

**CONSTRUCTION OF COOPERATIVE DISCOURSE:  
AN ANALYSIS OF INTERPRETER-MEDIATED DISCUSSION AT A  
BILATERAL STUDENT FORUM**

**EUNSUN LEE**

*University of Hawai'i at Mānoa*

**ABSTRACT**

In East Asia, there have been an increasing number of multilateral forums organized by non-profit organizations to promote mutual understanding and civil exchanges in the past two decades. Language becomes a major issue at these forums, in which participants often rely on voluntary interpreters to communicate with one another unlike many large-scale intergovernmental organizations that adopt a third language as their lingua franca. This paper explores the construction of cooperative discourse in interaction at a Korea-Japan bilateral student forum. In particular, it analyzes how participants strategically design their talks to enable effective delivery of their opinions and how the interpreter responds to those strategies by actively reconstructing the original speakers' discourse. The findings identified two ways in which the interpreter played a key role in establishing cooperative discourse: by polishing the participants' utterances while also maintaining the critical components of their mitigation and outlining strategies and by showing alignment with the speaker, the audience, and the content of the talks. These findings shed light on ways participants and the interpreter collaboratively display orientation to and discursively construct the institutional goal of promoting cooperation between the two countries.

**INTRODUCTION**

Globalization and multilateralism have facilitated various forms of engagement and dialogue across cultures. Conferences and forums serve as a major venue for such cross-cultural exchanges, where constructing cooperative discourse becomes a prime objective. One obstacle

*Second Language Studies*, 37(2), Spring 2019, pp. 1-33.

that arises at these meetings is linguistic differences among participants. Coming from different linguistic backgrounds, participants often adopt a commonly used language as a lingua franca or rely on the mediation of interpreting to communicate with each other. Although many large-scale intergovernmental organizations such as the United Nations and the World Trade Organization follow the lingua franca policy, it is quite common for civil organizations and grassroots forums to maintain a multilingual approach with the help of voluntary interpreters.

A few studies have shown that such multilingual practices in fact benefit the discussion processes in multilateral public meetings. By comparing linguistically heterogeneous and homogeneous social forum meetings at the European and national levels, Doerr (2012) argued that linguistically heterogeneous meetings were more inclusive owing to the listening-oriented, dialogical style of communication. In particular, the findings have pointed to the significant role of grassroots activists' practices of translation in democratizing the deliberation processes among heterogeneous groups led by an elite group of leaders. Though Doerr's (2012) study successfully exemplifies how voluntary translators in multilingual meetings have the potential to promote more inclusive discussion between civil agents and organization, the methods used in the study are limited to interviews regarding the marginalized groups' perception of the role of translators and participant observation of the translators' practices. As such, how participants and translators in these meetings accomplish the task of constructing the cooperative style of communication within and through interaction remains largely unknown.

To address this gap, this paper explores the case of a bilateral student forum in East Asia, which is organized and run by a pair of sister student organizations based in Japan and Korea, respectively. The forum is an ideal site for investigating how participants construct cooperative discourse in multilingual meetings through translation and interpreting. One major goal of this forum, according to its mission statement, is to facilitate discussion on innovative ways of promoting collaboration between the two countries. To that end, the participants engage in group discussions and open discussions as well as group presentations. Instead of adopting a third language as their lingua franca, they use their first languages, Japanese and Korean, with the help of voluntary interpreters who are also members of the organizations. Thus, the ways in which participants with varying degrees of language proficiency exchange ideas and comments at the

forum can provide valuable insights into the translator-mediated discursive construction of cooperativeness.

By analyzing the discursive strategies and patterns during discussion sessions (or question and response sessions), this paper aims to elucidate how university student participants at a bilateral student forum construct cooperativeness as sister organizations dedicated to promoting the bilateral relationship. The main objective is to add to the limited amount of research on the multilingual discursive practices of multilateral meetings in East Asia. I will first delineate the discursive strategies and patterns of the participants exchanging questions and responses with regard to their organizational identities and objectives. The analytical focus will then shift to the interpreter's utterances to see how they reflect or render the patterns and strategies deployed by the original speakers. Finally, I will discuss how the speakers' and interpreter's specific uses of resources and strategies contribute to the construction of cooperative discourse.

### INTERPRETER-MEDIATED INTERACTION

In order to study the discursive practices in interpreter-mediated discussion sessions, we first need to understand what is already known about interpreting discourse. One of the most comprehensive accounts of interpreting as an interactional practice is Wadensjö's (2014) book, which situates interpreting in the contexts of sociolinguistic and intercultural issues. Drawing upon the groundwork of Goffman and Bakhtin, the author theorizes the mediated practice of interpreting by connecting the descriptive analysis of translated texts with ethnomethodological interpretation of the discursive processes and ethnographic narratives of the participants. In doing so, the author emphasizes that interpreter-mediated discourse be understood in the light of certain institutional contexts which bring about the participants' strategic choice of language, as well as multilayered roles of interpreters. This approach to interpreting allows for viewing interpreter-mediated interaction at multilingual meetings as a dynamic process of participants' collaboratively constructing institutional discourse and identity.

According to Goffman (1981), the organization of spoken interaction results from participants' continuous evaluations and reevaluations of speaker-hearer roles or *status of participation*, at the utterance-to-utterance level. This *participation framework* reflects

alignments and stances between participants or utterances, which constitute the notion of *footing*. Goffman distinguishes between the *addressed*, the *unaddressed*, and the *bystander's* position in interaction. He also identifies three *production roles*, each of which is associated with different degrees of responsibilities. As an *animator*, one is only responsible for producing the sounds of the utterances. As an *author*, one selects the words and puts them together in the lines that are uttered. As a *principal*, one takes responsibility for the meaning, position, and belief that the utterances convey.

Edmonson (1986) revises Goffman's model by decomposing the notions of speaker and hearer into different sub-roles: "the sounds", "the formulation", and "the speaker-meaning" for the speaker and "uptaking", "getting the message", and "responding to the communication" for the hearer. Building on this revised model, Wadensjo (2014) proposes an analytical cluster of 'reception roles': *reporter*, *responder*, and *recapitulator*. As a *reporter*, one is expected to simply repeat or memorize the previous speaker's utterances. As a *responder*, one anticipates or is anticipated to expand the current discourse by providing their own opinions or attitudes or to at least reveal their own reactions in any forms. Finally, as a *recapitulator*, one is expected to take over the floor in the next turn and give authority to what was said by the prior speaker(s) by recapitulating it.

Theoretically, interpreters primarily take on the role of *recapitulator*, meaning that they would listen to the previous utterance produced by the primary speaker and expect to provide the following utterance as an *animator* and *author*. The *principal's* role will remain occupied by the primary speaker, who has called for the interpreter's utterance. In this regard, interpreters are positioned as the *unaddressed* participants in the interaction. In reality, however, interpreters often take or are ascribed the role of *responder* in the unfolding interaction, when, for instance, they have to deal with clarification in preparation for their rendition. Wadensjo (2014) suggests that detailed analysis of interpreter-mediated conversation can offer opportunities to uncover "how interpreter assist primary interlocutors to orientate themselves within the current framework of participation and how participants perceive the distribution of responsibility for the substance and the progressions of current talk" (p. 94).

Vigouroux's (2010) study exemplifies how the analytical framework discussed above can prove fruitful in examining the communicative functions of interpreting in non-professional

community contexts. In these contexts, interpreting is often performed by interpreters who themselves are members of the community and is not as highly regulated by norms as professional interpreting (e.g., courtroom interpreting). This in turn enables the interpreter's shifting between roles. By analyzing the French/Lingala-English interpreting during congregation at a church in Cape Town, South Africa, the researcher suggests that the interpreting activity is used as a "powerful interactional device to dramatize and shape the pastor's sermon" (p. 341). The analysis reveals that it is through the fluid, dynamic negotiation of production roles and the shift in footings that the church interpreter conveys the pastor's inspiration to the audience while also responding to it himself. To use the aforementioned framework from Wadensjo (2014), the interpreter constantly shifts between the roles of *recapitulator* and *responder* depending on the subtle differences in the interactional contexts—even for the identical utterances by the pastor (e.g., "Are you listening to me carefully"), the interpreter treats each call differently by distinguishing its intended purpose conveyed through the emotional intensity of the pastor. The pastor is then able to use the interpreter's turns to strengthen the emotional intensity of his sermon by eliciting the audience's response at relevant moments. These findings shed light on how practices of interpreting, firmly grounded in the moment-by-moment interactional contexts, can go beyond the mere translation of the texts in the speakers' utterances and contribute to the purposes of a larger discourse.

Another recent study that has examined participation framework and footing shifts in interpreter-mediated interaction is Marks (2012), which draws on Metzger's (1999) framework for analyzing footing shifts by interpreters. Following Wadensjo's (2014) categorization of interpreter's talk as relaying talk and coordinating talk, Metzger (1999) identified four types of footing shifts in relaying (source attribution, explanations, repetitions, and requests for clarification) and four in interactional management (introductions, responses to questions, interference, and summonses). Among these eight types, Marks's (2012) analysis revealed that five types of footing shifts existed in the interpreter-mediated academic meeting: source attribution, repetitions, responses to questions, interferences, and summonses. This finding confirms those of the previous research that interpreters' role is not limited to recapitulating the primary interlocutors' utterances but encompasses other communication functions such as coordinating the interlocutors' interaction.

### DISCUSSION SESSION AS A DISCOURSE

Studies of conference discourse are relevant to the current study since they share both monologic presentations and dialogic discussion sessions. In research on conferences, discussion sessions have been found to have particular discursive features. Although many researchers consider them as a part of the genre of conference presentations, Wulff, Swales, and Keller. (2009) draw attention to discussion sessions as a separate genre that possesses distinct features. The discussion session, or question and response session, consists of dialogues between the presenter and the discussants, whereas the presentation is a monologue delivered by the presenter. Moreover, while the presentations can be prepared in advance, interactions during the discussion sessions are more spontaneous and dynamic, as each discussant questions or expands the presenter's discourse. As such, the authors emphasize the need for more research on the discursual characteristics of discussion sessions as it is one of the challenges for which novice scholars are often left unprepared.

In analyzing the discourse of discussion sessions at an academic conference celebrating the retirement of a prominent scholar, Wulff et al. (2009) identify some frequent patterns used by the participants: hedges (I think, you know, kind of/sort of), positive evaluation (that's a very X), negative evaluation (it seems to me), and suggestions (Y would be interesting, I wonder if Z). The authors also note that the role of the chairs is largely restricted to time management and transitioning. Although the nature of academic conferences may be different from that of an extra-curricular university student forum, these observations offer useful insights to analyze the data in the current study.

Following Wulff et al.'s (2009) approach to discussion sessions as a distinct genre, Querol-Julián and Fortanet-Gómez (2012) also attempt to decompose the communicative patterns of discussion sessions at a professional academic conference with regard to the ways they present their evaluations. According to their analysis, the discussant, who is a member of the audience that takes a turn to make a comment or ask a question, constructs her/his turn in the following order of moves: (a) opening the turn (announcing the question), (b) contextualizing the question (referring to previous experience and/or checking their understanding of the presentation to

ground the question), (c) making a comment, and (d) formulating the question. The presenter in turn responds to the discussant as the following: (a) opening the turn (reacting to the question) and (b) responding to the question (straightforward response).

The findings from these studies attest to an important point that discussion sessions at conferences involve the participants' careful coordination and orientation to both the social norm of displaying politeness and the institutional objective of exchanging constructive feedback. The discussants and the presenter systematically deploy linguistic and non-linguistic resources to mitigate or strengthen their opinions and positions. A question then arises as to how the mediational work of interpreters discussed in the previous section will render the communicative strategies and patterns deployed by the presenter and discussants to construct their evaluations, criticisms, and mitigation. Furthermore, it would be fruitful to see how these practices orient and contribute to the institutional goal of constructing cooperative discourse. I will address these questions in the following section.

## THE CURRENT STUDY

### *Contexts*

The data for this study comes from ethnographic observations, interviews, and audio recordings of Korean and Japanese university students' interactions, who are members of two student organizations: KJ (the Korean organization) and JK (the Japanese organization). Founded in 2005, the two organizations started off as an alumni network of a one-week summer/winter camp organized by relevant associations and sponsored by the Korean and the Japanese government, which since 2004 has brought together more than 2,300 high school students from Korea and Japan who participate in business modeling group activities as well as in cultural exchange. Maintaining a close relationship with each other as sister organizations, they host several joint events and activities together throughout the year, in both online and face to face settings.

Not only do this type of voluntary civil exchanges serve as a venue for individuals to build friendship across borders and to broaden their perspectives, these exchanges also bear great significance in terms of the bilateral relation between Japan and Korea. Since the normalization

of diplomatic relations between the two countries in the 1960s, attempts for engagement between the two countries have taken place primarily in the economic and business domains. It was not until the late 1990s and early 2000s that cultural exchanges began to flourish with the Korean government lifting the ban on Japanese popular culture in 1998 (Korean National Diplomatic Academy, 2018). The successful co-hosting of the 2002 World Cup also added to the betterment of mutual perception between the citizens of two countries and thus to the improvement of the bilateral relationship. As a result, the past two decades have seen a considerable advancement in the civil exchanges between the two countries in various domains, led by foundations, educational institutions, and many non-profit organizations. The subject of this study, KJ and JK, is a prime example of continued efforts to promote mutual understanding and cross-border exchanges at the grassroots level.

Despite the substantial amelioration of mutual perceptions, the long history of diplomatic conflicts between the two countries often poses challenges to the construction of cooperative discourse. In the face of political and diplomatic issues in which the two countries' standpoints explicitly disagree, KJ and JK make it their mission to facilitate straightforward discussion of the issues based on facts and to reach mutually acceptable understanding and conclusion. For instance, the 2015 annual forum discussed the Japanese history textbook controversy (see Guex, 2015 for details) as a key topic and came up with a draft of a history textbook that both countries can agree upon and use.

The annual forum, which is their biggest and most central event, is attended by approximately 40 members from both sides, featuring group discussions and presentations of innovative ideas that will foster civil exchanges between Korea and Japan. Since the board members begin preparing as early as in November for the next year's event and the list of participants gets confirmed no later than in the following April, ethnographic observations started in January 2018 to get acquainted with the contexts as well as with the participants. I observed and recorded most of their biweekly online board meetings and followed up on chats or calls for the missed meetings to grasp the theme and the flow of the event.

During this preparation period, the outline, theme, and detailed schedule of the forum were decided, participants were recruited among the members of the two organizations, and the participants were divided by the board members into groups. The 2018 annual forum took place



in a middle-sized city in the Southern part of Japan over the period of five days. The number of participants was 42, including seven board members. Various factors were taken into consideration when the board members grouped the participants, such as the participants' previous experience with the forum or their language proficiency. The overarching theme of the forum was collaboration between Korea and Japan to address their common social problems through bilateral exchanges. The board members assigned a sub-theme, or field, (i.e., agriculture, laws, local community, medical, services, and state affairs) to each of the groups based on the survey results of the participants' interests. Each group was expected to come up with a project proposal that includes innovative ways to promote bilateral exchanges in the respective field.

Prior to the actual event, the participants engaged in online group discussions to work on two rounds of worksheets prepared by the board to facilitate research and discussion for developing a proposal. At the event, they reviewed, revised, and developed the ideas discussed in their worksheets and prepared for presentations to share their ideas with the entire body of participants and some guests from the sponsoring organizations and the community. The event primarily consisted of group discussions, presentations, and inter-group feedback, with occasional recreational activities plus a self-guided group tour of the city on the last day. Table 1 outlines important aspects of the event. The hours of group discussions are noted in the last row of the right column.

Table 1

*Outline of the Forum Event*

Theme	<b>Collaboration between Korea and Japan to address the common social problem through bilateral exchanges</b>
Number of Participants	44 (five groups of six & one group of seven plus seven board members)
Average age of participants	21.5
Groups	Agriculture, Laws, Local community, Medical, Services, State Affairs
Venue	A youth hostel and its conference rooms in a middle-sized city in the Southern part of Japan
Schedule	Day 1: opening ceremony; group meetings (3 hours) Day 2: mid-way presentations; feedback sessions (2 hours); group meetings (6 hours) Day 3: group meetings (8 hours); recreational activities Day 4: group meetings (2 hours); final presentations; closing ceremony Day 5: group tour of the city

***Participants***

The participants were mostly university students and a few high school students from Korea and Japan. Some of them participated in the summer camp before joining the organization to stay engaged in the bilateral exchange, while others had chosen to join through online advertisements or in-person references. In either case, their general interest in each other's language and culture or in cross-cultural engagement was high, which was readily confirmed by ethnographic observations and interviews. Although the organizational activities were completely extra-curricular and voluntary, most of the participants were highly committed to the activities and often engaged in more intimate relationship building with members from both organizations in addition to the official events.

The majority of participants have learned or are currently learning each other's language, though their proficiency levels vary greatly: some of them are highly advanced bilingual

speakers while others have basic proficiency in the other language or can only read it. Since neither of the organizations requires the participants to speak the other language to participate in their events, the forum event also adopts both languages as their official languages and designates one or more of the members in each group to serve as a translator/interpreter. Table 2 contains ethnographic information about the major participants that appear in the excerpts to be presented. The L2 proficiency indicates each participant's proficiency level in the other language (e.g., Korean for L1 Japanese speakers and Japanese for L1 Korean speakers) and is based on the participants' self-reported evaluations as well as on my ethnographic observation. Names of the participants are pseudonyms.

Table 2

*Participants' Information*

<i>Name (Initial)</i>	<i>L1</i>	<i>L2 proficiency</i>	<i>Gender</i>	<i>Age</i>	<i>Role (Affiliation)</i>
<i>Kiwook (KW)</i>	Korean	Advanced-Low	Male	27	<i>Laws group leader (KJ)</i>
<i>Juyong (JY)</i>	Korean	Advanced-Low	Male	23	<i>Medical group leader (KJ)</i>
<i>Sunmi (SM)</i>	Korean	Intermediate-Mid	Female	21	<i>Local Community group member (KJ)</i>
<i>Kiyeong (KY)</i>	Korean	Novice-High	Female	21	<i>Services group member (KJ)</i>
<i>Sohee (SH)</i>	Korean	Intermediate-Mid	Female	21	<i>Medical group member (KJ)</i>
<i>Ayano (AY)</i>	Japanese	Intermediate-Low	Female	18	<i>Laws group member (JK)</i>
<i>Yutaro (YU)</i>	Japanese	Intermediate-Low	Male	21	<i>Agriculture group member (JK)</i>
<i>Ninako (NI)</i>	Japanese	Intermediate-Low	Female	21	<i>Services group member (JK)</i>
<i>Moeko (MO)</i>	Japanese	Intermediate-Low	Female	20	<i>Medical group member (JK)</i>
<i>Ikumi (IK)</i>	Japanese	Advanced-Mid	Female	23	<i>Interpreter (KJ)</i>
<i>Kaito (KA)</i>	<i>Japanese</i>	<i>Intermediate-Low</i>	<i>Male</i>	<i>18</i>	<i>Co-Chair (JK)</i>

*Data*

At the forum, participants' interactions during group discussions, group presentations, discussion sessions, and feedback sessions were audio recorded using TASCAM digital recorders and an iPhone. Field notes of approximately 4,500 words were taken over the course of the event and its preparation period. Follow-up interviews were conducted in person during the

event and in online chat after. Following the data collection, the discussion sessions that came immediately after the mid-way presentations were extracted from the recordings to be transcribed and analyzed. Audio recorded data were transcribed based on Jefferson (2004) and then translated into English by me. The majority of the participants' utterances were produced spontaneously and thus were not always in concord with standard grammatical structures; the translation attempted to capture the raw nature of the talks as they were. For longer excerpts that contain more than three lines, line numbers were added and matched between the original texts and the translation as best as possible. The transcription conventions are included in appendix.

During the mid-way presentations, two presenters from each group gave a 20-minute presentation on their group's proposal using presentation slides, taking turns to deliver it in Japanese and Korean, respectively. They scripted the presentation in both languages in advance, so interpreting was not required for the presentation sessions. Each presentation was then followed by a 10-minute discussion session, facilitated by co-chairs and interpreted by a designated interpreter, Ikumi (See Table 2). Participants were encouraged to ask questions and make comments about the presentation in the language of their preference, which were responded by one or both of the presenters in either of the languages, i.e., questions or comments made in Korean were not necessarily answered in Korean and the same for Japanese.

The reason for choosing the discussion sessions as the subject of analysis is threefold: Firstly, as Wulff et al. (2009) have noted, the discussion session contains more interactive and dynamic features of communication between the presenter and the discussants compared to the presentation session. In addition to the communicative features of discussion sessions discussed in Wulff et al. (2009) and Querol-Julián and Fortanet-Gómez (2012), the fact that this forum works in groups adds some interesting features to the sessions. The presenters and discussants speak not just as an individual but also as a representative of their group. As members of different groups, they are expected to exchange critical yet constructive feedback and to improve their proposals in the final presentations.

Secondly, the presence of guests brings a higher degree of formality in the participants' interaction as well as a motivation for them to explicitly orient to the institutional goals of promoting mutual understanding and cooperation. The presentation and discussion sessions are also attended by a number of guests, including a few city government officials from the

international exchange department and some representatives from the sponsoring associations. The fact that they are being watched by outsiders who support and sponsor them frames the particular activity as highly institutional. Thus, construction of cooperative discourse becomes a major goal of the presentation and discussion sessions.

Finally, it is required in the discussion sessions by rule that each turn be interpreted by the designated interpreter before moving on to the next turn. This rule again contributes to the institutionalization of the interaction and enables rich analyses of contextualization cues and footings through the mediation of interpreters, which is the primary focus of this study. Therefore, in the following section, I will present the analysis on the discursive strategies deployed by the participants in the discussion sessions.

### *Analysis*

I take an Interactional Sociolinguistic approach to analyze linguistic and discursive features in local interactional contexts in relation to the “brought-along” knowledge (Giddens, 2013; Gumperz, 1982) and contexts derived from ethnographic observations and interviews. The analytical focus is twofold: What linguistic devices (lexical/grammatical items, discursive patterns, etc.) do the discussants and the presenters deploy to construct cooperative discourse during the discussion sessions? How does the interpreter convey or render these devices used by the participants? The ultimate goal of the analysis is to understand the local interactional practices in which participants of a bilateral student forum negotiate and construct cooperativeness across linguistic differences. Since the role of interpreters is key to the multilingual practices of this forum, I will first focus on the ways in which cooperative discourse is constructed by the presenters and the discussants, and then look at how the interpreter responds to those ways.

## **DEVICES AND STRATEGIES USED BY PRESENTERS AND DISCUSSANTS**

Participants of the current study displayed similar patterns in organizing the structure of their turns as those observed by Wulff et al. (2009) and Querol-Julián and Fortanet-Gómez (2012). In

the following sub-sections, I will discuss findings with regard to patterns or devices consistently found in the direct discourse by the presenters and discussants during the discussion sessions.

### *Mitigating Negative Feedback*

One of the most salient features of the participants' utterances during the discussion sessions was mitigation of negative feedback. The strategies for mitigation took various forms at both verbal and non-verbal levels. Italicized below are the English translations and the bolded part indicates the focus of analysis. All examples are provided by the discussants directly and not by the interpreter.

*Opening positive comments, followed by constructive criticism.* At the most noticeable level, comments or questions involving criticism always accompanied an opening line of positive remarks. The two excerpts below represent the typical structure of discussants' negative comments, which start with an appreciation or recognition of the presenters' efforts. In Excerpt 1, in response to the law group's presentation about promoting women's rights in Japan and Korea through a feminist non-profit organization, the commentator (Moeko) is expressing a concern that if the majority of the organization was female, its opinions would not be taken up by male population.

#### **Excerpt 1**

01 MO: 発表お疲れ様でした。っと、さきほど書籍を出版することで、あの:: 周りに  
 02 集中してもらって、活動を展開するっていう話をしていたと思うんですけど、  
 03 その::、周りに=世間的に広めることはできると思うんですけど、女性が多いまま  
 04 だと、その::、女性進出が今現在うまくいかない状況において、男性のかたは、  
 05 極端に言えば、今の現状で男性は、ちゃんと働けて満足しているので、  
 06 >極端に言ったら<効果は、あまり得られないんじゃないかと思って、...

01 *Great job on your presentation. Um, I think you mentioned earlier that by publishing a*  
 02 *book you would be able to draw **the-** people's attention to help proceed with the activities,*  
 03 *but **um, I agree that it would be possible to draw people's attention, but if the majority***  
 04 *was female, men might, in an extreme case, think that they are content with **the-** current*  
 05 *situation where women's advancement is not going well, because they have a job and they*

06 *can work without any issues, so in an extreme case, it may not be very effective after all...*

As shown in line 1 through 3, Moeko mitigates her negative feedback by starting with an acknowledgement and offering a partial agreement on the content of the presentation. In Excerpt 2, the commentator (Kiwook) also offers mitigation before making a criticism of the content of the medical group's presentation.

### **Excerpt 2**

KW: 그:: 설명 잘 들었는데요, 그, 약간, 의료 중에서도 너무 기술적인 측면이, 좀 중심이 된 것 같은데 ...

*I enjoyed listening to your explanation, but, um, it seems a bit too focused on the technical aspects among others within the medical theme, ...*

In both excerpts, the discussants provide a formulaic token of appreciation or recognition of the presenters' performance, such as "thank you for your presentation", "great job on your presentation", or "I enjoyed listening to your presentation". Shortly after the token is delivered, however, they move on to formulate their criticism. Excerpt 1, in particular, follows the same pattern discussed in Querol-Julián and Fortanet-Gómez (2012). In an attempt to point out the weakness of the laws group's proposal to establish a women's organization dedicated to promoting women's rights and their social advancement, Moeko opens the turn with a positive remark, contextualizes her question by displaying her understanding of the presenter's explanation, and then formulates her comment. In formulating her comment, she does not give the direct criticism until line 6, after a lot of hedging through multiple pauses and extreme case formulations ("in an extreme case").

In contrast, Kiwook, in Excerpt 2, formulates his direct criticism immediately after giving the appreciation token. Both cases illustrate the ritualized practice of opening negative comments with positive remarks, which points to the institutional needs of appreciating each other's work as a part of the efforts to maintain cooperative terms with one another.

***Lexical items, particles, and prosody for hedging.*** A variety of lexical items and particles as well as prosody facilitate mitigation for both discussants' negative comments and the presenters'

defense of their group’s proposal. Adjectives and adverbs such as “약간[yakkan] (a bit), 쪼끔[ccom] (little), 이제[icey](now), 그런[kulen] (such), 그래도[kulayto] (still), 개인적으로는[kayincekulonun] (personally), 그니까[kunikka] (what I mean is), 혹시[hoksi] (by any chance)” in Korean and “ちょっと[chotto] (little), あの[ano] (the), その辺[sono-hen] (around that), ...とか[toka] (‘... and/or’ particle), ...いう風に[iu huuni] (in such a way that ...)” in Japanese are frequently used for hedging throughout the discourse. The repeated use of “あの[ano] (the)” and “その[sno] (that)” in Excerpt 1 exemplifies how these lexical items contribute to constructing Moeko’s comment as a criticism while mitigating its face threatening effects at the same time. In Excerpt 2, Kiwook also inserts “약간[yakkan] (a bit)” before going into the direct criticism, which shows up in most of the other discussants’ negative feedback as well.

Hedging can also be accomplished by prosody, such as rising intonation, frequent pauses, change in tempo, and chunking (Chafe, 1993). Excerpt 3 shows an example of chunking for hedging negative comments. In this Excerpt, Moeko points out two weaknesses of the services group’s proposal for creating tour packages tailored for customers from different age groups: the obscure definition of ‘the elderly’ customers and the potential issues that can arise from the historical background of Japan and Korea.

### Excerpt 3

01 MO: ... 二個目の::その韓国でやる::高齢者については、えっと::歴史的な問題も  
 02 あるかなっていう風に思って::その::(.)新しい世代の交流と書いてあるけど実際に  
 03 その、高齢者のひとたちは(.) >ま、どれぐらいの高齢者を、想定するかちょっと  
 04 分かんないんですけどく、まあ戦争を通じて>韓国と日本は結構交流があった訳で  
 05 く、その辺はどういう風に考えてるのかな::っていう風に思いました。

01 ... *As for the second one – the Korea package tour for the elderly – um, I was thinking*  
 02 *there might be some historical issues as well. So even though it says ‘exchange with the*  
 03 *younger generation’, in reality, well, I’m not sure how old you define the elderly to be,*  
 04 *but, well, through wars, Korea and Japan have had a significant amount of exchange in*  
 05 *the past, so I was wondering what you thought about that sort of issues.*



She chunks two phrases in line 3 to 5, “ま、どれぐらいの高齢者を、想定するかちょっと分かんないんですけど(well, I’m not sure how old you define the elderly to be)” and “韓国と日本は結構交流があった訳で(Korea and Japan have had a significant amount of exchange in the past)” by uttering each of them in a relatively fast pace. The former chunk questions the definition of an expression used by the presenter and the latter raises the issue of historical aspects that were neglected in the presentation. Producing these parts of the utterance in a fast-paced fashion mitigates the situation potentially face-threatening to the discussant.

### ***Outlining the Talk***

Another salient feature in the discourse of the presenter and discussants is that they outline the agenda of their turn at the beginning. Excerpt 4 and 5 show a prototypical structure of the discussant’s question formulation and the presenter’s response to it.

#### **Excerpt 4: “I have two questions”**

JY: 네:: 저는:: 질문이 두 가지가 있는데요, 첫 번째로는 ... 라는 물음이구요 (0.5) 두 번째로는:: ...

*So, I have two questions: firstly, ..., secondly, ...*

#### **Excerpt 5: “To answer the first question first...”**

KW: 어:: 우선 첫 번째 질문에 답을 하자면은:: ... 글고 두 번째:: 질문에:: 대해선데요, ...  
(*Umm, to answer the first question first, ..., and as for the second question, ...*)

By stating the number of questions to be asked, the discussant in Excerpt 4 makes it easier for the audience to follow her turn. Likewise, in Excerpt 5, the presenter follows the structure and outline in his response in the same way as the discussant structured her turn. This discursive strategy was employed in almost every discussant’s and presenter’s utterance, which can be interpreted at two different levels: At the immediate interactional level, it shows the speakers’ orientation to both the ratified and addressed recipients, that is, the audience and the interpreter. By outlining the talk, the speakers not only make their turn more comprehensible to the half of

the audience who understand the language they chose to deliver the turn in, but also ensure that the number of key points in their turn will be maintained in the interpreter's rendition. This shows how presenters and discussants align with the frame of cooperative discourse in the local interactions during the discussion.

At the discursive level, it also testifies the speakers' orientation to the discussion sessions as an institutionalized discourse, in which speakers are to follow tacit rules to carry out the institutional activities and goals. This orientation is also tied with the construction of cooperative discourse in that participants follow a certain set of common rules to facilitate the successful and efficient accomplishment of organizational activities.

### *Speaking as a Team*

The final characteristic to be noted regarding the participants' direct discourse in the discussion sessions is speaking as a team. As mentioned earlier, one of the distinct features of discussion sessions at this forum is that the presenter and the discussants participate in the discussion as a representative of their group, which is comprised of others entirely from either Korea or Japan. This feature tends to have the participants mark their utterances as a joint enterprise rather than a personal opinion or account. The following two sub-sections identify the two most prominent strategies adopted by the participants.

*Distinguishing personal opinion with joint opinion.* In responding to discussants' questions or comments, presenters often refer to their group members and distinguish the responses based solely on their personal opinions from the ones based on the joint discussion that they had with other group members in advance. Excerpt 6 is an instance where the distinction is clearly marked in the beginning of the presenter's response to a comment.

**Excerpt 6:** "This is just my personal opinion but"

KW: 어:: 제 생각:: 제 생각인데 이제 이거는 >좀 더 팀원과 얘기해봐야 되는데요< 지금::  
생각으로는 이제 (.) 여성이 진출한다고:: 남성이 불이익을 받는다는 거는:: >약간 잘못된  
거 같아요<

*Umm, in my opinion, this is my personal opinion and well, [I] would need to talk about it more with my team mates, but, for now, it seems a little wrong to say that men would face disadvantages just because women advanced.*

Kiwook's explicit mentioning of the need to further discuss the issue as a team serves two functions in this context: Firstly, he displays respect to his teammates' opinions and highlights the significance of reaching agreement as a team in advancing the discussion. By doing so, he avoids the risk of appearing to dominate his group's opinions and reminds the audience of his status as a representative of his group. This strategy is also consistent with the organizational objectives of reaching mutual understanding and agreement, contributing to the discursive construction of cooperativeness.

**Expanding on the co-presenter's point.** Another strategy to speak as a team is to build and expand on the point previously made by the co-presenter. Excerpt 7, 8, and 9 make good examples of how the presenters can frame their turn as adding on to what their co-presenters have previously said.

**Excerpt 7:** "Adding on to what he just said, ..."

AY: あと::、つけたし? なんですけど、

*Also, **adding on?** to what he just said, ...*

**Excerpt 8:** "To add some words to the history issue, ..."

KY: 역사적 문제에 대해서 조금 더 추가적인 말씀을 드리자면;

*To add some words to the history issue, ...*

**Excerpt 9:** "We are expecting that ..."

- 01 SH: 어:: 그리고 추가하면은, 만약에 저희가 공동 브랜드를 통해서 이제 뭔가를  
 02 만든다고 한다면; 그 과정에서:: 이제 그 의료:: 각, 양국의 의료종사자들이, 이제  
 03 모여서 얘기를 하게 될 거잖아요; [...] 이게 의료기기::뿐만 아니라 다른 분야,  
 04 뭐, 의료품, 아, 의약품? 까지도 이제:: (.) 발전을 할 수 있다는 기대를,

- 05 저희는 예상하고 있습니다.
- 01 *Um, to add on, let's say, if we create something through a collaborative brand,*
- 02 *during the processes, the- medical professionals in each-, both countries will have to*
- 03 *meet up and have discussions, right? [...]* This will lead to the improvement of not only
- 04 *medical equipment but other fields such as medicine as well,*
- 05 *we are expecting.*

In Excerpt 7, Ayano uses the lexical item “つけたし [tsuketashi] (add on)” to mark the additive feature of her turn. “추가적인 말씀 [chwukacekin malssum](additional words-HON)” in Excerpt 8 is a counterpart of “つけたし [tsuketashi] (add on)” in Korean, indicating Kiyeong’s intention to succeed and build on to the previous speaker’s utterance. In Excerpt 9, in addition to the add-on marker “추가하면은 [chwukahamyenun] (to add on)”, Sohee uses the deferential first-person plural pronoun “저희 [cehuy] (we-DEF)” in line 5 to clearly indicate that the content of her turn is her group’s common opinion and not her personal view.

### DISCURSIVE STRATEGIES OF THE INTERPRETER

The previous section has looked at the linguistic devices and discursive strategies of the presenters and the discussants and how they reflect orientation to the institutional goal of constructing cooperative discourse as a group. In this section, I will discuss how these devices and strategies are rendered in the interpreter’s utterances. As mentioned earlier, the purpose of separating the analysis of the interpreter’s rendition from the original speakers’ utterances is to bring to the fore the ways in which the interpreter responds to the discursive strategies of the original speakers.

Since half of the audience rely to some extent on the interpreter, the language used by the original speakers comprises only a half of the discourse at the forum, the interpreter’s language being the other half. In other words, the original speakers’ utterances are not functionally complete until the interpreter renders it into the other language. Therefore, it is critical to examine how the interpreter maintains, modifies, or diminishes the various discursive strategies

deployed by the original speakers and what the implications are for constructing the cooperative discourse at the institutional level.

### *Mitigating Negative Feedback*

Mitigation of negative feedback was one of the most commonly used strategies by the presenters and the discussants in the discussion sessions. Throughout the data, however, it is shown that the designated interpreter, Ikumi, somehow diminishes the strategy. Although there are a number of devices and strategies Ikumi explicitly tries to retain from the original speaker's utterances, the range of the resources she uses in her utterances is relatively limited. This may seem a given considering that Ikumi is not a trained professional interpreter and is a university student from Japan majoring in communication in Korea. In addition, the discussion session has a time limit of 10 minutes, which makes the participants aware of time-keeping. The non-professional nature of her interpreting, however, makes the analysis of her discursive strategies more meaningful in that they are more likely to have been formed by her orientation to the organizational contexts and objectives and not so much from professional training on linguistic aspects of interpreting.

Although some of the linguistic devices for mitigating negative feedback, such as prosody, are obscured in the interpreter's rendition, she seems to employ her own strategies to enable a more concise and efficient delivery of the original utterances. Excerpt 10 illustrates how the interpreter conveys the original speaker's contextualization cues despite some of them being lost in the rendition. The discussant (Juyong) offers his criticism for the law group's proposal in two main points. In line 2 to 4, Juyong lists three question-type phrases: (a) “기존 여성 단체에 의한 연합을 제시하면 되지 않을까 (Wouldn't it be better to propose an association by already-existing women's organizations)”, (b) “굳이 신생 단체를 만들어 법률을 제정하는 것을 요구할 것인가 (Do you **really** have to create a new organization to call for legislation)”, and (c) “신생 단체의 말을 과연 국회가 경청해줄 것인가 (Is the National Assembly going to listen to what a start-up organization says)” to mitigate and gradually build up his criticism towards the laws group's proposal. In line 10 to 11, the interpreter, Ikumi, takes this gradual formulation of Juyong's criticism and renders it in a single question:

“すでに既存の女性団体があると思う んですけれどもなぜわざわざ新しく団体を作る必

要があるのか(I'm sure there already are some existing women's organizations but why would there be a need to **decisively** create a new organization)”.

### Excerpt 10

- 01 JY: 네:: 저는:: 질문이 두 가지가 있는데요, 첫 번째로는 (.) 아까도 말씀해(주셨듯이)  
 02 (몇, 몇) 단체가 나왔는데:: 기존 여성 단체에 의한 연합을 제시하면 **되지 않을까**  
 03 (0.3) 또:: >굳이 이제::< 신생 단체를 만들어? 이제 국회::나:: °인제° 법률::을  
 제정하는 것을 요구를 **할 것인가** (.)  
 04 신생 단체의 말을 과연? 그쪽이 경청해줄 **것인가** 라는 (물음)이구요  
 05 (0.5) 두 번째로는:: (지금) 기업법 이상으로 기업이 강제성을 띠는 것이 가능한가.  
 06 예를 들어? 기업에서:: 이제:: 이제:: 아까도 부당:: 인사 명령이 있었는데,  
 07 이 사람은 쉬다 와서=업무에 적응이 힘들니:: 다른 잡무 부서로 옮기는 것을  
 08 (.) 이제 법률로써:: 이걸 강제해서 막을 수가 있는가. (라는) 것이 궁금합니다.  
 01 JY: So, **I have two questions, firstly, as you mentioned earlier,**  
 02 *there was this organization [in your proposal] but **wouldn't it be better to propose an***  
*association by already-existing women's organizations*  
 03 (0.3) [**do you really have to**] create a new organization? to call for the National Assembly  
 or- new legislation (.)  
 04 *would they listen to what a start-up organization says at all? these are my questions*  
 05 (0.5) **Secondly**, would it be possible for the enterprise laws to be more coercive than they  
 currently are.  
 06 *For example, like, like, there was a mentioning about the unfair personnel order,*  
 07 *like “this person should be moved to a different miscellaneous duty since she had a break*  
*and would have hard time adapting to tasks”,*  
 08 *but would it be possible to coercively stop this by laws, I wonder.*  
 09 IK: えっと::質問が::二つあります。一つ目は::団体についてなんですけれども  
 10 すでに::既存、既存の::女性団体が>あると思うんですけれども、  
 11 <なぜわざわざ::°その::°新しく団体を、作る必要があるのか、という事と、  
 12 二つめは、企業::>についてなんですけれども<(2.0)

- 13 企業::の、(1.7)強制的な(1.0)企業に対して、強制的な法律::で(1.0)  
 14 その::育児休暇を取って来て、戻って来た方に対して、°その、まあ°  
 15 休んで来たから::ちょっと、違う::職種にしてあげた方が、  
 16 ちょっと適応::するのが(.)簡単に>なるんじゃないかっていう意見が  
 17 もし出て来た時に<どうやって::その法律として::強制的に  
 18 それを>防ぐことができるのか<(1.2)が、知りたいです。
- 09 **IK: Um, [I have] two questions. The first one is about the organization, mm,**  
 10 *there are already, already, um, some existing women's organizations,*  
 11 *so why would there be a need to expressly create a new organization,*  
 12 **and the second one is, about corporations, (0.2)**  
 13 *corporations', (1.7) coercive, (1.0) coercive laws against corporations, (1.0)*  
 14 *like, for those who returned after taking maternity leaves,*  
 15 *if some people suggested like "well, since this person had a break, it would be easier*  
 16 *for her to adapt to if we gave this person a different duty",*  
 17 *how would it be possible to coercively*  
 18 *prevent this by laws, I would like to know.*

This rendition deserves particular attention in terms of the ways in which it transforms the original utterance into a more concise one while also maintaining the mitigation strategies. First of all, the interpreter's rendition only took the first two out of three parts of the question raised by the discussant: (a) raising the possibility that the proposed project could be better served by an existing organization rather than by the new proposed organization and (b) questioning the validity of the idea to establish a new organization. She omits the third part, in which the discussant more directly problematized the feasibility of the proposal by mentioning the National Assembly. Although the shorter length of the rendition can leave an impression that it would be less mitigating than the original utterance, what the interpreter actually does is to decompose the discussant's utterance and reassemble it to mitigate the direct criticism in it.

Secondly, the interpreter's use of the lexical item “わざわざ[wazawaza] (decisively)” stands out because it mirrors the word “굳이[kwuci] (decisively)” from the original utterance which has

the same meaning in Korean. Maintaining the word that the original speaker used to contextualize his question as a cautious one and thus to soften the criticism indicates that the interpreter is orienting to maintain the mitigation strategies. Throughout the data, there were many instances where she directly translates the lexical items used to mitigate the criticism, such as extreme case formulations (see Excerpt 2: “in an extreme case”). Considering that she often reorganizes the syntactic structure the primary interlocutors’ utterances and paraphrases them in her rendition, the preservation of these lexical items evidences her conscious efforts to convey important contextualization cues. Moreover, it shows how the interpreter aligns with the original speakers in the needs for mitigating negative feedback.

### *Outlining the Talk*

Another salient feature was that the outlining strategy used by the original speakers was always reenacted by the interpreter. Excerpt 10 above demonstrates how the interpreter not only maintains the outlining structure but also adds on to it by providing a key word for each point. In line 9 and 12, the outlining of talk exactly matches that of the original speaker. Not only does the interpreter clearly mark the distinction of the first and second question, she also provides the keyword of each question after the markers.

By so doing, she displays orientation to her role not only as an ‘animator’ but also as a second ‘author’, who bears a responsibility to clearly convey the message to the audience. Although the original speaker’s utterance is also recipient-designed in that he included the outline at the beginning of the turn, it was not as polished as the interpreter’s rendition since he had to improvise the question. The interpreter, on the other hand, had a chance to listen to his utterance as a ‘recapitulator’ and thus was able to give a clearer, more concise rendition of the original utterance. This transformation of the outlining talk points to the primary interlocutors and the interpreter’s orientation towards the joint enterprise of constructing the discussion session as a cooperative discourse.

Excerpt 11, which came shortly after Excerpt 10, shows how the joint enterprise previously constructed by the discussant and the interpreter is further taken up by the next speaker, the presenter, who responds to the question after it has been interpreted.



**Excerpt 11**

- 19 KW: 어:: 우선 첫 번째 질문에 답을 하자면은:: ...  
 20 한국 일본 단일, >그니까< 이런:: 두가지 나라(을)? 대상으로만 해서  
 21 여성의 사회 진출이라는? 좀더 구체적이고? 명확한? (.) 집중력이 높은, 그::  
 22 정책, 방향성을 잡고:: 그걸로 추진할 생각이라:: ...  
 23 (그리고) 두 번째:: 질문에:: 대해선데요, (0.7) ...  
 24 강제적으로 그렇게 하는:: 것보다는 이제 감시, 관, 관리?  
 25 그런 차원을 위한 법률을 (.) 좀 더:: 강구하고자 생각하고 있습니다.
- 19 KW: *Umm, to answer the first question first, ...*  
 20 *we are going to be focusing exclusively on Korea and Japan, ...*  
 21 *to work on a more specific, clear, and highly focused policy goal, namely, women's social advancement, ...*  
 22 *And as for the second question, (0.7) ...*  
 23 *we are trying to think of such laws in the sense of a monitoring, or management purpose,*  
 24 *rather than as coercion on corporations.*

In formulating his response, the presenter too follows the order of the first and second question and clearly marks the distinction between the two. This practice supports the display of a cooperative attitude towards the previous speakers and thus reinforces the metadiscourse of outlining the talk. The metadiscourse not only makes it easier for the audience to follow the talk but also contributes to the macro-level discourse of constructing coherence and cooperativeness as a group. The fact that each turn is relatively long and thus can be hard for the audience to follow is complemented by the joint efforts of the commentators, presenters, and the interpreter.

***Use of Reported Speech***

Finally, the interpreter uses an idiosyncratic strategy, 'reported speech', to shift footing in the interaction. Excerpt 12 represents how the interpreter uses reported speech to align with the audience, backgrounding her identity as an interpreter or as a Japanese and foregrounding her shared position as a listener of the presentation. One of the presenters, Ninako, explains how Japan has become the number one destination for Korean travelers (line 3), due to the recent

deterioration of the bilateral relationship between Korea and Japan. In the utterance, Ninako uses declaratives to explain the phenomenon, thereby displaying her epistemic status as a presenter who has done a good amount of research in the relevant issues.

### Excerpt 12

01 NI: [...] っと二つ目の、日本、におけるパッケージなんですけど、  
 02 えっと、今(.)日本は去年(.) 韓国人が訪れる海外旅行先が去年の結果としては、  
 03 今までは中国が一位だったんですけど、去年は日本が一位になっていて、  
 04 それは、その::(.)韓国と中国の関係が、あんまり良くなくなってしまって、  
 05 そこで、えっと::日本の政府がビザとかをあんまり厳しくしなくなったりとか、  
 06 他の政策も有って、韓国、中国に流れていた観光客が日本に訪れている  
 07 っていう結果が出ていてまた、 [...]

01 NI: [...] *as for the second package [tour] in Japan,*  
 02 *um, currently, Japan was the country—as of last year—that the most number of Korean*  
 03 *people visited for overseas trips—China had been the number one until last year, but*  
 04 *last year Japan became the one—and that is because the relationship between Korea and*  
 05 *China has not been very well and,*  
 06 *in addition, the Japanese government has made the visa thing less strict*  
 07 *plus some other policies, and the tourists that were headed to China*  
 08 *are now visiting Japan, as a result. Also, [...]*

08 IK: [...] 그리고 두 번째 질문에 대한 답변으로서는; (1.5)  
 09 어:: 작년엔 한국, 인이:: 방문한:: 여행지:: 1 위가 일본::이었대요.  
 10 (글고) 그 이유로서는? 한중관계가 좀 악화::돼서,  
 11 >예전에는 중국을 방문했던 관광객들이?< 일본::으로 방문을 하게, 되었기 때문에  
 12 일본::이 1 위가 되었대요;  
 13 그래서, 그 부분에 있어(서)도, 효과가 있다고, 봤고? [...]

08 IK: *And as a response to the second question,*  
 09 *um, last year the number one travel destination Korean people visited was Japan,*  
 10 *[according to her].*

- 10 *And for the reason, it's because the relationship between Korea and China has*  
*deteriorated,*  
 11 *and those tourists who used to visit China are visiting Japan instead,*  
 12 *that's why Japan has become the number one, [according to her].)*  
 13 *Therefore [we thought] that it would be effective in that sense as well, ...*

In line 9 to 11, which corresponds to line 2 to 7, the interpreter, Ikumi, uses reported speech to summarize the original speaker's utterance: “작년에 한국인이 방문한 여행지 1 위가 일본이었대요(Last year, the number one travel destination Korean people visited was Japan)”. “-대요[tayyo]” is a sentence ending particle used to retell what a third person has said. Compared to its polite and formal counterpart “-다고 합니다[tako hamnita]”, “-대요[tayyo]” indicates a degree of intimacy, while still being a polite form. Since Ninako used declaratives in the original utterance, an unmarked choice for Ikumi would have been to use a first-person declarative in her rendition. Even if she had used first person, her epistemic stance would be left neutral because she is not the principal of the utterance.

By adopting a third-person rendition using the sentence-final particle ‘tayyo’, however, Ikumi explicitly shifts her footing within the interaction: she aligns her epistemic stance towards what she is interpreting with the audience who did not have prior knowledge about the news reported by the presenter. Her choice of ‘tayyo’ instead of ‘tako hamnita’ also indexes Ikumi’s affective stance closely aligning with the audience. As a designated interpreter and senior member of the organization, Ikumi is positioning herself not just as a reporter or animator but also as a responder who skillfully mediates between the original speaker and the audience.

Her use of the ‘tayyo’ form stands out even more since she does not use it very often throughout the sessions. Thus, it serves as a contextualization cue to inform the audience that the interpreter is part of the listening audience and the information provided is news even to someone who is from Japan like herself, which in turn contributes to drawing the audience’s attention on what is being delivered in the discussion session. This strategy used by the interpreter again gives support to the claim that interpreting does more than a mere translation of the texts: the interpreter recontextualizes and co-constructs the discourse with the primary interlocutors.

The interpreter's strategy of using reported speech to align her epistemic stance with the audience is also related to the construction of cooperative discourse. By marking certain parts of the discourse as deserving further attention, the interpreter negotiates the unfolding dynamics of the interaction, foregrounding her status as an active participant and not as a passive translator of the texts. Her active participation implies that she is orienting not only to her designated role as an interpreter but also to her authority as a senior member to influence the discursive practices of the forum and its overarching objective. In addition to mediating participants' talk, the interpreter projects her identity as a primary interlocutor through shifting her footing. In other words, the role of the interpreter at this forum involves not only the two functions discussed by Wadensjö (2014), relaying and coordinating, but displaying her own view towards the content of the talk as well. This expanded role of the interpreter strengthens the cooperative discourse as a joint enterprise which all of the participants are expected to take part in, including the interpreter, who is also a member of the exchange.

## CONCLUSION

This study has illustrated how the interpreter-mediated interaction in discussion sessions at a bilateral student forum discursively constructs cooperativeness in multilingual setting. The direct discourse from the presenters and discussants demonstrated features and strategies to mitigate negative feedback, improve the delivery of the turns, and speak as a team. The mitigation was performed by opening with positive remarks and using certain lexical items or prosody. Moreover, the participants typically used metadiscourse to provide an outline of their turn to be followed. Finally, they presented their comments as being representative of their entire group by distinguishing personal and group opinions or adding comments to the previous turn delivered by their own group members. These strategies contribute to the construction of cooperative discourse in that the participants display joint orientation to the institutional objective by delivering their talk in deliberately designed ways.

The study has also examined how the designated interpreter then conveys and renders these strategies deployed by the primary speakers and if she uses any idiosyncratic strategies to perform the interpreting activity. The mitigation and outlining strategies have been observed to

be largely maintained through interpreting. In addition, the interpreter occasionally used reported speech to shift footing and to show alignment with the audience in the interaction. These findings indicate that the interpreter has two significant roles in establishing the cooperative discourse. Firstly, the interpreter facilitates the discussion by providing a more concise and polished version of the original speaker's turn while also maintaining significant contextualization cues and critical components of the mitigation and outlining strategies. Secondly, the interpreter shifts footing to adjust her alignment with the speaker, the audience, and what she is interpreting with orientation to the organizational goal. In particular, she aligns with the audience in her epistemic and affective stance towards what has been informed by the presenter, marking it as something worth receiving attention. These practices suggest that the interpreter plays a dynamic role in the discussion session interaction, despite the session appearing as rather monologic and linear in its organization.

By investigating the understudied area of cross-cultural forum from a discourse analytic perspective, this study has demonstrated how discourse analysis can benefit the understanding of intercultural communication in institutionalized settings. By negotiating meanings and identities in the unfolding dynamics of interaction, the participants display orientation to the institutional goal of constructing cooperative discourse. The various ways in which the participants discursively construct the cooperative discourse suggest how people from different linguistic and cultural backgrounds can collaboratively work towards establishing the organizational identity. Moreover, the dynamic role of interpreters in intercultural interaction that this study has revealed calls for more attention from the field of applied linguistics on how interpreting affects the workings of participation framework, frames, and contextualization cues.

As globalization advances and various types of forums emerge across borders, more studies on multilingual, multilateral meeting interactions could further our understanding of intercultural communication. Findings from these studies will elucidate the linguistic resources used to perform institutional activities in intercultural environments and thus can inform pedagogical practices to prepare learners for such enterprises. For future research, it would be fruitful to compare L1 discourse of youth forums in Korea and Japan with the multilingual discourse presented in this study and examine how the communicative styles of Korean and Japanese L1 interactions found in the literature are projected or negotiated in intercultural settings.

**ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

This research was supported in part by the Ruth Crymes Memorial Grant, GSO Grant and Award at the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, and the East-West Center Summer Grant.

## REFERENCES

- Anderson, L. (2012). Code-switching and coordination in interpreter-mediated interaction. In C. Baraldi & L. Gavioli (Eds.), *Coordinating participation in dialogue interpreting* (pp. 115-148). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Baker, M. (2006). Contextualization in translator- and interpreter-mediated events. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 38(3), 321-337. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2005.04.010>
- Bucholtz, M., & Hall, K. (2005). Identity and interaction: A sociocultural linguistic approach. *Discourse Studies*, 7(4-5), 585–614. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445605054407>
- Chafe, W. L. (1993). Prosodic and functional units of language. In J. A. Edwards & M. D. Lampert (Eds.), *Talking data: Transcription and coding in discourse research* (pp. 33-44). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Giddens, A. (2013). *New rules of sociological method: A positive critique of interpretative sociologies*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Goffman, E. (1981). *Forms of talk*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.
- Greer, T., Ishida, M., & Tateyama, Y. (Eds). (2017). *Interactional competence in Japanese as an additional language. Pragmatics & interaction. Volume 4*. Honolulu, HI: National Foreign Language Resource Center.
- Guex, S. (2015). The history textbook controversy in Japan and South Korea. *Cipango-French Journal of Japanese Studies. English Selection*, (4). Available online at: <https://journals.openedition.org/cjs/968>
- Gumperz, J. J. (1982). *Discourse strategies* (Vol. 1). Cambridge: Cambridge University.
- Korean National Diplomatic Academy. (June 2018). “새로운 한일관계를 위한 민간교류” (Civil exchanges for a new Korea-Japan relationship”). *Jeju Forum for Peace and Prosperity 2018*. Retrieved from [http://www.jejuforum.or.kr/board/download.php?&bo\\_table=program&idx=619&file=2](http://www.jejuforum.or.kr/board/download.php?&bo_table=program&idx=619&file=2)
- Marks, A. R. (2012). Participation framework and footing shifts in an interpreted academic meeting. *Journal of Interpretation*, 22(1), Article 4.
- Querol-Julián, M., & Fortanet-Gómez, I. (2012). Multimodal evaluation in academic discussion sessions: How do presenters act and react? *English for Specific Purposes*, 31, 271-283.

Sohn, H. (1999). *The Korean language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.

Vigouroux, C. B. (2010). Double-mouthed discourse: Interpreting, framing, and participant roles. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 14(3), 341-369.

Wadensjo, C. (2014). *Interpreting as interaction*. London: Routledge.

Wulff, S., Swales, J. M., & Keller, K. (2009). "We have about seven minutes for questions": The discussion sessions from a specialized conference. *English for Specific Purposes*, 28, 79-92.



**APPENDIX****Transcription conventions**

(.) denotes a micro pause, a notable pause but of no significant length.

(0.2) denotes a timed pause. This is a pause long enough to time and subsequently show in transcription.

> < represents the pace of the speech has quickened

< > represents the pace of the speech has slowed down

( ) denotes that the words spoken here were too unclear to transcribe

(( )) denotes some contextual information where no symbol of representation was available.

Underlined denotes a raise in volume or emphasis

? a significant rise in intonation

¿ a subtle rise in intonation

, denotes a temporary rise or fall in intonation

**Bold** denotes a part of particular interest to the analyst

= represents latched speech, a continuation of talk

:: denotes elongated speech, a stretched sound

[...] denotes an omitted part

[translation] denotes an added grammatical element in translation that is not present in the original utterance