



universität
wien

MASTERARBEIT / MASTER'S THESIS

Titel der Masterarbeit / Title of the Master's Thesis

„Overlap and Turn Competition in Speaker-Assigned
Simultaneous Interpreting of a Televised Debate“

verfasst von / submitted by

Martin Hellweg, BA

angestrebter akademischer Grad / in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts (MA)

Wien, 2023 / Vienna 2023

Studienkennzahl lt. Studienblatt /
degree programme code as it appears on
the student record sheet:

UA 070 331 342

Studienrichtung lt. Studienblatt /
degree programme as it appears on
the student record sheet:

Masterstudium Translation Deutsch Englisch

Betreut von / Supervisor:

Univ.-Prof. Mag. Dr. Franz Pöchhacker

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my supervisor, Univ.-Prof. Mag. Dr. Franz Pöchlacker, for his support, feedback, and patience, without which this paper would never have seen the light of day. I would also like to thank my mum and dad, for their support during those many years of university, which finally did amount to something. And I must thank the many people I met along the way, in Vienna, Ottawa, Angers and Brussels. You know who you are...

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	8
1 Media Interpreting	10
1.1 Previous Research.....	11
1.1.1 Origins, Prevalence and Relevance.....	11
1.1.2 Politics and the Media.....	12
1.1.2.1 Infotainment: Fabricating Reality	12
1.1.3 Interpreter and Interpreting Requirements.....	13
1.1.3.1 The Audience	13
1.1.3.2 Interpreting Quality	15
1.1.3.3 Spontaneity.....	16
1.1.3.4 Stress	17
1.1.3.5 Interaction on Two Levels: On-Screen versus Off-Screen	17
1.1.3.6 Talk Show Interpreting as a Special Form of Media Interpreting.....	18
1.1.4 The CorIT Project	19
1.1.4.1 Typology	19
1.1.4.2 Interpreting Mode.....	20
1.1.4.3 Types of Genre	20
1.1.4.4 Types of Interaction	21
1.1.4.5 Types of Media Events.....	22
1.1.5 Extending the Situational Dimension	22
1.2 Behavioural Norms in (Media) Interpreting	24
1.2.1 Shlesinger's Social Norm	25
1.2.2 Zwischenberger's Conduit Concept.....	26
1.2.3 Dam's Call for Uniformity.....	28

1.2.4	Meaning versus Form	30
1.2.4.1	Dal Fovo	30
1.2.4.1.1	Text “DEB.04” - US presidential debates of 2004.....	30
1.2.4.1.2	Text “OB.09” - EU presidency debate	32
1.2.4.2	Schäffner	33
1.2.4.3	Discussion - Interpreting as Authentic Infotainment?.....	34
2	The Toolkit of Conversation Analysis	36
2.1	Turns	36
2.1.1	TCUs and TRPs	37
2.1.2	Adjacency Pairs: FPPs and SPPs	38
2.2	Repair.....	38
2.2.1	Self-Repair and Other-Repair	38
2.2.2	Repair: Placement, initiator technique and trajectory.....	40
2.2.3	The Relationship between Self-Repair and Other-Repair	41
2.3	Overlap.....	42
2.3.1	Occurrence of Overlap	43
2.3.2	Overlap Between More Than Two Speakers	45
2.3.3	Beats Instead of Turns	45
2.3.4	Overlap-Onset Positioning.....	45
2.3.5	Disfluencies - Perturbations and Hitches.....	46
2.3.5.1	Terminological (in)consistency	47
2.3.6	Pauses as Disfluencies	48
2.3.7	Phases of Overlap	49
2.3.8	Solo versus Competitive Production.....	50
2.3.9	Overlap Resolution	51
2.3.10	Post-Overlap	52
2.4	The Link between the Turn-Taking Structure and Overlap.....	54

3	Research Question and Methodology	55
3.1	Aim and Research Questions	55
3.2	Corpus, Methodology and Transcript	56
3.2.1	Transcription Conventions	58
3.2.2	Speaker table	59
4	Analysis.....	60
4.1	Excerpt 1	60
4.1.1	Excerpt 1 – Source Text.....	60
4.1.2	Excerpt 1 – Target Text	62
4.1.3	Excerpt 1 – Comparative Analysis	64
4.2	Excerpt 2	67
4.2.1	Excerpt 2 – Source Text.....	67
4.2.2	Excerpt 2 – Target Text	70
4.2.3	Excerpt 2 – Comparative Analysis	71
4.3	Excerpt 3	73
4.3.1	Excerpt 3 – Source Text.....	74
4.3.2	Excerpt 3 – Target Text	79
4.3.3	Excerpt 3 – Comparative Analysis	83
4.4	Excerpt 4	89
4.4.1	Excerpt 4 – Source Text.....	89
4.4.2	Excerpt 4 – Target Text	93
4.4.3	Excerpt 4 – Comparative Analysis	95
4.5	Excerpt 5	102
4.5.1	Excerpt 5 – Source Text.....	102
4.5.2	Excerpt 5 – Target Text	105
4.5.3	Excerpt 5 – Comparative Analysis	107
5	Discussion and Conclusions	111
	Bibliography	114

Transcripts.....	120
Excerpt 1 – Full Transcript EN+FR.....	120
Excerpt 2 – Full Transcript EN+FR.....	121
Excerpt 3 – Full Transcript EN+FR.....	122
Excerpt 4 – Full Transcript EN+FR.....	124
Excerpt 5 – Full Transcript EN+FR.....	126
Abstract (English)	131
Abstract (German)	132

Introduction

The present thesis investigates how a team of role-assigned simultaneous interpreters deal with overlapping speech in a televised debate when working with an output channel setup that allows the interpreters to also speak at the same time. This is achieved using a theoretical framework combining different insights from interpreting studies with the analytical toolbox of classical conversation analysis.

Within interpreting studies, media interpreting is a niche field of research in which the literature on televised debates is limited. Even beyond the realm of research on media interpreting, overlapping source-text speech and indeed overlapping speech in general has so far received little attention in interpreting studies. It is worth noting, however, that this form of interpreting is somewhat unique in that it allows multi-channel communication for both input and output – most forms of interpreting do not permit simultaneous output of multiple channels of interpretation into the same language which are intended to be heard simultaneously. Indeed, many traditional interpreting settings are deliberately designed to prevent this from happening, and it introduces a new dimension to interpreting – the prospect of turn-sequential competition between interpreters. The exotic nature of the subject matter explains the lack of research, and some of the insights provided may be germane only within this niche discipline. However, this specific setting also serves as a petri dish which brings to the fore and emphasises aspects which are difficult to examine in other settings, most notably the interaction between the interpreters themselves in direct relation to the texts. This in turn permits examination of broader questions that apply to all forms of interpreting in a setting where certain variables are more visible, for example regarding the interpreters' behaviour with regard to competitiveness and turn-taking. It is with this in mind that this paper intends to open up initial avenues of thought by approaching the issue from a qualitative and interaction-oriented perspective with a view to paving the way for further investigation.

The first chapter aims to provide a backdrop for the present investigation by exploring the existing literature on media interpreting as well as the thoughts of a selection of scholars on interpreters' behavioural tendencies and constants. To this end, the origins of the discipline are discussed and the natural habitat of this form of communication is explored, narrowed down to political debates in the media. After this examination of the context, the specificities of the setting and the demands vis-à-vis the interpreters themselves are described from a more technical perspective, and the different forms of such interpreted mediation are discussed along with previous research endeavours, delving into the seminal work of the extensive long-term

research in the framework of the CorIT project with a focus on the insights provided by Dal Fovo (2017). The first chapter's second arc discusses how behavioural norms within the interpreting profession and research have been construed by specific scholars, looking into the differences between individual and norm-based behaviour, the inherent contradictions of such norm-based behaviour illustrated by the concept of faithfulness and how such norms are perceived and communicated within and beyond the profession, the fractures different interpretations of such norms create within the profession, a corpus-based investigation into how such norms can differ when they are applied, and the impact of context on such norms in practice.

The second chapter outlines the conversation analytical toolbox which is used in the third chapter. As such, it explains the conceptual framework behind turn-taking, repairs and overlap in conversation, dwelling on when and how overlap occurs, how it provokes disfluencies in production and the difference between turn-based and beat-based sequential structures, how overlap is resolved, and how speakers alternate between solo and competitive production.

The third chapter provides insights into the aim of the study, as well as a description of the analysed corpus and research methodology.

The fourth chapter consists of a detailed analytical investigation of the selected excerpts. Every excerpt was examined in three stages, the first and second stages consisted in an independent analysis of the source text and the target text, respectively, and the third stage was a comparative analysis. The three sections for each excerpt reflect these three stages of the analysis. Analysis on the source text level focuses on high-conflictuality elements and the surrounding turn and/or beat structure. All problematic speaker transitions that lead to overlap in the source text excerpts are examined in detail, paying special attention to disfluencies and the level of production. The target text level analysis follows the same approach. The comparative analysis then explores to what extent the conflictuality and the sequential structure of the original are reflected in the target text, how the interpreters deal with conflict, and to what extent conflictual elements and turn structures in the target text arise from the source text or from within the target text.

The fifth chapter discusses the findings of the analysis, establishes links with the ideas on norm-based behaviour from the first chapter and calls for further research in the field.

1 Media Interpreting

The Routledge Encyclopaedia of Interpreting Studies describes media interpreting as “a very broad and diversified category of mediated cross-language communication, within the wider field of audio-visual translation” (Dal Fovo 2015a:245). Other names like Broadcast Interpreting or TV Interpreting are also found in the literature, with the latter being used as either a synonym of media interpreting or a sub-category used only for interpreting on television. The Galician Observatory of Media Accessibility of the University of Vigo’s Linguistics and Translation Department describes media interpreting on its website as

a context-driven interpreting practice in which the communicative ethos of the broadcaster, the production conditions and the inherent features of the medium shape the interpretation in terms of modality (consecutive, dialogue, simultaneous), interpreting broadcast output (live, recorded, edited, etc.) and the actual contents that require interpreting.

(GALMA 2021)

Media interpreting is commonly employed to grant broader audiences within a specific socio-cultural community more direct access to intersocietal events such as coronations, presidential elections, momentous moments in sports or science, etc. It is a hybrid discipline that combines elements from inter-national conference interpreting and inter-social community interpreting (Pöchhacker 2004:15). This makes for a somewhat unwieldy category that may appear fuzzy through the lens of traditional interpreting studies, since it transgresses the usual framework of setting, mode, and modality to encompass interpreting of any communicative event broadcast in the media (Dal Fovo 2015a). One of the most prevalent forms of media interpreting is on television, where it is most commonly performed in simultaneous mode. Consecutive mode is somewhat of an exception in media interpreting. Interpreters on talk shows may, for example, perform a mix of ‘short consecutive’ (without note-taking) and simultaneous interpreting, providing chuchotage for the guests in simultaneous mode with the host’s questions and then interpreting the answer aloud in consecutive mode (Dal Fovo 2015a). Signed-language interpreting is also common in the media (Dal Fovo 2015a), this paper will, however, focus on spoken-language interpreting.

1.1 Previous Research

1.1.1 Origins, Prevalence and Relevance

In the 1920s, radio broadcasting revolutionised mass communication and opened up a plethora of possibilities. One of these was combining this technology with interpreting to break down language barriers. Ironically, one of the first known examples of this was Hitler's first speech in Nuremberg, which was broadcast on French radio in the 1930s (Dal Fovo 2015a). Despite its comparatively early beginnings and the ubiquity of the media in today's interconnected world, media interpreting remains a rather exotic specimen when compared to conference or community interpreting. Media interpreting still lags far behind conference interpreting when it comes to professionalisation. As such, it has been overlooked by the scientific community to a certain extent, with notable exceptions, some of which are discussed in this paper.

Popularity and acceptance of media interpreting vary greatly from one culture to another. In 1997, Kurz described her own interpreting assignments on Austrian television by saying

[T]hey probably yield a fairly representative picture of the overall volume of and trends in media interpretation in Austria during the last 25 years or so, since by far the largest share of English-German TV interpretation was done by the author of the present paper (Kurz 1997:198).

If a single individual was responsible for the lion's share of all interpreting assignments ever performed on Austrian television in the language combination English-German in 1997, it is safe to assume that the number of interpreters active on Austrian television at the time was hovering in the low double digits at most. This also raises the sociological question of whether the Austrian media interpreters of the time can even be considered a profession rather than simply a very select group of individuals with a specific skill set. In this context, any establishment of a group-specific legal framework, institutionalized training programme or even professional associations was out of the question, at least on a national scale.

In other regions of the world, however, media interpreting has been accorded more mainstream acclaim. In Japan, news interpreting has been part of everyday television for decades, both on international channels such as CNN or BBC World as well as on the national public broadcaster NHK. Media interpreting in various configurations is also a widespread practice in Spanish-speaking countries, and the use of television interpreting has increased in

Italy in recent decades (Dal Fovo 2015a).

1.1.2 Politics and the Media

Media interpreting is a broad concept that encompasses a wide range of different interpreting modes and contexts. This thesis will focus on interpreting of televised presidential election debates, which is a broad topic in itself. The following chapter presents a rough outline of the interplay between politics and the media, with a view to providing some context for the following examination through the prisms of conversation analysis and interpreting studies.

1.1.2.1 Infotainment: Fabricating Reality

The first-ever presidential debate to be broadcast on live television was the one between John F. Kennedy and Richard Nixon, during the 1960 US presidential elections. It was an impressive demonstration of the power of the media which not only provides insights but also spawned myths and legends that have inspired science and fiction alike to this day. The debate was characterised by the stark contrast between the two contestants on screen. Kennedy seemed very much at home in this mediatic environment and exuded confidence, charm, and control. Nixon, however, seemed nervous and ill at ease, with sweat visibly trickling down his forehead. He looked oddly out of place in his suit that was barely distinguishable from the studio background. He was new to this environment and was not familiar with the rules that applied. It was thus that Richard Nixon, a battle-hardened veteran of politics if ever there was one, lost the contest before it had even begun – or so legend has it. Some of the stories told about this event and the impact it had on Kennedy's election may be apocryphal, but the lesson it teaches does have its merit and relevance, today as much as ever. It shows that long before technological progress had made possible today's endless stream of media content and the filtered realities of Twitter and Facebook bubbles, the media were key not only to how (political) content is made available to the public, but also to how it is perceived (Schroeder 2008).

Mass media act as a filter between reality and the public, influencing political discourse and the public's expectations of it (Dal Fovo 2017). Not only the programme being broadcast, but also the (perception of) political events themselves adhere to a specific set of rules if they are to coincide with the audience's expectations. These rules for events like presidential debates are set out by the medium itself; indeed, "presidential [debates] are best apprehended as television shows, governed not by the rules of rhetoric or politics but by the demands of the

host medium” (Schroeder 2008:9). Information and entertainment are thus melded with infotainment, which provides the framework for the interdependent relationship between the political and the mediatic sphere. The two spheres must negotiate in order to determine which content is topical enough to merit the public’s attention at a given place and time. The media consequently play a central role in shaping reality, both cultural and political (Dal Fovo 2017:173). At the same time, the audience bestows the media with the “power of (remote) control” (Mack 2002:205) in exchange for granting them access to the reality the media offer in the form of industrially manufactured messages. The media in turn are subservient to the primacy of audience ratings. The reality they peddle must meet the customers’ demands, otherwise the content loses its relevance and thus its power as a message. Anyone wanting to be a part of this reality, even a powerful political figure, puts themselves entirely at the mercy of the whims and woes of the audience. Interpreters are no exception to this rule.

1.1.3 Interpreter and Interpreting Requirements

The following chapter discusses the characteristics and requirements expected of media interpreters and the criteria and requirements the interpretation itself must adhere to.

1.1.3.1 The Audience

Falbo (2008) distinguishes between three different forms of media interpreting:

- liaison interpreting (interprétation de liaison),
- simultaneous interpreting in interviews, and
- simultaneous interpreting at major media events such as presidential debates, weddings/funerals, or sports interviews.

What all three have in common is that they are broadcast in the media, which has an impact on the process and the effect of the interpretation itself. In the latter two categories, the interpreter is physically present in the studio and actively involved as an essential part of the interaction between the primary interlocutors. The third category is different in this regard; the interpretation has no immediate bearing on the primary interaction. When interpreting is used to cover international events, “la raison même de l’interprétation est mise en cause” (Falbo 2008) since it no longer serves the purpose of enabling communication. Instead, it is a tool, neatly incorporated into the media’s arsenal and enabling them to extend their reach to an audience they would not have been able to reach with this content otherwise. Another aspect

that sets this form of media interpreting apart is a rift in the spatial/temporal alignment of source and target text: the primary on-screen interaction spawns a secondary level of off-screen interaction, which is simultaneous in time but spatially separated.

Falbo (2008) also points out that media content relayed through interpretation is subject to a monologisation effect which renders it monologic, as opposed to the polylogic nature of the original. Polylogic here means that the original is a text generated by a plurality of interactants, each of which has and represents their own voice. Since interpreters usually work in very small teams, most commonly two people, the primary interaction's plurality of voices is reduced to just two voices on the secondary level – the polylogic becomes monologic. This monologisation effect, Falbo argues, is an inherent characteristic of media interpreting. However, this does not mean that the entire diversity and nuance of the original is lost in translation. Indeed, interpreters have a range of techniques at their disposal which they can use to add depth to the monologous dimension within which they operate in order to emulate some of the original's polylogic characteristics, such as deliberate use of prosodic features, e.g. voice modulation to render Q&A sequences or exaggerating certain elements to reproduce irony.

Another of Falbo's points is that the mediatic context forces interpreters to work in conditions that are defined by what is essentially a contradiction in terms. The professional deontology of interpreting is constantly at odds with the aim to entertain that governs the media. Interpreting, in general, is a form of linguistic mediation with the underlying purpose of facilitating communication. Put simply, successful communication requires messages that are as clear as possible, and successful mediation requires the original message to be rendered as truthfully as possible. The problem with hybrid forms of communication like media interpreting is that people do not generally sit down in front of the TV intending to listen to and appreciate the performance of an interpreter. They want to be entertained. For an interpreted presidential debate, this means that the audience wants to experience the event as if they were a part of it (Dal Fovo 2018). In the case of spoken language interpretation on mainstream television, it is safe to assume that the majority of viewers will have little to no awareness of the technicalities and specificities of the interpretation performance they are witnessing (Kurz 1997). Spending an evening watching TV is not the same as attending a conference. The experience is not primarily about extracting important details and relevant information from the interpreted target text for the purpose of enhancing and adding to one's own knowledge or expertise, as is commonly the case with conference interpreting. Instead, the whole experience is about consuming bite-sized chunks of ready-made, industrially manufactured messages (Mack 2002). Everything revolves around the expectations of those

wielding the power of the remote control.

1.1.3.2 Interpreting Quality

The primacy of the audience in media interpreting is a recurrent topic in the literature (e.g. Kurz 1997, Mack 2002, Falbo 2008, Dal Fovo 2017). At the same time, however, examples of research where interpreting quality assessed on the basis of direct feedback from the actual end consumers of media interpreting are few and far between (Pöchhacker 2007), with some notable exceptions (e.g. Elsagir 2000). Quality in media interpreting in general has however been the subject of some research from other angles. Kurz and Pöchhacker (1995) examine expectations of interpreters and decision-makers in TV production, showing that criteria for interpreting quality can indeed be different in a media context. The importance of presentational aspects such as voice quality and nativeness regarding proficiency and fluency of speech production ranked higher than completeness in this study. This stands in contrast to quality criteria for conference settings, for example, where completeness is considered to be one of the most important aspects. Interestingly these findings, which represent the TV producers' opinion, do not coincide with Elsagir's (2000) results from the audience's point of view. In her study, respondents stated that they considered completeness to have a greater impact on quality than fluency and voice. However, when they were presented with a concrete example and asked which aspect of the interpretation particularly stood out to them, the most frequent answers were voice and fluency (Pöchhacker 2007). This example goes to show the methodological pitfalls for studies based on the audience's expectation. Research design must allow for the fact that recipients may indicate hypothetical preferences which do not necessarily coincide with their actual perception of the interpretation. This issue has already been raised in the context of conference interpreting (Pöchhacker 2004:154) and is just as pertinent when it comes to interviews of target groups as diverse and dispersed as television audiences. In a similar vein, an experimental study conducted by Chiaro (2002) on interpreting students found that poor interpreting performance delivered on television by a professional TV presenter was deemed acceptable by the interviewees. The presenter, Paolo Limiti, is a celebrity in Italy; Chiaro suggests that his charisma and excellent command of the foreign language may have influenced the interpreting students' perception.

Quality is by definition a matter of perspective. Mass media are no exception to this rule, which is why the insights from studies such as Elsagir's are particularly valuable. At the same time, television is a "generator and creator of products aiming at satisfying the public's

expectations, which television itself helped create in the first place” (Falbo 2012:172). This is why research like Kurz’ survey of TV producers is also highly relevant. Whether or not said producers have acquired some form of knowledge or experience to justify the position of power they are in is not an issue this paper will be addressing. What is relevant to this paper, however, is how their opinion regarding what decent TV should consist of becomes a self-fulfilling truth that informs the mind of the masses and coerces them into adopting this imposed notion of quality as their own.

1.1.3.3 Spontaneity

One element that supports this theory, and in doing so illustrates the effect media and media consumption have on perception, is the notion of artificial spontaneity on TV. Television producers generally aim to exercise as much control as possible over a programme that is intended to seem as spontaneous – and therefore authentic – as possible. Holly (1995) distinguishes between five categories of TV content, listed from least to most spontaneous:

- obviously read,
- recited (by heart),
- pseudo-spontaneous (with the teleprompter),
- semi-spontaneous (improvised from written text or keywords), and
- spontaneous.

Producers consider especially the last category too risky, which is why they try to avoid it. Mack (2002) describes how TV audiences become accustomed to this approach, which enables them to consume and enjoy what is clearly artificial communication in blissful ignorance. Without the screen in between, a person trying to engage in everyday conversation with the mechanical precision of, say, a news anchor, would hardly be perceived as reassuring by their interlocutors. However, the opposite is also true: people on TV without any preparation or speech training are unlikely to live up to the expectations of TV audiences, especially in a political context. A trained professional interpreting live on television would ideally be very well prepared, but they nonetheless find themselves in a similar predicament: simultaneous interpreting epitomises Holly’s fifth category of maximum spontaneity – the category to be avoided at all costs. Indeed, “even more than elsewhere, television interpreters seem to be the only participants in communication compelled to produce genuine fresh talk” (Mack 2002:211). The difficulty lies in making this “fresh talk” suit the audience’s palate without the additives and flavour enhancers of artificial spontaneity.

1.1.3.4 Stress

Stress factors are a recurrent topic in the interpreting studies literature in general and research on media interpreting in particular. Stress can add to the pressure interpreters face and affect interpreting performance. Kurz (1997, 2002) distinguishes between

- factors arising from the physical environment,
- work-related factors and
- psycho-emotional stress factors.

The physical environment can become a cause of stress if no soundproof interpreting booths are available, as this increases the risk of auditory or visual distraction. Another potential factor is the lack of direct contact with the other interactants. Even if a booth with a screen showing the primary interaction is set up, media interpreters are not able to see the speakers they are interpreting directly, i.e. without the intermediary of technology. Conference interpreters in offline meetings often (try to) insist on having a clear line of sight as a precondition for their services (1997, 2002). In interpreting for major media events (Falbo 2008), there is no possibility to interact with or get feedback from the audience or the primary interactants (Kurz 2002).

Work-related stress in media interpreting occurs because working in a media environment often lacks regularity and structure. Media interpreters are sometimes called upon at very short notice, which means a lack of time for preparation. They have to be very flexible when it comes to working hours and the time of day. In the case of overseas broadcasts, this might mean having to summon the wits and the stamina necessary for very intense cognitive performance in the small hours of the morning. In the case of lengthy broadcasts, high levels of concentration must be sustained non-stop for several hours (Kurz 2002).

Psychological and emotional stress can arise from the awareness that thousands of people are listening to the performance. This may seem obvious in an interpreting context, but for media interpreting, it goes beyond mere stage fright. Kurz (1997, 2002) discusses a number of factors regarding the impact of the complex (power) structures that emerge as the audience's quality expectations collide with the interpreter's behavioural norms.

1.1.3.5 Interaction on Two Levels: On-Screen versus Off-Screen

The services of media interpreters can be employed for a variety of different purposes. This has to do with how the mass media themselves operate as well as with the fact that broadcasting

formats themselves vary. Mack (2002) breaks down the countless varieties of televised content into two categories: on-screen and off-screen. The former consists of a carefully selected cast of primary interactants communicating with one another as on-screen interactants. This interaction is made accessible to an anonymous and undifferentiated audience, referred to as off-screen interactants. This form of communication is asymmetrical and unidirectional since the off-screen interactants cannot actively participate. At the same time, however, they are the ones vested with “the power of (remote) control” (Mack 2002:205). As discussed above, the mass media use industrially manufactured messages. This requires considerable resources, financially, technologically, and from a human resources perspective. Media interpreting is a very complex form of communication with demanding requirements for technology and the people involved. What makes it attractive to producers is that these high demands on technology and people are usually offset by the financial advantages it offers (Mack 2002:205,208).

Depending on the desired interaction format, media interpreters can be active on-screen, off-screen, or both. They can send messages unilaterally from the on-screen level to the audience off-screen. They can also communicate unilaterally with the off-screen audience while bilaterally facilitating interaction between the performers on screen at the same time. Here, the interpreter’s participation is essential to the interaction; however, it does not necessarily have to be performed by a professional interpreter. Sometimes bilingual moderators will take on the role of interpreter and step in to interpret for the audience whenever a foreign language is being used (Mack 2002).

What exactly interpreters do depends primarily on the format of the programme. In this sense, a distinction can be made between talk show interpreting and interpreting of major media events. For the sake of completeness, the following section provides a brief overview of the former before the paper goes on to focus on the latter in greater detail.

1.1.3.6 Talk Show Interpreting as a Special Form of Media Interpreting

In a standard talk show set-up as described by Dal Fovo (2015b), the interpreter sits next to or between one or more of the guests who require their services and provides chuchotage (whispered interpretation) whenever the guest is not speaking themselves. The guest’s contributions are in turn interpreted consecutively for everyone to hear. An alternative set-up includes the use of simultaneous interpreting to enable the audience to listen to the interpretation directly whenever a foreign language is spoken. Where consecutive interpreting

is used, a certain loss of information is considered inevitable under the circumstances and the interpreter is granted a certain extent of artistic license when it comes to additions, omissions, and explanations. In such settings, changes in footing are also not uncommon, with interpreters not only interpreting for others but also speaking for themselves. This is a somewhat unique characteristic of talk show interpreting in that the interpreter can be given full or even enhanced visibility. The interpreter is thus able to step into the limelight, as “les besoins de transmission/communication de la masse (les téléspectateurs) marquent le triomphe de [...] l'interprète” (Falbo 2008). Falbo (2008) describes cases where the interpreting performance itself becomes the subject of debate in the press after the broadcast. This increased visibility and involvement enables the interpreter to establish a rapport with the other interactants and allows them to shed their role's inherent restrictions. This becomes particularly apparent when they interact with bilingual moderators, where, depending on the situation, competitive or even territorial behaviour can emerge, with the interpreter and the moderator vying for the right to speak and assign turns or the moderator taking the odd jab at the interpreter's performance (Dal Fovo 2015b).

1.1.4 The CorIT Project

The CorIT project is to date the most extensive attempt to collect and provide access to a substantial corpus of media interpreting material for research purposes. The following chapter describes the approach behind CorIT, its structure, and its classification types.

1.1.4.1 Typology

The CorIT project was initiated by Francesco Straniero Sergio with the ambitious aim of creating an archive with all interpreted content ever broadcast on Italian television. The project started off with recordings from the archives of Italian public broadcaster RAI and was later extended to other broadcasters. The archive consists of spoken television interpreting material and covers over five decades of Italian TV (Falbo 2012). In 2017, the corpus comprised a total of some 2,700 recordings ranging from a few seconds to 90 minutes in length (Dal Fovo 2017). The individual elements of the corpus are categorised using ten classification criteria that describe either the interpreter or situational factors:

Interpreter

- a. Interpreter(s)'s name
- b. Interpreting mode

- c. Interaction type

Situational factors

- d. Names of the participants in the communication event
- e. Date
- f. Italian programme(s)/ broadcasting channel(s)
- g. Foreign broadcasting channel
- h. Macro-genre
- i. Television genre
- j. Type of text (source text/interpretation)

(Falbo 2012:158)

1.1.4.2 Interpreting Mode

Criterion b “interpreting mode” is subdivided into the following categories:

- short consecutive (consecutive without notes),
- ‘classic’ consecutive,
- simultaneous in presentia (SIP),
- simultaneous in absentia (SIA).

SIP and SIA indicate whether or not the interpreter has any influence on the primary interaction. SIP interpreting is required for the interaction to succeed, as might be the case in a bilingual interview. SIA refers to settings where the source text is produced independently of interpreting, such as a presidential debate (Falbo 2012:163-164).

1.1.4.3 Types of Genre

Falbo describes genres as “a powerful tool, through which an individual can categorize and assimilate the outer world [...], and yet they require constant adjustments to the ever-changing reality they are referred to” (Falbo 2012:171). Genres are informed by reality, but our perception of reality is also informed by genres. This theory of genres as a tool for a specific purpose is applied in practice in CorIT’s approach to categorising mass media content. We live in a world where consumers are constantly exposed to a stream of information with a “constant overlap of shows, and fragmentation of the television text owing to the intromission of other texts” (Falbo 2012:171). It is this constant overlap and fragmentation that makes media genres so elusive as categories. Falbo draws upon the work of Grasso, who distinguishes three forms

of genre in the media:

1. Genre as a production concept, usually market-oriented, which aims to produce a text with the highest possible acceptance and effect on the audience
 2. Genre as a set of conventions for the text and programming schedule
 3. Genre as a contract binding the audience to the text and defining their expectations
- (Grasso 2002:94-95).

The CorIT database distinguishes between two types or levels of genre: macro-genre and television genre. Genres are assigned on the basis of the source text or foreign channel. Macro-genres include categories like information, education-culture, entertainment, sports, infotainment, etc. The television genre category provides a sub-level perspective using specific references such as talk shows, TV news and coverage, reporting, information and entertainment show, presidential debates, weddings, or funerals. Due to the complex nature of certain programmes, however, overlaps both within and between these two categories cannot be altogether avoided.

1.1.4.4 Types of Interaction

CorIT uses a category referred to as “interaction types” for further differentiation based on source text characteristics such as genre, dialogicity and the degree of interaction. The underlying conceptual framework draws upon Bakhtin’s work on dialogicity. Bakhtin promoted an understanding of language as a social phenomenon created through an exchange between individuals (Bakhtin et al. 1981). Bres (2008) uses this idea to distinguish between two levels of discourse, for dialogues and monologues alike: dialogues can be either dialogue-like or dialogic, monologues are either monologue-like or monologic. The former distinction, dialogue-like/monologue-like, represents the external dimension and refers to the number of physical persons involved, one (monologue-like) versus many (dialogue-like). The latter, dialogic/monologic, is a more conceptual internal dimension, which depends on the number of voices within the same text. A monologue that includes quotes from a third party, for example, would be both monologue-like and dialogical. The text is produced by one person, which makes it monologue-like. The quote within the text however introduces a voice that is not the speaker’s, adding the dialogical dimension. CorIT uses this distinction to categorise interpretations, again on the basis of the source text. Interactive source texts with more than one participant, such as press conferences and interviews, are considered dialogue-like, while texts without intratextual exchange such as declarations of war or inauguration speeches are

considered monologue-like (Falbo 2012).

While this typology provides a certain degree of orientation, it lacks the sophistication necessary to describe turn-taking sequences in dialogical interactions. When comparing conversations, interviews, and conferences, for example, there is a considerable difference regarding the sequence and rhythm of the interaction. Kerbrat-Oreccioni (2005:17) uses the term *degré d'interaction* to describe the extent of interactivity: the more frequently turns alternate, the higher the degree of interaction. If interpreters hand over after 20-to-30-minute stints, as is common practice in conference interpreting, they are not able to tailor their degree of interaction to that of the source text. As a general rule, “[i]nteraction is not reproduced, as much as it is represented by the interpreters, mainly through meta-discourse and prosody” (Falbo 2012:168). The degree of interaction is consequently reduced, which produces a monologization effect (Straniero Sergio 2007).

1.1.4.5 Types of Media Events

Content produced by the mass media caters to consumer expectations that the media themselves generate. To a certain extent, however, media events are an exception to this rule since they are not organised directly by the media industry but rather by “public institutions, political parties, and any actor other than television” (Falbo 2012:173). The media then use these societal events of major importance to generate content. Nevertheless, as the name suggests, media events are mediated by the media industry. Dayan and Katz (1993) place media events into one of three categories, based on where the events are rooted in society:

- competition: typically includes political or sporting events such as presidential debates or the Olympics,
- conquest: ceremonial occasions to honour great achievements in politics or science such as the moon landing,
- crowning ceremonies: coronations as well as events like weddings or funerals.

1.1.5 Extending the Situational Dimension

In her study of Barack Obama’s presidential inauguration speech, held on 20 January 2009, Dal Fovo analyses this coronation-type text and identifies a phenomenon she refers to as an extension of the “situational dimension” (Dal Fovo 2017:174). The text is a public speech, and as such of course addressed to the audience that is physically situated where the text is being produced. However, the message is also intended to reach a wider audience, which extends the

situational dimension of the text. A president of the United States would typically address the American people as their primary target audience. Dal Fovo argues, however, that this text type also often features rhetorical devices designed to reach out to an audience beyond, a claim substantiated by evidence in Obama's speech:

And so to all other peoples and governments who are watching today [emphasis in original] from the grandest capitals to the small village where my father was born know that America is a friend of each nation and every man, woman and child who seeks a future of peace and dignity [...] (Dal Fovo 2017:174).

The symbolic and ceremonial character of the message is pivotal to achieving the desired effect by tapping into the collective consciousness' conditioning. What makes the text so appealing to its audience(s) is that it frames the event by "separating it from daily life, monumentalizing it, upholding its official definition, and offering a storyline and commentary to shape its interpretations" (Dayan & Katz 1992:38). The programme is broadcast nationally as well as internationally which enables the audience(s) to identify with this event and say, "I was there when it happened".

TV broadcasts of presidential debates instrumentalise the ceremonial dimension to generate entertainment value by allowing viewers to become part of a historic moment in time. But the ceremonial component pales in comparison to the thrill and excitement of the event's competitive dimension. This is why presidential debates are placed in the competition-type category, even though they have all the hallmarks and the ceremonial heft of a coronation-type event. The event is also rife with symbolism: the audience is witnessing a historical moment and by virtue of their voting rights are actually part of the jury which gets to decide about the outcome. This is of course limited to persons who have the right to vote in the country of the election, which is not necessarily the case for those relying on the interpretation. A rare exception to this is the debate in the run-up to the election of the President of the European Commission, also analysed by Dal Fovo (2018). Here, the source text does not only contain implicit references to the expansion of the situational dimension – the moderator explicitly instructs the participants not to speak at the same time because they are being interpreted:

Moderation <sorry one at a time because translators please>

Martin Schultz <no Guy these sounds XXX very nice that>

Moderation <we' re we' re translating in thirteen languages gentlemen please one at a

Regardless of whether or not the text is consumed in the original language, the audience's main interest lies in witnessing the face-off between the opponents. Conflict generates entertainment value for audiences independently of whether they are eligible to vote or directly affected by the outcome. Entertainment may even be the main or sole purpose of presidential debates on television – the notion that they actually have a bearing on the election results has been challenged in the literature. An extensive analysis of US elections by Erikson and Wlezien (2012:81) concluded that the influence of presidential debates on election outcomes is not significant. From the producers' perspective, the debate's impact on the outcome is of little relevance. The success of the media interpreters' performance and indeed the future of this type of programme do not depend on how well the candidates fare or the result of the election. Extending the situational dimension can lead to a broader audience and be the reason why a programme is interpreted into different languages, but even here the underlying principle of the media holds true: it all depends on "the audience's deadly click of the thumb" (Dal Fovo 2018:181).

1.2 Behavioural Norms in (Media) Interpreting

Media interpreters have to contend with a variety of factors in addition to the considerable pressure commonly associated with the interpreting profession in general. The constraints and requirements they face arise from either the assignment or the interpreter's understanding of what their job is and which role it confers.

The following chapter deals with role-related expectations and the resulting normative concepts in the literature and in practice. It addresses the concept of social norm and its origins from an interpreting studies perspective. The diverging perspectives of four notable scholars are discussed in order to provide a broad overview. Zwischenberger's (2015) critique of the conduit concept is used to shine a light on the notion of a supernorm as the underlying mechanism that governs all forms of interpretation. The work of Dam (2017) is then examined in order to take a look at the profession itself and her call for more uniformity with a view to better promoting the integrity, independence, and self-determination within the profession. The discrepancies between the positions of Dal Fovo (2017, 2018) and Schäffner (2017) are then

drawn upon to illustrate why it is difficult to agree upon what defines the role of media interpreters and their profession.

1.2.1 Shlesinger's Social Norm

Miriam Shlesinger (1989) was the first scholar to transfer the sociological concept of the social norm from translation studies to (conference) interpreting. Descriptive translation studies, with its understanding of translation as behaviour within a social context, sees norms as socio-cultural mechanisms that limit translators' behaviour. Norms can be situated anywhere on a continuum ranging from broadly established rules to idiosyncratic habits (Toury 1995). As early as 1989, Shlesinger pointed out how difficult it is to ascribe a certain form of behaviour to a specific point on this continuum. If any distinction is to be made between individual behaviour and social norms, this requires analysis of representative data sets. In order to compile a representative corpus able to provide meaningful data, however, a number of challenges need to be overcome. These include the small number of available and comparable interpreters in any given setting, the difficulty of reproduction due to the orality of this form of communication, and the fact that it is not always easy to gain access to recordings (Shlesinger 1989).

Shlesinger's thought-provoking observations of 1989 should not only lead to the emergence of CorIT many years later, but also triggered a heated discussion in the literature regarding norms themselves. Generally speaking, norms are social conventions that are used to assess actions or modes of action within a group. This allows us to gauge behaviour against pre-conceived notions such as "correct" or "appropriate". In addition to pointing out the methodological challenges that come with applying such a concept to a profession, Shlesinger (1989) also expressed doubts regarding the existence of such norms within the comparatively small world of conference interpreting, which was still a rather young profession at the time. She revoked some of these doubts later on, but her criticism at the time concerned what she perceived to be a lack of shared values and uniformity in the understanding of the respective roles in the profession and literature. She saw this as a necessary precondition for establishing professional norms. In response to Shlesinger's work, Harris (1990) pointed to a number of norms that existed in conference interpreting, such as working into the A-language, alternating in teams, or reproducing the speaker's position using the first person. He also posited what might be considered the first supernorm (Mack 2002, Zwischenberger 2015), the norm of the language mediator as an honest spokesperson, which states that the interpreter must "re-express

the original speakers' ideas and the manner of expressing them as accurately as possible and without significant omissions, and not mix them up with their own ideas and expressions" (Harris 1990:118). Harris considers this fundamental commitment a prerequisite for any interpreting activity.

1.2.2 Zwischenberger's Conduit Concept

Since this exchange between Shlesinger and Harris, the discussion on norms has been extended to include various modes, modalities, and settings (Inghilleri 2003, Monacelli 2009, Zwischenberger 2015, Biagini et al. 2017). Norms and how to identify them are still a point of contention. The existence and validity of different norms have repeatedly been called into question in the literature (Monacelli 2009, Dam 2017) – a fate not even Harris' honest spokesperson was spared (Monacelli 2009:15). With the emergence of interaction-oriented approaches in the literature, the lack of consensus Shlesinger criticised in the early 1990s started to give way to a more uniform understanding, at least as far as the creation of meaning in interpreted interaction is concerned (Zwischenberger 2015, Schäffner 2017, Dam 2017). In practice, however, the idea of the interpreter as a kind of mechanical translation device which can be used as a loyal and neutral interface between the primary interactors – the so-called metaphoric conduit concept (Zwischenberger 2017:96) – prevails and persists, especially in the realm of conference interpreting.

Zwischenberger (2015) refers to this concept as a supernorm. The conduit supernorm is not only practised and propagated by individual interpreters operating as individuals within the wide professional world, it is also one of the central maxims of AIIC, the International Association of Conference Interpreters. Zwischenberger's argument is based on an online survey of over 700 AIIC members conducted as part of a larger study. The study shows that this maxim is also reflected in the interpreters' self-image and expectations regarding their own work (Pöhhacker and Zwischenberger 2010). Zwischenberger (2015) criticizes that AIIC, as the central authority, subscribes to an overly simplistic perspective that promotes values as its core tenets that are impossible to reconcile with actual interpreting practice.

Faithfulness and detachment are promoted in various official AIIC documents. Zwischenberger interprets these documents as imperative speech acts, which present both faithfulness and detachment as "the only logical and natural reality that is unquestioned and shared by a certain group of people" (Zwischenberger 2015:95). The AIIC Practical Guide for Professional Conference Interpreters provided online by the institution requires AIIC members

to abide by the following codex:

It is your job to communicate the speaker's intended messages as accurately, faithfully, and completely as possible. At the same time, make it your own speech, and be clear and lively in your delivery [...] [be] not only accurate but convincing. Make them forget they are hearing the speaker through an interpreter. Make sense in every sentence, and finish every sentence.

[...] primary loyalty is always owed to the speaker and to the communicative intent that the speaker wishes to realize.

(AIIC 2016)

According to Zwischenberger, this raises the question of whether aiming for the greatest possible accuracy and faithfulness and aiming to formulate clearly and coherently are not mutually exclusive. The same applies to trying to produce a rendition that is lively and convincing and at the same time reflects “the emphasis, tone, and nuance of what is said” (AIIC 2016).

The results of the study by Pöchhacker and Zwischenberger (2010) corroborate these concerns. Among other things, the study examines interpreters’ attitudes towards four norms that are tied in with their understanding of the role of the interpreter:

- loyalty towards the speaker/original
- detachment of the interpreter
- intervention into the original
- reaction to working conditions.

Faithfulness and detachment were considered the most important factors, with the majority of respondents considering faithfulness to be more important than detachment. Where a source text was unintelligible, however, many of the respondents were willing to accept an intervention into the original. This illustrates how norms can be mutually exclusive.

Although the conduit supernorm cannot be implemented in practice, it continues to be promoted and advertised by organisations such as AIIC. This image of the passive and mechanical interpreter is popular in the field of conference interpreting, the “marketplace of powerful leaders” (Zwischenberger 2015:108). This understanding of the interpreter’s role implies a subordinate position in the communicative process instead of perceiving interpreters as partners in the construction of meaning (Zwischenberger 2015).

1.2.3 Dam's Call for Uniformity

Zwischenberger's criticism is anchored in the constructivist premise that meaning in interaction is constructed in collaboration, by primary interactors as well as interpreters. This view is representative of the interaction-oriented paradigm in interpreting studies (Pöchhacker 2004), which draws upon the findings of discourse-based research and has become a prevalent way of understanding the role of the interpreter (e.g. Schäffner 2017, Dam 2017). Against this backdrop, Helle Vrønning Dam stands out as one of the few scholars to opt for an approach that runs counter to this paradigm. She takes a prescriptive stance and laments the widespread misunderstanding of the metaphorical conduit concept in the literature.

Dam criticises what she describes as “state-of-the-art knowledge and understanding of the topics of interpreter role, ethics, norms and quality across the various sub-fields of interpreting” (2017:228). Her article discussed here underpins her arguments mainly through critical reference to chapters by other authors in the same book, *The Changing Role of the Interpreter* (Biagini et al. 2017). These authors “refrain from thematizing or downright dismiss the conduit model as invalid in the context of interpreting studies in line with current scholarly thinking” (2017:229). Her critique is levelled at their failure to distinguish between neutrality and the metaphorical image of the conduit. Just because interpreters are considered to be “participants and co-constructors of meaning” (2017:230), this does not mean that they cannot consciously choose to be neutral and impartial. She sees this as “vocational discourse” and a threat to the profession.

Sela-Sheffy coined the term “vocational discourse” (2010:141) in her work on professionalisation and status dynamics amongst Israeli translators. Dam describes vocational discourse as “foreground[ing] hostility towards practical and economical considerations, personal excellence [...] which cannot be acquired by training” (Dam 2017:233) with values such as “perfection, integrity, devotion and self-sacrifice” (2017:234). Its counterpart, professionalising discourse, sees work as a “means of earning a living, formal competences acquired through training and a series of other formal and objective parameters” (Dam 2017). Sela-Sheffy's large-scale study (2010) showed that a small and powerful elite was able to impose vocational thinking on the majority of the translation profession in certain contexts, in spite of this conflicting with the majority's interests and it being a disservice to the professionalisation of the profession. Dam applies these findings, which originally concerned only Israeli literary translators (Sela-Sheffy 2010:141), to the interpreting profession.

Dam uses a variety of examples from *The Changing Role of the Interpreter*, notably a

chapter by Miner (2017) and one by Turner and Best (2017), to illustrate how scholars lean towards vocational discourse. These mainly concern community settings, where interpreters are confronted with a significant imbalance in the power structure between the primary interactors, leading to moral conflicts. These conflicts motivate interpreters to comply with unorthodox expectations. Examples of unorthodox behaviour could include being available outside agreed working hours. For interpreters working with deaf people, another example consists of proactively engaging in the client's private conversations to avoid any awkwardness the interpreter's presence might cause. This can lead to a loss of impartiality and a rejection of professional ethics as the interpreter subordinates their own interests and needs to their client's (Dam 2017:231-234).

This school of research, represented by Miner's, Turner and Best's, but also Bahadir's chapters in the book (Dam 2017:230), focusses on the interpreter as an individual and interpreting as a contextualised activity. Dam sees such vocationalist tendencies as a move in the wrong direction. She supports this claim by comparing the results of Zwischenberger's (2017) survey, which state that conference interpreters derive professional satisfaction from setting and fulfilling their own standards, to the chapter by Monacelli and Boyd (2017) and its finding that standards are generally set by external stakeholders in civil mediation with interpreters. This is also reflected in Gentile's chapter (2017), which takes a socio-historical look at the image of interpreters. Gentile sees conference interpreting as a profession that suffers from a fragmented identity. This is in part due to the effects of globalisation and the influence of mass media on interpretation and human interaction in general. Another factor is the somewhat traumatic transition from a mythical profession of born bilingual geniuses that rub shoulders with the high and mighty to a craft exercised by trained professionals with a hard-earned skillset. Dam is concerned that this type of thinking in research risks aggravating the fragmented psyche and traumatism within the profession itself. As such, she welcomes AIIC's powerful unifying role and ability to impose its own standards, but Dam sees the chapters by Dal Fovo (2017) and Schäffner (2017) as proof that even conference interpreters have to submit to external expectations, such as the audience's.

If scholars like Miner, Turner, Best, Bahadir and Zwischenberger contend that interpreters should set their own standards and not subscribe to the unattainable ideals of neutrality, Dam sees this as a counterproductive and borderline "schizophrenic attitude" (Dam 2017:230). Dam's thinly veiled criticism concedes that "for descriptive and analytical purposes, this is a well-founded position", however, such "fluctuating norms [are] detrimental" (Dam 2017:237) to professionalisation. This concerns fluctuations or diversity in norms both

from one individual to another or between different forms, modes, or settings. She advocates a shared code of conduct that spans all areas of interpreting practice. Standard-setting and the definition of tasks must come from within the profession itself and not be imposed by external factors or actors. Dam believes that there are approaches to understanding the role of the interpreter in the literature that could help the profession carve out a clear identity for itself in the foreseeable future – but only if they eschew the diversity vocational discourse has to offer and commit to consensus and uniformity (Dam 2017:238).

1.2.4 Meaning versus Form

As Shlesinger (1989) pointed out, corpus-analytical procedures can be used to distinguish between norms and individual behaviour. The following chapter discusses the work of both Dal Fovo and Schäffner, who have examined norm-based behaviour using corpus linguistics.

1.2.4.1 Dal Fovo

1.2.4.1.1 Text “DEB.04” - US presidential debates of 2004

Eugenia Dal Fovo has examined the link between “ethics of entertainment” and “norms applying to conference interpreting” (2018:158) in media interpreting (Dal Fovo 2017, 2018). The corpus discussed here consists of the three US presidential debates of 2004. This includes two debates between the incumbent President Bush and contender John Kerry, as well as the only vice-presidential debate of the same election year, between Dick Cheney and John Edwards. The examined material comprises four source texts of ninety minutes each, as well as nine interpretations, making for a total of 17 hours and 2 minutes. Interpretation was provided simultaneously in absentia in all cases (Dal Fovo 2017).

All of the examined (vice-)presidential debates are facilitated by a moderator who enforces a Q and A format. Dal Fovo’s analysis shows that “conflict-eliciting elements almost invariably originate in the Qs” (2017:181). In order to keep the degree of conflictuality and thus the entertainment value as high as possible, the questions are deliberately designed to elicit an implicit attack on the opponent. The candidates cannot, however, address the opponent directly with their message. Instead, they are restricted to an exchange of questions and answers with the moderator. Within this rigid framework, they must try to highlight the opponent’s shortcomings and showcase their own qualities. The following excerpt demonstrates how they achieve this by referring to the opponent (in this case President Bush).

<i>*QRM: Senator Kerry(.) the U.S. (.) is preparing a new Iraq (.) government (.) and will proceed to withdraw U.S. troops (.) would you proceed with the same plans as President Bush</i> <i>*DBK: (.) Anthony I would not I have laid out a different plan because the President's plan is not working(.) you see that every night on television [. . .]</i>	<i>*INQM: signor senatore Kerry gli Stati Uniti stann:o preparando un nuovo governo iracheno e stanno procedendo anche al pensare al riti:ro delle truppe</i> <i>[the U.S. is preparing a new Iraqi government and are proceeding to withdraw troops]</i> <i>*INK: Anthony francamente no non lo farei io ho un piano differente perché il piano del presidente non funziona e lo vediamo tutti i giorni in televisione [...]</i> <i>[Anthony frankly no I would not do it I have a different plan because the President's plan is not working]</i>
--	--

(Dal Fovo 2017:192)

The moderator and the candidate cooperate in order to maintain the highest possible degree of conflictuality within the question-answer format. Elements in the questions that can be interpreted as a challenge are taken up as such in the answers. Conflictuality is upheld by validating the challenges, by either accepting them (e.g., correcting an objection) or rejecting them (e.g., rejecting an accusation).

The analysis of the source texts showed that 68% of conflictuality in question/answer pairs was maintained by validating the challenges. The percentage for the question/answer pairs in the target text is comparable (61%). However, if questions and answers are considered separately, the data point to a discrepancy between source and target texts. While 81% of the questions in the source texts contained conflict-eliciting elements, this was only true for 68% in the interpretation. Comparative analysis shows that the interpreters use conflict mitigation techniques, mostly “indirectness-operationalising devices” (Dal Fovo 2017:194), to defuse the questions. This is mainly because the element of challenge is less direct in the interpretation. Such conflict mitigation often occurs in combination with an omission of elements that would have emphasised the element of challenge. This undermines the build-up of conflictuality in the interpretation.

Since the interpretation is performed in absentia, the source text is produced

independently of the extent of conflictuality in the interpretation. Even if the element that elicits conflict is omitted or attenuated in the interpretation, the response usually has features that explicitly validate the challenge. This preserves the conflictuality of the source text as the speakers transition from question to answer. The lost notion of challenge is reintroduced as the answer is being interpreted, and the overall degree of conflictuality is maintained.

1.2.4.1.2 Text “OB.09” - EU presidency debate

Dal Fovo (2018) also conducted a comparative analysis of two Italian interpretations of the third round of the EU presidency debate, with similar findings as regards conflictuality. The analysed material is unusual for a presidential debate for two reasons:

- the target audience of the interpretation consists of EU citizens, who are directly affected by the outcome of the debate
- the analysis features a direct comparison between two teams of interpreters – one working for Rainews and one, consisting of SCIC interpreters, for Euronews.

Despite the fact that the target audience of the interpretation is actually entitled to vote in this case, entertainment remains paramount.

On the one hand, [the interpretation] follows the same entertainment rules that guide the first re-enactment instance; on the other, it must serve the comfort factor of a different sort of audience, an Italian-speaking audience (in Italy), whose goal is that of being informed, while, and perhaps more importantly, getting a feel of the event while it takes place.

(Dal Fovo 2018:160)

Dal Fovo avoids any direct comparison between the importance of the informational aspect of the message and its entertainment value, only mentioning briefly that the former is less central than the latter, even with an audience made up of the electorate. This importance of entertainment value has to do primarily with “the audience’s expectations [which] demand that information be provided as an aesthetic compensation of the original [...] in an entertaining way” (Dal Fovo 2018:160-161). In this regard, spectacularisation plays a major role, together with the degree of interaction and conflictuality.

Dal Fovo also points out that the teams apply different strategies, which in turn affects the audience’s reception of their performance. Her analysis of conflictuality shows that the degree of interaction varies considerably between the two interpretations. Simultaneous speech as well as interruptions in the source text were reproduced by the Rainews team in over 50% of occurrences. The Euronews team did not reproduce 98.9% of overlaps and interruptions.

The reasons for this are technical in part – the Euronews team was working with a single output channel, the interpreters could not be heard simultaneously. However, the high reproduction rate of the Rainews team does suggest that they were striving “to faithfully render [...] conflict talk, not just verbally, but also from an interactional viewpoint” (Dal Fovo 2018:179). Such reproduction of the interactional structure of the original makes the interpretation more appealing to the audience because it reduces the mismatch between sound and image (Dal Fovo 2018).

1.2.4.2 Schäffner

Christina Schäffner (2017) has produced one of the few corpus-analytical analyses of media interpretation with material that was not provided by CorIT. She examines interpretations of two of Angela Merkel’s press conferences, one with David Cameron and one with Barack Obama, with the interpreters working between English and German. Both conferences were streamed online and made available as video recordings by the respective governments themselves. This means that they do not, strictly speaking, qualify as a media event according to the above definition, as they are not distributed through traditional (commercial) media outlets. The transcripts used for the analysis were also available online. Schäffner focuses on signs of normative behaviour as interpreters deal with metaphors in the source text. Her paper focusses on three central questions:

1. How do simultaneous interpreters deal with metaphors?
2. Do metaphors require a higher cognitive effort of interpreters?
3. Can interpreters’ strategies in dealing with metaphors be seen as evidence of norms?

(Schäffner 2017:149-150)

Schäffner’s findings suggest that the approaches interpreters use to deal with metaphors do not differ greatly from the procedures found in translation. They do not, however, show any obvious correlation between the translation-level and the interpretation-level approach of the interpreters in a given situation. This is to say that similar translation-level strategies, e.g. replacing one linguistic image with another from a different context, are not necessarily always used in connection with the same interpretation-level strategies, e.g. hedging in one case and doubling in another. Another observation is that there is “no conclusive evidence to argue that metaphors [...] require a higher cognitive effort” (Schäffner 2017:166) than other textual elements. Neither does evidence suggest that interpreters always use the closest cognate

metaphor, the message is sometimes rendered using very different imagery. The interpreters do however try to remain close to the original wording, which is illustrated by their “combination of procedures in rendering metaphors, [which] can be taken as evidence of the interpreters’ struggle to produce a meaningful text” (Schäffner 2017:167).

Such attempts to reconcile faithfulness to the source text with intratextual coherence in the target text come at a price, however. Both requirements cannot always be met at the same time, which means interpreters find themselves stuck in the paradoxical predicament described by Zwischenberger (2015), as discussed above. Like Zwischenberger, Schäffner also points out that “these strategies do not lend support to the image of interpreters as conduits but rather reflect their awareness and self-monitoring” (2017:167). This awareness also allows interpreters to take into account the specific context in which the source text and the interpretation are being produced. “Political press conferences are high-level events, with politicians performing political actions in the public, mediatized arena [...]. Interpreters, too, perform in such an arena, and they are aware of this context [...]” (Schäffner 2017:167). This awareness of source text and context, such as the social position and political agenda of the primary interlocutors or the situation’s potential for conflict and the presence of the press/cameras, has an impact on how they work and adds to the cognitive load. The interpreters’ awareness of their operating within the overlapping discursive spheres of the media, politics, and interpretation as a discipline could give rise to normative behaviour for such situations. In this context, Schäffner refers to the interpreting norms identified by Shlesinger (2000), both regarding fluency and the primacy of meaning over form. Her own research on metaphors, however, does not provide any evidence of media interpreters resorting to norm-based behaviour. Schäffner puts this down to the fact that interpreters are exposed to too many different factors, which also include previous knowledge and experience, making straightforward conclusions on the normative force of specific behavioural patterns problematic.

1.2.4.3 Discussion - Interpreting as Authentic Infotainment?

Dal Fovo’s findings indicate that there is a tendency to preserve conflictuality in media interpreting. This tendency corresponds to the quality criteria identified by Kurz and thus contradicts the (general) validity of the conduit concept, which is in line with Zwischenberger’s position. Interpreters consciously decide on a strategy, taking into account the situational context in which the source and target text are produced (Schäffner 2017). Different contexts

require different strategies, and interpreters may have to adopt different roles in different circumstances. Both Dal Fovo's and Schäffner's findings show that this is also borne out in practice. It is thus difficult to identify concrete norms or differentiate between norm-based and other forms of behaviour. The evidence does suggest that interpreters must leave behind certain behavioural patterns, whatever their nature, when they enter the realm of mass media. Media interpreters operate within an interconnected web of powerful discourses, notably the media themselves, which require adherence to certain criteria that enhance the entertainment value. It is unrealistic and counterproductive for interpreters to go against the grain and insist on working only according to interpreting-specific criteria in a media context. This would defeat the purpose of entertainment media and run counter to the interaction-oriented understanding of interpreting as the result of interactive collaboration and, in a larger sense, communication as socially contexted behaviour.

An interesting observation, however, is that this relationship is reciprocal. If interpreting is part of an interaction that imposes a certain kind of behaviour on interpreters, the presence of interpreters also imposes certain conditions on the interaction. The other discourses involved cannot overrule everything. Interpreting is spontaneous text production. Interpreters are human beings and not conduits. They may be subject to certain restrictions, but they also have a right to self-realisation and self-determination. Any true interpreting performance, no matter how well prepared the interpreters are, both relies and thrives upon television producers' greatest fear: spontaneity and authenticity. Therefore, interpreters are by no means obliged to subjugate themselves entirely to the other discourses at play, even as the "power of (remote) control" looms in the "marketplace of the powerful".

2 The Toolkit of Conversation Analysis

This chapter provides a general overview of the field of conversation analysis, which shall, in turn, provide the framework for the analytical methodology of this paper.

Many forms of human interaction require us to take turns at doing something. Children know this is true for board and card games, but it is just as true for terms of political office, traffic at intersections or customers queueing up to be served in a shop or restaurant. Politics, traffic, and customer service are complex forms of human interaction with entire libraries written about them, and yet turn-taking provides them with an underlying structure of surprising simplicity: either it is your turn, or it is not. There is of course a lot more to these forms of interaction, but be it an election or a coup d'État, a set of traffic lights or a car crash, or a shop clerk selecting or not selecting someone as the next customer – all of these procedures allow us to establish, fairly unequivocally and reliably, whose turn it is to do something. The same basic principle also applies to so-called “speech exchange systems” (Sacks et al. 1974:696) or “talk-in-interaction” (Schegloff 2007:1), i.e. spoken human interaction such as interviews, meetings, debates, ceremonies, conversations etc. The problem with talk-in-interaction is, however, that the rules governing such encounters are not as obvious or simple as they might (arguably) be in a board game. While we all have a rough idea of how to engage and behave in “normal conversation”, the subliminal mechanisms at play are hard to understand or even observe, since they are “so deeply embedded in ordinary common-sense practice that they challenge articulate awareness and explicit, disciplined description” (Schegloff 2000:2).

Despite all this, and maybe surprisingly, human speech exchange, or talk-in-interaction, is not chaotic, but very organised. “It appears that all societies and sub-units of them have as a central resource for their integration an organization of interaction – an organization of interaction informed by the use of language” (Schegloff 2007:xiii). This includes all forms of communication, spoken and signed language, and even “monastic orders in which vows of silence constrain the conduct of interaction” (Schegloff 2007:xiii). Given its limited scope, the present paper shall omit the plethora of exceptions and variations which abound in natural human interaction and focus on certain key elements deemed pertinent to its purpose.

2.1 Turns

The basic building blocks of the conversation analytical toolbox are referred to as turns. Turns

are what give any form of interaction its underlying structure. In conversation analysis, they also serve as the base unit from which other units are derived, some of which are discussed below, such as TCUs, TRPs, or adjacency pairs.

The fundamental characteristic of a turn is that it “does something”, i.e. it represents an action. Conversation analysis categorises turns not on the basis of the topic it might be associated with, but on the basis of the action it performs.

An utterance like ‘would somebody like some more ice tea’ [...] is better understood as ‘doing an offer’ than as ‘about ice tea,’ as can be seen in the response to it, which does not do further talk about iced tea, but accepts an alternative to what has been offered.

(Schegloff 2007:1)

Turns are not only actions in and of themselves, they must also be recognisable as reactions to previous turns. Turns are generally produced one at a time, which allows participants to understand and process the individual messages and relate them to one another (Schegloff 2007:1). Ideally, thus, one turn should follow another in a sequence that enables a smooth flow of conversation without overlaps or excessively long pauses.

2.1.1 TCUs and TRPs

In conversation analysis, turns are subdivided into so-called turn-constructive units, or TCUs. “A speaker beginning to talk in a turn has the right and obligation to produce one TCU, which may realize one or more actions” (Schegloff 2007:4). TCUs have various distinctive characteristics that allow speakers to recognise them as such. TCUs, like turns, must constitute “a recognizable action in context” (Schegloff 2007:4). Recognisability in this sense is achieved through grammatical and/or intonational markers. A turn can consist of one or several TCUs, and TCUs play a decisive role in the exchange of turns, i.e. the transition from one speaker to another.

The place where transition becomes possible (without necessarily occurring) at the end of a TCU is referred to as transition-relevant place, or TRP. In every TRP, the speakers find themselves at a turn-sequential crossroads and need to make a (quick) decision on who is next to speak if disruption is to be avoided. If they succeed, the TRP results in one of two possible outcomes: the person speaking can either stop and cede the right to speak, or they can continue after completing the current TCU and initiate a new one. In either scenario, the next speaker needs to be selected somehow. This usually occurs either through self-selection or through

selection by the previous speaker. The former is what the name suggests, a speaker selects themselves as next speaker and simply continues. The latter is what might occur after a TCU that ends in a question that requires an answer or a complaint that requires a contradiction or an apology from another speaker (Schegloff 2007:xiv, 3-4).

2.1.2 Adjacency Pairs: FPPs and SPPs

Question and answer, complaint and apology, or complaint and contradiction - these are all TCU pairs, but they are also examples of another structural element of turn-taking, called adjacency pair. As the name implies, adjacency pairs consist of two actions that occur in immediate succession and happen in relation to one another. Adjacency pairs consist of two parts, called FPP (first pair part) and SPP (second pair part). An FPP initiates the exchange, an SPP provides the corresponding response. In its simplest form, an adjacency pair consists of two consecutive turns coming from two different speakers. Ideally, a speaker will produce an utterance that is recognisable as an FPP and then select another speaker to take the subsequent turn. The first speaker would then stop speaking and allow the selected second speaker to produce the corresponding SPP. This most basic form of an FPP-SPP exchange is not uncommon in practice, for example in question-answer sequences like "Coffee?" - "No thanks" or "Do you have the time?" - "It's half-past three." Most real-life examples, however, are more complex. Consequently, adjacency pair sequences often consist of more than two turns and can be extended by the insertion of so-called insert expansions. Insert expansions do not necessarily have to be produced by two different people. A speaker might choose to answer their own question, for example. Many utterances can be used as either FPP or SPP. A complaint could for example initiate a sequence as FPP or be the SPP produced in response to an inquiry. In some cases, utterances can even be both SPP and FPP, e.g. when asking someone to repeat a question (Schegloff 2007:13-17).

2.2 Repair

2.2.1 Self-Repair and Other-Repair

Given the complexity of speech exchange systems, it is only natural that talk-in-interaction does not always occur smoothly and without disruption. Speakers can address disruptions in communication by administering what is referred to as repair, in a variety of different ways. In conversation analysis, a distinction is made between the terms "repair" and "correction". "The

term ‘correction’ is commonly understood to refer to the replacement of an ‘error’ or ‘mistake’ by what is ‘correct’” (Sacks et al. 1977:363). Repair can occur where there is no apparent error or mistake and, conversely, obvious errors do not necessarily give rise to repair. Consequently, when repair is conducted, it does not always consist of a replacement of an erroneous segment. Corrections, in the traditional sense, are one form of repair, a sub-category featuring replacement and error, but there are also other forms without replacement or error, such as a word search, where one speaker helps another find the word they are looking for. Repair is generally applied to textual segments that a speaker considers unacceptable. These are referred to as repairable or trouble source. Repairables constitute a rather unwieldy category, and given that repair can be initiated without any apparent error “it appears that nothing is, in principle, excludable from the class ‘repairable’” (Sacks et al. 1977:361).

Conversation analysis borrows from sociology, where the distinction between “self” and “other” is an essential tool for analysis of social organization and interaction, and from linguistics, where “self-correction” and “other-correction” are used to describe different forms of correction from the speaker’s perspective. In conversation analysis, “‘self’ and ‘other’ are two classes of participants in interactive social organizations [...] specifically in turn-taking systems” (Sacks et al. 1977:363-364). This self-versus-other distinction is also applied from the speaker’s perspective. This definition provides a bearing on the basis of which it is possible to ask questions such as: who’s repairable is being repaired? Indeed, this is the first fundamental distinction to make when dealing with instances of repair: are we dealing with self-repair or other-repair? The next level of distinction focusses on the initiation and outcome of the procedure itself. “The initiation of reparative segments and their completion (with or without failure) can be quite distinct. [...] [T]he one who performs/accomplishes a repair is not necessarily the one who initiated the repair operation” (Sacks et al. 1977:364). This results in the following typology of classes of repair:

- self-initiated self-repair
- other-initiated self-repair
- self-initiated other-repair
- other-initiated other-repair
- failure after self-initiation
- failure after other-initiation

(Sacks et al. 1977:365).

2.2.2 Repair: Placement, initiator technique and trajectory

Observation has shown that self- and other-initiation follow a regular and distinguishable pattern as far as the placement of the initiation relative to the targeted repairable is concerned.

Self-initiation has three main types of position:

1. within the same turn as the repairable
2. in the same turn's TRP
3. in the third turn, i.e. after another speaker has spoken

(Sacks et al. 1977:366).

Other-initiation is generally placed in the turn following the repairable (Sacks et al. 1977:367).

It is not impossible for other-repair to be initiated through an interruption of the trouble-source turn, but the findings of Sacks et al. point to a strong tendency of speakers to 'withhold' their repair initiation until completion of the trouble-source turn, even when the repairable and its resolution are very obvious and simple to implement (Sacks et al. 1977:373).

Self- and other-initiation also make use of distinctively different initiator techniques. Self-initiation relies on "a variety of non-lexical speech perturbations, e.g. cut-offs, sound stretches, 'uh's etc., to signal the possibility of repair-initiation immediately following" (Sacks et al. 1977: 367). Other-initiation resorts to an array of turn-constructional devices, of which Sacks et al. provide the following recurrent examples, in order of their effectiveness and "strength", i.e. likelihood not to be self-interrupted and replaced by a stronger one (Sacks et al. 1977:369):

- *Huh, What?*
- *who, what, where*
- partial repeat of trouble-source turn, plus question word
- partial repeat of trouble-source turn
- *Y'mean* plus suggestion of a possible interpretation of the prior turn

(Sacks et al. 1977:366-368)

The outcome of repair, i.e. its success or failure, is not always evident immediately upon initiation. Indeed, we all learn early on in life that conversational misunderstanding can sometimes be resolved in an instant, but it can also take several turns and a lot of back and

forth until it has been rectified to everyone's satisfaction. This shows that the trajectory of repair operations from initiation to solution varies. Again, there are inherent differences between self- and other-initiation, which are contingent on their placement, discussed above. Most self-initiation occurs in the trouble-source turn, the majority of which is successfully accomplished within this turn. Self-initiation in the TRP or the third turn is also usually successful within the turn of initiation. Other-initiation is usually initiated in the turn following the trouble-source turn, but contrary to self-repair, other-repair often takes multiple turns before being concluded successfully (Sacks et al. 1977:368).

2.2.3 The Relationship between Self-Repair and Other-Repair

A look at placement, initiation technique and trajectory shows that self- and other-repair are distinct categories which follow different patterns. However, this does not mean that they are independent of one another. One thing they have in common is that they both deal with the same types of repairables. As stated above, the class of repairable extends beyond just errors and corrections. It can include instances of conversational assistance, e.g. collaborating to find the name of a person. It can also include structural aspects of the conversation itself, such as repair of speaker-selection, which is initiated from the same positions as content-related repair (Sacks et al. 1977:369-372). Another feature that establishes a link between self-initiation and other-initiation of repair is the observation that their placements are "organized by reference to each other" (Sacks et al. 1977:372). Due to the underlying turn-structure, which consists in an alternation of self- and other-turns, self- and other-repair initiations are also ordered relative to each other. They follow a "serial ordering of opportunities to repair some same potential repairable" (Sacks et al. 1977:373). This order consists of the common initiation placements already mentioned, so

- (1) trouble-source turn
- (2) trouble-source turn's TRP
- (3) second turn (other turn)
- (4) third turn.

Repair-initiation cascades down this order of repair-initiation opportunities, with every initiation in (2) the result of a missed initiation opportunity in (1), every initiation in (3) the result of a missed opportunity in (1) and (2), etc. The further down initiation occurs, the more opportunities have been missed. Speakers try to avoid this. This becomes especially manifest when observing the transition from (2) to (3), which is also the transition from self- to other-

initiation. Not only do speakers generally refrain from interrupting a repairable turn and wait for its completion, but they also routinely leave a gap after the troublesome turn's completion to provide an "extra opportunity" for the speaker to administer self-initiated self-repair before having to resort to other-initiation (Sacks et al. 1977:374). Where other-initiation does occur, it predominantly consists of an initiation technique aiming to simply locate the trouble source, thus providing the initial speaker with another opportunity for self-repair. While it is not unheard of, other-initiated other-repair actually occurs very rarely in the natural conversations examined by Sacks et al., which does not mean that it is not more prevalent in other contexts. In the examined recordings, however, its potential impact is often attenuated by adding a veneer of uncertainty, humour and/or use of a question format. Blunt, unattenuated repair, usually in the form of correction, is even rarer. It very often takes the form "no, [correction]", a correction which has in these cases often been invited and/or is a rejection of a correction in the previous turn, such as

A: *Listen to the pigeons*

B: *It's quail, I think*

A: *No, that's a pigeon.*

All of these observations are indicative of an overall hierarchy within repair-initiation opportunities and indeed across all forms of repair. When it comes to facilitating smooth communication, self-repair is preferred over other-repair, and self-initiation is preferred over other-initiation (Sacks et al. 1977:374-380). There is, however, much more to smooth communication than just that. Repairs provide a reliable system to remedy the turn structure. But what happens when the turn structure and the "one at a time" rule are disrupted, and talk overlaps?

2.3 Overlap

One of the major contributions made by the turn-taking model Sacks, Jefferson and Schegloff developed in the early 1970s (Sacks et al. 1974) was the hypothesis that speakers generally try to make conversation as smooth as possible by attempting to

- (1) follow the one-at-a-time rule
- (2) minimise transitional gaps and overlap between speakers
- (3) quickly resolve violations of 1) or 2).

This assumption has since been corroborated in the literature (e.g. Schegloff 2000, Jefferson 2004, Gervitz/Scheutz 2018). While compliance with these rules is enforced by etiquette to a certain extent, the underlying mechanism has little to do with politeness. It is a constitutive feature and precondition for orderly human interaction (Schegloff 2000:1). The “one-at-a-time” rule is a basic design feature of conversation. This constant holds true across all social categories, be they ethnic, gender, class or cultural. Even if members of certain categories are found to produce more overlapping speech than others, their talk is nonetheless co-constructed based on the premise of the one-at-a-time rule. Evidence for this is found “not only in the aggregate achievement of masses of conversational and other interactional data” (Schegloff 2000:3), but also when observing the participants’ reactions to any departure from the rule. There are two main exceptions to this, where standard turn-taking sequences are disrupted: excessive pauses or overlapping speech. It is important to differentiate between overlapping speech and parallel conversations happening at the same time as the interaction being analysed, even if the parallel conversation is the result of the initial conversation splitting up. Such parallel conversations will not be treated as a form of overlap in this paper, because they are a part of the environment of the conversation and not the conversation itself, even if the parallel conversation competes with the primary interaction, for example by threatening to drown it out through higher volume (Schegloff 2000:4).

2.3.1 Occurrence of Overlap

Overlapping speech occurs either when two or more speakers start simultaneously, or when one or several speakers start to speak while another is still speaking. However, how speakers actually deal with overlapping speech in practice is independent of how the overlap was brought about. The resources and practices necessary to deal with the question of who shall continue to speak, and who shall yield, are referred to as overlap resolution device (Schegloff 2000). Overlap and resolution are the result of speakers negotiating over turn space. The remedy for overlap is for one speaker to simply stop speaking. Since this is literally a matter of a split second, any continuation beyond an obvious and initial opportunity to stop is a noticeable occurrence. Persistent overlapping talk is indicative of the interlocutors negotiating over the available turn space (Jefferson 2004:47-48).

The present paper will be focussing mainly on overlap that is perceived as problematic because the purpose here is to examine how interpreters deal with overlap in a high-conflictuality environment which, by its very nature, is prone to problems. Not all overlap is

problematic, however. It can also occur that “simultaneous speakers do not appear to be contesting or even alternate claimants for a turn space” (Schegloff 2000:4). Schegloff excludes such occurrences and offers a brief explanation and description of the forms omitted. His main argument for the omission is that researchers treat unproblematic occurrences of overlapping speech differently (2000:4). The speakers themselves have also been shown to react differently to different forms of overlap. In general overlapping speech generates more disfluencies than non-overlapping speech (Adda-Decker 2008:3111). However, certain types of unproblematic overlap such as back-channelling, where overlapping speech is used to confirm that the message has been/is being understood, can also have the opposite effect and actually lead to less disfluency, seemingly helping certain speakers in the production of their utterances (Adda-Decker 2008:3111). Gervitz and Scheutz (2018) have produced a more comprehensive taxonomy of speech overlap that also covers unproblematic forms, including the forms Schegloff excludes, their argument being that

certain types of non-competitive overlap [...], including: terminal overlap, continuers, conditional access to turn [...], and “chordal” cases [...] are very common dialogue phenomena, and should be included in any thorough account of overlap.

(Gervitz/Scheutz 2018:4598)

They use the same categories as Schegloff, however, which he defines and describes as

- terminal overlaps: overlap where one speaker starts just before another finishes
- continuers: utterances like “uh-huh” or “mm-hm” that are intended to let the speaker know that they are being listened to and are expected to continue
- conditional access to the turn: clearly incomplete turns during which another speaker’s help is sought in order to continue, i.e. word searches or completing each other’s utterances
- choral/chordal cases: co-construction of meaning that is intended to be simultaneous, e.g. laughter or collective greetings

(Schegloff 2000:5-6).

Barring these exceptions where simultaneity is considered acceptable and unproblematic by the speakers, overlapping talk triggers an attempt to resolve the overlap. The overlap resolution devices employed to achieve this are “an integral component of the turn-taking organization for conversation, and for other speech-exchange systems that have overlap as a provided-for contingency” (Schegloff 2000:7).

2.3.2 Overlap Between More Than Two Speakers

Overlap can, of course, occur between any number of people engaged in the same conversation. Interestingly, however, Schegloff's findings suggest that this, or in fact any protracted occurrence of overlap involving more than two speakers, is the exception in real-life conversation. Where more than two speakers engage in conversation, the number of speakers involved tends to converge towards two very quickly. This is because overlap resolution devices become more effective as the number of speakers increases. On the rare occasion where three or more speakers start to talk simultaneously, resolution devices are invariably deployed to reduce this number to two, and then eventually to one (Schegloff 2000:7). In situations with more than two speakers, there are different possible constellations regarding who is speaking to whom. By far the most common configuration is that of two speakers speaking over and to each other, with the other participants standing by as onlookers. While the presence of third parties may affect how the two speakers deal with their overlapping speech, the practices used to address overlap are generally designed to deal with talk between only two individuals (Schegloff 2000:10).

2.3.3 Beats Instead of Turns

One of the main problems with the framework provided by conversation analysis is that it is not ideally suited for examining overlapping talk. The notions of current/next turn or adjacency and adjacency pairs do not apply to turns that occur simultaneously. Schegloff proposes the unit of beat, a phonetic sub-unit similar to a syllable, as a tool to examine the structural nature of simultaneous turns. "The topography of sequential and interactive organization in overlapping talk [...] may be supplied by the successive beats that compose it" (Schegloff 2000:20). This is not to say that every syllable is produced in perfect unison by the overlapping speakers; it is merely a structural reference and a tool for analysis. Speakers use beats to gauge one utterance against the preceding one in order to interpret their interlocutor's reaction or stance (Schegloff 2000:20).

2.3.4 Overlap-Onset Positioning

Overlapping talk can have different communicative effects, depending on where in the beat structure the overlap starts with regard to the ongoing utterance. Speakers can initiate overlap just as something is about to be said to demonstrate "independent knowledge of what is about

to be said” (Jefferson 2004:44). Overlap-onset halfway through an utterance can demonstrate knowledge of “what is in the course of being said” (Jefferson 2004:44). Overlap-onset just before completion of an utterance results in a “latch” (Jefferson 2004:44), an utterance that latches on to the utterance that is in the course of being completed. This often occurs when a TCU is extended beyond an initially anticipated point of completion. TCUs with several such extensions can thus spawn a series of multiple starts and drop-outs as the speakers try to negotiate turns and resolve overlap. Severe disruptions of this type can lead to trouble “being carried over into a subsequent, otherwise undisrupted, utterance” (Jefferson 2004:46), which may lead to perturbations or hitches appearing in the post-resolution phase, clear of overlapping speech.

2.3.5 Disfluencies - Perturbations and Hitches

Possibly the most prominent feature of overlapping talk, when compared to non-overlapping talk, is that it allows speakers to get away with a more intense and often aggressive-sounding delivery of speech without being seen as aggressive, rude, or otherwise erratic. Overlap can “warrant practices of talking that are otherwise problematic” (Schegloff 2000:17). Not only does overlap warrant such practices, but it also generally exhibits a higher density of them than other instances of talk-in-interaction. The practices themselves are referred to as speech disfluencies, or perturbations and hitches. Perturbations are irregularities in prosody; hitches are disturbances in the continuity of talk (Schegloff 2000:11-14). They consist of talk that is one or a combination of the following:

- suddenly louder
- higher in pitch
- faster or slower
- suddenly cut off
- followed by prolonged or stretched out sounds
- a repetition of a previous element (Schegloff 2000).

Depending on where they occur, perturbations and hitches can have different effects, which are often strategic in nature. They can for example make one of the two competitors look more in control, or outright force the other speaker to cede their turn. A rise in volume could be used to shout down an opponent, for example. They can however also have the opposite effect and weaken a speaker’s standing. Self-interruptions, for example, can sound like momentary surrenders in the interaction.

Disfluencies of speech are not always strategic devices; they can also be indicative of processing overload. However, when they occur together with overlap, there is a high likelihood that they are “practices of conduct rather than [...] behavioural casualties of conflict or processing overload” (Schegloff 2000:42). In this case, hitches and perturbations are indicators of the speakers’ attempts to manage and resolve the occurrence of overlap (Schegloff 2000:11-13). Schegloff demonstrates this in the following example, where Deb and Anne are having a go at their respective father/husband for making what they consider to be a silly pun as he is driving them back home from a party:

- 1 Deb: How [come you get thiz:: thi:s v:.....] ersion of] jovial
- 2 Anne: [W’d you please concentrate on drivi] ng the ca:r,]

(Schegloff 2000:13)

The utterance “would you please concentrate on driving the car” has three TRPs. It could end after “would you please concentrate” or after “on driving” or after “the car”, which it actually does. The other participants in the interaction see each of these TRPs approaching. Deb finds herself in an overlapping talk situation, but she expects Anne’s turn to end either on “concentrate” or on “driving”. Deb produces two noticeable hitches as a result: the sound stretches on “thiz::” and “v:.....ersion”. They both concur and indeed almost coincide with Anne’s TRPs on “concentrate” and “driving”. By stretching the sound, she is in fact stretching the turn in an attempt to hold on to her turn and finish after Anne. This has the effect of absorbing the other speaker’s talk, which “allow[s] [her] to emerge ‘into the clear’” (Schegloff 2000:13). After the failure of her first attempt with “thiz::”, she produces the longer “v:.....”, which she then releases into the remainder of “version of jovial”, the end of which – “jovial” – she is finally able to produce clear of overlap. This example also illustrates how the position of TRPs can influence the speakers’ expectations. The prospect of an imminent end of a TCU has an impact on the speakers’ behaviour and strategies, which can include hitches and perturbations. This type of hitch is referred to as pre-resolution stretch, a sound stretch leading up to a possible resolution of overlap (Schegloff 2000:15).

2.3.5.1 Terminological (in)consistency

The lion’s share of the theoretical content this chapter draws upon is the work of Gail Jefferson and Emanuel Schegloff. Together with Harvey Sacks, they laid the foundation for conversation

analysis with the seminal work the three of them published together in 1974 (Sacks et al. 1974), shortly before Sacks' untimely death due to an accident. It is worth noting here that Schegloff and Jefferson continued to examine the same or similar questions after Sacks' passing, but working "essentially independently" (Schegloff 2000:47). The result is a certain extent of overlap in the terminology. An example of this is the different take on Schegloff's "perturbations and hitches", which Jefferson refers to as "pronunciational and segmental adjustments". Both concepts arose from the observation of essentially the same features of speech, but they use different angles that provide different insights, which is why they will be described here without any intention of affording one preference over the other.

Jefferson sees speech disfluencies as systematic negotiation procedures that occur in overlap. She differentiates between two different forms: "within-word pronunciational adjustments" and "within-utterance segmental adjustments" (Jefferson 2004: 47-48). Pronunciational adjustments can be described as "manipulation of the sounds of the word a speaker is currently producing" (Jefferson 2004:47), i.e. a change in a word's speed, pitch, or amplitude. This results in either repetition of a syllable, i.e. a stutter, or a sound stretch like Deb's pre-resolution stretch "v:::ersion" in the example above. Typically, when used as a resolution device, a speaker will deploy a stutter or sound stretch during overlap and extend it until resolution has been achieved, as was the case with Deb. The aim of this perseverance is to preserve one's turn space, to keep the foot in the door until the overlap has subsided and it is once again possible to produce undisrupted speech into the clear.

Segmental adjustments can be described as "manipulation of larger parts of the utterance a speaker is currently producing" (Jefferson 2004:48), meaning a change in the words, clauses, or phrases themselves, for example by repeatedly recycling a phrase or parts of it. If pronunciational adjustment represents keeping a foot in the door, segmental adjustment is equivalent to a battering ram. The purpose here is not to simply preserve one's turn space; rather, it is an attempt to commandeer the turn at hand by subjecting the other speaker's talk to a "sheer acoustic battering" (Jefferson 2004:49) until they withdraw and (part of) the recycled utterance is allowed to occur clear of overlap.

2.3.6 Pauses as Disfluencies

While they are not strictly speaking "disfluencies", pauses can also play an important role when it comes to overlap and resolution. Overlap-onset frequently occurs following a pause after one of the speakers has completed a TCU. This is true for both comparatively long (around 0.7s)

and short (less than 0.2s) pauses (Jefferson 2004:45). Such short pauses, or micropauses, can also occur after an instance of overlap, in which case they indicate that both parties have dropped out and the turn space is now free. This ideally functions as a resolution device that allows just one speaker to take the free turn space and continue. However, it can also be the cause of more confusion if both speakers start, then drop, and then start again etc. (Jefferson 2004: 47).

2.3.7 Phases of Overlap

Overlap can be broken down into four phases: pre- and post-onset and pre- and post-resolution. The pre-onset phase takes place before the overlap occurs. At this point, the imminent occurrence of overlap is already detectable, either through body language or other behaviour that indicates the intent to start a turn, as an indraw of breath might. In this phase, “an already-speaking speaker may deploy the practices otherwise available for dealing with overlapping talk to address the prospect of incipiently overlapping talk, and possibly to interdict it” (Schegloff 2000:15). The mere prospect of an occurrence of overlapping talk prompts the speaker to treat the situation as if they were already speaking “against” someone else, triggering one of the hitches or perturbations discussed above, i.e. raising the voice or speeding up the pace in an attempt to nip any occurrence of overlap in the bud by taking up turn space and crowding out the other speaker. The counterpart of the pre-onset phase is the post-onset phase, which also regularly features instances of hitches and perturbations. Post-onset hitches and perturbations can be a signal that one speaker has registered that another speaker is speaking. Examples of this include speaking slower or quieter after a pre-onset increase in speed or volume. The opposite can also occur, with competitive behaviour like raising one’s voice only ensuing in the post-onset phase (Schegloff 2000:15-16).

The other two phases are the pre-resolution and the post-resolution phases. Pre-resolution refers to the phase where there is the “prospect of imminent ‘natural’ overlap resolution - i.e. by one utterance coming to closure, rather than being prematurely ended” (Schegloff 2000:14). This can also lead to a sound stretch with a view to absorbing the remaining overlap before its prospective completion. However, if the expected completion does not come to pass, it can lead to multiple failed attempts of such overlap resolution. The sound stretches in the above example show Deb producing such failed overlap resolution devices, whereas Anne delivers her turn fluently without any perturbations or hitches that would acknowledge the fact that Deb is speaking at the same time. There is however nothing

preventing both speakers from producing sound stretches or other devices more or less simultaneously as they reciprocally anticipate the completion of their interlocutor's turn, only to then find that the turn continues. The result is a series of quasi simultaneous sound stretches that cancel each other out, until one of the speakers stops and the other emerges “from overlap into the clear” (Schegloff 2000:17). This emergence marks the post-resolution phase, which can have various forms. As stated above, overlapping speech warrants behaviour that might be interpreted differently without the overlap. A raised voice may be perceived as angry when only one person is speaking, for example. The post-resolution phase is where speakers generally adjust their manner of speaking, back from competitive to solo production by reverting to the previous volume, speed, prosody etc. (Schegloff 2000:32).

2.3.8 Solo versus Competitive Production

The following example illustrates how resolution devices are deployed within a beat structure. It is a simplified representation of one of a plethora of possible permutations of overlapping talk-in-interaction, which assumes perfect simultaneity and a scenario free from context or prior interaction. L1, L2, L3 and P1, P2, P3 respectively represent the beats of the utterances of interlocutors Les and Paul:

1	Les:	[L1		<u>L2</u>		<u>L3</u>	
2	Paul:	[P1		P2		<u>P3</u>	

(Schegloff 2000:20).

The underlined beats are beats where resolution devices are deployed. On L1/P1, Les and Paul both find themselves occupying the same turn space. Upon realising this, either of them could defuse the situation by standing down and ceding the next turn, but in our example, they chose not to. As L2/P2 ensues, both are aware that overlap is occurring, but react differently. Les deploys a resolution device in L2, while Paul's P2 shows no change in behaviour to acknowledge the fact that Les is also speaking. Les' attempt to occupy more turn space on L2 has not gone unnoticed by Paul, however. To avoid losing ground, Paul deploys a resolution device himself on P3, at which point both speakers are interacting on the competitive level. This example illustrates that when overlap occurs, interlocutors have the choice between “solo production” or “competitive production”. On L2/P2, Les opts for “competitive production”, while Paul continues with “solo production” (Schegloff 2000:21).

Overlap can also occur with neither pronunciation nor segmental adjustments, in the form of solo production. When it comes to dominating the turn space, solo production can prove even more effective than a battering ram approach. “Paradoxically, this practice of talking in overlap may be the “strongest” of all in the stance which it adopts and conveys to co-participants, despite its failure to deploy any of the resources of competitiveness” (Schegloff 2000:30). The strength of extended solo overlap arises from the fact that it denotes a speaker who does not even deem the competition worth acknowledging.

2.3.9 Overlap Resolution

How quickly or easily overlap is resolved depends on a variety of factors. As discussed above, people naturally gravitate towards quick and easy resolution of trouble in talk-in-interaction, and consequently overlapping talk is resolved quickly and easily most of the time. Indeed, the vast majority of occurrences of overlap are resolved by one participant stopping to speak after the first overlapping beat. Of the occurrences that survive the first beat, most are resolved as soon as one of the participants deploys a resolution device and upgrades the talk to competitive production (Schegloff 2000:22). This upgrade to the competitive level most commonly happens on the second beat, and if it does not, it usually occurs on the third, meaning that “the vast majority of overlaps are resolved to a single speaker by the third beat” (Schegloff 2000:24). This is because overlap is often the result of a misinterpretation of turn-taking cues, for example when a speaker misreads where a turn ends or when two non-speakers simultaneously self-select and start to speak. In most cases, such misinterpretation is the only reason for the disruption. Unless one of the speakers has a specific reason to insist on occupying precisely the turn at hand and both are happy to settle for one of the next turns, resolution is easy, and overlap is short.

In natural, everyday conversation, longer, more complex stretches of competitive overlap are indeed comparatively rare (Schegloff 2000:29). But what about televised events that belong into the competition category (Dayan & Katz 1993), such as presidential debates? What if the participants are not collaborative and unwilling to cede a specific turn? Maybe a different question needs to be answered first - why would anyone not want to resolve overlap as quickly as possible in the first place? Why resist resolution beyond the second or even third beat, if both participants’ intention is to communicate with one another? The reasons behind occurrences of such extended intervals of competitive overlap are not to be found within the turn-taking structure itself, but in the situational and sequential context (Schegloff 2000:28).

For extended competitive overlap to occur, both of the interlocutors must have a specific reason that causes them to insist on taking a specific turn instead of settling for one of the next ones. Such reasons include avoiding deference because of status implications, needing a specific turn to use it for responsive action, or reacting to how previous turns were allocated or contested (Schegloff 2000:24). Research has not been able to produce a comprehensive list of reasons and triggers for competitive production during overlap, or which forms this production can take. Whether or not this is even possible remains to be seen. The use of new technologies such as automatic speech analysis has however started to make quantitative approaches possible, leading to new insights which are opening up new theoretical and empirical avenues. One example of automatised analysis of acoustic features conducted on a large set of real-world call-centre data of situations with customers and operators engaging in problem-solving tasks found that competitive and non-competitive overlap can be distinguished from one another using spectral and prosody features, and that voice quality can be an indicator for non-competitive overlap (Chowdhury 2018). Prosody, spectral features, and voice quality here refer to measurable variations of frequency bands rather than subjective interpretations of an observer. Such insights can be used to provide people with hearing impairments and users of ear implants with guidance that allows them to better deal with the difficulties of overlapping speech in conversations, which is a huge challenge for such individuals (Kurtić 2013). With artificial intelligence on the rise, a more in-depth understanding of what triggers overlap will also be essential if humans are to create “humanlike virtual conversation agents” (Hilton 2016:1263), even if this still seems a long way off and would require research to incorporate not only measurable features of speech but also aspects like social attitudes, context, and subjectivity (Hilton 2016).

2.3.10 Post-Overlap

In the post-overlap or post-resolution phase, speakers tone their competitive-level talk back down to solo production in order to avoid being heard as angry, rude, etc. The post-resolution phase can also be used to retrieve lost turns or to signal how the occurrence of overlap was perceived. Speakers’ attitudes towards and perception of an occurrence of overlap can vary greatly: Do they register the occurrence at all? If so, do they perceive it as problematic or not? If so, do they seek to resolve the issue or not? If so, on which level should they attempt to resolve it? Does the current state of turn occupancy need to be rectified? Does the overlap’s impact on the subsequent conversation need to be repaired? Or has the hearability or

understandability of an utterance been affected? (Schegloff 2000:32).

If the overlap is not registered at all by a speaker, there will be no reaction and they will continue with solo production. If the overlap is registered, the reaction it triggers can range from subtle to prominent. It could be a barely noticeable post-resolution hitch, like a doubled-up syllable hinting faintly at the speaker's awareness of the occurrence of overlap. It could also be a more obvious demonstration of the speaker's intention to repair either their own or the other speaker's turn. This could be achieved by responding to it, thus showing that the message was received in spite of the overlap, or by trying to repair the other's turn, thus showing that the turn has been lost. (Schegloff 2000:32-41).

The fact that there can be a risk of a turn being "lost" demonstrates that overlapping speech poses a challenge not only on the level of turn occupancy but also regarding the sequence of the interaction. Turns are supposed to succeed one another chronologically, with every turn being the response to the previous one. If two turns occur simultaneously, they cannot both receive a response: if the overlap is to stop, one of the two will necessarily get lost. However, a turn that is lost to subsequent talk after overlap is not necessarily lost for good. There are two types of retrieval procedures that can be triggered post-resolution in such cases: self-retrieval and other-retrieval. They can both be executed in either marked or unmarked form, leaving four options:

- Marked self-retrieval: one speaker drops out, waits for the other to finish, and then restarts their lost turn.
- Unmarked self-retrieval: continuing in solo production without acknowledging the impact the overlap might have had on the coherence of the utterance.
- Marked other-retrieval: A request for the other speaker to repeat the turn they produced during overlap (also possible after a change of topic).
- Unmarked other-retrieval: Either a "continuer" (a short token of acknowledgement, e.g. mm-hm) or an embedded repetition (incorporation of a part of the other speaker's possibly unheard turn into the next utterance) (Jefferson 2004: 50-58).

Both marked and unmarked self-retrieval allow a speaker to recover their lost turn, whereas both forms of other-retrieval amount to a deletion of the speaker's own utterance "by putting [themselves] at the service of another's talk" (Jefferson 2004:57).

2.4 The Link between the Turn-Taking Structure and Overlap

So how is simultaneous talk linked to turn-taking organisation? According to Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson, turn-taking organisation relies upon two types of “resource” and a set of “rules”. The resources consist in TCUs and turn-allocational resources. The former are discussed above, the latter are composed of “various [...] ways in which the opportunity to produce a turn at talk could get presented to, or actuated by, a participant” (Schegloff 2000:43). These include different practices participants can use to select the speaker and to claim a turn for themselves. The set of “rules” mentioned above applies to these practices. The rules state that self-selection should only occur when the current speaker refrains from selecting the next speaker themselves. Self-selection then follows the “first come, first served” principle (Schegloff 2000:41-44). But what happens when two or more potential next speakers, possibly including the current speaker, self-select and start to speak simultaneously? The ensuing gap in the turn-taking structure is where overlap resolution devices come into the equation and are used to negotiate a turn transfer (Schegloff 2000:41-44). Overlap resolution devices are able to fill this gap because they operate outside of the turn structure – not turn by turn but beat by beat. They are negotiated by the parties themselves and not subject to and pre-determined by rules, as the result of reactions to one another’s identity and stance. Thus, overlap resolution devices are both an exception to and a necessary part of the turn-taking system, filling the conceptual gap in conversation analysis caused by disruptions of the turn-taking structure and the “one at a time” rule.

3 Research Question and Methodology

3.1 Aim and Research Questions

The present corpus consists of speaker-assigned simultaneous interpretation, i.e. a designated interpreter is assigned to every speaker in the source text, who interprets them and only them (with the exception of the two moderators, who “share” the same interpreter). Speaker-assigned interpretation differs from traditional simultaneous interpretation settings in that turn-taking negotiation is eliminated almost entirely in the latter, because the timing of the handover is established beforehand – there is a predetermined point of transition instead of TRPs. Complications and a need for resolution could, in theory, occur, during the critical second(s) of the handover itself, but deontology/technology dictate that interpreters do not/cannot speak at the same time. The present speaker-assigned interpretation corpus is an exception to this unwritten rule; it features turn-level competition in both source and target text. Turn-taking and turn negotiation in the target text in simultaneous interpretation have to date received little attention in the literature, both within interpreting studies and beyond.

This study uses the conversation analytical toolbox to examine the turn structure, overlapping speech and conflictuality within a textual environment where one of the texts, the target text, is informed by turn-level constraints which do not occur in most other forms of communication. This means that certain elements which are present in other conversational formats are less dominant. Variables such as the impact of the primary speaker’s underlying intentions and agenda on their turn-taking behaviour can overshadow other parameters and interfere with investigation if the primary level of interaction is the only subject of study. If there is a secondary level, and the negotiation is examined on this, the primary interlocutors are no longer in the driver’s seat, at least not across the board. It is reasonable to assume that the interpreters’ intentions are less in line with the primary interlocutors’ political agenda than determined by the interpreters’ own constraints (see chapter 1.1.2 and 1.1.3), perception of their own role (see chapter 1.2), and their own conversational behaviour (see chapter 2) – and yet they are tethered to the sequential structure of the source text and must, within the constraints under which they labour, attempt to negotiate and avoid, engage in or resolve conflict with a view to emulating the turn-exchange on the primary level.

From a research perspective, this provides a promising environment for insights into the manifestation of norm-based behaviours, or indeed the overlap and conflict of different discursive structures such as the interpreting profession or the media environment. It also

shines a new light on communicative behaviour in this context. If the turn exchange of the target text is less informed by the intentionality of the source, what takes its place? This thought leads to this thesis' main research question: how is high-conflictuality turn negotiation in the source text reproduced in the interpretation? This comes with follow-up questions such as: To what extent is overlap reproduced? Is the turn structure reproduced or at least recognizable in the interpretation? This study will attempt to provide answers to these questions, in the hope of gaining insights into how the interpreters work and interact.

At the same time, this analysis also puts the reliability and accuracy of the conversation analytical toolkit itself to the test. Is it suitable for spoken interaction that veers so far from the everyday conversation Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson focussed on when they devised these tools? To what extent do the core tenets such as the overlap avoidance principle hold true when participants are forced to negotiate turn exchanges not on their own terms, but those of a parallel interaction?

3.2 Corpus, Methodology and Transcript

The corpus examined in this paper is derived from the TV broadcasts of the debate between the candidates in the second round of the 2017 French presidential elections, held on 3 May 2017. The French text is from the TF1 “EN DIRECT” live broadcast “Débat de l'entre-deux-tours : Marine Le Pen / Emmanuel Macron”, uploaded to YouTube by TF1's LCI account (Youtube 2017a). The English text stems from the interpreted version broadcast by FRANCE24, uploaded to YouTube by their FRANCE 24 English account (Youtube 2017b). The French original features two moderators as well as the two candidates, Emmanuel Macron and Marine Le Pen. The candidates are seated facing each other across a table in a purpose-built television studio, the two moderators are seated alongside them. In the English interpretation, three interpreters work on three channels. Two of the interpreters are assigned to one of the candidates, the third interpreter voices both of the moderators. All three are able to activate their channels/microphones independently, they can be heard speaking over one another at times.

The focus of analysis in this study lies primarily on how turn exchanges are negotiated between the candidates rather than the instances where moderators intervene to allocate turns. Indeed, the role and function of the moderators is marginal in the corpus, they serve less as a referee and more as a foil that emphasises the lack of structural discipline in the primary interaction. The primary participants each have an allocated timer, visible to the TV audience

at home (Figure 1), which runs as they speak and stops whenever they pause¹.



FIGURE 1, SOURCE: <https://youtu.be/iOAbdIWgz0?t=916>

The moderators use the time as an argument, directly verifiable by the viewers, to reprimand the candidates whenever one of them gets too far ahead. The moderators repeatedly point out that fairness requires them both to have an equal amount of speaking time. This usually results in the candidate letting their opponent speak uninterrupted, for a while. However, while the hosts do throw in occasional questions to give the debate a general thrust, most of the programme consists of the candidates speaking directly to or over each other.

Passages with a high occurrence of turn-level conflict were preselected for analysis. This was achieved by screening the entire broadcast of the source text for passages with continuous overlapping speech. During this process it emerged that one reasonable criterion to identify such passages was that the person occupying the turn space is not able to speak uninterrupted for 10 seconds. This also means that the segments end as soon as 10 seconds of uninterrupted speech are possible, and the turn negotiation becomes less conflictual. A second criterion was that of the continuity of the overlap, which again had to persist for several seconds (closer to five seconds) and consist of a claim for the turn space, with a view to ruling out short interjections which do not necessarily constitute turn competition. The selection of segments was almost exhaustive, since, while overlapping speech was fairly frequent, the speakers usually limited their interruptions to occasional short comments instead of stubbornly refusing to let the other finish. The selection represents the most intense displays of conflictuality in the broadcast, and while there was a limited number of exchanges comparable to Excerpt 1, the “least conflictual” of this selection, the broadcast did not contain any passages with a higher

¹ It was not possible to deduce from the TV broadcast alone how exactly this system works, how reactive it is, and how it deals with overlap.

extent of conflictuality that were not part of this analysis.

Once the passages had been identified, the audio tracks were extracted, separately, from the youtube videos of the French original and English interpretation. Both tracks were then synchronised and cropped in Audacity to ensure identical timelines without any offset. This was possible because the original was audible in the background of the interpreted version. Once synchronised, both tracks were then again exported individually. The two tracks were then imported separately into EXMARaLDA, which enabled switching back and forth between the two languages. Initially, both tracks were segmented and transcribed independently, but in the same file. Then, in a second phase of segmentation, both tracks and their transcripts were aligned with more precision. This was achieved by clicking on a segment and then playing the track in the other language to determine the exact starting point, creating one or several segments where necessary. The result was a transcript with all seven tracks, including both moderators and the interpreter representing both of them. After debugging in EXMARaLDA (i.e. verifying alignment, review of complete transcript and running the structure errors, segmentation errors and clean-up commands), the transcript was considered good to go and subjected to qualitative analysis using the toolkit provided by conversation analysis.

3.2.1 Transcription Conventions

The following conventions, an adapted version of the CorIT conventions (Dal Fovo 2018), were used for transcription.

(.), (..)	short pause (.) denotes micropauses (under 0.2 seconds), (..) is a slightly longer pause
(2.2)	pause with exact time in seconds, e.g. (2.2) represents a 2.2 second pause
wor-	truncated word
wo(rd)	unintelligible phoneme which does not affect the intelligibility of the entire word
(word)	word almost unintelligible
x, xxx	unintelligible syllable/word
wo:rd, wo::rd	drawn out syllable (the number of colons corresponds to the length)

word.word.word	syncopated “robotic” rhythm
word=word	phonemes latched together with no discernible transition
wo!rd	emphasis on the syllable preceding the !
WORD	raised voice
<<smile>>	paraverbal information

3.2.2 Speaker table

The following abbreviations are used for the speakers in the transcripts.

L	Marine Le Pen
M	Emmanuel Macron
H1	Host 1 - Nathalie Saint-Cricq
H2	Host 2 - Christophe Jakubyszyn
InL	Interpreter assigned to LP
InM	Interpreter assigned to MA
InH	Interpreter assigned to H1 and H2

4 Analysis

4.1 Excerpt 1

4.1.1 Excerpt 1 – Source Text

[1]	0 [00:00.0]1 [00:00.0]	2 [00:02.7]
H1	madame Le Pen quelle est votre vision vous (de:) marché.du.travail de.ses.	
[2]	3 [00:03.5]	4 [00:04.7]5 [00:05.2]6 [00:06.4]
L	(x xxx)	monsieur le ministre de l'économie (1.0) (ou) dois je dire
H1	(améliorations.eventuelles)	
[3]	7 [00:09.9]8 [00:10.4]	9 [00:10.9]
L	monsieur le conseiller euh: (0.9) (auprès) de mon sieur Hollande (0.8)	
M	c'est.vot(re). vision	
[4]	10 [00:11.6]	11 [00:12.5]12 [00:13.0]13 [00:13.7]
L	quatr.ans (.)	quatr.ans vous avez été (.) conseiller
M	donc du.marché.du.travail madame.Le.Pen (.) d'accord	
[5]	14 [00:15.2]15 [00:16.2]	16 [00:16.6]17 [00:16.9]
L	(0.5) économique de:! François Hollande (puis) deux ans ministre (0.4) <inhale>	
[6]	18 [00:18.4]	19 [00:20.2]20 [00:20.6]
L	mais si vous avez la recette pour diminuer le chômage (0.3) pourquoi est-ce que	
M	non! j'ai (mauvaise	
[7]	21 [00:22.0]	22 [00:24.0]
L	vous n'avez pas	pourquoi.est-ce.que (.) pourquoi (.)
M	nouvelle) pour vous c'est un quinquennat pour lequel nous sommes candidats ça ne	
[8]	23 [00:24.7]	24 [00:26.6]
L	pourquoi.est-ce.que (.) pourquoi.est-ce.que vous n'avez pas euh (.) fait profiter (0.4)	
M	dure pas six ans	

[9]

	25 [00:27.4]	26 [00:28.9]	27 [00:29.4]28 [00:30.4]29 [00:30.7]
L	monsieur Ho:llande! (0.4) euh de: (.) vos recettes: (0.2) et.SI.vous n'avez pas de		
M	eh parce que:		

[10]

	30 [00:33.0]	31 [00:34.7]32 [00:35.0]
L	recettes! parce.que.vos.resultats ont.été.en.l'occurrence.extreme!ment mauvais	
M		

H1 produces a TCU which is extended beyond the initial TRP (“[...]marché.du.travail”) by adding “de.ses. améliorations.eventuelles”. L starts on (3), interrupting H1 and then taking over from her. Both H1’s and LP’s words in (3) are unintelligible due to the overlap and what is possibly a disfluency in LP’s production. The overlap is resolved instantaneously by L stopping to let H1 finish, with L poised to take over. LP’s claim to the turn space is assertive enough to go unchallenged by H1, who hastily concludes the already initiated TCU with the utterance of “améliorations.eventuelles” and then yields.

After the initial sortie, LP’s diction is measured, calm and at times almost hesitant. Her turn is characterized by a start/stopping cadence with noticeable pauses for effect (each close to one second) in (5), (6) and (9), which she uses to underscore the sarcastic tone of her voice and nature of her words. LP’s pauses are not TRPs here; there is little reason to assume she intends to stop speaking, since she has yet to develop her point after having been selected to speak by the moderator and assertively corroborating her claim. The positioning, frequency and regularity of her pauses suggest that they are a deliberate stylistic device used to build suspense. LP’s pause in (9) is not an obvious TRP, but M uses it to interject a speedy TCU in solo production (9-11). His comment is a preemptive counter-attack, topped off with a sarcasm-laden “d’accord” in (12) which extends and completes the turn.

L continues in overlapping solo production in (10), the pause in (11) is less of an attempt at resolution than a continuation of the start/stop pattern already adopted in (5-9). The prominent repetition of “quatr.ans” in (10) and (12) does not serve the purpose of a resolution device either, despite the fact that it incidentally coincides with the effective resolution in (12). L employs the same calm and measured diction and start/stop structure used in the previous and following utterances and is not noticeably afflicted by the overlapping talk. This complete lack of hitches and perturbations suggests that L has not acknowledged her competitor’s attack and moved to the competitive level; the repetition is more a form of emphasis within solo production than a competitive resolution device.

L continues with solo production and the same start/stop pattern, however the interspersed pauses start getting shorter, with 0.5 and 0.4 seconds respectively in (13) and (17). In (18), LP's speed picks up noticeably, her style changes and the start/stop-feature is abandoned. The 0.3s pause in (19) is closer to a micropause than a pause for effect. (19) is also where M butts in rather violently with “non!”, intending to interrupt the unfinished TCU, but to little avail as L continues unperturbed, albeit levelling up to competitive production in (21) in reaction to the sudden competition. M sees out his short (4.4s) interjection from (19) to (23) in overlapping solo production, again using sarcasm (“un quinquennat [...] ne dure pas six ans”) and opting for a leisurely pace and an extension in (22) which increases the insistence of his observation about the self-contradictory nature of LPs statement. In (21), 1.3s into MA's interjection, L opposes MA's solo production with highly competitive talk and a high density of resolution devices, most notably no fewer than five restarts/repetitions of “pourquoi?”. The competitive talk continues beyond the resolution in (23) until (26), where L reverts to solo production, noticeably slower and reverting to the use of pauses (0.4s in both (24) and (25)). The pauses here may be the result of L still reeling from the effects of MA's interference, but they also resemble the pausing for effect she employed in (5), (6) and (9). In (28), L pauses for 0.2s at the end of her TCU and M makes an attempt to respond to the “pourquoi?” in (29), which is ignored by LP, who continues with an extension. Once the overlap in (29) has been resolved, L goes on to speak uninterrupted for 2m30s until segment (6) of Excerpt 2, which is noteworthy not least because M decides to leave his unfinished segment from (29) hanging in the air.

4.1.2 Excerpt 1 – Target Text

[1]	0 [00:00.0]1 [00:00.0]2 [00:02.7]3 [00:03.5]	4 [00:04.7]5 [00:05.2]
InH	misses Le Pen how do you see the labour market going forward	
[2]	6 [00:06.4]	7 [00:09.9]8 [00:10.4]9 [00:10.9]
InL	well mister (0.3) economy minister or should I say (0.5) mister (0.4) advi!	
[3]	10 [00:11.6]	11 [00:12.5]12 [00:13.0]
InL	ser of Hollande	
InM	INHALE what's your vision! of the labour market	

[4]	15 [00:16.2]16 [00:16.6]17 [00:16.9]	18 [00:18.4]19 [00:20.2]20 [00:20.6]
InL	(fff-) (0.4) four years you le:d erm:(1.8) Hollande's economy (0.4) policy if	
[5]	..	21 [00:22.0]22 [00:24.0]23 [00:24.7]
InL	you have the recipe for unemployment-	
InM		we! are candidates for five years
[6]	24 [00:26.6]25 [00:27.4]	26 [00:28.9]27 [00:29.4]28 [00:30.4]
InL	WHY:: didn't: you:(1.1) allo:w Hollande to benefit from your recipes	29 [00:30.7]
[7]	30 [00:33.0]	31 [00:34.7]32 [00:35.0] 33 [00:36.3]34 [00:36.5]35 [00:37.1]
InL	if you have no recipes (b')cos' your (0.3) results: were: in(0.7) the case	
[8]	..	36 [00:44.8]
InL	extremely: ba:d in.the.case.of.unemployment [...]	

This excerpt starts with a sequence from (0) to (18) which features prominent pauses in both length and number. InH initiates a question for InL in (2) in a turn which is concluded swiftly, without sounding rushed. The swift conclusion allows the transition from InH to InL to occur without overlap, via a 1.2s pause from the middle of (4) to the beginning of (6). InL then initiates a measured utterance, the tone conveying a sense of aloofness which is reinforced by the leisurely pace and short solo-production pauses in (6), (7) and (9). This contrasts with the urgency and frustration in the following utterance by InM in (12-13). Both statements are however produced clear of any overlap, and start and end with a pause. The pause at the end is extended by a false start (“fff...”) in (15) and then another pause until InL definitively reclaims the space in (17), producing a 1.8-second pause from (13) to (17) alone, which represents a very prominent TRP that remains unclaimed.

Each of these transitions are marked by a noticeable pause of close to one second. This seems natural during the first handover from InH to InL in (5). Pausing during solo production is also characteristic of InL’s style and diction here, which is why as InM starts to speak, the transitional pause in (11) sounds as though it might be the product of InL’s leisurely pace and InM’s timing. The transitional pause starting in (14) after InM’s utterance, however, no longer credibly conveys a natural exchange between interlocutors in this highly competitive setting, which becomes increasingly unnatural as it continues, with the false start “fff...”, for 1.8

seconds.

InL demonstrates a certain extent of dominance, and reclaims the turn space when InM finishes. This is to be expected since the moderator's question that initiated this sequence was directed at LP. InM does not try to extend his turns to claim the turn space, despite the sense of urgency conveyed by his voice and diction. The high frequency of transitional pauses and absence of overlap mean that no grabbing or hogging of turns takes place.

InL sticks to solo production throughout, whereas InM interjects in competitive mode. Both of InM's interjections are instances of repair on the content level. Both (12) and (23) are examples of other-initiated other repair in the TRP, but they are uttered clear of overlap, after a TRP pause. As such, they do not interfere with InL's completion of her utterances. And yet, despite the complete lack of overlap in this segment, InM's utterances are perceivable as interjections or even interruptions. This is the result of the urgent delivery and speedy completion, the difference between InM's competitive and InL's solo production, as well as the direct relationship between repair and repairable. The fact that two instances of other-repair, the last-resort option after failed self-repair in most contexts of conversation, occur within approximately 10 seconds of one another adds an additional layer of conflictuality which reinforces the insistence of the non-overlapping interruptions.

4.1.3 Excerpt 1 – Comparative Analysis

[1]	0 [00:00.0]1 [00:00.0]		2 [00:02.7]	
H1	madame Le Pen quelle est votre vision vous (de:) marché.du.travail de.ses.			
InH	misses Le Pen how do			
[2]	3 [00:03.5]		4 [00:04.7]	
L	(x xxx)		monsieur le ministre de l'économie (1.0) (ou) dois je	
H1	(améliorations.eventuelles)			
InL			well mister	
InH	you see the labour market going forward			
[3]	..		7 [00:09.9]8 [00:10.4]	
L	dire monsieur le conseiller euh: (0.9) (auprès) de mon sieur Hollande(0.8)			
M	c'est.vot(re).			
InL	(0.3) economy minister or should I say		(0.5) mister (0.4)	
[4]	..		10 [00:11.6]	
L	quatr.ans (.)		quatr.ans vous avez été (.)	
M	vision donc du.marché.du.travail madame.le.pen (.) d'accord			

InL	advi! ser of Hollande	
InM		INHALE what's your vision! of

[5]

	...	14 [00:15.2]15 [00:16.2]	16 [00:16.6]17 [00:16.9]
L	conseiller (0.5) économique de:!	François Hollande (puis) deux ans ministre (0.4)	
InL	(fff-)	(0.4)	four years you le:d erm:
InM	the labour market		

The overlap and brief turn-level conflict between L and H1 is not reflected in the TT. Instead, the noticeable 1.8s pause between (4) and (6) marks the conflict-free transition from InH to InL, with InL starting to speak after a 1.0s pause in the TT. After the handover, InL reproduces LP's diction and measured pace, including the pauses for effect and the sarcastic tone from (6) to (10). There are three brief instances of ST overlap in (9), (10) and (12). ST overlap in (9) coincides with a 0.4s pause in the TT, halfway through InL's utterance, ST overlap in (10) overlaps with InL speaking in the TT, and ST overlap in (12) occurs just as InM is about to start speaking. None of these are met with overlap within the TT, which comes as no surprise since they are very brief. However, by contracting LP's lengthy "dire monsieur le conseiller euh: (0.9) (auprès) de monsieur Hollande" to the snappy "mister (0.4) advi!ser of Hollande", InL concludes his sentence swiftly and, in doing so, deploys a strategy to deal with the terminal overlap in the ST in (9) ("c'est vot(re)") and the overlap in (10). The minimalist rendition and swift conclusion allow InL to free up cognitive capacities here and focus on the ST, while also minimising the overlap between channels his fellow interpreters are exposed to. The ST overlap in (12) is an instance of terminal overlap in the ST, where InM narrowly avoids terminal overlap in the TT. InM's microphone is active as segment (12) begins, however instead of starting to speak, he takes another breath, audible on his channel, and only starts once the ST overlap has been resolved. InM opts for a similar strategy as InL previously, condensing MA's utterance through speed and the omission of certain non-essential embellishments such as "madame.le.pen (.) d'accord". This, together with the urgency in the voice, allows InM to maintain some of the speedy and interjectional nature of MA's utterance in his rendition, despite it being followed and preceded in the TT by the pauses in (10-11) and (14), which detract from the momentum of the original, where MA's utterance is wedged between instances of terminal overlap on both ends.

[5]

	...	14 [00:15.2]15 [00:16.2]	16 [00:16.6]17 [00:16.9]
L	conseiller (0.5) économique de:!	François Hollande (puis) deux ans ministre (0.4)	
InL	(fff-)	(0.4)	four years you le:d erm:
InM	the labour market		

[6]	..	18 [00:18.4]	19 [00:20.2]20 [00:20.6]
L	<inhale>	mais si vous avez la recette pour diminuer le chômage (0.3)	pourquoi
M			non! j'ai
InL		(1.8)	Hollande's
[7]	..	21 [00:22.0]	
L		est-ce que vous n'avez pas	pourquoi.est-ce.que (.) pourquoi (.)
M		(mauvaise nouvelle) pour vous c'est un quinquennat pour lequel nous sommes	
InL		economy (0.4) policy if you have the recipe for unemployment-	
[8]	..	22 [00:24.0]	23 [00:24.7]
L		pourquoi.est-ce.que (.) pourquoi.est-ce.que vous n'avez pas euh (.) fait	
M		candidats ça ne dure pas six ans	
InL			
InM			we! are candidates for five years
[9]	..	24 [00:26.6]25 [00:27.4]	26 [00:28.9] 27 [00:29.4]28 [00:30.4]29 [00:30.7]
L		profiter (0.4) monsieur Ho:llande! (0.4) euh de: (.) vos recettes: (0.2)	et.SI.vous n'
M			eh parce
InL		WHY:: didn't: you:	(1.1) allo:w Hollande to
InM			
[10]	..	30 [00:33.0]	
L		avez pas de recettes! parce.que.vos.resultats ont.été.en.l'	
M		que:	
InL		benefit from your recipes	if you have no recipes (b')cos' your
[11]	31 [00:34.7]	32 [00:35.0] 33 [00:36.3]34 [00:36.5]35 [00:37.1]	
L		occurrence.extreme!ment mauvais	
InL		(0.3) results: were: in(0.7) the case extremely: ba:d	

The reasons for InL's false start "(fff-)" in (15), the mid-sentence pause of 4.0 seconds from (15) to (19), and the omission of "(puis) deux ans ministre" are subject to conjecture; however they do attest to the difficulty of the ST within this segment. This in turn explains why InL simply stops mid-sentence, rather abruptly, in (21), when the added challenge of highly competitive and extended overlap comes on top of an already challenging ST. It takes InL a full 5 seconds, from (21) to (25), to resume speaking in (25), despite LP's constant output during this time. On a lexical level, LP's text is no challenge – especially from (20) to (23), where L simply repeats "pourquoi est-ce que" over and over for 5.0 seconds – and yet InL

remains silent. This may be due to the difficulty of the preceding segments, or because he is waiting for a conclusive semantic unit to work with, but these repetitions constitute the resolution device which L uses to overpower MA. Their omission means that a fundamental element of the sequential organisation of the ST, which attests to the fierce nature of the exchange, is missing in the TT. Another missing element in the TT is the overlap itself, which is once again replaced by a series of non-conflictual and spaced-out transitions in (21), (23) and (25), each with noticeable pauses before and after. MA's riposte from (19) to (23), which takes 3.9 seconds, is rendered by InM with the brief "we! are candidates for five years", again using the same condensation strategy as above, making the utterance shorter and getting it out of the way quickly. The use of this strategy however means that the sarcastic tone and the incisive nature of MA's intervention are lost. The lack of overlap in the TT means that InM's solo production is not a display of disregard for the other speaker as it is in the ST, but simply an element of a civil conversation without conflict or flouting of norms. This lack of transgression means that LP's barrage of resolution devices, i.e. repetitions in (20)-(23), would have been entirely unwarranted and out of place within the TT. When InL resumes in (25), he speaks clear of overlap and again uses a condensation strategy, but hesitates noticeably, with the long pause preceding (25) followed by a 1.1s pause mid-utterance in (27) and 0.3s in (31) which contrasts with LP's steady stream of words.

4.2 Excerpt 2

4.2.1 Excerpt 2 – Source Text

LP's turn in Excerpt 2 was assigned to her by the moderator. L has been speaking uninterrupted for 2m30s at this point. According to the speaking time displayed on screen she was over 2 minutes behind M when she started the turn, but at the beginning of the recording she has just about caught up.

[1]	0 [00:00.0]1 [00:02.1]
L	et euh (.) (ça ce) ça n'est pas une anecdote! (.) monsieur Macron (..) euh
[2]	2 [00:06.7]3 [00:10.1]4 [00:10.7]
L	(.) ce sont des entreprises que vous avez euh vendues euh SFR! par exemple à
[3]	5 [00:12.0]6 [00:15.3]7 [00:16.4]
L	votre ami monsieur Drahi le patron de BFM:!(0.5) eeuh=six mille=six mille

	..	13 [00:23.3]	14 [00:26.2]
L	le dis (.) (baisse des) charges des TPE (.) fiscali-	(.) baisse de la fiscalité	
M	(0.6)	il n'y en a pas (.) non mais il n'y en a pas! (.) vous ne faites-	
InM	s t r a t e g y f o r	fighting unemployment in France (.) there isn't! one	

[7]

	15 [00:26.5]	16 [00:26.6]	17 [00:26.6]	18 [00:27.2]	19 [00:27.9]	20 [00:28.3]
L	(0.3)	je vous ai! (.) tout donné monsieur Macron tout ce				
M	(.) votre straté gie-	mais (.) madame-	mais madame-			
InL			I've.given.you.everything.I've.			
InM		your! strategy:				

[8]

	..	21 [00:29.6]	22 [00:30.5]
L	que vous n'avez pas fait		
M		madame le penc'qui est extraordinaire est que	
InL	told.you.everything.everything	.you.haven't.done	
InM		madame (.) Le Pen what's	

[9]

	..	23 [00:32.4]	24 [00:34.3]
M	votr' stratégie (.)	mais c'est normal (.) ça fait (.) des decennies que ça dure (.)	
InM	extraordinary is that	your! strategy and it's normal	(..) erm: for de!cades

M pauses briefly in (12) and then continues over LP's talk (12-13). M now switches to competitive production and addresses L directly. MA's talk in (13-20) features a very high density of resolution devices (6 repetitions/restarts/cut-offs in 6s), in contrast with MA's previous lack of disfluencies. L also sends clear signals of competitive production, but in (13-15), L completes her turn and with it the SPP to MA's FPP from (9-12).

MA's turn in (13) causes L to both stop and start speaking: MA's heavy deployment of resolution devices in (13) is effective in that LP's pause in (15) can be interpreted as her intending to let M take the floor. However, the content of MA's statement in (13) also requires an (almost) immediate reaction from LP, which is why she re-engages in overlapping solo production with a new turn (17-20) after a 0.3s intermission. LP's production in (17-20) is suddenly calm and without disfluencies, in contrast with both her own previous production and MA's competitive tone. L then yields and lets M continue, who quickly downgrades to solo production post-resolution in (22).

4.2.2 Excerpt 2 – Target Text

[2]

	2 [00:06.7]	3 [00:10.1]4 [00:10.7]
InL	(so) mister Macron (.) these are companies that you've sold! (1.3)	

[3]

	5 [00:12.0]	6 [00:15.3]7 [00:16.4]
InL	SFR for example to mister Drahi (.) the head of BFM (1.5)	

[4]

	8 [00:16.8]	9 [00:18.3]	10 [00:19.6]
InL	six thousand jobs six thousand jobs lost!		

[5]

	11 [00:19.7]	12 [00:22.6]
InM	for (.) three! minutes madame Le Pen has been explaining h e r :	

[6]

	13 [00:23.3]	14 [00:26.2]
InM	s t r a t e g y f o r fighting unemployment in France (.) there isn't! one	

InL pauses briefly (0.8s) as overlap ensues in the ST (6), but since this also coincides with the end of a TCU in the ST it is difficult to determine whether the pause is the result of overlap or InL waiting for ST input to interpret (with a reasonable decalage of 1.5s). Further on, InL omits LP's TCU extension "voilà", the claim of the turn space ends with "six thousand jobs lost!". InM does not render MA's first TCU (6-9: "(si vous) m'y autorisez"). Consequently, the hitch in InL's rendition of LP's repetition as "six thousand jobs six thousand jobs lost!" does not have any overlapping speech to compete with. InM interprets MA's second TCU (9-13), then pauses (0.4s in (14-15)).

[7]

	15 [00:26.5]	16 [00:26.6]	17 [00:26.6]	18 [00:27.2]	19 [00:27.9]	20 [00:28.3]
InL	I've.given.you.everything.I've.					
InM	your! strategy:					

[8]

	21 [00:29.6]	22 [00:30.5]
InL	told.you.everything.everything .you.haven't.done	
InM	madame (.) Le Pen what's	

[9]

	23 [00:32.4]	24 [00:34.3]
InM	extraordinary is that your! strategy and it's normal (..) erm: for de!cades	

[10]

	25 [00:35.6]	26 [00:39.7]
InM	this has been going on=your strategy is quite simply to sa- to lie: a lo:t and to	

InM extends the turn with “your! strategy:”. In the ST, M is fighting hard for the turn space here, MA’s cut-off after “votre strategie-“ makes it impossible for InM to continue this semantic unit. InM does not interpret the following “mais (.) madame- mais madame-“ sequence, with which M extends his claim to the turn space to retake it in (21).

While InM is speaking, InL completely omits LP’s comment in (12) and (13), 3.6s of non-redundant content that are a direct reaction to MA’s previous utterance. Leaving a brief pause (0.4s in (19)) after InM’s turn completion, InL throws in a very rapid burst of speech that sounds almost mechanical in its intonation (20-22) to render LP’s TCU (17-20). The double “everything.everything” here is not a hitch, since the second “everything” belongs to a different sentence. A very minor instance (less than 0.1s) of unproblematic terminal overlap between InL and InM occurs, marked by InM’s subtle micropause after “madame”.

4.2.3 Excerpt 2 – Comparative Analysis

- [1]
- | | |
|----------|--|
| | 0 [00:00.0]1 [00:02.1] |
| L | et euh (.) (ça ce) ça n'est pas une anecdote! (.) monsieur Macron (..) euh |
- [2]
- | | | |
|------------|--|------------------------|
| | 2 [00:06.7] | 3 [00:10.1]4 [00:10.7] |
| L | (.) ce sont des entreprises que vous avez euh vendues euh SFR! par exemple à | |
| InL | (so) mister Macron (.) these are companies that you've sold! | |
- [3]
- | | | |
|------------|---|------------------------|
| | 5 [00:12.0] | 6 [00:15.3]7 [00:16.4] |
| L | votre ami monsieur Drahi le patron de BFM:!! (0.5) eeuh=six mille=six mille | |
| M | alors là! (si vous) m'y | |
| InL | SFR for example to mister Drahi (.) the head of BFM (1.5) | |
- [4]
- | | | | |
|------------|---|-------------|---|
| | 8 [00:16.8] | 9 [00:18.3] | 10 [00:19.6] |
| L | emplois six mille emplois (.) perdus? | | voilà |
| M | autorisez ça fait (0.4) | | ça fait donc (.) à peu près trois minutes que |
| InL | six thousand jobs six thousand jobs lost! | | |
- [5]
- | | | |
|------------|---|--------------|
| | 11 [00:19.7] | 12 [00:22.6] |
| L | je vous | |
| M | madame Le Pen nous explique sa stratégie pour lutter contre l'chômage en France | |
| InM | for (.) three! minutes madame Le Pen has been explaining h e r : | |
- [6]

	..	13 [00:23.3]	14 [00:26.2]
L	le dis (.) (baisse des) charges des TPE (.) fiscali- (.) baisse de la fiscalité		
M	(0.6) il n'y en a pas (.) non mais il n'y en a pas! (.) vous ne faites-		
InM	s t r a t e g y f o r fighting unemployment in France (.) there isn't! one		

[7]

	15 [00:26.5]	16 [00:26.6]	17 [00:26.6]	18 [00:27.2]	19 [00:27.9]	20 [00:28.3]
L	(0.3) je vous ai! (.) tout donné monsieur Macron tout ce					
M	(.) votre straté gie- mais (.) madame- mais madame-					
InL					I've.given.you.everything.I've.	
InM				your! strategy:		

L speaks unchallenged until (6), where overlap ensues briefly, as M manifests his intention to take the floor. The overlap is resolved in (8-9) by a successful turn transition, where M takes over and continues. Highly competitive extended overlap occurs from the beginning of (12) to the end of (20), where MA's competitive production is pitted against LP's predominantly solo production. In spite of the lack of overlapping talk, the TT features a similar overall turn structure. InL speaks until a transition takes place after the 2.8s pause in (9). While there is no actual competitive overlap, the speed of InL's rapid-fire interjection (20-22) as well as InM's unfinished utterance in (16-18) do convey the impression of competitive disruption. The interpreters alternate short statements rather than engaging in overlap. This requires them to shorten the utterances, which changes the tone of the exchange, but allows them to avoid overlap without major losses regarding content and consistency.

The overlap-heavy ST with its non-linear beat sequence and rapid overlapping interjections makes it difficult for the interpreters to keep up. There are pauses between most TT turns, and the TT pace, while not unnaturally slow, is leisurely compared to the intensity of the ST (which is also audible in the background of the ST broadcast). The ST's consistent use of resolution devices and transitioning from solo to competitive and back again is not reflected in the TT. Since the overlap is not reproduced in the TT, hitches and perturbations that do occur do not serve the purpose of resolution devices within the ST itself. Indeed, the repetition in (8) "six thousand jobs" can be read as an emphasis in the TT, but since it is a resolution device in the ST, it could also be understood as an unwarranted resolution device in the TT. Most other disfluencies seem to be the result of interpreting constraints and strategies rather than renditions of resolution devices with no counterpart in the ST. The sudden burst of speed in (20-22) "I've.given.you.everything" does not reflect the ST, it is an attempt to make up for/catch up after InL's omission of LP's segments (12) to (14). The hitches "sa-" and "sa-" in (25) and (26) ("is quite simply to sa- to lie: a lo:t and to sa- to list all (.) the difficulties") are instances of

self-repair due to insufficient timelag, resulting in an attempt to translate the French “dire”, which is used as part of a collocation, with “say” before thinking of a more apposite expression.

[8]

	21 [00:29.6]	22 [00:30.5]
L	que vous n'avez pas fait	
M		madame le pen c'qui est extraordinaire est que
InL	told.you.everything.everything .you.haven't.done	
InM		madame (.) Le Pen what's

[9]

	23 [00:32.4]	24 [00:34.3]
M	votr' stratégie (..) mais c'est normal (..) ça fait (..) des decennies que ça dure (.)	
InM	extraordinary is that your! strategy and it's normal (..) erm: for de!cades	

[10]

	25 [00:35.6]	26 [00:39.7]
M	votre stratégie c'est simplement de dire beaucoup de mensonges (.) et de dire tout	
InM	this has been going on=your strategy is quite simply to sa- to	lie: a lo:t and to

Overall, the ST contains 12.8 seconds of problematic/competitive overlapping speech, all of which is lost in the TT. The only overlap found in the TT is the unproblematic occurrence of terminal overlap of less than 0.1s in (22). This instance of overlap has no equivalent in the ST, it arises from within the TT itself, where InL and InM almost instantaneously resolve the turn sequence disruption. It is worth noting that the onset of TT overlap at the very beginning of (22) does not occur at or even near a TRP: InL's high speed of delivery and almost aggressive tone give no indication of an imminent TT transition, quite the contrary. Neither does the ST offer any obvious indication of a transition from L to MA. That L does finally hand over only becomes evident 1.9s later, at the end of (22), where M reverts to solo production. Consequently, and given that InL was already engaging in competitive production, there is reason to assume that InM intentionally initiated competitive overlap (which would have been a faithful rendition of the tone of the ST), but then wasn't able to due to how the ST developed. However, the interpreters' reluctance to engage in overlap is still observable, as the time between the initial onset of competitive overlap in the ST and what almost became competitive overlap in the TT is 15.1s.

4.3 Excerpt 3

Excerpt 3 consists of the first half of the longest instance of extended competitive overlap in the entire 2.5-hour debate. The second half will be referred to as Excerpt 4 and analysed separately. Together, source text Excerpts 3 and 4 contain a full 2 minutes and 10 seconds

where neither of the participants lets the other speak uninterrupted for more than a few seconds (see respective ST vs TT comparison chapters for exact times) before violently interrupting and engaging in extended stints of overlapping speech with raised voices and unmistakable notes of malice and vitriol on both sides, until one of the moderators joins the fray towards the end, thus adding another layer of overlapping speech before resolution in segment (168). The only respite in this persistent power struggle occurs in segments (89) to (96), where L lets M speak uninterrupted for 17.8 seconds. This point was also chosen to split the transcript into Excerpt 3 and Excerpt 4 to facilitate analysis. It is however worth bearing in mind that the intensity of the exchange and the density of overlap and competitiveness of the source text remains unusually high throughout Excerpts 3 and 4, even within the text itself.

The topic here is still the labour market, however MA's accusations ("ne dites pas de bêtises!" etc.) and condescendence ("nous sommes dans un état où la propriété privée est respectée") are indicative of the tone of the debate, which consists in large part of attacks on a personal level: M insinuates incompetence, while L tries to frame him as a fraud and bankster ("vous savez tout vendre [...] contre les intérêts de la France"). These attacks are thinly veiled in the guise of a factual exchange on a series of technical details raised by L regarding MA's oversight of corporate transactions during his time in the previous government. What the transcript does not show is that L is leafing through several sizeable and visibly colour-coded folders with documents as she speaks (see Figure 1), and alternates between reading and speaking freely, whereas M shows no sign of needing to refer to any documents (later on, the video recording shows he has a small number of sheets of paper spread out on the white desk in front of him, barely visible on camera).

4.3.1 Excerpt 3 – Source Text

[4]		9 [00:11.9]		10 [00:12.7]	
L		(mais) votr' prédecas seur il voulait pas? le vendre			
M		surtout! (.) ça ne fait pas avancer le pays:		(mais)	

[5]		11 [00:14.3] 12 [00:14.6]		13 [00:15.7] 14 [00:16.0] 15 [00:17.6]	
L					
M		mais personne ne voulait la vendre (ça prend') simplement quand vous avez un			

The brief instances of overlap in (9) and (10) are the result of LP's question in (9). LP's question is a fairly polite, if insistent, interjection which is well-timed in terms of the TRP and concluded swiftly enough for both interlocutors to be able to remain on the solo production

level. MA's "(mais)" in (10) does not have any noticeable impact on the smooth continuation of the exchange and transitions. As she was asking her question, however, L was already readying her documents and demonstrating her intention to use them.

[6]

.. 16 [00:17.8]17 [00:18.5] 18 [00:20.3]19 [00:21.2]20 [00:21.5]21 [00:21.5]	
L	OOOOOH:
M	group: (.) privé! qui est détenu par des capitaux privés oui cherchez dans votr'

[7]

22 [00:23.9] 23 [00:23.9]24 [00:24.3]	
L	OUI je vais vous r'trouver ça immédiatement et vous allez (voir) que vous
M	=dossier vous sauriez bien (..) le vérifier=mais allez-y parce QUE (..) parce qu- mais

[8]

.. 25 [00:26.0]26 [00:26.9] 27 [00:28.3*]28 [00:29.0]	
L	êtes en difficultés (une fois de plus) JANVIER
M	non mais j- je connais! je connais un peu les dossiers

[9]

29 [00:29.9] 30 [00:30.9]31 [00:31.1]32 [00:32.0]33 [00:32.3]	
L	DEUX MILLE QUINZE devant l'assemblée J'AI! (0.9) pris la decision (.) pour
M	(et l'économie française)

[10]

.. 34 [00:33.0]35 [00:35.9]	
L	Alstom vous avez dit que (à) Du- monsieur Dupond-Aignan c'est pas moi
M	mais (on)

M continues and launches into an explanation of his own, until he interrupts himself in (18) to pre-emptively draw attention to the fact that L is about to read from one of her folders ("oui cherchez dans votr'=dossier vous sauriez bien (..) le verifier"). L in turn pre-empts the conclusion of MA's statement almost immediately in (20), raising her voice and trying to drown out M before he is able to utter any more than "oui cherchez". This hasty and violent pre-emptive intrusion into the turn space allows L to demonstrate, gleefully, that she has nothing to hide when it comes to her use of the dossiers ("OOOOOH: OUI je vais vous r'trouver ça immédiatement") and explain that it is M who is now in trouble ("vous allez (voir) que vous êtes en difficultés (une fois de plus)"). The 9.4 seconds from (20) to (29) consist entirely of overlapping speech which impedes the intelligibility of both participants, with LP's slightly raised voice increasingly drowning out large parts of MA's utterances towards the end of this segment. As L starts to almost shout in (27) to (29) and instrumentalises the fact that she is reading to assert dominance over the turn space, M starts to back down. MA's utterances start to lose their urgency in (27), his "(et l'économie française)" in (29) is subdued to the point of

being barely audible, and L is able to finally assert herself and resolve the overlap in (30) by raising her voice again, to indicate that she is now reading a quote which deserves everyone's attention.

- [10] .. 34 [00:33.0] 35 [00:35.9]
- | | |
|---|---|
| L | Alstom vous avez dit que (à) Du- monsieur Dupond-Aignan c'est pas moi |
| M | mais (on) |
- [11] .. 36 [00:36.7] 37 [00:37.1] 38 [00:37.7] 39 [00:38.0]
- | | |
|---|--|
| L | jan:vier! deux mille quinze devant l'assemblée J'AI pris la decision |
| M | parle d'Alstom? (ou de SFR:) |
- [12] .. 40 [00:39.9] 41 [00:40.0] 42 [00:41.4]
- | | |
|---|--|
| L | de permettre à General Electric de rentrer dans (Alstom) |
| M | mais voilà (mais xxx xx) ma- madame |
- [13] .. 43 [00:42.2] 44 [00:44.3] 45 [00:45.0] 46 [00:45.1] 47 [00:45.4] 48 [00:45.6]
- | | |
|---|--|
| L | J'AI moi personnellement le lenDEMAIN: le LEN- |
| M | le pen vous ne parlez pas du même suJET:: (0.3) vous parlez d'Alstom et d' |
- [14] .. 49 [00:46.3] 50 [00:47.4] 51 [00:48.2] 52 [00:48.5] 53 [00:49.4] 54 [00:49.5] 55 [00:49.5]
- | | |
|---|---|
| L | (xxx) laissez-moi terminer (.) le lendemain du départ (de) monsieur |
| M | General Electri:que mais donc nos citoyens méritent mieux qu' ça::: |
- [15] .. 56 [00:50.4] 57 [00:50.9] 58 [00:51.0] 59 [00:51.3] 60 [00:52.7] 61 [00:52.9] 62 [00:53.6] 63 [00:54.4]
- | | |
|---|---|
| L | Montebourg (0.4) vous! (.) avez accordé (0.2) alors qu'il le refusait (0.3) |
| M | |
- [16] 64 [00:54.7] 65 [00:55.9] 66 [00:56.0]
- | | |
|---|---|
| L | la vente de SFR (0.1) ET.C'EST.LA.RÉALITÉ.POURQUOI!.VOUS.L' |
|---|---|
- [17] 67 [00:57.3] 68 [00:57.8] 69 [00:58.8] 70 [00:59.5]
- | | |
|---|---|
| L | ASSUMEZ.PA:S? ASSUMEZ-LE! C'EST CE QUE VOUS FAITES |
| M | (je l'assume) mais je l'assume (d'autant plus que-) |

M has at this point resigned himself to letting L read out her quote, his question “mais (on) parle d'Alstom? (ou de SFR:)” is not intended as an interruption but rather as an interjection. MA's decreasing insistence in “(ou de SFR:)”, which is once again barely audible against LP's overlapping speech, does not suggest any intention of taking over the turn space. This may be

done deliberately – it is revealed to the audience later on that M is expecting L to produce a factual error at this point, it is thus in his interest to let her continue without interference. M waits for the cues of “General Electric” and “Alstom” in (40) and (42), the names of the companies that show that L is talking about two different things and is reading from the wrong file, before pouncing back into the foray to triumphantly brandish LP’s gaffe “vous ne parlez pas du même suJET:: (0.3)” in highly competitive production and turning it against L with “nos citoyens méritent mieux qu' ça::” to showcase her alleged incompetence, with complete disregard for the fact that L is speaking at the same time. LP’s reacts by ignoring his remark and voicing a brief meta-communication complaint about being interrupted, “laissez-moi terminer (.)”, in (50). The repetition and false starts of “le lendemain” in (44) and (47) and (52) show that L intends to stay on the solo-production level but cannot avoid deploying resolution devices to maintain her foothold against MA's attack and persistent overlap. From (56) to (67), M lets L speak unchallenged, but LP nonetheless rises to the competitive level by raising her voice in (66).

[16]

	64 [00:54.7]	65 [00:55.9]	66 [00:56.0]
L	la vente de SFR (0.1) ET.C'EST.LA.RÉALITÉ.POURQUOI!.VOUS.L'		

[17]

[17]	67 [00:57.3]	68 [00:57.8]	69 [00:58.8]	70 [00:59.5]
L	ASSUMEZ.PA:S? ASSUMEZ-LE!			C'EST CE QUE VOUS FAITES
M	(je l'assume) mais je l'assume			(d'autant plus que-)

[18]

	..	71 [01:00.7]	72 [01:01.6]	73 [01:02.4]
L	LE MIEUX: DE DÉPECER DES ENTRE PRISES et de (.) faire des fusions-			
M	mais-			

[19]

	..	74 [01:03.2]	75 [01:04.8*]	76 [01:05.3]	77 [01:05.6]	78 [01:05.6]	79 [01:05.6]
L	acquisitions ça vous savez très! bien faire (0.4) il y a aucun						
M	madame le pen						

[20]

	..	80 [01:06.2]	81 [01:07.3]	82 [01:07.7]
L	problème=			
M	vous êtes en train de lire une fiche qui ne correspond pas au dossier que			

[21]

	..	83 [01:09.4]	84 [01:09.7]	85 [01:11.0*]
M	vous avez cité (0.2)c'est triste! (0.2) pour vous (0.2) parce que ça montre votre			

[22]

	..	86 [01:13.1]	87 [01:14.0*]	88 [01:15.0*]
--	----	--------------	---------------	---------------

L	DEUX: dossiers vendu contre les intérêts de la France
M	impréparation à nos conCITOYENS mais- (ici-) mais c'

[23]

	89 [01:16.4]	90 [01:18.9]
L	monsieur Macron	
M	est faux je n'étais pas ministre pour SFR (0.2) quant à General Electric Alstom	

[24]

	91 [01:20.8]
M	monsieur Montebourg s'est battu (0.3) (x) me suis battu à ses côtés pour que ça ne

M lets L continue to speak in her forceful and agitated manner in competitive production, without providing any direct competition. This continues until (68), where his tone has become less competitive. MA's suddenly more conciliatory stance is indicative of a change in his strategy: to wait out the storm of LP's diatribe. M is increasingly less insistent, also on the content-level. M makes a feeble attempt to claim the turn space with "je l'assume" in (70), then backs down completely, makes another half-hearted attempt to intervene with "mais" in (72) and then once again holds back until (75). In (75), while L continues to rail and rage, MA's tone suddenly changes completely. M is now calm and reserved and almost conciliatory (in tone, but not in message) as he makes a point of speaking softly. The abrupt contrast to the previous diction is enough to stop L in her tracks, and M uses this lull to claim the turn space and finally unleash the severe accusation he had been holding back since LP's "General Electric" and "Alstom" in (41). MA's body language betrays his placid diction, as he leans over the table and repeatedly stabs a finger at L as a sneer flashes over his face and he states "vous êtes en train de lire une fiche qui ne correspond pas au dossier que vous avez cité (0.2) c'est triste! (0.2) pour vous (0.2) parce que ça montre votre impréparation à nos conCITOYENS". The pauses for effect, especially the ones that draw out "c'est triste! (0.2) pour vous (0.2)", add considerable weight to what is essentially a personal insult. L takes this humiliation without any interruption until M concludes his turn with a raised voice in "conCITOYENS" in (85). The transition here is smooth without overlap, L latches on to MA's last utterance in a raised voice but almost immediately reverts to measured solo production with the interjection "DEUX: dossiers vendu contre les intérêts de la France", before ceding the turn space to MA, who then continues uninterrupted for 17.8 seconds.

4.3.2 Excerpt 3 – Target Text

[1]	0 [00:00.0]1 [00:00.1]2 [00:00.7]	3 [00:02.8]
InM	we are i::n uh the uh (a) state! where we respect! private.prop(e'ty).it's.	
[2]	4 [00:04.8]	5 [00:06.0]6 [00:06.3] 7 [00:07.3]
InM	the.uh Vivendi group that sold SFR (.) so (.) you're ma- making a lot of uh	
[3]	8 [00:10.1]9 [00:11.9]10 [00:12.7]	
InM	mistakes! (.) uh uhh you (.) have been (0.2) (ah-) and it doesn't uh help the country	
[4]	11 [00:14.3]12 [00:14.6]13 [00:15.7]	14 [00:16.0]15 [00:17.6]16 [00:17.8]17 [00:18.5]
InM	to mo!ve on (1.1) NO!body wanted to sell SFR(0.3) when you have a private	
[5]	18 [00:20.3]19 [00:21.2]20 [00:21.5]21 [00:21.5]	
InM	(group) (.) which is owned by private capital (0.2) look! in your fi:les look	
[6]	22 [00:23.9]23 [00:23.9]	24 [00:24.3]25 [00:26.0]26 [00:26.9]27 [00:28.3*]
InL	yes! I'll find that for you immediately(3.0)	
InM	in_your files (3.0)	
[7]	28 [00:29.0]	29 [00:29.9]30 [00:30.9]31 [00:31.1] 32 [00:32.0]33 [00:32.3]
InL	JAN:uary=twenty fifteen before parliament	
InM	I know! the files (.) very well (xx)	

The target text of Excerpt 3 features only one brief instance of overlap in (29). This disruption is resolved almost instantly, after 0.4 seconds, as InL reclaims the turn space with a slight raise of the voice in “JAN:uary”, drowning out the end of InM’s interjection “I know! the files (.) very well (xx)”. This lack of competitive overlap is underpinned by the presence of various obvious TRP pauses which remain unused, such as the pauses in (12), (15) and (37) as well as the 3-second pause in (25), discussed below in more detail. The 1.1s pause in (12) is one of the most apparent examples: the TCU here has clearly been concluded, but more importantly, the TCU from (7) to (12) consists of an overt and vicious accusation/insult followed by a noticeable pause – one would expect at least some kind of reaction from a competitor in a presidential debate at this point. Instead, however, it is InM who initiates a new TCU after the pause, which continues until he interrupts himself in (19) to add taunt to insult and injury with “look! in your fi:les look in your files”, to which InL responds in a neutral tone: “yes! I'll find that for you immediately”.

As far as turn space occupancy is concerned, the first 25 seconds (segments (1)-(22)) discussed so far consist entirely of InM occupying the turn space. The first transition in (23) is smooth and natural without any overlap or noticeable pause as InL interjects “yes! I'll find that for you immediately (3.0)”. The long three-second TRP pause from (25) to (28) following this interjection clearly indicates next-speaker selection by InL and a handover back to InM. InL makes no sign of wanting to continue after concluding the TCU. At this point, however, both speakers seem reluctant to claim the space, which results in three seconds of silence. This silence is at odds with the dynamism and sense of urgency of the preceding exchange. Turn space occupancy is uncertain here until it is finally claimed by InM in (28), however only for him to yield to InL less than one second later, via a brief instance of unproblematic terminal overlap. InL then establishes ownership of the turn space in (29) and continues unchallenged until (46).

InM's stint from (2) to (29) features noticeable disfluencies which affect the overall impression of the rendition and making it sound hesitant and uncertain. These include prominent hesitation markers such as stutters, “uh” sounds, and unnatural pauses, especially in the part up to segment (10). There are also two utterances which are aborted mid-sentence: “uhh you (.) have been (0.2) (ah-) and it doesn't uh help the country to mo!ve on (1.1)” in (10) and “which is owned by private capital (0.2) look! in your fi:les look” in (17-21). They both feature short 0.2s pauses after the utterance is cut short, however these pauses occur for different reasons, which is also reflected in how InM continues after the respective pauses: the disfluencies in “(ah-) and it doesn't uh help the country to mo!ve on (1.1)” denote uncertainty and make the speaker sound slightly disoriented, whereas the repetition of look in “look! in your fi:les look” is not a disfluency but is used deliberately for emphasis, which is reinforced by an intonational structure that conveys determination and defiance. Indeed, this “look” utterance marks a turning point in the rendition, InM seems to gain in determination here. This transition from high-disfluency solo production towards a less disfluent and a more controlled and deliberate output conveys a sense of InM struggling at the beginning, up to segment (12), but then finding his way into this segment and developing a strategy to cope with the challenges he is facing on the primary level. In segment (13) “NO!body wanted to sell SFR (0.3)”, InM sounds more confident and exerts ownership over the turn space as he becomes increasingly defiant from (14)-(22), which culminates in “look! in your files”.

After the pause in (25), InM's offensive stance softens and his grasp on the turn space wanes quickly. InM's segment (28) is a lot less forceful than the previous utterances, and in

(29) InL faces only minimal resistance as he takes over with “JAN:uary=twenty fifteen before parliament”.

[9]

	..	37 [00:37.1]	38 [00:37.7]	39 [00:38.0]	40 [00:39.9]	41 [00:40.0]	42 [00:41.4]
InL	me) (0.6)	january twenty fifteen (be)fore parliament I have (.) the: (.)					
InM		(are we) talking about Alstom or SFR					

[10]

	43 [00:42.2]	44 [00:44.3]	45 [00:45.0]	46 [00:45.1]
InL	de(.)cision to allow G::E:: to take a stake in Alstom=I=personally (1.3)			
InM		misses LePen		

[11]

	..48 [00:45.6]	49 [00:46.3]	50 [00:47.4]	51 [00:48.2]	52 [00:48.5]
InL	the next day	let me finish			
InM	you're not talking about the sa:me: (.)	sss- subject you're talking about General			

[12]

	53 [00:49.4]	54 [00:49.5]	55 [00:49.5]	56 [00:50.4]	57 [00:50.9]	58 [00:51.0]	59 [00:51.3]	60 [00:52.7]	61 [00:52.9]
InL		the day after mister Montebourg left							
InM	Electric	and Alstom							

[13]

	62 [00:53.6]	63 [00:54.4]	64 [00:54.7]	65 [00:55.9]	66 [00:56.0]	67 [00:57.3]
InL	you! granted (x) whereas they were rev-(xx) (-ffing)	the sa!le of SFR! THAT'S				

[14]

	68 [00:57.8]	69 [00:58.8]	70 [00:59.5]	71 [01:00.7]	72 [01:01.6]
InL	THE REA!LITY WHY:!! DON'T you just ACCEPT! IT=ACCEPT IT THAT'S WHAT YOU DO! (0.2)				

[15]

	..	73 [01:02.4]	74 [01:03.2]	75 [01:04.8*]	76 [01:05.3]	77 [01:05.6]	78 [01:05.6]
InL	BE:ST=u:h (0.5)	to break up companies and do M and A					

[16]

	79 [01:05.6]	80 [01:06.2]	81 [01:07.3]	82 [01:07.7]
InL	you=can=do=that very=well there's no difficulty (0.3)			
InM		you're (.) rea:ding (.) a file		

[17]

	83 [01:09.4]	84 [01:09.7]	85 [01:11.0*]	86 [01:13.1]
InM	that does not! correspond to the case we were discussing which=shows=that you			

[18]

	..	87 [01:14.0*]	88 [01:15.0*]	89 [01:16.4]	90 [01:18.9]
InL		=sold against the interests of France (1.5)			
InM	are notprepared well prepared=	General			

InM's interjection in (39) "(are we) talking about Alstom or SFR" is the first instance of persistent overlapping speech, however it does not constitute a challenge on the turn-taking level, since it begins and ends in the middle of a TCU with no obvious TRPs in the vicinity and is concluded too swiftly to have the sufficient disruptive effect necessary for interruption and take-over. As such, InL and InM briefly occupy the same turn space in (39), but the overlap is resolved almost instantly without resolution devices and InL continues without overlap until (44). In (45), InL leaves a 1.3s pause after concluding the TCU in (44), which gives the impression of a concluded turn. InM uses this TRP to start a TCU in (46), 0.8 seconds into InL's pause. The transition from InL to InM from (44) to (46) has all the hallmarks of a smooth handover: InM lets InL conclude, even waits for 0.8 seconds, and then starts to speak with measured diction and a leisurely pace. This makes InL's "let me finish" in (52) sound somewhat gratuitous and misplaced, especially since InL's own "the next day" in (48) is an interruption of InM's TCU "misses LePen you're not talking about the sa:me: (.) sss- subject" which occurs 0.5 seconds after InM's turn was initiated. InM continues unperturbed and concludes the turn in (55). The following handovers to InL in (58) and back to InM in (81) are both smooth and without conflict, each facilitated by a brief transitional pause. The transition in (88) would also have been smooth, were it not for InM's TCU extension in "[...] shows=that you are not prepared well prepared". The addition of "well prepared" leads to a very brief instant of conflict as it latches on to the beginning of InL's turn, which is followed by an unnaturally long (1.5s) pause by both participants in (89).

The overlap caused by InM's interjection in (39) is resolved without resolution devices as mentioned above. It is nonetheless followed by post-resolution disfluencies in (40)-(43) - "I have (.) the: (.) decision". InL's interference in (52) coincides with a stutter in InM's production "sss- subject". In (62)-(64), InL's production is briefly unintelligible due to disfluencies "you! granted (x) whereas they were rev-(xx) (-ffing)". This faulty output coincides with InL starting to gain a sense of urgency, which gives a first inkling of the outbreak that is to follow. The tone of both interpreters has so far been neutral, but in (67) InL levels up to unmistakably competitive production with "THE REA!LITY WHY:! DON'T you just ACCEPT! IT=ACCEPT IT THAT'S WHAT YOU DO! (0.2) BE:ST=u:h (0.5)". InL raises his voice and uses intonation and diction to convey agitation and outrage. This forceful style of delivery continues with some variation until (80) for a total of 8.9 seconds of competitive non-overlapping production from InL. InM's response in measured solo production contrasts with this display of emotions; in (88) InL has also returned to a much calmer delivery.

4.3.3 Excerpt 3 – Comparative Analysis

[2]

	...	4 [00:04.8]	5 [00:06.0]6 [00:06.3]
M	groupe Vivendi qui l'a vendu=	ne dites pas de bê:TI:SES!(0.3)	vous en dites
InM	we respect! private.prop(e'ty).it's. the.uh Vivendi group that sold	SFR (.) so	

[3]

	..	7 [00:07.3]
M	beaucoup= ça n'est qu'une! des bêtises (..) que (.) vous avez proférées (d'puis tout à l	
InM	(.) you're ma- making a lot of uh mistakes! (.) uh	

[4]

	..	8 [00:10.1]	9 [00:11.9]	10 [00:12.7]
L			(mais) votr' prédeces seur il voulait	
M	'heur') mais surtout! (.) ça ne fait pas avancer le pays:		(mais)	
InM	uhh you (.) have been (0.2) (ah-) and it doesn't uh help the country			

[5]

	..	11 [00:14.3] 12 [00:14.6]	13 [00:15.7]	14 [00:16.0]15 [00:17.6]
L	p a s ? l e vendre			
M		mais personne ne voulait la vendre (ça prend') simplement		
InM	to mo!ve on	(1.1) NO!body wanted to sell SFR(0.3)		

Segment (9) “(mais) votr' prédecesseur il voulait pas? le vendre” is the first occurrence of ST overlap in this excerpt. It is omitted entirely in the TT. In the ST, the terminal overlap of “(mais)” and “pays” in (9) is resolved quickly (under 0.2 seconds), but 0.7 seconds later M engages in overlap again to react to LP’s mention of “votr' prédecesseur” by interjecting “(mais)” in (10). M reacts to LP’s comment even before she has finished uttering “prédeces-”. This interjection is not placed near a TRP; it serves the purpose of extending MA’s claim to the turn space by announcing that M intends to continue once L has finished her question. L concludes swiftly, and M continues with another “mais” in (12), this time clear of overlap.

The TT recording provides little insight into why InL omits the *prédecesseur* segment in (9). The ST segment is intelligible and InL is offered an ideal TRP opportunity during the transitional pause in (11). However, during this 1.1 second TT pause, which is also the pause between the end of LP’s turn in (11) and the start of InM’s turn in (13), the interactants become aware that M will continue to claim the turn space in the ST. The first indication of this appears in (11) and it becomes evident 0.3 seconds later in (12) when M initiates his turn. This means that InL is aware that InM will have to continue, which may have informed his choice to omit the segment and avoid overlap.

[7]

	18 [00:20.3]19 [00:21.2]20 [00:21.5]21 [00:21.5]	22 [00:23.8]
L	OOOOOH: OUI! je vais vous r'trouver ça	
M	oui cherchez dans votr'=dossier vous sauriez bien (..) le vérifier=mais	
InM	by private capital (0.2)	look! in your fi:les look in your files

[8]

	23 [00:23.9]	24 [00:24.3]	25 [00:26.0]
L	immédiatement et vous allez (voir) que vous êtes en difficultés (une fois de plus)		
M	allez-y	parce QUE (..) parce qu- mais non mais j-	(0.9)
InL	yes! I'll find that for you immediately		(3.0)
InM			(3.0)

[9]

	26 [00:26.9]	27 [00:28.3*]	28 [00:29.0]	29 [00:29.9]
L	JANVIER DEUX MILLE QUINZE devant l'			
M	je connais! je connais un peu les dossiers			
InL			JAN:uary=twenty fifteen before	
InM			I know! the files (.) very well (xx)	

[10]

	30 [00:30.9]	31 [00:31.1]32 [00:32.0]33 [00:32.3]
L	assemblée J'AI! (0.9) pris la decision (.) pour Alstom vous avez dit que (à) Du-	
M		
InL	parliament	

Looking at the TT alone, the long three-second TRP pause from (25) to (28) could seem awkward and unnatural, were it not for the fact that the primary level exchange is also audible in the recording. The sense of confusion conveyed by the ST-level overlap, start/stopping and sudden raise of the voice by L in “JANVIER DEUX MILLE QUINZE” is clearly audible during the TT pauses on the broadcast version of the interpretation. The interpreters are uncertain as to who should claim the turn space because this has not yet been negotiated on the primary level. This spawns confusion on the TT level, as InL omits ST segment (24) and (25) “et vous allez (voir) que vous êtes en difficultés (une fois de plus)” completely, opting for a 3.0s pause instead. Even once LP’s peremptory “JANVIER DEUX MILLE QUINZE” has resolved the uncertainty in the ST, the pause in the TT continues for another 1.6 seconds, despite (or perhaps because) of the fact that the ST is (over?)loaded with high-conflictuality content, i.e. high-quality infotainment content which the interpreters should be relaying.

InM has been silent since (22), waiting until the extended competitive ST overlap has been resolved. In (24), where InL fails to render LP’s “et vous allez (voir) que vous êtes en difficultés”, InM omits MA’s utterance “parce QUE (..) parce qu- mais non mais j-” on the same beats. InM’s omission could be either due to overlap-induced unintelligibility or a deliberate decision, since MA’s utterance does not convey factual information and gives the

interpreter little to work with. After the 0.9s pause in (25), M makes another attempt to take control with “je connais! je connais un peu les dossiers” in (26), this time without overlap at the beginning, which InM renders swiftly. The terminal overlap between ST segment (26) and (27) does not lead to disruption in the TT. The terminal overlap is reproduced, even though the ST overlap is more intrusive since it occurs clear of any TRP, in the middle of MA’s utterance “je connais un peu-“, whereas the TT overlap onset dovetails neatly with the TRP in the micropause at the end of “I know the files (.)” and would have produced a smooth transition had InM not added the extension “very well (xx)”. The noise “(xx)” seems to be of a more respiratory than communicative nature, but the fact that it is audible means that it extends InM’s occupancy of the turn space further into InL’s utterance, which ends abruptly 0.5 seconds later in (30) due to the lack of input caused by the 0.9s pause in the ST, discussed below in more detail.

[10]	30 [00:30.9]	31 [00:31.1]32 [00:32.0]33 [00:32.3]
L	assemblée J'AI! (0.9) pris la decision (.) pour Alstom vous avez dit que (à) Du-	
M		
InL	parliament (1.9)	

[11]	...	34 [00:33.0]35 [00:35.9]
L	monsieur Dupond-Aignan c'est pas moi	
M	mais (on) parle d'Alstom?	
InL	Aaay!! took the decision for Alstom you said to	

[12]	...	36 [00:36.7]37 [00:37.1]38 [00:37.7]39 [00:38.0]
L	jan:vier! deux mille quinze devant l'assemblée J'AI	
M	(ou de SFR:)	
InL	mister Dupond-Aignan=it's (on me) january twenty fifteen (be)fore	
InM	(are we) talking about Alstom or	

[13]	...	40 [00:39.9]41 [00:40.0]	42 [00:41.4]
L	pris la decision de permettre à General Electric de rentrer dans (Alstom)		
M	mais voilà (mais xxx		
InL	parliament I have (.) the: (.) de(.)cision to allow G::E:: to take a stake in		
InM	SFR		

[14]	...	43 [00:42.2]	44 [00:44.3]45 [00:45.0]46 [00:45.1]47 [00:45.4]
L	J'AI moi personnellement le lenDEMAIN: le		
M	xx) ma- madame le pen vous ne parlez pas du même suJET:: (0.3) vous		
InL	Alsom=I=personally (3.3)		
InM	misses LePen		

LP's 0.9s pause in (31) is a deliberate pause for effect. It is part of a complex and powerful resolution device deployed by L which consists of multiple components: it is initiated by "JANVIER DEUX MILLE QUINZE" in (27), continued by "J'AI" in (31), reinforced by the 0.9s pause in (31) and then invoked again with "J'AI" in (39) and "J'AI moi personnellement" in (43). The inception of this communicational device in (27)-(31) is akin to a technique a schoolteacher might use, who, instead of telling class to be quiet directly, simply raises their voice to drown out any chit-chat and then pauses to confirm that everyone is paying attention before continuing to read, thus communicating to those unwilling to behave that they are holding up everyone else and that the class has more important things to do. All of this is underpinned by the fact that L has announced that she is reading a quote from an official document, which adds a layer of authority. This structure is in large part reproduced by InL: the peremptory tone, the insistence in both "JAN:uary" in (29) and "Aaay!!" in (34), the pause, and most of the following highly technical content are reproduced to a remarkable degree of faithfulness, despite the combined difficulty of density, speed, proper names, numbers and the speaker flitting back and forth mid-sentence between reading and speaking freely to produce incomplete sentences, all of which occur within 11 seconds (29)-(41) in the ST. One difference between ST and TT however is the placement of the pause: LP's pause is placed after "J'AI", whereas InL's pause comes before "Aaay!!". This changes the effect and function of the respective pauses – L interrupts her own raised voice mid-sentence to create a dramatic effect, while InL pauses to listen for content. InL also stops abruptly mid-sentence, but his voice is neutral, which makes the pause seem less deliberate. The raised voice comes afterwards, but InL's insistence after a lengthy pause and without opposition from the competitor sounds like unwarranted competitive production due to a misplaced resolution device and more awkward than authoritative.

In the ST, M briefly interjects with "mais (on) parle d'Alstom?" in (35) and "(ou de SFR:)" in (36). This does not produce competitive overlap in the ST; only the second part in (36) overlaps very briefly with LP's output. In the TT, however, InM's entire rendition of this message "(are we) talking about Alstom or SFR" overlaps with InL, who at the time of overlap onset is in the middle of a number, "twenty fifteen", which is clearly not a TRP. This overlap triggers post-resolution hitches in InL's production as well as a grammatical error/missing verb in "I have (.) the: (.) de(.)cision to allow G::E::". These disfluencies and indeed this entire instance of conflictual overlap in (39) arise entirely from within the TT and have no equivalent in the ST. This may be a sign of cognitive overload, which may be caused at least in part by the overlap in and of itself, since InL is listening to MA, L and InM at the same time, while

monitoring his own output – this means he is effectively listening to or at least exposed to four distinct but simultaneously occurring instances of speech production.

[14]

	..	43 [00:42.2]	44 [00:44.3]45 [00:45.0]46 [00:45.1]47 [00:45.4]
L		J'AI moi personnellement le lenDEMAIN:	le
M	xx) ma- madame Le Pen vous ne parlez pas du même suJET:: (0.3)		vous
InL	Alsom=I=personally	(3.3)	
InM			misses LePen

[15]

	48 [00:45.6]	49 [00:46.3]50 [00:47.4]	51 [00:48.2]52 [00:48.5]
L	LEN-	(xxx) laissez-moi terminer (.) le lendemain du	
M	parlez d'Alstom et d'General Elec tri:que		mais donc nos citoyens
InL	the next day		let me finish
InM	you're not talking about the sa:me: (.) sss- subject you're talking about General		

[16]

	.. 53 [00:49.4]	54 [00:49.55 [00:49.5]	56 [00:50.4]57 [00:50.9]58 [00:51.0]59 [00:51.3]	60 [00:52.7]
L	débat (avec) monsieur Montebourg (0.4)		vous! (.) avez accordé(0.2)	
M	méritent mieux qu' ça:::			
InL			the day after mister Montebourg left	
InM	Electric	and Alstom		

[17]

	61 [00:52.9]	62 [00:53.6]	63 [00:54.4]	64 [00:54.7]	65 [00:55.9]66 [00:56.0]
L	alors qu'il le refusait(0.3)		la vente de SFR (0.1)	ET.C'	
InL	you! granted(x) whereas they were ref- (ee) -ving			the sa!le of SFR!	

[18]

	..	67 [00:57.3]68 [00:57.8]
L	EST.LA.RÉALITÉ.POURQUOI!.VOUS.L'ASSUMEZ.PA:S? ASSUMEZ-LE!	
M		(je l'assume)
InL		that's the reality why:

As the effectiveness of LP's "J'AI" resolution device discussed above starts to wear off in (42) and shows little effect in (43), L pairs it with another repetition device which revolves around the word "lendemain". On the content level, both are related in that "J'AI" emphasises the involvement and agency of Emmanuel Macron in the sale of SFR/Alstom, which insinuates culpability, and "lendemain" points to the immediacy of his action, which Marine Le Pen construes as indicative of ruthlessness. On the turn-structural level, the relevant aspect is LP's triple (partial) repetition of "lendemain" in (44), (48) and (52), with the voice raised to varying degrees. L uses this in combination with the direct address "(xxx) laissez-moi terminer" to accuse M of uncivilized behaviour and ruthlessness also within the debate. This entire dynamic

is lost in the TT. InL does render it as “the next day“ in (48), but as an isolated fragment which does not do justice to the forceful nature of the original and seems disconnected from the “the day after” in (58). Both “the next day“ and “let me finish” lack force compared to the original; more importantly, the beat-based structure of the overlapping original has been both reversed and turned into a sequence with alternating turns in the TT. This means that InL’s “let me finish” is out of place in three distinct ways: figuratively, since it is unjustified, within the turn sequence, since the placement is not apposite, and within the beat structure, since it occurs clear of overlap. The TT has a clear turn structure: in (42) InL creates an obvious TRP in the form of a 3.3s pause; InM takes over in (46), 2.9 seconds into this TRP, after a smooth handover. It is InL who interrupts InM with “the next day” in (48), InL’s “let me finish” is thus uncalled for. The ST, on the other hand, does not feature this alternating turn structure. Both contestants have been talking simultaneously since (42), and indeed L has not relinquished the turn space since (27), which is why she can credibly claim ownership of this turn. In the TT, InL has forfeited this claim due to the 2.9s pause in (43).

Justified or not, LP’s “laissez-moi terminer” fails to have the desired effect: M does not even let L finish the word “terminer” before interjecting “mais donc nos citoyens méritent mieux qu' ça:::”. This utterance is produced in complete overlap in the ST. It is completely omitted in the TT, despite this segment being intelligible in the recording, considerably simpler on the content-level than InL’s technical text, as well as emphasised by the derisively drawn out “ça:::” and a gesture where M raises both hands (Figure 2), which has no accompanying message for TT viewers.



FIGURE 1, SOURCE: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=iOAbBdlWgz0&t=774s>

This omission allows InM to avoid overlap with the TCU that InL started in (58).

Throughout this passage, the ST is rife with extended competitive overlap which impedes intelligibility. InL dominated the turn space in segments (29) to (42). From (43) to

(66) this is no longer the case – InL’s production is suddenly characterised by long silences and incoherent/incomplete utterances such as “the next day“ or “you! granted (x) whereas they were ref- (ee) -ving” which no longer communicate a strong message. InM, on the other hand, occupies a larger share of the turn space and controls it from (46) to (55). The ST does not call for such a change in turn space distribution. InL’s sudden lack of resolve may be due to challenges/overlap in the ST or temporary exhaustion after the considerable effort in the previous segment, but the result is a new and orderly turn-taking structure which does not reflect the chaotic overlap of the ST.

4.4 Excerpt 4

4.4.1 Excerpt 4 – Source Text

[28]	..	95 [01:31.9]	96 [01:33.5]
M	fait à la fois des turbines et (0.2) du matériel industriel (c'est) pas		
[29]	..	97 [01:34.3]	98 [01:35.1]99 [01:35.5]
L	(vous savez) tout vendre vous	vous savez tout vendre le seul	
M	la même chose (vous êtes) d'accord?	voilà donc (xxx xxx xx xxx xxx)	
[30]	..	100 [01:36.5]101 [01:37.3]	102 [01:39.0] 103 [01:39.3]
L	problème c'est que vous savez tout vendre mais pas au bénéfice (0.2)	des intérêts	
M	moi je défends	moi je défends	
[31]	..	104 [01:40.0]	105 [01:41.0*]
L	nationaux		
M	et vous avez cité un cas la lutte contre le chômage elle suppose des réformes en		

As mentioned in the previous section, M speaks uninterrupted for 17.8 seconds from (89) to (96), lecturing L on the functioning of the companies she had been reading about from her dossiers. LP’s face bears a sneer throughout this explanation until her sardonic riposte “(vous savez) tout vendre” in (97), with which L claims she has once again exposed M as the unscrupulous salesman she has been accusing him of being all along. (97) is a TRP which could have produced a smooth handover after MA’s “(c’est) pas la même chose”, but L continues unperturbed when overlap ensues as M extends his turn with “(vous êtes) d’accord”. Indeed, she quickly levels up to competitive production, striking a strident tone and raising her voice, with prominent disfluencies in the form of a triple repetition of “vous savez tout vendre” in

(97), (99) and (101), deployed over the course of 4 seconds and reinforced by the self-interruption in (99). This resolution device is powerful enough to destabilise MA, who is drowned out acoustically by L in (99) and is manifestly reeling for 3.5 seconds from (100) to (104), where his insistence wavers and he pauses before he tries to reassert himself with the repetition of “moi je défends” in (101) and (102).

[32]	.. 106 [01:42.1]107 [01:43.5]108 [01:44.0] 109 [01:45.2]110 [01:45.7]111 [01:46.6]
L	(xx)
M	profondeur(0.5) ('s=savez) parce que vous pouvez aller: (0.5) re:mue:r (.) les

[33]	112 [01:46.8]113 [01:47.1]114 [01:47.4] 115 [01:49.1]116 [01:49.3*]
L	loi El KhomRI: (.) dérégulation!: (.) dérèglement des professions
M	choses
H2	Marine Le Pen

[34]	.. 117 [01:51.1] 118 [01:51.5*]119 [01:51.7] 120 [01:52.7]121 [01:53.3]
L	(0.4) c'est ce que vous voulez faire! monsieur Macron
M	non mais madame Le Pen ne veut pas faire un

[35]	.. 122 [01:53.9]123 [01:54.0] 124 [01:54.4] 125 [01:54.9]126 [01:55.2]
M	débat sur le fond= c'est.pas.GRAVE (0.2) elle veut parler du
H2	=on a compris vos (xxx sur ce dossier xxx xxx)

[36]	.. 127 [01:55.9] 128 [01:56.9] 129 [01:57.4]
L	(non mais) c'est intéressant (de) parler de la déréglementation des (professions
M	passé (.) moi ce que je dis (0.6) ce! que! (.) ce! (.) ce.DONT nous
H2	on va-

[37]	.. 130 [01:58.2]131 [02:00.1]132 [02:00.3] 133 [02:00.9]134 [02:01.1] 135 [02:02.3]
L	xxx xxx)
M	avons besoin(0.2) aujourd'hui (0.2) je.l'ai.dit c'est de la simplicité(0.2) pour

MA's speed starts to decrease after (106). The pauses in (107) and (109) contribute to this, as well as the drawn-out vowel sounds in (108) and in (110), which are particularly noticeable since M finishes his turn with the unfinished sounding “re:mue:r (.) les choses”. The handover in (112)-(114) occurs after a 0.6s pause without conflict, however it is unclear whether M yields deliberately or simply relinquishes his intention to continue as L starts to speak in (114). L launches into a bullet-point-style list of accusations, but she is interrupted by the moderator H2 in (116), who raises his hand and addresses L with “Marine Le Pen”, in an attempt to get her

to stop and let the moderators take over. L ignores H2 and continues indifferently. 2.2 seconds later however, M engages in overlap with L in (118) – but instead of addressing L directly, as he has been doing consistently for the past minutes, M suddenly addresses H2 and refers to L in the third person: “madame Le Pen ne veut pas faire un débat sur le fond”. By subsequently refraining from any extension of this turn in (123), M instigates speaker selection and successfully hands over to H2 before L is able to react. H2 starts with “=on a compris vos” and faces immediate resistance from MA, who engages in overlap with H2 in (124). H2 continues with “(xxx sur ce dossier xxx xxx)”, but he is drowned out by MA. M briefly acknowledges H2’s existence by looking at him in (122), but then shifts his focus away from him and towards the camera. MA’s “c’est.pas.GRAVE” in (124) is not a reaction to H2’s input; M is responding to his own “madame Le Pen ne veut pas faire un débat “. As of (124), MA’s tone and indifference towards the fact that H2 is speaking also indicate that he is now no longer speaking to L or H2. M has at this point extended the situational dimension beyond his exchange with L and indeed the television studio and is speaking to the audience at home. He does so in solo production, because he has moved onto a communicational plane on which neither L nor the moderators exist. L attempts to compete in overlapping speech in (127), but yields after 2.3 seconds to MA’s heavy disfluencies, which he deploys in (129). During this overlap between M and LP, M makes a 0.6 second pause in (128), during which H2 makes another feeble and unsuccessful attempt to reinstate order by interrupting L with “on va-”. Both L and M ignore H2 completely, M continues the turn he has initiated and the overlap between L and M is resolved as L stops and M takes over in (132). H2 does not reattempt to intervene until (145), 15.6 seconds later.

[38]

..	137 [02:04.2]138 [02:04.5]	139 [02:05.2]140 [02:05.5]	141 [02:06.3]
M	les TPEpeu les TPE PME (0.3) c'est ce que je propose(0.3) on a BESOIN (0.6)		

[39]

	142 [02:06.9]	143 [02:08.5]144 [02:09.0]
M	d'avoir beaucoup plus de pragmatisme (0.4) et on a besoin d'avoir une politique en	

[40]

..	145 [02:12.5]	146 [02:12.9]
M	faveur de l'investissement (.) privé et publique=	
H2	=Emmanuel Macron=c'est	

[41]

..	147 [02:14.9]148 [02:15.1]	149 [02:16.5]
M	indi!spensable pour lutter contre le chômage (0.2) (et) il n'y a pas de fatalité(.)	

[42]

	150 [02:16.6]	151 [02:18.4]152 [02:18.8]153 [02:19.0]
M	vous ne proposez rien! pour lutter contre le chômage RRIEN	
H2	(j'vais v'donner)	
[43]	..	154 [02:19.5*] 155 [02:20.2]156 [02:20.4*] 157 [02:21.2] 158 [02:21.5]
M	vous proposez! (0.2) d'aller chercher de manière= très	
H2	l'occasion! =Marine Le Pen	
[44]	..	159 [02:23.5] 160 [02:24.4]161 [02:24.7]
L	mon sieur Ma cron	
M	approximative dans des dossier que vous ne connaissez pas! des CAS (.)	
H2	Marine	
[45]	..	162 [02:25.1]163 [02:25.6] 164 [02:26.0]165 [02:26.7] 166 [02:27.7]167 [02:27.9]
M	mais MOI je propose de créer de l'emploi pour les indépendants (0.2) les TPE PME	
H2	Le Pen je propo-	
[46]	168 [02:29.1]169 [02:29.3]	170 [02:30.2]
M	(0.2) les entreprises de tair- de taille intermediaire (0.2) et les (grandes groupes)	
H2	je vous propo:se de faire- (0.2)	
[47]	171 [02:31.7]	
H2	je.propose.(j'ste)ment.de.faire.des.propositions maintenant!.sur.un.sujet.qui.intéresse.	
[48]	..	
H2	. b e a u c o u p . d e . f r a n ç a i s [...]	

L makes a very brief attempt to regain the floor in (159), but apart from this, L lets M speak uninterrupted until the end of this passage. The passage ends in (170), where H2 is able to take back control and give the exchange a new direction and structure by introducing a new topic. H2 launches his first attempt to intervene in (116), but he is faced with a blatant display of increasingly overt disregard for the moderator's authority by L and M over the following until (170). Within this timeframe of 40.9 seconds, H2 initiates seven fruitless attempts to take the floor in (116), (123), (128), (145), (153), (157) and (161). All seven occur in TRPs, which means H2 is giving the presidential candidates the possibility to hand over smoothly without losing face. All are dismissed. H2's following attempts in (123), (145), (153), (157) are initiated clear of overlap, which indicates that H2 has claimed and taken rightful ownership of the respective turn, which is then forcibly wrested from him by MA, who dominates this passage.

M and L have differing reactions to H2's various attempts to intervene:

- (116) is simply ignored by LP, as discussed above
- (123) is briefly acknowledged on the content level but then cut short and overridden by M after 0.4 seconds
- (128) is not acknowledged on the content level, but is followed by a marked disfluency on the turn-taking level: “ce! que! (.) ce! (.) ce.DONT nous avons besoin”, probably triggered by the overlap with LP, but forcing H2 to back down
- (145) is ignored on all levels, M continues in solo production
- (153) is followed by a slight increase in the urgency of MA's production plus micropause “vous proposez! (0.2)”, before M continues in solo production
- (157) is ignored on all levels, M continues in solo production
- (161) is ignored on all levels, M continues in solo production.

During these attempts, H2 alternates between directly addressing L (in (116), (157) and (161)) and M (in (145)), using their respective names, as well as both of them indirectly (in (123), (128) and (153)), using general statements. H2 addresses L more frequently, despite the fact that M is speaking most of the time.

4.4.2 Excerpt 4 – Target Text

[20]	..	95 [01:31.9]	96 [01:33.5]
InL			
InM	makes tur!bines and indus!trial		
[21]	..	97 [01:34.3]	98 [01:35.1]99 [01:35.5]
InL	you! can!		
InM	equipment it isn't the same sec tor (0.2) you're mixing the two sectors		
[22]	102 [01:39.0]103 [01:39.3]104 [01:40.0]		
InL	SELL! EVERYTHING the only problem is that you can sell everything but		
[23]	..	105 [01:41.0*]106 [01:42.1]	
InL	not=to=the=benefit=of=the=national interest (0.5)		
InM	FIGHTing against		
[24]	107 [01:43.5]	108 [01:44.0]	109 [01:45.2]110 [01:45.7]
InM	unemployment call!s for in:-depth reforms(0.3) you! ca!::n shake things		

[25]

	115 [01:49.1]	116 [01:49.3*]	117 [01:51.1]	118 [01:51.5*]	119 [01:51.7]	120 [01:52.7]
InL	El Khomri law de:regula: tion! et cetera that's what you want to do					
InM	u::p (0.9)					

[26]

	122 [01:53.9]	123 [01:54.0]	124 [01:54.4]	125 [01:54.9]	126 [01:55.2]	127 [01:55.9]
InM	Madame Le Pen doesn't want to talk about substan tive matters she wants to					

In terms of overlap and handovers, there is little to report in this TT excerpt. There are only four handovers in total, found in (100), (106), (115) and (172), all of which occur swiftly and without extended overlap. Indeed, the two only instances of overlap in the ST are both micro-instances of unproblematic terminal overlap during handover, 0.2 seconds in (100) and 0.1 seconds in (115). InL deploys an overbearing and unwarranted barrage of post-onset resolution mechanisms from (100) onwards. In “you! can! SELL! EVERYTHING”, his voice is raised and he goes on to produce what sounds like a nonsensical message with “the only problem is that you can sell everything”. This is in truth a self-interruption/new sentence after “that”, but the intonation makes it sound like a single nonsensical sentence. This effect is reinforced by the raised voice and intensity of the statement, all of which make it sound very deliberate in its entirety. The statement is followed by the noticeably rushed passage “not=to=the=benefit=of=the=national interest”, after which InL yields without having been challenged. The ensuing 0.5s pause leads to a smooth handover to InM. Despite this unproblematic handover, InM starts by raising his voice in (106). InM’s subsequent segments are dotted with disfluencies, which become more noticeable towards (111) with “you! ca!::n shake things” and especially in the drawn-out vowel sound in “u::p” in (115). This disfluency seems oddly incongruent, an effect which is reinforced by the fact that InM stops speaking immediately after “u::p”, pauses, and then starts an entirely new turn in (122). Handover in (122) again occurs without conflict or overlap, facilitated by a transitional pause.

[27]

	128 [01:56.9]	129 [01:57.4]	130 [01:58.2]	131 [02:00.1]	132 [02:00.3]	133 [02:00.9]	134 [02:01.1]	135 [02:02.3]	136 [02:02.5]
InM	talk about the past (1.6) What we need today (0.3) a:nd I say- is								

[28]

	137 [02:04.2]	138 [02:04.5]	139 [02:05.2]	140 [02:05.5]	141 [02:06.3]	142 [02:06.9]
InM	simpli!city (.) for small and medium size ent'prise=I propose we: need (.) to					

[29]

	143 [02:08.5]	144 [02:09.0]	145 [02:12.5]
InM	h:ave more pragmatism we need to have a policy in favour of in vest!ment! (0.7)		

[30]	..	147 [02:14.9]148 [02:15.1]	149 [02:16.5]150 [02:16.6]	151 [02:18.4]
InM	this is indispensable to	fight against unemployment there	i:s no errr: fatality	
[31]	152 [02:18.8]153 [02:19.0]154 [02:19.5*]155 [02:20.2]156 [02:20.4*]	157 [02:21.2]	158 [02:21.5]	
InM	(.)	err: (0.8)	you are not proposing any: thing to fight against	
[32]	..	159 [02:23.5]	160 [02:24.4]161 [02:24.7]	162 [02:25.1]163 [02:25.6]
InM	err unemployment your knowledge of	the files is very	approximative	
[33]	165 [02:26.7]	166 [02:27.7]	167 [02:27.9]168 [02:29.1]	169 [02:29.3]170 [02:30.2]
InM	I: propose to create jobs (.) for self-employed people and SME:!	s (0.4) and large		
[34]	..	172 [02:34.6]173 [02:35.3]		
InM	companies (1.4)			
InH	I'd=like=to=hear	your suggestions on something that concerns the		
[35]	..	174 [02:37.3]175 [02:37.5]		
InH	French people			

InM continues uninterrupted until (171). During this stint, InM displays disfluencies which arise from difficulties in the ST – consequently they will be discussed in the comparative analysis. In (171), InM hands over smoothly to InH via a prominent 1.4s pause, after which InH takes over and directs the debate towards a new topic.

4.4.3 Excerpt 4 – Comparative Analysis

[32]	..	100 [01:36.5]101 [01:37.3]		
L	tout vendre le seul problème c'est que	vous savez tout vendre mais pas au bénéfice		
M	xxx xx xxx xxx)	moi je défends		
InL		you! can! SELL! EVERYTHING the only problem		
InM	you're mixing the two sectors			
[33]	102 [01:39.0]	103 [01:39.3]	104 [01:40.0]	105 [01:41.0*]
L	(0.2)	des intérêts natio naux		
M	moi je dé fends	et vous avez cité un cas la lutte contre le chômage elle		
InL	is that you can sell everything but not=to=the=benefit=of=the=national interest			

[34]

	..	106 [01:42.1]	107 [01:43.5]108 [01:44.0]
M		suppose des réformes en profondeur (0.5) (s=savez) parce que vous pouve:z	
InL		(0.5)	
InM		FIGHTing against unemployment call's for in:-depth	

[35]

	..	109 [01:45.2]110 [01:45.7]	111 [01:46.6]112 [01:46.8]113 [01:47.1]114 [01:47.4]	115 [01:49.1]
L		(xx)	loi El KhomRI: (.) déregulation!:(.)	
M		aller:(0.5) re:mue:r (.) les choses (0.3)		
InL				El
InM		reforms(0.3) you! ca!::n	shake things u::p (0.9)	

When observing the TT alone, the lack of turn competition stands in contrast to the presence and prominence of the deployed resolution devices as well as the turn-structure and pauses, all of which would be characteristic of highly competitive interaction. Both InL and InM seem to be working against some kind of invisible resistance and the TT seems oddly incongruent because there is little trace of the ST-level conflict from which the speakers' difficulties arise. The heavy disfluencies both InL and InM deploy from (100) to (109) are indicative of a conflictual exchange, but they sound excessive and theatrical or artificial due to the lack of any turn conflict or overlap.

When observing ST and TT together, some of the reasons for this incongruence within the TT become evident. At the same time, however, certain differences and distortions between original and interpretation also become evident, many of which stem from context rather than cotext and cannot be explained by a comparative analysis of the textual elements alone.

One observation is that the TT's lack of intratextual coherence is indeed rooted in the ST, but the interpreters reinforce and reframe it, thus imbuing the TT with a different quality and structure on the turn level. In the ST, the constant and highly competitive overlap and turn competition is indicative of how M and L are locked in a fight for survival and must overcome their opponent before they can clearly communicate a message. The message will come once the battle has been fought out and decided, which is why incongruence is acceptable. It also explains why they are not exchanging turns as conversational convention would usually have it. The incongruence in the ST is thus warranted by the belligerent character of the interaction, which is also reflected in the turn structure, or rather the lack thereof. In the TT however, the transitions are clear-cut and generously spaced out with noticeable pauses, and there is a complete lack of overlap. This eliminates the notion of fight and survival entirely. Both speakers seem to be speaking unchallenged by a conflict-averse opponent, and as such they

have little reason to diverge from normal conversational conduct and intertextual congruence on the informational level. The difference in turn transitions not only detracts from the conflictual nature, it also adds to the incongruence within the TT, thus provoking a shift from the visceral to the theatrical wherever disfluencies do occur. As a result, the distorted turn structure makes the interpreters' performance seem bumbling and awkward, and at odds with the rapacious scramble for dominance which characterises the ST.

In some instances the interpreters deliberately attempt to incorporate the intensity of the original into their performance. A case in point is InM's set of prominent disfluencies from (110) to (115) in "you! ca!::n shake things u::p (0.9)". As discussed in the TT analysis, it seems out of place in the TT. Comparison with the ST shows that this is a rendition of MA's "vous pouve:z aller: (0.5) re:mue:r (.) les choses", which also features heavy disfluencies. InM is thus not only rendering the message to a fair degree of accuracy, he is faithful to the original even in tone. The problem is that this tone is not naturally embedded in the TT because the conflictual context is lacking, which is why it feels out of place. Here, the interpreter sounds overbearing rather than bumbling, but the insistence of the utterance cannot have the intended effect because what it is designed to resist is not there – the competitor it is supposed to drown out is not competing.

[37]

	120 [01:52.7]	121 [01:53.3]	122 [01:53.9]	123 [01:54.0]	124 [01:54.4]
L	Macron				
M	Le Pen ne veut pas faire un débat sur le fond=				
H2	=on a compris vos (xxx sur ce dossier				
InL	what you want to do				
InM	Madame Le Pen doesn't want				

[38]

	125 [01:54.9]	126 [01:55.2]	127 [01:55.9]	128 [01:56.9]	129 [01:57.4]
L	(non mais) c'est intéressant (de) parler de la				
M	(0.2)	elle veut parler du passé (.) moi ce que je dis			ce! que!
H2	xxx	xxx)		on va-	
InM	to talk	about substan	tive matters she wants to	talk about the past	

[39]

	130 [01:58.2]	131 [02:00.1]	132 [02:00.3]	133 [02:00.9]	134 [02:01.1]
L	déreglementation des (professions xxx xxx)				
M	(.) ce! (.) ce.DONT nous avons besoin	(0.2)	aujourd'hui (0.2)	je.l'ai.dit c'	
InM	(1.6)	W h a t	we need	today	(0.3) a:nd I

InM and InL produce a series of disfluencies and omissions within this and the following excerpts, some of which arise from interpreting-related challenges on the textual or content level of the ST, others stem from problems the interpreters are confronted with on the turn

level. The focus here is on the latter, even if the levels cannot be dissociated entirely. In (123), H2 makes an attempt to take the floor with “=on a compris vos (xxx sur ce dossier xxx xxx)”, an utterance which is over one second long and initiated clear of overlap. The TT does not feature the utterance nor indeed any involvement of H2, which is due to a confluence of factors. Moreover, InL has just handed over to InM in (122), meaning an additional turn transition/overlap in the TT would complicate matters. In the ST, M violently overrides H2 after 0.4 seconds, which is considerably less than InM time lag of 2.2 seconds in (122). Consequently, InH does not have the time to wait for InL to finish and use the subsequent TRP to initiate his utterance in the TT before observing that M establishes clear dominance over H2 in the ST, which means that InM should also be dominant in the TT. InH would thus have to initiate an utterance in the knowledge that it should be almost immediately superseded by a dominant InM. This can only work if he can reliably expect InM to intervene immediately, which, as the transcript shows, is not the case, since the rapid exchange between M and L is not reproduced, even when H/InH is removed from the equation. MA’s “c'est.pas.GRAVE”, which he uses to silence and override H2, is also omitted in the TT. Interestingly, these two omissions cancel each other out and reinstate consistency within the TT: had only one of either H2’s “on a compris” or MA’s “c'est.pas.GRAVE” been reproduced, the counterpart would have been missing, which may have stood out as another instance of TT incongruence.

LP’s utterance starting in (127) “(non mais) c’est intéressant (de) parler de la déreglementation des (professions xxx xxx)” is also omitted entirely. The same goes for H2’s attempt to take the floor during this utterance in (128). In the ST, L initiates this turn as M is in the middle of a sentence, but M is able to drown her out with a barrage of heavy disfluencies: “ce! que! (.) ce! (.) ce.DONT nous avons besoin”, upon which L yields and M is able to continue. InL does not even attempt to take the floor. InM is thus able to speak unchallenged but then suddenly stops at the end of (129), despite the fact that M continues uninterrupted. Indeed, all three interpreters hesitate to take the floor, and a 1.6 second pause ensues as they wait for resolution of the ST-level conflict, because the overlap produced by MA, L and H2 from (128) to (130) makes the ST difficult to interpret or even understand.

[39]

	..	130 [01:58.2]	131 [02:00.1]	132 [02:00.3]	133 [02:00.9]	134 [02:01.1]
L	déreglementation des (professions xxx xxx)					
M	(.) ce! (.) ce.DONT nous avons besoin	(0.2)	aujourd'hui (0.2)	je.l'ai.dit c'		
InM	(1.6)	W h a t	we	need	today	(0.3) a:nd I

[40]

..	135 [02:02.3]	136 [02:02.5]	137 [02:04.2]	138 [02:04.5]
----	---------------	---------------	---------------	---------------

M	est de la simplicité (0.2)	pour les TPE	peu les TPE PME (0.3)	c'est ce que je
InM	say-	is simpli!city (.) for	small	and medium size

[41]

	139 [02:05.2]	140 [02:05.5]	141 [02:06.3]	142 [02:06.9]
M	propose(0.3)	on a BESOIN (0.6)	d'avoir beaucoup plus de pragmatisme	
InM	ent'prise= I propose	we:	need (.) to h:ave	

[42]

	143 [02:08.5]	144 [02:09.0]
M	(0.4)	et on a besoin d'avoir une politique en faveur de l'investissement (.) privé et
InM	more	pragmatism we need to have a policy in favour of in

After the 1.6 second pause and the chaotic overlap in the ST, InM takes the floor, but he is still reeling from the intensity of the previous segment. Two avoidable interpretation errors – “I say-” in (138) and “I propose” in (140) – occur despite the many pauses in the ST in (131), (133), (135), (137), (139) and (141), and without the ST being overly dense or technical. They can be interpreted as post-onset disfluencies, triggered by the cognitive overload resulting from the preceding overlap (Gile, 2008) rather than the challenging nature of the interpreted text itself.

[42]

	143 [02:08.5]	144 [02:09.0]
M	(0.4)	et on a besoin d'avoir une politique en faveur de l'investissement (.) privé et
InM	more	pragmatism we need to have a policy in favour of in

[43]

	145 [02:12.5]	146 [02:12.9]
M	publique=	c'est indi!spensable pour lutter contre le chômage
H2	=Emmanuel Macron=	
InM	vest!ment!	(0.7) this is indispensable

[44]

	147 [02:14.9]	148 [02:15.1]	149 [02:16.5]	150 [02:16.6]
M	(0.2)	(et) il n'y a pas de fatalité (.)	vous ne proposez rien! pour lutter	
InM	to	fight against unemployment there	i:s no errr:	

[45]

	151 [02:18.4]	152 [02:18.8]	153 [02:19.0]	154 [02:19.5*]	155 [02:20.2]
M	contre le chômage	RRIEN		vous proposez! (0.2)	d'aller
H2			xxx xxx xxx l'occa sion!		
InM		fatality (.)	err:	(0.8)	you

[46]

	157 [02:21.2]	158 [02:21.5]
M	chercher de manière=	très approximative dans des dossier que vous ne

H2	=Marine Le Pen
InM	are not pro posing any: thing to fight against err unemployment

[47]

	159 [02:23.5]	160 [02:24.4]161 [02:24.7]	162 [02:25.1]163 [02:25.6]	164 [02:26.0]
L	monsieur Ma	cron		
M	connaissez pas!	des CAS (.) mais MOI je propose de créer de l'emploi		
H2		Marine Le Pen	je propo-	
InM	your knowledge of	the files	is very	approximative

[48]

	165 [02:26.7]	166 [02:27.7]167 [02:27.9]	168 [02:29.1]169 [02:29.3]
M	pour les indépendants (0.2)	les TPE PME (0.2)	les entreprises de tair- de taille
InM	I: propose to	create jobs (.) for	self-employed people and

As discussed in the ST analysis for this excerpt, another level of conflict comes into play with H2's failed attempts to take the turn space between (116) and (161) and H2's repeated rejection by M and LP. H2's interventions are not reflected in the TT, and neither are LP's and MA's reactions to H2's attempts. These omissions are a good example of how information on the content level and information on the turn level are discrete aspects of a text and can at times even be disconnected entirely.

All of H2's interventions are devoid of information on the content level: H2 simply addresses the participants using their names in (116), (145), (157) and produces incomplete or unintelligible utterances in (123), (128), (153), and a combination of both in (161). This may be one of the reasons why they are omitted by the interpreter – InH is waiting for substance, which is never delivered.

H2's attempts to intervene may be devoid of information on the content level, but they contain essential information on the turn-taking level. On the ST level, they add a layer of turn conflictuality, as the dominant speaker(s) must now compete with an additional source of overlap. As discussed in the ST analysis, M and L either react briefly or ignore H2 entirely. But this means that M has to continue in solo production ignoring both H2 and LP, which requires a different approach. This is evident in (124), where M suddenly starts to address the TV audience back home rather than the moderators in the studio, because he has engaged in conflict with one of the moderators.

On the TT level, H2's attempts to intervene add a level of difficulty, for various reasons. The interpreters must process a third channel of simultaneous input from the ST, making it more challenging from a cognitive processing and auditive perspective. InH, however, is faced with an additional conundrum, because he also has the other two interpreters' time lag to

contend with. The turn sequence imposes a chronological order and prevents InH from splurting out segments as soon as he hears them. It does so in two different ways. One is the avoidance of overlap, and indeed possible double overlap, which is not present in the ST. The other is the logical order of turns – a turn cannot precede the turn it is responding to if it is to reflect the order of the ST. This is true even if the response is just a reaction that is independent of the content, like H2's addressing the participants with their name. The positioning of such an intervention is key - if the original turn sequence is not heeded, the interpreter risks overriding and cutting short a statement that was allowed to continue in the original, thus imposing an omission on one of the other interpreters.

The effect of omitting the turn-taking information is tantamount to an omission of essential constituents of the power structure in the exchange. This effect is compounded by the changes to the sequential structure, where the beat structure of the overlapping speech in the ST becomes an alternating turn structure in the TT. The result is a distortion of how the speakers interact, which informs the audiences perception of the speakers themselves. In the ST, the fact that H2 is completely ignored and overridden creates a tangible climate of conversational violence and abuse, with H2 as the victim and L and especially M as the victimisers. This conveys a strong sense of dominance and superiority exuded by both L and MA. This effect is enhanced every time H2 addresses them by name. It sounds like H2 is either looking to the person he is addressing for support and requesting permission to speak or trying to reprimand them without success – both of which bolster the image of strength the two candidates are trying to portray. In the ST, however, the element of violence and the portrayal of dominance and strength are missing. The complete lack of any trace of H2's seven-fold attempt to intervene portrays the opposite image. As discussed above, InL and InM seem considerably more civilised and docile than their ST counterparts due to the way they interact with each other. The complete lack of any conflictual interaction with InH widens this gap between the personas portrayed before the audience, despite the information on the content level being conveyed faithfully.

4.5 Excerpt 5

4.5.1 Excerpt 5 – Source Text

[1]
 .. 23 [00:23.6] 24 [00:24.3] 25 [00:25.2*]
M par=exemple quand peu:geo::t! (0.2) était menacé=l'état a investi et monté
H1 (xxx)

[2]
 .. 26 [00:26.1] 27 [00:27.7] 28 [00:27.8] 29 [00:28.5]
L ben=vous voyEZ:
M au capital pour sauver l'entreprise (0.8) et il y
H1 <<faint> (voilà:: alors)>

[3]
 .. 30 [00:28.9] 31 [00:29.6] 32 [00:29.7] 33 [00:30.3*] 34 [00:30.9] 35 [00:31.7] 36 [00:31.8]
L je le propose! vous dites que c'est ce qu'on (xxx) non parce que là
M a là (xxx) vous proposez quelque chose non j'ai rien dit je sais

[4]
 .. 37 [00:32.5] 38 [00:32.7] 39 [00:33.1] 40 [00:34.2] 41 [00:34.3] 42 [00:34.5]
L non car là NON MONSieur=car=là=c'
M que c'était c'est interessant (vos) solutions GÉNIALES

M occupies the turn space until the handover from M to L in (27), where H1 briefly makes a feeble attempt to intervene as a TRP emerges in both MA's and LP's turn. M however cuts short H1's attempt and is joined almost immediately (0.3s later) by L as both engage in overlapping competitive production. Locked in a struggle for dominance, neither M nor L produce coherent content as they unleash a barrage of resolution devices which most notably includes a series of self-interruptions: they both self-interrupt their own utterance with “non” in (33), M self-interrupts again in (36-37) with “c'était c'est”, L self-interrupts with “non” in (39) and again in (40), where she is finally able to gain the upper hand and speak uninterrupted for 3.2 seconds. Both M and L also raise their voices, which is most noticeable in (39)-(41) but also occurs earlier, albeit to a lesser extent.

[5]
 .. 43 [00:36.5] 44 [00:36.7] 45 [00:37.6]
L est=un=fonds souverain que je confierais moi (0.2) à des chefs d'entreprise (ce qui n'
M ça c'est

[6]
 .. 46 [00:38.3] 47 [00:39.3] 48 [00:40.1] 49 [00:40.5] 50 [00:41.0]
L est) pas le cas NON:: (0.9) ce (.) c'est pas

M	ce qui existe à la banque publique d'investissement ça avait été crée SI: mais
H1	d'accord voilà je vous proPOSE

[7]

	51 [00:43.5]	52 [00:44.7*]
L	une banque que je veux (.) c'est un	FONDS! SOUVERAIN! (2.0)
M	madame le pen vous dites (.)	n'IM:POR!:TE:quoi (.) mais n'

[8]

	53 [00:46.0]	54 [00:46.0]	55 [00:47.7]
L	<<big smile> MONSss::ieur macron (0.9)> ne jouez pas: avec		
M	importe quoi (. .) l e F O N D S s o u v e r a i n l e f o n d s s o u v e r a i n		
H1	bon		

At this point both L and M engage in highly competitive production paired with an uncharacteristically overt display of emotions with unveiled insults, sarcasm-laden smiles and deliberate and unrestrained patronising and humiliation in both tone of voice and content. The turns initiated by M in (45) and (50) and L in (48) lead to overlap, but they are timed with TRPs and the resulting overlap is at least in part due to turn extensions rather than flouting of conversational norms. This changes in (52) and is manifest in the subsequent segments, where the interaction descends into bile and bickering to the detriment of the utterances' intelligibility and coherence. Instead of finishing their sentences, M and L consistently self-interrupt their utterances in reaction to what their opponent is saying before concluding the semantic unit they are producing. The few pauses that do occur ((49), (52), (54)) are pauses for effect within the respective speaker's production; they do not serve as a structural element on the turn level, such as TRPs, because they are produced in competition with overlapping speech. The candidates are no longer engaging in turn-based handovers. Instead, both L and M are simultaneously producing a continuous flow of words. The individual utterances are often marked with a raised voice, either at their beginning (e.g. "NON::" in (48), "SI:" in (50), "MONSss:ieur" in (54)) or when the speaker gets to the main idea (e.g. "FONDS! SOUVERAIN!", "n'IM:POR!:TE:quoi") before being cut short through self-interruption.

[8]

	53 [00:46.0]	54 [00:46.0]	55 [00:47.7]
L	<<big smile> MONSss::ieur macron (0.9)> ne jouez pas: avec		
M	importe quoi (. .) l e F O N D S s o u v e r a i n l e f o n d s s o u v e r a i n		
H1	bon		

[9]

	56 [00:50.4]	57 [00:50.6]
L	moi ne jouez pas (ne)	je vois que vous cherchez à jouer
M	que vous proposez (..) mais je joue pas malheureusement c'est triste (2.1) mais	

[10]	...	58 [00:52.0]	59 [00:54.6]
L	avec moi l'élève et (au) professeur mais en c'qui=m'concerne	ce n'est pas	
M	(.) <<sad voice> non:::>	(1.7) mais	
[11]	...	60 [00:56.2] 61 [00:56.5]	62 [00:57.2]
L	particulièrement mon truc je vous dis		
M		moi non plus (vous) savez (.) c'est tri:ste:	
H1		(bon) alORS (..)	
[12]	..64 [00:58.0]	65 [00:58.9]	66 [00:59.1] 67 [01:00.4]
M	le pays mérite mieux (..) parce que dans le cas de whirlpool	ce que vous proposez	
H1	nous		
[13]	...	68 [01:01.2*] 69 [01:01.9]	70 [01:03.8] 71 [01:04.2]
M	c'est rien (..) vous proposez d'abord vous ne respectez pas les		
H1	(non) (est-ce qu') (.) (xx) (.)	(me=m: ME=M::)	
[14]	72 [01:04.5]	73 [01:06.0] 74 [01:06.1] 75 [01:06.4]	
M	vous ne respectez pas=non je repondrai sur le	fond à ce sujet parce que moi j'ai	
H1		hm-ouais	
[15]	...	76 [01:08.1] 77 [01:10.0]	78 [01:10.7]
M	entendu la colère moi j'ai passé des heures avec eux	vous=vous n'les respectez pas	

As both candidates become aware of the intensity of their argument and the image this portrays to the audience, they both abruptly temper their language and steer away from the concrete and on to the level of meta-communication. This change of direction is announced by LP's <<big smile>> in (54) and implemented in the form of L accusing M of wanting to play with her, from (55) onwards. M reacts 1.5 seconds later in (55), self-interrupting with “mais je joue pas”, using the opportunity to adopt a mockingly mawkish tone and measured diction and revert to a more civil mode of interaction. As the viciousness subsides, so does the unrestrained overlap and the interaction returns to a turn-based structure as soon as M concludes his turn with “malheureusement c’est triste (2.1) mais (.) <<sad voice> non:::>”. Both candidates’ utterances are now laden with sarcasm, but after the violent outburst they are suddenly respectful of the other’s right to speak and finish and keep interruptions to a minimum. However, this courtesy is not extended to the moderators.

As M and L compete to gain the upper hand, H1 tries to regain control of the situation, which adds a new parameter to the equation. H1’s first fruitless attempt to do so occurs in (27),

as mentioned above. When overlap between M and L ensues in (45), H1 reattempts to take control 0.8 seconds later in (46)-(47), latching on to one of LP's TRPs, but in the middle of MA's utterance. H1's interjection here is much more forceful than the first attempt and comes with a clear indication that she intends to redirect the discussion with "je vous proPOSE". However, both candidates continue their exchange without acknowledging H1's utterance. H1 makes a third attempt in (54), which coincides with a TRP in both MA's and LP's production, but the simple "bon" without any follow-up lacks the necessary resolve and is yet again ignored by M and LP. As of (61), M is speaking alone, and H1 makes another attempt in (62) with "(bon) alORS (..) nous", more insistent this time, and then follows up 3.2 seconds later in (68) with "(non) (est-ce qu') (.) (xx) (.)" and then "(me=m: ME=M::)" in (70). This finally triggers a reaction from MA, who interrupts what he is saying to L in (72) to provide H1 and/or the viewers with an explanation of why he is unwilling to let H1 take over: "non je repondrai sur le fond à ce sujet parce que moi j'ai entendu la colère moi j'ai passé des heures avec eux". H1 sounds unconvinced as she acquiesces with "hm-ouais" in (73), engaging in overlap with M halfway through his utterance, which ends 4.0 seconds later in (77). M then returns to addressing LP.

4.5.2 Excerpt 5 – Target Text

[1]	..	23 [00:23.6]	24 [00:24.3]	25 [00:25.2*]
InM	means the state can invest in a company when peugeot! was under			
[2]	..	26 [00:26.1]	27 [00:27.7]28 [00:27.8]	29 [00:28.5]
InM	threat the state increased (it) s-share of the capital to save the			
[3]	..	30 [00:28.9]31 [00:29.6]32 [00:29.7]	33 [00:30.3*]	34 [00:30.9]35 [00:31.7]36 [00:31.8]
InL	well you! see! I'm			
InM	company			
[4]	..	37 [00:32.5]	38 [00:32.7]39 [00:33.1]	40 [00:34.2] 41 [00:34.3]42 [00:34.5]
InL	proposing it			
InM	(s'inter(e)sting)			
[5]	..	43 [00:36.5]44 [00:36.7]	45 [00:37.6]	
InL	(so) this is a sovereign			
InM	because your (in) g - great solutions			

[6]	..	46 [00:38.3]	47 [00:39.3]	48 [00:40.1]	49 [00:40.5]	50 [00:41.0]
InL	fund that I would entrust (.) to business leaders					
InM	already exist (0.4) the					

[7]	..	51 [00:43.5]	52 [00:44.7*]
InL	it's not a: ba:nk that I want it's a sovereign fund		
InM	public investment bank already exists		

[8]	..	53 [00:46.0]	54 [00:46.0]	55 [00:47.7]
--	do:n't play: with me			

The handovers in (30), (37) and (47) occur without overlap via noticeable transitional pauses. The handovers in (43) and (51) feature brief instances of overlap. InM self-interrupts in (43) and only continues and completes the sentence “your (in) g-great solutions...” with “...already exist” a total of 4.0 seconds later, after InL has initiated and completed the turn from (43) to (47) and the transitional pause in (48). The handover in (51) features overlap which bears certain characteristics of conflict. It is brief, but too long to be qualified as terminal overlap. Neither is it an instance of unproblematic overlap, since InL also interrupts InM at a juncture that does not even remotely resemble a TRP and is consequently aware that overlap may ensue, which means that InL deliberately engages in conflict. There are also two disfluencies in InL’s production in the form of stretched vowel sounds in “a:” and “ba:nk” during the overlap.

Segment (42) features prominent disfluencies in InM’s production which occur clear of overlap. The timing and especially the length of InM’s pause from (43) to (49) suggest that this mid-sentence pause is a resolution device used to avoid overlap rather than a hesitation marker. The remainder of the excerpt features a slow exchange without overlap and only one handover in (61), via a 2.1-second transitional pause.

4.5.3 Excerpt 5 – Comparative Analysis

[1]	..	23 [00:23.6]	24 [00:24.3]	25 [00:25.2*]
M	par=exemple quand peu:geo::t! (0.2) était menacé=l'état a investi et monté			(xxx)
H1				
InM	means the state can invest in a company when peugeot! was under			
[2]	..	26 [00:26.1]	27 [00:27.7]28 [00:27.8]	29 [00:28.5]
L			ben=vous voyEZ:	
M	au capital pour sauver l'entreprise (0.8)			et il y
H1			<<faint> (voilà::: alors)>	
InM	threat the state increased (it) s-share of the capital to save the			
[3]	..	30 [00:28.9]31 [00:29.6]32 [00:29.7]	33 [00:30.3*]	34 [00:30.9]35 [00:31.7]36 [00:31.8]
L	je le propose! vous dites que c'est ce qu'on (xxx) non parce que là			
M	a la (xxx) vous proposez quelque chose non j'ai rien dit je sais			
InL				well you! see! I'm
InM	company			
[4]	..	37 [00:32.5]	38 [00:32.7]39 [00:33.1]	40 [00:34.2] 41 [00:34.3]42 [00:34.5]
L			non car là	NON MONsieur=car=là=c'
M	que c'était c'est interessant (vos) solutions GÉNIALES			
InL	proposing it			
InM				(s'inter(e)sting)
[5]	..		43 [00:36.5]44 [00:36.7]	45 [00:37.6]
L	est=un=fonds souverain que je confierais moi (0.2) à des chefs d'etreprise (ce qui n'			ça c'est
M				
InL			(so) this is a sovereign	
InM	because your (in) g - great solutions			
[6]	..	46 [00:38.3]	47 [00:39.3]	48 [00:40.1] 49 [00:40.5] 50 [00:41.0]
L	est) pas le cas		NON:: (0.9)	ce (.) c'est pas
M	ce qui existe (a-) la banque publique d'investissement ça avait été crée SI: mais			
H1	d'accord voilà je vous proPOSE			
InL	fund that I would entrust (.) to business leaders			
InM				already exist (0.4) the

The TT pause between (31) and (34) coincides with the onset of a sequence of highly competitive overlap in the ST. InL reproduces LP's utterance from (27), „ben=vous voyEZ:“ together with „je le propose“ from (30) faithfully but then withdraws from the turn space, despite the fact that L continues to occupy it: LP's turn continues from (32) to (34) and is then

extended by “non car là” in (39). The three turns L initiates from (32) to (39), all of which also initiate overlap, as well as the utterance in (40) and (41) “NON MONSieur=car=là” are thus missing in the TT. An important aspect here is that all of LP’s utterances omitted by InL from (32) to (41) are either incomplete, unintelligible, or devoid of coherent information: “vous dites que c’est ce qu’on (xxx)”, “non parce que là”, “non car là”, “NON MONSieur”. This means that the interpreter does not lose content on the informational level. On the turn-taking level, however, 3.5 seconds of highly competitive overlap and LP’s strong claim to the turn space, and indeed LP’s entire presence in this part of the conversation, are lost completely. As soon as L reverts to solo production and starts to produce coherent informational content, i.e. as of (42) “c’est=un=fonds souverain”, InL goes back to providing a faithful rendition of the ST.

As regards InM, there was a fleeting mention of disfluencies in (42) in the previous section. Comparative analysis provides further insights into their origins. The speedy high-density overlap in the ST would be difficult to interpret under any circumstances, but what makes InM’s life even harder is that MA’s sentences are either incomplete, unintelligible, or nonsensical, just like LP’s in the previous segment. This is true for the entire stint from (29) to (37): “et il y a la (xxx)”, “vous proposez quelque chose” (grammatically complete, but nonsensical without continuation), “non j’ai rien dit” “je sais que”. This explains InM’s disfluencies, which occur clear of overlap and thus communicate a lack of resolve in the following segment, “(s’inter(e)sting) because your (in) g-great solutions”. This means that InM’s hold on the turn space is already fleeting when InL takes over in (43).

This leads to the TT overlap in (43), where InL interrupts InM, thus prompting InM to produce the 4.0s mid-sentence pause from (43) to (49) described in the TT analysis. InM’s long pause is possible without loss of information because M makes a pause similar in length. However, there is a difference between ST and TT regarding the turn-structure and handover position, which creates a shift in the power dynamics of the exchange. M seems in control as he finishes his statement before a deliberate pause, whereas InM’s abrupt stop mid-sentence appears to have been forced upon him. InM then completes the utterance initiated in (42), before the pause, with ““already exist (0.4) the public investment bank already exists”. The repetition of “already exist” does not represent a disfluency intended to reproduce the conflictuality of the ST; the timing and structural similarity suggest that it is not a repetition in the conversation analytical sense; rather, it is a faithful rendition of MA’s “c’est ce qui existe (a-) la banque publique d’investissement ça avait été crée”, in which two separate utterances, “c’est ce qui existe” and “ça avait été crée” are both rendered as “already exist”.

[6]	..	46 [00:38.3]	47 [00:39.3]	48 [00:40.1]	49 [00:40.5]	50 [00:41.0]
L	est) pas le cas			NON:: (0.9)		ce (.) c'est pas
M	ce qui existe (a-) la banque publique d'investissement			ça avait été créée	SI: mais	
H1		d'accord voilà	je vous proPOSE			
InL	fund that I would entrust (.) to business leaders					
InM						already exist (0.4) the

[7]	..	51 [00:43.5]	52 [00:44.7*]
L	une banque que je veux (.) c'est un	FONDS! SOUVERAIN! (2.0)	
M	madame le pen vous dites (.)	n'IM:POR!:TE:quoi (.) mais n'	
InL		it's not a: ba:nk that I want	it's a sovereign fund
InM	public investment bank already exists		

[8]	..	53 [00:46.0]	54 [00:46.0]	55 [00:47.7]
L		<<big smile> MONSs::ieur macron (0.9)>		ne jouez pas: avec
M	importe quoi (. .) le	F O N D S s o u v e r a i n	le	fonds souverain
H1	bon			

As discussed in Section 4.5.1, L and M have at this point discarded conversational convention completely and are speaking and/or shouting over each other, resulting in a highly conflictual text with limited intelligibility and no identifiable turn structure. This conflictuality spills over to the TT level to a certain extent in the brief instance of conflictual overlap in (51). Due to the difference in time lag and technique between the two interpreters and as a result of omissions, the overlapping segments themselves are not the same as in the ST. MA's "SI: mais madame le pen vous dites (.) n'IM:POR!:TE:quoi (.) mais n'importe quoi", which overlaps with "c'est pas un banque que je veux", is omitted by InM. Instead, "it's not a: ba:nk that I want" overlaps with "already exists". This is in part the result of one of the strategies the interpreters use, which consists of condensing the message, which allows him to listen to longer segments without speaking and then start later but finish almost simultaneously with the original, (almost) anticipating what the speaker will say. A good example of this is InL and LP's start in (51) and (50) and InL's conclusion of the turn in (52): the offset in (51) is 2.5 seconds, whereas "nt it's a sovereign fund" is pronounced at the same time as "FONDS! SOUVERAIN!". However, this "speeding up" strategy also produces interruptions between the TT segments and inhibits a continuous flow.

The sequential offset between ST and TT identified in and around (51) also has an impact on conflictuality at the level of production: in the ST, both M and L raise their voices in (52), in reaction to one another. Given that the overlapping segments are not the same in the TT, the interpreters would have to either place the emphasis on different segments, if the

competitive production were to coincide in time, or emphasise the same segments and accept that the competitive production does not coincide. InL opts for the former, emphasising “a:ba:nk”, which L produces calmly and without disruption in the original. The fact that this occurs during the stint of competitive overlap in the TT, however, strongly suggests that InL is in fact reacting to InM rather than LP, i.e. the disruption originates primarily from within the TT rather than the ST.

H1’s intervention in (46)-(47), longer and more forceful this time, is once again omitted in the TT.

5 Discussion and Conclusions

A detailed examination of corpus excerpts consistently points to a stark contrast between the source and target text regarding the level of conflictuality, turn structure and occurrence of overlap. As mentioned above, overlap density and competitiveness are unusually high in the source text. The opposite is true for the target text. The lack of even unproblematic overlap would be worth noting even for a non-conflictual conversation, and the prominence and frequency of the pauses, especially transitional pauses, is such that the turn exchange seems unnaturally slow and staggered. It is worth reiterating at this point that the examined excerpts were deliberately selected to include only passages with extremely high conflictuality in the source text, and the statements above concern only these excerpts, not the target text as a whole.

The interpreters are dealing with an extreme situation, and consequently often opt for extreme strategies. These include compartmentalisation (“salami technique”), condensing the original message, increasing output speed, and omissions. All of these are used with a view to generating output as quickly and succinctly as possible to free up processing capacity. However, this means that the interpreters produce “bursts” of output rather than a steady flow, thus inadvertently reducing the likelihood of overlap. This effect is exacerbated due to effects occurring on the target text level – the interpreters adapt to each other as they adopt this “bursts of output” style. This creates an environment that incentivises alternate production rather than overlap, since both expect their interlocutor to conclude swiftly, which indeed they do. At the same time, however, the interpreters create an environment with a clear turn structure. As stated above, this does not necessarily reflect the often-chaotic sequential structure of the source text, and yet the target text has its own intrinsic consistency and logic. Analysis shows that even during long stints of continuous high-conflict overlap in the source text, interpreters do not simply reproduce their target text independently from one another, they interact, negotiate turns and adapt to one another. This would support Schäffner’s claim of interpreters’ awareness and self-monitoring beyond the confines of their “own” text. Schäffner refers to a press conference and interpreters’ awareness of political sensitivities in this specific context, and how this might give rise to context-specific norm-based behaviour. The example in this paper features a specific co-text (which is part of the context), and the interpreters’ reaction to the co-text, with clear indications of strong adherence to the norm of overlap avoidance, which is also one of the core tenets of conversation analysis. Indeed, the findings of this paper, most notably the complete lack of competitive overlap in the target text, suggest that continuous competitive overlap is not only avoided but quite simply not sustainable in simultaneous interpreting of this

kind. The reasons for this would require further research, but one likely cause is that the interpreters are effectively listening to four people speaking at the same time and have no cognitive resources to spare to engage in turn negotiations.

The TT does feature disfluencies, but they rarely coincide with ST disfluencies and generally differ in origin and/or purpose. The interpreters must of course contend with the usual constraints of their profession, whereas the primary interlocutors are speaking freely. As such, it is no surprise that the TT contains disfluencies owed to interpretation-related difficulties, which do not feature in the ST. However, there is also a marked tendency to omit the disfluencies that are used in the ST to negotiate turn-taking. This leads to an overall shift in how disfluencies are deployed: deliberate resolution devices which impact turn selection and sequence in the source text disappear and inadvertent disfluencies, which are not linked to the turn negotiation, reappear in other places in the target text. Exact reproduction of overlap is rare and very brief where it occurs. Exact reproduction of resolution devices is even rarer. Exact reproduction of a complete sequence of overlap, resolution device(s) and resolution is non-existent. This can be ascribed in large part to the difference in decalage between the two (or three) interpreters – time lag would have to be identical throughout the entire sequence, resolution devices deployed at the same positions, and the overlap would have to be faithfully reproduced to an unrealistic degree of precision. This is a case in point of Zwischenberger's claim of the impossibility of true faithfulness and indeed the inherent contradiction to any form of interpreting, which is all the more manifest in the high-conflictuality source texts with overlapping speech examined in this study. The interpreters cannot possibly be "true to the original" on all levels, and the additional element of having to reproduce the sequential structure of the primary interaction reinforces this effect.

In this specific case, this means that much of the conflictuality is lost, which seemingly contradicts Dal Fovo's claim that there is a tendency to preserve conflictuality in media interpreting. It is true that in the excerpts analysed in this study, the interpreters do not reproduce the extreme level of conflictuality found in the source text. However, this is in large part due to the interplay of overlap avoidance and the challenges of dealing with overlapping high-density input within which this norm has been discarded, all of which prevents a continuous flow of output and imposes strategies such as the observed alternation of short bursts as a means of survival. At the same time, the interpreters do produce their own interactional dynamic within the target text, and while they lose conflictuality in the form of overlap, there is at least a notion of conflict in the voices of the interpreters. This would suggest an attempt, albeit feeble, to nonetheless include a minimum of conflictuality in even these

extreme circumstances – as such the “tendency” identified by Dal Fovo is present even here. This can be interpreted as a slight presence of norms imposed by the media context, superimposed by a strong and consistent presence of overlap avoidance paired with the cognitive load due to the extreme difficulty of the source text, which requires the interpreters to prioritise and make significant trade-offs regarding “faithfulness”. The hierarchical constellation and interaction between these norms and how they impact the interpreters’ behaviour would require further study; however, the present findings show that their behaviour is governed not only by the constraints of the source text, but also by norms, conversational, contextual, or other, which go beyond faithfulness alone.

What this study’s comparative analysis has shown is that turn negotiation of high-conflictuality source texts undergoes profound changes or is omitted in the interpretation. In the present analysis, the principle of overlap avoidance and turn alternation is applied and adhered to with devotion, caution and efficiency. Overlapping speech in the source text is almost entirely eliminated in the target text. Indeed, the interpreters’ overlap resolution and prevention techniques are so efficient that there is hardly any overlap in the target text, originating in the source text or other. The rare instances of noticeable conflictual overlap identified in the target text are very brief deliberate attempts to emulate the almost constant overlap in the original, but the interpreters are unable to sustain the overlap and it takes a visible toll on their concentration. Instead, the interpreters transform the overlapping and at times incongruous double stream of consciousness that is the original into a clear-cut alternating turn structure, which is neatly separated by noticeable transitional pauses most of the time.

Continuous conflictual overlap in the source text is hard to process for interpreters, and impossible to reproduce in any sustained manner in the target text. The result is a target text with a new form of sequence organisation in which the interpreters reintroduce the rules of conversation analysis that were discarded in the original. Conversational convention seems to come out on top in the discursive struggle. Despite the interpreters’ unmistakable attempts to be true to the original and provide entertainment value, they cannot overcome the basic human need for efficient communication.

Bibliography

- Adda-Decker, M., Barras, C., Adda, G., Paroubek, P., et al. (2008) “Annotation and Analysis of Overlapping Speech in Political Interviews”. In: *Proceedings of the International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation, LREC 2008, 26 May - 1 June 2008, Marrakech, Morocco*, pp. 3105-3111.
- AIIC (2016) “Practical Guide for Professional Conference Interpreters”. In: https://aiic.org/document/547/AIICWebzine_Apr2004_2_Practical_guide_for_professional_conference_interpreters_EN.pdf. Accessed: 11 December 2022.
- Bahadir, Ş. (2017) “The Interpreter as Observer, Participant and Agent of Change: The Irresistible Entanglement Between Interpreting Ethics, Politics and Pedagogy”, In: Biagini, M., Boyd, M. S. & Monacelli, C. (eds.) *The Changing Role of the Interpreter. Contextualising Norms, Ethics and Quality Standards*. London/New York, Routledge
- Bakhtin, M.M. & Holquist, M. (1981) *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*, Austin, University of Texas Press.
- Biagini, M., Boyd, M. S. & Monacelli, C. (eds.) (2017) *The Changing Role of the Interpreter. Contextualising Norms, Ethics and Quality Standards*. London/New York, Routledge.
- Bres, J. (2008) “De l’épaisseur du discours: horizontalement, verticalement... et dans tous les sens”. In: <https://www.linguistiquefrancaise.org/articles/cmlf/abs/2008/01/cmlf08314/cmlf08314.html>. Accessed: 11 December 2022.
- Burkart, R. (2002) *Kommunikationswissenschaft*. Wien/Köln/Weimar, Böhlau Verlag.
- Chowdhury, S., Stepanov, E., Danieli, M. & Riccardi, G. (2018) “Automatic Classification of Speech Overlaps: Feature Representation and Algorithms”. *Computer Speech & Language* 55, pp. 145-167.
- Dal Fovo, E. (2012) “The More the Merrier? Teamwork and Lexical Variation in Simultaneous Interpretation on Television”. In: Zybatow, L. N., Petrova, A. & Ustaszewski, M. (eds.). *Translationswissenschaft: Alte und neue Arten der Translation in Theorie und Praxis - Translation Studies: Old and New Types of Translation in Theory and Practice*. Frankfurt, Peter Lang, pp. 54-77.

- Dal Fovo, E. (2015a) "Media Interpreting". In: Pöchhacker, F. (ed.). *Routledge Encyclopedia of Interpreting Studies*. London/New York, Routledge, pp. 245–247.
- Dal Fovo, E. (2015b) "Talk Show Interpreting". In: Pöchhacker, F. (ed.). *Routledge Encyclopedia of Interpreting Studies*. London/New York, Routledge, pp. 418–419.
- Dal Fovo, E. (2017) "Research on Television Interpreting - A Case of Flouted Norms". In: Biagini, M., Boyd, M. S. & Monacelli, C. (eds.) *The Changing Role of the Interpreter. Contextualising Norms, Ethics and Quality Standards*. London/New York, Routledge, pp. 173–202.
- Dal Fovo, E. (2018) "European Union Politics Interpreted on Screen: A Corpus-based Investigation on the Interpretation of the Third 2014 EU Presidential Debate". In: Russo, M., Bendazzoli, C. & Defrancq, B. (eds.). *Making Way in Corpus-based Interpreting Studies*. Singapore, Springer, pp. 157–184.
- Dam, H.V. (2017) "Interpreter Role, Ethics and Norms - Linking to Professionalization". In: Biagini, M., Boyd, M. S. & Monacelli, C. (eds.) *The Changing Role of the Interpreter. Contextualising Norms, Ethics and Quality Standards*. London/New York, Routledge, pp. 228–239.
- Dayan, D. & Katz, E. (1993) *Le grandi cerimonie dei media*. Bologna, Baskerville.
- Elsagir, I.M. (2000) „Anforderungen an Dolmetschleistungen im Fernsehen aus Zuschauersicht: Eine Fallstudie“. In: Kalina, S., Buhl, S. & Gerzymisch-Arbogast H. (eds.). *Dolmetschen: Theorie, Praxis, Didaktik; mit ausgewählten Beiträgen der Saarbrücker Symposien*. St. Ingbert, Röhrig, pp. 107–123.
- Erikson, R.S. & Wlezien, C. (2012) *The Timeline of Presidential Elections: How Campaigns Do (and Do Not) Matter*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.
- Falbo, C. (2008) "L'interprète dans la communication interculturelle à la television". In: *Proceedings of the Conference Les enjeux de la communication interculturelle, compétence linguistique, compétence pragmatique, valeurs culturelles, du 5 au 7 juillet 2007, Colloque international à l'U.F.M. de Montpellier*. In: http://www.msh-m.fr/article.php3?id_article=386. Accessed: 11 December 2022.
- Falbo, C. (2012) "CorIT (Italian Television Interpreting Corpus): Classification Criteria". In: Straniero Sergio, F. (ed.). *Breaking Ground in Corpus-based Interpreting Studies*. Bern, Lang, pp. 155–185.

- Frank, K. (2011) *Sprachgewalt: Die sprachliche Reproduktion der Geschlechterhierarchie*. Berlin/New York, Max Niemeyer Verlag.
- GALMA, Galician Observatory for Media Accessibility. “Media Interpreting”. *Galma Observatory*. In: <http://galmaobservatory.webs.uvigo.es/areas/media-interpreting/>. Accessed: 11 December 2022.
- Galtung, J. (1981) *Strukturelle Gewalt: Beiträge zur Friedens- und Konfliktforschung*. Reinbek bei Hamburg, Rowohlt.
- Gentile, P. (2017) “Interpreting as a Postmodern Profession: A Socio-historical Perspective”. In: Biagini, M., Boyd, M. S. & Monacelli, C. (eds.) *The Changing Role of the Interpreter. Contextualising Norms, Ethics and Quality Standards*. London/New York, Routledge, pp. 32-51.
- Gile, D. (2008) “Local Cognitive Load in Simultaneous Interpreting and its Implications for Empirical Research”. *Forum* 6: 59–77.
- Grasso, A. (2002) *Enciclopedia della televisione*. Milan, Garzanti.
- Harris, B. (1990) “Norms in Interpretation”. *Target* 2 (1), 115–119.
- Hilton, K. (2016) “The Perception of Overlapping Speech: Effects of Speaker Prosody and Listener Attitudes”. In: *Interspeech 2016 Proceedings*, pp. 1260-1264.
- Holly, W. (1995) “Secondary Orality in the Electronic Media”. In: Quasthoff, U. M. (ed.) *Aspects of Oral Communication*. Berlin, De Gruyter, pp. 340–363.
- Inghilleri, M. (2003) “Habitus, Field and Discourse: Interpreting as a Socially Situated Activity”. *Target* 15 (10), 243–268.
- Kerbrat-Orecchioni, C. (2005) *Le discours en interaction*. Paris, Armand Colin.
- Kurtić, E., Brown, G. & Wells, B. (2013) “Resources for Turn Competition in Overlapping Talk”. *Speech Communication* 55 (5), 721–743.
- Kurz, I. (1997) “Getting the Message Across - Simultaneous Interpreting for the Media”. In: Snell-Hornby, M., Jettmarová, Z. & Kaindl, K. (eds.) *Translation as Intercultural Communication*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins Publishing, pp. 195–205.

- Kurz, I. (2002) "Physiological Stress Responses during Media and Conference Interpreting". In: Garzone, G., Viezzi, M. (eds.) *Interpreting in the 21st Century*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins Publishing, pp. 195–202.
- Kurz, I. & Pöchhacker, F. (1995) "Quality in TV Interpreting" In: *Translatio: Nouvelles de la FIT – FIT Newsletter* 14/3-4, 350-358.
- Mack, G. (2002) "New Perspectives and Challenges for Interpretation - The Example of Television". In: Garzone, G. & Viezzi, M. (eds.) *1st Forlì Conference of Interpreting Studies 'Interpreting in the 21st Century, Challenges and Opportunities'*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins Publishing, pp. 203–213.
- Miner, A. (2017) "Professional Roles and Responsibilities in Designated Interpreting". In: Biagini, M., Boyd, M. S. & Monacelli, C. (eds.) *The Changing Role of the Interpreter. Contextualising Norms, Ethics and Quality Standards*. London/New York, Routledge, pp. 77–102.
- Monacelli, C. (2009) *Self-Preservation in Simultaneous Interpreting: Surviving the role*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins Publishing.
- Monacelli, C. & Boyd, M.S. (2017) "Professional Role, Norms and Ethics in Interpreting Studies Research". In: Biagini, M., Boyd, M. S. & Monacelli, C. (eds.) *The Changing Role of the Interpreter. Contextualising Norms, Ethics and Quality Standards*. London/New York, Routledge, pp. 203-216.
- Pöchhacker, F. (2004) *Introducing Interpreting Studies*. London/New York, Routledge.
- Pöchhacker, F. (2007) "Coping with Culture in Media Interpreting". *Perspectives* 15 (2), 123–142.
- Pöchhacker, F. & Zwischenberger, C. (2010) "Survey on Quality and Role: Conference Interpreters Expectations and Self-perceptions". In: <http://aiic.net/page/3405/survey-on-quality-and-role-conference-interpreters-expectationsand-self-perceptions/lang/1>
Accessed: 11 December 2022.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E.A. & Jefferson, G. (1974) "A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn-Taking for Conversation". *Language* 50 (4), 696–735.
- Sandrelli, A. (2017) "Simultaneous Dialogue Interpreting: Coordinating Interaction in Interpreter-Mediated Football Press Conferences". *Journal of Pragmatics* 107, 178–194.

- Schäffner, C. (2017) “Self-Awareness, Norms and Constraints. Dealing with Metaphors in Interpreter-Mediated Press Conferences”. In: Biagini, M., Boyd, M. S. & Monacelli, C. (eds.) *The Changing Role of the Interpreter. Contextualising Norms, Ethics and Quality Standards*. London/New York, Routledge, pp. 149–172.
- Schegloff, E.A. (2000) “Overlapping Talk and the Organization of Turn-Taking for Conversation”. *Language in Society* 29 (1), 1–63.
- Schegloff, E.A. (2007) *Sequence Organization in Interaction: Volume 1: A Primer in Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge/New York, Cambridge University Press.
- Schegloff, E.A., Jefferson, G. & Sacks, H. (1977) “The Preference for Self-Correction in the Organization of Repair in Conversation”. *Language* 53 (2), 361–382.
- Schroeder, A. (2008) *Presidential Debates: Fifty Years of High-Risk TV*. New York, Columbia University Press.
- Sela-Sheffy, R. (2010) “‘Stars’ or ‘Professionals’: the Imagined Vocation and Exclusive Knowledge of Translators in Israel”. *MonTi: Monografías de Traducción e Interpretación*, 131–152.
- Sela-Sheffy, R. (2015) “Elite and Non-Elite Translator Manpower: The Non-Professionalised Culture in the Translation Field in Israel”. *The Journal of Specialised Translation* 25, 54–73.
- Shaw, E.F. (1979) “Agenda Setting and Mass Communication Theory”. *Gazette International Journal for Mass Communication Studies* 25 (2), 96–105.
- Shlesinger, M. (1989) “Extending the Theory of Translation to Interpretation: Norms as a Case in Point”. *Target* 1 (1), 111–115.
- Shlesinger, M. (1998) “Corpus-based Interpreting Studies as an Offshoot of Corpus-Based Translation Studies”. *Meta* 43 (4), 486–493.
- Shlesinger, M. (2000) “Interpreting as a Cognitive Process: How Can We Know What Really Happens?” In: Tirkkonen-Condit, S. & Jääskeläinen, R. (eds.) *Tapping and Mapping the Process of Translation and Interpreting: Outlooks on Empirical Research*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins Publishing, pp. 3–15.
- Straniero Sergio, F. (2007) *Talkshow Interpreting. La mediazione linguistica nella conversazione spettacolo*. Trieste, EUT Edizioni Università di Trieste.

- Straniero Sergio, F. & Falbo, C. (eds.) (2012) *Breaking Ground in Corpus-Based Interpreting Studies*. Bern, Lang.
- Toury, G. (1995) *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins Publishing.
- Trömel-Plötz (1984) *Gewalt durch Sprache: Die Vergewaltigung von Frauen in Gesprächen*. Frankfurt am Main, Fischer Taschenbuch Verlag.
- Turner, G. & Best, B. (2017) „Professional Roles and Responsibilities in Designated Interpreting“. In: Biagini, M., Boyd, M. S. & Monacelli, C. (eds.) *The Changing Role of the Interpreter. Contextualising Norms, Ethics and Quality Standards*. London/New York, Routledge, pp. 102-121.
- Youtube (2017a) *REPLAY - Débat de l'entre-deux-tours : Marine Le Pen / Emmanuel Macron*. LCI. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=iOAbBdlWgz0&t=1032s>. Accessed: 13 September 2022.
- Youtube (2017b) *REPLAY - Watch the Full French Presidential Debate Between Macron and Le Pen*. FRANCE 24 English. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dH9uXWh3n-Y&t=860s>. Accessed: 13 September 2022.
- Zwischenberger, C. (2015) “Simultaneous Conference Interpreting and a Supernorm That Governs It All”. *Meta* 60 (1), 90–111.

Transcripts

Excerpt 1 – Full Transcript EN+FR

[1]

	0 [00:00.0]1 [00:02.1]
L	et euh (.) (ça ce) ça n'est pas une anecdote! (.) monsieur Macron (..) euh

[2]

	2 [00:06.7]	3 [00:10.1]4 [00:10.7]
L	(.) ce sont des entreprises que vous avez euh vendues euh SFR! par exemple à	
InL	(so) mister Macron (.) these are companies that you've sold!	

[3]

	5 [00:12.0]	6 [00:15.3]7 [00:16.4]
L	votre ami monsieur Drahi le patron de BFM:!(0.5) eeuh=six mille=six mille	
M		alors là! (si vous) m'y
InL	SFR for example to mister Drahi (.) the head of BFM (0.8)	

[4]

	8 [00:16.8]	9 [00:18.3]	10 [00:19.6]
L	emplois six mille emplois (.) perdus?		voilà
M	autorisez ça fait (0.4)	ça fait donc (.) à peu près trois minutes que	
InL		six thousand jobs six thousand jobs lost!	

[5]

	11 [00:19.7]	12 [00:22.6]
L		je vous
M	madame Le Pen nous explique sa stratégie pour lutter contre l'chômage en France	
InM	for (.) three! minutes madame Le Pen has been explaining	h e r :

[6]

	13 [00:23.3]	14 [00:26.2]
L	le dis (.) (baisse des) charges des TPE (.) fiscali- (.) baisse de la fiscalité	
M	(0.6)	il n'y en a pas (.) non mais il n'y en a pas! (.) vous ne faites-
InM	s t r a t e g y f o r fighting unemployment in France (.) there isn't! one	

[7]

	15 [00:26.5]	16 [00:26.6]	17 [00:26.6]	18 [00:27.2]	19 [00:27.9]	20 [00:28.3]
L	(0.3)	je vous ai! (.) tout donné monsieur Macron tout ce				
M	(.) votre straté gie-	mais (.) madame-	mais madame-			
InL			I've.given.you.everything.I've.			
InM	your! strategy:					

[8]

	21 [00:29.6]	22 [00:30.5]
L	que vous n'avez pas fait	
M		madame le pen c'est qui est extraordinaire est que
InL	told.you.everything.everything .you.haven't.done	
InM		madame (.) Le Pen what's

[9]

	..	23 [00:32.4]	24 [00:34.3]
M	votr' stratégie (.)	mais c'est normal (.) ça fait (.) des decennies que ça dure (.)	
InM	extraordinary is that your!	strategy and it's normal (.) erm: for de!cades	

Excerpt 2 – Full Transcript EN+FR

[1]

	0 [00:00.0]1 [00:02.1]
L	et euh (.) (ça ce) ça n'est pas une anecdote! (.) monsieur Macron (..) euh

[2]

	2 [00:06.7]	3 [00:10.1]4 [00:10.7]
L	(.) ce sont des entreprises que vous avez euh vendues euh SFR! par exemple à	
InL	(so) mister Macron (.) these are companies that you've sold!	

[3]

	..	5 [00:12.0]	6 [00:15.3]7 [00:16.4]
L	votre ami monsieur Drahi le patron de BFM:!	(0.5) eeuh= six mille=six mille	
M		alors là! (si vous) m'y	
InL	SFR for example to mister Drahi (.) the head of BFM	(1.5)	

[4]

	..	8 [00:16.8]	9 [00:18.3]	10 [00:19.6]
L	emplois six mille emplois (.) perdus?			voilà
M	autorisez ça fait (0.4)		ça fait donc (.) à peu près trois minutes que	
InL		six thousand jobs	six thousand jobs lost!	

[5]

	..	11 [00:19.7]	12 [00:22.6]
L			je vous
M	madame Le Pen nous explique sa stratégie pour lutter contre l'chômage en France		
InM	for (.) three! minutes madame Le Pen has been explaining	h e r :	

[6]

	..	13 [00:23.3]	14 [00:26.2]
L	le dis (.) (baisse des) charges des TPE (.) fiscali- (.) baisse de la fiscalité		
M	(0.6)	il n'y en a pas (.) non mais il n'y en a pas! (.) vous ne faites-	
InM	s t r a t e g y f o r	fighting unemployment in France (.) there isn't! one	

[7]

[7]	15 [00:26.5]	16 [00:26.6]	17 [00:26.6]	18 [00:27.2]	19 [00:27.9]	20 [00:28.3]
L	(0.3)	je vous ai! (.) tout donné monsieur Macron tout ce				
M	(.)	votre straté gie-		mais (.) madame-		mais madame-
InL		I've.given.you.everything.I've.				
InM		your! strategy:				

[8]

	..	21 [00:29.6]	22 [00:30.5]
L	que vous n'avez pas fait		
M	madame le pen c'qui est extraordinaire est que		
InL	told.you.everything.everything .you.haven't.done		
InM	madame (.) Le Pen what's		

[9]

	..	23 [00:32.4]	24 [00:34.3]
M	votr' stratégie (..) mais c'est normal (..) ça fait (..) des decennies que ça dure (.)		
InM	extraordinary is that your! strategy and it's normal (..) erm: for de!cades		

[10]

	25 [00:35.6]	26 [00:39.7]
M	votre stratégie c'est simplement de dire beaucoup de mensonges (.) et de dire tout	
InM	this has been going on=your strategy is quite simply to sa- to lie: a lo:t and to	

Excerpt 3 – Full Transcript EN+FR

[2]

	..	4 [00:04.8]	5 [00:06.0]6 [00:06.3]
M	groupe Vivendi qui l'a vendu= ne dites pas de bê:TI:SES! (0.3) vous en dites		
InM	we respect! private.prop(e'ty).it's. the.uh Vivendi group that sold SFR (.) so		

[3]

	..	7 [00:07.3]
M	beaucoup= ça n'est qu'une! des bêtises (..) que (.) vous avez proférées (d'puis tout à l	
InM	(.) you're ma- making a lot of uh mistakes! (.) uh	

[4]

	..	8 [00:10.1]	9 [00:11.9]	10 [00:12.7]
L	(mais) votr' prédecès seur il voulait			
M	'heur') mais surtout! (.) ça ne fait pas avancer le pays: (mais)			
InM	uhh you (.) have been (0.2) (ah-) and it doesn't uh help the country			

[5]

	..	11 [00:14.3]	12 [00:14.6]	13 [00:15.7]	14 [00:16.0]15 [00:17.6]
L	p a s ? l e vendre				
M	mais personne ne voulait la vendre (ça prend') simplement				
InM	to mo!ve on (1.1) NO!body wanted to sell SFR(0.3)				

[6]

	..	16 [00:17.8]17 [00:18.5]
M	quand vous avez un group: (.) privé! qui est détenu par des capitaux privés	
InM	when you have a private (group) (.) which is owned	

[7]

	..	18 [00:20.3]19 [00:21.2]20 [00:21.5]21 [00:21.5]	22 [00:23.8]
L	OOOOOH: OUI! je vais vous r'trouver ça		

M	oui cherchez dans votr'=dossier vous sauriez bien (..) le vérifier=mais
InM	by private capital (0.2) look! in your fi:les look in your files

[8]

	23 [00:23.9]	24 [00:24.3]	25 [00:26.0]
L	immédiatement et vous allez (voir) que vous êtes en difficultés (une fois de plus)		
M	allez-y parce QUE (..) parce qu- mais non mais j- (0.9)		
InL	yes! I'll find that for you immediately (3.0)		
InM	(3.0)		

[9]

	26 [00:26.9]	27 [00:28.3*]	28 [00:29.0]	29 [00:29.9]
L	JANVIER DEUX MILLE QUINZE devant l'			
M	je connais! je connais un peu les dossiers			
InL	JAN:uary=twenty fifteen before			
InM	I know! the files (.) very well (xx)			

[10]

	30 [00:30.9]	31 [00:31.1]	32 [00:32.0]	33 [00:32.3]
L	assemblée J'AI! (0.9) pris la decision (.) pour Alstom vous avez dit que (à) Du-			
M				
InL	parliament			

[11]

	34 [00:33.0]	35 [00:35.9]
L	monsieur Dupond-Aignan c'est pas moi	
M	mais (on) parle d'Alstom?	
InL	Aaay!! took the decision for Alstom you said to	

[12]

	36 [00:36.7]	37 [00:37.1]	38 [00:37.7]	39 [00:38.0]
L	jan:vier! deux mille quinze devant l'assemblée J'AI			
M	(ou de SFR:)			
InL	mister Dupond-Aignan=it's (on me) january twenty fifteen (be)fore			
InM	(are we) talking about Alstom or			

[13]

	40 [00:39.9]	41 [00:40.0]	42 [00:41.4]
L	pris la decision de permettre à General Electric de rentrer dans (Alstom)		
M	mais voilà (mais xxx		
InL	parliament I have (.) the: (.) de(.)cision to allow G::E:: to take a stake in		
InM	SFR		

[14]

	43 [00:42.2]	44 [00:44.3]	45 [00:45.0]	46 [00:45.1]	47 [00:45.4]
L	J'AI moi personnellement le lenDEMAIN: le				
M	xx) ma- madame le pen vous ne parlez pas du même suJET:: (0.3) vous				
InL	Alsom=I=personally (3.3)				
InM	misses LePen				

[15]

	48 [00:45.6]	49 [00:46.3]50 [00:47.4]	51 [00:48.2]52 [00:48.5]
L	LEN-	(xxx) laissez-moi terminer (.) le lendemain du	
M	parlez d'Alstom et d'General Elec tri:que	mais donc nos citoyens	
InL	the next day	let me finish	
InM	you're not talking about the sa:me: (.) sss- subject you're talking about General		

[16]

	.. 53 [00:49.4]	54 [00:49.55 [00:49.5]	56 [00:50.4]57 [00:50.9]58 [00:51.0]59 [00:51.3]	60 [00:52.7]
L	débat (avec) monsieur Montebourg (0.4)	vous! (.) avez accordé(0.2)		
M	méritent mieux qu' ça:::			
InL		the day after mister Montebourg left		
InM	Electric	and Alstom		

[17]

	61 [00:52.9]	62 [00:53.6]	63 [00:54.4]	64 [00:54.7]	65 [00:55.9]66 [00:56.0]
L	alors qu'il le refusait(0.3)	la vente de SFR (0.1)	ET.C'		
InL	you! granted(x) whereas they were ref- (ee) -ving	the salle of SFR!			

[18]

	..	67 [00:57.3]68 [00:57.8]
L	EST.LA.RÉALITÉ.POURQUOI!.VOUS.L'ASSUMEZ.PA:S? ASSUMEZ-LE!	
M		(je l'assume)
InL		that's the reality why:

Excerpt 4 – Full Transcript EN+FR

[32]

	..	100 [01:36.5]101 [01:37.3]
L	tout vendre le seul problème c'est que	vous savez tout vendre mais pas au bénéfice
M	xxx xx xxx xxx)	moi je défends
InL		you! can! SELL! EVERYTHING the only problem
InM	you're mixing the two sectors	

[33]

	102 [01:39.0]	103 [01:39.3]	104 [01:40.0]	105 [01:41.0*]
L	(0.2)	des intérêts natio naux		
M	moi je dé fends	et vous avez cité un cas la lutte contre le chômage elle		
InL	is that you can sell everything but not=to=the=benefit=of=the=national interest			

[34]

	..	106 [01:42.1]	107 [01:43.5]108 [01:44.0]
M	suppose des réformes en profondeur (0.5)	(s=savez) parce que vous pouve:z	
InL	(0.5)		
InM	FIGHTing against unemployment call's	for in:-depth	

[35]

	109 [01:45.2]110 [01:45.7] 111 [01:46.6]112 [01:46.8]113 [01:47.1]114 [01:47.4] 115 [01:49.1]
L	(xx) loi El KhomRI: (.) déregulation!: (.)
M	aller:(0.5) re:mue:r (.) les choses (0.3)
InL	El
InM	reforms(0.3) you! ca!::n shake things u::p (0.9)

[36]

	116 [01:49.3*] 117 [01:51.1] 118 [01:51.5*]119 [01:51.7]
L	déreglement des professions (0.4) c'est ce que vous voulez faire! monsieur
M	non mais madame
H2	Marine Le Pen
InL	Khomri law de:regula: tion! et cetera that's

[37]

	120 [01:52.7]121 [01:53.3] 122 [01:53.9]123 [01:54.0] 124 [01:54.4]
L	Macron
M	Le Pen ne veut pas faire un débat sur le fond= c'est.pas.GRAVE
H2	=on a compris vos (xxx sur ce dossier
InL	what you want to do
InM	Madame Le Pen doesn't want

[38]

	125 [01:54.9]126 [01:55.2] 127 [01:55.9] 128 [01:56.9] 129 [01:57.4]
L	(non mais) c'est intéressant (de) parler de la
M	(0.2) elle veut parler du passé (.) moi ce que je dis ce! que!
H2	xxx xxx) on va-
InM	to talk about substan tive matters she wants to talk about the past

[39]

	130 [01:58.2] 131 [02:00.1]132 [02:00.3] 133 [02:00.9]134 [02:01.1]
L	déreglementation des (professions xxx xxx)
M	(.) ce! (.) ce.DONT nous avons besoin (0.2) aujourd'hui (0.2) je.l'ai.dit c'
InM	(1.6) W h a t we need today (0.3) a:nd I

[40]

	135 [02:02.3]136 [02:02.5] 137 [02:04.2]138 [02:04.5]
M	est de la simplicité (0.2) pour les TPEpeu les TPE PME (0.3) c'est ce que je
InM	say- is simpli!city (.) for small and medium size

[41]

	139 [02:05.2] 140 [02:05.5] 141 [02:06.3]142 [02:06.9]
M	propose(0.3) on a BESOIN (0.6) d'avoir beaucoup plus de pragmatisme
InM	ent'prise= I propose we: need (.) to h:ave

[42]

	143 [02:08.5]144 [02:09.0]
M	(0.4) et on a besoin d'avoir une politique en faveur de l'investissement (.) privé et
InM	more pragmatism we need to have a policy in favour of in

[43]

	..	145 [02:12.5]	146 [02:12.9]
M	publique=		c'est indispensable pour lutter contre le chômage
H2		=Emmanuel Macron=	
InM	vest!ment!	(0.7)	this is indispensable

[44]

	147 [02:14.9]	148 [02:15.1]	149 [02:16.5]	150 [02:16.6]
M	(0.2)	(et) il n'y a pas de fatalité	(.)	vous ne proposez rien! pour lutter
InM	to	fight against unemployment	there	is no error:

[45]

	..	151 [02:18.4]	152 [02:18.8]	153 [02:19.0]	154 [02:19.5*]	155 [02:20.2]
M	contre le chômage	RRIEN			vous proposez! (0.2)	d'aller
H2			xxx xxx xxx	l'occasion!		
InM		fatality	(.)	error:	(0.8)	you

[46]

	..	157 [02:21.2]	158 [02:21.5]
M	chercher de manière=		très approximative dans des dossier que vous ne
H2		=Marine Le Pen	
InM	are not pro	posing any: thing to fight against	error unemployment

[47]

	..	159 [02:23.5]	160 [02:24.4]	161 [02:24.7]	162 [02:25.1]	163 [02:25.6]	164 [02:26.0]
L		monsieur Ma	cron				
M	connaissiez pas!		des CAS	(.)	mais MOI je propose de créer de l'emploi		
H2			Marine Le Pen		je propose-		
InM		your knowledge of	the files	is very	approximative		

[48]

	165 [02:26.7]	166 [02:27.7]	167 [02:27.9]	168 [02:29.1]	169 [02:29.3]
M	pour les indépendants (0.2)	les TPE PME (0.2)	les entreprises de taille	de taille	
InM	I: propose to	create jobs	(.) for	self-employed people	and

Excerpt 5 – Full Transcript EN+FR

[1]

	..	23 [00:23.6]	24 [00:24.3]	25 [00:25.2*]
M	par=exemple quand peu:geo::t!	(0.2)	était menacé=l'état a investi et monté	
H1			(xxx)	
InM	means the state can invest	in a company	when peugeot! was under	

[2]

	..	26 [00:26.1]	27 [00:27.7]	28 [00:27.8]	29 [00:28.5]
L			ben=vous voyez:		
M	au capital	pour sauver l'entreprise	(0.8)		et il y
H1			<<faint> (voilà::: alors)>		
InM	threat the state increased	(it) s-share of the capital	to	save	the

[3]

	.. 30 [00:28.9]31 [00:29.6]32 [00:29.7] 33 [00:30.3*] 34 [00:30.9]35 [00:31.7]36 [00:31.8]
L	je le propose! vous dites que c'est ce qu'on (xxx) non parce que là
M	a la (xxx) vous proposez quelque chose non j'ai rien dit je sais
InL	well you! see! I'm
InM	company

[4]

	.. 37 [00:32.5] 38 [00:32.7]39 [00:33.1] 40 [00:34.2] 41 [00:34.3]42 [00:34.5]
L	non car là NON MONSieur=car=là=c'
M	que c'était c'est interessant (vos) solutions GÉNIALES
InL	proposing it
InM	(s'inter(e)sting)

[5]

	.. 43 [00:36.5]44 [00:36.7] 45 [00:37.6]
L	est=un=fonds souverain que je confierais moi (0.2) à des chefs d'entreprise (ce qui n'
M	ça c'est
InL	(so) this is a sovereign
InM	because your (in) g - great solutions

[6]

	.. 46 [00:38.3] 47 [00:39.3] 48 [00:40.1] 49 [00:40.5] 50 [00:41.0]
L	est) pas le cas NON:: (0.9) ce (.) c'est pas
M	ce qui existe (a-) la banque publique d'investissement ça avait été crée SI: mais
H1	d'accord voilà je vous proPOSE
InL	fund that I would entrust (.) to business leaders
InM	already exist (0.4) the

[7]

	.. 51 [00:43.5] 52 [00:44.7*]
L	une banque que je veux (.) c'est un FONDS! SOUVERAIN! (2.0)
M	madame le pen vous dites (.) n'IM:POR!:TE:quoi (.) mais n'
InL	it's not a: ba:nk that I want it's a sovereign fund
InM	public investment bank already exists

[8]

	.. 53 [00:46.0]54 [00:46.0] 55 [00:47.7]
L	<<big smile> MONSs::ieur macron (0.9)> ne jouez pas: avec
M	importe quoi (..) le FONDS souverain le fonds souverain
H1	bon

[9]

	.. 56 [00:50.4]57 [00:50.6]
L	moi ne jouez pas (ne) je vois que vous cherchez à jouer
M	que vous proposez (..) mais je joue pas malheureusement c'est triste (2.1) mais
InL	do:n't play: with me

[10]	.. 58 [00:52.0] 59 [00:54.6]		
L	avec moi l'élève et (au) professeur mais en c'qui=m'concerne ce n'est pas		
M	(.) <<sad voice> non:::> (1.7) mais		
InL	I see that you're trying to play: with me the		
[11]	.. 60 [00:56.2] 61 [00:56.5] 62 [00:57.2]		
L	particulièrement mon truc je vous dis		
M	moi non plus (vous) savez (.) c'est tri:ste:		
H1	(bon) alORS (..)		
InL	teacher and the pu:pil! but erm it's not=my=thing		
[12]	..64 [00:58.0] 65 [00:58.9] 66 [00:59.1] 67 [01:00.4]		
M	le pays mérite mieux (..) parce que dans le cas de whirlpool ce que vous proposez		
H1	nous		
InM	the country deserves a better		
[13]	.. 68 [01:01.2*] 69 [01:01.9] 70 [01:03.8] 71 [01:04.2]		
M	c'est rien (..) vous proposez d'abord vous ne respectez pas les		
H1	(non) (est-ce qu') (..) () (.) (me=m: ME=M::)		
InM	(.) debate=in the case of whirlpool what YOU proposed is nothing! first of		
[14]	72 [01:04.5] 73 [01:06.0] 74 [01:06.1] 75 [01:06.4]		
M	vous ne respectez pas=non je repondrai sur le fond à ce sujet parce que moi j'ai		
H1	hm-ouais		
InM	all you don't respect! people you don't! respect people		
[15]	.. 76 [01:08.1] 77 [01:10.0] 78 [01:10.7]		
M	entendu la colère moi j'ai passé des heures avec eux vous=vous n'les respectez pas		
InM	(0.8) I:: (0.6) heard the anger! of people= I (.)		
[16]	79 [01:11.2] 80 [01:12.8] 81 [01:13.0] 82 [01:13.3] 83 [01:14.0]		
L	j'ai pas sé M campAG= =NE		
M	vous avez passé un: quart: d'heure: sur le parquet vous n'êtes		
InM	spent hours with the (.) workers=(of)=well you spent FIFTEEN minutes on the		
[17]	.. 84 [01:14.8] 85 [01:16.6]		
L	PAS: ENTRÉS vous n'êtes MÊME PAS rentrés de l'aut'côté des barrières de l'		
M	parking lot (.) of whirlpool (0.2) you didn't		
InM			

[18]	..	86 [01:17.4]	87 [01:19.2]
L	<<smile> là où vou=vous êtes protégés des journalistes c'est ça > <<big		
M	entreprise vous n'avez pas débattu mais (.) moi je		
InM	even go into the company: premesiss		
[19]	88 [01:19.7]	89 [01:20.7]	90 [01:21.6]
L	smile> sans les journalistes>		
M	suis rentré pour aller je m'en fiche des journalistes (.) j'allais au con=		
InL	where you were protected from journalists (0.4) without		
[20]	92 [01:22.5]	93 [01:23.4]	94 [01:23.6]
L	avec vos:! cameras personelles (0.9) ouais		
M	=tact! je suis allé AU: con!tact moi des salariés parce que c'est ça		
InL	the journalists with your personal camera		
InM	ah...ah.. I:! met the employees		
[21]	99 [01:26.6]	100 [01:26.9]	101 [01:28.5]
L	(les) salariés:!		
M	respecter les gens (.) et pendant que vous! faisiez vous votre numéro avec! les		
InM	and that! is what (me-) it means to respect (0.3) people when		
[22]	103 [01:30.5]	104 [01:32.9]	105 [01:32.9]
M	cameras moi j'étais avec les représentants des salariés parce que je les re:specte		
InM	(.) YOU (.) were: playing to the cameras I was with the representatives of		
[23]	106 [01:34.2]	107 [01:35.1]	108 [01:35.7]
M	et vous savez quoi? (0.6) <<suddenly calm> ils ont bien compris que		
InM	the employees because I respect them and you know what		
[24]	109 [01:36.8]	110 [01:37.7]	
L	<<calm> (les) sa:la:riés::> (0.6)		
M	vous=n=leur=proposiez rien (0.4) > ils ont bien compris que vous=ne=propo=		
InM	they understood that you don't propose anything		
[25]	111 [01:39.1]	112 [01:41.1]	113 [01:41.3]
L	ils: vous: ont HU:ÉES::! monsieur macron hu:és:		
M	=siez rien=le SOIR même mais oui! parce qu'ils sont en colère		
InL	they booed you they		
InM	to them (0.4) err		

[26]

	116 [01:42.8]	117 [01:43.2]	118 [01:43.6]	119 [01:44.9]	120 [01:45.1]	121 [01:45.4]
L	et ils vous ont dits deho:rs					
M	parce que ils savent que					
InL	et moi je prends cette part de colère j e p r e n d s cette part de colère					
InM	booed you an they said ou:t! ou:t!					

[27]

	122 [01:46.8]	123 [01:47.1]	124 [01:47.2]	125 [01:47.4]	126 [01:48.3]	127 [01:48.5]	128 [01:49.6]	129 [01:50.1]
L	moi							
M	toute la campagne							
InL	j'ai parlé d'eux							
InM	(mais) vous n'leur proposez rien!							
	because they know that I: I							
	ah (0.5) I resssp-							

[28]

	130 [01:50.2]	131 [01:50.9]	132 [01:52.5]	133 [01:53.2]
L	j'ai mis:: la lumière			
M	<<shaking head> (.) (tsss) (2.5)			
InL	(.) vous jouez avec leur colère madame le pen et le soir vous faites un			
InM	campaigned I spo:ke about them:			
	you don't propo!se anything (.) to them (.) they are angry			

[29]

	134 [01:53.5]	135 [01:53.8]	136 [01:54.6]	137 [01:55.0]	138 [01:55.8]
L	(0.9)				
M	communiqué en proposant quoi?				
InL	(0.9) la				
InM	I shed the li!ght				
	and in the eve!ning (.) you issued a communiqué (.) a				

[30]

	140 [01:58.4]
L	non la mise sous protection par l'état le temps de trouver
M	na:!tionalisation de whirl= =pool (1.2) mais c'est:: à se te:NIR: les cô:!tes:!
InM	statement (.) proposing (.) the nationalisation! of whirlpool

[31]

	141 [02:01.3]	142 [02:03.1]	143 [02:03.5]	144 [02:04.6]
L	un repreneur (0.4)			
M	(0.4)			
InL	certains ont essayé que vous			
	that it be protected by the state until a buyer=is=found			

Abstract (English)

Turn-taking has been largely ignored by research on simultaneous interpreting, which is not surprising given that deontology/technology traditionally dictate that interpreters do not/cannot speak simultaneously. A rare exception to this is found in television interpretation of political debates, in cases where speaker-assigned simultaneous interpreting is performed. Here, the interpreters can and indeed must negotiate whose turn it is to speak – or risk speaking at the same time. But as they negotiate, they are a) interpreting and b) heard on television, which implies considerable constraints and requirements. This study investigates how interpreters negotiate turns when dealing with a high-conflictuality source text. The analysed material stems from the highly conflictual televised debate between Emmanuel Macron and Marine Le Pen in the 2017 French presidential elections. The English-language broadcast by FRANCE 24 features three interpreters working on three different channels, allowing them to take the floor independently and speak over each other. The analysis shows a dominant tendency to avoid overlap and conflict which overrides any other normative forces. The interpreters consistently refrain from reproducing overlapping speech in the source. Instead, extended passages of highly conflictual overlap are transformed into clearly structured alternating turns, with noticeable transitional pauses and an almost complete lack of even unproblematic overlap.

Abstract (German)

Bisher hat die Thematik des Sprecherwechsels in der Forschung zum Bereich Simultandolmetschen wenig Beachtung gefunden. Dies ist kaum verwunderlich, da durch Deontologie und Technologie traditionell vorgegeben ist, dass Dolmetschende nicht gleichzeitig sprechen sollen bzw. können. Eine seltene Ausnahme bilden simultane Verdolmetschungen politischer Debatten im Fernsehen, bei denen den Redner*innen jeweils ein*e Dolmetschende*r zugewiesen wird. In diesem Szenario können und müssen die Dolmetscher aushandeln, wer an der Reihe ist – oder sie sprechen gleichzeitig. Die Dolmetschenden müssen also einerseits dolmetschen, sich andererseits dem Fernsehpublikum aussetzen, und gleichzeitig untereinander den Sprecherwechsel aushandeln. Diese Arbeit untersucht, wie Dolmetschende das Aushandeln des Sprecherwechsels im Umgang mit einem Ausgangstext mit hoher Konfliktivität bewältigen. Das untersuchte Material stammt aus der äußerst konfrontativen Fernsehdebatte zwischen Emmanuel Macron und Marine Le Pen im französischen Präsidentschaftswahlkampf 2017. In der englischsprachigen Übertragung von FRANCE 24 arbeiten drei Dolmetschende gleichzeitig auf drei unterschiedlichen Kanälen und sind somit in der Lage, unabhängig voneinander das Wort zu ergreifen und gleichzeitig zu sprechen. In der Analyse zeigt sich eine überwiegende Tendenz zur Vermeidung gleichzeitigen Sprechens, welche jegliche andere normative Kräfte aushebelt. Die Dolmetschenden vermeiden es konsequent, gleichzeitiges Sprechen im Quelltext zu reproduzieren. Stattdessen werden ausgedehnte Passagen gleichzeitigen Sprechens mit hoher Konfliktdichte in Form eines sauberen Sprecherwechsels mit deutlichen Pausen beim Wechsel wiedergegeben, unter fast vollständiger Vermeidung gleichzeitigen Sprechens.