنّي:س قابلت أنّو هنتي (.) إي بيشو إي يعني من رأيي إي أنّو إنت إي ما من حقك أنّو تتقدم ب: (..) طلب إي إي ب: إستئناف ضدّ القرار لأنّو ما من مصلحتك لأنّو أنتي حصلت (.) على الإقامة.

Interpreter: and du (.) and during the [court] session (.) the Immigration and Naturalization Service said that they (.) e: think e: yaʕni<sup>202</sup> they are of the opinion e: that you e: have no right to lodge (..) e: e: an appeal against °the decision° because it is **not** in your interest because you [already] have (.) received the [residence] permit.

**12** Lawyer: e: en ik heb toen uitgelegd (.) **bij** de rechtbank (.) dat ik vind dat er wel **degelijk** belang is omdat jij .hh e een verblijfsvergunning heb gekregen vanwege de de algeme slechte situatie in Syria (.) op dit momen.

Interpreter: e: and I explained then (.) **in** court (.) that I believe that there is **certainly** interest because you .hh e received a residence permit due to the the general bad situation in Syria (.) at this moment.

**13** المترجم: وهو إي وضّح (.) مَعْن عند المحكمة (.) إنّهو (.) أنتي فعلا (.) في إلك مصلحة (.) في الإستئناف (.) لأنّو إنتي حصلت على الإقامة (.) على ضوء (.) الوضع (.) إي: السيئ (.) حاليا (.) في (.) سوريا<sup>203</sup>

Interpreter: And he e explained (.) with [sic] them at [sic] the court (.) that (.) you do indeed (.) have an interest (.) in [lodging] an appeal (.) because you have received the residence [permit] (.) in view of the (.) bad (.) e: situation (.) at present (.) in (.) Syria?

**14** اللاجئ: صح

Immigrant: correct

In this section, where the researcher has introduced an excerpt, he has discussed the influence which immediacy (i.e. the immediate nature of the encounter) can have on how meaning is constructed. The researcher has shown how the immediacy of the event made the interpreter take a certain

<sup>202</sup> This is a filler probably used here by the interpreter to give himself time to think/reformulate.

<sup>203</sup> While producing this rendition, the interpreter sounds as if he is thinking.

decision (turn 11) and how he afterwards, when arguably having had some time to re-evaluate the materials provided by the lawyer, took another decision. The new rendition is found to be closer to the original than the first one (see turn 13). The researcher argues that the interpreter probably would have made a close rendition the first time if he had had enough time to reflect on his decision.

In this section, the researcher has been discussing those decisions for which the interpreter was unable to provide a reason during post-IME interview II. The researcher will now move on to the discussion of a second characteristic of talk, which is its unfolding nature, and how it can influence the process of sense-making in such encounters. Also in this case, the researcher does not have the perspective of the interpreter.

### 6.3.1.2 Influence of the nature of discourse

As indicated in section 1.2.3, and in the previous section, during the IME under investigation, the lawyer was discussing the legal procedure of the immigrant with him, which was one of his three communicative projects. In the excerpt below, the lawyer is discussing a weak point (from his perspective) in the backstory of the immigrant which, according to the lawyer, could be used by the IND against the immigrant during the ongoing legal procedure. Arguably, the lawyer, in the excerpt below, is trying to “dig out” information from the immigrant with the aim of using it if needed to counter-argue against possible arguments of the IND with regard to the point under discussion. In the excerpt, the interpreter seems to ‘reduce’<sup>204</sup> an important part of the original in which the lawyer explains why the IND might have a strong point. The underlined part in turn 373 is reduced in the rendition.

Excerpt:

**373** Lawyer: .hh dat is al een belangrijk punt in je verhaal= waar de waar de IND ook op gaat **zitten** (.) van **waarom waarom** hebben die politieagenten

---

<sup>204</sup> About 22% of the renditions made during the encounter belong to the ‘reduced renditions’ group (see table 5.1 in chapter Five).

dit gedaan, ik bedoel= ze kregen de opdracht om jou (.) **op** te pakken =want ze wisten waar je was (.) en ze laten je gewoon (.) lopen= zo zullen ze zelf ook in problemen komen.

Lawyer: .hh this is already an important point in your backstory= which which the IND will **scrutinize** (.) in the sense **why why** did those police agents did this, I mean=they were assigned to (.) arrest you=for they knew where you were (.) and they just let you (.) go=this way they will get into trouble themselves too.

**374** المترجم: يعني هاي النقطة بدها تركز عليها دائرة الهجرة والتجنيس إي الشرطة لشو عملو هوك هيك هني إي كانو عرفانين انت وين وجايين لعندك ومسكوك<sup>205</sup> ولو كان بدون اياك كانوا أخذوك هيك ما كانوا خلوك هيك تهرب!

Interpreter: yaʕni this point the immigration and Naturalization Service will concentrate on e: the police why did they do this they e knew where you were and they came to you and caught you (*immigrant interjects: "right"*) and if they had wanted you they would've taken you just like that they wouldn't have let you escape so easily!

**375** اللاجئ: والله .. (غير واضح) تنزل تحت تس تسمع ضرب رصاص .. (غير واضح) نقوس تهرب انت (.) ابوك عدنا ترجع تسلم حالك.

Immigrant: well [*unintelligible*] you go down when you hea hear shots [*unintelligible*] we shoot you run away (.) we have your father later you give yourself up again.

**376-377** Interpreter: Dat weet ik niet .. [*unintelligible*]<sup>206</sup> je gaat naar buit= je gaat naar beneden (.) en als je beschietingen hoort<sup>207</sup> dan moet je vluchten en daarna weer melden want (.) wij hebben jouw vader (.) toen ik waarom (.) naar rede vroeg e e zeiden ze e e dat ik m'n mond maar moest doen<sup>208</sup>.

Interpreter: I don't know .. [*unintelligible*] you go outsi= you go down (.) and if you hear shelling [sic] then you must ran a way and then report again for (.) we have your father (.) when I why (.) informed about the reason e e they said e e that I had to shut up.

During post-IME interview II, the researcher wanted to identify why the interpreter made this reduction and whether there was a conscious strategy. The interpreter said that he had 'no idea why' he had made this reduction (section 5.5.1). Looking at the transcribed text of the IME, there appear to be

<sup>205</sup> The immigrant interjects: 'correct'.

<sup>206</sup> Muddled talk.

<sup>207</sup> Last four words are pronounced in a nonchalant manner unlike how the immigrant had talked.

<sup>208</sup> Especially the last seven words pronounced in a flat and thinking manner.

no indications in the text preceding this extract that this piece of information had been mentioned earlier, which could have been the reason why the interpreter might have felt that it was not necessary to mention it again. Looking at the structure of the utterance, however, it is possible that the complex linguistic nature of the original could have caused the interpreter to not to be able to keep the reduced part. The original starts with a statement by the lawyer. Using the second personal pronoun, the lawyer directs his utterance towards the immigrant. He provides an evaluation of what he will say next: “hh that is already an important point in your story.” Then, arguably, he wants to change footing and talk from the perspective of the IND. He does this by predicting that the IND will come up with a stance, which he introduces, arguably, from the perspective of the IND: “which which the IND will **scrutinize**.” Note the stressed lexical item “**scrutinize**”; arguably the accent placed on this, together with the accent placed on the lexical items “**why why**” (see “**why why** those police agents did this”), show that that he is presenting the point of view of the IND from the perspective of the IND itself. Then, the lawyer again changes footing and introduces his point of view by saying “I mean=....”.

Looking at the rendition, it seems that that the interpreter manages to match these changes of footing. This does not mean, however, that this happened at no cost. Possibly, the change of footing required more attention from him than would have been the case if the original was without change of footing. The task of the interpreter might have been made even more challenging when the immigrant came in with the interjection “correct” relatively close to where the ‘reduced’ part would have come. It is thus possible that the interpreter’s chain of thought was interrupted with this interjection (see turn 374). When the immigrant takes his turn (turn 375), no trace is found of the missing part (the reduced part), which could mean that the reduction on the part of the interpreter caused him to miss that part. It is interesting to observe that when the interpreter takes a further turn, translating the response of the immigrant (see turn 376), he produces an expanded rendition in which he appears to add information not said by the immigrant, but sought by the lawyer, which is the explanation the lawyer was searching for in his original (see turn no 373 in the excerpt above): “[...] **why why** those police agents

did this [...].” Recall, as explained above, that the lawyer is presenting the view of the IND and hopes to take the perspective of the immigrant in the form of an explanation. It is not quite clear whether the interpreter made this expanded rendition because he found it difficult to produce a close rendition for linguistic reasons, or because he realized that the lawyer wanted an answer to the missing part which he by then had realized he had reduced in the previous rendition. It is not unthinkable that the interpreter at that point realized that the question of the lawyer had been left unanswered, and he might have felt during the interaction that he had to compensate for the reduced part. It is impossible to know now if during the interaction he was aware that he made a reduced rendition; but it is possible that he later became aware that the answer sought by the lawyer had not been given yet. It is also interesting to see that the expansion he produced was made in a way that could be understood to be the answer to the question of the lawyer. This part was produced in a vague way, possibly to prevent the immigrant from knowing he was making a divergent rendition of his original, in case the immigrant was able understand his rendition towards the lawyer. It was possibly produced to satisfy the need of the lawyer for an answer. No clear-cut reference to the question of the lawyer was made. The lawyer then proceeded to another point. Having said this, during interview II with the interpreter, the interpreter said that he had ‘no idea why’ he had made this reduction, possibly because he did not remember what had happened back then. The researcher tends to think that the interpreter was distracted during the production of the first original in this excerpt by the interjection of the immigrant, and that he realized that he had reduced this part of the original when the immigrant produced his original.

The point the researcher wants to make here is that the complex, unfolding nature of talk during such ‘communicative activities’ (with responses) constituted a challenge to the interpreter. Time constraints, as explained in section 6.3.1.1 above, in combination with the complex nature of talk could bring with them the possibility that the interpreter might take translation decisions he might not have taken if he had had more time. The researcher argues that the interpreter in this excerpt found the process of evaluation and re-evaluation of his own thinking (the internal dialogue) challenging because

of the sometimes complex nature of talk and the immediate nature of such encounters. The fact that the interpreter in this excerpt and in the excerpt in the previous section arguably realized that he had to repair the mistake he had made in the previous rendition could be evidence of this point. It is noticeable that, during interview I with him, the immigrant turned out to have understood the rendition<sup>209</sup>.

The researcher will argue in the following section that there is an interrelationship between this sometimes complex nature of talk (discussed in this section), the immediate nature of the talk/IME (discussed in section 6.3.1.1) and memory.

### **6.3.1.3 Memory/recollection**

As has become clear now, the nature of interpreting as a profession brings with it the need on the part of the interpreter to deal with discourse almost as it is being produced. It takes place in 'real-time'. Further, with regard to producing renditions, the process of sense-making on the part of the interpreter begins the moment the lawyer starts to produce his original, and does not stop when the lawyer stops talking. It goes on until the rendition has been produced, because the immigrant too contributes to this sense-making. The very presence of the immigrant brings with it his influence on the process of meaning-making, even if he does not say anything. In addition, as has been referred to earlier, unlike translators, interpreters do not have (enough) time to reflect on their translations; and arguably often do not have enough time to take (enough) notes<sup>210</sup>. The interpreter is required to be able to engage with the produced original as it is being produced and (often) to proceed to the next one while being produced. This 'online'/real-time nature of this profession together with the complexity of the nature of its discourse arguably burdens the memory of the interpreter.

---

<sup>209</sup> Out of 110 renditions made during the encounter, 93 were concluded to have been understood by the immigrant. These findings are part of my second research question.

<sup>210</sup> The interpreter mentioned that he takes notes during his work. He said that he produces enough of them.

In other cases, the interpreter might just forget to translate something without the challenges introduced in this section having had an influence. For example, in the extract below (turn 1), the lawyer has just started the meeting with the immigrant. He tells the immigrant that he and the immigrant have long been busy with the asylum procedure. It is noticeable that the adverbial “long” has been reduced by the interpreter. During interview II, the interpreter said he must have forgotten to translate it (see section 5.5.3.1). He was unable to find another reason. The interpreter did not mention what could have caused this forgetting.

Excerpt:

1 Lawyer: goed (....) .hhhh (.) ja we zijn al la:ng bezig met jouw::  
asielprocedure.

Lawyer: good (....) .hhhh (.) yeah we have been busy with you::r asylum  
procedure for a lo:ng time.

2 المترجم: إحنا صارنا فترة (.) عم نشغل مشغولين ب: (.) إجراءات لجو:تك.

Interpreter: we have been working on been busy with: (.) your asylum  
proce:dure (.) for some time.

It is not clear what caused the interpreter to make this reduction. The original is not very long. So, it is not anticipated that the length of the rendition caused him to forget. The interpreter is not very likely to have been tired, as he had just started to translate. Further, the encounter did not take place at the end of a long day for the interpreter. It is more probable that he “just” forgot. It is possible that while developing his thoughts during his internal dialogue, that he was distracted by some afforded ‘material’ provided by one of the primary interlocutors. It is also possible that this was visual ‘material’ as nothing could be heard in the recorded audio. The turns that follow do not show any interactional indications about this piece of information; i.e. the reduction was not recovered. We will never know, but it is possible that because this piece of information was not decisive for understanding the original and because the immigrant already knew that he had been busy with his immigration procedure, no attention was given to it, or it went unnoticed. The interpreter relativized the impact of this reduction during interview II

saying that the immigrant knew that he had been busy with the procedure for a long time.

To make my point clear, it is the very nature of interpreting which brings with it the loss of some afforded 'material'. If this 'text' was not oral but written and it was required to be translated into another language, the written translator would have probably not forgotten to translate it. During interview I, the immigrant seemed to have understood the original. The reduction does not seem to have influenced his understanding. This sub-category (which deals with forgetting) is mentioned eight times in the data (see table 5.4.3.1).

In the current section, the researcher has discussed the findings of the 'no conscious strategy' group. This group comprises those renditions where the interpreter did or could not provide motivations/explanations during interview II. Because the researcher lacked the perspective of the interpreter, he based the discussion on the nature of the profession, that of its discourse and the transcribed text. It needs to be mentioned that the researcher has divided the discussion into three sections for organizational purposes, not to suggest that the discussed phenomena happen separately from each other. They can all occur in one rendition.

In the following section, the researcher will discuss the findings of the 'strategies followed' group (see section 5.6). In this case, the researcher does have the perspective of the interpreter and will therefore base the discussion on this.

### 6.3.2 Discussion of ‘strategies followed’ group

The findings of post-IME interview II show that the interpreter, whilst probably unaware of dialogism as a theory, was to a considerable extent aware of how sense-making takes place in IMEs as explained in chapter Three. His answers suggest that 1) he thinks it is his job as an interpreter to help realise ‘shared understanding’ (Wadensjö, 1998) between the lawyer and the immigrant, 2) that he thinks he must bridge the differences in knowledge between the immigrant and the lawyer, 3) that he is aware that the nature of communication in ‘communicative event(s)’ such as the one under investigation is different than that dealt with by translators, who work with written texts, and that this fact brings with it challenges he must deal with, 4) that he thinks that the context in which this ‘communicative event’ takes place is important to be taken into consideration when renditions are produced, and 5) that he thinks that the previous knowledge of the primary interlocutors has an influence on how communication progresses during such ‘communicative events’. These points correspond to central concepts in dialogism regarding how sense is made during conversations. The points referred to correspond respectively to 1) the notion of intersubjectivity, 2) the notion of alterity, 3) the fact that the interrelationship between notions like implicitness and vagueness with context (which bring about the dialogic nature of situated interactions) leads to understanding becoming ‘fragmentary’, ‘partial’, and ‘partially shared’ (Rommetveit), 4) the notion of ‘contextualism’ (Linell), and 5) the notion of STR (Linell). The researcher argues that these views must have had an influence on the manner in which the interpreter produced his renditions during the IME under investigation, and that the translation decisions of this interpreter can be understood by utilizing the central dialogical concepts referred to in this paragraph<sup>211</sup>. In the sections below, the researcher will discuss the translation decisions of the interpreter and link them to the corresponding dialogical concepts. Each time an excerpt will be utilized to provide context to the discussion. The

---

<sup>211</sup> These concepts have been dealt with in the theory chapter (see section 3.1.4).

researcher will start now with the first two concepts: alterity and intersubjectivity.

## **A general introduction**

As indicated in the theory chapter (section 3.1.4.2), in dialogism, the term 'intersubjectivity' is used to refer to the interrelationship of communicating individuals with regard to co-operating communicatively during a social event with the aim of making sense of the world. And indeed, it can be observed in the collected data that the interpreter shows a tendency to want to help the immigrant understand the originals of the lawyer. At the same time, the interpreter makes clear that he takes the 'differentiated knowledge' between the immigrant and the lawyer into account when he produces his renditions. This last refers to the concept of 'alterity' in dialogism. In the collected data, which is collected during post-IME interview II with the interpreter, the interpreter arguably places more emphasis on alterity than on intersubjectivity when he discusses his strategies/decisions. He mentions that the differences between the lawyer and the immigrant need to be bridged during the process of producing the renditions; otherwise, the immigrant would not understand, he argues. He is found to place more importance on making the rendition understandable than on producing close renditions. The interpreter says that he produces his rendition within the freedom he has with the lawyer. However, this does not mean that he actively seeks to produce divergent renditions; the findings in this study show that the biggest group of renditions is 'close renditions', with 35% of his renditions being 'close renditions'<sup>212</sup>. Because of the greater prominence the interpreter gives in the collected data to what is termed 'alterity' in dialogism than to intersubjectivity, the first discussed concept which will be discussed is 'alterity'.

---

<sup>212</sup> Followed by the 'reduced renditions' category: about 22% of the renditions (see table 5.1 in chapter five).

### 6.3.2.1 Alterity

As indicated above, the interpreter stated that he often chooses to lower the register during the IME where he acts as interpreter; that is he utilizes ʕaammiya Arabic, which is informal Arabic that is utilized in daily life, not Modern Standard Arabic (MSA), which is the language of media, education, etc. He said that it was apparent from the syntax and vocabulary choices of the immigrant that he had enjoyed only a few years of education (see sections 5.6.3 and 5.6.10 for example), something also mentioned by the immigrant during post-IME interview I with the immigrant<sup>213</sup>.

It is believed that the interpreter meant by ‘lowering register’, in addition to choosing the informal mode of Arabic, that he used less complex syntax (compared to the syntax used by lawyers) and less challenging vocabulary, resulting in a communicative style which is accessible to the layman. It is not unthinkable that he mentioned that he lowers the register partly to save his professional face for ‘triadic speech events’ “[...] inherently contain a degree of threat to face [...]” (Mason and Stewart, 2001: 52). The interpreter said this in the context of producing divergent renditions, for example when he reduces *في لحظة معينة* [*at a certain moment*] in the excerpt below, or when ‘substituting’ “uitgelegd” [*explained*] with *فالتلك* [(she) *told you*]. Especially in the last case, it seems likely that he was trying to save his professional face (for more examples, see section 5.3.5.10).

The interpreter argued that if he had not lowered the register, the immigrant would have encountered difficulties in understanding the renditions. This opinion is expressed by the interpreter several times in the data, sometimes directly and sometime indirectly. The extract below shows one of the cases where the interpreter referred to this explanation/motivation. This shows that the interpreter takes alterity seriously when he takes decisions regarding how to translate. In this example, the lawyer is busy discussing the backstory of the immigrant. He is trying to ascertain whether his understanding of a

---

<sup>213</sup> Arguably, generally, when Middle Easterners mention that the educational level of somebody is not high, they mean that their education is limited, perhaps only to primary school. Given that mass education is relatively recent across the Arab world, there is not necessarily any stigma attached to having a modest level of literacy. The immigrant referred to this on several occasions.

certain part of the backstory is correct. In the context of the IME, the immigrant is meant to respond indicating whether the understanding of the lawyer is correct or not. If it is not, the immigrant is supposed to correct the information referred to by the lawyer (see section 1.2.3).

In the excerpt below, after the lawyer produces his original, the interpreter takes his turn and starts producing his rendition. If we take a close look at the rendition, we will see that it belongs to the ‘reduced+substituted rendition’<sup>214</sup> category, which means that he made reductions. One of the reductions the interpreter made concerns the adverbial “op een given moment” [*at a given moment*]. The researcher wanted to know why.

The interpreter mentioned that this reduction was needed because the “educational level” of the immigrant would not have allowed him to understand it if this adverbial had been rendered. The translation of the adverbial, في لحظة معينة, [*at a certain moment*], would have been over-formal, according to the interpreter. This expression, which he would have produced, was considered by the interpreter to be MSA, and thus unsuitable for this client: the immigrant would have found it difficult to understand. This is the reason he chose not to translate it, according to the interpreter.

The interpreter seems to think that if he afforded this adverbial, the immigrant might not be able to evaluate it in a correct way in his internal dialogue because he might not have been exposed to it previously, which might trouble the process of sense-making. The interpreter therefore chose to reduce it especially because he thinks that the reduction of this kind of ‘material’ does not affect the process of sense-making. The rendition gives the ‘intended meaning’ even if it is reduced; i.e. reducing this material does not affect the meaning that was intended by the lawyer, according to the interpreter (see section 5.6.1).

Excerpt:

**55** Lawyer: e:m ik heb begrepen dat e: tus ik heb het verhaal zo begrepen=  
jouw vriendin (.) of nee jouw jouw neef had een vriendin e: een meisje leren

---

<sup>214</sup> This and the other categories show the interrelationship between the originals and the renditions. They belong to the taxonomy of Wadensjö. See Table 5.1 in chapter Five.

kennen .hh waarmee e: ja die wat aanrommelde<sup>215</sup> om het zo maar te zeggen .hh (.) en (.) en op een gegeven moment heeft **jou** neef aan jou gevraagd om mee te gaan= zodat het meisje **ook** een vriendin mee zou nemen (.) en dan zou het allemaal wat minder (..) opvallen.

Lawyer: e:m I have understood that e: tog. I have understood the story in such a way=your **girlfriend** (.) or no your your cousin had a girlfriend e: had met a girl .hh with whom e: yeah he used to mess around a little bit (*chuckles*) to put it this way .hh (.) and (.) and at a given moment **your** cousin asked you to accompany [them]=so that the girl **too** would take along a [girl] friend (.) and then things would be less (..) noticeable.

56 المترجم: يعني: (.) حسب ما هوى (.) فهم أئو ابن عمك (.) كان عندو رفيقة: (.) وعمل معا شغلًا:ت، (.) وقال لك قال لك أئو تجي معو مشان هي كمان تجيب رفيقتها معا= مشان تغطو على هالموضوع.

Interpreter: yaʕni: (.) according to how he (.) has understood your cousin had a girl:friend (.) and he did things to her (.) and he said he said to you to come with him so that she too brings her [girl] friend with her=so you cover up this thing.

One cannot, of course, take all the answers of the interpreter as solid facts. While one might not be able to exclude that other reason(s) could have caused this reduction, for example reasons related to the nature of interpreting as a profession or memory (see section 6.3.1) or because these kind of expressions could be difficult to translate from Dutch into informal Arabic, it is noticeable that the interpreter here and also elsewhere in the data refers to the fact he has to take the 'differentiated knowledge' of interlocutors into account when he translates.

The other point the researcher wants to make here is that there are no 'textual' or 'activity' (as understood by Wadensjö) clues which would have helped him to conclude this strategy on the part of the interpreter had I not spoken to him personally. Further, the interpreter's explanation shows the importance of STK/R for sense-making during such encounters. Arguably, the choice of the interpreter to use informal language and the interrelated information given above is related to knowledge he gained during other interpreting jobs, which I discuss further below (sections 6.3.2.4 - 6.3.2.5).

It is worth mentioning that the findings relating to the second research question, on whether the immigrant understands the rendition or not, have

<sup>215</sup> Here lawyer laughs nasally.

shown that this rendition was partly not understood, meaning that most of the information in the original was understood. The part that was not understood related to the “yes he messed up with” element. The rest of the original was understood. This means that reducing that adverbial did not have influence on meaning-making, as argued also by the interpreter.

In this section, I showed that the interpreter adapts his translation decisions/strategies to suit the educational level of the immigrant. Thus he takes the ‘differentiated knowledge’ between the lawyer and the immigrant into account and chooses a translation strategy/decision accordingly. Adaptation of register and this kind of translation strategy/decision are arguably meant to serve the interests of the immigrant with regard to understanding the originals of the lawyer. This brings us to the next notion, intersubjectivity. This is a central notion in the theory of dialogism with regard to sense-making.

### **6.3.2.2 Intersubjectivity**

In the excerpt below, where the lawyer is busy with his third communicative project, he is asking the immigrant a question that is designed to elicit information that the lawyer might be able to use to the advantage of the immigrant during the ongoing legal procedure<sup>216</sup>. The interpreter produces an expanded rendition<sup>217</sup>. As explained in the findings chapter (section 5.6.16), the interpreter expanded ‘authorities’ with ‘regime’. The interpreter mentioned that he wanted to help the immigrant understand what ‘authorities’ meant; he was concerned that the immigrant would not understand the original term, because Syrians, according to the interpreter, generally use the word “regime” instead of “authorities” in such contexts.

If we look at turn 361 below, which of course precedes turn 365, we will see that the interpreter produced a substitution (‘regime’ is used instead of ‘authorities’). This could mean that expanding ‘authorities’ in the example below with ‘regime’ was not a coincidence, but rather a decision taken

---

<sup>216</sup> Detailed information is provided on the asylum procedure and the purpose of this IME in sections 1.2.2 and 1.2.3 respectively.

<sup>217</sup> Only 8% of the renditions produced belong to this category (see table 5.1 in chapter Five).

consciously. This, in turn, shows that the interpreter possibly wanted to “help” the immigrant with sense-making. It could be said that the interpreter, in his internal dialogue, decided to produce this expansion when he realized that the immigrant might find it difficult to make sense of the original afforded ‘material’. The findings show that the immigrant understood this rendition.

Excerpt:

**360** Lawyer: waar ben je het meeste bang voor, voor de autoriteiten, je vader of voor de familie (.) Hussein,

Lawyer: what are you afraid of the most, of the authorities, your father or of the Hussein (.) family,

**361** المترجم: مين أكثر (.) ناس او جهة بتخاف عل حياتك منا؟ (.) بِيَّك؟ النظام، ولا عائلة الحسين؟

Interpreter: Which (.) people or party are you afraid the most of for you life? (.) your father? the regime, or the Hussein family?

**362** اللاجئ: والله الكل<sup>218</sup>.

Immigrant: Actually all of them.

**363** ...

**364** Lawyer: waarom ben je bang voor de autoriteiten,

Lawyer: why are you afraid of the authorities,

**365** المترجم: لشو انتى خايف من السلطات، او النظام،

Interpreter: Why are afraid of the authorities, or the regime,

In section 6.3.2.1 and 6.3.2.2, the researcher has shown that the interpreter seems to be aware of the influence of alterity and intersubjectivity on the process of sense-making during the encounter. The researcher has also shown that this awareness is reflected in his production of renditions. The interpreter actively coordinates the interaction in order to accommodate the communicational needs of the immigrant. The findings show that the

<sup>218</sup> He says this in a sad manner.

interpreter wants to make the immigrant understand this rendition. It turned out during interview I that the immigrant did indeed understand the rendition.

In the following section, the researcher will argue that the interpreter was to a considerable extent aware of the challenges that IMEs bring with them for interpreters. More concretely, he is found to be aware of the challenges that the (generally) dialogic nature of interpreting as a profession brings with it for the interpreter.

### **6.3.2.3 The dialogic nature of the communicative event**

The interpreter is found to be to a considerable extent aware of the influence of the dialogic nature of the communicative activity on the process of meaning-making during the IME. He is also found to be aware of the fragmentary nature of meaning-making in such a communicative encounter. He mentioned that unlike written translation, interpreting is not about translating ‘word for word’; it is about making the immigrant understand what the lawyer says (section 5.6.1). The interpreter must sometimes produce reductions, substitutions etc. in order to be able to “make things clear for the immigrant”, said the interpreter. Interpreting is about ‘tāwḍīḥ’ (*making clear*) for the immigrant (section 5.6.16), according to the interpreter. The interpreter must also even guide when needed in the process of creating mutual understanding. There are 4 examples in the data (section 5.6.16) where the interpreter produced expansions, the explanation for this, according to the interpreter, being a willingness to “make things clear for the immigrant”. He said that if he had not done this, the immigrant might not have understood the renditions. We will discuss one of these examples.

In the excerpt below, the lawyer is recounting how the backstory goes according to the information he has in his files, which is his second communicative project during the IME. As mentioned section 1.2.3, the lawyer expects the immigrant to either confirm this information or to correct and/or complement it. Looking at the rendition, we notice that the interpreter produces an expansion. When requested to explain expanding the rendition with the adverbial *بعد هالموضوع* [*after this incident*], the interpreter indicated

that he did so “in order to make things clear for the immigrant, in order to avoid questions like “when?” being asked.” The interpreter therefore seems to be providing context in order to empower the immigrant to understand the rendition. He is aware that that if the context is not clear, this might make understanding difficult. We discussed in chapter Five the fact that context is essential for understanding meaning. If the wrong context is selected when evaluating the talk of others, an incorrect evaluation and thus miscommunication may ensue.

Excerpt:

**123** Lawyer: ok (..) e:mm (..) nou uiteindelijk hebben ze jullie laten gaan met een waarschuwing en heb je ook aantal weken geen contact met haar gezocht.

Lawyer: ok (..) e:mm (..) well eventually they let you go with a warning and you too did not seek to contact her for a number of weeks.

**124** المترجم: وفي النهاية أعطوكو تحذير و و و إي إي خلّوكن (.) تمشو (.) وانت لمدة (.) عدة أسابيع بعد هالموضوع (.) ما كان في اتصال بينك وبيننا.

Interpreter: And in the end they gave you a warning and and and e e they let you (.) go away (.) and you for (.) several weeks after this thing (.) there was no contact between you and her.

It needs to be mentioned that the original is unproblematic. The fact that the lawyer did not provide the extra context is no coincidence. As explained in chapter Five (see Implicitness, section 3.1.6.1), interlocutors do not make explicit every aspect of meaning. Some of it is left implicit. Implicitness forms an essential part of talk. The fact that the interpreter does this here could be interpreted as his wish to empower the immigrant. The interpreter seems to try to help the interpreter in the process of sense-making because the fragmentary nature of meaning-making during such encounters could sometimes impede sense-making. Of course, it is also possible that the interpreter said this to save his professional face.

In this section, the researcher has argued that the interpreter is aware of the influence of the dialogical nature of this profession on how sense is made, even if we did not have solid evidence that his explanation was genuine. As

has been pointed out, this dialogical nature brings with it the fact that context is incorporated in the process of sense-making. As discussed in chapter Three, engaging context is essential for interlocutors to be able to understand. In the following section, we will consider how the interpreter incorporates the notion of context in his decision-making process.

#### **6.3.2.4 Importance of context in decision-making on the part of the interpreter**

The interpreter has been found to be aware of the importance of context for sense-making and to take it into consideration when producing a rendition. He has been found to take two types of context into consideration during the evaluation of the afforded 'material' and the re-evaluation of his own thinking in the process of sense-making (i.e. in his internal dialogue): the first type of context a) relates to the setting where the IME takes place, while the second b) relates to the influence of the content of the conversation being dealt with. The researcher will now discuss the first type.

With regard to the first type of context, the interpreter indicated that the setting where he works influences how he chooses his translation decisions/strategies. As shown in section 5.6.8, the interpreter says that as an interpreter one has to stay very close to the original when one translates for formal institutions like the IND or the police, etc.; one has to translate 'word for word'. When interpreting in lawyers' offices, however, the interpreters adapt his strategies to the new setting which is characterized by its "shwayya [somewhat] informal nature;" one does not have to translate literally, word for word, as one would do at police interrogations, or in other more formal settings, said the interpreter. This is also seen in the excerpt below.

In the excerpt, the lawyer is revising the backstory of the immigrant. In a previous turn (no 57), the immigrant had corrected a piece of information for the lawyer: the girl he went out with was the sister of the girlfriend of his cousin, not her friend. In this turn below (no 119), while reading the backstory of the immigrant, the lawyer notices in his older notes that the information

corrected in turn 57 had already been corrected by the immigrant in a previous IME between him and the immigrant. He declares this to the immigrant. The interpreter made a 'reduced' rendition of this original. He reduced 'goed [good]' and 'trouwens [by the way]'.

When asked if he could explain this decision, the interpreter responded that the setting where he was working (for the lawyer) must have been the reason why he chose during the IME to reduce 'goed [good]' and 'trouwens [by the way]'. He was not sure anymore. He thinks that at that point he must have thought that they could be "neglected" because they were considered not important in the utterance - they do not add to the meaning, nor does their absence affect it, as he said – or that in that context (the office of the lawyer) he took the free choice of just not translating them. He would have chosen to translate "word for word" if this encounter had taken place in a police bureau, for example, or in another official setting.

As indicated earlier, it is impossible to know what led the interpreter to make these reductions back then. There could be many different reasons related to the nature of interpreting as profession, or memory, or both. It is also possible that this is indeed a policy that the interpreter adopts related to the consideration indicated above. The other possibility is that a combination of these factors caused these reductions to be made by the interpreter. The findings show that the immigrant understood the original. The immigrant confirms it was indeed the "sister" of the girlfriend of the cousin, not her girlfriend (see turn 121 below).

Excerpt:

**119** Lawyer: ok (...) °goed° Jah ik zie trouwens dat ik in de correcties en aanvullingen had ik dat al gecorrigeerd (.) dat het niet om de vriendin ging (.) maar om de zus.

Lawyer: Ok (...) °good° yeah by the way I see in the Corrections and Additions that I already had corrected that (.) that it was not about a girlfriend (.) but about her sister.

**120** المترجم: هو (.) شايف هون (.) في التصحيحات والإضافات (.) أنو صلح هالموضوع (.) أنو مو رفيقتنا (.) وأنما اختنا.

Interpreter: He (.) sees here (.) in the Corrections and Additions (.) that he

corrected this matter (.) that it's not her girlfriend (.) but her sister.

121 اللاجئ: اخنا صح

Immigrant: her sister correct

This is not the only context that the interpreter seems to take into account when he makes decisions with regard to the renditions he produces. The context related to the position of the immigrant in the legal procedure also seems to have an influence on his decision-making process.

Related to (a) the 'context of the discussed in the previous section is (b) the context of the legal procedure which is dealt with during the IME. In this study both are taken into account when renditions are made by the interpreter. In addition to the explanation discussed in the previous sections of why he chose to reduce 'goed [good]' and 'trouwens [by the way]', the interpreter mentioned that, during this meeting, the backstory of the immigrant was being revisited and the 'material' was thus not new to the immigrant, according to the interpreter. Accordingly, there was no need to produce 'close' renditions in this case. The immigrant must have understood the original, he said. Looking at the findings of post-IME interview I (with the immigrant), it appears that the immigrant had indeed understood the rendition.

As mentioned earlier in this section, if we look at the text of the IME, we will see that the topic which is being addressed in this original (turn 119 below) was already discussed at an earlier stage of the encounter. In turn 62, the immigrant had indicated that the person talked about in this turn was the "sister". It is probable that the "shwayya [somewhat] informal nature" made him assume the freedom to make these reductions, especially because he knew that this subject had already been talked about. If we look at turn 120 below, we will see that the interpreter uses "he corrected this matter" to remind the immigrant that this subject had already been mentioned.

Excerpt:

**119** Lawyer: ok (...) °goed° Jah ik zie trouwens dat ik in de correcties en aanvullingen had ik dat al gecorrigeerd (.) dat het niet om de vriendin ging (.) maar om de zus.

Lawyer: Ok (...) °good° yeah by the way I see in the Corrections and Additions that I already had corrected that (.) that it was not about a girlfriend (.) but about her sister.

**120** المترجم: هو (.) شايف هون (.) في التصحيحات والإضافات (.) أنو صلح هالموضوع (.) أنو مو رفيقتنا (.) وأنما اختنا.

Interpreter: He (.) sees here (.) in the Corrections and Additions (.) that he corrected this matter (.) that it's not her girlfriend (.) but her sister.

The relevance of previous knowledge on sense-making mentioned here brings us to the next topic, where I will argue that interpreter is well aware of the influence of STK/R on sense-making and that he takes this information into account when he makes decisions with regard to translation strategies.

### **6.3.2.5 Influence of STK/R on the strategies of the interpreter**

The interpreter has been found to integrate STK/R when he makes translation decisions, whether this knowledge is information he himself gained in the past during previous jobs, or information he thinks has been gained by the immigrant previously. With regard to the first type, an example is the knowledge the interpreter gained about the manner in which interpreters should translate for the IND, the police, and other formal institutions, in contrast to how interpreters should translate for other institutions which are less formal, such as lawyers' practices (as discussed in section 6.3.2.4). With regard to the second type, an example is the information that has been dealt with by the immigrant and the lawyer during previous meetings.

With regard to the second type, my data includes divergent renditions where the interpreter attributes certain translation decisions to the assumption (on his part) that the immigrant would understand these renditions even though they were not close. The interpreter explained this by saying that the 'material' which were then being discussed by the lawyer and the immigrant

were already known to them both because they had discussed them in the past, during previous meetings. This category is represented three times in the data. As mentioned previously (section 5.4.3.1), this frequency does not necessarily show the importance (or otherwise) of this group of findings. It is just noted to show how many times it was mentioned during the interview with the interpreter.

In the excerpt below (turn 95), the lawyer is revisiting the backstory of the immigrant. The interpreter produces a substituted rendition. The immigrant agrees with the rendition even though it arguably does not reflect the original exactly: “Klap krijgen” [to get hit] was substituted with ضريك [beat you]. During post-IME interview II with the interpreter, the researcher argued that ضريك was not as specific as “klap krijgen”. The interpreter responded that a close translation would be وجهلك ضربة [to deal you a blow] but this is not used in Syrian colloquial Arabic, where one would say “ضريك” [beat you]. I then reminded him that ضريك can mean different things, like “hitting with fists”, “slapping”, etc. He responded: “[the translation] gives the intended meaning; it suffices”. When asked if there were any other possible reasons, he responded “e::, because both [the immigrant and the lawyer] are talking about something they already know, they understand it and I thought the word ضريك is sufficient and the meaning is clear to both parties already.”

Excerpt:

**94** Lawyer: en jij krijgt toen een klap (.) van een van de agenten.

Lawyer: and then you received a blow (.) from one of the policemen.

**95** المترجم: واحد من هول الشرطة ضريك؟

Interpreter: one of them (.) of these policemen hit you?

**96** اللاجئ: صح

Immigrant: correct

As indicated in the discussion of reliability (section 7.6.3 below), one cannot guarantee that the interpreter has been able to remember what happened during the encounter itself; however, the type of explanation he provides has

been repeatedly given (see previous sections), which could mean that he is showing here how he really thinks he should be translating. This could then be seen as STK/R that he must have gained and which he uses here to explain his rendition. A “textual” approach (Wadensjö) or one based on CA would have been unlikely to have provided this information.

During the interview with him, the interpreter has been found to be aware that it is not always possible to produce close renditions, for different types of reasons. In the following section, I will argue that the interpreter often, whether consciously or unconsciously, produces renditions which are “good enough” for the current context where they are produced.

### **6.3.2.6 Understandings for “current practical purpose”**

The interpreter is found to be often working towards producing understanding that is sufficient for the immigrant at the particular stage of communication. This is a theoretical point discussed in section 3.1.6.3. As noted there, discussing the notion of understanding, Linell stresses that only partial understanding is meant and also stresses that understanding is needed only for current practical purposes. In the excerpt below, the lawyer is revisiting the backstory of the immigrant (turn 244). The interpreter does not start translating immediately. He engages in a side-sequence with the lawyer. He wants to obtain information on something mentioned by the lawyer before he produces his rendition. When he gets the answer from the lawyer, without back-channelling with the immigrant, the interpreter produces a rendition where the last sentence of the first original is reduced (turn 248). When asked about why he decided to take this decision, he said that in this case this ‘يفي بالغرض’ [*suffices for the purpose*].

We will never know what exactly happened at that point, but it is probable that the side-sequence had caused the interpreter to forget the detailed structure of the first original of the lawyer. However, due to the fact that “the family”, a major character in the backstory, was well-known to the immigrant, he must have known what the interpreter meant by “such a family”, especially because this original was used in the context of discussing the

consequences of the enmity of this family for him. The interpreter for his part might have thought that his rendition was not a close one, but that the immigrant probably had already understood which family the first original was talking about. During interview I, the immigrant seemed to have understood the original of the lawyer.

Excerpt:

**244** Lawyer: en mense mensen zeiden hoe (.) haal het je in je hoofd om met **die** familie e problemen te maken. De familie van (.) jouw vriendin bedoelde ze.

Lawyer: and people people said how (.) **did** you get it into your head to make e problems with **that** e family. They meant the family (.) of your girlfriend.

**245** Interpreter: mensen zei u?

Interpreter: you said people, Sir?

**246** Lawyer: ja de politieagenten

Lawyer: yes the police officers

**247** Interpreter: o de politie.

Interpreter: oh the police.

**248** المترجم: وقالك (.) الشرطة فلأك شو: (.) كي:ف خطر ببالك أتو تعمل (.) مشكل مع هيك (.) عائلة (.) مع هدولى الناس.

Interpreter: and (.) the police said what the hell (.) how did you get it into your head to make (.) problems with such (.) a family (.) with those people.

**249** اللاجئ: صح

Immigrant: correct

### 6.3.3 Conclusion

The purpose of this chapter has been to discuss the findings of the study. The researcher has shown that the methodological decisions taken in this study regarding data collection have helped generate valuable data, which would not have become available if the analysis had been based only on the transcribed data. Regarding the second research question about whether or not the immigrant understands the originals (via the renditions), it has been found that the immigrant understands the majority of the renditions (section 5.2.1). How can this be explained?

Based on this data, we have learnt that the immigrant does not depend on renditions only during the process of sense-making; he resorts also to a good extent to his STK/R during this process. For example, he has been found to sometimes make assumptions regarding the 'material' afforded by the interpreter, assumptions which are not warranted by the 'materials' that are afforded in the rendition produced by the interpreter. Other times, he is found to make assumptions that certain 'materials' have been afforded in the rendition when that is not the case, etc. In all the cases which belong to section 6.2.1 he has been found to have incorporated in his 'internal dialogue' during sense-making, 'material' related to his previous knowledge (i.e. STK/R). The above might be a possible explanation for why the majority of the renditions in the study were understood; for the immigrant had been exposed to this information during earlier IMEs among others with the lawyer. In addition, much of the treated information dealt with in these originals was related to something he was already familiar with: his backstory.

**However** this does not mean that STK/R helps in all cases, for not all originals were understood, even those in which STK/R played an important role. It is noticeable that these cases are of a legal nature or related to the legal procedure (discussed in section 6.2.2). Although the immigrant in all probability had also been exposed to this type of knowledge earlier, it is noticeable that this material proved to be challenging to him, probably due to the generally challenging nature of this type of information for the nonprofessional, as we saw in section 6.2.2.

In **Part III** of this chapter, the methodological decisions mentioned above have been again found valuable. They have provided information which would be difficult if not impossible to infer without taking into account the perspective of the interpreter. We have observed that the interpreter understandably does not have an explanation for every translation decision the researcher asked him about. In those cases, the constraints which have been found to have probably influenced the interpreter's decision-making process were related to the nature of the profession, the nature of its discourse, the situational context and to constraints involving memory.

With regard to translation decisions for which he indicated a reason, we have observed that the interpreter has been found to be adopting what we can call a dialogic way of approaching communication. He has been found to be assuming that it is his duty to help the primary interlocutors to understand each other, and to take into account the abilities of the immigrant to understand the materials afforded by the lawyer. He has been found to generally adapt his translation decisions to this ability. He has also been found to take into account the nature of oral communication and how meaning is made during talk. Furthermore, context and STK/R have been found to be taken into consideration by the interpreter in the process of making translation decisions. This analysis demonstrates that the sense-making process is a complex one. The researcher claims that this process is impoverished if the perspectives of the interlocutors are not incorporated into the analysis. The dynamics of this process are difficult to track and are impossible to incorporate into a transcribed text. When participants enter the IME, they do not leave their life experiences behind the door. These experiences play an important role in the life of human beings and they need to be addressed as carefully as possible.

## **Chapter Seven**

Conclusions of the study

## **7.0 Introduction**

This chapter starts with a short description of what this study is about and reminds the reader of the research questions (section 7.1). Following this, a concise presentation is provided of the topics treated in each chapter (section 7.2). In section 7.3, a brief reflection is provided of the answers to the research questions. Section 7.4 lists key outcomes of the study. The section is divided into three sub-sections (7.4.1-7.4.3). Each of these sections deals with the outcomes of the corresponding research question, considering what we have learned on the macro-/global analytical level; i.e. we take a step back and observe the answers from a helicopter view. In section 7.5, the contribution of this study is illuminated. Thereafter, in section 7.6, the researcher addresses the limitations of the study (sections 7.6.1-7.6.7), putting them into perspective. In section 7.7, the researcher provides ideas for topics which can be researched in the future. These are sub-divided into two types: section 7.7.1 puts forwards future research topics that are inspired by the results of this study, while section 7.7.2 deals with future research topics that are inspired by the limitations of this study. Section 7.8 provides some concluding remarks.

## **7.1 Description of the study and the research questions**

In this thesis, the researcher investigates sense-making in an IME, in a lawyer's office in the Netherlands, in a non-adversarial legal setting. The IME is a meeting between a Dutch-speaking lawyer and a Syrian Arabic-speaking immigrant, with a temporary residence permit with the intention that the immigrant will obtain an asylum residence permit. The interpreter is Iraqi and Arabic speaking. More specifically, the researcher investigates the manner in which this interpreter renders the originals of the lawyer. He then investigates whether or not the immigrant understood the originals. After this, the researcher asks the interpreter questions about his translation decisions. In both cases, the researcher tries to understand how the sense-making processes developed and how it influenced the meaning-making process on the part of both participants. More concretely, the research questions (the second two of which are composite, because the questions posed within them are very closely linked together) are:

- 1) How does the interpreter render the originals of the lawyer?**
- 2) Does the immigrant understand these originals (via the renditions), and what can be learned from the immigrant's answers in terms of the sense-making processes?**
- 3) How does the interpreter explain his translation decisions, and what can be learned from them in terms of the sense-making processes?**

## **7.2 Brief recapitulation of the chapters**

In dialogism, the unit of analysis is a concrete interaction that is situated (Linell, 2009: 30), and in qualitative studies like this one, it is essential to provide a good description of what is to be studied (see section 4.1). To this end, the researcher contextualized the IME in chapter one: in addition to Immigration (section 1.1), information is provided on how the asylum procedure in the Netherlands is designed, on the associated organizations

and on the legal status of the participating immigrant (sections 1.2-1.2.3). This information provides the reader with tools to understand what was happening during the IME and why and what is at stake for the immigrant. This information is also needed to understand the rest of the thesis. In section 1.3, information is provided about the need for interpreters during such IMEs. Within this section, information is provided on the right for an interpreter (section 1.3.1) and the fact that interpreters are needed from the start of the procedure (section 1.3.2). Section 1.3.3 presents the professional background of the interpreter who participated in this study.

In chapter two, relevant literature was critically reviewed and critiqued, and information was provided about the gap this study aimed to fill. In addition to revisiting a number of definitions of interpreting (section 2.1), revisiting the issue of how to name this profession (section 2.2), a brief historical overview is given (section 2.3). Following this two central notions were dealt with: Role and (Dis-)empowerment (section 2.4). In section 2.4.1, role is dealt with. Here a number of reasons/explanation are presented as to why researchers continue to (re-)address the concept of Role. In section 2.4.2, the concept (dis-)empowerment is addressed and its interrelationship is discussed with the concept of role in previous research. Section 2.5 presents some influential research methods in DI, while 2.6 discusses the contribution of this study regarding the gap it sought to fill.

In chapter three, which consists of three parts (Part I, II and III), the researcher discussed the theoretical framework of the study. In Part I, dialogism, the overarching theory in this study, was discussed by, among other things, contrasting it to its counter-theory: monologism (section 3.1.3) and by presenting its principles/assumptions and discussing them (section 3.1.4). A critique is also provided. Sections 3.1.5 - 3.1.5.2.2 discusses central concepts for this study, which are meanings and understandings. Section 3.1.6 deals with the notion of Nature of Talk. In section 3.1.7, other central concepts are discussed: understanding and miscommunication. In sections 3.1.8 and 3.1.9, the concepts of 'understanding that are not made public' and 'double dialogicality' are discussed.

Part II of the chapter dealt with the theoretical model of Wadensjö (1998). The researcher provided an exposition of relevant tools for this study, and

offered a critique. The researcher also showed how this study is different from previous studies and explained what the contribution of the current study will be. For this contribution we need dialogism which is presented in Part I. In part III of the chapter, the researcher discussed how he will apply the tools he discussed in parts I and II. This part paves the way for the analysis of the data.

In Chapter four, the methodology of the study was discussed. After explaining the qualitative nature of this study, a case was made for conducting post-hoc interviews with the participants in order to serve the agenda of utilizing the theory of the study. In addition, information was provided on how data was collected, which decisions had to be made and why.

In Chapter five, the researcher presented the data that had been collected. The categorization was implemented in such a way as to reflect the structure of the research questions. In Part II, the researcher categorized the findings related to Understanding and Miscommunication. In Part III, the data collected that is related to the answers of the interpreter were categorized in such a way as to represent how the interpreter referred to them.

This data was discussed in Chapter six. In part I, the researcher mentioned the answers to the first research question. In part II, sections 6.2.1 – 6.2.1.4, the researcher discussed the factors which contributed to understanding on the part of the immigrant, while sections 6.2.2 – 6.2.2.4 dealt with the factors which contributed to miscommunication. In part III, in section 6.3.1, the researcher dealt with those renditions for which the interpreter did not provide an explanation, while section 6.3.2 dealt with the renditions for which the interpreter did provide explanations.

### **7.3 Questions of the study answered**

As mentioned in the previous section, in chapter five, the answers to the research questions were presented. In Part I, the answers to the first research question were shown, utilizing the taxonomy of Wadensjö (complemented and adapted by the researcher): see table 5.1 (in section

5.1). This taxonomy was utilized to show how these renditions relate to the originals produced by the lawyer. It shows by category how the renditions are represented in the data: their type, and their percentages. As mentioned, during the encounter, 110 renditions were produced. 86 renditions fell within the categories developed by Wadensjö. The rest (24) fell within the additional categories the researcher has developed for this study.

Regarding the second research question, we may recall that it consisted of two parts: 'Does the immigrant understand these originals (via the renditions)' and 'what can be learned from the immigrant's answers in terms of the sense-making processes?' Related to the *first* part of the question, it can be concluded that the majority of the originals had been understood, 93 out of 110 (section 5.2.1). Breaking down these findings, it has been found that 12 of the understood originals related to the legal process which was being discussed during the IME (first communicative project by the lawyer), 45 were related to revisiting the backstory (second communicative project) while the rest (36) were related to questions asked by the lawyer about the backstory (third communicative project). It is noteworthy that in total 18 originals related to the first project (i.e. were legal process-related), 48 related to the second project (revisiting the backstory) and 39 related to the third project (asking questions to the immigrant). This shows that 66.66% of the first type were understood, 93.75% of the second type and 92.30% of the third type. The remaining originals (5) were not directly related to the topics mentioned. With regard to the miscommunicated originals (12 in total; see section 5.2.2), 6 belong to the first communicative project and 3 to each one of the second and third projects. In addition to the originals that were understood or miscommunicated, there were those originals that were either 'partly understood' or 'partly miscommunicated' (see 5.2.3 and 5.2.4 respectively). There is one partly understood original while there are three originals that are partly miscommunicated.

In relation to the *second* part of this (second) research question, which deals with the question what we can learn from the answers of the immigrant in terms of the sense-making processes, we have learned that (1) regarding the originals the immigrant turned out to have understood, it emerged that

sense-making on the part of the immigrant did not seem to depend only on the renditions of the interpreter. The immigrant was found to incorporate in his internal dialogue 'material' not said in the renditions. He assumed that interpreter meant something, although this was not supported by the 'material' in the rendition. The 'material' referred to by the immigrant does not show this (see section 6.2.1.1: 'The immigrant says "yes" assuming that the interpreter meant what he himself had gone through'). (2) The immigrant has also been found to incorporate in his internal dialogue 'material' that was not reflected in the corresponding rendition. Here also, he was found to assume that that was the case; i.e. he assumed that the interpreter had mentioned this 'material' (see section 6.2.1.2: 'Understanding something the interpreter has not said') when this was not the case. (3) In section 6.2.1.3: 'Understanding the original directly via Dutch', the immigrant was found to have incorporated in his internal dialogue 'material' not mentioned in the corresponding rendition. In all these cases (as presented above in sections 6.2.1.1 - 6.2.1.3), the immigrant has been found to be not dependent only on the renditions, but also on his previous knowledge (STK/Rs), in understanding the renditions during the sense-making processes. (4) In section 6.2.1.4: 'Not being able to say "something"<sup>219</sup> but recognizing it when mentioned by the researcher', it was found that it can be tricky when discussing asylum-related renditions with the immigrant. There is a risk that he could be prematurely concluded to have miscommunicated the original. It turns out that in some cases, when the researcher digs deeper, that the immigrant had understood the originals but finds it difficult to show his understanding due to the challenging nature of the legal material.

In the previous paragraph, I dealt with some factors which were found to have influenced understanding on the part of the immigrant during the process of sense-making in a positive way. In this paragraph, the researcher will provide a recapitulation of the factors that have been found to have probably caused some of the renditions to be miscommunicated, partly understood it or partly miscommunicated during the sense-making process. These factors relate to the processes of sense-making in which the

---

<sup>219</sup> Which is STK/R related.

immigrant was engaged during the IME, and which the researcher attempted to learn from. It should be recalled that I am still dealing with the second part of the second research question. In section 6.2.2.1: 'Term/notion/talk miscommunicated', it turns out that a term/notion that is related to legal talk can sometimes cause the immigrant to miscommunicate a rendition. In section 6.2.2.2: 'Miscommunicated procedure (not showing understanding of the information about the procedure with regard to the rendition under discussion)', the original sometimes turns out to be miscommunicated due to the complexity of the asylum procedure for the immigrant. There are sometimes 'linguistic factors', related to the choice of lexical items or expressions used by the interpreters, and at other times 'global factors', related to understanding the bigger picture with relation to the legal procedure. Although the procedure had been explained to the immigrant or talked about on several occasions prior to this IME (chapter One), STK/R does not seem to have helped sufficiently to understand this and other originals, unlike in sections 6.2.1.1 – 6.2.1.4 which are discussed in the previous paragraph.

In section 6.2.2.3: 'Partly/vaguely understanding information on procedure', it has been noticed in the data that the immigrant in some cases understands the information related to the asylum procedure in a partial way (i.e. only parts of the informational content are understood), or vaguely (he does not show clear understanding). There are four examples of this. In one case, the original is understood, in one partly understood, partly miscommunicated and one original was miscommunicated respectively. This means that understanding how the procedure is designed could be considered important to understanding the original. During post-IME interview I with the immigrant, it turned out also in these cases that the legal information was challenging. Thus here also the STK/R did not help the immigrant sufficiently to understand the originals. In section 6.2.2.4: 'Not understanding clearly which organization does what', in four cases which were probed, it could be observed that the immigrant encountered difficulties in understanding which legal organization was responsible for which task during the asylum procedure. The researcher concluded this during the interview with the immigrant during the process of probing. In this regard, the immigrant

indicated during post-IME interview I that he does not clearly understand the difference between the IND and the court regarding their tasks and responsibilities in relation to the appeal he had submitted. Of the four cases probed, in three, the originals were miscommunicated (see 5.2.2) and in one partly miscommunicated (see 5.2.4). It can be observed that the immigrant does not know or cannot tell (in a clear way) which organization performs the legal task under discussion, a factor which arguably contributed to miscommunicating the original in these three cases.

In all cases related to the second research question, it has become clear that the process of sense-making is complicated, and that if the relevant participant is not interviewed, important information will be missed. Therefore, the methodological decisions of this study to interview the immigrant were immensely important for the understanding how the sense-making process develops during such encounters.

So far, I have shown the answers to the first and the second research questions. In the rest of this section, I will show the answers to the third research question: 'How does the interpreter explain his translation decisions, and what can be learned from his answers in terms of the sense-making processes?' In Part III of chapter Six: 'The explanations of the interpreter explaining his translation decisions', the researcher discussed the data presented in chapter Five related to the explanations of the interpreter about his translation decisions<sup>220</sup>. We learned that the interpreter *cannot always* explain the sense-making processes manifested in the renditions: in section 6.3.1: Discussion of 'no conscious strategy' Group, the researcher discussed the fact that the interpreter sometimes simply could not provide an explanation as to why he took a certain decision. The researcher discussed the fact that some of these renditions may relate to the immediate nature of the communicative event (section 6.3.1.1): the immediacy of the event can cause the interpreter take a decision that he might not have taken if the profession was not characterized with this immediacy. In section 6.3.1.2: Influence of the nature of discourse, the researcher discussed the fact that the influence of the unfolding nature of the discourse in interpreting can

---

<sup>220</sup> The researcher explained in chapter Four the difference between his methodology regarding data-elicitation methods and that of TAPS (section 4.2.9).

sometimes explain certain decisions of the interpreter. It has been found that the interpreter might later re-evaluate his thinking (in his internal dialogue) and decide that another translation decision is better. In section 6.3.1.3: Memory, a third factor was discussed which may explain certain translation decisions. The interpreter can simply forget to translate a component of the original.

Where the interpreter did provide explanations about how the meaning-making process developed, we found in section 6.3.2: 'Discussion of 'strategies followed' group, that whilst probably unaware of dialogism as a theory, the interpreter was to a considerable extent aware of how sense-making develops in IMEs. His answers suggested that 1) he thinks it is his job as an interpreter to help realise 'shared understanding' (Wadensjö, 1998) between the lawyer and the immigrant, 2) that he thinks he must bridge the differences in knowledge between the immigrant and the lawyer , 3) that he is aware that the nature of communication in 'communicative event(s)' such as the one under investigation is different than that dealt with by translators, who work with written texts, and that this fact brings with it challenges he must deal with, 4) that he thinks that the context in which this 'communicative event' takes place is important to be taken into consideration when renditions are produced , and 5) that he thinks that the previous knowledge of the primary interlocutors has an influence on how communication progresses during such 'communicative events'. These points correspond to central concepts in dialogism regarding how sense is made during conversations. The points referred to correspond respectively to 1) the notion of intersubjectivity, 2) the notion of alterity, 3) the fact that the interrelationship between notions like implicitness and vagueness with context (which bring about the dialogic nature of situated interactions) leads to understanding becoming 'fragmentary', 'partial', and 'partially shared' (Rommetveit, 1974), 4) the notion of 'contextualism' (e.g. Linell, 2009), and 5) the notion of STK/R (e.g. Linell, 2009). The researcher argued and showed in chapter Four that these views must have had an influence on the manner in which the interpreter produced his renditions during the IME under investigation, and

that the translation decisions of this interpreter can be understood by utilizing the central dialogical concepts referred to in this paragraph<sup>221</sup>.

After having briefly presented the answers to the three researcher questions, the researcher will proceed now to the outcomes.

## **7.4 Key outcomes of the study**

The findings that have been distilled from the collected data, and have been presented in chapter Five and discussed in chapter Six will now be looked at from a helicopter view in order to identify in overall terms what we have learned. The *fil rouge* is ‘sense-making’, for as was discussed earlier in the thesis, the research questions revolve around the processes of sense-making.

It needs to be stressed that I aim to contextualize the findings utilizing the theoretical underpinning of the study and that it is not my aim to re-introduce the findings and/or to re-discuss them. The findings of each Part will be dealt with separately.

### **7.4.1 Outcomes related to the first research question**

The results of the first research question show that while ‘close renditions’ constitute the largest group (section and table 5.1), they represent less than 36% of the total number of renditions. How can this be interpreted?

In this study, these results are not understood as separate entities, which need to be understood in terms of equivalence. They need to be understood in the context of all the factors which play a role during the process of sense-making.

In this regard, it is noticeable that the interpreter considered that staying close to the originals was less important than “making the immigrant understand” and he found that it is important to adapt the translation to the needs of the immigrant (sections 6.3.2.1 – 6.3.2.2). On his part, the immigrant was found to be actively participating in the realizations of the

---

<sup>221</sup> These concepts have been discussed in the theory chapter (see sections 3.1.4-3.1.4.5).

renditions by his assumptions, etc. (sections 6.2 – 6.2.2.4). Therefore, the results of the first research question need to be interpreted in the light of the results of the second and third research questions. Without incorporating the perspectives of the immigrant and the interpreter, we would face difficulty in understanding how these renditions came into being. It should be recalled that sense-making (including meaning-making and understanding) is a complex process in which all the participants play a role (see chapter Three).

In the following section, I will address the question what we can say to have learned from the findings related to the second research question. The answers will help us also understand the share of the immigrant into how the renditions came into being, as both the interpreter and the immigrant influence each other and are source of 'material' for each during the process of meaning-making.

#### **7.4.2 Outcomes of the second research question**

We observed in chapter Six that the process of sense-making needs to be studied holistically. Sense-making is a process which is contributed to by all the participants. Therefore, any attempt to address questions similar to the ones of this study will be less effective if the perspective of the participants is not incorporated in the analysis of the data. The interpreter influences how the immigrant understands, and the immigrant also influences how the interpreter produces his renditions (see chapter Three).

In the context of the second research question, we observed in chapter Six that the immigrant did not only depend on the renditions produced during the interaction (section 6.2). He was also found to incorporate into his internal dialogue 'material' learned, among other things, during previous interactions with the lawyer, with the asylum organizations and which he gained in his previous life. This material is termed STK/R in dialogism. We observed that while STK/R is very important for understanding on the part of the immigrant (section 6.2.1), it does not allow him always to understand the originals (section 6.2.2). In this regard, among other things we observed that nodding or giving a semiotic response suggesting understanding does not necessarily

mean that the immigrant had indeed understood, for there is no linear relationship between understanding/miscommunication and those semiotic responses. Thanks to the data collection methods utilized in this study, the researcher has been found to elicit this insightful data. And thanks to dialogism that we are able to understand how this process took place.

In addition to the above, this part has raised questions regarding the interrelationship between STK/R and the different IMEs. It argues that notions such as 'partial understanding' (discussed in 3.1.6.3) and 'understanding for (current) practical purposes' (discussed in 3.1.6.3) are not confined to one IME, but they could also be seen in relation to inter-IME communication (i.e. across IMEs), in the sense that the partiality of understanding and understanding for (current) practical purposes could also be present across different IMEs.

### **7.4.3 Outcomes of the third research question**

We have observed in chapter Six that the process of meaning-making is a complicated one. While the researcher does not claim to fully have managed to enable the interpreter to re-construct his internal dialogue, he does claim that the interpreter provided insightful information regarding the process of meaning-making developed on his part. We saw that the interpreter's understanding of how sense-making develops during the IMEs corresponds to the way dialogism theorizes this process. That being said, it is essential to note that the researcher does not want to claim that the explanation provided by the interpreter were always reliable. This is also referred among others in Chapter Six and also in chapter Four. Furthermore, it is inevitable that these explanations are coloured with meanings which the interpreter developed during the interview with the researcher, for the process of meaning develops as a continuum. It does not start at a certain moment and stop at another.

Going back to the theoretical underpinning of this study, it has provided me with solid foundations to understand how the sense-making process developed during the IME under investigation. DI literature had informed me that the question whether or not that the interpreter was an active participant

or not had become redundant. The question was how this involvement manifests itself? From early on, the researcher decided that transcripts are not enough for understanding the holistic process of sense-making. The decision to interview the relevant participants provided invaluable insights into how sense-making had developed from the perspective of the interpreter.

The methodological decisions regarding data collections made perfect sense in the light of the theory I have chosen for the study.

#### **7.4.4 Conclusions of the section**

One of the conclusions derived from this study, which is not directly related to the research questions, but which is well explainable according to dialogism, is that the status of the immigrant regarding his abilities to follow the 'material' dealt with during the IME is important during the overall sense-making process. Both the lawyer and the interpreter sounded to be aware of the influence of this factor on communication. It seems that it has influenced many decisions taken by the interpreter, for as we can see in table 5.4.3.1, he referred 16 times to the fact that he chose to render his translation in informal Arabic - the most frequent explanation he provided. The immigrant himself referred to the disempowered position he was in. The lawyer also mentioned that he used less high register. These conclusions show us again the importance of paying attention to the interrelationship of Role and (Dis-)empowerment in DI (see section 2.4.). As discussed in the sections 2.4.1.1 - 2.4.1.5, Role has been approached by researchers from different angles. This study does not address Role for the sake of theorizing it; rather, role became an important part of the study, as the third research question was being treated. This goes as well for the interrelationship with (Dis-)empowerment. It was not addressed independently, but came to the fore during interview I and II.

The other conclusion that can be drawn is that, probably not surprisingly, legal-related language could be challenging for some immigrants. Apart from that, the communication seemed to have progressed successfully. That being said, the researcher argues that it is essential not to underestimate the

influence STK/Rs has on sense-making. One last issue which the researcher had not totally anticipated was that the concept of culture would get the little attention it received from all participants. In this regard, one can only refer to a Norwegian study (Felberg and Skaaden, 2012) which advised that non-cultural issues get more attention in DI. It argues that the practitioners too often 'other' the immigrant by attributing too much communication to culture, thereby disempowering the immigrant and the interpreter.

## **7.5 Contributions of the study**

As mentioned in section 2.6, this study contributes to the field on several levels, the first being the type of IME. To my knowledge, the type of IME that is studied in this thesis has not been studied previously. Regardless, the research questions that are investigated and/or the methodology that is adopted are new. It is true that there are studies in which researchers talk to immigrants and/or interpreters (see sections 2.4.1.3 and 2.4.1.4 for examples), however, the methodology is different. The type of data collection methods these studies utilize are different as are the aims, in that this study addresses the sense-making processes on micro-level. In addition, what strikes the researcher is that there are not many studies that deal with contexts in which the immigrant is from the Middle East. This needs to change in the light of the waves of immigrants from the Arabic-speaking world.

In addition to the type of IME under investigation, this study also contributes to the field in terms of theory; it adds another dimension to the analysis, enabling the researcher to incorporate STK/R into it. This new theoretical dimension calls for enriching the data collection methods, which is thought to be another contribution: reflective interviews are used in this study to enable the participants to reflect on the process of sense-making. This approach has not been previously adopted in DI as far I am aware, at least in the way I have used them in this study. Regarding the fourth and last contribution, as indicated in the introduction to the thesis (section 0.2), there is also a need on the part of many interpreters to have access to this type of data, in order to be able to see how other interpreters work. This type of data can also be

used by curriculum designers to reflect on points which they might consider including in their training programmes.

## **7.6 Limitations of the study and gateways for future research**

Like any study, this one is not without limitations. In this section, the researcher will discuss the limitations of this study (sections 7.6.1-7.6.8) and will relate them to a discussion as to what we can learn from them to benefit future studies (sections 7.7–7.7.2).

### **7.6.1 Study being a one-case study**

The very nature of studies like this one, combined with the limitations which a PhD study imposes regarding resources and time, put one in a dilemma: on the one hand there is this topic which it is important to research; on the other hand, the resources and time which are available are not enough to conduct multiple investigations, of sufficient breadth to be able to make some careful claims regarding generalizations. The question which then arises is: is such a case study worth doing? The researcher claims it certainly is worth doing, for in addition to answering the questions of this study, the rich data it has produced open up the eyes of this researcher and other researchers to topics which had not previously been discussed well, if at all, and which therefore need further research. In this study, the data collected has inspired the researcher to ask several other questions (see section 7.7.1.1 below).

In addition to these questions, which can be researched by this or other researchers, case studies like this one can be replicated and when there are multiple ones, there is more room to think about generalizations. If similar studies are conducted, the accumulated data could lead to theory development (Gile, 1995).

### **7.6.2 Naturalness of the data**

Although the researcher took all available precautions to reduce the influence of the presence of the recording devices during the IME, there are no guarantees that the participants acted during the IME as they would have

done if the IME was not being recorded. In dialogism, sense-making is theorized as being not always only between human beings. Artefacts also are a source of information during the process of meaning-making on the part of the individual. (e.g. section 3.1.5.1). This means that it can be assumed that the presence of the recording devices did not go unnoticed, that the different participants engaged in some sort of interaction with the device during the overall sense-making process; that is that the participants took the presence of the dictaphones into consideration while evaluating and re-evaluating the 'material' in their internal dialogue. This may suggest that the data collected was not as 'pure' as it would have been if these devices were not present.

During the two post-IME interviews, in addition to the dictaphones, there was also the researcher in the room. According to the same theoretical perspectives, it is inevitable that the collected data was coloured. The question that arises is to what extent the data was 'polluted'<sup>222</sup>.

Issues of data 'pollution' notwithstanding, if theory is to be developed, such data is essential. The data collected might not be 100% natural, however, the influence of this unnaturalness on the development of theory could be reduced by conducting more studies of a similar nature. The findings of this study are not considered watertight facts as in exact science and are not considered as such by the researcher (see chapter Four and Six). The researcher argues that the data collected is as close to naturalness as is possible in a research situation. It is also important to mention that the lawyer and the researcher had agreed that the data collection would not be carried out or proceed if the lawyer had the impression that the participants showed a different attitude during the interview than he had been accustomed to. Regarding the post-IME interviews, the researcher ensured that the participants knew each time that they had the full right to stop without questions being asked. In addition to this, the very nature of such studies requires that the participants are recorded and that some interviews are conducted (see sections 2.4.1.3, 2.4.1.4 and 2.5.1). For information on how the researcher dealt with this and similar matters, see sections 4.2 – 4.2.5.

---

<sup>222</sup> This topic is discussed in section 4.2.3.1.

### **7.6.3 Reliability of the answers of the participants during the interviews**

Related to the topic of the previous section is the topic of the reliability of the answer of the participants. The researcher carefully prepared the participants for the post-IME interviews, regarding why they would be interviewed, the type of questions they would get, and what he expected from them, and although he took all the available precautions during the period prior to holding these interviews. However, it cannot be ruled out that the participants might have not always said what they believed to be true, for different reasons. It is not unthinkable that here or there they wanted to please the researcher, or simply did not remember things and made a guess. This topic has been dealt with in chapter Four (among others in section 4.2). The reliability of the data and naturalness regarding previous studies have also been addressed (e.g. sections 2.5-2.5.1.1). Reasons related to confidentiality (on part of both of the participants) and saving professional face (on the part of the interpreter), etc. could have also contributed to answers that might not have been sincere.

While admitting the above, the researcher attempted nevertheless to counteract these factors by engaging critically with the answers. The transcribed text was used to investigate to what extent the explanation provided was trustworthy, for the transcribed text provides clues to how sense-making developed regarding the data under investigation (see chapter Four and Six). Furthermore, answers given at different moments during the interview were investigated and weighed against each other (see chapter Four and Six).

### **7.6.4 Not including the perspective of the lawyer on the micro-level of sense-making**

The researcher has not incorporated the perspective of the lawyer on the micro-level on how sense-making developed during the recorded IME. Technically, this was also not the objective of the study (see the research

questions: section 0.2.1). However, given the use of a dialogical theory as the underpinning of the study, that would have provided more insights as to how sense-making developed during the interaction. For, as explained in section 3.1.5, all the interlocutors contribute to meaning-making and even if it is not their particular utterances that are being investigated, these influence how sense-making develops. There were several reasons for not incorporating the perspective of the lawyer. To start with, back then, the researcher had not yet solidified his theoretical approach to interpreting the data. He did not yet have a crystal-clear idea which theory he would be using to base the analysis on; although it was obvious that taking the perspective of the lawyer would be a good thing to do, the researcher chose not to do so because of reasons related to time constraints. Furthermore, the researcher wanted to avoid causing the lawyer to refuse to take part or to call off the participation process once it had started. As an interpreter himself, the researcher knew how busy lawyers are.

### **7.6.5 Time interval between the IME and both interviews rather long**

After recording the IME, appointments were made with the immigrant and the interpreter for interviews. Time was reserved for transcribing and analysing the recorded data (section 4.2.1). Two weeks after the recording, the immigrant was interviewed; a week later, the interpreter. Despite the explanation provided in section 4.2.1 regarding the practical considerations that necessitated this approach, and the ways in which the researcher addressed this issue and tried to minimise its impact (section 4.1.3.1), it is undeniably true that if the time interval between the IME and interview I and II had been shorter, the interviewees might have been better able to reconstruct their internal dialogue due to recollection issues. It is believed that this time interval can be shortened to one and two weeks respectively if more people are involved in conducting this kind of research.

### **7.6.6 Not incorporating the visual aspects of sense-making during the recording**

One of the shortcomings of this study is that the visual aspects of sense-making during the IME have not been incorporated in the analysis, which is unfortunate. However, as indicated in section 4.2.3.1, there were some ethical and practical reasons for this. The researcher attempted to compensate for this shortcoming during the interviews that followed. While the researcher admits that the interviews could not replace those missing visual aspects, the interviews are hoped and believed to have compensated for some of the loss of visual aspects during the IME.

### **7.6.7 Limitations due to lack of time**

Ascertaining whether or not the immigrant understood the original by investigating each and every one of the originals during the interview was not possible due to reasons related to time. Furthermore, it was anticipated that if all originals had to be investigated the immigrant would have had a reason to not to want to participate, for that would have made the investigation very long. After careful weighing of the pros and cos, the researcher chose to investigate only those cases where there is a reason to think textual analysis was not sufficient. For a more elaborated discussion see for example section 4.2.1.

## **7.7 Looking forward: avenues for future research and recommendations<sup>223</sup>**

Research is about generating knowledge, which this study has done. In addition, the study has found some useful avenues for future research, which will also help generate useful knowledge if conducted. These avenues are sometimes inspired by the data collected and discussed in this study. Other times, they are inspired by the limitations of this study. The individual

---

<sup>223</sup> This title is inspired by Davitti (2011).

suggestions presented below could be combined depending on the aims of the specific study. The ideas that are presented below are only examples. Researchers can develop complementary or other ideas.

### **7.7.1 Future research inspired by the findings of this study**

In the following sections, the researcher will consider different kinds of possible future research inspired by the findings of this study.

#### **7.7.1.1 In the case of the immigrant**

In section 6.2.1.1, the researcher argued that the development of an IME like this one seems to not only depend on the originals and the renditions and their interrelation with the situated context. The co-construction of meaning seems also to be influenced by the STK/R: the immigrant was seen to make assumptions about what the interpreter has meant with his renditions, even when these assumptions were not based on the materials provided in these renditions. The assumptions related to 'realities' subscribed to.

Based on the discussion in the aforementioned section, several interesting questions arise: for example, what if the originals did not correspond with the 'reality' that the immigrant subscribed to, in the sense that the lawyer had made mistakes, for example while revisiting the backstory of the immigrant? Would that have influenced the outcome of the IME between him and his client? Remember the renditions in these cases under investigation were not close renditions.

Other questions that arise are for example: is the quality of the texts in the reports of lawyers with regard to the backstory, etc. not solely dependent on the quality of the work of this interpreter and the attentiveness of this immigrant and lawyer, but also on how among other things individual immigrants deal with the STK/Rs? To what extent do the immigrant, the lawyer and the interpreter take into account that the quality of the work produced collectively in an IME of this type seems to depend in part on the previous encounters between the lawyer, the immigrant and this and other interpreters who translated for the lawyer and the immigrant? How does this

influence their behaviour with regard to meaning-making? One of the conclusions of this section suggests that understanding is not a static phenomenon related to the current situation (the current IME) and that understanding is interrelated with the understandings of previous meetings with, among others, the lawyer. In this regard, do the lawyer and the interpreter take a more relaxed attitude in relation to ‘facilitating understanding’ because they, among other things, assume that the immigrant has heard the material under discussion before? These, and possibly other questions, invite further research.

In section 6.2.1.2: ‘Understanding something the interpreter has not said’, the immigrant was found to incorporate in this internal dialogue things that had not been mentioned in the rendition. Many questions arise in this regard which are similar to those mentioned in the paragraph above. In this case and in the case of the paragraph above, more research is needed to see whether or not this could also be the case in other types IME’s.

Section 6.2.1.3: ‘Understanding the original directly via Dutch’, reminds us that some immigrants might not be totally dependent on the renditions after some time, after they have learned some Dutch as in this study. This opens up opportunities for research as to how end-users and interpreters deal with this: i.e. among other things whether or not to what extent the linguistic knowledge acquired by the immigrant is taken into account during the IME’s.

In 6.2.1.4: ‘Not being able to say “something<sup>224</sup>” but recognizing it when mentioned by the researcher’, the researcher dealt with a delicate matter. Sometimes during my interview with the immigrant, as in this example, he was unable to clearly say what he had understood and the researcher was unsure whether this was because the immigrant did not understand the rendition under investigation or whether it was possibly because he encountered difficulties in expressing his thoughts with regard to it. The researcher argued that caution is advised when investigating understanding in the case of renditions dealing with the asylum procedure: the challenging nature of the asylum procedure may cause the immigrant to fail to explain

---

<sup>224</sup> Which is STK/R related.

how he understood the rendition even if he had understood it. This topic too opens up future research avenues: e.g., whether or not /to what extent this can be seen in other cases.

Due to limitations related to the size of the thesis, the researcher is unable to mention more examples of future research avenues related to the immigrant. However, the discussion chapter provides many openings for other researchers.

### **7.7.1.2 In the case of the interpreter**

As discussed in section 6.3.2, the findings of post-IME interview II show that the interpreter, whilst probably unaware of dialogism as a theory, was to a considerable extent aware of how sense-making takes place in IMEs as explained in chapter three. His answers corresponded to central concepts in dialogism regarding how sense is made during conversations. It is believed that this opens up a rich starting point to do research into a) whether or not, and if so to what extent this can be encountered in other lawyer-immigrant IME's as well, b) whether or not, and if so to what extent this can be seen in other types of IME's.

Researchers can also share the results of this study and then use a quantitative research tool to investigate what other interpreters think. It is also possible to engage end-users (e.g. lawyers and immigrants) with the results and investigate what they think of them.

### **7.7.1.3 In the case of the lawyer**

As discussed in chapters Five and Six, the lawyer was found to take alterity into account while producing his originals: he said that he does not utilize a high register in order to avoid the immigrant encountering difficulty in understanding the content of the IME. This was also observed in the data of the IME, which can be considered not to be of high-register (Appendix I). It is unknown how other lawyers handle sense-making in their offices. This opens up considerable opportunities for researchers to study this type of interpreter-mediated discourse.

### **7.7.2 Inspired by the limitations of this study**

In section 7.6.1 above, the researcher referred to the fact that one of the limitations of this study is that it is a case study; that is that only one case has been studied. Researchers, with the same/similar research agenda, could consider multiplying the cases. This should be possible if multiple researchers co-operated, or if one researcher had enough time and resources to do multiple case studies.

Regarding the limitation discussed in section 7.6.2 about how natural the data of this study is, in such cases, one could consider whether or not it is possible that the participants of a study like the one under investigation would be willing to consider endorsing the researchers for future research. This way, the new participants would have one reason less to act unnaturally. Once there is trust, one can see if the current lawyer for example, and/or other lawyers, might be willing to consider co-operating in future projects. This could also solve the limitation discussed in 7.6.1 about case studies.

Regarding the limitations referred to in 7.6.3: Reliability of the answers of the participants during the interviews, it is believed that the more reliability a researcher enjoys in the eyes of the lawyer and the interpreter, the bigger the chance they will endorse the researcher in the future. Once they do so, this will consolidate the chances of the researcher getting data that is more reliable. In this study, it is believed that the fact that the researcher had worked as a professional interpreter/translator helped the lawyer and the interpreter to co-operate with him. The researcher also believes that if the lawyer had not endorsed him, the immigrant would not have been as willing to participate as he was. This image of the researcher as a trustworthy professional is thought to have helped the participants to provide trustworthy information.

Researchers should build on their image as trustworthy professionals. Once one is known as a trustworthy researcher, it is believed that professionals will want to co-operate and will be willing to divulge more information that is close to reality as they know it.

Regarding section 7.6.4, future studies could incorporate the perspective of the lawyer on how sense-making developed during the IME on the micro-

level. This would provide the researcher with an extra dimension for the analysis. This extracted data could also be used in the triangulation of the overall data.

With regard to the limitation which is addressed in 7.6.5: time interval between the IME and both interviews rather long, the researcher could consider employing a professional transcriber, at least if these are available in the languages of the study, or to decide to use a shorter version of the IME. One could also consider co-operating with (an)other researcher(s).

In section 7.6.6, the researcher discussed the lack of the visual side of sense-making in the IME. It might be worthwhile to consider approaching previous participants with the question whether or not they would consider letting a camera into a future IME. If a first study has gone well from the perspective of the participants, they might be willing to think about letting a camera into the interaction on a subsequent occasion.

## **7.8 Concluding remarks**

Immigration has been present throughout human history. Indeed, it has been an integral part of history. Politicians deal with the political dimensions of immigration; researchers, on the other hand, with the academic dimensions. The focus of the study has been on an important aspect of immigration: communication. Powerful organizations belonging to the host state that are tasked to deal with asylum applicants have the obligation to regulate the process of asylum. One of their main tools is communication. Within communication, the process of sense-making is a crucial one, for if the immigrant did not communicate well enough with these organizations their very well-being could sometimes be jeopardised. Luckily, we have discovered that the process of sense-making went well during the IME under investigation.

## Bibliography

- Al-Rubai'i, A.M.H.A. 2009. Instructing novice consecutive interpreters: Steps to improve the performance of memory. *Babel*. **55**(4), pp.329-344.
- Alexieva, B. 2002. A Typology of Interpreter-Mediated Events. In: Pöchhacker, F. and Shlesinger, M. eds. *The Interpreting Studies Reader*. London: Routledge, pp.219-232.
- Amato, A. and Garwood, C. 2011. Cultural mediators in Italy: a new breed of linguists. *inTRAlinea*. **13**, pp.1-5.
- Amnesty International. [no date]. *Categoriale Bescherming*. [Online]. [Accessed 09-12-2016]. Available from: <http://www.amnesty.nl/categoriale-bescherming>
- Apfelbaum, B. 2007. Conversational Dynamics as an instructional resource in interpreter-mediated technical Settings. In: Wadensjö, C., et al. eds. *The Critical Link Four, Professionalisation of interpreting in the community: Selected papers from the 4th International Conference on Interpreting in Legal, Health and Social Settings, Stockholm, Sweden, 20-23 May 2004*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Arksey, H. and Knight, P. 1999. *Interviewing for social scientists : an introductory resource with examples*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Baker, M. 2011. *In Other Words - a Coursebook on Translation*. London: Routledge.
- Translation and interpreting*. 2011. s.v.
- Bakhtin, M.M. 1986. The problem of speech genres. In: Emerson, C. and Holquist, M. eds. *Speech genres & other late essays*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Bancroft, M.A., Bendana, L., Bruggeman, J. and Feuerle, L. 2013. Interpreting in the Gray Zone: Where Community and Legal Interpreting Intersect. *Translation & Interpreting*. **5**(1), pp.94-113.
- Baraldi, C. 2009. Forms of mediation: the case of interpreter-mediated interactions in medical systems. *Language and Intercultural Communication*. **9**(2), pp.120-137.
- Barsky, R.F. 1993. The Interpreter and the Canadian Convention Refugee Hearing: Crossing the Potentially Life-Threatening Boundaries between "coccod-e-eh," "cluck-cluck," and "cot-cot-cot". *TTR*. **6**(2), pp.131-157.
- Barsky, R.F. 1994. *Constructing a Productive Other*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin B.V.
- Barsky, R.F. 1996. The Interpreter as Intercultural Agent in Convention Refugee Hearings. *Translator*. **2**(1), pp.45-63.
- Barsky, R.F. 2005. Activist Translation in an Era of Fictional Law. *TTR*. **18**(2), pp.17-48.
- Bartlett, F.C. 1932. *Remembering : a study in experimental and social psychology*. Cambridge: The University Press.
- Bateson, G. 1972. *Steps to an ecology of mind*. New York: Ballantine Books.
- Baumgarten, N., Meyer, B. and Oezcetin, D. 2008. Explicitness in translation and interpreting: A critical review and some empirical evidence (of an elusive concept). *Across Languages and Cultures*. **9**(2), pp.177-203.

- BBC. 2014. *Graphics: Europe's asylum seekers*. [Online]. [Accessed 08-12-2016]. Available from: <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-europe-24636868>
- Benmaman, V. 1997. Legal Interpreting by any Other Name is Still Legal Interpreting. In: Carr, S.E., et al. eds. *The Critical Link: Interpreters in the Community, Papers from the First International Conference on Interpreting in Legal, Health, and Social Service Settings (Geneva Park, Canada, June 1-4, 1995)*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, pp.179-190.
- Berge, S.S. 2014. Social and private speech in an interpreted meeting of deafblind persons. *Interpreting*. **16**(1), pp.81-105.
- Berk-Seligson, S. 1989. The role of register in the bilingual courtroom: evaluative reactions to interpreted testimony. *International Journal of Sociology of Language*. **1989**(79), pp.79-92.
- Bernstein, B. 1972. A Sociolinguistic Approach to Socialization; with Some Reference to Educability. In: Gumperz, J.J. and Hymes, D. eds. *Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.
- Birner, B.J. 2013. *Introduction to Pragmatics*. Chichester, West Sussex, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Bischoff, A., Kurth, E. and Henley, A. 2012. Staying in the middle: A qualitative study of health care interpreters' perceptions of their work. *Interpreting*. **14**(1), pp.1-22.
- Blinstrubaité, A. 2000. Interaction in liaison interpreting. *Perspectives*. **8**(2), pp.125-133.
- Blommaert, J. 2001. Investigating Narrative Inequality: African Asylum Seekers' Stories in Belgium. *Discourse & Society*. **12**(4), pp.413-449.
- Bogner, D., Brewin, C. and Herlihy, J. 2010. Refugees' Experiences of Home Office Interviews: A Qualitative Study on the Disclosure of Sensitive Personal Information. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*. **36**(3), pp.519-535.
- Bontempo, K. and Napier, J. 2011. Evaluating emotional stability as a predictor of interpreter competence and aptitude for interpreting. *Interpreting*. **13**(1), pp.85-105.
- Bot, H. and Verrept, H. 2013. Role issues in the Low Countries: Interpreting in mental healthcare in the Netherlands and Belgium. In: Schäffner, C., et al. eds. *Interpreting in a Changing Landscape*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin B.V. .
- Braun, V. and Clarke, V. 2006. Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*. **3**(2), pp.77-101.
- Brikci, N. and Green, J. 2007. *A Guide to Using Qualitative Research Methodology*. Medecins Sans Frontieres.
- Bruner, J. 1990. *Acts of Meaning*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Bryman, A. 2004. *Social Research Methods*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bryman, A. 2016. *Social Research Methods*. 5th ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bryman, A. and Bell, E. 2011. *Business Research Methods*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bucholtz, M. 2000. The politics of transcription. *Journal of Pragmatics*. **32**(10), pp.1439-1465.
- Carr, S.E., Roberts, R.P., Dufour, A. and Steyn, D. eds. 1997. *The Critical Link: Interpreters in the Community, Papers from the First International Conference on Interpreting in*

- Legal, Health, and Social Service Settings (Geneva Park, Canada, June 1-4, 1995)*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Chen, J. 2007. Strategies for abating intercultural noise in interpreting. *Meta*. **52**(3), pp.529-541.
- Christensen, T.P. 2011. User expectations and evaluation: a case study of a court interpreting event. *Perspectives-Studies in Translatology*. **19**(1), pp.1-24.
- Clark, H.H. 1996. *Using language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- COA. 2016. *About COA*. [Online]. [Accessed 08-12-2016]. Available from: <https://www.coa.nl/en/about-coa>
- Creswell, J.W. 1994. *Research design: qualitative & quantitative approaches*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.
- Creswell, J.W. 2014. *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approaches*. 4th ed. Los Angeles: SAGE Publications.
- Crotty, M. 1998. *The foundations of social research : meaning and perspective in the research process*. Second ed. London: Sage Publications.
- Crotty, M. 2003. *The foundations of social research : meaning and perspective in the research process*. London: Sage Publications.
- A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*. Sixth ed. 2008. s.v. Comment Clause,
- Davitti, E. 2012. *Dialogue Interpreting as Intercultural Mediation: Integrating Talk and Gaze in the Analysis of Mediated Parent-Teacher Meetings*. Doctor of Philosophy thesis, University of Manchester.
- De Raad van State. 2016. *Administrative Jurisdiction Division*. [Online]. [Accessed 09-12-2016]. Available from: <http://www.raadvanstate.nl/the-council-of-state.html>
- De Rechtspraak. 2016. *Raad van State*. [Online]. [Accessed 09-12-2016]. Available from: <https://www.rechtspraak.nl/Organisatie-en-contact/Organisatie/Raad-van-State>
- De Rijksoverheid. 2014. *Immigratie- en Naturalisatiedienst (IND)*. [Online]. [Accessed 05-09-2014]. Available from: <https://www.rijksoverheid.nl/contact/contactgids/immigratie-en-naturalisatiedienst-ind>
- Dimitrova, B.E. 1997. Degree of Interpreter Responsibility in the Interaction Process in Community Interpreting. In: Carr, S.E., et al. eds. *The Critical Link: Interpreters in the Community, Papers from the First International Conference on Interpreting in Legal, Health, and Social Services Settings (Geneva Park, Canada, June 1-4, 1995)*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Doornbos, N. 2006. *Op verhaal komen: Institutionele communicatie in de asielprocedure*. Doctor of Philosophy thesis, University of Nijmegen.
- Dufva, H. 2004. Language, Thinking and Embodiment: Bakhtin, Whorf and Merleau-Ponty. In: Bostad, F., et al. eds. *Bakhtinian perspectives on language and culture: Meaning in Language, Art and New Media*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan Ltd, pp.133-146.
- Edwards, J.A. 1993. Talking data : transcription and coding in discourse research. In: Edwards, J.A. and Lampert, M.D. eds. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates c1992.
- Edwards, R., Temple, B. and Alexander, C. 2005a. **Users' experience of interpreters**. The critical role of trust. *Interpreting*. **7**(1), pp.77-95.

- Edwards, R., Temple, B. and Alexander, C. 2005b. Users' experiences of interpreters: The critical role of trust. *Interpreting: International Journal of Research & Practice in Interpreting*. **7**(1), pp.77-95.
- Eraslan Gercek, S. 2008. "Cultural Mediator" or "Scrupulous Translator"? Revisiting Role, Context and Culture in Consecutive Conference Interpreting. In: Boulogne, P., ed. *CETRA RESEARCH SEMINAR IN TRANSLATION STUDIES 2007, Leuven*. KU Leuven Centre for Translation Studies.
- Erasmus, M., Mathibela, L., Hertzog, E. and Antonissen, H. eds. 1999. *Liaison Interpreting in the Community*. Pretoria: Van Schaik.
- European Commission. 2009. *Reflection Forum on Multilingualism and Interpreter Training*. OIB.
- Felberg, T.R. and Skaaden, H. 2012. The (de)construction of culture in interpreter-mediated medical discourse. *Linguistica Antverpiensia New Series-Themes in Translation Studies*. **11**, pp.95-112.
- Flick, U. 2006. *An introduction to Qualitative Research*. Los Angeles: SAGE Publications.
- Fogtman Fosgerau, C. 2013. The co-construction of understanding in Danish naturalization interviews. *International Journal of Bilingualism*. **17**(2), pp.221-236.
- Fogtmann Fosgerau, C. 2013. The co-construction of understanding in Danish naturalization interviews. *International Journal of Bilingualism*. **17**(2), pp.221-236.
- Foley, T. 2006. *Lawyers and Legal Interpreters: Different Clients, Different Culture*.
- Gallez, E. and Maryns, K. 2014. Orality and authenticity in an interpreter-mediated defendant's examination: A case study from the Belgian Assize Court. *Interpreting*. **16**(1), pp.49-80.
- Garber, N. 2000. Community Interpretation : A Personal View. In: Roberts, R.P., et al. eds. *The Critical Link 2: Interpreters in the Community: Selected Papers from the Second International Conference on Interpreting in Legal, Health and Social Service Settings, Vancouver, Canada 19-23 May 1998*. Vancouver, B.C.: John Benjamins B.V., pp.9-20.
- Gavioli, L. and Baraldi, C. 2011. Interpreter-mediated interaction in healthcare and legal settings: Talk organization, context and the achievement of intercultural communication. *Interpreting*. **13**(2), pp.205-233.
- Gentile, A., Ozolins, U. and Vasilakakos, M. 1996. *Liaison interpreting : A handbook*. Carlton South, Vic., Australia: Melbourne University Press.
- Gerring, J. 2007. *Case Study Research: Principles and Practices*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Gibb, R. and Good, A. 2014. Interpretation, translation and intercultural communication in refugee status determination procedures in the UK and France. *Language and Intercultural Communication*. **14**(3), pp.385-399.
- Gile, D. 1995. *Basic Concepts and Models for Interpreter and Translator Training*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Gillespie, A. 2010. The dialogical turn: Turning the corner? *Theory & Psychology*. **20**(3), pp.461-463.
- Gillham, B. 2000. *Case Study Research Method*. London: Bloomsbury.

- Goffman, E. 1961. *ENCOUNTERS: Two Studies in the Sociology of Interaction*. London: Allen Lane; The Penguin Press.
- Goffman, E. 1981. *Forms of Talk*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Goos, J.B.A. 2008. *De asielprocedure*. Netherlands: Kluwer a Wolters Kluwer business.
- Graumann, C.F. 1990. Perspectival structure and dynamics in dialogues. In: I. Markova, I.K.F.e. ed. *The dynamics of dialogue* New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf, pp.105-126.
- Gray, D.E. 2004. *Doing Research in the Real World*. Los Angeles: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Gray, D.E. 2009. *Doing Research in the Real World*. 2nd ed. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Grbić, N. and Pöllabauer, S. 2006. Community Interpreting: signed or spoken? Types, modes, and methods. *Linguistica Antverpiensia*. **5**, pp.247-261.
- Gumperz, J.J. 1982. *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hadziabdic, E., Albin, B. and Hjelm, K. 2014. Arabic-speaking migrants' attitudes, opinions, preferences and past experiences concerning the use of interpreters in healthcare: a postal cross-sectional survey. *BMC Research Notes*. **7**(71).
- Hale, S. 1997. The Treatment of Register Variation in Court Interpreting. *Translator*. **3**(1), pp.39-54.
- Hale, S. 2007. *Community Interpreting*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hale, S. 2011. The positive side of community interpreting: An Australian case study. *Interpreting*. **13**(2), pp.234-248.
- Hale, S. and Napier, J. 2013. *Research Methods in Interpreting, A practical Resource*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- The Oxford Companion to Philosophy*. 2nd ed. 2005. s.v. The Theory of Knowledge,
- Hammersley, M. and Traianou, A. 2012. *Ethics in Qualitative Research: Controversies and Contexts*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Healthcare Interpretation Network. 2007. *National Standard Guide for Community Interpreting Services*,. [Online]. [Accessed 2016]. Available from: [http://www.multiple-languages.com/materials/National\\_Standard\\_Guide\\_for\\_Community\\_Interpreting\\_Services.pdf](http://www.multiple-languages.com/materials/National_Standard_Guide_for_Community_Interpreting_Services.pdf)
- Hertog, E. and Van der Veer, B. eds. 2006. *'Taking stock: Research and methodology community interpreting'*. Antwerp: Hoger Instituut voor Vertalers & Tolken, Hogeschool Antwerpen.
- Holquist, M. ed. 1981. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M.M. Bakhtin*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Hox, J.J. and Boeije, H.R. 2005. Data Collection, Primary vs. Secondary. *Encyclopedia of Social Measurement*. **1**, pp.593-599.
- Hrehovčík, T. 2009. Teaching Community Interpreting: A New Challenge? In: *Language, Literature and Culture in a Changing Transatlantic World: International conference proceedings April 22-23, 2009, Prešov*. Prešovská Univerzita, pp.160-164.
- Hsieh, E. 2006. Conflicts in how interpreters manage their role in provider-patient interactions. *Social Science & Medicine*. **62**, pp.721-730.
- Immigratie- en Naturalisatiedienst. 2013. *Immigratie- en Naturalisatiedienst: Dé toelatingsorganisatie van Nederland*. [Online]. [Accessed 09-12-2016].

- Immigratie- en Naturalisatiedienst. 2014. *De procedure in het aanmeldcentrum*. [Online]. [Accessed 01-12-2014]. Available from: <https://ind.nl/Documents/6072.pdf>
- Immigratie- en Naturalisatiedienst. 2015. *Voordat uw asielprocedure begint*. [Online]. [Accessed 09-12-2016]. Available from: [https://ind.nl/Documents/Nederlands%20-%20RVT\\_2015.pdf](https://ind.nl/Documents/Nederlands%20-%20RVT_2015.pdf)
- International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies. [No date]. *The phenomenon of migration: Its significance or meaning in human societies throughout history*. [Online]. [Accessed 2015]. Available from: [http://www.ifrc.org/PageFiles/89397/the%20phenomenon%20of%20migration\\_TY\\_PEFI\\_final\\_En.pdf](http://www.ifrc.org/PageFiles/89397/the%20phenomenon%20of%20migration_TY_PEFI_final_En.pdf)
- International Refugee Rights Initiative. [no date]. *The 1951 Convention relating to the Status of Refugees and its 1967 Protocol*. [Online]. [Accessed 09-12-2016]. Available from: <http://www.refugeelawinformation.org/1951-convention>
- Jääskeläinen, R. 2010. Think-aloud protocol. In: Gambier, Y. and Van Doorslaer, L. eds. *Handbook of Translation Studies*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin Publishing Company, pp. ix, 458.
- Jacobsen, B. 2009. The Community Interpreter: A Question of Role. *Hermes – Journal of Language and Communication Studies*. **42**, pp.155-166.
- Jacquemet, M. 2009. Transcribing refugees: the entextualization of asylum seekers' hearings in a transidiomatic environment. *Text & Talk*. **29**(5), pp.525-546.
- Jacquemet, M. 2011. Crosstalk 2.0: asylum and communicative breakdowns. *Text & Talk*. **31**(4), pp.475-497.
- Jiang, L.H., Han, C., Jiang, J.L. and Feng, Y. 2014. The sociological turn in the interpreter's role: Discourse interpreting filters. *Translation and Interpreting Studies*. **9**(2), pp.274-298.
- Jick, T.D. 1979. Mixing Qualitative and Quantitative Methods: Triangulation in Action. *Administrative Science Quarterly*. **24**(4), pp.602-611.
- Josephs, I. 1998. Do you know Ragnar Rommetveit? On dialogue and silence, poetry and pedantry, and cleverness and wisdom in psychology (An interview with Ragnar Rommetveit). *Culture & Psychology*. **4**(2), pp.189-212.
- Kaufert, J. and Putsch, R. 1997. Communication through interpreters in healthcare: Ethical dilemmas arising from differences in class, culture, language and power. *The Journal of Clinical Ethics*. **8**(1), pp.71-87.
- Keselman, O., Cederborg, A.C. and Linell, P. 2010. "That is not necessary for you to know!": Negotiation of participation status of unaccompanied children in interpreter-mediated asylum hearings. *Interpreting: International Journal of Research & Practice in Interpreting*. **12**(1), pp.83-104.
- Lai, M. and Mulayim, S. 2014. Interpreter linguistic intervention in the strategies employed by police in investigative interviews. *Police Practice and Research*. **15**(4), pp.307-321.
- Landesman, C. 1997. *An Introduction to Epistemology*. Cambridge, USA: Blackwell Publishers Inc.
- Leanza, Y. 2005. Roles of community interpreters in pediatrics as seen by interpreters, physicians and researchers. *Interpreting: International Journal of Research & Practice in Interpreting*. **7**(2), pp.167-192.

- Li, S. 2011. *Understanding Interactions in Interpreted Tradic Medical Consultations in Primary Care*. Doctor of Philosophy thesis, University of Leeds.
- Li, S.Y. 2013. Co-construction of interpreted conversation in medical consultations. *Applied Linguistics Review*. **4**(1), pp.127-149.
- Li, X. 2015. Putting interpreting strategies in their place. *Babel*. **61**(2), pp.170-192.
- Linell, P. 1982. *The Written Language Bias in Linguistics*. Linköping: University of Linköping.
- Linell, P. 2003. *What is dialogism? Aspects and elements of a dialogical approach to language, communication and cognition*. Lecture first presented at Vaxijo University, O.T.v.-.-. p.22. 26-02-2003. Available from: <http://cspeech.ucd.ie/Fred/docs/Linell.pdf>
- Linell, P. 2009. *Rethinking Language, Mind, and World Dialogically: Interactional and Contextual Theories of Human Sense-Making*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing Inc.
- Liu, M.H. and Chiu, Y.H. 2009. Assessing source material difficulty for consecutive interpreting: Quantifiable measures and holistic judgment. *Interpreting*. **11**(2), pp.244-266.
- Lourenço, P., Basto, I., Cunha, C. and Bento, T. 2013. Dialogism in detail: Per Linell's Rethinking language, mind, and world dialogically and its potentials. *Culture & Psychology*. **19**(3), pp.421-430.
- Luhmann, N. 1995. *Social Systems*. Standford: Stanford University Press.
- Major, G. and Napier, J. 2012. Interpreting and knowledge mediation in the healthcare setting: What do we really mean by "accuracy"? *Linguistica Antverpiensia New Series-Themes in Translation Studies*. **11**, pp.207-225.
- Marková, I. 1990a. Introduction. In: Markova, I.a.K.F. ed. *The Dynamics of Dialogue*. New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf, pp.1-22.
- Marková, I. 2000. Amédée or How to Get Rid of It: Social Representations from a Dialogical Perspective. *Culture & Psychology*. **6**(4), pp.419-460.
- Marková, I. 2003a. *Dialogicality and Social Representations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Marková, I., Linell, P., Grossen, M. and Salazar Orvig, A. eds. 2007. *Dialogism: interaction, social knowledge and dialogue*. London: Equinox.
- Maryns, K. 2006. *The asylum speaker : language in the Belgian asylum procedure*. Manchester: St Jerome Publishing.
- Routledge Encyclopedia of Interpreting Studies*. 2015. s.v. Asylum Settings,
- Maryns, K. and Blommaert, J. 2001. Stylistic and thematic shifting as a narrative resource: Assessing asylum seekers' repertoires. *Multilingua*. **20**(1), pp.61-84.
- Mason, I. 2001. Introduction. In: Mason, I. ed. *Triadic Exchanges: Studies in Dialogue Interpreting*. Manchester: St. Jerome, pp.i-vi.
- Mason, I. 2006. On mutual accessibility of contextual assumptions in dialogue interpreting. *Journal of Pragmatics*. **38**(3), pp.359-373.
- Mason, I. and Ren, W. 2012. Power in face-to-face interpreting events. *Translation and Interpreting Studies*. **7**(2), pp.233-252.

- Mason, I. and Stewart, M. 2001. Interactional Pragmatics, Face and the Dialogue Interpreter. In: Mason, I. ed. *Triadic Exchanges: Studies in Dialogue Interpreting*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing, pp.51-70.
- Matthews, B. and Ross, L. 2010. *Research methods: a practical guide for the social sciences*. Essex: Pearson Education Limited.
- Maxwell, J.A. 2005. *Qualitative Research Design: An Interactive Approach*. 2nd ed. London: SAGE.
- Maxwell, J.A. 2013. *Qualitative Research Design, An Interactive Approach*. London: SAGE.
- Maynard, M. 1994. *Methods, Practice and Epistemology: The Debate About Feminism and Research*. [Online].
- Merlini, R. 2009. Seeking asylum and seeking identity in a mediated encounter: The projection of selves through discursive practices. *Interpreting*. **11**(1), pp.57-92.
- Routledge Encyclopedia of Interpreting Studies*. 2015. s.v. Dialogue Interpreting, pp.102-107.
- Merlini, R. and Favaron, R. 2005. Examining the “voice of interpreting” in speech pathology. *Interpreting: International Journal of Research & Practice in Interpreting*. **7**(2), pp.263-302.
- Mesa, A. 2000. The Cultural Interpreter: An Appreciated Professional, Results of a Study on Interpreting Services: Client, Health Care Worker and Interpreter Point of View. In: Roberts, R.P., et al. eds. *The Critical Link 2: Interpreters in the Community: Selected Papers from the Second International Conference on Interpreting in Legal, Health and Social Settings, Vancouver, Canada, 19-23 May 1998*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, pp.67-79.
- Minhua, L. and Yu-Hsien, C. 2009. Assessing source material difficulty for consecutive interpreting: Quantifiable measures and holistic judgment. *Interpreting: International Journal of Research & Practice in Interpreting*. **11**(2), pp.244-266.
- Napier, J. 2013. Community interpreting: Asian language interpreters. *Translation and Interpreting: The International Journal of Translation and Interpreting Research*. **5**(2), pp.45-61.
- Naturalisatiedienst, I.-e. 2014. *Over de IND*. [Online]. [Accessed 06-09-2014]. Available from: <https://ind.nl/EN/individuals/Pages/default.aspx>
- Nicolaas, H. and Sprangers, A. 2006. Internationale migratie: Nederland in een Europese context. In: Tubergen, F.v. and Maas, I. eds. *Alloctonen in Nederland in internationaal perspectief*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, pp.13-35.
- Collins English Dictionary*. 2016a. s.v. Ontology,
- Stanford Encyclopaedia of Philosophy Online*. 2016b. s.v. Epistemology,
- Norström, E., Fioretos, I. and Gustafsson, K. 2012. Working conditions of community interpreters in Sweden. *Interpreting*. **14**(2), pp.242-260.
- Nunan, D. 1992. *Research Methods in Language Learning*. 13th ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Patton, M.Q. 1992. *Qualitative Evaluation and Research Methods*. 2nd ed. London: Sage Publications.
- Peetz, V. 1972. 'Propositional Content'. *Analysis*. **32**(6), pp.183-186.

- Pöchhacker, F. 1999. 'Getting Organized': The Evolution of Community Interpreting. *Interpreting*. **4**(1), pp.125-140.
- Pöchhacker, F. 2001. Quality assessment in conference and community interpreting. *Meta*. **46**(2), pp.410-425.
- Pöchhacker, F. 2004. *Introducing Interpreting Studies*. London: Routledge.
- Pöchhacker, F. 2007. Critical Linking up Kinship and convergence in interpreting studies. In: Wadensjö, C., et al. eds. *The Critical Link 4 Professionalisation of interpreting in the community selected papers from the 4th International Conference on interpreting in Legal, Health and Social Service Settings, Stockholm, Sweden, 20-23 May 2004*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing House, pp.11-23.
- Routledge Encyclopedia of Interpreting Studies*. 2015. s.v. Interpreting Studies,
- Pöllabauer, S. 2004a. Interpreting in asylum hearings. *Interpreting: International Journal of Research & Practice in Interpreting*. **6**(2), pp.143-180.
- Pöllabauer, S. 2004b. Interpreting in Asylum Hearings, Issues of Role, Responsibility and Power. *Interpreting*. **6**(1).
- Pöllabauer, S. 2006a. "During the interview, the interpreter will provide a faithful translation." The potentials and pitfalls of researching interpreting in immigration, asylum, and police settings: methodology and research paradigms. *Linguistica Antverpiensia*. **5**.
- Pöllabauer, S. 2006b. "During the Interview, the Interpreter Will Provide a Faithful Translation." The Potentials and Pitfalls of Researching Interpreting in Immigration, Asylum, and Police Settings: Methodology and Research Paradigms. *Linguistica Antverpiensia*. **5**, pp.229-244.
- Potter, J. 1998. Cognition as context (whose cognition?). *Research on Language and Social Interaction*. **31**(1), pp.29-44.
- Potter, J. and Te Molder, H. 2005. Talking cognition: Mapping and making the terrain. In: Potter, H.t.M.J. ed. *Conversation and cognition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp.1-54.
- Raad voor Rechtstbijstand. 2016. *Nieuws*. [Online]. [Accessed 09-12-2016]. Available from: <http://www.rvr.org/nieuws/2010/juli/nieuwe-asielprocedure.html>
- Rabin, C. 1958. The Linguistics of Translation. In: Booth, A.D., et al. eds. *Aspects of TRANSLATION*. London: Secker and Warburg.
- Raido, V.E. 2014. *Translation and Websearching*. New York: Routledge-Taylor & Francis.
- Raymond, C.W. 2014. Epistemic Brokering in the Interpreter-Mediated Medical Visit: Negotiating "Patient's Side" and "Doctor's Side" Knowledge. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*. **47**(4), pp.426-446.
- Roberts, R.P. 1997. Community Interpreting Today and Tomorrow. In: Carr, S.E., et al. eds. *The Critical Link: Interpreters in the Community, Papers from the First International Conference on Interpreting in Legal, Health, and Social Services Settings (Geneva Park, Canada, June 1-4, 1995)*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, pp.7-26.
- Rogers, M. and Corsellis, A. 2008. *Training and Assessment of Public Service Interpreters*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

- Rommetveit, R. 1974. *On Message Structure: A framework for the study of language and communication*. London: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
- Roy, C.B. 2000. *Interpreting as a Discourse Process*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Rudvin, M. 2006. The cultural turn in Community Interpreting: A brief analysis of epistemological developments in Community Interpreting literature in the light of paradigm changes in the humanities. *Linguistica Antverpiensia, New Series – Themes in Translation Studies (LANS – TTS)*. 5, pp.21-41.
- Rudvin, M. 2007. *Interpreting*. 9(1), pp.47-69.
- Russell, S. 2001. Cecilia Wadensjö (1998) Interpreting as Interaction. *Forensic Linguistics*. 8(1), pp.133-138.
- Searle, J.R. 1969. *Speech Acts: An essay in the philosophy of language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Seidman, I. 2006. *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and the social sciences*. 3rd ed. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Shackman, J. 1984. *The Right to be Understood: A handbook on working on with, employing and training community interpreters*. Cambridge: Cambridge National Extension College.
- Shah, A. 2008. *Global Issues: Social, Political, Economic and Environmental Issues That Affect Us All*. [Online]. [Accessed 08-12-2016]. Available from: <http://www.globalissues.org/article/537/immigration#IntroductionWorldwideImmigrantsStatistics>
- Shisheng, L. and Shuang, L. 2012. The role shift of the interpreter to a cultural mediator: From the perspective of cultural orientations and contexting. *Babel*. 58(2), pp.145-163.
- Silverman, D. 2006. *Interpreting Qualitative Data. Methods for analyzing talk, text and interaction*. 3rd ed. London: Sage Publications.
- Smirnov, S. 1997. An overview of liaison interpreting. *Perspectives*. 5(2), pp.211-226.
- Snape, D. and Spencer, L. 2003. The Foundations of Qualitative Research. In: Ritchie, J. and Lewis, J. eds. *Qualitative Research Practice: A Guide for Social Science Students and Researchers*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Spijkerboer, T. [no date]. *De nieuwe asielprocedure*. [Online]. [no place mentioned]: Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam. Available from: [https://www.vluchtelingenwerk.nl/sites/public/Vluchtelingenwerk/migrate/pdf-bibliotheek/Nieuwe\\_asielprocedure\\_Spijkerboer\\_2010.pdf?phpMyAdmin=7w5ZyEx7eG8GI5V6d7LIau64Ca&phpMyAdmin=d103b040daaa28b558cce86d2a2af0e5](https://www.vluchtelingenwerk.nl/sites/public/Vluchtelingenwerk/migrate/pdf-bibliotheek/Nieuwe_asielprocedure_Spijkerboer_2010.pdf?phpMyAdmin=7w5ZyEx7eG8GI5V6d7LIau64Ca&phpMyAdmin=d103b040daaa28b558cce86d2a2af0e5)
- Stake, R.E. 2000. The case study method in social inquiry. In: Gomm, R., et al. eds. *Case Study Method: Key Issues, key Texts*. London: SAGE Publication.
- Suchman, L.A. 1987. *Plans and situated actions: The problem of human-machine communication*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Susam-Sarajeva, Ş. 2009. The Case Study Research Method in Translation Studies. *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer: Training for Doctoral Research*. 3(1), pp.37-56.
- Swanborn, P.G. 2010. *Case Study Research: What, Why and How?* Los Angeles: SAGE Publications.

- Takimoto, M. 2006. Interpreters' role perceptions in business dialogue interpreting situations. *Monash University Linguistics Papers*. 5(1).
- Taylor, S. and Bogdan, R. 1998. *Introduction to Qualitative Research Methods: A Guidebook and Resource*. 3rd ed. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Taylor, S., J. and Bogdan, R. 1984. *Introduction to Qualitative Research Methods: The Search for Meanings*. 2nd ed. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Tipton, R. 2011. *A Socio-theoretical Account of Interpreter-Mediated Activity with Specific Reference to the Social Service Context: Reflection and Reflexivity*. Doctor of Philosophy thesis, University of Salford.
- Tirkkonen-Condit, S. 1990. Professional vs. Non-professional Translation: A Think-Aloud Protocol Study. In: Halliday, M.A.K., et al., eds. *Learning, keeping and using language: Selected papers from the 8th World Congress of Applied Linguistics, 16-21 August 1987, Sydney*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, pp.381-398.
- UNHCR. 2001. Refugees. *The Wall Behind which Refugees Can Shelter*. [Online]. 123. 2.
- UNHCR. 2016a. *Asylum seekers*. [Online]. [Accessed 2016]. Available from: <http://www.unhcr.org/pages/49c3646c137.html>
- UNHCR Syria Regional Refugee Response. 2016. *EUROPE: Syrian Asylum Applications*. [Online]. [Accessed 08-12-2016]. Available from: <http://data.unhcr.org/syrianrefugees/asylum.php>
- UNHCR, T.U.R.A. 2016b. *EUROPE: Syrian Asylum Applications*. [Online]. [Accessed 08-12-2016]. Available from: <http://data.unhcr.org/syrianrefugees/asylum.php>
- United Nations. 2016. *UN Special Rapporteur on the human rights of migrants concludes his follow up country visit to Greece*. [Online]. [Accessed 09-12-2016]. Available from: <http://www.ohchr.org/en/NewsEvents/Pages/DisplayNews.aspx?NewsID=19972&LangID=E>
- Urpi, M.V. 2012. State of the art in Community Interpreting research Mapping the main research topics. *Babel-Revue Internationale De La Traduction-International Journal of Translation*. 58(1), pp.50-72.
- Valsiner, J. and Van der Veer, R. 2000. *The social mind : construction of the idea* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Van Dale Groot Woordenboek Nederlands-Engels. 2nd ed. 1991. s.v.
- Vargas-Urpi, M. 2014. Public service interpreting for Chinese immigrants in Catalonia: a study based on interpreters', coordinators' and users' views. *Language and Intercultural Communication*. 14(4), pp.475-499.
- VluchtelingenWerk, N. 2012. *Vluchtelingen in Getallen 2012*. [Online]. Available from: [http://www.vluchtelingenwerk.nl/pdf-bibliotheek/VLUCHTELINGEN\\_IN\\_GETALLEN\\_2012\\_def\\_OO.pdf](http://www.vluchtelingenwerk.nl/pdf-bibliotheek/VLUCHTELINGEN_IN_GETALLEN_2012_def_OO.pdf)
- VluchtelingenWerk, N. 2014. *Over Vluchtelingenwerk*. [Online]. Available from: <https://www.vluchtelingenwerk.nl/wat-wij-doen/begeleiding-van-asielzoekers>
- Wadensjö, C. 1995. Dialogue Interpreting and the Distribution of Responsibility. *Hermes, Journal of Linguistics*. 14(1995), pp.111-129.
- Wadensjö, C. 1998. *Interpreting as Interaction*. London: Addison-Wesley Longman Limited.

- Wadensjö, C. 2007. Foreword: Interpreting professions, professionalisation, and professionalism. In: Wadensjö, C., et al. eds. *The Critical Link 4 Professionalisation of interpreting in the community Selected papers from the 4th international Conference on Interpreting in Legal, Health and Social Service Settings, Stockholm, Sweden, 20-23 May 2004*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing House, pp.1-8.
- Walliman, N. 2006. *Social Research Methods*. Los Angeles: SAGE Publications.
- Watermeyer, J. 2011. "She Will Hear Me": How a Flexible Interpreting Style Enables Patients to Manage the Inclusion of Interpreters in Mediated Pharmacy Interactions. *Health Communication*. **26**(1), pp.71-81.
- Wengraf, T. 2001. *Qualitative research interviewing : biographic narrative methods and semi-structured methods*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Werkwijzer Vluchtelingen. 2016. *Land van herkomst*. [Online]. [Accessed 08-12-2009]. Available from: <http://www.werkwijzervluchtelingen.nl/feiten-cijfers/aantallen-herkomst.aspx>
- Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek- en Documentatiecentrum. 2011. *De Nederlandse Immigratiekaart: Achtergronden en ontwikkelingen van verschillende internationale migratietypen*. Den Haag.
- Williams, L. 2005. Interpreting Services for Refugees: Hearing Voices? *International Journal of Migration, Health and Social Care*. **1**(1), pp.37-49.
- Wittgenstein, L. 1953. *Philosophical Investigations*. New York: MacMillan.
- Yin, R.K. 2003. *Case study research: design and methods*. 3rd ed. Thousand Oaks, Calif: SAGE Publications.
- Yin, R.K. 2014. *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*. 5th ed. Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE Publications, Inc.

## Appendix I<sup>225</sup>

The text below is the transcribed data of the IME recorded by the researcher. The Dutch and Arabic originals have been translated into English. I have attempted to stay as close as possible to the original text in order to show how sense-making developed during the encounter. Linguistic deficiencies have largely been kept as they are. The reader is advised to read chapter one before reading the transcribed text. This will provide them with context, which will make understanding this text less challenging. All the names in the text have been changed for the sake of anonymity. The Arabic text reflects how the audio-text sounds. It is in Syrian Arabic, the language of the immigrant, reflects how the renditions were produced. For more information on the process of transcription and the decisions which were made, see section 4.2.8.

### Transcription Conventions

The signs which have been used to reflect phonetic features of the oral text which are relevant to this study but which are not captured by standard features of writing is are as follows:

- The colon sign (:), whether in Dutch, Arabic or English represents the lengthening of the sound which precedes it. The colon sign in [So:] thus indicates that the the word is pronounced with a lengthened vowel. In a few cases, this sign has been repeated to indicate that the length of is even longer than a standard elongation. For example, the repetition of the colon sign in [e:::] indicates that [e] here is much longer than the [e] when one or even two colons have been used.
- The dot sign placed between two bracket \*(.)\* means that there is an interval between the word that precedes it and the one that follows it. It is utilized to indicate a very short silence (micro-pause). (..) indicates a pause roughly twice the length of (.), etc.

---

<sup>225</sup> The Arabic text has been kept in Syrian dialect as it was produced by the participants. The researcher has not changed it to Modern Standard Arabic as this study is concerned with studying natural talk.

- To indicate that an element of the text has been pronounced more quietly than the rest of the text, the sign [◌̣] is used. For example, in this example صَحْ، صَحْ these two Arabic word have been pronounced quietly.
- [.hh] indicates that the speaker is inhaling.
- Walla(h) is a filler.
- The text between <text> is pronounced in a quicker way than the speaker usually talks.
- [e::] indicates that the speaker is making a hesitation or other filler sound in Dutch (sometimes represented in writing in English as 'errr').
- .. [unintelligible] indicates that the audio is difficult or to understand or totally incomprehensible due to muddled talk, etc.
- In the Arabic text, [إي] indicates that the speaker is making a hesitation or other filler sound in Arabic. It can be compared to [E::] mentioned in the previous point.
- When the speaker put a particular stress on a syllable or word, this is made bold. For example, in [de**g**elijk], the first syllable has been made bold because the speaker has put particular stress on it.
- The (,) sign is used to function as question mark (?) functions in a normal text, indicating question intonation
- The (?) sign is used to show a rising intonation higher than that indicated the comma sign mentioned in the previous point. It shows that there is a questioning intonation with rising tone.
- The texts have been provided with footnotes. It is advisable to read these footnotes in the text or in its translation. In order to avoid unnecessary repetition footnotes have been given once, most of the time in the original text.
- [ ] text placed in these brackets is not part of the original text as uttered but put in in order to make the translation better readable.
- Texts placed in tables are the 'back-translation[s]' (Baker, 2011) of the Dutch and Arabic talk.
- The . represents terminating intonation (usually with a falling tone).

- = sign indicates that the talk which comes next is produced directly after the first speaker had stopped talking.
- yaʕni is a word that can have different functions in Arabic. Where it is used untranslated, it functions as a filler.
- The footnotes in the Arabic text are written in English and are intended also for the non-Arabic speaker. They provide information on how the interaction progresses.
- At some points where the participant has used pragmatic features which are difficult to show in written text, a note is made of these features in the form of a footnote. See for example turn 152.
- Footnotes are also used to provide extra-linguistic information as in turn 266 where the immigrant confirms something.

This approach, of necessity, has its limitations, such that it might not be reflect 100% of how this interaction went. However, the approach I have adopted has been found to be the most appropriate one in the light of the research questions of this study.

(Door closes)

Lawyer<sup>226</sup>: zo:

Lawyer: So:<sup>227</sup>

1 Lawyer: goed (....) .hhhh (.) ja we zijn al la:ng bezig met jou::r asielpcedure.

Lawyer: good (....) .hhhh (.) yeah we have been busy with you::r asylum procedure for a lo:ng time.

2 المترجم: إحنا صارنا فترة (.) عم نشغل مشغولين ب: (.) إجراءات لجو:نك.

Interpreter: we have been working on been busy with: (.) your asylum procedure (.) for some time.

3 Lawyer: .hh we zijn e:: een aantal weken geleden bij de rechtbank geweest (.) in Den Helder<sup>228</sup>.

Lawyer: .hh we went e:: to court a number of weeks ago (.) in Den Helder.

4 المترجم: قبل إي: عدة أسابيع: ع (.) كنا: في محكمة في دن هيلدر.

Interpreter: several wee:ks ago e: (.) we had a court session in Den Helder.

5 اللاجئ: صح صح.

Immigrant: °correct correct°

6 Interpreter: klopt

Interpreter: correct

7 Lawyer: he:m<sup>229</sup> dat was (.) e: een beetje bijzondere procedu:re (.) want ik ben in beroep gegaan tegen een beslissing van de IND (.) terwijl je een verblijfsvergunning had.

Lawyer: he:m it was (.) e: a unusual procedu:re a little bit (.) for I lodged an appeal against a decision of the IND (.) at a **time** when you [already] had a residence permit.

<sup>226</sup> It would be advisable to read the first chapter before reading this text.

<sup>227</sup> While taking a seat, indicating the meeting can start.

<sup>228</sup> The name of the city has been changed.

<sup>229</sup> This is a filler. It indicates that the lawyer is about to start his rendition.

8 المترجم: هذه الإجراءات كانت إيه استثنائية بعض الشيء لأنو هوّى (. عمل (. إستئناف (. ضد (.)  
قرا:ر (. دائرة الهجرة والتجنيس في حين إنو القرار كان إقامة،

Interpreter: this procedure was e somewhat exceptional for he (. made [sic] (. an appeal (. against (. the deci:sion of (. the immigration and naturalization bureau when the decision [already taken by the IND] was a residence permit,

9 اللاجئ: صح (. شكرا.

Interpreter: correct (. thanks

10 Lawyer: en e: (. de IND (. heeft (. daar op zitting ook gezegd dat ze vonden dat we eigenlijk=dat je helemaal geen recht had om in (. beroep te gaan (. omdat je geen belang had=want je hebt nu verblijfsvergunning .h dus dan kun je niet in beroep e e tegen een asielbesluit.

Lawyer: and e: (. the IND (. said (. there during the [court] session indeed that they were of the opinion that we actually=that you had no right whatsoever to (. lodge an appeal (. because you had no interest=for you have now a residence permit .h so you cannot lodge an appeal e e against an asylum decision.

11 المترجم: وأثّ (. وأثناء الجلسى (. دائرة الهجرة والتجنيس:س قابلت أنو هنىّ (. إي بيشو إي يعني من رأيين إي أنو إنت إي ما من حقاك أنو تتقدم ب: (..) طلب إي إي ب: إستئناف ضد القرار لأنو ما من مصلحتك لأنو أنتى حصلت (. على الإقامة.

Interpreter: and du (. and during the [court] session (. the Immigration and Naturalization Servi:ce sai:d that they (. e: think e: yaʕni<sup>230</sup> they are of the opinion e: that you e: have no right to lodge (. e: e: an appeal against °the decision° because it is **not** in your interest because you [already] have (. received the [residence] permit.

12 Lawyer: e: en ik heb toen uitgelegd (. **bij** de rechtbank (. dat ik vind dat er wel **degelijk** belang is omdat jij .hh e een verblijfsvergunning heb gekregen vanwege de de algeme slechte situatie in Syria (. op dit momen.

Interpreter: e: and I explained then (. **in** court (. that I believe that there is **certainly** interest because you .hh e received a residence permit due to the the general bad situation in Syria (. at this moment.

<sup>230</sup> This is a filler probably used here by the interpreter to give himself time to think/reformulate.

13 المترجم: وهو إي وضّح (.) مَعُن عند المحكمة (.) إنّهو (.) أنتي فعلا (.) في إلك مصلحة (.) في الإستئناف (.) لأنّو إنتي حصلت على الإقامة (.) على ضوء (.) الوضع (.) إي: السيئ (.) حاليا (.) في (.) سوريا؟<sup>231</sup>

Interpreter: And he e explained (.) with [sic] them at [sic] the court (.) that (.) you do indeed (.) have an interest (.) in [lodging] an appeal (.) because you have received the residence [permit] (.) in view of the (.) bad (.) e: situation (.) at present (.) in (.) Syria?

14 اللاجئ: صح

Immigrant: correct

15 Lawyer: en e: (....) toen is jou (.) een (..) verblijfsvergunning verleend (..) met (.) ingang (..) van? .hh even kijk:en (....) mart twee ja maart of juni tweede duizend (...) elf Geloof ik he?

Lawyer: and e: (....) back then you (.) were granted a residence permit (..) with (.) start date (..) of? .hh let's see: (....) March two yeah March or June two thousand (...) eleven I think heh?

16 المترجم: وأعطوك إقامي (.) تاريخ ابتدائها صلاحيتها=بقي يبيلش (.) في شهر ثلاثي او شهر ستي 2011؟

Interpreter: and they gave you a residence [pemit] (.) its validity start date= well it starts (.) in month three or six 2011?

17 Lawyer tries to interject [unintelligible]

18 المترجم: ستة مع بداية 2011

Interpreter: June at the start of 2011

19 المترجم: =خمس طاعش ستي

Interpreter: =fifteen six

20 اللاجئ: صح (.) بشهر إداعش (.) أ ألفين وإداعش.

Immigrant: correct (.) in month eleven (.) tw two thousand and eleven.

21 Interpreter: klopt (.) 2011.

Interpreter: correct (.) 2011.

<sup>231</sup> While producing this rendition, the interpreter sounds as if he is thinking.

**22** Lawyer: precies (.) en ik heb toen gezegd van (.) ja:: .h (.) maar d (.) je hebt in tweed duizend **negen** al asiel aangevraagd= en de hoofdregel is dat een asiel (.) vergunning ingaat (.) e: vanaf het moment van asielaanvraag= dus (.) die verblijfsvergunning had moeten worden verleend met ingang .h van juni 2009.

Lawyer: Exactly (.) and I said then something like (.) ye:::ah .h (.) but (.) you applied for asylum already in two thousand and **nine**= and the main rule is that the asylum (.) [residence] permit starts (.) e: from the moment of the asylum application=thus (.) that residence permit should have been granted from .h june 2009.

**23** المترجم: لكن (.) هو قال لُون نعم (.) ماشي (.) بس إنت قدمت طلب اللجوء في الفين وتسعة (.) و أو القاعدة الأساسية هو أنو طلب اللجوء (.) يعني أو الإقامة الممنوحة (.) بتسري المفعول (.) من تا: ريخ طلب اللجوء=يعني لازم تبلش في شهر ستي (.) الفين وتسعة.

Interpreter: But (.) he said to them yes (.) okay (.) but you submitted the asylum application in two thousand and nine (.) and or the main rule is that the asylum application (.) that is or the granted residence [permit] (.) is valid (.) from the date of the asylum application=that is it must start in month six (.) two thousand and nine.

**24** اللاجئ: صح

Immigrant: correct

**25** interpreter: klopt

Interpreter: correct

**26** Lawyer: en e: om die rede heb ik gezegd ja IND als jullie e::: met een andere datum (*unintelligible*) (.) **dan** moeten jullie **wel** uitlegggen (..) **waarom** dat niet met ingang van 2009 is.

Lawyer: and e: for that reason I said Yes IND if you e::: [*unintelligible*] with another date (.) you **will then** need to explain (..) **why** not from 2009.

(....)

**27** المترجم: إيه يعني (.) هو قال (غير واضح) إذا إنتو (.) إي عيّننو إي تاريخ بداية الإقامى (.) تاريخ مختلف (.) فلأزم ت تقولونه (.) توضّحونه السبب (.) أشو ما: أخذتو بتاريخ الفين وتسعة=الفين وتسعة،

Interpreter: e: yaʕni (.) he said (*unintelligible*) if you (.) e set e the start date of the residence (permit) (.) a different date (.) then you need to to say to us (.) explain to us the reason (.) for what reason you did no:t pick two thousand and nine=two thousand and nine,

Immigrant: correct

29 Interpreter: =klopt

Interpreter: correct

30 Lawyer: want mijn standpunt e: (.) is dat bekend dus **eigenlijk** als als ss je zo een beslissing neemt (.) dat ze jouw asiolverhaal (.) e on voldoende vonden= wat je hebt verteld .h= maar wij weten niet waar**om** en dan moeten nog op kunnen reage:ren .h = omdat het grote gevolgen heeft voor jouw e::: verblijfspositie in Nederland.

Lawyer: for my point of view e: (.) is that means thus **actually** if if ss you take such a decision (.) that they consider your backstory (.) e insufficient<sup>232</sup>= what you said .h= but we do not know **why** and we must then be enabled to res:pond to it [the decision] .h = because it has big consequences for your e::: residence position in the Netherlands.

31 المترجم: يعني هوى (.) وجهة نظروو (.) إبتوو (.) هنى (.) فى هالحالى (.) قرروا بانو قصة اللجوء تبعتك مئا كافية (.) وفي هالحالى (.) بدون يقولونا لشو (.) شو السبب مشان نقدر كمان نقدم برء على (.) هالموضوع= لأنو هالشي ممكن يكون إله (.) عواقب (.) او تأتى:ر (.) على (.) إقامتك فى هولندا<sup>233</sup>.

Interpreter: yaʕni he (.) from his point of view (.) that (.) they (.) in that case (.) decided that your backstory isn't sufficient (.) **and in such a case** (.) they must say to us **for what** (.) **what is the reason** so that we can also submit a response (.) regarding this subject=for this thing can have (.) consequences (.) or influen:ce (.) on (.) your residence in the Netherlands [*interrupted by immigrant*].

32 correct

33 Lawyer: .hh em: (.) want op het moment dat wij gelijk krijgen (.) en dat je **toch** een verblijfvergunning krijgt (.) met datum ingang e: jouw asielaanvraag (.) dat betekent dat je komende **juni** (.) al asiel onbepaalde tijd kan aanvragen en ook je Nederlandse paspoort kan krijgen.

Lawyer: .hh em: (.) for the moment that we are said to be right [by the court] (.) and that you nonetheless receive a residence permit (.) with a start date e: [which is] your asylum application [date] (.) this means that you coming June (.) already can apply for a permanent asylum [residence permit] and you can also get your Dutch passport.

<sup>232</sup> In the sense that it is not good enough for an 'asylum residence permit' (see 1.2.2 in chapter one).

<sup>233</sup> Immigrant interjects (see turn 32).

**34 المترجم:** لأنّو إذا (.) إحنة (.) إي أخذنه (.) اللي بدنا إيّاه (.) وَ و إعترفوا بأنّو (.) تاريخ الإقامى تبعك (.) هو نفس (.) تاريخ (.) طلب اللجوء (.) ففي=هالشى معناه إنّو في شهر سنّى الجاي، من حقّك انه تقدم بطلب للحصول على إقامى مفتوحة، (.) وفينك أنّو تقدم على إي (.) البسبور = على الجنسية.

Interpreter: Because if (.) we (.) e took (.) what we want (.) and and they admitted that (.) your residence [permit] date (.) is the same as (.) the date of (.) the asylum [application] date (.) in this=this thing means that in month six which is coming you have the right to apply for an open-ended residence [permit] (.) and you can apply for a e (.) the passport=for the nationality.

**35 اللاجئ:** صح

Immigrant: correct

**36 Interpreter:** klopt

Interpreter: correct

**37 Lawyer:** .hhh nou die beslissing van de rechtbank was op 15 oktober (.) en de IND had vier weken de tijd om daar tegen in hoger beroep te gaan.

Lawyer: .hhh well that decision of the court was on October 15 (.) and the IND had four weeks to lodge a higher appeal against it.

**38 المترجم:** قرار المحكمى كان صادر في 15 عشرة (.) ودائرة الهجرة والتجنيس كان الا (.) اربع اسابيع من الوقت (.) مشان نتقدم بإستئناف في المحكمة العليا.

Interpeter: the decision of the court was issued on October 15 (.) and the Immigration and Naturalization Service had (.) four weeks of time (.) in order to lodge an appeal at the Higher Court.

**39 Lawyer:** nou die zijn voorbij, (.) en ik heb niks gehoord (.) dus ze zijn niet in hoger beroep (.) gegaan.

Lawyer: these have passed (.) and I have heard nothing (.) so they have not lodged an appeal (.)

**40 المترجم:** الأربعة أسابيع (.) مرّوا (.) وخلصوا (.) وهو ما (سمع<sup>234</sup>) شي فمشان هيك (.) دائرة الهجرة والتجنيس ما قدمت إستئناف في المحكمة العليا.

Interpreter: The four weeks (.) have passed (.) and come to an end (.) and he has not (heard?) anything and this is why (.) the Immigration and Naturalization Services has not lodged an appeal at the High Court.

<sup>234</sup> Word difficult to hear.

41 Lawyer: de rechtbank heeft ook gezegd dat ze binnen zes weken nieuwe besluit moeten nemen en **dat is** komende dinsdag.

Lawyer: the court said also that they have to take a new decision<sup>235</sup> within six weeks and **that is** next Tuesday.

42 المترجم: والمحكمة .. (غير واضح) خلال ست أسابيع بدون يتخذو قرار جديد (.). وهدول بيخلصو (.).  
يوم الثلاثاء (.). الجاي.

Interpreter: and the court .. [unintelligible] within six weeks they need to have taken a new decision (.). and those will end (.). coming (.). Tuesday.

43 اللاجئ: الجاي .. (غير واضح)

Immigrant: the coming .. [rest unintelligible]

44 Lawyer: .hh dus ik ben heel benieuwd (.).<sup>236</sup> of het gaat gebeuren.

Lawyer: .hh thus I am very curious (.). whether it is going to happen.

45 المترجم: فهو متشوق متشوق كتي::ر (.). شو بدو يصير.

Interpreter: so he is longing really longing (.). [to know] what is going to happen.

46 اللاجئ: والله شكرا شكرا يعني هو عمل اللي عليه.

Immigrant: well thanks, thanks, he did what he had to do.

47 Interpreter: dank u wel (.). u heeft e:: gedaan wat u moet doen.

Interpreter: Thank you (.). you e:: did what you must do.

48 Lawyer: okay: .hh eem wat ik vandaag wil **do:en** (.). is nog een keer met jou (.). door jouw asielrelaas (.). lopen e::m d doornemen wat jij hebt verteld .hh e:n e:n voor het geval dr straks (.). **toch** een voornemen komt= want dat **kan** .hh em en dat we ons goed kunnen verdedigen bij e: bij de IND e: om uit te leggen dat je **echt** recht heb op die verblijfsvergunning (.). vanaf 2009= omdat je vanwege je **eigen** problemen Syria ben vertrokken=en **niet** (.). omdat het nu zo slecht is.

<sup>235</sup> In such case, the IND will be expected either to grant the immigrant the 'asylum residence permit' he wants or to decide they want to reject to do so, in which case they will have to send the immigrant a concept decision called Intention to Reject in which the IND explains why it does not to provide the immigrant with an 'asylum resident permit' (see 1.2.2 in chapter One).

<sup>236</sup> Interpreter interrupts here and starts producing his rendition (turn 45).

Lawyer: Okay: .hh e:m what I want to **do**: today (.) is again together with you (.) to walk through (.) your e:::m backstory what you told .hh a:nd a:nd so that in case later (.) **nonetheless** an 'Intention to Reject'<sup>237</sup> came=for that is **possible** .hh em and so that we can defend ourself well e: in front of the IND e: to explain that you **really** have the right to have that residence permit (.) [starting] from 2009=because you left Syria because of your **own** problems= and **not** (.) because the situation is very bad there.

49 المترجم: يعني اللي اليوم بدو يعملوا معك (.) أتو يراجع معك (.) إي قضية (.) قصة اللجوء و تصريحاتك وشغلاتك اللي قلنا، (.) مشان (.) اذا إي::: قاموا باتخاذ (.) نية قرار (.) أو نية رفض (.) ففي هيك حالي (.) وهذا الشي طبعا ممكن يحصل (.) إي في هالحالة يكون عدنا رد مشان أتو (.) إي وفي هالحالة نحاول ندافع عن وجهة نظرنا (.) بأنو دائرة الهجرة والتجنيس (.) كان لازم تمنحك الإقامة (.) من إي 2009 =لأنو انت غادرت سوريا بسبب المشاكل (.) الي تعرضت (.) الا (.)<sup>238</sup> شخصيا.

Interpreter: yaʕni what he wants do together with you today (.) is to review with you (.) e the matter (.) your backstory and your statements and your things which you have said (.) so that (.) if e::: they took (.) a decision concept<sup>239</sup> (.) or an Intention to Reject (.) so in such a case (.) and this thing **is** possible of course (.) e in that case we have an answer so that if (.) e and such a case we try to defend our point of view (.) that the Immigration and Naturalization Service (.) should have granted you a residence [permit] (.) from e 2009=because you left Syria because of the problems (.) you encountered (.) [*immigrant interject: correct*] personally.

50 اللاجئ: صح

Immigrant: correct

51 Lawyer: goe:d e::: ok e: nou je hebt in jouw interview e: verteld (.) dat (.) jij samen (.) met jouw neef die hier nu even niet is maar wie ik nog een gesprek ga hebben (.) dat jullie samen naar Nederland zijn vertrokken= omdat jullie samen problemen hebben gekregen in Syria.

Lawyer: goo:d e::: ok e: well you said in your e: interview<sup>240</sup> (.) that (.) you together (.) with your cousin who is not here right now but with whom I will have a conversation (.) that you together departed to the Netherlands=because you together got into troubles in Syria.

<sup>237</sup> This term refers to a concept decision the IND can take when it wants to reject a request of an immigrant (see section 1.2.2).

<sup>238</sup> Here immigrant interjects: صح

<sup>239</sup> This is the Intention to Reject referred to in section 1.2.2. The IND can decide to reject an application. Before it takes the decision, it informs the party concerned and gives them the opportunity to react to this intention to reject. After receiving the response from the lawyer, the IND takes the decision either to stick to its intention to reject the application, or to take a favourable decision for the immigrant.

<sup>240</sup> The lawyer is referring to the 'detailed hearing' held by the IND (see 1.2.2 in chapter one).

52 المترجم: انت (.) حكيت في المقابلي (.) أنو انتي إي في وقتنا غادرت إي البلد (.) مع ابن عمك أو ابن أخوك (.) الي اليوم مو معنا<sup>241</sup> ابن عمك<sup>242</sup> إي: غادرتو إلى هولندا=لأنو انتو الإثنين تعرضتو إلى: مشاكل.

Interpreter: you (.) said in the interview (.) that you e at the time left e [your] country (.) with your cousin or your nephew (.) who is today not with us<sup>243</sup> your cousin e: you left to the Netherlands=because both of you got into: troubles.

53 اللاجئ: صح°

Immigrant: correct

54 interpreter: klopt

Interpreter: correct

55 Lawyer: e:m ik heb begrepen dat e: tus ik heb het verhaal zo begrepen= jouw vriendin (.) of nee jouw jouw neef had een vriendin e: een meisje leren kennen .hh waarmee e: ja die wat aanrommelde<sup>244</sup> om het zo maar te zeggen .hh (.) en (.) en op een gegeven moment heeft **jou** neef aan jou gevraagd om mee te gaan= zodat het meisje **ook** een vriendin mee zou nemen (.) en dan zou het allemaal wat minder (..) opvallen.

Lawyer: e:m I have understood that e: tog. I have understood the story in such a way=your **girlfriend** (.) or no your your cousin had a girlfriend e: had met a girl .hh with whom e: yeah he used to mess around a little bit (*chuckles*) to put it this way .hh (.) and (.) and at a given moment **your** cousin asked you to accompany [them]=so that the girl **too** would take along a [girl] friend (.) and then things would be less (..) noticeable.

56 المترجم: يعني: (.) حسب ما هوى (.) فهم أنو ابن عمك (.) كان عندو رفيقة: (.) وعمل معا شغلًا: (.) وقال لك قال لك أنو تجي معو مشان هي كمان تجيب رفيقتها معا= مشان تغطو على هالموضوع.

Interpreter: yaʕni: (.) according to how he (.) has understood your cousin had a girl:friend (.) and he did things to her (.) and he said he said to you to come with him so that she too brings her [girl] friend with her=so you cover up this thing.

57 اللاجئ: أختنا أختنا.

Interpreter: her sister her sister

<sup>241</sup> Here the immigrant interjects: my cousin.

<sup>242</sup> Interpreter adopts in the translation what the immigrant just interjected. See last footnote.

<sup>243</sup> here immigrant interjects 'my cousin'

<sup>244</sup> Here lawyer laughs nasally.

58 Interpreter: nee? Ze zou haar zus meenemen.

Interpreter: no? She would take her sister with her.

59 Lawyer: haar **zus** is het, .hh **Ok** = ik heb hier een vriendin staan, een vriendin van een vriendin=maar het gaat om de zus.

Lawyer: it is her **sister**, .hh **OK** (.) I have girlfriend noted here, a girlfriend of a girlfriend=but it is a sister.

60 [the interpreter interrupts the lawyer and addresses the immigrant: ]

61 المترجم: هون المكتوب رفيقة رفيقتنا.

Interpreter: here the text says a friend her friend.

62 اللاجئ: (غير واضح)<sup>245</sup>.

Immigrant: [unintelligible]

63 Interpreter: haar zus.

Interpreter: her sister.

64 Lawyer: °ok° .hh en e: jullie zijn ee met z'n vieren weg- geweest en d'rna ben je die zus vaker gaan ontmoeten.

Lawyer: °ok° .hh and e: you went out the four of you and then you started to meet her sister more often.

65 المترجم: انتو طلعتو إي انتو الاربعة مع بعض وبعدا قابلت اختا (..) بعدا ب بأكثر من مرة.

Interpreter: you went out e: the four of you together and after that you met her sister (..) after that no more than once.

66 اللاجئ: صح

Immigrant: correct

67 Interpreter: klopt

Interpreter: correct

<sup>245</sup> Interpreter starts to translate.

**68** Lawyer: 't was een leuk meisje.

Lawyer: she was a nice girl.

**69** المترجم: كانت إي: صبيية: حلوى:؟

Interpreter: she was e: a beautiful gi:rl?

**70** اللاجئ: كانت حلوة نعم .

Immigrant: Was beautiful yes.

**71** Lawyer: [chuckles]

Lawyer: [chuckles]

**72** Interpreter: 't was een leuk meisje.

Interpreter: she was a nice girl.

**73** Lawyer: 't was een leuk meisje (.) ok.

Lawyer: she was a nice girl (.) ok.

**74** Lawyer: .hhh en: je bent haar gaan opzoeken (.) op (.) op ar school?

Lawyer: .hhh and: you went to visit her (.) at (.) at her school?

**75** المترجم: وكما:ن إي رحت زرتا في مدرستا.

Interpreter: and also: e you went to visit in her school.

**76** اللاجئ: صح

Immigrant: correct

**77** Intepreter: klopt

Interpreter: correct

**78** Lawyer: en e:m toen jullie (.) samen (.) op straat liepen (.) kwam er een politieauto en e: er zijn twee politie in burger naar jou toe gekomen.

Lawyer: and e:m when you (.) together (.) walked over street (.) a police car came and e: and two policemen in plain clothes came to you.

**79** المترجم: ولما كنتو تمشو في الشارع؟ إجت سيارة شرطة نزلو فيها اتنين (. ) إي لابسين مدني (. )  
شرطة لابسين مدني اجو لعندك؟

Interpreter: and when you were walking on street? A police car came two came out (. ) e: in civilian clothing (. ) police in civilian clothing came to you?

**80** اللاجئ: شرطة لابسين مدني (. ) إيه.

Immigrant: police people in plain clothes (. ) Yeah.

**81** Interpreter: klopt ( ) politie in burger.

Interpreter: correct (. ) police in plain clothes.

**82** Lawyer: precies en die hebben jouw identitetiskaart gevraagd.

Lawyer: exactly and they asked to see your identity card.

**83** المترجم: وطلبوا منك هويتك.

Interpeter: and they asked for your ID.

**84** اللاجئ: صح

Immigrant: correct

**85** Lawyer: en die vroegen ook (. ) wie is dat meisje die bij jou is?

Lawyer: and they asked also (. ) who is that girl who is with you?

**86** المترجم: وكمان سألوا مين هال:صبيبة اللي معك.

Interpreter: and also they asked who this girl was who was with you.

**87** اللاجئ: صح

Immigrant: correct

**88** Lawyer: en toen heb je gezegd dat het jou zus is.

Lawyer: and then you said that it was your sister.

**89** المترجم: وقلت لُون إنه هاي اختي.

Interpreter: and you said to hem this is my sister.

90 اللاجئ: صح

Immigrant: correct

91 Lawyer: en toen gingen ze vragen ja wat is de naam van jouw vader=en toen ging het fout=want dat wist ze natuurlijk niet.

Lawyer: and then they asked yeah what is the name of your father=and then it went wrong=for she did not know of course.

92 المترجم: سألوها شو إسم أبوك=وطبعاً هون (. ) حصل الخطأ لأنه ما عرفت تجاوب.

Interpreter: they asked her what is the name of your father<sup>246</sup>

93 اللاجئ: صح

Interpreter: correct

94 Lawyer: en jij krijgt toen een klap (. ) van een van de agenten.

Lawyer: and then you received a blow (. ) from one of the policemen.

95 المترجم: واحد متون (. ) من هدول الشرطة ضريك؟

Interpreter: one of them (. ) of these policemen hit you?

96 اللاجئ: صح

Immigrant: correct

97 Lawyer: en e ze wilde het meisje meenemen.

Lawyer: and e they wanted to take the girl with them.

98 المترجم: كان بدون ياخو (. ) البنت معهن.

Interpreter: they wanted to take the girl (. ) with them.

99 اللاجئ: صح

Immigrant: correct.

100 Lawyer: Uiteindelijk heb je geld kunnen betalen en toen hebben ze je e met rust gelaten.

<sup>246</sup> Unlike in the original of the lawyer, this 'your' refers to the girl's father.

Lawyer: eventually you were able to pay money and then they left you in peace.

101 المترجم: وفي النهاية دفعتمون مصاري مشان يتركوك لخالك.

Interpreter: In the end you payed them money to make them leave you in peace.

Immigrant : correct

102 صح

103 Lawyer: Hoeveel heb je gegeven?

Lawyer: How much did you give?

104 المترجم: قديش دفعت لُون؟

Interpreter: how much did you pay them?

105 اللاجئ: والله ما اتزكر .. (غير واضح)<sup>247</sup>

Immigrant: I really don't remember .. (*unintelligible*)

106 Interpreter: dat weet ik echt niet meer. Ik heb ze wat geld gegeven wat ik mee zat.

Interpreter: I really do not know that anymore. I gave them some money which I had on me.

107 Lawyer: je hebt hier verteld (.) e::: ongeveer 2000 pond (.) Kan dat?

Lawyer: you said here<sup>248</sup> (.) e::: about 2,000 pounds (.) is this possible?

108 المترجم: هون قُلت لُون (.) تقريبا ألفين (.) جنبيه؟

Interpreter: here you told them (.) about two thousands (.) pounds?

109 اللاجئ: والله ممكن هيك والله ما اتذكر.

Immigrant: well something like that I really do not remember

<sup>247</sup> The immigrant talks in a low voice.

<sup>248</sup> That is in the IND report he is reading in.

110 المترجم<sup>249</sup>: جنبه جنيه.

Interpreter: pounds pounds.

111 112 اللاجئ: سوري سوري (. مصاري سورية.

Interpreter: Syrian Syrian (.) Syrian money.

113 Interpreter: Lira (.) Syrische Lira.

Interpreter: Lira (.) Syrian Lira.

114 Lawyer: Lira.

Lawyer: Lira

115 Interpreter: geen pond.

Interpreter: not pounds.

116 Lawyer: Lira<sup>250</sup> het is al lang geleden he?

Lawyer: Lira it has been a long time he?

117 المترجم: من زمان حكاها (. أكثر أربع سنين.

Interpreter: he said this (.) a long time ago.

118 اللاجئ: من زمان (. يعني من شي .. (غير واضح)

Immigrant: a long time ago (.) like .. [unintelligible]

119 Lawyer: ok (...) °goed° Jah ik zie trouwens dat ik in de correcties en aanvullingen had ik dat al gecorrigeerd (.) dat het niet om de vriendin ging (.) maar om de zus.

Lawyer: Ok (...) °good° yeah by the way I see in the Corrections and Additions that I already had corrected that (.) that it was not about a girlfriend (.) but about her sister.

120 المترجم: هو (. شاييف هون (. في التصحيحات والإضافات (. أتو صلح هالموضوع (. أتو مو رفيقتنا (. وأتما اختا.

Interpreter: He (.) sees here (.) in the Corrections and Additions (.) that he

<sup>249</sup> The Interpreter interjecting.

<sup>250</sup> In a low voice, as if he is making notes.

corrected this matter (.) that it's not her girlfriend (.) but her sister.

121 اللاجئ: اخنا صح

Immigrant: her sister correct

122 Interpreter: klopt (.) haar zus.

Interpreter: correct (.) her sister.

123 Lawyer: ok (..) e:mm (..) nou uiteindelijk hebben ze jullie laten gaan met een waarschuwing en heb je ook aantal weken geen contact met haar gezocht.

Lawyer: ok (..) e:mm (..) well eventually they let you go with a warning and you too did not seek to contact her for a number of weeks.

124 المترجم: وفي النهاية أعطوكو تحذير و و و إي إي إي خلّوكن (.) تمشو (.) وانت لمدة (.) عدّة أسابيع بعد هالموضوع (.) ما كان في اتصال بينك وبيننا.

Interpreter: And in the end they gave you a warning and and and e e they let you (.) go away (.) and you for (.) several weeks after this thing (.) there was no contact between you and her.

125 اللاجئ: لا (.) إي ما فهمت عليك السؤال.

Immigrant: no (.) e I didn't understand you the question.

126 Interpreter: Ik zal het herhalen meneer heeft het niet begrepen.

Interpreter: I will repeat the gentleman did not understand it.

127 Lawyer: ja

Lawyer: yes

128 المترجم: بعد ما أعطوكن تحذير (.) تركوكن.

Interpreter: after they gave you a warning (.) they let you go.

129 اللاجئ: مين أعطانا تحذير؟ (..) الشرطة يعني؟

Immigrant: who gave us a warning? (..) You mean the police?

130 المترجم: إيه

Interpreter: yeah

131 اللاجئ: إيه إيه<sup>251</sup>

Immigrant: yeah yeah<sup>252</sup>

132 المترجم: وبعدا (.) عدة اسابيع بعد هالحادثة (.) ما كان ما كان في إتصال.

Interpreter: And after that (.) a number of weeks after this incident (.) there was no there was no contact.

133 Interpreter: dat klopt.

Interpreter: that is right.

134 Lawyer: en toen heeft ze jou opgebeld (.) en gevraagd waarom je haar niet meer wilde zien.

Lawyer: and then she phoned you up (.) and asked why you no longer wanted to see her.

135 المترجم: وبعدا هي تلفنت لك وقالت لك إيه إيه ما بدك (.) تشوفا.

Interpreter: and after that she phoned you up and said to you why why you do not want (.) to see her.

136 اللاجئ: صح.

Immigrant: correct.

137 Lawyer: je hebt toen uitgelegd dat je bang was voor de politie en niet meer naar haar toe wilde komen.

Lawyer: you explained back then that you were afraid of the police and did not want to go to her any longer.

138 المترجم: وقلت لها انو انتي خيفان من الشرطة: و ما بدك تروح لعندا.

Interpreter: and you said to her that you are afraid of the police: and you do not want to go to her.

139 اللاجئ: صح.

Immigrant: correct

<sup>251</sup> Interpreter continues with below rendition.

<sup>252</sup> Here the interpreter carries on with the last turn.

**140** Lawyer: en uiteindelijk heb je voorgesteld om elkaar (.) te ontmoeten (.) maar dan in het huis van jouw broer.

Lawyer: and eventually you proposed to (.) meet each other (.) but then in the house of your brother.

**141** المترجم: وبعدا إيه اقترحت انو إي نتقابلوا مع بعض؟ في بيت اخوك.

Interpeter: and after that you suggested e meeting each other? In the house of your **brother**.

**142** اللاجئ: صح

Immigrant: correct

**143** Lawyer: dat huis stond leeg.

Lawyer: the house was empty

**144** المترجم: وهالبيت كان فاضي.

Interpreter: and this house was empty.

**145** Lawyer: jouw broer woonde daar niet meer?

Lawyer: your brother did not live there any more?

**146** المترجم: أخوك ما كان ساكن هونيك في البيت؟

Interpreter: you brother was not living there in the house?

**147** اللاجئ: لا

Immigrant: no

**148** Interpreter: nee

Interpreter: no

**149** Lawyer: waar (.) waar was hij, Waar was jouw broer,<sup>253</sup>

Lawyer: where (.) where was he? Where was your brother?

<sup>253</sup> Interrupted by interpreter, who starts to translate following rendition.

150 المترجم: وين كان؟

Interpreter: where was he?

151 اللاجئ: والله كان يروح للبيت ويجي (. ) على بيت أهلي يعني.

Immigrant: well he used to go home and come back (. ) to the house of my family I mean.

152 Interpreter: hij gaat naar het huis van mijn ouders<sup>254</sup>.

Interpreter: he goes to the house of my parents.

153 Lawyer: maar woonde hij bij jouw ouders?

Lawyer: but he used to live with your parents?

154 المترجم: كان ساكن عند اهلك؟

Interpreter: he lived with your family?

155 اللاجئ: كان ساكن .. (غير واضح)<sup>255</sup>

Immigrant: he lived ...

156 المترجم: ساكن عند اهلك؟

Interpreter: he was living with your family?

157 اللاجئ: وبيته فاضي.

Immigrant: and his house was empty.

158 Interpreter: Ja (. ) en daarom stond<sup>256</sup>.

Interpreter: yes (. ) and that is why .

159 اللاجئ: وأحيانا يروح هونيك وأحيانا يجي بس اكثر شيء كان ..<sup>257</sup>

Immigrant: and sometimes he goes there and sometimes he comes but most of the time ..

<sup>254</sup> Rendition produced in a nonchalant manner.

<sup>255</sup> Produced in low voice, and interpreter jumps in.

<sup>256</sup> The immigrant interrupts.

<sup>257</sup> The interpreter jumps in.

**160** Interpreter: zijn huis meesal leeg. Soms ging ie wel daar snapt u? Maar niet altijd.

Interpreter: his house most of the time empty [*sic*]. Sometimes he did go there [*sic*] do you undersand? But not always.

**161** Lawyer: nee percies (.) even voor eigen mijn beeldvorming dus? (.) hij had er wel wat spullen staan van hemzelf= het was niet zo dat er helemaal niets stond en hij woonde daar **wel eens** maar verbleef meestal bij jouw ouders.

Lawyer: no precisely (.) just for me to imagine? (.) he did have some stuff there belonging to himself=it was not that there was nothing there, and he lived there **sometimes** but lived most of the time with your parents.

**162** المترجم: يعني مشان (.) تخيلو هو (.) مشان يتصور الوضع هو كان البيت فيه إي أغراض أو حاجات لأخوك؟ (.) ما كان فاضي يعني؟ .. (غير واضح)

Interpeter: just for the sake of (.) his imagination (.) so that he can imagines the situation the house there was e stuff or things belonging to your brother in it? That is it was not empty? .. [*unintelligible*]

**163** اللاجئ: ما كان معبّي كان فيه شوية أغراض والله شوية أغراض .. (غير واضح)<sup>258</sup>

Immigrant: it was not full there was some stuff yeah some stuff .. [*unintelligible*]

**164** Interpreter: er stonden daar wat aantal spullen in het huis.

Interpreter: there were [*sic*] some stuff in the house.

**165** اللاجئ: مش هالبيت المليان الجاهز الكامل ..<sup>259</sup>

Immigrant: the house was not that full (.) ready (.) complete ...

**166** Interpreter: het is dus niet dat hij volledig e::: gemeubeld (.) was.

Interpreter: thus it is not that it was (.) fully e::: furnished.

**167** Lawyer: nee **precies** ok (...) e:m **ja** je hebt ook sex met haar gehad e::: in zijn woning.

Lawyer: no **precisely** ok (...) e:m **yeah** you had also sex with her e::: in his residence.

<sup>258</sup> The interpreter starts with his following rendition before immigrant has finished his original.

<sup>259</sup> Interrupted by the interpreter.

168 المترجم: كمان إي مارست الجنس معا في (.) بيتو.

Interpreter: also e you had sex with her in (.) his house.

169 اللاجئ: صح صح.

Immigrant: correct correct

170 Lawyer: en op een gegeven moment is jouw broer naar je toe gekomen en gezegd e: dat hij het door had wat was jij aan het doen was met dat meisje in zijn huis en als jij het nog een keer zou doen dat hij dan naar jouw vader zou toe stappen.

Lawyer: And at a given moment you brother came to you and said e: that he was aware what you were doing with that girl in his house and if you did it once more he would go to you father.

171 المترجم: وبعدا أخوك اجا لعندك وقال لك أنا عرفان شو بتعمل مع هالبننت في (.) في إي بيتي (.) وإذا عدتا مرة ثانية بدو كان يبلغ الوالد.

Interpreter: and after that your brother came to you and said to you I know what you are doing with this girl in (.) in e my house (.) and if you repeated it again he would inform the father.

172 Lawyer: em nou ongeveer twee weken later ben je gebeld door e door dit meisje.

Lawyer: well about two weeks later you were phoned by e this girl.

173 المترجم: بعد تق بعد تقريبا اسبوعين (.) إي تلفنت لك هاي الصبيي.

Interpreter: after ab after about two weeks (.) e this girl phoned you.

174 اللاجئ: والله شي اسبوعين.

Immigrant: Wallah about two weeks.

175 Interpreter: ongeveer (.) zo ongeveer ..<sup>260</sup>

Interpreter: about (.) about ..

176 اللاجئ: ما بتذكر والله ما بتذكر. من زمان.

<sup>260</sup> Interrupted by the immigrant.

Immigrant: I don't remember really I don't remember. [It was a] long time ago.

**177** Interpreter: kan ik me niet herinneren =kan me niet herinneren omdat het lang geleden is.

Interpreter: I cannot remember=cannot remember because it has been a long time.

**178** Lawyer: ja' en em ze vertelde dat ze je moest zien.

Lawyer: yeah and em she said that she needed to see you.

**179** المترجم: قالت لك انو (.) لازم تشوفك.

Interpreter: she said to you that (.) she must see you.

**180** اللاجئ: صح

Immigrant: correct

**181** Lawyer: je hebt gevraagd wat is er aan de hand.

Lawyer: you asked what happened.

**182** المترجم: سألتنا شو فيه؟

Interpreter: you asked her what has happened?

**183** Lawyer: maar dat wilde ze eerst niet vertellen.

Lawyer: but she did not want to say at the beginning.

**184** المترجم: في البداية ما كان بدا تفلك.

Interpreter: initially she did not want to tell you.

**185** En uiteindelijk heeft ze gezegd dat haar zus is vermoord (.) door haar familie.

Lawyer: and eventually she said that her sister had been killed (.) by her family.

**186** المترجم: وفي النهاية قالت لك انو اختنا (.) اتقتلت من قبل عائلتنا.

Interpreter: and in the end she said to you that her sister (.) was killed by her

family.

187 اللاجئ<sup>261</sup>: صح

Immigrant: correct

**188** Lawyer: °ok° e: ze waren dr achtergekomen dat e: haar zus (.) dus de vriendin van jouw neef (.) e: een abortus had moeten laten ee uitvoeren.

Lawyer: °ok° e: they had found out that e: her sister (.) that is the girlfriend of your cousin (.) een had to undergo an abortion.

**189** المترجم: وهنّي (.) الأهل اكتشفو أنّه اخنا (.) يعني (.) رفيقة ابن عمك (.) إي عملت (.) عملية اجهاض (.) إسقاط.

Interpreter: and they (.) the family found out that her sister (.) that is (.) the girlfriend of you cousin (.) had undergone (.) an abortion (.)

**190** Lawyer: En haar familie heeft haar toen **in** het ziekenhuis vermoord.

Lawyer: and her family killed her then **in** the hospital.

**191** المترجم: وأهلا (.) أو عائلنا قتلوها بالمشفى.

Interpreter: and her relatives (.) or her family killed her **in** the hospital.

192 اللاجئ: صح

Immigrant: correct

**193** Interpreter: klopt

Interpreter: correct

**194** Lawyer: en e:m (...) ja je hebt jouw neef gebeld (.) en dit verteld.

Lawyer: And e:m (...) yeah you phoned your cousin (.) and told him this.

**195** المترجم: وأنت إتصلت بابن عمك وقلتلو.

Interpeter: And you contacted your cousin and said to him.

196 اللاجئ: صح

<sup>261</sup> The immigrant interjects this.

Immigrant: correct

197 هالشي

Interpreter: this

198 Interpreter: klopt.

Interpreter: correct

199 Lawyer: en e:m jouw vriending wilde (.) dat je haar meenam (.) dat je met haar wegging.

Lawyer: e:m your girlfriend wanted (.) that you took her (.) that you left with her.

200 المترجم: ورفيقتك قالتلك إنه إي خدني معك أو انوو (.) تهربو مع بعض.

Interpreter: and your girlfriend said to you e take me with you or that (.) you flee together.

201 اللاجئ: صح

Immigrant: correct

202 Lawyer: en als je dat niet zou doen zou ze alles (.) tegen haar familie zeggen en dan zeggen dat (.) jij verantwoordelijk bent e: <sup>262</sup>

Lawyer: and if you did not do that she would tell everything (.) to her family and say that (.) you are responsible e:

203 المترجم: وقالتك إذا ما تعمل هيك هي بدا تحكي كل شي ل: أهلا لعيلتها (.) وبتقولهن انه انت المسؤول عن هالشي.

Interpreter: and she said to you if you don't do this she would tell everything to her relatives to her family (.) and she would say to them you are responsible °for this matter.°

204 اللاجئ: آ

Immigrant: yeah

205 Lawyer: en daarbij zei ze het intereseert me niet dan ga ik maar dood maar jij ook.

<sup>262</sup> The interpeter jumps in.

Lawyer: and at the same time she said I don't care I will die but so will you.

206 المترجم: وقالئك أنا إي إي ب هالحالة ما بيهمني؟ (.) خلاص بموت (.) لكن بتموت انت كمان.

Interpreter: and she said to you I don't mind in such a case? (.) Ok I'll die (.) but you will die too.

207 اللاجئ: صح

Immigrant: correct

208 Interpreter: klopt

Interpreter: correct

209 Lawyer: hoe oud was zij?

Lawyer: how old was she?

210 -

211 المترجم: قديش كان عمرا؟

Interpreter: what was her age?

212 اللاجئ: والله من جيلي تقريبا.

Immigrant: well about my generation

213 Interpreter: ongeveer hetzelfde leeftijd als ik?

Interpreter: about the same age as me?

214 Lawyer: e: toen?<sup>263</sup>

Lawyer: e: then?

215 المترجم: بوقتنا<sup>264</sup>

Interpreter: back then (*lawyer chuckles*)

216 المترجم: بوقتنا:؟ بوقتنا قديش كان.(.) والله ما تذكر.

Immigrant: at the time::? At the time how old she was (.) I really do not

<sup>263</sup> While chuckling.

<sup>264</sup> Lawyer chuckles.

remember.

**217** Interpreter: hoe laat was het toen (.) dat kan ik me echt (.) echt niet herinneren.

Interpreter: what time was it then (.) really (.) really I can't remember.

**218** Lawyer: 18 19? Zo iets?

Lawyer: 18 19? Something like that?

**219** المترجم: ثمنطاعش تسعطاعش (.) هيك شي؟

Interpreter: eighteen nineteen (.) something like that?

**220** اللاجئ: والله هيك شي.

Interpreter: well something like that

**221** Lawyer: Denk ik.<sup>265</sup>

Lawyer: I think so.

**222** Interpreter: ongeveer ongeveer.

Interpreter: roughly roughly.

**223** Lawyer: °ok° (.) °goed°(..) E:m (...) vervoelgens e: heb je e: (..) Ahmed gebeld<sup>266</sup> Ahmed, ja.

Lawyer: Ok (.) good (..) e:m (...) the:n e: you phone:d (..) Ahmed.

**224** المترجم: وبعدا (.) تلفنت لأحمد،

Interpreter: and after that (.) you phoned Ahmed,

(.)

**225** اللاجئ: صديقي ايه نعم.

Immigrant: my friend yes

**226** Interpreter: mijn vriend, ja, Ahmed (.) ja.

<sup>265</sup> The lawyer interjects this before the interpreter has started to produce the translation.

<sup>266</sup> The interpreter asks lawyer: Ahmed?

Interpreter: my friend, yes, Ahmed (.) yes.

**227** Lawyer: is een vriend van jou, (.) o:kay .hh En je hebt verteld wat er (.) wat er aan de hand was.

Lawyer: he is a friend of yours, (.) o:kay .hh and you said what had (.) what was going on,

**228** المترجم: وقالتو (.) شو (.) شو صار معك.

Interpreter: and you said to him (.) what (.) °what happened to you.°

**229** اللاجئ: صح

Immigrant: correct

**230** Interpreter: Klopt

Interpreter: correct

**231** Lawyer: e:n em jij hebt aan hem gevraagd of hij een woning voor jou kon regelen (.) waar je met je toekomstige vrouw kon n: kon verblijven.

Lawyer: a:nd em you asked him if he could arrange a house for you (.) where you could could reside with you future wife.

**232** المترجم: وطلبت منو انو يدبرلك (.) شي بيت (.) انه تقدر تسكن فيه مع: زوجة، المستقبل.

Interpreter: and you requested him to find you (.) some house (.) that you could reside in with your future wife.

**233** اللاجئ: صح

Immigrant: correct

**234** Interpreter: klopt

Interpreter: correct

**235** Lawyer: en e: dat heeft hij gedaan (.) hij heeft een woningruimte geregeld in de wijk al Karama.

Lawyer: and e: he did that (.) he arranged a dwelling space in al Karama.

**236** اللاجئ: كرامة صح

Immigrant: al Karam correct

237 Lawyer: al Karama.

Lawyer: al Karama.

238 المترجم: نو نو هو: عمل هالشي؟ (.) رتبلك (.) إي في منطقة الكرامة (.) رتبلك بيت (.) مسكن.

Interpreter: and and he did this:? (.) He arranged (.) e in al Karama (.) arranged a house (.) a dwelling.

239 اللاجئ: صح

Immigrant: correct

240 Lawyer: en e:m (..) ja: kort (.) ongeveer (.) iets minder dan een week toen jullie d'r woonden is ter een inval geweest in e de woning.

Lawyer: and e:m (..) yea:h short (.) about (.) a little less than a week when you moved there there was a raid on the house.

241 المترجم: وَ أَقْلَ من اسبوع بعد ما سكتتو هونيك (.) إي حصل فيه اقتحام (.) ل: المسكن

Interpreter: and and less than a week after you moved there (.) e: the house (.) was raided.

242 اللاجئ: صح

Immigrant: correct

243 Interpreter: klopt

Interpreter: correct

244 Lawyer: en mense mensen zeiden hoe (.) haal het je in je hoofd om met **die** familie e problemen te maken. De familie van (.) jouw vriendin bedoelde ze.

Lawyer: and people people said how (.) **did** you get it into your head to make e problems with **that** e family. They meant the family (.) of your girlfriend.

245 Interpreter: mensen zei u?

Interpreter: you said people, Sir?

**246** Lawyer: ja de politieagenten

Lawyer: yes the police officers

**247** Interpreter: o de politie.

Interpreter: oh the police.

**248** المترجم: وقالك (.) الشرطة فلأك شو: (.) كي:ف خطر ببالك أتو تعمل (.) مشكل مع هيك (.) عائلة (.) مع هدولى الناس.

Interpreter: and (.) the police said what the hell (.) how did you get it into your head to make (.) problems with such (.) a family (.) with those people.

**249** اللاجئ: صح

Immigrant: correct

**250** Lawyer: e:n toen hebben ze gezegd (.) we brengen je naar beneden en je moet goed luisteren we schieten dadelijk (.) in de lucht (.) en dan ren je (.) dan ga je weg.

Lawyer: a:nd then they said (.) we will bring you down and you must listen well we will shoot in the air (.) shortly (.) and then you run (.) then you run away.

**251** المترجم: وقالوك بدنا نناخذك لتحت (.) اسمع منيح بدنا نقوس بالهوة (.) وبدك تهرب.

Interpreter: and they said to you we want to take you down (.) listen well we want to shoot in the air (.) and you must run away.

**252** اللاجئ: لا ما قال بنقوس= قال تسمع ضرب رصاص تهرب.

Immigrant: no he did not say we will shoot=he said when you hear shooting you run away.

**253** اللاجئ: هو ما قلّي نقوس بالهوا.

Immigrant: he did not say to me we will shoot in the air.

**254** Interpreter<sup>267</sup>: ze zeiden niet we schieten in de lucht= ze zeiden als je e::: als je als je <sup>268</sup> het geluid van beschietingen hoort dan moet je (.) vluchten.

<sup>267</sup> The interpreter starts directly after the last original of the immigrant.

<sup>268</sup> The immigrant interjects: *when you hear bullet sounds*.

Interpreter: they did not say we will shoot in the air =they said if you e::: if you if you hear the sound of shots then you have to (.) flee.

**255** Lawyer: ok (..) maar je moest je wel laten melden (.) op het politiebureau.

Lawyer: ok (..) but you had to report back (.) to the police station.

**256** المترجم: لكن (.) كان بذك (.) تبالغ (.) تروح تبلغ عن حالك؟ إي في مركز الشرطة (.) في المخفر.

Immigrant: But (.) you were required (.) to go and report e at the police station (.)

**257** اللاجئ: .. (غير واضح<sup>269</sup>) يعني قبل ما يجوني؟

Immigrant: .. (*unintelligible*) you mean before they came to me?

**258** Interpreter: Voor: dat ze b bij mij waren geweest?

Interpreter: before they had come to me?

**259** Lawyer: =nee (.) ze zeiden je je(.) als je schoten hoort ren je weg= maa:r (..) later moet je je wel bij de politie melden.

Lawyer: =no (.) they said you you (.) if you hear shots then you run away=bu:t (..) later you were required to go to the police.

**260** المترجم: قالوك لما بنقوس (.) بذك تهرو:ب (.) لكن بعدين بذك ترجع الى مخفر الشرطة.

Interpreter: They said to you when we shoot (.) you must run away (.) but later you must retun to the police station.

**261** اللاجئ<sup>270</sup>: هو قلّي اذا سمعت صوت رصاص تهرب = ترجع تسلّم حالك.

Interpreter: He said to me if you heard sound of bullets you run away=you return to give yourself up.

**262** المترجم: ترجع؟ تسلّم حالك.

Interpreter: you return? And give yourself up.

**263** Interpreter: ja= ze zeiden als je de de schoten e hoort (.) dan **moet** je vluchten .hh en daarna moet je melden.

<sup>269</sup> Interruptions.

<sup>270</sup> The immigrant starts 5 words before the end of the original of the lawyer.

Interpreter: ja=they said if you hear the the shots e (.) then you **must** flee .hh and after that you must report.

**264** Lawyer: Ok (.) en ze hadden je vader vast.

Lawyer: Ok (.) and they were holding your father.

**265** المترجم: وكانوا ماسكين بيك.

Interpeter: and they were holding your father.

**266** اللاجئ: أبوي<sup>271</sup>.

Interpreter: my father.

**267** Lawyer: °goed° (..) e:m (.) wat is er zo bijzonder aan die familie,

Lawyer: °goed° (..) e:m (.) what's so special about that family,

**268** المترجم: شو؟ هال (.) شي (.) الإستثنائي؟ في هدولة عيلة ال (.) العيلة،

Interpreter: what is? this (.) special? thing (.) about this family (.) the family,

**269** المترجم: يشتغلوا يشتغلوا مع الحكومي كانوا.

Immigrant: they were working they were working with the government

**270** اللاجئ<sup>272</sup>: يعني مدعومي:ن من الحكومة.

Immigrant: that is they are **backed** by the government.

**271** Interpreter: zij worden ondersteund en werken samen met de (..) autoriteiten.

Interpreter: they are supported and work together with the (..) authorities.

**272** Lawyer: en op wel wat voor manier werken ze samen,

Lawyer: and in which manner do they work together,

**273** = شو؟ كيف يشتغلو مع الحكومة؟

<sup>271</sup> He said this in a confirming voice.

<sup>272</sup> The immigrant says this after interpreter has started to produce the following rendition (turn 271).

How? How do they work with the government?

274 يشتغلو على المخدرات = تجار سلاح هتّى (. مدعو مين = زكّنين يعني.

Immigrant: they work in drugs=weapons traders they are (.) [they] are supported=[they] are rich yaʕni.

275 Interpreter: ze zijn betrokken bij wapen (.) en drugshandel. Zij (.) zijn rijk (..) en zij krijgen ondersteuning.

Interpreter: they are involved in weapons (.) and the drugs trade. They (.) are rich (..) and they are supported

276 Lawyer: en hoe weet je dat?

Lawyer: and how do you know that?

277 المترجم: كيف عرفت<sup>273</sup>؟

Interpreter: how did you know [that]?

278 المترجم: معروفين في كل حلب (. بيت الحسين كل الناس تعرفو.

Immigrant: they are known throughout Aleppo (.) the family of Hussein all the people know it.

279 (المحامي يتمم بالضحك)

(Lawyer chuckles)

280 Interpreter: Hussein (.) familie Hussein (.) zijn bekend overall in Aleppo=iedereen weet (.) wie (.) die mensen zijn.

Interpreter: The Hussein (.) family Hussein (.) is known everywhere in Aleppo=everyone (.) knows (.) who those people are.

281 Lawyer: en hoe haal je het dan (.) in je je hoofd (.) om juist met iemand van die familie ..<sup>274</sup>

Lawyer: and how did you get that then (.) into your head (.) to [unintelligible] with somebody from that family.

282 المترجم<sup>275</sup>: وكيف .. (غير واضح) هالعيلة بالزبط.

<sup>273</sup> Rendition produced in an expeditious manner, compared to the original.

<sup>274</sup> Interrupted by the interpreter.

Interpreter: And how [unintelligible] exactly this family.

283 اللاجئ: هالشغلى الشغلة هيڪ صارت .. (غير واضح)

Immigrant: this matter this matter happened the way it did [unintelligible]

284 Interpreter<sup>276</sup>: .. is het ons lot die heeft ons samen (.) heeft gebracht.

Interpreter: .. (unintelligible) it is our fate which brought (.) brought us together.

285 Lawyer: ja (.) Heb je nooit heb je d'r ooit stil bij gestaan?

Lawyer: yeah (.) have you never have you ever reflected on it?

286 المترجم: ما فكرت؟ فكرت مرة شى مرة بها الموضوع،

Interpreter: you did not think? You did not .. think some day about this matter,

287 اللاجئ: والله (.) فكرت بس هذا الي صار (.) يعني شغلى صارت.

Immigrant: well (.) I did think but this is what happened (.) it just happened

288 Interpreter: ik heb daar wel still bij gestaan<sup>277</sup>= maar het is gebeurd zoals het gebeurd is.

Interpreter: I did reflect on that =but it happened the way it did.

289 Lawyer: °ok° (...) e: inmiddels is ter hoop veranderd in Syria (.) ook in Aleppo is is **f**link gevochten heb je e: enig idee waa (.) of die familie nog steeds aan de kant van de autoriteiten staat= of ze daar zijn of ze weg zijn?

Lawyer: °ok°. (...) t! e: in the meantime a lot has changed in Syria (.) in Aleppo too there there has been **f**ierce fighting have you e e any idea whee (.) whether that family is still on the side of the authorities=whether they are there or have left?

290 المترجم: يعني في الوقت اللي فات صار في كثير تغيرات في سوريا وفي حلب صار في معارك و اشتباكات<sup>278</sup> حسب معلوماتك (.) هدول لساتون واقفين مع النظام هالعيلى (.) ولا طلعو ولا لساتون موجودين،

<sup>275</sup> The interpreter interrupts the lawyer. Interpreter and the lawyer talk at the same time.

<sup>276</sup> The interpreter jumps in.

<sup>277</sup> The last three words were not pronounced clearly.

<sup>278</sup> Here the immigrant jumps in and says: 'correct'.

Interpreter: yaʕni in the past period many changes have taken place in Syria and in Aleppo battles and confrontations have taken place [immigrant: correct] according to your information they are still on the side of the regime this family (.) or they have left or they are still there,

**291** اللاجئ: والله ما اعرف.

Interpreter: I really don't know.

**292** Interpreter: weet ik echt niet.

Interpeter: I really don't know.

**293** Lawyer: nee (.) Heb je nog contact met mensen in Syria?

Lawyer: no (.) are you still in contact with people in Syria?

**294** المترجم: في عندك اتصال مع: ناس في سوريا؟

Interpreter: do you have contact with: people in Syria?

**295** اللاجئ: والله لا لا (.) في لبنان إي بس في سوريا لا.

Immigrant: well no no (.) in Lebanon yes e but in Syria no.

**296** Interpreter: nee in Lebanon wel in Syria niet.

Interpreter: no in Lebanon yes in Syria no

**297** Lawyer: wie heb je in Lebanon?

Lawyer: who do you have in Lebanon?

**298** المترجم: مين عندك في لبنان؟

Interpreter: who do you have in Lebanon<sup>279</sup>?

**299** اللاجئ: أصدقائي (غير واضح) كم أصدقاء؟<sup>280</sup>

Immigrant: My friends (unintelligible) how many friend?<sup>281</sup>

<sup>279</sup> The immigrant intrrupts at the word 'Lebanon'.

<sup>280</sup> Interrupted by the interpreter.

<sup>281</sup> The immigrant gets interrupted by the interpreter.

**300** Interpreter<sup>282</sup>: vrienden van mij (.) een paar.

Interpreter: friends of mine (.) a few.

**301** Lawyer: en je en je eigen familie, je ouders,

Lawyer : and your and your own family, your parents,

**302** المترجم: وأهلك؟ (.) عيلتك؟

Interpreter : and your relatives? (.) your family?

**303** اللاجئ: لا لا ما عندي (.) في سوريا (.) ما في تلفونات في سوريا.

Immigrant: no no I don't have (.) in Syria (.) no telephones in Syria.

**304** Immigrant: die verblijven in Syria (.) en in Syria zijn er geen telefon (.) contacten.

Interpreter: they reside in Syria (.) and in Syria there are no telephone contacts.

**305** Lawyer: en en op een andere manier geprobeerd contact te krijgen via landgenoten die inmiddels in Nederland zijn or iets dergelijks,

Lawyer: and and you tried in another manner to get in contact via countrymen who are now living in the Netherland or something like that,

**306** المترجم: ما حاولت بطريقة أخرى انو يكون هناك اتصال مثلا عن طريق رفقاتك، او ناس من نفس بلدك،

Interpreter: you haven't tried another way to get in contact for instance via your friends or people from the same country as yours,

**307** اللاجئ: = والله انا انا جيت العار لأهلي وما:

Interpreter: =Walla I I have brought shame on my family and I don't:

**308** Interpreter: ik heb m'n familie schande <sup>283</sup> toegebracht en ik

Interpreter: I have brought shame upon my family and I

<sup>282</sup> Interrupting the immigrant.

<sup>283</sup> The lawyer interjects: 'yes'.

**309** اللاجئ: يعني ما بدني (.) انا انا ما بدني احكي مَعون (.) انا ما بدني أحكي مَعون بخجل من حالي ... (غير واضح).

Immigrant: I just don't (.) I don't want to talk with them (.) I don't want to talk with them I am ashamed of myself ... [*unintelligible*].

**310** Interpreter<sup>284</sup>: ik schaam me (.) om met ze (.) te praten.

Interpreter: I am ashamed (.) to talk (.) with them.

**311** Lawyer: °ok° (..) waar schaam je,

Lawyer: °ok° (..) what are you ashamed of,

**312** المترجم: ليه تخجل من حالك؟<sup>285</sup>

Interpreter: **why** are you ashamed of yourself?

**313** اللاجئ: ايه جبتلهم العار انا<sup>286</sup>

Immigrant: well I have brought shame on them

**314** Interpreter: ik heb schande veroorzaakt (.) voor ze<sup>287</sup>.

Interpreter: I have caused disgrace (.) for them.

**315** اللاجئ: (غير واضح)<sup>288</sup>

Immigrant: [*unintelligible*]

**316** Interpreter: bij ons is dit (.) is hier sprake van schande<sup>289</sup>.

Interpreter: where I am from this (.) is this is considered a shameful matter.

**317** Lawyer: heb je **daar** still bij gestaan? dat dat =ook kon gebeuren toen je met (.) het meisje aan het rommelen was?

Lawyer: have you thought about **this**? That something like that=could happen when you (.) were messing with the girl?

<sup>284</sup> The interpreter jumps in at the word 'ashamed'.

<sup>285</sup> Rendition produced in a manner as if he suggests that the immigrant shouldn't feel ashamed.

<sup>286</sup> Here the interpreter starts with the rendition before the immigrants has ended his original.

<sup>287</sup> Rendition produced in a noticeably quieter tone than the original.

<sup>288</sup> The immigrant and interpreter talk at the same time.

<sup>289</sup> Rendition produced in a noticeably quieter tone than the original.

**318** المترجم: لما: طَبّ لَمَّا كُنْتَ تَعْمَلُ هَالشغلات مع الـبننت؟<sup>290</sup> (.) مع الصبية ما فكرت انو هالشي ممكن ..<sup>291</sup>

Interpreter: when: ok when you were doing these things with the girl (.) with the girl you did not think that this was possible ..

**319** اللاجئ: والله ما توقعت هيك راح يصير كنت ... (غير واضح)<sup>292</sup>

Immigrant: Well I didn't expect this would happen I was ... [unintelligible]

**320** Interpreter: ik ... (unintelligible)<sup>293</sup> dat het dat het zo zal lope::n (.) ik was nog e: op een lere [unintelligible] jonge leeftijd en ja<sup>294</sup>.

Interpreter: I .. (unintelligible) that that would happe::n (.) I was still e: young and yeah.

**321** Lawyer: °ok° (...<sup>295</sup>) heb je nog geprobeerd e e (..) na ja ja goed ik me voorstellen dat je ongerust maakt over je familie gezien wat er gebeurd is in de afgelopen (.) periode in Syria? Heb je even nog (.) een of andere manier (.) geprobeerd om contact te: ..<sup>296</sup>

Lawyer: °ok° (...) have you tried e e (..) I can imagine that you are worried about your family given what has happened in the previous (.) period in Syria? Have you (.) one way or another (.) tried to contact ... [interrupted]

**322** المترجم: نتصوّر أنّو انتي تكون قلقا:ن (..) على عيلتك في سوريا في ظل كل اللي بيحصل هونيك في سوريا= ما:: حاولت بالفترة الأخيرة انو تحاول تحصل شي خبر ..<sup>297</sup>

Interpreter: We can imagine that you could be worried (..) about your family in Syria in the light of all that is happening in Syria= have you no::t tried in the last period that is to try to get some news (interrupted).

**323** اللاجئ: وال::ه ما عندي خبر .. (غير واضح) من عند اصدقائي في لبنان بعرف انه (..) بشيخ مقصود عدنا .. (غير واضح) صار في معارك .. (غير واضح)

Immigrant: I really don't know [unintelligible] (.) I know from my friends in Lebanon that (..) in Shaikh Maqsoud where I used to live .. [unintelligible] battles raged .. [unintelligible]

<sup>290</sup> This part of rendition is produced in a blaming tone.

<sup>291</sup> The interpreter starts with his rendition.

<sup>292</sup> The immigrant and interpreter talk at the same time.

<sup>293</sup> The immigrant and interpreter talk at the same time.

<sup>294</sup> He sounds like he shrugs his shoulders.

<sup>295</sup> 12x the short interval (.)

<sup>296</sup> The interpreter starts with his rendition.

<sup>297</sup> The immigrant starts talking.

**324** Interpreter: van mijn vrienden in Lebanon e weet ik wel dat Shaik Maqsood wijk (.) waar waar ik heb gewoond dat is dus e e vernietigd (.) daar waren gevechten (.) waardoor e: (.) ravage is ontstaan.

Interpreter: I do e know from my friends in Lebanon that Shaikh Maqsoud neighbourhood (.) where I used to live is e e destroyed (.) there were battles (.) because of which e: (.) havoc has been caused.

**325** اللاجئ: سمعت أنّو كل الناس كلّون طلّعوا منها .. (غير واضح)<sup>298</sup>

Immigrant: I have heard that all the people have left it ... [unintelligible]

**326** Interpreter<sup>299</sup>: ze geven aan dat allerlei inwoners daar (.) de wijk zijn (.) ontvlucht.

Interpreter: They indicated that all sort of people there (.) have left (.) the district.

**327** Lawyer: °Ok° (.) en waar die familie van (.) famil Hussein wonen,

Lawyer: °Ok° (.) and where that family (.) the Hussein family live,

**328** المترجم: والمكان المنطقة اللي كان ساكن فيها عيلة الحسين،

Interpreter: and the place the district where the Hussein family used to live,

**329** اللاجئ: والله ما عارف (..) بالسريان بالزهراء هيك هديك المناطق (.) بالبلد .. (غير واضح)<sup>300</sup>  
والله ما اعرف الزهراء حي الزهراء هيك شي .. (غير واضح)

Immigrant: I really don't know (..) in Al-Siryaan in Al-Zahraa somewhere in those areas (.) .. [unintelligible]<sup>301</sup> I really do not know Al-Zahraa Al-Zahraa district something like this .. [unintelligible]

**330** Lawyer: Is daar ook zwaar gevechten?

Lawyer: was there also heavy fighting?

**331** المترجم: =كمان هونيك كان في معارك (.) واشتباكات كثير.

Interpreter: =also there there were battles (.) and many confrontations.

<sup>298</sup> The interpreter starts rendition.

<sup>299</sup> Interrupting and mumbling

<sup>300</sup> The interpreter starts to translate: "In die wijken (.) Al-Siryan Al-Zahraa"

<sup>301</sup> The interpreter starts to translate: "In die wijken (.) Al-Siryan Al-Zahraa"

**332** اللاجئ: والله ما بعرف والله ما بعرف<sup>302</sup> بس شيخ مقصود انا سألت عنها عد أصحابي منطقتنا قالو لي صار فيه حركة.

Immigrant: I really don't know I really don't know but Shaikh Maqsoud I asked my friends about our area they said to me there has been movement.

**333** Interpreter: informeert [*sic*] bij vrienden (.) naar Shaikh Maqsood wijk (.) ze zeiden dat het oorlog (.) gebied is.

Interpreter: I asked friends (.) about the Shaikh Maqsoud quarter (.) they said that it is a (.) war zone.

**334** اللاجئ: غير مناطق ما بعرف.

Immigrant: the other districts I don't know.

**335** Interpreter: andere wijken weet ik niet.

Interpreter: the other quarters, I don't know.

**336** Lawyer: °ok° (.....) ok (.....) je bent niet naar de politie toegegaan he heb ik begrepen,

Lawyer: °ok° (.....) ok (.....) you didn't go to the police as I have understood,

**337** المترجم: حسب ما فهم انه انت ما رحنت لل:شرطة

Interpreter: as he has understood you did not go to the: police

**338** اللاجئ: إيه.

Immigrant: yeah

**339** Interpreter: Nee

Interpreter: no

**340** Immigrant: ... [*unintelligible, mumbling*]

Immigrant: ... [*unintelligible, mumbling*]

<sup>302</sup> The interpreter starts to translate these words.

<sup>303</sup> The immigrant tries to take the floor and raises his voice and carries on with his original.

**341** Interpreter: nee (.) ik ben gevluht ik ben niet geweest.

Interpreter: no (.) I fled I did not go.

**342** Lawyer: hehum<sup>304</sup> (.) e:m ik heb wel begrepen dat je e: na een paar dagen je broer heb gebeld.

Lawyer: hehum (.) e:m I understood that you e: phoned your brother after a few days.

**343** المترجم: إي لكن هو فهم أُو انت بعد ..<sup>305</sup> شي كم يوم إي اتصلت بأخوك،

Interpreter: e but he understood that you after ... some days you e contacted you brother,

**344** اللاجئ: صح

Immigrant: correct

**345** Interpreter: klopt

Interpreter: correct

**346** Lawyer: en die was boos op je.

Lawyer: and he was angry at you.

**347** المترجم: وكان إي إي متعصب.

Interpreter: and he was e e angry.

**348** اللاجئ: صح (.) قَلِّي اهرب خَلِّصْ حالك.

Immigrant: correct (.) he said to me flee save yourself.

**349** Interpreter: hij zei ja e: loop maar weg (.) red uzelf.

Interpreter: He said yeah e: run away (.) save yourself.

<sup>304</sup> With this filler, he shows he understood what was said.

<sup>305</sup> Here he sounds as if he is thinking.

**350** Lawyer: huhum e: (.) heeft hij toen iets verteld over hoe het met je vader was, want (.) de politie zei dat ze hem vasthouden. Was dat inderdaad zo?

Lawyer: Huhum e: (.) did he say something then about how your father was, for (.) the police said that they were detaining him. Was that indeed the case?

**351** المترجم<sup>306</sup>: ما قال لك شي عن عن بيك؟<sup>307</sup> لان الشرطة قالوا لك انه ماسكينو (.) كانوا فعلا ماسكينو؟

Interpreter: didn't he say anything about your father? [*unintelligible*] for the police told you that they were holding him (.) were they really holding him?

**352** اللاجئ: كان (.) هذه الشرطة ماسكينو.

Immigrant: they (.) they the police were holding him.

**353** Interpreter: ja: ze hebben wel gepakt<sup>308</sup>.

Interpreter: yea:h they were holding.

**354** المترجم: قال لي روح روح (..) ما ما (.) ما تفرجيننا وشك.

Immigrant: he said go go (..) don't don't (.) don't show us your face.

**355** Interpreter: hij zei dat ik maar moest vluchten en mijn gezicht niet meer laten zien.

Interpreter: he said that I had to flee and not to show my face again.

**356** Lawyer: .hh ja: en was dat e: omdat hij zo met je meelefde of was of was was ie toch ook boos,

Lawyer: .hh yea:h and was that e: because he sympathized with you so much or was or was was he also angry,

**357** المترجم: أهرب لانو هو كان متعاطف معك؟ ولا لانو هو كان (.) غضبان عليك،

Interpreter: run away because he sympathized with you? Or because he was (.) angry with you,

<sup>306</sup> The interpreter start to translate while there are muddled voices.

<sup>307</sup> The interpreter carries on with translation while there are muddled voices.

<sup>308</sup> The last word is pronounced unclearly.

358 اللاجئ: كان غضبان علي=و يعرف انا بس أجي راح أموت (. ) انو أبوية راح يقتلني ... (غير واضح)

309

Immigrant: he was angry with me=and he knows that the moment I come I will die (. ) that my father will kill me ... [unintelligible]

359 Interpreter: Hij was wel boos= en hij wist wel dat e e als ik zondra ik terug kwam (. ) dat dat ik (. ) gedood zou worden door mijn eigen vader<sup>310</sup>.

Interpreter: He certainly was angry=and he did know that e e if I the moment I came back (. ) that that I (. ) would be killed by my own father.

360 Lawyer: waar ben je het meeste bang voor, voor de autoriteiten, je vader of voor de familie (. ) Hussein,

Lawyer: what are you afraid of the most, of the authorities, your father or of the Hussein (. ) family,

361 المترجم: مين أكثر (. ) ناس او جهة بتخاف عل حياتك منا؟ (. ) بَيِّك؟ النظام، ولا عائلة الحسين؟

Interpreter: Which (. ) people or party are you afraid the most of for you life? (. ) your father? the regime, or the Hussein family?

362 اللاجئ: والله الكل<sup>311</sup>.

Immigrant: Actually all of them.

363 ...

364 Lawyer: waarom ben je bang voor de autoriteiten,

Lawyer: why are you afraid of the authorities,

365 المترجم: لشو انتي خايف من السلطات، او النظام،

Interpreter: Why are afraid of the authorities, or the regime,

366 اللاجئ: وقتها انا كان كان مطلوب= إذا يمسوني هني إي بيت الحسين مدعومين .. (غير واضح) ببشيلوا لحمي من جلدي.

Immigrant: back then I was was wanted=if they catch me they e the Hussein family are supported .. [unintelligible] they will skin me.

<sup>309</sup> The interpreter starts to translate.

<sup>310</sup> The interpreter speaks in a very flat tone compared to who the immigrant talked.

<sup>311</sup> He says this in a sad manner.

**367** Interpreter: ik e omdat ik gezocht ben, en e e familie Hussein e hebben wel invloed als ze me te pakken krijgen dan zullen ze e: e mijn mijn mijn huid uit mijn vlees vlees halen.

Interpreter: I e because I was wanted, and e e the Hussein family e does have influence if they get hold of me then they will e: e remove my my my skin from my flesh flesh.

**368** Lawyer: >heb je enig idee waarom de politie het zo gedaan hebben, want als ze zo'n goede contact hadden met de familie Hussein waarom hebben ze je gewoon meegenomen,<

Lawyer: <do you have any idea why the police acted this way, for if their relationship with the police was that good -with the Hussein family why didn't they just take you with them,<

**369** (أصوات متداخلة)

*Muddled voices*

**370** المترجم: عندك إي فكرة الشرطة لشو عملت هيك يعني إذا كان هني عندون إتصال هيك مليح مع عائلة الحسين فكانو يخلوك مَعن بعد ما مسكوك.

Interpreter: do you have any idea why the police acted like this because if their relationship with Hussein family was that good then they would have kept you with them after they arrested you.

**371** المترجم: والله ما أعرف هني قالولي انت تنزل تسمع ضرب رصاص تهرب.

Immigrant: I really don't know they said to me you go down when you hear bullet sounds you run away.

**372** Interpreter: dat week ik echt niet ze zeiden als je beschietingen hoort dan moet je (.) vluchten.

Interpreter: I really don't know that they said if you hear shellings then you have to (.) run away.

(Long silence)

**373** Lawyer: .hh dat is al een belangrijk punt in je verhaal= waar de waar de IND ook op gaat **zitten** (.) van **waarom waarom** hebben die politieagenten dit gedaan, ik bedoel= ze kregen de opdracht om jou (.) **op** te pakken =want ze wisten waar je was (.) en ze laten je gewoon (.) lopen= zo zullen ze **zelf** ook in problemen komen.

Lawyer: .hh this is already an important point in your backstory= which which the IND will **scrutinize** (.) in the sense **why why** did those police agents did this, I mean=they were assigned to (.) arrest you=for they knew where you were (.) and they just let you (.) go=this way they will get into trouble **themselves** too.

**374** المترجم: يعني هاي النقطة بدها تركز عليها دائرة الهجرة والتجنيس إي الشرطة لشو عملو هوك هيك هني إي كانوا عرفانين انت وين وجايين لعندك ومسكوك<sup>312</sup> ولو كان بدون اياك كانوا أخذوك هيك ما كانوا خلوك هيك تهرب!

Interpreter: yaʕni this point the immigration and Naturalization Service will concentrate on e: the police why did they do this they e knew where you were and they came to you and caught you (*immigrant interjects: "right"*) and if they had wanted you they would've taken you just like that they wouldn't have let you escape so easily!

**375** اللاجئ: والله .. (غير واضح) تنزل تحت تس تسمع ضرب رصاص .. (غير واضح) نقوس تهرب انت (.) ابوك عدنا ترجع تسلم حالك.

Immigrant: well [*unintelligible*] you go down when you hea hear shots [*unintelligible*] we shoot you run away (.) we have your father later you give yourself up again.

**376-377** Interpreter: Dat weet ik niet .. [*unintelligible*]<sup>313</sup> je gaat naar buit= je gaat naar beneden (.) en als je beschietingen hoort<sup>314</sup> dan moet je vluchten en daarna weer melden want (.) wij hebben jouw vader (.) toen ik waarom (.) naar rede vroeg e e zeiden ze e e dat ik m'n mond maar moest doen<sup>315</sup>.

Interpreter: I don't know .. [*unintelligible*] you go outsi= you go down (.) and if you hear shellings [*sic*] then you must ran a way and then report again for (.) we have your father (.) when I why (.) informed about the reason e e they said e e that I had to shut up.

**378** Lawyer: hahum

Lawyer: hahum<sup>316</sup>

**379** Interpreter: dicht moest doen.

Interpreter: shut up.

<sup>312</sup> The immigrant interjects: 'correct'.

<sup>313</sup> Muddled talk.

<sup>314</sup> Last four words are pronounced in a nonchalant manner unlike how the immigrant had talked.

<sup>315</sup> Especially the last seven words pronounced in a flat and thinking manner.

<sup>316</sup> As if indicating that he understood what had been said.

**380** Lawyer: ok (...<sup>317</sup>) ja je hebt verteld (.) **dat** e:m (...) die mensen waren d'r (.)  **twee** in burger kleding en de rest in uniform (.) klopt dat?

Lawyer: ok (...) yeah you said (.) **that** e:m (...) those people were (.) **two** in plain clothes and the rest in uniform (.) is that right?

**381** المترجم: قُلْتُ لَوْنِ اَنْوَ هَلْ هَلْ هَدَوْلَةُ الْاَشْخَاصِ (.) اِثْنَيْنِ مَنُونِ كَانُو لِابْسِينِ مَدْنِي وَالْبَاقِي كَانُوا لِابْسِينِ بَزَاتِ عَسْكَرِي، مَطْبُوط.

Interpreter: you said to them that those those persons (.) two of them were wearing civilian clothing and the rest were wearing military uniforms, correct.

**382** المترجم: كم واحد لابسين مدني؟

Interpreter: how many were in civilian clothing?

**383** اللّاجئ<sup>318</sup>: يعني والله ما عم بتذكر عدد اثنين؟ ثلاثة، ما اتذكر ما اتذكر.

Immigrant: well I don't remember two? Three, I don't remember I don't remember.

**384** اللّاجئ<sup>319</sup>: بس كان في لابسين عسكري وفي لابسين مدني.

Immigrant: but there were those in military clothing and those in civilian clothing.

**385** Interpreter: een aantal waren in burger gekleed <sup>320</sup> de rest in uniform (..) maar hoeveel 2 3 dat weet ik niet meer.

Interpreter: a number were in civilian clothing [*talking simultaneously*] and the rest in uniform but how many 2 3 I don't know that anymore.

**386** Lawyer: hehum (.) °ok°.

Lawyer: hehum (.) °ok°.

**387** Lawyer: em hebben die (.) die agenten zich gelegitimeerd?

Lawyer: and did those (.) officers identify themselves?

**388** المترجم: هَدَوْلَةُ الشَّرْطَةِ (.) عَرَفُوا عَنْ هَوِيَّاتِنِ = عَنْ نَفْسِنِ؟ شَرْطَةُ؟

<sup>317</sup> While leafing through the report he was discussing with the immigrant.

<sup>318</sup> Sounding unhappy.

<sup>319</sup> This original is produced after the interpreter has already started to produce the rendition for the lawyer of turn 385.

<sup>320</sup> Here the interpreter and the immigrant talk simultaneously. See last footnote.

Interpreter: those policemen (.) identified themselves= themselves?  
Policemen?

389 اللاجئ: لا

Immigrant: no

390 اللاجئ: لا

Immigrant: no

391 Interpreter: nee

Interpreter: no

392 Lawyer: >Hoe he ja wacht even =d'r waren mensen in uniform bij  
daarom wist je dat ze van de politie waren.<

Lawyer: <how wait a moment=there were people in uniform with them this is  
why you knew they were from the police>

393 المترجم<sup>321</sup>: يعني كان معاهن ناس لابسين<sup>322</sup> شرطة مشان هيك عرفت انو شرطة،

Interpreter: so they had people with them in [*immigrant: "police"*] police  
clothing this is why you knew they were police,

394 اللاجئ: شرطة لابسين ملابس شرطة.

Interpreter: police wearing police clothing.

395 Interpreter: ja ze hebben politieuniform aan.

Interpreter: yeah they are dressed in police uniform.

396 Lawyer: °ok° (.) heb je enig idee hoe ze wisten dat je d'r zat,

Lawyer: °ok° (.) do you have any idea how they knew you were there,

397 المترجم: أي فكرة كيف عرفوا؟ انو انت كنت هونيك،

Interpreter: any idea how they came to know? That you were there,

<sup>321</sup> Jumping in at the last word of the lawyer.

<sup>322</sup> The immigrant interjects here the word 'police', showing that he agrees with what the interpreter was about to say.

398 المترجم: والله ما بعرف.

Immigrant: I really don't know.

399 Interpreter: weet ik echt niet.

Interpreter: I really don't know.

(..<sup>323</sup>)

400 Lawyer: waren daar<sup>324</sup> ook mensen van de familie bij?

Lawyer: Were there also people from the family with them?

401 المترجم: كان في ناس من قرابينك او من عيلتك (.) موجودين (.) كمان؟

Interpreter: Were there also people from your relatives or your family (.) there?

402 اللاجئ: لا

Immigrant: no

403 Interpreter: nee<sup>325</sup>

Interpreter: no

(...)

404 Lawyer: °ok° (....) e je hebt hier verteld dat e: ze hebben ook niet aangeklopt he ze hebben de deur geforceerd en ze zijn naar binnen gekomen (.) bij jou.

Lawyer: °ok° (....) e you said here<sup>326</sup> that e: they also did not knock they forced open the door and they came inside (.) where you were.

405 المترجم: قلت لُون كمان اَنُو انتي هَنّي ما دقوا عالِباب هَنّي كَسرو ال الباب ودخلوا.

Interpeter: you said to them also that you they did not knock at the door they broke the the door and came in.

406 اللاجئ: كَسرو الباب ودخلوا، (..) لا لا.

<sup>323</sup> Silence for 7 seconds.

<sup>324</sup> This word is not fully intelligible.

<sup>325</sup> Said in a more decisive manner than the original.

<sup>326</sup> In the report he is discussing.

Immigrant : they broke the door and came in, (..) no no.

**407** Interpreter: nee<sup>327</sup>

Interpreter: no

**408** المترجم: (..) دقوا الباب ثلاث دقات وفتحت لُون.

Immigrant: They knocked on the door three times and I opened for them<sup>328</sup>.

**409** Interpreter: ze hebben 3 keer aangeklopt en .. [unintelligible]<sup>329</sup> open.

Interpreter: they knocked three times and [unintelligible] open.

**410** المترجم: منفق مع صاحبي هذا (.) أحمد (.) يد يدق 3 دقات أفتحلو.

Immigrant: I agreed with this friend of mine (.) Ahmed (.) he kn knocks three times and I open [the door] for him.

**411** Interpreter: want ik had afgesproken met e met die vriend van mij (.) Ahmed (.) dat hij 3 keer zou aankloppen<sup>330</sup> en dan kon open doen.

Interpreter: for I had agreed with e with that friend of mine (.) Ahmed (.) that he would kock three times and then I would be able to open [the door].

**412** Lawyer: ok maar je hebt zelf de deur opgen gemaakt,

Lawyer: ok but you opened the door yourself,

**413** المترجم: انت اللي فتحت لُون الباب؟

Interpreter: you opened the door for them?

**414** اللاجئ: فتحت الباب ايه.

Immigrant: I opened the door yeah.

**415** Interpreter: ja de deur opengemaakt<sup>331</sup>.

Interpreter: yes [I] opened the door

<sup>327</sup> He says this in a firm way.

<sup>328</sup> Here interpreter jumps in directly.

<sup>329</sup> Lawyer interjects 'ye:s'.

<sup>330</sup> Lawyer interjects: 'yea:h'.

<sup>331</sup> Rendition produced in a firmer way.

(..<sup>332</sup>)

**416** Lawyer: ja ze hebben aan jou gevraagd waarom je **bang** bent voor de familie .h want e: d'r is sexueel contact geweest tussen jou en dat meisje=maar **niet** tegen haar zin= waarom (.) zou de familie toch boos op je zijn.

Lawyer: yeah they<sup>333</sup> asked you why you **fear** the family .h for e: there had been sexual contact between you and that girl=but **not** against her will=why (.) would the family nevertheless be angry with you.

**417** المترجم: قالوا لك أنتي من شو خايف يعني لشو خايف من هالعيلى أنتي مارست الجنس مع هالبننت ايه لكن مو ضد ضد رغبتا فشو أنتي إي: لشو هنتي بدون يصيرو يعني إي يغضبوا عليك،

Interpreter: they said to you what are you afraid of that is why are you afraid of this family that you had sexual contact with this girl yeah but not against her will so why you e: for what reason would they become that is e get angry with you,

**418** اللاجئ: أهل البننت يعني؟

Immigrant: you mean the family of the girl?

**419** Interpreter: de .. [*unintelligible*] de familie van dat meisje (.) wilde?

Interpreter: the .. [*unintelligible*] the family of that girl (.) want? [*sic*]

**420** اللاجئ: إي شرف هدا ممكن شرف عرض .. (غير واضح)

Immigrant: well it is about honour this is possible honour virtue [*unintelligible*]

**421** Interpreter: een eer (.) sprake van een eer (.) van schending van een eer.

Interpreter: an honour [*sic*] (.) about an honour [*sic*] (.) about violating an honour [*sic*].

(..)

**422** Lawyer: **ja**: ik vind het een beetje een rare vraag van de IND moet ik zeggen<sup>334</sup>.

Lawyer: **ye:s** I find this a strange question a little bit the IND is asking I must

<sup>332</sup> 10 seconds silence. The lawyer seems to be reading in the report.

<sup>333</sup> Refers to the IND. The lawyer is reading in the report which he is discussing.

<sup>334</sup> The lawyer produces the last three words smilingly.

say.

**423** المترجم<sup>335</sup>: هوى كمان بدو يقولك انو شايغو سؤال غريب من دائرة الهجرة والتجنيس.

Interpreter: he too wants to tell you that he finds it a strange question from the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

**424** Lawyer: volgens mij gaat het niet om of dat meisje dat wilde of niet.

Lawyer: I think it is about whether that girl wanted that or not.

**425** المترجم<sup>336</sup>: مو المهم انو البننت بدا ولا ما بدا (.) مو هذا هو المهم.

Interpreter: it is not important that the girl wants or does not want (.) it is not this which is important.

**426** Lawyer: volgens mij gaat het erom dat jij sex hebt gehad met het meisje terwijl de familie dat niet eens wist en dat meisje niet getrouwd was en ze jou (.)<sup>337</sup> niet kende als huwelijkskandidaad of iets dergelijks.

Lawyer: I think it is about that you had sex with the girl while the family did not even know that and that the girl was not married and they (.) did not know [you] as a marriage candidate or something like that.

**427** المترجم<sup>338</sup>: حسب (.) حسب وجهة نظرو انو انت مارست الجنس مع البننت والأهل ما عندون خبر (.) وانو انتو ما ما متجوزين ولا حتى نا عرفانين انو انت اصلا بدك (.) تخطبا أو شي هيك شي.

Interpreter: from (.) from his point of view it is that you had sex with the girl while the family was **unaware** (.) and that you two are not not married and [the family does] not **even** e know that you want to (.) ask her hand or something like that.

**428** اللاجئ: صح

Interpreter: correct

**429**: Interpreter: klopt

Interpreter: correct

**430** Lawyer: (..) °ok° (..) heb je hier nog iets op aan te vullen,

<sup>335</sup> While smiling.

<sup>336</sup> The interpreter jumps in.

<sup>337</sup> The interpreter seems to try to start to translate.

<sup>338</sup> The interpreter jumps in.

Lawyer: (..) °ok° (..) do you have something to add to this,

431 المترجم: في اي شي تحب تضيفو؟

Interpreter: is there something you would like to add?

432 اللاجئ: لا لا انا الموضوع كله (..) ناسيه يعني .. (غير واضح)

Immigrant: no no I have forgotten the whole (.) matter that is ...  
[unintelligible]

433 Interpreter: **nee**: ik: ben het hele onderwerp e vergeten en ..  
[unintelligible]<sup>339</sup>

Interpreter: **no**: I have forgotten the whole e subject and .. [unintelligible]

434 Lawyer: ja ik ben even aan het kijken (.) want dit heeft in 2007  
afgespeeld (.) we zijn **echt 6** jaar verder nu.

Lawyer: yes I am searching (.) for this played out in 2007 (.) we are **really  
six** years later now.

435 المترجم: يعني هالشي كلو حصل في ألفين وسبعة يعني هلا صار ست سنين؟

Interpreter: yeah all this happened in two thousand and seven that is it has  
been six years now?

436 اللاجئ: إي تقريبا ست سنين.

Immigrant: yeah about six years.

437 Intepreter: ja ongeveer 6 jaar.

Interpreter: yes about six years.

438 Lawyer: ja want je bent e: van e: van Syria naar Turkije gegaan (.) toen  
naar Griekenland en daar heb je nog 2 jaar anderhalf jaar heb je daar  
gezeten.

Lawyer: yes for you went e: from e: from Syria to Turkey (.) then to Greee  
and you stayed there two years one-and-a-half years you stayed there.

439 المترجم: لأنو أنت طلعت لتركيا (.) بعدين الى اليونان وظلّيت سنة تنتين تقريبا سنة ونص هونيك.

<sup>339</sup> The interpreter is interrupted by lawyer.

Interpreter: for you went to Turkey (.) then to Greece and you stayed one two years approximately one-and-a-half years there.

440 اللاجئ: صح حتى 2009

Immigrant: correct until 2009

441 Interpreter: klopt tot 2009.

Interpreter: correct until 2009.

442 Lawyer: ja precies en toen ben je naar Nederland gekomen.

Lawyer: yes exactly and then you came to the Netherlands.

443 المترجم: اي بالضبط وبعدين جيت لهولندا.

Interpreter: yeah exactly and after that you came to the Netherlands.

444 اللاجئ: لهولندا

Immigrant: to the Netherlands.

445 Interpreter: Nederland ja

Interpreter: the Netherlands yes

446 Lawyer: goed (.) toen heb je eerst de hele Dublin procedure gehad= omdat ze vonden dat (.) je: terug moest naar Griekenland.

Lawyer: good (.) then you had the entire Dublin procedure=because they found that (.) you: had to go back to Greece.

447 المترجم: وبالاول اي كان حصل معنا إجراءات (.) دبلن لأنو هنتي الأول كان من رأيين هنت لازم ترجع لليونان،

Interpreter: and in the beginning e the Dublin procedure (.) had happened with us [sic] because they in the beginning they thought that you should return to Greece,

448 اللاجئ: صح

Immigrant: yes

449 Interpreter: dat klopt.

Interpreter: that is correct.

(..)

**500** Lawyer: ja (.) toen heeft het **heel** lang geduurd<sup>340</sup>.

Lawyer: yes (.) then it took a **very** long time.

**501** المترجم: وهاي طوّلت فترة منيحة (.) كثير.

Interpreter: and this lasted a **good** time (.) long.

**502** اللاجئ: صح

Immigrant: correct

**503** Interpreter: klopt

Interpreter: correct

**504** Lawyer: maar goed (.) uiteindelijk heb je een verblijfsvergunning.

Lawyer: but anyway (.) eventually you have a residence permit.

**505** المترجم: بالنهاية حصلت على الإقامة (.) وهذا هو أهم شيء.

Interpreter: in the end you got the residence [permit] (.) and that is the most important thing.

**506** اللاجئ: صح

Immigrant: correct

**507** Interpreter: klopt

Interpreter: correct

**508** Lawyer: °ok° (....) goed e:: n (.) wat ik al zei 26 november moet de IND een besluit nemen van de rechtbank.

Lawyer: °ok° (....) good a::nd (.) as I said November 26 the IND must take a decision as decided by the court.

<sup>340</sup> The interpreter is heard laughing.

509 Lawyer: November

Lawyer: November

510 المترجم: يعني مثل ما قال لك 11 26 لازم تكون دائرة الهجرة والتجنيس إي إي: تكون اتخذت قرار لأن هاي حَكَم فيه المحكمة.

Interpreter: so like he said to you November 26 the Immigration and Naturalization Service must have e: taken a decision because that is the decision the court has taken.

511 اللاجئ: اوكي

Immigrant: ok

512 Lawyer: e: d'r wordt even spannend e::

Lawyer: e: it is getting tense e::

513 المترجم: يعني (.) مشوق الموضوع.

Interpreter: yaʕni (.) **Exciting** is the matter.

514 اللاجئ: والله انشاء الله خير.

Immigrant: well hopefully something positive will come out [of it].

515 Interpreter: ik hoop het beste.

Interpreter: I hope for the best.

516 Lawyer: Kijk het het fijne is dat het alleen maar **beter** voor je kan worden. De verblijfsvergunning die je heb die kan niet worden ingetrokken.

Lawyer: look the good thing is that it can only get **better** for you. The residence permit which you have can't be withdrawn.

517 المترجم: الشيء المنيح (.) أنو وضعك (.) فقط ممكن أنو يتحسن يعني ال الإقامة اللي معك: (.) ما ممكن أنو تنسحب.

Interpreter: the good thing is (.) that your situation (.) can only improve that is the residence [permit] you ha:ve (.) can't be withdrawn.

518 اللاجئ: صح

Immigrant: correct

519 المترجم<sup>341</sup>: مشان هيك ما في داعي للقلق.

Interpreter: which is why there is no need to worry.

520 اللاجئ: إذا إذا مثال إذا وقف احداث سوريا.

Immigrant: if if for example if the events of Syria stopped.

521 Interpreter: maar stel (.) dat

Interpreter: but suppose (.) that

522 اللاجئ: يعني اذا خلس الحرب فب سوريا ... (غير واضح)<sup>342</sup>

Immigrant: that is if the war in Syria ended ... [*unintelligible*].

523 Interpreter: stel dat de situatie in Syria allemaal rustiger wordt en geen oorlog meer in Syria.

Interpreter: suppose the situation in Syria got quieter no war anymore in Syria.

524 Lawyer: Ja dat is ook de rede **waarom** ik deze procedure heb **doorgezet** omdat de verblijfsvergunning die je **nu** hebt (.) is de kans **groot** dat wanneer (.) e de situatie in Syria verandert dat de IND zal zeggen we trekken hem in terug en je moet **alsnog** terug.

Lawyer: yes that is also the reason **why I pushed** ahead with the procedure because the residence permit which you have **now** (.) the possibility is **high** that when (.) e the situation in Syria changes that the IND will say we will withdraw it and you **still** have to go back.

525 المترجم: يعني مشان هيك احنة است احنة استمرينا بها الاجراءات (.) لآنو إي نوع الاقامة اللّي معاك هلاً (.) إذا تحسّن الوضع في سوريا إي ممكن دائرة الهجرة والتجنيس إي تقول بدنا نسحبوا وبّدك ترجع (.) لهونيك.

Interpreter: this is also why we con. we continued with this procedure (.) for e the residence [permit] type you hold now (.) if the situation in Syria improved e it is e possible the Immigration and Naturalization Service e would say we want to withdraw it and you must go back (.) there.

526 Lawyer: en e:m (.) op het moment dat (..) e: ze de verblijfsvergunning met ingang 2009 geven (.) zou dat nog steeds kunnen.

<sup>341</sup> The lawyer and the intepreter interrupt one another.

<sup>342</sup> Interrupts the interpreter who had himself interrupted.

Lawyer: and e:m (.) the moment that (..) e: they give the residence permit from 2009 (.) that would still be possible.

527 المترجم: او: في لحظة اَنُو أعطوك الاقامى بتاريخ 2009 إي كمان هالشي ممكن يحصل.

Interpreter: a:nd the moment they gave you the residence [permit] from 2009 e even then this thing is possible.

528 Lawyer: maar een heel stuk moeilijker.

Lawyer: but it would be much more difficult.

529 المترجم: لكن بيكون اصعب (.) بكثير.

Interpreter: but that would much more (.) difficult.

530 Lawyer: maar ik verwacht (.) persoonlijk eerlijk gezegd niet (.) dat e: in e: wat is it? [unintelligible] nee juni 2009 (.) ja juni 2009 (.) e: nee (.) e: Juni 2014 e: de: kwestie Syria opgelost is.

Lawyer: but to be honest personally (.) I do not believe (.) that e:in e: when is it? [unitelligible] no June 2009 (.) yes June 2009 (.) e: no (.) e: June 2014 e: the question Syria<sup>343</sup> will have been solved.

531 المترجم: لكن هو شخصيا ما بيتوقع إي اَنُو إي في لغاية شهر 6 الفين إي و: إي أربعتاعش (.) تكون القضية في سوريا انحلت.

Interpreter: but he personally does not expect e that e by month six e [i.e. June] two thousand and e fourteen (.) the question in Syria will: have been solved.

532 اللاجئ: صح

Immigrant: correct

533 Lawyer: of denk je zelf van wel,

Lawyer: or do you think it will,

534 المترجم: ولأ انتى هيك رأيك،

Interpreter: or do you think so,

535 المترجم: والله انا هذا بلدي باتمى لو الخير .. (غير واضح)<sup>344</sup>

<sup>343</sup> That is the war.

Immigrant: Well it is my homeland and I hope the best for it .. [unintelligible]

**536** Interpreter: het is mijn land en ik hoop het aller beste daarvoor ...  
[unintelligible]

Interpreter: it is my homeland and I hope the best for it [unintelligible]

**537** Lawyer: dat snap ik.

Lawyer: I understand it.

**538** المترجم: مفهوم.

Interpreter: Understood.

**539** Lawyer: ok e:mm ik wacht heel even volgende week af of ter een reactie komt van de IND komt ie niet (.) dan g a ik bij de IND wel (.) **a**andringen op een beslissing e:: en ik moet het even uitzoeken maar volgens mi:j kunnen we zelfs een dwangsom vorderen.

Lawyer: ok e:mm I will wait until next week whether a response will come from the IND if not (.) then I will **urge** the (.) IND to take a decision e::: and I will have to figure out but I think we can even demand a penalty.

**540** المترجم: إي: بدو يستتئى (.) لغاية الاسبوع الجاي =إذا ما سمع اي شي = بدو: إي يتصل بدائرة الهجرة والتجيس ويلح عليهم إي في اتخاذ قرار (.) وبدو كمان (.) يشوف إذا كمان في هيك شي (.) بحث إمكانية (.) لآتو احنى ممكن نطلب منن تعويض مادي.

Interpreter: e: he wants to wait (.) until next week=if he did not hear anything=he will e contact the Immigration and Naturalization Service and urge them e to take a decision (.) and he also wants(.) to see if there is a possibility (.) for us to claim financial compensation.

**541** اللاجئ: اوكي

Immigrant: ok

**542** Lawyer: e:m (...) ja die (.) ik krijg van de IND te horen wat ze gaan doen= en als ik dat weet dan informer ik jou ook meteen.

Lawyer: e:m (...) yes that (.) the IND will tell me what they will do=and when I know that then I will inform you directly.

<sup>344</sup> Followed by a mixture of voices with the interpreter.

**543** المترجم: هو (.) بدّو أنّو دائرة الهجرة والتجنيس أنّو يبّلغوه (.) شو بدّون يعملو، (.) وأوّل ما (.) بيّجي خبر (.) هوى (.) بيبتعت لك كمان خبر.

Interpreter: he (.) wants the Immigration and Naturalization to inform him (.) what they want to do, (.) and the moment (.) there is news (.) he (.) he will inform you.

**544** Interpreter: het is goed.

Interpeter: that's good.

**545** Lawyer: ja? Heb je vragen.

Lawyer: yeah? Do you have questions.

**546** المترجم: في اسئلي؟

Interpreter: are there questions?

**547** اللاجئ: لا

Immigrant: no

## Appendix II

Concise representation of the groups and categories which are referred to throughout chapter Five( and the rest of the thesis).

### Part I

Part I treats the first research question: *How does the interpreter render the originals of the lawyer?* The answers to this question are provided in table (5.1) which shows the interrelationship between the originals of the lawyer and the renditions of the interpreter. The taxonomy of Wadensjö (extended by the researcher) is utilized to show this interrelation.

### Part II

Part II deals with the second research question: *Does the immigrant understand these originals (via the renditions), and what can be learned from the immigrant's answers in terms of the sense-making processes?* The answers to this question have been put in four categories:

- 'originals understood' (see 5.2.1)
- 'originals miscommunicated' (see 5.2.2)
- 'originals partly understood' (see 5.2.3)
- 'originals partly miscommunicated' (5.2.4)

The factors/reasons which possibly contributed to understanding/miscommunicating/partly understanding/partly miscommunicating the originals (i.e. 5.2.1 – 5.2.4 above) have been placed into two categories<sup>345</sup>:

- 5.3.1 – 5.3.4 categorize possible *reasons/explanations/factors* as to why the original under investigation was miscommunicated.
- 5.3.5 – 5.3.10 cover the findings with regards to the originals that were concluded to have been understood by the immigrant. They provide some useful findings about how understandings came into being during the encounter under investigation

### Part III

This part deals with the third research question: *How does the interpreter explain his translation decisions, and what can be learned from them in terms*

---

<sup>345</sup> These factors/reasons relate to what has been learned from the immigrant's answers in terms of the sense-making processes (see the second research question).

*of the sense-making processes?* It contains 19 categories<sup>346</sup>. These are divided into two groups:

- 5.5 'No conscious strategy' group, which is divided into:
  - Category 5.5.1 ('no idea why') through to category 5.5.3.4 ('unconsciously')
- 5.6 'Strategies followed' group, which is divided into:
  - o Category 5.6.1 ('giving the intended meaning') through to category 5.6.19 ('reorganizing the utterances')

---

<sup>346</sup> These categories relate to what has been learned from the immigrant's answers/to what he mentioned in terms of the sense-making processes (see the third research question).