A Dutch discourse marker in interpreter-mediated police interviewing with drafting: A corpus-based approach to dialogue interpreting

Bart Defrancq – Sofie Verliefde
Ghent University / Belgium

Abstract – This study systematically analyses the use of a Dutch discourse marker (*dus*) by nine interpreters assisting in 12 police interviews. It is an attempt to approach dialogue interpreting with the analytical framework of corpus-based linguistics and a data collection that can stand the comparison with existing corpora of mostly simultaneous interpreting. In terms of frequencies, the results show that interpreters do not seem to divert from general usage patterns for spoken Dutch. However, their use of *dus* is mostly disconnected from the speech they are interpreting. While explicitation seems to be at play in a certain number of cases, the bulk of instances serves interaction coordination purposes. A substantial number of instances with a filler function are also found, where interpreters struggle to understand the source speech or to articulate their interpretation. Finally, some interesting cases of so-called discursive control enforced by *dus* are observed, further confirming the special relationship interpreting holds with drafting of written records during the interview.

Keywords – dialogue interpreting; interpreter-mediated police interviewing; discourse marker; turn management; written record

1. INTRODUCTION

Miriam Shlesinger is traditionally credited with initiating the corpus-based turn in interpreting studies. In Shlesinger (1998), she called upon interpreting scholars to start building corpora of interpretation in order to offer interpreting researchers a collection of naturalistic data and an opportunity to perform large-scale empirical research. Shlesinger's call should not be mistaken for the starting point of the collection of interpreted text. Long before 1998, researchers had been collecting interpretations. Lederer (1980), for instance, reports findings based on a collection of simultaneous interpretations carried out at one conference and completed with experimental data. Using Lederer's data for a study of anticipation in interpreting, van Besien (1999) explicitly refers to the data as 'a corpus'. In the field of dialogue interpreting, considerable amounts

of data recorded during court hearings, police interviews, medical consultations, etc., have been compiled, exploited and, in some cases, even made accessible to the research community. Rarely are those called corpora. So, the first question we need to answer in this paper is: when does a text collection qualify as a corpus?

Text collections of different kinds are called corpora and there is no clear cut-off point beyond which a collection cannot be considered a corpus any longer (McEnery and Wilson 1996). However, corpus linguists usually put forward a number of critical features of corpora. They are expected to be:

1. machine-readable (McEnery and Wilson 1996), facilitating consultation and control of the results;
2. representative of the language, including the language varieties (Biber 1993), allowing researchers to draw generalisations and to replicate research;
3. sizable (Crystal 1995), providing enough data to draw reliable conclusions and to investigate low-frequency features;
4. collected and sampled on the basis of language-external factors (Sinclair 2005), providing naturalistic and independent data for multiple research purposes.

Few collections of interpreting data meet these criteria. For instance, although Bakti and Bóna (2014: 34, our emphasis) claim to perform an analysis of "an experimental *corpus* collected for an earlier study," their research data are clearly not collected based on language-external factors, as they were elicited through a linguistic experiment geared towards the study of a particular linguistic feature. Similarly, Davitti (2013), a study analysing performances of public service interpreters in three meetings, does not qualify as a corpus study, because three meetings can hardly be considered representative of the field of public service interpreting. A study based on 65 interpreter-mediated encounters, such as the one reported in Gavioli and Baraldi (2011), has a better chance of representing at least some of the variety, although the authors themselves specifically deny representativeness in a later study (Baraldi and Gavioli 2012).

If text collections do not count as corpora, as is the case of most of the collections of dialogue interpreting, does it make sense to refer to 'corpus-based dialogue interpreting studies'? The question is an important one. Corpus-based interpreting studies has rapidly evolved over the last ten to 15 years. The availability of corpus materials from several international institutions and the significant improvement of automatic transcription tools removed two of the main obstacles to research that Shlesinger (1998) identified.

Important, though comparatively small-scale, corpora have been collected in various research centres. Quite a few research papers applying corpus-based methods have been published over the years, focusing on lexical and pragmatic properties of interpreted texts, translation universals and cognitive load, though in a small number of language pairs. These studies have mainly focused on conference interpreting while dialogue interpreting has mostly been overlooked. It is remarkable, for instance, that the special issue of the *Interpreters' Newsletter* (issue 22), published in 2017 and specifically devoted to *Corpus-based Dialogue Interpreting Studies*, as its title reads, contains not a single contribution showcasing empirical work based on a corpus (Bendazzoli 2017). In the issue, two contributions are theoretical (Angelelli 2017; Gao and Wang 2017), one is pedagogical illustrating the use of corpora in a training programme for dialogue interpreters (Spinzi 2017), one is an empirical study based on one single naturalistic instance of dialogue interpreting over the telephone (Määttä 2017), and another one is based on data collected during a moot court (Liu and Hale 2017).

The dearth of studies has numerous reasons. The limited accessibility of settings where dialogue interpreting takes place and the severe restrictions imposed in terms of data protection prevent many available collections to reach the status of a fully exploitable corpus. Unsurprisingly, most of the larger data collections stem from court hearings (Hale 2004; Mason 2008; Angermeyer 2015), most of which are open to the public and are recorded in written form by the court itself.

The research agenda put forward in the research on dialogue interpreting is also a factor. Focusing on interactional coordination and interpreters' roles in interpreter-mediated communication, research into dialogue interpreting has rarely promoted investigation of consistent linguistic patterns across dialogue interpretations. The analyses of discourse marker used in Hale (2004) and Mason (2008) are exceptional in that respect. The purpose of this study is to analyse, in the same systematic way, discourse marker use by interpreters in the context of police interpreting.

Section 2 will first review the broader literature on discourse marker use in interpreter-mediated dialogues. Subsequently, in Section 3, we will motivate our choice to focus on the police context and put forward the research questions for our study. While Hale (2004) focused on discourse markers held especially relevant of witness examination in court (*well*, *see*, and *now*), we will focus on a particular discourse marker whose use is critical in police interviews, namely *dus*, which is the Dutch equivalent of

English 'so'. In the same section, we will show why certain uses of *so/dus* are procedually important. Data and methods are set out in Section 4, while the results, discussion, and conclusions are presented in Sections 5, 6 and 7, respectively.

2. DISCOURSE MARKERS IN INTERPRETING

It is widely acknowledged that interpreters have a propensity to shape the discourse quite differently from the source text, especially with regard to the marking of semantic coherence relations between and inside topical units. In consecutive conference interpreting, for instance, there is evidence that interpreters —novices and professionals alike— use cohesive markers that have no equivalent in the source text. In one particular case of consecutive interpreting at a literary conference in Italy, Mead (2012) finds that the interpreter uses *quindi* ('so'), even though the consecutive relationship is not explicitly marked at that particular point of the English source text. Interestingly, Mead (2012: 176) attributes the addition by the interpreter to a systemic difference between English and Italian, the latter allegedly preferring explicit marking of cause-effect relations. Similarly, Bastin (2003) observes that interpreting trainees add cohesive devices when interpreting consecutively from English into French, emphasising that the additions improve the perceived quality of their performance.

Similarly, in dialogue interpreting the presence of untriggered cohesive markers is widely attested, as well as the absence of markers at points where they should have been triggered by markers in the source text (Berk-Seligson 1990; Hale 2004; Mason 2008; Gallai 2013, 2017; Blakemore and Gallai 2014). The latter four studies analyse naturalistic data and are directly relevant to a corpus-based approach. Based on an analysis of a substantial corpus of court interpretations, Hale (2004) concludes that interpreters often omit discourse markers that underscore the confrontational stance taken by the speaker. As a result, the illocutionary strength of the speech act performed is altered, which may have an effect on how the addressee will respond. She also speculates that omissions may be attributable to two factors: on the one hand, systemic differences between languages that make it difficult to translate discourse markers; on the other hand, omission may also be the result of the interpreter's focus on the propositional content of the speaker's utterance. This focus may divert interpreters' attention away from items that do not contribute directly to the propositional content.

By contrast, Gallai (2013, 2017) and Blakemore and Gallai (2014) mostly discuss cases where interpreters add discourse markers. Blakemore and Gallai (2014) argue that these additions are signposts of the interpreters' understanding of the speaker's utterances, but stress that hearers are unable to recognise them as such, as they have no access to the speaker's utterances. Additions thus have the effect of strengthening mutuality between speaker and hearer, as the hearer of an interpreted utterance is bound to project contextual assumptions triggered by the discourse marker onto the speaker, and not onto the interpreter (see Delizée and Michaux 2019). In Gallai (2013, 2017) the question of the interpreter's visibility is raised in connection with additions of discourse markers. Finally, Mason (2008) attempts to tie particular tendencies in discourse marker use to gender properties of the interpreters involved. These tendencies are both cognitively and socially determined. Male interpreters tend to omit utterance-initial discourse markers more often than female interpreters, because of limited memory resources. Greater awareness of social hierarchies, in turn, makes men omit more politeness items when an addressee is of lower status. Poorer awareness, in contrast, lets women omit more deferential items. However, women tend to add politeness items to their interpretations more than men, which is interpreted by Mason (2008) as an effect of prioritising group solidarity.

It is sometimes hypothesised that interpreters use untriggered markers to better represent the speaker's 'mental model' (Jacobsen 2002), that is, given the context in which they interpret, they assume that leaving the relationship implicit would not convey the speaker's thoughts in the target language accurately enough (Jacobsen 2002; Blakemore and Gallai 2014).

Finally, as far as simultaneous interpreting is concerned, Shlesinger (1995) concludes from an experimental study that the majority of cohesive shifts, namely, differences in the use of cohesive items from source text to target text, consist of omissions of cohesive markers. In a corpus study based on simultaneous interpretations performed during sessions of the European Parliament, however, Amon (2006) observes one untriggered occurrence of French *donc* 'therefore' in a target text, which he analyses as a placeholder for a substantial omission. In a much larger corpus drawn from the same setting as Amon's data, Defrancq *et al.* (2015) observe that the addition of cohesive markers is quite common across two language combinations (French-English and French-Dutch). For some frequent markers, such as *so* and its Dutch equivalent *dus*, additions

account for 40 per cent to 50 per cent of all occurrences. A general tendency to add discourse markers was found for other language combinations in the European Parliament (see Götz 2020 for English-Hungarian, and Gumul and Bartłomiejczyk 2022 for English-Polish), casting doubt on systemic differences as an explanatory factor. Defrancq *et al.* (2015) also point out that additions cannot always be explained in terms of explicitation, that is, they do not always represent the speaker's assumed 'mental model'. Quite a few occurrences of English *so* and Dutch *dus* are used to cover up large omissions and create an illusion of coherence. Similarly, Defrancq (2016) observes that English-speaking simultaneous European Parliament interpreters sometimes use an untriggered *well* when they seem to feel that their interpretation is inaccurate. For instance, *well* frequently appears to occur in self-repairs performed by several interpreters. Clearly, these are not cases in which interpreters endeavour to reflect the speakers 'mental model'; the items rather reflect interpreters' monitoring of their own speech.

The two explanatory dimensions for the addition of discourse markers that we can draw from the literature are thus systemic differences between source and target language, on the one hand, and the tendency to explicitate either implied speakers' intentions or to express a personal assessment on form (or content) of the interpretation by the interpreters themselves. The modal dimension seems to be less relevant, as additions seem to occur across interpreting modes. However, judging by the number of cases different authors discuss, it seems that the simultaneous mode is more affected by additions than consecutive in dialogue. Our study will seek to challenge these findings on the basis of a larger dataset of dialogue interpreting than is used in most other studies.

3. POLICE INTERPRETING

3.1. Research into police interpreting

The police context is underrepresented in interpreting studies (Gamal 2017). The available empirical research on police interpreting is limited both in empirical and in contextual scope. Most of the studies are based on no more than five police interviews: Krouglov (1999), four interviews; Komter (2005), one interview; Gallai (2013), five interviews; Nakane (2014), four interviews; Kredens (2017), one interview; Monteoliva-García (2017), two interviews; Defrancq and Verliefde (2018), one interview; and Tipton (2021), two interviews. Verliefde and Defrancq (2022) draw on ten interviews. Only

Russell (2001) and Filipović (2022) stand out with 28 and 100 police interviews, respectively. However, their interviews were very fragmentarily transcribed.

Studies focus almost exclusively on police interpreting in legal systems that belong to common law: Australia in Nakane (2014); the United Kingdom in Krouglov (1999), Russell (2001), Gallai (2013, 2017), Blakemore and Gallai (2014), Kredens (2017), Monteoliva-García (2017) and Tipton (2021); and the United Kingdom and the United States in Filipović (2022). Only Komter (2005), Defrancq and Verliefde (2018), and Verliefde and Defrancq (2022) deal with police interpreting in continental Europe, the Netherlands and Belgium, respectively.

The continental inquisitorial legal system is particularly interesting as police officers are required to conduct oral police interviews and to (simultaneously) draft a written record of those interviews. According to Komter (2006), the drafting phase has turn-like status in the interaction. In such a context, interpreter-mediated interviews include not only the spoken interaction of three participants, but also the entextualisation process (Park and Bucholtz 2009). This process is a polyphonic representation in itself: police officers record interviewees' statements as rendered by interpreters. Interpreters are seen to actively engage in a variety of ways with this entextualisation process (Defrancq and Verliefde 2018; Verliefde and Defrancq 2022).

This is where the interest of discourse marker use in police interpreting lies: multiple discourses intersect during the interview, which are meant to be conflated into one single written discourse at the end. In an inquisitorial legal system such as the Belgian one, interviewees have the right to request that their statements be taken down verbatim (Smets and Ponsaers 2011). However, they rarely are, as police officers tend to enhance the logical and chronological coherence of the interviewees' accounts, while focusing on cause-effect relationships to establish interviewees' involvement in criminal offenses (Smets and Ponsaers 2011). That sort of enhancement is partly achieved through discourse markers. Interpreters, in turn, are known to assist with the drafting process, adapting answers to the question format, pausing, spelling names (Pöchhacker and Kolb 2009), and upgrading the interviewee's register (Defrancq and Verliefde 2018). The latter pattern is likely to affect discourse features of the interpretation, including the use of discourse markers. The role of markers of consequence is paramount in this respect as those are instrumental to making cause-effect relationships explicit.

There is another reason why the European continental police context is especially interesting for the analysis of markers of consequence. In English, the most frequent of these markers, *so*, is reported to be used as "an agent of discursive control" (Ainsworth 2018: 36), meaning that a reformulation or summary introduced by *so* is difficult to challenge for the interlocutor. Interestingly, police officers are reported to use these kinds of reformulations frequently before taking down interviewees' statements (Komter 2022). For instance, in Excerpt (1), taken from Komter (2022),[1] the first quoted utterance starts with *so* and is followed by the information that is about to be typed up (albeit from a different deictic framework).[2]

Excerpt (1)

1. P: So yesterday you went to the market with your children.
2. S: Yes.
3. P: ((types, 6 s)
Yesterday,
4. P: To the market, then we're talking about Waterlooplein I assume.
5. S: What do you say, yes.
6. P: Yes.
7.   ((types, 17 s:))
I went to the Waterlooplein, together with my children.
8. P: Uh (4) have you uh been to the stalls

Pre-drafting reformulations invite interviewees to agree with the wording the police officer proposes to use in the written record. They underscore that the police officer is in charge of the written discourse that results from the recent exchange. Given the interpreters' role in the drafting process, interpretations might also present evidence of discursive control.

The data used for this paper was collected in an area where only Dutch can be used in legal proceedings. We will therefore first review the literature on the most common Dutch marker of consequence: *dus*.

3.2. Dus

Compared to its English's and French counterparts (*so* and *donc*, respectively), *dus* has attracted little research. As our purpose is empirical, we will focus in this section on the

---

[1] https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fcomm.2022.797145/full

[2] In fact, Komter's (2022) examples are translations of transcriptions based on interviews conducted in Dutch. The agent of discursive control is *dus*, rather than English *so*.

different uses of *dus* which are described in the literature, giving special attention to the literature on spoken Dutch.

For spoken registers, the absolute frequency of *dus* reported in Oostdijk (2000) on a sample of 615,000 tokens of the *Corpus Gesproken Nederlands* (CGN)[3] is 3,895, or a relative frequency of 6.3 occurrences per 1,000 words. Degand (2011) reports a relative frequency of 4.3 per 1,000 words in a larger sample of CGN (1.7 million tokens), consisting exclusively of spoken data from the Netherlands. Finally, Degand and van Bergen (2018) report a frequency of 7.2 occurrences per 1,000 words in a CGN subcorpus comprising only face-to-face interactions. Face-to-face interactions are directly relevant to the interpreting data to be analysed, as those were collected in dialogue settings. Higher frequencies in face-to-face interactions are likely due to the floor management functions for which *dus* is recruited. It is to be expected that interpreting data collected in dialogue settings show similarly high frequencies of *dus*. As interpreters are known to take charge of turn coordination in dialogue interpreting (Wadensjö 1998), one may wonder whether interpreters use *dus* to render turn management organisation by the participant or rather their own turn management.

Dus is traditionally described as a connective (Pander Maat and Degand 2001; Stukker *et al.* 2009) or a discourse marker (Evers-Vermeul 2010; Degand 2011; Buysse 2017; Degand and van Bergen 2018). Most authors attribute functions to *dus* in three widely accepted domains of discourse: the ideational, the interpersonal, and the textual domain (Halliday 1985). In the ideational domain, *dus* connects states of affairs that are in a causal relationship; its use foregrounds subjective features of that relationship (Pander Maat and Degand 2001; Stukker *et al.* 2009). In the interpersonal domain, *dus* may signal inferences connecting illocutionary meanings with locutionary meanings (Degand 2001) and turn management functions, such as turn uptake and turn yielding (Degand and van Bergen 2018). In the textual domain, *dus* enables reactivation of previously uttered information (Evers-Vermeul 2010), including concluding, rephrasing and repetition. In this particular function, *dus* may be used as an agent of discursive control in the sense of Ainsworth (2018). As pointed out above, Komter (2022) quotes several examples of *dus* introducing pre-drafting reformulations by police officers, which typically ensure discursive control. Finally, Defrancq *et al.* (2015) show that simultaneous interpreters frequently use *dus* to create an illusion of cohesion during and after a period

---

[3] https://taalmaterialen.ivdnt.org/download/tstc-corpus-gesproken-nederlands

of inadequate rendition. It often occurs in those cases in combination with hesitation markers, such as *uh*, and usually has no equivalent in the source text.

Unfortunately, there are few frequency data on the individual functions of *dus*. Buysse (2017) provides a functional breakdown of occurrences in both source texts and translations showing that inferential uses and concluding uses are most frequent and make up slightly more than half of the occurrences.

3.3. Research questions

There seem to be significant research gaps in the field and in particular as regards dialogue interpreting in a police context. There is evidence that simultaneous interpreters add substantial numbers of discourse markers to their interpretations. There is also some evidence to that effect in dialogue interpreting but, due to the small collections of dialogue data, it is unclear how strong this tendency is. For lack of sufficient instances, it is unknown which factors could explain additions in dialogue interpreting. A thorough functional analysis is therefore needed to find out to which functional categories additions mostly belong. Therefore, the research questions of this study are as follows:

1. How frequent is *dus* and how frequent are untriggered (that is, added) instances of *dus* in dialogue police interpreting?
2. What are the functions of *dus* used by dialogue interpreters in police contexts?

It is important to mention that this study will only focus on the use of *dus* in Dutch interpretations. Discourse marker use in other languages is not taken into account. As the corpus contains seven languages other than Dutch, including them would require a detailed review of discourse markers in all the languages, which is beyond the scope of this study.

4. DATA AND METHODOLOGY

The data used in this study are drawn from a collection of 12 police interviews conducted in Belgium between 2014 and 2019. According to Belgian law, these interviews are conducted in Dutch and, if the interviewee has not got sufficient knowledge of the language, interpreted by a sworn interpreter. Recordings of these interviews were authorised under the Court of Ghent's Prosecutor General's authorisation and stored with

password protection on local servers at Ghent University. Besides the recordings, the written records of the interviews were obtained and stored. The recordings were transcribed using the Jefferson (2004) conventions and pseudonymised. Transcriptions were made by different legal interpreters or, when those were not available, by people with a language degree in the non-institutional language. Turns in the non-institutional language were back-translated to Dutch. Table 1 provides an overview of the interviews and their main features.

Interview	Language	Interpreter		Topic	Duration	Recording
		Dutch	Gender			
1	French	A	F	Threats and assault with a knife	2h 55m	Audio
2	English	A	F	Sham relationship	3h 00m	Video
3	Turkish	B	M	Sham marriage	1h 45m	Video
4	Romanian	B	F	Human trafficking and forced prostitution	4h 15m	Audio
5	Arabic	B	M	Sham marriage	2h 45m	Audio + video
6	Arabic	B	M	Sham marriage	1h 25m	Audio + video
7	Pashto	B	M	Drug trafficking	1h 55m	Audio
8	Pashto	B	M	Possession of prohibited weapon	0h 30m	Audio
9	Romanian	B	F	Human trafficking and forced prostitution	3h 40m	Audio + video
10	Romanian	B	F	Human trafficking and forced prostitution	4h 15m	Audio + video
11	Greek	A	M	Sham relationship	2h 30m	Video
12	Greek	A	M	Sham relationship	2h 20m	Video
Total					**31h 15m**	

Table 1: Overview and main features of the interpreter-mediated interviews

In all, the collection contains approximately 31 hours of interpreter-mediated police interviewing involving nine different interpreters (the same interpreters are active in Interviews 5 and 6, 9 and 10, and 11 and 12). Half of the recorded interviews deal with sham relationship procedures. Police officers are able to plan these interviews in advance, which makes it easier for them to coordinate with the researchers in these cases.

The nine interpreters involved are all sworn interpreters according to the pre-2016 requirements. In a nutshell, this means that they provided proof of their knowledge of two languages, including Dutch, and had no criminal record prior to the oath they were invited to take at the court to become sworn interpreters. The Belgian law on sworn interpreters

and translators was overhauled in 2014 as a result of the implementation of Directive 64/2010/EU.[4] It now imposes a legal training programme of, at least, 32 hours. The interpreters' level of experience was not queried at the time of the interviews they interpreted.

Interview	Language	Tokens	Interpreter tokens
1	French	32,000	15,000
2	English	13,000	7,000
3	Turkish	11,000	4,000
4	Romanian	42,000	18,000
5	Arabic	16,000	8,000
6	Arabic	9,000	5,000
7	Pashto	12,000	5,000
8	Pashto	6,000	2,000
9	Romanian	39,000	19,000
10	Romanian	30,000	14,000
11	Greek	21,000	10,000
12	Greek	14,000	7,000
Total		**245,000**	**114,000**

Table 2: Numbers of tokens in the different sub-corpora

As shown in Table 2, the corpus contains roughly 245,000 tokens. Slightly less than half of those tokens (114,000) are attributable to the interpreters. Figures vary considerably across encounters depending on the features of the interrogation. In half of the encounters the written record drafted during the interrogation is sight-translated by the interpreter at the very end of the interview. This accounts for higher shares of interpreting in the total token count of the encounter. The interviews in Pashto were partly conducted in the regionally dominant language, as the Pashto suspect had some knowledge of it, which accounts for the lower share of interpreter tokens. Most instances of interpretation are carried out in consecutive mode. However, in Belgian police interviews it is not uncommon to see interpreters use the simultaneous mode and even switch multiple times from one mode to another. Interviews 1, 9 and 10 contain stretches of simultaneous interpreting. Simultaneous interpreting is mainly used when the interviewee is speaking.

---

[4] Law of 10 April 2014 modifying several provisions regarding the creation of a national register for legal experts and with a view to create a national register of sworn translators, interpreters, and translators-interpreters. *Belgian Official Journal* of 19 December 2014, p. 104479.

By most standards, the collection is small; in the area of interpreting research, however, its size is fairly average. The problems and usefulness of interpreting research based on nano-corpora, such as the *Interpreter-mediated Police Interviewing with Drafting* corpus (IMPID; Verliefde 2022), have been reviewed in the literature (Defrancq and Collard 2019). The data are not publicly available as they contain sensitive personal information that needs to be protected. It is therefore debatable whether the collection represents a real corpus of interpreting. We will nevertheless apply regular corpus-based methods to query the corpus and extract both quantitative and qualitative data.

All instances of *dus* were extracted using *AntConc* 3.4.4 (Anthony 2014) and placed in a wide context window. A considerable number of utterance-initial occurrences was expected, compelling us to take into account a substantial piece of previous context to be able to identify the function of the connective.

In assigning functions, we privileged a manual close reading approach, using the different semantic and interactional functions listed previously as a frame of reference. In doing that, we have applied the following annotation principles:

1. only assign a consequential function if the relationship between two phrasal or clause units can be interpreted as a cause-effect relationship between states of affairs;

2. only assign an inferential function if the relationship between two phrasal or clause units can be interpreted as an inferential relationship;

3. only assign a rephrasing function if the unit or clause following *dus* contains information already communicated in the same language. The latter requirement is important in the context of interpreting, as interpreting itself is inherently an act of rephrasing which includes self-repairs and conclusive statements at the end of turns that summarise the content of the turn;

4. only assign a turn-management function if turns are effectively transferred;

5. only assign a filler function if *dus* occurs in combination with hesitations, pauses and substantial omissions, while its function cannot be accounted for by any of the other functions;

6. label all cases that could not be assigned to one of the previous categories to a category 'unassigned'.

The annotation principles were applied in the described order. This implies that ambiguous cases are attributed to the higher category. For instance, if an instance of *dus*

occurs at the beginning of a successfully transferred turn in combination with hesitations, it is analysed as a turn-taking device rather than as a filler.

5. RESULTS

5.1. Quantitative analysis

Table 3 shows the absolute and normalised frequencies of *dus* in the interpreters' turns in each interview and the number and share of occurrences that are elicited, that is, that can be considered to be triggered by a discourse marker in the source speech.

Interview	#	/1,000w	Elicited	Non elicited	Percentage elicited
1	29	4.38	3	26	10.3
2	9	3.10	0	9	0.0
3	14	8.24	1	13	7.7
4	79	10.97	11	68	13.9
5	1	0.03	0	1	0.0
6	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
7	5	2.50	0	5	0.0
8	2	2.50	0	2	0.0
9	25	3.47	2	23	0.8
10	54	9.64	3	51	5.6
11	32	8.02	3	29	9.4
12	15	5.17	6	9	40.0
Total	**265**	**5.88**	**29**	**236**	**10.9**

Table 3: Frequencies of *dus* per interpretation

The overall relative frequency of *dus* in interpretations seems to be in line with the frequency reported in Degand and van Bergen (2018) for monolingual face-to-face interactions, which was 7.2 per 1,000 words. Compared with simultaneous interpreting data from the European Parliament, the dialogue interpreters in our sample appear to use *dus* slightly more. In the data presented by Defrancq *et al.* (2015), the frequency of *dus* in simultaneous interpretation performed in the European Parliament was 3.8 occurrences per 1,000 words (98 occurrences in a corpus of roughly 26,000 words).[5]

Variation across interpreters is high. There seems to be no plausible explanation for the variation other than individual usages. There is no observable relation with A-

---

[5] Defrancq *et al.* (2015) aggregate data for several discourse markers. The data given here report on the subset of occurrences of *dus*.

interpretation or B-interpretation into Dutch, as both highest and lowest frequencies are found in the group of B-interpreters. Usage does not seem to be gender-related either.

What all interpretations have in common is a low elicitation rate. Overall, only one in nine occurrences can be ascribed to the presence of a marker in the source speech. One fifth of the elicited instances occur in one single interpretation (Interview 12). These figures are all the more striking as the elicitation rate observed in the simultaneous data used by Defrancq *et al. (*2015) was 57.1 per cent (56 out of 98 cases). Dialogue interpreting appears to incentivise interpreters more to add the connective *dus* to their interpretations. In this regard, it should be noted that a substantial number of untriggered instances of *dus* occur in non-renditions (Wadensjö 1998), that is, in interpreter utterances that cannot be analysed as interpretations. In non-renditions, interpreters address one of the primary participants directly. In our corpus, 43 examples of this type were found. Excerpt (2), drawn from Interview 1, illustrates such a case (S = interviewee and I = interpreter).[6]

Excerpt 2

1. S <EN HOEVEEL KEER (.) PENDANT <u>DEUX MOIS></u> (.) COMBIEN DE
      [in Dutch] how many times [in French] during two months how many
2. S FOIS IL EST VENU CHEZ VOUS <person 1>
      times did he come here <person 1>
3. I hoeveel keer dat <person 1> hier in de afgelopen twee maanden bij jullie
      how many times <person 1> has been here with you in the last two months
4. I geweest is↓ **dus** dat zou hij wel eens willen weten↓
      so that's what he would like to know

In line 4, the interpreter adds an utterance referring to the interviewee in third person: *hij* ('he'), while explicitating the illocutionary force of the interviewee's turn. An instance of *dus* is used to introduce the addition.

Occurrences in non-renditions account for almost a fifth of the non-elicited cases. A functional analysis was carried out to find out in what circumstances interpreters add the other 80 per cent of non-elicited cases.

---

[6] In Interview 1, the interviewee has some knowledge of Dutch and uses it occasionally throughout the interview.

5.2. Functional analysis

Nearly all instances of *dus* can be straightforwardly categorised using the annotation criteria put forward in Section 3. Table 4 presents the breakdown of the observed cases.

Function	Total	Non elicited	Non renditon	Elicited	Percentage elicited
Consequence	26	20	7	6	23.1
Inference	27	22	6	5	18.5
Rephrasing	52	49	9	3	5.8
Turn taking	98	87	11	11	11.2
Turn yielding	13	11	3	2	15.4
Filler	42	42	3	0	0.0
Unassigned	7	5	4	2	28.6
Total	**265**	**222**	**43**	29	**10.9**

Table 4: Functions of *dus* in interpreting

All categories are well represented in the corpus. Turn management functions (turn taking and turn yielding) prevail, totalling almost 40 per cent of the cases. Rephrasing and filler functions jointly account for a third of the occurrences. Consequential and inferential *dus* amounts to almost a fifth. In total, seven cases could not straightforwardly be assigned to one of the categories.

The share of elicited instances is highest in the consequential uses. This is expected, as adding a marker in the ideational plane contributes to the meaning of the utterances and may distort the participants' message. In other uses, the risk of distortion is smaller, as well as the resulting ethical pressure to avoid additions.

In what follows, we will discuss a number of illustrative cases of untriggered uses, placing them in a wider context of interpreter strategies.

5.2.1. Explicitation of a cause-effect relationship

Excerpt (3), drawn from Interview 11, shows a consequential use of *dus* in line 14, which has no equivalent in the Greek source. The interviewee refers to the flight tickets the couple might have used to return to Greece, which would be evidence of their initial intention not to stay in Belgium. However, as he made the journey back in a lorry, he never used the tickets.

Excerpt (3)

1. S μπορέσουμε κάνουμε κάτι μείναμε αν δεν μπορέσουμε είχαμε
    if we can find anything we'll stay, if we cannot find anything
2. S κόψει τα εισιτήρια επιστροφής και θα φυ=θα ξανά γυρνάγαμε
    there is still the return ticket and then we'll go back again
3. S πάλι πίσω[(.hhh) μετά η (person17) έμεινε εγώ έφυγα πιο νωρίς
    together later (person 17) stayed and I left earlier
4. I [χμ
    (uhum)
5. S με:: φορτηγό και τα εισιτήρια πήγανε χαμένα δεν ξέρεις τα
    by lorry and the tickets got lost I mean we never
6. S χρησιμοποιήσαμε ποτέ τα επιστροφής
    used the tickets for the return flight
[7-9]
10. I met 't idee van te komen en te zien:: (.) of:: we:: (.) we hier konden
     with the idea to come and to see whether we would be able
11. I blijven of nie (.hh) en: als het zou tegenslagen dan hadden we ons
     to stay here or not and if we failed then we'd still have our
12. I euhm (.) terugticket onze terugvlucht al (.) ma dan uiteindelijk is
     return ticket our flight back but in the end
13. I (person17) gebleven (.) en ik ben me een vrachtwagen teruggegaan
     (person 17) stayed and I went back by lorry
14. I **dus** de (.h) de retourtickets die::: die zijn gewoon verloren gegaan
     so the return tickets they they basically got lost

In Greek the clauses in line 5 are linked up with the coordinate conjunction και ('and'). The interpreter, however, chooses to foreground the cause-effect relationship between the journey in the lorry and the failure to use the flight tickets. The use of consequential *dus* may be regarded as a typical explicitation of a clausal relationship. Explicitation might be an attempt to downplay the loss of evidence, as is further evidenced by the addition of a trivialising *gewoon* ('just/basically').

5.2.2. Rephrasing, repeating, and marking the most suitable segment as an answer

Rephrasing is obviously nearly always the result of an addition by the interpreter: interpreters usually do not copy rephrasings or repetitions by the primary participants. Excerpt 4, drawn from Interview 4, shows how the interpreter rephrases a previous segment of the interpretation, while no rephrasing takes place in the source utterance. The rephrasing is signalled by *dus*.

Excerpt (4)

1. S   deci dacă mă lasă să termin povestea de la ce-am ajuns cu
        so if he allows me to finish my story about what happened with the fight
2. S   ↑cearta pot să-i spun eu cănd am ajuns aici el mi-a arătat site-ul lui
        then I can tell him that when I arrived here he showed me his website
3. I   >hij zeg< als je [m::ij (2) het verh:aal
4. S   [dar (.) >după aceia am aflat mai multe și de aia am și plecat<
        but after that there was more that I found out and I left
5. I   dat eu::h eh van begin tot einde **dus** tot de ruzie (.) dan gaat u m:e=euh
        that uh uh from beginning to end so until the fight then you'll
6. I   misschien begrijpen van waar dat hij geld had↑
        perhaps understand where he got the money

Often these instances of *dus* occur when interpreters summarise the content of a long turn by the interviewee, emphasising the information unit most likely to be a suitable answer by repeating it near the end of their turn and by marking it with *dus*. In Excerpt 5, from the same interview, questions are asked about the whereabouts of a particular person suspected of being the ringleader of a human trafficking network. The interviewee starts describing a bar where members of the ring met. He is interrupted by the interpreter in line 7, who starts rendering his turn. She concludes by repeating a clause from the beginning of her turn, introducing it with *dus*.

Excerpt (5)

1. P   [(xxxx) in die café he↑ (xxxxxx)
        xxxx in that bar right xxxxx
2. I   În acea cafenea
        in that bar
3. S   >În acea cafenea< (1) era el (person7) (3) (person20) (2) (person22)
        in that bar he was there (person7) (person20) (person22)
4. I   °ja°
        yes
5. P   ja
        yes
6. S   Și mai erau:: dar acum nu știu dacă erau cu el era mai
        and there were more people but I don't recall if they were with hem there
7. S   multă lume jucau un biliard înăuntru [dar nu știu::: eu am stat afară (xxx)
        were many more they played pool inside but I don't know I was outside
8. I   [er wa- (.) er waren nog mensen **nu weet ik nie** of die
                                    there we- were more people now I don't recall if
9. I   andere ware::n (.) euh samen met hem of nie (.) 't was een eu::h
        those others were with him or not it was a uh
10. I   biljarttafel ze waren eu:h (a.) aan 't spelen en ik zat buiten stond
        pool table they were uh playing and I was outside was
11. I   buiten te roken↓ °**dus 'k weet het nie**
        outside smoking so I don't know

Excerpt (6), drawn from Interview 12, shows a case where the interpreter repeats a segment from one of his previous turns, following turns by both participants. The segment is the most suitable element to form a question-answer pair with the question asked by the police officer in line 1 whether the couple is considering getting engaged. The use of *dus* seems to single out that particular element to fit the adjacency pair.

Excerpt (6)

1. P   oe=iz=eu::h is er al sprake van een verloving↑
         How is uh can we say that you are already engaged

2. I   (.hhh) αραββώνας υπάρχει κιόλας↑ έχετε αραββωνιαστεί↑
         are you already engaged are you engaged

3. S   αραββώνας↑ τι εννοείτε↑
         engaged what do you mean

4. I   ε::: αν έχετε αραββωνιαστεί (.) δηλαδή <επίσημα> [είπατε ότι
         uh if you're already engaged so actually if you already officially registred

5. S   [°να° (3) επίσημα↑ (2) όχι
         officially no

6. I   θα παντρευτείτε
         that you'd marry

7. I   neen
         no

8. S   δηλαδή να έρθουν οι γονείς μου και οι γονείς του και να:::↓
         you mean my parents and his parents come and

9. I   ge bedoelt da::: (.) zijn ouders en mijn ouders samenzitten en
         you mean my parents and his parents meeting and

10. I   bespreken da we kunnen trouwen **dat is** [(.) **nog nie gebeurd**
          discussing marriage that has not been the case yet

11. P   [ja: da=in iedere cultuur
                                yeah in every culture

12. P   eu::h gaat het er wat anders aan toe
          uh people go about it somewhat differently

13. I   ανάλογα με τον πολιτισμό λέει μπορεί να είναι διαφορετικό
          depending on the culture he says it may differ

14. I   αλλά::: δεν έχετε::: [(.) βάλει
          but you haven't yet

15. S   [όχι γιατί είναι λίγο δύσκολο ((laughs)) (xxx)
                    [no cos it is a bit complicated

16. S   αλλά αν γίνει κάτι (.) θα γίνει και θα ρθουν όλοι μαζί (.) έτσι
          but when we get to that point it is obvious that we'll all meet

17. I   sowieso als als er iets gebeurt als we zouden trouwen of zo (.hh)
          in any case if something happens if we'd want to get married or so .hh

18. I   dan:: m=moeten de ouders eu:h allemaal samenkomen **dus**
          then our parents uh should all meet so

19. I   **dat is nog nie gebeurd**
          that has not been the case yet

Excerpt (7), drawn from Interview 11, illustrates a similar case. The most suitable answer to the police officer's question is the reference to *Netflix* in the interviewee's statement.

That segment is again introduced by means of *dus*. Interestingly, the police officer had already identified the reference to *Netflix* directly from the source in line 5. In other words, the interpreter singles out the segment which is already available in the common ground between the police officer and himself.

Excerpt (7)

1. P ok e=een favoriet euh tv-programma van eu::h hem en haar
      okay a favourite tv programme of uh hers and his

2. I ε:: κάποιος ε::: <αγαπημένο> πρόγραμμα στη τηλεόραση (.)
      does either of you have a favourite tv programme

3. I δικό σου της (person17)
      you or (person17)

4. S εδώ δεν ξέρω (.) εδώ κάποια στιγμή βλέπαμε νετφλιξ δεν έχει κάτι
      well I don't know there are times that we watch Netflix but
      there isn't much

5. P [**Netflix**↑

6. S [ναι ναι (.) ναι κάποια στιγμή βλέπαμε το νετφλιξ εδώ γιατί όλες
      yeah yeah at some we watched Netflix cos

7. S τις άλλες >τα κανάλια δεν τα καταλαβαίνουμε<
      we couln't understand any of the other channels

8. I [hm ge-

9. S [(.hhh) αλλά συνήθως >πιο πολύ τηλεόραση που έχουμε στο
      .hhh but more often than not we don't switch the tv on

11. S σπίτι είναι μονίμως κλειστή< (.) περισσότερες φορές γιατί (xxx)
      very often cos for one you've got to reach out for it

12. S ένα να τεντώσεις το χέρι και δεν (.) πολύ ασχολιούμαστε με την
      and we don't want to spend time watching

13. S τηλεόραση
      television

14. I το τελευταίο ↑στο σπίτι↑
      the last one home

15. S τς πιο πολύ ασχολ=την τηλεόραση είναι κλειστή [(.) δεν (.) μόνο
      well we more often d the tv is not on only at night when we

16. I   [ναι οκει
                                                   [yeah ok

17. S τα βράδια άμα αν έχουμε όρεξη >θα δούμε καμιά ταινία στο
      feel like it then we watch some movie on

18. S νετφλιξ< (.hh) και τίποτα άλλο
      Netflix that's it no more than that

19. I echt tv kijken doen we nie omda::: ja alle kanalen die hier gegeven
      we don't actually watch tv cos the channels that are available here

20. I worden daar begrijpen we niks van (.hh) **dus** het enige da we af en
      we cannot understand any of it .hh so the only thing we occasionally

21. I toe::: euh zien is **een film op Netflix** (.hh) ma m:eestal staat de tv
      uh watch is a movie on Netflix .hh but mostly the tv is switched off

22. I eigenlijk uit
      actually

Cases like (4), (5) and (6) are most frequent in the Romanian and Greek interviews and seem to be characteristic of interpreters who grant primary participants long turns in the conversation and are also given the opportunity by one of the participants to engage in asides with the other primary participant. Most interestingly, they seem to prompt police officers to focus on the item singled out while drafting the written record.

5.2.3. Fillers

As far as the use of fillers is concerned, it is noticeable that *dus* is especially frequent in stretches of simultaneous interpreting, as illustrated in Excerpt (8), drawn from Interview 10. Unsurprisingly, these instances appear to be due to comprehension or production issues. Witness the many filled pauses that co-occur with *dus*.

Excerpt (8)

1. S eu am avut ocazia să-l cunosc de abia în 2018 (.)
   I had the opportunity to get to know him only in 2018
2. I ik ik heb hem gekend [in 2018
   I I got to know him in 2018
3. S   [prima dată pe (person5) (2) si stând la mine în oraș↑ (xxx)
   the first time (person5) while he was staying in my town
4. I [de eerste keer op=(person5) (.) en (person5) woont **eu::h dus eu::h**
   the first time on (person5) and (person5) lives u:h so u:h
5. I in dezelfde stad me mij al twintig jaar↓
   in the same town as I for twenty years

In line 2 the interpreter starts rendering the interviewee's turn in line 1, but she is interrupted halfway through the first sentence. She chooses not to yield the turn, interpreting simultaneously until the point where background noises make the recording inaudible (indicated with xxx in line 3). These noises seem to distract her causing her to hesitate (line 4) and to use *dus*. These uses come very close to the ones reported in Defrancq *et al.* (2015), where *dus* is shown to fill up gaps in the interpretation.

5.2.4. Turn management

Most of the observed instances of *dus* (104 out of 265) are turn management devices. In slightly less than 90 per cent of the cases, interpreters signal their own turn management. The remaining cases are ambiguous. In Excerpt (9), for instance, *dus* in line 2 may either

signal the interpreter's own turn management or render the participant's turn taking device *bun* 'good', 'right' in line 1.

Excerpt 9

1. S **bun** întrebarea este în felul următor [(.) cum s-a petrecut am înțeles↓
good the question is the following: how did it happen I got that
2. I   [**dus** de vraag (1) is
so the question is
3. S [ce exact să îmi spuna exact (.) ce vor să știe cum s-a petrecut ce
what exactly they tell me what they want to know how did what happen
4. I [hoe de zaak in elkaar zit (1) <WAT precies> (1)
what the case looks like what exactly
5. I over wat wil je spreken
what you want to talk about

Excerpt (9) also illustrates another feature of *dus* as a turn taking device: frequently it introduces overlapping speech and, occasionally, a stretch of simultaneous interpreting. The presence of *dus* seems to indicate that the interpreter's intent may not be to interpret simultaneously, but rather to force a turn transition from the interviewee to herself. The interviewee's failure to yield the turn leads to the overlapping speech.

5.2.5. Unassigned cases

Five of the seven unassigned instances seem to share a distinctive feature, namely a sudden change of perspective or even rendition mode. This is illustrated in Excerpt (10), taken from Interview 1. In line 2 the interpreter first reports in third person what the interviewee said in line 1. Then she produces a short sigh (.hhh) and starts interpreting in first person what the interviewee had previously said. The transition between the renditions modes is marked with an instance of *dus*.

Excerpt (10)

1. S c'est assassiner comme tuer quelqu'un ça↓
that's to assassinate like killing someone
2. I voor hem is't een is dat een moord (.hhh) **dus** ik wil duidelijk maken dat
to him that's murder so I want to clarify that
3. I <het gaat (.) om ongeboren kinderen (.hhh) die geaborteerd worden>
this is about unborn children that are being aborted

The use of *dus* in (10) is likely associated with the written record that is being drafted: it signals the start of the segment that is to be recorded by the police officer in the appropriate first-person style used in written records. This is further evidenced by the

reporting phrase *duidelijk maken* ('clarify'), which is typical of the discourse of the written register and was never used by the interviewee. Examples such as (10) seem to be connected to the use of *dus* as a turn taking device: instead of signalling the start of her turn, the interpreter seems to signal the start of the segment to be recorded. Figure 1, taken from the written record of the interview, confirms that the police officer started taking down the interpreter's turn from the moment she uttered *dus* onward. There is no reference to *murder* in the written record.[7]

aborteren en wie niet. Als het niet waar is dan betaal ik alles. Ik wil duidelijk maken dat het gaat om ongeboren kinderen die geaborteerd worden nadat de termijn om legaal abortus te plegen reeds is verstreken.

Figure 1: Extract from the written record of Interview 1

6. DISCUSSION

First, it is important to underline that the overall frequency of *dus* in interpreters' utterances is comparable to its frequency in dialogic spoken Dutch registers. However, it is also quite clear that the discourse marker's use is mostly disconnected from the primary participants' discourse. This strongly suggests that interpreters re-shape the original discourse to a significant extent in dialogue contexts. Of course only one discourse marker (*dus*) was analysed and it was used by only nine interpreters. Therefore, the results definitely need to be confirmed for a larger set of markers and a larger population of interpreters. With regard to the latter aspect, the data clearly point to considerable variation across interpreters.

The interaction format seems to induce interpreters to use instances of *dus* that are unrelated to the primary participants' discourse. An essential part of the dialogue interpreters' task is to coordinate talk (Wadensjö 1998), which is reflected in a large number of instances where *dus* is used to manage turn taking. This raises an interesting question regarding coordination in interviews where interpreters do not use *dus* or only use it very parsimoniously, namely, Interviews 5 to 8. There are indications that coordination is indeed weaker in Interviews 7 and 8. These are conducted in Dutch and Pashto with the same participants and the same interpreter. At several points the interpreter's competence is called into question and he is sidelined for a significant part

---

[7] Translation: 'abort and who not. If it is not true, I'll pay for everything. I want to clarify that this is about unborn children that are being aborted after the deadline for a legal abortion is passed'.

of the interview, as the interviewee has knowledge of Dutch. This clearly makes him a secondary participant in the interaction. As for Interviews 5 and 6, interpreted by the same interpreter with different interviewees, turn management lies firmly in the hands of the interpreter. However, he mostly relies on *ok* as a turn management device. Finally, interpreters who resort to simultaneous interpreting in the course of the interview are the ones who use *dus* most frequently. At first sight, this seems surprising, because simultaneous interpreting requires less coordination. However, simultaneous interpreting could be a side-effect rather than a strategy: a participant who is unwilling to yield the floor can force an interpreter into simultaneous interpreting by simply ignoring the signal for turn transition.

A second point that needs to be raised is how interpreters seem to use *dus* in relation to the written record. Several examples show interpreters singling out bits of information by repeating them and signposting them by means of *dus*. Often these segments constitute the most suitable answer to a question previously asked by the police officer. We hypothesised that the role of *dus* is to draw the police officer's attention to the signposted segment in order for it to be taken down in the written record. This use comes close to the discursive control function discussed in Section 3.1: *dus* introduces a reformulation of the previous discourse in a version that is difficult to challenge for the police officer as it suits the required features of the written record. Excerpt (10) is particularly illustrative of this as *dus* is used at the transition point between two very different representations of the previous discourse: one meant for the police officer (third person) and one specifically designed for the written record (first person and register update). It remains to be seen whether this pattern can also be found in other contexts of dialogue interpreting with drafting, but it certainly adds to other research showing that interpreting for the written record prompts particular discursive strategies in interpreters (Defrancq and Verliefde 2018; Verliefde and Defrancq 2022).

7. Conclusions

The motivation for this study was the observation that text collections of dialogue interpreting rarely meet the criteria put forward by corpus linguists to qualify as a corpus. The criterion of representativeness is especially problematic as most text collections are small and only include interpretations of a limited number of interpreters. That does not

disqualify the research carried out on them, which can yield valuable insights in terms of the interpreter's role, responsibility, interaction patterns, etc.

Our study set out to systematically analyse the use of one particular Dutch discourse marker by nine interpreters recorded in 12 police interviews. The data collection used for this is comparable in size to most available interpreting corpora. The main results can be summarised as follows: in terms of frequencies, interpreters do not divert from general usage patterns for spoken Dutch. However, their use of *dus* is mostly disconnected from the speech they are interpreting. Nearly 90 per cent of the occurrences have no equivalent in the corresponding source utterances. While explicitation seems to be at play in a certain number of cases, the bulk of instances serves interaction coordination purposes. Given the cognitive challenges interpreting poses it is not surprising to also find a substantial number of filler instances where interpreters struggle to understand the source speech or to articulate their interpretation. Some interesting cases of so-called discursive control enforced by *dus* were also observed, further confirming the special relationship interpreting holds with drafting of written records during the interview.

REFERENCES

Ainsworth, Janet. 2018. Anatomy of a false confession: The linguistic and pyschological characteristics of a false confession. In Girolamo Tessuto, Vhijay Bhatia and Jan Engberg eds. *Frameworks for Discursive Actions and Practices of the Law*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars, 23–39.

Amon, Marri. 2006. Cohérence dans le discours: Quelques remarques sur les difficultés et les stratégies des interprètes. In Kjersti Fløttum ed. *Phénomènes Linguistiques et Genres Discursifs*. Rodskild University: Rodskild University Digital Archive. http://ojs.ruc.dk/index.php/congreso/article/download/5265/2868

Angelelli, Claudia. 2017. Can ethnographic findings become corpus-studies data? A researcher's ethical, practical and scientific dilemmas. *The Interpreters' Newsletter* 22: 1–16.

Angermeyer, Philipp S. 2015. *'Speak English or what?': Codeswitching and Interpreter Use in New York City Small Claims Court*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Anthony, Laurence. 2014. *AntConc* (Version 3.2.4). Tokyo: Waseda University. https://www.laurenceanthony.net

Bakti, Mária and Judit Bóna. 2014. Source language-related erroneous stress placement in the target language output of simultaneous interpreters. *Interpreting* 16/1: 34–48.

Baraldi, Claudio and Laura Gavioli. 2012. Introduction: Understanding coordination in interpreter-mediated interaction. In Claudio Baraldi and Laura Gavioli eds. *Coordinating Participation in Dialogue Interpreting*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1–22.

Bastin, Georges. 2003. Les marqueurs de cohérence en interprétation consecutive. *The Interpreters' Newsletter* 12: 176–187.

Bendazzoli, Claudio. 2017. Editorial: A dialogue on dialogue interpreting (DI) corpora. *The Interpreters' Newsletter* 22: VII–XVII.

Berk-Seligson, Susan. 1990. *The Bilingual Courtroom*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Biber, Douglas. 1993. Representativeness in corpus design. *Literary and Linguistic Computing* 8/4: 243–257.

Blakemore, Diane and Fabrizio Gallai. 2014. Discourse markers in free indirect style and interpreting. *Journal of Pragmatics* 60: 106–120.

Buysse, Lieven. 2017. English *so* and Dutch *dus* in a parallel corpus: An investigation into their mutual translatability. In Karin Aijmer and Diana Lewis eds. *Contrastive Analysis of Discourse-pragmatic Aspects of Linguistic Genres*. Cham: Springer, 33–60.

Crystal, David. 1995 *The Cambridge Encyclopaedia of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Davitti, Elena. 2013. Dialogue interpreting as intercultural mediation: Interpreters' use of upgrading moves in parent-teacher meetings. *Interpreting* 15/2: 168–199.

Defrancq, Bart. 2016. Well, interpreters… A corpus-based study of a pragmatic particle used by simultaneous interpreters. In Gloria Corpas Pastor and Miriam Seghiri Dominguez eds. *Corpus-based Approaches to Translation and Interpreting: From Theory to Applications*. Bern: Peter Lang, 105–128.

Defrancq, Bart and Sofie Verliefde. 2018. Interpreter-mediated drafting of written records in police interviews: A case study. *Target* 30/2: 212–239.

Defrancq, Bart and Camille Collard. 2019. Using data from simultaneous interpreting in contrastive linguistics. In Renata Enghels, Bart Defrancq and Marlies Jansegers eds. *New Approaches to Contrastive Linguistics: Empirical and Methodological Challenges*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 159–182.

Defrancq, Bart, Koen Plevoets and Cédric Magnifico. 2015. Connective markers in interpreting and translation: Where do they come from? In Jesus Romero Trillo ed. *Corpus Pragmatics in Translation and Contrastive Studies*. Singapore: Springer, 195–222.

Degand, Liesbeth. 2001. *Form and Function of Causation: A Theoretical and Empirical Investigation of Causal Constructions in Dutch*. Leuven: Uitgeverij Peeters.

Degand, Liesbeth. 2011. Connectieven in de rechterperiferie: Een contrastieve analyse van *dus* en *donc* in gesproken taal. *Nederlandse Taalkunde* 16/3: 333–348.

Degand, Liesbeth and Geertje van Bergen. 2018. Discourse markers as turn transition devices: Evidence from speech and instant messaging. *Discourse Processes* 55/1: 47–71.

Delizée, Anne and Christine Michaux. 2019. The negotiation of meaning in dialogue interpreting: On the effects of the verbalization of interpreters' inferences. *Translation, Cognition and Behavior* 2/2: 263–382.

Evers-Vermeul, Jacqueline. 2010. 'Dus' vooraan of in het midden? Over vorm-functierelaties in het gebruik van connectieven. *Nederlandse Taalkunde* 15: 149–175.

Filipović, Luna. 2022. The tale of two countries: Police interpreting in the UK vs. in the US. *Interpreting* 24/2: 254–278.

Gallai, Fabrizio. 2013. *Understanding Discourse Markers in Interpreter-mediated Police Interviews*. Salford: University of Salford dissertation.

Gallai, Fabrizio. 2017. Pragmatic competence and interpreter-mediated police investigative interviews. *The Translator* 23/2: 177–196.

Gamal, Muhammad. 2017. Police interpreting: The facts sheet. *Semiotica* 216: 297–316.

Gao, Fei and Binhua Wang. 2017. A multimodal corpus approach to dialogue interpreting studies in the Chinese context: Towards a multi-layer analytic framework. *The Interpreters' Newsletter* 22: 17–38.

Gavioli, Laura and Claudio Baraldi. 2011. Interpreter-mediated interaction in healthcare and legal settings: Talk organization, context and the achievement of intercultural communication. *Interpreting* 13/2: 205–233.

Götz, Andrea. 2020. Discourse markers and connectives in interpreted Hungarian discourse: A corpus-based investigation of discourse properties and their interdependence. *Beszédtudomány – Speech Science* 2020: 259–284.

Gumul, Ewa and Magdalena Bartłomiejczyk. 2022. Interpreters' explicitating styles: A corpus study of material from the European Parliament. *Interpreting* 24/2: 164–191.

Hale, Sandra. 2004. *The Discourse of Court Interpreting*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Halliday, Michael. 1985. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Arnold.

Jacobsen, Bente. 2002. *Pragmatic Meaning in Court Interpreting: An Empirical Study of Additions in Consecutively Interpreted Question-Answer Dialogues*. Aarhus: Aarhus School of Business dissertation.

Jefferson, Gail. 2004. A glossary of transcript symbols. In Gene Lerner ed. *Conversation Analysis: Studies from the First Generation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 13–31.

Komter, Martha. 2005. Understanding problems in an interpreter-mediated police interrogation. In Stacy Burns ed. *Ethnographies of Law and Social Control*. Bingley: Emerald, 203–224.

Komter, Martha. 2006. From talk to text: The interactional construction of a police record. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 39/3: 201–228.

Komter, Martha. 2022. Institutional and academic transcripts of police interrogations. *Frontiers in Communication* 7. https://doi.org/10.3389/fcomm.2022.797145

Kredens, Krzysztof. 2017. Making sense of adversarial interpreting. *Language and Law/Linguagem e Direito* 4/1: 17–33.

Krouglov, Alex. 1999. Police interpreting. Politeness and sociocultural context. *The Translator* 5/2: 285–302.

Lederer, Marianne. 1980. *La Traduction Simultanée: Fondement Théoriques.* Lille: Université de Lille.

Liu, Xin and Sandra Hale. 2017. Facework strategies in interpreter-mediated cross-examinations: A corpus-assisted approach. *The Interpreters' Newsletter* 22: 57–78.

Määttä, Simo. 2017. English as a Lingua Franca in telephone interpreting: Representations and linguistic justice. *The Interpreters' Newsletter* 22: 39–56.

Mason, Marianne. 2008. *Courtroom Interpreting*. Lanham: University Press of America.

McEnery, Tony and Andrew Wilson. 1996. *Corpus Linguistics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Mead, Peter. 2012. Consecutive interpreting at a literature festival. In Cynthia Kellett-Bidoli ed. *Interpreting across Genres: Multiple Research Perspectives*. Trieste: University of Trieste, 171–183.

Monteoliva-García, Eloisa. 2017. *The Collaborative Construction of the Stand-by Mode of Interpreting in Police Interviews with Suspects*. Edinburgh: Heriot-Watt University dissertation.

Nakane, Ikuko. 2014. *Interpreter-mediated Police Interviews: A Discourse-pragmatic Approach.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Oostdijk, Nelleke. 2000. The *Spoken Dutch Corpus*: Overview and first evaluation. In Maria Gravilidou, George Carayanni, Stella Markantonatou, Stelios Piperidis and Gregory Stainhaouer eds. *Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation*. Paris: ELRA Language Resources Assocation, 887–893.

Pander Maat, Henk and Liesbeth Degand. 2001. Scaling causal relations and connectives in terms of speaker involvement. *Cognitive Linguistics* 12/3: 211–245.

Park, Joseph and Mary Bucholtz. 2009. Public transcripts: Entextualisation and linguistic representation in institutional contexts. *Text & Talk* 29/5: 485–502.

Pöchhacker, Franz and Waltraub Kolb. 2009. Interpreting for the record: A case study of asylum review hearings. In Sandra Hale, Uldis Ozolins and Ludmila Stern eds. *Quality in Interpreting – A Shared Responsibility*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 119–134.

RusseLl, Sonia. 2001. 'Let me put it simply…': The case for a standard translation of the police caution and its explanation. *Forensic Linguistics* 7/1: 26–48.

Shlesinger, Miriam. 1995. Shifts in cohesion in simultaneous interpreting. *The Translator* 1/2: 193–214.

Shlesinger, Miriam. 1998. Corpus-based interpreting studies as an offshoot of corpus-based translation studies. *Meta* 43/4: 486–493.

Sinclair, John. 2005. Corpus and text – Basic principles. In Martin Wynne ed. *Developing Linguistic Corpora: A Guide to Good Practice*. Oxford: Oxbow Books, 1–16.

Smets, Lotte and Paul Ponsaers. 2011. Het proces-verbaal van een verdachtenverhoor: een bron van informatie? Diverse formats van geschreven communicatie tussen politie en parket. C*ahiers Politiestudies* 21/4: 123–144.

Spinzi, Cinzia. 2017. Using corpus linguistics as a research and training tool for Public Service Interpreting (PSI) in the legal sector. *The Interpreters' Newsletter* 22: 79–100.

Stukker, Ninne, Ted Sanders and Arie Verhagen. 2009. Categories of subjectivity in Dutch causal connectives: A usage-based analysis. In Ted Sanders and Eve Sweetser eds. *Causal Categories in Discourse and Cognition*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 119–171.

Tipton, Rebecca. 2021. 'Yes I understand': Language choice, question formation and code-switching in interpreter-mediated police interviews with victim-survivors of domestic abuse. *Police Practice and Research* 22/1: 1058–1076.

Van Besien, Fred. 1999. Anticipation in simultaneous interpreting. *Meta* 44/2: 250–259.

Verliefde, Sofie. 2022. *Interpreting-mediated Police Interviewing cum Drafting*. Ghent: Ghent University dissertation.

Verliefde, Sofie and Bart Defrancq. 2022. Interpreter-mediated access to the written record in police interviews. *Perspectives* 31: 519–547

Wadensjö, Cecilia. 1998. *Interpreting as Interaction*. London: Longman.

Corresponding author
Bart Defrancq
Ghent University
Faculty of Arts and Philosophy
Department of Translation, Interpreting and Communication
Groot-Brittanniëlaan 45
9000 Ghent
Belgium
E-mail: bart.defrancq@ugent.be